

Savill, Nicola, Cornelissen, Piers, Pahor, Anja and Jefferies, Elizabeth (2019) rTMS evidence for a dissociation in short-term memory for spoken words and nonwords. *Cortex*, 112. pp. 5-22.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3331/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010945218302387?via%3Dihub>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at  
[ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

**rTMS evidence for a dissociation in short-term memory for spoken words and nonwords**

Nicola J. SAVILL<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Piers CORNELISSEN<sup>3</sup>, Anja PAHOR<sup>4</sup>, & Elizabeth JEFFERIES<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *School of Psychological and Social Sciences, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York, UK*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Psychology and York Neuroimaging Centre, University of York, Heslington, York, UK*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Ellison Place, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK*

<sup>4</sup> *Department of Psychology, University of California, 900 University Ave, Riverside, US*

\*Corresponding Author:

Nicola Savill

School of Psychological & Social Sciences,

York St John University,

Lord Mayor's Walk,

York

YO31 7EX

UK

Email: [n.savill@yorks.j.ac.uk](mailto:n.savill@yorks.j.ac.uk)

Tel: +44 (0)1904 876171

Keywords: TMS, verbal short-term memory, semantic, supramarginal gyrus, anterior temporal lobe

## rTMS evidence for a dissociation in short-term memory for spoken words and nonwords

### Abstract

Differing patterns of verbal short-term memory (STM) impairment have provided unique insights into the relationship between STM and broader language function. Lexicality effects (i.e., better recall for words than nonwords) are larger in patients with phonological deficits following left temporoparietal lesions, and smaller in patients with semantic impairment and anterior temporal damage, supporting linguistic accounts of STM. However, interpretation of these patient dissociations are complicated by (i) non-focal damage and (ii) confounding factors and secondary impairments. This study addressed these issues by examining the impact of inhibitory transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) on auditory-verbal STM performance in healthy individuals. We compared the effects of TMS to left anterior supramarginal gyrus (SMG) and left anterior middle temporal gyrus (ATL) on STM for lists of nonwords and random words. SMG stimulation disrupted nonword recall, in a pattern analogous to that observed in patients, compatible with a role for this site in processing speech sounds without support from long-term lexical-semantic representations. Stimulation of ATL, a semantic site, disrupted the recall of words but not nonwords. A visual pattern memory task indicated that these effects of TMS were restricted to the verbal domain. These data provide convergent evidence for the conclusions of neuropsychological studies that support linguistic accounts of verbal STM.

## Introduction

1  
2           Neuropsychological studies have played an important role in the development of neurological models  
3  
4 of short-term memory (STM). These studies show double dissociations between phonological and semantic  
5  
6 STM impairment, suggesting that several independent abilities contribute to verbal STM. Patients with  
7  
8 phonological STM deficits show relatively selective difficulties in Immediate Serial Recall (ISR) for nonwords but  
9  
10 not words, while those with semantic STM deficits show a reduced influence of imageability but relatively  
11  
12 normal nonword ISR. Double dissociations have also been reported in probe recognition: when matching a  
13  
14 probe word to items in a list presented a few seconds before, based on either the semantic or phonological  
15  
16 characteristics of the words, patients can show relatively-selective deficits in category or rhyme matching, even  
17  
18 when they can make the same judgements to single items with a high degree of accuracy (Freedman & Martin,  
19  
20 2001; R. C. Martin, Lesch, & Bartha, 1999; R. C. Martin, Shelton, & Yaffee, 1994). This pattern licences a revision  
21  
22 of the original phonological loop model proposed by Baddeley and Hitch (1974), who anticipated a unitary  
23  
24 verbal STM capacity.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30           The dissociation between semantic and phonological tasks in some cases appears to be relatively  
31  
32 selective to STM. Nevertheless, in a broader sample of patients, studies have shown a strong association  
33  
34 between STM deficits for phonological or semantic content and broader language deficits within these domains  
35  
36 (Hoffman, Jefferies, Ehsan, Jones, & Lambon Ralph, 2012, 2009; Jefferies, Hoffman, Jones, & Lambon Ralph,  
37  
38 2008; Jefferies, Jones, Bateman, & Lambon Ralph, 2005; N. Martin & Saffran, 1997; Verhaegen, Piertot, &  
39  
40 Poncelet, 2013): patients who show the hallmarks of semantic STM deficits tend to have difficulties in semantic  
41  
42 tasks in which STM loads are minimal, and likewise patients with phonological STM deficits tend to have  
43  
44 associated problems in phonological processing more generally. This observation led to a 'language systems'  
45  
46 view of verbal STM, in which STM capacity was seen as an emergent property of linguistic processing within  
47  
48 phonological and semantic systems. These accounts anticipate that interactions between semantic and  
49  
50 phonological representations that support language tasks more broadly also underpin the capacity to sustain  
51  
52 linguistic information over time. As a consequence, patients with phonological impairment, typically  
53  
54 consequent of stroke aphasia, can show greater reliance on meaning to support phonological sequences – for  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 example, such cases may show an increased effect of imageability (Jefferies, Crisp, & Lambon Ralph, 2006;  
2 Reilly et al., 2012), while patients with semantic impairment, such as those with semantic dementia, show  
3  
4 reduced effects of lexicality as their capacity to repeat nonwords is largely spared but ISR for sequences of  
5  
6 words that are not fully understood is impaired (Hoffman, Jefferies, Ehsan, Jones, et al., 2009; Jefferies, Bott,  
7  
8 Ehsan, & Lambon Ralph, 2011; Jefferies, Crisp, et al., 2006; Jefferies et al., 2008; Jefferies, Jones, Bateman, &  
9  
10 Lambon Ralph, 2004; Jefferies et al., 2005; Knott, Patterson, & Hodges, 2000; Majerus, Norris, & Patterson,  
11  
12 2007).

13  
14  
15  
16 To summarise, while a small number of cases show a dissociation between general language ability and  
17  
18 STM performance (c.f., Vallar & Baddeley, 1984; Vallar, Di Betta, & Silveri, 1997; Warrington & Shallice, 1969),  
19  
20 the majority of patients show an association (i.e., a link between STM performance and their broader language  
21  
22 function/performance). It has been suggested that phonological deficits specific to STM tasks might occur in  
23  
24 cases with very mild impairment, while semantic deficits specific to STM tasks might occur in people with very  
25  
26 mild semantic access problems linked to difficulties in controlling semantic retrieval (Hoffman, Jefferies, Ehsan,  
27  
28 Hopper, & Lambon Ralph, 2009; Hoffman, Jefferies, & Lambon Ralph, 2011). Current accounts of verbal STM  
29  
30 are in agreement that an important role is played by long-term linguistic representations. However, there is still  
31  
32 controversy about the nature of the relationship between verbal STM capacity and broader language  
33  
34 processing, with some theories anticipating a more direct link in which verbal STM is indistinguishable from  
35  
36 ongoing language processing (e.g., Acheson & MacDonald, 2009; Jefferies, Frankish, & Lambon Ralph, 2006a;  
37  
38 Patterson, Graham, & Hodges, 1994), and other frameworks anticipating a more indirect link in which there are  
39  
40 separable yet interacting processes (e.g., Hulme et al., 1997; Saint-Aubin & Poirier, 1999, 2000). Both long-term  
41  
42 lexical representations of the phonological sequences that correspond to real words, and semantic  
43  
44 representations that allow these word forms to be associated with meaning, contribute to the ISR advantage  
45  
46 seen for words relative to nonwords (Hoffman, Jefferies, Ehsan, Jones, et al., 2009; Hulme, Maughan, & Brown,  
47  
48 1991; Hulme, Roodenrys, & Brown, 1995; Jefferies, Frankish, et al., 2006a; Jefferies, Frankish, & Lambon Ralph,  
49  
50 2006b; Majerus & van der Linden, 2003; Saint-Aubin & Poirier, 1999, 2000; Thorn, Gathercole, & Frankish,  
51  
52 2005). However, these theoretical positions also make different predictions about the relevance of brain  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 regions that support heteromodal concepts, with some accounts suggesting these are critical to verbal STM,  
2 and others proposing that the semantic influence in verbal STM is played out within a language system that is  
3 distinct from non-verbal concepts that allow us to recognise objects and understand and produce actions (e.g.,  
4 Papagno, Vernice, & Cecchetto, 2013; Patterson et al., 2006).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Many neuropsychological studies have supported a distinction between semantic processing in  
10 temporal lobe regions and phonological processing in temporoparietal junction and inferior parietal cortex  
11 (e.g., Alexander, Hospital, & Street, 1992; Hodges, Patterson, Oxbury, & Funnell, 1992; Jefferies, Jones,  
12 Bateman, & Lambon Ralph, 2005; Lambon Ralph, Cipolotti, Manes, & Patterson, 2010; R. C. Martin et al., 1994;  
13 Price et al., 2003; Sakurai et al., 1998; Shallice & Warrington, 1974; Warrington, 1975; Warrington & Shallice,  
14 1969; Wilshire & Fisher, 2004). These observations, combined with the importance of both semantic and  
15 phonological abilities to verbal short-term memory, predict that there should be qualitatively different patterns  
16 of verbal STM deficits following lesions within these brain areas. While this hypothesis is broadly supported by  
17 neuropsychology, here we test the prediction using inhibitory off-line transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)  
18 in healthy participants. This approach has some unique advantages: it licences causal inferences, like  
19 neuropsychology, yet allows relatively focal inferences about specific brain regions in the absence of  
20 confounding factors. We target regions implicated in phonological processing (left supramarginal gyrus, SMG)  
21 and heteromodal conceptual knowledge (left anterior temporal lobe, ATL), with more precision than would be  
22 possible in patients with large lesions or neurodegenerative disease. Moreover, we apply TMS to these  
23 different regions within the same participants, eliminating confounds operating at the level of the individual. In  
24 contrast, our earlier case-series comparisons of verbal STM in patients with semantic dementia and  
25 phonological dyslexia following stroke aphasia (Jefferies, Crisp, et al., 2006) had the disadvantage of comparing  
26 patients with different aetiologies (although the advantage of investigating participants with deficits largely  
27 restricted to the relevant cognitive domain): in these circumstances it is hard to exclude the effect of  
28 confounding factors resulting from the comparison of neurodegeneration and cardiovascular accident.  
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 While there are also studies focussed on semantic and phonological deficits specifically in stroke  
57 patients (N. Martin & Saffran, 1997; Verhaegen et al., 2013), stroke rarely causes lesions to ATL, since this is a  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 watershed region supplied by both middle cerebral artery and the anterior temporal branch of the posterior  
2 cerebral artery (Phan, Donnan, Wright, & Reutens, 2005; Phan, Fong, Donnan, & Reutens, 2007). Consequently,  
3  
4 studies of stroke aphasia are not well-suited to investigating the functional significance of ATL. This highlights a  
5  
6 key advantage of TMS: it can be applied to theoretically-significant sites, instead of requiring naturally-  
7  
8 occurring lesions. In addition, stroke tends to cause significant damage to white matter damage, which will  
9  
10 make a major contribution to cognitive impairment. In the context of the vasculature of the brain, localising  
11  
12 focal regions responsible for specific semantic or phonological impairments due to stroke is complicated since  
13  
14 damage will tend to involve other perisylvian, middle cerebral artery territory that could, independently or  
15  
16 interactively, underlie the impairment. Thus, methods such as voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping are  
17  
18 helpful in identifying common loci of lesions (e.g., Buchsbaum et al., 2011; Kümmerer et al., 2013; Mirman et  
19  
20 al., 2015; Schwartz et al., 2009; Schwartz, Faseyitan, Kim, & Coslett, 2012; Walker et al., 2011) but do not  
21  
22 necessarily isolate critical function.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 In addition to avoiding confounds associated with individual participants, and the capacity to select  
29  
30 stimulation sites irrespective of where brain injury and degeneration tends to occur, TMS studies also allow the  
31  
32 assessment of a site's functional significance in the absence of any gross language deficits and secondary  
33  
34 impairments. In neuropsychological studies, it can be difficult to distinguish the relative contribution of  
35  
36 semantic and phonological representations due to the broad impact of aphasia on everyday language usage  
37  
38 across domains: for example, words with degraded meaning will also show diminished use of their  
39  
40 phonological form (Papagno et al., 2013). These considerations, along with the "lack of 'pure specificity'" of  
41  
42 impairments to one type of processing associated with damage (Price, in press), uncertainty and variability  
43  
44 regarding premorbid function, and the adjacency of functions with different associated impairments  
45  
46 (Humphreys & Lambon Ralph, 2015) limits interpretations of functional specificity based on neuropsychological  
47  
48 data. Inhibitory brain stimulation in healthy participants can allow greater spatial resolution while retaining the  
49  
50 capacity to draw causal inferences about brain regions that make a necessary contribution to specific aspects  
51  
52 of cognition. TMS can thus help to determine whether specific semantic and phonological regions critically  
53  
54 contribute to verbal short-term memory function.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Studies applying TMS to modulate verbal short-term memory function to date have tested a range of  
2 left-lateralised language-related sites (inferior and superior parietal, lateral prefrontal, premotor, mid- and  
3 posterior-temporal) but have predominantly assessed response times in probe recognition tasks (Deschamps,  
4 Baum, & Gracco, 2014; Düzel, Hufnagel, Helmstaedter, & Elger, 1996; Herwig et al., 2003; Kirschen, Davis-  
5 Ratner, Jerde, Schraedley-Desmond, & Desmond, 2006; Liao, Kronemer, Yau, Desmond, & Marvel, 2014;  
6 Mottaghy et al., 2000; Mottaghy, Gangitano, Krause, & Pascual-Leone, 2003; Nixon, Lazarova, Hodinott-Hill,  
7 Gough, & Passingham, 2004; Postle et al., 2006; Romero Lauro, Walsh, & Papagno, 2006; Romero Lauro, Reis,  
8 Cohen, Cecchetto, & Papagno, 2010). While these tasks have helped to identify candidate sites contributing to  
9 the storage, rehearsal or manipulation of verbal material, they primarily place demands on order memory  
10 rather than item memory (in these button press tasks, items are often drawn repeatedly from a small set of  
11 items, such as digits or letters, and therefore the task is to verify the presence of familiar items at a given  
12 position in a sequence), and thus offer little in the way of insight regarding the nature of support from long-  
13 term representations of individual items in STM. TMS studies that have examined effects on short-term verbal  
14 recall of items have focused on either limited set of words (e.g., free recall of a single 12 word list per TMS  
15 condition, Grafman et al., 1994) or delayed recall of unfamiliar nonwords (Acheson, Hamidi, Binder, & Postle,  
16 2011). This latter TMS study examined relationships between STM function and broader language processing:  
17 Acheson et al. (2011) localised stimulation sites in left posterior superior temporal gyrus (pSTG) and posterior  
18 middle temporal gyrus (pMTG), on the basis of their contribution to phonological encoding and lexical-  
19 semantic retrieval outside of a STM context (guided by fMRI activation in nonword reading and picture naming  
20 tasks, respectively). They found that fewer nonwords were produced as a consequence of pSTG stimulation,  
21 relative to pMTG stimulation or no TMS. Furthermore, disruption to the phonological site affected a non-STM  
22 task, paced reading (and slowed picture naming latencies, but to a lesser extent than disruption of the lexical-  
23 semantic pMTG site). Accordingly, the authors (Acheson et al., 2011; Acheson & MacDonald, 2009) proposed  
24 that our ability to briefly maintain an unfamiliar sequence of speech sounds causally depends on the same  
25 phonological encoding and articulatory planning systems involved in language production, with nonword  
26 maintenance drawing upon temporary activation of long-term phonological representations. An untested  
27

1  
2 implication of this study is that disruption of the lexical-semantic site would diminish the benefits of long-term  
3 lexical-semantic representations for familiar words (relative to unfamiliar nonwords) in STM.

4  
5 The present study tested the prediction that inhibitory TMS to phonological and semantic sites would  
6  
7 differentially disrupt STM for nonwords and words respectively. This pattern is seen in patients with  
8  
9 phonological or semantic deficits and is predicted by language-based accounts of STM. Our choice of brain  
10  
11 stimulation sites was guided by studies which have previously used TMS to successfully modulate phonological  
12  
13 or semantic performance outside of a STM context, as well as the locations of brain injury in patients with  
14  
15 phonological and semantic deficits (in the context of stroke aphasia and semantic dementia). Left  
16  
17 supramarginal gyrus (SMG) was selected as a phonological site given the sensitivity of phonological task  
18  
19 performance to TMS disruption here (Pattamadilok, Knierim, Duncan, & Devlin, 2010; Romero Lauro et al.,  
20  
21 2010, 2006; Sliwiska, James, & Devlin, 2015; Sliwiska, Khadilkar, Campbell-Ratcliffe, Quevenco, & Devlin,  
22  
23 2012). The left inferior parietal region, incorporating our target site within SMG, has been widely linked to  
24  
25 verbal maintenance and phonological processing more generally (Henson, Burgess, & Frith, 2000; R. C. Martin,  
26  
27 Wu, Freedman, Jackson, & Lesch, 2003; Paulesu et al., 1996; Paulesu, Frith, & Frackowiak, 1993; Salmon et al.,  
28  
29 1996; Vallar et al., 1997). Neuropsychological and functional imaging evidence implicate SMG involvement in  
30  
31 more abstract, heteromodal phonological and speech perception/production tasks (Baldo, Katseff, & Dronkers,  
32  
33 2012; Booth et al., 2003; Fridriksson et al., 2010; Herman, Houde, Vinogradov, & Nagarajan, 2013; Kemeny et  
34  
35 al., 2006; Moser, Baker, Sanchez, Rorden, & Fridriksson, 2009; Newman & Twieg, 2001; Oberhuber et al., 2016;  
36  
37 Papoutsi et al., 2009; Parker Jones et al., 2014; Pilkington et al., 2017; Raizada & Poldrack, 2007; Shuster &  
38  
39 Lemieux, 2005; Tomasino et al., 2015; Turkeltaub & Branch Coslett, 2010), including tasks with minimal  
40  
41 maintenance demands (e.g., Booth et al., 2002; Celsis et al., 1999; Church, Balota, Petersen, & Schlaggar, 2011;  
42  
43 Gold & Buckner, 2002; Liebenthal, Sabri, Beardsley, Mangalathu-Arumana, & Desai, 2013; Oberhuber et al.,  
44  
45 2016; Peramunage, Blumstein, Myers, Goldrick, & Baese-Berk, 2011; Prabhakaran et al., 2006; Wilson,  
46  
47 Isenberg, & Hickok, 2009; see also Lorca-Puls et al., 2017). It has been suggested that SMG's involvement in  
48  
49 STM might primarily be an index of phonological linguistic processing requirements rather than STM load  
50  
51 (Buchsbaum & Esposito, 2008; Majerus et al., 2012; Ravizza, Delgado, Chein, Becker, & Fiez, 2004). SMG is  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 strongly implicated in the process of mapping between orthographic (written) codes and phonological codes  
2 (cf., Price, 2012), and between acoustic and articulatory motor codes (Corina et al., 2010; Hickok & Poeppel,  
3  
4 2007; Rauschecker & Scott, 2009). On the basis of this literature on SMG and its implication in processing  
5  
6 syllable/word-level phonological form, we predicted that TMS to this region would impair both word and  
7  
8 nonword recall in a verbal STM task, but affect nonword recall to a greater extent since nonword maintenance  
9  
10 relies entirely upon temporary acoustic-to-motor activation (i.e., without available supportive activation of  
11  
12 long-term lexical-semantic representations).  
13  
14

15  
16 Our second stimulation site, left ATL, is not implicated in phonological processing. Neither is it  
17  
18 implicated in lexical-level knowledge (which is associated with more posterior temporal regions: Gow, 2012;  
19  
20 Graves, Grabowski, Mehta, & Gupta, 2008; Hickok & Poeppel, 2007). Instead, converging evidence from  
21  
22 neuropsychology, neuroimaging and brain stimulation shows that this site is critical for heteromodal semantic  
23  
24 memory (Coutanche & Thompson-Schill, 2015; Lambon Ralph et al., 2016; Pobric, Jefferies, & Lambon Ralph,  
25  
26 2010a; Visser, Jefferies, Embleton, & Lambon Ralph, 2012). Patients with semantic dementia have relatively  
27  
28 focal atrophy of anterior temporal (ATL) cortex which correlates with progressive semantic impairment across  
29  
30 verbal and non-verbal tasks (Mion et al., 2010; Mummery et al., 2000; Patterson, Nestor, Rogers, & Nestor,  
31  
32 2007). Other aspects of cognition, including phonological and verbal STM for nonwords and numbers  
33  
34 processing, are largely spared (Jefferies et al., 2005; Jefferies, Patterson, Jones, Bateman, & Lambon Ralph,  
35  
36 2004; Majerus et al., 2007). However, patients with semantic dementia do show some impairment of verbal  
37  
38 STM for words that have become semantically degraded, suggesting that semantic activation contributes to the  
39  
40 capacity to maintain phonological sequences in STM (Jefferies et al., 2008; Knott, Patterson, & Hodges, 1997;  
41  
42 Patterson et al., 1994). While effects of semantic variables are often seen in STM, it remains controversial the  
43  
44 extent to which semantic support can be considered independently from lexical variables such as word usage  
45  
46 or co-occurrence (Benetello, Cecchetto, & Papagno, 2015; Papagno et al., 2013). We have provided some  
47  
48 compatible experimental evidence for interactions between semantic and phonological properties in STM in  
49  
50 healthy individuals, suggestive of direct effects on phonological maintenance (Savill et al., 2018; Savill, Ellis, &  
51  
52 Jefferies, 2017; Savill, Metcalfe, Ellis, & Jefferies, 2015), but these studies do not rule out differences emerging  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 in an indirect manner (for example, condition-related attentional or strategic differences at encoding or  
2 retrieval). Therefore, one of our key objectives was to examine whether reduced lexicality effects might be  
3  
4 replicated in healthy individuals after selective interference with a key semantic site.  
5  
6

7 Previous studies applying TMS to a similar unilateral, left ATL site have elicited temporary disruption of  
8  
9 performance in a range of semantic tasks in healthy individuals (Binney & Lambon Ralph, 2015; Hoffman &  
10  
11 Crutch, 2016; Jackson, Lambon Ralph, & Pobric, 2015; Lambon Ralph, Pobric, & Jefferies, 2009; Pobric,  
12  
13 Jefferies, & Lambon Ralph, 2007, 2010b; Pobric et al., 2010a; Pobric, Lambon Ralph, & Jefferies, 2009), in line  
14  
15 with this region's implication in heteromodal conceptual knowledge/semantic representation (see Lambon  
16  
17 Ralph, Jefferies, Patterson, & Rogers, 2016, for a recent review). Indeed, although ATL atrophy in SD is bilateral  
18  
19 and semantic memory is thought to be bilaterally represented (Lambon Ralph et al., 2016; Patterson et al.,  
20  
21 2007), observations of asymmetries in atrophy and function strongly indicate that the left ATL has a more  
22  
23 important role than the right in tasks requiring semantically driven speech production (Woollams & Patterson,  
24  
25 in press)<sup>1</sup>, which suggests it should be a good candidate site to test. Thus, we could determine whether  
26  
27 inhibitory TMS to this semantic site would interfere with the STM advantage normally seen for words relative  
28  
29 to nonwords.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 This study is the first to (1) investigate the effects of inhibitory TMS on immediate serial recall (ISR)  
36  
37 using spoken presentation and recall measures, which have not been used commonly in cognitive  
38  
39 neuroscience; (2) use TMS to examine the contribution of long-term representations to STM performance (i.e.,  
40  
41 by assessing the effects of stimulation on the lexicality effect in this task); and (3) consider the impact of  
42  
43 modulation of left ATL function in healthy individuals on STM. By testing spoken verbal recall (rather than, for  
44  
45 example, a probe recognition task) and by using an unlimited set of word and nonword stimuli (rather than a  
46  
47 restricted set of items), our study is well-placed to examine the mechanisms that maintain item identity in  
48  
49 STM. Furthermore, by avoiding visual presentation of verbal stimuli, we eliminate any potential effects of  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>1</sup> There is some debate whether the left ATL's greater role in verbal semantic tasks than the right ATL reflects  
56  
57 the connectivity of heteromodal representations within left ATL with a left lateralised, pre-semantic language  
58  
59 system (Patterson et al., 2007) or due to the left hemisphere being responsible for language-mediated  
60  
61 semantic representations (Gainotti, 2015). In either case there is ample evidence for this verbal/nonverbal  
62  
63 asymmetry in semantic performance between left and right ATL.  
64  
65

1 disruption to orthographic-phonological mapping processes, also linked to SMG (e.g., Stoeckel, Gough,  
2 Watkins, & Devlin, 2009). The spoken context privileges phonological access (Baddeley, 1986) and accordingly  
3  
4 affords a relatively pure test of phonological buffering capacities. As such, our task provides a robust test of any  
5  
6 semantic influences on verbal STM.  
7

8  
9 Given the limited number of experimental trials that can be tested under TMS conditions within a  
10  
11 single session, plus marked individual differences in both ISR and the effects of stimulation, we compared the  
12  
13 recall of test lists calibrated to each individual's word and nonword spans and in relation to performance in a  
14  
15 non-TMS baseline ISR task within each session. We controlled for residual variation in list difficulty and  
16  
17 individual performance with linear mixed effects modelling. Furthermore, we included a visual pattern memory  
18  
19 control task to identify possible non-specific effects of TMS. Due to its role in phonological processing, we  
20  
21 expected stimulation of SMG to disrupt verbal STM, and particularly impact recall of nonword items that are  
22  
23 not supported by long-term word-level representations. If semantic activation does not make a necessary  
24  
25 contribution to STM, then TMS to ATL should not impact ISR; if, on the other hand, stimulation of ATL is  
26  
27 sufficient to impact recall, we would expect this effect to be specific to words. A dissociation in the effects of  
28  
29 TMS to SMG and ATL would be consistent with language-based accounts of verbal STM.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## 37 **Method**

### 38 **Study Overview**

39  
40  
41 The study employed a within-subjects design, allowing us to compare auditory-verbal serial recall  
42  
43 performance for lexical-semantic stimuli (nouns) and non-lexical, phonological material (nonwords) with and  
44  
45 without the effects of stimulation, applied to a site linked to phonological processing (left supramarginal gyrus)  
46  
47 and a site linked to semantic but not phonological processing (left anterior temporal lobe). Participants  
48  
49 performed the verbal short-term memory task immediately after stimulation with a low-frequency (1 Hz) ten-  
50  
51 minute inhibitory train of rTMS pulses offline. In this 'offline' method, when TMS pulses are applied repeatedly  
52  
53 at a low frequency, the effects last beyond the end of the stimulation period (for approximately the period of  
54  
55 stimulation, e.g., Chen et al., 1997), allowing us to test effects on recall performance without any disrupting  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 influence from the loud clicks, jaw contractions, or eye blinks following peripheral nerve stimulation associated  
2 with each stimulation pulse. Participants performed the baseline testing (i.e., without TMS) either before TMS  
3 stimulation or ~35 min after TMS stimulation (25 minutes after completing the TMS experiment; by which time,  
4 the effects should no longer be present: Lambon Ralph et al., 2009; Pobric et al., 2007, 2009; Whitney, Kirk,  
5 O’Sullivan, Lambon Ralph, & Jefferies, 2011). The order of baseline testing was counterbalanced across sessions  
6 for each participant. The study also made use of a non-linguistic visual pattern memory control task (an  
7 electronic variant of the pattern span task used to assess visuo-spatial memory, adapted from Della Sala, Gray,  
8 Baddeley, Allamano, & Wilson, 1999) to characterise any non-specific effects of TMS. With this principled TMS  
9 approach (by testing for dissociations), we minimised the stimulation demands on our participants and  
10 dispensed with the need for active control sites, which have been questioned on ethical grounds (Davis, Gold,  
11 Pascual-leone, & Bracewell, 2013). The two stimulation sites were tested in separate sessions; for any given  
12 participant, these sessions took place at the same time of day at least seven days apart. Prior to the first TMS  
13 session, participants were individually tested on their verbal recall span for lists of words, lists of nonwords and  
14 their visual memory span. Experimental list lengths were set to span plus one item for word and nonword lists  
15 (or one grid-size above span for the visual STM task), to maximise sensitivity to the effects of TMS. In each  
16 session, there were two testing phases lasting less than 10 minutes, in the TMS-free baseline period and  
17 directly after TMS.

## 40 **Participants**

41  
42 Participants were 24 native British English students from the University of York (aged between 19 and  
43 35 years; 12 males), screened for contraindications for receiving TMS. This sample size was determined by our  
44 counterbalancing requirements (which required a multiple of 12) and our previous observation of significant  
45 stimulation effects on immediate serial recall from transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in a sample of  
46 24 participants (Savill, Ashton, et al., 2015). The current sample is one of the largest for this field: of the 12 TMS  
47 studies on verbal short-term memory cited here, only two included a larger sample size and the mean N is 15.  
48 We excluded and replaced two participants who were not native speakers of British English, two who had  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 significantly different baseline performances and one who chose to withdraw after the first TMS session<sup>2</sup>. All  
2 participants were right-handed with normal hearing and normal or corrected-to-normal vision, and were  
3  
4 reimbursed £20 for their time. Each participant gave their informed consent before each TMS testing session,  
5  
6  
7 and the experiment was reviewed and approved by the research ethics committee of the York Neuroimaging  
8  
9 Centre.

## 10 Stimuli

### 11 Word and Nonword List Stimuli.

12 Eight-item test lists for immediate serial recall were designed to accommodate possible high spans.

13  
14 Two open sets of twenty word lists and twenty nonword ISR lists, for use before and after TMS were created  
15  
16 (i.e., stimuli appeared once within a session). Lists comprised unrelated CVC items, such that no phoneme was  
17  
18 repeated within a given syllable position in the list, and word lists (all nouns) were constructed to ensure they  
19  
20 were matched for their averaged properties of lexical frequency (Set A  $M = 4.13$ ,  $SD = 0.22$ ; Set B  $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD$   
21  
22  $= 0.23$ ; according to SUBTLEX, van Heuven, Mandera, Keuleers, & Brysbaert, 2014), imageability (Set A  $M = 5.67$ ,  
23  
24  $SD = 0.33$ ; Set B  $M = 5.69$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ; according to Cortese & Fugett, 2004) and AoA (Set A  $M = 6.30$ ,  $SD = 0.22$ ;  
25  
26 Set B  $M = 6.45$ ,  $SD = 0.66$ ; according to Kuperman, Stadthagen-Gonzalez, & Brysbaert, 2012). Nonword lists  
27  
28 were created by recombining the phonemes of word lists and so that they sounded like plausible 'English'  
29  
30 words (rather than phonologically-odd) (e.g., the word list 'bus /bʌs/, note /nəʊt/, patch /pætʃ/, hawk /hɔ:k/,  
31  
32 yell /jel/, roof /ru:f/, game /geɪm/, dish /dɪʃ/' became the nonword list 'putch /pʌtʃ/, hoce /həʊs/, yal /jæl/,  
33  
34 norb /nɔ:b/, ket /ket/, roosh /ru:ʃ/, gim /gɪm/, dafe /deɪf/'). This design tactic can be considered successful since  
35  
36 there were no differences in summed biphone probability between the final set of words and nonwords (words  
37  
38  $M = .006$ ; nonwords  $M = .006$ ;  $t(638) = 0.81$ ,  $p = .42$ ) (calculated using the Phonotactic Probability Calculator;  
39  
40 Vitevitch & Luce, 2004). Stimuli were recorded by a female British English speaker and edited to 750 ms in  
41  
42 length, with background noise removed and average intensity controlled using Praat ([www.praat.org](http://www.praat.org)).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

---

60 <sup>2</sup> Our 24 participants comprise the final group of participants whose data were fully transcribed and analysed.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### **Visual Memory task stimuli.**

We used a pattern STM task that required participants to temporarily store and reproduce visual patterns (similar to Della Sala et al., 1999). The stimuli were square and rectangular arrays of cells (3×3, 4×4, 5×5, 6×6, 7×7; 3×4, 4×5, 5×6, 6×7) (each sized 5 × 6 cm), in which half of the cells were white and the remainder were black. To minimise response time associated with the reproduction of different visual patterns, participants were presented with partially-filled grids to complete: Two non-contiguous black cells from each probe pattern array were changed to white for test trials; two mouse clicks were permitted per trial. Forty unique pattern arrays were developed for each grid size (10 for each TMS and baseline session) and a further four of each size were developed for the span task to determine each participant's grid size for the TMS experiment.

### **Procedure**

#### **Span Testing.**

Prior to the first TMS session, participants' word, nonword, and pattern spans were assessed. ISR lists of increasing length (four lists per length, from three to eight monosyllabic items; not used in the main experiment) were auditorily presented and word and nonword spans were each determined as the final length that at least two of four lists were recalled completely correctly. Pattern span was similarly tested: In the span test, four trials of each grid size were tested, increasing in size over time; span was determined as the final grid size that both of the two missing cells were correctly clicked in at least two of the four trials and test size was set to the next size up. Span+1 sizes ranged from 5-7 for words, 4-5 for nonwords and from 5×5-6×7 matrices for visual patterns.

#### **Localisation of Stimulation Sites.**

Structural T1-weighted MRI scans (TR = 7.8 ms, TE = minimum full, flip angle 20°, matrix size = 256 × 256, 176 slices, voxel size = 1.13 × 1.13 × 1 mm<sup>3</sup>) were used to anatomically identify lateral sites for stimulation in each participant's brain. Each individual anatomical image was overlaid on the MNI template and the subject-specific stimulation site was marked. The individual sites are plotted in Figure 1.

1 SMG targets were identified rostral to the posterior ascending ramus of the lateral fissure, in the left  
2 ventral anterior supramarginal gyrus (average MNI coordinate = -53, -37, 25). This particular location was  
3  
4 targeted on the basis of previous demonstrations of its sensitivity to TMS disruption of phonological task  
5  
6 performance (e.g., Pattamadilok et al., 2010; Romero Lauro et al., 2010, 2006, Sliwinska et al., 2015, 2012) and  
7  
8 fMRI evidence of its involvement in heteromodal phonological and speech production tasks, including tasks  
9  
10 with minimal maintenance demands (e.g., Booth et al., 2002; Oberhuber et al., 2016; see also Lorca-Puls et al.,  
11  
12 2017).  
13  
14

15  
16 ATL target sites were localised following Pobric, Lambon Ralph, & Jefferies (2009); an individual's ATL  
17  
18 site was selected approximately 1 cm in from the tip of the temporal pole, along the left middle temporal gyrus  
19  
20 (average MNI coordinate = -52, 0, -23). Previous studies found that inhibitory TMS to this site disrupted  
21  
22 semantic performance (Binney & Lambon Ralph, 2015; Jackson, Lambon Ralph, et al., 2015; Lambon Ralph et  
23  
24 al., 2009; Pobric et al., 2007, 2010b, 2010a, 2009) and fMRI evidence shows semantic activation (Hoffman,  
25  
26 Binney, & Lambon Ralph, 2015).  
27  
28  
29

30 To verify the functional distinctiveness of our two stimulation sites, we entered the average  
31  
32 coordinates for each stimulation site in Neurosynth (Yarkoni, Poldrack, & Nichols, 2011) to generate functional  
33  
34 connectivity maps. We identified distinct patterns of functional connectivity related to motor control/imagery  
35  
36 for SMG and semantic memory for ATL (See Figure 1).  
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. A glass brain (top) plotting the MNI coordinates of the individual anatomically localised stimulation sites within left supramarginal gyrus (SMG; cyan) and anterior temporal lobe (ATL; red). Functional connectivity maps for the average stimulation sites in Neurosynth (Yarkoni et al., 2011) identified distinct patterns of functional connectivity for SMG and ATL (middle panel). Comparison with the resting-state networks identified by Yeo et al. (2011; bottom panel) revealed that SMG's pattern of intrinsic connectivity resembled the ventral attention network, and included auditory-motor regions (shown in violet), while ATL's pattern of intrinsic connectivity overlapped with the default mode network, implicated in memory (shown in red).

The 'Brainsight' frameless stereotaxy system was used to co-register the identified site within SMG and ATL to the participant's head. Four landmarks were used to co-register each participant's head to their brain image using a Polaris infra-red tracking device (i.e., tip of the nose, left/right tragus and nasion).

### Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation.

Before TMS testing began, the individual's active motor threshold was established in each testing session. This was determined by the lowest stimulation intensity required to elicit visible contraction of the first

dorsal interosseous muscle in the contralateral hand. Motor thresholds ranged between 38% and 65% of maximum stimulator output, with an average of 49% of stimulator output. A 70-mm figure-of-eight coil, attached to a MagStim Rapid2 stimulator, was used to deliver the magnetic pulses. Repetitive trains of TMS were applied at 1 Hz for 10 min; participants were stimulated at 120% of their active motor threshold.

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 2. TMS Experimental Protocol. (A) The structure of an individual verbal short-term memory trial and a visual pattern memory control trial in the TMS Experiment. The procedure for word and nonword verbal short-term memory trials differed only in the number of list items presented and in the initial block cue detailing the number and type of items in the upcoming lists. The visual display over the course of a verbal short-term memory trial is shown above the concurrent auditory components of the task. Participants were instructed to try to verbally recall all the trial's list items in the order

1 that they had been presented at the end of each list, identified by a question mark on screen. In visual pattern memory  
2 trials, participants were instructed to use the mouse to click the two white cells in the test pattern array that were black in  
3 the trial pattern array. For all trials, the block cue screen appeared at the beginning of a block (consisting of either four  
4 word list trials, four nonword trials, or two pattern memory trials). This screen had a longer display period at the start of  
5 pattern trials to accommodate adjustment to the switch in input modality and task demands. Within a block, a 0.5 s  
6 preparation screen (exclamation mark fixation) preceded the onset of stimulus presentation in the next trial, following a  
7 trial-end mouse-click. (B). Structure of a single TMS session. Different experimental sets were used to test performance in  
8 the baseline and post-TMS phases. ISR stimuli were reordered within their sets for the second session to form new lists,  
9 such that each item was heard at most, once more a week later.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Experimental Procedure.**

18  
19 The procedure was identical for both TMS sessions (see Figure 2). A PC running E-Prime software  
20 (Psychology Tools, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA) was used to present the experiment. Experimental trials were set to  
21 span+1 size, as determined in prior span testing. Both versions of the ISR task, for use with TMS and in the  
22 baseline task, contained twenty word lists, twenty nonword lists and ten pattern trials (in blocks of four word  
23 lists, four nonword lists, followed by two pattern trials, or four nonword lists, four word lists followed by two  
24 pattern trials). Participants wore a headset with in-built microphone to listen to and recall the lists. At the  
25 beginning of a word or nonword block of trials, a screen reminded participants of the type of list and number of  
26 items (e.g., '6 words' or '5 nonwords') that were coming up. An exclamation mark was displayed on screen  
27 from 250 ms prior to the onset of the first item until the offset of the final item in a list. Items were presented  
28 at a rate of 1 s per item. At the end of the presented list, a question mark appeared, which acted as the cue to  
29 verbally recall the items in serial order (see Figure 2). Participants pressed a key to indicate when they had  
30 finished recalling a list, which prompted the next trial. Participants were asked to recall items in the order in  
31 which they were presented and to attempt recall all items, even if unsure. Pattern memory trials were  
32 prompted by a display for five seconds ('Two patterns next (click two cells)'). Patterns were displayed for four  
33 seconds, and after a 0.5 s interval with an exclamation mark display, the test array was displayed and stayed on  
34 screen until two mouse clicks had been registered. Cells briefly changed in colour to grey to acknowledge cell  
35 clicks. Participants had been instructed to click the two cells that had changed from black to white. They had  
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 two practice trials of each trial type to familiarise themselves with the task. Verbal responses were digitally  
2 recorded.  
3

#### 4 **Transcription.**

5  
6 Verbal responses were transcribed phoneme-by-phoneme. We adapted the coding scheme used by  
7 Savill, Metcalfe, Ellis, & Jefferies (2015) to accommodate different list lengths. Coding focused on whether list  
8 items were recalled, either in the correct or incorrect position, or not. We also recorded the category of  
9 response error types according to the criteria used by Savill, Metcalfe, et al. (2015).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

#### 16 **Data Analysis**

17  
18 The ISR and visual pattern memory control task data were analysed separately.  
19  
20

#### 21 **ISR data analysis.**

22  
23 To control for variability across individual participants in overall performance and the effects of TMS  
24 (e.g., due to skull thickness; anatomical variability) and account for fluctuations in the linguistic properties of  
25 individual ISR lists on our recall measures, we applied linear mixed effects modelling to the recall accuracy data.  
26 We used PROC MIXED (SAS v9.4, SAS Institute, North Carolina, USA) to build a logistic generalized linear mixed  
27 model to predict the recall data for each participant for each ISR test item (whether the item was recalled in  
28 position or not – i.e., a binary distribution, using a logit link function). This analysis approach accounts for  
29 interdependence of the data arising from repeated measurements of the same participants and adjusts for  
30 non-normal distributions (Baayen, Davidson, & Bates, 2008; Dixon, 2008). Fixed effects included stimulation  
31 site (ATL versus SMG), TMS (no-stimulation baseline versus post-TMS), lexicality (words vs. nonwords), test list  
32 size (4, 5, 6 or 7) and the serial position of the item in the list as fixed effects. In addition, we included the  
33 three-way interaction between site, TMS and lexicality, which allowed us to generate the planned comparisons  
34 required to test our hypotheses. To prevent over-fitting, other interaction terms were only included if they  
35 significantly improved model fit, assessed via a significant reduction in -2 Log-likelihood: the critical three-way  
36 interaction did improve model fit but no other 2-way or 3-way interaction terms did so. Consequently, the final  
37 model included the five fixed effects and this single interaction term. -2 Log-likelihood was 22162.1 for the  
38 empty model, 21206.8 for the final model, and 21211.27 for the final model minus the three-way interaction  
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 term. The Pearson chi-square by degrees of freedom was 0.98, suggesting there was no over-dispersion in the  
2 fitted model. We permitted individual intercept variation for each subject and item as random effects and  
3  
4 specified an ‘unstructured’ variance–covariance structure for the G-matrix in the model. Two participants who  
5  
6 showed blanket facilitation following TMS were excluded from further analysis: they were alone in failing to  
7  
8 show any disruptive effects of TMS for either words or nonwords (i.e., numerically poorer), following either  
9  
10 SMG or ATL stimulation.  
11

12  
13  
14 Four planned comparisons, corrected for multiple comparisons within the GLIMMIX procedure,  
15  
16 checked for significant effects of TMS on ISR performance: These compared differences between the baseline  
17  
18 and TMS conditions in the recall of words and nonwords for both sites (e.g., nonwords SMG baseline vs  
19  
20 nonwords SMG TMS). Descriptive (unmodelled) data are also provided for different response categories to  
21  
22 characterise any effects of TMS on error types.  
23  
24

#### 25 26 **Visual pattern memory control task data analysis.**

27  
28 Similar to the ISR analysis, we used PROC MIXED (SAS v9.4, SAS Institute, North Carolina, USA) to build a logistic  
29  
30 generalized linear mixed model to predict the pattern completion accuracy data for each participant for each  
31  
32 pattern trial (whether the pattern was correctly recalled or not – i.e., a binary distribution, using a logit link  
33  
34 function). Fixed effects included stimulation site (ATL versus SMG), TMS (no-stimulation baseline versus post-  
35  
36 TMS), grid array size (5×5, 5×6, 6×6, or 6×7) and trial number in session (1-10) as fixed effects. We included the  
37  
38 two-way interaction between site and TMS. To prevent over-fitting, other terms were only included if they  
39  
40 significantly improved model fit, assessed via a significant reduction in -2 Log-likelihood. To succinctly capture  
41  
42 a non-linear effect of trial number, the final model consequently included the four fixed effects, along with trial  
43  
44 number included as a continuous variable with second and third order polynomial terms and the single  
45  
46 interaction term of TMS x site. -2 Log-likelihood was 1154.86 for the empty model and 1138.79 for the final  
47  
48 model, and 1138.98 for the final model minus the two-way interaction term. The Pearson chi-square by  
49  
50 degrees of freedom was 0.96 suggesting there was no over-dispersion in the fitted model. We permitted  
51  
52 individual intercept variation for each subject and item as random effects and specified an ‘unstructured’  
53  
54 variance–covariance structure for the G-matrix in the model. The two participants who had been excluded in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

the previous analysis for showing blanket facilitation following TMS were excluded in this analysis, also.

Planned comparisons assessed the TMS effect on LS Mean pattern recall probability according to site.

## Results

### ISR Results

The modelled mean probability of items recalled in position for each TMS condition and the average TMS effect scores are displayed in **Figure 3**.



**Figure 3.** Performance in the immediate serial recall (ISR) task (left) and the control visual pattern memory task (right). The bar graphs in the top panels show modelled mean performance (Least Squares Means) in each condition. Error bars = +/-1 standard error of the mean (SEM). The bottom panel shows average *changes* in recall performance following TMS compared to baseline, for nonwords and words in the ISR task and across trials in the pattern memory control task. These

data are expressed as odds ratios, since in a logistic model, the effect of TMS can be characterised in terms of changes in the probability that a particular item or pattern will be recalled. Changes in odds ratios larger than one (1 = no change from pre to post-TMS; dotted lines are provided for reference) correspond to greater TMS effects (i.e., more disruption in performance). Error bars = 95% confidence intervals. In ISR, the effect of SMG stimulation on nonword recall was the most statistically-robust effect; the effect of SMG stimulation on words was close to significance. The effect of ATL stimulation on word recall was also significant, while stimulation of this semantic site had no effect on nonword recall. In the pattern memory task, stimulation to neither site disrupted performance.

Table 1. Details of the statistical model used to estimate the recall of words and nonwords before and after TMS was applied to supramarginal gyrus and anterior temporal lobe.

Model Parameters	F-value (DF)	Z-value	p-value	Parameter Estimate	Parameter 95% CI	-2Log likelihood
<b>Empty Model</b>						22162.1
<b>Full Model</b>						21206.8
<b>Fixed Effects</b>						
Site (ATL, SMG)	1.98 (1, 17776)		.20	-0.01	-0.13 – 0.12	
Item (WD, NW)	363.93 (1, 17776)		<.001	-2.29	-2.54 – -2.03	
TMS (PRE, POST)	13.16 (1, 17776)		<.001	0.11	-0.02 – 0.23	
Site*Stim*TMS	4.43 (4, 17776)		.40	1) 0.12 2) 0.12 3) 0.19 4) 0.03	-0.14 – 0.39 -0.08 – 0.31 -0.06 – 0.38 -0.15 – 0.21	
Item position in list	623.01 (1, 17776)		<.001	-0.36	-0.39 – -0.33	
List size	111.71 (1, 17776)		<.001	-0.58	-0.68 – -0.47	
<b>Random Effects</b>						
Subject covariance		3.26	<.001	0.58		
Item covariance		11.45	<.001	0.49		

Note. The table shows the fixed and random effects in the final model used to generate planned comparisons examining the effect of TMS on the recall of words and nonwords for each site. Only fixed effects that significantly improved model fit were included: the three-way interaction, while not significant overall, did improve model fit. Site: Anterior temporal lobe (ATL) vs. Supramarginal gyrus (SMG). Item: words (WD) vs. nonwords (NW). TMS: performance at no-TMS baseline (PRE) and post-TMS (POST). For dummy variable coding, the control levels were SMG for site, words for item type and POST for TMS.

Since our focus was on a hypothesised double dissociation between ATL and SMG, we built a mixed-effects model that allowed us to compare performance before and after inhibitory stimulation was applied to these two sites. Planned comparisons of least-squares means, comparing pre- and post-TMS sessions for words

and nonwords, were consistent with our predictions: SMG stimulation significantly disrupted nonword recall:  $t(17776) = 2.98, p = .003$ , while the effect for words was not significant ( $t(17776) = 1.64, p = .101$ ). The opposite pattern was found for ATL, although these effects were more subtle: stimulation to this semantic site significantly disrupted word recall:  $t(17776) = 2.08, p = .038$ , while nonword performance was not significantly affected ( $t < 1$ ). Full details of the model are provided in Table 1.

Descriptive data on the nature of errors in each TMS condition are provided in Table 2. In brief, these categorical data indicate that the dissociation across sites seen in the effect of TMS on overall item recall largely related to changes in the percentage of items recalled in the correct position; and changes in phonologically related errors, notably an increase in phoneme recombination errors in the nonword list condition following SMG stimulation.

Table 2. *ISR response types as a percentage of total test items.*

	Nonword List Condition				Word List Condition			
	ATL Session		SMG Session		ATL Session		SMG Session	
	Baseline	TMS	Baseline	TMS	Baseline	TMS	Baseline	TMS
<b>Item recalled in position (used in LME)</b>	<b>47.01</b> (19.49)	<b>46.98</b> (18.63)	<b>47.74</b> (17.81)	<b>43.26</b> (16.84)	<b>64.27</b> (14.97)	<b>62.99</b> (15.39)	<b>63.84</b> (12.98)	<b>62.55</b> (13.68)
<b>Item recalled out of position</b>	<b>0.88</b> (1.13)	<b>1.26</b> (1.90)	<b>1.00</b> (0.88)	<b>0.89</b> (1.30)	<b>7.04</b> (5.57)	<b>7.36</b> (5.07)	<b>7.91</b> (4.99)	<b>7.07</b> (5.22)
Item Omission	0.57 (1.25)	0.57 (1.85)	0.54 (1.26)	0.18 (0.50)	5.44 (7.04)	6.44 (8.01)	6.07 (6.48)	7.79 (7.31)
Phoneme Recombination Error	24.99 (10.45)	25.10 (10.97)	25.60 (10.62)	28.51 (10.62)	11.62 (6.48)	11.30 (3.29)	10.55 (4.38)	11.05 (3.64)
Phon-related non-recombination error	24.94 (10.11)	24.61 (8.39)	23.91 (7.97)	25.69 (8.15)	9.68 (3.08)	9.77 (4.80)	9.74 (4.91)	10.08 (4.55)
Other (List intrusions/Unrelated)	1.61 (2.16)	1.47 (1.85)	1.21 (1.89)	1.48 (2.35)	1.95 (1.80)	2.14 (1.77)	1.88 (1.81)	1.46 (1.60)

*Note.* Data show response type as a percentage of target items. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. Response types shown in bold relate to test items that were recalled; data corresponding to those items recalled in the correct position were fed into our mixed effects modelling analyses.

## Visual pattern memory control task results

As expected, TMS did not disrupt recall in the pattern memory task at all. Planned comparisons of least-squares means, comparing pre- and post-TMS sessions for words and nonwords, were consistent with our predictions. Despite adjustments for span that avoided floor and ceiling effects (individual raw correct recall ranged from 15% to 70%), TMS did not significantly alter recall from baseline at either site [SMG:  $t(852) = 0.10$ ,  $p = .92$ ; ATL,  $t(852) = 0.71$ ,  $p = .48$ ]. These results indicate that the disruptive TMS effects on ISR performance cannot be attributed to general effects of TMS.

Table 3. *Details of the statistical model used to estimate pattern recall performance before and after TMS was applied to supramarginal gyrus and anterior temporal lobe.*

Model Parameters	F-value (DF)	Z-value	p-value	Parameter Estimate	Parameter 95% CI	-2Log likelihood
<b>Empty Model</b>						1154.86
<b>Full Model</b>						1138.79
<b>Fixed Effects</b>						
Site (ATL, SMG)	0.08 (1, 852)		.77	-0.02	-0.42 – 0.38	
TMS (PRE, POST)	0.33 (1, 852)		.57	0.02	-0.38 – 0.42	
Site*TMS	0.19 (1, 852)		.67	0.12	-0.44 – 0.69	
Trial number	2.92 (1, 852)		.09	-0.43	-0.93 – 0.06	
Trial number*Trial number	4.17 (1, 852)		.04	0.08	0.003– 0.15	
Trial number*Trial number*Trial number	5.69 (1, 852)		.02	-0.0004	-0.0008 – -0.00008	
Array size	10.27 (1, 852)		.001	-0.08	-0.13 – -0.03	
<b>Random Effects</b>						
Subject covariance		2.45	.007	0.35		

*Note.* The table shows the fixed and random effects in the final model used to generate planned comparisons examining the effect of TMS on pattern recall for each site. Only fixed effects that significantly improved model fit were included. Site: Anterior temporal lobe (ATL) vs. Supramarginal gyrus (SMG). TMS: performance at no-TMS baseline (PRE) and post-TMS (POST). For dummy variable coding, the control levels were SMG for site and POST for TMS.

## Discussion

This study used inhibitory transcranial magnetic stimulation to provide convergent evidence for dissociable neural processes underpinning verbal STM for meaningful and meaningless material. Inhibitory TMS

1 to left supramarginal gyrus (SMG), implicated in phonological processing, reduced recall of nonword lists. In  
2 contrast, stimulation of left anterior temporal lobe (ATL), implicated in heteromodal semantic processing,  
3  
4 disrupted word but not nonword recall. For the first time, the study demonstrates that TMS can disrupt a  
5  
6 relatively direct marker of verbal STM – namely, the accuracy of spoken immediate serial recall, which is  
7  
8 important since most studies have used more indirect measures such as response time for sequence  
9  
10 recognition. In this way, our methods are much closer to classical neuropsychological assessments than those  
11  
12 typically used in cognitive neuroscience (although unsurprisingly, the effects of TMS in healthy participants  
13  
14 were more subtle than the effect of lesions in neuropsychological populations).  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Another novel feature of the study is that it contrasted two sites, SMG and ATL, hypothesised to make  
20  
21 dissociable contributions to phonological and semantic aspects of language respectively. To our knowledge,  
22  
23 this is the first time the effect of inhibitory stimulation to ATL has been assessed using a verbal STM paradigm.  
24  
25 Consequently, the study provides highly novel evidence for a necessary role of anterior temporal cortex in the  
26  
27 maintenance of familiar meaningful words in healthy participants; since this was the first study of its kind and  
28  
29 effects were small, the results should be regarded as preliminary and in need of replication. Nevertheless, the  
30  
31 dissociation that we observed between the SMG and ATL sites converges with the patient and neuroimaging  
32  
33 literature in suggesting that these distributed brain regions are differentially recruited to support STM  
34  
35 depending on the novelty of the individual stimuli and the availability of long-term representations. Patterns of  
36  
37 converging evidence are important within cognitive neuroscience because each methodology has limitations  
38  
39 which can be overcome through the use of other methods to address the same research question. Unlike  
40  
41 neuroimaging studies, neuropsychology allows causal inferences; however, patients typically have large lesions  
42  
43 and, depending on the aetiology, both cortical grey matter and the underlying white matter tracts can be  
44  
45 affected, potentially eliciting dysfunction at sites that are distant from a focal lesion. Moreover, ATL and SMG  
46  
47 are rarely affected in the same way – while SMG is prone to damage from middle cerebral artery stroke, middle  
48  
49 and inferior temporal gyrus within ATL are rarely damaged by stroke because these regions have a dual blood  
50  
51 supply from both the anterior cerebral artery and the anterior branch of the posterior cerebral artery (Phan et  
52  
53 al., 2005, 2007). In this context, TMS studies of healthy participants can make an important contribution to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 knowledge, because they can elicit equivalent “virtual lesions” in SMG and ATL. In contrast, neuropsychological  
2 studies have rarely compared these sites in the same study, and when they have done so, they have compared  
3  
4 patients with stroke affecting SMG with cases who have neurodegeneration affecting ATL in the context of  
5  
6 semantic dementia (Jefferies, Crisp, et al., 2006). There are likely to be many important differences between  
7  
8 these patients beyond lesion location that are difficult to control within neuropsychological investigations.  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 14 *Role of left anterior supramarginal gyrus*

15  
16 The SMG finding complements studies that have previously used TMS at this site to disrupt button-  
17  
18 press tests of recognition. It is notable that when we use a direct measure of phonological maintenance, we  
19  
20 can modulate verbal STM capacity with TMS. Similarly, Acheson et al. (2011) found reductions in nonword  
21  
22 recall resulting from stimulation to pSTG (a site implicated in phonological encoding). Here, we show that  
23  
24 disruption further along the dorsal pathway (cf. Saur et al., 2008) affects verbal recall capacity for nonwords.  
25  
26 ISR is a more direct measure of phonological maintenance than reaction time in STM recognition tasks, given  
27  
28 this component of cognition is thought to emerge from the coupling between hearing and speaking. There are  
29  
30 no button presses in immediate serial recall to add another source of variance in neural recruitment.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 This is a salient consideration for the broader neurobiological literature on STM, since in neuroimaging  
36  
37 studies, often for practical reasons such as scanner noise and timing issues related to the use of auditory  
38  
39 stimuli, stimuli are visually presented and responses are restricted to a button press (cf. Rottschy et al., 2012,  
40  
41 for a summary). The response mode in such studies – and typical use of sub-span numbers of items – places  
42  
43 fairly low demands on item memory; instead relative emphasis is given to order recognition. These studies  
44  
45 might lack sensitivity to the engagement of lexical-semantic representations to support immediate serial recall.  
46  
47 Studies using visual presentation also face some more practical concerns regarding the interpretation of  
48  
49 activity changes: There may be difficulties in disentangling STM-related activity in SMG from its role in decoding  
50  
51 written words (and confounds with the lexicality advantage of reading familiar words compared to nonwords).  
52  
53  
54 Moreover, written presentation might encourage the use of a visual, orthographic code to maintain  
55  
56  
57 information.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The few neuroimaging studies that have measured spoken recall have either not found significant SMG  
2 activation (e.g., Collette et al., 2001; Grasby et al., 1993; notably Collette et al. did find distinct regions  
3 supporting STM for words compared to nonwords) or have interpreted SMG activation primarily in terms of  
4 phonological processing/sequencing/attentional demands (e.g., stronger activity for nonwords than words, for  
5 words with increasing phonological similarity, for novel vs. overlearned sequences), rather than a storage  
6 buffer (Chein & Fiez, 2001; Kalm, Davis, & Norris, 2012; Kalm & Norris, 2014; Logie, Venneri, Della Sala,  
7 Redpath, & Marshall, 2003). The greater disruption to the recall of nonwords than words following SMG-TMS  
8 could be understood in a similar way. That is, the effects of SMG stimulation on recall could correspond to  
9 interference with general/broad phonological processing capacities, rather than specific phonological buffering  
10 processes.

11 A benefit afforded by our silent testing environment, away from scanner noise, is the ability to examine  
12 changes in the qualities of recall errors as a consequence of stimulation. Our results indicate that TMS primarily  
13 affected whether a target item would be recalled or not (as opposed to a particular category of error).  
14 However, we also found tentative evidence, in the case of nonwords, that stimulation of SMG impacted recall  
15 by increasing ordering errors at the phoneme level (i.e. increased phoneme recombination errors, which result  
16 in fewer items being correctly recalled). This increase is compatible with our SMG stimulation site supporting  
17 the sequencing and structuring of phonological information (Gelfand & Bookheimer, 2003; Moser et al., 2009).  
18 This conclusion is compatible with a recent study by Papagno et al. (2017), which compared the effects of  
19 direct electrical stimulation of SMG and Broca's area on digit span performance in awake patients undergoing  
20 surgery. SMG primarily affected order errors rather than item errors (unlike Broca's area which primarily  
21 impacted the number of items recalled). On this basis they proposed that SMG plays a crucial role in memory  
22 for serial order. We did not find an increase in item order errors with SMG stimulation but when the  
23 phonological form of items are well-learned or a task uses a restricted set of items (like the number words 1-9),  
24 the task demands focus on the retention of whole items in order (Quinlan, Roodenrys, & Miller, 2017;  
25 Roodenrys & Quinlan, 2000; Saint-Aubin & Poirier, 2000). In contrast, for unfamiliar items (like nonwords),  
26 ordering mechanisms are necessary to maintain constituent phonemes in sequence, and consequently,

1 disruption of ordering mechanisms gives rise to item errors of the form we observed (Jefferies, Frankish, et al.,  
2 2006a, 2006b; Jefferies, Jones, et al., 2004; Jefferies, Lambon Ralph, & Baddeley, 2004; Page, Madge, Cumming,  
3 & Norris, 2007; Savill, Ashton, et al., 2015).

4  
5  
6  
7 Our SMG results are also broadly consistent with neuropsychological studies of patients with SMG  
8 lesions who show similar effects in immediate serial recall and repetition tasks -- i.e., more difficulty with  
9 nonwords than words (Baldo et al., 2012; Jefferies, Crisp, et al., 2006; Verhaegen et al., 2013). In line with the  
10 view that SMG supports the capacity to maintain a phonological sequence, lesions to SMG disrupt phonological  
11 judgement tasks but *not* verbal tasks that involve well-learned lexical forms in the absence of a sequencing  
12 requirement, such as paired associate learning. In other words, the classical distinction between impaired STM  
13 and preserved LTM difference might come about because measures of STM rely more on phonological  
14 sequencing than LTM tasks (Belleville, Caza, & Peretz, 2003). A limitation of this study is that we did not assess  
15 the effect of TMS on language tasks beyond immediate serial recall. The window for recording behavioural data  
16 post-TMS was relatively short and we prioritised obtaining adequate numbers of lists in the verbal STM task.  
17 However, we selected this site on the basis on previous brain stimulation studies that modulated phonological  
18 decision tasks and nonword reading (Hartwigsen et al., 2016; Pattamadilok et al., 2010; Re, Reddy, Roux, &  
19 Durand, 2012; Sliwinska et al., 2015, 2012; Stoeckel et al., 2009), as well as long-term phonological learning and  
20 retrieval (Meinzer et al., 2013; Perceval, Martin, Copland, Laine, & Meinzer, 2017; Savill, Ashton, et al., 2015).

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Our data also do not preclude the possibility that SMG might support an even more basic facet of  
42 cognition – such as attention through time – which is critical to phonological processing. Our pattern span  
43 control task involved STM but not attention through time. Therefore, future studies could assess the effects of  
44 TMS for non-language tasks that involve temporal attention and sequencing requirements. In line with this  
45 proposal, recent studies have found effects of SMG stimulation on short-term memory for tone pitch  
46 sequences (Schaal et al., 2015) – i.e. sequencing and maintenance beyond language, and speech-motor  
47 adaptation performance (Shum, Shiller, Baum, & Gracco, 2011) – in line with a broader auditory-to-motor  
48 function.

1  
2 Finally, it is important to note that the effects of TMS are relatively focal, and SMG is thought to include  
3 regions with different functional profiles (Oberhuber et al., 2016). Offline TMS of the form used in this study is  
4 not suited to a mapping approach but our findings might not extend to other nearby sites.  
5  
6

#### 7 *Role of anterior temporal cortex*

8  
9  
10 One of our study's novel findings was that it was possible to selectively disrupt word recall with  
11 stimulation of left anterior temporal cortex. This site is implicated in heteromodal semantic processing and  
12 while this region also contains functional subdivisions (Jackson, Hoffman, Pobric, & Lambon Ralph, 2015;  
13 Lambon Ralph et al., 2016; Murphy et al., 2017), the anterior middle temporal gyrus site we stimulated is  
14 heteromodal (Margulies et al., 2016; Visser & Lambon Ralph, 2011) and associated with conceptual  
15 representation (Murphy et al., 2017). In sharp contrast to the findings for SMG, nonwords were impervious to  
16 ATL stimulation. This pattern is broadly consistent with studies of semantic dementia: these patients show  
17 preserved verbal STM for nonwords reflecting their intact phonological skills (Jefferies et al., 2005; Majerus et  
18 al., 2007), yet disruption of word recall and phonological errors for semantically-degraded items. While  
19 phonological migration responses increased for nonwords following SMG stimulation, compatible with its role  
20 in phonological ordering, these errors did not notably increase after ATL stimulation. We might have expected  
21 to observe an increase in the case of words, in accordance with hypotheses that suggest semantic information  
22 can help to maintain phonological sequences (Hoffman, Jefferies, Ehsan, Jones, et al., 2009; Patterson et al.,  
23 1994; Savill et al., in press; Savill, Metcalfe, et al., 2015). However, pre-production editing could be used to  
24 avoid nonword responses for word lists in healthy people -- leading to omissions rather than phoneme  
25 recombination errors. Indeed, a review of the errors indicates that TMS to both stimulation sites resulted in  
26 increased omission errors in the recall of words.  
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 Importantly, the temporary semantic disruption of healthy word recall we observed is compatible with  
52 (i) accounts of the disruption of word recall in semantic dementia operating at a semantic level, and not just at  
53 the level of lexical familiarity (i.e., due to degraded word usage, Papagno et al., 2013) and (ii) accounts of STM  
54 that hold that semantic activation necessarily contributes to STM performance (c.f., Kowaliewski & Majerus,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

2018), reflecting the neural architecture of the underlying language system responsible for processing single words.

Given that this is the first study looking at ISR in ATL, with a relatively small sample size, and the effects on word recall were small, the results should be regarded as preliminary and in need of replication. This is especially the case because there is increasing evidence that TMS can elicit quite variable effects across people. We have used statistical models that can estimate parameters for stimulation, having controlled for effects of participant and specific items in ISR. We are now actively investigating individual differences in the effects of TMS and how these might relate to differences in underlying brain organisation.

#### *Future directions*

Multiple theoretical accounts and neuropsychological evidence might predict that SMG and ATL dissociate with respect to STM function and this study provides evidence that these sites dissociate using a spatially-specific and causal method within the same participants. However, with our offline method we cannot determine whether the disruption(s) to recall performance arose through functional disruption affecting stages of phonological encoding, rehearsal, and/or production at recall—or indeed whether the relative timing of TMS effects differed between the phonological and semantic stimulation sites. Thus, future studies applying online TMS methods to test disruptive effects at different points in time, e.g., encoding/retention vs. retrieval, would help to determine which mechanistic accounts provide the best explanation of the way in which long-term lexical-semantic activation is expressed in STM.

Future studies might also consider additional sites: The choice to stimulate two left-lateralised sites to compare semantic and phonological disruption was guided by scientific, practical and ethical considerations; however, the extent of behavioural disruption (certainly the size of the present ATL effect) may have been mitigated by this design. Given the bilateral representation of semantic memory and bilateral atrophy seen in semantic dementia, future TMS studies that could safely (and comfortably) harness bilateral ATL stimulation might offer a more robust index of the strength of semantic effects.

### Concluding comments

This special issue considers whether it is useful to assume the existence of short-term memory buffers specific to one input or output domain. Our findings link different sites to different aspects of verbal STM. In this way, they add to neuropsychological evidence that there are brain regions that support specific processes that contribute to verbal STM, and they suggest that TMS can provide useful converging evidence for the necessary role of a brain region in a specific processing capacity.

### Acknowledgments

This study was supported by a European Research Council grant (SEMBIND–283530). Furthermore, support was provided by the Slovenian Research Agency to AP (P5-0062).

### References

- Acheson, D. J., Hamidi, M., Binder, J. R., & Postle, B. R. (2011). A common neural substrate for language production and verbal working memory. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *23*, 1358–1367.
- Acheson, D. J., & MacDonald, M. C. (2009). Verbal working memory and language production: Common approaches to the serial ordering of verbal information. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*, 50–68.
- Alexander, M. P., Hospital, B., & Street, P. (1992). Lesion Localization of Phonological Agraphia. *Brain and Language*, *43*, 83–95.
- Baayen, R. H., Davidson, D. J., & Bates, D. M. (2008). Mixed-effects modeling with crossed random effects for subjects and items. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *59*, 390–412.
- Baddeley, A. D. (1986). *Working Memory*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. J. (1974). Working Memory. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *Psychology of learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory* (Volume 8, pp. 47–89). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Baldo, J. V., Katseff, S., & Dronkers, N. F. (2012). Brain regions underlying repetition and auditory-verbal short-term memory deficits in aphasia: Evidence from voxel-based lesion symptom mapping. *Aphasiology*, *26*,

338–354.

1  
2 Belleville, S., Caza, N., & Peretz, I. (2003). A neuropsychological argument for a processing view of memory.

3  
4 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 48, 686–703.

5  
6  
7 Benetello, A., Cecchetto, C., & Papagno, C. (2015). When meaning is useless. *Memory*, 23, 1001–1012.

8  
9 Binney, R. J., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2015). Using a combination of fMRI and anterior temporal lobe rTMS to  
10  
11 measure intrinsic and induced activation changes across the semantic cognition network.

12  
13 *Neuropsychologia*, 76, 170–181.

14  
15  
16 Booth, J. R., Burman, D. D., Meyer, J. R., Gitelman, D. R., Parrish, T. B., & Mesulam, M. M. (2002). Functional  
17  
18 Anatomy of Intra- and Cross-Modal Lexical Tasks. *NeuroImage*, 16, 7–22.

19  
20  
21 Booth, J. R., Burman, D. D., Meyer, J. R., Gitelman, D. R., Parrish, T. B., & Mesulam, M. M. (2003). Relation  
22  
23 between brain activation and lexical performance. *Human Brain Mapping*, 19, 155–169.

24  
25  
26 Buchsbaum, B. R., Baldo, J. V., Okada, K., Berman, K. F., Dronkers, N. F., D'Esposito, M., & Hickok, G. (2011).  
27  
28 Conduction aphasia, sensory-motor integration, and phonological short-term memory -- An aggregate  
29  
30 analysis of lesion and fMRI data. *Brain and Language*, 119, 119–128.

31  
32  
33 Buchsbaum, B. R., & Esposito, M. D. (2008). The search for the phonological store: from loop to convolution.  
34  
35 *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20, 762–778.

36  
37  
38 Celsis, P., Boulanouar, K., Doyon, B., Ranjeva, J. P., Berry, I., Nespoulous, J. L., & Chollet, F. (1999). Differential  
39  
40 fMRI responses in the left posterior superior temporal gyrus and left supramarginal gyrus to habituation  
41  
42 and change detection in syllables and tones. *NeuroImage*, 9, 135–144.

43  
44  
45 Chein, J., & Fiez, J. A. (2001). Dissociation of verbal working memory system components using a delayed serial  
46  
47 recall task. *Cerebral Cortex*, 11, 1003–1014.

48  
49  
50 Chen, R.-S., Classen, J., Gerloff, C., Celnik, P., Wassermann, E. M., Hallett, M., & Cohen, L. G. (1997). Depression  
51  
52 of motor cortex excitability by low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neurology*, 48, 1398–  
53  
54 1403.

55  
56  
57 Church, J. A., Balota, D. A., Petersen, S. E., & Schlaggar, B. L. (2011). Manipulation of Length and Lexicality  
58  
59 Localizes the Functional Neuroanatomy of Phonological Processing in Adult Readers. *Journal of Cognitive*

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

*Neuroscience*, 23, 1475–1493.

Collette, F., Majerus, S., Van der Linden, M., Dabe, P., Degueldre, C., Delfiore, G., ... Salmon, E. (2001).

Contribution of lexico-semantic processes to verbal short-term memory tasks: A PET activation study.

*Memory*, 9, 249–259.

Corina, D. P., Loudermilk, B. C., Detwiler, L., Martin, R. F., Brinkley, J. F., & Ojemann, G. (2010). Analysis of naming errors during cortical stimulation mapping: Implications for models of language representation.

*Brain and Language*, 115, 101–112.

Cortese, M. J., & Fugett, A. (2004). Imageability ratings for 3,000 monosyllabic words. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36, 384–387.

Coutanche, M. N., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2015). Creating concepts from converging features in human cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, 25, 2584–2593.

Davis, N. J., Gold, E., Pascual-leone, A., & Bracewell, R. M. (2013). Challenges of proper placebo control for non-invasive brain stimulation in clinical and experimental applications. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 38, 2973–2977.

Della Sala, S., Gray, C., Baddeley, A. D., Allamano, N., & Wilson, L. (1999). Pattern span: A tool for unwinding visuo-spatial memory. *Neuropsychologia*, 37, 1189–1199.

Deschamps, I., Baum, S. R., & Gracco, V. L. (2014). On the role of the supramarginal gyrus in phonological processing and verbal working memory: Evidence from rTMS studies. *Neuropsychologia*, 53, 39–46.

Dixon, P. (2008). Models of accuracy in repeated-measures designs. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59, 447–456.

Düzel, E., Hufnagel, A., Helmstaedter, C., & Elger, C. (1996). Verbal working memory components can be selectively influenced by transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with left temporal lobe epilepsy.

*Neuropsychologia*, 34, 775–783.

Freedman, M., & Martin, R. C. (2001). Dissociable components of short-term memory and their relation to long-term learning. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 18, 193–226.

Fridriksson, J., Kjartansson, O., Morgan, P. S., Hjaltason, H., Magnúsdóttir, S., Bonilha, L., & Rorden, C. (2010).

1 Impaired Speech Repetition and Left Parietal Lobe Damage. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30, 11057–11061.

2 Gainotti, G. (2015). Is the difference between right and left ATs due to the distinction between general and  
3  
4 social cognition or between verbal and non-verbal representations? *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral*  
5  
6  
7 *Reviews*, 51, 296–312.

8  
9 Gelfand, J. R., & Bookheimer, S. Y. (2003). Dissociating neural mechanisms of temporal sequencing and  
10  
11 processing phonemes. *Neuron*, 38, 831–842.

12  
13  
14 Gold, B. T., & Buckner, R. L. (2002). Common prefrontal regions coactivate with dissociable posterior regions  
15  
16 during controlled semantic and phonological tasks. *Neuron*, 35, 803–812.

17  
18  
19 Gow, D. W. (2012). The cortical organization of lexical knowledge: a dual lexicon model of spoken language  
20  
21 processing. *Brain and Language*, 121, 273–88.

22  
23 Grafman, J., Pascual-Leone, A., Alway, D., Nichelli, P., Gomez-Tortosa, E., & Hallett, M. (1994). Induction of a  
24  
25 recall deficit by rapid-rate transcranial magnetic stimulation. *NeuroReport*, 5, 1157–1160.

26  
27  
28 Grasby, P. M., Frith, C. D., Friston, K. J., Bench, C., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Dolan, R. J. (1993). Functional mapping  
29  
30 of brain areas implicated in auditory—verbal memory function. *Brain*, 116, 1–20.

31  
32  
33 Graves, W. W., Grabowski, T. J., Mehta, S., & Gupta, P. (2008). The left posterior superior temporal gyrus  
34  
35 participates specifically in accessing lexical phonology. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20, 1698–1710.

36  
37  
38 Hartwigsen, G., Weigel, A., Schuschan, P., Siebner, H. R., Weise, D., Classen, J., & Saur, D. (2016). Dissociating  
39  
40 parieto-frontal networks for phonological and semantic word decisions: A condition-and-perturb TMS  
41  
42 study. *Cerebral Cortex*, 26, 2590–2601.

43  
44  
45 Henson, R. N., Burgess, N., & Frith, C. D. (2000). Recoding, storage, rehearsal and grouping in verbal short-term  
46  
47 memory: an fMRI study. *Neuropsychologia*, 38, 426–440.

48  
49  
50 Herman, A. B., Houde, J. F., Vinogradov, S., & Nagarajan, S. S. (2013). Parsing the phonological loop: Activation  
51  
52 timing in the dorsal speech stream determines accuracy in speech reproduction. *Journal of Neuroscience*,  
53  
54 33, 5439–5453.

55  
56  
57 Herwig, U., Abler, B., Schönfeldt-Lecuona, C., Wunderlich, A., Grothe, J., Spitzer, M., & Walter, H. (2003). Verbal  
58  
59 storage in a premotor-parietal network: evidence from fMRI-guided magnetic stimulation. *NeuroImage*,

20, 1032–1041.

1  
2 Hickok, G., & Poeppel, D. (2007). The cortical organization of speech processing. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*,  
3  
4 8, 393–402.

5  
6  
7 Hodges, J. R., Patterson, K. E., Oxbury, S., & Funnell, E. (1992). Semantic dementia: Progressive fluent aphasia  
8  
9 with temporal lobe atrophy. *Brain*, 115, 1783–1806.

10  
11 Hoffman, P., Binney, R. J., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2015). Differing contributions of inferior prefrontal and  
12  
13 anterior temporal cortex to concrete and abstract conceptual knowledge. *Cortex*, 63, 250–266.

14  
15  
16 Hoffman, P., & Crutch, S. (2016). Knowing what and where: TMS evidence for the dual neural basis of  
17  
18 geographical knowledge. *Cortex*, 75, 151–159.

19  
20  
21 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Ehsan, S., Hopper, S., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2009). Selective short-term memory  
22  
23 deficits arise from impaired domain-general semantic control mechanisms. *Journal of Experimental*  
24  
25 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35, 137–156.

26  
27  
28 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Ehsan, S., Jones, R. W., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2009). Semantic memory is key to  
29  
30 binding phonology: converging evidence from immediate serial recall in semantic dementia and healthy  
31  
32 participants. *Neuropsychologia*, 47, 747–760.

33  
34  
35 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Ehsan, S., Jones, R. W., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2012). How does linguistic knowledge  
36  
37 contribute to short-term memory? Contrasting effects of impaired semantic knowledge and executive  
38  
39 control. *Aphasiology*, 26, 383–403.

40  
41  
42 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2011). Explaining semantic short-term memory deficits:  
43  
44 evidence for the critical role of semantic control. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 368–381.

45  
46  
47 Hulme, C., Maughan, S., & Brown, G. D. A. (1991). Memory for familiar and unfamiliar words: Evidence for a  
48  
49 long-term memory contribution to short-term memory span. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 30, 685–  
50  
51 701.

52  
53  
54 Hulme, C., Roodenrys, S., & Brown, G. (1995). The role of long term memory mechanisms in memory span.  
55  
56 *British Journal of Psychology*, 86, 527–536.

57  
58  
59 Hulme, C., Roodenrys, S., Schweickert, R., Brown, Gordon, D. A., Martin, S., & Stuart, G. (1997). Word-

1 frequency effects on short-term memory tasks: evidence for a reintegration process in immediate serial  
2 recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, 1217–1232.

3  
4 Humphreys, G. F., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2015). Fusion and fission of cognitive functions in the human  
5 parietal cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, 25, 3547–3560.

6  
7  
8  
9 Jackson, R. L., Hoffman, P., Pobric, G., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2015). The nature and neural correlates of  
10 semantic association versus conceptual similarity. *Cerebral Cortex*, 1–15.

11  
12  
13  
14 Jackson, R. L., Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Pobric, G. (2015). The timing of anterior temporal lobe involvement in  
15 semantic processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 27, 1388–1396.

16  
17  
18  
19 Jefferies, E., Bott, S., Ehsan, S., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2011). Phonological learning in semantic dementia.  
20  
21 *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 1208–1218.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Jefferies, E., Crisp, J., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2006). The impact of phonological or semantic impairment on  
30 delayed auditory repetition: Evidence from stroke aphasia and semantic dementia. *Aphasiology*, 20, 963–  
31 992.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 Jefferies, E., Frankish, C. R., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2006a). Lexical and semantic binding in verbal short-term  
40 memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 54, 81–98.

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Jefferies, E., Frankish, C. R., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2006b). Lexical and semantic influences on item and order  
49 memory in immediate serial recognition: evidence from a novel task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
*Psychology*, 59, 949–964.

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

- 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
- Jefferies, E., Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Baddeley, A. D. (2004). Automatic and controlled processing in sentence recall: The role of long-term and working memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *51*, 623–643.
- Jefferies, E., Patterson, K. E., Jones, R. W., Bateman, D., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2004). A category-specific advantage for numbers in verbal short-term memory: Evidence from semantic dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *42*, 639–660.
- Kalm, K., Davis, M. H., & Norris, D. G. (2012). Neural mechanisms underlying the grouping effect in short-term memory. *Human Brain Mapping*, *33*, 1634–1647.
- Kalm, K., & Norris, D. G. (2014). The representation of order information in auditory-verbal short-term memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*, 6879–6886.
- Kemeny, S., Xu, J., Park, G. H., Hosey, L. A., Wettig, C. M., & Braun, A. R. (2006). Temporal dissociation of early lexical access and articulation using a delayed naming task - An fMRI study. *Cerebral Cortex*, *16*, 587–595.
- Kirschen, M. P., Davis-Ratner, M. S., Jerde, T. E., Schraedley-Desmond, P., & Desmond, J. E. (2006). Enhancement of phonological memory following transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). *Behavioural Neurology*, *17*, 187–194.
- Knott, R., Patterson, K. E., & Hodges, J. R. (1997). Lexical and semantic binding effects in short-term memory: Evidence from semantic dementia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *14*, 1165–1216.
- Knott, R., Patterson, K. E., & Hodges, J. R. (2000). The role of speech production in auditory-verbal short-term memory: evidence from progressive fluent aphasia. *Neuropsychologia*, *38*, 125–142.
- Kowialiewski, B., & Majerus, S. (2018). The non-strategic nature of linguistic long-term memory effects in verbal short-term memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *101*, 64–83.
- Kümmerer, D., Hartwigsen, G., Kellmeyer, P., Glauche, V., Mader, I., Klöppel, S., ... Saur, D. (2013). Damage to ventral and dorsal language pathways in acute aphasia. *Brain*, *136*, 619–629.
- Kuperman, V., Stadthagen-Gonzalez, H., & Brysbaert, M. (2012). Age-of-acquisition ratings for 30,000 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, *44*, 978–990.
- Lambon Ralph, M. A., Cipolotti, L., Manes, F., & Patterson, K. E. (2010). Taking both sides: do unilateral anterior temporal lobe lesions disrupt semantic memory? *Brain*, *133*, 3243–3255.

- 1  
2 Lambon Ralph, M. A., Jefferies, E., Patterson, K. E., Rogers, T. T., Lambon Ralph, M. A., Jefferies, E., ... Rogers, T.  
3  
4 T. (2016). The neural and computational bases of semantic cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *18*,  
5 42–55.  
6
- 7 Lambon Ralph, M. A., Pobric, G., & Jefferies, E. (2009). Conceptual knowledge is underpinned by the temporal  
8  
9 pole bilaterally: Convergent evidence from rTMS. *Cerebral Cortex*, *19*, 832–838.  
10
- 11 Liao, D. A., Kronemer, S. I., Yau, J. M., Desmond, J. E., & Marvel, C. L. (2014). Motor system contributions to  
12  
13 verbal and non-verbal working memory. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 1–8.  
14
- 15 Liebenthal, E., Sabri, M., Beardsley, S. A., Mangalathu-Arumana, J., & Desai, A. (2013). Neural dynamics of  
16  
17 phonological processing in the dorsal auditory stream. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*, 15414–15424.  
18
- 19 Logie, R. H., Venneri, A., Della Sala, S., Redpath, T. W., & Marshall, I. (2003). Brain activation and the  
20  
21 phonological loop: the impact of rehearsal. *Brain and Cognition*, *53*, 293–296.  
22
- 23 Lorca-Puls, D. L., Gajardo-Vidal, A., Seghier, M. L., Leff, A. P., Sethi, V., Prejawa, S., ... Price, C. J. (2017). Using  
24  
25 transcranial magnetic stimulation of the undamaged brain to identify lesion sites that predict language  
26  
27 outcome after stroke. *Brain*, *140*, 1729–1742.  
28
- 29 Majerus, S., Attout, L., D’Argembeau, A., Degueldre, C., Fias, W., Maquet, P., ... Balteau, E. (2012). Attention  
30  
31 supports verbal short-term memory via competition between dorsal and ventral attention networks.  
32  
33 *Cerebral Cortex*, *22*, 1086–1097.  
34
- 35 Majerus, S., Norris, D. G., & Patterson, K. E. (2007). What does a patient with semantic dementia remember in  
36  
37 verbal short-term memory? Order and sound but not words. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *24*, 131–151.  
38
- 39 Majerus, S., & van der Linden, M. (2003). Long-term memory effects on verbal short-term memory: A  
40  
41 replication study. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *21*, 303–310.  
42
- 43 Margulies, D. S., Ghosh, S. S., Goulas, A., Falkiewicz, M., Huntenburg, J. M., Langs, G., ... Smallwood, J. (2016).  
44  
45 Situating the default-mode network along a principal gradient of macroscale cortical organization.  
46  
47 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*, 12574–12579.  
48
- 49 Martin, N., & Saffran, E. M. (1997). Language and auditory-verbal short-term memory impairments: Evidence  
50  
51 for common underlying processes. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *14*, 641–682.  
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
- Martin, R. C., Lesch, M. F., & Bartha, M. C. (1999). Independence of input and output phonology in word processing and short-term memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *41*, 3–29.
- Martin, R. C., Shelton, J. R., & Yaffee, L. S. (1994). Language processing and working memory: Neuropsychological evidence for separate phonological and semantic capacities. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *33*, 83–111.
- Martin, R. C., Wu, D., Freedman, M., Jackson, E. F., & Lesch, M. (2003). An event-related fMRI investigation of phonological versus semantic short-term memory. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *16*, 341–360.
- Meinzer, M., Jähnigen, S., Copland, D. A., Darkow, R., Grittner, U., Avirame, K., ... Flöel, A. (2013). Transcranial direct current stimulation over multiple days improves learning and maintenance of a novel vocabulary. *Cortex*, *50*, 137–147.
- Mion, M., Patterson, K. E., Acosta-Cabronero, J., Pengas, G., Izquierdo-Garcia, D., Hong, Y. T., ... Nestor, P. J. (2010). What the left and right anterior fusiform gyri tell us about semantic memory. *Brain*, *133*, 3256–3268.
- Mirman, D., Chen, Q., Zhang, Y., Wang, Z., Faseyitan, O. K., Coslett, H. B., & Schwartz, M. F. (2015). Neural organization of spoken language revealed by lesion-symptom mapping. *Nature Communications*, *6*, 6762.
- Moser, D., Baker, J. M., Sanchez, C. E., Rorden, C., & Fridriksson, J. (2009). Temporal order processing of syllables in the left parietal lobe. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*, 12568–12573.
- Mottaghy, F. M., Gangitano, M., Krause, B. ., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2003). Chronometry of parietal and prefrontal activations in verbal working memory revealed by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *NeuroImage*, *18*, 565–575.
- Mottaghy, F. M., Krause, B. J., Kemna, L. J., Töpper, R., Tellmann, L., Beu, M., ... Muller-Gartner, H. W. (2000). Modulation of the neuronal circuitry subserving working memory in healthy human subjects by repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuroscience Letters*, *280*, 167–170.
- Mummery, C. J., Patterson, K. E., Price, C. J., Ashburner, J., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Hodges, J. R. (2000). A voxel-based morphometry study of semantic dementia: Relationship between temporal lobe atrophy and semantic memory. *Annals of Neurology*, *47*, 36–45.

- 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
- Murphy, C., Rueschemeyer, S. A., Watson, D., Karapanagiotidis, T., Smallwood, J., & Jefferies, E. (2017). Fractionating the anterior temporal lobe: MVPA reveals differential responses to input and conceptual modality. *NeuroImage*, *147*, 19–31.
- Newman, S. D., & Twieg, D. (2001). Differences in auditory processing of words and pseudowords: An fMRI study. *Human Brain Mapping*, *14*, 39–47.
- Nixon, P., Lazarova, J., Hodinott-Hill, I., Gough, P., & Passingham, R. E. (2004). The inferior frontal gyrus and phonological processing: an investigation using rTMS. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *16*, 289–300.
- Oberhuber, M., Hope, T. M. H. H., Seghier, M. L., Parker Jones, Ö., Prejawa, S., Green, D. W., & Price, C. J. (2016). Four functionally distinct regions in the left supramarginal gyrus support word processing. *Cerebral Cortex*, *26*, 4212–4226.
- Page, M. P. A., Madge, A., Cumming, N., & Norris, D. G. (2007). Speech errors and the phonological similarity effect in short-term memory: Evidence suggesting a common locus. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *56*, 49–64.
- Papagno, C., Comi, A., Riva, M., Bizzi, A., Vernice, M., Casarotti, A., ... Bello, L. (2017). Mapping the brain network of the phonological loop. *Human Brain Mapping*, *38*, 3011–3024.
- Papagno, C., Vernice, M., & Cecchetto, C. (2013). Phonology without semantics? Good enough for verbal short-term memory. Evidence from a patient with semantic dementia. *Cortex*, *49*, 626–636.
- Papoutsis, M., de Zwart, J. A., Jansma, J. M., Pickering, M. J., Bednar, J. A., & Horwitz, B. (2009). From phonemes to articulatory codes: An fMRI study of the role of Broca's area in speech production. *Cerebral Cortex*, *19*, 2156–2165.
- Parker Jones, Ö., Prejawa, S., Hope, T. M. H. H., Oberhuber, M., Seghier, M. L., Leff, A. P., ... Price, C. J. (2014). Sensory-to-motor integration during auditory repetition: a combined fMRI and lesion study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 24.
- Pattamadilok, C., Knierim, I. N., Duncan, K. J., & Devlin, J. T. (2010). How does learning to read affect speech perception? *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *30*, 8435–8444.
- Patterson, K. E., Graham, N. L., & Hodges, J. R. (1994). The impact of semantic memory loss on phonological

representations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 6, 57–69.

Patterson, K. E., Lambon Ralph, M. A., Jefferies, E., Woollams, A. M., Jones, R., Hodges, J. R., & Rogers, T. T.

(2006). “Presemantic” Cognition in Semantic Dementia: Six Deficits in Search of an Explanation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18, 169–183.

Patterson, K. E., Nestor, P. J., Rogers, T. T., & Nestor, T. P. (2007). Where do you know what you know? The representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8, 976–987.

Paulesu, E., Frith, C. D., & Frackowiak, R. S. J. (1993). The neural correlates of the verbal component of working memory. *Nature*, 362, 342–345.

Paulesu, E., Frith, U., Snowling, M. J., Gallagher, A., Morton, J., Frackowiak, R., & Frith, C. (1996). Is developmental dyslexia a disconnection syndrome? Evidence from PET Scanning. *Brain*, 119, 143–157.

Peramunage, D., Blumstein, S. E., Myers, E. B., Goldrick, M., & Baese-Berk, M. (2011). Phonological neighborhood effects in spoken word production: an fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23, 593–603.

Perceval, G., Martin, A. K., Copland, D. A., Laine, M., & Meinzer, M. (2017). High-definition tDCS of the temporo-parietal cortex enhances access to newly learned words. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 17023.

Phan, T. G., Donnan, G. A., Wright, P. M., & Reutens, D. C. (2005). A digital map of middle cerebral artery infarcts associated with middle cerebral artery trunk and branch occlusion. *Stroke*, 36, 986–991.

Phan, T. G., Fong, A. C., Donnan, G., & Reutens, D. C. (2007). Digital map of posterior cerebral artery infarcts associated with posterior cerebral artery trunk and branch occlusion. *Stroke*, 38, 1805–1811.

Pilkington, E., Keidel, J., Kendrick, L. T., Saddy, J. D., Sage, K., & Robson, H. (2017). Sources of phoneme errors in repetition: Perseverative, neologistic, and lesion patterns in jargon aphasia. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11, 1–14.

Pobric, G., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2007). Anterior temporal lobes mediate semantic representation: mimicking semantic dementia by using rTMS in normal participants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104, 20137–41.

Pobric, G., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2010a). Amodal semantic representations depend on both

1 anterior temporal lobes: evidence from repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuropsychologia*,  
2 48, 1336–1342.  
3

4 Pobric, G., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2010b). Category-Specific versus Category-General Semantic  
5 Impairment Induced by Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation. *Current Biology*, 20, 964–968.  
6

7 Pobric, G., Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Jefferies, E. (2009). The role of the anterior temporal lobes in the  
8 comprehension of concrete and abstract words: rTMS evidence. *Cortex*, 45, 1104–1110.  
9

10 Postle, B. R., Ferrarelli, F., Hamidi, M., Feredoes, E., Massimini, M., Peterson, M., ... Tononi, G. (2006).  
11 Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation dissociates working memory manipulation from retention  
12 functions in the prefrontal, but not posterior parietal, cortex. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18, 1712–  
13 1722.  
14

15 Prabhakaran, R., Blumstein, S. E., Myers, E. B., Hutchison, E. R., Britton, B., Hutchison, E. R., & Britton, B. (2006).  
16 An event-related fMRI investigation of phonological--lexical competition. *Neuropsychologia*, 44, 2209–  
17 2221.  
18

19 Price, C. J. (2012). A review and synthesis of the first 20 years of PET and fMRI studies of heard speech, spoken  
20 language and reading. *NeuroImage*, 62, 816–847.  
21

22 Price, C. J. (in press). The evolution of cognitive models: From neuropsychology to neuroimaging and back.  
23 *Cortex*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.12.020>.  
24

25 Price, C. J., Gorno-tempini, M. L., Graham, K. S., Biggio, N., Mechelli, A., Patterson, K. E., & Noppeney, U. (2003).  
26 Normal and pathological reading : converging data from lesion and imaging studies. *NeuroImage*, 20, 30–  
27 41.  
28

29 Quinlan, P. T., Roodenrys, S., & Miller, L. M. (2017). Serial reconstruction of order and serial recall in verbal  
30 short-term memory. *Memory and Cognition*, 45, 1126–1143.  
31

32 Raizada, R. D. S., & Poldrack, R. A. (2007). Selective amplification of stimulus differences during categorical  
33 processing of speech. *Neuron*, 56, 726–740.  
34

35 Rauschecker, J. P., & Scott, S. K. (2009). Maps and streams in the auditory cortex: nonhuman primates  
36 illuminate human speech processing. *Nature Neuroscience*, 12, 718–24.  
37

- 1 Ravizza, S. M., Delgado, M. R., Chein, J. M., Becker, J. T., & Fiez, J. A. (2004). Functional dissociations within the  
2 inferior parietal cortex in verbal working memory. *NeuroImage*, *22*, 562–573.  
3
- 4 Re, E., Reddy, M., Roux, F., & Durand, J. (2012). Segregation of lexical and sub-lexical reading processes in the  
5 left perisylvian cortex. *PloS One*, *7*, e50665.  
6
- 7 Reilly, J., Troche, J., Paris, A., Park, H., Kalinyak-Fliszar, M., Antonucci, S. M., & Martin, N. (2012). Lexicality  
8 effects in word and nonword recall of semantic dementia and progressive nonfluent aphasia.  
9  
10 *Aphasiology*, *26*, 404–427.  
11
- 12 Romero Lauro, L. J., Reis, J., Cohen, L. G., Cecchetto, C., & Papagno, C. (2010). A case for the involvement of  
13 phonological loop in sentence comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 4003–4011.  
14
- 15 Romero Lauro, L. J., Walsh, V., & Papagno, C. (2006). The neural correlates of phonological short-term memory:  
16 A repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *18*, 1147–1155.  
17
- 18 Roodenrys, S., & Quinlan, P. T. (2000). The effects of stimulus set size and word frequency on verbal serial  
19 recall. *Memory*, *8*, 71–8.  
20
- 21 Rottschy, C., Langner, R., Dogan, I., Reetz, K., Laird, a R., Schulz, J. B., ... Eickhoff, S. B. (2012). Modelling neural  
22 correlates of working memory: a coordinate-based meta-analysis. *NeuroImage*, *60*, 830–46.  
23
- 24 Saint-Aubin, J., & Poirier, M. (1999). The influence of long-term memory factors on immediate serial recall: an  
25 item and order analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, *34*, 347–352.  
26
- 27 Saint-Aubin, J., & Poirier, M. (2000). Immediate serial recall of words and nonwords: Tests of the retrieval-  
28 based hypothesis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *7*, 332–340.  
29
- 30 Sakurai, Y., Takeuchi, S., Kojima, E., Yazawa, I., Murayama, S., Kaga, K., ... Kanazawa, I. (1998). Mechanism of  
31 short-term memory and repetition in conduction aphasia and related cognitive disorders : a  
32 neuropsychological, audiological and neuroimaging study. *Journal of Neurological Sciences*, *154*, 182–193.  
33
- 34 Salmon, E., Van der Linden, M., Collette, F., Delfiore, G., Maquet, P., Degueldre, C., ... Franck, G. (1996).  
35 Regional brain activity during working memory tasks. *Brain*, *119*, 1617–1625.  
36
- 37 Saur, D., Kreher, B. W., Schnell, S., Kummerer, D., Kellmeyer, P., Vry, M.-S., ... Weiller, C. (2008). Ventral and  
38 dorsal pathways for language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *105*, 18035–18040.  
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 Savill, N., Ashton, J., Gugliuzza, J., Poole, C., Sim, Z., Ellis, A. W., & Jefferies, E. (2015). tDCS to temporoparietal  
2 cortex during familiarisation enhances the subsequent phonological coherence of nonwords in immediate  
3 serial recall. *Cortex*, *63*, 132–144.  
4  
5  
6  
7 Savill, N., Ellis, A. W., & Jefferies, E. (2017). Newly-acquired words are more phonologically robust in verbal  
8 short-term memory when they have associated semantic representations. *Neuropsychologia*, *98*, 85–97.  
9  
10  
11 Savill, N., Ellis, R., Brooke, E., Koa, T., Ferguson, S., Rojas-Rodriguez, E., ... Jefferies, E. (2018). Keeping it  
12 together: Semantic coherence stabilises phonological sequences. *Memory & Cognition*, *46*, 426–237.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Savill, N., Metcalfe, T., Ellis, A. W., & Jefferies, E. (2015). Semantic categorisation of a word supports its  
17 phonological integrity in verbal short-term memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *84*, 128–138.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Schaal, N. K., Williamson, V. J., Kelly, M., Muggleton, N. G., Pollok, B., Krause, V., & Banissy, M. J. (2015). A  
22 causal involvement of the left supramarginal gyrus during the retention of musical pitches. *Cortex*, *64*,  
23  
24  
25  
26 310–317.  
27  
28  
29 Schwartz, M. F., Faseyitan, O., Kim, J., & Coslett, H. B. (2012). The dorsal stream contribution to phonological  
30 retrieval in object naming. *Brain*, *135*, 3799–3814.  
31  
32  
33 Schwartz, M. F., Kimberg, D. Y., Walker, G. M., Faseyitan, O., Brecher, A., Dell, G. S., & Coslett, H. B. (2009).  
34 Anterior temporal involvement in semantic word retrieval: Voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping  
35 evidence from aphasia. *Brain*, *132*, 3411–3427.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Shallice, T., & Warrington, E. K. (1974). The dissociation between short term retention of meaningful sounds  
41 and verbal material. *Neuropsychologia*, *12*, 553–555.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Shum, M., Shiller, D. M., Baum, S. R., & Gracco, V. L. (2011). Sensorimotor integration for speech motor  
46 learning involves the inferior parietal cortex. *The European Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*, 1817–1822.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Shuster, L. I., & Lemieux, S. K. (2005). An fMRI investigation of covertly and overtly produced mono- and  
51 multisyllabic words. *Brain and Language*, *93*, 20–31.  
52  
53  
54  
55 Sliwinska, M. W., James, A., & Devlin, J. T. (2015). Inferior parietal lobule contributions to visual word  
56 recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *27*, 593–604.  
57  
58  
59  
60 Sliwinska, M. W., Khadilkar, M., Campbell-Ratcliffe, J., Quevenco, F., & Devlin, J. T. (2012). Early and sustained  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

supramarginal gyrus contributions to phonological processing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3, 161.

1  
2 Stoeckel, C., Gough, P. M., Watkins, K. E., & Devlin, J. T. (2009). Supramarginal gyrus involvement in visual word  
3  
4 recognition. *Cortex*, 45, 1091–1096.  
5

6  
7 Thorn, A. S. C., Gathercole, S. E., & Frankish, C. R. (2005). Redintegration and the benefits of long-term  
8  
9 knowledge in verbal short-term memory: an evaluation of Schweickert's (1993) multinomial processing  
10  
11 tree model. *Cognitive Psychology*, 50, 133–158.  
12

13  
14 Tomasino, B., Marin, D., Maieron, M., D'Agostini, S., Medeossi, I., Fabbro, F., ... Luzzatti, C. (2015). A multimodal  
15  
16 mapping study of conduction aphasia with impaired repetition and spared reading-aloud.  
17  
18 *Neuropsychologia*, 70, 214–226.  
19

20  
21 Turkeltaub, P. E., & Branch Coslett, H. (2010). Localization of sublexical speech perception components. *Brain*  
22  
23 *and Language*, 114, 1–15.  
24

25  
26 Vallar, G., & Baddeley, A. D. (1984). Phonological short-term store, phonological processing and sentence  
27  
28 comprehension: A neuropsychological case study. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 1, 121–141.  
29

30  
31 Vallar, G., Di Betta, A. M., & Silveri, M. C. (1997). The phonological short-term store-rehearsal system: patterns  
32  
33 of impairment and neural correlates. *Neuropsychologia*, 35, 795–812.  
34

35  
36 van Heuven, W. J. B., Mandera, P., Keuleers, E., & Brysbaert, M. (2014). SUBTLEX-UK: A new and improved  
37  
38 word frequency database for British English. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 67, 1176–  
39  
40 1190.  
41

42  
43 Verhaegen, C., Piertot, F., & Poncelet, M. (2013). Dissociable components of phonological and lexical-semantic  
44  
45 short-term memory and their relation to impaired word production in aphasia. *Cognitive*  
46  
47 *Neuropsychology*, 30, 544–563.  
48

49  
50 Visser, M., Jefferies, E., Embleton, K. V., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2012). Both the middle temporal gyrus and the  
51  
52 ventral anterior temporal area are crucial for multimodal semantic processing: distortion-corrected fMRI  
53  
54 evidence for a double gradient of information convergence in the temporal lobes. *Journal of Cognitive*  
55  
56 *Neuroscience*, 24, 1766–1778.  
57

58  
59 Visser, M., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2011). Differential contributions of bilateral ventral anterior temporal lobe  
60  
61

1 and left anterior superior temporal gyrus to semantic processes. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23,  
2 3121–31.  
3

4 Vitevitch, M. S., & Luce, P. A. (2004). A web-based interface to calculate phonotactic probability for words and  
5 nonwords in English. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36, 481–487.  
6

7 Walker, G. M., Schwartz, M. F., Kimberg, D. Y., Faseyitan, O., Brecher, A., Dell, G. S., & Coslett, H. B. (2011).  
8 Support for anterior temporal involvement in semantic error production in aphasia: New evidence from  
9 VLSM. *Brain and Language*, 117, 110–122.  
10

11 Warrington, E. K. (1975). The selective impairment of semantic memory. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*  
12 *Psychology*, 27, 635–657.  
13

14 Warrington, E. K., & Shallice, T. (1969). The selective impairment of auditory verbal short-term memory. *Brain*,  
15 92, 885–896.  
16

17 Whitney, C., Kirk, M., O'Sullivan, J., Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Jefferies, E. (2011). The neural organization of  
18 semantic control: TMS evidence for a distributed network in left inferior frontal and posterior middle  
19 temporal gyrus. *Cerebral Cortex*, 21, 1066–75.  
20

21 Wilshire, C. E., & Fisher, C. A. (2004). “Phonological” dysphasia: A cross-modal phonological impairment  
22 affecting repetition, production, and comprehension. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 21, 187–210.  
23

24 Wilson, S. M., Isenberg, A. L., & Hickok, G. (2009). Neural correlates of word production stages delineated by  
25 parametric modulation of psycholinguistic variables. *Human Brain Mapping*, 30, 3596–3608.  
26

27 Woollams, A. M., & Patterson, K. E. (in press). Cognitive consequences of the left-right asymmetry of atrophy in  
28 semantic dementia. *Cortex*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.11.014>.  
29

30 Yarkoni, T., Poldrack, R., & Nichols, T. (2011). Large-scale automated synthesis of human functional  
31 neuroimaging data. *Nature Methods*, 8, 665–670.  
32

33 Yeo, B. T. T., Krienen, F. M., Sepulcre, J., Sabuncu, M. R., Lashkari, D., Hollinshead, M., ... Buckner, R. L. (2011).  
34 The organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic functional connectivity. *Journal of*  
35 *Neurophysiology*, 106, 1125–1165.  
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 2

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



**B. TMS protocol**  
(single session ~ 45-55 minutes)




Figure 3  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

