Supporting Information

Supporting Information Corrected January 04, 2013

Bedny et al. 10.1073/pnas.0900010106

SI Materials and Methods

SYN

 \mathbf{y}

Structural and functional data were collected on a 3-tesla Siemens scanner at the Athinoula A. Martinos Imaging Center at the McGovern Institute for Brain Research at MIT. T1 weighted structural images were collected in 128 axial slices with 1.33 mm isotropic voxels (TR = 2 ms , TE = 3.39 ms). Functional, blood oxygenation level dependent (BOLD), data were acquired in $3 \times 3 \times 4$ mm voxels (TR = 2 sec, TE = 30 ms), in 30 near-axial slices. The first four seconds of each run were excluded to allow for steady state magnetization.

Data analysis was performed using SPM2 (www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk) and in-house software. The data were realigned, smoothed with a 5 mm smoothing kernel, and normalized to a standard template, in Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space. The general linear model was used to analyze BOLD activity of each subject as a function of condition. Covariates of interest were convolved with a standard hemodynamic response function (HRF). Nuisance covariates included: run effects, an intercept term and global signal. Time series data were subjected to a high-pass filter (128 Hz).

BOLD signal differences between conditions were evaluated through second level, random effects analysis. In whole-brain analyses, false positive rate was controlled at α < .05 (corrected) by performing Monte-Carlo permutation tests on the data (using a cluster size threshold of pseudot $= 3$). ROI analyses were performed on PSC during TR 3 through 10 relative to a rest baseline. (The first two TRs were excluded to account for the hemodynamic lag.) Functional ROIs were identified in individual subjects based on localizer experiments or orthogonal contrasts. For the purposes of defining ROIs, contrasts were thresh-

- 1. Lumley T, Diehr P, Emerson S, Chen L (2002) The importance of the normality assumption in large public health data sets. *Annu Rev Public Health* 23:151–169.
- 2. Steiger JH (1980) Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychol Bull* 87:245–251.
- 3. DeCoster J (2007) *Applied Linear Regression Notes Set 1*. Available at www.stathelp.com/notes.html. Accessed December 16 2008.

olded in individual subjects at $P < 0.00001, k \ge 10$. If no voxels were observer at this threshold, the threshold was lowered to $P <$ 0.0001 and then 0.001. If no voxels were observed at the lowered threshold, the subject was excluded from that analysis.

Voxel-by-voxel pattern correlation analysis was used to compare the similarity of activations between the sighted and EB groups. We performed random-effects analyses, in each group, for the ToM network (belief stories–physical stories contrast) and Language Network (physical stories–backward speech contrast). For each contrast and group we extracted voxel-wise t-values from the entire cerebrum. All negative *t* values were set to zero, so as to focus specifically on belief-and-language-related activity above their respective baselines. We then computed a correlation between the pattern of *t* values in the sighted and EB group for belief contrast and for the language contrast. Note that the distributions of t-values were not normal in any of the samples. The large sample sizes, however, rendered the regression robust to violations of the normality assumption (1). We compared the resulting correlations coefficients to each other using the procedure described in Steiger (ref. 2; see also ref. 3). This procedure is designed to compare correlations that are based on data from the same sample. The sample size for this comparison was the number of independently measured *t* values, or 'resels'(4, 5). We computed the average number of resels in each image based on the RPV.img file provided by SPM (average number of resels $= 494$). We performed the same correlation analyses across two halves of our sighted participants to rule out the possibility that the language network is in general more variable across participants than the ToM network. For this analysis we computed the ToM and language correlations across two halves of our sighted participants.

- 4. Poline JB, Worsley KJ, Holmes AP, Frackowiak RS, Friston KJ (1995) Estimating smoothness in statistical parametric maps: Variability of p values. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 19:788–796.
- 5. Worsley KJ, Friston KJ (1995) Analysis of fMRI time-series revisited—again. *NeuroImage* 2:173–181.

Fig. S1. Number of active voxels in the Left Inferior Frontal Gyrus (LIFG) for the Belief - Physical Representations contrast. On the *y* axis is the number of voxels in the LIFG that reached a threshold of $P < 0.0001$, uncorrected in each individual subject. Each point represents a single subject. Xs represent EB participants; dots represent sighted participants.

AS PNAS

Fig. S2. Greater activity in EB than sighted participants for the physical stories–backwards speech contrast. Depicted is a group-by-condition interaction of Group: sighted vs. early blind; condition: physical stories vs. backwards speech. These are results of a whole-brain, random-effects analyses, *P* 0.05 corrected.

ANA

 \mathbf{S}

Fig. S3. Similarity between activation patterns of sighted and EB in the ToM and language contrasts. *R* values of between-group correlations computed over voxel-wise activation pattern in the ToM and language contrasts. The ToM contrast is the pattern of activation for the belief stories greater than physical representation stories. The language contrast is the pattern of activation for physical representation stories greater than backwards speech. On the left are correlations between two halves of the sighted participants. On the right are correlations between EB and sighted groups.

SVNAS

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Experiment 2

Fig. S4. Examples of stories and questions from each condition in experiments 1 and 2. On the left are stories from experiment 1. To the right of each story is its corresponding true/false questions. On the right are stories from experiment 2. For each story, participants decided whether the protagonist felt or the news was ''very good,'' ''a little good,'' ''a little bad,'' or ''very bad.'' Belief stories appear in dark gray.

PNAS PNAS

Table S1. Accuracy and reaction time data for experiments 1 and 2

PNAS PNAS

Shown are the means of accuracy and reaction time data across participants. Standard deviations appear in parentheses. RT, reaction time.

Table S2. Demographic characteristics of EB participants

PNAS PNAS

Age of blindness describes onset of blindness, which is defined as absence of vision with at most minimal light perception. RLF, retinopathy of prematurity; JD, juris doctorate.