



HAL
open science

Tilted writing after stroke, a sign of biased verticality representation.

Caroline Jolly, Céline Piscicelli, Rémi Gimat, Laure Mathevon, Anne Chrispin, Monica Baciou, Dominic Perennou

► To cite this version:

Caroline Jolly, Céline Piscicelli, Rémi Gimat, Laure Mathevon, Anne Chrispin, et al.. Tilted writing after stroke, a sign of biased verticality representation.. *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 2020, 63 (1), pp.85-88. 10.1016/j.rehab.2019.12.001 . hal-02361252

HAL Id: hal-02361252

<https://hal.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/hal-02361252>

Submitted on 7 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Tilted writing after stroke, a possible sign of biased verticality representation

Caroline JOLLY¹, Céline PISCICELLI¹⁻², Remi GIMAT², Claire BERENGER², Eric GUINET¹,
Laure MATHEVON², ANNE CHRISPIN², Monica BACIU¹, Dominic PERENNOU¹⁻²

1. Laboratoire de Psychologie et NeuroCognition, CNRS UMR5105, Université Grenoble Alpes, 1251
avenue centrale, 38040 Grenoble cedex 9, France

2. Service de Rééducation Neurologique, Institut de Rééducation, Hôpital sud CHU Grenoble-Alpes,
Avenue de Kimberley 38834 Echirolles, France

Collaborators of the spatial dysgraphia group: Eric GUINET¹, Claire BERENGER², Anne
CHRISPIN²

Corresponding author: DPerennou@chu-grenoble.fr

Letter to the editor (case study) for the Annals of PRM

Title: 83 characters, including spaces

Words in the main text: 15821 table and 1 figure

15 ref / 15

1 Dear Editor
2
3

4 Handwriting is a complex task involving motor, linguistic, perceptual, and attentional skills
5 predominantly controlled by the left hemisphere but requiring a spatial organization that
6 depends on the right hemisphere[1]. Handwriting is often affected after right-hemispheric
7 lesions, with a spectrum of signs related to the spatial layout of the written language,[2-5]
8 constituting spatial dysgraphia/agraphia.[2,6,7] These signs are multi-faceted.[2-4,7] Most
9 deal with spatial compression or mental rotation of the space and are related to spatial neglect:
10 omitting the left half of the paper, overwriting or compressing some words, and omitting and
11 substituting letters or graphemes. Others such as tilted writing and a progressive increase of
12 the left margin cannot be interpreted as signs of spatial neglect and remain to be understood.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Here we present a case suggesting that these handwriting signs after stroke might be due to a
23 counterclockwise tilt in representing the vertical, transposed on the sheet of paper referring to
24 top and bottom.
25
26
27
28

29 JW was a 75-year-old right-handed male who had a right fronto-parietal hematoma (Fig. 1A
30 and 1B) causing left hemiplegia with hemianesthesia, left hemianopsia and spatial neglect
31 (US National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale score 13). At entry in rehabilitation (day 13
32 after the stroke), JW showed spatial neglect and pusher syndrome interpreted as a result of an
33 extreme bias in the internal model of verticality [8]. He behaved as if he implicitly aligned his
34 body posture onto a representation of the vertical, tilted counterclockwise. JW also presented
35 a consistent and global counterclockwise tilt of his written production (Fig. 1E-G): drawing (-
36 12°) and writing (left margin -9° with respect to the vertical, lines -11° with respect to the
37 horizontal). He wrote without any space compression, deletions or omissions.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 JW agreed to a further clinical investigation of these troubles to guide their rehabilitation, and
48 also signed informed consent to be enrolled in the cohort DOBRAS
49 (clinicaltrial.gov:NCT03203109). Several domains of spatial cognition were assessed at 2, 3
50 and 9 months post-stroke (M2, M3 and M9): spatial neglect by means of a battery of tests
51 including the representation of the subjective straight ahead (SSA),[9] representation of the
52 vertical (visual vertical [VV] and postural vertical [PV])[8], and drawing and writing on blank
53 and cued (lined) paper as well as after a modulation of the verticality bias. Assessments
54 involved using validated tests, devices, and protocols, all routinely used (details in additional
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 material), except for a novel procedure to test handwriting. The SSA (10 trials) was compared
2 to the actual straight ahead (0°), whereas deviations affecting the VV and PV (10 trials each)
3 were compared to published normal values.[8]
4
5

6 To interpret JW's drawing and writing, we tested 12 right-handed healthy individuals (5
7 males), matched in age (mean [SD] 75.2 [2.8] years) and sociocultural level. All participants
8 were tested in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration, with the approval of the local ethical
9 committee (2019-04-09-1) after giving their written consent.
10
11
12

13 Statistical analysis involved using SPSS v23 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). The existence
14 of a systematic deviation (tilt) by comparison to the reference was tested by one-sample *t*
15 tests. Negative values indicated a counterclockwise tilt (leftward, upward). Amplitudes and
16 the significance of JW's tilts were analyzed with Z-scores (VV, PV) or T-scores (drawing,
17 writing) calculated with control data. Conditions were compared by Wilcoxon test for paired
18 samples or Friedman ANOVA. Significance was set according to Bonferroni corrections
19 (bilateral tests). Data are presented as mean (SD).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *JW's spatial neglect* was severe at M2, affecting body and non-body spaces (Table 1), without
30 any sign of spatial alexia. Only a few neglect signs persisted at M3 but no longer at M9, when
31 the representation of the SSA, not tested earlier, was also normal (-0.7° [2.8], p=0.739).
32
33
34
35

36 *JW's representation of verticality* was tested under baseline conditions at M2 and M9 and also
37 after a modulation procedure (M3). Thresholds of significance were corrected at
38 0.05/4=0.012. At M2, JW showed a severe transmodal counterclockwise tilt affecting the VV
39 (-13.1°; 11.9*T-scores, p<10⁻⁶) and PV (-11.2°; 12.4*T-scores, p<10⁻⁶). This bias remained at
40 M9 but was attenuated (VV= -5.3°; PV= -5.7°). As expected[10], the PV was modulated after
41 10 min of ipsilesional (right) whole body tilt in the dark at 30° (-9.8° before, 0.5° immediately
42 after). JW's writing (9 lines and margins) was better oriented 20 min after the modulation
43 procedure (before -10.2° (2.2) vs after -6° (1.5); p=0.008).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In controls and JW, *drawing orientation* was quantified by the tilt with respect to the
52 horizontal for the 5 horizontal segments of the landscape to be copied (Fig. 1E)[11]. The
53 corrected P-value was 0.05/4=0.012. The drawing was tilted counterclockwise: slightly for
54 controls (-1.5° [0.57]; t=8.5, p<10⁻⁶) and markedly for JW at M3 (-4.5°, t=5 and p=0.008;
55 5.3*T-scores, p<10⁻⁶) and M9 (-8.4°, t=3.8 and p=0.02; 12.1*T-scores, p<10⁻⁶). Because M3
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and M9 data did not differ ($p=0.08$), they were pooled to show a substantial and remaining
2 counterclockwise tilt (-6.7°) greatly deviated from the horizontal ($t=4.9$, $p<10^{-3}$), much greater
3 than the control deviation (9.1 *T-scores, $p<10^{-6}$).
4
5

6 *To analyze writing orientation*, controls and JW were asked to copy the first 5 lines of the
7 French version of the Brave Handwriting Kinder test[12] (Fig. 1G), a text standardized to
8 diagnose dysgraphia in children. They were seated comfortably with the head and trunk
9 aligned and wrote at a comfortable speed on a paper sheet that was blank or cued (lined) and
10 was affixed to a graphic tablet (Wacom© Intuos 4 A5 USB) carefully centered in front of
11 them on a slanted table (30°). The written samples were digitized, and 3 criteria were
12 measured by an operator (CJ) who was blinded to the writer: the orientation of each of the 5
13 lines with respect to the horizontal, the orientation of the left margin with respect to the
14 vertical (4 segments defined between the beginning of lines averaged to give a margin
15 orientation per individual), and the mean time to write a letter calculated by using Ductus
16 software[13].
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *For writing on blank paper*, thresholds of significance were $0.05/6=0.008$ for orientation and
28 $p=0.05/3=0.016$ for time. The lines were tilted counterclockwise for all individuals: slightly
29 for controls (-1.8° [1]; $t=6.4$, $p<10^{-4}$) and markedly for JW at M3 (-11.1° [2.6], 9.3 *T-scores,
30 $p<10^{-6}$) and M9 (-8.2° [0.7], 6.4 *T-scores, $p<10^{-6}$). Because M3 and M9 data were
31 comparable ($p=0.080$), they were pooled. JW showed a substantial deviation, far away from
32 the horizontal (-9.9° ; $t=13.8$, $p<10^{-6}$), and much greater than that for controls (7.4 *T-scores,
33 $p<10^{-6}$). The left margin was vertical for controls (-0.4 [2.9]; $t=0.49$, $p=0.64$) but tilted
34 counterclockwise for JW (8 values pooled for M3-M9: -8.1° , $t=20.4$, $p<10^{-6}$). After a
35 transformation (90°), margins and lines did not differ for controls ($p=0.182$) or JW ($p=0.02$),
36 which indicates that they remained orthogonal. Writing a letter took 0.5 (0.16) sec for controls
37 but more time for JW at M3 (1.3 sec; 5 *T-scores, $p=10^{-6}$) and M9 (0.9 sec; 2.5 *T-scores,
38 $p=0.012$).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *For writing on a paper spatially cued*, individuals were asked to copy the same text following
51 lines tilted at 12° and 24° (Fig. 1H-K), counterclockwise (upward) or clockwise (downward).
52 The corrected p-value was $0.05/10=0.005$. Friedman ANOVA revealed no effect in controls
53 ($p=0.118$); they followed the lines with negligible deviations at -24° (-0.1° [0.3]; $t=1.3$,
54 $p=0.2$), -12° (-0.1° [0.3]; $t=1.3$, $p=0.2$), 12° (0° [0.6]; $t=0.23$, $p=0.82$), and 24° (-0.6° [0.7];
55 $t=3.03$, $p=0.01$). In contrast, cueing had a strong effect on JW ($p<10^{-3}$ for pooled data for M3-
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 M9). He wrote above lines, and the deviation increased with the downward cueing (Fig.
2 1J,K). He followed lines at -24° (-0.6° ; $t=-2.9$, $p=0.017$) but not lines at -12° (-1.3° [1.1]; $t=-$
3 3.9 , $p=0.004$), 12° (-4.1° [2]; $t=-6.5$, $p<0.001$), or 24° (-8.8° [2.5°]; $t=11.2$, $p<0.001$).
4
5

6 JW never wrote with the smallest sign of spatial dysgraphia but with a consistent vertically
7 oriented bias persistent for at least 9 months (although attenuated), even though the spatial
8 neglect disappeared and representation of the SSA was normal. This observation excluded a
9 causal association between spatial neglect and tilted writing and helps in understanding why
10 prism adaptation improves neglect-related signs of spatial dysgraphia but not line
11 inclinations[7]. In contrast, JW showed disorders related to verticality bias, with a
12 counterclockwise tilt consistent in magnitude for 2 modalities of verticality perception:
13 drawing and both components of handwriting (i.e., left margin and lines), the writing keeping
14 isotropic dimensions and orthogonality between margin and line deviations. Two ways to
15 modulate spatial representation brought consistent additional information. When submitted to
16 a procedure that should transiently attenuate his verticality bias, JW wrote with an attenuated
17 tilt. When instructed to follow tilted lines, he failed to write on lines tilted to the side opposite
18 his own verticality bias and only succeeded with the lines that greatly tilted in the same
19 direction as his own verticality bias.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 This case study demonstrates that tilted handwriting may result from a biased representation
34 of the vertical. It argues for a multi-determined impaired spatial organization of writing after
35 right hemisphere lesions[14], responding to several mechanisms: spatial neglect, feed-back
36 related errors, or motor direction bias and also bias in the representation of the vertical. JW
37 correctly constructed letters that excluded feed-back-related errors. His drawing was also
38 homogeneously tilted, which excluded a motor bias error. This tilt had detrimental
39 consequences on executing the task, slower than for controls.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 This extends to handwriting the close link between perception and action with respect to the
48 vertical, until now documented only for postural control. The detection of tilted handwriting
49 could signal a biased representation of the vertical, which should be explored[15].
50
51
52
53

54 In conclusion, our case study brings new insights into tilted writing, which must be
55 differentiated from other signs of spatial dysgraphia and may be caused by a bias in the
56 representation of the vertical. Our observations open a new avenue for both clinical practice
57 and research.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

REFERENCES

1. Rapp B,O Dufor, The neurotopography of written word production: an fMRI investigation of the distribution of sensitivity to length and frequency. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011;23:4067-81.
2. Ardila A,M Rosselli, Spatial agraphia. *Brain Cogn* 1993;22:137-47.
3. Cubelli R, A Guiducci,P Consolmagno, Afferent dysgraphia after right cerebral stroke: an autonomous syndrome? *Brain Cogn* 2000;44:629-44.
4. Jang DH, MW Kim, KH Park,JW Lee, Language-specific dysgraphia in Korean patients with right brain stroke: influence of unilateral spatial neglect. *J Korean Med Sci* 2015;30:323-7.
5. Yoon JH, MK Suh,H Kim, Language-specific dysgraphia in Korean stroke patients. *Cogn Behav Neurol* 2010;23:247-55.
6. Hécaen H,P Marcie, *Disorders of written language following right hemisphere lesions, in Hemisphere function in the human brain*, I.S.J.D.J.G. Beaumont, Editor 1974, Elek: London.
7. Rode G, L Pisella, L Marsal, S Mercier, Y **Rossetti**,D Boisson, Prism adaptation improves spatial dysgraphia following right brain damage. *Neuropsychologia* 2006;44:2487-93.
8. Perennou DA, G Mazibrada, V Chauvineau, R Greenwood, J Rothwell, MA Gresty, et al., Lateropulsion, pushing and verticality perception in hemisphere stroke: a causal relationship? *Brain* 2008;131:2401-13.
9. Jeannerod M,B Biguer, *The directional coding of reaching movements. A visuomotor conception of spatial neglect*, in *Neurophysiological and neuropsychological aspects of spatial neglect.*, M. Jeannerod, Editor 1987, North-Holland: Amsterdam. p. 87-113.
10. Barra J, A Marquer, R Joassin, C Reymond, L Metge, V Chauvineau, et al., Humans use internal models to construct and update a sense of verticality. *Brain* 2010;133:3552-63.
11. Gainotti G,C Tiacci, Patterns of drawing disability in right and left hemispheric patients. *Neuropsychologia* 1970;8:379-84.
12. Hamstra-Bletz L, J DeBie,B Den Brinker, *Concise Evaluation Scale for children's handwriting*. 1987, Germany: Lise,Swets, Zeitlinger.
13. Guinet E,S Kandel, Ductus: a software package for the study of handwriting production. *Behav Res Methods* 2010;42:326-32.
14. Croisile B,O Hibert, Spatial or afferent agraphia without left-sided neglect. *Aphasiology* 1998; 12:147-159.
15. Piscicelli C,D Perennou, Visual verticality perception after stroke: A systematic review of methodological approaches and suggestions for standardization. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med* 2017;60:208-216.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Spatial neglect in JW after right hemispheric stroke at 2, 3 and 9 months (M2, M3, M9) post-stroke

Peripersonal neglect was assessed by the Bells (cancellation) test (Gauthier et al., 1989), line bisection test (mean deviation for 2 lines of 200 mm), copying a landscape (Gainotti & Tiacci, 1970), text-reading, and overlapping figures test (Gainotti, D'Erme, & Bartolomeo, 1991). Personal neglect was assessed by the thumb-finding test (Bisiach, Perani, Vallar, & Berti, 1986), the reformulated comb-and-razor test (Beschlin & Robertson, 1997; McIntosh et al., 2000) and the Fluff-Test (Cocchini et al., 2001). The Catherine Bergego Scale was also used, giving ecological information about both body and non-body neglect (Bergego et al., 1995). Asterisks indicate pathological scores. Details on these methodological references are in the references section of additional material.


	M2	M3	M9
Body neglect scores			
Bisiach test (0 to 3, cut-off > 0)	1*	3*	0
Comb test (% neglect index, cut-off > 11%)	13*	0	9
Razor test (% neglect index, cut-off > 11%)	21*	0	0
Fluff-Test (omissions 0 to 15, cut-off > 2)	3*	2	0
Non-body neglect scores			
Bells cancellation test (total omissions, cut-off ≥ 6)	1	1	1
Line bisection (ipsilesional deviation in mm, cut-off ≥ 7 mm)	20*	5.5	-2
Landscape copying (omissions 0 to 5, cut-off > 0)	0	0	0
Text reading (omissions, cut-off > 0)	0	0	0
Overlapping figures test (omissions, cut-off > 0)	0	0	0
Neglect in daily life score			
Catherine Bergego Scale	6.3	4.4	0

1 **Figure 1. Some puzzling behaviors presented by JW after a right hemisphere stroke.**

2
3 **A)** Axial Flair MRI slice and **B)** coronal FSE T2-weighted MRI slice 2 months after stroke,
4 showing a right parietal hematoma in resorption. **C)** Leftward lateropulsion and pusher
5 behavior in standing. **D)** Line bisection 1 month after stroke. The 21-mm ipsilesional
6 deviation indicated severe spatial neglect (cut-off 6.5 mm). **E)** Copying a landscape (Gainotti
7 and Tiacci, 1970) 1 month after stroke, showing signs of spatial neglect (left parts of the first
8 tree and the house) associated with a -12° inclination of the main axis of the drawing. **F)** Short
9 text written by JW before the stroke. Main line axes were approximately horizontal (0.5°). **G)**
10 Short text written by JW after stroke showing a global counterclockwise tilt (plain blue lines).
11 The dashed blue line represents the horizontal reference. Plain blue lines indicate the
12 inclination of the orthogonal coordinate system. The mean tilt of lines was -9.4° and mean tilt
13 of the left margin -9° . Finally, counterclockwise tilts observed after stroke were all congruent
14 in direction and amplitude: drawing, margin and lines. **H-K)** JW's handwriting on cued
15 (lined) paper, with lines traced 24° upward (H), 12° upward (I), 24° downward (J) and 12°
16 downward (K).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



e-component

[Click here to download e-component: AdditionalMaterial.docx](#)