

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

**Reading Modality Modifies Reading Network:
Insights from Neural basis of
Braille in Proficient Blind Readers**

Mengyu Tian^{1*}, Elizabeth J. Saccone¹, Judy S. Kim^{1,2}, Shipra Kanjlia^{1,3}, Marina Bedny¹

¹ Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
Maryland 21218

² Department of Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511

³ Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

*To whom correspondence may be addressed: Mengyu Tian, Email: mengyutian@jhu.edu

11 **Abstract**

12 The neural basis of reading is highly consistent across a variety of languages and visual scripts.
13 An unanswered question is whether the sensory modality of symbols influences the neural basis
14 of reading. According to the modality-invariant view, reading depends on the same neural
15 mechanisms regardless of the sensory input modality. Consistent with this idea, previous studies
16 find that the visual word form area (VWFA) within the ventral occipitotemporal cortex
17 (vOTC) is active when blind individuals read Braille by touch. However, connectivity-based
18 theories of brain function suggest that the neural entry point of written symbols (touch vs. vision)
19 may influence the neural architecture of reading. We compared the neural basis of the visual
20 print (sighted n=15) and tactile Braille (congenitally blind n=19) in proficient readers using
21 analogous reading and listening tasks. Written stimuli varied in word-likeness from real words to
22 consonant strings and non-letter shape strings. Auditory stimuli consisted of words and backward
23 speech sounds. Consistent with prior work, vOTC was active during Braille and visual reading.
24 However, in sighted readers, visual print elicited a posterior/anterior vOTC word-form gradient:
25 anterior vOTC preferred larger orthographic units (words), middle vOTC preferring consonant
26 strings, and posterior vOTC responded to shapes (i.e., lower-level physical features). No such
27 gradient was observed in blind readers of Braille. Consistent with connectivity predictions, in
28 blind Braille readers, posterior parietal cortices (PPC) and parieto-occipital areas were recruited
29 to a greater degree and PPC contained word-preferring patches. Lateralization of Braille in blind
30 readers was predicted by laterality of spoken language, as well as by reading hand. These
31 results suggested that the neural basis of reading is influenced by symbol modality and support
32 connectivity-based views of cortical function.

33 **Highlights**

- 34 1. Only sighted but not blind (Braille) readers show a posterior/anterior vOTC lexicality
35 gradient
- 36 2. Posterior parietal cortex distinctively contributes to Braille reading.
- 37 3. Lateralization of spoken language and reading hand predict lateralization of Braille
- 38 4. The sensory modality of written symbols influences the neural basis of reading

39 **Keywords**

40 **Braille reading; blindness; reading; VWFA; posterior parietal cortex**

41

42

43 **Introduction**

44 Written language is among the most impressive human cultural achievements. The capacity to
45 record and transmit information over space and time has enabled the accumulation of scientific,
46 technological, and historical knowledge across generations and continents. How does the human
47 brain accommodate this cultural invention, which emerged only approximately 5,000 years ago?

48 Despite being a recent cultural invention, the neural basis of reading is highly consistent across a
49 variety of languages and visual scripts, including alphabetic, logographic (e.g., Chinese), and
50 syllabic writing systems (e.g., Japanese Kana) (Bolger, Perfetti, & Schneider, 2005; Feng et al.,
51 2020; Hu et al., 2010; Krafnick et al., 2016; Nakamura et al., 2012; Rueckl et al., 2015). All of
52 these reading systems engage regions within the left lateral ventral occipitotemporal cortex
53 (vOTC) (Baker et al., 2007; Cohen et al., 2000; Dehaene & Cohen, 2011; Dehaene et al., 2010).

54 A region in the left lateral vOTC has been termed the ‘visual word form area’ (VWFA) because
55 of its preferential response to written words and letter combinations over other visual stimuli.

56 The VWFA is situated within a posterior/anterior processing gradient. During reading, visual
57 symbols are first processed by early visual cortices and posterior portions of vOTC, which
58 represent simple visual features (e.g., line junctions) (Dehaene, Cohen, Sigman, & Vinckier,
59 2005; DiCarlo & Cox, 2007). By contrast, the middle and anterior portions of lateral vOTC are
60 specialized for progressively larger orthographic units, from written letters, letter
61 combinations/bigrams, and finally whole words (Binder, Medler, Westbury, Liebenthal, &
62 Buchanan, 2006; Cohen et al., 2000; Dehaene, Cohen, Sigman, & Vinckier, 2005; Dehaene et
63 al., 2004; Glezer, Jiang, & Riesenhuber, 2009; Lerma-Usabiaga, Carreiras, & Paz-Alonso, 2018;
64 Purcell, Shea, & Rapp, 2014; Vinckier et al., 2007).

65 An open question is whether the vOTC posterior/anterior processing stream is the only way for
66 the brain to implement reading and, relatedly, why the neural basis of reading takes this
67 particular form. Examining the neural basis of tactile Braille offers unique insights into these
68 questions. Specifically, we can ask whether and how the sensory modality of written symbols
69 influences the neural basis of reading.

70 Tactile Braille reading achieves similar behavioral goals for people who are blind as visual print
71 reading does for the sighted: rapid access to linguistic meaning from a temporally stable
72 symbolic record. Proficient blind readers can read upwards of 200 words per minute by passing
73 the fingers along lines of Braille text, in which words are written as patterns of raised dots
74 (Millar, 2003). Each Braille character consists of dots positioned in a three-rows-by-two-
75 columns matrix. A single Braille character can be used to represent a letter, number, or
76 punctuation mark. In the most commonly used form of English Braille (Grade 2 Braille), Braille
77 characters also stand for frequent letter combinations (e.g., EA ⠠, OW ⠠) and whole words (e.g.,
78 e = every, tm = tomorrow) (<http://www.brl.org>) (Millar, 2003).

79 Consistent with a modality-invariant view of reading, several recent studies have reported that
80 the neural basis of Braille reading and that of visual print reading depend on similar vOTC
81 mechanisms (Büchel, Price, & Friston, 1998a; Debowska et al., 2016; Rączy et al., 2019; Reich,
82 Szwed, Cohen, & Amedi, 2011). Visual print and tactile Braille reading elicit activation peaks at
83 the anatomical location of the ‘VWFA’ in both sighted and blind readers (Debowska et al., 2016;
84 Dziegiel-Fivet et al., 2021; Kim, Kanjlia, Merabet, & Bedny, 2017; Rączy et al., 2019; Reich et
85 al., 2011; Siuda-Krzywicka et al., 2016). In sighted adults who are trained to recognize Braille
86 words, transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) to the VWFA disrupts reading accuracy (Bola et
87 al., 2019; Siuda-Krzywicka et al., 2016). A recent study also found similar repetition suppression
88 effects in vOTC for tactile (blind readers) and visual (sighted readers) pseudowords (Rączy et al.,
89 2019). This evidence supports the idea that reading depends on the same neural mechanisms in
90 vOTC, regardless of symbol modality (i.e., touch vs. vision).

91 At the same time, both theoretical considerations and empirical evidence suggest that the neural
92 basis of tactile Braille and visual print reading may differ in important ways that have not been
93 fully tested. In sighted readers, posterior portions of vOTC receive visual written forms from
94 early visual cortices and pass this information along the posterior/anterior orthographic gradient
95 (e.g., Dehaene et al., 2005). By contrast, in people who are blind, Braille information enters the
96 cortex at primary somatosensory cortex (S1), making a posterior/anterior gradient unlikely. A
97 number of imaging studies also find that Braille reading activates visual areas outside of vOTC
98 in people who are blind, including V1 and dorsal occipital areas (Cohen et al., 1997, 1999;
99 Gizewski, Gasser, De Greiff, Boehm, & Forsting, 2003; Kupers et al., 2007; Melzer et al., 2001;

100 Sadato et al., 1998, 1996). TMS to the occipital pole and midoccipital cortex disrupts Braille
101 reading (Cohen et al., 1997, 1999; Kupers et al., 2007). This suggests that vOTC may not make a
102 unique contribution to Braille reading in the same way that it does to visual reading.

103 Moreover, visual cortices of people who are born blind, including vOTC and early visual areas
104 (V1-V3), are recruited for non-visual functions apart from Braille (e.g., Amedi, Raz, Pianka,
105 Malach, & Zohary, 2003; Büchel et al., 1998b; Burton, Snyder, Diamond, & Raichle, 2002;
106 Gougoux, Zatorre, Lassonde, Voss, & Lepore, 2005; Kanjlia, Loiotile, Harhen, & Bedny, 2021;
107 Kujala, Alho, Paavilainen, Summala, & Naatanen, 1992; Sathian, 2005). Particularly relevant for
108 the neural basis of Braille, large swaths of blind ‘visual’ cortex, including portions of V1,
109 participate in processing spoken language, including high-level semantic and grammatical
110 information (Bedny, Pascual-Leone, Dodell-Feder, Fedorenko, & Saxe, 2011; Bedny,
111 Richardson, & Saxe, 2015; Burton, Snyder, Diamond, & Raichle, 2002; Noppeney, Friston, &
112 Price, 2003; Röder, Stock, Bien, Neville, & Rösler, 2002; Watkins et al., 2012). Indeed, there is
113 evidence that the anatomical location of the ‘VWFA’ shows larger responses to spoken language
114 and responds to the grammatical structure of spoken sentences in people who are blind, more so
115 than in people who are sighted (Dzięgiel-Fivet et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2017). This pattern
116 suggests possible involvement in high-order language processing, rather than a reading-specific
117 role in blindness. Furthermore, since the anatomical distribution of written language is believed
118 to be influenced by the anatomical distribution of spoken language (Behrmann & Plaut, 2013;
119 Hannagan & Grainger, 2013; Saygin et al., 2016; Stevens, Kravitz, Peng, Tessler, & Martin,
120 2017a), recruitment of the visual cortex for language processing could itself modify the neural
121 basis of Braille reading in blind people. For example, we might expect Braille to recruit occipital
122 regions that are connected to visual networks recruited for spoken language. Together this
123 evidence suggests that the anatomical distribution and function role of visual cortices in blind
124 Braille readers and sighted visual readers may not be equivalent and merits further investigation.

125 There are also reasons to hypothesize that tactile Braille reading may differentially recruit
126 networks outside of the visual system, specifically the posterior parietal cortex (PPC). The vOTC
127 occupies a key connectivity position in sighted readers, in that it is connected to visual input on
128 the one hand and linguistic representations on the other (Barttfeld et al., 2018; Bouhali et al.,
129 2014; Hannagan, Amedi, Cohen, Dehaene-Lambertz, & Dehaene, 2015; Li, Osher, Hansen, &

130 Saygin, 2020; Saygin et al., 2016; Stevens, Kravitz, Peng, Tessler, & Martin, 2017b; Yeatman,
131 Rauschecker, & Wandell, 2013). The PPC arguably occupies an analogous connectivity-based
132 position for tactile Braille. Not only is PPC anatomically proximal and densely connected to
133 early somatosensory cortices (SMC) but like anterior/lateral vOTC, it is connected to language
134 and working memory systems (Burks et al., 2017; Duhamel, Colby, & Goldberg, 1998; Kaas,
135 2012; Lewis & Van Essen, 2000; Ruschel et al., 2014). Analogous to the functional role of
136 vOTC in visual shape recognition, the PPC furthermore plays a key role in tactile shape and
137 texture perception, pertinent to Braille recognition (Bauer et al., 2015; Hegner, Lee, Grodd, &
138 Braun, 2010). For example, stronger PPC activity is observed during tactile pattern
139 discrimination compared to vibrotactile detection (Hegner et al., 2010). We therefore
140 hypothesized that portions of PPC may specialize for tactile Braille letter and word recognition,
141 analogous to specialization for visual word form recognition within the vOTC of sighted print
142 readers. To our knowledge, the hypothesis of selective responses to Braille words in PPC has not
143 previously been tested. Although previous studies have examined activity in early SMC and
144 found expanded finger representations in proficient Braille readers, there is no evidence that this
145 plasticity reflects specialization for Braille letters and words (Burton, Snyder, Conturo, et al.,
146 2002; Burton, Sinclair, & McLaren, 2004; Kupers et al., 2007; Pascual-Leone et al., 1993;
147 Pascual-Leone & Torres, 1993; Sadato et al., 1998). One goal of the current study was therefore
148 to test whether any portion of PPC shows preferential responses to Braille letters and words in
149 blind readers of Braille, akin to specialization for visual letters and words found in vOTC of
150 sighted readers.

151 Finally, we hypothesized that lateralization patterns of Braille (blind) and visual print (sighted)
152 reading would be analogous but distinct. The reading network is typically strongly left-
153 lateralized in sighted people, like the spoken language network (Behrmann & Plaut, 2020;
154 Ossowski & Behrmann, 2015; Schlaggar & McCandliss, 2007; Seghier & Price, 2011; Vinckier
155 et al., 2007). Studies with sighted people who have right-lateralized spoken language responses
156 find that reading ‘follows’ spoken language into the right hemisphere (Behrmann & Plaut, 2020;
157 Cai, Lavidor, Brysbaert, Paulignan, & Nazir, 2008; Cai, Paulignan, Brysbaert, Ibarrola, & Nazir,
158 2010; Cai & Van der Haegen, 2015; Van der Haegen, Cai, & Brysbaert, 2012). In people who
159 are blind, left-lateralization of spoken language is reduced and highly variable across individuals
160 (Lane et al., 2017; Röder, Rösler, & Neville, 2000; Röder et al., 2002) We therefore

161 hypothesized that responses to Braille would be likewise less left-lateralized in blind readers and
162 would show co-lateralization with spoken language across individuals.

163 A further potential determining factor of Braille lateralization that does not arise for visual print,
164 is reading hand. In visual reading, information typically enters through both eyes and is projected
165 to both hemispheres. By contrast, in the case of Braille, it is possible for the information to enter
166 the left or the right hemisphere first, depending on the reading hand. Reading hand preferences
167 and reading styles differ widely across proficient blind Braille readers (Millar, 1984, 2003).
168 Many blind readers use both hands during naturalistic reading, however, one hand is thought to
169 track position on the page, while the other is used for word recognition (Millar, 2003). We
170 hypothesized that during single hand Braille reading, lateralization in early somatosensory
171 cortices would depend on which hand was used during word recognition, but that the effect of
172 reading hand would weaken in posterior parietal reading regions and would disappear in
173 language regions (Lane et al., 2017).

174 To test these predictions, we compared the neural basis of reading in proficient congenitally
175 blind and sighted readers using analogous reading and spoken language tasks. In the reading
176 tasks, participants were presented with words, consonant strings, and non-letter shapes/false
177 fonts. Reading stimuli were visual (print) for the sighted participants and tactile (Braille) for the
178 blind participants. In the spoken language task, both groups listened to audio words and
179 backward speech sounds. First, we tested the prediction that there is a posterior-to-anterior
180 gradient in preference from false-fonts to consonant strings and finally words in the vOTC of
181 sighted but not blind readers. Previous studies find that posterior vOTC responds as much or
182 more to false fonts as to letters and words, with only a small lateral/anterior portion (so-called
183 VWFA) being selective to written words and letters (Vinckier et al., 2007). By contrast, we
184 predicted that in blind readers, the entire extent of vOTC would show a preference for words,
185 consistent with its involvement in language processing (Kim et al., 2017; Lane, Kanjlia, Omaki,
186 & Bedny, 2015; Röder et al., 2002; Watkins et al., 2012). Next, we tested the hypothesis that the
187 PPC of blind Braille readers shows a functional profile analogous to the vOTC of the sighted:
188 selective responses to written words as opposed to tactile shapes in a subset of PPC, surrounded
189 by equal or greater responses to tactile shapes. We compared responses in PPC with those of
190 early SMC, where we would expect larger or equal responses to tactile shapes. Moreover, we

191 hypothesized that regions of PPC most distal from S1 and posterior to it are most likely to show
192 specialization for Braille letters and words, an anterior/posterior gradient analogous to the
193 posterior/anterior gradient observed in the vOTC of sighted readers. We also examined responses
194 across groups in other cortical areas previously implicated in reading: left inferior frontal cortex
195 (IFC) and primary visual cortex (V1) and used whole-cortex analyses to quantify the anatomical
196 distribution of visual and Braille reading (Burton, Snyder, Conturo, et al., 2002; Harold Burton,
197 Sinclair, & Agato, 2012; Rueckl et al., 2015; Sadato et al., 1998). Finally, we used laterality
198 index analyses to compare lateralization patterns across written and spoken word comprehension
199 in the two groups. We tested the prediction that lateralization of reading would be driven by the
200 lateralization of spoken language in higher-order language regions (left IFC), by reading hand in
201 early SMC, and by both factors in reading-related areas (PPC).

202 **Method**

203 **Participants**

204 Nineteen congenitally blind (12 females, mean age = 40.36 years, SD = 14.82) and 15 sighted
205 control (9 females, mean age = 23 years, SD = 6) participants took part in the task-based fMRI
206 experiment (see Table 1 for participant characteristics). The data from 10 blind and 15 sighted
207 participants have been reported previously (Kim et al., 2017). All participants were native
208 English speakers, and none had suffered from any known cognitive or neurological disabilities
209 (screened through self-report). Sighted participants had normal or corrected to normal vision. All
210 the blind participants had at most minimal light perception from birth. Blindness was caused by
211 pathology anterior to the optic chiasm (i.e., not due to brain damage). All blind participants were
212 fluent Braille readers who began learning Braille at an average age of 4.6 years (SD = 1.49) and
213 rated their reading ability as proficient to expert (mean = 4.57, SD = 0.69 on a scale of 1 to 5) and
214 reported reading on average 20 hours per week (SD=19). We obtained information on Braille-
215 reading hand dominance, whether they read bimanually, and reading frequency through a post-
216 experimental survey conducted over the telephone with 17 of the 19 blind adult participants
217 (Table 1). All participants gave informed consent according to procedures approved by the Johns
218 Hopkins Medicine Institutional Review Board.

220

221 **Table 1 Participants information**

Participant no.	Age (y)	Gender	Handedness	Reading handedness	Levels of education	Cause of blindness	Age started reading Braille (y)	Reading hours per week	Self-reported Braille reading ability (1-5)
B1	21	M	L	Bi-R	SC	LCA	4	14	5
B2	64	F	R	Bi-R	BA	ROP	6	56	5
B3	53	M	R	Bi-R	JD	LCA	6	7	4
B4	34	M	R	L	SC	Born without optic nerve	3	21	5
B5	42	M	Am	L	BA	ROP	3	21	5
B6	29	M	R	Bi-L	SC	LCA	4	<1	4
B7	39	F	R	L	BA	ROP	4	2	5
B8	34	F	R	--	SC	Optic Nerve Detached	3	--	5
B9	49	M	R	Bi-R	BA	unknown	8	<1	3
B10	26	F	R	Bi-R	MA	ROP	3	56	3
B11	49	F	L	R	MA	LCA	7	14	5
B12	39	F	R	L	MA	ROP	5	14	5
B13	35	F	R	Bi-L	MA	LCA	4	14	5
B14	46	F	R	--	BA	ROP	4	--	5
B15	33	F	R	L	BA	ROP	4	14	4
B16	25	F	Am	Bi-R	MA	LCA	5	56	5
B17	23	M	R	Bi-R	BA	LCA	4	28	5
B18	70	F	R	R	HS	ROP	7	7	4
B19	68	F	R	Bi-R	MA	ROP	5	7	5
Average									
Blind (n=19)	41 (SD=14.82)	12F	2L/2Am	--	BA	--	4.68 (SD=1.49)	19.47 (SD=18.97)	4.57 (SD=0.69)
Sighted (n=15)	23 (SD=6)	9F	1 L	--	BA	--	--	--	--

Handedness: left (L), ambidextrous (Am), or right (R), based on Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. BA = Bachelor of Arts; MA = Master of Arts; HS = High School; JD = Juris Doctor; SC = Some College; ROP = Retinopathy of prematurity; LCA = Leber’s congenital amaurosis. For Braille ability, participants were asked: “On a scale of 1 to 5, how well are you able to read Braille, where 1 is ‘not at all’, 2 is ‘very little’, 3 is ‘reasonably well’, 4 is ‘proficiently’, and 5 is ‘expert’?”

222 **Stimuli**

223 The fMRI task including reading and listening tasks (Figure 1). There were three stimulus
 224 conditions for the reading task: words, non-word consonant strings, and non-letter shapes
 225 (control condition). During the reading task, stimuli were visual for the sighted participants and

226 tactile for the blind participants. For the listening task, there were two conditions: words and
227 backward speech sounds (control condition).

228 The word stimuli consisted of 240 common nouns, verbs, and adjectives. For the tactile reading
229 task (blind group), the Braille words were written in Grade-II contracted English Braille, which
230 is the most common form of Braille in the United States. Braille characters contain between 1-6
231 raised pins in set positions within a 2 x 3 array (see Figure 1). In Grade-II contracted English
232 Braille, there are contractions such that single Braille characters represent frequent letter
233 combinations (e.g., “th”) or frequent whole words (e.g., the “c” can stand for “can”). With
234 contractions, the Braille words were on average 4 Braille characters (range = 1-8 Braille
235 characters, SD = 2.1 characters) and 11 tactile pins per word. Note that each participant was
236 presented with 120 of the 240 words during the reading task; the other 120 words were presented
237 auditorily during the listening task (see below). The word lists were counterbalanced across
238 participants. In the tactile consonant string condition, there were 24 strings repeated 5 times
239 throughout the experiment. Each string stimulus consisted of 4 Braille letters, which were
240 created using 20 English consonants. Last, the tactile control stimuli consisted of 24 unique
241 strings of 4 non-letter shapes made of Braille pins (see Figure 1). Note that any dot array within a
242 2 x 3 grid could be part of a Braille character. Therefore, to prevent participants from processing
243 the shapes as Braille letters, the shapes varied in size and pin number within arrays ranging in
244 size from 4×5 to 7×7 . The average number of Braille pins per string in the control condition
245 was 58.

246 For the sighted group, the word stimuli consisted of 240 common nouns, verbs, and adjectives
247 that were on average 4 letters long (range = 3-5 letters, SD = 0.7 letters). Visual word stimuli
248 consisted of a new set of words matched to the Braille words on average character length (i.e., 4
249 visual letters matched to 4 Braille characters), raw frequency per million, averaged frequency per
250 million of orthographic neighbors, and averaged bigram frequency (all comparisons $p > 0.4$,
251 obtained from the MCWord Orthographic Wordform Database; Medler & Binder, 2005).

252 Different groups of words were used for the visual and Braille experiment to enable character
253 length matching since Braille contractions represent two or more English letters with a single
254 Braille character. Like the blind participants, sighted participants encountered half (120) of the
255 words during reading trials and the other half during auditory trials, counterbalanced across

256 participants. The visual consonant strings were the same 24 consonant letter combinations from
257 the tactile consonant strings described above. Lastly, the control stimuli in the visual reading task
258 were 24 unique strings, each comprised of 4 characters, which were false fonts. There were 20
259 false font characters in total, which matched the 20 English consonants on the number of strokes,
260 presence of ascenders and descenders, and the stroke thickness.

261 The stimuli for the listening task were taken from each group's respective word list. For the
262 audio word condition, stimuli were 120 words taken from the reading task described above. For a
263 given word, half of the participants received it in the reading task and half received it in the
264 listening task. The auditory words were recorded by a female native English speaker. The
265 average word length was 5 letters long (SD = 1.4 letters). The average playtime for the auditory
266 stimuli was 0.41 s long (SD = 0.3 s). The control auditory stimuli comprised backward speech
267 sounds, which were created by playing each audio word in reverse.

268 **Procedure**

269 The experiment had a total of 5 runs, each with 20 task trials. In each trial, participants were
270 presented with a block of 6 stimuli from a single condition (e.g., tactile reading consonant strings
271 condition) and then performed a memory probe task. All stimulus conditions for both reading
272 and listening trials were presented in every run. Each condition was repeated 4 times per run, and
273 the order of conditions was counterbalanced across runs. There were 6 rest periods (16 s)
274 throughout each run. One sighted participant and two blind participants were excluded from
275 behavioral analysis due to failure to record their responses.

276 For the blind participants, each trial began with a 0.5 s auditory cue instructing participants to
277 "Touch" (reading trial), or "Listen" (listening trial). Then participants felt or heard blocks of 6
278 target items, one at a time. For 10 of the blind participants, tactile target stimuli were presented
279 on the Braille display for 2 s, followed by a 0.75 s inter-stimulus interval (ISI) (6-item list
280 duration: 16.5 s) (Kim et al., 2017). For the newly added 9 blind participants, the ISI was
281 lengthened to 1.75 s due to a coding error which caused the 6-item list duration to be prolonged
282 to 22.5 s. Control analyses revealed no effects of ISI duration on the results and the data are
283 henceforth combined. After the 6-item list had been presented, there was a short delay (0.2 s),

284 followed by a beep (0.5 s). Then a probe stimulus (2 s) was then presented, and participants
285 indicated with a key press whether or not the probe had been present in the list. Participants had
286 5.3 s to make a response. The participants were asked to read with their dominant hand and
287 responded with the other hand. The listening task was analogous in format to the reading task.
288 The audio words and backward speech were on average 0.41 s long. The timing and sequence of
289 events were identical for the listening task (6-item list duration 16.5 s).

290 For sighted participants, the trial event sequence (cue, 6-item block, beep, probe, response) was
291 analogous to above. Each trial began with an auditory cue instructing participants to “Look”
292 (reading trial) or “Listen” (listening trial). During reading trials, 6 visual stimuli appeared
293 centrally for 1 s each, followed by an ISI of 0.75, during which participants were asked to
294 maintain gaze on a black central fixation cross (total block duration: 10.5 s). Note that visual
295 reading blocks were shorter than tactile reading blocks for the blind participants because pilot
296 testing indicated that visual reading is faster under these conditions. Listening trials also had a
297 total stimulus block duration of 10.5 s, to be consistent with the reading trials within the sighted
298 group.

299 **fMRI data acquisition**

300 Functional and structural images were acquired using a 3T Phillips scanner at the F. M. Kirby
301 Research Center. T1-weighted images were collected using a magnetization-prepared rapid
302 gradient-echo (MP-RAGE) in 150 axial slices with 1 mm isotropic voxels. Functional BOLD
303 scans were collected T1-weighted structural images were collected in 150 axial slices with 1 mm
304 isotropic voxels. Functional BOLD scans were collected in 36 sequential ascending axial slices.
305 TR = 2 s, TE = 0.03 s, flip angle = 70°, voxel size = 2.4 × 2.4 × 2.5 mm, inter-slice gap = 0.5
306 mm, field of view (FOV) = 192 × 172.8 × 107.5. Acquisition parameters were identical for the
307 resting-state and task fMRI experiment.

308 **fMRI data analysis**

309 *Preprocessing and whole-cortex analysis*

310 Analyses were performed using FSL (version 5.0.9), FreeSurfer (version 5.3.0), the Human
311 Connectome Project workbench (version 1.2.0), and custom in-house software. The cortical
312 surface was created for each participant using the standard FreeSurfer pipeline (Dale, Fischl, &
313 Sereno, 1999; Glasser et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2004). For task data, preprocessing of functional
314 data included motion-correction, high-pass filtering (128 s cut-off), and resampling to the
315 cortical surface. Cerebellar and subcortical structures were excluded. On the surface, the task
316 data were smoothed with a 6 mm FWHM Gaussian kernel. Two runs for blind and three runs for
317 sighted participants were dropped due to equipment failure.

318 The three conditions in the reading task and two conditions in the listening task were entered as
319 covariates of interest into general linear models. Only the six-item period in each trial was
320 entered into the model. Covariates of interest were convolved with a standard hemodynamic
321 response function, with temporal derivatives included. Probe stimulus, response periods, and the
322 trials in which participants failed to respond were entered as covariates of no interest. The effect
323 of the mean signal of white matter and CSF, as well as the motion spike, were also included as
324 the covariates of no interest. Runs were combined within subjects using fixed-effects models.

325 Data across participants were combined within groups using random-effects analysis. Reported
326 whole-cortex contrasts were run thresholded at $p < 0.01$ vertexwise, and $p < 0.05$ cluster-
327 corrected.

328 *fMRI ROI analysis*

329 Individual-subject functional regions of interest (ROIs) were defined within the vOTC and other
330 regions previously implicated in Braille reading (V1), language (left inferior frontal cortex, IFC),
331 and tactile perception (left posterior parietal cortex, PPC, and hand region of the left primary
332 somatosensory-motor cortex, SMC). To construct the left vOTC search space, we first combined
333 the left fusiform, inferior temporal, and lateral occipital parcels from FreeSurfer's automated
334 aparc parcellation and then excluded V1, V2 regions, and the vertices with y-axis greater than -
335 30 (Lerma-Usabiaga et al., 2018). To test the posterior-to-anterior function gradient, the left

336 vOTC search space was divided to three portions: posterior ($y < -64$), middle ($-48 > y \geq -64$),
337 and anterior portion ($y \geq -48$). The search space in the right hemisphere was created by
338 flipping the left vOTC masks along the x-axis. The V1 search space was defined from a
339 previously published anatomical surface-based atlas (PALS-B12; Van Essen, 2005). The left
340 inferior frontal language (IFC) search space was defined by using a sentence vs. non-words
341 contrast (Fedorenko, Hsieh, Nieto-Castañón, Whitfield-Gabrieli, & Kanwisher, 2010). The
342 parietal search space was defined by the orthogonal contrast of all tactile conditions (words,
343 consonant strings, and control) > rest in whole-cortex analysis, excluding the occipital parcels
344 from Freesurfer's automated aparc parcellation. To look for lateralization effects in vOTC across
345 groups, we examined responses separately for the right and left hemispheres.

346 Individual-subject functional ROIs were defined in group-wise search spaces (described below).
347 Each individual subject's ROI was defined as the top 5% of vertices activated for the
348 tactile/visual consonant strings > tactile/visual controls contrast within the search spaces listed
349 above. We used this consonant string contrast for the primary analysis in order to focus on
350 orthographic as opposed to semantic responses. However, all analyses were also repeated using
351 the words > control contrast and results from these analyses are reported in the supplementary
352 material (Figure S3 and Figure S5). To avoid using the same data to define ROIs and to test
353 hypotheses, a leave-one-run-out cross-validation procedure was used. ROIs were defined based
354 on data from all but one run, then the percent signal change (PSC) was extracted from the left-
355 out run. This procedure was repeated iteratively across all runs and the PSC was averaged across
356 iterations.

357 Repeated-measured ANOVAs were used to analyze the ROI data, and two-tailed paired *t*-tests
358 were used for pairwise comparisons. All *p* values were Bonferroni-corrected for multiple
359 comparisons.

360 *Topographical preference map*

361 To explore the posterior-to-anterior gradient in left vOTC and in a data-driven way, we mapped
362 the topographical preference of the vOTC during reading using a winner-take-all approach. We
363 took the bilateral vOTC as the mask, and color-coded each vertex within the mask according to
364 which stimulus condition it responded most strongly. The topographical preference map of the

365 PPC and parieto-occipital/dorsal occipital cortex was created using the same winner-take-all
366 approach. The mask was defined by the orthogonal contrast of all tactile conditions (words,
367 consonant strings, and control) > rest in the whole-cortex analysis.

368 *Laterality index analysis*

369 To determine whether spoken and written language co-lateralize to the same hemisphere, we
370 performed laterality index (LI) analyses. LI was calculated separately for the reading and
371 listening tasks for each participant in the SMC, PPC, vOTC, V1, IFC, and also for the whole
372 cortex. For the reading task, LI was determined based on the tactile/visual words > rest contrast.
373 For the listening task, LI was determined using the audio words > rest contrast. The LI was
374 calculated using the standard formula: $(L - R) / (L + R)$, where L and R refer to the sums of the z
375 statistics from the relevant contrast within the left and right hemispheres, respectively. LI ranges
376 from -1 to 1, with a score of 1 indicating strong left lateralization and -1 strong right
377 lateralization.

378 The bootstrap/histogram method was used to ensure that LIs were not overly influenced by
379 arbitrary activation threshold choices or outlier voxels. Bootstrapped LIs were computed using
380 20 evenly spaced thresholds ranging from $z = 1.28$ to $z = 4.26$ (corresponding to one-sided $p =$
381 0.1 to $p = 0.00001$, uncorrected). For every threshold, each participant's z statistic map was
382 masked to only include the voxels exceeding the threshold within the search space. Then we
383 sampled the suprathreshold voxels 100 times with replacement in each hemisphere at a sampling
384 ratio $k = 1.0$. The LIs were then calculated using each pair of left and right hemisphere samples,
385 yielding a histogram of 10,000 threshold-specific LIs. Next, a single LI for each threshold was
386 calculated by averaging the values after removing the upper and lower 25% of the 10,000
387 threshold-specific values. Finally, the LI reported for each participant represents the average
388 across all thresholds.

389 A small number of participants were excluded from the LI analysis for a particular region if they
390 did not have suprathreshold activation in both hemispheres (listening task- SMC: 2 sighted, 2
391 blind participants excluded; PPC: 1 sighted; V1: 6 sighted; IFC: 1 sighted; reading task- SMC: 4
392 sighted; PPC: 1 sighted; IFC: 1 sighted).

393 To examine the effect of spoken language lateralization and Braille reading handedness on the
394 reading lateralization, a multiple regression was conducted for each region. The LI of spoken
395 words in IFC and dominant reading hand were entered as regressors and the LI of written words
396 was the dependent variable. Although some participants reported reading Braille bimanually, the
397 participants were asked to read tactile stimuli during the experiment only with their dominant
398 reading hand. There were 7 blind participants in the left Braille-reading handed group and 10 in
399 the right Braille-reading handed group.

400

401 **Results**

402 **Behavioral Results**

403 *Higher accuracy and shorter reaction times for word-like stimuli*

404 Because the two groups differed in age, we regressed out the effect of age on accuracy and
405 reaction times and performed analyses on the residuals (see Figure S1 in Supplementary
406 materials, results from raw data are also included in Figure S1). In the reading task, there was a
407 significant effect of age on accuracy (main effect of age, $F_{(1, 85)} = 5.681, p < 0.05$). A two-way
408 lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA performed on
409 the residuals revealed higher accuracy on more word-like stimuli (words and consonant strings >
410 control) in both blind and sighted groups (main effect of lexicality: $F_{(2, 54)} = 13.963, p < 0.001$).
411 There was no lexicality by group interaction ($F_{(2, 54)} = 0.872, p = 0.737$). The group effect was
412 marginal (sighted > blind, $F_{(1, 27)} = 3.603, p = 0.068$). For the listening task, there was a trending
413 effect of age on accuracy ($F_{(1, 56)} = 2.907, p = 0.094$). A two-way lexicality (words, control) by
414 group (sighted, blind) ANOVA on the residuals revealed a lexicality effect (words > control; $F_{(1,$
415 $29)} = 50.944, p < 0.001$), no group effect ($F_{(1, 27)} = 0.843, p = 0.367$) or group by lexicality
416 interaction ($F_{(1, 27)} = 0.549, p = 0.465$).

417 Likewise, for reaction times during the reading task, there was a significant effect of age ($F_{(1, 85)}$
418 $= 39.089, p < 0.001$). A two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group (sighted,
419 blind) ANOVA on the residuals revealed a lexicality effect (words and consonant strings <

420 control; $F_{(2, 54)} = 8.09, p < 0.001$). There was no group effect ($F_{(1, 27)} = 8.09, p = 0.297$). The
421 group by lexicality interaction effect was marginal ($F_{(2, 54)} = 2.763, p = 0.072$). Pairwise
422 comparisons showed the shorter reaction times on more word-like stimuli in blind group, but
423 there was no difference across stimuli in the sighted group (blind: words vs. control, $t_{(16)} = -2.91,$
424 $p < 0.01$; consonant strings vs. control, $t_{(16)} = -2.604, p < 0.01$; words vs. consonant strings, $t_{(16)} =$
425 $-0.686, p > 0.99$; sighted: all pairwise comparisons $p > 0.05$; the p -values were Bonferroni-
426 corrected).

427 During the listening task, the main effect of age on reaction time was significant ($F_{(1, 85)} =$
428 $15.892, p < 0.001$). A two-way lexicality (words, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA on
429 the residuals revealed a lexicality effect (words < control; $F_{(1, 29)} = 50.944, p < 0.001$). There was
430 no group effect ($F_{(1, 27)} = 0.071, p = 0.792$) or group by lexicality interaction ($F_{(1, 29)} < 0.001, p >$
431 0.99).

432 **fMRI Results**

433 *Visual (sighted) but not tactile Braille reading (blind) elicits a posterior-to-anterior functional* 434 *gradient in left vOTC and shows left-lateralization*

435 Two signatures of visual reading responses in vOTC are 1) a posterior-to-anterior word form
436 gradient and 2) left-hemisphere lateralization. We asked whether Braille reading in blind
437 individuals shows similar posterior-to-anterior and laterality effects as visual reading in sighted
438 people. We divided the left and right vOTC each into the posterior, middle, and anterior
439 subregions (ROIs) and compared responses in these subregions across hemispheres and groups
440 (see Methods, Figure 1). We first conducted a four-way hemisphere (left, right) by
441 posterior/anterior subregion (posterior, middle, anterior) by lexicality (words, consonant strings,
442 control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA to examine reading responses across groups. This
443 ANOVA revealed a four-way interaction ($F_{(4, 128)} = 3.028, p < 0.05$), indicating that lexicality,
444 hemisphere, and posterior/anterior subregion interact with group. Next, we used separate
445 ANOVAs for each group to unpack the 4-way interaction. Because of the large number of factors
446 and to preserve readability, we report only hypothesis-relevant effects in this section. A complete
447 summary of all effects can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

448 For the sighted group, we found the expected three-way interaction between hemisphere (left,
449 right), posterior/anterior subregion (posterior, middle, anterior) and lexicality (words, consonant
450 strings, control; $F_{(4, 56)} = 4.287, p < 0.01$). Next, we looked at each hemisphere separately in the
451 sighted group.

452 In the left vOTC, there was a two-way interaction between lexicality (words, consonant strings,
453 control) and posterior/anterior subregion (posterior, middle, anterior; $F_{(4, 56)} = 9.69, p < 0.001$),
454 reflecting the expected posterior-to-anterior functional gradient. Pairwise comparisons revealed
455 that the posterior vOTC responded similarly to all visual stimuli (all pairwise comparisons $p >$
456 0.05). By contrast, in middle vOTC, consonant strings elicited higher responses than both words
457 and control stimuli (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -test for words vs. consonant strings: $t_{(14)} = -$
458 $3.918, p < 0.05$; consonant strings vs. control: $t_{(14)} = 4.106, p < 0.01$). In anterior vOTC,
459 responses to words and consonant strings were both higher than control and not different from
460 each other (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -test for words vs. control: $t_{(14)} = 3.461, p < 0.05$;
461 consonant strings vs. control: $t_{(14)} = 3.327, p < 0.05$, all other pairwise comparisons $p > 0.05$).

462 In the right vOTC of the sighted group, a two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control)
463 by posterior/anterior subregion (posterior, middle, anterior) ANOVA revealed no main effect of
464 lexicality ($F_{(2, 28)} = 0.448, p > 0.05$) and no interaction ($F_{(4, 56)} = 0.987, p > 0.05$). To
465 summarize, these results demonstrate that in the sighted group, there was a posterior-to-anterior
466 functional gradient for processing word form during reading in the left but not right vOTC.

467 Next, we examined these effects in the blind group. We conducted a three-way hemisphere (left,
468 right) by posterior/anterior subregion (posterior, middle, anterior) by lexicality (words,
469 consonant strings, control) ANOVA. Unlike in the sighted, there was no significant three-way
470 interaction ($F_{(4, 56)} = 0.877, p = 0.482$). Although there was no interaction, we conducted a
471 separate ANOVA testing for a lexicality effect across the posterior/anterior subregions for each
472 hemisphere separately in order to match the analysis of the sighted group.

473 In the left vOTC of the blind group, all three (posterior, middle, anterior) subregions responded
474 most to words, followed by consonant strings followed by tactile shapes (Figure 1). There was a
475 two-way interaction between lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) and posterior/anterior
476 subregion (posterior, middle, anterior; $F_{(4, 72)} = 3.198, p < 0.05$). However, the nature of this

477 interaction was different from that observed in the sighted group. All pairwise-comparisons
478 between conditions were significant in all three subregions (words > consonant strings >
479 control), except the difference between words and consonant strings did not reach significance in
480 the anterior vOTC (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -test for words vs. consonant strings: posterior
481 vOTC $t_{(18)} = 2.678, p < 0.05$; middle vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 3.166, p < 0.05$; anterior vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 2.016, p$
482 $= 0.177$; words vs. control: posterior vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 5.463, p < 0.001$; middle vOTC $t_{(18)} = 8.547, p$
483 < 0.001 ; anterior vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 5.874, p < 0.001$; consonant strings vs. control: posterior vOTC:
484 $t_{(18)} = 3.413, p < 0.01$; middle vOTC $t_{(18)} = 4.696, p < 0.01$; anterior vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 5.034, p <$
485 0.001).

486 Unlike in the sighted group, in the right hemisphere of the blind group, lexicality effects were
487 similar to the left hemisphere. All three (posterior, middle, anterior) subregions responded most
488 to words, followed by consonant strings followed by tactile shapes. There was also a two-way
489 interaction between lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) and subregion (posterior,
490 middle, anterior; $F_{(4, 72)} = 7.064, p < 0.001$). Pairwise comparisons showed that the posterior
491 right vOTC responded more to words than control ($t_{(18)} = 4.112, p < 0.01$); the middle vOTC
492 responded more to words than both consonant strings ($t_{(18)} = 4.011, p < 0.01$) and control ($t_{(18)} =$
493 $4.819, p < 0.001$); and the anterior vOTC responded most strongly to words and consonant
494 strings than control stimuli (words vs. consonant strings: $t_{(18)} = 2.429, p = 0.07$; words vs.
495 control: $t_{(18)} = 5.561, p < 0.001$; consonant strings vs. control, $t_{(18)} = 4.522, p < 0.01$). Other
496 pairwise comparisons did not reach significance (posterior vOTC: words vs. consonant strings,
497 $t_{(18)} = 2.349, p = 0.091$; consonant strings vs. control, $t_{(18)} = 2.16, p = 0.134$; middle vOTC:
498 consonant strings vs control, $t_{(18)} = 2.073, p = 0.159$).


499 In summary, in the blind group, the entire posterior/anterior extent of the vOTC responded more
500 to words than either consonant strings or tactile shapes. Unlike in the sighted, we did not observe
501 the posterior-to-anterior functional gradient or a left hemisphere dominance for written words.

502 For the listening task, similar to the reading task, we conducted a four-way hemisphere (left,
503 right) by subregion (posterior, middle, anterior) by lexicality (words, control) by group (sighted,
504 blind) ANOVA. The four-way interaction effect with group was marginal and we, therefore, did
505 not proceed to further analyses ($F_{(2, 64)} = 2.717, p = 0.074$). It is worth noting that in sighted

506 group, responses to auditory stimuli were below rest in posterior vOTC and above rest in the
507 more anterior regions. This pattern was not observed in the blind group (see Figure S2).

508 ***Topographical preference map of vOTC: gradient only in sighted readers***

509 In order to explore the posterior-to-anterior gradient in a data-driven way, we mapped the
510 topographical preferences of the blind and sighted vOTC during reading using a winner-take-all
511 approach (Figure 1B). We coded the vertex-wise preferences in different colors for words,
512 consonant strings, and control stimuli (see Methods). In the sighted group, a clear posterior-to-
513 anterior gradient in the left vOTC was observed. The posterior section shows a preference for the
514 visual control false font stimuli whereas anteriorly, most vertices preferred consonant strings or
515 words. In the sighted group's right vOTC, almost all vertices responded most strongly to the
516 control stimuli. These patterns contrast starkly with the blind vOTC maps, which show a clear,
517 bilateral preference for tactile words throughout the entire extent of both left and right vOTC.



518

519 **Figure 1.** (A) Responses in left vOTC across the posterior, middle, and anterior subregions for
 520 blind and sighted groups during the reading tasks (left column). Bars show results from
 521 consonant string > false fonts leave-one-run out individual subject ROI analysis. Error bars
 522 denote standard errors +/- the mean. Asterisks (*) denote significant Bonferroni-corrected
 523 pairwise comparisons within the task ($p < 0.05$). The right upper row showed example stimuli for
 524 the reading trials for the blind and sighted groups. (B) Maps of the blind and sighted vOTC
 525 showing topographical preference to words, consonant strings, or control stimuli during the
 526 reading task.

527 ***The posterior parietal cortex (PPC) but not S1 of blind readers shows a preference for written***
528 ***Braille words and consonant strings***

529 We tested the hypothesis that the PPC shows preferential involvement in Braille reading,
530 analogous to vOTC preference for visual print in the sighted group (Figure 2A). A two-way
531 lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA in the reading
532 task showed a main effect of lexicality ($F_{(2, 64)} = 13.206, p < 0.001$) and a group by lexicality
533 interaction ($F_{(2, 64)} = 5.123, p < 0.01$; functional ROIs were defined using the words > controls
534 contrast). There was no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 1.452, p = 0.237$). In the sighted group,
535 consonant strings elicited higher responses than both words and control stimuli (Bonferroni-
536 corrected paired t -test, words vs. consonant strings: $t_{(14)} = -3.805, p < 0.01$; consonant strings vs.
537 control: $t_{(14)} = 6.922, p < 0.001$; words vs. control: $t_{(14)} = 1.406, p > 0.99$). By contrast, in the
538 blind group the PPC responded more to both tactile words and consonant strings relative to
539 control stimuli (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -test, words vs. consonant strings: $t_{(18)} = 1.571, p =$
540 0.298 ; consonant strings vs. control: $t_{(18)} = 3.028, p < 0.01$; words vs. control: $t_{(18)} = 3.165, p <$
541 0.01). Note that when the posterior parietal ROI was defined instead using the words > controls
542 contrast, the blind group continued to show a larger lexicality preference than the sighted (see
543 Supplemental Materials for details; Figure S5). These results suggest a specific involvement of
544 the PPC in tactile Braille reading.


545 For the listening task, the two-way lexicality (words, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA
546 revealed a significant main effect of lexicality in the PPC (words > control, $F_{(1, 32)} = 11.112, p <$
547 0.01 ; see Figure S4). There was no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 3.275, p = 0.08$) and no
548 interaction between group and lexicality ($F_{(1, 32)} = 2.372, p = 0.133$).

549 We examined responses of the left SMC hand region to test whether it showed a similar
550 preference for Braille words and consonant strings as the PPC (Figure 2A). For the reading task,
551 the two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA
552 showed a main effect of lexicality ($F_{(2, 64)} = 7.265, p < 0.001$; functional ROIs were defined
553 using the words > controls contrast), with higher responses to the consonant strings than control
554 stimuli. Noting that the responses to all stimuli were below rest in SMC in blind group. There
555 was no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.604, p = 0.443$) and no group by condition interaction (F

556 $(2, 64) = 1.501, p = 0.231$). For the listening task, the two-way lexicality (words, control) by group
557 (sighted, blind) ANOVA revealed a main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 15.622, p < 0.001$), with
558 overall greater responses in sighted group than blind group. There was no main effect of
559 lexicality ($F_{(1, 32)} = 1.933, p = 0.174$) and no interaction ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.658, p = 0.423$). Results
560 were similar when the SMC ROIs were instead defined using the words > controls contrast. In
561 sum, unlike in the PPC, we found no evidence for specialization of SMC for Braille reading as
562 compared to perception of control tactile shapes.

563 ***Topographical preference map of parieto-occipital stream: shift in preference from shapes to***
564 ***word-like Braille stimuli along anterior-to-posterior axis***

565 Finally, we constructed a data-driven preference map in PPC and parieto-occipital/dorsal
566 occipital cortex analogous to the one created for vOTC (see Figure 2B). In the blind group, this
567 map shows preferential responses to tactile shapes in anterior portions of PPC, immediately
568 adjacent to S1. A small middle region in left and right PPC showed a preference for consonant
569 strings, whereas the most posterior portion of PPC, as well as parieto-occipital and dorsal
570 occipital regions responded preferentially to words. To summarize, the overall pattern suggests
571 an anterior-to-posterior decoding pattern in the parieto-occipital stream in the blind group,
572 analogous to the posterior-to-anterior vOTC gradient observed in sighted readers.



573

574 **Figure 2.** (A) Responses in left PPC, and SMC ROIs for blind and sighted groups during the
 575 reading (blue colors) tasks. Error bars denote standard errors +/- the mean. Asterisks (*) denote
 576 significant Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons within the task ($p < 0.05$). T = tactile, V =
 577 visual. (B) Maps of the blind and sighted vOTC showing topographical preference to words,
 578 consonant strings, or control stimuli during the reading task in the posterior parietal and parieto-
 579 occipital cortex. Black line: hand region of the primary sensory-motor cortex; yellow line:
 580 vertices showed the preference for consonant strings.

581 ***Left vOTC responds to linguistic stimuli in blind and sighted readers, but differently to words***
582 ***and consonant strings across groups***

583 We examined the effects of lexicality across groups on left vOTC responses during the reading
584 tasks using a two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group (sighted, blind)
585 ANOVA (functional ROIs were defined using the words > controls contrast, Figure 3). We
586 observed a main effect of lexicality ($F_{(2, 64)} = 42.293, p < 0.001$) and no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.004, p = 0.948$). A lexicality by group interaction revealed different response patterns
587 across sighted and blind individuals ($F_{(2, 64)} = 10.272, p < 0.001$). While in the blind group
588 words elicited larger responses than consonant strings, responses to consonant strings were
589 numerically but not significantly larger than to words in the sighted group (Bonferroni-corrected
590 paired t -test words vs. consonant strings blind: $t_{(18)} = 3.027, p < 0.05$; sighted: $t_{(18)} = -1.317, p =$
591 0.614). In both groups, words and consonant strings showed larger responses than control stimuli
592 (all pairwise comparisons $p < 0.05$) (Figure 3).
593

594 For the listening task, a two-way lexicality (words, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA
595 revealed greater overall responses to words than control stimuli (main effect of lexicality, $F_{(1, 32)}$
596 $= 35.919, p < 0.001$; functional ROIs were defined using the words > controls contrast). There
597 was no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 1.362, p = 0.252$). The lexicality by group interaction was
598 marginal ($F_{(1, 32)} = 3.785, p = 0.061$), indicating a larger difference between audio words and
599 audio control stimuli in the blind group than in the sighted group. A similar pattern was observed
600 when the vOTC functional ROI was instead defined using the words > control contrast (see
601 Supplemental Materials; Figure S3).

602 ***The left inferior frontal cortex (IFC) prefers word-like written and spoken stimuli across blind***
603 ***and sighted readers***

604 We analyzed responses in the left IFC across groups with the prediction that this high-level
605 language region would show similar response patterns across blind and sighted readers.
606 Consistent with this prediction, responses were similar across groups for both tasks in the left
607 IFC. For the reading task, a two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by group
608 (sighted, blind) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of lexicality, with larger responses
609 for words and consonant strings over the control condition ($F_{(2, 64)} = 46.313, p < 0.001$; Figure 3;


610 functional ROIs were defined using the words > controls contrast). Neither the main effect of
611 group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.004, p = 0.947$) nor the interaction ($F_{(2, 64)} = 1.017, p = 0.367$) were
612 significant. Likewise, for the listening task, the two-way lexicality (words, control) by group
613 (sighted, blind) ANOVA revealed the expected main effect of lexicality (words > control; $F_{(1, 32)}$
614 $= 23.778, p < 0.001$). There was no main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.753, p = 0.392$) and no
615 lexicality by group interaction ($F_{(1, 32)} = 0.357, p = 0.554$). There was also no group-by-
616 condition interaction when functional ROIs were defined using the words > controls contrast.
617 Both groups still showed a preference for words over control stimuli and in this case, there was
618 also a larger response to words over consonant strings in both groups (see Supplemental
619 Materials for details; Figure S5). These results are consistent with prior studies showing similar
620 responses to spoken and written language in the left inferior frontal cortex of blind and sighted
621 adults.

622 ***V1 shows a preference for words in blind readers***

623 We investigated the effects of lexicality across groups in V1 (Figure 3), because it was
624 previously identified as relevant to Braille reading (Sadato et al., 1996; Cohen et al. 1997). As
625 with vOTC, we first examined responses in left V1 during the reading task using the consonant
626 strings > control functional ROIs. A two-way lexicality (words, consonant strings, control) by
627 group (sighted, blind) ANOVA revealed main effects of lexicality ($F_{(2, 64)} = 4.247, p < 0.05$) and
628 group (sighted > blind, $F_{(1, 32)} = 6.964, p < 0.05$). There was also a significant lexicality by group
629 interaction ($F_{(2, 64)} = 9.487, p < 0.001$). In the blind group, V1 responded most to words and
630 there was no difference between consonant strings and control (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -
631 test, words vs. consonant strings: $t_{(18)} = 2.641, p < 0.05$; words vs. control: $t_{(18)} = 3.691, p < 0.01$;
632 consonant strings vs. control: $t_{(18)} = 2.367, p = 0.214$). In the sighted group, V1 responded more
633 to control stimuli than consonant strings (Bonferroni-corrected paired t -test, $t_{(14)} = 2.652, p <$
634 0.01). There was no difference between other conditions (pairwise comparisons $p > 0.05$.) V1
635 responses in the blind group were similar when functional ROIs were defined using words >
636 control (see Supplemental Materials for details; Figure S5). In the sighted group, however, a
637 marginal preference for words over false fonts emerged in this alternative analysis (Bonferroni-
638 corrected paired t -test, $t_{(14)} = 2.573, p = 0.067$; Figure S5). This latter result is consistent with
639 some previous studies showing that V1/V2 responded more to words than non-letter control

640 stimuli like scrambled words (Szwed et al., 2011; Szwed, Qiao, Jobert, Dehaene, & Cohen,
641 2014).

642 For the listening task, the two-way lexicality (words, control) by group (sighted, blind) ANOVA
643 showed a main effect of group ($F_{(1, 32)} = 16.067, p < 0.001$), with overall greater activation seen
644 in blind than sighted V1. There was no main effect of lexicality ($F_{(1, 32)} = 2.344, p = 0.316$) and
645 no interaction between the factors ($F_{(1, 32)} = 1.589, p = 0.217$). Notably in the sighted but not
646 blind group, responses to both words and audio control were below rest. This pattern of results
647 was the same in words > control ROI (See Supplemental Materials for details; Figure S5).



648

649 **Figure 3.** Response of left vOTC (upper left), left IFC (upper right), left V1 (lower left) during
650 reading (blue colors) and listening (orange colors) tasks for blind (left) and sighted groups
651 (right). Bars show PSC for tactile stimuli (blind group), visual stimuli (sighted group), and audio
652 stimuli (both groups). Error bars denote standard errors +/- the mean. Asterisks (*) denote


653 significant Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons within the task ($p < 0.05$). T = tactile, V =
654 visual.

655 ***Lateralization of Braille correlates with spoken language lateralization and Braille-reading***
656 ***hand***

657 We used a lateralization index (LI) analysis to investigate the lateralization of spoken and written
658 language across blind and sighted readers. First, we computed LIs separately for written
659 (tactile/visual words > rest) and spoken (audio words > rest) language in the SMC, PPC, vOTC,
660 V1, IFC and whole cortex in sighted and blind groups. On average, the blind group showed no
661 systematic lateralization for written or spoken words in any region (one-sample t tests of LI = 0,
662 reading: SMC: $t_{(18)} = 0.167, p = 0.869$; PPC: $t_{(18)} = -1.257, p = 0.225$; vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 0.799, p =$
663 0.435 ; V1: $t_{(18)} = 0.735, p = 0.472$; IFC: $t_{(18)} = -0.054, p = 0.958$; whole cortex: $t_{(18)} = -0.166, p =$
664 0.87 ; listening: SMC: $t_{(13)} = -1.332, p = 0.206$; PPC: $t_{(18)} = 0.051, p = 0.96$; vOTC: $t_{(18)} = 0.322, p$
665 $= 0.751$; V1: $t_{(18)} = -0.506, p = 0.619$; IFC: $t_{(18)} = -1.135, p = 0.271$; whole cortex: $t_{(18)} = 0.395, p$
666 $= 0.697$). For the sighted group, we found left-lateralized activation in vOTC, IFC and whole
667 cortex for written words (one-sample t tests of LI = 0, vOTC: $t_{(14)} = 5.31, p < 0.001$; IFC: $t_{(13)} =$
668 $5.776, p < 0.001$; whole cortex: $t_{(14)} = 5.748, p < 0.001$). The sighted group's SMC, PPC and V1
669 activity was not systematically lateralized for written words (one-sample t tests of LI = 0, SMC:
670 $t_{(10)} = 1.172, p = 0.268$; PPC: $t_{(13)} = 0.404, p = 0.692$; V1: $t_{(14)} = 1.614, p = 0.129$). For spoken
671 words, the sighted group's vOTC and IFC activity was left lateralized (one-sample t tests of LI =
672 0, vOTC: $t_{(14)} = 3.42, p < 0.01$; IFC: $t_{(13)} = 3.767, p < 0.01$). We found right-lateralized activation
673 in PPC and V1 for spoken words in the sighted group (one-sample t tests of LI = 0, PPC: $t_{(13)} = -$
674 $3.161, p < 0.01$; V1: $t_{(8)} = -3.872, p < 0.01$). There were no systematic lateralization in SMC and
675 whole cortex for the listening task (one-sample t tests of LI = 0, SMC: $t_{(13)} = -0.848, p = 0.412$;
676 whole cortex: $t_{(14)} = 1.449, p = 0.169$). To summarize, we found left-lateralized activity in vOTC
677 and IFC for written and spoken words in the sighted group. By contrast, the blind group did not
678 show systematic lateralization in any of the regions or the whole cortex for written or spoken
679 words. Among blind participants there was substantial variability in lateralization, with some
680 participants showing strong left and others strong right lateralization, consistent with previous
681 studies of lateralization of spoken language in this population (Figure 4, see also Lane et al.,
682 2017 and Roder et al., 2002).

683 Next, we determined if lateralization of the Braille reading network could be predicted by the
684 laterality of spoken language and Braille reading hand across blind individuals. A multiple
685 regression analysis was conducted in each region, with the LI of spoken words in IFC and
686 dominant reading hand entered as the regressors and the LI of written words as the dependent
687 variable. First, both the dominant reading hand and the LI of spoken words in IFC predicted the LI
688 of written words in PPC, vOTC and whole cortex (PPC: dominant reading hand: $\beta = 0.55, p <$
689 0.001 ; LI of spoken words in IFC: $\beta = 0.55, p < 0.001$; adjust $r^2 = 0.843$; vOTC: dominant reading
690 hand: $\beta = 0.468, p < 0.01$; LI of spoken words in IFC: $\beta = 0.611, p = 0.001$; adjust $r^2 = 0.727$; whole
691 cortex: dominant reading hand: $\beta = 0.399, p = 0.001$; LI of spoken words in IFC: $\beta = 0.534, p <$
692 0.001 ; adjust $r^2 = 0.761$). Second, in V1 and the IFC, only the LI of spoken words predicted the LI
693 of written words (V1: dominant reading hand: $\beta = 0.258, p = 0.144$; LI of spoken words in IFC: $\beta =$
694 $0.734, p = 0.001$; adjust $r^2 = 0.575$; IFC: dominant reading hand: $\beta = -0.112, p = 0.359$; LI of spoken
695 words in IFC: $\beta = 0.814, p < 0.001$; adjust $r^2 = 0.702$). Last, we found in SMC, only the dominant
696 reading hand predicted the LI of written words (dominant reading hand: $\beta = 1.624, p < 0.001$; LI
697 of spoken words in IFC: $\beta = 0.311, p = 0.261$; adjust $r^2 = 0.771$). To summarize, in blind
698 individuals, responses to Braille written words and spoken words were co-lateralized to the same
699 hemisphere across most of the Braille reading network, including the vOTC, V1, PPC, and the
700 IFC. Braille reading hand also had an effect on the lateralization of Braille written words in
701 vOTC, PPC, and SMC.

702 In the sighted group, we did not find the co-lateralization of spoken and written language to the
703 same hemisphere. The correlation between the LI of spoken words in IFC and the LI of written
704 words in vOTC was not significant ($r = -0.233, p = 0.423$). In addition, there were no
705 correlations between the LI of spoken words in IFC and the LI of written words in V1, SMC or
706 whole cortex (V1: $r = -0.301, p = 0.296$; SMC: $r = 0.169, p = 0.62$; whole cortex: $r = 0.12, p =$
707 0.683). However, the LI of spoken words in IFC was positively correlated with the LI of written
708 words in PPC and IFC (PPC: $r = 0.55, p < 0.05$; IFC: $r = 0.732, p < 0.01$).



709

710 **Figure 4.** (A) Correlations between the LIs of audio words in IFC and the LIs of tactile words in
 711 SMC (upper left), PPC (upper middle), vOTC (upper right), V1 (lower left), IFC (lower middle)
 712 and whole cortex (lower right) in blind individuals. Data points represent individual participants.
 713 LI 1 score indicates strong left lateralization and -1 indicates strong right lateralization. (B)
 714 Average of LI in left-handed blind readers of Braille and right-handed blind readers of Braille.
 715 Asterisks (*) on the bar denote significant difference from 0; asterisks (*) between two bars
 716 denote significant difference between the LI of left-handed blind readers and the LI of right-
 717 handed blind readers ($p < 0.05$); Cross (†) on the bar denotes marginal difference from 0 ($0.05 < p$
 718 < 0.1); cross(†) between two bars denotes marginal difference between the LI of left-handed blind
 719 readers and the LI of right-handed blind readers ($0.05 < p < 0.1$).

720 ***Whole cortex analyses***


721 Tactile Braille (blind) and visual print (sighted) reading activated both common and distinctive
722 cortical areas across groups. For reading as compared to rest, both sighted (visual words) and
723 blind (Braille words) readers activated the bilateral vOTC (blind peak: -41, -57, -13; sighted
724 peak: -41, -58, -12), including the location of the classic VWFA (peak: -46, -53, -20), as well as
725 early visual cortices, specifically the foveal confluence (V1/V2/V3) (Figure 5). Within vOTC,
726 responses in the blind group extended further medially and anteriorly and were more extensive in
727 the right hemisphere, relative to the sighted group. The vOTC activation in the blind group also
728 extended further laterally and superiorly, into lateral occipital, occipitotemporal, and inferior
729 temporal cortex. Both groups also activated posterior prefrontal cortices (inferior frontal gyrus
730 and middle frontal gyrus). Notably, visual cortex responses (e.g., V1) are likely driven at least in
731 part, by different processes across groups, since the sighted group is performing a visual task,
732 whereas the blind group is performing a tactile task.

733 In the blind but not sighted group, reading relative to rest produced extensive activation in
734 bilateral posterior parietal cortices, including superior parietal lobule and supramarginal gyrus
735 (SMG). This parietal activation was posterior to early sensory-motor hand representations. The
736 sighted group activated only a small cluster in parietal cortex, in the left superior parietal lobule.
737 The blind, but not sighted group, also activated parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital regions
738 (middle occipital gyrus). The sighted group additionally activated a lateral temporal region that
739 was not observed in the blind group. Finally, whereas responses to written words were left-
740 lateralized in the sighted group, they were bilateral in the blind group.

741 Listening to words (audio words > rest) likewise revealed partially overlapping responses across
742 groups. In the blind group only, listening to words activated the bilateral vOTC (peak: -42, -44, -
743 16), including the location of the classic VWFA, and early ‘visual’ cortices. Both groups
744 activated classic fronto-temporal language regions in inferior and lateral prefrontal as well as
745 lateral temporal cortices (Figure 5). Responses in frontal regions were left-lateralized in the
746 sighted group and bilateral in the blind group. The sighted but not blind group activated the left
747 sensorimotor cortex/postcentral gyrus.

748 Reading as compared to hearing words (tactile/visual words > audio words) also revealed
749 similarities and differences across groups (Figure 5). For the sighted group (visual words > audio
750 words), reading words induced greater activation in bilateral vOTC, including the typical
751 location of the VWFA and regions posterior to it, as well as bilateral early visual cortices. Like
752 the sighted, the blind group also activated a region in the left vOTC (fusiform; peak: -27, -61, -
753 14), but this activation was medial to the typical VWFA location. A cluster of activity was also
754 observed lateral to the typical VWFA location in the blind group, in the inferior temporal/lateral
755 occipital cortex (peak: -45 -67 -6). Outside vOTC, a cluster of activity was also observed in the
756 blind group in left foveal early ‘visual’ cortices. The blind but not sighted group also showed
757 extensive activation in posterior parietal cortices, including the SMG and superior parietal
758 lobule. Blind readers also activated dorsal occipital/parieto-occipital cortices during reading. The
759 blind group additionally activated the bilateral superior frontal gyrus and right precentral gyrus.
760 In the sighted group, a small cluster was observed in the left superior parietal lobule.

761 In sum, we observed the following pattern. First, although both groups activated vOTC during
762 reading, the peak location, distribution and functional profile of responses in vOTC were distinct
763 across groups. Only the blind group showed robust vOTC responses during spoken word
764 comprehension. Second, in contrast to the sighted group, the blind group activated extensive
765 posterior parietal, parieto-occipital, and dorsal occipital areas during (Braille) reading. This
766 parieto-occipital stream was not engaged by spoken word comprehension in blind readers.



767

768 **Figure 5.** Whole-cortex results for blind (left column) and sighted (right column) groups for the
769 following contrasts: tactile/visual words > rest (top row), audio words > rest (middle row),
770 tactile/visual words > audio words (bottom row). The blue circles marked the approximate
771 location of the classic VWF (MNI coordinate: -46, -53, -20). The yellow line marked the hand
772 S1/M1 region. Whole cortex contrasts were thresholded at $p < 0.01$ vertex-wise, and at $p < 0.05$
773 cluster-corrected.

774 **Discussion**

775 Consistent with previous studies, we find that reading activates partially overlapping networks
776 across blind readers of tactile Braille and sighted readers of visual print. In particular, we
777 observed similar responses to written and spoken words and letters in the left IFC of sighted and
778 blind people. We also observed partially overlapping responses in the vOTC across groups. In
779 agreement with past findings, the highest peak of activation for Braille reading relative to rest
780 and visual reading relative to rest was near the canonical ‘VWFA’ location (Braille words > rest:
781 -41, -57, -13; sighted visual words > rest: -41, -58, -12) (Cohen et al., 2000; Dziegiel-Fivet et al.,
782 2021; Kim et al., 2017; Rączy et al., 2019; Reich et al., 2011). However, we also observed key
783 differences in the neural bases of Braille and visual print reading, in vOTC, V1, and posterior
784 parietal cortices, as well as in lateralization patterns.

785 **vOTC of sighted but not blind readers contains a hierarchical word form gradient**

786 Consistent with past research, in sighted readers, we observed a posterior-to-anterior functional
787 gradient only in the left vOTC. The posterior portion of the left vOTC responded equally to all
788 visual stimuli in the ROI analysis, the middle portion showed a preference for consonant strings,
789 while the most anterior portion responded more to words and consonant strings than to false
790 fonts. Preferential responses to consonant strings in the middle vOTC of sighted readers are
791 consistent with prior literature showing stronger activation to non-word stimuli in the VWFA
792 when longer presentation times are used or more attention is required (Bruno, Zumberge, Manis,
793 Lu, & Goldman, 2008; Cohen, Dehaene, Vinckier, Jobert, & Montavont, 2008; Dehaene &
794 Cohen, 2011; Ludersdorfer, Schurz, Richlan, Kronbichler, & Wimmer, 2013). A winner-take-all
795 map revealed a similar pattern as the ROI analysis and further showed larger responses to false
796 fonts than consonant strings or words in posterior portions of left vOTC. The larger responses to
797 false fonts in posterior vOTC likely reflect greater attention to less familiar visual stimuli, as
798 indicated by slower reaction times and poorer accuracy. This pattern is consistent with prior
799 studies with sighted readers (Ludersdorfer et al., 2013; Wang, Yang, Shu, & Zevin, 2011). In
800 addition, in sighted readers, the posterior vOTC showed a modality-specific response: above rest
801 activity during visual reading and deactivation during listening, while the most anterior aspect of
802 left vOTC responded equally to visual and auditory stimuli. These results are consistent with the

803 view that in sighted readers the middle and anterior portions of left lateral vOTC become
804 specialized for recognition of letters and words, constituting the so-called ‘VWFA.’

805 By contrast, in the blind group, we found no evidence for left-lateralization, no evidence for a
806 posterior-to-anterior functional gradient, or posterior/anterior change in modality preference. In
807 blind readers, the entire posterior/anterior extent of bilateral vOTC showed a preference for
808 Braille words over consonant strings and tactile shapes during reading and a larger response to
809 spoken words than backward speech. Unlike in the sighted group, in the blind group, no portion
810 of the vOTC showed a consonant string preference over words and shapes, whereas in the
811 sighted group, the middle vOTC responded more to consonant strings than words. In addition,
812 there was no change in preference for written as opposed to spoken words along the
813 posterior/anterior extent of vOTC.

814 The Whole-cortex analysis also revealed differences in lateral/medial organization of vOTC
815 across groups. As noted above and previously documented, when Braille and spoken words were
816 compared to rest, a peak of activation was observed in the classic VWFA region along the
817 medial/lateral axis, although in blind readers, additional activity was also observed throughout
818 much of vOTC. By contrast, when Braille words were compared to spoken words in the blind
819 group, peak activity in the vOTC was medial to the classic VWFA location (peak: -27, -61, -14).
820 We did not observe such a medial peak for the same contrast in sighted readers. This medial
821 vOTC region has previously been shown to be functionally connected to dorsal parietal cortices,
822 which are involved in spatial attention and effortful letter-by-letter reading in sighted people
823 (Bouhali, Bézagu, Dehaene, & Cohen, 2019; Cohen et al., 2008; Corbetta & Shulman, 2002;
824 Henry et al., 2005; Saalman, Pigarev, & Vidyasagar, 2007). As discussed in detail below, the
825 PPC appears to play an important role in Braille reading and may send information to medial
826 vOTC in blind readers.

827 Although the precise role of vOTC in Braille reading remains to be determined, the present
828 evidence suggests that although the vOTC is involved in both tactile reading and visual reading,
829 the anatomical distribution of responses within vOTC, the functional profile, and therefore likely
830 the cognitive contribution differs. In sighted readers, information reaches lateral vOTC from
831 early visual areas and is sent onward to fronto-temporal language regions, as well as receiving

832 top-down input from the language regions (Bouhali et al., 2014; Hannagan et al., 2015; Saygin et
833 al., 2016; Stevens et al., 2017b; Yeatman et al., 2013). Lateral vOTC thus contributes to
834 decoding linguistic information (phonological, semantic, and grammatical) from visual word
835 forms (Dehaene & Cohen, 2011; Price & Devlin, 2011). By contrast, we hypothesize that in
836 blind readers of Braille, the classic VWFA location in lateral vOTC receives linguistic (i.e.,
837 semantic, grammatical) information from fronto-temporal language circuits and serves as one of
838 the entry points for language into posterior ‘visual’ circuits. This hypothesis is supported by prior
839 studies showing that in blind but not sighted people, the classic VWFA location is sensitive to
840 syntactic complexity of spoken sentences and shows enhanced responses to spoken language
841 (Burton, Snyder, Diamond, et al., 2002; Dzięgiel-Fivet et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2017; Lane et al.,
842 2015). At the same time, the current data and prior evidence suggest that other parts of the
843 ‘visual’ cortex, including a medial portion of vOTC, may play a role in Braille reading. An
844 intriguing albeit speculative possibility is that medial vOTC receives Braille-relevant input from
845 PPC. Lacking connectivity data, the present study cannot test this hypothesis directly. One way
846 to test this possibility in future work would be to use online TMS in combination with fMRI to
847 disrupt information flow to the vOTC in blind readers of Braille by stimulating parietal cortices.

848 **Parieto-occipital decoding stream in blind readers of Braille**

849 We observed more extensive and different involvement of posterior parietal/parieto-occipital
850 cortices in Braille as opposed to visual print reading. Large segments of PPC were activated
851 during Braille reading relative to rest and spoken word comprehension. PPC activity in the blind
852 group extended inferiorly and anteriorly, into regions adjacent to and immediately posterior to
853 S1, including the supramarginal gyrus (SMG) and much of the superior parietal lobule. Notably,
854 the hand regions of S1 itself did not show robust responses during Braille reading or preferential
855 responses to Braille letters or words, consistent with prior studies (Burton, Snyder, Conturo, et
856 al., 2002; Kupers et al., 2007). Additionally, in the blind group only, parietal activation extended
857 posteriorly into parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital regions adjacent to parietal cortices and
858 ultimately into the foveal confluence. By contrast, visual print reading (relative to false fonts) by
859 sighted readers activated only a small region within the superior parietal lobule, consistent with
860 prior studies (Cohen et al., 2008; Martin, Schurz, Kronbichler, & Richlan, 2015; Reilhac, Peyrin,
861 Démonet, & Valdois, 2013).

862 The cognitive role of the wider parietal network in Braille reading is not known. The PPC has
863 strong connectivity with S1 and contains high-level tactile areas, as well as multimodal
864 representations of texture and shape (Bauer et al., 2015; Hegner et al., 2010; Kaas, 2012). Some
865 of the activation we observed likely reflects processes related to recognition of tactile patterns
866 that constitute Braille but are not specific to Braille letters or words (Boven, Hamilton,
867 Kauffman, Keenan, & Pascual-Leone, 2000; Wong, Gnanakumaran, & Goldreich, 2011), akin to
868 general responses to shapes, including false fonts, observed in vOTC of sighted readers (Grant,
869 Thiagarajah, & Sathian, 2000; Sathian & Stilla, 2010; Stilla et al., 2008). Consistent with this
870 possibility, much of the PPC, particularly its anterior portion, was more responsive to the more
871 tactilely complex and unfamiliar dot shapes than to Braille letters or words. Again, this paralleled
872 preferential responses to false fonts in posterior vOTC of sighted readers. Importantly, however,
873 within the larger swath of PPC activation, ROI analyses revealed word and letter preferring
874 subregions in the blind group, suggesting a specific involvement in Braille processing.

875 Word-specific activation in parieto-occipital areas extended posteriorly into dorsal occipital
876 cortices, only in the blind group. Unlike anterior portions of the PPC, parieto-occipital and dorsal
877 occipital areas showed larger responses to Braille words than Braille consonants or control
878 shapes. However, like anterior PPC, parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital regions responded
879 more to Braille words than to spoken words. This pattern suggests that parieto-occipital and
880 dorsal occipital areas are involved in reading-specific processing, rather than language
881 comprehension or tactile pattern recognition.

882 The winner-take-all map of PPC showed that the preference for words is located in the posterior
883 aspect of the PPC, adjacent to parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital areas. Interestingly, in the
884 blind group only, this map also revealed consonant preferring regions in an anatomically
885 intermediate position between shape preferring areas in anterior portions of PPC and word
886 preferring areas in parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital cortices. These regions did not emerge in
887 corrected whole-brain analyses and therefore should be interpreted with caution, requiring
888 investigation in future studies. However, the overall pattern suggests an anterior-to-posterior
889 parieto-occipital reading stream, analogous to the posterior-to-anterior vOTC gradient observed
890 in sighted readers. Within this gradient, parietal regions closer to S1, in anterior PPC represent
891 shape/texture information relevant to Braille, with posterior PPC and parieto-occipital regions

892 representing Braille orthography and still more posterior occipital areas representing linguistic
893 information.

894 As noted in the Introduction, involvement of the PPC in Braille reading is predicted by
895 connectivity-based theories of brain function (Bedny, 2017; Hannagan et al., 2015; Mahon &
896 Caramazza, 2011; Saygin et al., 2016). One hypothesis, therefore, is that the PPC, along with
897 adjacent parieto-occipital areas, plays an analogous role in Braille orthographic processing to the
898 role of the vOTC in orthographic processing of visual print: conversion of tactile patterns to
899 orthographic representations (Dehaene & Cohen, 2011; Dehaene et al., 2005).

900 Further work is needed to uncover the precise cognitive contribution of PPC and parieto-
901 occipital cortices to Braille reading. In sighted readers, the PPC also contributes to reading but
902 under different circumstances. The PPC is thought to participate in grapheme to phoneme
903 conversion, letter position decoding, as well as working memory processes and shows more
904 robust activity when effortful letter-by-letter reading is required (e.g., when words are degraded)
905 (Carreiras, Quiñones, Hernández-Cabrera, & Duñabeitia, 2015; Cohen et al., 2004; Costanzo,
906 Menghini, Caltagirone, Oliveri, & Vicari, 2012; Dehaene-Lambertz, Monzalvo, & Dehaene,
907 2018; Henry et al., 2005; Jonides et al., 1998; Koenigs, Barbey, Postle, & Grafman, 2009;
908 Ossmy, Ben-Shachar, & Mukamel, 2014; Taylor, Rastle, & Davis, 2013). Parietal cortex also
909 shows sensitivity to phonological rather than orthographic information during visual reading, in
910 contrast to the VWFA (Booth et al., 2003; Bouhali et al., 2019). In future studies, it would be
911 interesting to separate parietal responses to phonological as opposed to word-form information in
912 blind readers of Braille. In addition, further research is needed to explore the anatomical layout
913 of Braille-responsive parietal areas. For example, whether the parieto-occipital stream contains
914 punctate regions analogous to the VWFA, or more distributed responses to Braille letters and
915 words remains an open question. Likewise, in future studies, it will be important to test the
916 precise role of the PPC in Braille reading and to dissociate the functions of PPC, parieto-
917 occipital, and dorsal occipital regions.

918 **Differential role of early visual cortex in Braille and visual print reading**

919 We observed responses to reading in V1 in the blind but not sighted group. Like dorsal occipital
920 areas, V1 showed a preference for words over consonant strings and control shapes. The

921 involvement of V1 in Braille reading is consistent with previous studies (Cohen et al., 1997;
922 Kupers et al., 2007; Sadato et al., 1996). We further found that, in whole-cortex results, a portion
923 of V1 (foveal aspect of left V1) responded more to Braille reading than auditory word
924 comprehension, whereas other portions of V1 (right hemisphere, and peripheral) did not show
925 such a preference. This evidence is consistent with prior work suggesting that V1 does not have a
926 single, homogeneous function in people who are blind but rather contains multiple anatomically
927 separable functional subdivisions (Amedi et al., 2003; Bedny et al., 2011; Burton, Diamond, &
928 McDermott, 2003; Burton, Snyder, Diamond, et al., 2002; Kanjlia et al., 2021; Kanjlia, Pant, &
929 Bedny, 2019; Lane et al., 2015; Noppeney et al., 2003). Likewise, V1 may contain anatomically
930 separable Braille-specific and high-level language responses in blind readers of Braille.

931 **Lateralization of Braille reading: effects of spoken language lateralization and reading** 932 **hand**

933 With the exception of the primary somatosensory cortex, laterality of responses to written words
934 in the entire reading network (vOTC, PPC, V1, and IFC) is predicted by the laterality of spoken
935 word comprehension across blind individuals. On average congenitally blind individuals showed
936 reduced left-lateralization of responses to spoken and written words (see also Lane et al., 2017).
937 Those blind individuals who show right-lateralized responses to spoken words also show right-
938 lateralized responses to written words. Previous studies with sighted readers with right
939 hemisphere spoken language responses have likewise observed co-lateralization of spoken and
940 written language (Cai et al., 2010; Van der Haegen et al., 2012). We did not observe this pattern
941 in the current sighted sample, possibly because all sighted participants in the current study had
942 strongly left-lateralized responses to spoken language and thus there was little interindividual
943 variability. Together, these data suggest that written and spoken language tend to co-lateralize in
944 blind and sighted readers alike. This observation is consistent with the hypothesis that strong
945 connectivity to spoken language networks is one of the determining factors of which regions
946 become ‘recycled’ for reading.

947 We also found a significant effect of reading hand on the lateralization of Braille reading that
948 was independent of the effect of spoken language lateralization. That is, right-hand Braille
949 readers showed more left-lateralized activation whereas left-hand Braille readers showed a

950 bilateral response to Braille. In contrast to the effect of spoken language on laterality, the effect
951 of reading hand was strongest in the primary somatosensory cortex, persisted in PPC and vOTC,
952 and was absent in IFC and V1. This observation is consistent with the idea that V1 occupies the
953 top of a processing hierarchy for people who are blind (Buechel, 2003). Effects of reading hand
954 thus persist past S1 but wane at higher stages of processing, whereas effects of language
955 lateralization are most prominent at higher processing stages and disappear in early sensory areas
956 (i.e., S1).

957 In sum, the lateralization of Braille reading is jointly determined by the lateralization of spoken
958 language and the input hand that receives the initial Braille stimulus. Although specific
959 lateralization patterns differ across sighted and blind groups, an analogous connectivity principle
960 appears to govern lateralization of reading in sighted and blind readers: lateralization depends
961 jointly on connectivity to sensory input regions (unilateral S1/ bilateral V1) and language
962 networks.

963 **General conclusions**

964 We find that the neural basis of Braille reading differs from that of visual print reading in several
965 ways. While visual print reading recruits a posterior/anterior vOTC gradient, no such gradient is
966 observed in the vOTC of blind readers of Braille. Blind readers of Braille recruit posterior
967 parietal cortices to a greater degree and in a different way compared to visual print reading in
968 sighted people. Only blind readers show preferential responses to written words in PPC and
969 parieto-occipital cortex. We observed suggestive evidence for an anterior-to-posterior stream of
970 processing in the parietal cortex of blind Braille readers, with anterior parietal areas involved in
971 tactile pattern perception and more posterior parietal, parieto-occipital and dorsal occipital
972 regions involved in word recognition. In blind and sighted readers alike, lateralization of spoken
973 language predicts lateralization of written language. However, on average, spoken word and
974 visual word recognition is highly left-lateralized in sighted people. By contrast, neither Braille
975 reading nor spoken word recognition is strongly left-lateralized in people who are born blind. In
976 blind readers of Braille, reading hand also affects lateralization of responses to Braille.

977 Comparing the neural basis of reading across blind and sighted people suggests that there is no
978 ‘standard reading brain.’ The input modality of symbols influences the neural basis of their

979 recognition. At the same time, similar anatomical principles govern the localization of visual
980 print and tactile Braille. Connectivity patterns constrain the localization of visual print and tactile
981 Braille reading alike.

982

983

984

985 **Credit Author Statement**

986 J.K., S.K., and M.B. designed research; J.K., S.K., and M.B. performed research; M.T. analyzed
987 data; M.T., E.S. and M.B. wrote the paper.

988

989 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

990 The authors declare no competing interests.

991 **Acknowledgments**

992 We would like to thank all our blind and sighted participants, the blind community and the
993 National Federation of the Blind. Without their support, this study would not be possible. This
994 work was supported by grants from the Johns Hopkins Science of Learning Institute (80034917)
995 and the NIH/NEI (R01 EY027352-01). We would also like to thank the F. M. Kirby Research
996 Center for Functional Brain Imaging at the Kennedy Krieger Institute for their assistance in data
997 collection.

998

999 **References**

- 1000 Amedi, A., Raz, N., Pianka, P., Malach, R., & Zohary, E. (2003). Early “visual” cortex activation
1001 correlates with superior verbal memory performance in the blind. *Nature Neuroscience*,
1002 6(7), 758–766. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1072>
- 1003 Baker, C. I., Liu, J., Wald, L. L., Kwong, K. K., Benner, T., & Kanwisher, N. (2007). Visual
1004 word processing and experiential origins of functional selectivity in human extrastriate
1005 cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(21), 9087–9092.
1006 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0703300104>
- 1007 Barttfeld, P., Abboud, S., Lagercrantz, H., Adén, U., Padilla, N., Edwards, A. D., ... Dehaene-
1008 Lambertz, G. (2018). A lateral-to-mesial organization of human ventral visual cortex at
1009 birth. *Brain Structure and Function*, 223(7), 3107–3119. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-018-1676-3)
1010 018-1676-3
- 1011 Bauer, C., Yazzolino, L., Hirsch, G., Cattaneo, Z., Vecchi, T., & Merabet, L. B. (2015). Neural
1012 correlates associated with superior tactile symmetry perception in the early blind. *Cortex*,
1013 63, 104–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.08.003>
- 1014 Bedny, M. (2017). Evidence from Blindness for a Cognitively Pluripotent Cortex. *Trends in*
1015 *Cognitive Sciences*, 21(9), 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.06.003>
- 1016 Bedny, M., Pascual-Leone, A., Dodell-Feder, D., Fedorenko, E., & Saxe, R. (2011). Language
1017 processing in the occipital cortex of congenitally blind adults. *Proceedings of the National*
1018 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108(11), 4429–4434.
1019 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014818108>
- 1020 Bedny, M., Richardson, H., & Saxe, R. (2015). “Visual” cortex responds to spoken language in
1021 blind children. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(33), 11674–11681.
1022 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0634-15.2015>
- 1023 Behrmann, M., & Plaut, D. C. (2013). Distributed circuits, not circumscribed centers, mediate
1024 visual recognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(5), 210–219.

- 1025 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.03.007>
- 1026 Behrmann, M., & Plaut, D. C. (2020). Hemispheric Organization for Visual Object Recognition:
1027 A Theoretical Account and Empirical Evidence*. *Perception*, *49*(4), 373–404.
1028 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0301006619899049>
- 1029 Binder, J. R., Medler, D. A., Westbury, C. F., Liebenthal, E., & Buchanan, L. (2006). Tuning of
1030 the human left fusiform gyrus to sublexical orthographic structure. *NeuroImage*, *33*(2),
1031 739–748. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.06.053>
- 1032 Bola, Ł., Matuszewski, J., Szczepanik, M., Drożdziel, D., Sliwiska, M. W., Paplińska, M., ...
1033 Marchewka, A. (2019). Functional hierarchy for tactile processing in the visual cortex of
1034 sighted adults. *NeuroImage*, *202*, 116084.
1035 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116084>
- 1036 Bolger, D. J., Perfetti, C. A., & Schneider, W. (2005). Cross-cultural effect on the brain revisited:
1037 Universal structures plus writing system variation. *Human Brain Mapping*, *25*(1), 92–104.
1038 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20124>
- 1039 Booth, J. R., Burman, D. D., Meyer, J. R., Gitelman, D. R., Parrish, T. B., & Mesulam, M. M.
1040 (2003). Relation between brain activation and lexical performance. *Human Brain Mapping*,
1041 *19*(3), 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10111>
- 1042 Bouhali, F., Bézagu, Z., Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2019). A mesial-to-lateral dissociation for
1043 orthographic processing in the visual cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
1044 *Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(43), 21936–21946.
1045 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1904184116>
- 1046 Bouhali, F., de Schotten, M. T., Pinel, P., Poupon, C., Mangin, J. F., Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L.
1047 (2014). Anatomical connections of the visual word form area. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1048 *34*(46), 15402–15414. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4918-13.2014>
- 1049 Boven, R. W. V., Hamilton, R. H., Kauffman, T., Keenan, J. P., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2000).
1050 Tactile spatial resolution in blind Braille readers. *Neurology*, *54*(12), 2230–2236.
1051 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.54.12.2230>

- 1052 Bruno, J. L., Zumberge, A., Manis, F. R., Lu, Z. L., & Goldman, J. G. (2008). Sensitivity to
1053 orthographic familiarity in the occipito-temporal region. *NeuroImage*, 39(4), 1988–2001.
1054 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.10.044>
- 1055 Büchel, C., Price, C., & Friston, K. (1998a). A multimodal language region in the ventral visual
1056 pathway. *Nature*, 394(6690), 274–277. <https://doi.org/10.1038/28389>
- 1057 Büchel, C., Price, C., & Friston, K. (1998b). A multimodal language region in the ventral visual
1058 pathway. *Nature*, 394(6690), 274–277. <https://doi.org/10.1038/28389>
- 1059 Buechel, C. (2003). Cortical hierarchy turned on its head. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6(7), 657–658.
- 1060 Burks, J. D., Boettcher, L. B., Conner, A. K., Glenn, C. A., Bonney, P. A., Baker, C. M., ...
1061 Sughrue, M. E. (2017). White matter connections of the inferior parietal lobule: A study of
1062 surgical anatomy. *Brain and Behavior*, 7(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.640>
- 1063 Burton, H., Diamond, J. B., & McDermott, K. B. (2003). Dissociating cortical regions activated
1064 by semantic and phonological tasks: A fMRI study in blind and sighted people. *Journal of*
1065 *Neurophysiology*, 90(3), 1965–1982. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00279.2003>
- 1066 Burton, H., Snyder, A. Z., Conturo, T. E., Akbudak, E., Ollinger, J. M., & Raichle, M. E. (2002).
1067 Adaptive Changes in Early and Late Blind: A fMRI Study of Braille Reading. *Journal of*
1068 *Neurophysiology*, 87(1), 589–607. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00285.2001>
- 1069 Burton, H., Snyder, A. Z., Diamond, J. B., & Raichle, M. E. (2002). Adaptive Changes in Early
1070 and Late Blind: A fMRI Study of Verb Generation to Heard Nouns. *Journal of*
1071 *Neurophysiology*, 88(6), 3359–3371. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00129.2002>
- 1072 Burton, H., Snyder, A. Z., Diamond, J. B., & Raichle, M. E. (2002). Adaptive Changes in Early
1073 and Late Blind: A fMRI Study of Verb Generation to Heard Nouns. *Journal of*
1074 *Neurophysiology*, 88(6), 3359–3371. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00129.2002>
- 1075 Burton, Harold, Sinclair, R. J., & Agato, A. (2012). Recognition memory for Braille or spoken
1076 words: An fMRI study in early blind. *Brain Research*, 1438, 22–34.
1077 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2011.12.032>

- 1078 Burton, Harold, Sinclair, R. J., & McLaren, D. G. (2004). Cortical activity to vibrotactile
1079 stimulation: An fMRI study in blind and sighted individuals. *Human Brain Mapping*, 23(4),
1080 210–228. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20064>
- 1081 Cai, Q., Lavidor, M., Brysbaert, M., Paulignan, Y., & Nazir, T. A. (2008). Cerebral lateralization
1082 of frontal lobe language processes and lateralization of the posterior visual word processing
1083 system. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20(4), 672–681.
1084 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20043>
- 1085 Cai, Q., Paulignan, Y., Brysbaert, M., Ibarrola, D., & Nazir, T. A. (2010). The left ventral
1086 occipito-temporal response to words depends on language lateralization but not on visual
1087 familiarity. *Cerebral Cortex*, 20(5), 1153–1163. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhp175>
- 1088 Cai, Q., & Van der Haegen, L. (2015). What can atypical language hemispheric specialization
1089 tell us about cognitive functions? *Neuroscience Bulletin*, 31(2), 220–226.
1090 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12264-014-1505-5>
- 1091 Carreiras, M., Quiñones, I., Hernández-Cabrera, J. A., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2015). Orthographic
1092 coding: Brain activation for letters, symbols, and digits. *Cerebral Cortex*, 25(12), 4748–
1093 4760. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu163>
- 1094 Cohen, Celnik, P., Pascual-Leone, A., Corwell, B., Faiz, L., Dambrosia, J., ... Hallett, M. (1997).
1095 Functional relevance of cross-modal plasticity in blind humans. *Nature*, 389(6647), 180–
1096 183. <https://doi.org/10.1038/38278>
- 1097 Cohen, Dehaene, S., Naccache, L., Lehéricy, S., Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Hénaff, M. A., &
1098 Michel, F. (2000). The visual word form area: spatial and temporal characterization of an
1099 initial stage of reading in normal subjects and posterior split-brain patients. *Brain : A*
1100 *Journal of Neurology*, (2), 291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/123.2.291>
- 1101 Cohen, L., Dehaene, S., Vinckier, F., Jobert, A., & Montavont, A. (2008). Reading normal and
1102 degraded words: Contribution of the dorsal and ventral visual pathways. *NeuroImage*,
1103 40(1), 353–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.11.036>
- 1104 Cohen, L., Henry, C., Dehaene, S., Martinaud, O., Lehéricy, S., Lemer, C., & Ferrieux, S.

- 1105 (2004). The pathophysiology of letter-by-letter reading. *Neuropsychologia*, 42(13), 1768–
1106 1780. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.04.018>
- 1107 Cohen, Weeks, R. A., Sadato, N., Celnik, P., Ishii, K., & Hallett, M. (1999). Period of
1108 susceptibility for cross-modal plasticity in the blind. *Annals of Neurology*, 45(4), 451–460.
1109 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1531-8249\(199904\)45:4<451::AID-ANA6>3.0.CO;2-B](https://doi.org/10.1002/1531-8249(199904)45:4<451::AID-ANA6>3.0.CO;2-B)
- 1110 Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in
1111 the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(3), 201–215. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn755>
- 1112 Costanzo, F., Menghini, D., Caltagirone, C., Oliveri, M., & Vicari, S. (2012). High frequency
1113 rTMS over the left parietal lobule increases non-word reading accuracy. *Neuropsychologia*,
1114 50(11), 2645–2651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.07.017>
- 1115 Dale, A. M., Fischl, B., & Sereno, M. I. (1999). Cortical surface-based analysis: I. Segmentation
1116 and surface reconstruction. *NeuroImage*, 9(2), 179–194.
1117 <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0395>
- 1118 Debowska, W., Wolak, T., Nowicka, A., Kozak, A., Szwed, M., & Kossut, M. (2016).
1119 Functional and structural neuroplasticity induced by short-term tactile training based on
1120 braille reading. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 10(OCT), 1–13.
1121 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00460>
- 1122 Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Monzalvo, K., & Dehaene, S. (2018). *The emergence of the visual word*
1123 *form: Longitudinal evolution of category-specific ventral visual areas during reading*
1124 *acquisition*. *PLoS Biology* (Vol. 16). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2004103>
- 1125 Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2011). The unique role of the visual word form area in reading.
1126 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(6), 254–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.04.003>
- 1127 Dehaene, S., Cohen, L., Sigman, M., & Vinckier, F. (2005). The neural code for written words:
1128 A proposal. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(7), 335–341.
1129 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.05.004>
- 1130 Dehaene, S., Jobert, A., Naccache, L., Ciuciu, P., Poline, J. B., Bihan, D. Le, & Cohen, L.

- 1131 (2004). Letter binding and invariant recognition of masked words: Behavioral and
1132 neuroimaging evidence. *Psychological Science*, *15*(5), 307–313.
1133 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00674.x>
- 1134 Dehaene, S., Pegado, F., Braga, L. W., Ventura, P., Nunes Filho, G., Jobert, A., ... Velay, J. L.
1135 (2010). How learning to read changes the cortical networks for vision and language.
1136 *Science*, *330*(6009), 1359–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1194140>
- 1137 DiCarlo, J. J., & Cox, D. D. (2007). Untangling invariant object recognition. *Trends in Cognitive*
1138 *Sciences*, *11*(8), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.06.010>
- 1139 Duhamel, J. R., Colby, C. L., & Goldberg, M. E. (1998). Ventral intraparietal area of the
1140 macaque: Congruent visual and somatic response properties. *Journal of Neurophysiology*,
1141 *79*(1), 126–136. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1998.79.1.126>
- 1142 Dzięgiel-Fivet, G., Plewko, J., Szczerbiński, M., Marchewka, A., Szwed, M., & Jednoróg, K.
1143 (2021). Neural network for Braille reading and the speech-reading convergence in the blind:
1144 Similarities and differences to visual reading. *NeuroImage*, *231*(February).
1145 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.117851>
- 1146 Fedorenko, E., Hsieh, P. J., Nieto-Castañón, A., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., & Kanwisher, N. (2010).
1147 New method for fMRI investigations of language: Defining ROIs functionally in individual
1148 subjects. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *104*(2), 1177–1194.
1149 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00032.2010>
- 1150 Feng, X., Altarelli, I., Monzalvo, K., Ding, G., Ramus, F., Shu, H., ... Dehaene-Lambertz, G.
1151 (2020). A universal reading network and its modulation by writing system and reading
1152 ability in French and Chinese children. *ELife*, *9*, 1–51. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.54591>
- 1153 Gizewski, E. R., Gasser, T., De Greiff, A., Boehm, A., & Forsting, M. (2003). Cross-modal
1154 plasticity for sensory and motor activation patterns in blind subjects. *NeuroImage*, *19*(3),
1155 968–975. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119\(03\)00114-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00114-9)
- 1156 Glasser, M. F., Sotiropoulos, S. N., Wilson, J. A., Coalson, T. S., Fischl, B., Andersson, J. L., ...
1157 Jenkinson, M. (2013). The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the Human Connectome

- 1158 Project. *NeuroImage*, 80, 105–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.127>
- 1159 Glezer, L. S., Jiang, X., & Riesenhuber, M. (2009). Evidence for Highly Selective Neuronal
1160 Tuning to Whole Words in the “Visual Word Form Area.” *Neuron*, 62(2), 199–204.
1161 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2009.03.017>
- 1162 Gougoux, F., Zatorre, R. J., Lassonde, M., Voss, P., & Lepore, F. (2005). A functional
1163 neuroimaging study of sound localization: Visual cortex activity predicts performance in
1164 early-blind individuals. *PLoS Biology*, 3(2), 0324–0333.
1165 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0030027>
- 1166 Grant, A. C., Thiagarajah, M. C., & Sathian, K. (2000). Tactile perception in blind braille
1167 readers: A psychophysical study of acuity and hyperacuity using gratings and dot patterns.
1168 *Perception and Psychophysics*, 62(2), 301–312. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03205550>
- 1169 Hannagan, T., Amedi, A., Cohen, L., Dehaene-Lambertz, G., & Dehaene, S. (2015). Origins of
1170 the specialization for letters and numbers in ventral occipitotemporal cortex. *Trends in*
1171 *Cognitive Sciences*, 19(7), 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.05.006>
- 1172 Hannagan, T., & Grainger, J. (2013). The Lazy Visual Word Form Area: Computational Insights
1173 into Location-Sensitivity. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 9(10).
1174 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003250>
- 1175 Hegner, Y. L., Lee, Y., Grodd, W., & Braun, C. (2010). Comparing tactile pattern and
1176 vibrotactile frequency discrimination: A human fMRI study. *Journal of Neurophysiology*,
1177 103(6), 3115–3122. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00940.2009>
- 1178 Henry, C., Gaillard, R., Volle, E., Chiras, J., Ferrieux, S., Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2005).
1179 Brain activations during letter-by-letter reading: A follow-up study. *Neuropsychologia*,
1180 43(14), 1983–1989. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.04.007>
- 1181 Hu, W., Lee, H. L., Zhang, Q., Liu, T., Geng, L. B., Seghier, M. L., ... Price, C. J. (2010).
1182 Developmental dyslexia in Chinese and English populations: Dissociating the effect of
1183 dyslexia from language differences. *Brain*, 133(6), 1694–1706.
1184 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq106>

- 1185 Jonides, J., Schumacher, E. H., Smith, E. E., Koeppe, R. A., Awh, E., Reuter-Lorenz, P. A., ...
1186 Willis, C. R. (1998). The role of parietal cortex in verbal working memory. *Journal of*
1187 *Neuroscience*, 18(13), 5026–5034. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.18-13-05026.1998>
- 1188 Kaas, J. H. (2012). Somatosensory System. In *The Human Nervous System* (Third Edit, pp.
1189 1074–1109). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374236-0.10030-6>
- 1190 Kanjlia, S., Loiotile, R. E., Harhen, N., & Bedny, M. (2021). ‘Visual’ cortices of congenitally
1191 blind adults are sensitive to response selection demands in a go/no-go task. *NeuroImage*,
1192 236(April), 118023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118023>
- 1193 Kanjlia, S., Pant, R., & Bedny, M. (2019). Sensitive Period for Cognitive Repurposing of Human
1194 Visual Cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, 29(9), 3993–4005. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy280>
- 1195 Kim, J. S., Kanjlia, S., Merabet, L. B., & Bedny, M. (2017). Development of the visual word
1196 form area requires visual experience: Evidence from blind braille readers. *Journal of*
1197 *Neuroscience*, 37(47), 11495–11504. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0997-17.2017>
- 1198 Koenigs, M., Barbey, A. K., Postle, B. R., & Grafman, J. (2009). Superior parietal cortex is
1199 critical for the manipulation of information in working memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1200 29(47), 14980–14986. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3706-09.2009>
- 1201 Krafnick, A. J., Tan, L. H., Flowers, D. L., Luetje, M. M., Napoliello, E. M., Siok, W. T., ...
1202 Eden, G. F. (2016). Chinese Character and English Word processing in children’s ventral
1203 occipitotemporal cortex: fMRI evidence for script invariance. *NeuroImage*, 133, 302–312.
1204 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.03.021>
- 1205 Kujala, T., Alho, K., Paavilainen, P., Summala, H., & Naatanen, R. (1992). Neural plasticity in
1206 processing of sound location by the early blind: an event-related potential study * Teija
1207 Kujala, Kimmo Alho, Petri Paavilainen, Heikki Summala and Risto Näätänen. *Methods*,
1208 84(5), 469–472.
- 1209 Kupers, R., Pappens, M., De Noordhout, A. M., Schoenen, J., Ptito, M., & Fumal, A. (2007).
1210 rTMS of the occipital cortex abolishes Braille reading and repetition priming in blind
1211 subjects. *Neurology*, 68(9), 691–693. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000255958.60530.11>

- 1212 Lane, C., Kanjlia, S., Omaki, A., & Bedny, M. (2015). “Visual” cortex of congenitally blind
1213 adults responds to syntactic movement. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(37), 12859–12868.
1214 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1256-15.2015>
- 1215 Lane, C., Kanjlia, S., Richardson, H., Fulton, A., Omaki, A., & Bedny, M. (2017). Reduced Left
1216 Lateralization of Language in Congenitally Blind Individuals. *Journal of Cognitive
1217 Neuroscience*, 29(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01045
- 1218 Lerma-Usabiaga, G., Carreiras, M., & Paz-Alonso, P. M. (2018). Converging evidence for
1219 functional and structural segregation within the left ventral occipitotemporal cortex in
1220 reading. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
1221 115(42), E9981–E9990. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1803003115>
- 1222 Lewis, J. W., & Van Essen, D. C. (2000). Corticocortical connections of visual, sensorimotor,
1223 and multimodal processing areas in the parietal lobe of the macaque monkey. *Journal of
1224 Comparative Neurology*, 428(1), 112–137. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1096-
1225 9861\(20001204\)428:1<112::AID-CNE8>3.0.CO;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/1096-9861(20001204)428:1<112::AID-CNE8>3.0.CO;2-9)
- 1226 Li, J., Osher, D. E., Hansen, H. A., & Saygin, Z. M. (2020). Innate connectivity patterns drive
1227 the development of the visual word form area. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1–12.
1228 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75015-7>
- 1229 Ludersdorfer, P., Schurz, M., Richlan, F., Kronbichler, M., & Wimmer, H. (2013). Opposite
1230 effects of visual and auditory word-likeness on activity in the visual word form area.
1231 *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(August), 491.
1232 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00491>
- 1233 Mahon, B. Z., & Caramazza, A. (2011). What drives the organization of object knowledge in the
1234 brain? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(3), 97–103.
1235 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.01.004>
- 1236 Martin, A., Schurz, M., Kronbichler, M., & Richlan, F. (2015). Reading in the brain of children
1237 and adults: A meta-analysis of 40 functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. *Human
1238 Brain Mapping*, 36(5), 1963–1981. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22749>

- 1239 Medler, D. A., & Binder, J. R. (2005). An on-line orthographic database of the English language.
1240 *Http://Www. Neuro, Mew. Edu/Meword.*
- 1241 Melzer, P., Morgan, V. L., Pickens, D. R., Price, R. R., Wall, R. S., & Ebner, F. F. (2001).
1242 Cortical activation during Braille reading is influenced by early visual experience in
1243 subjects with severe visual disability: A correlational fMRI study. *Human Brain Mapping,*
1244 *14(3)*, 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.1051>
- 1245 Millar, S. (1984). Is There a “Best Hand” for Braille? *Cortex, 20(1)*, 75–87.
1246 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(84\)80025-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(84)80025-8)
- 1247 Millar, S. (2003). *Reading by Touch. Reading by Touch.* Routledge.
1248 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203359440>
- 1249 Nakamura, K., Kuo, W. J., Pegado, F., Cohen, L., Tzeng, O. J. L., & Dehaene, S. (2012).
1250 Universal brain systems for recognizing word shapes and handwriting gestures during
1251 reading. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,*
1252 *109(50)*, 20762–20767. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1217749109>
- 1253 Noppeney, U., Friston, K. J., & Price, C. J. (2003). Effects of visual deprivation on the
1254 organization of the semantic system. *Brain, 126(7)*, 1620–1627.
1255 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awg152>
- 1256 Ossmy, O., Ben-Shachar, M., & Mukamel, R. (2014). Decoding letter position in word reading.
1257 *Cortex, 59*, 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.07.002>
- 1258 Ossowski, A., & Behrmann, M. (2015). Left hemisphere specialization for word reading
1259 potentially causes, rather than results from, a left lateralized bias for high spatial frequency
1260 visual information. *Cortex, 72*, 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.12.013>
- 1261 Pascual-Leone, A., Cammarota, A., Wassermann, E. M., Brasil-Neto, J. P., Cohen, L. G., &
1262 Hallett, M. (1993). Modulation of motor cortical outputs to the reading hand of braille
1263 readers. *Annals of Neurology, 34(1)*, 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.410340108>
- 1264 Pascual-Leone, A., & Torres, F. (1993). Plasticity of the sensorimotor cortex representation of

- 1265 the reading finger in braille readers. *Brain*, *116*(1), 39–52.
1266 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/116.1.39>
- 1267 Price, C. J., & Devlin, J. T. (2011). The Interactive Account of ventral occipitotemporal
1268 contributions to reading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(6), 246–253.
1269 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.04.001>
- 1270 Purcell, J. J., Shea, J., & Rapp, B. (2014). Beyond the visual word form area: The orthography-
1271 semantics interface in spelling and reading. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *31*(5–6), 482–510.
1272 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2014.909399>
- 1273 Rączy, K., Urbańczyk, A., Korczyk, M., Szewczyk, J. M., Sumera, E., & Szwed, M. (2019).
1274 Orthographic Priming in Braille Reading as Evidence for Task-specific Reorganization in
1275 the Ventral Visual Cortex of the Congenitally Blind. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*,
1276 *31*(7), 1065–1078. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01407
- 1277 Reich, L., Szwed, M., Cohen, L., & Amedi, A. (2011). A ventral visual stream reading center
1278 independent of visual experience. *Current Biology*, *21*(5), 363–368.
1279 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.01.040>
- 1280 Reilhac, C., Peyrin, C., Démonet, J. F., & Valdois, S. (2013). Role of the superior parietal
1281 lobules in letter-identity processing within strings: fMRI evidence from skilled and
1282 dyslexic readers. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(4), 601–612.
1283 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.12.010>
- 1284 Röder, B., Rösler, F., & Neville, H. J. (2000). Event-related potentials during auditory language
1285 processing in congenitally blind and sighted people. *Neuropsychologia*, *38*(11), 1482–1502.
1286 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(00\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(00)00057-9)
- 1287 Röder, B., Stock, O., Bien, S., Neville, H., & Rösler, F. (2002). Speech processing activates
1288 visual cortex in congenitally blind humans. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *16*(5), 930–
1289 936. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2002.02147.x>
- 1290 Rueckl, J. G., Paz-Alonso, P. M., Molfese, P. J., Kuo, W. J., Bick, A., Frost, S. J., ... Frost, R.
1291 (2015). Universal brain signature of proficient reading: Evidence from four contrasting

- 1292 languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
1293 *America*, 112(50), 15510–15515. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1509321112>
- 1294 Ruschel, M., Knösche, T. R., Friederici, A. D., Turner, R., Geyer, S., & Anwender, A. (2014).
1295 Connectivity architecture and subdivision of the human inferior parietal cortex revealed by
1296 diffusion MRI. *Cerebral Cortex*, 24(9), 2436–2448. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bht098>
- 1297 Saalmann, Y. B., Pigarev, I. N., & Vidyasagar, T. R. (2007). Neural Mechanisms of Visual
1298 Attention: How Top-Down Feedback Highlights Relevant Locations. *Science*, 316(5831),
1299 1612–1615. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1139140>
- 1300 Sadato, N., Pascual-Leone, A., Grafman, J., Deiber, M. P., Ibañez, V., & Hallett, M. (1998).
1301 Neural networks for Braille reading by the blind. *Brain*, 121(7), 1213–1229.
1302 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/121.7.1213>
- 1303 Sadato, N., Pascual-Leone, A., Grafman, J., Ibañez, V., Deiber, M., Dold, G., & Hallett, M.
1304 (1996). Activation of the primary visual cortex by Braille reading in blind subjects. *Nature*,
1305 380(6574), 526–528. <https://doi.org/10.1038/380526a0>
- 1306 Sathian, K. (2005). Visual cortical activity during tactile perception in the sighted and the
1307 visually deprived. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 46(3), 279–286.
1308 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20056>
- 1309 Sathian, K., & Stilla, R. (2010). Cross-modal plasticity of tactile perception in blindness.
1310 *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, 28(2), 271–281. [https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-](https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-2010-0534)
1311 [2010-0534](https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-2010-0534)
- 1312 Saygin, Z. M., Osher, D. E., Norton, E. S., Youssoufian, D. A., Beach, S. D., Feather, J., ...
1313 Kanwisher, N. (2016). Connectivity precedes function in the development of the visual
1314 word form area. *Nature Neuroscience*, 19(9), 1250–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4354>
- 1315 Schlaggar, B. L., & McCandliss, B. D. (2007). Development of neural systems for reading.
1316 *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 30, 475–503.
1317 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.28.061604.135645>

- 1318 Seghier, M. L., & Price, C. J. (2011). Explaining left lateralization for words in the ventral
1319 occipitotemporal cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society*
1320 *for Neuroscience*, *31*(41), 14745–14753. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2238-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2238-11.2011)
1321 11.2011
- 1322 Siuda-Krzywicka, K., Bola, Ł., Paplińska, M., Sumera, E., Jednoróg, K., Marchewka, A., ...
1323 Szwed, M. (2016). Massive cortical reorganization in sighted braille readers. *ELife*,
1324 *5*(MARCH2016), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.10762>
- 1325 Smith, S. M., Jenkinson, M., Woolrich, M. W., Beckmann, C. F., Behrens, T. E. J., Johansen-
1326 Berg, H., ... Matthews, P. M. (2004). Advances in functional and structural MR image
1327 analysis and implementation as FSL. *NeuroImage*, *23*(SUPPL. 1), 208–219.
1328 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.07.051>
- 1329 Stevens, W. D., Kravitz, D. J., Peng, C. S., Tessler, M. H., & Martin, A. (2017a). Privileged
1330 functional connectivity between the visual word form area and the language system.
1331 *Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(21), 5288–5297. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0138-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0138-17.2017)
1332 17.2017
- 1333 Stevens, W. D., Kravitz, D. J., Peng, C. S., Tessler, M. H., & Martin, A. (2017b). Privileged
1334 functional connectivity between the visual word form area and the language system.
1335 *Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(21), 5288–5297. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0138-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0138-17.2017)
1336 17.2017
- 1337 Stilla, R., Hanna, R., Hu, X., Mariola, E., Deshpande, G., & Sathian, K. (2008). Neural
1338 processing underlying tactile microspatial discrimination in the blind: A functional
1339 magnetic resonance imaging study. *Journal of Vision*, *8*(10), 1–19.
1340 <https://doi.org/10.1167/8.10.13>
- 1341 Szwed, M., Dehaene, S., Kleinschmidt, A., Eger, E., Valabrègue, R., Amadon, A., & Cohen, L.
1342 (2011). Specialization for written words over objects in the visual cortex. *NeuroImage*,
1343 *56*(1), 330–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.01.073>
- 1344 Szwed, M., Qiao, E., Jobert, A., Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2014). Effects of Literacy in Early

- 1345 Visual and Occipitotemporal Areas of Chinese and French Readers. *Journal of Cognitive*
1346 *Neuroscience*, 26(3), 459–475. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00499
- 1347 Taylor, J. S. H., Rastle, K., & Davis, M. H. (2013). Can cognitive models explain brain
1348 activation during word and pseudoword reading? A meta-analysis of 36 neuroimaging
1349 studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(4), 766–791. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030266>
- 1350 Van der Haegen, L., Cai, Q., & Brysbaert, M. (2012). Colateralization of Broca’s area and the
1351 visual word form area in left-handers: fMRI evidence. *Brain and Language*, 122(3), 171–
1352 178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2011.11.004>
- 1353 Van Essen, D. C. (2005). A Population-Average, Landmark- and Surface-based (PALS) atlas of
1354 human cerebral cortex. *NeuroImage*, 28(3), 635–662.
1355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.06.058>
- 1356 Vinckier, F., Dehaene, S., Jobert, A., Dubus, J. P., Sigman, M., & Cohen, L. (2007). Hierarchical
1357 Coding of Letter Strings in the Ventral Stream: Dissecting the Inner Organization of the
1358 Visual Word-Form System. *Neuron*, 55(1), 143–156.
1359 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2007.05.031>
- 1360 Wang, X., Yang, J., Shu, H., & Zevin, J. D. (2011). Left fusiform BOLD responses are inversely
1361 related to word-likeness in a one-back task. *NeuroImage*, 55(3), 1346–1356.
1362 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.12.062>
- 1363 Watkins, K. E., Cowey, A., Alexander, I., Filippini, N., Kennedy, J. M., Smith, S. M., ... Bridge,
1364 H. (2012). Language networks in anophthalmia: Maintained hierarchy of processing in
1365 “visual” cortex. *Brain*, 135(5), 1566–1577. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aws067>
- 1366 Wong, M., Gnanakumaran, V., & Goldreich, D. (2011). Tactile Spatial Acuity Enhancement in
1367 Blindness: Evidence for Experience-Dependent Mechanisms. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1368 31(19), 7028–7037. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6461-10.2011>
- 1369 Yeatman, J. D., Rauschecker, A. M., & Wandell, B. A. (2013). Anatomy of the visual word form
1370 area: Adjacent cortical circuits and long-range white matter connections. *Brain and*
1371 *Language*, 125(2), 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2012.04.010>

1372

1373