1 Classification: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES – Neuroscience.

2 Title: Intra-modal plasticity for binaural spatial processing in the auditory cortex of early blind
3 individuals.

4 **Short title:** Binaural spatial processing in early blind individuals.

Authors: Kiki Derey¹, Elia Formisano^{1,3}, Giancarlo Valente¹, Minye Zhan¹, Ron Kupers^{2,4},
Beatrice de Gelder^{1,5}

7 Author affiliation:

Department of Cognitive Neuroscience, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht
 University, 6200 MD, Maastricht, The Netherlands.

2. BRAINlab and Neuropsychiatry Laboratory, Department of Neuroscience and Pharmacology,
 Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, 2200 Copenhagen,
 Denmark.

3. Maastricht Center for Systems Biology, Maastricht University, 6200 MD, Maastricht, The
Netherlands.

4. Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, Yale University, 300 Cedar Street, New
 Haven, CT 06520, USA.

17 5. Department of Computer Science, University College London, Gower Street,

18 London, WC1E 6BT, UK.19

Corresponding author: Beatrice de Gelder, Department of Cognitive Neuroscience, Faculty of
 Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, 6200 MD, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
 Telephone: 0031 (0) 43 3881437. E-mail address: b.degelder@maastrichtuniversity.nl.

23 **Keywords:** auditory, blindness, cortical plasticity, fMRI, sound localization.

24 Abstract

25 Activation in visual cortical areas during auditory spatial tasks is often observed in early blind individuals. But intra-modal plastic effects of early blindness on sound location processing within 26 27 auditory cortex have rarely been studied. We compared sound azimuth processing in auditory 28 and visual cortices of early blind and sighted individuals using subject-specific binaural 29 recordings in a phase-encoding functional MRI experiment. Blind individuals exhibited a 30 reduced response to spatial sounds compared to sighted individuals in left planum temporale, 31 yet recruited a number of regions that are part of the visual dorsal "where" pathway, including 32 retrosplenial cortex, right middle occipital gyrus, and transverse occipital sulcus. General spatial 33 response properties of auditory areas were mostly similar for blind and sighted individuals (e.g. azimuth sampling), but the planum temporale of early blinds was less sensitive to binaural 34 spatial cues. Specifically, we observed an interaction between binaural sound location encoding 35 36 and sound frequency in blind but not in sighted individuals. Moreover, decoding sound azimuth 37 from activity patterns in planum temporale was less accurate in blind individuals. Finally, reliable binaural spatial information was not evident in occipital and parietal response patterns in the 38 early blind either. These results indicate that early blindness results in auditory intra-modal 39 40 plasticity for binaural sound location processing. The interaction between sound frequency and location observed here may reflect alternative mechanisms for processing azimuth position in 41 blind individuals, such as the analysis of monaural spectral cues. 42

43 Significance statement

In many cases, sensory deprivation such as deafness or blindness triggers increased reliance
on the remaining, intact modalities. The present study shows that loss of vision can also
profoundly alter auditory processing. Specifically, visual deprivation affects binaural sound

47 location processing in the human auditory cortex. These results provide new insights in the
48 adaptive potential of the human brain following sensory deprivation and on the relationship
49 between behavioral performance and underlying neuroplastic processes.

50 \body

51 Introduction

Early blindness is associated with superior spatial hearing skills such as enhanced localization acuity in the azimuthal periphery (1-4) and more accurate sound localization under monaural listening conditions (5-7). The latter results sparked the hypothesis that some early blind individuals (EB) learn to use spectral, monaural cues for sound localization in the horizontal dimension, possibly at the cost of their spatial acuity in the vertical plane (7).

57 Several neuroimaging studies investigating cross-modal plasticity show that EB recruit dorsal extrastriate areas during sound localization tasks, including the right occipital cortex (8), the 58 right middle occipital gyrus (9, 10), and the right cuneus (10). In addition, monaural sound 59 60 localization performance and neural activity in dorsal extrastriate areas are correlated in blind 61 individuals (6, 11). A virtual lesion study supports the notion that these areas are indeed relevant for auditory localization in EB (12). It was therefore argued that extrastriate visual areas 62 63 - which are part of the visual "where" pathway - preserve their functional specialization for spatial processing even when the input modality changes from visual to auditory (9, 10). 64

Relatively few studies have investigated auditory intra-modal plasticity following the loss or absence of vision. The main findings reported by these studies are that early blind humans show an expansion of tonotopic areas in auditory cortex (AC) (13), shorter latencies of early auditory evoked potentials (14), and a reduced hemodynamic response during low-demand listening conditions (15). Intra-modal cerebral changes in the domain of spatial audition have been investigated even less. One study reported an increase in the percentage of spatially

selective neurons in the auditory cortex of early blind cats (16). Yet it remains unclear how early visual deprivation may alter sound location processing in AC, how such intra-modal plasticity relates to the cross-modal recruitment of occipital areas, and whether the recently hypothesized superior processing of monaural, spectral cues is reflected in neural activity patterns.

The present study therefore investigates both intra- and cross-modal cerebral changes in EB during sound localization in the horizontal plane. A group of EB (see *SI Table 1* for participant characteristics) participated in a phase-encoding functional MRI paradigm with individual binaural recordings of sounds at three intensity levels moving smoothly through far space. We compare their hemodynamic response patterns to those of SI (17).

80 Results

81 Global processing of spatial sounds in EB and SI

82 During scanning, participants were presented with participant-specific binaural recordings of 83 logarithmic frequency modulated (FM) sweeps that moved smoothly in the horizontal plane at 84 zero elevation relative to the listener. FM sweeps (0.45s long) made a full circle around the 85 head of the participant in 20s (rotation speed = 18°). FM sweeps either spanned a frequency 86 range of 250 - 700Hz (Fig SI 1A) or 500 - 1400Hz (Fig SI 1C). Frequency decreased exponentially at a rate of 2.5 octaves/s and sweeps were repeated at a rate of 2Hz. Recordings 87 88 were presented at three different intensity levels spaced 10dB apart (see SI Materials and Methods for details). 89

To test the global effect of spatial sound processing on the blood oxygenation level dependent (BOLD) signal we estimated a random effects general linear model (RFX GLM) on the functional data with two predictors for each condition: one modeling a sustained response and the other modeling a phasic onset and offset response (see *SI Methods and Materials* and *SI Fig 2* for details).

95 Spatial sounds elicited bilateral activation of primary and higher order auditory cortices in both EB and SI. Active regions included Heschl's gyrus (HG), Heschl's sulcus (HS), planum 96 temporale (PT), planum polare (PP), and superior temporal gyrus (STG; Figure 1). In addition, 97 98 both EB and SI showed activation of the parieto-occipital Sulcus (POS; bilateral in SI, right 99 hemisphere in EB). SI furthermore exhibited increased activation in right motion sensitive area (hMT+), right posterior cingulate cortex (pCC), and bilateral anterior insular cortex (alns). In EB 100 101 we observed additional clusters of activation in bilateral retrosplenial complex (RSC), bilateral 102 transverse occipital sulcus (TOS), right middle occipital gyrus (MOG), right anterior calcarine sulcus (aCS), left precuneus, and left pCC (Fig 1; see also individual activation maps for SI and 103 104 EB in SI Fig 3 and SI Fig 4, respectively).

105 A between-group comparison using the summary statistics approach (18) showed that EB 106 recruited the left planum temporale (PT) significantly less than SI when listening to spatial 107 sounds (Fig 2A). A similar trend was observed in right PT at a more lenient threshold (p < .05, 108 uncorrected) but the cluster did not survive the more stringent cluster size thresholding 109 procedure implemented here. The reduced response in the posterior auditory areas is not 110 caused by a general lower guality or lower signal-to-noise ratio in the data of the EB group as 111 the between-group comparison also confirmed that several parietal and occipital areas were activated more strongly in blind participants. These include bilateral TOS, right MOG, right 112 113 anterior CS, and bilateral inferotemporal cortex (IT; Fig 2A).

114 Waveshape Index

Visual inspection of the BOLD time courses confirmed that fMRI responses varied across regions (Fig 2B). In left PT, for instance, there was a sustained response for both SI and EB, yet the amplitude was reduced in EB. In contrast, parietal and occipital areas exhibited a stronger response in EB than in SI. Additionally, the phasic response component was more present in

these regions. We quantified the contribution of the sustained and phasic response components
to the overall BOLD response by computing a Waveshape Index (WI): the normalized difference
between the parameter value for the phasic predictor and the sustained predictor as estimated
with the previously described RFX GLM (see also *SI Materials and Methods*).

123 WI indices were distributed unimodally in the auditory cortex of SI and EB (see SI Fig 5A and

124 5B). Average WI values were positive and close to zero, indicating that the hemodynamic

response consisted of a combination of a transient and a sustained component in which the

126 sustained component was slightly more pronounced (mean SI left hemisphere = .14 [SD

127 (standard deviation) = .13]; mean SI right hemisphere = .13 [SD = .16]; mean EB left

hemisphere = .13 [SD = .15]; mean EB right hemisphere = .19 [SD = .20]). There were no group

differences in the distribution of WIs in the auditory cortex. In the active clusters in the parietal

and occipital cortex of EB, the transient component was represented more strongly (SI Fig 5C,

mean EB left hemisphere = 0.00 [SD = .39, mean EB right hemisphere = -.21 [SD = .33]).

132 Spatial tuning properties of the auditory cortex

133 We computed a response azimuth function (RAF) for each auditory responsive vertex (location on the cortical surface, see SI Materials and Methods for details) by estimating a Finite Impulse 134 Response (FIR) deconvolution (19) and associating the resulting parameter estimates with 135 azimuth position based on the subject-specific optimal HRF time-to-peak (see SI Materials and 136 137 Methods and SI Table 2 for details). RAFs revealed that the acoustic azimuth is sampled 138 inhomogeneously in a similar way in SI and EB. Specifically, the distribution of preferred 139 azimuth position (defined as the vector sum of azimuths eliciting a peak response in the RAF; SI Materials and Methods) across auditory cortex showed that the majority of vertices responded 140 preferentially to contralateral sound locations in both frequency ranges (SI Fig 6A and SI Fig 7). 141 Although there was a trend towards a group difference in the proportion of contralaterally tuned 142

143 vertices in the 500 – 1400Hz frequency range (p = .06), none of the proportions differed 144 significantly between participant groups (see *SI Methods – Response azimuth functions* for 145 details on the statistical testing procedure). Another characteristic spatial tuning property is the 146 location of the steepest slope in the RAF, that is, the azimuth position showing the greatest 147 modulation rate. Most auditory vertices in EB exhibited such peak modulation rates at locations 148 close to the frontal midline (*SI Fig 6B*), analogous to our findings in SI (17).

We measured spatial selectivity as the Equivalent Rectangular Receptive Field (ERRF) width by 149 transforming the area under the RAF into a rectangle with height equivalent to the peak 150 151 response in the RAF, and an equivalent area. The width of this area is the ERRF width, which provides a measure to compare spatial selectivity across conditions (20). Results showed a 152 153 significant interaction effect between sound intensity and group (left hemisphere: mixed 154 ANOVA, F(2,60) = 4.11, p = .021; right hemisphere: mixed ANOVA, F(2,60) = 3.45, p = .038; SI 155 Fig 8). Analyses of simple main effects indicated that this interaction is caused by an increase in 156 ERRF width with increasing sound level in SI (left hemisphere p < .001, right hemisphere p < .001157 .001), which was absent in the left hemisphere of EB (p = 1.00) and reduced in the right 158 hemisphere of EB (p = .015, but only the differences between soft-medium and soft-loud were significant). In agreement with this, there was a significant between group difference at the 159 160 loudest intensity level in both hemispheres (p = .015 for left and right hemisphere; full details 161 about the statistical procedures and results are provided in SI).

162 Topographic organization of spatial preference

We projected azimuth preference maps on the inflated cortical surface of each participant by color coding the preferred azimuth of each vertex in a green-blue-red color scale (*SI Materials and Methods*). Similar to our findings in SI (17), we did not observe a clear spatial gradient or topographic organization in the azimuth preference maps in EB (*SI Fig 9*). Maps also varied

167 greatly across participants and were modulated by sound intensity. That is, we analyzed the 168 consistency of azimuth preference across three sound levels (*SI Materials and Methods*) and 169 observed level-variant location tuning in most participants (*SI Fig 9*). These results suggest that 170 the auditory cortex of EB – analogous to the auditory cortex in SI – does not contain a clear 171 azimuthal spatiotopic map.

172 Coding sound location based on binaural spatial cues

173 We inferred participant-specific binaural difference predictors from the audio recordings by 174 computing the interaural level difference between the left and right channel and convolving this with the HRF. Binaural sum predictors were also created by convolving the sum in power in the 175 176 left and right ear of the recording with the HRF (see SI Materials and Methods). We then 177 employed these predictors to estimate a RFX GLM to identify regions that are modulated by azimuth based on binaural spatial cues, i.e. regions sensitive to binaural differences (contrast: 178 179 binaural difference > baseline). Note that we estimated the GLM on only two out of three sound 180 intensities, which resulted in three RFX GLM estimations that each included two sound levels (loud and medium, loud and soft, and medium and soft). Data of the remaining condition were 181 used at a later stage to test the level invariance of decoding sound azimuth position from the 182 BOLD signal in these regions responsive to binaural spatial cues. 183

Results indicate a complex interaction between sound frequency and binaural spatial sensitivity in the auditory cortex of EB. Figure 3 shows that in the 250 – 700Hz frequency range, binaural spatially sensitive regions were mostly found in left PT. In right PT, we only observed a modulation by binaural difference in some intensity conditions and regions sensitive to binaural difference were less widespread in general. Moreover, in the 500 – 1400Hz frequency range, such binaural spatially sensitive areas were exclusively identified in the right (posterior) auditory cortex. This is distinctly different from our previous findings in SI, where contralaterally tuned

spatially sensitive regions could reliably be identified in bilateral PT for each sound intensitycondition (17).

193 We then investigated the spatial information represented in those regions in EB that are 194 sensitive to binaural information. We employed the BOLD responses from these areas during 195 the left-out intensity condition to reconstruct the sound azimuth trajectory, either with an 196 opponent coding model or a local, one-channel coding model (SI Materials and Methods for details). Although correlating the reconstructed trajectory to the actual sound trajectory showed 197 that there is some spatial information present in the binaural spatially sensitive areas in EB, 198 199 correlation values were more variable and on average lower than in SI both for the opponent coding model (Fig 4A; t(8.506) = 2.873, p = .019) and for each local, single channel model (left 200 201 hemisphere: t(22) = 3.490, p = .002; right hemisphere: t(27) = 2.146, p = .041; Fig 4B, see also 202 SI Fig 10).

203 In EB, the RFX GLM estimate contrasting *binaural* difference > baseline also identified some 204 regions that are sensitive to binaural spatial cues outside of the auditory cortex. However, the cortical location of these areas was inconsistent across sound level conditions (SI Fig 11), which 205 indicates that these areas do not contain a meaningful representation of the acoustic azimuth. 206 207 This was confirmed by decoding the azimuth trajectories from the BOLD responses in these 208 areas: correlations between the decoded and actual trajectory varied greatly across conditions (SI Fig 12). Instead, it appears that these areas were identified by the binaural difference 209 predictor because of the similarity of this predictor to the relatively strong phasic response 210 component in the hemodynamic response of these areas (see Results - Waveshape Index). 211

212 Discussion

In this study we explored the effects of early-onset blindness on sound location processing in
the human brain, focusing on intra-modal plasticity of the temporal cortex and cross-modal

215 plasticity of the occipital and parietal cortex. Our results showed a reduced response to spatial sounds in the left PT of EB compared to SI, and a similar trend in right PT. In the visual dorsal 216 "where" pathway, we observed the cross-modal recruitment of retrosplenial cortex, right middle 217 218 occipital gyrus, and transverse occipital sulcus. General spatial response properties of the 219 auditory responsive areas - such as azimuth sampling, location of steepest slopes, and the 220 apparent absence of a clear spatiotopic organization - were mostly similar across blind and 221 sighted. However, sound level had a differential modulatory effect on auditory spatial selectivity: 222 spatial selectivity decreased bilaterally with increasing sound level in SI, but only - and to a lesser extent – in the right hemisphere in EB. Strikingly, the auditory cortex of EB was less 223 224 sensitive to binaural spatial cues and the location information represented within binaural 225 spatially sensitive regions was also reduced compared to SI. These results suggest that early 226 onset blindness leads to changes in the cortical processing of sound location, shifting away from 227 representations based on binaural differences. Importantly, our data indicate that the processing 228 of binaural cues has not shifted to occipital or parietal areas. Instead, EB may have come to rely on a different mechanism for auditory localization in the azimuthal plane, for instance the 229 230 processing of spectral cues (7, 10).

231 **Reduced BOLD response in PT of early blinds**

232 The diminished response amplitudes to spatial sounds in EB observed here were specific to areas that are associated with sound location processing (i.e. posterior auditory cortex) in 233 humans (17, 21-24), and with homologous areas in other mammals, such as monkeys (25, 26) 234 and cats (27). However, other neuroimaging studies comparing sighted to early blind individuals 235 236 do not commonly report a similar effect (6, 8, 9), but see (15). This may in part be a result of 237 methodological differences. Most studies, for instance, use lower imaging resolutions than the 238 present study. We furthermore optimized inter-subject anatomical consistency using cortex 239 based alignment (28). Optimal alignment procedures are especially important for group level

240 analyses of the auditory cortex due to the high amount of inter-individual anatomical variability in 241 Heschl's gyrus (29, 30) and PT (31). The functional significance of the observed reduction in hemodynamic activity in PT of EB is not yet clear. Based on previous findings, it was 242 243 hypothesized that the auditory cortex in EB processes sounds more efficiently (14, 15, 32). Yet 244 the exact nature of the neural processing mechanisms involved, their specificity to sound location processing, and their consequence on a behavioral level remain open questions. Future 245 246 psychoacoustic, electrophysiological and neuroimaging research in humans and other mammals may elucidate these issues. 247

248 Spatial selectivity of the auditory cortex in early blinds

249 At the lowest sound intensities tested here, there was no difference in spatial selectivity of 250 auditory areas in EB and SI. However, our data showed that increases in sound intensity have a smaller effect on spatial selectivity in EB. Specifically, spatial selectivity did not decrease with 251 252 increasing sound intensity in the left hemisphere in EB, and only moderately in the right 253 hemisphere. In contrast, SI showed a clear bilateral reduction in auditory spatial selectivity during medium and high sound level conditions (17). In line with findings in early blind cats (16), 254 255 this indicates that early visual deprivation affects spatial selectivity of the auditory cortex in humans. Such differences in spatial tuning width may be even more pronounced during active 256 257 sound localization tasks. It remains to be tested whether this difference also contributes to the superior sound localization abilities of EB. 258

259 Using monaural spectral cues for sound localization in the horizontal plane

Our present findings show that the auditory cortex of EB is tuned less to binaural difference cues than that of SI. Our results furthermore suggest that the processing of binaural spatial information in EB has not shifted towards the co-activated occipital and parietal areas. Possibly, EB utilize monaural spectral cues for horizontal sound localization, a hypothesis that was proposed based on studies showing that EB perform better during monaural horizontal sound localization than SI (5, 6). Moreover, there is evidence that EB with better monaural sound localization skills have a reduced spatial acuity in the vertical dimension (7), that is, in the dimension for which SI employ spectral cues. This suggests that a sub set of EB learns to process monaural spectral cues for horizontal sound localization at the cost of spatial acuity in the vertical plane (7).

To examine this possibility, we performed a detailed analysis of the stimulus recordings (see SI 270 Methods and SI Results, as well as SI Fig 13 and SI Fig14), showing that spectral variation as a 271 272 function of azimuth is indeed available in the subject-specific recordings, especially in the 500 -1400Hz frequency range. Consequently, EB may rely on alternative neural mechanisms for 273 274 sound location processing based on monaural spectral cues for the sounds in this frequency 275 range. The interaction between sound frequency and location observed in the present study -276 reflected in reduced sensitivity to binaural spatial cues especially in the 500 - 1400Hz range -277 may also be indicative of this. Future studies combining psychoacoustic measures with 278 neuroimaging techniques can provide valuable insights into alternative sound location 279 processing strategies employed by EB, including the use of monaural spectral cues in the horizontal plane. 280

281 Cross-modal recruitment of the visual spatial processing network in early blinds

Blind subjects listening to spatial sounds activated several occipital, parietal and inferotemporal areas that are related to visual spatial processing. One of these areas, the right MOG, has been implicated in auditory spatial processing in blind humans before. Specifically, Renier, *et al.* (9), demonstrated that this area preserves its functional role for spatial processing following early visual deprivation, despite a change in input modality to either auditory or tactile stimuli. In the present study we find a similar pattern of activation in the right MOG of EB during spatial

auditory processing and deactivation in SI. Our findings thus support the notion that, following
early visual deprivation, the MOG retains its functional role yet processes input from different
modalities.

291 We also observed that spatial sounds modulated activity in EB in the right RSC and bilateral 292 TOS, two areas that are part of the visual spatial processing stream (33-35). Neither area is 293 commonly reported as active in EB during spatial hearing paradigms (6, 8, 9), although even in SI modulations of oscillatory activity in the RSC by an auditory "what" task were demonstrated 294 (36). It may be that processing of the relatively complex spatial sounds employed here - long-295 296 duration and with movement - engages a more extensive network including the RSC and TOS 297 than the discrete, static stimuli used in previous studies (6, 8, 9). It is conceivable, for instance, 298 that the RSC in EB constructs and updates a mental image of sound position in EB, resulting in 299 a representation of the sound trajectory in the space surrounding the participant.

300 Cross-modal plasticity in the aCS and IT of early blinds

Prior research indicates that activity in the aCS of EB is correlated with performance on a range of tasks (37, 38). It was therefore proposed that in EB, this area is involved in attentional processing during auditory tasks, similar to mechanisms of visual attention in SI (38). If so, the activity in the right aCS observed in EB here may represent an attentional effect related to sound onset and offset. This notion is supported by the time course of the aCS activation, which shows an onset and offset response but no sustained change from baseline (Fig 2).

Lastly, we observed small clusters of activation in bilateral inferotemporal cortex in a location corresponding to the parahippocampal place area (PPA). It is conceivable that the brain of blind humans activates this area – which has been implicated in visual scene processing and other object-based properties (35, 39) – when listening to spatial sounds in the course of constructing scenes based on auditory information. Further research must determine the exact nature and

functional relevance of the increased hemodynamic responses in blinds in this area and in theoccipital and parietal areas described before.

314 Conclusion

The present study demonstrates that early blindness affects processing of binaural spatial cues for sound localization (azimuth) in planum temporale. Our findings furthermore indicate that although early blinds co-activate their occipital cortex whilst listening to spatial sounds, it is not involved in the processing of binaural cues. These results indicate that early blinds encode sound (azimuth) position employing a different mechanism. Future research is therefore needed to investigate alternative mechanisms for sound azimuth processing in early blinds such as the use of spectral cues.

322 Materials and methods

323 Twelve early blind (EB) individuals with damage to the peripheral visual system (retina or optic nerve) participated in the imaging experiment (see SI Table 1 for clinical characteristics). Data 324 325 of four participants had to be discarded due to extensive, stimulus-locked motion during the 326 scanning session. Data of the remaining eight participants (median age = 44 years, 4 males) are included in the analysis (see SI Table 1 for clinical characteristics). For comparison with the 327 328 sighted group, we reanalyzed a data set that has been previously acquired with an identical experimental paradigm (17). This study included eight sighted individuals (median age = 27329 330 years, 5 males). None of the participants reported a history of hearing loss. The Ethical Committee of the Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience at Maastricht University granted 331 approval for the study. Methods are described in detail in SI Materials and Methods. 332

333 Acknowledgements

- 334 This work was funded by by the European Research Council under the European Union's
- 335 Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) ERC grant agreement number 295673

(BdG), the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant

- agreement No 645553, ICT DANCE (IA, 2015-2017; BdG), the Netherlands Organization for
- 338 Scientific Research (NWO), 480-09-006, 453-12-002 (EF), and the Lundbeck foundation,
- 339 Denmark (RK).

340 References

- 3411.Rauschecker JP & Kniepert U (1994) Auditory localization behaviour in visually deprived cats.342European Journal of Neuroscience 6(1):149-160.
- King AJ & Parsons CH (1999) Improved auditory spatial acuity in visually deprived ferrets.
 European Journal of Neuroscience 11(11):3945-3956.
- 3453.Röder B, et al. (1999) Improved auditory spatial tuning in blind humans. Nature 400(6740):162-346166.
- Voss P, et al. (2004) Early-and late-onset blind individuals show supra-normal auditory abilities
 in far-space. *Current Biology* 14(19):1734-1738.
- 3495.Lessard N, Pare M, Lepore F, & Lassonde M (1998) Early-blind human subjects localize sound350sources better than sighted subjects. Nature 395(6699):278-280.
- Gougoux F, Zatorre RJ, Lassonde M, Voss P, & Lepore F (2005) A functional neuroimaging study
 of sound localization: visual cortex activity predicts performance in early-blind individuals. *PLoS Biol* 3(2):e27.
- Voss P, Tabry V, & Zatorre RJ (2015) Trade-off in the sound localization abilities of early blind
 individuals between the horizontal and vertical planes. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 35(15):6051 6056.
- 3578.Weeks R, et al. (2000) A positron emission tomographic study of auditory localization in the
congenitally blind. The Journal of Neuroscience 20(7):2664-2672.
- 3599.Renier LA, et al. (2010) Preserved functional specialization for spatial processing in the middle360occipital gyrus of the early blind. Neuron 68(1):138-148.
- Collignon O, *et al.* (2011) Functional specialization for auditory–spatial processing in the occipital
 cortex of congenitally blind humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108(11):4435-4440.
- Voss P, Gougoux F, Zatorre RJ, Lassonde M, & Lepore F (2008) Differential occipital responses in
 early-and late-blind individuals during a sound-source discrimination task. *Neuroimage* 40(2):746-758.
- Collignon O, Lassonde M, Lepore F, Bastien D, & Veraart C (2007) Functional cerebral
 reorganization for auditory spatial processing and auditory substitution of vision in early blind
 subjects. *Cerebral Cortex* 17(2):457-465.
- 13. Elbert T, et al. (2002) Expansion of the tonotopic area in the auditory cortex of the blind. The
 Journal of Neuroscience 22(22):9941-9944.

 and somatosensory discrimination in sighted and blind human subjects. <i>Cognitive Brain</i> <i>Research</i> 4(2):77-93. Stevens AA & Weaver KE (2009) Functional characteristics of auditory cortex in the blind. <i>Behavioural brain research</i> 195(1):134-138. Korte M& Rauschecker JP (1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats with early blindness. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bNv259. Munford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2- 3):109-114. Uee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Espostto M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebrai Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham	372	14.	Röder B, Rösler F, Hennighausen E, & Näcker F (1996) Event-related potentials during auditory
 <i>Research</i> 4(2):77-93. Stevens AA & Waver KE (2009) Functional characteristics of auditory cortex in the blind. <i>Behavioural brain research</i> 196(1):134-138. Korte M & Rauschecker JP (1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats with early blindness. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, de Gider B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bh/269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> B(2- 3):109-114. Lee C- C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The Journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentille G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):303-31811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & & Lark K (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF do cat auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpher	373		and somatosensory discrimination in sighted and blind human subjects. Cognitive Brain
 Stevens AA & Weaver KE (2009) Functional characteristics of auditory cortex in the blind. <i>Behavioural brain research</i> 19(1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats with early blindness. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bhv269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Humon brain mapping</i> 8(2- 3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The Journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwag W, Gentlie G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-H (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 98(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ,	374		Research 4(2):77-93.
 Behavioural brain research 196(1):134-138. Korte M & Rauschecker JP (1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats with early blindness. Journal of Neurophysiology 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Ccrebral Cortex</i>:bhv269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C- C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature meroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuros</i> 5(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 43(1):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):280-293. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically alig	375	15.	Stevens AA & Weaver KE (2009) Functional characteristics of auditory cortex in the blind.
 Korte M & Rauschecker JP (1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats with early blindness. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, & Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bhv269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2- 3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. Deouell UY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Splank RT, KusonJange 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):288-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):288-2903. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross con	376		Behavioural brain research 196(1):134-138.
 with early blindness. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 70(4):1717-1721. Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bh/269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(6):273-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvayage (X: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group indep	377	16.	Korte M & Rauschecker JP (1993) Auditory spatial tuning of cortical neurons is sharpened in cats
 Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i>:bhv269. Mumford J & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2- 3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffthst TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG Study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) nalysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager OX: From singl	378		with early blindness. Journal of Neurophysiology 70(4):1717-1721.
 (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex:</i>bhv269. Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & SU T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cor	379	17.	Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location
 Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i> 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):209-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minck	380		(Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> :bhv269.
 47(4):1469-1475. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell U, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebroks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory c	381	18.	Mumford JA & Nichols T (2009) Simple group fMRI modeling and inference. <i>Neuroimage</i>
 Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mopping</i> 27(5):392-401. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex lan	382		47(4):1469-1475.
 3):109-114. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks LC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis context (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and longuage</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the f	383	19.	Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 8(2-
 Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):385-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Form isano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of	384		3):109-114.
 performance. <i>Nature neuroscience</i> 14(1):108-114. Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of act auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of act auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of act auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Noter I atonisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with	385	20.	Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task
 Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David	386		performance. Nature neuroscience 14(1):108-114.
 sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804. Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functio	387	21.	Warren JD & Griffiths TD (2003) Distinct mechanisms for processing spatial sequences and pitch
 Brunetti M, <i>et al.</i> (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisngle -Subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenital	388		sequences in the human auditory brain. <i>The journal of neuroscience</i> 23(13):5799-5804.
 different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261. Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in co	389	22.	Brunetti M, et al. (2005) Human brain activation during passive listening to sounds from
 Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i>	390		different locations: an fMRI and MEG study. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 26(4):251-261.
 in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. Neuron 55(6):985-996. van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. NeuroImage 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. Journal of Neurophysiology 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. Science 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. Journal of neurophysiology 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. Brain and language 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802. <	391	23.	Deouell LY, Heller AS, Malach R, D'Esposito M, & Knight RT (2007) Cerebral Responses to Change
 van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	392		in Spatial Location of Unattended Sounds. <i>Neuron</i> 55(6):985-996.
 influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811. Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleon JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	393	24.	van der Zwaag W, Gentile G, Gruetter R, Spierer L, & Clarke S (2011) Where sound position
 Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Neurophysiology</i> 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	394		influences sound object representations: A 7-T fMRI study. <i>NeuroImage</i> 54(3):1803-1811.
 Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. Journal of Neurophysiology 83(5):2723-2739. 26. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. Science 292(5515):290-293. 27. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. Journal of neurophysiology 89(6):2889-2903. 28. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping 27(5):392-401. 29. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. Brain and language 3(2):318-323. 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802. 	395	25.	Recanzone GH, Guard DC, Phan ML, & Su T-IK (2000) Correlation Between the Activity of Single
 Neurophysiology 83(5):2723-2739. Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	396		Auditory Cortical Neurons and Sound-Localization Behavior in the Macaque Monkey. Journal of
 Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	397		Neurophysiology 83(5):2723-2739.
 monkey auditory cortex. <i>Science</i> 292(5515):290-293. 27. Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. 28. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. 29. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	398	26.	Tian B, Reser D, Durham A, Kustov A, & Rauschecker JP (2001) Functional specialization in rhesus
 Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF of cat auditory cortex. <i>Journal of neurophysiology</i> 89(6):2889-2903. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	399		monkey auditory cortex. Science 292(5515):290-293.
 401 of cat auditory cortex. Journal of neurophysiology 89(6):2889-2903. 402 28. Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) 403 data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model 404 analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping 405 27(5):392-401. 406 29. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. 407 Brain and language 3(2):318-323. 408 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency 409 and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex 410 8(5):397-406. 411 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, 412 quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews 29(1):26-49. 414 32. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked 415 potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of 416 neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181. 417 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature 418 Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802. 	400	27.	Stecker GC, Mickey BJ, Macpherson EA, & Middlebrooks JC (2003) Spatial sensitivity in field PAF
 Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. <i>Human brain mapping</i> 27(5):392-401. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. <i>Brain and language</i> 3(2):318-323. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	401		of cat auditory cortex. Journal of neurophysiology 89(6):2889-2903.
403data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model404analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping40527(5):392-401.40629.Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex.407Brain and language 3(2):318-323.40830.Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency409and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex4108(5):397-406.41131.Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic,412quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews41329(1):26-49.41432.Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked415potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of416neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181.41733.Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature418Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802.	402	28.	Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC)
404analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping40527(5):392-401.40629.Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex.407Brain and language 3(2):318-323.40830.Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency409and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex4108(5):397-406.41131.Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic,412quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews41329(1):26-49.41432.Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked415potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of416neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181.41733.Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature418Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802.	403		data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model
 27(5):392-401. 29. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. Brain and language 3(2):318-323. 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802. 	404		analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping
 29. Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex. Brain and language 3(2):318-323. 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802. 	405		27(5):392-401.
 Brain and language 3(2):318-323. 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	406	29.	Campain R & Minckler J (1976) A note on the gross configurations of the human auditory cortex.
 408 30. Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency 409 and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 410 8(5):397-406. 411 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, 412 quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 413 29(1):26-49. 414 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked 415 potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> 416 <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 417 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> 418 <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	407		Brain and language 3(2):318-323.
 and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? <i>Cerebral Cortex</i> 8(5):397-406. 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	408	30.	Leonard CM, Puranik C, Kuldau JM, & Lombardino LJ (1998) Normal variation in the frequency
 410 8(5):397-406. 411 31. Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, 412 quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 413 29(1):26-49. 414 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked 415 potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> 416 <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 417 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> 418 <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	409		and location of human auditory cortex landmarks. Heschl's gyrus: where is it? Cerebral Cortex
 Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic, quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	410		8(5):397-406.
 quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. <i>Brain Research Reviews</i> 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, <i>et al.</i> (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	411	31.	Shapleske J, Rossell SL, Woodruff PWR, & David AS (1999) The planum temporale: a systematic,
 29(1):26-49. 32. Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	412		quantitative review of its structural, functional and clinical significance. Brain Research Reviews
 Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	413		29(1):26-49.
 415 potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. <i>International journal of</i> 416 <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 417 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> 418 <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	414	32.	Manjunath N, et al. (1998) Shorter latencies of components of middle latency auditory evoked
 <i>neuroscience</i> 95(3-4):173-181. 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	415		potentials in congenitally blind compared to normal sighted subjects. International journal of
 417 33. Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? <i>Nature</i> 418 <i>Reviews Neuroscience</i> 10(11):792-802. 	416		neuroscience 95(3-4):173-181.
418 Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802.	417	33.	Vann SD, Aggleton JP, & Maguire EA (2009) What does the retrosplenial cortex do? Nature
	418		Reviews Neuroscience 10(11):792-802.

- 419 34. Epstein RA & Higgins JS (2007) Differential parahippocampal and retrosplenial involvement in 420 three types of visual scene recognition. *Cerebral Cortex* 17(7):1680-1693. 421 35. Troiani V, Stigliani A, Smith ME, & Epstein RA (2012) Multiple object properties drive scene-422 selective regions. Cerebral Cortex:bhs364. 423 36. Ahveninen J, et al. (2012) Dissociable influences of auditory object vs. spatial attention on visual 424 system oscillatory activity. PloS one 7(6):e38511. 425 Amedi A, Raz N, Pianka P, Malach R, & Zohary E (2003) Early /`visual/' cortex activation 37. 426 correlates with superior verbal memory performance in the blind. Nat Neurosci 6(7):758-766. 427 38. Stevens AA, Snodgrass M, Schwartz D, & Weaver K (2007) Preparatory activity in occipital cortex 428 in early blind humans predicts auditory perceptual performance. The Journal of Neuroscience 429 27(40):10734-10741. 430 39. Epstein R & Kanwisher N (1998) A cortical representation of the local visual environment. Nature 431 392(6676):598-601.
- 432

433 Figures and Figure Legends



Sighted individuals

Figure 1. Processing of spatial sounds in sighted and early blind individuals. Maps show the result of a within group RFX GLM contrasting *sustained & phasic > baseline* (see *SI Materials and Methods* for details). Group maps are projected on the cortical surface of a representative subject, cluster size corrected with initial threshold p < .05, final threshold p < .05, 3000 iterations.



440



442 Maps display the result of a mixed effects model with group modeled as fixed effect and subject

as random effect. Maps are cluster size corrected for multiple comparisons (initial threshold p <
.05, final threshold p < .05, 3000 iterations). (B) Average percentage BOLD signal change over
time for EB and SI in regions-of-interest (ROIs) based on the results of the mixed effects model
(see A). Gray area indicates the sound presentation period. Black lines show the average BOLD
time course for EB, dark gray lines for SI. Error bars reflect the standard error.







458 Figure 4. Decoding azimuth from the auditory cortex of SI and EB. Scatter plots show the 459 correlation values between the result of a bilateral, opponent coding model and the actual sound 460 azimuth position (x axis) plotted against the result of a unilateral, single-channel coding model (y 461 axis; left graph is left hemisphere, right graph is right hemisphere). Circles represent 462 correlations for SI: black dots for sounds in the 250–700Hz frequency range, white dots for the 463 500–1400Hz frequency range. Diamonds represent correlations for EB with sounds in the 250 – 464 700 Hz frequency range. Each symbol (circle or diamond) represents the correlation value for 465 one of the conditions tested in this study within a frequency range (12 in total), e.g. soft intensity 466 - starting left - moving clockwise. For EB we show only eight correlation values in the 250 -467 700Hz frequency range as the GLM estimation with data from the medium and soft condition did 468 not result in bilateral clusters, making it impossible to implement the data in a bilateral, opponent 469 coding model. For similar reasons, no correlation valeus are shown for the 500 – 1400Hz range. Dots above the gray diagonal indicate a higher correlation for the local population coding model 470 471 than for the opponent population coding model. Values below the gray diagonal indicate the 472 opposite.

473 SI Materials and Methods

474 **Stimuli**

We presented participants with a phase encoding stimulation paradigm (1) similar to those used to map visual space in the occipital cortex (2) and the tonotopic organization in the auditory cortex (3). This paradigm enables the mapping of the acoustic azimuth in the auditory cortex and offers the possibility to investigate which other cortical areas or networks are recruited during the processing of azimuthal location in CB.

480 Stimuli consisted of logarithmic frequency modulated (FM) sweeps with a duration of 0.45s that 481 were repeated at a rate of 2Hz. Frequency decreased exponentially at a rate of 2.5 octaves/s and ranged either between 250 - 700Hz (Figure SI 1A) or between 500 - 1400Hz (Figure SI 482 1C). Each stimulus started and ended with a 10s stationary period at $+90^{\circ}$ or -90° to 483 accommodate for attentional effects at sound onset, as well as for hemodynamic on- and offset 484 485 effects. This resulted in a total stimulus duration of 40s: a 10s stationary period, a 20s movement period during which the sound moved smoothly through the horizontal plane making 486 a full circle around the head (rotation speed = $18^{\circ}/s$), and another 10s stationary period. Onset 487 488 and offset were ramped with a 50ms linear slope. A stimulus started either at the left or right, and rotation direction was clockwise or counter clockwise. Stimuli were presented at three 489 different intensity levels, spaced 10dB apart. 490

The presence of spatial cues was maximized by making individual binaural recordings for each participant (OKM II Classic Microphone, Soundman, Germany; sampling rate = 44.1kHz). Participants were seated in a chair and microphones were placed in their ear canals. The chair was positioned in the middle of a normal room (internal volume = 95m³) with walls and ceiling of gypsum board and a floor of wood with a thin carpet on top. Sounds were played through a 3D sound system with 22 loudspeakers in a spherical set-up in the far field (12 speakers in the 497 horizontal plane at the elevation of the interaural axis and a distance of 2.4m from the 498 participant, 5 speakers at vertical azimuth $< 0^{\circ}$, and 5 speakers at vertical azimuth $> 0^{\circ}$). We 499 positioned sounds in the acoustic 3D environment with the virtual reality software Vizard 500 (Worldviz, Santa Barbara, United States). Participants were monitored by the experimenter 501 during the recordings to ensure that no head movements were made. Sounds were presented 502 at 75dB SPL.

This procedure resulted in realistic, well localizable auditory stimuli (see SI Figure 3). In line with the duplex theory of sound localization (4, 5), the stimulus in the range of 500 – 1400Hz mostly contains ILD cues for azimuth position whereas information in the ITD scale is limited (Fig SI 3B). The stimulus in the range of 250 – 700Hz, in contrast, contains both ILD and ITD information (Fig SI 3D). The presence of ILD information in our recordings in the 250 – 700Hz range is probably due to the fact that sounds were recorded in a room with some reverberation (6).

510 We used MR-compatible earphones (Sensimetrics Corporation, www.sens.com) to present the audio recordings during the fMRI session. Sounds were played at three intensity levels which 511 512 were scaled individually for each participant such that the lowest intensity was comfortable and audible on top of the scanner noise. Sound intensity then increased in 10dB steps from one 513 514 level to another. This resulted in 24 conditions (i.e. two frequency levels, two starting points, two 515 rotation directions, three intensity levels). Silent imaging techniques were not possible for this 516 design due to the long stimulus duration. We therefore took care to ascertain the audibility of the 517 stimuli on top of the scanner noise. Sound intensity was furthermore equalized (subjective perception) between the 250 – 700Hz and the 500 – 1400Hz frequency range. 518

519 Data acquisition

520 Functional data was collected with a Siemens whole body MRI scanner at the Scannexus MRI 521 scanning facilities (Maastricht, www.scannexus.nl) with a Siemens Prisma 3.0T. Data were recorded with a standard T₂*-weighted echo planar imaging sequence covering the temporal 522 523 cortex as well as parts of the parietal, occipital and frontal cortex [echo time (TE) = 30ms; repetition time (TR) = 2000ms; flip angle = 90° ; matrix size = 100 x 100; voxel size 2 x 2 x 2 524 mm³: number of slices = 32)]. Anatomical data was obtained with a T₁-weighted MPRAGE 525 sequence with the following parameters: TE = 2,17ms; TR = 2250ms; voxel size 1 x 1 x 1 mm³; 526 matrix size = 192 x 256 x 256. Each condition was presented 3 times, resulting in 72 trials in 527 528 total. Trials were presented in 6 runs of 12 trials each in which each run presented sounds of one intensity only (soft, medium or loud). The order of runs was randomized and 529 counterbalanced across participants. Starting position and rotation direction of the sounds were 530 counterbalanced and randomized both within and across runs. Participants were instructed to 531 532 listen attentively to the location of the sounds.

533 fMRI analysis

534 Data were analyzed with BrainVoyager QX (Brain Innovation) and customized Matlab code (The 535 Mathworks). Most data analysis methods have been described previously (1).

536 Preprocessing

Preprocessing of functional data consisted of head motion correction (trilinear/sinc interpolation, the first volume of the first run functioned as reference volume for alignment), inter-scan slicetime correction (sinc interpolation), linear drifts removal and temporal high-pass filtering (threshold at 7 cycles per run). We coregistered functional data to the T₁-weighted images of each individual, and sinc-interpolated to 3D Talairach space at 2mm³ resolution (7). Gray/white matter borders were defined with the automatic segmentation procedure of BrainVoyager QX and complemented with manual improvements. Optimum co-registration of cortical surface

544 across participants was achieved with cortex based alignment (CBA) of the participants' cortical 545 surface reconstructions (8). For the detailed analysis of the auditory cortex in the context of the population coding model, we performed the CBA constrained by an anatomical mask of 546 547 Heschl's gyrus (9). This procedure is similar to the functional CBA procedure (10): an 548 anatomical definition of a region of interest is used to optimize the local realignment of this region rather than a globally realigning the entire cortex. Functional data were then projected 549 550 from volume space to surface space by creating mesh time courses from volume time courses. 551 A value was obtained for each vertex of the cortex mesh by sampling (trilinear interpolation) and computing the average value of that location in the volume time course from the gray/white 552 553 matter boundary up to 4mm into the gray matter (toward the pial surface).

554 Global sound processing

555 To evaluate which regions of the brain are modulated by the presentation of sound fragments, we estimated a GLM with two predictors: a conventional, sustained predictor, and a phasic 556 557 predictor (SI Fig 2). The addition of the phasic predictor was motivated by studies showing that the auditory cortex exhibits a variety of activation patterns to long duration sound stimuli, 558 559 including phasic responses (11, 12). Considering the long-duration stimuli used in the present experiment (40s) we expected these two predictors together to provide a good model of the 560 561 BOLD response in AC. In addition, we had no a priori expectations on the response to long duration sounds in the occipital and parietal cortices of EB as previous research generally 562 presented short audio clips. We therefore included the phasic predictor to allow for more 563 flexibility in capturing hemodynamic responses in areas other than auditory cortex. We 564 565 computed the conventional sustained predictor by convolving a boxcar function for the entire 566 duration of the auditory stimulus with a double gamma hemodynamic response function (13). The phasic predictor consisted of a transient response to the onset of the stimulus as well as a 567

transient response to the offset of the stimulus, convolved with the HRF (SI Figure 2). Sustained
and phasic predictors were then entered in a random effects general linear model (RFX GLM).

570 Waveshape Index

To investigate whether the response profile of areas active during sound processing is mainly driven by a sustained response, a phasic response, or a combination of both, we computed the Waveshape Index (WI) as the normalized difference between the resulting beta weights of the sustained predictor and the beta weights of the phasic predictor (Equation 1; (11)). Beta estimates were obtained with the RFX GLM using the sustained and phasic predictors described before.

577
$$WI = \frac{\beta_{sustained} - \beta_{phasic}}{\beta_{sustained} + \beta_{phasic}}$$
 Equation 1

A positive WI indicates that the observed activation pattern is mainly driven by a sustained
response. In contrast, a negative WI suggests that a phasic response is driving the activation. A
WI close to 0 indicates a response profile that contains both phasic and sustained components.

581 Individual estimation of time-to-peak of hemodynamic response function

Similar to the analysis process of the original SI data set (1), we started the analysis of the EB 582 583 data with an estimation of the time-to-peak (TTP) of the hemodynamic response function (HRF) for each participant. This was done to ensure that inter-individual differences in the shape of the 584 HRF do not affect our results. We estimated 3 General Linear Models (GLMs) with double 585 gamma HRF functions (13) for each functional run with TTPs ranging from 4 to 8s, in steps of 586 587 2s. The optimal TTP value for each participant was selected based on the number of 588 significantly active voxels (auditory > baseline, p < .05, Bonferroni corrected) resulting from each TTP value and the average t value across these voxels (see also SI Table 2). 589

590 **Response azimuth functions**

We analyzed the hemodynamic responses to azimuth position for auditory responsive vertices 591 592 (GLM, auditory > baseline, False Discovery Rate (FDR; (14)), q < 0.05) with a Finite Impulse 593 Response (FIR) deconvolution (15) which provided 20 beta estimates per vertex (one for every 594 TR). The 10 beta values associated with the stationary periods at the beginning and end of each stimulus were discarded to accommodate for BOLD on- and offset responses. A Response 595 Azimuth Function (RAF) with 10 linearly spaced response estimations was then constructed by 596 associating the beta weights with an azimuth position using the participant-specific TTP 597 (azimuthal distance of 36[°] between two adjacent bins). Trials were pooled across rotation 598 direction as our participants frequently experienced front/back reversals, which is common in 599 600 human sound localization (16, 17).

601 Preferred azimuth position of a vertex was defined as the vector sum of the azimuths eliciting a 602 peak response in the RAF (75% or more of the maximum response of that vertex; see also (18, 603 19)). We furthermore computed from each RAF the location of the steepest ascending and descending slope as the maxima and minima of the spatial derivative of the RAF (19). RAFs 604 605 were mildly smoothed with a moving average window, width = three azimuthal locations, weights [0.2 0.6 0.2]. We tested for differences in azimuth sampling between EB and SI – that 606 607 is, differences in the proportion of vertices responding preferentially to contralateral, ipsilateral, 608 and midline locations – with a permutation testing procedure. First, participants were randomly 609 divided into two groups. We then computed the difference in mean proportion per azimuth 610 region between the randomized groups. This procedure was repeated 10,000 times. P values were computed as the number of occasions for which the observed difference in means in the 611 actual data was larger than the difference in means in the randomized data, divided by the 612 number of repetitions. P values were Bonferroni corrected for multiple comparisons. 613

To conclude, we quantified a vertex's tuning width with the equivalent rectangular receptive field (ERRF) that has been used previously to investigate spatial sensitivity in cat auditory cortex (20). The area under the RAF was transformed into a rectangle with height equivalent to the peak response in the RAF and an equivalent area. The resulting ERRF width does not provide information on absolute tuning width, yet it does enable the comparison of spatial selectivity across conditions.

Note that we discarded from the analyses above those auditory responsive vertices that

621 exhibited high frequency oscillations as these, given the current experimental design and the

sluggish hemodynamic response, likely reflect noise rather than neural responses to the stimuli.

To this end, we estimated the Fourier transform of each RAF and excluded those having more

than 20% of total power in high frequency bands (average proportion of vertices

625 discarded = 16.1% [SD = 5.3%]).

626 **Topographic organization of azimuth preference**

To plot azimuth preference on the cortical surface we constructed 20 azimuth bins of 20° each linearly spaced from -90° to 90° . As mentioned before, we collapsed sound locations in the front and back due to weak front-back localization in humans (16, 17) by pooling azimuthal preferences for sound positions at positive azimuths θ and π - θ and negative azimuths $-\theta$ and π - θ from the frontal midline. Azimuth preference was color coded in a green-blue-red color scale.

We additionally computed for each vertex the consistency of azimuth preference across the three sound levels to evaluate whether azimuth tuning was level-invariant. We marked vertices that met the consistency criterion (preferred azimuth across all three sound levels not spaced further than 45[°] apart from each other nor switches in preferred hemifield) in the azimuth tuning maps.

637 Coding sound location based on binaural spatial cues

638 First we used a regression analysis with 'binaural difference predictors' to identify the regions responsive to binaural spatial cues. Binaural difference predictors were inferred from the audio 639 640 recordings by computing the interaural level and/or time differences between the left and right 641 channel and convolving these with the HRF. As the ILD and ITD regressor were highly 642 correlated, we used only the ILD predictor and refer to it as binaural difference predictor in both frequency conditions. We additionally constructed a binaural sum predictor to explain the 643 644 variance due to the general neural response to sound independent of sound position. This was done by convolving the sum in power in the left and right ear of the recording with the HRF (1). 645

646 As described in the main text (Results - Coding sound location based on binaural cues), we estimated three GLMs with these predictors, each using data of only two out of three sound 647 648 intensity conditions. We then tested whether it is possible to decode sound azimuth position 649 from the BOLD time course of the regions identified by the GLM estimates during the left-out intensity condition. We tested an opponent channel coding model and a local, one channel 650 651 model. For the opponent channel coding, azimuth position estimates were computed for each 652 time point from the measured opponent population response by calculating the difference in 653 average hemodynamic response of the spatially sensitive vertices in each hemisphere. We then computed an index of similarity by calculating the correlation between the reconstructed 654 azimuthal trajectory (after mild temporal smoothing of the average hemodynamic response: 655 656 moving average window spanning three time points) and the actual azimuthal trajectory of the auditory stimulus. For the local, one-channel model, we compared the indices of similarity 657 658 derived from the local, unilateral population responses to those derived from the opponent, twochannel population responses. 659

660 Coding sound location based on monaural spectral cues

We converted recordings from stereo to mono by summing the squared energy in the left and right channel. Next, we computed a spectrogram for azimuth positions -90° and +90°. To ensure that spectral analyses were not confounded by the frequency modulation of the tones employed here, we selected for each azimuth position the maximum power within a frequency band in a window of 225ms before and after the time point associated to that azimuth location. Note that the total duration of the FM tone was 450ms. We then computed spectral variation as a function of azimuth by computing the difference (in dB) between spectral power at -90° and +90°.

668 SI Results

669 Spatial tuning properties of the auditory cortex

670 A simple main effects analysis showed that the difference in ERRF width between SI and EB 671 was statistically significant at the loudest intensity level (independent samples t-test; left 672 hemisphere: t(30) = 3.219, p = .015; right hemisphere: t(30) = 3.275, p = .015; Bonferroni corrections were applied to all statistical tests in this section to correct for multiple comparisons). 673 A closer examination of the effect of sound intensity within each participant group confirmed an 674 675 increasing ERRF width with increasing sound level in SI (repeated measures ANOVA; left hemisphere: F(2,30) = 25.941, p < .001; right hemisphere: F(2,30) = 27.322. p < .001; see also 676 (1)). Pairwise comparisons showed that the difference in ERRF width was significant at each 677 sound level in both hemispheres (largest p = .018). In contrast, we did not observe a significant 678 679 effect of sound level within the group of EB in the left hemisphere (repeated measures ANOVA; 680 F(2,30) = 4.253; p = 1.00). Although the right hemisphere exhibited a significant simple main 681 effect of sound intensity (F(2,30) = 7.047, p = .015), the pairwise comparisons indicated that only the difference between the soft and medium conditions, and between the soft and loud 682 conditions were significant (largest p = .011). 683

684

685 **Coding sound location based on monaural spectral cues**

We assessed whether alternative azimuth position cues were available in the stimuli, which may be processed through different neural mechanisms than the binaural encoding of sound location observed in SI. To this end, we examined the presence of monaural, spectral variation as a function of azimuth in the spectrograms of the subject-specific stimulus recordings. First we converted recordings from stereo to mono (see *SI Materials and Methods* for details). Next we computed spectral variance as the difference between spectrograms at the extreme left (-90°) and extreme right (+90°) for recordings in both frequency ranges.

693 SI Figure 9 shows that, on average, there was more spectral variation between -90° and +90° in 694 the recordings in the 500-1400Hz range than in the 250 – 700Hz range (see SI Figure 10 for 695 details on single subject spectral variation). The presence of these monaural spectral cues in such relatively low frequency ranges is due to the characteristics of the room in which we made 696 697 the stimulus recordings. Specifically, we made recordings in a standard room - not an anechoic 698 room – to mimic natural listening conditions. That more spectral variation was found in the 500 699 - 1400Hz stimuli is in agreement with the interaction between sound frequency and binaural 700 spatial sensitivity previously described. Specifically, although regions modulated by binaural 701 spatial cues were less ubiquitous in PT of EB in both frequency ranges, in the 500 - 1400Hz 702 range a modulation by binaural spatial information was present unilaterally only. This suggests 703 that especially for this frequency range, sound location may have been processed through 704 neural mechanisms relying on other spatial cues such as monaural spectral variance.

705

706

707 SI References

708 1. Derey K, Valente G, de Gelder B, & Formisano E (2015) Opponent Coding of Sound Location 709 (Azimuth) in Planum Temporale is Robust to Sound-Level Variations. Cerebral Cortex:bhv269. 710 2. Engel SA, Glover GH, & Wandell BA (1997) Retinotopic organization in human visual cortex and 711 the spatial precision of functional MRI. Cerebral cortex 7(2):181-192. 712 3. Striem-Amit E, Hertz U, & Amedi A (2011) Extensive cochleotopic mapping of human auditory 713 cortical fields obtained with phase-encoding FMRI. PLoS One 6(3):e17832. 714 4. Rayleigh L (1907) XII. On our perception of sound direction. The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin 715 Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science 13(74):214-232. 716 Grothe B, Pecka M, & McAlpine D (2010) Mechanisms of sound localization in mammals. 5. 717 Physiological Reviews 90(3):983-1012. 718 6. Rakerd B & Hartmann W (1985) Localization of sound in rooms, II: The effects of a single 719 reflecting surface. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 78(2):524-533. 720 7. Tailarach J & Tournoux P (1988) Co-planar stereotaxic atlas of the human brain: 3-dimensional 721 proportional system—an approach to cerebral imaging. Stuttgart and New York: Thieme Verlag. 722 Goebel R, Esposito F, & Formisano E (2006) Analysis of functional image analysis contest (FIAC) 8. 723 data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general linear model 724 analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human brain mapping 725 27(5):392-401. 726 9. Kim J-J, et al. (2000) An MRI-based parcellation method for the temporal lobe. Neuroimage 727 11(4):271-288. 728 10. Frost MA & Goebel R (2013) Functionally informed cortex based alignment: an integrated 729 approach for whole-cortex macro-anatomical and ROI-based functional alignment. Neuroimage 730 83:1002-1010. Harms MP & Melcher JR (2003) Detection and quantification of a wide range of fMRI temporal 731 11. 732 responses using a physiologically-motivated basis set. Human brain mapping 20(3):168-183. 733 12. Harms MP & Melcher JR (2002) Sound repetition rate in the human auditory pathway: 734 representations in the waveshape and amplitude of fMRI activation. Journal of Neurophysiology 735 88(3):1433-1450. 736 Friston KJ, Frith CD, Turner R, & Frackowiak RS (1995) Characterizing evoked hemodynamics 13. 737 with fMRI. Neuroimage 2(2PA):157-165. 738 14. Benjamini Y & Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful 739 approach to multiple testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B 740 (Methodological):289-300. 741 15. Dale AM (1999) Optimal experimental design for event-related fMRI. Human brain mapping 8(2-742 3):109-114. 743 Musicant AD & Butler RA (1985) Influence of monaural spectral cues on binaural localization. 16. 744 The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 77(1):202-208. 745 17. Oldfield SR & Parker SP (1984) Acuity of sound localisation: a topography of auditory space. II. 746 Pinna cues absent. Perception 13(5):601-617. 747 Middlebrooks JC, Xu L, Eddins AC, & Green DM (1998) Codes for sound-source location in 18. 748 nontonotopic auditory cortex. Journal of Neurophysiology 80(2):863-881. Stecker GC, Harrington IA, & Middlebrooks JC (2005) Location coding by opponent neural 749 19. 750 populations in the auditory cortex. *PLoS Biol* 3(3):e78. 751 20. Lee C-C & Middlebrooks JC (2011) Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity sharpens during task 752 performance. Nature neuroscience 14(1):108-114.





755 SI Figure 1. Stimulus properties. (A) Spectrograms show the frequency-time representation of the binaural recordings of a stimulus in the 500-1400Hz range for a representative participant 756 757 (left channel at the top, right channel at the bottom). The time period displayed here 758 corresponds to the first 10s of the movement phase of the sound, which spans half a circle 759 (from -90° to 90°). Colors indicate power. (B) Plotted are the interaural level (top) and interaural 760 time (bottom) spectrograms for the audio clip in (A). The difference in power between the left 761 and right channel were used to compute ILD (red colors indicate more power in the left channel, 762 blue colors more power in the right channel). We computed interaural phase differences 763 between the frequency-time spectrograms of the left and right channel and converted these to 764 time differences to create a plot of ITD. Colors indicate time differences in milliseconds. (C) 765 Similar as (A) but for a stimulus in the 250–700 Hz frequency range. (D) Similar as (B) but for 766 the audio clip shown in (B). Reproduced with permission from (1).



767



- sustained response peaks at 12s post stimulus onset and remains at a plateau until 2s post
- stimulus offset, when it starts to return to baseline. In the phasic regressor, an early peak
- response is present at 6s post stimulus onset, after which the response quickly descends to
- baseline. A second peak is present at 6s post stimulus offset.



778SI Figure 3. Individual BOLD activation maps for processing of spatial sounds in EB.779Displayed are the results of a fixed effects general linear model (FFX GLM) estimation within780each subject, contrasting sustained & phasic > baseline (FDR, q < .05; see SI Materials and781Methods for details). Individual maps are displayed on the cortical surface of the participant.



- 783 SI Figure 4. Individual BOLD activation maps for processing of spatial sounds in SI.
- Displayed are the results of a fixed effects general linear model (FFX GLM) estimation within each subject, contrasting *sustained* & *phasic* > *baseline* (FDR, q < .05; see *SI Materials and*
- 786 *Methods* for details). Individual maps are displayed on the cortical surface of the participant.



SI Figure 5. Waveshape Indices. Bars plot the percentage of vertices with WI within 11 bins ranging from -1 to 1 in steps of .2 for the auditory cortex in SI (A), the auditory cortex in EB (B), and the parietal and occipital cortices in EB (C). WI is computed as the normalized difference between the parameter estimates for the sustained and phasic predictor (see *SI Materials and Methods*) and scaled between -1 and 1 for ease of visualization. Gray bars indicate percentages for the left hemisphere, black bars for the right hemisphere.







789 SI Figure 6. Azimuth tuning and steepest slopes in SI and EB. The average distribution of 790 azimuth preference is reported per hemisphere and frequency condition across RAFs of SI (top 791 row) and EB (bottom row). The azimuth position of the stimulus is indicated by the angular 792 dimension, the radial dimension signals the proportion of vertices exhibiting a directional 793 preference for each azimuth position tested (black line). The 95% confidence interval is signaled by the shaded gray area (estimated with bootstrapping, 10,000 repetitions). (B) Reported is the 794 795 average distribution of steepest slope location on the azimuth across RAFs of SI (top row) and 796 EB (bottom row). Distributions on the left are the average in the 250 – 700Hz frequency range,

on the right in the 500 – 1400Hz. For ipsilaterally tuned vertices we included the steepest

positive slope, for contralaterally tuned vertices the steepest negative slopes. Lines indicate the

average proportion of steepest slopes per azimuth position.



800

801 SI Figure 7. Azimuth sampling in EB and SI. Bars represent the percentage of vertices with 802 that specific azimuth preference (contralateral, ipsilateral, or midline) in the 250 - 700Hz 803 frequency range (A) and the 500 – 1400Hz range (B). Black bars show percentages for EB, gray bars for SI. Percentages were derived from the azimuth tuning distribution (see Figure 4). 804 For midline percentages we pooled -20°, +20°, - 160°, + 160°; for contralateral and ipsilateral 805 percentages either +40° until +140° or -40° until -140°, depending on the hemisphere. 806 807 Percentages are averaged across subjects and hemispheres. Error bars denote the standard 808 deviation. The asterisk (*) denotes a trend towards significance (p = .06; all others p > .2).



SI Figure 8. Modulation of tuning width (ERRF width) by sound level. Plotted is the average
median ERRF width for each sound intensity condition across SI (black bars) and EB (gray
bars) per hemisphere. An increase in ERRF width signals a decrease in spatial selectivity.
Significant differences are described in the text (see *Results – Spatial selectivity of the auditory cortex in EB*). Error bars reflect the standard deviation.



SI Figure 9. Azimuth preference maps in EB. Plotted is the preferred azimuth position for each vertex in the 250-700Hz frequency range at a medium sound level. Clusters delineated in white are consistently encoding location across the three intensity levels in the 250-700Hz range. We did not observe any such clusters in the 500 – 1400Hz range.



SI Figure 10. (A) Representative examples of decoded azimuth trajectories from the 820 821 hemodynamic response in the posterior auditory cortex of SI. Black arrows indicate starting point of the sound (-90° or +90°) and motion direction (counter clockwise). Colored dots indicate 822 823 the position of the sound every 36° or 2 s, that is, at every measured time point. Black dots indicate the starting position: the first time point measured. Colored dotted lines connect the 824 measured time points and indicate the azimuthal trajectory of the sound in the various sound 825 826 intensity conditions: red corresponds to loud intensity, yellow to medium intensity and green to 827 soft intensity. Note that the radius in these plots is arbitrary and was selected to create nonoverlaying azimuthal trajectories for ease of visualization. The polar plot at the top shows 828

829 the known sound azimuth position over time modeled for the 500- 1400Hz sounds starting at the right (+90°) and rotating counter clockwise. The second polar plot shows the azimuth position 830 decoded from the measured BOLD response in both hemispheres with a bilateral, two-channel 831 832 opponent population code. The closer the decoded trajectory resembles the known azimuth trajectory shown at the top, the higher the decoding accuracy. In the third polar plot, azimuth 833 position is decoded from the measured BOLD response in the left hemisphere with a unilateral, 834 835 local population coding model. The polar plot at the bottom shows the same but for the population in the right hemisphere. (B) Similar to (A) but for EB. 836



SI Figure 11. Regions sensitive to binaural spatial cues in the parietal and occipital
cortex of EB. Maps result from the same RFX GLM estimations shown and described in *Figure*6. Note that we used a different color scale here for ease of visualization. Blue colors indicate
regions responding maximally to binaural spatial cues for ipsilateral locations, purple regions
respond preferentially to binaural disparities arising from contralateral locations. Regions are
numbered A1 to A9 for ease of visualization of the correlation values between decoded azimuth
positions and the actual sound trajectory shown in *SI Fig 11*.



847 SI Figure 12. Decoding azimuth from response patterns in occipital and parietal cortex.

Circles indicate the correlation value between the decoded azimuth trajectory based on the response pattern in an occipital or parietal area (x axis, see *SI Fig 10*) and the actual sound trajectory. Per area, correlation values for the conditions in the data of the intensity that was left out of the GLM estimate are shown. As each area was identified by only one GLM estimate, this results in four correlation values per area (clockwise – start left, clockwise – start right, counter clockwise – start left, and counter clockwise – start right).







SI Figure 14. Spectral variation as a function of azimuth on a single subject level. Per
subject we expressed the difference in spectral energy for sounds at -90° and +90° in decibel
(dB), averaged across conditions. Red lines represent the average variation in the 250 – 700Hz
frequency range; blue lines in the 500 – 1400Hz range. Shaded areas indicate the 95%

- so confidence interval as estimated with a bootstrapping procedure (10000 repetitions). Also on
- this single subject level, more variation in spectral energy between sounds at -90° and +90° is
- present in the 500 1400Hz frequency range than in the 250 700Hz range.

870 SI Tables

SI Table 1. Characteristics of early blind participants

ID	Sex	Age	Handedness	Cause	Onset	Residual vision
EB01	F	35	Right	Unknown	At birth	None
EB02	F	40	Right	ROP	At birth	None
EB03	F	54	Right	ROP	At birth	None
EB04	М	46	Ambidexter	Optic nerve damage	Age 6*	None
EB05	М	39	Right	Leber's ON	At birth	Minimal light sensitivity
EB06	М	48	Right	Leber's ON	At birth	Minimal light sensitivity
EB07	М	63	Right	ROP	At birth	Minimal light sensitivity
EB08	F	29	Right	ROP	At birth	None**

ON = optic neuropathy; ROP = retinopathy of prematurity; M = male; F = female; * Severe nystagmus at birth but some residual light and shape perception, total loss of vision at age 6 after eye surgery; ** Minimal light sensitivity until two years of age.

871

	Time to peak (s)	Average t [SD]	Number of voxels [SD]
EB01	4	5.99 [<i>0.35</i>]	274 [80]
	6*	6.09 [<i>0.45</i>]	390 [<i>90</i>]
	8	6.03 [<i>0.43</i>]	394 [<i>97</i>]
EB02	4	6.17 [<i>0.57</i>]	306 [<i>307</i>]
	6*	6.48 [<i>0.75</i>]	360 [272]
	8	6.44 [<i>0.72</i>]	297 [140]
EB03	4	6.52 [<i>0.19</i>]	358 [<i>198</i>]
	6*	6.74 [<i>0.28</i>]	407 [256]
	8	6.77 [<i>0.26</i>]	351 [<i>296</i>]
EB04	4	6.27 [<i>0.30</i>]	720 [718]
	6	6.41 [<i>0.34</i>]	1247 [<i>1220</i>]
	8*	6.43 [<i>0.38</i>]	1650 [<i>1650</i>]
EB05	4	6.35 [<i>0.53</i>]	273 [152]
	6*	6.59 [<i>0.48</i>]	249 [173]
	8	6.56 [<i>0.49</i>]	206 [<i>199</i>]
EB06	4	5.88 [<i>0.13</i>]	640 [<i>220</i>]
	6*	5.92 [<i>0.25</i>]	545 [172]
	8	5.95 [<i>0.33</i>]	343 [107]
EB07	4	5.69 [<i>0.29</i>]	124 [131]
	6*	5.94 [<i>0.18</i>]	146 [<i>126</i>]
	8	5.93 [<i>0.19</i>]	162 [<i>126</i>]
EB08	4	6.24 [0.35]	182 [185]
	6*	6.35 [<i>0.41</i>]	184 [<i>160</i>]
	8	6.13 [<i>0.48</i>]	117 [111]

SI Table 2. Results of the optimal time-to-peak estimation in early blinds.

SI Table 2. Results of the optimal time-to-peak estimation in early blinds. Reported are the results of the GLM estimations based on a TTP of 4, 6 or 8 seconds for each participant. We selected the most relevant TTP by optimizing both the average *t* value and the number of significantly active voxels (auditory > baseline, p < 0.05, Bonferroni) across all functional runs. The *t* statistic was leading in cases with a clear difference in average *t* value. However, when the difference in *t* value was relatively small across two or more different TTPs, the number of significantly activated voxels was also considered.