Title: Measuring language lateralisation with different language tasks: A systematic review

Abigail R. Bradshaw¹

Paul A. Thompson¹

Alexander C. Wilson¹

Dorothy V. M. Bishop¹

Zoe V. J. Woodhead¹

¹Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford

Corresponding author: Abigail Bradshaw, Department of Experimental Psychology, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3UD, 01865 271386
abigail.bradshaw@psy.ox.ac.uk

Abstract: Language lateralisation refers to the phenomenon in which one hemisphere (typically the left) shows greater involvement in language functions than the other. Measurement of laterality is of interest to both researchers investigating the neural organisation of the language system and to clinicians needing to establish an individual's hemispheric dominance for language prior to surgery, as in patients with intractable epilepsy. Recently, there has been increasing awareness of the possibility that different language processes may develop hemispheric lateralisation independently, and to varying degrees. However, it is not always clear whether differences in laterality across language tasks with fMRI are reflective of meaningful variation in hemispheric lateralisation, or simply of trivial methodological differences between paradigms. This systematic review aims to assess different language tasks in terms of the strength, reliability and robustness of the laterality measurements they yield with fMRI, to look at variability that is both dependent and independent of aspects of study design, such as the baseline task, region of interest, and modality of the stimuli. A key finding is that subtraction of lower-level speech motor and acoustic perception processes can increase the laterality seen for expressive and receptive language paradigms, consistent with models which predict a hierarchical increase in laterality with increasing complexity of linguistic processing.

Keywords: *hemispheric specialisation, language processes, neuroimaging*

It is well established that for most individuals, the left hemisphere is dominant in mediating language functions, as proposed in the 19th century by Paul Broca. Our understanding of such hemispheric specialisation for language in the centuries since still leaves many unanswered questions. Because both expressive and receptive aphasia are so reliably associated with left-hemisphere injury, there tends to be an assumption that left-sided lateralisation is a general feature of language processing, consistent across language domains. Nevertheless, there is evidence that lateralisation may differ within individuals for different language functions, as well as between individuals in side and extent.

Early suggestions of within-individual variability can be found in Rasmussen and Milner's (1975) reports of Wada testing in patients undergoing surgery to treat epilepsy. They reported on several patients with bilateral speech representation, manifest as a dissociation between the hemispheric organisation of different language functions. Specifically, while anaesthetic injection to one hemisphere selectively disrupted naming and not verbal serial order tasks (e.g. reciting the days of the week), an injection to the other hemisphere produced the reverse pattern. This was construed as evidence that in some cases a 'division of labour' can exist between the hemispheres, in which different 'speech centres' can lateralise to different hemispheres independently. Although such evidence was from the study of a special population, it was argued that such a phenomenon should not necessarily be considered as a result of the type of brain damage and reorganisation that occurs in epilepsy. This raises the possibility that cerebral lateralisation may be a multifactorial rather than a unitary process, with different language processes developing hemispheric lateralisation independently, and to varying degrees (Bishop, 2013).

Indeed, several contemporary models of language predict different patterns of lateralisation for different language processes (Hickok & Poeppel, 2007; Peele, 2012; Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014). These predictions are summarised in Table 1. Different

models make different distinctions between language processes and use different terminology, but some general patterns emerge. Acoustic processing of speech input and speech articulation are generally considered to be bilateral, whereas comprehension and generation of more meaningful language is considered to be lateralised. There are some points of disagreement between theories however, either in terms of the extent of lateralisation for a particular language process or the theoretical reasons proposed for such patterns of lateralisation.

Table 1: Model-based predictions of language lateralisation

Theoretical principle/ Model	Speech acoustic processing	Speech comprehension	Speech articulation	Semantics	Syntax
Dual stream model of speech processing (Hickok & Poeppel., 2007)	B	B	L	B	-
Hierarchical asymmetry of linguistic complexity (Peelle., 2012)	B	L	-	L	L
Bilateral sensorimotor inputs/outputs and left lateralised central language processes (Price., 2012)	B	L	B	L	L
COM-PRE hypothesis (Poeppel., 2014)	B	L	B	L	L

B = Bilateral, L = Lateralised

Contemporary non-invasive techniques allow more extensive research on patterns of laterality than earlier clinical studies. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data can be used to calculate a laterality index (LI), a single value description of the predominance of activity in one hemisphere. This calculates laterality as the difference between activity in each hemisphere (L and R) divided by the total activity across the hemispheres.

$$LI = \frac{L - R}{L + R}$$

Multiple language tasks have been used with fMRI. At first glance, the literature appears to support the notion that language laterality is not unitary, because we can see differences between tasks in the strength of the laterality measurements they yield. However, the reasons for such variability in LI strength across language tasks can be debated; could it simply be an artefact of more trivial differences in task design, or does it reveal something fundamental about the hemispheric organisation of different components of language? Answering such questions requires optimisation of protocols for LI measurement, to ensure that variability in LIs measured for different language functions cannot be attributed to differences in task sensitivity or measurement error.

This systematic review aims to establish which tasks provide the most robust measures of laterality using fMRI for different core components of language processing. Identifying such tasks will enable future research to systematically probe patterns of co-lateralisation and independent lateralisation of different language functions, in both typical and disordered populations.

Materials and Methods

A protocol for this systematic review has been registered on Open Science Framework and can be found at <https://osf.io/hyvc4/>. A companion paper to this review covering

different methods of LI calculation can be found as a pre-print at www.peerj.com/preprints/2962. Information on the eligibility criteria and search-strategy used to identify papers for this systematic review can be found in this companion paper. A list of the selected papers is given in Appendix 1, and a summary table of their characteristics in Appendix 2.

Data collection and analysis

The variable nature of the methods and measures reported by different papers did not permit performance of a meta-analysis. Instead, to illustrate the strength of laterality measured across different language tasks, we produced forest plots showing the mean and 95% confidence intervals of LI values reported in the studies, as well as their associated methods of LI calculation, region(s) of interest, and language and baseline tasks (Figures 1a, 1b and 1c). These outcome measures were not always available in every paper however; LI values and/or their spread were sometimes omitted altogether or given in a different form e.g. median values. Where standard deviation or standard error were given, these were converted to 95% confidence intervals. A summary table of these measures is given in Appendix 3.

To avoid the potential confound of heterogeneity in samples in terms of handedness, we included mean LIs reported either from only right handed participants, or from mixed handedness samples where the relative proportion of left and right handers was representative of the general population (around 10% left handed, 90% right handed). We excluded LIs reported from studies which selected a participant group on the basis of their pre-known lateralisation. Where more than one frontal LI was reported from a study, IFG LIs were selected; where more than one temporoparietal LI was reported, that LI calculated from the largest area of temporoparietal cortex was selected. Forest plots were

created using a script in R, which is available along with the data on open science framework (<https://osf.io/t24rv/>).

Results

The main language tasks identified in our search are listed in Table 2, with counts of the number of studies using each task (one study is missing from these counts as their language task did not fit in to any of these categories). Mean LIs reported from studies using these different language tasks are given in Figures 1a, 1b and 1c. A single language task typically engages multiple language processes in an overlapping fashion. This may either be because of task requirements, or reflect spontaneous engagement of task irrelevant processing by the perception of linguistic stimuli. Table 2 provides one characterisation of the different language processes engaged by each of the tasks included in this review.

Table 3: Processes engages by different baseline tasks.

Task	N studies	Speech motor planning	Speech articulation	Phono-logical access	Ortho-graphical processing	Semantics	Word retrieval	Syntax
Verbal fluency	53	✓	(✓)	✓		✓	✓	
Sentence generation	5	✓	(✓)	✓		✓	✓	✓
Passive speech listening	7			✓		✓		✓
Text reading	2	(✓)	(✓)	✓	✓	✓		✓
Phonemic judgement	8			✓	(✓)	(✓)		
Semantic decision	20			(✓)	(✓)	✓	✓	
Sentence comprehension	8			✓	(✓)	✓		✓
Naming	9	✓	(✓)	✓		✓	✓	

✓ = engaged

(✓) = sometimes engaged (e.g. depending on task demands, modality of stimuli, occurrence of automatic linguistic processing)

In addition, we categorised baseline tasks in the same manner (see Table 3). This is crucial because when activation for a language task is subtracted from a baseline, the aim is to isolate specific linguistic functions, and the extent to which this is successful will depend on the demands of the baseline task.

Table 3: Processes engages by different baseline tasks.

Task	N studies	Speech motor planning/ articulation	Phono-logical access	Ortho-graphical processing	Semantics	Word retrieval	Working memory	Non-speech motor process	Non-speech acoustic processing
Rest	37				(✓)				
Perceptual decision (non-linguistic)	25						✓		
Finger tapping	3							✓	
Non-word/word repetition	8	✓	✓						
Recite months of the year/count sequence	2	✓	✓		✓	✓			
Tone listening	3								✓
Backward speech listening	2								✓
Nonsense text reading	2	✓	✓	✓					
Spatial position naming	1	✓	✓		✓	✓			

✓ = engaged

(✓) = sometimes engaged (e.g. depending on task demands, modality of stimuli, occurrence of automatic linguistic processing)

A

Figure 1a: Forest plot of mean LI values for different language tasks reported from studies meeting our criteria, divided into panels a, b and c. Each panel is divided up according to region of interest used for LI calculation (frontal, temporoparietal, combined frontal and temporoparietal and global). Error bars represent 95% confidence limits. Colour of symbol indicates type of baseline task used (active or passive), and shape of symbol indicates method of LI calculation (see key). *Papers did not report a measure of spread for LI values, so confidence interval is not shown. **LI values reported by this paper are given at different thresholds: $z = 5.3$ (Top), $z = 2.3$ (Bottom). This Figure along with Figures 1b and 1c are published on Figshare and can be found at:

https://figshare.com/articles/Forrest_Plots_of_LI_values_for_different_language_tasks/4977950

B

Figure 1b: Forest plot of mean LI values for different language tasks reported from studies meeting our criteria. See Figure 1a legend for description. *Papers did not report a measure of spread for LI values, so confidence interval is not shown. **LI values reported by this paper are given at different thresholds: $t = 5$ (Top), $t = 4$ (Middle) and $t = 3$ (Bottom).

C

Figure 1c: Forest plot of mean LI values for different language tasks reported from studies meeting our criteria. See Figure 1a legend for description. *Papers did not report a measure of spread for LI values, so confidence interval is not shown.

The following review will discuss each language task in turn, with reference to the involvement of different language processes and the forest plots of mean LI values (Figures 1a-1c). Tables 2 and 3 highlight the difficulty in designing a task which isolates a single language function in order to study its laterality; this must be kept in mind when interpreting LI values and theorising on the lateralisation of particular language processes.

Verbal fluency

Verbal fluency tasks have traditionally been viewed as the gold standard for measuring language lateralisation with fMRI. Here, the participant must generate (covertly or overtly) words that meet certain criteria, such as beginning with a particular letter (phonemic fluency), belonging to a particular semantic category (semantic fluency), verbs that are semantically associated with a particular noun (verb generation), or words that are antonyms/synonyms (antonym/synonym generation). Any lateralisation induced by this task may thus reflect a mixture of phonological, semantic, word retrieval and speech motor planning/articulation processes (see Table 2). Lateralisation of speech motor processes is a subject of debate (see Table 1), with some considering them left lateralised (Hickok and Poeppel, 2007), but others bilateral (Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

LI strength, reproducibility and robustness

Across the papers reviewed here, verbal fluency tasks are consistently reported as yielding the strongest laterality when compared to other receptive and expressive tasks (Vikingstad, George, Johnson & Cao, 2000; Ramsey, Sommer, Rutten & Kahn, 2001; Deblaere et al., 2002; Baciú, Juphard, Cousin & Le Bas, 2005; Harrington, Buonocore & Farias, 2006; Dodoo-Schittko, Rosengarth, Doenitz & Greenlee, 2012; Jensen-Kondering, Ghobadi, Wolff, Jansen & Ulmer, 2012; Niskanen et al., 2012; Van der Haegen, Cai & Brysbaert, 2012; Ocklenburg, Hugdahl & Westerhausen, 2013; Zaca, Jarso & Pillai, 2013). Mean LIs reported from different verbal fluency tasks are displayed in Figure 1a.

A number of studies have compared the use of different verbal fluency paradigms. When a frontal ROI is used, semantic fluency is reported as less strongly lateralising than verb generation or phonemic fluency (Kleinhans, Mueller, Cohen & Courchesne, 2008; Ruff et al., 2008; Sanjuan et al., 2010). Conversely, two studies using combined frontal and temporoparietal ROIs reported no differences in their strength of laterality (Rutten,

Ramsey, van Rijen & van Veelen, 2001; Tailby, Weintrob, Saling, Fitzgerald & Jackson, 2014). This suggests that these tasks may differ in the extent of lateralisation they induce across different language areas (see following section, effect of region of interest).

Interestingly, multiple studies report finding that LIs from generation tasks can vary substantially depending on methodological choices made when calculating laterality, such as the threshold chosen (Dodoo-Schittko et al., 2012), the use of normalisation, smoothing and clustering techniques (Baciu et al., 2005), and the activity measure used (Harrington et al., 2006).

Effect of region of interest

Verbal fluency tasks tend to induce the strongest laterality in frontal ROIs (Vikingstad et al., 2000; Gaillard et al., 2003; Vingerhoets et al., 2003; Vernooji et al., 2007; Szaflarski et al., 2008; Propper et al., 2010; Niskanen et al., 2012; Partovi et al., 2012a; Partovi et al., 2012b; Ocklenburg et al., 2013; Zaca et al., 2013). Although they can induce strong laterality in temporoparietal ROIs (Stippich et al., 2003; Harrington et al., 2006; Jensen-Kondering et al., 2007), this may not be significantly greater than other tasks within this ROI (Zaca et al., 2013). However, this may depend on the particular fluency task used; Jensen-Kondering et al. (2012) reported that while phonemic fluency and verb generation yielded the strongest lateralisation for a frontal ROI, the strongest laterality for a temporoparietal ROI was seen with semantic fluency, consistent with a role for such areas in semantic cognition.

Effect of baseline task

Whilst the majority of studies using verbal fluency tasks tend to employ a passive baseline task such as fixation, a number have used active baselines such as finger tapping or silent word repetition (see Figure 1a and Table 3). Dodoo-Schittko et al. (2012) reported that an active baseline task which required subvocal manipulation of the order of syllables within a

pseudoword yielded significantly stronger laterality for a verb generation task compared to the use of a passive resting baseline. This is consistent with the idea of subtraction of bilateral speech motor planning related activity (Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

Sentence generation

Sentence generation requires participants to generate sentences to describe presented pictures. These sentences may either be pre-defined and learnt prior to scanning, or generated during the scan itself. Sentence as opposed to word generation involves additional syntactic and semantic-integration processes relating to the construction of a sentence (see Table 2). These are argued to be left lateralised by multiple models (Peele, 2012; Poeppel, 2014). Poeppel's (2014) COM-PRE hypothesis makes a distinction between bilateral processing within input and output interfaces (e.g. auditory perception and speech production), and left dominant processing of combinatorics and composition (COM) or linguistically-based predictions (PRE). Similarly, Peele (2012) predicts that while unconnected language (e.g. single words) is processed bilaterally, processing of connected language that requires more complex linguistic operations is left lateralised. Thus, these models might predict stronger laterality for sentence generation over word generation paradigms, due to the additional sentential processing demands.

LI strength, reliability and robustness

Mean LIs reported from sentence generation studies are illustrated in Figure 1b. High mean LIs of between 0.74 and 0.89 have been reported for sentence generation, both when sentences are pre-learnt prior to scanning (e.g. Stippich et al., 2003), and when they are actively generated during the scan (e.g. Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2016). However, other studies have reported more modest laterality estimates of between 0.48 and 0.65, again with both variants of the task (Partovi et al., 2012a; Partovi et al., 2012b; Mazoyer et al., 2014). Thus, it does not appear to be the case that strength of laterality differs according to

whether sentences are generated spontaneously during the scanning session, or learnt prior to scanning. Partovi et al. (2012a) report good reproducibility for sentence generation, however their analysis simply looked at significant differences in group means over repeated testing, and not at reproducibility of individual participant's LIs.

Effect of ROI

There is mixed evidence as to whether sentence generation yields differences in the laterality measured from frontal versus temporoparietal ROIs. While Partovi et al. (2012a; 2012b) and Stippich et al. (2003) reported equivalent strength of laterality across both, Tzourio-Mazoyer et al. (2016) reported significantly stronger laterality in frontal than temporal areas. Interestingly, in contrast to the exclusively right handed samples of the former studies, this latter study used a mixed handedness sample. This suggests the possibility that greater regional heterogeneity may characterise the atypical profiles of language lateralisation that are more often found within atypical handedness samples.

Effect of baseline

When sentences are learnt prior to scanning, studies generally employ simple cross-fixation or rest as a baseline (Stippich et al., 2003; Partovi et al., 2012a; Partovi et al., 2012b). Conversely, the two studies using spontaneous generation of sentences during the scanning session used an active linguistic baseline, in which participants covertly generated the months of the year (Mazoyer et al., 2014; Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2016). This 'high level' baseline would have subtracted out activity related to speech motor planning for overlearned and automated utterances to enable better isolation of processes specific to the construction of novel sentences, such as syntactic and lexico-semantic processing (contrast relevant rows in Tables 2 and 3). This highlights how the choice of baseline has important implications for interpretation of measured laterality in relation to linguistic processes.

Passive speech listening

Passive speech listening as a language paradigm appears to yield more variable laterality estimates, perhaps reflective of the wide variety of language processes that it can engage (see Table 2). Lower level acoustic processing of speech sensory input is predicted to be bilateral by multiple models (Hickok & Poeppel, 2007; Peele, 2012; Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014). However, there are discrepancies in the extent of lateralisation assumed for mapping of sound to meaning, considered bilateral by Hickok and Poeppel (2007) but left lateralised by other authors (Peele, 2012; Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014) due to the need to process meaning at a sentential level. Thus, depending on the baseline subtraction used, different levels of processing may be isolated to result in variable levels of laterality.

LI strength, reliability and robustness

The majority of studies using passive listening tasks report very weak average LIs (see Figure 1c for mean LI values), indicating bilateral activation, and it is often the most weakly lateralising task when compared to others (Harrington et al., 2006; Binder, Swanson, Hammeke & Sabsevitz, 2008; Miro et al., 2014; Ocklenburg et al., 2014; Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2015). A notable exception to this was presented by Thivard et al. (2005) who reported a mean laterality index of 0.72 within a frontal ROI for a passive story listening task, stronger than that seen in this ROI for a semantic fluency task (0.51). High test-retest correlations have been reported for speech listening (Razafimandimby et al., 2007).

Effect of ROI

Studies are inconsistent as to whether stronger laterality is found for speech listening within a frontal or a temporoparietal ROI. Harrington et al. (2006) reported that temporoparietal LIs were stronger and more reliable than frontal LIs, whereas other studies have reported weaker and more variable LIs for a temporal compared to a frontal ROI (Thivard et al., 2003; Ocklenburg et al., 2013; Miro et al., 2014). Thus, despite being a

receptive task, in general posterior language areas appear to be poorly lateralised for speech listening tasks.

Effect of baseline task

The varying levels of asymmetry reported for speech listening tasks may in part be attributable to the baseline used by different studies. Binder et al. (2008) found that changing the baseline from rest to tone listening raised the average LI for word listening from 0.1 to 0.52. In this regard it is interesting that the two studies reporting near-zero average LI values for speech listening employed rest as a baseline task (Ocklenburg et al., 2013; Miro et al., 2014). Conversely, Thivard et al. (2005) and Harrington et al. (2006) both used backwards speech listening as a baseline and reported stronger laterality measurements for speech listening. This effect of baseline is consistent with the idea of bilateral early auditory processing that must be subtracted out by a non-linguistic auditory stimulus in order to reveal asymmetry for higher-level 'central language processes' (Peele, 2012; Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

Text reading

Reading text or narrative requires decoding of orthography into phonological representations, semantic and syntactic processing of the decoded sentence, and binding within and across sentences to arrive at an overall understanding of text meaning (see Table 2). Visual word form processing is considered to rely on a lateralised ventral occipito-temporal region, although this may not reflect a left specialisation for orthography *per se* (Price, 2012).

LI strength and effect of ROI

Our search identified only two papers investigating lateralisation of text reading. Both studies used the same covert (silent) text reading task with a baseline of covert nonsense

text reading. Backes et al. (2005) reported moderately strong laterality (LI = 0.59) using a combined frontal-temporoparietal ROI, whereas Deblaere et al. (2002) reported weak laterality (LI = 0.21) using a global LI (see Figure 1c). This supports the hypothesis that global LIs are generally weaker than regional LIs.

Phonemic judgement

Phonemic judgement tasks require a decision relating to phonological structure; most commonly, a rhyme judgement. This task relies on mapping of acoustic or visual input onto phonological units such as phonemes and syllables, a process known as decoding. The precise nature of these stored phonological codes remains a debate; according to theorists in the tradition of the motor theory of speech perception (e.g. Liberman & Mattingly, 1985), these are represented as speech motor gestures in left premotor cortex. Hickok and Poeppel (2007) argue that while the phonological codes themselves are bilaterally represented, the process of their mapping onto articulatory motor representations relies on a left lateralised dorsal stream. Conversely, other models propose that such processing of single words is a less strongly lateralised process (Peele, 2012).

LI strength, reliability and robustness

Phonemic judgement tasks yield relatively strong laterality, with reported LI values ranging from 0.41 to 0.84 (see Figure 1b). However, when compared to other tasks, phonemic judgement is often reported as more weakly lateralising (Seghier et al., 2004; Baciú et al., 2005; Niskanen et al., 2012). Phonemic judgement may be superior to other tasks however in terms of robustness and reproducibility. Morrison et al. (2016) reported that a rhyming decision task demonstrated greater reliability than a word generation task, yielding reproducible dominance classifications in 100% of participants, and average test-retest correlations for LI values of 0.9 and above. Furthermore, such reproducibility of LIs

obtained with rhyming decision was more robust against changes in the activity measure used for LI calculation.

Effect of ROI

Rhyming decision tasks yield particularly strong laterality when a frontal or a combined frontal-temporoparietal ROI is used (Baciu et al., 2005; Clements et al., 2006; Cousin et al., 2007; Niskanen et al., 2012). For example, Cousin et al. (2007) identified a particularly strong leftward asymmetry for the inferior frontal gyrus during rhyme detection. Thus, frontal ROIs may be optimal for yielding the strongest laterality with this task.

Effect of baseline task

All studies within our search using phonemic judgement were found to employ an active perceptual decision baseline task on either non-linguistic material (e.g. line orientation matching) or nonsense words or characters (e.g. nonsense word font matching). This subtracts out non-linguistic working memory processes (see Table 3).

Semantic decision

Semantic decision tasks require a judgement about a word's semantic content or about the semantic relationship between a pair of words, such as whether two words belong to the same category. Such conceptual knowledge is proposed to rely on a distributed processing network, with different brain areas each contributing to different aspects of an item's representation (Warrington & McCarthy, 1983, 1987; Warrington & Shallice, 1984). In addition to this distributed network, Patterson, Nestor and Rogers (2007) have argued for the existence of a 'semantic hub' within the bilateral anterior temporal lobes that integrates the distributed modality-specific representations into one amodal representation. However, a recent meta-analysis of functional imaging studies by Rice, Ralph and Hoffman (2015) suggested that while conceptual knowledge does appear

to be represented bilaterally in the anterior temporal lobes, left lateralised activity was more likely when semantic content was accessed linguistically. This is in contrast to the predictions of Hickok and Poeppel's (2007) model of language in which mapping of sound to meaning is considered as a bilateral process.

LI strength, reproducibility and robustness

The strength of laterality reported for semantic decision tasks is quite variable, ranging from near-zero to around 0.8 (see Figure 1c for mean LI values). This may depend on the type of semantic decision required by the task. Tasks which require judgement of the semantic relatedness of two words appear to yield relatively strong laterality, ranging from 0.59 to 0.84 (Fernandez et al., 2001; Seghier et al., 2004; Bethmann, Tempelmann, De Bleser, Scheich & Brechmann, 2007; Häberling et al., 2016). In contrast, category membership tasks with single words appear to give much lower LIs, ranging from 0.03 to 0.52 (Hund-Georgiadis, Lex & von Cramon, 2001; Ramsey et al., 2001; Deblaere et al., 2002; Hund-Georgiadis, Lex, Friederici & von Cramon, 2002; van Oers et al., 2010). This suggests that it may be the process of integrating and comparing across semantic representations for different concepts that is strongly lateralising; conversely a simple lexical look-up to determine the category membership of a single concept may not be strongly lateralised.

Jansen et al. (2006) reported very low reproducibility for synonym decision LIs across a range of different LI calculation methods within Broca's area; much higher reproducibility was found however when a temporoparietal ROI was used. Conversely, Harrington et al. (2006) reported high test-retest correlations for an abstract/concrete semantic decision task across both frontal (IFG) and temporoparietal ROIs. This discrepancy between the two studies could be due to the differences in the tasks they used.

Effect of ROI

The majority of studies report no significant differences in the magnitude of laterality found within temporoparietal and frontal ROIs for semantic decision tasks (Ramsey et al., 2001; Hund-Georgiadis et al., 2002; Harrington et al., 2006; Bethmann et al., 2007; van Oers et al., 2010; Häberling et al., 2016). Some studies have reported differences across ROIs, however these can be in opposite directions (Fernandez et al., 2001; Szaflarski et al., 2008). As discussed, some evidence suggests that LIs calculated from temporoparietal ROIs for semantic decision may be more reproducible than those calculated from frontal ROIs (Jansen et al., 2006).

Effect of baseline tasks

Semantic decision laterality is also strongly influenced by the baseline task used. Binder et al. (2008) and Hund-Georgiadis et al. (2001; 2002) manipulated the baseline and found that the use of an active perceptual decision task as opposed to passive rest yielded a large increase in the strength and consistency of semantic decision laterality. Binder et al. (2008) argued that resting baselines are unsuitable for subtraction with semantic decision, since they allow for the activation of conceptual language representations as the participant 'day dreams' and engages in 'inner speech'. An active perceptual decision baseline interrupts such ongoing conceptual processing and engages the same executive and attentional processes as the language paradigm. Baseline tasks that engage linguistic processing themselves may result in reduced laterality; for example, Deblaere et al. (2002) suggested their finding of weak laterality for semantic decision may have been due to a vowel decision baseline task. However, it should be noted that Binder et al. (2008) reported identical laterality strength (a mean LI of 0.62) for semantic decision using either a baseline of tone decision or phoneme decision. Overall, this evidence suggests that baseline tasks used for semantic decision must be active, sufficiently engaging and

challenging so as to prevent ‘day-dreaming’, and ideally involve material from a non-linguistic domain e.g. symbols or tones.

Sentence comprehension

Sentence comprehension tasks require some judgement about the content of a spoken or written sentence. Syntactic and semantic processing are often confounded (see Table 2); for example, the task may require participants to decide if two sentences with different grammatical constructions have the same meaning. However, they are noteworthy among other tasks in the extent of their syntactic processing requirements. Laterality of syntax has been a subject of debate, with some authors arguing for a bilateral involvement in syntax (e.g. Hund-Georgiadis et al., 2001), but others arguing for a left dominance (Friederici, 2011; Tyler et al., 2011; Wright, Stamatakis & Tyler., 2012). At a more general level, multiple models would predict left lateralisation for the sentence-level processing engaged by this task, without making specific claims about lateralisation of syntactic processing *per se* (e.g. Peele, 2012; Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

LI strength, reliability and robustness

Multiple studies report strong laterality for sentence comprehension tasks (Kennan, Kim, Maki, Koizumi & Constable, 2002; Harrington et al., 2006; Sanjuan et al., 2010; Jensen-Kondering et al., 2012; Niskanen et al., 2012; Vassal et al., 2016), with LI values ranging from 0.55 to 0.88 (see Figure 1b). Studies which compare sentence comprehension laterality measures to those of other tasks suggest that it can outperform semantic decision, phoneme decision, story listening and naming tasks in terms of the strength of laterality, although this can depend on the ROI (Harrington et al., 2006; Niskanen et al., 2012).

Effect of ROI

Evidence appears inconsistent as to the effect of ROI on the laterality obtained with sentence comprehension tasks. Studies have reported both stronger laterality for frontal than temporoparietal ROIs (Jensen-Kondering et al., 2012; Niskanen et al., 2012) and vice versa (Harrington et al., 2006; Sanjuan et al., 2010). In terms of reliability of lateralisation, Harrington et al (2006) reported very high reproducibility for a visual sentence comprehension task across both frontal and temporoparietal ROIs, with test-retest correlations above 0.9. In contrast, auditory sentence comprehension yielded more reliable lateralisation within a temporoparietal than a frontal ROI. Modality of the stimuli may thus affect which ROI is optimal.

Effect of baseline task

Generally, active baselines are employed for sentence comprehension tasks. A notable exception is seen in Harrington et al. (2006) who used passive listening to backwards speech as a baseline for auditory sentence comprehension. This passive baseline may explain the weaker laterality they reported as compared to other studies (mean LI of around 0.45). Interestingly, Sanjuan et al. (2010) who also reported a relatively low level of laterality compared to other studies used phoneme decision as a baseline. As previously discussed in relation to a study by Deblaere et al. (2002) using semantic decision, it is possible that the use of such a baseline with high linguistic processing demands may lower the strength of the laterality seen.

Naming

Naming tasks require the generation of the name of an item in response to either a visual (pictorial) or verbal description. According to Hillis' (2007) model of naming, picture naming involves three major levels of processing; a semantic level in which amodal general and specific semantic information is accessed from a structural description of an object; a

lemma level which involves the defining features of an object at a more abstract level (e.g. what makes a sheep a sheep); and a phonological/orthographical level, in which the phonological and orthographical representations associated with that concept are accessed. Thus, naming tasks have the potential to engage multiple key components of the language network (see Table 2).

LI strength, reliability and robustness

Studies using naming as a language activation task report a wide variety of LI values, ranging from 0.08 to 0.96 (see Figure 1b). This can partly be explained by variation in the nature of the naming task used. Zero to moderate laterality has been reported for picture naming tasks, which are often the least lateralising when compared to other tasks (Vikingstad et al., 2000; Deblaere et al., 2002; Harrington et al., 2006; Jansen et al., 2006; van Oers et al., 2010). However, the lateralising ability of naming tasks can be increased by the addition of sentence comprehension demands. A naming from written or auditory description task known as ‘responsive naming’ requires comprehension of a question describing an object in order to generate the required name. This has been reported to yield strong laterality across both frontal and temporal ROIs, in the range of 0.65 to 0.96 (Gaillard et al., 2002; Niskanen et al., 2012). This increase in laterality with the addition of sentence-level processing is consistent with models of language which predict an increase in laterality for connected versus unconnected language i.e. structured sentences versus single words (Peele, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

Picture naming also shows poor reliability in laterality measurement. Jansen et al. (2006) reported that picture naming did not determine dominance reproducibly in about a third of participants. Rutten et al. (2002) similarly reported a failure to find significant test-retest correlations for naming LIs. Significant test-retest correlations were reported by Harrington et al. (2006) for a picture naming task at around the same level as those seen

for semantic decision; however, reproducibility of naming laterality was lower than that seen for verb generation and sentence comprehension.

Effect of ROI

Naming tasks do not appear to favour one ROI over another in laterality measurement. We found two studies which reported differences in the laterality measured from frontal and temporoparietal ROIs, however this difference was in opposite directions (Harrington et al., 2006; Brennan et al., 2007). The majority of studies instead report highly similar strength of laterality across frontal and temporoparietal ROIs (Vikingstad et al., 2000; Gaillard et al., 2002; van Oers et al., 2010; Niskanen et al., 2012). Furthermore, Rutten et al. (2002) reported similar levels of reproducibility of naming LIs for both regions.

Effect of baseline task

The baselines used with picture naming provide interesting evidence on the processes underlying its laterality. Deblaere et al. (2002) reported near zero laterality for picture naming using a baseline which required participants to name the position of the intersection of four lines (e.g. up, down, left, right). This task involves engagement in similar semantic and word retrieval processes (see Table 3), which may explain the weak laterality measured. However, Brennan et al. (2007) reported strong laterality for a picture naming task with a number counting baseline. This would subtract out speech production and word retrieval processes for an automated speech sequence, predicted to involve bilateral activity (Price, 2012; Poeppel, 2014). This subtraction would thus isolate spontaneous non-automated retrieval and word generation processes which may engage left hemisphere language systems, increasing measured laterality.

Combined Task Analysis

Combined task analysis (CTA) involves the calculation of LIs from contrast images generated by combining scans across multiple language tasks. This method identifies commonalities between tasks' activity patterns in order to isolate the 'core' language network, and exclude task-specific, non-linguistic activity caused by differences in task design that may influencing the LI value. In this way, CTA represents a theoretical alternative to baseline tasks to subtract domain-general activity. Indeed, there is evidence that CTA results in higher and more reliable and robust estimates of laterality for language (Ramsey et al., 2001; Rutten et al., 2002; Sommer, Ramsey, Mandl, & Kahn, 2003; Jansen et al., 2006; Harrington et al., 2006; van Rijn et al., 2008; Doodoo-Schittko et al., 2012; Niskanen et al., 2012).

However, the theoretical assumptions which motivate CTA can be questioned. CTA assumes that variability in laterality for different tasks should be ascribed to non-linguistic processes or viewed simply as measurement error, rather than reflecting the underlying nature of hemispheric organisation for language (e.g. Ramsey et al., 2001). Such a theoretical stance ignores the possibility of multidimensional lateralisation across different language processes. Indeed, recent fMRI studies have reported cases of dissociated laterality for different language functions within individuals (Vikingstad et al., 2000; Van der Haegen et al., 2012; Häberling et al., 2016; see Bradshaw, Bishop & Woodhead., 2017 for a review), corroborating those early clinical reports of a 'division of labour' across the hemispheres in patients with bilateral language representation (Rasmussen and Milner, 1975). It is not yet known whether such crossed language dominance has significant functional implications for language abilities. Bishop (2013) speculated that having expressive and receptive language functions in opposite hemispheres may make one more vulnerable to development of language disorders or impairments.

CTA would not be an appropriate method to further investigate such a phenomenon; instead, it will be necessary to design fMRI protocols that probe the within-subject variation in language lateralisation across a range of tasks, while controlling for non-linguistic confounds. Conversely, the strong, reliable and robust LI values provided by CTA would be more useful in cases where a clear categorical decision on an individual's language lateralisation is required.

Summary and conclusions

This review has highlighted the high level of variation in the strength and reliability of laterality measured using different language tasks. Some of this variability does appear to be related to methodological aspects of study design, such as the baseline task used, the region of interest chosen, and the modality of the stimuli. These need optimization on an individual task basis in order to ensure robust laterality measurement.

However, there is evidence that some of this variability in laterality may relate to more linguistically relevant parameters. Systematic study of the effect of baseline on laterality measurement has revealed that higher LIs can be obtained with the subtraction of speech motor activity in the domain of expressive language (Brennan et al., 2007; Dodoo-Schittko et al., 2012), or with the subtraction of non-linguistic acoustic processing activity in the domain of receptive language (Thivard et al., 2005; Harrington et al., 2006; Binder et al., 2008). This is consistent with models which predict that the sensory input and motor output systems involved in speech are bilateral, with left lateralisation emerging as the complexity of linguistic processing increases (Peele, 2012; Poeppel, 2014).

A further theme present in language models is a distinction between bilateral processing of single words and phonemes and left lateralised processing of phrases and sentences, what Peele (2012) refers to as 'unconnected' and 'connected' speech respectively. Poeppel (2014) similarly argues that lateralisation emerges when

combinatorial and structure building processes are engaged. This may underlie the significant increase in laterality seen for responsive naming versus picture naming tasks, the former additionally engaging sentence level processing. However, such a view would predict higher laterality for sentence generation than word generation tasks, something which does not appear to be obviously the case in the literature. This may require more systematic study, comparing laterality for generation of sentences versus unconnected word lists in response to a cue word.

However, these models arguably elaborate little on their theoretical justifications for predicting stronger lateralisation for sentence-level processing. Peele (2012) simply refers to ‘increased linguistic demands’, while Poeppel (2014) refers to similarly ambiguous and underdefined ‘COM’ (combinatorics and composition) and ‘PRE’ (linguistically based prediction) processes. More work is needed to try to isolate specific aspects of sentence processing such as syntax and semantic binding, in order to investigate what is driving the strong laterality measured in sentence comprehension tasks.

CTA can provide an efficient method of isolating language activity shared across multiple different aspects of language functioning, to allow robust and reliable measurement of laterality of the core language network. However, this methodology ignores the potential significance of variability in laterality across different language functions, both within individuals and at a group level. Investigation of phenomena such as dissociated dominance may provide fresh insights into the nature and development of language lateralisation, and its relation to language function.

Funding

This work was supported by an Advanced Grant awarded by the European Research Council (project 694189 - Cerebral Asymmetry: New directions in Correlates and Etiology

– CANDICE). Dorothy Bishop is funded by programme grant 082498/Z/07/Z from the Wellcome Trust.

References

- Baciu, M., Juphard, A., Cousin, E., & Le Bas, J. (2005). Evaluating fMRI methods for assessing hemispheric language dominance in healthy subjects. *European Journal of Radiology*, 55(2), 209-218. doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2004.11.004
- Backes, W., Deblaere, K., Vonck, K., Kessels, A., Boon, P., Hofman, P., . . . Aldenkamp, A. (2005). Language activation distributions revealed by fMRI in post-operative epilepsy patients: Differences between left- and right-sided resections. *Epilepsy Research*, 66(1-3), 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.epilepsyres.2005.06.007
- Bethmann, A., Tempelmann, C., De Bleser, R., Scheich, H., & Brechmann, A. (2007). Determining language laterality by fMRI and dichotic listening. *Brain Research*, 1133(1), 145-157. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2006.11.057
- Binder, J. R., Swanson, S. J., Hammeke, T. A., & Sabsevitz, D. S. (2008). A comparison of five fMRI protocols for mapping speech comprehension systems. *Epilepsia*, 49(12), 1980-1997. doi:10.1111/j.1528-1167.2008.01683.x
- Bishop, D. V. M. (2013). Cerebral asymmetry and language development: Cause, correlate, or consequence? *Science*, 340(6138), 1230531. doi:10.1126/science.1230531
- Bradshaw, A. R., Bishop, D. V. M., & Woodhead, Z. V. J. (2017). Methodological considerations in assessment of language lateralization with fMRI: a systematic review. *PeerJ Preprints*, 5:e2962v2. doi: 10.7287/peerj.preprints.2962v2
- Brennan, N. M. P., Whalen, S., Branco, D. d. M., O'Shea, J. P., Norton, I. H., & Golby, A. J. (2007). Object naming is a more sensitive measure of speech localization than number counting: Converging evidence from direct cortical stimulation and fMRI. *Neuroimage*, 37, S100-S108. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.04.052
- Clements, A. M., Rimrodt, S. L., Abel, J. R., Blankner, J. G., Mostofsky, S. H., Pekar, J. J., . . . Cutting, L. E. (2006). Sex differences in cerebral laterality of language and visuospatial processing. *Brain and Language*, 98(2), 150-158. doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2006.04.007
- Cousin, E., Peyrin, C., Pichat, C., Lamalle, L., Le Bas, J., & Baciu, M. (2007). Functional MRI approach for assessing hemispheric predominance of regions activated by a phonological and a semantic task. *European Journal of Radiology*, 63(2), 274-285. doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2007.01.030
- Deblaere, K., Backes, W., Hofman, P., Vandemaele, P., Boon, P., Vonck, K., . . . Aldenkamp, A. (2002). Developing a comprehensive presurgical functional MRI protocol for patients with intractable temporal lobe epilepsy: A pilot study. *Neuroradiology*, 44(8), 667-673. doi:10.1007/s00234-002-0800-4

- Dodoo-Schittko, F., Rosengarth, K., Doenitz, C., & Greenlee, M. W. (2012). Assessing language dominance with functional MRI: The role of control tasks and statistical analysis. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(11), 2684-2691. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.07.032
- Fernandez, G., de Greiff, A., von Oertzen, J., Reuber, M., Lun, S., Klaver, P., . . . Elger, C. (2001). Language mapping in less than 15 minutes: Real-time functional MRI during routine clinical investigation. *Neuroimage*, 14(3), 585-594. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0854
- Friederici, A. D. (2011). The brain basis of language processing: From structure to function. *Physiological Reviews*, 91(4), 1357-1392. doi:10.1152/physrev.00006.2011
- Gaillard, W., Balsamo, L., Xu, B., Grandin, C., Braniecki, S., Papero, P., . . . Theodore, W. (2002). Language dominance in partial epilepsy patients identified with an fMRI reading task. *Neurology*, 59(2), 256-265.
- Gaillard, W., Sachs, B., Whitnah, J., Ahmad, Z., Balsamo, L., Petrella, J., . . . Grandin, C. (2003). Developmental aspects of language processing: FMRI of verbal fluency in children and adults. *Human Brain Mapping*, 18(3), 176-185. doi:10.1002/hbm.10091
- Giraud, A., Kleinschmidt, A., Poeppel, D., Lund, T. E., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Laufs, H. (2007). Endogenous cortical rhythms determine cerebral specialization for speech perception and production. *Neuron*, 56(6), 1127-1134. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2007.09.038
- Häberling, I. S., Steinemann, A., & Corballis, M. C. (2016). Cerebral asymmetry for language: Comparing production with comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, 80, 17-23. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.11.002
- Harrington, G., Buonocore, M., & Farias, S. (2006). Intrasubject reproducibility of functional MR imaging activation in language tasks. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*, 27(4), 938-944.
- Hickok, G., & Poeppel, D. (2007). Opinion - the cortical organization of speech processing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8(5), 393-402. doi:10.1038/nrn2113
- Hillis, A. E. (2007). Aphasia - progress in the last quarter of a century. *Neurology*, 69(2), 200-213. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000265600.69385.6f
- Hund-Georgiadis, M., Lex, U., Friederici, A., & von Cramon, D. (2002). Non-invasive regime for language lateralization in right- and left-handers by means of functional MRI and dichotic listening. *Experimental Brain Research*, 145(2), 166-176. doi:10.1007/s00221-002-1090-0
- Hund-Georgiadis, M., Lex, U., & von Cramon, D. (2001). Language dominance assessment by means of fMRI: Contributions from task design, performance, and stimulus modality. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 13(5), 668-675. doi:10.1002/jmri.1094

- Hunter, Z. R., & Brysbaert, M. (2008). Visual half-field experiments are a good measure of cerebral language dominance if used properly: Evidence from fMRI. *Neuropsychologia*, 46(1), 316-325. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.07.007
- Jansen, A., Menke, R., Sommer, J., Foerster, A. F., Bruchmann, S., Hempleman, J., . . . Knecht, S. (2006). The assessment of hemispheric lateralization in functional MRI - robustness and reproducibility. *Neuroimage*, 33(1), 204-217. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.06.019
- Jensen-Kondering, U. R., Ghobadi, Z., Wolff, S., Jansen, O., & Ulmer, S. (2012). Acoustically presented semantic decision-making tasks provide a robust depiction of the temporo-parietal speech areas. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*, 19(3), 428-433. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2011.04.038
- Kennan, R., Kim, D., Maki, A., Koizumi, H., & Constable, R. (2002). Non-invasive assessment of language lateralization by transcranial near infrared optical topography and functional MRI. *Human Brain Mapping*, 16(3), 183-189. doi:10.1002/hbm.10039
- Kleinhans, N. M., Mueller, R., Cohen, D. N., & Courchesne, E. (2008). Atypical functional lateralization of language in autism spectrum disorders. *Brain Research*, 1221, 115-125. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2008.04.080
- Knecht, S., Jansen, A., Frank, A., van Randenborgh, J., Sommer, J., Kanowski, A., & Heinze, H. (2003). How atypical is atypical language dominance? *Neuroimage*, 18(4), 917-927. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00039-9
- Liberman, A., & Mattingly, I. (1985). The motor theory of speech-perception revised. *Cognition*, 21(1), 1-36. doi:10.1016/0010-0277(85)90021-6
- Mazoyer, B., Zago, L., Jobard, G., Crivello, F., Joliot, M., Perchey, G., . . . Tzourio-Mazoyer, N. (2014). Gaussian mixture modeling of hemispheric lateralization for language in a large sample of healthy individuals balanced for handedness. *Plos One*, 9(6), e101165. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0101165
- McGettigan, C., & Scott, S. K. (2012). Cortical asymmetries in speech perception: What's wrong, what's right and what's left? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(5), 269-276. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2012.04.006
- Miro, J., Ripolles, P., Lopez-Barroso, D., Vila-Ballo, A., Juncadella, M., de Diego-Balaguer, R., . . . Falip, M. (2014). Atypical language organization in temporal lobe epilepsy revealed by a passive semantic paradigm. *Bmc Neurology*, 14, 98. doi:10.1186/1471-2377-14-98
- Morrison, M. A., Churchill, N. W., Cusimano, M. D., Schweizer, T. A., Das, S., & Graham, S. J. (2016). Reliability of task-based fMRI for preoperative planning: A test-retest study in brain tumor patients and healthy controls. *Plos One*, 11(2), e0149547. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0149547
- Niskanen, E., Kononen, M., Villberg, V., Nissi, M., Ranta-aho, P., Saisanen, L., . . . Vanninen, R. (2012). The effect of fMRI task combinations on determining the hemispheric dominance of language functions. *Neuroradiology*, 54(4), 393-405. doi:10.1007/s00234-011-0959-7

- Ocklenburg, S., Hugdahl, K., & Westerhausen, R. (2013). Structural white matter asymmetries in relation to functional asymmetries during speech perception and production. *Neuroimage*, 83, 1088-1097. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.07.076
- Partovi, S., Jacobi, B., Rapps, N., Zipp, L., Karimi, S., Rengier, F., . . . Stippich, C. (2012). Clinical standardized fMRI reveals altered language lateralization in patients with brain tumor. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*, 33(11), 2151-2157. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A3137
- Partovi, S., Konrad, F., Karimi, S., Rengier, F., Lyo, J. K., Zipp, L., . . . Stippich, C. (2012). Effects of covert and overt paradigms in clinical language fMRI. *Academic Radiology*, 19(5), 518-525. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2011.12.017
- Patterson, K., Nestor, P. J., & Rogers, T. T. (2007). Where do you know what you know? the representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8(12), 976-987. doi:10.1038/nrn2277
- Peelle, J. E. (2012). The hemispheric lateralization of speech processing depends on what "speech" is: A hierarchical perspective. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6, 309. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2012.00309
- Poeppel, D. (2014). The neuroanatomic and neurophysiological infrastructure for speech and language. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 28, 142-149. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2014.07.005
- Price, C. J. (2012). A review and synthesis of the first 20 years of PET and fMRI studies of heard speech, spoken language and reading. *Neuroimage*, 62(2), 816-847. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.04.062
- Propper, R. E., O'Donnell, L. J., Whalen, S., Tie, Y., Norton, I. H., Suarez, R. O., . . . Golby, A. J. (2010). A combined fMRI and DTI examination of functional language lateralization and arcuate fasciculus structure: Effects of degree versus direction of hand preference. *Brain and Cognition*, 73(2), 85-92. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2010.03.004
- Ramsey, N., Sommer, I., Rutten, G., & Kahn, R. (2001). Combined analysis of language tasks in fMRI improves assessment of hemispheric dominance for language functions in individual subjects. *Neuroimage*, 13(4), 719-733. doi:10.1006/nimg.2000.0722
- Rasmussen, T., & Milner, B. (1975). Clinical and surgical studies of the cerebral speech areas in man. In K. J. Zulch, O. Creutzfeldt & G. C. Galbraith (Eds.), *Cerebral localization* (pp. 238). Berlin: Springer.
- Razafimandimby, A., Maiza, O., Herve, P., Lecardeur, L., Delamillieure, P., Brazo, P., . . . Dollfus, S. (2007). Stability of functional language lateralization over time in schizophrenia patients. *Schizophrenia Research*, 94(1-3), 197-206. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2007.04.011
- Rice, G. E., Ralph, M. A. L., & Hoffman, P. (2015). The roles of left versus right anterior temporal lobes in conceptual knowledge: An ALE meta-analysis of 97 functional neuroimaging studies. *Cerebral Cortex*, 25(11), 4374-4391. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhv024

- Ruff, I. M., Brennan, N. M. P., Peck, K. K., Hou, B. L., Tabar, V., Brennan, C. W., & Holodny, A. I. (2008). Assessment of the language laterality index in patients with brain tumor using functional MR imaging: Effects of thresholding, task selection, and prior surgery. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*, 29(3), 528-535. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A0841
- Rutten, G., Ramsey, N., van Rijen, P., & van Veelen, C. (2002). Reproducibility of fMRI-determined language lateralization in individual subjects. *Brain and Language*, 80(3), 421-437. doi:10.1006/brln.2001.2600
- Sanjuan, A., Bustamante, J., Forn, C., Ventura-Campos, N., Barros-LoCERTALES, A., Martinez, J., . . . Avila, C. (2010). Comparison of two fMRI tasks for the evaluation of the expressive language function. *Neuroradiology*, 52(5), 407-415. doi:10.1007/s00234-010-0667-8
- Sanjuan, A., Forn, C., Ventura-Campos, N., Rodriguez-Pujadas, A., Garcia-Porcar, M., Belloch, V., . . . Avila, C. (2010). The sentence verification task: A reliable fMRI protocol for mapping receptive language in individual subjects. *European Radiology*, 20(10), 2432-2438. doi:10.1007/s00330-010-1814-7
- Seghier, M., Lazeyras, F., Pegna, A., Annoni, J., Zimine, I., Mayer, E., . . . Khateb, A. (2004). Variability of fMRI activation during a phonological and semantic language task in healthy subjects. *Human Brain Mapping*, 23(3), 140-155. doi:10.1002/hbm.20053
- Sommer, I., Ramsey, N., Mandl, R., & Kahn, R. (2003). Language lateralization in female patients with schizophrenia: An fMRI study. *Schizophrenia Research*, 60(2-3), 183-190. doi:10.1016/S0920-9964(02)00300-6
- Stippich, C., Mohammed, J., Kress, B., Hahnel, S., Gunther, J., Konrad, F., & Sartor, K. (2003). Robust localization and lateralization of human language function: An optimized clinical functional magnetic resonance imaging protocol. *Neuroscience Letters*, 346(1-2), 109-113. doi:10.1016/S0304-3940(03)00561-5
- Suarez, R. O., Whalen, S., O'Shea, J. P., & Golby, A. J. (2008). A surgical planning method for functional MRI assessment of language dominance: Influences from threshold, region-of-interest, and stimulus mode. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, 2(2), 59-73. doi:10.1007/s11682-007-9018-8
- Szaflarski, J. P., Holland, S. K., Jacola, L. M., Lindsell, C., Privitera, M. D., & Szaflarski, M. (2008). Comprehensive presurgical functional MRI language evaluation in adult patients with epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 12(1), 74-83. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2007.07.015
- Tailby, C., Weintrob, D. L., Saling, M. M., Fitzgerald, C., & Jackson, G. D. (2014). Reading difficulty is associated with failure to lateralize temporooccipital function. *Epilepsia*, 55(5), 746-753. doi:10.1111/epi.12607
- Thivard, L., Hombrouck, J., du Montcel, S., Delmaire, C., Cohen, L., Samson, S., . . . Lehericy, S. (2005). Productive and perceptive language reorganization in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuroimage*, 24(3), 841-851. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.10.001

- Tyler, L. K., Marslen-Wilson, W. D., Randall, B., Wright, P., Devereux, B. J., Zhuang, J., . . . Stamatakis, E. A. (2011). Left inferior frontal cortex and syntax: Function, structure and behaviour in patients with left hemisphere damage. *Brain*, 134, 415-431. doi:10.1093/brain/awq369
- Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., Marie, D., Zago, L., Jobard, G., Perchey, G., Leroux, G., . . . Mazoyer, B. (2015). Heschl's gyrification pattern is related to speech-listening hemispheric lateralization: FMRI investigation in 281 healthy volunteers. *Brain Structure & Function*, 220(3), 1585-1599. doi:10.1007/s00429-014-0746-4
- Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., Joliot, M., Marie, D., & Mazoyer, B. (2016). Variation in homotopic areas' activity and inter-hemispheric intrinsic connectivity with type of language lateralization: An FMRI study of covert sentence generation in 297 healthy volunteers. *Brain Structure & Function*, 221(5), 2735-2753. doi:10.1007/s00429-015-1068-x
- Van der Haegen, L., Cai, Q., & Brysbaert, M. (2012). Colateralization of broca's area and the visual word form area in left-handers: FMRI evidence. *Brain and Language*, 122(3), 171-178. doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2011.11.004
- van Oers, C. A. M. M., Vink, M., van Zandvoort, M. J. E., van der Worp, H. B., de Haan, E. H. F., Kappelle, L. J., . . . Dijkhuizen, R. M. (2010). Contribution of the left and right inferior frontal gyrus in recovery from aphasia. A functional MRI study in stroke patients with preserved hemodynamic responsiveness. *Neuroimage*, 49(1), 885-893. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.08.057
- van Rijn, S., Aleman, A., Swaab, H., Vink, M., Sommer, I., & Kahn, R. S. (2008). Effects of an extra X chromosome on language lateralization: An fMRI study with klinefelter men (47,XXY). *Schizophrenia Research*, 101(1-3), 17-25. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2008.02.001
- van Veelen, N. M. J., Vink, M., Ramsey, N. F., Sommer, I. E. C., van Buuren, M., Hoogendam, J. M., & Kahn, R. S. (2011). Reduced language lateralization in first-episode medication-naïve schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, 127(1-3), 195-201. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2010.12.013
- Vassal, F., Schneider, F., Boutet, C., Jean, B., Sontheimer, A., & Lemaire, J. (2016). Combined DTI tractography and functional MRI study of the language connectome in healthy volunteers: Extensive mapping of white matter fascicles and cortical activations. *Plos One*, 11(3), e0152614. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0152614
- Vernooij, M. W., Smits, M., Wielopolski, P. A., Houston, G. C., Krestin, G. P., & van der Lugt, A. (2007). Fiber density asymmetry of the arcuate fasciculus in relation to functional hemispheric language lateralization in both right- and left-handed healthy subjects: A combined fMRI and DTI study. *Neuroimage*, 35(3), 1064-1076. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.12.041
- Vikingstad, E., George, K., Johnson, A., & Cao, Y. (2000). Cortical language lateralization in right handed normal subjects using functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 175(1), 17-27. doi:10.1016/S0022-510X(00)00269-0
- Vingerhoets, G., Alderweireldt, A., Vandemaele, P., Cai, Q., Van der Haegen, L., Brysbaert, M., & Achten, E. (2013). Praxis and language are linked: Evidence from co-

lateralization in individuals, with atypical language dominance. *Cortex*, 49(1), 172-183. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2011.11.003

Warrington, E., K., & McCarthy, R. (1983). Category specific access dysphasia. *Brain*, 106(4), 859. doi:https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:4563/10.1093/brain/106.4.859

Warrington, E., & McCarthy, R. (1987). Categories of knowledge - further fractionations and an attempted integration. *Brain*, 110, 1273-1296. doi:10.1093/brain/110.5.1273

Warrington, E., & Shallice, T. (1984). Category specific semantic impairments. *Brain*, 107(SEP), 829-854. doi:10.1093/brain/107.3.829

Wright, P., Stamatakis, E. A., & Tyler, L. K. (2012). Differentiating hemispheric contributions to syntax and semantics in patients with left-hemisphere lesions. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(24), 8149-8157. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0485-12.2012

Zaca, D., Jarso, S., & Pillai, J. J. (2013). Role of semantic paradigms for optimization of language mapping in clinical fMRI studies. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*, 34(10), 1966-1971. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A3628