Title: Simultaneous object perception deficits are related to reduced visual processing speed in amnestic mild cognitive impairment

Authors names and affiliations: Adriana L. Ruiz-Rizzo[1,2], Peter Bublak[3], Petra Redel[1], Timo Grimmer[5], Hermann J. Müller[1,2], Christian Sorg[4,5,6], Kathrin Finke[1,2,3]

[1] Department of Psychology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany.

[2] Graduate School of Systemic Neurosciences, Munich, Germany.

[3] Hans Berger Department of Neurology, Jena University Hospital, Jena, Germany.

[4] Klinikum rechts der Isar, TUM-NIC Neuroimaging Center, Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany.

[5] Klinikum rechts der Isar, Department of Psychiatry, Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany.

[6] Klinikum rechts der Isar, Department of Neuroradiology, Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany.

Corresponding author: Kathrin Finke, E-mail address: finke@psy.lmu.de. Postal address: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Department of General and Experimental Psychology / Neuro-Cognitive Psychology, Leopoldstr. 13, 80802 Munich (Germany)

Final version: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2017.03.029

Abstract [167 words]

Simultanagnosia, an impairment in simultaneous object perception, has been attributed to deficits in visual attention and, specifically, to processing speed. Increasing visual attention deficits manifest over the course of Alzheimer's disease (AD), where the first changes are present already in its symptomatic pre-dementia phase: amnestic mild cognitive impairment (aMCI). In this study, we examined whether patients with aMCI due to AD show simultaneous object perception deficits and whether and how these deficits relate to visual attention. Sixteen AD patients with aMCI and 16 age-, gender-, and education-matched healthy controls were assessed with a simultaneous perception task, with shapes presented in an adjacent, embedded, or overlapping manner, under free viewing without temporal constraints. We used a parametric assessment of visual attention based on the Theory of Visual Attention. Results show that patients make significantly more errors than controls when identifying overlapping shapes, which correlate with reduced processing speed. Our findings suggest simultaneous object perception deficits in very early AD, and a visual processing speed reduction underlying these deficits.

Keywords:

Amnestic mild cognitive impairment; Alzheimer's disease; neuropsychology; visual perception; attention; Balint syndrome

1. Introduction

Deficient memory is considered the hallmark of Alzheimer's disease (AD), already manifesting in mild dementia and amnestic mild cognitive impairment (aMCI) as a symptomatic predementia phase of AD (Albert, et al., 2011,Morris, et al., 2001,Petersen, 2004). However, growing evidence suggests the presence of visual attentional impairments early in the course of AD (Alescio-Lautier, et al., 2007,Bonney, et al., 2006,Bublak, et al., 2011,Finke, et al., 2013,Perry and Hodges, 1999,Perry, et al., 2000,Rapp and Reischies, 2005,Redel, et al., 2012,Rizzo, et al., 2000). Significant relationships of such impairments to hypometabolism and functional connectivity changes in frontoparietal attention systems have been documented (Neufang, et al., 2011,Neufang, et al., 2014,Sorg, et al., 2012,Sorg, et al., 2007). Of note, frontoparietal hypometabolism and atrophy overlapping with β-amyloid accumulation at the aMCI stage have been revealed even to precede similar changes in memory-relevant temporal structures (Drzezga, et al., 2011,Engler, et al., 2006,Kemppainen, et al., 2007,Mattsson, et al., 2014,Mintun, et al., 2006,Sorg, et al., 2012). Among the affected attention functions, for example, visual processing speed shows a staged decline (Bublak, et al., 2011), implying that individual cases suffer from more or less severe slowing. Critically, for diverse patient groups, it has been suggested that reduced visual processing speed can lead to impairments in the ability to perceive several objects at the same time, i.e., to symptoms of simultanagnosia (Chechlacz, et al., 2012,Duncan, et al., 2003,Finke, et al., 2007). Thus, in the present study, we asked whether patients with aMCI show deficits in simultaneous object perception and, if so, whether these deficits are associated with a reduction of processing speed.

Patients with simultanagnosia are not able to integrate the objects within a visual scene to achieve a meaningful interpretation, although recognition of single objects is usually preserved (Bálint, 1909,Coslett and Saffran, 1991,Holmes, 1918,Wolpert, 1924). In patients with full-blown simultanagnosia, perception appears to stick to a single object at a time in the

scene, resulting in the acquisition of visual information in a piecemeal fashion (Rizzo and Vecera, 2002). Particular severe problems occur if two or more objects are presented in an overlapping manner (e.g., Bálint and Harvey, 1995,Luria, 1959). For example, Luria reported that patients with simultanagnosia were not able to identify two overlapping triangles of different colors that formed the 'star of David'; rather, they reported only one of them (Luria, 1959). Interestingly, the neural damage in cases with simultanagnosia due to acquired lesions typically involves extensive bilateral frontoparietal areas (Chechlacz, et al., 2012,Ptak, 2012), including the same regions (e.g., Corbetta, 1998) that are affected in predementia phases of AD (Perry and Hodges, 1999). Thus, some degree of simultanagnosia can be expected to be present in aMCI patients, too.

A crucial step towards a systematic analysis of processing speed and visual short-term memory (VSTM) as putative causes of simultaneous object perception deficits was taken by applying parametric measurement of attention based on the 'Theory of Visual Attention' (TVA; Bundesen, 1990) to patients with simultanagnosia. TVA is a unified computational account for visual single-stimulus recognition and attentional selection from multi-element displays (Bundesen, 1990), essentially implementing a mathematical formalization of the biased competition model (Desimone and Duncan, 1995). Within TVA, both visual recognition and attentional selection consist in making perceptual categorizations (Bundesen, 1998). There are two fundamental capacity parameters that can be independently estimated based on the TVA formalization: visual processing speed *C* and VSTM storage capacity *K*. Parameter *C* is a quantitative estimate of the number of objects that can be processed in parallel per second; parameter *K*, in turn, is the estimate of the maximum number of objects that can be maintained simultaneously in the VSTM store. Both *C* and *K* parameters can be derived from an individual's performance in a whole-report task, where observers' ability to perceive and report multiple letter stimuli is assessed as a function of the effective array exposure duration (Bundesen, 1990) (for application in clinical samples, see Bublak, et al.,

2011,Finke, et al., 2005,McAvinue, et al., 2015). Using TVA assessment, Duncan et al. (Duncan, et al., 2003) found severely reduced visual processing speed, even with single-item presentation, in two patients with both dorsal and ventral simultanagnosia, while VSTM storage capacity appeared to be preserved (Duncan, et al., 2003). Furthermore, Finke et al. (Finke, et al., 2007) conducted a first group analysis based on TVA: an assessment of patients with Huntington's disease, who typically suffer from increasingly severe visual processing speed deficits (Finke, et al., 2006). Finke et al. (Finke, et al., 2007) found that patients with more pronounced slowing displayed greater impairments in simultaneous object perception. They concluded that a slowing of the rate of visual information uptake gives rise to impaired perception of multiple overlapping stimuli in Huntington's disease (Finke, et al., 2007). These results were also replicated in a recent study in patients with posterior cortical dementia (Neitzel, et al., 2016). Of note, a staged decline of visual processing speed was also found in the amnestic form of Alzheimer's disease (Bublak, et al., 2011). Thus, given the relevance of deficient visual processing speed in diverse patient groups, in the present study we, too, focused on the role of this specific attentional (dys-)function with regard to potential deficits in simultaneous object perception in aMCI patients.

In particular, we aimed to ascertain whether there are deficits in simultaneous object perception in aMCI due to AD, and, if so, whether these deficits are associated with a reduction of visual processing speed. To this end, we compared aMCI patients and healthy control participants on several simultanagnosia tests and a TVA-based whole-report paradigm.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Participants

Sixteen patients with a diagnosis of aMCI due to AD (9 females; mean age 70.9 ± 7.8 years; 11.6 mean years of education) and 16 age-, gender-, and education-matched healthy controls

(9 females; 69.9 ± 7.4 years old, 11.6 mean years of education) participated in our study. Patients were diagnosed at, and recruited from, the Memory Clinic of the Department of Psychiatry, Technische Universität München, Germany, and controls were recruited from the general community through flyers and word-of-mouth recommendation. All participants gave written informed consent to take part in this study according to the Declaration of Helsinki II, and the study had local ethical committee approval.

Participants underwent a standardized diagnostic process that included medical, psychiatric, and neurological examinations. Patients had additionally brain-imaging diagnostics including structural MRI and FDG-PET. All participants had undergone an informant-derived Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR; Morris, 1993), with patients having values of 0.5 and controls of 0, and neuropsychological assessment using the neuropsychological battery of the Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD; German version; Berres, et al., 2000), including the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE; Folstein, et al., 1975) and the Clock-Drawing Test (CDT; Shulman, et al., 1993). Based on this assessment, aMCI patients fulfilled cognitive impairment criteria according to Petersen (Petersen, et al., 2001,Petersen, et al., 1999), along with largely preserved activities of daily living (Bayer ADL scale; Hindmarch, et al., 1998), and no dementia according to ICD-10 criteria (WHO, 2010). Furthermore, all aMCI patients of this study met the criteria for mild cognitive impairment due to AD (Albert, et al., 2011). Beyond patients' mild cognitive impairment, they had biological signs of AD in terms of bilateral temporo-parietal hypometabolism as shown in FDG-PET (Albert, et al., 2011). Criteria for exclusion form the study were history of other neurological diseases and imaging evidence of marked brain lesions that affected cognition (e.g., stroke lesions). Three of the 16 patients were under antidepressant medication (n = 1 with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, n = 1 with tricyclic, and n = 1 with noradrenergic and specific serotonergic antidepressants). Concerning genotyping, eleven patients had either one (n = 9) or two (n = 2) alleles of the APOE ε4 allele.

Healthy controls were free of any current, or history of, psychiatric or neurological condition. Patients and controls did not differ in age, gender, or education (see Table 1). As expected from the diagnosis, aMCI patients had significantly lower MMSE scores, i.e., a lower global cognitive state, than controls [$t(30) = -4.025$, $p < .001$] (Table 1 for all demographic details). All aMCI patients were able to follow verbal instructions and to concentrate sufficiently during the tasks. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were not color-blind.

2.2. Procedure

After their routine clinical assessment, aMCI patients and controls underwent testing of simultanagnosia and visual attention, specific for the present study. This testing was conducted in two to three one-hour sessions. Well-established clinical test batteries known to be sensitive to simultanagnosia symptoms were administered to most of our study participants (n = 13 aMCI and n = 10 HC). Moreover, the Simultaneous Perception Task (SPT), a time-unlimited experimental task that allows for different levels of difficulty and has proved useful to reveal simultanagnosia symptoms in neurodegenerative samples, such as Huntington's disease (Finke, et al., 2007), was applied in all participants. To assess visual attention, TVA-based whole- and partial-report were applied in all participants, but we only focus on the whole-report results here. In both the SPT and the TVA whole-report (TVA-WR), stimuli were shown on a 17-inch monitor (1024 x 768 pixels screen resolution). The viewing distance was approximately 50 cm.

2.3. Assessment of simultanagnosia symptoms

2.3.1. Neuropsychological assessment of simultanagnosia – BORB and VOSP

Specific tasks were taken from two standardized and widely used neuropsychological batteries that are employed to assess impairments in the simultaneous perception of visual

objects and spatial locations in patient populations. More specifically, the Overlapping Figures – Line Drawings subtest of the Birmingham Object Recognition Battery (BORB) (Riddoch and Humphreys, 1993) and the subtests Dot Counting, Position Discrimination, and Number Location of the Visual Object and Space Perception Battery (VOSP) (Warrington and James, 1991) were used. For the BORB, we obtained the time (in seconds) per sheet in paired non-overlapping and overlapping line drawing condition and a ratio between the two (i.e., overlapping time divided by non-overlapping time). For the VOSP, we used the total score of correct responses in each subtest.

2.3.2. Experimental assessment of simultaneous object perception—SPT

The SPT (Finke, et al., 2007) is an experimental task that assesses simultaneous object perception deficits. We consider the SPT as complementary to the standard neuropsychological simultanagnosia batteries because it is time-unconstrained (i.e., it sets no time limit for participants to respond to stimuli), uses basic geometric shapes for which no elaborated semantic knowledge is needed, and delivers more detailed information on the pattern of deficits in simultaneous object perception because set sizes and condition types vary. In short, the SPT consists of the digital presentation of nine different black line drawings of shapes on a white background without time limit. These nine line drawings correspond to basic shapes including square, triangle, heart-shape, pentagon, hexagon, moon, cross, star, and circle (see Figure 1). The participant's task is to identify them in each of 16 trials under four conditions that increase in the complexity of simultaneous object perception. The first condition, Single Stimulus, is a control condition in which each of these open shapes is separately presented twice; this condition permits ensuring that the participant can correctly perceive, identify, and name all the stimuli. In the three following conditions – Adjacent, Embedded, and Overlapping – the shapes are simultaneously presented in trial displays with two to five items presented in an adjacent, embedded, or overlapping manner (Figure 1). After

the participant indicates that the answer is complete, the next trial starts. A trial counts as an error if the participant is not able to identify at least one of the shapes presented on that trial. The percentage of error trials is computed for each of the conditions that include simultaneously presented shapes. Importantly, we made sure that all participants were able to correctly name all shapes presented in whatever size, small or large, in a pretest. Moreover, to reduce the influence of potential changes in verbal recall ability, or of variability of verbal productions, in patients, the verbal labels they assigned to displayed objects were scored as 'correct' even if these labels were 'uncommon', as long as they indicated correct visual identification.

2.4. Assessment of visual attention

TVA is a computational model that permits mathematical estimation of relevant, independent attentional capacity parameters such as visual processing speed, *C*, and VSTM storage capacity, *K* (Bundesen, 1990). The participant's task is to report verbally as many letters as possible from briefly presented arrays of letters on a black background. Only 'fair certainty' of recognition, rather than the order or speed of reporting, is emphasized in the instruction. The duration of the arrays is individually adjusted in a short pretest. The experimenter enters the reported letters in the reported order and starts the next trial with a button press.

To estimate TVA parameters, an exponential growth function models the participant's letter report accuracy as a function of the effective exposure duration, according to a maximum likelihood method. The threshold for visual perception, parameter *t0*, expressed in milliseconds, is the estimated minimal exposure duration below which information uptake is assumed to be zero. The other two parameters estimated from TVA-WR accuracy are processing speed *C* – i.e., the number of items that can be processed in parallel per second – and VSTM storage capacity *K* – i.e., the number of items that can be held in a VSTM store.

2.5. Statistical analysis

The SPSS v.22 statistical package was used to perform statistical analyses. Two-sample *t*-tests were used to evaluate the differences between aMCI patients and controls in all demographic variables as well as in TVA-WR parameter estimates, and BORB and VOSP results. A mixed ANOVA was conducted on SPT performance (i.e., percentage of errors) with Group (aMCI, HC) as between-subjects factor, and Condition type (Adjacent, Embedded, and Overlapping) and Set size (2, 3, 4, 5) as within-subjects factors, to compare group performance in multiple object perception. Finally, a Spearman-rho analysis was performed to evaluate the association between SPT performance in the Overlapping condition and TVA-WR parameter estimates (processing speed *C*, and VSTM storage capacity *K*) in the group of aMCI patients.

3. Results

3.1. Patients show simultaneous object perception deficits in clinical neuropsychological and experimental tasks

3.1.1. Simultanagnosia symptoms in standard neuropsychological tests

Participants' performance in the BORB and VOSP is presented in Table 2. In the BORB, aMCI patients needed roughly the same time as controls to name non-overlapping pairs of line drawings [patients: M = 25.78, SD = 7.89 seconds vs. controls: M = 21.95 SD = 4.57 seconds, $t(21) = 1.36$, $p = .093$, Cohen's $d = .59$], but significantly more time than controls to name pairs of overlapping line drawings [M = 38.82, SD = 23.71 s vs. M = 25.13, SD = 3.80 s, $t(21) = 1.80$, $p = .043$, Cohen's $d = .79$]. Thus, we found higher overlapping to non-overlapping figures ratios for aMCI patients than for controls [M = 1.48, SD = .50 vs. M = 1.16, SD = .14, $t(21) = 1.92$, $p = .034$, Cohen's $d = .84$]. Analyzing the aMCI patients' performance based on the BORB test norm data [i.e., M = 21.5 s per sheet (0.9 per item) for overlapping line drawings, and M = 23.9 per sheet (1.0 per item) for non-overlapping drawings] revealed that they were significantly impaired in their identification (i.e., naming)

time for both non-overlapping and overlapping line drawings (Riddoch and Humphreys, 1993). At the individual level, all but one aMCI patients exhibited longer identification times and higher overlapping to non-overlapping ratios than the average values reported in the test's norms (i.e., 1.0/1.1; Riddoch and Humphreys, 1993). Of note, general performance in the BORB did not correlate with the CERAD delayed verbal recall (p-value > .1), and only the overlapping to non-overlapping ratio significantly correlated with the CERAD delayed visual recall (rho = -.786, p = .001), so that longer times to identify overlapping, compared to non-overlapping, figures were associated with lower scores in visual recall.

In the space perception battery of the VOSP, aMCI patients exhibited significantly lower performance than controls in the Position Discrimination subtest only [patients: M = 17.92, SD = 2.46 vs. controls: M = 19.50, SD = .85, t(21) = -2.15, p = .024, Cohen's d = -.94; other subtests' p-values > .1]. An additional comparison of aMCI patient data to the tests' norm data revealed that in Position Discrimination, aMCI patients scored on average below the 5% cut-off score (i.e., 18) for healthy participants and their numerical average was even below that of the clinical norm group with right-hemisphere damage (i.e., M = 18.7) (Warrington and James, 1991). At the individual level, almost half (46%) of the patients failed this subtest. We did not find significant differences between the groups in the Dot Counting and Number Location subtests, with the patients too performing within the norms in these tests. Unlike the BORB, the VOSP Position Discrimination scores correlated significantly negatively with the CERAD delayed verbal recall (rho = -.724, p = .003), but not with the visual recall (rho = -.081, p = .396). However, when the association between Position Discrimination and delayed verbal recall was assessed in the only six patients who failed the subtest, the correlation was no longer significant (rho = .088, p = .434).

In sum, aMCI patients showed deficits in simultaneous object perception in standard neuropsychological tests. These deficits were revealed chiefly in the BORB Overlapping Figures – Line Drawings subtest, sensitive to simultanagnosia symptoms. Additionally,

significant deficits in position discrimination appear to indicate a deficit in simultaneous perception of spatial locations. However, normal performance in dot counting and location of numbers indicates that spatial perception was basically spared in the aMCI patients. Importantly, the deficits observed in aMCI were not related to low global cognitive state as measured by the MMSE (all ps > .2). Only the deficit in simultaneous perception of spatial locations was related to verbal memory performance, and only the overlapping to non-overlapping ratio was associated with visual memory performance.

3.1.2. Simultaneous object perception deficits in experimental SPT task

Average error percentages in the SPT are depicted in Figure 2 separately for each group, condition, and set size. The mixed ANOVA, with main terms for Group, Condition, and Set size, revealed all main effects to be significant (Group: $F_{1, 30} = 18.482$, $p < .001$; Condition: $F_{1.79, 53.66} = 20.173$, $p < .001$; and Set size: $F_{2.93, 87.93} = 19.909$, $p < .001$). Three two-way interactions among the factors were also observed (Group by Condition: $F_{1.79, 53.66} = 8.481$, $p = .001$; Group by Set size: $F_{2.93, 87.93} = 8.434$, $p < .001$; and Condition by Set size: $F_{3.47, 103.98} = 10.868$, $p < .001$). Finally, there was also a significant Group by Condition by Set size interaction ($F_{3.47, 103.98} = 4.003$, $p = .007$). To analyze this three-way interaction in more detail, we computed mixed ANOVAs with the factors Group and Set size separately for each Condition (i.e., Adjacent, Embedded, and Overlapping). In all conditions, significant main effects of Group (Adjacent: $F_{1, 30} = 5.171$, $p = .030$; Embedded: $F_{1, 30} = 11.942$, $p = .002$; Overlapping: $F_{1,30} = 16.904$, $p < .001$) indicated that aMCI patients generally made more errors than controls. A significant main effect of Set size was found only in the Overlapping condition ($F_{2.652, 79.56} = 24.513$, $p < .001$; Adjacent and Embedded ps > .188). Similarly, the Group by Set size interaction was only significant in the Overlapping condition ($F_{2.652, 79.56} = 9.518$, $p < .001$; Adjacent and Embedded ps > .188). Post-hoc *t*-tests showed that aMCI patients were significantly worse than healthy controls when more than three shapes were

simultaneously presented [Figure 2; four shapes, mean: 40.62 vs. 3.12, aMCI patients and controls, respectively, $t(30) = 3.795$, $p = .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.38$; five shapes: 56.25 vs. 15.62, respectively, $t(30) = 4.044$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.48$; both ps one-tailed]. These results indicate that aMCI patients were in general worse than controls in identifying simultaneously presented shapes. However, only when these shapes were presented in an overlapping manner did aMCI patients show particularly severe difficulties with larger set sizes (i.e., > 3 items).

3.2. Visual attention deficits

As listed in Table 3, aMCI patients exhibited significantly lower processing speed *C* estimates and significantly higher perceptual thresholds *t0* than healthy control participants in the TVA-WR. In other words, aMCI patients required relatively longer stimulus durations and were able to process fewer elements simultaneously compared to control participants. However, we did not find a significant difference in VSTM storage capacity *K* estimates between groups. Neither processing speed *C* (rho = -.242, p = .183) nor *t0* estimates (rho = -.372, p = .130) significantly correlated with global cognitive state as assessed by the MMSE.

3.3. Overlapping figure perception deficits are associated with reduced processing speed in aMCI

To determine whether simultaneous object perception deficits in patients with aMCI are associated with a slowing in visual information uptake (i.e., a reduction in visual processing speed *C*), we correlated the percentage of errors in the SPT Overlapping condition, collapsed across set size (i.e., the measure that was assumed to be most sensitive for subtle changes in simultaneous object perception and that turned out to be most affected), with processing speed *C* in patients with aMCI. As expected, higher error percentages in identifying simultaneously presented, overlapping objects were associated with lower estimates of processing speed *C* (Figure 3; rho = -.497, p = .025, one-tailed), but not with VSTM capacity *K* (rho = .034, p =

.450) or *t0* (rho = .148, p = .292) estimates. To examine whether the relationship between simultaneous perception deficits and processing speed would be confirmed when using clinically established tasks for the assessment of simultanagnosia, we calculated the correlations between visual processing speed and performance on those tasks on which patients performed worse than healthy controls. Note that complete data were available only for a subgroup of patients (n = 13). We found a tendency towards a negative relationship between the latencies to name pairs of overlapping objects in the BORB and processing speed *C* (rho = -.426, p = .073). However, the correlation between errors in the Position Discrimination condition of the VOSP and processing speed *C* was non-significant (rho = .128, p = .339). The correlation between the percentage of errors in the SPT and processing speed *C* did not change for patients with at least one risk e4 allele of ApoE (*n* = 11) compared to the whole sample of patients (*n* = 16) and became non-significant (Closed circles in Figure 3; rho = -.372, p = .130). Importantly, these deficits in simultaneous object perception did not relate to the relatively low global cognitive state in aMCI patients as assessed by the MMSE (rho = -.301, p = .128), or to verbal memory as assessed in the CERAD delayed verbal recall (rho = .111, p = .341). However, similar to the BORB results, simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI patients did also relate to visual memory recall (rho = -.532, p = .017) and were, thus, not solely impaired by the patients' relatively low global cognitive state or general memory impairments.

We also examined whether a more low-level visual impairment, i.e., the elevated visual threshold that was documented, might alternatively, or additionally, explain the deficits in SPT performance. Importantly, the significant association between visual processing speed *C* and percentage of errors in the SPT Overlapping condition was replicated when controlling for *t0* (rho = -.492, p = .031). Accordingly, the simultaneous object perception deficits displayed by aMCI patients are not so much related to a more basic elevation of the visual threshold than to a reduction of visual processing speed per se.

Finally, we examined for a more general association between the rate of visual information uptake and simultaneous object perception also in our normal observers. The respective correlation between the percentage of errors in the SPT Overlapping condition and visual processing speed *C* was not significant in the healthy control group (rho = -.162, p = .274, one-tailed). However, the difference between the respective correlation coefficients of the patient and healthy groups was not significant either (Z = .97, p = .166, one-tailed).

4. Discussion

The present study investigated whether aMCI patients show a deficit of simultaneous object perception and whether such a deficit is attributable to a reduced visual processing rate. We provide direct evidence for (1) simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI as an early symptomatic predementia phase of AD, and (2) reduced visual processing speed underlying simultaneous object perception deficits. Three main findings support this evidence. First, aMCI patients show deficits in simultaneous object perception. More specifically, when aMCI patients had to identify each one of a set of overlapping shapes in the BORB, they needed significantly more time than age-, education-, and gender-matched healthy controls, resulting in significantly higher overlapping to non-overlapping time ratios. Second, compared to healthy controls, aMCI patients showed significantly lower processing speed *C* in a TVA-based whole-report paradigm. Finally, specifically the individual severity of the processing speed reduction was significantly related to – and would, thus, appear to underlie – the simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI.

4.1. Simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI

We found that patients with aMCI had significant difficulties compared to healthy controls in two tasks of simultaneous object perception, the BORB and the SPT. In both tasks, deficits occurred in particular when objects were presented in an overlapping manner, i.e., under

conditions that are conducive for simultanagnosia symptoms to become manifest (Bálint and Harvey, 1995,Laeng, et al., 1999,Luria, 1959,Riddoch and Humphreys, 2004,Valenza, et al., 2004). More precisely, in the BORB, aMCI patients were slow particularly in the overlapping condition, as indexed by a higher overlapping-to-non-overlapping time ratio; in the SPT, they exhibited an increasing number of errors with increasing set size particularly in the overlapping condition. Importantly, aMCI patients showed relatively normal speed in identifying non-overlapping drawings in the BORB, and all patients were able to name the single shapes presented at all (large and small) sizes in the screening part of the SPT, as well as in the Adjacent condition. Thus, importantly, the deficit in identifying overlapping shapes does not relate to reduced visual acuity, semantic memory deficits, or visual object agnosia. Remarkably, although simultaneous object perception deficits as reported here are characteristic of posterior cortical atrophy (Neitzel, et al., 2016,Tang-Wai, et al., 2004) and quite common in AD dementia (Mendez, et al., 1990,Rizzo, et al., 2000), whether they are also present in individuals with aMCI at a symptomatic predementia phase of the more typical form of AD had, to the best of our knowledge, not been systematically tested before.

The use of the experimental SPT delivered fine-grained information on the nature of the multiple object perception deficits in aMCI. Specifically, we observed that only when stimuli were presented in an overlapping manner did aMCI patients show increased set size effects compared to healthy controls. Of note, the simultaneous object perception deficits were not only evident in our experimental task, but were also revealed in the BORB. As the diagnosis of aMCI focuses on memory impairments, simultaneous object perception is usually not evaluated in routine neuropsychological assessment; thus, it is unsurprising that such deficits in an established standard neuropsychological test for simultanagnosia had not been reported before. Furthermore, it is worth noting that both tasks use free viewing conditions without any time restrictions, and yet performance was particularly compromised in conditions with multiple overlapping shapes. In most previous studies, the duration of

stimulus exposition to patients with simultanagnosia had been limited (Coslett and Saffran, 1991,Duncan, et al., 2003,Huberle and Karnath, 2006,Pavese, et al., 2002). In the present study, by contrast, we used the non-speeded SPT to enable us to examine separately processing speed and simultaneous object perception. In other words, we used the SPT to determine whether indications of slowing of visual processing in a whole-report task using briefly presented letter arrays (Duncan, et al., 2003,Finke, et al., 2007) can make valid predictions regarding deficits under unconstrained viewing conditions.

Furthermore, the present study revealed a positive association between the degree of simultaneous object perception deficits and the degree of visual memory impairment in aMCI patients. In the BORB, higher overlapping to non-overlapping time ratios related to lower scores in visual recall. In the SPT, more errors in the overlapping condition related to lower scores in visual recall. Thus, our results shed light on the question as to why especially visual memory tests using complex visual material such as the Rey-Osterrieth and the Benton tests are exceptionally sensitive for the earliest AD-related decline even in the preclinical phase (Kawas, et al., 2003). Difficulties in these tasks might result from basic impairments in the encoding of multiple visual stimuli or stimuli containing multiple parts. Thus, while appropriate for cognitive screening, conclusions about the deficits underlying low performance in these tests should be drawn with caution.

Unlike with visual memory impairments, simultaneous object perception deficits were not associated with relatively low global cognitive state or verbal memory impairments in aMCI. This lack of association strongly suggests that simultaneous object perception deficits constitute an independent aspect in their own right in aMCI, which might, in turn, underlie low performance in visual memory tasks. In the context of evidence suggesting that aMCI is a heterogeneous entity in its clinical progression (Li and Zhang, 2015), assessing simultaneous object perception might help disclose multi-dimensionality in aMCI patients who, at first glance, present as a single-domain aMCI individuals. The simultaneous object perception

deficits displayed by aMCI patients are, however, not comparable to those shown by the classical cases reported by Bálint (Bálint, 1909); rather, they would be classified only as 'mild' (Hecaen and De Ajuriaguerra, 1954).

Concerning daily-life functioning, we usually do not perceive and handle objects in an isolated manner. Thus, arguably, increasing deficits in the simultaneous perception of objects likely contribute to the incipient problems of daily living during aMCI, including impairments in spatial navigation (Laczo, et al., 2009), such as in way-finding (Allison, et al., 2016), which might signal the clinical start of AD dementia.

4.2. Visual processing speed reduction leads to simultaneous perception deficits in aMCI

In the present study, we followed the group study-based approach to neurodegenerative diseases advocated by Rizzo and Vecera (Rizzo and Vecera, 2002) and first applied by Finke et al. (Finke, et al., 2007) in research on simultanagnosia and its underlying attentional deficits. Based on a staged decline in visual attention functions and in particular processing speed in individual cases of aMCI (Bublak, et al., 2011), and on previous reports that visual processing speed reduction can lead to symptoms of simultanagnosia (Chechlacz, et al., 2012,Duncan, et al., 2003,Finke, et al., 2007,Neitzel, et al., 2016), we hypothesized that reduced visual processing speed underlies simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI. In agreement with the results in patients with stroke (Duncan, et al., 2003) and Huntington's disease (Finke, et al., 2007), we observed a significant association between visual processing speed and simultaneous object perception in aMCI patients. Taken together, these results indicate that aMCI patients' reductions in visual processing speed underlie their simultaneous object perception deficits. Moreover, our results complement the previous findings in indicating that, despite heterogeneous causes, the relationship between a reduced speed of visual information uptake and deficient simultaneous objects perception constitutes a general principle across patients with symptoms of simultanagnosia. Likewise, our results add to the

existing evidence that sufficient visual processing speed provides the necessary basis for identifying, integrating, and making sense of the components of complex visual scenes. Accordingly, the association between processing speed (reductions) and simultaneous object perception (errors) would not be exclusive to aMCI patients, but may hold for healthy participants, too. In the present study, such an association may simply have been obscured by healthy participants performing near ceiling on the simultaneous object perception task. Consistent with a general association, we did not find a significant difference in the correlation coefficients between the aMCI patients and the control participants. However, further studies using experimental conditions best suited to assess simultaneous object perception in healthy samples are required to settle the generalizability of this association.

At a first glance, it might seem astonishing that reduced visual processing speed would affect the identification of overlapping shapes only, leaving the speed and accuracy of identifying multiple shapes presented in an embedded or adjacent fashion relatively unaffected. As similarly argued before (Duncan, et al., 2003,Finke, et al., 2007), patients with slow visual processing might use a strategy of serial selection. Consistent with the piecemeal perception known from patients with simultanagnosia (Paterson and Zangwill, 1944,Rizzo and Vecera, 2002), such a strategy would engender the selection of one stimulus after the other. For example, with adjacent stimuli, adaptive concentration of the available, reduced processing resources on a given stimulus location at a time will increase the likelihood of successful encoding, though the overall time taken for the whole set of stimuli will be increased and patients will appear to perform slower. Embedded stimuli, too, might be processed and reported in series, starting with the outer- or inner-most object and reporting them in a sequential manner, ordered by stimulus size. When objects are overlapping, as they typically are in multi-element complex daily scenes, according to biased competition models (Bundesen, 1990,Bundesen, et al., 2005,Desimone and Duncan, 1995), objects would compete for selection and access to VSTM. Moreover, the amount of processing capacity that

is distributed among objects is limited, and, thus, only those objects that are processed fastest are selected and stored in VSTM (Bundesen, 1990). If processing capacity is overall reduced – as in patients with simultaneous perception deficits – only the most salient object can be selected; the others, by contrast, will not gain access to VSTM and will thus not be consciously represented (Duncan, et al., 2003).

One might expect that processing speed would also be related to performance in the Adjacent and Embedded conditions, given that multiple objects must be perceived and categorized across all SPT conditions. In non-overlapping conditions, however, the receptive fields are not shared, as a result of which the neural competition is not as severe as in the Overlapping condition (Bundesen, et al., 2005,Desimone and Duncan, 1995). In our overlapping condition, the stimulus array contained multiple objects that were superimposed at the same location, i.e., they were segmented into shape parts, or fragments, with overlapping contours. In this situation, a serial selection strategy cannot be successful. Due to the concentration of processing resources on one single location, two or more objects that share the same position will also have to share processing capacity. Thus, when patients with slowed visual processing are forced (to attempt) to divide their limited processing resources among multiple objects, their capacity will be exhausted (Humphreys and Price, 1994,Riddoch and Humphreys, 2004). Consequently, the likelihood of making errors or omitting some objects will be high, because patients cannot muster the resources necessary to reach the depth of discrimination required for successful (whole-) object identification. Thus, all but the most salient objects will have only a low probability of being identified.

The association with visual processing speed *C* was only borderline significant with performance in the Paired Overlapping condition of the BORB, and not reliable for the Position Discrimination condition of the VOSP. These results differ from a previous report of significant correlations in patients with posterior cortical atrophy (Neitzel, et al., 2016). As clinical neuropsychological batteries designed to assess severe symptoms, the BORB and

VOSP may not be sensitive to more subtle deficits in simultaneous object perception, as displayed by aMCI patients. In the BORB, only pairs of overlapping objects are presented, while in the SPT aMCI patients showed a significantly increased error rate only at higher set sizes in the Overlapping condition (see Figure 2 and Table 2). Thus, the more complex SPT, with up to five overlapping stimuli, yielded a greater variation of responses, permitting a significant relationship between simultaneous object perception deficits and reduced processing speed to be successfully established in aMCI.

Since the first analyses of patients with simultanagnosia, the precise underlying cognitive deficit has been matter of debate. For example, a 'general weakening' of visual traces (Luria, 1959) or visual representations (Bálint, 1909) was suggested to slow even the perception of single objects, thereby disproportionately affecting the perception of multiple objects. This view received support from evidence that single-item processing too is slowed in patients with simultanagnosia (Friedman and Alexander, 1984,Kinsbourne and Warrington, 1962,Levine and Calvanio, 1978). Other authors (Coslett and Saffran, 1991,Friedman-Hill, et al., 1995,Pavese, et al., 2002) proposed that a deficit in VSTM storage gives rise to an inability to bind shape and position properties of more than one object and, as a result, in storing multiple objects. Accordingly, Rizzo and Vecera (Rizzo and Vecera, 2002) proposed to take attentional functions and specifically VSTM into consideration to gain a clearer understanding of simultanagnosia. However, research examining whether VSTM or processing speed deficits underlie symptoms of simultanagnosia has found that the latter are primarily related to visual processing speed, rather than to VSTM storage capacity, reductions (Duncan, et al., 2003,Finke, et al., 2007,Neitzel, et al., 2016).

It is well known that with increasing encoding time, more items can be encoded into VSTM (Vogel, et al., 2006). Thus, appropriate methodological procedures are required for validly measuring (individual) VSTM capacity in participants with reduced visual processing speed. In the TVA-based whole-report paradigm, exposure durations are adjusted individually

so as to ensure that even participants displaying severely reduced processing speeds and/or an elevated visual threshold can fill their VSTM store up to its limit (Bundesen, 1990,Finke, et al., 2005). Following this approach (which permits processing speed and storage capacity to measured independently), we were able to demonstrate that VSTM storage capacity is actually relatively spared in aMCI patients. For subsequent stages of the disease – i.e., AD dementia –, by contrast, previous reports have already documented reduced VSTM capacity (Bublak, et al., 2011,Vecera and Rizzo, 2004).

4.3. Possible neural mechanisms underlying simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI

According to the neural TVA, processing capacity is directly related to the number and activation of cortical neurons that are devoted to the processing of a visual object, so that (potentially) important objects are represented by more cells than less important ones (Bundesen, et al., 2005,Bundesen, et al., 2015). Consequently, any disease process that hampers neuronal function can reduce processing capacity.

In the typical aMCI, structural and functional changes of a frontoparietal network are well documented (Mattsson, et al., 2014,Perry and Hodges, 1999,Sorg, et al., 2012,Sorg, et al., 2007). Frontoparietal regions, as well as the white-matter tracts connecting them, are considered relevant for attentional processing (Coull, et al., 1996,Ptak, 2012,Thiebaut de Schotten, et al., 2011). Early in the process of AD, at the aMCI stage, frontal and posterior parietal regions show hypometabolism even without signs of gray matter atrophy (Kljajevic, et al., 2014) and decreased functional connectivity (Sorg, et al., 2007), and amyloid deposition, metabolic changes, and atrophy when AD is already established (Buckner, et al., 2005).

Another factor that might contribute to reduced processing speed is the dysfunction of the cholinergic system, like that occurring in AD (Coyle, et al., 1983), as cholinergic neurotransmission is known to be relevant for fast perceptual processing (Schliebs and

Arendt, 2011). The cholinergic system is assumed to play a decisive role in the attentional processing of sensory stimuli (e.g., Rizzo, et al., 2000) due to its innervation of attention-related (i.e., frontal and parietal) areas (Lawrence and Sahakian, 1995). In sum, the simultaneous object perception deficits that we observed in patients with aMCI find an explanation in the reduction of visual processing speed, which, in turn, might be attributable to the neural changes in a frontoparietal attention network.

4.4. Limitations

Visual crowding due to contour interactions (Hess, et al., 2000,Huurneman, et al., 2012) might, conceivably, also explain simultaneous object perception deficits in aMCI patients. If so, the deficits would be indicative of a low-level visual, rather than a higher-level cognitive, limitation. Indeed, in our sample of aMCI patients, the perceptual threshold *t0* was significantly increased (see Table 3). However, the association between visual processing speed *C* and SPT performance remained unaffected even when we controlled for this low-level factor. Future studies might more systematically vary contour interactions to examine for possible effects of visual crowding on simultaneous object perception in aMCI patients. Further, as deficits in attentional selection parameters have previously been described in aMCI (Redel, et al., 2012), follow-on studies might also profitably investigate the association between TVA partial-report and SPT performance. Moreover, further research would be necessary in order to determine whether visual processing speed is a basic mechanism underlying simultaneous object perception in healthy observers generally.

4.5. Outlook

The findings of significant simultaneous object deficits have clinical implications and demonstrate the relevance of analyzing cognitive domains beyond memory in aMCI patients

in both clinical and research settings. Investigating in a longitudinal manner the neural mechanisms of reduced visual processing speed in aMCI and their relation to the spread of AD pathology and brain connectivity measures could help us better understand when and how these deficits start to appear.

5. Conclusion

In this study, we report simultaneous object perception deficits in patients with aMCI and show that these deficits are particularly severe in patients with reduced visual processing speed. Collectively, our results and those of previous studies allow us to conclude that visual processing speed reduction is a crucial process that underlies deficits in simultaneous object perception.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration [EU Marie Curie Initial Training Network “Individualised Diagnostics & Rehabilitation of Attention Disorders” (INDIREA), grant no. ITN-2013-606901 to A.R., H.M., and K.F], by the Alzheimer Research Initiative e.V. (AFI) [grant to K.F. and C.S.], and by the Graduate School of Systemic Neurosciences, LMU Munich.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Tables

Table 1. Demographic variables of both groups.

Variable	**aMCI patients N = 16**	**Control participants N = 16**	**t(30)**	**p**
Sex [female (%) / male (%)]	7 / 9 (43.8) / (56.3)	7 / 9 (43.8) / (56.3)	--	--
Age [years]	70.86 (7.81)	69.95 (7.39)	.34	.369
Education [years]	11.63 (1.86)	11.63 (1.02)	.00	.500
MMSE / 30	26.69 (1.49)	28.44 (.89)	**-4.02***	<.001
Handedness [right / left / ambidextrous]	15 / 1 / 0	12 / 2 / 2	--	--

***** Statistically significant at $p < .05$, one-tailed. Means (Standard Deviation, SD) are shown if not otherwise stated; MMSE: MiniMental State Examination (Folstein, et al., 1975).

Table 2. BORB and VOSP results for both groups.

	aMCI patients (N = 13)		Healthy controls (N = 10)					
Subtest	M	SD	M	SD	t(21)	p	95% CI	Cohen's d
BORB								
Paired non-overlapping (seconds per sheet)	25.78	7.89	21.95	4.57	1.36	.093	[-2.01, 9-67]	.59
Paired overlapping (seconds per sheet)	38.82	23.71	25.13	3.80	**1.80**	.043	[-2.14, 29.52]	.79
Ratio (overlapping / non-overlapping)	1.48	.50	1.16	.14	**1.92**	.034	[-.02, .65]	.84
VOSP								
Dot counting /10	9.31	1.11	9.70	.67	-.98	.168	[-1.22, .44]	-.43
Position discrimination /20	17.92	2.46	19.50	.85	**-2.15**	.024	[-3.14, -.01]	-.94
Number location/10	8.38	1.56	8.70	1.16	-.53	.299	[-1.54, .91]	-.23

BORB: Birmingham Object Recognition Battery (Riddoch and Humphreys, 1993), Line Drawings condition; VOSP: Visual Object and Space Perception Battery (Warrington and James, 1991). In bold: statistically significant at $p < .05$, one-tailed. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation. CI: Confidence Interval of the difference; HC: Healthy Control; aMCI: amnestic Mild Cognitive Impairment.

Table 3. Whole-report TVA (TVA-WR) estimates for aMCI patients and healthy controls.

TVA-WR parameters	aMCI patients (N = 16)		Healthy controls (N = 16)		t(30)	p	95% CI	Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD				
Processing speed *C*	13.82	5.37	17.55	5.36	**-1.97**	.029	[-7.60, .25]	-.72
Storage capacity *K*	2.63	.39	2.69	.44	-.37	.358	[-.35, .25]	-.13
Visual threshold *t0*	112	60.39	35.17	46.91	**4.02***	<.001	[37.78, 115.87]	1.47

In bold: statistically significant at $p < .05$ and at $p < .001$ (*), one-tailed. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation. CI: Confidence Interval of the difference; HC: Healthy Control; aMCI: Amnestic Mild Cognitive Impairment; TVA: Theory of Visual Attention (Bundesen, 1990).

Figures



Figure 1. Example-items: (a.) Adjacent- (b.) Embedded-, and (c.) Overlapping-shapes condition of the Simultaneous Perception Task (SPT; see (Finke, et al., 2007) for a presentation of all trial displays). Each condition has 4 trials of 2 to 5 different geometrical shapes that are presented to the participant without time limit. A trial counts as an error trial if the participant fails to identify at least one of the shapes. Before the adjacent condition, there is a control condition, in which each shape is presented alone to ensure that the participant can identify and name them all.



Figure 2. Mean error percentages in the Simultaneous Perception Task (SPT) per set size and condition type are depicted for the MCI patients group (dark gray) and the age-, gender-, and education-matched healthy control participants group (light gray). Note that aMCI patients did not make errors in the 2-shapes trials in both the Adjacent and Overlapping conditions of the SPT. Error bars indicate standard error of the mean. * Significantly different at $p < .005$, two-tailed.



Figure 3. Scatterplot relating aMCI patients' individual parameter estimates of visual processing speed *C* and their percentage of errors in the Overlapping condition of the Simultaneous Perception Task (SPT). *C* estimates are significantly negatively correlated with errors; rho = -.497, p = .025, one-tailed. Closed circles are aMCI patients with at least one risk allele (4 allele) and open circles are aMCI patients with the 3 allele or 2 allele.

References

Albert, M.S., DeKosky, S.T., Dickson, D., Dubois, B., Feldman, H.H., Fox, N.C., Gamst, A., Holtzman, D.M., Jagust, W.J., Petersen, R.C., Snyder, P.J., Carrillo, M.C., Thies, B., Phelps, C.H. 2011. The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement 7(3), 270-9. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.008.

Alescio-Lautier, B., Michel, B.F., Herrera, C., Elahmadi, A., Chambon, C., Touzet, C., Paban, V. 2007. Visual and visuospatial short-term memory in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer disease: role of attention. Neuropsychologia 45(8), 1948-60. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.04.033.

Allison, S.L., Fagan, A.M., Morris, J.C., Head, D. 2016. Spatial Navigation in Preclinical Alzheimer's Disease. J Alzheimers Dis 52(1), 77-90. doi:10.3233/JAD-150855.

Bálint, R. 1909. Seelenlähmung des "Schauens,"optische Ataxie, räumliche Störung der Aufmerksamkeit. Monatschr Psychiat Neurol 25, 51-81.

Bálint, R., Harvey, M. 1995. Psychic paralysis of gaze, optic ataxia, and spatial disorder of attention. Cognitive Neuropsychology 12(3), 265-81. doi:10.1080/02643299508251999.

Berres, M., Monsch, A.U., Bernasconi, F., Thalmann, B., Stahelin, H.B. 2000. Normal ranges of neuropsychological tests for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. Stud Health Technol Inform 77, 195-9.

Bonney, K.R., Almeida, O.P., Flicker, L., Davies, S., Clarnette, R., Anderson, M., Lautenschlager, N.T. 2006. Inspection time in non-demented older adults with mild cognitive impairment. Neuropsychologia 44(8), 1452-6. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.12.002.

Bublak, P., Redel, P., Sorg, C., Kurz, A., Forstl, H., Muller, H.J., Schneider, W.X., Finke, K. 2011. Staged decline of visual processing capacity in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Aging 32(7), 1219-30. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2009.07.012.

Buckner, R.L., Snyder, A.Z., Shannon, B.J., LaRossa, G., Sachs, R., Fotenos, A.F., Sheline, Y.I., Klunk, W.E., Mathis, C.A., Morris, J.C., Mintun, M.A. 2005. Molecular, structural, and functional characterization of Alzheimer's disease: evidence for a relationship between default activity, amyloid, and memory. J Neurosci 25(34), 7709-17. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2177-05.2005.

Bundesen, C. 1990. A theory of visual attention. Psychol Rev 97(4), 523-47.

Bundesen, C. 1998. A computational theory of visual attention. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 353(1373), 1271-81. doi:10.1098/rstb.1998.0282.

Bundesen, C., Habekost, T., Kyllingsbaek, S. 2005. A neural theory of visual attention: bridging cognition and neurophysiology. Psychol Rev 112(2), 291-328. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.112.2.291.

Bundesen, C., Vangkilde, S., Petersen, A. 2015. Recent developments in a computational theory of visual attention (TVA). Vision Res 116(Pt B), 210-8. doi:10.1016/j.visres.2014.11.005.

Chechlacz, M., Rotshtein, P., Hansen, P.C., Riddoch, J.M., Deb, S., Humphreys, G.W. 2012. The neural underpinings of simultanagnosia: disconnecting the visuospatial attention network. J Cogn Neurosci 24(3), 718-35. doi:10.1162/jocn_a_00159.

Corbetta, M. 1998. Frontoparietal cortical networks for directing attention and the eye to visual locations: identical, independent, or overlapping neural systems? Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 95(3), 831-8.

Coslett, H.B., Saffran, E. 1991. Simultanagnosia. To see but not two see. Brain 114 (Pt 4), 1523-45.

Coull, J.T., Frith, C.D., Frackowiak, R.S., Grasby, P.M. 1996. A fronto-parietal network for rapid visual information processing: a PET study of sustained attention and working memory. Neuropsychologia 34(11), 1085-95.

Coyle, J.T., Price, D.L., DeLong, M.R. 1983. Alzheimer's disease: a disorder of cortical cholinergic innervation. Science 219(4589), 1184-90.

Desimone, R., Duncan, J. 1995. Neural mechanisms of selective visual attention. Annu Rev Neurosci 18, 193-222. doi:10.1146/annurev.ne.18.030195.001205.

Drzezga, A., Becker, J.A., Van Dijk, K.R., Sreenivasan, A., Talukdar, T., Sullivan, C., Schultz, A.P., Sepulcre, J., Putcha, D., Greve, D., Johnson, K.A., Sperling, R.A. 2011. Neuronal dysfunction and disconnection of cortical hubs in non-demented subjects with elevated amyloid burden. Brain 134(Pt 6), 1635-46. doi:10.1093/brain/awr066.

Duncan, J., Bundesen, C., Olson, A., Humphreys, G., Ward, R., Kyllingsbaek, S., van Raamsdonk, M., Rorden, C., Chavda, S. 2003. Attentional functions in dorsal and ventral simultanagnosia. Cogn Neuropsychol 20(8), 675-701. doi:10.1080/02643290342000041.

Engler, H., Forsberg, A., Almkvist, O., Blomquist, G., Larsson, E., Savitcheva, I., Wall, A., Ringheim, A., Langstrom, B., Nordberg, A. 2006. Two-year follow-up of amyloid deposition in patients with Alzheimer's disease. Brain 129(Pt 11), 2856-66. doi:10.1093/brain/awl178.

Finke, K., Bublak, P., Dose, M., Muller, H.J., Schneider, W.X. 2006. Parameter-based assessment of spatial and non-spatial attentional deficits in Huntington's disease. Brain 129(Pt 5), 1137-51. doi:10.1093/brain/awl040.

Finke, K., Bublak, P., Krummenacher, J., Kyllingsbaek, S., Muller, H.J., Schneider, W.X. 2005. Usability of a theory of visual attention (TVA) for parameter-based measurement of attention I: evidence from normal subjects. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 11(7), 832-42.

Finke, K., Myers, N., Bublak, P., Sorg, C. 2013. A biased competition account of attention and memory in Alzheimer's disease. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 368(1628), 20130062. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0062.

Finke, K., Schneider, W.X., Redel, P., Dose, M., Kerkhoff, G., Muller, H.J., Bublak, P. 2007. The capacity of attention and simultaneous perception of objects: a group study of Huntington's disease patients. Neuropsychologia 45(14), 3272-84. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.06.006.

Folstein, M.F., Folstein, S.E., McHugh, P.R. 1975. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. J Psychiatr Res 12(3), 189-98.

Friedman-Hill, S.R., Robertson, L.C., Treisman, A. 1995. Parietal contributions to visual feature binding: evidence from a patient with bilateral lesions. Science 269(5225), 853-5.

Friedman, R.B., Alexander, M.P. 1984. Pictures, Images, and Pure Alexia: A Case Study. Cognitive Neuropsychology 1(1), 9-23. doi:10.1080/02643298408252014.

Hecaen, H., De Ajuriaguerra, J. 1954. Balint's syndrome (psychic paralysis of visual fixation) and its minor forms. Brain 77(3), 373-400.

Hess, R.F., Dakin, S.C., Kapoor, N. 2000. The foveal 'crowding' effect: physics or physiology? Vision Res 40(4), 365-70.

Hindmarch, I., Lehfeld, H., de Jongh, P., Erzigkeit, H. 1998. The Bayer Activities of Daily Living Scale (B-ADL). Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 9 Suppl 2, 20-6.

Holmes, G. 1918. Disturbances of Visual Orientation. Br J Ophthalmol 2(9), 449-68.

Huberle, E., Karnath, H.O. 2006. Global shape recognition is modulated by the spatial distance of local elements--evidence from simultanagnosia. Neuropsychologia 44(6), 905-11. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.08.013.

Humphreys, G.W., Price, C.J. 1994. Visual feature discrimination in simultanagnosia: A study of two cases. Cognitive Neuropsychology 11(4), 393-434. doi:10.1080/02643299408251980.

Huurneman, B., Boonstra, F.N., Cox, R.F., Cillessen, A.H., van Rens, G. 2012. A systematic review on 'Foveal Crowding' in visually impaired children and perceptual learning as a method to reduce Crowding. BMC Ophthalmol 12, 27. doi:10.1186/1471-2415-12-27.

Kawas, C.H., Corrada, M.M., Brookmeyer, R., Morrison, A., Resnick, S.M., Zonderman, A.B., Arenberg, D. 2003. Visual memory predicts Alzheimer's disease more than a decade before diagnosis. Neurology 60(7), 1089-93.

Kemppainen, N.M., Aalto, S., Wilson, I.A., Nagren, K., Helin, S., Bruck, A., Oikonen, V., Kailajarvi, M., Scheinin, M., Viitanen, M., Parkkola, R., Rinne, J.O. 2007. PET amyloid ligand [11C]PIB uptake is increased in mild cognitive impairment. Neurology 68(19), 1603-6. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000260969.94695.56.

Kinsbourne, M., Warrington, E.K. 1962. A disorder of simultaneous form perception. Brain 85, 461-86.

Kljajevic, V., Grothe, M.J., Ewers, M., Teipel, S., Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging, I. 2014. Distinct pattern of hypometabolism and atrophy in preclinical and predementia Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Aging 35(9), 1973-81. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2014.04.006.

Laczo, J., Vlcek, K., Vyhnalek, M., Vajnerova, O., Ort, M., Holmerova, I., Tolar, M., Andel, R., Bojar, M., Hort, J. 2009. Spatial navigation testing discriminates two types of amnestic mild cognitive impairment. Behav Brain Res 202(2), 252-9. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2009.03.041.

Laeng, B., Kosslyn, S.M., Caviness, V.S., Bates, J. 1999. Can Deficits in spatial indexing contribute to simultanagnosia? Cognitive Neuropsychology 16(2), 81-114. doi:10.1080/026432999380915.

Lawrence, A.D., Sahakian, B.J. 1995. Alzheimer disease, attention, and the cholinergic system. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 9 Suppl 2, 43-9.

Levine, D.N., Calvanio, R. 1978. A study of the visual defect in verbal alexia-simultanagnosia. Brain 101(1), 65-81.

Li, X., Zhang, Z.J. 2015. Neuropsychological and neuroimaging characteristics of amnestic mild cognitive impairment subtypes: a selective overview. CNS Neurosci Ther 21(10), 776-83. doi:10.1111/cns.12391.

Luria, A.R. 1959. Disorders of "simultaneous perception" in a case of bilateral occipito-parietal brain injury. Brain 82, 437-49.

Mattsson, N., Tosun, D., Insel, P.S., Simonson, A., Jack, C.R., Jr., Beckett, L.A., Donohue, M., Jagust, W., Schuff, N., Weiner, M.W., Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging, I. 2014. Association of brain amyloid-beta with cerebral perfusion and structure in Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment. Brain 137(Pt 5), 1550-61. doi:10.1093/brain/awu043.

McAvinue, L.P., Vangkilde, S., Johnson, K.A., Habekost, T., Kyllingsbaek, S., Bundesen, C., Robertson, I.H. 2015. A Componential Analysis of Visual Attention in Children With ADHD. J Atten Disord 19(10), 882-94. doi:10.1177/1087054712461935.

Mendez, M.F., Turner, J., Gilmore, G.C., Remler, B., Tomsak, R.L. 1990. Balint's syndrome in Alzheimer's disease: visuospatial functions. Int J Neurosci 54(3-4), 339-46.

Mintun, M.A., Larossa, G.N., Sheline, Y.I., Dence, C.S., Lee, S.Y., Mach, R.H., Klunk, W.E., Mathis, C.A., DeKosky, S.T., Morris, J.C. 2006. [11C]PIB in a nondemented population: potential antecedent marker of Alzheimer disease. Neurology 67(3), 446-52. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000228230.26044.a4.

Morris, J.C. 1993. The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR): current version and scoring rules. Neurology 43(11), 2412-4.

Morris, J.C., Storandt, M., Miller, J.P., McKeel, D.W., Price, J.L., Rubin, E.H., Berg, L. 2001. Mild cognitive impairment represents early-stage Alzheimer disease. Arch Neurol 58(3), 397-405.

Neitzel, J., Ortner, M., Haupt, M., Redel, P., Grimmer, T., Yakushev, I., Drzezga, A., Bublak, P., Preul, C., Sorg, C., Finke, K. 2016. Neuro-cognitive mechanisms of simultanagnosia in patients with posterior cortical atrophy. Brain. doi:10.1093/brain/aww235.

Neufang, S., Akhrif, A., Riedl, V., Forstl, H., Kurz, A., Zimmer, C., Sorg, C., Wohlschlager, A.M. 2011. Disconnection of frontal and parietal areas contributes to impaired attention in very early Alzheimer's disease. J Alzheimers Dis 25(2), 309-21. doi:10.3233/JAD-2011-102154.

Neufang, S., Akhrif, A., Riedl, V., Forstl, H., Kurz, A., Zimmer, C., Sorg, C., Wohlschlager, A.M. 2014. Predicting effective connectivity from resting-state networks in healthy elderly and patients with prodromal Alzheimer's disease. Hum Brain Mapp 35(3), 954-63. doi:10.1002/hbm.22226.

Paterson, A., Zangwill, O.L. 1944. DISORDERS OF VISUAL SPACE PERCEPTION ASSOCIATED WITH LESIONS OF THE RIGHT CEREBRAL HEMISPHERE. Brain 67(4), 331-58. doi:10.1093/brain/67.4.331.

Pavese, A., Coslett, H.B., Saffran, E., Buxbaum, L. 2002. Limitations of attentional orienting. Effects of abrupt visual onsets and offsets on naming two objects in a patient with simultanagnosia. Neuropsychologia 40(7), 1097-103.

Perry, R.J., Hodges, J.R. 1999. Attention and executive deficits in Alzheimer's disease. A critical review. Brain 122 (Pt 3), 383-404.

Perry, R.J., Watson, P., Hodges, J.R. 2000. The nature and staging of attention dysfunction in early (minimal and mild) Alzheimer's disease: relationship to episodic and semantic memory impairment. Neuropsychologia 38(3), 252-71.

Petersen, R.C. 2004. Mild cognitive impairment as a diagnostic entity. J Intern Med 256(3), 183-94. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2796.2004.01388.x.

Petersen, R.C., Doody, R., Kurz, A., Mohs, R.C., Morris, J.C., Rabins, P.V., Ritchie, K., Rossor, M., Thal, L., Winblad, B. 2001. Current concepts in mild cognitive impairment. Arch Neurol 58(12), 1985-92.

Petersen, R.C., Smith, G.E., Waring, S.C., Ivnik, R.J., Tangalos, E.G., Kokmen, E. 1999. Mild cognitive impairment: clinical characterization and outcome. Arch Neurol 56(3), 303-8.

Ptak, R. 2012. The frontoparietal attention network of the human brain: action, saliency, and a priority map of the environment. Neuroscientist 18(5), 502-15. doi:10.1177/1073858411409051.

Rapp, M.A., Reischies, F.M. 2005. Attention and executive control predict Alzheimer disease in late life: results from the Berlin Aging Study (BASE). Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 13(2), 134-41. doi:10.1176/appi.ajgp.13.2.134.

Redel, P., Bublak, P., Sorg, C., Kurz, A., Forstl, H., Muller, H.J., Schneider, W.X., Perneczky, R., Finke, K. 2012. Deficits of spatial and task-related attentional selection in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Aging 33(1), 195 e27-42. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2010.05.014.

Riddoch, M.J., Humphreys, G.W. 1993. BORB: Birmingham object recognition battery. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, LEA, East Sussex.

Riddoch, M.J., Humphreys, G.W. 2004. Object identification in simultanagnosia: When wholes are not the sum of their parts. Cogn Neuropsychol 21(2), 423-41. doi:10.1080/02643290342000564.

Rizzo, M., Anderson, S.W., Dawson, J., Myers, R., Ball, K. 2000. Visual attention impairments in Alzheimer's disease. Neurology 54(10), 1954-9.

Rizzo, M., Vecera, S.P. 2002. Psychoanatomical substrates of Balint's syndrome. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 72(2), 162-78.

Schliebs, R., Arendt, T. 2011. The cholinergic system in aging and neuronal degeneration. Behav Brain Res 221(2), 555-63. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2010.11.058.

Shulman, K.I., Gold, D.P., Cohen, C.A., Zucchero, C.A. 1993. Clock-drawing and dementia in the community: A longitudinal study. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 8(6), 487-96. doi:10.1002/gps.930080606.

Sorg, C., Myers, N., Redel, P., Bublak, P., Riedl, V., Manoliu, A., Perneczky, R., Grimmer, T., Kurz, A., Forstl, H., Drzezga, A., Muller, H.J., Wohlschlager, A.M., Finke, K. 2012. Asymmetric loss of parietal activity causes spatial bias in prodromal and mild Alzheimer's disease. Biol Psychiatry 71(9), 798-804. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.09.027.

Sorg, C., Riedl, V., Muhlau, M., Calhoun, V.D., Eichele, T., Laer, L., Drzezga, A., Forstl, H., Kurz, A., Zimmer, C., Wohlschlager, A.M. 2007. Selective changes of resting-state networks in individuals at risk for Alzheimer's disease. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 104(47), 18760-5. doi:10.1073/pnas.0708803104.

Tang-Wai, D.F., Graff-Radford, N.R., Boeve, B.F., Dickson, D.W., Parisi, J.E., Crook, R., Caselli, R.J., Knopman, D.S., Petersen, R.C. 2004. Clinical, genetic, and neuropathologic characteristics of posterior cortical atrophy. Neurology 63(7), 1168-74.

Thiebaut de Schotten, M., Dell'Acqua, F., Forkel, S.J., Simmons, A., Vergani, F., Murphy, D.G., Catani, M. 2011. A lateralized brain network for visuospatial attention. Nat Neurosci 14(10), 1245-6. doi:10.1038/nn.2905.

Valenza, N., Murray, M.M., Ptak, R., Vuilleumier, P. 2004. The space of senses: impaired crossmodal interactions in a patient with Balint syndrome after bilateral parietal damage. Neuropsychologia 42(13), 1737-48. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.05.001.

Vecera, S.P., Rizzo, M. 2004. Visual Attention and Visual Short-Term Memory in Alzheimer's Disease. in: Cronin-Golomb, A., Hof, P.R. (Eds.). Vision in Alzheimer's Disease Interdisciplinary Topics in Gerontology. Karger, Basel, pp 248-70.

Vogel, E.K., Woodman, G.F., Luck, S.J. 2006. The time course of consolidation in visual working memory. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform 32(6), 1436-51. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.32.6.1436.

Warrington, E.K., James, M. 1991. The visual object and space perception battery. Thames Valley Test Company, Bury St Edmunds.

WHO. 2010. International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, ICD-10.

Wolpert, I. 1924. Die simultanagnosie — störung der gesamtauffassung. Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie 93(1), 397-415. doi:10.1007/BF02900065.