Manuscript accepted for publication in *Neurobiology of Aging*

# Perirhinal cortex is associated with fine-grained discrimination of conceptually confusable objects in Alzheimer's disease

Aurélien Frick[1,2*], Gabriel Besson[3], Eric Salmon[1] and Emma Delhaye[1,2,4]

[1] GIGA-CRC In Vivo Imaging, University of Liège, Belgium

[2] Psychology and Neuroscience of Cognition Research Unit, University of Liège, Belgium

[3] CINEICC, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Coimbra, Portugal

[4] CICPSI, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Lisboa, Portugal

***Corresponding author:**

Aurélien Frick

GIGA-Cyclotron Research Center In Vivo Imaging

Allée du 6 Août, B30

4000 Liège

Belgium

Email: aurelien.frick@uliege.be or aurelien.frick@hotmail.com

**Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to acknowledge the inspiration and support from Christine Bastin, as well as her helpful suggestions with the manuscript.

**Funding**

This work was funded by the Alzheimer Research Foundation (SAO-FRA 2020/0031), FRS.-FNRS, and the Léon Frédéricq Foundation

**Disclosure statement**

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

**CRediT roles**

Aurélien Frick, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Gabriel Besson, Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

Eric Salmon, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing

Emma Delhaye, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Project administration, Writing – review & editing

## Highlights

- The perirhinal cortex (PrC) is damaged early in Alzheimer's disease (AD)
- It allows for conceptually and perceptually confusable objects discrimination
- We investigated perceptual and conceptual discrimination in different tasks
- Conceptual confusability disambiguation was linked to the left PrC
- Conceptual discrimination of confusable objects can be a marker of PrC damage

## Abstract

The perirhinal cortex (PrC) stands among the first brain areas to deteriorate in Alzheimer's disease (AD). Many efforts have been made to understand its role in different cognitive functions, to eventually identify early cognitive markers of AD. Based on recent research, the present paper tests to what extent the PrC is involved in representing and discriminating confusable objects based on the conjunction of their perceptual and conceptual features. To this aim, AD patients and control counterparts performed three tasks: a naming task, a recognition memory task, and a conceptual matching task, where we manipulated conceptual confusability and, in the recognition memory task, perceptual confusability. In addition, a high-resolution structural MRI of the antero-lateral parahippocampal subregions was obtained for each participant. The main results were that the sensibility to conceptual confusability was associated with the left PrC volume in both AD patients and control participants for the recognition memory task, while it was specifically associated with the volume of the left PrC in AD patients for the conceptual matching task. This suggests that a decreased volume of the PrC is related to the ability to disambiguate conceptually confusable items. Therefore, testing recognition memory or conceptual matching of easily conceptually confusable items can provide a potential cognitive marker of PrC atrophy.


Key words: perirhinal cortex, Alzheimer's disease, episodic memory, semantic memory, conceptual distance, perceptual distance

## Introduction

It is well-established that the medial temporal lobe (MTL), comprising the hippocampus, entorhinal (ErC), perirhinal (PrC) and parahippocampal cortices, is critical for declarative long-term memory (Squire et al., 2004). In this system, the PrC, composed of Brodmann areas (BA) 35 and 36, has received increasing interest in the last decades with a particular focus on its role in cognition (for a review, see Suzuki & Naya, 2014). The PrC plays a key role in memory-related behaviors such as the ability to recognize a previously experienced stimulus (Squire et al., 2007) and especially using familiarity, as opposed to recollection (e.g., Brown & Aggleton, 2001. For instance, a rare lesion-based human neuropsychological case (NB), who had a surgical resection of a large portion of the PrC sparing the hippocampus, presents impaired familiarity with preserved recollection (Bowles et al., 2007). This line of evidence has also received strong support by a wide variety of neuroimaging studies (see Bastin et al., 2019, for review).

The MTL is widely connected with the neocortex, and the PrC receives much of its neocortical input from the ventral visual stream (VVS; Suzuki & Amaral, 1994), which is critical to build perceptual representations of objects (Lee et al., 2012). This has led some researchers to interpret the PrC as an extension of the representational hierarchy within the VVS for object identification (Murray & Bussey, 1999), making this cortex responsible for processing and storing representations of complex feature conjunctions (Bussey & Saksida, 2007). Based on this idea, Bussey et al. (2002) introduced the perceptual–mnemonic/feature conjunction (PMFC) model that emphasizes the conjunctive processing function of the PrC, required to perform fine-grained perceptual discrimination between highly similar objects composed of overlapping features. This model has been supported by multiple subsequent imaging and lesion studies, which have linked the PrC with fine-grained visual discrimination of perceptually ambiguous objects (e.g., Barense et al., 2007; Buckley & Gaffan, 2006; Bussey

et al., 2005; Inhoff et al., 2019). In addition, some recent lesion and neuroimaging studies have suggested that this role of fine-grained object discrimination could be extended to the antero-lateral ErC (alErC) onto which the PrC projects directly, through the integration of the object with additional spatial features (Connor & Knierim, 2017; Ferko et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, not all inputs received by the PrC come from the VVS. Indeed, the PrC also receives multi-modal projections, such as from the insular cortex and area 13 of the orbitofrontal cortex (Suzuki & Amaral, 1994), and is also part of the anterior temporal lobe, that is considered by predominant semantic memory models as a semantic hub responsible for the amodal integration of conceptual information (Patterson et al., 2007; Ralph et al., 2016). As such, the left PrC has recently been identified as key for the integration of the meaning of object representations derived from visual information (Clarke & Tyler, 2015; Martin et al., 2018; Price et al., 2017; see Bastin et al., 2019) and is recruited when conceptually confusable objects must be differentiated (Bruffaerts et al., 2019; Clarke & Tyler, 2015; Kivisaari et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2015). Therefore, the cognitive role of the PrC is not only dealing with the conjunction of perceptual features, but also with the conjunction of conceptual features (Martin et al., 2018), even though it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a perceptual and conceptual feature (e.g., "has four legs"). This also implies that the PrC should not be confined to a role in mnemonic similarity tasks (Kent et al., 2016) developed under Yassa and Stark's model of pattern separation (Yassa & Stark, 2011). Indeed, under the assumption of a role in conceptual or perceptual disambiguation, its function is thus not restricted to memory, nor to discrimination between similar exemplars of the same concept but also to discrimination between exemplars representing different concepts or percepts, as long as they overlap. Taken together, these theories seem to point to the idea that the role of the PrC could be better understood by considering the type of representation it underlies (i.e., fine-grained representation of fully specified object concepts), rather than the type of process it supports

(episodic memory *vs.* semantic memory *vs.* perception) (Sheldon et al., 2019; Bastin et al., 2019). However, as to what type of representation it precisely supports, the question remains elusive to date.

Critically, the study of the cognitive function of the PrC is particularly relevant in the frame of Alzheimer's disease (AD) research. AD-related neuropathology starts years before the onset of behavioral symptoms leading to AD diagnosis, and occurs as accumulation of tau neurofibrillary tangles propagates in the brain (see Sexton et al., 2022). More precisely, Stage 1 of AD concerns the transentorhinal cortex, corresponding to BA 35 within the PrC and to the alErC (see Braak & Braak, 1991, Braak & Braak, 1997). As such, one may predict that patients diagnosed with AD should display impairments when it comes to recruiting the cognitive functions supported by this region. We recently proposed that the very first impairment occurring early in the course of AD would thereby affect representations at the level of entity by binding its perceptuo-conceptual features enabling to differentiate it from similar but distinct entities (Bastin & Delhaye, 2023).

While studies exploring familiarity processing in patients with AD or with Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) at risk of AD led to inconsistent results (see Koen & Yonelinas, 2014; Schoemaker et al., 2014), some studies showed evidence for impairments in MCI patients to perform tasks requiring the fine perceptual discrimination of objects (Newsome et al., 2012; Yeung et al., 2013). Moreover, recent work showed that the volume of the alErC significantly and selectively predicts the processing of the spatial arrangement of conjunctive objects features in healthy aging (Yeung et al., 2017) as well as the ability to discriminate in memory between similar objects despite being differently presented at recognition using familiarity in amnestic MCI patients (Besson et al., 2020). In addition, studies have also reported a greater vulnerability to distinguish between distinctive features (e.g., "has stripes") than shared ones (e.g., "has four legs") early in the course of AD, causing close concepts to become gradually supported solely

by shared features, and eventually merge these concepts together into a single unit (Laisney et al., 2011). This degradation was shown across a variety of tasks where distinctive features were manipulated such as in naming (Garrard et al., 2005), semantic priming (Laisney et al., 2011), or recognition memory (Flanagan et al., 2013). Finally, two studies have demonstrated an impaired capacity in AD patients to name (Kivisaari et al., 2012) and to discriminate in memory (Kivisaari et al., 2013) what the authors considered as "confusable" concepts, and this impairment was related to the atrophy of the left medial PrC.

Yet, these aforementioned studies considered "conceptual confusability" between object concepts as the distinction between belonging (confusable) or not (not confusable) to the same category-domain (living *vs.* non-living). In other words, in these studies, all living things were considered more "confusable" than non-living things. This is based on the idea put forward by some models of semantic memory that living things are inherently more confusable than non-living things due to their conceptual structure (see the Conceptual Structure Account (CSA); see Clarke & Tyler, 2015, for review). According to these models, concepts confusability could be precisely characterized by computing their feature-based statistics using feature-based matrices, where conceptual confusability would be defined by the number of conceptual features that they share, their tendency to co-occur, as well as the number of distinctive features that a particular concept has as compared to other concepts from the same category. Depending on these measures, a concept might be more or less confusable with other concepts. Yet, despite the fact that living concepts are thought to be inherently more confusable in nature, because they share a greater number of features that tend to co-occur more often, and tend to have less distinctive features, there should still be more and less confusable concepts in both living and non-living domains. On this basis, Wright et al. (2015) developed a quantitative measure of the sensitivity to conceptual confusability, which relates performance to a quantitative distance between objects, based on their internal conceptual structure defined by their features. Thereby,

this method goes beyond the approximative distinction between living *vs.* non-living used in previous studies (Kivisaari et al., 2012, 2013). Here we suggest that this method can then also be extended to perceptual distances between objects. Yet, to date, no study has ever used it to assess sensibility to perceptual confusability.

In this study, with the aim to better characterize the cognitive role of the MTL regions, and more specifically of the PrC region, we tested the hypothesis according to which this region is involved in conceptual and/or perceptual fine-grained discrimination, regardless of the type of memory involved, be it semantic or episodic, or the type of task. To do so, we sought to better quantify and characterize conceptual confusability among living and non-living things. We implemented several tasks assessing a variety of cognitive functions all requiring fine conceptual discrimination (naming task, subsequent recognition memory and conceptual matching task). Across these tasks, we manipulated conceptual similarity across living and non-living things, using the quantification metrics of conceptual similarity developed by feature-based models. In addition, for the recognition memory task only, we accounted for perceptual similarity between to-be-discriminated items (see Wright et al., 2015 and Naspi et al., 2022 for a similar method, and the Methods section for details). Our main hypothesis was that in both the recognition memory and conceptual matching tasks, higher conceptual similarity would be related to the integrity of the left PrC in patients with AD but not in control participants. Indeed, we expected patients' variability in volumes and cognitive scores to come predominantly from a similar factor (the AD pathology within the transentorhinal region) while controls' variability - in the absence of such a common factor - to come from a more diverse set of factors not necessarily affecting simultaneously volumes and cognitive scores.

## Methods

### *Participants*

A total of 24 patients diagnosed with mild probable AD (clinical criteria from McKhann et al., 2011) and 23 control participants took part in the study. They were matched in terms of age and education level. All participants were community-dwelling individuals; they were all French-speaking, had normal or corrected-to-normal vision, and reported no neurological or psychiatric history (except for the disease in the case of AD patients). They all underwent a short neuropsychological evaluation. Demographics and neuropsychological data are shown in Table 1. The study was approved by the Ethics committee of the Medicine Faculty of the University of Liège. Participants signed an informed consent form prior to taking part in the experiment.

**Table 1. Demographic information and comparison of the neuropsychological evaluation between AD patients and control participants (t-tests).**

| | AD patients Mean (SD) | Control Participants Mean (SD) | *p*-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Female/Male | 10/14 | 11/12 | |
| Age | 74.79 (6.30) | 72.26 (4.18) | .113 |
| Education | 12.46 (3.09) | 13.09 (3.34) | .506 |
| MoCA | 21.00 (3.16) | 27.43 (1.27) | < .001 |
| Letter fluency | 16.29 (7.36) | 18.96 (4.47) | .142 |
| Category fluency | 18.62 (6.83) | 26.26 (5.32) | < .001 |
| WAIS-3 digit symbol substitution | 16.37 (14.50) | 18.91 (18.72) | .605 |
| WAIS-3 vocabulary | 31.85 (9.09) | 37.21 (7.82) | .056 |
| WMS-3 Logical Memory immediate recall | 7.96 (3.42) | 13.13 (3.44) | < .001 |

*Materials*

276 object concepts were selected from 16 categories of living and non-living things from existing feature norms (CSLB property norms, Devereux et al., 2014) and were translated into French. Each selected concept was associated with a picture representing the object it defines. In a pilot test, an independent group of 10 young participants evaluated the exemplarity of the picture for the concept-label on a scale from 1 (not representative at all) to 7 (very representative). Pictures received mean exemplarity judgements of 6.18 (range: 4.5 - 7). Concepts pairs (e.g., target-distractor pairs in the memory task, or test-pairs in the conceptual matching task) were characterized by an index of conceptual similarity as the cosine between their production frequency vectors within the feature norms database (McRae et al., 2005). We also extracted measures from the CSA representing the interaction between feature sharedness and their correlational strength ('correlation x distinctiveness', CxD), which represents the extent to which concepts are distinctive (with more or less distinctive features, that more or less co-occur with one another) and thus, whether they will be more easily identified or will require additional differentiation processes.

In addition, perceptual distances between stimuli pairs in the episodic recognition task were computed using the HMax computational model of vision (available at http://cbcl.mit.edu/software- datasets/standardmodel), following Clarke et al.'s study (2015). HMax models different hierarchical stages of the ventral processing stream in different layers, progressing from early visual cortex (V1/V2) to posterior inferior temporal cortex (IT). The C1 layers correspond to increasingly position- and scale-invariant early visual cortex (V1/V2) that maintain feature specificity, while C2 layers simulate the extrastriate visual area cells (V4/IT) that integrate visual features from previous layers to represent object shape. Measures based on these two layers have been validated in studies of visual object recognition that have distinguished the time courses and neural correlates of semantic versus visual processing (Clarke & Tyler, 2014; Clarke et al., 2015). Here, we captured the C1 and C2 responses of

HMax IT (hence respectively capturing low- and mid-level visual object information (Riesenhuber & Poggio, 1999; Serre et al., 2007), on our images resized to 92 x 92, using the same setting (i.e., Serre et al., 2005) and precomputed S2 features from natural image fragments). Principal components analyses were then performed on each matrix, concatenating respectively C1 and C2 features across all stimuli, and only the respectively 12 and 6 best components were kept and concatenated in a single matrix of 18 visual features per stimuli. The perceptual distance between two stimuli was then computed as the euclidean distance between the 18-values vectors of each stimulus.

*Procedure*

Participants completed three tasks: a naming task, a recognition memory task and a conceptual matching task. These tasks are described in the following.

Naming task. 96 pictures of object concepts were presented one by one on a monitor for 3 seconds, preceded by a fixation cross (500 ms) and followed by a blank screen (500 ms). Half of the pictures represented living things and the other half represented non-living things. Participants were asked to name the object represented in the picture at a basic-level within the 3 seconds presentation to avoid any ceiling effects, especially in control participants. Participants' verbal answers given within the 3-seconds presentation of the stimuli were collected by the experimenter using a dedicated answer-sheet. The naming task served as incidental encoding for the subsequent forced-choice recognition memory task that directly followed.

Recognition memory task. 60 unique pictures (30 living & 30 non-living) from the naming task were randomly selected and matched with a distractor from the same subordinate categories (e.g., birds, mammals, etc.) (Figure 1). Each target-distractor pair was associated with an index of their conceptual distance extracted from the feature-norms database (cosine), as well as with

an index of their perceptual distance. There was no difference of conceptual distance between living and non-living pairs ($M_{\text{Living Pairs}}$ = 0.74 vs. $M_{\text{Non-Living Pairs}}$ = 0.72, $t$ = 0.30, $df$ = 58, $p$ = .765) but this was not true for perceptual distance, with non-living pairs being more perceptually distant than living pairs ($M_{\text{Living Pairs}}$ = 3.75 vs. $M_{\text{Non-Living Pairs}}$ = 4.53, $t$ = -3.24, $df$ = 58, $p$ = .002). Each trial began with a fixation cross (500 ms) followed by the target-distractor pairs. Each pair was presented on the monitor for 3 seconds and ended with a 500 ms blank screen. Within the 3-seconds presentation, participants were asked to indicate which of the two presented pictures was presented in the previous naming task using the right and left arrows of the keyboard.

Conceptual matching task. Trials for the conceptual matching task began with a fixation cross (500 ms) followed by a word-picture pair (120 trials in total) presented for 3 seconds and ended by a 500 ms blank screen. In half of the pairs, the picture matched the concept label (filler trials), while in the other half, the word and the picture did not correspond to the same concept, although the two concepts represented by the word and by the picture belonged to the same superordinate category. Cosine similarity was computed between each word-picture non-matching pair, half of the non-matching trials being livings, and the other half, non-livings. There was no difference of conceptual distance between living and non-living pairs ($M_{\text{Living Pairs}}$ = 0.34 vs. $M_{\text{Non-Living Pairs}}$ = 0.35, $t$ = -0.25, $df$ = 118 $p$ = .892). Participants were instructed to determine whether the word referred to the same concept as the one represented in the picture or not (Figure 1). Participants answered verbally, and their answers were encoded by the experimenter using the response-keys “1” or “2”.



Figure 1. Example of trials from the recognition memory task (left) and of the conceptual matching task (right) for living object concepts, illustrating concepts from higher vs. lower conceptual distance values from the distribution of our sampled materials.

*MRI acquisition*

Images were acquired on a 3T Siemens Prisma scanner with a 64-channel head coil. Two anatomical images were acquired: a T1-weighted structural MRI (acquisition matrix = 240 x 256 x 224, voxel size = 1 x 1 x 1 $mm^3$) and a high-resolution T2-weighted structural MRI (acquisition matrix = 448 x 448 x 60, voxel size = .4 x .4 x 1.2 $mm^3$) with a partial field of view covering the entire MTL with an oblique coronal orientation perpendicular to the long axis of the hippocampus. The quality of each image was systemically visually checked, especially the T2-MRI that is highly sensitive to movement (after reminding the participant to stay still during the entire following 8 minutes of acquisition). When T2-MRI were acquired twice (N=14), we chose the image with the best quality for further processing.

*Volume segmentation*

High-resolution T2-MRI was labeled using the Automatic Segmentation of Hippocampal Subfields software package using an atlas package available online ('ashs_atlas_upennpmc_20161128', from the NITRC repository made available on ASHS website) (Yushkevich, Amaral, et al., 2015). This atlas package was generated from images manually segmented following classical documentation for the hippocampus segmentation (Adler et al., 2014; Duvernoy, 1988) and Ding and van Hoesen (2010) procedure for the ErC and PrC segmentation (the landmark used by this manual protocol for the anterior extent of the PrC - i.e., 2 mm anterior to the first slice of the hippocampal head – cuts off an anterior portion of the PrC (see also Yushkevich et al., 2015). The hippocampus, the ErC, BA35 and BA36 in the left and right hemisphere were thereby labeled in each participant. Each ASHS output was

visually checked for quality control. For the ErC and PrC subregions, volumes were normalized by the extent of their segmentation in the slice direction (hippocampal axis), dividing their volume by the product of the number of slices and the slice thickness (Yushkevich et al., 2015). In addition, regional volumes were adjusted before analyses to account for total estimated intracranial volume (ICV) for each participant using the formula $Volume_{adjusted} = Volume_{raw} - \beta_{ICV}(ICV_{indiv} - ICV_{mean})$, where β refers to the regression coefficient of the model on a given regional volume of interest while using ICV as predictor, based on extensive prior work (e.g., Delhaye et al., 2019, Gellersen et al., 2022, Yeung et al., 2017).

*Data analyses*

The data were analyzed with R version 4.1.2 (Team R Core, 2021). We analyzed accuracy on the three behavioral tasks on a trial-by-trial basis with binomial Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) to account for the binary outcome (0, 1) of the dependent variable. These models were fit with the package *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015). This model was run on accuracy of the naming task with group (AD, control) as a between-subjects factor, domain (living, non-living) as a within-subject factor, and CxD (to account for conceptual confusability) as a continuous factor (centered scale). Additionally, participant's ID and trial number were set as random factors. Another binomial GLMM was run for the recognition memory task with conceptual distance and perceptual distance based on the indices of perceptual and conceptual distance (both centered scale) as continuous factors. A third GLMM as that for the recognition memory task was run for the matching task with the same factors, with the exclusion of perceptual distance (because the pairs consisted of a word and a picture). Following these GLMMs, pairwise comparisons were used with Tukey's adjustments when there were multiplicity issues using the *emmeans* package (Lenth, 2020) and the function *lstrends* from *lsmeans* package to deal with continuous factors; estimated marginal means

(EMMs) from the models are reported. Plots of the results were obtained using the *ggplot2* package (Wickham, 2016) and error bars represent standard errors.

To investigate the recognition memory and matching tasks in relation with the integrity of the sub-hippocampal regions, we used a measure of the 'accuracy sensitivity to conceptual/perceptual similarity'. To compute this measure, we adapted Wright et al. (2015)'s method by correlating each participant's accuracy to the conceptual distance value on a trial-by-trial level using Pearson correlations and then transforming each Rho-value obtained for each participant by a Fisher transformation to give a Z-score. We also implemented the same method to compute a measure of 'accuracy sensitivity to perceptual similarity' using the perceptual distance in the recognition memory task only. We then examined how these scores were associated with eight volumes of brain regions of interest: left and right ErC, left and right BA35, left and right BA36, and left and right hippocampus score (average of the volumes CA fields, dentate gyrus, and subiculum) separately for AD patients and control participants using multiple regressions. Importantly, these relations were controlled by the cognitive level as evidenced by the score at the MoCA, which was added as a control variable in our regression analyses[1]. Finally, we conducted these analyses separately between living and non-living stimuli for conceptual distance in AD patients only (we did not run these in control participants due to ceiling effects, nor for the perceptual distance, because of the observed significant difference between living and non-living stimuli in terms of this distance).

The data used for these analyses as well as the analytic codes are publicly available on the Open Science Framework repository: https://osf.io/r4gfy/

[1] We also explored how the performance at the naming task could explain the relation between the brain volumes and conceptual and perceptual distance in the recognition and matching tasks. Yet, as these analyses did not reveal any significant effect of the naming performance, see Analytic Code "Supp_Analyses_NamingVar_AD.R" on https://osf.io/r4gfy/.

## Results

*Naming task*

Regarding the accuracy on the naming task, there were main effects of group, $\chi^2 = 22.46$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, and domain, $\chi^2 = 8.45$, $df = 1$, $p = .004$, but not of CxD, $p = .290$. This indicated that, overall, control participants were more accurate than AD participants ($M_{control} = .91$ *vs.* $M_{AD} = .78$) and accuracy was higher for non-living stimuli than for living stimuli ($M_{living} = .80$ *vs.* $M_{non\text{-}living} = .90$). Interestingly, group and domain significantly interacted, $\chi^2 = 24.52$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, revealing that whereas accuracy was similar between living and non-living stimuli for control participants ($M_{living} = .90$ *vs.* $M_{non\text{-}living} = .92$, $p = .250$), it was higher for non-living stimuli than for living stimuli in AD participants ($M_{living} = .64$ *vs.* $M_{non\text{-}living} = .87$, $p < .001$; Figure 2). Control participants showed higher accuracy than AD participants for both living and non-living stimuli, *ps* < .026. Naming was not influenced by conceptual confusability.

*Recognition memory task*

Regarding accuracy on the recognition memory task, the analysis revealed main effects of group, $\chi^2 = 37.35$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, domain, $\chi^2 = 8.75$, $df = 1$, $p = .003$, and conceptual distance, $\chi^2 = 7.66$, $df = 1$, $p = .006$, but not of perceptual distance, $p = .751$. Overall, control participants were significantly more accurate than AD patients ($M_{control} = .99$ *vs.* $M_{AD} = .88$), accuracy for non-living stimuli was significantly higher than for living stimuli ($M_{living} = .94$ *vs.* $M_{non\text{-}living} = .97$) and the estimated marginal mean of linear trend for conceptual distance was positive (1.98) meaning that accuracy significantly increased as conceptual distance increased (Figure 2). No interactions were significant, *ps* > .168.

Table 2 shows the results of the multiple regression assessing the relation between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the volume of the different brain regions within the MTL. As indicated in Table 2, only the left BA36 was significantly associated with accuracy

sensitivity to conceptual similarity in both AD patients, $t = 2.20$, $p = .045$, and control participants, $t = 2.39$, $p = .038$. No other regions turned out to be significant in both populations, *ps* > .088.

Regarding accuracy sensitivity to perceptual similarity, none of the regions of the MTL was associated with this measure for both AD patients and control participants, *ps* > .099 (Table 2).

**Table 2. Multiple regressions between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual and perceptual similarity and the volumes of the different brain regions of the MTL for the recognition memory task.**

| | Conceptual Similarity | | | | | | Perceptual Similarity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Control participants | | | AD patients | | | Control participants | | | AD patients | | |
| Variables | β | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* | B | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* |
| Left BA35 | -0.010 | -0.574 | 0.579 | -0.017 | -1.506 | 0.154 | -0.034 | -1.818 | 0.099 | -0.0003 | -0.032 | 0.975 |
| Right BA35 | -0.008 | -0.916 | 0.381 | 0.005 | 0.492 | 0.630 | -0.006 | -0.624 | 0.546 | -0.007 | -0.762 | 0.459 |
| Left BA36 | **0.008** | **2.392** | **0.038** | **0.006** | **2.204** | **0.045** | 0.001 | 0.415 | 0.687 | 0.0002 | 0.082 | 0.936 |
| Right BA36 | -0.002 | -0.586 | 0.571 | -0.001 | -0.404 | 0.693 | 0.003 | 1.218 | 0.251 | 0.003 | 1.140 | 0.272 |
| Left ERC | 0.008 | 0.743 | 0.474 | -0.005 | -0.379 | 0.7103 | -0.0003 | -0.025 | 0.980 | 0.013 | 1.366 | 0.194 |
| Right ERC | -0.030 | -1.888 | 0.088 | 0.008 | 0.738 | 0.473 | 0.010 | 0.603 | 0.560 | 0.005 | 0.560 | 0.585 |
| Left Hippocampus Score | 0.010 | 1.225 | 0.249 | -0.008 | -1.638 | 0.124 | 0.007 | 0.673 | 0.516 | -0.002 | -0.551 | 0.590 |
| Right Hippocampus Score | -0.002 | -0.313 | 0.761 | 0.006 | 1.257 | 0.229 | -0.002 | -0.363 | 0.724 | 0.002 | 0.408 | 0.689 |
| MoCA | -0.0003 | -0.019 | 0.985 | 0.002 | 0.146 | 0.886 | 0.024 | 1.172 | 0.268 | -0.003 | -0.306 | 0.764 |

*Conceptual matching task*

This analysis revealed a main effect of group, $\chi^2 = 29.84$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, domain, $\chi^2 = 5.45$, $df = 1$, $p = .020$, and conceptual distance, $\chi^2 = 34.69$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$. Overall, control participants showed significantly higher accuracy than AD participants ($M_{control} = .97$ *vs.* $M_{AD} = .87$), accuracy for non-living stimuli was significantly higher than for living stimuli ($M_{living} = .90$ *vs.* $M_{non\text{-}living} = .96$) and the direction for conceptual distance was positive (estimated marginal mean of linear trend = 4.32), revealing that accuracy significantly increased as conceptual distance increased (Figure 2). No interactions were significant, *ps* > .083.




Figure 2. Naming accuracy as function of group, domain and CxD (A), recognition memory accuracy (B) and conceptual matching accuracy (C) as a function of group, domain and conceptual distance.

Table 3 indicates the results of the multiple regression analyses regarding the relation between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the volumes of the different brain regions within the MTL. For AD patients, the analysis yielded significant effects on the left BA36

(PrC), $t$ = -2.55, $p$ = .023, but not on other regions, *ps* > .059. For control participants, none of the brain volumes were significantly associated with this measure, *ps* > .056.

**Table 3. Multiple regressions between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the volume of the different brain regions of the MTL in the conceptual matching task**

| | Control participants | | | AD patients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | β | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* |
| Left BA35 | 0.007 | 0.375 | 0.714 | 0.024 | 2.052 | 0.059 |
| Right BA35 | -0.016 | -1.206 | 0.249 | 0.021 | 1.896 | 0.079 |
| Left BA36 | -0.0002 | -0.041 | 0.968 | **-0.007** | **-2.554** | **0.023** |
| Right BA36 | 0.005 | 1.292 | 0.219 | -0.005 | -1.435 | 0.173 |
| Left ERC | -0.003 | -0.210 | 0.837 | -0.015 | -1.297 | 0.215 |
| Right ERC | 0.018 | 1.024 | 0.324 | -0.014 | -1.301 | 0.214 |
| Left Hippocampus Score | 0.019 | 1.558 | 0.143 | 0.003 | 0.552 | 0.590 |
| Right Hippocampus Score | -0.020 | -2.102 | 0.056 | 0.002 | 0.498 | 0.626 |
| MoCA | 0.013 | 0.478 | 0.640 | 0.005 | 0.351 | 0.731 |

*Living vs. non-living items in the recognition and matching tasks*

We applied the same regression analyses to investigate the relation between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the brain volumes of the MTL and doing so by considering living and non-living items separately for AD patients in both the recognition memory and conceptual matching tasks (Table 4). For the recognition task, these analyses revealed that the right PrC was significantly associated with the accuracy sensitivity measure for non-living items (right BA35: $t$ = 3.85, $p$ = .006; right BA36: $t$ = -2.65, $p$ = .033) but not other regions, *ps* > .063. For living items, no significant associations between the accuracy sensitivity measure and any brain regions were significant, *ps* > .082.

Regarding the conceptual matching task, no significant associations were found for living items, ps > .067, whereas for non-living items, both the left and right PrC and ErC were associated with the measure of accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity (right BA35: $t$ = 3.65, $p$ = .003; left BA35: $t$ = 2.30, $p$ = .037; right BA36: $t$ = -2.24, $p$ = .042; left BA36: $t$ = -2.38, $p$ = .032; right ERC: $t$ = -2.26, $p$ = .040; left ERC: $t$ = 2.17, $p$ = .047). The right and left hippocampus regions were not significantly associated with the accuracy sensitivity measure, *ps* > .319.

**Table 4. Multiple regressions between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the volumes of the different brain regions of the MTL for living and non-living stimuli in AD patients in the recognition memory task**

| | Recognition Task | | | | | | Matching Task | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Living | | | Non-Living | | | Living | | | Non-Living | | |
| Variables | β | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* | B | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* |
| Left BA35 | -0.020 | -1.147 | 0.271 | -0.027 | -2.206 | 0.063 | 0.023 | 1.333 | 0.204 | **0.026** | **2.299** | **0.037** |
| Right BA35 | -0.009 | -0.589 | 0.565 | **0.051** | **3.849** | **0.006** | 0.007 | 0.451 | 0.659 | **0.040** | **3.650** | **0.003** |
| Left BA36 | 0.007 | 1.875 | 0.082 | 0.007 | 2.125 | 0.071 | -0.008 | -1.982 | 0.067 | **-0.006** | **-2.377** | **0.032** |
| Right BA36 | 0.002 | 0.417 | 0.683 | **-0.010** | **-2.650** | **0.033** | -0.003 | -0.521 | 0.610 | **-0.007** | **-2.243** | **0.042** |
| Left ERC | -0.005 | -0.287 | 0.778 | -0.06 | -0.445 | 0.670 | -0.008 | -0.430 | 0.673 | **-0.025** | **-2.173** | **0.047** |
| Right ERC | 0.013 | 0.882 | 0.419 | 0.014 | 1.227 | 0.259 | 0.005 | -0.314 | 0.758 | **-0.024** | **-2.259** | **0.040** |
| Left Hippocampus Score | -0.007 | -0.947 | 0.360 | -0.007 | -0.987 | 0.356 | 0.003 | 0.377 | 0.712 | 0.003 | 0.573 | 0.576 |
| Right Hippocampus Score | 0.008 | 1.090 | 0.294 | -0.004 | -0.519 | 0.620 | -0.0001 | -0.017 | 0.986 | 0.005 | 1.033 | 0.319 |
| MoCA | -0.001 | -0.056 | 0.956 | 0.021 | 1.440 | 0.1930 | 0.016 | 0.795 | 0.440 | -0.008 | -0.570 | 0.578 |

*Comparison between mild and moderate AD patients*

In the light of the results obtained in the previous sections, we conducted exploratory analyses to examine the idea that the matching task might be particularly relevant to track PrC atrophy due to the AD neuropathology, for instance in individuals at risk to develop AD. We ran further analyses on conceptual confusability for the recognition memory and matching tasks by splitting the AD patients tested in our study into two groups based on the median of their scores at the MoCA. These low MoCA patients and high MoCA patients were matched in terms of age and education (for demographic information about these two groups, see Table S1 in the Supplementary Material). These analyses revealed that the only significant association was between the conceptual matching task and the volume of left BA36 of the AD patients with a low MoCA score ($t$ = - 2.60, $p$ = .048). Other associations failed to reach significance, $ps$ > .069 (Table 5).

**Table 5. Multiple regressions between accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the volume of the different brain regions of the MTL for AD patients with low scores at the MoCA (<=22; Low MoCA Group) and with high scores at the MoCA (>22; High MoCA Group) in the recognition memory task and the conceptual matching task.**

| | Recognition Memory | | | | | | Conceptual Matching | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low MoCA patients | | | High MoCA patients | | | Low MoCA patients | | | High MoCA patients | | |
| Variables | β | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* | B | *t* | *p-value* | β | *t* | *p-value* |
| Left BA35 | -0.042 | -2.308 | 0.069 | -0.042 | -2.308 | 0.069 | 0.031 | 1.539 | 0.184 | -0.003 | -0.179 | 0.888 |
| Right BA35 | 0.0002 | 0.012 | 0.991 | 0.0002 | 0.012 | 0.991 | 0.011 | 0.717 | 0.506 | -0.063 | -3.094 | 0.199 |
| Left BA36 | 0.006 | 1.659 | 0.158 | 0.006 | 1.659 | 0.158 | **-0.011** | **-2.597** | **0.048** | 0.015 | 3.503 | 0.972 |
| Right BA36 | -0.001 | -0.353 | 0.738 | -0.001 | -0.353 | 0.738 | -0.004 | -0.829 | 0.445 | 0.005 | 0.558 | 0.676 |
| Left ERC | 0.006 | 0.447 | 0.673 | 0.006 | 0.447 | 0.673 | -0.025 | -1.665 | 0.156 | 0.066 | 2.814 | 0.217 |
| Right ERC | -0.003 | -0.182 | 0.863 | -0.003 | -0.182 | 0.863 | -0.033 | -1.888 | 0.117 | -0.010 | -0.984 | 0.505 |
| Left Hippocampus Score | -0.014 | -1.686 | 0.153 | -0.014 | -1.686 | 0.153 | -0.0001 | -0.015 | 0.989 | -0.059 | -4.699 | 0.133 |
| Right Hippocampus Score | 0.019 | 1.733 | 0.144 | 0.019 | 1.733 | 0.144 | 0.015 | 1.204 | 0.282 | 0.014 | 1.489 | 0.376 |

**Discussion**

In the present study, we investigated fine-grained episodic and semantic discriminations of both perceptually (for episodic memory only) and conceptually confusable objects and their associations with the integrity of the brain structures of the MTL in AD patients and control counterparts, with the aim to improve our understanding of the role of the PrC region in cognition. More specifically, we used a quantitative measure to capture the structural conceptual and perceptual confusability of objects and their relation to performance to provide refined examinations of how volumes from the MTL structures are associated with finer-grained discrimination in AD (we called this score accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity).

First, behavioral results from the naming task showed that AD patients named less object concepts than control participants, but more particularly, that patients had difficulties for naming living stimuli as compared to non-living stimuli, regardless of their confusability, whereas no such difference was found for healthy volunteers. This result is in line with previous reports showing that AD patients experience word-finding difficulties and produce naming errors (e.g., 'hippopotamus' for 'rhinoceros') to a larger extent than healthy individuals, and that these difficulties seem to be especially important for living stimuli (see Laws et al., 2007). Interestingly, when subsequently asked to recognize the previously seen objects on a forced-choice recognition memory task, although AD patients showed poorer recognition memory performance than control participants (e.g., Goldstein et al., 2019), both populations showed lower recognition accuracy for living stimuli than for non-living stimuli, and for both groups and across domains, accuracy was particularly lower when the pairs of items were relatively conceptually close (e.g., seashell and crayfish) than when the pairs showed items that are conceptually distant (e.g., cat and camel). These results are partially consistent with the previous findings showing that AD patients' recognition memory is poorer for living than for

non-living stimuli (Kivisaari et al., 2013). Yet, contrary to this study, we found that poorer recognition of living stimuli as compared to non-living stimuli also holds for control participants, and that poorer memory in case of high conceptual confusability occurred regardless of the domain. One possible explanation for this difference could be related to the fact that there were 96 stimuli in our naming (and encoding) task whereas in Kivisaari et al. (2013), there were only 60 stimuli at encoding, therefore potentially making our encoding task costlier. Moreover, in our task, participants had to give their responses rapidly (3 seconds, see Methods), which measures a rapid access to concept, contrary to Kivisaari et al. (2013) who did not use such timing constraints in their design. In addition, this effect of conceptual confusability on memory in healthy subjects is relatively consistent with a study by Montefinese et al. (2015) showing that conceptual proximity between memory targets and lures, calculated using feature norms, induces an increase in false alarm rates, even in young subjects. However, controls' performance on this task is close to ceiling, limiting the variability in the dataset and potentially hindering statistical effects, so we are cautious about any further interpretations. In addition, a similar pattern was observed for the conceptual matching task.

At the brain level, our analyses focused on the accuracy sensitivity to similarity score (i.e., correlating accuracy with the conceptual or perceptual distance at the trial level for each subject) adapted from Wright et al. (2015). This method allows for finer conceptualization of conceptual confusability (see also Taylor et al., 2012) than considering objects' confusability as reflected by their domain, either living or non-living, hence using two discrete categories. Using this measure, we found that the left PrC (BA 36) was associated with greater accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity in both AD patients and control participants in the recognition memory task, and in AD patients only in the conceptual matching task, with a trend of an association with left BA 35 as well. Altogether, these results support the idea of a hemispheric specialization of the PrC, in accordance with previous findings on the importance

of the left PrC in fine-grained disambiguation for highly confusable objects specifically, relative to less confusable ones (see Bruffaerts et al. 2019 for review; Bruffaerts et al., 2013; Clarke & Tyler, 2014; Duke et al., 2017).

In addition, when disentangling stimuli as livings *vs* non-livings (Table 4) and investigating the association between our measure of accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity and the different brain regions in AD patients, we observed strong relations between the volume of the perirhinal and entorhinal cortices, with some interesting lateralization differences depending on the task. For the recognition task, the right PrC (BA 35 and BA 36) was associated with the measure of accuracy sensitivity for non-living items while, for living items, only the left PrC (BA 36) was marginally associated with this measure. In the matching task, on the other hand, both the left and right PrC (BA 35 and BA 36) and ErC were associated with accuracy sensitivity for non-living items whereas only the left PrC was marginally associated with performance for living items. The association between the ability to disambiguate non-living close concepts and the integrity of the right PrC might be explained by the coarse activation hypothesis (Jung-Beeman, 2005), which argues that semantic processing is coarser in the right than in the left hemisphere. Indeed, non-living stimuli are generally less complex than living stimuli in terms of their conceptual structure, and this might explain why distinguishing highly conceptually similar non-living concepts was more associated with the right PrC in AD patients. As for the left PrC, while it was also involved in the disambiguation of non-living items for the matching task (see also Liuzzi et al., 2019), it was specifically marginally associated with conceptual discrimination of more confusable items (i.e., living) in both tasks, fitting with the idea of a specific left-lateralized involvement of the PrC in fine-grained conceptual disambiguation (see Bruffaerts et al., 2019). Yet, more research is needed at this stage to unravel any potential lateralization of the PrC based on the type of items that have to be disambiguated and the type of the task.

Interestingly, our results showed correlations in both patients and controls in the recognition memory task, while only in patients in the conceptual matching task. We did not have expectations as to observing correlations in our control group, with the reasoning that controls' variability in PrC integrity would come from a diverse set of factors not necessarily affecting simultaneously volumes and cognitive scores. These correlations in controls suggest that our measure of sensitivity to conceptual confusability in recognition memory is highly sensitive to variations in PrC volume, and not only to variations due to AD neuropathology, probably due to the episodic nature of the task, known to favor the use of familiarity (Bastin & Vander Linden, 2003), that is also highly reliant on the PrC. As for the matching task, the association between the PrC and accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity did not hold for control participants. We interpret this discrepancy in control participants in terms of the nature of the tasks. Indeed, the recognition memory task is tapping at the interface of episodic and semantic processes, leaving room for some variability, especially coming from episodic memory. Conversely, the matching task is purely semantic, where it is not expected that healthy controls would show variability as semantic memory, if anything, improves in aging (Lalla et al., 2022). In line with this idea, we observed that, when splitting the sample according to the MoCA scores, there were non-significant associations between the brain volumes and the accuracy sensitivity to conceptual similarity for the recognition memory task whereas in the matching task, the left PrC (BA 36) was associated with this measure only for patients having lower scores at the MoCA. Therefore, it seems that the matching task might not be used as an early marker of PrC atrophy in the course of AD, although future studies using a sample of MCI patients would best allow to answer this question given the statistical limits of median split analyses (DeCoster et al., 2011), and the resulting small sample size for group comparisons and correlational analyses, that call for caution in their interpretation.

Concerning the recognition memory task, the absence of relation between our measure of sensitivity to perceptual similarity and the PrC was surprising in the light of the extensive literature showing PrC involvement in fine-grained perceptual discrimination (e.g., Inhoff et al., 2019; but see Gellersen et al., 2022). A possible explanation for this result is that the HMax model we used captures visual features from low- and mid-level visual information, which might not finely reflect human perceived similarity. Previous studies have indeed shown that models based on objects conceptual structure are better predictors of neural activity patterns associated with individual objects than the HMax model (Clarke et al., 2015), as the HMax model does not reflect abstract object information that is not directly related to the visual input, such as semantic domain (livings vs. non-livings) that has been used previously to characterize similarity in association with PrC integrity in healthy and pathological aging (Kivisaari et al., 2012, 2013).

Despite the important new findings evidenced in this study, it has nevertheless some limitations. First, it is now clear that brain volumes are not the most sensitive measure of the presence of AD in the brain, and more refined biomarkers exist to track the presence of AD neuropathology (Jack et al., 2018). Second, we used brain volumes as a proxy of brain function, although we reckon that functional alterations are not linearly linked with structural integrity changes (Jack et al., 2013). Illustrating these two limitations, it was convincingly shown that changes to the functional connectivity between MTL sub-regions related to tau pathology are associated with cognitive behavioral measures similar to ours in the absence of structural damage in cognitively unimpaired older adults (Berron et al., 2019). This limitation could thus explain why here, the brain volumes are not associated with cognitive performance for AD patients with higher scores at the MoCA as compared to those with lower scores (Table 5). Yet, our study aligns with a now extensive body of research using this correlational approach, all pointing to a clear association between regional volumes in the transentorhinal region and key

cognitive functions such as conceptual and perceptual discriminations, not only in AD, but also in MCI (Delhaye et al., 2019) and in at-risk older adults without complaints (Gellersen et al., 2022, Olsen et al., 2017, Yeung et al., 2017, 2019). In addition, the cross-sectional design employed might not be best to deal with the high variability of the neuro-cognitive profiles of AD patients, which could weaken the associations we investigated here (for a similar point albeit in healthy aging, see Armstrong et al., 2020). Future studies should use a longitudinal design to confirm cross-sectional findings that start to accumulate on the role of perirhinal shrinkage in the ability to disambiguate highly confusable objects across different tasks. Another limitation concerns the fact that our observed group differences for the associations between brain volumes and cognitive measures are based on significant and non-significant effects resulting from different statistical models. We acknowledge that conclusions could be stronger if the statistical design allows for the examination of group interactions in a single model, and if behavioral effects were characterized by significant group interactions, which was not the case.

To conclude, the present study reports that across different tasks, namely a recognition memory task and an item-matching task, the volume of the left PrC accounts for difficulties in distinction between highly confusable objects, supporting existing evidence on the role of the left PrC in fine-grained conceptual disambiguation of confusable objects, here using refined measures to quantify conceptual confusability.

**References**

Adler, B. L., Yarchoan, M., Hwang, H. M., Louneva, N., Blair, J. A., Palm, R., Smith, M. A., Lee, H. gon, Arnold, S. E., & Casadesus, G. (2014). Neuroprotective effects of the amylin analogue pramlintide on Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis and cognition. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *35*(4), 793–801. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2013.10.076

Armstrong, N. M., An, Y., Shin, J. J., Williams, O. A., Doshi, J., Erus, G., ... & Resnick, S. M. (2020). Associations between cognitive and brain volume changes in cognitively normal older adults. *Neuroimage, 223*, 117289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117289

Barense, M. D., Groen, I. I. A., Lee, A. C. H., Yeung, L. K., Brady, S. M., Gregori, M., Kapur, N., Bussey, T. J., Saksida, L. M., & Henson, R. N. A. (2012). Intact Memory for Irrelevant Information Impairs Perception in Amnesia. *Neuron*, *75*(1), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEURON.2012.05.014

Barense, M. D., Henson, R. N. A., Lee, A. C. H., & Graham, K. S. (2010). Medial temporal lobe activity during complex discrimination of faces, objects, and scenes: Effects of viewpoint. *Hippocampus*, *20*(3), 389–401. https://doi.org/10.1002/HIPO.20641

Bastin, C., & Van der Linden, M. (2003). The contribution of recollection and familiarity to recognition memory: a study of the effects of test format and aging. *Neuropsychology*, *17*(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.17.1.14

Bastin, C., & Delhaye, E. (2023). Targeting the function of the transentorhinal cortex to identify early cognitive markers of Alzheimer's disease. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-023-01093-5

Bastin, C., Besson, G., Simon, J., Delhaye, E., Geurten, M., Willems, S., & Salmon, E. (2019). An integrative memory model of recollection and familiarity to understand memory deficits. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *42*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X19000621

Bates, D., Mächler, M., & Bolker, B. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using (lme4). *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Besson, G., Simon, J., Salmon, E., & Bastin, C. (2020). Familiarity for entities as a sensitive marker of antero-lateral entorhinal atrophy in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. *Cortex*, *128*, 61-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.02.022

Bowles, B., Crupi, C., Mirsattari, S. M., Pigott, S. E., Parrent, A. G., Pruessner, J. C., Yonelinas, A. P., & Köhler, S. (2007). Impaired familiarity with preserved recollection after anterior temporal-lobe resection that spares the hippocampus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *104*(41), 16382–16387. https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.0705273104/SUPPL_FILE/05273FIGURE9.JPG

Braak, H., & Braak, E. (1991). Neuropathological stageing of Alzheimer-related changes. *Acta Neuropathologica 1991 82:4*, *82*(4), 239–259. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00308809

Braak, H., & Braak, E. (1997). Frequency of Stages of Alzheimer-Related Lesions in Different Age Categories. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *18*(4), 351–357. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-4580(97)00056-0

Brown, M. W., & Aggleton, J. P. (2001). Recognition memory: What are the roles of the perirhinal cortex and hippocampus? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience 2001 2:1*, *2*(1), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.1038/35049064

Brown, M. W., & Banks, P. J. (2015). In search of a recognition memory engram. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *50*, 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2014.09.016

Bruffaerts, R., Tyler, L. K., Shafto, M., Tsvetanov, K. A., & Clarke, A. (2019). Perceptual and conceptual processing of visual objects across the adult lifespan. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50254-5

Bruffaerts, R., de Deyne, S., Meersmans, K., Liuzzi, A. G., Storms, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (2019). Redefining the resolution of semantic knowledge in the brain: Advances made by the introduction of models of semantics in neuroimaging. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *103*, 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2019.05.015

Bruffaerts, R., Dupont, P., Peeters, R., de Deyne, S., Storms, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (2013). Similarity of fMRI Activity Patterns in Left Perirhinal Cortex Reflects Semantic Similarity

between Words. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*(47), 18597–18607. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1548-13.2013

Buckley, M. J., & Gaffan, D. (1997). Impairment of visual object-discrimination learning after perirhinal cortex ablation. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *111*(3), 467–475. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.111.3.467

Buckley, M. J., & Gaffan, D. (2006). Perirhinal cortical contributions to object perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *10*(3), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TICS.2006.01.008

Bussey, T. J., & Saksida, L. M. (2002). The organization of visual object representations: a connectionist model of effects of lesions in perirhinal cortex. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *15*(2), 355–364. https://doi.org/10.1046/J.0953-816X.2001.01850.X

Bussey, T. J., & Saksida, L. M. (2007). Memory, perception, and the ventral visual-perirhinal-hippocampal stream: Thinking outside of the boxes. *Hippocampus*, *17*(9), 898–908. https://doi.org/10.1002/HIPO.20320

Bussey, T. J., Saksida, L. M., & Murray, E. A. (2002). Perirhinal cortex resolves feature ambiguity in complex visual discriminations. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *15*(2), 365–374. https://doi.org/10.1046/J.0953-816X.2001.01851.X

Bussey, T. J., Saksida, L. M., & Murray, E. A. (2005). The perceptual-mnemonic/feature conjunction model of perirhinal cortex function. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section B: Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, *58*(3–4), 269–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/02724990544000004

Clarke, A., & Tyler, L. K. (2014). Object-Specific Semantic Coding in Human Perirhinal Cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(14), 4766–4775. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2828-13.2014

Clarke, A., & Tyler, L. K. (2015). Understanding What We See: How We Derive Meaning From Vision. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*(11), 677–687. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TICS.2015.08.008

Clarke, A., Devereux, B. J., Randall, B. & Tyler, L. K. (2015). Predicting the time course of individual objects with MEG. *Cerebral Cortex*, **25**, 3602–3612. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu203

Connor, C. E., & Knierim, J. J. (2017). Integration of objects and space in perception and memory. *Nature Neuroscience*, *20*(11), 1493-1503. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4657

DeCoster, J., Gallucci, M., & Iselin, A. M. R. (2011). Best practices for using median splits, artificial categorization, and their continuous alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, *2*(2), 197-209. https://doi.org/10.5127/jep.008310

Delhaye, E., Mechanic-Hamilton, D., Saad, L., Das, S. R., Wisse, L. E. M., Yushkevich, P. A., Wolk, D. A., & Bastin, C. (2019). Associative memory for conceptually unitized word pairs in mild cognitive impairment is related to the volume of the perirhinal cortex. *Hippocampus*, *29*(7), 630-638. https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.23063

Devereux, B. J., Tyler, L. K., Geertzen, J., & Randall, B. (2014). The Centre for Speech, Language and the Brain (CSLB) concept property norms. *Behavior Research Methods*, *46*(4), 1119–1127. https://doi.org/10.3758/S13428-013-0420-4/FIGURES/4

di Paola, M., Macaluso, E., Carlesimo, G. A., Tomaiuolo, F., Worsley, K. J., Fadda, L., & Caltagirone, C. (2007). Episodic memory impairment in patients with Alzheimer's disease is correlated with entorhinal cortex atrophy. *Journal of Neurology 2007 254:6*, *254*(6), 774–781. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00415-006-0435-1

Ding, S. L., & van Hoesen, G. W. (2010). Borders, extent, and topography of human perirhinal cortex as revealed using multiple modern neuroanatomical and pathological markers. *Human Brain Mapping*, *31*(9), 1359–1379. https://doi.org/10.1002/HBM.20940

Duke, D., Martin, C. B., Bowles, B., McRae, K., & Köhler, S. (2017). Perirhinal cortex tracks degree of recent as well as cumulative lifetime experience with object concepts. *Cortex, 89*, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CORTEX.2017.01.015

Duvernoy, H. (1988). *The human hippocampus: an atlas of applied anatomy*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Flanagan, K. J., Copland, D. A., Chenery, H. J., Byrne, G. J., & Angwin, A. J. (2013). Alzheimer's disease is associated with distinctive semantic feature loss. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(10), 2016–2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2013.06.008

Ferko, K. M., Blumenthal, A., Martin, C. B., Proklova, D., Minos, A. N., Saksida, L. M., ... & Köhler, S. (2022). Activity in perirhinal and entorhinal cortex predicts perceived visual similarities among category exemplars with highest precision. *Elife*, 11, e66884.

Garrard, P., Maloney, L. M., Hodges, J. R., & Patterson, K. (2005). The effects of very early Alzheimer's disease on the characteristics of writing by a renowned author. *Brain*, *128*(2), 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1093/BRAIN/AWH341

Goldstein, F. C., Loring, D. W., Thomas, T., Saleh, S., & Hajjar, I. (2019). Recognition Memory Performance as a Cognitive Marker of Prodromal Alzheimer's Disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *72*(2), 507–514. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-190468

Inhoff, M. C., Heusser, A. C., Tambini, A., Martin, C. B., O'Neil, E. B., Köhler, S., Meager, M. R., Blackmon, K., Vazquez, B., Devinsky, O., & Davachi, L. (2019). Understanding perirhinal contributions to perception and memory: Evidence through the lens of selective perirhinal damage. *Neuropsychologia*, *124*, 9–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2018.12.020

Jung-Beeman, M. (2005). Bilateral brain processes for comprehending natural language. Trends in cognitive sciences, 9(11), 512-518. https ://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.09.009

Kent, B. A., Hvoslef-Eide, M., Saksida, L. M., & Bussey, T. J. (2016). The representational–hierarchical view of pattern separation : Not just hippocampus, not just space, not just memory? Neurobiology of Learning and Memory, 129, 99-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2016.01.006

Kivisaari, S. L., Monsch, A. U., & Taylor, K. I. (2013). False positives to confusable objects predict medial temporal lobe atrophy. *Hippocampus*, *23*(9), 832–841. https://doi.org/10.1002/HIPO.22137

Kivisaari, S. L., Probst, A., & Taylor, K. I. (2020). The Perirhinal, Entorhinal, and Parahippocampal Cortices and Hippocampus: An Overview of Functional Anatomy and Protocol for Their Segmentation in MR Images. *FMRI*, 355–383. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41874-8_24

Kivisaari, S. L., Tyler, L. K., Monsch, A. U., & Taylor, K. I. (2012). Medial perirhinal cortex disambiguates confusable objects. *Brain*, *135*(12), 3757–3769. https://doi.org/10.1093/BRAIN/AWS277

Koen, J. D., & Yonelinas, A. P. (2014). The Effects of Healthy Aging, Amnestic Mild Cognitive Impairment, and Alzheimer's Disease on Recollection and Familiarity: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Neuropsychology Review*, *24*(3), 332–354. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11065-014-9266-5/FIGURES/4

Laisney, M., Giffard, B., Belliard, S., de la Sayette, V., Desgranges, B., & Eustache, F. (2011). When the zebra loses its stripes: Semantic priming in early Alzheimer's disease and semantic dementia. *Cortex*, *47*(1), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CORTEX.2009.11.001

Lalla, A., Tarder-Stoll, H., Hasher, L., & Duncan, K. (2022). Aging shifts the relative contributions of episodic and semantic memory to decision-making. *Psychology and Aging*, *37*(6), 667–680. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000700

Laws, K. R., Adlington, R. L., Gale, T. M., Moreno-Martínez, F. J., & Sartori, G. (2007). A meta-analytic review of category naming in Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(12), 2674–2682. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2007.04.003

Lee, S. H., Kravitz, D. J., & Baker, C. I. (2012). Disentangling visual imagery and perception of real-world objects. Neuroimage, 59(4), 4064-4073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.10.055

Liuzzi, A. G., Dupont, P., Peeters, R., Bruffaerts, R., De Deyne, S., Storms, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (2019). Left perirhinal cortex codes for semantic similarity between written words defined from cued word association. *Neuroimage*, *191*, 127-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.02.011

Martin, C. B., Douglas, D., Newsome, R. N., Man, L. L. Y., & Barense, M. D. (2018). Integrative and distinctive coding of visual and conceptual object features in the ventral visual stream. *ELife*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.7554/ELIFE.31873

McKhann, G. M., Knopman, D. S., Chertkow, H., Hyman, B. T., Jack, C. R., Kawas, C. H., Klunk, W. E., Koroshetz, W. J., Manly, J. J., Mayeux, R., Mohs, R. C., Morris, J. C., Rossor, M. N., Scheltens, P., Carrillo, M. C., Thies, B., Weintraub, S., & Phelps, C. H. (2011). The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *7*(3), 263–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JALZ.2011.03.005

Murray, E. A., & Bussey, T. J. (1999). Perceptual–mnemonic functions of the perirhinal cortex. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *3*(4), 142–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01303-0

Naspi, L., Hoffman, P., Devereux, B., Thejll-Madsen, T., Doumas, L. A., & Morcom, A. (2021). Multiple dimensions of semantic and perceptual similarity contribute to mnemonic discrimination for pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *47*(12), 1903. https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001032

Newsome, R. N., Duarte, A., & Barense, M. D. (2012). Reducing perceptual interference improves visual discrimination in mild cognitive impairment: Implications for a model of perirhinal cortex function. *Hippocampus*, *22*(10), 1990–1999. https://doi.org/10.1002/HIPO.22071

Olsen, R. K., Yeung, L. K., Noly-Gandon, A., D'Angelo, M. C., Kacollja, A., Smith, V. M., ... & Barense, M. D. (2017). Human anterolateral entorhinal cortex volumes are associated with cognitive decline in aging prior to clinical diagnosis. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *57*, 195-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2017.04.025

Patterson, K., Nestor, P. J., & Rogers, T. T. (2007). Where do you know what you know? The representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience 2007 8:12*, *8*(12), 976–987. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2277

Price, A. R., Bonner, M. F., Peelle, J. E., & Grossman, M. (2017). Neural coding of fine-grained object knowledge in perirhinal cortex. *BioRxiv*, 194829. https://doi.org/10.1101/194829

Ralph, M. A. L., Jefferies, E., Patterson, K., & Rogers, T. T. (2016). The neural and computational bases of semantic cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience 2016 18:1*, *18*(1), 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2016.150

Riesenhuber, M., & Poggio, T. (1999). Hierarchical models of object recognition in cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, *2*(11), 1019-1025. https://doi.org/10.1038/14819

Sasaki, T., Leutgeb, S., & Leutgeb, J. K. (2015). Spatial and memory circuits in the medial entorhinal cortex. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *32*, 16-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2014.10.008

Schoemaker, D., Gauthier, S., & Pruessner, J. C. (2014). Recollection and Familiarity in Aging Individuals with Mild Cognitive Impairment and Alzheimer's Disease: A Literature Review. *Neuropsychology Review*, *24*(3), 313–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11065-014-9265-6/FIGURES/1

Serre, T., Oliva, A., & Poggio, T. (2007). A feedforward architecture accounts for rapid categorization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(15), 6424-6429. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0700622104

Serre, T., Wolf, L., & Poggio, T. (2005). Object recognition with features inspired by visual cortex. In 2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'05) (Vol. 2, pp. 994-1000). Ieee.

Sexton, C., Snyder, H., Beher, D., Boxer, A. L., Brannelly, P., Brion, J. P., Buée, L., Cacace, A. M., Chételat, G., Citron, M., DeVos, S. L., Diaz, K., Feldman, H. H., Frost, B., Goate, A. M., Gold, M., Hyman, B., Johnson, K., Karch, C. M., … Carrillo, M. C. (2022). Current directions in tau research: Highlights from Tau 2020. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *18*(5), 988–1007. https://doi.org/10.1002/ALZ.12452

Sheldon, S., Fenerci, C., & Gurguryan, L. (2019). A neurocognitive perspective on the forms and functions of autobiographical memory retrieval. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *13*, 4. https://doi.org/10.3389/FNSYS.2019.00004/BIBTEX

Squire, L. R., Stark, C. E. L., & Clark, R. E. (2004). THE MEDIAL TEMPORAL LOBE. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *27*, 279–306. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV.NEURO.27.070203.144130

Squire, L. R., Wixted, J. T., & Clark, R. E. (2007). Recognition memory and the medial temporal lobe: a new perspective. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, *8*(11), 872. https://doi.org/10.1038/NRN2154

Suzuki, W. A., & Naya, Y. (2014). The perirhinal cortex. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *37*, 39–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-NEURO-071013-014207

Suzuki, W. L., & Amaral, D. G. (1994). Perirhinal and parahippocampal cortices of the macaque monkey: Cortical afferents. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, *350*(4), 497–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/CNE.903500402

Taylor, K. I., Devereux, B. J., Acres, K., Randall, B., & Tyler, L. K. (2012). Contrasting effects of feature-based statistics on the categorisation and basic-level identification of visual objects. *Cognition*, *122*(3), 363–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGNITION.2011.11.001

Taylor, K. I., Devereux, B. J., & Tyler, L. K. (2011). Conceptual structure: Towards an integrated neurocognitive account. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/01690965.2011.568227*, *26*(9), 1368–1401. https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2011.568227

Taylor, K. I., & Probst, A. (2008). Anatomic localization of the transentorhinal region of the perirhinal cortex. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *29*(10), 1591–1596. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2007.03.024

Team R Core. (2021). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*.

Tyler, L. K., Chiu, S., Zhuang, J., Randall, B., Devereux, B. J., Wright, P., Clarke, A., & Taylor, K. I. (2013). Objects and Categories: Feature Statistics and Object Processing in the Ventral Stream. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *25*(10), 1723–1735. https://doi.org/10.1162/JOCN_A_00419

Tyler, L. K., & Moss, H. E. (2001). Towards a distributed account of conceptual knowledge. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *5*(6), 244–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01651-X

Viganò, S., & Piazza, M. (2021). The hippocampal-entorhinal system represents nested hierarchical relations between words during concept learning. *Hippocampus*, *31*(6), 557–568. https://doi.org/10.1002/HIPO.23320

Wright, P., Randall, B., Clarke, A., & Tyler, L. K. (2015). The perirhinal cortex and conceptual processing: Effects of feature-based statistics following damage to the anterior temporal lobes. *Neuropsychologia*, *76*, 192–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2015.01.041

Yassa, M. A., & Stark, C. E. L. (2011). Pattern separation in the hippocampus. Trends in Neurosciences, 34(10), 515-525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2011.06.006

Yeung, L. K., Ryan, J. D., Cowell, R. A., & Barense, M. D. (2013). Recognition memory impairments caused by false recognition of novel objects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *142*(4), 1384–1397. https://doi.org/10.1037/A0034021

Yeung, L. K., Olsen, R. K., Bild-Enkin, H. E., D'Angelo, M. C., Kacollja, A., McQuiggan, D. A., ... & Barense, M. D. (2017). Anterolateral entorhinal cortex volume predicted by altered intra-item configural processing. Journal of Neuroscience, 37(22), 5527-5538. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3664-16.2017

Yushkevich, P. A., Amaral, R. S. C., Augustinack, J. C., Bender, A. R., Bernstein, J. D., Boccardi, M., Bocchetta, M., Burggren, A. C., Carr, V. A., Chakravarty, M. M., Chételat, G., Daugherty, A. M., Davachi, L., Ding, S. L., Ekstrom, A., Geerlings, M. I., Hassan, A., Huang, Y., Iglesias, J. E., … Zeineh, M. M. (2015). Quantitative comparison of 21 protocols for labeling hippocampal subfields and parahippocampal subregions in in vivo MRI: Towards a harmonized segmentation protocol. *NeuroImage*, *111*, 526–541. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2015.01.004

Supplemental Material

**Table S1. Demographic and brain volumes comparisons (t-tests) between AD patients with Lower MoCA scores (n = 14) and AD patients with Higher MoCA scores (n = 10).**

| | Low MoCA Mean (SD) | High MoCA Mean (SD) | *p*-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Female/Male | 7/7 | 3/7 | |
| Age | 75.50 (6.41) | 73.80 (6.34) | .526 |
| Education | 12.14 (3.63) | 12.90 (2.18) | .564 |
| MoCA | 19.00 (2.63) | 23.80 (0.79) | < .001 |
| Letter fluency | 15.00 (7.30) | 18.10 (7.43) | .320 |
| Category fluency | 15.93 (6.04) | 22.40 (6.26) | .018 |
| WAIS-3 digit symbol substitution | 17.29 (15.56) | 15.10 (13.58) | .724 |
| WAIS-3 vocabulary | 30.45 (7.84) | 33.56 (10.65) | .463 |
| WMS-3 Logical Memory immediate recall | 6.71 (2.64) | 9.70 (3.74) | .032 |
| Left ERC | 20.85 (3.94) | 22.79 (3.18) | .214 |
| Right ERC | 18.81 (4.93) | 20.00 (4.39) | .549 |
| Left BA 35 | 15.41 (3.87) | 19.28 (4.81) | .040 |
| Right BA 35 | 17.48 (4.79) | 16.51 (4.42) | .620 |
| Left BA 36 | 59.93 (14.98) | 65.42 (16.11) | .395 |
| Right BA 36 | 60.09 (17.12) | 55.29 (13.02) | .464 |
| Left Hippocampus Score | 67.22 (10.26) | 71.96 (7.63) | .231 |
| Right Hippocampus Score | 68.66 (12.12) | 71.90 (10.12) | .498 |
| | | | |