

**Neural correlates of visual vs. abstract letter processing in
Roman and Arabic scripts**

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | JOCN-2013-0007.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | n/a |
| Complete List of Authors: | Carreiras, Manuel; BCBL, Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language, Perea, Manuel; University of Valencia, Gil, Cristina; BCBL, Mallouh, Reem; BCBL, Salillas, Elena; BCBL, |
| Keywords: | Event related potentials, Linguistics: Lexicon |
| | |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Neural correlates of visual vs. abstract letter processing in Roman and Arabic scripts
10
11
12
13
14

15 Manuel Carreiras^{1,2}, Manuel Perea³, Cristina Gil-López¹, Reem Abu Mallouh¹, and
16
17 Elena Salillas¹
18
19
20
21

22¹ Basque Center for Cognition, Brain, and Language, Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain
23
24

25² IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain
26
27

28³ ERI-Lectura, Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain
29
30
31
32

33 Running Head: Correlates of letter representations
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Address for correspondence:
44
45

46 Manuel Carreiras
47

48 Basque Center on Cognition, Brain, and Language
49

50 Paseo Mikeletegi, 69
51

52 20009- Donostia-San Sebastián (Spain)
53
54

55 email: m.carreiras@bcbl.eu
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5 In alphabetic orthographies, letter identification is a critical process during the
6
7 recognition of visually presented words. In the present experiment, we examined
8
9 whether and when visual form influences letter processing in two very distinct
10
11 alphabets (Roman and Arabic). Disentangling visual vs. abstract letter representations
12
13 was possible because letters in the Roman alphabet may look visually similar/dissimilar
14
15 in lowercase and uppercase forms (e.g., c-C vs. r-R) and letters in the Arabic alphabet
16
17 may look visually similar/dissimilar depending on their position within a word (e.g., فـ
18
19 - ف vs. ع - ع). We employed a masked priming same-different matching task while
20
21 ERPs were measured from individuals who had learned the two alphabets at an early
22
23 age. Results revealed a prime-target relatedness effect dependent on visual form in
24
25 early components (P/N150) and a more abstract relatedness effect in a later
26
27 component (P300). Importantly, the pattern of data was remarkably similar in the two
28
29 alphabets. Thus, these data offer empirical support for a universal (i.e., across
30
31 alphabets) hierarchical account of letter processing in which the time course of letter
32
33 processing in different scripts follows a similar trajectory from visual features to visual
34
35 form independent of abstract representations.
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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Letter identification is a fundamental part of the process of lexical access in
8
9 alphabetic orthographies. Learning to read involves a thorough training in which the
10
11 cognitive system associates a common (abstract) representation to the different visual
12
13 forms in which a letter is presented (i.e., d, **D**, *d*, or D would correspond to the abstract
14
15 letter unit “d”). Indeed, a basic assumption of neural accounts of letter and word
16
17 recognition (e.g., Dehaene, Cohen, Sigman, & Vinckier, 2005; Grainger, Rey, & Dufau,
18
19 2008; Whitney, 2001) is that letters are initially processed by detectors at a retinotopic
20
21 level: visually different letters across case like “g” and “G” would activate different
22
23 letter detectors, whereas visually similar letters across case like “c” and “C” would
24
25 activate the same detectors. Later in processing, the letters would be processed at an
26
27 abstract level (i.e., invariant to visual factors) so that visually different letters across
28
29 case like “g” and “G” would also activate the same letter detectors.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 To track the time course of visual vs. abstract representations of letters, an
37
38 excellent approach is to employ a technique that taps into the early stages of
39
40 processing such as masked priming (Forster & Davis, 1984; see Grainger, 2008, for
41
42 review) while event related potentials (ERPs) are being recorded. Empirical evidence
43
44 using masked priming with behavioral measures does suggest that there is fast access
45
46 to abstract letter representations. For the sake of simplicity, we will focus on the
47
48 masked priming same-different matching task, which is the task employed in the
49
50 present experiment (see Carreiras, Perea, & Abu Mallouh, 2012, for a review of the
51
52 literature on masked letter priming with other tasks). The typical setup of this task is
53
54 the following: a probe is initially presented for 1 sec., after which the target item is
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preceded by a forwardly-masked 50-ms prime. The participant's task is to decide
4
5 whether or not the target is the same as the probe (see Figure 1 for a depiction of the
6
7 task). For "same" probe-target trials, Kinoshita and Kaplan (2008) found masked
8
9 repetition priming effects of comparable magnitude for prime-target pairs that had
10
11 similar and dissimilar visual features across case (e.g., c-C and g-G). Using a
12
13 task/design parallel to that of Kinoshita and Kaplan (2008), Carreiras, Perea, and Abu
14
15 Mallouh (2012) found a similar masked repetition effect in an intricate script, Arabic.
16
17 Arabic does not have the lowercase/uppercase distinction. Instead, the shape of the
18
19 letters in Arabic may vary depending on the position in the word (initial, middle, final,
20
21 isolated; see Carreiras et al., 2012, for further details). Specifically, some of the letters
22
23 look visually dissimilar in the different word positions (e.g., ع and ع correspond to
24
25 the letter 'ayn), while others look visually similar (e.g., ف and ف correspond to the
26
27 letter fā'). Carreiras et al. found that the magnitude of the masked repetition priming
28
29 effect was equivalent for letter pairs with similar visual features across word position
30
31 and for letter pairs with dissimilar visual features across word position. Taken together,
32
33 these experiments have shown that: i) the cognitive system quickly converts a letter's
34
35 visual codes into abstract codes; and ii) this process occurs in very different
36
37 orthographies (see also Bowers, Vigliocco, & Haan, 1998; Perea, Abu Mallouh, &
38
39 Carreiras, in press, for behavioral evidence of fast activation of abstract codes using
40
41 masked priming with words in English and Arabic, respectively).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 One obvious limitation of behavioral experiments on letter recognition is that
52
53 early temporal differences in the visual processing of letters may not be reflected in
54
55 response times. Bear in mind that pairs of visually similar letters like "c" and "C" may
56
57 produce greater relatedness effects early in processing (at perceptual, retinotopic
58
59
60

1
2
3 level) than pairs of visually dissimilar letters like “g” and “G”, but this may be hidden by
4
5 a similar activation later in processing (at a more abstract level). To investigate in detail
6
7 the time course of letter perception and thus to disentangle (potential) early effects of
8
9 visual letter form and later effects of abstract letter identities, the best strategy is to
10
11 obtain an online measure of letter processing. One such option is to record event
12
13 related potentials or ERPs –these are voltage changes recorded from the scalp and
14
15 extracted from the background EEG by averaging time-locked responses to stimuli
16
17 onset.
18
19

20
21 To our knowledge, there is only one published experiment on the time course
22
23 of letter processing that combined masked priming with ERP recordings. Petit, Midgley,
24
25 Holcomb, and Grainger (2006) presented single-letter targets that had been preceded
26
27 by a briefly masked letter prime –they used the 26 letters in the Roman alphabet. Petit
28
29 et al. manipulated the name and case consistency across primes and targets and also
30
31 examined whether letters had uppercase and lowercase forms with similar or
32
33 dissimilar features. No explicit task was required from the participants in each trial but
34
35 every six trials on average, the trial sequence was followed by a “recall” signal (“?”)
36
37 and participants had to press the key corresponding to the target letter they had just
38
39 seen. Petit et al. found an effect of prime–target visual similarity between 120 and 180
40
41 ms. Given that visual similarity was confounded with differences in name and case,
42
43 they contrasted prime–target letter pairs of the same name conducting an analysis as a
44
45 function of the similarity of the uppercase and lowercase versions of the letters and
46
47 found that the P150 component was larger for dissimilar letters. Petit et al. also
48
49 reported an interaction between case and name consistency, which they interpreted
50
51 as an effect of case-specific letter identity between 180 and 220 ms, although no
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analyses were reported concerning the visual similarity between lowercase and
4
5 uppercase versions of the same letter in this time window. Finally, they found an effect
6
7 of case-independent letter identity between 220 and 300 ms. Petit et al. discussed
8
9 their data as supporting a hierarchical account of letter recognition that involves both
10
11 early case-specific and late case-independent representations of letters.
12
13

14
15 Other ERP experiments have also examined the impact of visual similarity on
16
17 letter recognition using non-priming paradigms. Rey, Dufau, Massol, and Grainger
18
19 (2009) found differences between letters and matched non-letters in visual features
20
21 around 150 ms after stimulus onset (see also Bentin, Allison, Puce, Perez, & McCarthy,
22
23 1996; Wong, Gauthier, Woroch, DeBuse, & Curran, 2005, for similar findings in a
24
25 similar time window [N170]). Finally, Madec, Rey, Dufau, Klein, and Grainger (2012)
26
27 examined the correlation between inter-item variability in behavioral and ERP
28
29 measures during letter processing. In an early time window (between 90 and 110 ms),
30
31 they found significant correlations at occipital electrodes. Later, in a 150–200 ms time
32
33 window, effects were significant at the occipital and fronto-central electrodes. Finally,
34
35 they found significant correlations at occipital electrodes in the 200-250 ms time
36
37 window. Madec et al. suggested that, consistent with a hierarchical model of letter
38
39 recognition, low-level visual feature processing is observed at occipital regions around
40
41 100 ms, followed by letter identification processes between 150 and 200 ms in more
42
43 anterior regions and feedback processing participating in the conscious identification
44
45 of the letter in primary visual areas in the 200-250 ms time window.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The hierarchical (neurologically plausible) accounts of letter/word recognition
54
55 proposed by Dehaene et al. (2005) and Grainger et al. (2008) were originally designed
56
57 for the Roman alphabet. One basic question here is whether these accounts are
58
59
60

1
2
3 universal or not, and so hold across alphabets. This is particularly important because
4
5 the different visual forms in the two alphabets studied here have different origins: case
6
7 in the Roman alphabet vs. position within a word in the Arabic alphabet.

8
9
10 Understanding the mechanisms underlying invariant recognition of the arbitrary signs
11
12 that compose quite distinct alphabets is a major step towards understanding reading.

13
14 Particularly, a comparison of the process of letter recognition in Arabic vs. Roman
15
16 scripts may shed some light on whether the same dynamic processes underlie letter
17
18 recognition in different alphabets (i.e., a hierarchical process in which higher-level
19
20 processing becomes more and more abstract –as reflected in late components in the
21
22 ERP waves) or whether some effects (e.g., the early visual effect found by Petit et al.,
23
24 2006, in the Roman alphabet) are specific to the characteristics of a given alphabet.

25
26 The combination of masked priming with ERPs in individuals who learned both the
27
28 Arabic and Roman alphabet at an early age provides the means to capture potential
29
30 early differential effects of visual similarity and later effects of abstract letter
31
32 processing across alphabets, using a within-subject design.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Unlike the Petit et al. (2006) masked priming experiment in which the ERPs
40
41 were measured in the absence of any task when the target letter appeared on the
42
43 screen (except for occasional trials; 1/6 of trials), we opted to employ a task (the
44
45 masked priming same-different matching task) in which all trials required a response.
46
47
48 This allows us to examine the relationships between the latency data and the ERP
49
50 waves of early and late components. Furthermore, as indicated earlier, Petit et al.
51
52 (2006) employed the 26 letters of the Roman alphabet. To examine the role of visual
53
54 similarity, Petit et al. conducted a post hoc analysis of visual similarity in an early time
55
56 window (180–220 ms). Here we opted for a direct manipulation of visual similarity.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 That is, we examined masked repetition priming for a subset of letters that were: 1)
4
5 visually similar/dissimilar across case in the Roman alphabet (e.g., c-C vs. g-G); and 2)
6
7 visually similar/dissimilar across letter position in the Arabic alphabet (e.g., ف - ف vs.
8
9 ع - ع). The general procedure of the experiment was parallel to that employed by
10
11 Kinoshita and Kaplan (2008) and by Carreiras et al. (2012). The main differences were
12
13 that: i) ERPs were recorded, which allows us to separate the time course of visual and
14
15 abstract letter representations, and ii) the same participants were presented with
16
17 Roman and Arabic letters –in different blocks.
18
19
20
21
22

23 Of specific interest in the present experiment are the early time windows in the
24
25 ERP waves, in particular the N/P150 component (see Petit et al., 2006). This
26
27 component usually displays a posterior scalp distribution focused over right occipital
28
29 scalp sites and seems to be sensitive to processing at the level of visual features. This
30
31 can take the form of a bipolar effect across frontal and occipital electrodes. While this
32
33 component is more positive over occipital areas, it is more negative over frontal areas
34
35 of the scalp (e.g., Chauncey Holcomb, & Grainger, 2008; Holcomb & Grainger, 2006).
36
37 We will also consider other components that occur slightly later in time, such as the
38
39 N250 and the P3 components. The N250 component has been associated to the
40
41 degree of prime-target orthographic and phonological overlap, thus suggesting that it
42
43 is sensitive to processing sublexical representations (Carreiras, Duñabeitia, & Molinaro,
44
45 2009; Grainger, Kiyonaga, & Holcomb, 2006). The P3 component is usually present
46
47 when the task requires a binary decision and this component is normally associated
48
49 with the response that participants have to execute (see Donchin & Coles, 1988).
50
51 Differences in the latency of the P3 have been found to vary as a function of the
52
53 difficulty of stimulus evaluation (Kutas, McCarthy, & Donchin, 1977).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Participants. Sixteen students (11 female) at Universidad Politécnica de Valencia and the Universitat de València took part in the experiment. Ages ranged between 20 and 30 years (mean: 23.5 years). The participants were native speakers of Arabic who had attended primary and secondary school in their home countries. They reported having learnt the two alphabets (Arabic and Roman) very early in pre-school/primary school. They also reported that, on a daily basis, they would read/write in both Modern Standard Arabic and Spanish (or languages which, like French/English, employ the Roman script). All of them had normal/corrected-to-normal vision and were right-handed, as assessed with an abbreviated version of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971). The data of three of the participants was discarded because the raw EEG data were too noisy and presented too many artifacts to obtain stable data.

Materials. The experiment consisted of two blocks: one with Arabic letters and the other with Latin letters (i.e., Roman Alphabet). In the Arabic block, we employed the same eight letters as Carreiras et al. (2012), and the same experimental design. Four of these letters were visually dissimilar when written in middle and isolated forms (ع / عـ, ح / حـ, ك / كـ, and م / مـ) and the other four letters were visually similar when written in isolated and middle forms (ظ / ظـ, ف / فـ, د / دـ, and ر / رـ). We created 32 probe-prime-target triplets in which the probe and the target were the same and 32 probe-prime-target triplets in which the probe and the target were different. For “same” trials, we manipulated the prime-target relatedness (identity [e.g., Ccc], control [e.g., Cxc]) and the probe-target letter type (similar [e.g., Ccc or Cxc] dissimilar

1
2
3 [e.g., Bbb or Bxb]); for “different” trials and to have a zero prime-target contingency
4
5 (see Carreiras et al., 2012), we manipulated the probe-target relationship rather than
6
7 the prime-target relationship. To avoid physical continuity, the prime was presented in
8
9 Arial 12-pt font, and the reference and the target were presented in Arial 22-pt font. A
10
11 list of examples for the different experimental conditions is displayed in Figure 1. To
12
13 obtain stable data, we carried out the experimental block eight times (i.e., 512 trials
14
15 overall) (see also Carreiras et al., 2012, for a similar procedure).
16
17
18
19

20 **<Insert Figure 1 about here>**
21

22
23 In the Roman block, we also employed eight letters. Four letters were visually
24
25 dissimilar when written in lowercase and uppercase (D/d, G/g, B/b, and R/r) and the
26
27 other four letters were visually similar when written in lowercase and uppercase (C/c,
28
29 S/s, V/v, and X/x) –all these letters had been employed by Kinoshita and Kaplan (2008).
30
31 The creation of the lists was the same as in the Arabic block, except that the
32
33 manipulation was case (lowercase vs. UPPERCASE) instead of letter position (middle vs.
34
35 isolated). There were also 512 trials in this block. All participants received the two
36
37 blocks: half of the participants received the Arabic block first, and the other half
38
39 received the Roman block first.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Procedure. Participants were tested individually in a quiet room. Presentation of the
46
47 stimuli and recording of behavioral/neurophysiological responses were controlled by
48
49 Presentation software. On each trial, a reference letter was presented above a forward
50
51 mask consisting of a hash mark (#) for 1000 ms. Then the probe disappeared and the
52
53 forward mask was replaced by a prime for 50 ms, and this was immediately replaced
54
55 by the target stimulus. The target stimulus remained on the screen for 1000 ms or until
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the participant's response (see Figure 1, for a schematic representation of a given trial).
4
5 The inter-trial interval varied randomly between 500 and 1000 ms. After this interval,
6
7 an asterisk was presented for 1000 ms in order to allow participants to blink.
8
9
10 Participants were told that they would see two succeeding letters and that they were
11
12 to press a button labeled "same" if they thought the two stimuli corresponded to the
13
14 same letter and to press a button labeled "different" if they thought that the two
15
16 stimuli were different letters. Participants were instructed to make this decision as fast
17
18 and as accurately as possible. Participants reported not having seen any briefly
19
20 presented stimuli (i.e., primes) when asked immediately after the experiment. Each
21
22 participant received a different random order of stimuli. Each participant received a
23
24 total of 20 practice trials prior to each experimental block.
25
26
27
28
29

30 EEG recording and analyses

31
32
33 Scalp voltages were collected using a BrainAmp recording system from 32
34
35 Ag/AgCl electrodes mounted in an elastic cap (ElectroCap International, Eaton, USA,
36
37 10-10 system). Figure 2 displays the schematic distribution of the recording sites. A
38
39 left mastoid was used as online reference and the signal was re-referenced offline to
40
41 the average of right and left mastoids before the statistical analyses. Eye movements
42
43 and blinks were monitored with four further electrodes, thus providing bipolar
44
45 recordings of the horizontal (Heog-, Heog+) and vertical (Veog-, Veog+) electro-
46
47 oculogram. Inter-electrode impedances were kept below 5 K Ω . EEG was filtered with
48
49 an analogue band-pass filter of 0.01-100 Hz and a digital 0.1 high-pass and 30 Hz low-
50
51 pass filters were applied before the statistical analyses. The signals were sampled
52
53 continuously throughout the experiment with a sampling rate of 500 Hz.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

<Insert Figure 2 about here>

As in prior research with the masked priming same-different matching task, the focus was exclusively on “same” responses. Bear in mind that, to keep a zero contingency scenario, “different” responses involved primes and targets that were unrelated (see Perea et al., 2011, for discussion). When the probe and the prime were the same, in half of the trials the responses were “same” and in the other half they were “different”. When the probe and the prime were different, in half of the trials the responses were “same” and in the other half they were “different”. Only trials free of ocular artifacts (blinks and eye movements) and muscular artifacts were averaged and analyzed (more than 95% of the trials). Epochs of the EEG up to 1000 ms from the onset of the target letter were the primary data. The baseline correction was performed using the average EEG activity in the 100 ms preceding the onset of the target as a reference signal value. Separate ERPs were formed for each of the experimental conditions, each of the participants and each of the electrode sites (see electrode numbers in Figure 2). We conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) considering the Electrode Factor (27), Prime-Target relatedness (2 levels: identity, control), Letter Type (2 levels: similar, dissimilar) and Alphabet (2 levels: Roman, Arabic). Neither the Order of Blocks nor the Type of Probe-Target (lowercase-uppercase or uppercase-lowercase in the Roman alphabet; medial-isolated or isolated-medial in the Arabic alphabet) had a significant effect on performance so that for the sake of simplicity they were not entered in the reported ANOVAs. Whenever an interaction with Electrode was found, regions of interest (ROIs) were defined which can reliably capture the distribution of effects. When appropriate, p-values are reported using the Greenhouse-Geisser (1959) correction. In accordance with our hypotheses, the statistical analyses focused on the

1
2
3 main effects of prime-target relatedness and their interactions with the other factors.
4
5 An initial visual analysis was performed on the 0-1000 ms time window, which was
6
7 later divided into two windows (60-260 ms) and (280-500 ms). Peak amplitudes and
8
9 peak latencies were obtained for different time windows.
10
11

12 Results

13 Behavioral measures

14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Incorrect responses and response times that exceeded two standard deviations
21
22 from the participant's mean were excluded from the latency analyses. The average
23
24 response times and percent errors are presented in Table 1. For "same" responses,
25
26 ANOVAs based on the participant mean correct RTs and percentage of errors were
27
28 conducted based on a 2 (prime-target relatedness: identity, control) x 2 (Letter type:
29
30 similar, dissimilar) x script (Roman vs. Arabic).
31
32

33
34
35 The ANOVA on the RT data showed faster response times for trials involving
36
37 Roman letters than for trials involving Arabic letters ($F(1,12)=25.69$, $p<.001$) as well as
38
39 faster reaction times for trials involving "similar" letters than for the trials involving
40
41 "dissimilar" letters ($F(1,12)=16.74$, $p<.001$). In addition, response times were faster
42
43 when the target letter was preceded by an identity letter prime than when preceded
44
45 by a control letter prime, $F(1,12)=94.79$, $p<.001$. As expected, the repetition priming
46
47 effect was quite large for both similar and dissimilar letters (48 vs. 37 ms, respectively,
48
49 both $ps<.001$) –note that the priming effect was 11-ms greater for the similar letters
50
51 than for the dissimilar letters (Similarity x Prime-target relatedness interaction,
52
53 $F(1,12)=5.86$, $p=.032$). Finally, the effect of prime-target relatedness was not
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 modulated by script (two-way relatedness x script interaction: $F < 1$; three-way script x
4
5 relatedness x similarity interaction: $F < 1$).
6
7

8
9 The ANOVA on error data only revealed that participants committed more
10 errors on control trials than on identity trials, $F(1,12)=10.26$, $p=.008$. None of the other
11 effects/interactions were significant –note, however, that the relatedness effect was
12 slightly greater (marginally significant) for the trials in the Roman script than for the
13 trials in the Arabic script (two-way interaction: $F(1,12)=3.88$, $p=.072$).
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 <Insert Table 1 about here>
22

23 24 Electrophysiological measures 25

26
27 For “same” responses, ERP grand averages in frontal and parietal electrodes
28 time-locked to the onset of the target letters for the contrasts between the identity
29 and control conditions for similar-dissimilar letters, as well as the topographical maps
30 of these effects, are displayed in Figure 3. Visual inspection of Figure 3 reveals the
31 presence of a consistent N/P150 component, with a frontal relatedness effect only
32 when the prime is dissimilar to the target and a posterior effect when the prime is
33 similar to the target. This effect is consistent across the two scripts.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 <Insert Figures 3 and 4 about here>
46

47 In addition, an effect of prime-target relatedness appears at the P300 window
48 (see Figure 4) with a centro-parietal distribution for both similar and dissimilar letters,
49 and with a frontal distribution only for the dissimilar letters. Finally, there is a very
50 salient difference in P300 latency depending on prime-target relatedness, regardless of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 visual similarity (see Figure 5). This faster latency for targets preceded by identity than
4
5 for targets preceded by a control prime occurred both in Roman and Arabic scripts.
6
7

8
9 <Insert Figure 5 about here>

10
11 PEAK AMPLITUDE

12
13
14 *N/P150*

15
16
17 The polarity and distribution of the N/P150 depends on prime-target relatedness
18 and on letter type. As shown in Figure 3, two ROIs were defined, including frontal
19 (Fp1, Fp2, F7, F8, FC2, FC5, FC6) and posterior electrodes (CP5, P3, P4, P7, P8, O1).
20 (Fp1, Fp2, F7, F8, FC2, FC5, FC6) and posterior electrodes (CP5, P3, P4, P7, P8, O1).
21 An ANOVA ROI (2 levels: frontal and posterior) x alphabet (2 levels: Roman vs.
22 Arabic) x prime-target relatedness (2 levels: identity and control) x letter type (2
23 levels: similar vs. dissimilar) showed a similarity x relatedness interaction ($F(1,12)=$
24 5.48, $p=0.037$). To examine this interaction, we conducted ANOVAs separately for
25 each condition of visual similarity. When probes and targets were visually *similar*,
26 control prime-target pairs were more negative than identity prime-target pairs in
27 posterior electrodes, regardless of script (relatedness in frontal electrodes: $F<1$,
28 relatedness in posterior electrodes: $F(1,12)=15.12$, $p=0.002$; ROI x relatedness:
29 $F(1,12)=3.75$, $p=0.07$). When probes and targets were visually *dissimilar*, control
30 prime-target pairs were more positive than identity prime-target pairs in frontal
31 electrodes, regardless of script (relatedness in frontal electrodes: $F(1,12)=7.87$,
32 $p=0.016$, relatedness in posterior electrodes: $F<1$; ROI x relatedness: $F(1,12)=8.62$,
33 $p=0.012$).
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

1
2
3 The N/P150 relatedness effect was measured by peak amplitude within an interval
4 between 60 and 260 ms (see Figure 3). Further analyses of consecutive time
5 windows of 20 milliseconds collapsing through the two alphabets showed that the
6 relatedness effect started earlier for visually dissimilar than for visually similar
7 letters (time window x similarity x ROI x relatedness: $F(5,60)=6.06$; $p=0.002$; see
8 Table 2). The frontal effect for visually dissimilar letters appeared earlier (90 to 110
9 ms). In contrast, the parietal prime-target relatedness effect for visually similar
10 letters appeared in the 150 to 190 ms time window after target onset.

21 *P3 peak amplitude*

22
23
24
25
26 Parietal classical distributed P3 effects and frontal P3 effects were analyzed
27 separately. To better capture the effects in the frontal and parietal sites, frontal
28 sites were divided into three ROIs each (Left-frontal: F7, F3; Frontocentral: Fp1,
29 Fp2; Right-frontal: F8, F4). A similar ROIs division was applied for parietal sites
30 (Left-parietal: C3, CP5, P3; Centroparietal electrodes: CP1, CP2, Pz; and Right-
31 parietal: C4, CP6, P4). The centroparietal peak amplitude showed a prime-target
32 relatedness effect ($F(1,12)=4.81$, $p=0.049$) that did not depend on alphabet
33 (interaction relatedness x alphabet: $F(1,12)=2.54$, $p=0.1$) or on the visual similarity
34 between probe and target (interaction letter type x relatedness: $F<1$).

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Interestingly, the effects of relatedness on the P3 amplitude in frontal sites were
48 modulated by similarity, appearing only for visually dissimilar probe-targets. For
49 visually *dissimilar* probe-targets, an ROI x relatedness interaction ($F(2,24)=6.1$,
50 $p=0.02$) showed that the relatedness effect was localized in fronto-central and left-
51 frontal electrodes (central: $F(1,12)= 5.18$, $p=0.04$; left-frontal: 3.48 , $p=0.08$;
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 collapsed: $F(1,12)= 4.36$, $p=0.05$; right-frontal: $F<1$). No main effect of relatedness
4
5 ($F(1,12)=0.003$, $p=0.9$) or relatedness x alphabet interaction ($F(1,12)=0.1$, $p=0.6$)
6
7 appeared for similar letters.
8
9

10 LATENCIES

11
12
13
14 *N/P150 Peak latencies:* The peak latencies at this time window were not
15
16 modulated by any of the experimental factors.
17

18 *P3 latency*

19
20
21
22 The P3 latency was modulated by relatedness, but not by probe-target visual
23
24 similarity. All sites with the exception of most frontal electrodes (Fp1, Fp2, F4, F7,
25
26 F8) showed earlier peak latencies for identity prime-target ($F(1,12)=27.98$,
27
28 $p<0.001$). This effect was independent of visual similarity between prime and
29
30 target.
31
32

33
34
35 *P300 Prediction of reaction times.* A final analysis revealed that the P3 latency
36
37 correlated strongly with the priming effects in the latency data ($r=.79$, $p=0.001$):
38
39 The greater the difference between the control and identity conditions in the P300
40
41 peak latency, the greater the priming effect in the latency data.
42
43
44

45 Discussion

46
47
48 The present experiment has revealed a number of relevant findings for neural
49
50 models of letter and word recognition. Firstly, as in previous behavioral experiments
51
52 with the Roman and Arabic alphabets, response times were faster when the target
53
54 letter was preceded by an identity letter prime than when preceded by an control
55
56 letter prime –note that the priming effect was slightly larger for visually similar than
57
58 letter prime –note that the priming effect was slightly larger for visually similar than
59
60

1
2
3 for visually dissimilar pairs. Second, we found a consistent N/P150 component. This
4
5 component revealed a frontal relatedness effect when primes and targets were
6
7 visually dissimilar and a posterior effect when they were visually similar. In addition,
8
9 the effect for visually dissimilar targets occurred in an earlier time window than that
10
11 for visually similar targets. Again, this effect was equivalent in the Roman and Arabic
12
13 alphabets. Third, we obtained a main effect of prime-target relatedness in the P300
14
15 time window with a centro-parietal distribution for both visually similar and dissimilar
16
17 prime-target pairs, and with a frontal distribution only for the visually dissimilar letters
18
19 –again this effect was similar in the two scripts. Fourth, there was a very salient
20
21 difference of prime-target relatedness in P3 latency that was not modulated by letter
22
23 similarity –this effect also occurred similarly in the Roman and Arabic scripts. And fifth,
24
25 the latency of the P3 component strongly predicted reaction times.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Thus, the present data have revealed that processing of letters in the Roman
33
34 and Arabic scripts follows approximately the same path. The similarities between the
35
36 processing of letters in the two alphabets is particularly striking if we consider that in
37
38 the Roman alphabet we manipulated case (uppercase vs. lowercase) whereas in the
39
40 Arabic alphabet we used primes and targets that exhibit different forms depending on
41
42 their position in a word (middle vs. isolated). This strongly suggests that the fast
43
44 conversion from visual form into visual-form-independent abstract letter
45
46 representations is a universal phenomenon, i.e., it occurs in different alphabets.
47
48 Therefore, the present data are consistent with neural accounts that propose that the
49
50 time course of letter processing involves sensitivity to physical similarity in the earlier
51
52 stages of processing, followed by an abstract identification of letters in later stages of
53
54 processing (e.g., Dehaene et al., 2005; Grainger et al., 2008). The present study has
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 established that these accounts, proposed initially for the Roman script, can be readily
4
5 generalized to other alphabets (Arabic).
6
7

8
9 Similarly to previous behavioral studies with the masked priming same-
10 different matching task, we found a masked repetition priming effect in Roman and in
11 Arabic for letter pairs with similar visual features and for letter pairs with dissimilar
12 visual features (Carreiras et al., 2012; Kinoshita & Kaplan, 2008). Even though the
13 effect was robust for both visually similar and visually dissimilar letter pairs, it was
14 slightly larger for the visually similar pairs (interaction: $p=.03$). This may have been due
15 to the fact that the statistical power was larger than in previous experiments (i.e.,
16 number of trials was larger) and it may represent a residual effect of visual similarity in
17 the response times. This may be analogous to the residual effect of mirror invariance
18 for reversible letters that occurs in the early stages of processing (Duñabeitia, Molinaro,
19 & Carreiras, 2011). Despite the fact that we develop the capacity of inhibiting mirror
20 invariance for reading and achieve an abstract representation of letters (e.g., Dehaene
21 et al., 2005; 2010; Pegado et al., 2011; Perea, Moret-Tatay & Panadero, 2011; see
22 Kolinsky et al., 2011, for review), the cognitive system may still retain some sensitivity
23 to the effects of visual form.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The analyses of the ERP signal revealed a relatedness effect for the visually
46 dissimilar targets in the 90-110 ms time window in frontal electrodes, while for the
47 visually similar targets the effect occurred in the 150-190ms time window in parietal
48 electrodes –note that the polarity of the two effects was the opposite. Interestingly,
49 equivalent effects were observed in the two alphabets. This pattern of data suggests
50 an early contribution of letter form sensitivity (i.e., the effects for visually dissimilar
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 letters are slightly earlier than for visually similar letters) followed by an abstract letter
4
5 identification processes. There is an effect of repetition priming for both similar and
6
7 dissimilar letters that occurs within a 200 ms window that is consistent with previous
8
9 masked priming experiments (see Petit et al., 2006) and this also suggests that the
10
11 P/N150 component, regardless of its precise topography and polarity, is sensitive to
12
13 letter identification processes (see Bentin et al., 1996; Schendan, et al., 1998;
14
15 Tarkiainen et al., 1999; 2002; Wong et al., 2005).
16
17
18
19

20 In a later window (280-500 ms) signaling the P3 component, we found a
21
22 masked repetition priming effect of equivalent magnitude for visually similar and
23
24 dissimilar letters with a centro-parietal distribution that also occurred for dissimilar
25
26 letters with a frontal distribution. This reveals the existence of an abstract processing
27
28 of the letters, but it also reveals that (to some degree) this process is modulated by
29
30 visual similarity even at later processing stages. It is important to note here that the
31
32 relatively late ERP activity related to letter processing has also been reported in
33
34 previous experiments (Madec et al., 2012; see Petit et al., 2006). Madec et al.
35
36 interpreted this late activity as feedback processing to amplify and stabilize the activity
37
38 in the primary areas, to help letter recognition (see also Twomey et al., 2011). Another
39
40 possibility is that the P300 (P3) component that has been elicited with a frontal
41
42 distribution by the dissimilar letters resembles the P3a component. The P3a
43
44 component has been associated with brain activity related to the engagement of
45
46 attention and the processing of novelty (see Polich, 2003). Thus, control primes may
47
48 attract more attention/be more novel in the case of dissimilar letters when comparing
49
50 probes and targets and thus still show sensitivity to the visual appearance of the
51
52 primes. In contrast, it could be argued that the P3 component with the centro-parietal
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 distribution for visually dissimilar and similar letters resembles the so-called P3b
4
5 component, which is thought to reflect processes involved in stimulus evaluation,
6
7 categorization, decision making and/or updating (Donchin, 1981; Donchin & Coles,
8
9 1988), or an index of the match or mismatch of the target as compared to a
10
11 maintained working memory trace (Näätänen, 1990), that in the present experiment
12
13 would be the one generated by the probe. Specifically, according to Näätänen's view,
14
15 the prime in the identity priming condition would match the memory trace established
16
17 between the probe and the target, while the unrelated prime would deviate from
18
19 them, thus leading to the observed P3 effect. Importantly, this finding (which occurs
20
21 both in the Roman and Arabic alphabets) also supports fast conversion to an abstract
22
23 processing of the letters.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 A final finding that deserves consideration is that the relatedness effects
31
32 obtained in the P3 component were closely related to the relatedness effects obtained
33
34 in the reaction times (see McCarthy & Donchin, 1981). As indicated earlier, statistical
35
36 analyses of the peak P3 latencies revealed a repetition priming effect for visually
37
38 similar and dissimilar letters in the two alphabets. The latency of the P3 component
39
40 strongly predicted reaction times. Given that differences in latency of the P3 have
41
42 been found to vary as a function of the difficulty of stimulus evaluation, they may
43
44 reflect the time it takes to evaluate/categorize events (e.g., Kutas, McCarthy, &
45
46 Donchin, 1977; McCarthy & Donchin, 1981). Therefore, the longer latency of the P300
47
48 elicited by the unrelated control condition relative to the identity condition may well
49
50 be the result of a longer processing time needed to categorize whether the probe and
51
52 target are the same when the prime is an unrelated control item.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In sum, the present ERP data, obtained in two very distinct alphabets (Roman
4
5 and Arabic) are consistent with a universal model of letter recognition that includes
6
7 the activation of abstract representations during the late processes corresponding to
8
9 letter identification but that retains some form sensitivity during the entire flow of
10
11 information processing.
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

For Review Only

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Bentin, S., Allison, T., Puce, A., Perez, A., & McCarthy, G. (1996). Electrophysiological
8 studies of face perception in humans. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *8*,
9 551–565.
10
11
12
13 Bowers, J. S., Vigliocco, G., & Haan, R. (1998). Orthographic, phonological, and
14 articulatory contributions to masked letter and word priming. *Journal of*
15 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, *24*, 1705-1719.
16
17
18
19 Carreiras, M., Duñabeitia, J.A., & Molinaro, N. (2009). Consonants and vowels
20 contribute differently to visual word recognition: ERPs of relative position
21 priming. *Cerebral Cortex*, *19*, 2659-70.
22
23
24
25 Carreiras, M., Perea, M., & Abu Mallouh, R. (2012). Priming of abstract letter
26 representations may be universal: The case of Arabic. *Psychonomic Bulletin and*
27 *Review*, *19*, 685–690. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-012-0260-8
28
29
30
31 Chauncey, K. Holcomb, P.J., & Grainger, J. (2008). Effects of stimulus font and size on
32 masked repetition priming: An ERP investigation. *Language and Cognitive*
33 *Processes*, *23*, 183-200.
34
35
36
37 Dehaene, S., Cohen, L., Sigman, M., & Vinckier, F. (2005). The neural code for written
38 words: a proposal. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *9*, 335-341.
39
40
41 Dehaene, S., Nakamura, K., Jobert, A., Kuroki, C., Ogawa, S., & Cohen, L. (2010). Why
42 do children make mirror errors in reading? Neural correlates of mirror
43 invariance in the visual word form area. *Neuroimage*, *49*, 1837-1848.
44
45
46
47 Donchin, E. (1981). Surprise! . . . Surprise? *Psychophysiology*, *18*, 493–513.
48
49
50
51 Donchin, E., & Coles, M. G. H. (1988). Is the P300 component a manifestation of
52 context updating? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *11*, 355–372.
53
54
55
56 Forster, K.I., & Davis, C. (1984). Repetition priming and frequency attenuation in lexical
57 access. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,
58 *10*, 680–698. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.10.4.680
59
60

- 1
2
3 Duñabeitia, J.A., Molinaro, N., & Carreiras, M. (2011) Through the looking-glass: Mirror
4 reading. *Neuroimage*, *54*, 3004-3009.
5
6
7 Grainger, J., Kiyonaga, K. & Holcomb, P. J. (2006) The time course of orthographic and
8 phonological code activation. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 1021-1026.
9
10
11 Grainger, J., Rey, A., & Dufau, S. (2008). Letter perception: from pixels to
12 pandemonium. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, doi:10.1016/j.tics.2008.06.006
13
14
15 Greenhouse, S. & Geisser, S. (1959). On methods in the analysis of profile data.
16 *Psychometrika*, *24*, 95-112.
17
18
19 Holcomb, P.J. & Grainger, J. (2006). On the time-course of visual word recognition: En
20 ERP investigation using masked repetition priming. *Journal of Cognitive*
21 *Neuroscience*, *18*, 1631-1643.
22
23
24
25 Kinoshita, S & Kaplan, L. (2008). Priming of abstract letter identities in the letter match
26 task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *61*, 1873-1885.
27
28
29 Kinoshita, S., & Norris, D. (2009). Transposed-letter priming of pre-lexical orthographic
30 representations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and*
31 *Cognition*, *35*, 1-18.
32
33
34
35 Kolinsky, R., Verhaeghe, A., Fernandes, T., Mengarda, E.J., Grimm-Cabral, L., & Morais,
36 J. (2011). Enantiomorphy through the looking glass: literacy effects on mirror-
37 image discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *140*, 210-
38 238.
39
40
41
42 Kutas, M., McCarthy, G., & Donchin, E. (1977). Augmenting mental chronometry: The
43 P300 as a measure of stimulus evaluation time. *Science*, *197*, 792-795.
44
45
46 Madec, S., Rey, A., Dufau, S, Klein, M., & Grainger, J. (2012). The time course of visual
47 letter perception. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *24*, 1645-1655
48
49
50
51 McCarthy, G. & Donchin, E. (1981). A metric for thought: a comparison of P300 latency
52 and response time. *Science*, *211*, 77-80.
53
54
55 Nääätänen, R. (1990). The role of attention in auditory information processing as
56 revealed by event-related potentials and other brain measures of cognitive
57 function. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *13*, 201-288.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Oldfield, R.C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: The Edinburgh
4 inventory. *Neuropsychologia*, 9, 97–113.
5
6
7 Pegado, F., Nakamura, K., Cohen, L., & Dehaene, S. (2011). Breaking the Symmetry:
8 Mirror discrimination for single letters but not for pictures in the Visual Word
9 Form Area. *Neuroimage*, 55, 742-749.
10
11
12
13 Perea, M., abu Mallouh, R., & Carreiras, M. (in press). Early access to abstract
14 representations in developing readers: Evidence from masked priming.
15 *Developmental Science*. DOI: 10.1111/desc.12052
16
17
18 Perea, M., Moret-Tatay, C., & Carreiras, M. (2011). Facilitation vs. Inhibition in the
19 masked priming same-different matching task. *Quarterly Journal of*
20 *Experimental Psychology*, 64, 2065-2079. DOI:10.1080/17470218.2011.582131
21
22
23
24 Perea, M., Moret-Tatay, C., & Panadero, V. (2011). Suppression of mirror
25 generalization for reversible letters: Evidence from masked priming. *Journal of*
26 *Memory and Language*, 65, 237–246.
27
28
29
30 Petit, J.P., Midgley, K. J., Holcomb, P.J., & Grainger, J. (2006) On the time-course of
31 letter perception: a masked priming ERP investigation. *Psychonomic Bulletin*
32 *and Review*, 13, 674–681.
33
34
35
36 Polich, J. (2003). Overview of P3a and P3b. In J. Polich (Ed.), *Detection of Change: Event-*
37 *Related Potential and fMRI Findings* (pp. 83-98). Kluwer Academic Press:
38 Boston.
39
40
41
42 Rey, A., Dufau, S., Massol, S., & Grainger, J. (2009). Testing computational models of
43 letter perception with item-level ERPs. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 26, 7–22.
44
45
46 Schendan, H. E., Ganis, G., & Kutas, M. (1998). Neurophysiological evidence for visual
47 perceptual categorization of words and faces within 150 ms. *Psychophysiology*,
48 35, 240–251.
49
50
51
52 Tarkiainen, A., Cornelissen, P. L., & Salmelin, R. (2002). Dynamics of visual feature
53 analysis and object-level processing in face versus letter-string perception.
54 *Brain*, 125, 1125–1136.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tarkiainen, A., Helenius, P., Hansen, P. C., Cornelissen, P. L., & Salmelin, R. (1999).
4 Dynamics of letter string perception in the human occipitotemporal cortex.
5 *Brain*, 122, 2119–2131.
6
7
8
9 Twomey, T., Kawabata, D K. J., Price, C. J. & Devlin, J. T. (2011). Top–down modulation
10 of ventral occipito-temporal responses during visual word recognition.
11 *Neuroimage*, 55, 1242–1251.
12
13
14 Whitney, C. (2001). How the brain encodes the order of letters in a printed word: The
15 SERIOL model and selective literature review. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*,
16 8, 221-243.
17
18
19
20 Wong, A. C., Gauthier, I., Woroch, B., DeBuse, C., & Curran, T. (2005). An early
21 electrophysiological response associated with expertise in letter perception.
22 *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 5, 306–318.
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

Author's notes

The research reported in this article has been partially supported by Grants CONSOLIDER-INGENIO2010 CSD2008-00048 and PSI2011-26924 from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness and ERC-2011-ADG-295362 grant from the European Research Council.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Manuel Carreiras, Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language, Paseo Mikeletegi 69, 2000, Donostia, Spain (e-mail: m.carreiras@bcbl.eu).

Table 1. Mean response times and percentage of errors per condition (the standard errors are between brackets)

| | | ARABIC script | | ROMAN script | |
|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Similar | Identity | 526 (16.7) | 4.1 (1.1) | 473 (15.5) | 2.7 (0.9) |
| | Control | 573 (13.5) | 6.2 (1.3) | 521 (13.0) | 5.8 (1.7) |
| Dissimilar | Identity | 536 (14.7) | 6.5 (1.4) | 499 (19.0) | 4.1 (0.9) |
| | Control | 570 (14.4) | 7.2 (1.6) | 538 (15.2) | 7.0 (1.1) |

Table 2. Amplitude differences between the repetition priming and unrelated condition (relatedness effect) for similar and dissimilar letters in the two alphabets together in the two ROIs (frontal and parietal) for windows of 20 milliseconds in the P/N150.

| | | 90-110 ms. | 110-130 ms. | 130-150 ms. | 150-170 ms. | 170-190 ms. | 190-210 ms. |
|------------|----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dissimilar | Frontal | F(1,12)=5.8 p=0.03 * | F(1,12)=5.81 p= 0.03 * | F(1,12)=2.09 p=0.05 Roman | F(1,12)=3.7 p=0.07 | F(1,12)=1.8 p=0.2 | F(1,12)=0.06 p=0.8 |
| | Parietal | F(1,12)=0.68 p=0.4 | F(1,12)=1.15 p=0.3 | F(1,12)=4.45 p=0.06 | F(1,12)=1.29 p=0.27 | F(1,12)=1.8 p=0.19 | F(1,12)=0.04 p=0.8 |
| Similar | Frontal | F(1,12)=0.08 p=0.7 | F(1,12)=0.76 p=0.4 | F(1,12)=0.27 p=0.61 | F(1,12)=1.45 p=0.25 | F(1,12)=0.2 p=0.6 | F(1,12)=0.02 p=0.8 |
| | Parietal | F(1,12)=0.4 p=0.5 | F(1,12)=0.1 p=0.7 | F(1,12)=0.54 p=0.47 | F(1,12)=6.98 p=0.02 * | F(1,12)=5.5 p=0.03 * | F(1,12)=3.01 p=0.1 |

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Experimental paradigm

Figure 2. Electrode montage


Figure 3. N1/P150 amplitude peak differences for the identity vs. control contrast for similar and dissimilar letters in Arabic and Roman alphabets. Voltage maps represent differences in peak amplitudes, in μV , and show different topographies depending on letter similarity

Figure 4. P3 amplitude peak differences for the identity vs. control contrast. Peak amplitudes are computed at different latencies, and differences between identity and control conditions are plotted for each ROI. The three bars represent from left to right the three ROIs left/central/right. Voltage maps represent differences in peak amplitudes, in μV .


Figure 5. P3 peak latencies differences for identity vs. control contrasts and regression between differences in RTs and differences in P3 latency. Voltage maps represent differences in peak latencies, in ms.

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


Roman Alphabet



Arabic Alphabet



200x231mm (300 x 300 DPI)




114x118mm (96 x 96 DPI)

only


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

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

ROMAN ALPHABET



ARABIC ALPHABET




228x195mm (300 x 300 DPI)


Only

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

ROMAN ALPHABET






ARABIC ALPHABET



118x155mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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



79x93mm (300 x 300 DPI)