



## The functional anatomy of single-digit arithmetic in children with developmental dyslexia



Tanya M. Evans<sup>a</sup>, D. Lynn Flowers<sup>a,b</sup>, Eileen M. Napoliello<sup>a</sup>, Olumide A. Olulade<sup>a</sup>, Guinevere F. Eden<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Center for the Study of Learning, Department of Pediatrics, Georgetown University Medical Center, Suite 150 Building D, 4000 Reservoir Road NW, Washington, DC 20057, USA

<sup>b</sup> Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157, USA

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Accepted 16 July 2014

Available online 25 July 2014

#### Keywords:

Dyslexia  
Arithmetic  
Language  
Development  
Reading

### ABSTRACT

Some arithmetic procedures, such as addition of small numbers, rely on fact retrieval mechanisms supported by left hemisphere perisylvian language areas, while others, such as subtraction, rely on procedural-based mechanisms subserved by bilateral parietal cortices. Previous work suggests that developmental dyslexia, a reading disability, is accompanied by subtle deficits in retrieval-based arithmetic, possibly because of compromised left hemisphere function. To test this prediction, we compared brain activity underlying arithmetic problem solving in children with and without dyslexia during addition and subtraction operations using a factorial design. The main effect of arithmetic operation (addition versus subtraction) for both groups combined revealed activity during addition in the left superior temporal gyrus and activity during subtraction in the bilateral intraparietal sulcus, the right supramarginal gyrus and the anterior cingulate, consistent with prior studies. For the main effect of diagnostic group (dyslexics versus controls), we found less activity in dyslexic children in the left supramarginal gyrus. Finally, the interaction analysis revealed that while the control group showed a strong response in the right supramarginal gyrus for subtraction but not for addition, the dyslexic group engaged this region for both operations. This provides physiological evidence in support of the theory that children with dyslexia, because of disruption to left hemisphere language areas, use a less optimal route for retrieval-based arithmetic, engaging right hemisphere parietal regions typically used by good readers for procedural-based arithmetic. Our results highlight the importance of language processing for mathematical processing and illustrate that children with dyslexia have impairments that extend beyond reading.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

### Introduction

Proficient mathematical cognition is the basis for many routine activities in our daily lives (e.g., keeping track of time or money) and a key factor in children's academic success. Arithmetic, the branch of mathematics concerned with addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, is especially important in the early stages of math learning. As such, there has been a significant interest in the neural basis of normal mathematical cognition and numerosity (Menon, 2010; Nieder and Dehaene, 2009), as well as its disorders (for review, see Ashkenazi et al., 2013). A model of number processing that integrates brain imaging with behavioral and patient studies has been put forward as the "triple-code model" (Dehaene, 1992; Dehaene and Cohen, 1995; Dehaene et al., 2003). This model specifies that distinct brain regions are assigned to specific systems of representations of numerical information (quantitative, verbal, and visual systems), and their respective contributions vary depending on the task. For example, bilateral parietal

cortices have been identified as a locus of quantity representation (Nieder and Dehaene, 2009), and have been shown to elicit greater activity when subjects solve arithmetic problems with more procedural demands such as subtraction (De Smedt et al., 2011) and division (Rosenberg-Lee et al., 2011). Other aspects of mental arithmetic, such as verbal representation of numbers and fact retrieval, have been associated with language functions (i.e., the verbal representation of numbers in the triple-code model) and are thought to be subserved by left hemisphere perisylvian language areas (Dehaene et al., 1999, 2003). Examples of brain imaging studies in support of this include the demonstration that addition of small numbers (Stanescu-Cosson et al., 2000) or well-rehearsed arithmetic facts such as multiplication (Chochon et al., 1999; Lee, 2000; Prado et al., 2007), both of which utilize verbal retrieval, elicit activity in language areas, including left hemisphere angular and inferior frontal regions (for review see Dehaene et al., 2003). Grabner et al. (2007) have shown that adults with higher mathematical competence have stronger activation of the left angular gyrus while solving multiplication problems, suggesting their stronger reliance on language-mediated processes for multiplication. Grabner et al. (2009) also showed stronger activation of the left angular gyrus while solving arithmetic problems for which participants reported using fact retrieval rather than procedural strategies.

\* Corresponding author at: Center for the Study of Learning, Georgetown University Medical Center, BOX 571406, Suite 150, Building D, 4000 Reservoir Road, NW, Washington, DC 20057, USA.

E-mail address: [edeng@georgetown.edu](mailto:edeng@georgetown.edu) (G.F. Eden).

These studies demonstrate an important role for left hemisphere language areas in specific aspects of arithmetic and dovetail with earlier behavioral studies, which have revealed a relationship between phonological awareness (i.e., the ability to isolate and manipulate the sounds of words) and computation of arithmetic problems solved through verbal fact retrieval (i.e., small addition and multiplication, which are more likely to be retrieved), but not subtraction and division problems, which are typically solved through procedural strategies. Studies in typically developing children have identified a relationship between phonological awareness and later mathematical skill development (Simmons and Singleton, 2008). For example, Hecht et al. (2001) found that phonological awareness from a range of measures (including phonological memory and the rate of access to phonological codes) was the best long-term predictor of mathematical competency (measured by untimed computation and timed small-digit arithmetic) in the later elementary school years. De Smedt et al. (2010) found a positive correlation in fifth graders between phonological awareness skills (measured by a phoneme elision task) and speed and accuracy on an arithmetic verification task (in which subjects determine whether an arithmetic problem is correct or incorrect). Importantly, this relationship was found to be specific to arithmetic problems likely to be solved through retrieval mechanisms, suggesting an important connection between phonological awareness and arithmetic fact retrieval.

These findings have led to the idea that developmental dyslexia, a reading disability characterized by core weakness in reading and phonological awareness, is concomitant with weaknesses in arithmetic (De Smedt and Boets, 2010; Simmons and Singleton, 2008). Developmental dyslexia is a common learning disability, neurobiological in origin, that is characterized by poor reading that cannot be accounted for by low intelligence (Lyon et al., 2003; Peterson and Pennington, 2012). It is marked by difficulties in recognizing and decoding single words, the latter thought to be due to a deficit in phonological awareness. Many students with dyslexia are also diagnosed with math disability, and incidence rates of deficits in both have been reported to be as high as 50% (Lewis et al., 1994). Further, candidate susceptibility genes for dyslexia (e.g., *ROBO1*) appear to contribute to not only dyslexia but also its correlated phenotypes like math difficulties (Mascheretti et al., 2014). Interestingly, even dyslexic children with scores in the normal range in mathematics (assessed via standardized tests) show subtle deficits in arithmetic performance (Simmons and Singleton, 2008). For example, they demonstrate decreased accuracy and increased reaction times compared to controls on multiplication problems typically solved via verbal fact retrieval strategy (Boets and De Smedt, 2010). Also, the characteristic ‘operation effect’ seen in typically developing children and adults (Barrouillet et al., 2008; Delazer et al., 2003), in which addition and multiplication problems are solved more quickly than subtraction and division problems, is absent in these struggling readers. Boets and De Smedt (2010) suggest that dyslexic children are unable to implement the same time-saving strategies of verbally retrieving arithmetic facts from memory that are characteristic of typically developing children.

Differences in arithmetic fact retrieval have also been found in adults with developmental dyslexia compared to typical readers (Simmons and Singleton, 2008). For example, dyslexic college students exhibit slower reaction times compared to age-matched controls in solving small addition and multiplication problems, with intact performance on subtraction and measures of basic numerical and spatial processing, including symbolic number comparison and mental rotation (Gobel and Snowling, 2010). Another study of dyslexia in young adults reported slower reaction times compared to controls when solving single-digit arithmetic problems (De Smedt and Boets, 2010). These researchers also found a significant correlation between phonological awareness skills and the frequency of reported use of retrieval strategies during arithmetic and argue that individuals with dyslexia, despite years of experience, have subtle behavioral deficits isolated to simple arithmetic processing attributed to their weaknesses in language-based skills, specifically phonological awareness.

Together, these behavioral findings demonstrate that retrieval-based arithmetic skills rely on mechanisms related to phonological awareness, and that individuals with reading disability (who typically have deficits in phonological awareness) exhibit a weakness in retrieval-based arithmetic even without meeting diagnostic criteria for math disability. These observations lead to the prediction that left hemisphere perisylvian brain regions are compromised in children with dyslexia during the solving of arithmetic problems via retrieval. While the neural basis for reading and phonological awareness has been studied extensively in dyslexia using brain imaging technology (Linkersdörfer et al., 2012; Maisog et al., 2008; Richlan et al., 2013), there have been no such investigations into arithmetic problem solving in dyslexia. Interestingly, Prado et al. (2011) demonstrated direct anatomical convergence for brain areas involved in multiplication of small numbers and phonological processing of single words in typical adults, suggesting a shared neural representation for this type of retrieval-based arithmetic and language processing involving the retrieval of phonological codes. These language areas seem to be underutilized by children with weaknesses in arithmetic fluency (De Smedt et al., 2011) but have not been previously studied in children with impaired reading such as in dyslexia. A better understanding of the neural representation of numerical processing in dyslexia is of theoretical importance, as it provides insights into the neural basis for dyslexia's behavioral manifestations (which includes some weaknesses in specific aspects of arithmetic even in the absence of a formal diagnosis of math disability) and potentially provides an explanation for why a diagnosis of math disability occurs more often in children who are diagnosed with dyslexia than those who are normal readers (Barbaresi et al., 2005; Katusic et al., 2001; Lewis et al., 1994).

Here, we examined the neural basis of single-digit addition and subtraction in children with pure developmental dyslexia (i.e., impaired single word reading and phonological awareness skills while maintaining normal performance on a standardized measure of calculation compared to age-matched typical readers). Based on prior work (Grabner et al., 2007, 2009; Prado et al., 2011), we expected that brain regions involved in retrieval-based arithmetic such as multiplication, e.g. left angular gyrus (AG), middle temporal gyrus (MTG), and inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), would be affected in children with dyslexia during other retrieval-based arithmetic (e.g. addition of small numbers), such as the left angular gyrus (AG), middle temporal gyrus (MTG), and inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), would be affected in children with dyslexia during other retrieval-based arithmetic (e.g. addition of small numbers). On the other hand, we predicted that right hemisphere parietal regions underlying nonverbal representation would not be affected in children with dyslexia when performing primarily procedural-based arithmetic (subtraction of small numbers). We used a factorial design to test for the effects of arithmetic operation (addition versus subtraction), diagnostic group (dyslexic versus non-dyslexic), and their interactions.

## Material and methods

### Subjects

The subjects were a subset of a group of children participating in a larger study on reading, reading disability, and reading development (Evans et al., 2013; Krafnick et al., 2011, 2014; Olulade et al., 2013a,b). Subjects with developmental dyslexia had a documented history of their reading disability, and most attended a school that specializes in the teaching of children with learning disabilities. To be included in this study, the dyslexic children had to have a standard score of less than 92 (30th percentile) on either real word or pseudoword reading accuracy. This cut-off is consistent with prior studies (Bruck, 1992; Krafnick et al., 2014; Olulade et al., 2013a) and ensured that we would have a continuum of skills when the dyslexics were combined with the non-dyslexics for later correlation analysis. Non-dyslexic control subjects were recruited from within the same geographic region in

the Washington DC metropolitan area and came from families with similar socio-economic backgrounds as the dyslexic group (for both groups the majority of parents had college degrees). The control subjects scored above 92 on both real word and pseudoword reading. All participants were monolingual English speakers and in good physical health. Subjects were included only if both their verbal and performance IQ scores on the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (Wechsler, 1999) were above a standard score of 80 and their performance on the Woodcock Johnson-III calculation subtest, which includes simple fact retrieval as well as more complex mathematical functions (Woodcock et al., 2001), was above a standard score of 92. Five subjects (three controls, two dyslexics) were excluded due to excessive head motion in the scanner (see the fMRI analysis section below), leaving 28 children (14 controls, 14 dyslexics) in the final analysis. Their behavioral data are provided in Table 1. The Georgetown University Institutional Review Board approved all experimental procedures, and informed consent was obtained from the legal guardian for all pediatric subjects, who themselves verbally assented. For their participation, the children received toy prizes and pictures of their brains from the MRI.

### Neuropsychological battery

All subjects were evaluated through standardized measures. We assessed verbal and performance IQ using the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI, Wechsler, 1999). The Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement III (W-J III, Woodcock et al., 2001) was used to assess single real word reading accuracy (word identification subtest), pseudoword reading accuracy (word attack subtest), and untimed computation (calculation subtest). Phonemic awareness skills were measured on the Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test, Third Edition (Lindamood, 2004).

Controls were matched to the dyslexic children on age, verbal IQ, and the calculation subtest of the W-J III. A match on verbal IQ (vocabulary and similarities subtests) allowed us to determine that any between-group differences on the retrieval-based arithmetic task were not attributable to general differences in verbal abilities, but rather specific reading-based skills such as phonemic awareness. As expected, the children with developmental dyslexia scored significantly lower ( $p < 0.01$ ) than controls on measures of single word reading, pseudoword reading, and phonemic awareness. The dyslexic sample on average had a pseudoword reading skill that was more than one standard deviation below their verbal IQ and a real word reading skill that was more than two standard deviations below their verbal IQ score. See Table 1 for details.

### fMRI task

All children performed single-digit calculation verification for both the addition and subtraction conditions. Both tasks consisted

**Table 1**

Behavioral scores for dyslexic and control children. Groups are matched for age, verbal IQ, and calculation (Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement III, W-J III). Dyslexics and controls differ significantly in performance IQ, pseudoword reading (W-J III Word Attack), real word reading (W-J III Word ID), and phonemic awareness (LAC-3). All scores are standardized scores. M = males, SD = standard deviation, Sig = significance of *t*-test, \* $p < 0.01$ , and ns = not significant.

	Dyslexics n = 14(7 M)		Controls n = 14(9 M)		Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Age	10.37	1.32	10.21	2.76	ns
Verbal IQ	111.3	10.78	118.79	14.52	ns
Performance IQ	98.93	8.70	113.36	11.43	*
Real word reading	81.93	6.81	117.86	11.00	*
Pseudoword reading	95.86	5.42	112.93	10.64	*
Phonemic awareness	99.36	8.50	113.79	11.25	*
Calculation	107.07	13.41	114.46	7.03	ns

of a two-operand equation and a single-digit resultant (e.g.,  $2 + 3 = 5$  or  $7 - 4 = 3$ ) similar to those used by Rivera et al. (2005). Subjects indicated via right or left thumb button press whether the resultant was correct or incorrect. For incorrect experimental stimuli, resultants differed from the correct answer by one (e.g.,  $2 + 3 = 6$ ). See Supplementary Table A for a full list of arithmetic problems used as experimental stimuli. Addition and subtraction were presented in alternating blocks within the same experimental run, interspersed with blocks of an active control task and rest (fixation). For the active control condition, one of the operands and the resultant in each equation were replaced by pseudofont characters, and subjects indicated whether these characters, which were located on either side of the equal sign, were the same (e.g.,  $1 - 5 = 1$ ) or different (e.g.,  $4 + 1 = 2$ ). The rest (fixation) condition required subjects to fixate on a central cross hair while “not focusing on any particular train of thought and staying relaxed.” Correct and incorrect arithmetic problems (50% correct, 50% incorrect) and same and different control problems (50% same, 50% different) were randomized within each block.

Accuracy and reaction time were collected while subjects performed the tasks in the scanner using the same software that was utilized in stimulus presentation (Presentation, Neurobehavioral Systems, Albany, CA). A  $2 \times 2$  (arithmetic operation  $\times$  diagnostic group) factorial analysis of variance was conducted with arithmetic operation (addition and subtraction) as a within-subjects factor and diagnostic group (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) as a between-subjects factor. For consistency with the imaging analysis, the difference between the arithmetic task (i.e. addition and subtraction) and the active control task was calculated for accuracy and reaction time.

### fMRI acquisition

A block design paradigm was utilized, with the run consisting of one block (42 s in duration) dedicated to each of the two arithmetic tasks and their respective active control tasks (i.e., addition, addition control, subtraction, and subtraction control). These four blocks alternated with five 18-second blocks of rest (fixation). There were an additional 6 s of fixation at the beginning of the run (to allow for saturation effects) and 3 s at the end, that were excluded from analysis. As such, the run was 4 min and 27 s in duration.

For each trial, stimuli were presented in black font on a white screen for 1200 ms, with a 3000-millisecond interval, during which a black fixation cross was presented. For the arithmetic tasks and their control conditions, this resulted in 10 trials per block for each run. With a TR of 3 s, this resulted in the acquisition of 14 whole-head EPI volumes for each 42-second block of addition, addition control, subtraction, and subtraction control. Subjects performed two such runs, with each run containing all condition types, and both runs were combined for the analysis, yielding 28 time points per condition. Scanning was performed using a 3.0 Tesla Siemens TIM Trio Magnetom scanner with the following acquisition parameters: TR = 3000 ms, TE = 30 ms,  $64 \times 64$  matrix, 192 mm FOV, 50 axial slices,  $3.0 \times 3.0 \times 2.8$  mm voxels. Structural 3-D T1 MPRAGES were acquired and used to co-register the functional data.

### fMRI analysis

Using SPM8 (SPM8, Wellcome Department of Cognitive Neurology, London), we modeled the hemodynamic response function using the general linear model during performance of the arithmetic operations of (1) addition and (2) subtraction, regressing out the global mean signal and 6 motion parameters (rotational: roll, pitch, yaw; translational: x, y, z) as parameters of no interest. As a conservative measure, reaction time difference (experimental minus control task) was also included as a regressor of no interest. Only subjects with less than 3 mm motion across function runs were included in the analysis. Contrast maps were generated for each subject with each arithmetic operation



contrasted to its active control condition (pseudofonts) and entered into a full factorial 2 (arithmetic operation)  $\times$  2 (diagnostic group) ANOVA with arithmetic operation (addition and subtraction) as a within-subjects factor and diagnostic group (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) as a between-subjects factor. F-maps were generated to test for main effects and interactions. Thresholds of  $p < 0.005$  (height) and minimum cluster size  $k > 30$  were implemented. For the interaction analysis, the average percent signal change was extracted from the significant cluster for each condition using MarsBar (Brett et al., 2002) to examine the direction of the response. All coordinates are reported using MNI convention. Using the SPM Anatomy Toolbox (Eickhoff et al., 2005, 2007), the location of the peak of the activations were also assigned to the most likely cytoarchitectonic area using the maximum probability map (MPM). The most relevant cytoarchitectonic maps for this study (for parietal cortex) come from Caspers et al. (2006) and Choi et al. (2006).

## Results

### Behavioral data

Measures of accuracy and reaction time for each arithmetic operation (addition and subtraction task) and for the difference between the arithmetic task and the active control task can be found in Table 2. Using the difference measures (arithmetic task minus the active control task) for accuracy, there was a significant main effect of arithmetic operation ( $F = 5.798$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), with addition problems solved more accurately than subtraction problems. There was no significant main effect of diagnostic group ( $F = 0.248$ ,  $p = 0.62$ ) or arithmetic operation  $\times$  diagnostic group interaction for accuracy. For reaction time difference, there was a significant main effect of arithmetic operation ( $F = 10.938$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), where addition problems were solved quicker than subtraction problems. There was no significant main effect of diagnostic group ( $F = 2.478$ ,  $p = 0.122$ ) or arithmetic operation  $\times$  diagnostic group interaction ( $F = 0.984$ ,  $p = 0.326$ ).

### fMRI data

#### Main effect of arithmetic operation

As can be seen in Table 3A and Fig. 1, when both groups were combined, a main effect of arithmetic operation (addition versus subtraction) was found in five clusters. For one of these regions, greater activation was seen for the addition task, and this was located in the left superior temporal gyrus (OP 1/BA 42). The four other regions elicited significantly greater activity during subtraction: one in the left

intraparietal sulcus (hIP1/BA 40), one in the right supramarginal gyrus of the inferior parietal lobe (PFt/BA 40), another in the right inferior parietal lobe with extensions into the intraparietal sulcus and superior parietal lobe (Area 2/BA 40), and the fourth in the anterior cingulate (BA 32).

#### Main effect of diagnostic group

When both arithmetic operations were combined, a main effect of diagnostic group (dyslexics versus controls) was found in only one region, namely the left supramarginal gyrus of the inferior parietal lobe, (PF/BA 40 – Table 3B). As can be seen in Fig. 2, activity in this region was higher in typically reading controls compared to dyslexic children (for addition and subtraction combined).

#### Diagnostic group $\times$ arithmetic operation interaction

One significant cluster emerged for the interaction of diagnostic group by arithmetic operation, and it was located in the right supramarginal gyrus of the inferior parietal lobe (PFm/BA 40 – Table 3C). The average percent signal change was extracted from this cluster to determine the nature of this interaction. As can be seen in Fig. 3, the controls engaged this region during subtraction but not during addition, resulting in a significant difference in the controls between these two conditions. However, the dyslexics did not show this dissociation, instead having equal activity for addition and subtraction. Therefore, a comparison between the dyslexic and control groups demonstrated less activity in this region for the dyslexics during subtraction and more activity during addition.

## Discussion

Performance on some mathematical tasks is impaired in children with dyslexia compared to non-dyslexic controls (Miles et al., 2001). This study investigated the hypothesis that retrieval-based arithmetic skills rely on left hemisphere language areas and are altered in children with dyslexia. First, we combined all children (dyslexics and controls) to examine the main effects for activity underlying two types of single-digit arithmetic: addition of small numbers, which is typically retrieval-based and is thought to rely on left hemisphere perisylvian regions, versus subtraction of small numbers, which is more procedural-based and thought to rely on bilateral parietal cortices. The results revealed, consistent with expectations, that the entire group utilized left superior temporal gyrus (BA 42) for addition and bilateral intraparietal sulcus (BA 40), right supramarginal gyrus (BA 40), and the anterior cingulate (BA 32) for subtraction. Next, for the main effect of diagnostic group, we found that children with dyslexia relative to controls exhibited hypoactivity in the left supramarginal gyrus (BA 40) during both arithmetic tasks combined. This result confirms our prediction of less activity in perisylvian brain areas that subserve language processes in children with dyslexia, even during arithmetic tasks. Finally, the interaction of arithmetic operation (addition, subtraction) and diagnostic group (dyslexics, controls) revealed a significant effect in the right supramarginal gyrus (BA 40). Here, controls showed greater activity for subtraction than addition, as expected. However, this differentiation was absent in the dyslexics (activity for both operations was equal). The dyslexics showed more activity here than controls for addition, and less activity than controls for subtraction, indicating an atypical and perhaps less optimal approach to solving arithmetic problems. These results are consistent with behavioral work in dyslexia, which has linked weaknesses in arithmetic to language deficits (De Smedt and Boets, 2010; Simmons and Singleton, 2008). Specifically, our finding of less activity in the left supramarginal gyrus in the dyslexic group during arithmetic processing provides support for this hypothesis. Further, our results are also consistent with the hypothesis that children with dyslexia may use less optimal procedural-based strategies when solving what are typically retrieval-based arithmetic tasks, such as addition for small numbers (Boets and De Smedt, 2010), as evidenced

**Table 2**

Means and standard deviation for percent accuracy and reaction time in milliseconds are given for the experimental tasks of addition and subtraction, their respective control tasks, and difference scores between the two (arithmetic task minus active control task) for both the dyslexic and the control groups. SD = standard deviation, Acc. = accuracy, and RT = reaction time.

		Dyslexics		Controls	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Addition</b>	Accuracy	93%	10%	93%	8.2%
	Reaction Time	1909 ms	455	1598 ms	500
<b>Control</b>	Accuracy	97%	5%	99%	2.9%
	Reaction Time	1214 ms	239	1176 ms	188
<b>Addition minus Control Acc.</b>		–4%	11%	–6%	8%
<b>Addition minus Control RT</b>		695 ms	342	423 ms	363
<b>Subtraction</b>	Accuracy	78%	17%	84%	23%
	Reaction Time	2158 ms	412	2103 ms	650
<b>Control</b>	Accuracy	96%	9%	96%	4.5%
	Reaction Time	1216 ms	234	1223 ms	205
<b>Subtraction minus Control Acc.</b>		–18%	17%	–12%	24%
<b>Subtraction minus Control RT</b>		941 ms	319	879 ms	533

**Table 3**  
Peak coordinates from factorial analysis of arithmetic operation, diagnostic group and interactions. All activation peaks were assigned to the most probable brain areas as indicated by the SPM Anatomy Toolbox (Eickhoff et al., 2005, 2007).

Macroanatomical location	Cytoanatomical location (Probability)	Brodmann's area	Peak MNI coordinates			Peak F statistic	Volume(voxels)
			x	y	z		
<b>A. Main effect of arithmetic operation</b>							
<i>Addition &gt; Subtraction</i>							
Left superior temporal gyrus	OP 1 (40%)	42	-52	-30	12	24.03	109
<i>Subtraction &gt; Addition</i>							
Right inferior/superior parietal lobe, intraparietal sulcus	Area 2 (40%)	40	36	-42	46	18.73	149
Right supramarginal gyrus	PFt (40%)	40	48	-34	48	16.03	82
Anterior cingulate		32	0	22	40	14.71	117
Left intraparietal sulcus	hIP1 (40%)	40	-38	-52	46	13.56	67
<b>B. Main effect of diagnostic group</b>							
<i>Controls &gt; Dyslexia</i>							
Left supramarginal gyrus	PF (70%)	40	-56	-40	34	15.37	36
<i>Dyslexia &gt; Controls</i>							
n.s.							
<b>C. Interaction: diagnostic Group × arithmetic operation</b>							
Right supramarginal gyrus	PFm (80%)	40	48	-46	52	11.48	69


by the atypical engagement of right inferior parietal cortex (SMG) for addition by the dyslexic group.

#### Main effect of activity underlying arithmetic operation: addition versus subtraction


A main effects analysis of arithmetic operation identified greater activation during addition relative to subtraction in the left superior temporal gyrus (STG). Reliance on the left STG for addition is in accordance with previous studies of addition reporting activity in the left STG and neighboring regions. For example, Zhou et al. (2007) found that adults activated left STG during multiplication. Other studies examining addition have reported task-related activity in nearby regions such as left angular and supramarginal gyri (Lee, 2000). Grabner

et al. (2009) identified the left angular gyrus as a locus for retrieval-based arithmetic. Our finding in the STG is consistent with these studies in that left temporal–parietal regions are known to subserve verbally mediated retrieval, including phonological processing, and are therefore candidate regions for being involved in retrieval-based arithmetic.

More activity for subtraction relative to addition was observed in bilateral inferior parietal cortices and bilateral intraparietal sulci extending into right superior parietal lobe in the dyslexics and controls combined. This observation is highly consistent with prior work on subtraction in typical readers, reflecting greater reliance on quantitative networks for subtraction compared to addition. For example, several studies in adults have shown activity in bilateral parietal cortices during subtraction (Chochon et al., 1999; Fehr et al., 2007; Lee, 2000), as did the



**Fig. 1.** Main effect of arithmetic operation. Displayed is a rendering of the main effect of arithmetic operation from the factorial analysis (addition > subtraction in blue, subtraction > addition in green). Bar chart display the percent signal change averaged across children with dyslexia and controls in addition (blue) and subtraction (green) conditions. Detailed results can be found in Table 3A. STG = superior temporal gyrus, IPL = inferior parietal lobe, IPS = intraparietal sulcus, SPL = superior parietal lobe, and SMG = supramarginal gyrus.




**Fig. 2.** Main effect of diagnostic group. Displayed is a rendering of the main effect of diagnostic group from the factorial analysis. Bar chart displays the percent signal change averaged across addition and subtraction conditions for children with dyslexia (yellow) and controls (red). Detailed results can be found in Table 3B.

only report on children, which showed activation in bilateral parietal cortices during subtraction relative to children in a forced choice single-digit arithmetic task (De Smedt et al., 2011). Our observation of greater reliance on the anterior cingulate (BA 32) for subtraction is consistent with studies on subtraction and arithmetic in general (Arsalidou and Taylor, 2011), and attributed to heightened task demand (Gruber et al., 2001), reflecting engagement of executive control.

*Main effects of activity related to diagnostic group: dyslexics versus controls*

The main effects analysis of diagnostic group revealed that the dyslexic group showed less activity during arithmetic performance (addition and subtraction combined) in the left supramarginal gyrus (BA 40). Rivera et al. (2005) identified age-related increases in left SMG activity during a similar calculation task (addition and subtraction were combined in this study), indicating that our children with dyslexia



**Fig. 3.** Diagnostic group × arithmetic operation effect. Displayed is a rendering of (diagnostic group × arithmetic operation) interaction from the factorial analysis. Bar chart displays the percent signal change in typically developing controls and in children with dyslexia for addition (blue) and subtraction (green) conditions. Detailed results can be found in Table 3C.

may be exhibiting a neural profile characteristic of younger typically developing children. Our results also fit well with the recent observation that white matter integrity in left hemisphere fronto-parietal tracts (i.e. the arcuate fasciculus) is associated with children's arithmetic competence for problems solved via fact retrieval (that is for addition and multiplication, but not subtraction; Van Beek et al., 2013). Further, this correlation disappears when decoding skills are controlled for, suggesting yet again that this relationship is driven by phonological processing abilities.

Importantly, the left SMG has been an area of long-standing interest in dyslexia. Previous work has implicated the left SMG in skilled reading (Jobard et al., 2003), and its role in reading has been attributed to phonological processing (He et al., 2013; Sliwinska et al., 2012; for review see Price, 2012). Studies contrasting dyslexics and non-dyslexic children have shown the left SMG to be hypoactive in dyslexics during reading and reading-related tasks, as illustrated by a recent meta-analysis across a number of investigations (Richlan et al., 2011). This same area also contains relatively less gray matter volume in dyslexics versus non-dyslexics (adults and children combined), as again demonstrated by a meta-analytic approach (Linkersdörfer et al., 2012). Our findings demonstrate that underactivity here on the part of the dyslexics is not limited to tasks involving phonological processing, but also occurs during verbally-mediated arithmetic processing. Given the key role of this region in reading and phonological processing and the dyslexics' weakness in these areas, our results of underactivation of the left SMG during arithmetic provide further evidence for verbal representations in the "triple-code model" (Dehaene, 1992; Dehaene and Cohen, 1995; Dehaene et al., 2003), and support the theory that language skills (most likely phonological awareness skills, as these are the core deficit in dyslexia) play a key role in arithmetic processing. To test this post hoc, we extracted the fMRI signal from the left SMG cluster using MarsBar (Brett et al., 2002) for both the addition and the subtraction operation, and conducted a correlation analysis with these and all of the subjects' phonemic awareness standardized scores attained using the Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test, Third Edition. We found a significant positive correlation for addition ( $p = 0.00514$ ) but not subtraction ( $p = 0.3778$ ), in support of the previously described role of phonemic awareness skills in retrieval-based arithmetic (De Smedt et al., 2010; Hecht et al., 2001). Also, the locus of the left SMG can be tied to prior studies, as it is near the angular gyrus, previously reported to be modulated in activity during arithmetic problem solving based on individual differences in ability and interpreted to indicate reliance on language-mediated processes (Grabner et al., 2007).

#### *Interaction of arithmetic operation and diagnostic group*

We expected an interaction between diagnostic group and arithmetic operation in left hemisphere language areas, specifically less activity here in the dyslexics during addition. Instead, the interaction analysis revealed an effect in the right supramarginal gyrus of the inferior parietal lobe (BA 40), where the control group showed activity for subtraction but not for addition, consistent with prior reports of right parietal cortex involvement in operations such as subtraction that rely to a greater extent on procedural strategy (De Smedt et al., 2011). The dyslexic group, however, demonstrated equal activity underlying addition and subtraction in this region, relying on right IPL for both subtraction and addition, thus suggesting utilization of the same quantitative strategy for both operations. This finding is consistent with behavioral work by Boets and De Smedt (2010); De Smedt and Boets (2010), who observed similar reaction times for both operations in dyslexics instead of the faster reaction time observed for addition versus subtraction seen in typical readers (Barrouillet et al., 2008; Delazer et al., 2003). They concluded that the retrieval-based strategies that are more time-efficient were not available to the dyslexics, forcing them to utilize more time-consuming quantitative means, thereby employing similar strategies across both operations. Our imaging results provide

direct evidence for this hypothesis by showing equal activity in right IPL for both arithmetic operations in the dyslexics instead of reserving it for the procedural-based calculation task only, as seen in typical readers. This less efficient strategy for addition is likely fostered by limitations in retrieval-based processes in other brain regions, such as the left SMG, which revealed hypoactivity in the dyslexics during arithmetic in the main effects analysis for diagnostic group.

Of note is the interesting resemblance between our results and those of De Smedt et al. (2011) in their neuroimaging study of children with typical versus low levels of arithmetical fluency when solving small (e.g.,  $5 + 2$ ) and large (e.g.,  $8 + 7$ ) arithmetic problems. Similarly, as reported here for the dyslexics, children with poor arithmetic fluency showed equal activity in right parietal cortex for large and small problems, while the children with better arithmetic fluency engage this area only during the larger (more procedurally demanding) problems, much like our controls. Our findings therefore integrate and confirm the predictions made by this earlier behavioral (Boets and De Smedt, 2010) and neuroimaging (De Smedt et al., 2011) work. They also fit well with the observation that greater activity during calculation in the left SMG, associated with arithmetic fact retrieval, is positively correlated with higher Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test math subtest scores in high school seniors, whereas higher activity right intraparietal sulcus, an area associated with quantity processing mechanisms, is correlated with lower scores, suggesting that right parietal activation during simple arithmetic is associated with non-optimal math development (Price et al., 2013).

Of note is also the lower activity in the dyslexic children in the right IPL during subtraction relative to controls. This pattern is similar to the profile seen in children with math disability (MD) described by Ashkenazi et al. (2012), who identified reduced activity in MD children solving complex arithmetic problems in right superior and inferior parietal lobes. This result suggests that children with dyslexia also exhibit atypical activity in brain regions outside of the language network, which is worthy of further investigation.

#### *Implications for dyslexia*

This work is consistent with the theory that, while showing no measurable deficits on standardized measures of mathematics, children with dyslexia may exhibit subtle impairments in arithmetic skills. Here, we show that arithmetic takes on a different neural profile in dyslexics compared to non-dyslexics in left hemisphere language areas, as well as right hemisphere quantity computational areas. This raises the question whether interventions in phonological awareness that have been shown to be effective in improving reading skills in dyslexic children transfer to improvements in retrieval-based arithmetic. It is worth noting that the dyslexic children in our study were not severely impaired on phonological awareness and decoding as is typically reported for dyslexia (even though their performance was significantly lower than that of the controls), raising the possibility that a more impaired population would show even more pronounced differences for the neural bases of retrieval-based arithmetic than those reported here.

#### *Implications for math disability (dyscalculia)*

While the study was conducted in children who would not meet the criteria for MD, our results might provide insight into why children with dyslexia are more prone to MD than non-dyslexic children. Children with MD (also referred to as developmental dyscalculia) show a core deficit in comprehending numerosities (for review, see Butterworth et al., 2011) and have impairments in basic number processing tasks (Landerl et al., 2004). Neuroimaging research indicates that children with dyscalculia show less activation than typically developing controls in bilateral intraparietal sulci during tasks of magnitude comparison (Mussolin et al., 2010; Price et al., 2007) and approximate calculation (Kucian et al., 2006). However, no group differences emerge during



exact calculation of simple addition problems (Kucian et al., 2006). Anatomical studies have shown reduced gray matter volume in bilateral intraparietal sulcus in dyscalculia (Isaacs et al., 2001; Rotzer et al., 2008; Rykhlevskaia et al., 2009). A topic of much debate has been whether the math disability seen in children with reading disability (MD + RD combined) is the same as that seen in non-dyslexic children or if it is different, possibly driven by the same issues that cause their reading problems. As recently described by Willcutt et al. (2013), there are several theories that could explain combined reading and math disability (MD + RD): (i) a disorder that is completely independent of MD and RD alone; (ii) a disorder that shares the etiology for reading problems with RD alone, but the math difficulties are a consequence of the reading problems and not the same as the number sense deficits seen in MD alone; (iii) a partially shared etiology yet, at the same time, a separate etiology that accounts for the different manifestations; or (iv) a mostly shared etiology for MD, RD, and MD + RD, but the three can present as alternate manifestations (leading to differential diagnosis) despite generally similar profiles. Willcutt et al. (2013) favors this last model based on behavioral studies of MD + RD, consistent with the position of Branum-Martin et al. (2013), who found via modeling that profiles of children in all three categories are similar and that they do not represent distinct groups, even though they can be made to appear as such when using cut-offs. They propose that a dimensional approach must be used when considering these disabilities. Consistent with this position are the findings described in the introduction that children and adults with RD, despite being categorized as “normal” on math using standardized tests, display significant problems in specific aspects of math (Boets and De Smedt, 2010; De Smedt and Boets, 2010; Gobel and Snowling, 2010). This is further supported by our results showing that, in dyslexia, there are alterations in brain systems that subserve arithmetic even in the absence of a diagnosis of MD. Neurobiological models for MD + RD have been discussed (Ashkenazi et al., 2013), and future studies employing functional brain imaging in children with MD + RD will be able to address this and other hypotheses.

## Conclusion

In sum, this study provides a neural account for the behavioral deficits observed during arithmetic in children with reading disability, even if they do not manifest in significant and clinically meaningful impairment in calculation as determined by commonly used achievement tests. Children with dyslexia demonstrated underactivation of the left supramarginal gyrus during addition and subtraction problem solving, and they showed a lack of differentiation of arithmetic operation in the right inferior parietal lobe compared to their typically reading peers. This work has implications for remediation strategies for mathematics in dyslexic students and potential insights into math disability in children with reading disability.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.07.028>.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (P50HD40095 and R01HD05610701) and the National Science Foundation (SBE0541953 Science of Learning Center). We are grateful to the staff at the Center for Functional and Molecular Imaging, and the support of the Intellectual and Developmental Disorders Research Center (IDDR5P30HD040677-13). We thank each of our participants for their time and the families and staff at the Jemicy School in MD for supporting this project. We are also grateful to the following for aiding in the acquisition of behavioral and MRI data: Emma Cole, Gina Smith, Iain DeWitt, Megan Luetje, Robert Twomey, Alison Merikangas, Ashley Wall-Piche, Corinna Moore, Emily Curran and

Jenni Rosenberg. We also thank Diana Alkire for editing the manuscript and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

## References

- Arsalidou, M., Taylor, M.J., 2011. Is  $2 + 2 = 4$ ? Meta-analyses of brain areas needed for numbers and calculations. *NeuroImage* 54, 2382–2393.
- Ashkenazi, S., Rosenberg-Lee, M., Tenison, C., Menon, V., 2012. Weak task-related modulation and stimulus representations during arithmetic problem solving in children with developmental dyscalculia. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* 2 (Suppl. 1), S152–S166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2011.09.006>.
- Ashkenazi, S., Black, J.M., Abrams, D.A., Hoeft, F., Menon, V., 2013. Neurobiological underpinnings of math and reading learning disabilities. *J. Learn. Disabil.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022219413483174>.
- Barbareis, W.J., Katusic, S.K., Colligan, R.C., Weaver, A.L., Jacobsen, S.J., 2005. Math learning disorder: incidence in a population-based birth cohort, 1976–82, Rochester, Minn. *Ambul. Pediatr.* 5 (5), 281–289.
- Barrouillet, P., Mignon, M., Thevenot, C., 2008. Strategies in subtraction problem solving in children. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* 99 (4), 233–251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2007.12.001>.
- Boets, B., De Smedt, B., 2010. Single-digit arithmetic in children with dyslexia. *Dyslexia (Chichester, England)* 16 (2), 183–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dys.403>.
- Branum-Martin, L., Fletcher, J.M., Stuebing, K.K., 2013. Classification and identification of reading and math disabilities: the special case of comorbidity. *J. Learn. Disabil.* 46 (6), 490–499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022219412468767>.
- Brett, M., Anton, J.-L., Valabregue, R., Poline, J.-B., 2002. Region of interest analysis using an SPM toolbox. Presented at the Human Brain Mapping Meeting, Sendai, Japan.
- Bruck, M., 1992. Persistence of dyslexics' phonological awareness deficits. *Dev. Psychol.* 28 (5), 874–886. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.28.5.874>.
- Butterworth, B., Varma, S., Laurillard, D., 2011. Dyscalculia: from brain to education. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 332 (6033), 1049–1053. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1201536>.
- Caspers, S., Geyer, S., Schleicher, A., Mohlberg, H., Amunts, K., Zilles, K., 2006. The human inferior parietal cortex: cytoarchitectonic parcellation and interindividual variability. *Neuroimage* 33 (2), 430–448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.06.054>.
- Chochon, F., Cohen, L., van de Moortele, P.F., Dehaene, S., 1999. Differential contributions of the left and right inferior parietal lobules to number processing. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 11 (6), 617–630.
- Choi, H.-J., Zilles, K., Mohlberg, H., Schleicher, A., Fink, G.R., Armstrong, E., Amunts, K., 2006. Cytoarchitectonic identification and probabilistic mapping of two distinct areas within the anterior ventral bank of the human intraparietal sulcus. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 495 (1), 53–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cne.20849>.
- De Smedt, B., Boets, B., 2010. Phonological processing and arithmetic fact retrieval: evidence from developmental dyslexia. *Neuropsychologia* 48 (14), 3973–3981. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.10.018>.
- De Smedt, B., Taylor, J., Archibald, L., Ansari, D., 2010. How is phonological processing related to individual differences in children's arithmetic skills? *Dev. Sci.* 13 (3), 508–520. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00897.x>.
- De Smedt, B., Holloway, I.D., Ansari, D., 2011. Effects of problem size and arithmetic operation on brain activation during calculation in children with varying levels of arithmetical fluency. *Neuroimage* 57 (3), 771–781. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.12.037>.
- Dehaene, S., 1992. Varieties of numerical abilities. *Cognition* 44 (1–2), 1–42.
- Dehaene, S., Cohen, L., 1995. Towards an anatomical and functional model of number processing. *Math. Cogn.* 1, 83–120.
- Dehaene, S., Spelke, E., Pinel, P., Stanescu, R., Tsivkin, S., 1999. Sources of mathematical thinking: behavioral and brain-imaging evidence. *Science* 284 (5416), 970–974. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5416.970>.
- Dehaene, S., Piazza, M., Pinel, P., Cohen, L., 2003. Three parietal circuits for number processing. *Cogn. Neuropsychol.* 20 (3), 487–506. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02643290244000239>.
- Delazer, M., Girelli, L., Granà, A., Domahs, F., 2003. Number processing and calculation—normative data from healthy adults. *Clin. Neuropsychol.* 17 (3), 331–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/clin.17.3.331.18092>.
- Eickhoff, S.B., Stephan, K.E., Mohlberg, H., Grefkes, C., Fink, G.R., Amunts, K., Zilles, K., 2005. A new SPM toolbox for combining probabilistic cytoarchitectonic maps and functional imaging data. *Neuroimage* 25 (4), 1325–1335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.12.034>.
- Eickhoff, S.B., Paus, T., Caspers, S., Grosbras, M.-H., Evans, A.C., Zilles, K., Amunts, K., 2007. Assignment of functional activations to probabilistic cytoarchitectonic areas revisited. *Neuroimage* 36 (3), 511–521. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.03.060>.
- Evans, T.M., Flowers, D.L., Napoliello, E.M., Eden, G.F., 2013. Sex-specific gray matter volume differences in females with developmental dyslexia. *Brain Struct. Funct.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00429-013-0552-4>.
- Fehr, T., Code, C., Herrmann, M., 2007. Common brain regions underlying different arithmetic operations as revealed by conjunct fMRI-BOLD activation. *Brain Res.* 1172, 93–102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2007.07.043>.
- Gobel, S.M., Snowling, M.J., 2010. Number-processing skills in adults with dyslexia. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.* 63 (7), 1361–1373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17470210903359206> (2006).
- Grabner, R.H., Ansari, D., Reishofer, G., Stern, E., Ebner, F., Neuper, C., 2007. Individual differences in mathematical competence predict parietal brain activation during mental calculation. *Neuroimage* 38 (2), 346–356. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.07.041>.



- Grabner, R.H., Ansari, D., Koschutnig, K., Reishofer, G., Ebner, F., Neuper, C., 2009. To retrieve or to calculate? Left angular gyrus mediates the retrieval of arithmetic facts during problem solving. *Neuropsychologia* 47 (2), 604–608. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.10.013>.
- Gruber, O., Indefrey, P., Steinmetz, H., Kleinschmidt, A., 2001. Dissociating neural correlates of cognitive components in mental calculation. *Cereb. Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)* 11 (4), 350–359.
- He, Q., Xue, G., Chen, C., Chen, C., Lu, Z.-L., Dong, Q., 2013. Decoding the neuroanatomical basis of reading ability: a multivoxel morphometric study. *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.* 33 (31), 12835–12843. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0449-13.2013>.
- Hecht, S.A., Torgesen, J.K., Wagner, R.K., Rashotte, C.A., 2001. The relations between phonological processing abilities and emerging individual differences in mathematical computation skills: a longitudinal study from second to fifth grades. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* 79 (2), 192–227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jecp.2000.2586>.
- Isaacs, E.B., Edmonds, C.J., Lucas, A., Gadian, D.G., 2001. Calculation difficulties in children of very low birthweight: a neural correlate. *Brain J. Neurol.* 124 (Pt 9), 1701–1707.
- Jobard, G., Crivello, F., Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., 2003. Evaluation of the dual route theory of reading: a metanalysis of 35 neuroimaging studies. *Neuroimage* 20 (2), 693–712. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119\(03\)00343-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00343-4).
- Katusic, S.K., Colligan, R.C., Barbarese, W.J., Schaid, D.J., Jacobsen, S.J., 2001. Incidence of reading disability in a population-based birth cohort, 1976–1982, Rochester, Minn. *Mayo Clin. Proc. Mayo Clin.* 76 (11), 1081–1092. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4065/76.11.1081>.
- Krafnick, A.J., Flowers, D.L., Napoliello, E.M., Eden, G.F., 2011. Gray matter volume changes following reading intervention in dyslexic children. *Neuroimage* 57 (3), 733–741. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.10.062>.
- Krafnick, A.J., Flowers, D.L., Luetje, M.M., Napoliello, E.M., Eden, G.F., 2014. An investigation into the origin of anatomical differences in dyslexia. *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.* 34 (3), 901–908. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2092-13.2013>.
- Kucian, K., Loenneker, T., Dietrich, T., Dosch, M., Martin, E., von Aster, M., 2006. Impaired neural networks for approximate calculation in dyscalculic children: a functional MRI study. *Behav. Brain Funct.* 2, 31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1744-9081-2-31>.
- Landerl, K., Bevan, A., Butterworth, B., 2004. Developmental dyscalculia and basic numerical capacities: a study of 8–9-year-old students. *Cognition* 93 (2), 99–125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2003.11.004>.
- Lee, K.M., 2000. Cortical areas differentially involved in multiplication and subtraction: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study and correlation with a case of selective acalculia. *Ann. Neurol.* 48 (4), 657–661.
- Lewis, C., Hitch, G.J., Walker, P., 1994. The prevalence of specific arithmetic difficulties and specific reading difficulties in 9- to 10-year-old boys and girls. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry Allied Discip.* 35 (2), 283–292.
- Lindamood, P.C., 2004. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test: Examiners Manual. Pro-Ed.
- Linkersdörfer, J., Lonnemann, J., Lindberg, S., Hasselhorn, M., Fiebach, C.J., 2012. Grey matter alterations co-localize with functional abnormalities in developmental dyslexia: an ALE meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 7 (8), e43122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043122>.
- Lyon, G., Shaywitz, S., Shaywitz, B., 2003. A definition of dyslexia. *Ann. Dyslexia* 53 (1), 1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11881-003-0001-9>.
- Maisog, J.M., Einbinder, E.R., Flowers, D.L., Turkeltaub, P.E., Eden, G.F., 2008. A meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of dyslexia. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1145, 237–259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1196/annals.1416.024>.
- Mascheretti, S., Riva, V., Giorda, R., Beri, S., Lanzoni, L.F.E., Cellino, M.R., Marino, C., 2014. KIAA0319 and ROBO1: evidence on association with reading and pleiotropic effects on language and mathematics abilities in developmental dyslexia. *J. Hum. Genet.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/jhg.2013.141>.
- Menon, V., 2010. Developmental cognitive neuroscience of arithmetic: implications for learning and education. *ZDM Int. J. Math. Educ.* 42 (6), 515–525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11858-010-0242-0>.
- Miles, T.R., Haslum, M.N., Wheeler, T.J., 2001. The mathematical abilities of dyslexic 10-year-olds. *Ann. Dyslexia* 51 (1), 299–321. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11881-001-0015-0>.
- Mussolin, C., De Volder, A., Grandin, C., Schlögel, X., Nassogne, M.-C., Noël, M.-P., 2010. Neural correlates of symbolic number comparison in developmental dyscalculia. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 22 (5), 860–874. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21237>.
- Nieder, A., Dehaene, S., 2009. Representation of number in the brain. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 32, 185–208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.051508.135550>.
- Olulade, O.A., Flowers, D.L., Napoliello, E.M., Eden, G.F., 2013a. Developmental differences for word processing in the ventral stream. *Brain Lang.* 125 (2), 134–145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2012.04.003>.
- Olulade, O.A., Napoliello, E.M., Eden, G.F., 2013b. Abnormal visual motion processing is not a cause of dyslexia. *Neuron* 79 (1), 180–190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.05.002>.
- Peterson, R.L., Pennington, B.F., 2012. Developmental dyslexia. *Lancet* 379 (9830), 1997–2007. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60198-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60198-6).
- Prado, J., Mutreja, R., Zhang, H., Mehta, R., Desroches, A.S., Minas, J.E., Booth, J.R., 2011. Distinct representations of subtraction and multiplication in the neural systems for numerosity and language. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 32 (11), 1932–1947. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21159>.
- Price, C.J., 2012. A review and synthesis of the first 20 years of PET and fMRI studies of heard speech, spoken language and reading. *Neuroimage* 62 (2), 816–847. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.04.062>.
- Price, G.R., Holloway, I., Räsänen, P., Vesterinen, M., Ansari, D., 2007. Impaired parietal magnitude processing in developmental dyscalculia. *Curr. Biol.* 17 (24), R1042–R1043. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.10.013>.
- Price, G.R., Mazzocco, M.M.M., Ansari, D., 2013. Why mental arithmetic counts: brain activation during single digit arithmetic predicts high school math scores. *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.* 33 (1), 156–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2936-12.2013>.
- Richlan, F., Kronbichler, M., Wimmer, H., 2011. Meta-analyzing brain dysfunctions in dyslexic children and adults. *Neuroimage* 56 (3), 1735–1742. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.02.040>.
- Richlan, F., Kronbichler, M., Wimmer, H., 2013. Structural abnormalities in the dyslexic brain: a meta-analysis of voxel-based morphometry studies. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 34 (11), 3055–3065. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22127>.
- Rivera, S.M., Reiss, A.L., Eckert, M.A., Menon, V., 2005. Developmental changes in mental arithmetic: evidence for increased functional specialization in the left inferior parietal cortex. *Cereb. Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)* 15 (11), 1779–1790. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhi055>.
- Rosenberg-Lee, M., Chang, T.T., Young, C.B., Wu, S., Menon, V., 2011. Functional dissociations between four basic arithmetic operations in the human posterior parietal cortex: a cytoarchitectonic mapping study. *Neuropsychologia* 49 (9), 2592–2608. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.04.035>.
- Rotzer, S., Kucian, K., Martin, E., von Aster, M., Klaver, P., Loenneker, T., 2008. Optimized voxel-based morphometry in children with developmental dyscalculia. *Neuroimage* 39 (1), 417–422. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.08.045>.
- Rykhlevskaia, E., Uddin, L.Q., Kondos, L., Menon, V., 2009. Neuroanatomical correlates of developmental dyscalculia: combined evidence from morphometry and tractography. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 3, 51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.09.051.2009>.
- Simmons, F.R., Singleton, C., 2008. Do weak phonological representations impact on arithmetic development? A review of research into arithmetic and dyslexia. *Dyslexia (Chichester, England)* 14 (2), 77–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dys.341>.
- Sliwinska, M.W., Khadilkar, M., Campbell-Ratcliffe, J., Quevenco, F., Devlin, J.T., 2012. Early and sustained supramarginal gyrus contributions to phonological processing. *Front. Psychol.* 3, 161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00161>.
- Van Beek, L., Ghesquière, P., Lagae, L., De Smedt, B., 2013. Left fronto-parietal white matter correlates with individual differences in children's ability to solve additions and multiplications: A tractography study. *Neuroimage*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.12.030>.
- Wechsler, D., 1999. Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence. Psychological Corporation.
- Willcutt, E.G., Petrill, S.A., Wu, S., Boada, R., Defries, J.C., Olson, R.K., Pennington, B.F., 2013. Comorbidity between reading disability and math disability: concurrent psychopathology, functional impairment, and neuropsychological functioning. *J. Learn. Disabil.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022219413477476>.
- Woodcock, R.W., McGrew, K.S., Mather, N., 2001. Woodcock–Johnson tests of achievement. Riverside Publishing, Itasca, IL.
- Zhou, X., Chen, C., Zang, Y., Dong, Q., Chen, C., Qiao, S., Gong, Q., 2007. Dissociated brain organization for single-digit addition and multiplication. *Neuroimage* 35 (2), 871–880. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.12.017>.