

The spatial distribution of perseverations in neglect patients during a nonverbal fluency task depends on the integrity of the right putamen

Kaufmann, B C; Frey, J; Pflugshaupt, T; Wyss, P; Paladini, R E; Vanbellinghen, T; Bohlhalter, S; Chechlac, M; Nef, T; Müri, R M; Cazzoli, D; Nyffeler, T

DOI:

[10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.01.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.01.025)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Kaufmann, BC, Frey, J, Pflugshaupt, T, Wyss, P, Paladini, RE, Vanbellinghen, T, Bohlhalter, S, Chechlac, M, Nef, T, Müri, RM, Cazzoli, D & Nyffeler, T 2018, 'The spatial distribution of perseverations in neglect patients during a nonverbal fluency task depends on the integrity of the right putamen', *Neuropsychologia*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.01.025>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked for eligibility: 07/02/2018

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.01.025>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1
2
3
4 **The Spatial Distribution of Perseverations in Neglect**
5
6 **Patients during a Nonverbal Fluency Task Depends on**
7
8 **the Integrity of the Right Putamen**
9
10

11
12
13
14
15
16 Kaufmann B C*^a, Frey J*^a, Pflugshaupt T^a, Wyss P^c, Paladini R E^{b,c}, Vanbellingen T^{a,c}, Bohl-
17 halter S^a, Chechlacz M^d, Nef T^c, Müri RM^{b,c}, Cazzoli D^{b,c}, Nyffeler T^{a,b,c}.
18
19

20
21
22 * contributed equally to the paper
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 ^a Neurocenter, Luzerner Kantonsspital, Lucerne, Switzerland
30

31 ^b Perception and Eye Movement Research Laboratory, Department of Clinical Research
32 and Department of Neurology, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland
33

34
35 ^c ARTORG Center for Biomedical Engineering Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
36

37 ^d University of Birmingham, School of Psychology, Birmingham, United Kingdom
38
39
40

41 Corresponding author:
42

43
44 Prof. Dr. med. Thomas Nyffeler
45

46 ARTORG Center for Biomedical Engineering Research,
47 University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
48

49
50 Neurocenter,
51 Luzerner Kantonsspital, Lucerne, Switzerland
52

53
54
55 Tel. +41 41 205 5686

56
57 thomas.nyffeler@luks.ch
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Deficient inhibitory control leading to perseverative behaviour is often observed in neglect patients. Previous studies investigating the relationship between response inhibition and visual attention have reported contradictory results: some studies found a linear relationship between neglect severity and perseverative behaviour whereas others could not replicate this result. The aim of the present study was to shed further light on the interplay between visual attention and response inhibition in neglect, and to investigate the neural underpinnings of this interplay. We propose the use of the Five-Point Test, a test commonly used to assess nonverbal fluency, as a novel approach in the context of neglect. In the Five-Point Test, participants are required to generate as many different designs as possible, by connecting dots within forty rectangles. We hypothesised that, because of its clear definition of perseverative errors, the Five-Point Test would accurately assess both visual attention as well as perseverative behaviour. We assessed 46 neglect patients with right-hemispheric stroke, and performed voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping (VLSM) to identify neural substrates of perseverative behaviour as well as the spatial distribution of perseverations. Our results showed that the Five-Point Test can reliably measure neglect and perseverative behaviour. We did not find any significant relationship between neglect severity and the frequency of perseverations. However, within the subgroup of neglect patients who displayed perseverative behaviour, the spatial distribution of perseverations significantly depended on the integrity of the right putamen. We discuss the putative role of the putamen as a potential subcortical hub to modulate the complex integration between visual attention and response inhibition processes.

Keywords: Neglect; Visual Attention; Response Inhibition; Five-Point Test; Lesion mapping; Putamen

1 Introduction

Visual attention and response inhibition are strongly interrelated in everyday behaviour. The former is crucial for the monitoring of environmental signals (Bari & Robbins, 2013) and the detection of relevant changes. Response inhibition, on the other hand, allows to flexibly adjust behaviour in response to these changes (Bari & Robbins, 2013; van Belle, Vink, Durston, & Zandbelt, 2014). At the cortical level, a current model suggests that visual attention is controlled by a ventral attention network - which includes the inferior parietal lobule (IPL), the superior temporal gyrus (STG), and the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) - and by a dorsal attention network, including the medial intraparietal sulcus (mIPS), the superior parietal lobule (SPL), the precuneus, the supplementary eye field (SEF), and the frontal eye field (FEF) (Corbetta & Shulman, 2002; Karnath & Rorden, 2012). The distinct ventral and dorsal attention networks have collaborative roles, allowing flexible adjustment of their dynamic interaction (Vossel, Geng & Fink, 2014). Response inhibition, on the other hand, is controlled by a cortical network including the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), the cingulate cortex, and the premotor cortex (Gandola, et al., 2013; Husain & Kennard, 1997; Mannan, et al., 2005; Menon, Adleman, White, Glover, & Reiss, 2001; Pierrot-Deseilligny, Rivaud, Gaymard, & Agid, 1991). Despite the extensive literature concerning visual attention and response inhibition, theories about these two cognitive functions have mostly been developed separately. Even less is known about how both functions interact, i.e., how visual attention influences response inhibition. One approach to analyse this topic is to assess the behaviour of patients suffering from an impairment of these cognitive functions due to stroke. A lesion involving the attentional network may lead to neglect (i.e., the failure to attend to the contralesional hemisphere), whereas another lesion involving the response inhibition network may lead to perseverative behaviour, defined as a failure to inhibit prepotent responses and/or their extension to different behaviours (Jahanshahi, Obeso, Rothwell, & Obeso, 2015; Pia, Folegatti, Guagliardo, Genero, & Gindri, 2009). However, strokes do not follow functional anatomy, but vascularisation, so that especially after extensive strokes (e.g. large MCA strokes) both networks may be damaged

1 at the same time. Indeed, in stroke patients with neglect, perseverations are frequently observed,
2 occurring in 30% (Na, et al., 1999) to 90% (Rusconi, Maravita, Bottini, & Vallar, 2002; Vallar,
3 Zilli, Gandola, & Bottini, 2006) of cases.
4
5

6
7
8 According to Rusconi et al. (2002) and Vallar et al. (2006), neglect and perseverative behaviour can
9 co-occur, but represent two independent disorders, both functionally and anatomically. For instance,
10 in cancellation tasks - where perseverative behaviour in neglect patients can take the form of erro-
11 neous re-cancellations of ipsilesional targets or distractors; Mark, Kooistra, & Heilman, 1988; Val-
12 lar, et al., 2006 - double dissociations between contralesional omissions and perseverative errors
13 have been documented (i.e., some patients show contralesional omissions, but no perseverations,
14 and other patients show the reverse behavioural pattern; Na, et al., 1999; Nys, van Zandvoort, van
15 der Worp, Kappelle, & de Haan, 2006; Pia, et al., 2009; Ronchi, Posteraro, Fortis, Bricolo, & Val-
16 lar, 2009; Rusconi, et al., 2002). Moreover, some studies have shown that the number of persevera-
17 tive errors does not seem to correlate with neglect severity (Pia, et al., 2009; Pia, Ricci, Gindri, &
18 Vallar, 2013; Rusconi, et al., 2002; Vallar, et al., 2006). However, it has also been shown that visual
19 attention impairment critically influences the number of perseverations. For instance, several stud-
20 ies in patients with neglect demonstrated that perseveration severity is related to neglect severity,
21 and that the amount of perseverative responses linearly increases towards the ipsilesional side of
22 space (Mannan, et al., 2005; Na, et al., 1999; Nys, et al., 2006). Others, in turn, have suggested that
23 the highest degree of perseveration is found in patients with mild to moderate neglect severity, the
24 interaction between neglect and perseveration following an “inverted U-curve” (Kleinman, DuBois,
25 Newhart, & Hillis, 2013).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The discrepancy between the aforementioned results might be explained, at least in part, by the het-
54 erogeneous assessment methods and analysis techniques applied the different studies. For instance,
55 in cancellation tasks, the assessment of the absolute number of perseverations might lead to biased
56 results, since neglect patients often do not cancel any targets at all within the left, contralesional
57 side of space (e.g. Rusconi et al., 2002). Furthermore, no univocal definition of perseverative errors
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 has been used in previous studies using cancellation tasks (for an overview, see Gandola et al.,
2
3 2013), leading to very different forms of drawing behaviour being considered as perseverative (i.e.,
4
5 "scribbling" outside of a target, drawing additional targets, drawing cartoons, etc.).
6
7

8
9 The aim of the present study is to shed further light on the interplay between visual attention and
10
11 response inhibition in neglect patients, by using a novel assessment that has the potential to measure
12
13 the spatial deployment of visual attention and perseverative behaviour more accurately. To this end,
14
15 we used the Five-Point Test (Regard, Strauss, & Knapp, 1982), a sensitive neuropsychological
16
17 measure of figural fluency, in which perseverative errors are clearly defined. Participants are given
18
19 three minutes time to generate as many different designs as possible by connecting at least two out
20
21 of five dots with straight lines. Repeated designs are regarded as perseverative errors. We hypothe-
22
23 sized that this test would represent a sensitive instrument to assess both spatial biases in visual at-
24
25 tention and perseverative behaviour in neglect patients. Moreover, we aimed at investigating the
26
27 neural correlates subtending the interaction between visual attention and response inhibition, using
28
29 voxel-based symptom-lesion mapping (VLSM).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2 Methods

2.1 Subjects

Forty-six patients suffering from left-sided visual neglect after a first, ischemic or haemorrhagic, right-hemispheric stroke (aged between 27 and 82, mean = 60.54, $SD = 13.58$; 20 women; mean years of education = 12.05, $SD = 3.19$) were included in the study after giving written, informed consent. Figure 1 shows an overlap map of the lesions of all patients included in the study. Diagnosis of neglect was based on performance in the following tasks (all printed on A3 sheets of paper, in landscape orientation): (1) The Line Bisection Task (Wilson, Cockburn, & Halligan, 1987). A mean relative rightward deviation equal to or greater than 11% from the actual midline was considered as clinically relevant (Wilson, et al., 1987); (2) A cancellation task, i.e., The Bells test (Gauthier, Dehaut, & Joanette, 1989), the Star Cancellation test (Wilson, et al., 1987), or the Random Shape Cancellation test (Weintraub & Mesulam, 1988). The Centre of Cancellation (CoC), i.e., the centre of mass of the spatial distribution of detected items, was used to assess neglect (Rorden & Karnath, 2010). The CoC allows quantifying neglect severity taking into account both the number of omissions and the spatial distribution of these omissions (Rorden & Karnath, 2010). Furthermore, calculating the CoC also allows comparing the same indicator across the different cancellation tasks. A CoC value of 0 indicates an unbiased spatial distribution; positive CoC values indicate a shift towards the right side of space, while negative CoC values indicate a shift towards the left side of space. CoC values larger than 0.08 were considered as clinically relevant (C. Rorden & H.O. Karnath, 2010). Patients who fulfilled the criterion for clinical significance in at least one of the tests were considered as presenting with visual neglect, and were thus included in the study.

Twenty healthy controls were matched to the patient group with respect to age, sex, and years of education (aged between 51 and 82, mean = 65.75, $SD = 9.05$; 11 women; mean years of education = 12.55, $SD = 2.24$). There was no statistically significant difference between the patient and the healthy control groups with respect to age ($t(64) = 1.567, p = .122$; 2-tailed), gender ($\chi^2(1) = .743, p$

= .389), or education ($t(64) = .630, p = .531$; 2-tailed). All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity.

Ethical approval to conduct the present study was provided by the Ethics Committees of the States of Bern and Lucerne. The study was carried out in accordance with the principles laid down in the latest version of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Figure 1

about here

2.2 Five-Point Test

In the Five-Point Test (Regard, et al., 1982), participants were presented with an A4 sheet of paper, in portrait orientation, on which a grid composed of 40 rectangles was printed (5 rectangles within each line and 8 rectangles within each column of the grid; size of all rectangles 34 mm x 28 mm each). Each rectangle contained a fixed pattern of five dots, symmetrically arranged (see Figure 4 for a depiction of the test grid). Participants were required to generate as many different designs as possible, one in each rectangle, by connecting at least two out of the five dots with straight lines. Repeated designs (i.e., drawing exactly the same pattern of lines multiple times) were regarded as perseverative errors. Designs with lines that failed to connect dots were regarded as rule violations and were not scored. The number of unique designs and of perseverative errors generated during three minutes was scored.

2.3 Analyses of Behavioural Data

2.3.1 Figural Fluency Performance and Spatial Distribution of Designs in the Five-Point Test

To assess participants' performance in the Five-Point Test, figural fluency (i.e., the number of all produced designs) and the spatial distribution of the designs (i.e., the CoC of all designs) were compared between neglect patients and healthy controls, using an independent samples t – test.

An additional analysis aimed at examining more specifically the spatial distribution of the produced designs over the five columns of the Five-Point Test grid in the two groups of participants. For this purpose, we performed a mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the between-subjects factor 'group' (healthy controls and neglect patients) and the within-subjects factor 'Column' (columns of the test grid, numbered one to five). Homogeneity of variances was tested using Mauchly's test of sphericity. If the sphericity condition was not met, the degrees of freedom were adapted by means of the Huynh-Feldt correction.

For all analyses, a p -value of $< .05$ was considered as statistically significant. For all t -tests, the Levene's test was used to assess homogeneity of variances. If the condition concerning the homogeneity of variances was not met, the degrees of freedom were corrected by means of the Welch-Satterthwaite method (as implemented in SPSS 23).

2.3.2 The Five-Point Test as a Diagnostic Tool for the Evaluation of Neglect

In order to assess whether the Five-Point Test represents a valid diagnostic tool for the evaluation of neglect and its severity, a second series of analyses aimed to compare the results of the Five-Point Test with the ones of commonly used cancellation tasks and the Line Bisection Task. Therefore, the CoCs of the Five-Point Test and the CoC of the cancellation tasks as well as the CoC of the Five-Point Test and the patients' performance obtained from the Line Bisection Task were correlated using a Pearson's correlation. In addition, to compare the sensitivity of the two types of tests, the

1 CoCs obtained from the cancellation tasks and from the Five-Point Test in neglect patients were
2
3 compared using a paired sample t -test.
4

5
6 In order to assess the relationship between the spatial distribution of designs and the number of pro-
7
8 duced designs in neglect patients, the CoCs obtained from the Five-Point test were correlated with
9
10 the number of produced designs using a Pearson's correlation.
11
12
13

14 **2.3.3 Perseverative Behaviour in the Five-Point Test**

15
16 An additional independent samples t – test was used to test whether the percentage of perseverative
17
18 errors differed significantly between patients and healthy controls.
19
20

21
22 In order to examine if neglect patients who produced a higher number of correct designs in the
23
24 Five-Point Test showed a higher number of perseverative errors in the same test, Pearson's correla-
25
26 tion was calculated between both variables.
27
28

29
30 Whether patients with more severe neglect would also show a larger amount of perseverative errors
31
32 was examined with a Pearson's correlation between the CoC of the Five-Point Test (including all
33
34 items) and the percentage of perseverative errors.
35
36

37
38 In order to analyse if the increased perseverative behaviour in neglect patients was biased by ne-
39
40 glect itself - i.e. patients might not be able to decide whether two designs are the same or different
41
42 because of their neglect - the mean number of *Neglect-driven perseverations* and the mean number
43
44 of *Non-Neglect-driven perseverations* was compared within the Neglect group using a paired t-test.
45
46 *Neglect-driven perseverations* were defined as perseverations that occur in a column that is on the
47
48 right-hand of a previous design with the same pattern. Hereby the patient might not be able to per-
49
50 ceive whether two designs are the same or different because he might not attend to the pattern he
51
52 has drawn previously (Figure 2). On the other hand, *Non-Neglect-driven perseverations* were de-
53
54 fined as perseverations that occur in a column that is on the left-hand or below of a previous design
55
56 with the same pattern (Figure 2). Hereby the possibility of seeing the original pattern should not be
57
58 limited by the neglect itself.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 -----

5
6 Figure 2

7
8
9 about here

10
11
12 -----

13 14 15 **Temporal Distribution of Perseverations**

16
17 Additionally, we aimed at assessing the temporal distribution of perseverations in detail. In patients
18 with perseverations ($n = 32$) the mean number of continuous perseveration was compared to the
19 mean number of recurrent perseverations using a paired t-test. Based on the taxonomy of Sandson
20 and Albert (1987) we defined continuous perseverations as repetitive designs in directly adjoining
21 rectangles to the same designs. Recurrent perseverations were defined as repetitive designs in not
22 adjoining rectangles (Figure 3).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 -----

34
35 Figure 3

36
37
38 about here

39
40
41 -----

42
43
44
45
46
47 A descriptive analysis aimed to judge the overall variability of perseverative designs. Therefore, the
48 mean number as well as the distribution of different perseverative designs was analysed within ne-
49 glect patients.
50
51

52 53 54 **Spatial Distribution of Perseverations**

55
56
57 Furthermore, we aimed at assessing the spatial distribution of perseverations in closer detail. First,
58 in order to analyse whether the spatial distribution of unique designs and perseverative designs
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 would differ in neglect patients with perseverative behaviour, we compared the CoC of unique de-
2 signs with the CoC of perseverations by means of a dependent sample *t*-test.
3

4
5
6 In a second step, and since some patients showed a stronger rightward shift in the production of
7 perseverations than in the production of unique designs (i.e., a higher CoC of perseverations com-
8 pared to the CoC of unique designs), we divided patients presenting perseverations into two sub-
9 groups: 1) patients with no rightward shift in perseverations production (i.e., CoC perseverations \leq
10 CoC unique designs; see Figure 4A for an example); and, 2) patients with a rightward shift in per-
11 severations production (i.e., CoC perseverations $>$ CoC unique designs; see Figure 4 B for an ex-
12 ample).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 -----

28 Figure 4

29 about here
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 -----

43 **2.4 Lesion Mapping and Analysis**

44 **2.4.1 Lesion mapping**

45 Lesions were manually delineated on the patients' individual structural MRI images by an experi-
46 enced rater, by means of the MRICron software (<http://sph.sc.edu/comd/rorden/mricron>). The rater
47 was naïve with respect to the hypotheses of the study. The same lesion delineation procedure out-
48 lined by Karnath and colleagues (Karnath, Rennig, Johannsen, & Rorden, 2011) was applied, i.e.,
49 diffusion-weighted scans were used for lesion mapping if an MRI was conducted within the first 48
50 h post-stroke, otherwise T2-weighted scans were used. The borders of the lesions were manually
51 delineated on every transverse slice of the individual MRI images. Images were then normalised
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 into MNI space with the Clinical Toolbox for SPM (Rorden et al., 2012;
2
3 <https://www.nitrc.org/projects/clinicaltbx/>), using enantiomorphic normalization (Nachev et al.,
4
5 2008) and run in SPM12 (<http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>).

9 **2.4.2 Lesion overlap and subtraction, and lesion-symptom mapping analyses**

10 The freely available NPM software (<http://www.cabiatl.com/micro/npm/>) was used for voxel-based
11
12 lesion-symptom mapping (VLSM). The Bruner-Munzel test was chosen for analyses of continuous
13
14 behavioural data (Rorden, Karnath, & Bonilha, 2007), using the CoC of all designs as predictor ($n =$
15
16 46). For lesion comparisons between neglect patients with perseverations ($n = 32$) and without per-
17
18 severations ($n = 14$), the Liebermeister test was applied. Furthermore, subtraction plots were com-
19
20 puted (i.e., subtracting the lesions of neglect patients with perseverations minus the lesions of ne-
21
22 glect patients without perseverations), by means of the MRICron software.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29 An additional VLSM analysis was computed in order to asses lesions in the context of temporal
30
31 distribution of perseverations. Therefore VLSM analysis was computed in order to compare the
32
33 lesions of neglect patients with continuous ($n = 5$), and those with recurrent perseverations ($n = 10$),
34
35 using the Liebermeister test.

36
37
38
39 Furthermore, VLSM analysis was computed in order to compare the lesions of neglect patients with
40
41 and those without a rightward shift in perseveration production, again using the Liebermeister test.

42
43
44
45 For all analyses, only voxels that were lesioned in at least 20% of the patients were included. The
46
47 significance threshold was adjusted by means of a false discovery rate (FDR criterion of 0.05). Fur-
48
49 thermore, as proposed by Medina and colleagues (Medina, Kimberg, Chatterjee, & Branch Coslett,
50
51 2010), we controlled for multiple comparisons using a permutation-based thresholding (Kimberg,
52
53 Coslett, & Schwartz, 2007), applying 4000 iterations.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3 Results

3.1 Analysis of Behavioural Data

Fluency Performance and Spatial Distribution of Designs in the Five-Point Test

Neglect patients and healthy controls showed significant differences in their Five-Point Test performance. Figural fluency (i.e., the number of produced designs) was significantly lower in neglect patients than in healthy controls (number of produced designs: healthy controls $m = 33.45$, $SD = 6.42$; neglect patients $m = 12.26$, $SD = 6.64$; $t(64) = 12.03$, $p < .001$).

Furthermore, neglect patients showed a strong rightward bias in their production of designs (as reflected by high, positive CoC values), whereas healthy controls showed a minimal leftward bias (as reflected by low, negative CoC values) (CoC values: healthy controls $m = -0.04$, $SD = 0.07$; neglect patients $m = 0.65$, $SD = 0.29$; $t(56.11) = -15.07$, $p < .001$).

More specifically, the analysis of the number of designs over the five columns of the test grid in the two groups revealed a significant main effect of the factor 'group' ($F(1, 64) = 144.82$, $p < .001$), a significant main effect of the factor 'column' ($F(2.59, 165.762) = 24.79$, $p < .001$), and, crucially, an highly significant interaction effect between the factors 'column x group' ($F(2.59, 165.762) = 45.16$, $p < .001$). The mean number of produced designs for each column of the Five-Point Test grid in both groups is presented in Figure 5, showing a rightward gradient in neglect patients and a very modest leftward gradient in healthy controls.

Figure 5

about here

The Five-Point Test as a Diagnostic Tool for the Evaluation of Neglect

A Pearson's correlation between the CoC of the cancellation tasks and the CoC of the Five-Point Test in neglect patients evidenced a highly significant ($r = .51, p < .001, n = 46$) and strong (i.e., $> .50$, according to (Cohen, 1988)) relationship, showing that the Five-Point Test is a valuable tool to measure neglect. Correlation between the CoC of the Five-Point Test and the Line Bisection task did not reveal any significance ($r = .197, p = .189, n = 46$).

In neglect patients, the CoC of the Five-Point Test showed a significantly stronger rightward deviation than the CoC of the cancellation tasks (CoC Five-Point Test $m = 0.65, SD = 0.29$; CoC cancellation tasks $m = 0.32, SD = 0.29$; $t(45) = -7.69, p < .001, n = 46$), suggesting that the Five-Point Test induced a larger spatial bias in neglect than the cancellation task.

A Pearson's correlation between the CoC in the Five-Point Test and the number of designs was highly significant ($r = -.573, p > 0.001$). Patients who produced more designs had a smaller CoC compared to patients with fewer designs.

Perseverative Behaviour in the Five-Point Test

Overall, neglect patients showed significantly more perseverative errors than healthy controls (percentage of perseverative errors: healthy controls $m = 8.59, SD = 11.29$; neglect patients $m = 18.81, SD = 17.11$; $t(53.412) = -2.87, p = .006, n = 66$).

In neglect patients, the number of correct designs did not correlate with the number of perseverative errors ($r = .153, p = .220$, mean number of correct designs = 10.89 ($SD = 6.7$), mean number of perseverations = 2.41 ($SD = 2.4$)). This means that participants who produced a higher number of correct designs in the Five-Point Test did not necessarily produce more perseverative errors.

The severity of neglect (reflected by the CoC) did not correlate with the number of perseverative errors (expressed as the percentage of all designs) ($r = 0.13, p = 0.40$). This means that patients with

a more positive CoC in the Five-Point Test (and hence a more severe neglect) did not necessarily show a higher percentage of perseverative errors.

Neglect patients produced significantly more *Non-Neglect-driven perseverations* than *Neglect-driven perseverations* (mean number of *Neglect driven perseverations* $m = .50, SD = .84$; mean number of *Non-Neglect-driven perseverations* $= 2.13, SD = 2.25; t(45) = -5.262, p < 0.001$).

Temporal Distribution of Perseverations

In patients with perseverations ($n = 32$) the mean number of continuous perseverations ($m = 1.75, SD = 1.74$) compared to the mean number of recurrent perseverations ($m = 1.91, SD = 1.49$) was not significant ($t(31) = -.404, p = .689$). On a descriptive level, we found 5 patients who produced the same designs continuously, 10 patients who produced recurrent perseverations, and 17 patients who produced both - continuous as well as recurrent perseverations. Patients produced between 0 and 5 different perseverative designs (Figure 6).

Figure 6
about here

Spatial Distribution of Perseverations

Overall, the mean spatial distribution of unique designs and perseverative designs did not differ in neglect patients with perseverative behaviour (CoC unique designs: $m = .60, SD = .34$; CoC perseverative designs: $m = .67, SD = .31; t(31) = -1.40, p = .172, n = 32$). However, some patients showed a stronger rightward shift in the production of perseverations than in the production of unique designs. Thus, we divided patients presenting with perseverations into two subgroups: 1) patients with no rightward shift in perseveration production (i.e., CoC perseverations \leq CoC unique

1 designs; $n = 19$); and 2) patients with a rightward shift in perseveration production (i.e., CoC per-
2 severations > CoC unique designs; $n = 13$).
3
4
5
6

7 **3.2 Lesion-Symptom Mapping Analysis**

8
9 The VLSM analysis of continuous behavioural data (i.e., CoC of all design) using the Brunner–
10 Munzel test yielded no significant results. Moreover, using a binomial Liebermeister test, we failed
11 to find significant differences between the lesions of neglect patients with perseverations and ne-
12 glect patients without perseverations. Descriptive subtraction plots (lesions of patients with per-
13 severations minus patients without perseverations) are shown in Figure 7.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Additional VLSM analysis using binomial Liebermeister test failed to find significant differences
23 between neglect patients with continuous perseverations and patients with recurrent perseverations.
24
25
26

27 In a further step, we contrasted the lesions of patients with a rightward shift in perseveration pro-
28 duction (i.e., CoC perseverations > CoC unique designs) with those showing no rightward shift in
29 perseveration production (i.e., CoC perseverations \leq CoC unique designs) by means of a Lieber-
30 meister test. This analysis revealed a significant lesion cluster (108 Voxels; corrected for false dis-
31 covery rate [FDR; significance threshold of .05], 4000 permutations), located in the anterior part of
32 the putamen (MNI coordinates 23, 11, 6; see Figure 8). This means that within the group of neglect
33 patients presenting perseverative behaviour, those with a rightward shift in their production of per-
34 severations are significantly more likely to have this putaminal area damaged than those who do not
35 show this behaviour.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

Figure 7

about here

Figure 8

about here

4 Discussion

1
2
3
4 In the present study, we demonstrate that the Five-Point Test, a well-known test to assess figural
5 fluency, can also accurately measure perseverative behaviour and visual attention in neglect. Com-
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In the present study, we demonstrate that the Five-Point Test, a well-known test to assess figural fluency, can also accurately measure perseverative behaviour and visual attention in neglect. Compared to healthy controls, neglect patients showed a significant spatial shift towards the right side in their design production, as well as significantly more perseverations. Whereas we did not find a significant correlation between number of perseverations and neglect severity per se, a VLSM analysis showed that - within the subgroup of patients with neglect and perseverative behaviour - the horizontal spatial distribution of these perseverations seems to critically depend on the integrity of the right putamen.

The Five-Point Test was found to be a valuable instrument to assess neglect. In comparison to healthy subjects, neglect patients produced significantly fewer designs, and their spatial distribution was significantly shifted towards the right side. Whereas healthy controls produced almost the same number of designs in each column, neglect patients showed a spatial gradient in their graphic production, i.e., the more towards the right the column of the test grid was located, the higher was the number of designs produced in this column. We also found a significant and strong correlation between the CoC of the Five-Point Test and the CoC of commonly applied cancellation tasks, suggesting clinical usefulness of the Five-Point Test in neglect assessment. Interestingly, the CoC of the Five-Point Test showed a significantly stronger rightward deviation than the CoC of the cancellation tasks. This result suggests that the Five-Point Test might induce a larger spatial bias than commonly used cancellation tasks.

Moreover, the Five-Point Test allows to easily and reliably ascertain the presence, the severity, and the spatial dynamics of perseverative behaviour in neglect patients (in terms of number and spatial distribution of perseverative graphic productions). In previous studies using cancellation tasks, no univocal definition of perseverative errors has been used (Gandola, et al., 2013). By contrast, perseverations are clearly defined in the Five-Point Test.

1 Regarding fluency, we found that neglect patients produced significantly fewer designs than healthy
2 subjects. Furthermore, patients with a more severe neglect produced less designs. This impaired
3 fluency might be explained by a reduction of arousal, which is an important component of severe
4 neglect following right hemisphere injury (Corbetta & Shulman, 2011; Heilman, Valenstein, &
5 Watson, 2000).

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Some previous studies have suggested no relationship between neglect severity and perseverative
14 behaviour (Pia, et al., 2009; Pia, et al., 2013; Rusconi, et al., 2002; Vallar, et al., 2006). In line with
15 these results, in our study we did not find any correlation between neglect severity, as measured
16 with the Five-Point Test, and the number of perseverations produced in the same test. Overall, pa-
17 tients produced significantly more perseverations that occurred on the left-hand of the original de-
18 sign than perseverations that occurred on the right-hand of the original designs.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 Lesions in patients with neglect and additional perseveration also tended to be located around the
30 well-known inhibition network, involving the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), the dorsolateral prefron-
31 tal cortex (DLPFC) and the premotor cortex (Gandola, et al., 2013; Husain & Kennard, 1997; Man-
32 nan, et al., 2005; Menon, et al., 2001; Pierrot-Deseilligny, et al., 1991). This suggest that impaired
33 inhibition, or impaired 'contention scheduling' with a failure for controlling action selection (Cooper
34 & Shallice, 2000) may play a pivotal role.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

105 However, additional analysis revealed that in some neglect patients, the production of persevera-
106 tions showed a stronger rightward shift than the production of unique designs. This suggests that, at
107 least in a subsample of patients, perseverations are influenced by a visual attentional gradient, as
108 suggested by some authors (Kleinman, et al., 2013; Nys, et al., 2006). Indeed, a lesion analysis with
109 a VLSM approach showed that the spatial distribution of perseverative responses in neglect criti-
110 cally depends on the integrity of the right putamen. Neglect patients with a putaminal lesion showed
111 a stronger rightward shift in perseverations production compared to those without a lesion in this
112 region.

1 The putamen has previously been described as a hub, connecting the networks subtending the con-
2 trol of inhibition and visual attention (Jarbo & Verstynen, 2015). On the one hand, the putamen is
3 thought to be a central component of the frontal-subcortical circuit associated with inhibitory proc-
4 esses of executive control (van Belle, et al., 2014). For instance, a recent study using fibre tracto-
5 graphy (Jarbo & Verstynen, 2015) has evidenced both structural and functional connectivity be-
6 tween the putamen and the inferior frontal gyrus, a cortical area strongly implied in inhibitory func-
7 tions (Jahanshahi, et al., 2015). In fact, a lesion of the putamen, triggering a disruption of the fron-
8 tal-subcortical circuit, leads to impaired executive functioning with perseverations (Kokubo, Su-
9 zuki, Hattori, Miyai, & Mori, 2015).

22 On the other hand, the putamen also has anatomical connections with rostral parietal areas, thereby
23 influencing visual attention (Jarbo & Verstynen, 2015). Thus, a lesion of the putamen can not only
24 lead to perseverations, but also to impaired contralesional visual attention. Indeed, previous studies
25 demonstrated that patients with a stroke affecting the putamen show left-sided neglect (Karnath &
26 Rorden, 2012; Vallar & Perani, 1987).

35 Alternatively, perseverative behaviour in neglect has been discussed in the context of impaired
36 working-memory processes (Husain, Mannan, Hodgson, Wojciulik, Driver & Kennard, 2001). Es-
37 pecially, recurrent perseverations have been mentioned in the context of memory impairments
38 (Helm-Estabrooks, N., Ramage, A., Bayles, K. A. & Cruz, R., 1998; Sandson & Albert, 1987). In
39 our study patients did not show any difference between the mean number of continuous, i.e. repeti-
40 tive designs directly adjoining to the same designs, and the mean number of recurrent, i.e. repetitive
41 designs not adjoining to the same designs, perseverations. Furthermore, VLSM analyses between
42 patients with continuous perseverations and patients with recurrent perseverations were not signifi-
43 cant. However, neglect patients produced more perseverations on the left-hand side of the original
44 design than the right-hand (i.e. patients had significantly more non-neglect driven than neglect-
45 driven perseverations), which might be an additional argument for impaired working memory proc-

1 **esses.** Hence, beside impaired response inhibition an impaired working-memory may influence per-
2
3 severative behaviour.
4

5
6 In summary, our findings suggest that the relationship between impairments in visual attention and
7
8 **response inhibition might not be a direct one** (for instance, neglect severity did not correlate with
9
10 perseverative behaviour). Rather, it seems that the influence of visual attention impairment on per-
11
12 severations may be conveyed through a ‘moderator entity’, for which the putamen appears to be a
13
14 good candidate as a neural substrate. It is therefore conceivable that the rightward shift in persevera-
15
16 tion production, observed in the present study in neglect patients with a lesion involving the puta-
17
18 men, represents an additional spatial gradient, i.e., over and above the one determining neglect.
19
20

21
22 Such a hypothesis is in line with the view that the putamen not only plays a key role in the modula-
23
24 tion of motor functions, but also of cognitive functions (Haber, 2003) see also for a review Provost,
25
26 Hanganu, & Monchi, 2015).
27
28

29
30 Our study also has some limitations. First, we did not include patients with right-hemispheric le-
31
32 sions but no neglect. Thus, we cannot compare the results of our sample with the ones of a control
33
34 group with perseverations but no neglect. As such, our results cannot be generalized to persevera-
35
36 tive behaviour per se, but are – in line with the main focus of our study – specific to the occurrence
37
38 of perseverative behaviour in neglect patients. Future studies, including a larger sample of patients
39
40 with right hemispheric lesions, with and without neglect, should shed further light on more general
41
42 mechanisms involved in perseveration.)
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Second, the administration of the Five-Point Test and of the cancellation task shows some methodo-
50
51 logical differences. The Five-Point test requires participants to 'actively' produce designs, while the
52
53 Cancellation Tasks asks for cancelling targets that are already present. Furthermore, patients are
54
55 given three minutes of time to complete the Five-Point Test, whereas cancellation tasks are gener-
56
57 ally untimed. Therefore, a direct comparison of the sensitivity of the two tests might be confounded
58
59 through this factor. However, one may argue that, even when administering the cancellation tasks
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 on A3 sheets of paper, in landscape orientation (which, because of the greater horizontal extension,
2 may result in a greater difficulty), we found the Five-Point Test (administered on A4 sheets of pa-
3 per, in portrait orientation) to be more sensitive in assessing neglect. Furthermore, an allocentric
4 perceptual impairment may also influence the performance in the Five-Point Test. Allocentric ne-
5 glect cannot be reliably assessed with the cancellation tasks used in the present study (i.e., The Bells
6 test (Gauthier, Dehaut, & Joannette, 1989), the Star Cancellation test (Wilson, et al., 1987), or the
7 Random Shape Cancellation test (Weintraub & Mesulam, 1988)).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 In conclusion, we found that the Five-Point Test is able to reliably assess neglect as well as per-
19 severative behaviour. Furthermore, our study contributes to the understanding of the interplay be-
20 tween executive processes, which should prevent perseverative phenomena, and neglect. Our lesion
21 analysis approach showed that the spatial distribution of perseverations significantly depends on the
22 integrity of the right putamen, suggesting that this region might play a role for the complex integra-
23 tion between visual attention and response inhibition processes.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by SNF Grant Nr 320030_169789.

We are grateful to the patients and healthy individuals who took part in our study. We would also like to thank the clinical teams at the Inselspital, Bern University Hospital and at the Kantonsspital Luzern for their assistance.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Bari, A., & Robbins, T. W. (2013). Inhibition and impulsivity: behavioral and neural basis of re-
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- 113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
- Bari, A., & Robbins, T. W. (2013). Inhibition and impulsivity: behavioral and neural basis of re-
response control. *Prog Neurobiol*, *108*, 44-79.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)* (2 ed.).
- Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the
brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci.*, *3*, 201-205.
- Corbetta, M. & Shulman, G. L. (2011). Spatial Neglect and Attention Networks. *Annu Rev
Neurosci*, *34*, 569-599.
- Gandola, M., Toraldo, A., Invernizzi, P., Corrado, L., Sberna, M., Santilli, I., Bottini, G., &
Paulesu, E. (2013). How many forms of perseveration? Evidence from cancellation tasks in
right hemisphere patients. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*, 2960-2975.
- Gauthier, L., Dehaut, F., & Joanette, Y. (1989). The Bells test: A quantitative and qualitative test
for visual neglect. *International Journal of Clinical Neuropsychology*, *11*, 49-54.
- Head, D., Kennedy, K. M., Rodrigue, K. M. & Raz, N. (2009). Age-Differences in Perseveration:
Cognitive and Neuroanatomical Mediators of Performance on the Wisconsin Card Sorting
Test. *Neuropsychologia*, *47* (4), 1200-1203.
- Heilman, K. M., Valenstein, E. & Watson, R. T. (2000). Neglect and Related Disorders. *Seminars
in Neurology*, *20* (4), 463- 470.
- Helm-Estabrooks, N., Ramage, A., Bayles, K. A. & Cruz, R. (1998). "Perseverative Behaviour in
Fluent and Non-Fluent Aphasic Adults." *Aphasiology*, *12*, (7), 689-698.
- Husain, M., & Kennard, C. (1997). Distractor-dependent frontal neglect. *Neuropsychologia*, *35*,
829-841.
- Husain, M., Mannan, S., Hodgson, T., Wojciulik, E., Driver, J., & Kennard, C. (2001). Impaired
spatial working memory across saccades contributes to abnormal search in parietal neglect.
Brain, *124*, 941-952.
- Jahanshahi, M., Obeso, I., Rothwell, J. C., & Obeso, J. A. (2015). A fronto-striato-subthalamic-
pallidal network for goal-directed and habitual inhibition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *16*,
719-732.
- Jarbo, K., & Verstynen, T. D. (2015). Converging Structural and Functional Connectivity of Orbi-
tofrontal, Dorsolateral Prefrontal, and Posterior Parietal Cortex in the Human Striatum.
Journal of Neuroscience, *35*, 3865-3878.
- Karnath, H. O., Rennig, J., Johannsen, L., & Rorden, C. (2011). The anatomy underlying acute ver-
sus chronic spatial neglect: a longitudinal study. *Brain*, *134*, 903-912.
- Karnath, H. O., & Rorden, C. (2012). The anatomy of spatial neglect. *Neuropsychologia*, *50*, 1010-
1017.

- 1 Kimberg, D. Y., Coslett, H. B., & Schwartz, M. F. (2007). Powerinvoxel- based lesion-
2 symptommapping. *J. Cogn.Neurosci.*, *19*, 1067-1080.
3
- 4 Kleinman, J. T., DuBois, J. C., Newhart, M., & Hillis, A. E. (2013). Disentangling the neuro-
5 anatomical correlates of perseveration from unilateral spatial neglect. *Behav Neurol.*, *26*,
6 131-138.
7
- 8
9 Kokubo, K., Suzuki, K., Hattori, N., Miyai, I., & Mori, E. (2015). Executive Dysfunction in Pa-
10 tients with Putaminal Hemorrhage *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, *24*,
11 1978–1985.
12
- 13
14 Mannan, S. K., Mort, D. J., Hodgson, T. L., Driver, J., Kennard, C., & Husain, M. (2005). Revisit-
15 ing previously searched locations in visual neglect: role of right parietal and frontal lesions
16 in misjudging old locations as new. *J Cogn Neurosci*, *17*, 340-354.
17
- 18
19 Mark, V. W., Kooistra, C. A., & Heilman, K. M. (1988). Hemispatial neglect affected by non-
20 neglected stimuli. *Neurology*, *38*, 1207-1211.
21
- 22
23 Medina, J., Kimberg, D. Y., Chatterjee, A., & Branch Coslett, H. (2010). Inappropriate usage of the
24 Brunner-Munzel test in recent voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping studies. *Neuropsy-
25 chologia*, *48*, 341-343.
26
- 27
28 Menon, V., Adleman, N. E., White, C. D., Glover, G. H., & Reiss, A. L. (2001). Error-related brain
29 activation during a Go/NoGo response inhibition task. *Hum Brain Mapp*, *12*, 131-143.
30
- 31
32 Na, D. L., Adair, J. C., Kang, Y., Chung, C. S., Lee, K. H., & Heilman, K. M. (1999). Motor per-
33 severative behavior on a line cancellation task. *Neurology*, *52*, 1569 - 1576.
34
- 35
36 Nachev, P., Coulthard, E., Jäger, H. R., Kennard, C., & Husain, M. (2008). Enantiomorphic nor-
37 malization of focally lesioned brains. *NeuroImage*, *39*, 1245-1226.
38
- 39
40 Nys, G. M., van Zandvoort, M. J., van der Worp, H. B., Kappelle, L. J., & de Haan, E. H. (2006).
41 Neuropsychological and neuroanatomical correlates of perseverative responses in subacute
42 stroke. *Brain*, *129*, 2148–2157.
43
- 44
45 Pia, L., Folegatti, A., Guagliardo, M., Genero, R., & Gindri, P. (2009). Are drawing perseverations
46 part of the neglect syndrome? *Cortex*, *45*, 293-292.
47
- 48
49 Pia, L., Ricci, R., Gindri, P., & Vallar, G. (2013). Drawing perseveration in neglect: effects of target
50 density. *J Neuropsychol*, *7*, 45-57.
51
- 52
53 Pierrot-Deseilligny, C., Rivaud, S., Gaymard, B., & Agid, Y. (1991). Cortical control of reflexive
54 visually-guided saccades. *Brain*, *114*, 1473-1485.
55
- 56
57 Provost, J.-S., Hanganu, A., & Monchi, O. (2015). Neuroimaging studies of the striatum in cogni-
58 tion Part I: healthy individuals. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *9*.
59
- 60
61 Regard, M., Strauss, E., & Knapp, P. (1982). Children's production on verbal and non-verbal flu-
62 ency tasks. . *Perceptualand Motor Skills*, *55*, 839-844.
63
- 64
65 Ronchi, R., Posteraro, L., Fortis, P., Bricolo, E., & Vallar, G. (2009). Perseveration in left spatial
neglect: Drawing and cancellation tasks. *Cortex*, *45*, 300-312.

- 1 Rorden, C., & Karnath, H. O. (2010). A simple measure of neglect severity. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*,
2 2758-2763.
3
- 4 Rorden, C., Karnath, H. O., & Bonilha, L. (2007). Improving Lesion–Symptom Mapping. *J Cogn*
5 *Neurosci*, *19*, 1081-1088.
6
- 7 Rusconi, M. L., Maravita, A., Bottini, G., & Vallar, G. (2002). Is the intact side really intact? Per-
8 severative responses in patients with unilateral neglect: a productive manifestation.
9 *Neuropsychologia*, *40*.
10
- 11 Sandson, J., & Albert, M. L. (1987). Perseveration in behavioral neurology. *Neurology*, *37*, 1736-
12 1174.
13
- 14 Tucha, L., Aschenbrenner, S., Koerts, J. & Lange, K. W. (2012). The Five-Point Test : Reliability,
15 Validity and Normative Data for Children and Adults, *PLOSONE*.
16
- 17 Vallar, G., & Perani, D. (1987). The anatomy of spatial neglect in humans. *Advances in Psychology*,
18 *45*, 235-258.
19
- 20 Vallar, G., Zilli, T., Gandola, M., & Bottini, G. (2006). Productive and defective impairments in the
21 neglect syndrome: graphic perseveration, drawing productions and optic prism exposure.
22 *Cortex*, *42*, 911-920.
23
- 24 van Belle, J., Vink, M., Durston, S., & B. Zandbelt, B. B. (2014). Common and unique neural net-
25 works for proactive and reactive response inhibition revealed by independent component
26 analysis of functional MRI data. *Neuroimage*, *103*, 65-74.
27
- 28 Vossel, S., J. Geng, J. J., & Fink , G. R. (2014). Dorsal and Ventral Attention Systems: Distinct
29 Neural Circuits but Collaborative Roles. *The Neuroscientist*, *20*(2), 150 –159.
30
- 31 Weintraub, S., & Mesulam, M. (1988). Visual hemispatial inattention: stimulus parameters and ex-
32 ploratory strategies. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *51*, 1481-1488.
33
- 34 Wilson, B. A., Cockburn, J., & Halligan, P. W. (1987). Development of a behavioral test of visu-
35 ospatial neglect. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *68*, 98-102.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

File Name "**Figure 1 Brain lesions of all 46 patients**" 2 column fitting image




Figure 1 Brain lesions of all 46 patients with right-hemisphere stroke. The color-coded legend is determined by the number of patients with damage to a specific brain region. Lesion overlap maps are plotted on the CH2 template available in MRICron (<http://sph.sc.edu/comd/rorden/mricron>). Axial slices are oriented according to the neurological convention. The z-position of each axial slice, in MNI coordinates, is indicated by the numbers at the top of the figure, and also depicted by the blue lines on the sagittal slice (left-hand side of the figure).

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

File Name "**Figure 2 Neglect driven and Non-Neglect driven perseverations**" single column fitting image





Figure 2 *Neglect-driven* perseverations (orange) were repetitive designs, which occur in a column that is on the right-hand of an original design with the same pattern. *Non-Neglect-driven* perseverations (blue) were defined as perseverations which occur in a column that is on the left-hand or below of a previous design (highlighted with a red star) with the same pattern.

File Name "**Figure 3 Continuous and Recurrent Perseverations**" single column fitting image

Continuous



Recurrent




Figure 3 *Continuous perseverations* (blue) were defined as repetitive designs in directly adjoining rectangles (here as an example Z). *Recurrent perseverations* (orange) were defined as repetitive designs in not adjoining rectangles (here as an example I). The original designs are highlighted with a red star.

File Name "**Figure 4 Example of the results of the 5PT**" single column fitting image




Figure 4 Example of the results of the Five-Point Test in: (A) a patient with left hemispatial neglect, but no rightward shift in perseverations production (Centre of Cancellation (CoC) unique designs = 0.258; CoC of perseverations = 0.225); (B) a patient with left hemispatial neglect and a rightward shift in perseverations production (CoC unique designs = 0.296; CoC of perseverations = 0.575). Unfabled designs represent unique designs. Perseverative errors (i.e., repeated designs) are highlighted by yellow dots. The green lines represent the CoC of unique designs, the red lines the CoC of perseverations. The CoC can range from -1 to +1 (see numbers at the bottom of the grids); positive values indicate a shift towards the right side of space, negative values indicate a shift towards the left side of space. A CoC value of 0 indicates an unbiased spatial distribution.

File Name "**Figure 5 ANOVA 5PT**" single column fitting image






Figure 5. Mean number of produced designs for each column of the Five-Point Test grid, in neglect patients (grey bars) and in healthy controls (black bars). Columns are numbered from the left to the right with ascending numbers (i.e., 1 = far left; 3 = middle; 5 = far right). Error bars indicate the standard error of means.

1 File Name "Figure 6 Nr of participants and nr of different perseverative designs" single col-
2 umn fitting image
3
4



23 **Figure 6** Number of participants who produced one, two, three, four or five different perseverative
24 designs in the Five-Point Test.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

File Name "Figure 7 Brain Lesions Pat with and without perseverations" 2 column fitting image




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


1 **Figure 7.** (A) Brain lesions of all 32 Patients with perseverations; (B) Brain lesions of all 14 pa-
2 tients without perseverations; (C) Lesion subtraction plots between patients with perseverations (n
3 = 32) and patients without perseverations ($n = 14$). The color-coded legend is determined by the
4 number of patients with damage to a specific brain region. Lesion overlap maps are plotted on the
5 CH2 template available in MRICron (<http://sph.sc.edu/comd/rorden/mricron>). Axial slices are ori-
6 ented according to the neurological convention. The z-position of each axial slice, in MNI coordi-
7 nates, is indicated by the numbers at the top of the figure, and also depicted by the blue lines on the
8 sagittal slice (left-hand side of the figure).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

File Name "**Figure 8 Putamen**" 2 column fitting image


(A) Brain lesions of patients with a rightward shift in perseveration production ($n = 13$)



(B) Brain lesions of patients with no rightward shift in perseveration production ($n = 19$)





(C) Lesion contrast of patients with a rightward shift in perseveration production with those showing no rightward shift in perseveration production



1
2
3 **Figure 8. A)** Brain lesions of all 13 patients with a rightward shift in perseveration production (i.e.,
4 CoC perseverations > CoC unique designs); **(B)** Brain lesions of all 19 patients with no rightward
5 shift in perseveration production (i.e., CoC perseverations \leq CoC unique designs); **(C)** Results of
6 the VLSM analysis concerning the rightward shift in perseveration production in neglect patients.
7 Voxels with damage that were a significant predictor of a rightward shift in perseveration produc-
8 tion are depicted in red (significance level 0.05, based on the Liebermeister test with FDR correc-
9 tion). The significant lesion cluster of 108 voxels was located in the anterior putamen (MNI coordi-
10 nates: 23, 11, 6). The cluster of voxels is displayed on the CH2 template in MNI space, as available
11 in MRICron (<http://sph.sc.edu/comd/rorden/mricron>). Axial slices are oriented according to the neu-
12 rological convention. The z-position of each axial slice, in MNI coordinate is indicated by the num-
13 bers at the top of the figure, and also depicted by the blue lines on the midsagittal slice (left-hand
14 side of the figure).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure_1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)







Figure_2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure_3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Continuous




Recurrent




Figure_4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure_5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure_6
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure_7
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure_8
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

