

1 **Full title**

2 **Intrinsic functional reorganisation of the attention network**
 3 **in the blind**

4 **Running title: Attention network reorganisation in the blind**

5 Wen Qin ^{1, *}, Yong Liu ², Tianzi Jiang ², and Chunshui Yu ¹

6 ¹ Department of Radiology and Tianjin Key Laboratory of Functional Imaging,
 7 Tianjin Medical University General Hospital, Tianjin 300052, China

8 ² Brainnetome Center and National Laboratory of Pattern Recognition, Institute of
 9 Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

10 ***Correspondence to:** Wen Qin, MD, Department of Radiology, Tianjin Medical
 11 University General Hospital, No. 154, Anshan Road, Heping District, Tianjin 300052,
 12 China; E-mail: wayne.wenqin@gmail.com. Phone: +86-22-60363760; Fax:
 13 +86-22-60362206

14

15

16

17 **Keywords:** attention network; blindness; functional connectivity strength; functional
 18 coupling; functional magnetic resonance imaging; resting-state, visual network; visual
 19 deprivation.

20

21 **Abstract**

22 Attention can bias visual perception by modulating the neuronal activity of visual
 23 areas. However, little is known if blindness can reshape the intrinsic functional
 24 organisation within the attention networks and between the attention and visual
 25 networks. A voxel-wise network-based functional connectivity strengthen mapping
 26 analysis was proposed to thirty congenitally, thirty early and thirty late blind subjects,
 27 and thirty sighted controls. Both the blind and sighted subjects exhibited similar
 28 spatial distributions of the intrinsic dorsal (DAN) and ventral (VAN) attention
 29 networks. Moreover, compared to the sighted controls, the blind subjects showed
 30 increased functional coupling within the DAN, and between the DAN and VAN, and
 31 between the attention sub-networks and visual areas, suggesting an increased
 32 information communication by visual deprivation. However, the onset age of
 33 blindness had little impact on the functional coupling of the attention network,
 34 indicating that non-visual sensory experience is enough for driving the development
 35 of intrinsic functional organization of the attention network. Finally, a positive
 36 correlation was identified between the duration of blindness and the functional
 37 coupling of the posterior inferior frontal gyrus with the visual network, representing
 38 an experience-dependent reorganisation after visual deprivation.

39 Introduction

40 Attention is a cognitive process to focus our limited brain resources to preferentially
 41 process certain external stimuli or internal ideas while ignoring irrelevant ones (Raz
 42 and Buhle 2006). Attention is thought to be controlled by two segregated functional
 43 networks: a bilaterally distributed dorsal attention network (DAN) which is mainly
 44 composed of the frontal eye field (FEF) and intraparietal sulcus (IPS) and involves in
 45 endogenous and exogenous orienting of attention; and a right-lateralized ventral
 46 attention network (VAN) which is mainly consisting of the anterior insula (aINS) and
 47 temporoparietal junction (TPJ) and involves in reorienting of attention in response to
 48 salient stimuli (Corbetta and Shulman 2002; Corbetta et al. 2008). These two attention
 49 networks dynamically interact to determine which aspects of sensory information will
 50 be perceived (Buschman and Miller 2007; McMains and Kastner 2011). Both genetic
 51 and environmental factors can shape the organisation of the attention networks
 52 (Rueda et al. 2005; Bellgrove et al. 2007; Neufang et al. 2015). For example, visual
 53 attention training can improve the attention performance and reshape the attention
 54 networks in sighted subjects (Rueda et al. 2005; Rueda et al. 2012).

55 As blindness interrupts the main information transfer system of the human brain,
 56 long-term visual deprivation may affect attention behavior and reshape the
 57 organisation of the attention networks. In fact, superior auditory/tactile attention
 58 abilities have been observed in blind subjects (Roder et al. 1999; Collignon et al. 2006;
 59 Forster et al. 2007). The congenitally (CB) and early blind (EB) subjects have shown
 60 increased activation in the FEF and IPS of the DAN than the sighted control (SC)
 61 when performing attention-demanding tasks (Burton et al. 2004; Garg et al. 2007;
 62 Stevens et al. 2007; Burton et al. 2010). These findings indicate that visual
 63 deprivation can reshape regional activity of the attention networks. However, it is still
 64 unknown if and how visual deprivation reshapes the intrinsic functional couplings of
 65 the attention networks.

66 In the SC, the attention networks dynamically interact with the visual network
 67 (VN). Stimulus-driven signals from the VN can selectively recruit the VAN based on
 68 their salience and relevance; and top-down signals from the DAN can modulate the
 69 activity of visual areas to improve the perception of specific aspects of visual stimuli
 70 (Buchel et al. 1998a; Tootell et al. 1998; Jack et al. 2006; Silver et al. 2007; Cate et al.
 71 2009; Bressler and Silver 2010). In the CB/EB, despite of the structural reorganisation
 72 (Shimony et al. 2006; Ptito et al. 2008; Jiang et al. 2009; Shu et al. 2009), the
 73 functional specification (location, motion, object, or language processing) of the
 74 occipital cortex is relatively preserved (Amedi et al. 2007; Renier et al. 2010;
 75 Collignon et al. 2011; Reich et al. 2011; Wolbers et al. 2011). However, it is unclear if
 76 the intrinsic functional organisation of the attention networks is also preserved in the
 77 blind. The cross-modal activation of the occipital cortex in the blind is frequently
 78 reported in the attention-demanding nonvisual tasks (Bavelier and Neville 2002;
 79 Collignon et al. 2009; Sathian and Stilla 2010), whereas simple passive
 80 auditory/tactile tasks cannot activate the occipital cortex (Sadato et al. 1996; Sadato et
 81 al. 1998; Weeks et al. 2000). Furthermore, the occipital cortex of the EB can be
 82 activated by pure top-down attention signals, which is very similar with the visual
 83 attention-induced response in the visual cortex in the SC (Gougoux et al. 2005;
 84 Stevens et al. 2007; Renier et al. 2010). These findings suggest that even after visual
 85 deprivation, functional interactions between the attentional and occipital regions still
 86 exist. However, little is known how visual deprivation impacts the intrinsic functional
 87 coupling between the attention and visual networks.

88 Visual deprivation-induced reorganisation may depend on the development
 89 maturity degree of the brain at the time of onset of blindness. Compared to the late
 90 blind (LB), the CB/EB exhibit different reorganisation patterns in cortical thickness
 91 (Jiang et al. 2009; Park et al. 2009; Kupers et al. 2011), glucose metabolism
 92 (Wanet-Defalque et al. 1988; Veraart et al. 1990), task-evoked activation (Buchel et al.
 93 1998b), and functional connectivity density (FCD) (Qin et al. 2015) in the occipital

cortex. Using the same auditory attention task, although both the EB and the LB demonstrated improvement in attention performance, the temporal and spatial alteration patterns in event-related potentials are largely different (Roder et al. 1999; Fieger et al. 2006). Nevertheless, we are unclear whether the developmental maturity degree of the brain at the time of onset of blindness has an effect on the intrinsic functional organisation of the attention networks in the blind.

Most of our knowledge on the functional organisation of the attention networks comes from the task-based functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) that detects regional blood-oxygen-level-dependence (BOLD) activation evoked by a specific task (reflecting functional segregation). In contrast, the resting-state fMRI primarily focuses on the synchronization of spontaneous activity among brain regions (reflecting functional integration). A pioneer study has segregated the DAN and VAN by resting-state functional connectivity (rsFC) analysis (Fox et al. 2006). A following study further reveals a correlation between attention performance and the rsFC between the DAN and VAN in normal subjects (Wen et al. 2012). These findings indicate that rsFC analysis is a promising technique to evaluate the intrinsic functional organisation of the attention networks.

In this study, we recruited gender- and age-matched CB, EB, LB and SC (thirty subjects in each group), and proposed a voxel-wise network-based functional connectivity strength (FCS) mapping (NB_FCSM) method to compare intergroup FCS differences within each attention network (DAN and VAN), between the DAN and VAN, and between the attention and visual networks (DAN-VN and VAN-VN). Based on previous findings in the blind, we proposed four hypotheses: (1) the intrinsic functional organisation of the attention networks is preserved in the blind because the same brain regions show activation in non-visual attention tasks in the blind and in visual attention tasks in the SC (Garg et al. 2007; Stevens et al. 2007; Corbetta et al. 2008; Burton et al. 2010); (2) the blind subjects have increased functional couplings in the attention network since they show superior non-visual attention performance,

122 and increased activation in the network during non-visual attention tasks (Roder et al.
123 1999; Collignon et al. 2006; Forster et al. 2007; Garg et al. 2007; Stevens et al. 2007);
124 (3) the blind subjects have increased functional couplings between the attention and
125 visual networks for they show increased occipital activation evoked by non-visual
126 attention-demanding tasks (Gougoux et al. 2005; Stevens et al. 2007; Renier et al.
127 2010); and (4) the onset and/or duration of blindness may impact the intrinsic
128 functional organisation of the attention networks in the blind as the CB/EB and LB
129 show different reorganisation patterns in the occipital cortex (Jiang et al. 2009; Park et
130 al. 2009; Collignon et al. 2013; Qin et al. 2015).

131 **Materials and methods**

132 **Subjects**

133 This study recruited 90 right-handed blind subjects and thirty sighted controls (22
134 males, age range 20-44 years). Blind subjects included thirty CB (onset since birth, 22
135 males, age range 18-39 years), thirty EB (onset from 0.5 to 12 years old, 22 males,
136 age range 20-45 years), and thirty LB (onset from 13 to 28 years old, 22 males, age
137 range 20-38 years). The samples size, age and gender of the four groups were well
138 matched (Table 1). The protocol was approved by the Medical Research Ethics
139 Committee of Tianjin Medical University, and written informed consent was obtained
140 from all participants prior to the experiment.

141 **MRI data acquisition**

142 MRI data were obtained using a 3.0 Tesla MR scanner (Trio Tim system; Siemens,
143 Erlangen, Germany) with a 12-channel head coil. The resting-state fMRI data were
144 acquired using a gradient-echo echo-planar imaging sequence with the following
145 parameters: repetition time = 2000 ms, echo time = 30 ms, flip angle = 90°, matrix =
146 64 × 64, field of view = 220 mm × 220 mm, 32 axial slices with a thickness of 3 mm
147 and a gap of 1 mm. During scans, all subjects were instructed to keep eyes closed and

148 awake, stay motionless, and think of nothing in particular. The three-dimensional
149 structural images were acquired using a magnetization-prepared rapid-acquisition
150 gradient echo sequence: repetition time = 2000 ms, echo time = 2.6 ms, inversion time
151 = 900 ms, flip angle = 9°, matrix = 256 × 224, field of view = 256 mm × 224 mm, 176
152 continuous sagittal slices with a thickness of 1 mm.

153 **The fMRI data preprocessing**

154 The resting-state fMRI data were preprocessed using Statistical Parametric Mapping
155 (SPM8, <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>). The first 10 volumes were removed
156 because of incomplete T1 relaxation, and to allow the participants to adapt to the
157 scanning environment. The remaining 170 volumes were corrected for the acquisition
158 time delay between slices and were realigned to the first volume to estimate and
159 correct rigid head motion. All subjects were within the predefined head motion
160 thresholds of translation < 2 mm and rotation < 2°. We also calculated the frame-wise
161 displacement (FD) (Power et al. 2012) and percent of spike motion (defined as FD >
162 0.5) in each subject. The mean FD was included as an additional nuisance variable
163 during all fMRI-related statistical analyses to further exclude out the effect of head
164 motion. Then fMRI dataset were affinely coregistered with the structural volume,
165 and the structural images were segmented and nonlinearly normalized into the
166 Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space. Finally, the fMRI volumes were written
167 to the MNI space and resampled into 3-mm³ voxels using the deformation parameters
168 derived from structural images. Several spurious variances, including the motion
169 parameters (six parameters and their first time derivatives), and average BOLD
170 signals of the whole brain, ventricular and white matter were removed from the
171 normalized fMRI data through linear regression. After band-pass frequency filtering
172 (0.01-0.08 Hz), the functional images were spatially smoothed with a Gaussian kernel
173 of 6 mm full width at half maximum.

174 **Attention network extraction**

175 The attention networks were extracted based on a meta-analysis of attention-evoked
176 coactivation. BrainMap Sleuth 2.0.3 (<http://www.brainmap.org/>) was used to search
177 papers reporting brain activation evoked by visual attention tasks in right-handed
178 healthy adults using either positron emission tomography or fMRI. We excluded
179 conditions aimed to investigate the effects of diseases, handedness, gender or drugs on
180 task-evoked activation. All retrieved foci were transformed into MNI space and
181 manually checked to exclude those out of the MNI grey matter mask. A total of 128
182 papers that included 360 experiments, 4793 subjects, and 3470 foci were finally
183 included in the meta-analysis.

184 The meta-analysis was performed using the revised version of Activation
185 Likelihood Estimation (ALE) technique (Eickhoff et al. 2009; Turkeltaub et al. 2012)
186 implemented in GingerALE 2.3.6 (<http://www.brainmap.org/>). This algorithm aims to
187 identify regions showing convergent activation across experiments if the merged
188 activation is higher than the expectation under a random spatial association. For a
189 given experiment, all activation coordinates are modelled as independent Gaussian
190 probability distributions and combined to generate a modelled activation (MA) map
191 for this experiment. To minimize within-experiment foci number and proximity on the
192 ALE calculation, the maximum probability of each voxel in a given experiment was
193 considered as the MA value (Turkeltaub et al. 2012). Then, the ALE score of each
194 voxel was calculated by summing individual MA values of all experiments. A
195 random-effect non-parametric permutation test was used to identify voxels with
196 significant ALE differences against the null-hypothesis. Multiple comparisons were
197 corrected using a false discovery rate (FDR) method ($q < 0.05$ and cluster size > 1000
198 mm^3). The task-evoked spatial activation pattern in the attention network was shown
199 in Supplementary Fig. 1.

200 **DAN and VAN extraction**

201 As performed in a prior study (Fox et al. 2006), we used rsFC-based conjunction
 202 analysis to define the DAN and VAN. The right FEF [28 -6 52] and IPS [30 -58 46]
 203 were used to identify the DAN, and the right aINS [38 26 -6] and TPJ [58 -42 30]
 204 were used to identify the VAN. These peak MNI coordinates were defined based on
 205 the ALE map (Supplementary Fig. 1). A 6mm-radius sphere centered on each
 206 coordinate was drawn and the overlap voxels between the sphere and ALE map were
 207 taken as the seed. Pearson correlation coefficients between the mean time series of
 208 each seed and that of each voxel of the whole brain were computed and transformed
 209 into z-values using Fisher's transform. In each group, individuals' z-values were
 210 entered into a one-sample *t*-test to identify brain regions with significant positive
 211 correlations with each seed. The conjunction analysis was then applied to identify the
 212 DAN regions that exhibit positive rsFC with both the FEF and IPS and the VAN
 213 regions that show positive rsFC with both the aINS and TPJ ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected;
 214 cluster size > 30 voxels). The spatial distributions of the DAN and VAN of each group
 215 are shown in Supplementary Figs 2 and 3, respectively. We used a leave-one-out
 216 (LOO) method to verify if the inter-subject variability would impact the spatial
 217 distribution pattern of the DAN and VAN of each group. In each LOO experiment, we
 218 performed conjunction analysis using the same method as the original one after
 219 excluding one subject's rsFC data. The spatial overlapping ratio (SOR) and spatial
 220 correlation coefficient (SCC) of the DAN/VAN between each LOO experiment and
 221 original one were calculated. The SOR and SCC of the DAN/VAN between each pair
 222 of groups were also calculated to evaluate the spatial similarity of the attention
 223 networks among the groups.

224 To increase the functional specificity of the DAN and VAN, we further redefined
 225 the two attention networks within brain regions that showed both high functional
 226 connectivity with the hubs of this network and high activation by visual attention
 227 tasks, which was computed by multiplying the rsFC-based DAN and VAN with the

228 ALE-based coactivation map. Because we aimed to investigate if the intrinsic
229 functional couplings of brain regions that originally serve visual attention in the SC
230 would change after visual deprivation, the redefined DAN and VAN were only
231 calculated from the SC subjects.

232 **NB-FCSM**

233 A NB-FCSM method was proposed to voxel-wisely compare intergroup FCS
234 differences within (DAN and VAN) and between networks (DAN-VAN, DAN-VN
235 and VAN-VN). Similar to the FCD mapping that measures the degree distribution of
236 the intrinsic functional networks at the voxel-level (Tomasi and Volkow 2012),
237 NB_FCSM measures the weighted degree distribution, namely the FCS (Liang et al.
238 2013). As an extension of the original whole-brain FCS analysis (Liang et al. 2013),
239 this method can not only measure FCS distribution within a network, but also map the
240 FCS between each pair of networks, which can provide information about
241 inter-network functional coupling. The preprocessing steps were the same as the rsFC
242 analysis. The pipeline of NB-FCSM is shown in Fig. 1. For within-network FCS, we
243 first calculated the rsFC between each pair of voxels within a given network to
244 construct a voxel-wise correlation matrix. Then a threshold ($P < 0.05$, uncorrected) of
245 the positive rsFC was used to sparsify the correlation matrix. Within-network FCS of
246 a given voxel was calculated as the average rsFC between this voxel and all other
247 survived voxels within the sparse matrix, and this step was iterated for each remaining
248 voxel. Similarly, between-network FCS was calculated except that the rsFC was
249 calculated from each pair of voxels from two different networks (e.g., A and B). We
250 obtained two between-network FCS measures: $FCS_{A\&B}$ represents the average rsFC of
251 one voxel in network A with all survived voxels in network B, and vice versa for $FCS_{B\&A}$.
252 To test the effect of connectivity thresholding on our results, we also calculated
253 FCS using four different thresholds ($r > 0, 0.1, 0.2$ and 0.3) and compared the
254 intergroup differences.

255 Statistical analyses

256 A fixed-effect general linear model (GLM) was used to voxel-wisely compare
 257 intergroup differences in FCS within each attention network, between the DAN and
 258 VAN, and between the DAN/VAN and VN ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected), controlling for
 259 the effects of age, gender and mean FD. Brain regions with significant FCS
 260 differences were extracted as regions-of-interest (ROIs) and entered into *post-hoc*
 261 comparisons to test pair-wise differences among the four groups ($q < 0.05$, FDR
 262 corrected). To clarify which functional connectivities contributed to the FCS changes
 263 in blind subjects, the rsFC between each identified ROI and each voxels of the whole
 264 brain were calculated, and intergroup differences in rsFC were compared using the
 265 same statistical model as the FCS analyses ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected). Finally, partial
 266 correlation analyses controlling for the effects of gender and mean FD were
 267 performed to test possible correlations of regional FCS with onset age and duration of
 268 blindness ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).

269 Results

270 Demographic data

271 The demographic data of these subjects are shown in Table 1. A total of thirty CB,
 272 thirty EB, thirty LB and thirty SC were included in this study. There were no
 273 significant differences in gender ($\chi^2 = 0$, $P = 1$), age ($F = 1.95$, $P = 0.125$), mean FD (F
 274 $= 0.21$, $P = 0.888$) and percentage of motion spikes ($\chi^2 = 2.33$, $P = 0.508$) among the four
 275 groups. The age of onset of blindness was 0 year in the CB, 7.7 ± 3.2 years in the EB,
 276 and 18.0 ± 4.4 years in the LB; and the duration of blindness was 25.7 ± 4.6 years in
 277 the CB, 20.8 ± 7.9 years in the EB, and 10.2 ± 4.2 years in the LB.

278 The spatial distribution of the attention network

279 The spatial distribution of the attention network identified by coordinated-based ALE

meta-analysis ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) is shown in Supplementary Fig. 1. Visual attention-evoked activation was located in the bilateral FEF, IPS, middle (MFG) and inferior (IFG) frontal gyrus, superior parietal lobule (SPL), dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC), aINS, and the right TPJ. The spatial distributions of the DAN and VAN in each group identified by rsFC-based conjunction analyses ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) are shown in Fig. 2A-C, and Supplementary Figs. 2 and 3. The spatial distribution maps of these two networks were similar among the CB, EB, LB and SC (SOR: $56.3 \pm 4.7\%$ for the DAN and $55.2 \pm 2.2\%$ for the VAN; SCC: 0.693 ± 0.038 for the DAN and 0.524 ± 0.048 for the VAN). The overlapped regions of the DAN for all groups included the bilateral FEF, IFG, IPS and SPL, whereas the overlapped regions of the VAN included the right-lateralized TPJ, aINS, IFG, MFG, dACC and superior frontal gyrus (SFG). LOO methods demonstrated that the spatial distributions of the rsFC-based DAN/VAN were highly consistent in each group (SOR = $91.7 \pm 1.6\%$, SCC = 0.991 ± 0.004), indicating a highly reproducibility of the resting-state DAN and VAN (Fig. 2D). The spatial distributions of the redefined DAN and VAN with both positive rsFC and high activation probability in the SC are shown in Fig. 3. The DAN was composed of the bilateral FEF, posterior IFG (pIFG), IPS and SPL; and the VAN was a right-lateralized network and included the aINS, TPJ, pIFG, MFG, and dACC. The right pIFG was the only region shared by the DAN and VAN.

FCS changes within the attention network in the blind

Within the DAN, GLM analysis showed significant intergroup FCS differences ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) in the bilateral SPL/IPS and the right FEF and pIFG (Fig. 4A). The blind groups generally had increased FCS than the SC group, but they did not differ from each other. There were no significant FCS differences within the VAN among the four groups.

Significant between-network FCS differences ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) were found between the bilateral FEF and SPL/IPS (DAN components) and the VAN (Fig.

307 3B), and between the bilateral aINS, dACC, the right pIFG and TPJ (VAN
308 components) and the DAN (Fig. 3C). Generally, the FCS in each region was increased
309 in the blind than in the SC, but there were no significant differences among the blind
310 groups. The only exception was that the CB had a higher FCS between the right FEF
311 and the VAN than the EB, and a higher FCS between the left FEF and the VAN than
312 the LB ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).

313 In the validation analysis, we recalculated FCS using four different connectivity
314 thresholds ($r > 0, 0.1, 0.2$ and 0.3 , respectively) and repeated these intergroup
315 comparisons. The intergroup FCS differences were highly consistent across the four
316 thresholds and very similar with the original ones (Supplementary Figs 4 and 5).

317 **FCS changes between the attention and visual networks in the blind**

318 The GLM showed significant intergroup FCS differences ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected)
319 between the DAN and VN (Fig. 5A and B). Generally speaking, compared to the SC,
320 the blind subjects showed increased FCS between hubs (the bilateral FEF, IPL and
321 pIFG) of the DAN and the VN and between higher-level visual hubs (the bilateral
322 superior [SOG] and inferior [IOG] occipital gyri, the left lingual gyrus [LG] and the
323 right middle occipital gyrus [MOG]) and the DAN, and decreased FCS between the
324 primary visual areas (the bilateral calcarine sulcus [CalS]) and the DAN (most of
325 them can pass FDR correction). Among the blind subjects, the CB had a lower FCS
326 between the left IOG and the DAN compared to the EB and LB, while higher FCS
327 between the right pIFG and the VN relative to the LB ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) (Fig.
328 5A and B).

329 GLM analysis also revealed significant intergroup FCS differences ($q < 0.05$,
330 FDR corrected) between the VAN and VN (Fig. 5C and D). Compared to the SC, the
331 blind subjects showed increased FCS between hubs (the right pIFG, MFG, TPJ, and
332 the bilateral aINS and dACC) of the VAN and the VN and between hubs (most of the
333 right visual areas, the left middle temporal visual area [MT] and SOG) of the VN and

the VAN ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected). No significantly decreased FCS between the VAN and VN were found in any blind groups. In the blind groups, the CB showed a higher FCS between the right aINS and the VN than the LB ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected), and a higher FCS between the right pIFG and the VN than the EB and LB ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) (Fig. 5C and D). As shown in Supplementary Figs 4-6, the intergroup FCS differences between the attention and visual networks were highly consistent across rsFC thresholds and very similar with the original ones.

The rsFC changes within the attention network in the blind

Treating all regions with significant FCS differences as seeds, voxel-wise rsFC analyses ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) demonstrated: within the DAN, the blind subjects generally had increased rsFC between the left SPL and the left IPS and pIFG, and between the right SPL and the right FEF, pIFG and IPS compared to the SC. Blind subjects also had increased rsFC between most hubs (such as the bilateral FEF and SPL) of the DAN and those (such as the bilateral aINS and dACC, and right pIFG and TPJ) of the VAN. However, there were no significant differences in rsFC within the attention network among blind subjects (Supplementary Fig. S7).

The rsFC changes between the attention and visual networks in the blind

Voxel-wise rsFC analyses ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected) demonstrated that most hubs (including bilateral FEF, IPL and pIFG) of the DAN had increased rsFC with higher-level visual areas in the blind compared with the SC, while the primary visual areas (bilateral CalS) showed decreased rsFC with most DAN hubs (Supplementary Fig. S8). Blind subjects also had increased rsFC between most hubs (such as the bilateral dACC and aINS, and right MFG, pIFG, and TPJ) of the VAN and those (such as the bilateral MT and SOG) of the VN (Supplementary Fig. S9). There were no significant differences in rsFC of DAN-VN and VAN-VN among blind subjects.

359 **Correlations between connectivity changes and blindness chronometry**

360 While controlling for gender and head motion effects, partial correlation analyses ($q <$
 361 0.05, FDR corrected) showed that duration of blindness was positively correlated with
 362 the FCS between the right pIFG of both the VAN ($pr = 0.346$, $P < 0.001$) and DAN
 363 ($pr = 0.311$, $P = 0.003$) and the VN, and negatively correlated with the FCS between
 364 the left IOG of the VN and the DAN ($pr = -0.326$, $P = 0.002$) (Fig. 9). Furthermore,
 365 after additionally controlling for the onset of blindness, the correlations between the
 366 right pIFG of the VAN and the VN and between the left IOG of the VN and the DAN
 367 were still significant. There were no significant correlations between the FCS of each
 368 ROI and the age of onset of blindness ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).

369 **Discussion**

370 In this study, we found that the blind had similar spatial pattern of the attention
 371 network with the SC, suggesting that the intrinsic functional organisation of the
 372 attention network is preserved in the blind. The blind subjects showed increased
 373 functional connectivity within the DAN, between the DAN and VAN, and between
 374 the attention and visual networks, indicating increased information communication
 375 within and between these attention-related networks in the blind. The lack of
 376 connectivity differences between the blind groups and the lack of correlations
 377 between connectivity and onset age of blindness suggest that the intrinsic functional
 378 organisation of the attention network is not influenced by its developmental maturity
 379 degree at the time of onset of blindness. Our study provided systematic knowledge of
 380 the intrinsic functional reorganisation of the attention networks by blindness with
 381 different onset age, and can improved our understanding about the interactions
 382 between higher-level attention network and visual areas in compensating for visual
 383 loss..

384 **Methodological consideration**

385 In light of the FCD that voxel-wisely measure the unweighted degree distribution of
 386 the whole brain network (Tomasi and Volkow 2012), the FCS is proposed to
 387 voxel-wisely measure the weighted degree distribution of the network (Liang et al.
 388 2013). In contrast to the FCD that is sensitive to connection thresholds, the FCS is
 389 insensitive to connection thresholds because of the weighting property, which is
 390 supported by our findings of different connection thresholds resulting in similar
 391 intergroup FCS differences. Here, we extended the traditional whole-brain-level FCS
 392 analysis to voxel-wisely assess the FCS within and between networks, namely the
 393 NB-FCSM. Compared with the independent component analysis (ICA) that is
 394 typically used to measure the global between-network functional connectivity (Allen
 395 et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2014), our voxel-wise between-network FCS analysis can
 396 identify the specific brain regions with between-network connectivity differences
 397 between groups. A prerequisite for robust application of NB-FCSM is accurate
 398 definition of networks of interest. Here, we combined the coordinated-based ALE
 399 meta-analysis and the rsFC-based conjunction analysis to more accurately define the
 400 DAN and VAN. Thus, each voxel of the redefined attention networks possess both
 401 high functional connectivity and coactivation, which was used for NB-FCSM.

402 **Preserved intrinsic functional organisation in the attention network in the blind**

403 The human attention system closely interacts with the sensory systems. For example,
 404 the VAN controls stimulus-driven reorienting from sensory modalities and the DAN
 405 generates top-down signals to bias the response of the sensory cortex (Astafiev et al.
 406 2003; Kincade et al. 2005) (Astafiev et al. 2006; Indovina and Macaluso 2007). As the
 407 main information input of the human brain, visual experience plays an important role
 408 in establishing and reshaping the functional organisation of the attention network. For
 409 example, visual attention training can reshape the attention network in normal
 410 subjects (Rueda et al., 2005; Rueda et al., 2012). In this study, we found that the

attention networks showed similar spatial distribution in the blind and the SC, suggesting that the intrinsic functional organisation of the attention networks is preserved in the blind. This finding also indicates that the functional organisation of the attention network can be normally established in the blind by receiving inputs from non-visual sensory modalities because there are dense connections between the attentional regions and the thalamus (Behrens et al. 2003) and non-visual sensory cortices (Umarova et al. 2010). The preserved functional organisation of the attention network in the blind may provide new evidence for the supramodal nature of the attention regions, which is supported by the sensory modality-independent functional specialization of the attention network. For example, a certain attentional region is functionally specialized for processing a specific type of attention despite of the inputs from what sensory modalities (Downar et al. 2000; Smith et al. 2010; Ptak 2012).

Enhanced intrinsic functional coupling of the attention network in the blind

Superior auditory/tactile attention performance has been frequently reported in the blind (Roder et al. 1999; Collignon et al. 2006; Forster et al. 2007; Collignon and De Volder 2009). Enhanced activation in the FEF and IPS is also observed in the CB/EB compared the SC when performing attention-demanding tasks (Burton et al. 2004; Garg et al. 2007; Stevens et al. 2007; Burton et al. 2010). In this study, we found increased functional couplings within and between the attention networks in the blind, which may provide an explanation for the superior attention performance from a new perspective of functional integration. We found increased connectivity in the DAN but not in the VAN in the blind, which is consistent with previous studies reporting enhanced activation only in the DAN regions in the CB/EB than the SC during attention-demanding tasks (Burton et al. 2004; Garg et al. 2007; Stevens et al. 2007; Burton et al. 2010). This finding suggests that the DAN and VAN respond differently to visual deprivation, reflecting different dependencies of the development of the

functional organisation of the DAN and VAN on visual experience.

The DAN and VAN do not work independently, instead, they closely interact to determine which aspects of sensory information will be attended to (Buschman and Miller 2007; McMains and Kastner 2011). In consistent with a previous study (Fox et al. 2006), we found that the right posterior IFG/MFG was the region shared by the DAN and VAN, which may be the anatomical substrate for information communication between the two attention networks. In the theory of reorienting (Corbetta et al. 2008), when one focuses on an object, the DAN sends sustained top-down inhibition signals to the right TPJ to prevent unimportant and low-relevant stimuli from transferring to the VAN; when the stimuli are important and relevant enough to break the inhibition by the TPJ, the VAN is activated and sends the reorienting salient signals to the DAN. The increased intrinsic functional coupling between the DAN and VAN suggests that the information transfer efficiency or the functional integration of the attention networks is enhanced after visual deprivation, which may facilitate the switching between top-down attention and stimulus-driven reorienting. This finding may explain why the blind subjects have superior attention performance (Roder et al. 1999; Collignon et al. 2006; Forster et al. 2007; Collignon and De Volder 2009).

Enhanced intrinsic functional coupling between the attention and visual networks in the blind

In the SC, the DAN strongly interacts with the visual areas to bias the visual perception (Buchel et al. 1998a; Tootell et al. 1998; Jack et al. 2006; Silver et al. 2007; Cate et al. 2009; Bressler and Silver 2010). In the blind, the deprived visual perception of the V1 may cause reduced functional coupling between the DAN and the V1. In contrast, the V1 of the blind involves in attention-demanding nonvisual tasks (Bavelier and Neville 2002; Collignon et al. 2009; Sathian and Stilla 2010), which may cause an increased functional coupling between the DAN and the V1.

Thus, the reduced functional coupling between the DAN and the V1 in the blind may be a combined consequence of these two mechanisms. The same mechanisms can also be applied to explain for the increased functional coupling between the VAN and the V1 in the blind. In contrast to the V1, the functional specialization of the higher-level visual areas has found to be preserved to process non-visual stimuli in the blind (Amedi et al. 2007; Renier et al. 2010; Collignon et al. 2011; Reich et al. 2011; Wolbers et al. 2011). They can interact with the attention networks to process non-visual attention tasks after visual deprivation (Buchel et al. 1998a; Tootell et al. 1998; Jack et al. 2006; Silver et al. 2007; Cate et al. 2009; Bressler and Silver 2010). Thus, our findings of the increased functional coupling between the attention and higher-level visual areas in the blind may reflect an increased interaction between them, which may provide an explanation for the increased attention task-evoked activation (Garg et al. 2007; Stevens et al. 2007) and baseline brain activity and metabolism (Wanet-Defalque et al. 1988; Veraart et al. 1990; Jiang et al. 2015) in these regions, and superior attention performance (Roder et al. 1999; Collignon et al. 2006; Forster et al. 2007; Collignon and De Volder 2009) in the blind.

Functional reorganisation of the attention-related networks and brain maturity

In the blind, the structural and functional reorganisation of the visual cortex has been found to be dependent on the development maturity degree of the visual cortex at the time of onset of blindness. Before or within the critical developmental period, visual deprivation results in more significant reorganisation in the occipital cortex than that occurs after the period. Compared to the LB, the CB/EB have more significant changes in cortical thickness (Jiang et al. 2009; Park et al. 2009; Kupers et al. 2011), glucose metabolism (Wanet-Defalque et al. 1988; Veraart et al. 1990), task-evoked activation (Buchel et al. 1998b), and FCD (Qin et al. 2015) in the occipital cortex. Unexpectedly, we found that the functional reorganisation of the attention-related networks was quite similar among the three blind groups and was not correlated with

onset age of blindness, indicating that the functional reorganisation of the attention-related networks is not dependent on their development maturity degree at the time of onset of blindness. That is, the non-visual sensory experience is enough for driving the development of the functional organisation of the attention networks. The increased functional coupling may be related to enhancing or unmasking connections of the attention-related networks (Kupers et al. 2011; Qin and Yu 2013).

In contrast, although the blind people similarly demonstrated increased intrinsic functional coupling between the attention and visual networks, some hubs and connections between the two networks can also impacted by blindness duration. The most vulnerable attention area is the posterior IFG, the conjunction hub of DAN and VAN (Fox et al. 2006), whose functional coupling with the VN was affected by duration of visual deprivation, indicating the experience-dependent factors may reshape the intrinsic functional connectivity.

Conclusions

In summary, our findings demonstrated that long-term visual deprivation can reshape the intrinsic functional coupling within the attention network, and between the attention and visual networks; furthermore, the functional reorganisation of the attention-related networks is not dependent on their development maturity degree at the time of onset of blindness. These compensatory changes may help blind people to more effectively allocate the remaining sensory resources to be aware of the surrounding environment.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (81771818 and 81425013), National Key Research and Development Program of China

(2018YFC1314300), and Tianjin Key Technology R&D Program
(17ZXMFSY00090).

519

520 **References:**

521 Allen EA, Damaraju E, Plis SM, Erhardt EB, Eichele T, Calhoun VD. 2014. Tracking whole-brain
522 connectivity dynamics in the resting state. *Cereb Cortex*. 24:663-676.

523 Amedi A, Stern WM, Camprodon JA, Bermpohl F, Merabet L, Rotman S, Hemond C, Meijer P,
524 Pascual-Leone A. 2007. Shape conveyed by visual-to-auditory sensory substitution activates the
525 lateral occipital complex. *Nat Neurosci*. 10:687-689.

526 Astafiev SV, Shulman GL, Corbetta M. 2006. Visuospatial reorienting signals in the human
527 temporo-parietal junction are independent of response selection. *Eur J Neurosci*. 23:591-596.

528 Astafiev SV, Shulman GL, Stanley CM, Snyder AZ, Van Essen DC, Corbetta M. 2003. Functional
529 organisation of human intraparietal and frontal cortex for attending, looking, and pointing. *J*
530 *Neurosci*. 23:4689-4699.

531 Bavelier D, Neville HJ. 2002. Cross-modal plasticity: where and how? *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 3:443-452.

532 Behrens TE, Johansen-Berg H, Woolrich MW, Smith SM, Wheeler-Kingshott CA, Boulby PA, Barker
533 GJ, Sillery EL, Sheehan K, Ciccarelli O, Thompson AJ, Brady JM, Matthews PM. 2003.
534 Non-invasive mapping of connections between human thalamus and cortex using diffusion
535 imaging. *Nat Neurosci*. 6:750-757.

536 Bellgrove MA, Chambers CD, Johnson KA, Daibhis A, Daly M, Hawi Z, Lambert D, Gill M,
537 Robertson IH. 2007. Dopaminergic genotype biases spatial attention in healthy children. *Mol*

538 Psychiatry. 12:786-792.

539 Bressler DW, Silver MA. 2010. Spatial attention improves reliability of fMRI retinotopic mapping

540 signals in occipital and parietal cortex. Neuroimage. 53:526-533.

541 Buchel C, Josephs O, Rees G, Turner R, Frith CD, Friston KJ. 1998a. The functional anatomy of

542 attention to visual motion. A functional MRI study. Brain. 121:1281-1294.

543 Buchel C, Price C, Frackowiak RS, Friston K. 1998b. Different activation patterns in the visual cortex

544 of late and congenitally blind subjects. Brain. 121 (Pt 3):409-419.

545 Burton H, Sinclair RJ, Dixit S. 2010. Working memory for vibrotactile frequencies: comparison of

546 cortical activity in blind and sighted individuals. Hum Brain Mapp. 31:1686-1701.

547 Burton H, Sinclair RJ, McLaren DG. 2004. Cortical activity to vibrotactile stimulation: an fMRI study

548 in blind and sighted individuals. Hum Brain Mapp. 23:210-228.

549 Buschman TJ, Miller EK. 2007. Top-down versus bottom-up control of attention in the prefrontal and

550 posterior parietal cortices. Science. 315:1860-1862.

551 Cate AD, Herron TJ, Yund EW, Stecker GC, Rinne T, Kang X, Petkov CI, Disbrow EA, Woods DL.

552 2009. Auditory attention activates peripheral visual cortex. PLoS One. 4:e4645.

553 Collignon O, De Volder AG. 2009. Further evidence that congenitally blind participants react faster to

554 auditory and tactile spatial targets. Can J Exp Psychol. 63:287-293.

555 Collignon O, Dormal G, Albouy G, Vandewalle G, Voss P, Phillips C, Lepore F. 2013. Impact of

556 blindness onset on the functional organisation and the connectivity of the occipital cortex. Brain.

557 136:2769-2783.

558 Collignon O, Renier L, Bruyer R, Tranduy D, Veraart C. 2006. Improved selective and divided spatial

559 attention in early blind subjects. *Brain Res.* 1075:175-182.

560 Collignon O, Vandewalle G, Voss P, Albouy G, Charbonneau G, Lassonde M, Lepore F. 2011.

561 Functional specialization for auditory-spatial processing in the occipital cortex of congenitally

562 blind humans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 108:4435-4440.

563 Collignon O, Voss P, Lassonde M, Lepore F. 2009. Cross-modal plasticity for the spatial processing of

564 sounds in visually deprived subjects. *Exp Brain Res.* 192:343-358.

565 Corbetta M, Patel G, Shulman GL. 2008. The reorienting system of the human brain: from environment

566 to theory of mind. *Neuron.* 58:306-324.

567 Corbetta M, Shulman GL. 2002. Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain.

568 *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 3:201-215.

569 Downar J, Crawley AP, Mikulis DJ, Davis KD. 2000. A multimodal cortical network for the detection

570 of changes in the sensory environment. *Nat Neurosci.* 3:277-283.

571 Eickhoff SB, Laird AR, Grefkes C, Wang LE, Zilles K, Fox PT. 2009. Coordinate-based activation

572 likelihood estimation meta-analysis of neuroimaging data: a random-effects approach based on

573 empirical estimates of spatial uncertainty. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 30:2907-2926.

574 Fieger A, Roder B, Teder-Salejarvi W, Hillyard SA, Neville HJ. 2006. Auditory spatial tuning in

575 late-onset blindness in humans. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 18:149-157.

576 Forster B, Eardley AF, Eimer M. 2007. Altered tactile spatial attention in the early blind. *Brain Res.*

577 1131:149-154.

578 Fox MD, Corbetta M, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Raichle ME. 2006. Spontaneous neuronal activity

579 distinguishes human dorsal and ventral attention systems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*

580 103:10046-10051.

581 Garg A, Schwartz D, Stevens AA. 2007. Orienting auditory spatial attention engages frontal eye fields
582 and medial occipital cortex in congenitally blind humans. *Neuropsychologia*. 45:2307-2321.

583 Gougoux F, Zatorre RJ, Lassonde M, Voss P, Lepore F. 2005. A functional neuroimaging study of
584 sound localization: visual cortex activity predicts performance in early-blind individuals. *PLoS*
585 *Biol.* 3:e27.

586 Indovina I, Macaluso E. 2007. Dissociation of stimulus relevance and saliency factors during shifts of
587 visuospatial attention. *Cereb Cortex*. 17:1701-1711.

588 Jack AI, Shulman GL, Snyder AZ, McAvoy M, Corbetta M. 2006. Separate modulations of human V1
589 associated with spatial attention and task structure. *Neuron*. 51:135-147.

590 Jiang A, Tian J, Li R, Liu Y, Jiang T, Qin W, Yu C. 2015. Alterations of Regional Spontaneous Brain
591 Activity and Gray Matter Volume in the Blind. *Neural Plast*. 2015:141950.

592 Jiang J, Zhu W, Shi F, Liu Y, Li J, Qin W, Li K, Yu C, Jiang T. 2009. Thick visual cortex in the early
593 blind. *J Neurosci*. 29:2205-2211.

594 Kincade JM, Abrams RA, Astafiev SV, Shulman GL, Corbetta M. 2005. An event-related functional
595 magnetic resonance imaging study of voluntary and stimulus-driven orienting of attention. *J*
596 *Neurosci*. 25:4593-4604.

597 Kupers R, Pietrini P, Ricciardi E, Ptito M. 2011. The nature of consciousness in the visually deprived
598 brain. *Front Psychol*. 2:19.

599 Liang X, Zou Q, He Y, Yang Y. 2013. Coupling of functional connectivity and regional cerebral blood
600 flow reveals a physiological basis for network hubs of the human brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*

601 A. 110:1929-1934.

602 McMains S, Kastner S. 2011. Interactions of top-down and bottom-up mechanisms in human visual
603 cortex. *J Neurosci.* 31:587-597.

604 Neufang S, Geiger MJ, Homola GA, Mahr M, Akhrif A, Nowak J, Reif A, Romanos M, Deckert J,
605 Solymosi L, Domschke K. 2015. Modulation of prefrontal functioning in attention systems by
606 NPSR1 gene variation. *Neuroimage.* 114:199-206.

607 Park HJ, Lee JD, Kim EY, Park B, Oh MK, Lee S, Kim JJ. 2009. Morphological alterations in the
608 congenital blind based on the analysis of cortical thickness and surface area. *Neuroimage.*
609 47:98-106.

610 Power JD, Barnes KA, Snyder AZ, Schlaggar BL, Petersen SE. 2012. Spurious but systematic
611 correlations in functional connectivity MRI networks arise from subject motion. *Neuroimage.*
612 59:2142-2154.

613 Ptak R. 2012. The frontoparietal attention network of the human brain: action, saliency, and a priority
614 map of the environment. *Neuroscientist.* 18:502-515.

615 Ptito M, Schneider FC, Paulson OB, Kupers R. 2008. Alterations of the visual pathways in congenital
616 blindness. *Exp Brain Res.* 187:41-49.

617 Qin W, Xuan Y, Liu Y, Jiang T, Yu C. 2015. Functional Connectivity Density in Congenitally and Late
618 Blind Subjects. *Cereb Cortex.* 25:2507-2516.

619 Qin W, Yu C. 2013. Neural pathways conveying novisual information to the visual cortex. *Neural Plast.*
620 2013:864920.

621 Raz A, Buhle J. 2006. Typologies of attentional networks. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 7:367-379.

622 Reich L, Szwed M, Cohen L, Amedi A. 2011. A ventral visual stream reading center independent of
623 visual experience. *Curr Biol.* 21:363-368.

624 Renier LA, Anurova I, De Volder AG, Carlson S, VanMeter J, Rauschecker JP. 2010. Preserved
625 functional specialization for spatial processing in the middle occipital gyrus of the early blind.
626 *Neuron.* 68:138-148.

627 Roder B, Teder-Salejarvi W, Sterr A, Rosler F, Hillyard SA, Neville HJ. 1999. Improved auditory
628 spatial tuning in blind humans. *Nature.* 400:162-166.

629 Rueda MR, Checa P, Combita LM. 2012. Enhanced efficiency of the executive attention network after
630 training in preschool children: immediate changes and effects after two months. *Dev Cogn*
631 *Neurosci.* 2 Suppl 1:S192-204.

632 Rueda MR, Rothbart MK, McCandliss BD, Saccomanno L, Posner MI. 2005. Training, maturation, and
633 genetic influences on the development of executive attention. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
634 102:14931-14936.

635 Sadato N, Pascual-Leone A, Grafman J, Deiber MP, Ibanez V, Hallett M. 1998. Neural networks for
636 Braille reading by the blind. *Brain.* 121 (Pt 7):1213-1229.

637 Sadato N, Pascual-Leone A, Grafman J, Ibanez V, Deiber MP, Dold G, Hallett M. 1996. Activation of
638 the primary visual cortex by Braille reading in blind subjects. *Nature.* 380:526-528.

639 Sathian K, Stilla R. 2010. Cross-modal plasticity of tactile perception in blindness. *Restor Neurol*
640 *Neurosci.* 28:271-281.

641 Shimony JS, Burton H, Epstein AA, McLaren DG, Sun SW, Snyder AZ. 2006. Diffusion tensor
642 imaging reveals white matter reorganisation in early blind humans. *Cereb Cortex.*

643 16:1653-1661.

644 Shu N, Li J, Li K, Yu C, Jiang T. 2009. Abnormal diffusion of cerebral white matter in early blindness.

645 Hum Brain Mapp. 30:220-227.

646 Silver MA, Ress D, Heeger DJ. 2007. Neural correlates of sustained spatial attention in human early

647 visual cortex. J Neurophysiol. 97:229-237.

648 Smith DV, Davis B, Niu K, Healy EW, Bonilha L, Fridriksson J, Morgan PS, Rorden C. 2010. Spatial

649 attention evokes similar activation patterns for visual and auditory stimuli. J Cogn Neurosci.

650 22:347-361.

651 Stevens AA, Snodgrass M, Schwartz D, Weaver K. 2007. Preparatory activity in occipital cortex in

652 early blind humans predicts auditory perceptual performance. J Neurosci. 27:10734-10741.

653 Tomasi D, Volkow ND. 2012. Aging and functional brain networks. Mol Psychiatry. 17:471, 549-458.

654 Tootell RB, Hadjikhani N, Hall EK, Marrett S, Vanduffel W, Vaughan JT, Dale AM. 1998. The

655 retinotopy of visual spatial attention. Neuron. 21:1409-1422.

656 Turkeltaub PE, Eickhoff SB, Laird AR, Fox M, Wiener M, Fox P. 2012. Minimizing within-experiment

657 and within-group effects in Activation Likelihood Estimation meta-analyses. Hum Brain Mapp.

658 33:1-13.

659 Umarova RM, Saur D, Schnell S, Kaller CP, Vry MS, Glauche V, Rijntjes M, Hennig J, Kiselev V,

660 Weiller C. 2010. Structural connectivity for visuospatial attention: significance of ventral

661 pathways. Cereb Cortex. 20:121-129.

662 Veraart C, De Volder AG, Wanet-Defalque MC, Bol A, Michel C, Goffinet AM. 1990. Glucose

663 utilization in human visual cortex is abnormally elevated in blindness of early onset but

664 decreased in blindness of late onset. Brain Res. 510:115-121.

665 Wanet-Defalque MC, Veraart C, De Volder A, Metz R, Michel C, Dooms G, Goffinet A. 1988. High

666 metabolic activity in the visual cortex of early blind human subjects. Brain Res. 446:369-373.

667 Wang D, Qin W, Liu Y, Zhang Y, Jiang T, Yu C. 2014. Altered resting-state network connectivity in

668 congenital blind. Hum Brain Mapp. 35:2573-2581.

669 Weeks R, Horwitz B, Aziz-Sultan A, Tian B, Wessinger CM, Cohen LG, Hallett M, Rauschecker JP.

670 2000. A positron emission tomographic study of auditory localization in the congenitally blind. J

671 Neurosci. 20:2664-2672.

672 Wen X, Yao L, Liu Y, Ding M. 2012. Causal interactions in attention networks predict behavioral

673 performance. J Neurosci. 32:1284-1292.

674 Wolbers T, Zahorik P, Giudice NA. 2011. Decoding the direction of auditory motion in blind humans.

675 Neuroimage. 56:681-687.

676

Table 1: Demographic information of blind and sighted subjects

Measures	CB	EB	LB	SC	Statistics	P value
Gender (male/female)	22 / 8	22 / 8	22 / 8	22 / 8	$\chi^2 = 0^a$	1
Age (mean $\pm$ SD), years	25.7 $\pm$ 4.6	28.5 $\pm$ 6.6	28.2 $\pm$ 4.1	28.6 $\pm$ 5.9	$F = 1.95$	0.125
Onset age of blindness (mean $\pm$ SD), years	0	7.7 $\pm$ 3.2	18.0 $\pm$ 4.4	/	/	/
Duration of blindness (mean $\pm$ SD), years	25.7 $\pm$ 4.6	20.8 $\pm$ 7.9	10.2 $\pm$ 4.2	/	/	/
Mean FD (mean $\pm$ SD)	0.15 $\pm$ 0.07	0.16 $\pm$ 0.05	0.15 $\pm$ 0.07	0.14 $\pm$ 0.05	$F = 0.21$	0.888
Motion spikes (mean $\pm$ SD), %	1.69 $\pm$ 2.54	1.59 $\pm$ 2.35	2.31 $\pm$ 4.35	0.94 $\pm$ 1.79	$\chi^2 = 2.33^b$	0.508

Note: ^a chi-square test. ^b Kruskal Wallis Test, A motion spike is defined as a time point with FD > 0.5. CB = congenitally blind, EB = early blind, FD = frame-wise displacement, SC = sighted control, SD = standard deviation.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Pipeline of network-based functional connectivity mapping.

Abbreviations: FC = functional connectivity, FCS = functional connectivity strength.

There are four main steps for NB-FCSM: A) Extracting the timecourses of each voxel for each network; B) calculating the functional correlation matrix within each network and between each pair of networks; C) calculating the functional connectivity strength of each voxel; D) generating the FCS maps of each network and between each pair of networks.


Figure 2. Spatial similarities of the dorsal and ventral attention networks derived from rsFC-based conjunction analysis. (A) and (B) show spatial overlaps of the DAN and VAN across groups, respectively. The color of each voxel indicates the number of groups (1 to 4) that share this voxel in the DAN or VAN. **(C)** represents the spatial correlation coefficients and overlapping ratio of the attention networks between each pair of groups. **(D)** shows the spatial correlation coefficients and overlapping ratio of the attention networks between each LOO iteration and the use of full data in each group.




Figure 3. The refined dorsal and ventral attention networks in the sighted controls. The DAN **(A)** and VAN **(B)** were identified by combination of ALE-based coactivation and rsFC-based conjunction analyses ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected). Each non-zero voxel of an attention network has both positive rsFC with the hubs of this network and high activation probability by visual attention tasks. The color bar represents the T value of the conjunction analysis. The DAN (red) and VAN (blue) are spatially overlapped at the right posterior IFG (green) **(C)**.

Figure 4. FCS changes within the attention networks in the blind. General linear model is used to compare FCS differences within the attention networks between the total blind subjects and the sighted controls ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected), while controlling for the effects of age, gender, and mean FD. Color bar represents the T value. Warm and cold colors represent increased and decreased FCS in the blind, respectively. **(A)** shows the intergroup FCS differences within the DAN; **(B)** shows brain regions of the DAN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the VAN; and **(C)** shows brain regions of the VAN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the DAN. The lines connecting any two groups in bar graphs indicate significant differences between the two groups ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).


Figure 5. FCS changes between the attention and visual networks in the blind. General linear model is used to compare FCS (between the attention and visual networks) differences between the total blind subjects and the sighted controls ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected), while controlling for the effects of age, gender, and mean FD. Color bar represents the T value. Warm and cold colors represent increased and decreased FCS in the blind, respectively. **(A)** shows brain regions of the DAN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the VN; **(B)** shows brain regions of the VN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the DAN; **(C)** shows brain regions of the VAN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the VN; **(D)** shows brain regions of the VN that exhibit intergroup differences in FCS with the VAN. The lines connecting any two groups in bar graphs indicate significant differences between the two groups ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).

Figure 6. Correlations between duration of blindness and FCS in the blind. Partial correlation analyses controlling for the effects of gender and mean FD are performed to test correlations between duration of blindness and regional FCS in the blind ($q < 0.05$, FDR corrected).







A Doral Attention Network




B Ventral Attention Network










C Overlapping Map







CB EB LB SC





R.pIFG**R.pIFG****L.IOG**