Independent contributions of language activations in left and right temporal cortex to aphasia outcomes after stroke

Sarah M. Schneck[1], Deborah F. Levy[1], Jillian L. Entrup[1], Melodie Yen[1], Dana K. Eriksson[2], Marianne Casilio[1], Anna V. Kasdan[1], Lily Walljasper[1], Caitlin F. Onuscheck[1], Larry T. Davis[3], Howard S. Kirshner[4,5], Michael de Riesthal[1], & Stephen M. Wilson[1,6]

Abstract

Recovery from aphasia after stroke is thought to depend on functional reorganization of language processing in surviving brain regions. Many studies have investigated this process, but progress has been impeded by methodological limitations relating to task performance confounds, contrast validity, and sample sizes. Furthermore, few studies have accounted for the complex relationships that exist between patterns of structural damage, distributed networks of functional activity, and behavioral outcomes.

The present cross-sectional study aimed to overcome these critical methodological limitations and to disentangle the relationships between structure, function, and behavior. We recruited 70 individuals with post-stroke aphasia and 45 neurologically normal comparison participants. We used a valid and reliable language mapping fMRI paradigm that adapted dynamically to each participant's task performance, and carried out whole-brain permutation analyses along with hypothesis-driven analyses of individually defined functional regions of interest (ROIs). Multivariable models were constructed that incorporated lesion load estimates derived from machine learning and language activations across multiple brain regions.

We found strong evidence that left posterior temporal cortex is the most critical region for language processing in post-stroke aphasia: functional activity in this region was reduced in aphasia, predictive of aphasia outcomes in a whole-brain analysis above and beyond the contribution of lesion load, and remained predictive even above and beyond other functional predictors, with a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$). We also found that right posterior temporal cortex made an independent contribution to aphasia outcomes: functional activity was attenuated in aphasia, suggesting diaschisis, yet was predictive of aphasia outcomes above and beyond left hemisphere lesion load and functional predictors, with a small effect size ($f^2 = 0.08$). We corroborated the importance of left frontal cortex: functional activity was attenuated

in aphasia and predictive of aphasia outcomes over and beyond the contribution of lesion load; however, unlike in the bilateral temporal regions, functional activity in the left frontal lobe did not remain predictive once other functional predictors were included in the model. There was no support for other potential compensatory mechanisms such as recruitment of the right frontal lobe, the bilateral multiple demand network, or perilesional regions.

Taken together, our findings demonstrate that functional imaging can provide critical insights into language processing in aphasia that cannot be obtained from structural imaging alone, with the left and right posterior temporal cortices making independent contributions to aphasia outcomes after stroke.

Author affiliations:

1 Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232, USA

2 Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

3 Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232, USA

4 Department of Neurology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232, USA

5 Vanderbilt Stroke and Cerebrovascular Center, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232, USA

6 School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

Correspondence to: Stephen M. Wilson

School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

E-mail: smwilson@uq.edu.au

Introduction

Aphasia is an acquired language disorder and is one of the most common consequences of stroke.[1] Fortunately, language function in post-stroke aphasia typically improves over time, though the extent of recovery is highly variable.[2,3] Recovery of language function is thought to depend on the functional reorganization of language processing in surviving brain regions.[4–6] The overarching goal of the present cross-sectional study was to rigorously and comprehensively characterize the neural basis of language processing in individuals with post-stroke aphasia.

Many previous functional imaging studies have investigated the reorganization of language processing in people with aphasia after stroke.[4] In a recent systematic review and meta-analysis, we showed that there is little consistency in the findings across this literature.[7] The most compelling findings attest to the continued importance of residual core left hemisphere fronto-temporal language areas: these regions show reduced functional activity when individuals with aphasia are compared to neurologically normal participants,[8,9] and within cohorts with aphasia, activation of these regions is positively correlated with aphasia outcomes.[10,11] There is some evidence that right temporal activation may also be associated with better aphasia outcomes, possibly reflecting pre-existing variability in the capacity of the non-dominant hemisphere.[9]

In contrast, there is limited evidence for other theories of functional reorganization, including compensatory recruitment of right hemisphere homotopic regions,[12–16] bilateral domain-general networks,[17–19] or perilesional left hemisphere regions.[20] We argued that the evidence for these ideas is compromised by three critical methodological limitations.[7] First, task performance confounds are both pervasive and very difficult to control given the inherent difficulty that people with aphasia experience with language tasks,[21–23] and can have dramatic effects on functional activation.[24] Second, many commonly used language contrasts do not actually selectively activate the left-lateralized language network in neurologically normal individuals,[25] making it challenging to interpret findings in people with aphasia. Third, many studies have included relatively few participants, and perhaps consequently, have often not appropriately corrected for multiple comparisons.[26]

Accordingly, the first aim of the present study was to make a concerted effort to overcome these three major methodological limitations.[7] To minimize task performance confounds, we used an adaptive language mapping fMRI paradigm in which items were dynamically tailored

to real-time participant performance in the scanner.[25] The validity and reliability of this paradigm has been established by demonstrating that it robustly activates the left-lateralized language network in neurologically normal individuals.[25] We recruited a large and diverse cohort of 70 individuals with aphasia to maximize statistical power, allowing us to use gold standard whole-brain permutation analyses,[27] which we complemented with hypothesis-driven analyses of individually defined functional regions of interest (ROIs).

Another major challenge in the literature to date has been how to address the complex relationships that exist between patterns of structural damage, distributed networks of functional activity in surviving regions, and behavioral outcomes. For example, it could be the case that only individuals with extensive left hemisphere damage have a need for compensatory recruitment of right hemisphere regions, in which case any analysis of right hemisphere functional activity would first need to take into account variability in left hemisphere damage and functional activity.[11,28–30] The majority of studies have not accounted for structural damage when investigating functional reorganization, despite clear evidence that lesion location and extent are powerful predictors of aphasia outcomes.[2,3,31] Moreover, functional reorganization likely relies on the interplay between multiple brain regions,[4] yet most of the literature involves mass univariate analyses of fMRI data in which functional activity in each voxel is modeled in isolation. There have been some notable exceptions—that is, studies that have investigated the complex relationships between structural damage and functional activity and/or modeled distributed patterns of functional activity[11,19,30,32–50]—but although many of these analyses have been nuanced and innovative, they have often been impacted by the three methodological issues outlined above.[7]

Consequently, our second aim was to address the complex relationships that hold between lesion location and extent, functional activity in multiple brain regions, and aphasia outcomes, by incorporating structural information and language activations in multiple brain regions into multivariable analyses of functional imaging and behaviour, while maintaining methodological rigor with respect to the critical issues identified above. Specifically, we took the perspective that the most important axis on which individuals with aphasia vary in terms of brain structure is the extent to which their lesions impact the language network.[3,30] We therefore used machine learning to empirically determine the extent to which different patterns of structural damage were associated with aphasia outcomes,[31] which allowed us to derive a scalar lesion load estimate for each individual. We used these lesion load estimates throughout the study to explore how structural variability relates to functional and behavioral observations. Most

importantly, we included these lesion load estimates into our functional models to identify brain regions where language activations were predictive of aphasia outcomes *above and beyond* expectations based on lesion location and extent. Finally, we constructed models that incorporated functional activation in multiple brain regions, going beyond the mass univariate approach, to identify which brain regions make unique and independent contributions to aphasia outcomes.

Materials and methods

Our study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at Vanderbilt University Medical Center and the University of Arizona. Our study procedures are described in brief here; please see Supplementary materials and methods for additional details.

Participants

We recruited 70 individuals with chronic or late subacute post-stroke aphasia. The inclusion criteria were: (1) initial aphasia following left hemisphere supratentorial ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke; (2) at least ~3 months post-stroke; (3) aged 18 to 90; and (4) fluent and literate in English premorbidly. The exclusion criteria were: (1) neurodegenerative disease, or any other neurological condition impacting language or cognition; (2) significant damage to any right-hemisphere regions homotopic to language regions; (3) major psychiatric disorder; (4) serious substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms; (5) any contraindication to MRI; or (6) compelling evidence of right hemisphere dominance for language. We also recruited 45 neurologically normal comparison participants. Demographic and medical history data are provided in Table 1 and Supplementary Table 1.

Language function was evaluated with the Quick Aphasia Battery (QAB).[51] The 70 participants with aphasia exhibited marked variability in the profile and severity of their language impairments. (Table 2; Supplementary Table 2). All analyses in the present study used the QAB overall summary measure.

Neuroimaging

All participants were scanned on 3 Tesla MRI scanners using standard sequences. Lesions were manually delineated, and images were warped to standard space using enantiomorphic normalization[52] and unified segmentation.[53] Infarcts varied widely in location and extent, but were mostly situated in middle cerebral artery (MCA) territory (Table 1; Fig. 1A).

We sought to quantify each individual's lesion load with a single scalar measure with which we could (1) depict this fundamental dimension of variability throughout our study and (2) incorporate the impact of structural damage into our functional analyses. To operationalize lesion load, we created lesion impact vectors, which quantified lesion impact across 44 left hemisphere ROIs (Fig. 1B), and used support vector regression to empirically determine how different patterns of structural damage related to aphasia outcomes.[31] Specifically, using a leave-one-out cross-validation procedure, a QAB score was predicted for each individual based on the relationships between lesion impact vectors and observed QAB overall scores for the remaining 69 participants with aphasia. Predicted QAB scores thus represented the expected impact of each individual's lesion on language function and were subsequently used as scalar representations of lesion load. The relationship between predicted and observed QAB overall scores is shown in Fig. 1C. As can be seen, aphasia outcomes were predicted quite accurately based on structural imaging.

To identify brain regions involved in language processing, we used an Adaptive Language Mapping (ALM) paradigm that we developed previously.[25] This paradigm involved an AB block design in which a semantic matching language condition (Fig. 2A) was contrasted with a perceptual matching control condition (Fig. 2B).

The ALM paradigm was developed to address two specific methodological challenges. First, individuals with aphasia inherently find language tasks challenging, resulting in task difficulty confounds which make it hard to determine whether any observed activation differences reflect functional reorganization as opposed to effects of accuracy or reaction time.[21–24,54] In the prior literature, the majority of contrasts and second level analyses were not matched for accuracy, reaction time, or cognitive demands, and in many cases, individuals with aphasia were unable to perform language tasks in the scanner.[7] The ALM paradigm was designed to confront this problem by dynamically selecting items according to each individual's real-time performance, with the goal of presenting each participant, regardless of language abilities, with tasks in the scanner that were difficult yet achievable.[25,55] Second, many commonly used language

contrasts do not selectively activate the left-lateralized language network in neurologically normal individuals.[7,25] This is a major limitation, because aphasia typically results from left hemisphere damage, and so fMRI paradigms that selectively activate left hemisphere language regions (in undamaged brains) are a prerequisite for understanding how these core language functions might be reorganized after left hemisphere damage.[7] The ALM paradigm reliably activates left-lateralized language regions in neurologically normal individuals, making it an ideal tool for investigating potential reorganization of core language functions.[25]

Statistical analysis

We carried out a series of whole-brain voxelwise analyses, and a parallel series of analyses based on individually defined functional ROIs.[56] The whole-brain group analyses were corrected for multiple comparisons using permutation testing (thresholded based on cluster extent at $P < .05$; cluster-defining threshold: $P < .005$; 1000 permutations; implemented with *randomise_parallel*). The parallel ROI analyses served two purposes. First, the small number of hypothesis-driven ROIs improved sensitivity by allowing us to conduct analyses without needing to correct for multiple comparisons at the whole-brain level. Second, the use of individually defined functional ROIs permitted the quantification of activations for language processing in spatial locations that could differ across participants.[56] This may be especially beneficial in stroke survivors, in whom it is plausible that language activations may be displaced from typical locations, due to the impact of lesions and potential functional reorganization.[57] Individually defined functional ROIs were defined within four large search spaces—left temporal, left frontal, right temporal, and right frontal (Fig. 2D)—by partitioning the data into localizer and response testing components.[58] Each set of ROI analyses (comprising four models, one for each ROI) was corrected for multiple comparisons using the false discovery rate (FDR) procedure.[59]

We first mapped language processing in individuals with aphasia, and separately in comparison participants using 1-sample voxelwise *t*-tests, then we compared these two groups directly in whole-brain and ROI analyses, including covariates of age, sex, handedness, and education.

Second, to identify brain regions where activation for language processing was correlated with aphasia outcome (QAB overall) in individuals with aphasia, we carried out whole-brain and ROI analyses with QAB overall score as the dependent variable. In addition to the covariates

just described, these analyses included covariates of stroke type (ischemic, hemorrhagic) and time post onset (logarithmically transformed).

Third, we identified brain regions where activation for language processing was predictive of aphasia outcome (QAB overall) above and beyond expectations based on structural damage (i.e., the lesion load variable, which was operationalized as the predicted QAB overall score based on structural damage). Again, whole-brain and ROI analyses were performed. Aphasia outcome (QAB overall) was again the dependent variable but, critically, the lesion load variable was also included in the models (along with the covariates just described). This required any significant finding to be significant *above and beyond* what structural information was able to explain. We also included the interaction of lesion load by time post onset, which accounted for significant variance because our more chronic participants tended to have greater lesion loads, since they had been mostly recruited in the context of long-term involvement in aphasia groups.

Finally, we included language activations from multiple functional ROIs simultaneously in a single model, along with the lesion load variable and the covariates, to investigate which ROIs made unique and independent contributions to accounting for aphasia outcomes. In other words, this final analysis sought to identify brain regions in which language activations were predictive of aphasia outcomes not only above and beyond what structural information could explain, but also above and beyond what language activations in other brain regions could explain.

Results

Functional MRI task performance

In the scanner, 67 out of 70 individuals with aphasia performed above chance on the language condition of the ALM paradigm, and all 70 performed above chance on the perceptual condition, confirming task compliance (Fig. 2E,F,G). There were, however, significant interactions of group by condition for accuracy ($P < .001$), mean difficulty level ($P < .001$), and reaction time ($P = .014$), indicating that the aphasia group were disproportionately impaired on the language condition (please see Supplementary Results for details).

Functional MRI task activation patterns

The aphasia group activated a strongly left-lateralized network for the contrast of the semantic condition with the perceptual condition (Fig. 3A; Table 3). Activated regions included the whole length of the left STS extending ventrally to the posterior MTG and posterior ITG, and posteriorly to the angular gyrus; the left IFG (pars opercularis, triangularis, and orbitalis) extending posteriorly to the dorsal and ventral precentral gyrus; the right IFG (pars triangularis and opercularis); and the right cerebellum. Comparison participants activated a similar network (Fig. 3B; Table 3).

Despite the similarity of the activation maps in the two groups, a direct comparison between the groups revealed reduced activation in individuals with aphasia in the left posterior STS extending ventrally to the posterior MTG and posterior ITG, and posteriorly to the angular gyrus; the left IFG (pars orbitalis, triangularis, and opercularis) extending ventrally to the anterior temporal lobe; and the right cerebellum (Fig. 3C; Table 3). No regions showed increased activation in individuals with aphasia relative to comparison participants.

The ROI analyses largely mirrored these findings (Supplementary Tables 3–6), revealing reduced activation in individuals with aphasia compared to comparison participants in the left temporal ROI ($\beta = -0.25$ percent signal change, $t(109) = -6.23$, $P_{FDR} < .001$) and left frontal ROI ($\beta = -0.22$, $t(109) = -4.04$, $P_{FDR} < .001$), and no difference between the groups in the right frontal ROI ($\beta = -0.008$, $t(109) = -.33$, $P_{FDR} = .74$). However, the greater sensitivity of the ROI analyses revealed an additional between-groups difference in the right temporal ROI, where individuals with aphasia showed reduced activation relative to comparison participants ($\beta = -0.05$, $t(109) = -2.34$, $P_{FDR} = .029$).

Functional MRI initial correlational analyses

In the initial whole-brain correlational analysis (not yet incorporating structural information), we observed positive associations between voxelwise activity and QAB overall scores in several left-hemisphere language regions, including the left posterior STS extending ventrally to the posterior ITG, and anteriorly to the left anterior STG, and the left IFG (pars orbitalis, triangularis, and opercularis) (Fig. 3D; Table 3). In other words, greater activation in these regions was associated with better aphasia outcomes, operationalized as higher QAB overall scores. No negative relationships were observed.

The ROI analyses largely mirrored these findings (Fig. 3E, Supplementary Tables 7–10), showing positive relationships with QAB overall scores in the left temporal ROI (β = 8.80, $t(62)$ = 6.26, P_{FDR} < .001) and left frontal ROI (β = 4.56, $t(62)$ = 4.23, P_{FDR} < .001), and no relationship in the right frontal ROI (β = 0.16, $t(62)$ = 0.05, P_{FDR} = .96). Again, however, the greater sensitivity of the ROI analyses facilitated the detection of an additional positive relationship between language activation and language function in the right temporal ROI (β = 7.92, $t(62)$ = 2.13, P_{FDR} = .049).

By examining the plots demonstrating significant relationships between functional activity and aphasia outcomes in Fig. 3E, it can be readily appreciated that lesion load estimates—depicted with the yellow-orange-red color scale—were strongly associated with both axes of these plots. This indicates that these findings might be driven by structural differences between individuals. To address this potential confound, we next sought to determine whether functional activations have independent explanatory power, or whether their associations with aphasia outcomes are secondary to structural damage to core left hemisphere language regions.

Integration of functional MRI, structural MRI, and behavior

To identify brain regions where activation was associated with successful language processing *above and beyond* what could already be explained by structural damage, we added lesion load (i.e., predicted QAB overall score based on structural imaging alone) to create integrated structure-function-behaviour models. The whole-brain analysis revealed a positive relationship between voxelwise activity and QAB outcomes in a single cluster extending from the left posterior STS to the MTG and ITG (Fig. 4A, Table 3). In this region, greater functional activation was predictive of higher observed QAB overall scores, above and beyond expectations based on structural damage alone. There were no negative associations observed.

To illustrate this finding, two case examples are provided (Fig. 4B,C). These individuals both had extensive fronto-parietal lesions reflecting infarction of the upper division of the MCA. Their observed QAB overall scores were quite different (7.9 and 1.8, respectively), which could not be accounted for structurally because of the similarity of their lesions. However, the difference between their aphasia outcomes parallels differences in their functional activation for language processing. The individual in Fig. 4B showed robust and extensive activation in the left posterior temporal lobe, while the individual in Fig. 4C did not, despite this core region being spared in both individuals. These individuals thus exemplify the overall pattern observed

in the cohort, whereby activation of the left posterior temporal region was predictive of achieving QAB overall scores above and beyond what was expected based on structural damage.

We next carried out ROI analyses (first, a separate model for each ROI) using the same model structure as in the whole-brain analysis (Fig. 4D, Supplementary Tables 11–14). The ROI analyses confirmed the importance of the left temporal ROI (β = 4.87, $t(60)$ = 4.39, P_{FDR} < .001). In addition, the greater sensitivity of the ROI analyses revealed further positive associations between functional activity and aphasia outcomes in the left frontal ROI (β = 1.99, $t(60)$ = 2.52, P_{FDR} = .019) (demonstrated in the case examples above) and the right temporal ROI (β = 6.19, $t(60)$ = 2.74, P_{FDR} = .016) (not seen in the case examples). There was no association in the right frontal ROI (β = 1.72, $t(60)$ = 0.88, P_{FDR} = .38).

While these ROI analyses showed that functional activity in three regions could predict aphasia outcomes above and beyond lesion location and extent, these three models were all separate from one another, modeling functional activity in each region in isolation, which is not a realistic assumption. Indeed, when we examined correlations (across participants) between activity in these three regions, we found that in neurologically normal comparison participants, left temporal language activation was strongly correlated with both left frontal language activation (r = .56, P < .001) and right temporal language activation (r = .58, P < .001). In the aphasia group, left temporal language activation remained strongly correlated with left frontal language activation (r = .58, P < .001) and was marginally correlated with right temporal activation (r = .22, P = .070).

To address this limitation, we carried out a final ROI analysis in which functional activity in the three potentially predictive regions (left temporal, left frontal, right temporal) was entered simultaneously into a single model, along with lesion load (i.e., predicted QAB) and covariates (Fig. 4E; Supplementary Table 15). This model revealed that functional activity in both the left temporal (β = 3.75, $t(58)$ = 3.00, P = .004) and right temporal (β = 4.49, $t(58)$ = 2.16, P = .035) ROIs predicted aphasia outcomes above and beyond all other variables. In contrast, functional activity in the left frontal ROI was no longer predictive (β = 0.80, $t(58)$ = 1.01, P = .32), now that functional activity in the temporal ROIs was included in the same model.

The final full model that included functional activity in the left temporal, right temporal, and left frontal regions, explained 76.8% of the variance in aphasia outcomes (Fig. 5; Supplementary Table 15). In comparison, only 66.5% of the variance was explained when only

structural information and covariates were included (Fig. 1C; Supplementary Table 16). In other words, adding distributed functional activity to the model explained an additional 10.3% of the variance in aphasia outcomes ($F(3, 58) = 8.57$, $P < .001$), with a large effect size (Cohen's $f^2 = 0.44$).

Finally, we evaluated the relative contributions of the three functional regions. The left temporal ROI exhibited the largest effect sizes, explaining an additional 8.2% of variance when entered first (Cohen's $f^2 = 0.32$, a medium effect), or 3.6% of variance when entered last ($f^2 = 0.15$, a medium effect). The right temporal ROI explained an additional 3.7% of variance when entered first ($f^2 = 0.13$, a small effect), or an additional 1.9% when entered last ($f^2 = 0.08$, a small effect). The left frontal ROI explained an additional 3.2% of variance when entered first ($f^2 = 0.11$, a small effect), but as noted above, did not make a significant contribution when entered last.

Discussion

The overall goal of this study was to rigorously and comprehensively characterise the neural basis of language processing in individuals with post-stroke aphasia. We were able to alleviate three major methodological limitations that have often impacted prior studies, and in doing so, we confirmed the two most compelling findings from the literature to date: that individuals with aphasia have reduced activation throughout the left hemisphere language network,[8,9,42] and that functional activity throughout the left-hemisphere language network correlates with aphasia outcomes.[9–11,16,34,36] To build on these findings, we addressed the complex relationships that exist between patterns of structural damage, distributed networks of functional activity in surviving regions, and behaviour, by using machine learning to quantify lesion load, and incorporating this structural information into multivariable analyses of language activations in multiple brain regions and behaviour. These analyses refined our understanding of the roles of left posterior temporal cortex, right posterior temporal cortex, and left inferior frontal cortex in language processing in aphasia, revealing that functional activity in all three of these regions is predictive of aphasia outcomes *above and beyond* patterns of structural damage, and that language activations in both temporal lobes make independent contributions even when functional activity in other regions is taken into account.

Left posterior temporal cortex

Taken together, three of our key findings suggest that left posterior temporal cortex is the most critical region for language processing in post-stroke aphasia. First, in the whole-brain analysis to identify brain regions where language activation predicted aphasia outcomes above and beyond structural information, the only significant cluster was localized to left posterior temporal cortex, extending from the STS to the middle and inferior temporal gyri. This finding was confirmed in our ROI analysis. Second, language activation in the posterior temporal ROI was predictive of aphasia outcomes even when activations in other ROIs (left inferior frontal and right posterior temporal) were included in the same model, demonstrating that the left temporal region makes an independent contribution to aphasia outcomes. Third, left temporal activation explained the greatest proportion of additional variance in aphasia outcomes and always had the largest effect size, regardless of whether it was entered first or last in the multivariable models.

The association of left temporal *damage* with poor aphasia outcomes is well established,[3,60,61] and it was not surprising that this effect would be mediated by a reduction in functional activation. But why does functional activation of this region explain language outcomes *above and beyond* structural damage? We propose at least three possible explanations.

First, it may be that our measure of left posterior temporal functional activation provides a more direct measure of the functionality of this region than our lesion load estimate, because our lesion masks may not always reliably encode damage to the critical language region. Reasons for this could include difficulties ascertaining the lesion status of voxels (especially near lesion borders), intersubject variability introduced in the normalization to standard space, and individual differences in the locations of critical language regions.

Second, there may be functional abnormalities in regions that are structurally spared. This could include long term perfusion deficits[62] or diaschitic effects of nearby or distant damage. A structural analysis would not detect these abnormalities and their potentially negative consequences for language outcome, while a functional analysis would be sensitive to reduced or absent activation and would again provide a better estimate of outcome.

The third, and most interesting, possibility is that the functional activation may represent functional reorganization. That is, those individuals who are able to recruit surviving regions within left posterior temporal cortex more extensively than they did before their stroke, or who activate surviving language regions more strongly (resulting in greater BOLD signal change),

may have better language outcomes. In a recent longitudinal study, we observed relatively good recoveries for most participants with damage to the left frontal, parietal, and other components of the language network, while individuals with extensive left temporal damage or complete left perisylvian damage had the poorest outcomes.[3] A major mechanism of recovery may involve surviving parts of the language network learning to take over the roles of damaged parts, and the left temporal region may have the greatest capacity in this respect.

The hypothesis that functional reorganization may contribute to our findings can only be verified by future longitudinal studies. To date, there is limited evidence for longitudinal changes over the course of recovery.[7] In the most compelling finding so far regarding left temporal cortex, Saur and colleagues reported increased activation in the posterior MTG over the first year after stroke.[63] In another study from this group, change over time in left MTG activity in a single individual was shown to relate to recovery of language function.[64] These studies do not distinguish, however, between reactivation of structurally preserved but functionally abnormal tissue versus functional reorganization.

Several previous studies have investigated the relationships between structural damage and functional activity and/or modeled distributed patterns of functional activity.[11,19,30,32–50] Most notably, in a recent study also using our ALM paradigm, Turkeltaub and colleagues reported that functional activity in several left temporal ROIs (among other regions) was associated with naming and word finding, above and beyond lesion load.[50]

The causality of the functional activations has not been established by our study. Although we have shown that left posterior temporal activation makes a greater contribution to predicting aphasia outcomes than any other region, this does mean that the variable functionality is inherent to this region. The presence or absence of left temporal activity could reflect successful or unsuccessful engagement of the language network, which might ultimately depend on other cognitive, behavioral, or neural factors. For example, an executive deficit[65] or a pervasive disconnection syndrome[66,67] could plausibly lead to an inability to recruit the language network for language processing, which could produce the association of functional activity with aphasia outcomes that we observed.

Right posterior temporal cortex

The role of the right temporal lobe in recovery from aphasia is much less well-established,[7] though the idea that the right hemisphere plays an important role in recovery from aphasia has

a long history. A seminal study from Weiller and colleagues[12] provided the first evidence from functional neuroimaging by demonstrating increased right temporal activity in six individuals who had recovered from Wernicke's aphasia, relative to comparison participants (albeit with limited statistical support).[7] Later, an important study by Crinion and Price[9] found that activation of a more anterior right temporal region was associated with language comprehension outcomes in 17 individuals with aphasia. While several other methodologically robust analyses have provided additional support for potential right temporal involvement in language processing after stroke,[14,16,50] there is a surprisingly lack of compelling evidence for this position, given the popularity of the claim.[7]

Our study provides several pieces of evidence that bear on the role of right posterior temporal cortex in aphasia recovery. First, our ROI analyses revealed reduced activation in people with aphasia in right posterior temporal cortex. This finding is likely to represent diaschisis, that is, loss of function in a surviving brain region that is connected to damaged regions.[68] The right temporal region is robustly connected to its homotopic counterpart.[69] Diaschisis is an important mechanism in understanding post-stroke aphasia,[70] and has been clearly demonstrated in certain contexts, such as the hyperacute impact of subcortical strokes on cortical language areas.[71] However, diaschisis has rarely been convincingly demonstrated in task-based functional neuroimaging studies, a few exceptions including compelling demonstrations of reduced activity in undamaged left inferior temporal gyrus[72] and anterior temporal regions.[10] Notably, most previous reports of differential right posterior temporal activity in individuals with aphasia have actually been increases.[12,30,32,50,73–76]

Second, our initial correlational analyses showed that functional activation of right posterior temporal cortex was correlated with aphasia outcomes. This is similar to the (more anterior) finding from Crinion and Price[9]; see also[14,16]. However, these findings are limited in that they cannot exclude that right temporal correlations with aphasia outcomes may reflect diaschitic effects of left temporal damage or dysfunction. The recent study by Turkeltaub and colleagues showed that activity in the right mid STS was associated with oral word reading, even after accounting for left hemisphere lesion load.[50] But left temporal damage also causes left temporal dysfunction, and we observed strong correlations between left and right temporal activity in comparison participants, reduced right temporal activity in people with aphasia (as a group), and persisting but attenuated correlations between left and right temporal activity in the aphasia cohort, raising the possibility that lesion effects could be mediated by left hemisphere activity.

In this context, our third finding provides stronger evidence for a critical contribution of right posterior superior temporal cortex to aphasia outcomes after stroke. Specifically, we found that right posterior temporal activation was predictive of aphasia outcomes above and beyond not only lesion load, but even after accounting for functional activation of core left hemisphere language regions. This finding emerged in our analyses based on individually defined functional ROIs, which are more sensitive and better accommodate individual variability than whole-brain analyses. By showing that right temporal activations continued to predict aphasia outcomes even when both lesion load and left hemisphere activations were included in the model, we have demonstrated that diaschitic effects are not likely to account for the association between right temporal activations and aphasia outcomes, thus supporting an independent role for right temporal cortex in language processing in aphasia.

We cannot determine based on our data whether the relationship between right temporal activation and aphasia outcomes reflects premorbid variability in the capacity of the non-dominant hemisphere or functional reorganization. Crinion and Price observed that right temporal activation in the aphasia group in their study did not exceed the range of comparison participants, suggesting that the finding reflected premorbid variability in the capacity of the non-dominant hemisphere rather than reorganization.[9] We also observed that right temporal activation in our aphasia cohort was largely within the range of comparison participants (Fig. 3E), so we, too, consider the former explanation more likely. However, given that at a group level, people with aphasia had attenuated right temporal activation compared to comparison participants, it is also plausible that our findings reflect functional recruitment of the right hemisphere in a subset of participants, overlaid on a diaschitic effect that reduces right temporal activity at the group level. Future longitudinal studies may be able to resolve this question. In our view, there is presently limited evidence for longitudinal recruitment of right temporal regions for language,[7] but there are some compelling cross-sectional findings,[14,50] and several recent studies have reported longitudinal increases in right temporal activity for speech (not language) contrasts.[77,78]

Left inferior frontal cortex

The left inferior frontal cortex is the brain region where language activation has most consistently been associated with aphasia outcomes, in several methodologically robust analyses[11,16,34] and numerous other studies.[7] We replicated this finding (Fig. 3D), and we further observed in our ROI analyses that language activation in the left inferior frontal region

predicted aphasia outcomes above and beyond lesion load. This strengthens the evidence for the importance of left inferior frontal activation for language processing in aphasia.

However, surprisingly, when language activations from the bilateral temporal lobes were included in the model, we no longer observed an independent contribution of activity in the left inferior frontal cortex. This could be explained in part by the fact that left temporal and left frontal language regions are closely interconnected, [79–81] and their activations in our data were quite highly correlated. It is possible that in a larger sample with more representation of different lesion patterns, an independent contribution of frontal activation might be observed. But despite the collinearity, left temporal activations *did* make an independent contribution, above and beyond left frontal activations. This suggests that left temporal activation may be more critical than left frontal activation for language function after stroke.

Why, then, have frontal correlations been more frequently observed than temporal correlations?[7] One possible explanation is that fMRI is inherently biased towards frontal language activations, which are more readily detectable,[82] because active tasks, which tend to enhance psychometric properties,[25] also tend to engage "language executive" regions in the left frontal lobe.[83]

Other potential mechanisms

Several mechanisms that have been proposed to potentially contribute to language processing in post-stroke aphasia were not strongly supported by our data. Increased activity in the right pars opercularis is a frequent finding in the literature, including in two methodologically robust studies[15,50] and numerous other studies.[7] However, we did not observe increased (or decreased) activation in people with aphasia in the right IFG, nor did we find any evidence that activity in this region was associated with aphasia outcomes, in any of the models that we explored. In a previous study of neurologically normal participants, we observed that the right pars opercularis is modulated by linguistic demand; that is, it is more active for more challenging than less challenging language conditions.[58] This suggests that prior findings in the right IFG may reflect performance confounds, as previously suggested by Geranmayeh and colleagues.[23] In our study, performance confounds were minimized (though not entirely eliminated) by our adaptive paradigm, which could explain why we did not observe differential activity in the right IFG.

Similarly, we did not observe increased activity in the bilateral multiple demand network, which has been speculated to be another potential compensatory mechanism[17,18,23]. This finding is consistent with a recent study that investigated this issue specifically and also reported no upregulation of the multiple demand network in aphasia.[84]

Finally, we did not observe increased activity in perilesional areas outside the language network.[20] Although our study did not explicitly investigate perilesional activations with respect to individual lesions, another recent study using our adaptive language mapping paradigm[25] did take this approach, and also did not find evidence for compensatory perilesional activations in aphasia.[85]

Limitations

Our study had several noteworthy limitations. First, the adaptive paradigm did not completely succeed in matching performance across the groups: individuals with aphasia were less accurate on the language task than comparison participants, faced less difficult items, and were slower. Several researchers have similarly made efforts to manipulate and match task difficulty between people with aphasia and comparison participants,[17,72,86,87] with varying degrees of success. The likely consequences of the language task being more difficult for the individuals with aphasia can be evaluated, since we have examined the impact of linguistic demand in a prior study, and found that linguistic demand modulated the left hemisphere language network, the right IFG, and the bilateral multiple demand network.[58] In contrast, here we observed decreased activation in left hemisphere language regions in individuals with aphasia, and no increases in the right IFG, in multiple demand regions, or in any other brain regions. This suggests that the residual performance confounds had a minimal impact and were unlikely to have contributed to our main findings.

Second, although our analyses were multidimensional in many ways, our data reduction choices did leave some variability unexplored in the present study. In particular, we incorporated structural information into our analyses of functional activation and behavior via a single scalar measure of lesion load. It is plausible that lesions to different parts of the language network have different consequences for language processing,[47] so future studies should seek to integrate structural information in more specific ways. On the behavioral side, we used a global language measure to characterize language performance, which can be vulnerable to masking important individual variability.[88] However, the measure we used had

strong psychometric qualities[51] and different domains of language processing are highly correlated in aphasia,[51,89,90] so the QAB overall score was a good starting point. Relatedly, our language mapping paradigm and aphasia battery were both focused on core linguistic functions and do not provide information about functional communication abilities in people with aphasia. Future work should investigate the neural correlates of communication in aphasia from a more holistic perspective. Along these lines, although we used the term "aphasia outcomes" throughout this paper, we acknowledge that there are many other important aspects of outcome for people with aphasia beyond purely linguistic function (e.g., functional communication, participation, quality of life).

Third, there were some practical limitations to our cohort of individuals with aphasia. We included participants in the late subacute period (~3 months post-stroke) despite the potential for continued recovery and neural reorganization throughout the first year[3] and beyond. This decision prioritized adequate sample size while recognizing that language recovery is generally modest after 3 months: in a previous longitudinal study, we observed mean recovery of only 0.4 ± 0.5 QAB points between 3 and 12 months post-stroke (based on 67 patients, including 31 in the present study).[3] We mitigated this limitation by including time post onset in all relevant models, with a logarithmic transformation to match observed recovery trajectories.[91] Also, as the data were acquired over a 7-year period, multiple scanners were used with different acquisition parameters. While our preprocessing pipeline was designed to harmonize data across scanners, this is a source of variability that would be better to avoid in future work.

Conclusion

In sum, our goal was to comprehensively characterise the neural basis of language processing in individuals with post-stroke aphasia. We addressed several major methodological challenges by using an adaptive language mapping paradigm with a large and diverse sample of individuals with aphasia, and investigated the complex relationships between patterns of structural damage, distributed networks of functional activity, and behavioral outcomes using multivariable models that integrated structural MRI, functional MRI and behavioral measures. We showed that functional imaging provides critical insights into language processing in aphasia that cannot be obtained from structural imaging alone. Our findings highlighted the importance of the left and right posterior temporal cortices, which we showed make independent contributions to aphasia outcomes after stroke, even after taking into account lesion load and functional activations in other brain regions.

Data availability

The data underlying the analyses reported in this article are available on the Open Science Framework (OSF) at https://osf.io/ga8e5. Specifically, the dataset includes all reported contrast images (thresholded and unthresholded), all individual participant data underlying the ROI and behavioral analyses, and the Matlab code for the statistical analyses.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully thank the many people with aphasia who generously gave their time and energy to participate in this study; their caregivers and loved ones; Fabi Hersch, Dominique Herrington, Trisha Kennedy, Amanda Hereford, and many other clinicians for assistance with recruitment; Melissa Duff and Catie Chang for helpful feedback; lab members Andrew DeMarco, Sydney Franklin, Ian Quillen, Maysaa Rahman, Jill Rawls, Kiiya Shibata, and Emma Willey for their contributions to this work; and Scott Squire, Seth Smith, and the MRI technologists at the Vanderbilt University Institute of Imaging Science for assistance with MRI scanning.

Funding

This research was supported in part by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) (R01 DC013270; F32 DC020096; F31 DC021108; F31 DC020112) and the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR) (90ARHF0007).

Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material accompanies this article.

References

1. Pedersen PM, Jørgensen HS, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Olsen TS. Aphasia in acute stroke: incidence, determinants, and recovery. *Ann Neurol.* 1995;38:659–666.

2. Kertesz A, McCabe P. Recovery patterns and prognosis in aphasia. *Brain.* 1977;100:1–18.

3. Wilson SM, Entrup JL, Schneck SM, et al. Recovery from aphasia in the first year after stroke. *Brain.* 2023;146:1021–1039.

4. Hartwigsen G, Saur D. Neuroimaging of stroke recovery from aphasia – Insights into plasticity of the human language network. *NeuroImage.* 2019;190:14–31.

5. Stefaniak JD, Halai AD, Lambon Ralph MA. The neural and neurocomputational bases of recovery from post-stroke aphasia. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2020;16:43–55.

6. Chang YN, Lambon Ralph MA. A unified neurocomputational bilateral model of spoken language production in healthy participants and recovery in poststroke aphasia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2020;117:32779–32790.

7. Wilson SM, Schneck SM. Neuroplasticity in post-stroke aphasia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of functional imaging studies of reorganization of language processing. *Neurobiol Lang.* 2021;2:22–82.

8. van Oers CAMM, Vink M, van Zandvoort MJE, et al. 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.* 2010;49:885–893.

9. Crinion J, Price CJ. Right anterior superior temporal activation predicts auditory sentence comprehension following aphasic stroke. *Brain.* 2005;128:2858–2871.

10. Crinion JT, Warburton EA, Lambon-Ralph MA, Howard D, Wise RJS. Listening to narrative speech after aphasic stroke: The role of the left anterior temporal lobe. *Cereb Cortex.* 2006;16:1116–1125.

11. Griffis JC, Nenert R, Allendorfer JB, et al. The canonical semantic network supports residual language function in chronic post-stroke aphasia. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2017;38:1636–1658.

12. Weiller C, Isensee C, Rijntjes M, et al. Recovery from Wernicke's aphasia: A positron emission tomographic study. *Ann Neurol.* 1995;37:723–732.

13. Rosen HJ, Petersen SE, Linenweber MR, et al. Neural correlates of recovery from aphasia after damage to left inferior frontal cortex. *Neurology.* 2000;55:1883–1894.

14. Leff A, Crinion J, Scott S, Turkheimer F, Howard D, Wise R. A physiological change in the homotopic cortex following left posterior temporal lobe infarction. *Ann Neurol.* 2002;51:553–558.

15. Blank SC, Bird H, Turkheimer F, Wise RJS. Speech production after stroke: The role of the right pars opercularis. *Ann Neurol.* 2003;54:310–320.

16. Tyler LK, Marslen-Wilson WD, Randall B, et al. Left inferior frontal cortex and syntax: Function, structure and behaviour in patients with left hemisphere damage. *Brain.* 2011;134:415–431.

17. Brownsett SLE, Warren JE, Geranmayeh F, Woodhead Z, Leech R, Wise RJS. Cognitive control and its impact on recovery from aphasic stroke. *Brain.* 2014;137:242–254.

18. Geranmayeh F, Chau TW, Wise RJS, Leech R, Hampshire A. Domain-general subregions of the medial prefrontal cortex contribute to recovery of language after stroke. *Brain.* 2017;140:1947–1958.

19. Schneider HR, Wawrzyniak M, Stockert A, Klingbeil J, Saur D. fMRI informed voxel-based lesion analysis to identify lesions associated with right-hemispheric activation in aphasia recovery. *NeuroImage Clin.* 2022;36:103169.

20. Fridriksson J, Richardson JD, Fillmore P, Cai B. Left hemisphere plasticity and aphasia recovery. *NeuroImage.* 2012;60:854–863.

21. Price CJ, Friston KJ. Scanning patients with tasks they can perform. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 1999;8:102–108.

22. Price CJ, Crinion J, Friston KJ. Design and analysis of fMRI studies with neurologically impaired patients. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2006;23:816–826.

23. Geranmayeh F, Brownsett SLE, Wise RJS. Task-induced brain activity in aphasic stroke patients: what is driving recovery? *Brain.* 2014;137:2632–2648.

24. Binder JR, Medler DA, Desai R, Conant LL, Liebenthal E. Some neurophysiological constraints on models of word naming. *NeuroImage.* 2005;27:677–693.

25. Wilson SM, Yen M, Eriksson DK. An adaptive semantic matching paradigm for reliable and valid language mapping in individuals with aphasia. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2018;39:3285–3307.

26. Eklund A, Nichols TE, Knutsson H. Cluster failure: Why fMRI inferences for spatial extent have inflated false-positive rates. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2016;113:7900–7905.

27. Nichols TE, Holmes AP. Nonparametric permutation tests for functional neuroimaging: a primer with examples. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2002;15:1–25.

28. Heiss WD, Kessler J, Thiel A, Ghaemi M, Karbe H. Differential capacity of left and right hemispheric areas for compensation of poststroke aphasia. *Ann Neurol.* 1999;45:430–438.

29. Heiss WD, Thiel A. A proposed regional hierarchy in recovery of post-stroke aphasia. *Brain Lang.* 2006;98:118–123.

30. Skipper-Kallal LM, Lacey EH, Xing S, Turkeltaub PE. Functional activation independently contributes to naming ability and relates to lesion site in post-stroke aphasia. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2017;38:2051–2066.

31. Levy DF, Entrup JL, Schneck SM, et al. Multivariate lesion symptom mapping for predicting trajectories of recovery from aphasia. *Brain Commun.* 2024;6:fcae024.

32. Specht K, Zahn R, Willmes K, et al. Joint independent component analysis of structural and functional images reveals complex patterns of functional reorganisation in stroke aphasia. *NeuroImage.* 2009;47:2057–2063.

33. Warren JE, Crinion JT, Lambon Ralph MA, Wise RJS. Anterior temporal lobe connectivity correlates with functional outcome after aphasic stroke. *Brain.* 2009;132:3428–3442.

34. Fridriksson J, Bonilha L, Baker JM, Moser D, Rorden C. Activity in preserved left hemisphere regions predicts anomia severity in aphasia. *Cereb Cortex.* 2010;20:1013–1019.

35. Tyler LK, Wright P, Randall B, Marslen-Wilson WD, Stamatakis EA. Reorganization of syntactic processing following left-hemisphere brain damage: Does right-hemisphere activity preserve function? *Brain.* 2010;133:3396–3408.

36. Papoutsi M, Stamatakis EA, Griffiths J, Marslen-Wilson WD, Tyler LK. Is left fronto-temporal connectivity essential for syntax? Effective connectivity, tractography and performance in left-hemisphere damaged patients. *NeuroImage.* 2011;58:656–664.

37. Wright P, Stamatakis EA, Tyler LK. Differentiating hemispheric contributions to syntax and semantics in patients with left-hemisphere lesions. *J Neurosci.* 2012;32:8149–8157.

38. Abel S, Weiller C, Huber W, Willmes K, Specht K. Therapy-induced brain reorganization patterns in aphasia. *Brain.* 2015;138:1097–1112.

39. Geranmayeh F, Leech R, Wise RJS. Network dysfunction predicts speech production after left hemisphere stroke. *Neurology.* 2016;86:1296–1305.

40. Griffis JC, Nenert R, Allendorfer JB, Szaflarski JP. Interhemispheric plasticity following intermittent theta burst stimulation in chronic poststroke aphasia. *Neural Plast.* 2016;2016:4796906.

41. Sims JA, Kapse K, Glynn P, Sandberg C, Tripodis Y, Kiran S. The relationships between the amount of spared tissue, percent signal change, and accuracy in semantic processing in aphasia. *Neuropsychologia.* 2016;84:113–126.

42. Griffis JC, Nenert R, Allendorfer JB, Szaflarski JP. Linking left hemispheric tissue preservation to fMRI language task activation in chronic stroke patients. *Cortex.* 2017;96:1–18.

43. Skipper-Kallal LM, Lacey EH, Xing S, Turkeltaub PE. Right hemisphere remapping of naming functions depends on lesion size and location in poststroke aphasia. *Neural Plast.* 2017;2017:8740353.

44. Nenert R, Allendorfer JB, Martin AM, et al. Longitudinal fMRI study of language recovery after a left hemispheric ischemic stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 2018;36:359–385.

45. Johnson JP, Meier EL, Pan Y, Kiran S. Treatment-related changes in neural activation vary according to treatment response and extent of spared tissue in patients with chronic aphasia. *Cortex.* 2019;121:147–168.

46. Purcell JJ, Wiley RW, Rapp B. Re-learning to be different: Increased neural differentiation supports post-stroke language recovery. *NeuroImage.* 2019;202:116145.

47. Stockert A, Wawrzyniak M, Klingbeil J, et al. Dynamics of language reorganization after left temporo-parietal and frontal stroke. *Brain.* 2020;143:844–861.

48. Lorca-Puls DL, Gajardo-Vidal A, PLORAS Team, et al. Brain regions that support accurate speech production after damage to Broca's area. *Brain Commun.* 2021;3:fcab230.

49. Wawrzyniak M, Schneider HR, Klingbeil J, et al. Resolution of diaschisis contributes to early recovery from post-stroke aphasia. *NeuroImage.* 2022;251:119001.

50. Turkeltaub PE, Martin KC, Laks AB, DeMarco AT. Right hemisphere language network plasticity in aphasia. *Brain* 2025;awaf308.

51. Wilson SM, Eriksson DK, Schneck SM, Lucanie JM. A quick aphasia battery for efficient, reliable, and multidimensional assessment of language function. *PloS One.* 2018;13:e0192773.

52. Nachev P, Coulthard E, Jäger HR, Kennard C, Husain M. Enantiomorphic normalization of focally lesioned brains. *NeuroImage.* 2008;39:1215–1226.

53. Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Unified segmentation. *NeuroImage.* 2005;26:839–851.

54. Fridriksson J, Morrow L. Cortical activation and language task difficulty in aphasia. *Aphasiology.* 2005;19:239–250.

55. Wilson SM, Eriksson DK, Yen M, Demarco AT, Schneck SM, Lucanie JM. Language mapping in aphasia. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* 2019;62:3937–3946.

56. Fedorenko E, Hsieh PJ, Nieto-Castañón A, Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Kanwisher N. New method for fMRI investigations of language: Defining ROIs functionally in individual subjects. *J Neurophysiol.* 2010;104:1177–1194.

57. Blank IA, Kiran S, Fedorenko E. Can neuroimaging help aphasia researchers? Addressing generalizability, variability, and interpretability. *Cogn Neuropsychol.* 2017;34:377–393.

58. Quillen IA, Yen M, Wilson SM. Distinct neural correlates of linguistic and non-linguistic demand. *Neurobiol Lang.* 2021;2:202–225.

59. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol.* 1995;57:289–300.

60. Marie P. La troisième circonvolution frontal gauche ne joue aucun rôle spécial dans la fonction du langage. *Sem Médicale.* 1906;26:241–247.

61. Metter EJ. Brain-behavior relationships in aphasia studied by positron emission tomography. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1991;620:153–164.

62. Richardson JD, Baker JM, Morgan PS, Rorden C, Bonilha L, Fridriksson J. Cerebral perfusion in chronic stroke: Implications for lesion-symptom mapping and functional MRI. *Behav Neurol.* 2011;24:117–122.

63. Saur D, Lange R, Baumgaertner A, et al. Dynamics of language reorganization after stroke. *Brain.* 2006;129:1371–1384.

64. Saur D, Hartwigsen G. Neurobiology of language recovery after stroke: Lessons from neuroimaging studies. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2012;93:S15–S25.

65. Schumacher R, Halai AD, Lambon Ralph MA. Assessing and mapping language, attention and executive multidimensional deficits in stroke aphasia. *Brain.* 2019;142:3202–3216.

66. Siegel JS, Ramsey LE, Snyder AZ, et al. Disruptions of network connectivity predict impairment in multiple behavioral domains after stroke. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2016;113:E4367–E4376.

67. Marebwa BK, Fridriksson J, Yourganov G, Feenaughty L, Rorden C, Bonilha L. Chronic post-stroke aphasia severity is determined by fragmentation of residual white matter networks. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7:8188.

68. Carrera E, Tononi G. Diaschisis: Past, present, future. *Brain.* 2014;137:2408–2422.

69. Salvador R, Suckling J, Coleman MR, Pickard JD, Menon D, Bullmore E. Neurophysiological architecture of functional magnetic resonance images of human brain. *Cereb Cortex.* 2005;15:1332–1342.

70. Price CJ, Warburton EA, Moore CJ, Frackowiak RS, Friston KJ. Dynamic diaschisis: Anatomically remote and context-sensitive human brain lesions. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2001;13:419–429.

71. Hillis AE, Wityk RJ, Barker PB, Beauchamp NJ, Gailloud P, Murphy K, et al. Subcortical aphasia and neglect in acute stroke: The role of cortical hypoperfusion. *Brain.* 2002;125:1094–1104.

72. Sharp DJ, Scott SK, Wise RJS. Retrieving meaning after temporal lobe infarction: the role of the basal language area. *Ann Neurol.* 2004;56:836–846.

73. Ohyama M, Senda M, Kitamura S, Ishii K, Mishina M, Terashi A. Role of the nondominant hemisphere and undamaged area during word repetition in poststroke aphasics: A PET activation study. *Stroke.* 1996;27:897–903.

74. Cao Y, Vikingstad EM, George KP, Johnson AF, Welch KMA. Cortical language activation in stroke patients recovering from aphasia with functional MRI. *Stroke.* 1999;30:2331–2340.

75. Robson H, Zahn R, Keidel JL, Binney RJ, Sage K, Lambon Ralph MA. The anterior temporal lobes support residual comprehension in Wernicke's aphasia. *Brain.* 2014;137:931–943.

76. Nenert R, Allendorfer JB, Martin AM, et al. Neuroimaging correlates of post-stroke aphasia rehabilitation in a pilot randomized trial of Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy. *Med Sci Monit.* 2017;23:3489–3507.

77. Stefaniak JD, Geranmayeh F, Lambon Ralph MA. The multidimensional nature of aphasia recovery post-stroke. *Brain.* 2022;145:1354–1367.

78. Upton E, Doogan C, Fleming V, et al. Efficacy of a gamified digital therapy for speech production in people with chronic aphasia (iTalkBetter): Behavioural and imaging outcomes of a phase II item-randomised clinical trial. *eClinicalMedicine.* 2024;70:102483.

79. Hampson M, Peterson BS, Skudlarski P, Gatenby JC, Gore JC. Detection of functional connectivity using temporal correlations in MR images. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2002;15:247–262.

80. Turken U, Dronkers NF. The neural architecture of the language comprehension network: Converging evidence from lesion and connectivity analyses. *Front Syst Neurosci.* 2011;5:1.

81. Braga RM, DiNicola LM, Becker HC, Buckner RL. Situating the left-lateralized language network in the broader organization of multiple specialized large-scale distributed networks. *J Neurophysiol.* 2020;124:1415–1448.

82. Diachek E, Morgan VL, Wilson SM. Adaptive language mapping paradigms for presurgical language mapping. *Am J Neuroradiol.* 2022;43:1453–1459.

83. Binder JR, Frost JA, Hammeke TA, Cox RW, Rao SM, Prieto T. Human brain language areas identified by functional magnetic resonance imaging. *J Neurosci.* 1997;17:353–362.

84. de Clercq P, Gonsalves AR, Gerrits R, Vandermosten M. Individualized functional localization of the language and multiple demand network in chronic post-stroke aphasia. *Biorxiv* 2024. http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2024.01.12.575350

85. DeMarco AT, van der Stelt C, Paul S, et al. Absence of perilesional neuroplastic recruitment in chronic poststroke aphasia. *Neurology.* 2022;99:e119–e128.

86. Raboyeau G, De Boissezon X, Marie N, et al. Right hemisphere activation in recovery from aphasia: Lesion effect or function recruitment? *Neurology.* 2008;70:290–298.

87. Sharp DJ, Turkheimer FE, Bose SK, Scott SK, Wise RJS. Increased frontoparietal integration after stroke and cognitive recovery. *Ann Neurol.* 2010;68:753–756.

88. Turkeltaub PE. A taxonomy of brain-behavior relationships after stroke. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* 2019;62:3907–3922.

89. Kertesz A, Phipps J. Numerical taxonomy of aphasia. *Brain Lang.* 1977;4:1–10.

90. Hula W, Donovan NJ, Kendall DL, Gonzalez-Rothi LJ. Item response theory analysis of the Western Aphasia Battery. *Aphasiology.* 2010;24:1326–1341.

91. Yagata SA, Yen M, McCarron A, Bautista A, Lamair-Orosco G, Wilson SM. Rapid recovery from aphasia after infarction of Wernicke's area. *Aphasiology.* 2017;31:951–980.

Tables

Table 1 Demographic and medical history information

	Individuals with aphasia (*n* = 70)	**Comparison participants (*n* = 45)**
Age	59.3 ± 13.4 (32 – 81) years	54.5 ± 16.3 (21 – 83) years
Sex	43 M; 27 F	20 M; 25 F
Handedness	61 RH; 9 NRH	34 RH; 11 NRH
Education***	14.0 ± 3.1 (6 – 20) years	16.8 ± 1.9 (12 – 20) years
Lesion extent	89.7 ± 101.0 (0.7 – 434.5) cm^3	
Time post onset	29.8 ± 44.8 (2.8 – 259.4) months	
Stroke type	63 ischemic, 7 hemorrhagic	

Values displayed are mean ± SD (range). M = Male; F = Female; RH = Right-handed; NRH = Non Right-Handed; *** = Significant group difference at $P < .001$.

Table 2 Language evaluation

	Individuals with aphasia	Comparison participants
Quick Aphasia Battery (QAB)		
Word comprehension**	9.2 ± 1.6 (2.9 – 10.0)	9.9 ± 0.2 (8.8 – 10.0)
Sentence comprehension***	6.1 ± 3.5 (0.0 – 10.0)	9.5 ± 0.9 (5.4 – 10.0)
Word finding***	6.2 ± 3.2 (0.0 – 10.0)	9.8 ± 0.4 (8.5 – 10.0)
Grammatical construction***	6.9 ± 3.4 (0.0 – 10.0)	9.9 ± 0.1 (9.5 – 10.0)
Speech motor programming***	7.9 ± 3.5 (0.0 – 10.0)	10.0 ± 0.0 (10.0 – 10.0)
Repetition***	6.9 ± 2.7 (0.0 – 10.0)	9.9 ± 0.3 (8.8 – 10.0)
Reading***	6.5 ± 3.3 (0.0 – 10.0)	9.9 ± 0.3 (8.8 – 10.0)
QAB Overall***	**7.0 ± 2.6 (0.7 – 9.9)**	9.8 ± 0.2 (9.0 – 10.0)
Written word comprehension	8.7 ± 2.6 (0.0 – 10.0)	—
Pyramids and Palm Trees—Pictures	13.5 ±1.0 (10 – 14)	—

Values displayed are mean ± SD (range). All QAB measures, and the written word comprehension measure are out of 10 points. The short form of Pyramids and Palm Trees is out of 14 points. ** = significant group difference at $P < .01$; *** = significant group difference at $P < .001$.

Table 3 Brain regions activated by each contrast

Brain region(s)	MNI coordinates			Extent	Max *t*	*P*
	x	y	z	(mm^3)		
Language processing in individuals with aphasia						
Left STS, MTG, ITG, angular gyrus, hippocampus, IFG (all pars), precentral gyrus, SFG, pre-SMA	–41.1	3.6	10.7	123608	10.4	< .001
Right cerebellum (crus I and II)	25.0	–76.6	–34.6	16272	7.6	.009
Left precuneus	–3.5	–53.6	22.0	5608	8.0	.030
Right IFG (pars triangularis and orbitalis)	45.3	30.6	–3.8	4280	5.1	.046
Language processing in comparison participants						
Left STS, MTG, ITG, angular gyrus, hippocampus, IFG (all pars), precentral gyrus, SFG, pre-SMA, precuneus	–39.7	–2.6	6.5	153656	16.0	< .001
Right cerebellum (crus I and II)	25.8	–76.4	–34.7	19680	15.4	.006
Right STS	54.1	–24.8	–3.0	7992	6.2	.013
Right IFG (pars triangularis and orbitalis)	45.7	31.7	–4.5	4776	7.1	.030
Right hippocampus	22.8	–12.5	–17.6	3592	6.2	.043
Aphasia < Comparison						
Left IFG (all pars), anterior STG, MTG	–51.7	–50.8	6.9	20544	5.7	.002
Left posterior STS, MTG, ITG, angular gyrus	–46.6	21.6	3.0	20256	4.7	.002
Left SFG	–2.8	44.7	46.0	7656	4.3	.024
Right cerebellum (crus I and II)	24.2	–79.1	–31.8	6064	5.1	.042
Correlation with QAB						
Left STS, MTG, ITG, hippocampus, IFG (all pars), anterior STG	–50.0	–2.8	–1.4	34960	6.1	.006
Correlation with QAB, above and beyond structure						
Left posterior STS, MTG, ITG	–55.7	–40.6	–10.4	11408	5.6	.031

MNI coordinates show centers of mass. SMA = supplementary motor area.

Figure legends

Figure 1 Analysis of structural imaging data. (**A**) Lesion overlay. *n* = Number of people with aphasia with damage to each voxel. (**B**) Regions of interest (ROIs) from the human Brainnetome Atlas used for predicting QAB overall from structural data. (**C**) Prediction of QAB overall from structural data (i.e., lesion masks) and covariates (age, sex, handedness, education, stroke type, time post onset). The horizontal line depicts the mean observed QAB overall score. Each data point is color-coded (on a scale from yellow to red) to indicate the individual's lesion load (i.e., predicted QAB overall score based on structural imaging only), in this and subsequent figures.

Figure 2 Functional MRI paradigm and behavioral data. (**A**) Example item from the Semantic condition. In this condition, participants viewed two written words, one above the other, and decided if the words "go together", i.e., if they were semantically related. The rectangle around the words indicates that the 'match' button has been pressed. (**B**) Example item from the Perceptual condition. In this condition, participants viewed two false font strings, one above the other, and decided if the strings were identical. This is a mismatch trial, so the 'match' button has not been pressed. (**C**) The adaptive staircase procedure in a representative participant. We used a 2-down-1-up adaptive staircase procedure with weighted step sizes and 7 levels of difficulty, which aimed to keep all participants at around 80% accuracy. Grey = Semantic condition; White = Perceptual condition; Green line = Semantic level of difficulty; Green dots = Correct Semantic trials; Red dots = Error Semantic trials; Blue line = Perceptual level of difficulty; Blue dots = Correct Perceptual trials; Yellow dots = Error Perceptual trials. (**D**) Search regions for functional regions of interest (ROIs) that were defined in individual participants. (**E**) Accuracy on the scanner task in individuals with aphasia and neurologically normal participants. (**F**) Difficulty level. (**G**) Reaction time. The color of each aphasia datapoint indicates the lesion load estimate.

Figure 3 Standard functional MRI analysis. (**A**) Brain regions activated for the Semantic condition compared to the Perceptual condition in 70 individuals with aphasia. (**B**) Brain regions activated for the Semantic condition compared to the Perceptual condition in 45 neurologically normal comparison participants. (**C**) Brain regions that were less activated for language processing in individuals with aphasia compared to neurologically normal participants. Note that there were no regions that were more activated in the aphasia cohort. (**D**) Brain regions where BOLD signal change was correlated with Quick Aphasia Battery

(QAB) overall scores. (**E**) The association between BOLD signal change in individually defined regions of interest (ROIs) and QAB overall scores in individuals with aphasia (hot colored datapoints) and neurologically normal comparison participants (blue datapoints). The color of each aphasia datapoint indicates the lesion load estimate. The red fit lines are based only on the aphasia cohort. These plots are not adjusted for covariates (but covariates were included in the analyses described in the main text).

Figure 4 Integrated functional and structural MRI analysis. (**A**) Brain regions where BOLD signal change was correlated with the difference between the actual observed Quick Aphasia Battery (QAB) overall score, and the QAB overall score that was predicted based on lesion location and extent, and covariates. In other words, activation of these regions was predictive of outperforming structural expectations. (**B**) An example of an individual with aphasia who had substantial activation of the left temporal language region, and a QAB score (7.9) that greatly exceeded the score that was predicted based on lesion location and extent. (**C**) An example of an individual with aphasia who had negligible activation of the left temporal language region, and a QAB score (1.8) that was much lower than was predicted based on lesion location and extent. (**D**) Added variable plots (partial regression residual leverage plots) showing the independent predictive value of activation in each of the four regions of interest (ROIs) for predicting QAB overall scores, above and beyond lesion location/extent and other covariates. The color of each participant's datapoint indicates the lesion load estimate. The case examples from panels C and D are indicated with blue and green circles respectively. (**E**) Added variable plots (partial regression residual leverage plots) showing the extent to which activation in each of the three regions of interest (ROIs) that were predictive in panel D was able to predict QAB overall scores, above and beyond not only structural damage and other covariates, but also the other predictive functional regions.

Figure 5 Full model. Prediction of QAB overall from structural data (i.e., lesion load), covariates (age, sex, handedness, education, stroke type, time post onset), and functional activity in the left temporal, right temporal, and left frontal language areas. The color of each participant's datapoint indicates the lesion load estimate.

Figures

Figure 1



Figure 2


A
CALENDAR
DATE
B
C
Level
Time (s)
D
E
Accuracy (% correct)
Semantic Percept
Aphasia
Semantic Percept
Neurologically normal
F
Difficulty level
Semantic Percept
Aphasia
Semantic Percept
Neurologically normal
G
Reaction time (ms)
+ Lesion –
Semantic Percept
Aphasia
Semantic Percept
Neurologically normal

Figure 3


A
Aphasia
L R
2.65 t 8
B
Neurologically normal
L R
2.69 t 8
C
Aphasia < Neurologically normal
L R
2.62 t 6
D
Correlation with QAB overall
L R
2.65 t 6
E
QAB overall
L pSTS ΔBOLD (%)
R pSTS ΔBOLD (%)
L IFG ΔBOLD (%)
R IFG ΔBOLD (%)
Aphasia
+ Lesion –
Neurologically normal

Figure 4


A
Correlation with ΔQAB overall relative to structural prediction
z = 0
z = –18
L
R
2.65 t 4
B
QAB = 7.9
0% t 0%
C
QAB = 1.8
0% t 0%
D
Leverage of fMRI over and above lesion and covariates
E
Leverage of fMRI over and above lesion, covariates, and other ROIs
Adjusted ΔQAB
Adjusted L pSTS ΔBOLD (%)
Adjusted R pSTS ΔBOLD (%)
Adjusted L IFG ΔBOLD (%)
Adjusted R IFG ΔBOLD (%)
+ Lesion –

Figure 5


QAB overall
Predicted QAB overall (Structure + Function)
+ Lesion –
0
2
4
6
8
10