

**Supplementary Materials and Results:** The following are available online at [www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1](http://www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1)

Contents:

### **Supplementary Materials**

- Supplementary Table 1: Summary of tests for aphasia in German language
- Supplementary Table 2: The healthy participants
- Supplementary Table 3: The aphasic participants
- Supplementary Table 4: List of changed target verbs in NAVS-G /NAT-G compared to original NAVS-G
- Supplementary Table 5: List of log. frequency of each target verb used in NAVS-G /NAT-G
- Supplementary Table 6: List of novel sentences in NAVS-G /NAT-G
- Supplementary Figure 1: NAVS-G errors in patients with aphasia

### **Supplementary results: Within group analysis**

- Supplementary Table 7: All participants' results in the different subtests
- Supplementary Table 8: Complete NAVS-G VNT results
- Supplementary Table 9: Complete NAVS-G ASPT results
- Supplementary Table 10: Complete NAVS-G SPPT results
- Supplementary Table 11: Complete NAVS-G SCT results
- Supplementary Table 12: Complete NAT-G results

Supplementary Materials

**Supplementary Table1 1: Overview of aphasia tests in the German language**

German Tests for Aphasia	Comprehension		Production			Reading
	Sentences	Syntax	Repetition	Naming	Sentence syntax	
Aachener Aphasie Test	x		x	x	x	(x)
Aachener Aphasie Bedside-Test	x			x	x	
Aphasie-Check-Liste	x		x	x		x
Amsterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test						
Aphasie-Schnell-Test	x					x
Bielefelder Aphasie Screening	x		x	x	x	x
Kurze Aphasieprüfung	x		x	x		x
Komplexe Sätze					x	x
Sätze verstehen	x	x				
Lexikon modellorientiert 2.0	x		x	x		x
Sprachsystematisches Aphasiescreening	x	x	x	x	x	x
Token-Test	x					(x)
NAVS	x	x		x	x	x
NAT					x*	(x)

Supplementary Table 1 gives an overview of frequently used German language tests. It compares three aspects of speech: “comprehension” (subdivided in “sentence comprehension” and “syntax”), “production” (subdivided in “repeating”, “naming”, “sentence production”, and “syntax”), and “reading”.

The Bielefelder Aphasie Screening (Richter et al. 2006) is another diagnostic test for German stroke patients, allowing aphasia's diagnosis, aphasia's severity, and the syndrome classification. Basic syntactic skills are examined in several subtests (the analysis of spontaneous speech, sentence comprehension, and sentence production for picture description). However, a depth-diagnostics concerning syntax, e.g., the production of complex sentences, is missed. In contrast to the above-mentioned traditional aphasia test batteries, the "Lexikon modellorientiert 20" (LeMO) is based on the language faculty's cognitive neuropsychological models (Morton 1979 and 1970) to aphasia assessment and to plan individual treatment. This model lacks the syntax system. Therefore, the LEMO could not identify syntactic deficits.

## Characteristics of Healthy and aphasic participants

Supplementary Table 2: The healthy participants

Characteristics of Participants				
Subject	Gender	Age in years	Educational qualification	Highest educational degree
1	f	60	3	3
2	m	60	3	2
3	f	64	3	2
4	f	49	3	2
5	m	57	4	3
6	m	48	4	3
7	f	57	4	2
8	f	62	4	3
9	m	66	4	3
10	f	28	4	3
11	m	30	4	3
12	m	25	4	3
13	f	25	4	3
14	f	29	4	3
15	m	34	4	3
16	m	34	4	3
17	m	52	2	2
18	f	79	2	1
19	f	68	3	1
20	m	78	3	2
21	f	72	3	2
22	m	77	2	2
23	m	75	2	2
24	m	52	4	3
25	f	84	1	1
6	f	88	1	1
27	m	56	2	1

Supplementary Table 2 reports: gender - f= female. m= male - education (Ed.) qualification - 1 = No school leaving certificate. 2 = junior high school certificate covering eight years ("Hauptschulabschluss"). 3 = secondary high school leaving certificate covering ten years ("Realschulabschluss"). 4 = Abitur -, and highest educational qualification - 1= no education degree. 2= completed apprenticeship degree. 3 = university degree.

Pat.	infarct size	Aphasia (T0)			Aphasia (T1)								MoCA(T1)							NAVS-G /NAT-G		
		Severity	Type	GS	severity	Type	GS	SS	TT	R	W	N	C	GS	Ex	N	At	L	Ab	M	O	GS
	ml			0-530			0-530	0-30	0-50	0-150	0-90	0-120	0-120	0-30	0-5	0-3	0-6	0-3	0-2	0-5	0-6	%
1	47.24	middle	Global	213	mild	Broca	457	25	44	135	75	105	98									76
2	79.59	middle	Broca	237	mild	Anomic	471	25	48	136	77	103	94	18	2	3	4	1	1	2	5	90
3	38.64	severe	Global	182	mild	Anomic	446	26	40	139	83	83	101									98
4	7.26	mild	Anomic	447	minimal	RA	#	28	50	^	89	^	^	24	4	3	6	2	1	2	6	95
5	1.81	mild	Broca	460	minimal	RA	#	29	50	^	89	^	^	26	5	3	6	2	2	2	6	98
6	24.96	minimal	RA	512	minimal	RA	#	29	50	^		^	^	25	4	2	6	1	2	4	6	98
7	35	mild	Anomic	416	minimal	RA	#	29		^		^	^	27	4	3	6	2	1	4	6	97
8	106.99	severe	Global	64	minimal	RA	516	27	45	148	89	120	114									98
9	18.48	very severe	Global	#	minimal	RA	490	21	49	130	83	114	114									95
10	3.23	very severe	Global	#	mild	Broca	394	19	27	124	51	81	70	#								81
11	16.18	very severe	Global	#	middle	Broca	378	16	47	94	51	82	59	#								67
12	^	mild	Anomic	#	minimal	RA	#	28	46	^	90	^	^	25	5	1	6	2	2	3	6	82
13	*	severe	Broca	#	mild	Broca	*	21	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	92
14	*	mild	Anomic	*	minimal	RA	*	29	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	98
15	34.5	mild	Anomic	476	minimal	RA	513	29	45	150	90	119	109	28	5	3	6	3	2	3	6	76

## Supplementary Table2: The aphasic participants

Supplementary Table 3 reports the AAT results of the patients with aphasia at stroke time and NAVS-G and NAT-G testing (chronic time). Patients' row data of the AAT's six description levels for spontaneous speech (including communicative verbal behavior (1), articulation and prosody (2), automatized language (3), semantic structure (4), phonemic structure (5), and syntactic structure (6)), and the row data of the five AAT's subtests (token test (TT), repetition (R), written language (WR), naming (N), and sentence comprehension (C)) are reported for the chronic time. A total of 530 points can be achieved in the AAT. Patients N. 13 and 14 had a clinical diagnosis of aphasia based on AAT spontaneous speech analysis only, as AAT's testing was not available. Patient n. 6 refused further testing.

MoCA test could be performed only in patients who participated in Large scale protocol and when the clinic profile was light. The character # displays patients who could perform neither the AAT at the acute phase nor the MoCA in the chronic phase. The MOCA includes seven subtests for testing executive function (Ex), naming (N), attention (A), language (L), abstraction (Ab), verbal memory (M), and orientation (Or). In bracket are noticed the maximal scores for each subtest.

The table also reports the NAVS/NAT-G global scores (GS) for each patient.

Abbreviation: RA = residual aphasia

## List of novel verbs in NAVS-G /NAT-G

**Supplementary Table 3: List of changed target verbs in NAVS-G /NAT-G compared to original NAVS-G**

Verb in NAVS (original version)	German translation	alternative Verb in NAVS-G /NAT-G	Reason for change
cut (ob2)	schneiden (ob2)	küssen (ob2) transl.: <i>kiss</i>	NAT verb
read (op3)	vorlesen (op3)	schreiben (op3) transl.: <i>write</i>	exclusion of compound verbs
watch (op2)	beobachten (ob2)	essen (op2) transl.: <i>eat</i>	different argument structure
stir (ob2)	rühren (op2)	retten (ob2) transl.: <i>save</i>	different argument structure
pinch (ob2)	kneifen (ob2)	jagen (ob2) transl.: <i>chase</i>	NAT verb
pour (op3)	einschenken (op3)	zeigen (op3) transl.: <i>show</i>	exclusion of compound verbs
tickle (ob2)	kitzeln (ob2)	ziehen (ob2) transl.: <i>pull</i>	NAT verb
shave (op2)	rasieren (ob2)	fegen (op2) transl.: <i>sweep</i>	different argument structure

We substituted: 1) 'to watch' (beobachten) and 'to shave' (rasieren), as they are op2 in English but ob2 in German. To stir' (rühren) is ob2 in English but op2 in German; 2) 'to pour' (einschenken) and 'to read' (vorlesen), as their translation to German is a compound verb; 3) 'to cut', 'to pinch' and 'to tickle' were replaced by 'to kiss' - küssen-, 'to chase' - jagen- and 'to pull' - ziehen- other ob2-verbs used in the sentences in the original NAT.

## Frequency of verbs used in NAVS-G and NAT-G.

**Supplementary Table 4: List of log. frequency of each target verb used in NAVS-G /NAT-G**

Verb	Argument structure	log. frequency
bellen (bark)	ob1	.4771
heulen (howl)	ob1	.8451
krabbeln (crawl)	ob1	0
lachen (laugh)	ob1	20374

schwimmen (swim)	ob1	1.415
<b>ob1 mean</b>		<b>.9549</b>
jagen (chase)	ob2	1.4472
küssen (kiss)	ob2	1.4914
retten (save)	ob2	1.8573
schubsen (shove)	ob2	0
ziehen (pull)	ob2	2.4533
<b>ob2 mean</b>		<b>1.4498</b>
fahren (drive)	op2	2.6857
waschen (wash)	op2	1.301
beißen (bite)	op2	1.3222
essen (eat)	op2	1.8261
fegen (sweep)	op2	.7782
<b>op2 mean</b>		<b>1.5827</b>
stellen (put)	ob3	2.8457
geben (give)	ob3	3.2378
<b>ob3 mean</b>		<b>3.0418</b>
schicken (send)	op3	1.7634
schreiben (write)	op3	2.4857
überreichen (deliver)	op3	1.5051
werfen (throw)	op3	2.1818
zeigen (show)	op3	2.7226
<b>op3 mean</b>		<b>2.1317</b>

#### List of novel sentences in NAVS-G /NAT-G

Supplementary Table 5: List of novel sentences in NAVS-G /NAT-G

Test	German Verb (English translation)	novel sentence in ASPT
ASPT	küssen (kiss)	Der Mann küsst die Frau.
	schreiben (write)	Der Mann schreibt (der Frau) einen Brief.

	essen (eat)	Der Mann isst (ein Brötchen).
	retten (save)	Der Mann rettet die Frau.
	jagen (chase)	Der Hund jagt die Katze.
	ziehen (pull)	Der Junge zieht das Mädchen.
	fegen (sweep)	Der Mann fegt (den Boden).
NAT/SPPT/SVT	schubsen (shove)	z.B. Aktiv: Der Junge schubst das Mädchen

### MRI data acquisition and lesion analysis

For the diffusion-weighted imaging, we used a standard sequence (23 slices, matrix = 128 x 128 pixel, voxel size = 1.8 x 1.8 x 5 mm, repetition time = 3.1 s, echo time = 79 ms, flip angle = 9, six diffusion-encoding gradient directions with a b-factor of 1000 s/mm<sup>2</sup>). All patients received FLAIR images (repetition time = 9000 ms, echo time = 93.0 ms, flip angle = 14, matrix 200 x 256 pixel, voxel size = 0.94 x 0.94 x 5.00 mm, 23 slices). As a prerequisite for spatial normalization, a high-resolution T1 anatomical scan was obtained from 91 patients (repetition time = 2200 ms, echo time = 2.15 ms, flip angle = 12, matrix = 256 x 256 pixel, voxel size = 1 x 1 x 1 mm, 176 slices).

For lesion analysis, a rough delineation of the diffusion-weighted imaged lesion was performed using a customized region-of-interest toolbox implemented in SPM8 (<http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm8>). Individual intensity thresholds were applied to find the best match between the binary lesion map and the diffusion-restricted brain tissue. Subsequently, the lesions maps were inspected in MRICron (<http://www.cabiatl.com/mrico/mricon/stats.html>) and manually adjusted if necessary. In one case, no diffusion-weighted image was available and the lesion was drawn directly onto a FLAIR image. For spatial normalization of the lesion maps, the underlying diffusion-weighted imaging scan (or FLAIR image) was co-registered to the anatomical T1 scan (n = 91). High-resolution T1 scans were segmented using the VBM8 toolbox (r435; <http://dbm.neuro.uni-jena.de/vbm/download/>). Deformation field parameters for nonlinear normalization into the stereotactic Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) standard space were then computed using the DARTEL (diffeomorphic anatomical registration through exponentiated lie algebra; [177]) approach implemented in VBM8. Normalization quality of lesion maps was visually checked by M.H. In five cases in which no T1 scan of sufficient quality was available, parameters for normalization were obtained using FLAIR images. As smaller diffusion restricted areas may be indiscernible in chronic MRI scans or CT scans, our approach of mapping lesions on acute diffusion-weighted images may contribute significantly to a more precise determination of lesion.





Patients with aphasia produced several kinds of mistakes when performing the NAVS-G and NAT-G tests. According to the literature, differentiating between representational deficits, deficits in syntactic operation, and semantic errors is, however, possible.

Supplementary results: Descriptive statistics

**Supplementary Table 6: Participants' results in the different NAVS-G and NAT-G subtests**

N.					NAT				SPPT				SVT		total score
	VNT	VCT	ASPT	NAT	NAT can	non-can	NAT OR	SPTT	SPPT can.	non-can.	SPPT OR	SVT total	SVT can.	non-can.	
LHSP1	81.8%	100%	<b>84.7%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	60%	46.7%	40%	3.0%	46.7%	13.3%	.0%	80%	100%	60%	76.3%
LHSP 2	95.5%	100%	100%	<b>83.3%</b>	100%	66.7%	20%	40%	46.7%	33.3%	20%	83.3%	86.7%	80%	90%
LHSP 3	100%	100%	100%	<b>96.7%</b>	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	93.3%	80%	40%	100%	100%	100%	98.3%
LHSP 4	86.4%	100%	<b>96.8%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	86.7%	93.3%	80%	40%	90%	100%	80%	94.8%
LHSP 5	95.5%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	93.3%	86.7%	60%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	98.3%
LHSP 6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	86.7%	73.3%	20%	100%	100%	100%	97.9%
LHSP 7	86.4%	100%	100%	90%	93.3%	86.7%	60%	90%	93.3%	86.7%	60%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	96.6%
LHSP 8	100%	100%	<b>99.4%</b>	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	86.7%	93.3%	80%	40%	100%	100%	100%	97.9%
LHSP 9	99%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	66.7%	100%	33.3%	.0%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	95.2%
LHSP 10	86.4%	100%	100%	20%	33.3%	6.7%	.0%	23.3%	40%	67%	.0%	80%	93.3%	66.7%	8.8%
LHSP 11	72.7%	95.5%	<b>71%</b>	46.7%	66.7%	26.7%	.0%	36.7%	53.3%	20%	.0%	76.7%	93.3%	60%	67.0%
LHSP 12	86.4%	100%	<b>96.2%</b>	33.3%	60%	6.7%	.0%	40%	80%	.0%	.0%	83.3%	86.7%	80%	82.1%
LHSP 13	99%	100%	100%					53.3%	60%	46.7%	.0%	83.3%	66.7%	100%	82.5%
LHSP 14	99%	100%	100%					90%	93.3%	86.7%	60%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	87.6%
LHSP 15	77.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	60%	40%	100%	100%	100%	76.3%
HP1	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP2	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
HP3	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP4	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP5	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%

HP6	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP7	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP8	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP9	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
HP10	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP11	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP12	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP13	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP14	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP15	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP16	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP17	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	76.7%	93.3%	60%	.0%	100%	100%	100%	97.6%
HP18	95.5%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	93.3%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	990%
HP19	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
HP20	100%	95.5%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	60%	100%	100%	100%	990%
HP21	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP22	95.5%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	60%	86.7%	100%	73.3%	96.9%
HP23	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	86.7%	100%	73.3%	20%	96.7%	93.3%	100%	98.3%
HP24	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HP25	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83.3%	100%	66.7%	.0%	100%	100%	100%	98.3%
HP26	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	76.7%	93.3%	60%	20%	100%	100%	100%	97.6%
HP27	100%	100%	1000%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	86.7%	73.3%	40%	100%	100%	100%	97.9%
RHSP3	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	60%	80%	93.3%	66.7%	40%	100%	100%	100%	97.3%
RHSP4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	93.3%	86.7%	80%	100%	100%	100%	990%
RHSP5	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
RHSP6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.3%
RHSP7	100%	100%	100%	86.7%	93.3%	80%	40%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	60%	90%	93.3%	86.7%	96.2%
RHSP8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP9	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP10	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP11	95.5%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	86.7%	100%	73.3%	60%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	97.6%

RHSP12	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.7%	100%	93.3%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
RHSP13	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	80%	100%	100%	100%	99.3%
RHSP14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RHSP15	100%	100%	100%	93.3%	100%	86.7%	60%	90%	100%	80%	60%	100%	100%	100%	98.3%

### Complete results of the logistic regression

Please note that the effect is positive or negative depending on whether the  $z/X^2$  score is positive or negative respectively

**Supplementary Table 8: Complete NAVS-G VNT results**

<i>A. LHSP</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i><math>\chi^2</math></i>	<i>z</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Power</i>
patients with aphasia									
<i>single predictor models</i>									
<b>VAN</b>								0,193	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	1,254	1,12			0,0005	12,11			
participant	0,289	0,538			0,297	1,089			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VAN					0,047	6,1058	6,106	0,1926	70%
2 vs. 1			-2,8577	1,2892	0,08		-2,217		
3 vs. 1			-2,1724	1,2661	0,129		-1,716		
3 vs. 2			0,6853	0,724	0,344		0,947		
<b>VAO</b>								0,054	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	1,521	1,233			0,000	14,426			
participant	0,293	0,541			0,289	1,123			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VAO			1,0872	0,7375	0,14		1,474	0,0545	29%
<b>VT</b>								0,297	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,290	0,538			0,275	1,192			
participant	0,285	0,534			0,306	1,048			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VT					0,002		17,46	0,2968	97%

ob2 vs. ob1			-2,822	1,1183	.02786		-2.524
ob3 vs. ob1			-3,963	1,1933	.00416		-3.321
op2 vs. ob1			-.7153	1,2905	.57856		-.554
op3 vs. ob1			-1,8911	1,1551	.14323		-1.637
ob3 vs. ob2			-1,1407	0,6956	.14323		-1.640
op2 vs. ob2			2,1069	0,866	.02879		2.433
op3 vs. ob2			0,9312	0,6453	.1828		1.443
op2 vs. ob3			3,2477	0,9595	.00416		3.385
op3 vs. ob3			2,072	0,7631	.02081		2.715
op3 vs. op2			-1,1757	0,9134	.21795		-1.287
<b>AATgs</b>							.059
<i>random effects</i>							
item	1,094	1,046			0,062	3,471	
participant	0,069	0,263			0,841	0,040	
<i>fixed effects</i>							
AATgs			0,004	0,002	0,036	2,101	0%
<b>AATsy</b>							.048
<i>random effects</i>							
item	2,221	1,490			0,000	21,808	
participant	0,000	0,000			0,998	0,000	
<i>fixed effects</i>							
AATsy			0,374	0,147	.011	2,555	64%
<b>frequency</b>							.157
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,860	0,928			0,016	5,752	
participant	0,281	0,530			0,304	1,058	
<i>fixed effects</i>							
frequency			-1,043	0,376	0,006	-2,774	82%
<b>Age</b>							.062
<i>random effects</i>							
item	1,916	1,384			0,000	19,820	
participant	0,051	0,226			0,824	0,050	

*fixed effects*

frequency	-0,072	0,029	.013	-2,478	63%
-----------	--------	-------	------	--------	-----

*adjusted models*

<b>VAN + Age</b>	<b>0,248</b>				
------------------	--------------	--	--	--	--

*random effects*

item	1,282	1,132	0,001	12,298	
participant	0,046	0,214	0,842	0,040	

*fixed effects*

VAN			0,047	6,131	0,2481	74%
2 vs. 1	-2,888	1,299	0,078	-2,224		
3 vs. 1	-2,196	1,275	0,128	-1,722		
3 vs. 2	0,692	0,731	0,344	0,947		
age	-0,072	0,029	0,013	-2,483		

<b>VT + Age</b>	<b>0,357</b>				
-----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--

*random effects*

item	0,292	0,540	0,279	1,170	
participant	0,038	0,196	0,866	0,028	

*fixed effects*

VT			0,001	17,579	0,3566	98%
ob2 vs.ob1	-2,845	1,121	0,028	-2,538		
ob3 vs.ob1	-4,001	1,197	0,004	-3,342		
op2 vs.ob1	-0,7184	1,2933	0,57856	-0,555		
op3 vs.ob1	-1,9032	1,158	0,14323	-1,644		
ob3 vs.ob2	-1,1558	0,6998	0,14323	-1,652		
op2 vs.ob2	2,127	0,869	0,029	2,447		
op3 vs.ob2	0,9421	0,6484	0,1828	1,453		
op2 vs.ob3	3,283	0,964	0,004	3,406		
op3 vs.ob3	2,098	0,767	0,021	2,735		
op3 vs.op2	-1,1848	0,9166	0,21795	-1,293		
age	-0,072	0,029	0,013	-2,493		

<b>VT + Age + frequency + AAT syntax</b>	<b></b>				
--	---------	--	--	--	--



*fixed effects*

VT			0,0238	11,26	
ob2 vs.ob1	-2,4321	1,110E+00	0,0949	-2,191	
ob3 vs.ob1	-2,6046	1,3939	0,1028	-1,869	
op2 vs.ob1	-0,2514	1,2962	0,8474	-0,194	
op3 vs.ob1	-1,1231	1,2005	0,4369	-0,936	
ob3 vs.ob2	-0,1724	0,8961	0,8474	-0,192	
op2 vs.ob2	2,1808	0,8444	0,0949	2,583	
op3 vs.ob2	1,309	0,6519	0,1028	2,008	
op2 vs.ob3	2,3532	1,0614	0,0949	2,217	
op3 vs.ob3	1,4815	0,7886	0,1028	1,879	
op3 vs.op2	-0,8717	0,8973	0,4369	-0,972	
frequency	-0,73591	0,43498	0,09068	-1,692	
age	-0,08327	0,03066	0,0066	-2,716	
AAT syntax	0,42061	0,15481	0,00659	2,717	

VAN + frequency + age, + AAT syntax

*fixed effects*

VAN			0,04722	1,679	0,3488
2 vs. 1	-1,56801	1,4339	-1,094	0,411	
3 vs. 1	-1,49826	1,26803	-1,182	0,411	
3 vs. 2	0,06975	0,81548	0,086	0,932	
verb frequency	-0,87694	0,51064	0,08592	-1,717	
age	-0,08287	0,03074	0,00701	-2,696	
AAT syntax	0,42041	0,15497	0,00667	2,713	

**Between population analysis**

	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R-squared</i>	<i>Power*</i>
<i>single models</i>									
<b>Group</b>								<b>0,206</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,109	0,330			0,001	10,991			
participant	0,757	0,870			0,596	0,281			

*fixed effects*

Group			0,000	29,329	100,00%
HS vs. RH*	0,416	0,623	0,504	0,668	
HS vs. LH*	2,478	0,470	0,000	5,275	
RH vs. LH*	2,062	0,510	0,000	4,046	

*models with interactions*

<b>Group*VAN</b>					<b>0,238</b>
------------------	--	--	--	--	--------------

*random effects*

item	0,128	0,357	0,008	6,965	
participant	0,560	0,748	0,552	0,354	

*fixed effects*

Group			0,000	32,816	
VAN			0,450	1,599	
Group*VAN			0,186	6,179	
<b>Group*VAO</b>					<b>0,270</b>

*random effects*

item	0,1169	0,3419	0,008	7,112	
participant	0,5706	0,7554	0,313	0,576	

*fixed effects*

Group			0,000	34,184	
VAO			0,106	2,620	
Group*VAO			0,346	2,120	
<b>Group*VT</b>					<b>0,826</b>

*random effects*

item	0,13063	0,3614	0,924	0,009	
participant	0,01733	0,1316	0,569	0,325	

*fixed effects*

Group			0,000	26,703	
VT			0,003	16,228	
Group*VT			0,226	10,596	
<b>Group*frequency</b>					<b>0,222</b>

*random effects*

item	0,1372	0,3705			0,094	2,797		
participant	0,3555	0,5963			0,533	0,389		
<i>fixed effects</i>								
Group					0,000	27,451		
frequency					0,047	3,951		
Group*frequency					0,021	7,718		
HS			0,372		0,464	0,423	0,802	0,031 11%
RH			-0,046		0,521	0,930	-0,087	0,000 3%
LH*			-1,043		0,376	0,006	-2,774	0,157 82%

HP	Variance	SD	Estimate	SE	p	$\chi^2$	z	R <sup>2</sup>	Power
<i>single predictor models</i>									
<b>VAN</b>								0,008	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VAN					0,128	0,938			7%
<b>VAO</b>								0,003	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VAO			-0,184	0,821	0,822		-0,224		8%
<b>VT</b>								0,038	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
VT					0,921	0,927	0,8932		3%

ob2 vs. ob1	-2,316E-13	1,419	1	0
ob3 vs. ob1	-0,9275	1,423	0,949	-0,652
op2 vs. ob1	-0,7006	1,231	0,949	-0,569
op3 vs. ob1	-2,152E-13	1,419	1	0
ob3 vs. ob2	-0,9275	1,423	0,949	-0,652
op2 vs. ob2	-0,7006	1,231	0,949	-0,569
op3 vs. ob2	1,641E-14	1,419	1	0
op2 vs. ob3	0,2269	1,235	1	0,184
op3 vs. ob3	0,9275	1,423	0,949	0,652
op3 vs. op2	0,7006	1,231	0,949	0,569

B. RHSP *Variance SD Estimate SE p  $\chi^2$  z R<sup>2</sup> Power*

**single predictor models**

**VAN** **0,103**

*random effects*

item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000
participant	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000

*fixed effects*

VAN 0,517 1,322 26%

**VAO** **0,101**

*random effects*

item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000
participant	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000

*fixed effects*

VAO 1,220 1,124 0,278 1,086 24%

VT - the estimates of this model are not reliable

**C. healthy participants**

*Variance SD Estimate SE p  $\chi^2$  z R<sup>2</sup> Power*

*single predictor models*

<b>VAN</b>							0,008
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
participant	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
VAN				0,128	0,938		7%
<b>VAO</b>							0,003
<i>single predictor models</i>							
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
participant	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
VAO		-0,184	0,821	0,822		-0,224	8%
<b>VT</b>							0,038
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
participant	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
VT				0,921	0,927		3%

Supplementary Table 9: Complete NAVS-G ASPT results

<i>LHSP</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Power</i>
<i>single predictor models</i>									
<b>VAN</b>									<b>0,039</b>
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,146	0,382			0,765	0,089			
participant	31,202	5,586			0,000	103,360			

<i>fixed effects</i>						
VAN				0,000	15,919	0,039035 0,66
2 vs. 1		-3,5965	1,2248	0,00996	-2,936	
3 vs. 1		-2,2592	1,1763	0,05478	-1,921	
3 vs. 2		1,3373	0,5314	0,01777	2,517	
<b>VAO</b>						<b>0,006</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,947	0,973		0,109	2,576	
participant	27,614	5,255		0,000	99,941	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
VAO		-0,882	0,637	0,166	-1,386	24%
<b>VT</b>						<b>0,039</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,076	0,276		0,875	0,025	
participant	31,973	5,655		0,000	103,790	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
VT				0,002	16,896	78%
<b>NIHSS</b>						<b>0,241</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,994	0,997		0,084	2,976	
participant	7,340	2,709		0,000	25,374	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
NIHSS		-0,924	0,418	0,027	-2,209	61%
<b>mRS</b>						<b>0,280</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	1,013	1,007		0,082	3,031	
participant	6,703	2,589		0,000	26,090	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
mRS		-2,906	1,212	0,016	-2,938	69%
<b>BI</b>						<b>0,281</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	1,060	1,029		0,073	3,207	

participant	4,466	2,113		0,000	12,939		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
BI*		0,170	0,063	0,006	2,721		84%
<b>adjusted models</b>							
<b>VAN + NIHSS</b>						0,327	
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,128	0,358		0,792	0,069		
participant	7,612	2,759		0,000	26,176		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
VAN				0,000	16,026		87%
2 vs. 1		-3,586	1,220	0,010	-2,939		
3 vs. 1		-2,261	1,174	0,054	-1,925		
3 vs. 2		1,325	0,525	0,017	2,523		
NIHSS		-0,952	0,431	0,027	-2,211		
<b>VT + NIHSS</b>						0,329	
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,056	0,238		0,907	0,014		
participant	7,684	2,772		0,000	26,365		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
VT				0,002	16,896	0,32872	87%
ob2ob1		-2,24222	1,26263	0,1082	-1,776		
ob3 vs. ob1		-4,205	1,402	0,024	-2,998		
op2 vs. ob1		-2,24243	1,188326	0,0986	-1,887		
op3 vs. ob1		-3,416	1,210	0,024	-2,823		
ob3 vs. ob2		-1,96233	0,993949	0,0967	-1,974		
op2 vs. ob2		-0,00021	0,741602	0,9998	0		
op3 vs. ob2		-1,17369	0,724765	0,1317	-1,619		
op2 vs. ob3		1,962122	0,896349	0,0953	2,189		
op3 vs. ob3		0,788637	0,829337	0,3796	0,951		
op3 vs. op2		-1,17349	0,584159	0,0967	-2,009		
NIHSS		-0,9556	0,4338	0,02760	-2,203		
<b>VT + Barthel</b>							

<i>fixed effects</i>									
VT					0,00208		16,835	0,389095	0,89
ob2 vs. ob1			-2,27673	1,276271	0,10640				-1,784
ob3 vs. ob1			-4,25276	1,415509	0,02310				-3,004
op2 vs. ob1			-2,27723	1,200333	0,09640				-1,897
op3 vs. ob1			-3,46884	1,224748	0,02310				-2,832
ob3 vs. ob2			-1,97603	1,004822	0,09640				-1,967
op2 vs. ob2			-0,0005	0,755128	0,99950				-0,001
op3 vs. ob2			-1,19211	0,738454	0,13310				-1,614
op2 vs. ob3			1,975536	0,904304	0,09640				2,185
op3 vs. ob3			0,783919	0,834165	0,38590				0,94
op3 vs. op2			-1,19162	0,595039	0,09640				-2,003
Barthel			0,17321	0,06342	0,00631				2,731
<b>between population analyses</b>									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R-squared</i>	<i>Power</i>
<i>Single models</i>									
<b>Group</b>								<b>0,093</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,451	0,672			0,128	2,321			
participant	4,350	2,086			0,000	89,156			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Group					0,107	4,464			36%
<b>Models with interactions</b>									
<b>Group*VAN</b>								<b>0,102</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,213	0,462			0,475	0,512			
participant	4,815	2,194			0,000	93,049			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Group					0,093	4,748			
VAN					0,074	5,201			
Group*VAN					0,175	6,338			



<b>Group*VAO</b>					<b>0,113</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	0,440	0,663	0,129	2,300	
participant	4,457	2,111	0,000	89,946	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Group			0,095	4,698	
VAO			0,647	0,209	
Group*VAO			0,127	4,122	
<b>Group*VT</b>					<b>0,124</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	0,066	0,258	0,803	0,062	
participant	4,771	2,184	0,000	93,044	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Group			0,105	4,509	
VT			0,073	8,574	
Group*VT			0,530	7,064	

**Supplementary Table 10: Complete NAVS-G SPPT results**

A. NAVS-G SPPT in LHSP									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>χ<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>z</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Power</i>
<b>Single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>									
<b>0,129</b>									
<i>random effects</i>									
item	2,459	1,568			0,000	55,380			
participant	3,318	1,821			0,000	118,240			
<i>fixed effects</i>									

Canonicity	2,318	0,661	0,000	3,504	0,1292566	98%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>	<b>0,108</b>					
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,321	0,567	0,317	1,003		
participant	10,601	3,256	0,000	88,993		
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity without relatives	2,618	0,551	<.001	4,748	0,1079276	21%
<b>Sentence type</b>	<b>0,394</b>					
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000		
participant	3,478	1,865	0,000	122,960		
<i>fixed effects</i>						
<b>Sentence type</b>			<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>82,395</b>	<b>100%</b>	
P vs. A	-3,981	0,8486	0,00000543	-4,691		
OW vs. SW	-1,3988	0,4998	0,0057	-2,799		
OR vs. SR*	-2,0581	0,4672	0,0000151	-4,405		
SR vs. A	-4,7911	0,8618	6,76E-08	-5,56		
SW vs. A	-2,4767	0,8461	0,00427	-2,927		
OR vs. P	-2,8681	0,5018	3,64E-08	-5,716		
OW vs. P	0,1055	0,4551	0,81664	0,232		
OR vs. OW	-2,9736	0,5067	2,19E-08	-5,869		
SR vs. SW	-2,3144	0,5152	0,0000117	-4,492		
OR vs. non-OR	-12,2722	1,6902	3,85E-12	-7,261		
<b>NIHSS</b>	<b>0,090</b>					
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,796	1,948	0,000	88,997		
participant	2,394	1,547	0,000	83,745		
<i>fixed effects</i>						
NIHSS	-0,466	0,205	0,023	-2,277		66%
<b>AAT.ss</b>	<b>0,177</b>					
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,785	1,946	0,000	89,088		

participant	1,470	1,213		0,000	47,805	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
AAT.ss			0,320	0,083	0,000	3,867 96%
<b>AAT.sy*</b>					<b>0,135</b>	
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,790	1,947		0,000	88,984	
participant	1,934	1,391		0,000	67,145	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
AAT.sy			0,845	0,278	0,002	3,038 85%
<b>Aph.severity</b>					<b>0,168</b>	
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,774	1,943		0,000	72,953	
participant	1,665	1,290		0,000	49,338	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Aph.se			1,125	0,337	0,001	3,338 0%
<b>Token Test</b>					<b>0,111</b>	
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,930	1,982		0,000	67,291	
participant	2,537	1,593		0,000	70,892	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Token Test			0,178	0,080	0,025	2,236 0%
<b>adjusted models</b>						
<b>Canonicity + AAT.ss</b>					<b>0,307</b>	
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,443	1,563		0,000	55,394	
participant	1,457	1,207		0,000	47,721	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity			2,318	0,661	0,000	3,506 96%
AAT.ss			0,320	0,083	0,000	3,872
<b>Canonicity without relatives + AAT.ss</b>					<b>0,449</b>	





<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,3365	0,5801		0,300	1,073		
participant	4,2219	2,0547		0,000	35,170		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
canonicity without relatives		2,6481	0,5583	0,000	4,743	0,4446722	99%
AAT.ss		0,5021	0,164	0,002	3,062		
<b>Sentence type + AAT.ss*</b>						<b>0,569</b>	
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
participant	1,524	1,235		0,000	49,173		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Sentence type				0,000	82,377	0,5689824	100%
P vs. A*		-3,993	0,848	0,000		-4,711	
OW vs. SW*		-1,407	0,502	0,006		-2,805	
OR vs. SR*		-2,044	0,466	0,000		-4,390	
SR vs. A*		-4,807	0,861	0,000		-5,583	
SW vs. A*		-2,480	0,845	0,004		-2,935	
OR vs. P*		-2,858	0,501	0,000		-5,701	
OW vs. P		0,1062	0,4575	0,8164		0,232	
OR vs. OW		-2,9645	0,5064	0,0000		-5,854	
SR vs. SW*		-2,327	0,517	0,000		-4,500	
non-OR vs. OR*		-12,239	1,685	0,000		-7,264	
relative vs. non-relative		-3,0568	0,5889	0,00000		-5,191	
AAT.ss		0,329	0,085	0,000		3,866	
<b>Canonicity + AAT syntax</b>							
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Canonicity		-2,3161	0,6608	0,000457		-3,505	
AAT syntax		0,8436	0,2773	0,002348		3,042	
<b>Canonicity without relatives + AAT syntax</b>							
<i>fixed effects</i>							

Canonicity			2,6405	0,5578	0,00000		4,734
AAT syntax			1,6817	0,5683	0,00309		2,959
<b>sentence type + AAT syntax</b>							
<i>fixed effects</i>							
sentence type					0,00000		69,247
P vs. A			-3,9791	0,8471	0,0000		-4,698
OW vs. SW			-1,3985	0,5000	0,0057		-2,797
OR vs. SR			-2,0639	0,4685	0,0000		-4,405
SR vs. A			-4,7885	0,8603	0,0000		-5,566
SW vs. A			-2,4753	0,8447	0,0042		-2,93
OR vs. P			-2,8732	0,5031	0,0000		-5,712
OW vs. P			0,1054	0,4554	0,8170		0,231
OR vs. OW			-2,9786	0,5079	0,0000		-5,864
SR vs. SW			-2,3132	0,5154	0,0000		-4,488
OR vs. non-OR			-12,2928	1,6960	0,0000		-7,248
relative vs. non-relative			-3,0543	0,5885	0,0000		-5,190
AAT syntax			0,8547	0,2834	0,00256		3,016
<b>Canonicity + NIHSS</b>							<b>0,219</b>
<i>random effects</i>							
item	2,450	1,565			0,000		55,355
participant	2,373	1,541			0,000		83,690
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Canonicity			2,316	0,661	0,000		3,505
NIHSS			-0,465	0,204	0,023		-2,281
<b>Canonicity without relatives + NIHSS</b>							<b>0,274</b>
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,330	0,574			0,307		1,044
participant	8,043	2,836			0,000		68,434
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Canonicity			2,629	0,554	0,000		4,742
NIHSS			-0,783	0,420	0,062		-1,864

<b>Sentence type + NIHSS</b>										0,482
<i>random effects</i>										
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000				
participant	2,488	1,577			0,000	86,779				
<i>fixed effects</i>										
Sentence type					<.001	69,185				100%
P vs. A*			-3,974	0,845	0,000		-4,702			
OW vs. SW*			-1,401	0,500	0,006		-2,800			
OR vs. SR*			-2,056	0,467	0,000		-4,403			
SR vs. A*			-4,785	0,858	0,000		-5,574			
NIHSS			-0,477	0,210	0,023		-2,276			
<b>Sentence type + education</b>										
<i>fixed effects</i>										
Sentence type					1,54E-13	69,155	0,3944695			100%
<b>between population analysis</b>										
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>χ2</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>R-squared</i>	<i>Power</i>	
<i>Single predictor models</i>										
<b>Group</b>										0,229
<i>random effects</i>										
item	2,452	1,566			0,000	186,180				
participant	2,896	1,702			0,000	149,120				
<i>fixed effects</i>										
Group					0,00000	35,736				100%
HS vs. RH			1,078	0,625	0,084		1,727			
HS vs. LH			3,857	0,620	0,000		6,226			
RH vs. LH			2,779	0,650	0,000		4,278			
<i>models with interactions</i>										
<b>Group*canonicity</b>										0,317
<i>random effects</i>										

item	2,472	1,572		0,000	120,900	
participant	1,920	1,386		0,000	149,770	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Group				0,000	40,021	
Canonicity				0,000	12,526	
Group*Canonicity				0,512	0,774	
<b>Group*canonicity without relatives</b>					<b>0,143</b>	
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,800	1,949		0,075	3,170	
participant	0,316	0,562		0,000	80,989	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Group				0,000	15,269	
Canonicity without relatives				0,000	17,310	
Group*Canonicity without relatives				0,029	7,071	
<i>Canonical</i>						56%
HS vs. RH		0,641	1,036	0,536	0,619	
HS vs. LH		2,450	0,901	0,020	2,718	
RH vs. LH		1,809	0,950	0,085	1,904	
<i>Non-Canonical</i>						97%
HS vs. RH		2,426	1,104	0,028	2,197	
HS vs. LH		4,705	1,086	0,000	4,333	
RH vs. LH		2,280	0,986	0,028	2,312	

<b>Group*Sentence type</b>					<b>0,441</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	2,723	1,650		0,068	3,343
participant	0,128	0,358		0,000	155,900
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Group				0,000	32,619
Sentence type				0,000	101,713
Group*Sentence type				0,013	22,341

<i>Active</i>						
Group			0,973	0,056	0,002	1%
<i>Passive</i>						
Group			0,198	3,242	0,182	9%
<i>Subject Wh-questions</i>						
Group			0,051	5,934	0,179	43%
HS>RH	0,621	1,303	0,634		0,477	
HS>LH	2,955	1,128	0,026		2,621	
RH>LH	2,334	1,187	0,074		1,967	
<i>Object Wh-questions</i>						
Group			0,013	8,691	0,272	66%
HS>RH	3,010	1,406	0,048		2,141	
HS>LH	4,905	1,479	0,003		3,316	
RH>LH	1,895	1,333	0,155		1,421	
<i>Subject-Relative</i>						
Group			0,000	24,200	0,349	94%
HS>RH	0,509	1,309	0,698		0,389	
HS>LH	5,489	1,486	0,001		3,693	
RH>LH	4,980	1,631	0,003		3,054	
<i>Object-Relative</i>						
Group			0,000	30,263	0,294	100%
HS>RH	0,566	0,689	0,411		0,822	
HS>LH	3,771	0,794	0,000		4,749	
RH>LH	3,205	0,799	0,000		4,011	
Group*Sentence type*Age					0,655	
random effects						
item	2,179	1,476	0,053	3,754		
participant	0,143	0,379	0,000	129,550		
fixed effects						
Group			0,000	38,928		
Sentence type			0,000	83,104		



Age	-0,066	0,024	0,006	-2,728	
<i>Group*Age:</i>			.032	12,238	
effect of age in HP	-0,09533	0,02877	0,002763	-3,314	98%
effect of age in RH	-0,06288	0,02883	0,0438	-2,181	62,50%
effect of age in LH	-0,06899	0,05757	0,2308	-1,198	28,50%
<i>Sentence Type*Age</i>			0,032	12,238	
Active			0,9576	0,3782	
Passive			0,9576	0,6301	
Subject Wh-questions			0,9576	0,0865	
Object Wh-questions			0,9576	3,3847	
Subject Relative			0,9576	1,1319	
Object-Relative			0,9576	1,8153	
<i>Group*Sentence Type*Age</i>			0,021835	23,7732	.654
sentence type*age in HS			0,14148	9,3946	.243
sentence type*age in RH			0,09609	12,209	.103
sentence type*age in LH			0,5175	4,2252	.031
<b>Group*Sentence type*Education</b>					<b>.947</b>
random effects					
item	1,490	1,221	0,046	3,974	
participant	0,150	0,387	0,000	97,701	
fixed effects					
Group			0,000	47,131	
Sentence type			0,000	75,390	
Ed.Qual	1,423	0,388	0,000	3,671	
<i>Sentence Type*Ed.q.</i>			0,067	10,300	
<i>Group*Sentence Type*Ed.q.</i>			0,0002486	36,714	
Active			0,79725	1,264	
Passive			0,79725	1,3334	
Subject Wh-questions			0,8648	0,2906	
Object Wh-questions			0,5538	3,3789	
Subject Relative			0,8648	0,4065	

Object-Relative	.341 (0,5*)	5,732			
HS	0,000	4,667	.49	100%	
RH	0,0303	2,323	.24	55%	
LH	0,1255	1,532	.007	33,50%	

\*uncorrect

<b>B NAVS-G SPPT in RHSP without aphasia</b>									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Power</i>
<b>Single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								<b>0,073</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	2,284	1,511			0,000	28,700			
participant	0,958	0,979			0,008	6,971			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity			1,438	0,780	0,065		1,844	0,07347395	49%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>								<b>0,040</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	2,460	1,568			0,000	13,149			
participant	0,457	0,676			0,455	0,559			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity without relatives			1,017	1,086	0,349		0,936		19%
<b>Sentence type</b>								<b>0,234</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	1,370	1,171			0,000	15,134			
participant	0,989	0,994			0,008	7,075			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Sentence type					0,018	13,672			82%

P vs. A		0	1,672	1	0	
OW vs. SW		-1,584	1,178	0,3248	-1,344	
OR vs. SR*		-1,93	0,9999	0,1787	-1,93	
SR vs. A		-1,674	1,423	0,3419	-1,177	
SW vs. A		-0,779	1,511	0,6735	-0,516	
OR vs. P		-3,604	1,359	0,0401	-2,652	
OW vs. P		-2,363	1,382	0,2182	-1,71	
OR vs. OW		-1,241	0,9574	0,3248	-1,296	
SR vs. SW		-0,895	1,222	0,5798	-0,733	
OR vs. non-OR		-9,599	3,176	0,025	-3,023	
<b>Ed. Qual.</b>						<b>0,162</b>
random effects						
item	2,980	1,726		0,000	40,203	
participant	0,276	0,525		0,285	1,142	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Ed.qual		1,568	0,567	0,006	2,768	80%
<b>Ed. Grad.</b>						<b>0,039</b>
random effects						
item	3,050	1,747		0,000	40,733	
participant	0,835	0,914		0,016	5,752	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Ed.grad		0,939	0,613	0,126	1,531	39%
<b>Age</b>						<b>0,103</b>
random effects						
item	3,073	1,753		0,000	40,929	
participant	0,650	0,806		0,042	4,141	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Age		-0,063	0,029	0,029	-2,181	70%
<b>adjusted models</b>						
<b>Canonicity + Ed.qual</b>						<b>0,234</b>

<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,258	1,503		0,000	28,467	
participant	0,269	0,518		0,292	1,109	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity			1,432	0,775	0,065	1,847 43%
Ed.qual			1,562	0,564	0,006	2,767
<b>Canonicity without relatives + Ed.qual</b>						<b>0,140</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,461	1,569		0,000	13,207	
participant	0,098	0,313		0,030	0,863	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity without relatives			1,027	1,091	0,346	0,942 16%
Ed.qual			1,150	0,718	0,109	1,602
<b>Sentence type + Ed.qual</b>						<b>0,376</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	1,357	1,165		0,000	14,596	
participant	0,278	0,528		0,287	1,133	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Sentence type					0,018	13,671 92%
OR vs. SR*		-1,930	1,000	0,179		-1,930
OR vs. P*		-3,604	1,359	0,040		-2,652
OR vs. OW*		-1,241	0,957	0,325		-1,296
non-OR vs. OR*		-9,599	3,176	0,025		-3,023
Non-Relvs.Rel*		-1,919	0,826	0,020		-3,250
Ed.qual		1,566	0,566	0,006		2,769

C NAVS-G SPPT in HP									
	Variance	SD	Estimate	SE	p	$\chi^2$	z	R <sup>2</sup>	Power
Single predictor models									

<b>Canonicity</b>					<b>0,119</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	3,506	1,872	0,000	31,679	
participant	3,913	1,978	0,000	32,56	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Canonicity	1,8503	0,9296	0,0465	1,99	0,11891541 56%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>					<b>0,000</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	1,308	1,144	1,000	0,000	
participant	0,000	0,000	0,437	0,604	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Canonicity without relatives	0,003	0,826	0,997	0,003	0,000000 6%
<b>Sentence type</b>					<b>0,239</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	0,134	0,366	0,626	0,238	
participant	3,743	1,935	0,000	31,250	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Sentence type			0,000	42,442	100%
P vs. A	0	1,672	1	0	
OW vs. SW	-1,584	1,178	0,3248	-1,344	
OR vs. SR*	-1,93	0,9999	0,1787	-1,93	
SR vs. A	-1,674	1,423	0,3419	-1,177	
SW vs. A	-0,779	1,511	0,6735	-0,516	
OR vs. P	-3,604	1,359	0,0401	-2,652	
OW vs. P	-2,363	1,382	0,2182	-1,71	
OR vs. OW	-1,241	0,9574	0,3248	-1,296	
SR vs. SW	-0,895	1,222	0,5798	-0,733	
OR vs. non-OR	-9,599	3,176	0,025	-3,023	
<b>Ed. Qual.</b>					<b>0,188</b>
<i>random effects</i>					
item	4,345	2,084	0,000	43,723	

participant	0,307	0,554		0,254	1,302	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Ed.qual			1,441	0,266	0,000	5,427 100%
<b>Ed. Grad.</b>						<b>0,114</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	4,552	2,134		0,000	44,785	
participant	1,869	1,367		0,000	16,684	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Ed.grad			1,488	0,468	0,001	3,181 89%
<b>Age</b>						<b>0,243</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	4,733	2,176		0,000	45,582	
participant	1,856	1,362		0,000	14,912	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Age			-0,095	0,029	0,001	-3,314 96%

**adjusted models**

<b>Canonicity + Ed.qual</b>						<b>0,28</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	3,219	1,794		0,000	30,430	
participant	0,300	0,547		0,264	1,254	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity			1,790	0,902	0,047	1,985 53%
Ed.qual			1,437	0,265	0,000	5,429
<b>Canonicity without relatives + Ed.qual</b>						<b>0,059</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,707	0,841		1,000	0,000	
participant	0,000	0,000		0,684	0,165	
<i>fixed effects</i>						

Canonicity without relatives			-0,005	0,826	0,995		-0,006		7%
Ed.qual			0,533	0,447	0,233		1,193		
<b>Sentence type + Ed.qual</b>								0,507	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,135	0,368			0,594	0,284			
participant	0,275	0,524			0,308	1,041			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Sentence type					0,000	42,457			100%
OR vs. SR*			-2,665	0,677	0,000		-3,935		
OR vs. P*			-4,113	1,106	0,000		-3,720		
OR vs. OW*			-3,381	0,845	0,000		-4,001		
non-OR vs. OR*			-13,485	2,215	0,000		-6,087		
Non-Relvs.Rel*			-2,898	0,730	0,000		-3,969		
Ed.qual			1,426	0,263	0,000		5,417		

**Supplementary Table 11: Complete NAVS-G SCT results**

<b>NAVS-G SCT in patients with aphasia</b>									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Power</i>
<b>single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								0,088	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,424	0,651			0,066	3,390			
participant	0,879	0,937			0,002	9,282			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity			1,329	0,466	0,004		2,851		83%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>								0,092	
<i>random effects</i>									

item	0,000	0,000		0,999	0,000	
participant	1,747	1,322		0,008	6,936	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity without relatives			1,424	0,599	0,018	2,376 69%
<b>Sentence type*</b>						0,19
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,126	0,355		0,499	0,457	
participant	0,894	0,945		0,002	9,299	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Sentence type				0,004	17,211	100%
<b>NIHSS</b>						0,058
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,796	0,892		0,003	8,603	
participant	0,500	0,707		0,050	3,827	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
NIHSS			-0,254	0,121	0,036	-2,098 67%
<b>BI</b>						0,047
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,799	0,894		0,003	8,638	
participant	0,519	0,720		0,050	3,842	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
BI			0,044	0,022	0,042	2,032 58%
<b>AAT.ss*</b>						0,096
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,798	0,893		0,003	8,614	
participant	0,283	0,532		0,240	1,379	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
AAT.ss			0,161	0,053	0,003	3,005 91%
<b>AAT.sy</b>						0,055



*random effects*

item	0,793	0,891		0,003	8,570	
participant	0,523	0,723		0,040	4,228	

*fixed effects*

AAT.sy			0,368	0,187	0,050	1,961	53%
<b>Aph.se</b>							<b>0,108</b>

*random effects*

item	1,803	1,343		0,000	15,917	
participant	0,599	0,774		0,073	3,213	

*fixed effects*

Aph.se			0,701	0,270	0,009	2,599	0%
--------	--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	----

**adjusted models**

<b>Canonicity + AAT.ss</b>							<b>0,185</b>
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

*random effects*

item	0,424	0,651				
participant	0,281	0,530				

*fixed effects*

Canonicity			1,332	0,467	0,004	2,853	85%
AAT.ss			0,161	0,053	0,003	3,015	

<b>Canonicity without relatives + AAT.ss</b>							<b>0,286</b>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

*random effects*

item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000	
participant	0,409	0,640		0,488	0,481	

*fixed effects*

Canonicity			1,435	0,602	0,017	2,385	72%
AAT.ss			0,232	0,082	0,005	2,821	

<b>Sentence type + AAT.ss</b>							<b>0,287</b>
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

*random effects*

item	0,125	0,353						
participant	0,280	0,529						
<i>fixed effects</i>								
Sentence type*				0,004	17,574			97%
ORvs.non-OR		-5,812	1,700	0,006		-3,418		
Relvs.non-Rel		-1,145	0,454	0,012		-2,519		
AAT.ss		0,162	0,053	0,002		3,026		

<b>NAVS-G SCT in RHSP</b>									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>z</i>	<i>R-squared</i>	<i>Power*</i>
<b>single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								0,004	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	17,490	4,182			0,001	11,054			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity			0,576	0,774	0,457		0,744		14%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>								0,000	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,361	0,601			0,853	0,034			
participant	25,314	5,031			0,012	6,369			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity without relatives			0,005	1,136	0,996		0,004		6%
<b>Sentence type</b>								0,011	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	18,540	4,306			0,001	11,286			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Sentence type					0,6982	0,1503			18%

c. Healthy participants									
	Variance	SD	Estimate	SE	p	$\chi^2$	z	R-squared	Power*
<b>single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								0,002	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,233	0,483			0,864	0,029			
participant	8,539	2,922			0,002	9,817			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity			0,318	0,823	0,699		0,386		8%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>								0,000	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	7,335	2,708			0,683	0,167			
participant	0,904	0,951			0,092	2,843			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity without relatives			0,000	1,148	1,000		0,000		12%
<b>Sentence type</b>								0,007	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,141	0,376			0,918	0,011			
participant	9,114	3,019			0,002	9,846			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Sentence type					0,9819	0,7189			8%

Supplementary Table 12: Complete NAT-G results

NAT-G LHSP									
	Variance	SD	Estimate	SE	p	$\chi^2$	z	R <sup>2</sup>	Power
<i>single predictor models</i>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								0,066	

<i>random effects</i>						
item	1,534	1,238		0,001	10,678	
participant	12,847	3,584		0,000	186,760	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity		2,228	0,652	0,001	3,416	96%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>						<b>0,078</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000	
participant	21,440	4,630		0,000	90,186	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity without relatives		2,883	0,652	0,000	4,425	91%
<b>Sentence type</b>						<b>0,194</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000	
participant	14,650	3,827		0,000	202,910	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Sentence type				0,000	39,635	99%
<b>NIHSS</b>						<b>0,235</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,480	1,575		0,000	21,597	
participant	9,558	3,092		0,000	143,150	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
NIHSS		-1,042	0,468	0,026	-2,227	77%
<b>AAT.sy*</b>						<b>0,306</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,451	1,566		0,000	21,470	
participant	6,171	2,484		0,000	89,345	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
AAT.sy		1,630	0,551	0,003	2,958	89%
<b>Aph.se</b>						<b>0,287</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,462	1,569		0,000	21,443	

participant	5,531	2,352		0,000	90,100	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Aph.se		1,805	0,654	0,006	2,761	0%
<b>Token Test</b>						<b>0,259</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,473	1,573		0,000	21,418	
participant	5,333	2,309		0,000	89,142	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Token Test		0,319	0,126	0,011	2,530	0%
<b>AAT.ss*</b>						<b>0,41</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	2,496	1,580		0,000	21,831	
participant	3,889	1,972		0,000	58,158	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
AAT.ss*		0,613	0,157	0,000	3,916	99%
<b>adjusted models</b>						
<b>Canonicity + AAT.ss</b>						<b>0,484</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	1,599	1,264		0,001	11,146	
participant	4,077	2,019		0,000	59,749	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity		2,273	0,663	0,001	3,426	99%
AAT.ss		0,630	0,161	0,000	3,921	
<b>Canonicity without relatives + AAT.ss</b>						<b>0,567</b>
<i>random effects</i>						
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000	
participant	3,662	1,914		0,000	26,416	
<i>fixed effects</i>						
Canonicity without relatives		2,861	0,637	0,000	4,489	100%
AAT.ss		0,627	0,182	0,001	3,444	
<b>Sentence type + AAT.ss</b>						<b>0,615</b>

<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000	
participant	4,654	2,157			0,000	65,341	
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Sentence type					0,000	40,124	100%
Pvs.A		-4,137	1,035	0,000		-3,996	
OWvs.SW		-2,258	0,780	0,005		-2,895	
SRvs.A		-5,067	1,073	0,000		-4,722	
ORvs.P		-2,169	0,730	0,005		-2,972	
ORvs.OW		-2,403	0,743	0,002		-3,236	
SRvs.SW		-3,421	0,832	0,000		-4,113	
ORvs.non-OR		-10,472	2,435	0,000		-4,301	
Rel vs. Non-Rel		-3,104	0,712	0,000		-4,261	
AAT.ss		0,679	0,171	0,000		3,963	

<b>between group analyses</b>									
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>χ<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>z</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Power</i>
<b>single predictor models</b>									
Group								0,196	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	5,429	2,330			0,000	22,629			
participant	1,239	1,113			0,000	179,400			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Group					0,001	13,309			88,00%
HSvs.RH			-1,431	1,024	0,162		1,398		
HSvs.LH			-3,787	0,981	0,000		3,861		
RHvs.LH			-2,355	1,041	0,036		2,262		
<b>models with interactions</b>									
Group*Canonicity								0,199	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,795	0,892			0,001	11,919			

participant	5,831	2,415		0,000	184,010		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Group				0,002	12,902		
Canonicity				0,001	10,756		
Group*Canonicity				0,150	3,792		
<b>Group*Canonicity without relatives</b>						<b>0,120</b>	
<i>random effects</i>							
item	0,000	0,000		1,000	0,000		
participant	7,140	2,672		0,000	82,725		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Group				0,067	5,396		
Canonicity without relatives				0,001	11,093		
Group*Canonicity without relatives				0,018	8,031		
<i>Canonical</i>							
Group				0,346	2,122	0,065	3,00%
HSvs.RH	0,719	1,573		0,648	0,457		
HSvs.LH	2,767	1,632		0,270	1,696		
RHvs.LH	2,048	1,722		0,351	1,190		
<i>Non-Canonical</i>							
Group				0,002	12,692	0,249	77,00%
HSvs.RH	1,925	1,287		0,135	1,496		
HSvs.LH	4,834	1,281		0,000	3,774		
RHvs.LH	2,908	1,293		0,037	2,250		
<b>Group*Sentence type</b>						<b>0,204</b>	
<i>random effects</i>							
item	7,216	2,686		0,835	0,044		
participant	0,027	0,165		0,000	198,330		
<i>fixed effects</i>							
Group				0,010	9,237		
Sentence type				0,000	30,745		
Group*Sentence type				0,059	17,763		
<i>Active</i>							
Group				0,548	1,205	0,081	13%

<i>Passive</i>									
Group				0,642	0,887			0,014	0%
<i>Subject Wh-Questions</i>									
Group				0,736	0,613			0,014	0%
<i>Object Wh-Questions</i>									
Group				0,214	3,085			0,134	7%
<i>Subject Relative</i>									
Group				0,680	0,772			0,009	1%
<i>Object Relative</i>									
Group				0,120	4,242			0,189	13%

**NAT-G RHSP**

	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>χ<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>z</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Power</i>
<b>single predictor models</b>									
<b>Canonicity</b>								<b>0,046</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	2,053	1,433			0,037	4,354			
participant	1,946	1,395			0,018	5,633			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity			1,185	0,944	0,210		1,254		17%
<b>Canonicity without relatives</b>								<b>0,000</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									
item	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
participant	0,000	0,000			1,000	0,000			
<i>fixed effects</i>									
Canonicity without relatives			0,000	1,007	1,000		0,000		5%
<b>Sentence type</b>								<b>0,106</b>	
<i>random effects</i>									



item	0,775	0,880	0,321	0,984	
participant	2,005	1,416	0,020	5,394	
<i>fixed effects</i>					
Sentence type			0,262	6,483	48%

---

