

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Research at Birmingham

A neural chronometry of memory recall

Wimber, Maria; Staresina, Bernhard

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Wimber, M & Staresina, B 2019, 'A neural chronometry of memory recall', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*.

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

A neural chronometry of memory recall

Bernhard P. Staresina* and Maria Wimber

School of Psychology and Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham UK

*Correspondence: b.staresina@bham.ac.uk (B. Staresina)

Abstract

Episodic memory allows us to mentally travel through time. How does the brain convert a simple reminder cue into a full-blown memory of past events and experiences? In this Review, we integrate recent developments in the cognitive neuroscience of human memory retrieval, pinpointing the neural chronometry underlying successful recall. Electrophysiological recordings suggest that sensory cues proceed into the medial temporal lobe within the first 500 ms. At this point, a hippocampal process sets in, geared towards internal pattern completion and coordination of cortical memory reinstatement between 500 and 1500 ms. We further highlight the dynamic principles governing the recall process, which include a reversal of perceptual information flows, temporal compression, and theta clocking.

Key words: memory, recall, hippocampus, pattern completion, reinstatement, theta

Memory recall – the brain’s time machine

One of the most remarkable capacities of the human mind is to mentally travel back in time and re-live past experiences in great detail. Just think of how looking at your vacation photo album, hearing the first notes of an old favourite song or smelling the perfume of a loved one can re-ignite entire experiences and associated emotions, sensations and thoughts. In experimental terms, a scenario in which an external or self-generated (i.e., internal) reminder elicits a vivid memory is referred to as **cued recall** (see Glossary). Intriguingly, the conversion of a simple cue to a full-blown memory can occur within a few hundred milliseconds. Despite decades of neuroimaging research though, little is still known about the precise temporal dynamics that govern successful memory recall. Is there a particular sequence in which particular brain regions need to engage? Where and when does the conversion from cue to target representations take place? Do the neural codes change from perceiving to retrieving?

In this Review, we discuss new results elucidating the neural chronometry of cued recall. After a brief summary of computational models and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) work, we delve into recent findings from human electrophysiology, capitalising on direct invasive recordings and time-resolved multivariate pattern analyses. Mounting evidence suggests the following scenario: Within the first ~500 ms after cue presentation, information traverses dedicated cortical pathways and progresses towards the medial temporal lobe (MTL). In MTL cortex, the cue elicits an initial ‘old/new’ signal. If the cue is deemed old/familiar, a hippocampal process sets in at ~500 ms, in the first instance geared towards reactivating the hippocampal cell assembly assigned to the initial experience (**pattern completion**). If successful, hippocampal pattern completion triggers the sustained **reinstatement** of the cortical memory trace between ~500 and 1500 ms. This is the time

interval in which a full-blown mnemonic representation unfolds, with posterior parietal regions contributing to the maintenance and goal-directed manipulation of the target memory (Box 1). On a mechanistic level, memory recall exhibits distinctive temporal dynamics, including flow reversal, time compression and theta clocking (Figure 1, Key Figure).




Figure 1 - Key Figure: A schematic of the neural chronometry of cued recall. Top left to right: A memory cue enters the hippocampus in a feed-forward fashion, followed by pattern completion at approximately 500 ms after cue onset. From 500 ms onward, target memories are reinstated in neocortex. Memory signals are projected to posterior parietal regions, with reciprocal interactions for maintenance and translation into goal-directed behaviour. Bottom left: Example of a unique event that involves eating a bagel in the kitchen for breakfast. Reinstatement propagates from the hippocampus back to the neocortical regions that coded aspects of the original experience. This reinstatement cascade progresses along a feed-back pathway that reconstructs an event in the reverse order from its original encoding. Each stage of this backward reconstruction process is characterized by bursts of neural activity in the reactivated neocortical areas and occurs within time-limited, rhythmic windows defined by the hippocampal theta rhythm.

Computational accounts and fMRI evidence for pattern completion and reinstatement

The question of how a simple cue can trigger recall of a past experience has a long history in computational models of memory. Following the seminal discovery that intact episodic memory critically relies on the hippocampus [1], theoretical work has tried to link this region's unique physiological properties to its putative role in coordinating memory recall [2-5]. First, the hippocampal circuitry itself enables so-called 'pattern completion' processes [3]. Second, the hippocampus is reciprocally connected with a host of multi-modal regions in high-level association cortex [6]. Together, these properties put the hippocampus in a privileged position to orchestrate cued recall. Specifically, it is thought that during the initial experience, a particular set of hippocampal neurons co-activates with and is thereby linked to the cortical sites representing the constituents of the experience. The specific configuration of cortical sites (participating regions and activation profiles) forms the so-called **engram** [7]. As the cortical sites disengage/reconfigure to process new incoming information, the reciprocal link between hippocampal neurons and the cortical engram lives on in the form of strengthened synaptic weights, also referred to as the **hippocampal index** [5]. Later presentation of a subset of the engram (i.e., a partial cue) again propagates into the hippocampus, where the entire index is activated via **auto-associative processes**, thereby reinstating the complete cortical engram.

A number of recent fMRI studies on cued recall have provided some empirical evidence for these computational accounts of hippocampal pattern completion and cortical reinstatement (Glossary). Particularly, the advent of multivariate pattern analyses (MVPA; [8], including **representational similarity analysis** and **machine learning** approaches) has yielded great

progress in the assessment of memory-guided reinstatement. Not only have these methods consistently shown that cortical reinstatement is stronger during successful relative to unsuccessful recall, but activation levels in the hippocampus predict the extent of cortical reinstatement [9-12]. Regarding pattern completion within the hippocampus, fMRI evidence is scarcer, but a recent high-resolution fMRI study showed enhanced similarity of hippocampal encoding and retrieval activation patterns for successful vs. unsuccessful cued recall [13] (see also [14, 15]). Together, these findings are consistent with a hippocampal pattern completion process geared towards orchestrating cortical reinstatement. However, given the temporal ambiguity of the **BOLD signal**, most of these findings would also be compatible with hippocampal activity following cortical reinstatement. Thus, to establish whether hippocampal engagement during memory recall indeed initiates reinstatement, real-time (i.e., millisecond-precision) temporal resolution is needed.

Electrophysiological recordings elucidate the neural chronometry of recall

Temporal dissociation of different memory signals

The most widely used method to glean real-time insights into human cognitive processes is non-invasive electrophysiological recordings via Electroencephalography (EEG) or Magnetoencephalography (MEG). Most early EEG investigations focused on different forms of recognition memory, rather than cued recall per se. Specifically, event-related potentials (ERPs) were used to distinguish between familiarity-based and recollection-based recognition [16], with the latter being more akin to cued recall. In brief, an early (300-500 ms) frontal ERP has been linked to familiarity-based recognition, whereas a later (> 500 ms) posterior ERP has been linked to recollection-based recognition [17]. (Note that we hereafter refer to onset

latencies of significant differences between memory conditions or changes from baseline where this information is available.) These data hint towards different mnemonic processes being discernible via human electrophysiological recordings, with recall-related processes unfolding ~500 ms after the reminder. However, given the ambiguities about neural generators of surface electrical/magnetic fields, the underlying brain regions – and the link to hippocampal signals in particular – have remained largely unknown.

One methodological approach that overcomes many of the above-mentioned modality-specific limitations is direct invasive recordings from the hippocampus and cortical target sites in human epilepsy patients (**intracranial EEG** (iEEG); [18]). The first set of iEEG studies on memory employed simple old/new recognition tests, revealing an initial response peaking around 400 ms in entorhinal/perirhinal cortex and distinguishing correctly identified old from new stimuli (for review, see [19]). In the hippocampus, corresponding old/new responses were typically observed later, from ~500 ms onwards [20-22]. However, the simple comparison of old vs. new stimuli leaves open whether this response reflects a novelty signal or recall of episodic details associated with the old stimulus. An iEEG study designed to distinguish between old/new discrimination and associative retrieval (cued recall) indicated the latter. ERPs were derived for (i) new items (correct rejection, CR), (ii) recognised old items without recalling associative details (item recognition, IR) and (iii) recognised old items and recalling associative details (associative recognition, AR). Hippocampal ERPs showed an associative recall effect (AR > IR) most pronounced between 500 and 1500 ms [23]. In fact, a novelty response (CR vs. IR) did not unfold until much later in the trial once the memory decision was made, perhaps reflecting encoding of the novel experience [24]. In any case, a dedicated hippocampal signal distinguishing successful from unsuccessful recall and statistically emerging at ~500 ms has since been demonstrated with complementary

measures including action potentials of single hippocampal neurons [25] (Figure 2a, *top*) and gamma (>30 Hz) power [26, 27] (Figure 2a, *bottom*). While the convergence of the effect across different electrophysiological signals speaks to its robustness, the exact relationship between ERPs, action potentials and gamma power is still not entirely understood [28], and it would be informative to directly link these different signals within a single study. In sum, studies investigating the temporal profiles of successful recall highlight a process that unfolds ~500 ms after presentation of a reminder, with invasive recordings directly linking this process to the hippocampus.

It deserves mention that the hippocampal signal usually increases from pre-cue baseline levels prior to 500 ms (Figure 2a). As further elaborated below, this increase might reflect the activation of visually-selective neurons responding to the cue from ~270 ms [29] (see also [25, 30]), or preparatory processes imposed by the cued-recall paradigm (i.e., participants anticipate memory search demands). In any case, the difference between successful and unsuccessful recall tends not to unfold before 500 ms, at which point sensory cue processing and an initial old/new assessment are likely to be completed.




Figure 2: Invasive recordings in humans elucidate the neural chronometry of memory recall. **a.** At ~500 ms after cue onset, a hippocampal signal emerges specifically for successful cued recall. *Top:* Single unit example depicting hippocampal firing rates (baseline corrected). Left inset: placement of microwire bundle used for recordings. Right inset: raster plot of action potentials for successful recall. (adapted from [25]). *Bottom:* Gamma power increase for successful vs. unsuccessful recall. Left inset: example depth electrode. Right inset: hippocampal group coverage. (adapted from [26]). **b.** Hippocampal signals precede activation in cortical target sites (cortical signals are aligned to hippocampal signals). *Top:* For successful recall only, entorhinal cortex (EC) neurons fire within 30 ms of hippocampal spikes. Inset: example EC microwire placement. (adapted from [25]). *Bottom:* Lateral temporal cortex (LTC) ripples (80-120 Hz) within 30 ms after MTL ripples. Inset: group coverage of LTC. (adapted from [36]). **c.** Reinstatement of memory representations in cortical target sites after 500 ms. *Top:* Population decoding of successfully retrieved target objects from entorhinal cortex (EC) neurons. Inset: coverage of EC. (adapted from [25]). *Bottom:* Reinstatement of encoding representations in lateral temporal cortex (LTC), as assessed via encoding-retrieval similarity (ERS) of spectral power. Inset: group coverage of LTC. (adapted from [34]).

Timing of hippocampal pattern completion and cortical reinstatement

What is the functional significance of this hippocampal process emerging at ~500 ms? As mentioned above, models of memory recall postulate hippocampal pattern completion coordinating reinstatement of the mnemonic engram in cortex. In a recent iEEG study [26], participants first learned trial-unique nouns paired with one of two colours or one of two scenes. During retrieval, participants were asked to recall the associated colour/scene when cued with a noun. To assess hippocampal pattern completion, **encoding-retrieval similarity** (ERS) of the spectral activation patterns was examined. Hippocampal ERS was not only greater for successful than unsuccessful recall between 500 and 1500 ms (with a concurrent increase in gamma power), but also greater for a given noun-image combination with its exact encoding counterpart than with other encoding trials sharing the same image. This suggests that upon receiving a partial cue (the noun), reactivation (completion) of the event-specific hippocampal encoding pattern sets in at ~500 ms during successful recall.

Invasive recordings have also begun to shed light on the reinstatement of memory engrams outside the hippocampus. The first cortical recipient of hippocampal output is the entorhinal cortex (EC [31]). In fact, computational models suggest that hippocampus-mediated reinstatement is multiplexed, such that the hippocampus points to indices in EC, which in turn index cortical target sites [32]. EC might thus serve as the interface between intra-hippocampal pattern completion and cortical engram reinstatement [33]. Using simultaneous single neuron recordings from the hippocampus and EC, a recent study showed that during successful cued recall, entorhinal spikes followed hippocampal spikes within 30 ms [25] (Figure 2b, *top*). Importantly, at the population level, the mnemonic target could be decoded from entorhinal spiking patterns from 600-1500 ms (Figure 2c, *top*), with hippocampal firing

rates predicting the strength of entorhinal reinstatement. Recall-related reinstatement has also been demonstrated in cortical regions further downstream. Using a cued recall paradigm with concrete noun pairs, another iEEG study [34] showed enhanced ERS during successful recall in ventral and lateral temporal cortex. Again, this effect was seen between 500 and 1500 ms after cue onset (Figure 2c, *bottom*). A subsample of patients was implanted with microelectrode arrays in middle temporal gyrus (MTG), and reinstatement was observed across individual MTG neurons between 500 and 1500 ms [35]. Intriguingly, recent work now tied these reinstatement effects in temporal cortex to preceding signals in the MTL [36]. Specifically, reinstatement was most prevalent when temporal cortex and MTL were coupled via ripples (transient bursts of ~80-120 Hz oscillations, *Box 2*). Critically, lateral temporal cortex ripples emerged within 50 ms after MTL ripples, similar to the entorhinal neurons spiking after hippocampal neurons mentioned above (Figure 2b, *bottom*). No MTL-triggered ripples were seen in motor cortex control sites (where target memories should not be represented). Lastly, cortical >500 ms reinstatement has also been observed via non-invasive EEG/MEG recordings [37-40], and recent advances in source reconstruction methods [41] hold promise that dynamic hippocampal-neocortical interactions can now be investigated comprehensively in healthy participants.

Together, results from electrophysiological recordings in humans reveal that a hippocampal pattern completion process sets in at 500 ms for successful recall, upon which the hippocampus drives memory reinstatement in cortical target sites. Of course, some variability in the precise timing of hippocampal engagement is to be expected across events, participants, imaging modalities and experimental paradigms. However, by aligning engagement of extra-hippocampal regions to hippocampal signals on a trial-by-trial level, the above-mentioned studies make a strong case for hippocampal activation preceding cortical

reinstatement. We note however that conclusive evidence for a causal role would require direct perturbation of the hippocampal response. Great progress has been made recently using direct electrical stimulation of MTL regions during spatial and verbal learning in humans [42-45]. That said, whether perturbation of the hippocampus at different latencies differentially affects cued recall performance is still an open question (*Outstanding Questions*). Rodent models have shown that electric or optogenetic manipulation of hippocampal ripples directly impacts spatial memory performance [46, 47]. Given that hippocampal ripples have now been linked successful recall in humans as well [36, 48] (Box 2), electrical manipulation of cue-evoked ripples at different time points might be a viable approach to establish the causal role of the hippocampus in orchestrating cortical reinstatement.

It also deserves mention that the observation of a 500 ms latency stems from experimental settings in which participants' attention is fully focused on memory retrieval. In more natural settings, cues are less explicit or noisier, and the 500 ms interval can thus be regarded a lower temporal bound for hippocampal pattern completion processes. Moreover, averaging across many trials and integrating across multiple participants will obscure trial-by-trial variability in cue-evoked effect latencies, e.g. due to fluctuation in levels of attention [49]. To more closely examine the processes leading up to the moment of recall, researchers have resorted to response-locked (button press or verbal response) instead of cue-locked analyses. Those data show – with equal consistency – that a hippocampal signal and ensuing memory reinstatement sets in ~ 1 s prior to the response [23, 26, 34, 35, 48, 50]. Response-locked analyses also allow, in principle, to better resolve the extent of reinstatement needed to terminate memory search given specific task demands. For instance, greater levels of

reinstatement are likely needed to support recall of perceptual details as opposed to recalling a categorical gist/semantic features [51] (see below).

The temporal codes of memory recall

As reviewed above, accumulating evidence suggests that hippocampal-neocortical dynamics between 500 and 1500 ms after a reminder reinstate mnemonic patterns. In this section, we zoom in on the temporal dynamics that govern the reinstatement process within this critical time window. We first review the evidence regarding the timeline of memory reactivation for single events and event sequences, before turning to the role of theta oscillations in clocking the reinstatement process.


An information flow reversal between perception and memory?

During cued recall, sensory information pertaining to the cue enters the hippocampus in a feed-forward fashion. When successfully matched with an overlapping, stored memory trace, hippocampal pattern completion then reinstates mnemonic target content back in neocortex (see computational models discussed in earlier sections [33]). The cue-to-memory conversion should thus be associated with a reversal of the information flow from a feed-forward, cue-driven input process to a feed-back, memory-driven output process (see Key Figure). In experimental terms, study designs that use cross-category cued recall (e.g., object-scene or word-face associations) are particularly well suited for isolating purely mnemonic target reinstatement from perceptual cue processing.

One fMRI study used cross-category (object-scene) cued recall in conjunction with **dynamic causal modelling** to provide empirical support for the hypothesised reversal of information flow from cue to target. The same MTL cortical region was found to either send information to the hippocampus when its preferred category (objects for perirhinal cortex, scenes for parahippocampal cortex) served as cue, or to receive information from the hippocampus when its preferred category was the target [52]. Similar results were obtained from studies employing laminar recordings in monkeys [53-55]. Using object-based cued recall, a feed-forward signal was observed across perirhinal cortex layers during the cue period. During the delay period where the target representation was presumably recalled, this flow across layers reversed and indicated a feed-back signal [55]. Although no recordings were obtained from the hippocampus, one likely scenario is that the switch from cue to target representation was mediated by hippocampal pattern completion. Within our timeline of human memory recall, this conversion would take place around 500 ms post cue presentation.

Once a cue has ignited pattern completion within hippocampal circuits, how are the different constituent elements of an episodic memory then reconstructed in neocortex? Even a static visual image is composed of multiple layers of information that are processed along a detailed-perceptual to abstract-semantic gradient (e.g., [56, 57]). If remembering entails a reversal of information flow compared with perception, are the various constituent features of a visual stimulus also recreated in reverse order when reconstructed from memory? A recent study using EEG-based decoding and reaction time measures provides direct evidence for this view [51]. Participants either perceived visual objects, or recalled them from memory when cued with a reminder word (Figure 3a). Perception followed the well-established forward stream, with perceptual features (photo vs. line drawing) coming online more rapidly than conceptual features (animate vs. inanimate), as evident in neural decoding time-series

and behavioural reaction times. Critically, this relative timing flipped when an object was reconstructed from memory: conceptual information was now classified more rapidly than perceptual information. Cued recall thus appears to trigger a neural processing cascade that temporally prioritizes abstract-conceptual over detailed-perceptual information. The findings are consistent with the idea that the MTL preferentially back-projects to multi-sensory areas that contain high-level abstract representations of an event [58]. They are also in line with findings showing that mental imagery with no bottom-up visual input, reliant on the hippocampus [59], tends to recapitulate relatively late stages of visual processing [60, 61]. It should be noted, however, that under highly controlled task conditions, mnemonic reinstatement during cued recall can be found even in early visual cortex, suggesting that the back-propagation does not terminate at high-level conceptual stages [9]. An interesting question is whether recurrent neural networks [62] can realistically simulate such reinstatement that starts at high levels of the visual hierarchy without direct perceptual input, and then back-propagates from conceptual to perceptual levels of representation. Such models could potentially make interesting predictions about the degree of perceptual detail that can be achieved by a mnemonic backward reconstruction process that lacks any bottom-up visual input. Future studies will also reveal whether this reverse information processing cascade generalizes across different task contexts and different types of memories, including more complex multiple-element episodes as discussed in the following section (e.g. [63, 64]).



a significant fluctuation at 8 Hz (left bottom). Top right: Significant modulation of object decodability by the phase of an 8 Hz rhythm extracted from virtual sources in the hippocampus. Bottom right: Classifier-locked analysis showing significant phase locking 200-300 ms before maximal classification (i.e., reinstatement) of the recalled object, with source reconstruction suggesting an origin of the phase-locked signal in the hippocampus and parietal areas (adapted from [86]).

Temporal dynamics of sequence replay during memory recall

Episodes unfold, by definition, across time and contain multiple events. Much work on the **replay** of event sequences has been conducted in rodents, reviewed elsewhere (e.g. [65]). Here we focus on the emerging literature investigating the reactivation of event sequences in humans. While evidence is accumulating for forward and backward replay during periods of inactivity following learning [66, 67], very few studies have investigated sequential reactivation during cued recall. In one recent EEG study [68], participants were presented with short movie or sound clips, and later asked to mentally replay these clips when cued with a reminder. The neural trajectories that uniquely characterized a clip during its initial perception were replayed in a forward sequence during cued recall, both for visual and auditory memories. A follow-up MEG study [69] used sequences of short movies that together constituted a coherent episode (e.g., a movie of a boat, divers jumping off the boat, divers under water). A critical word stimulus was presented during one of the three sequential clips. During retrieval, participants were asked to mentally replay the full movie in order to judge when in the sequence the word had appeared. Behavioural reaction times and neural patterns suggested a time-compressed forward skipping through the sequences during recall. This finding is consistent with other, within-event evidence indicative of a time-compressed forward recall process [70].

Interestingly, one of the above-mentioned studies on replay during rest periods [66] identified reward as the critical determinant of the direction of replay, with rewarded sequences becoming preferentially replayed in reverse order. The same study also demonstrated that abstract, structural information about a sequence is consistently replayed before object-specific information, consistent with the conceptual-to-perceptual gradient of memory reinstatement discussed above. Clearly, more work is needed to establish the conditions that trigger forward and backward sequential replay during awake recall, and their respective functional significance for the retention and reorganization of memories over time (see [51, 71]; *Outstanding Questions*).

Theta oscillations as a clocking mechanism

In this final section, we review the role of brain oscillations in the theta frequency range for temporally orchestrating the recall process. Theta oscillations (~4-8 Hz) dominate the field potential of the rodent hippocampus, and have been identified in human iEEG recordings at similar or slower frequencies [72-74]. Several brain regions, including medial prefrontal and anterior thalamic nuclei, have been discussed as pacemakers of this rhythm, synchronizing the hippocampus with larger subcortical and neocortical networks [75]. Within the medial temporal lobe, the timing of neural activity within a theta cycle appears to play a central role for the emerging memory codes. In rodents, different neural assemblies that represent different information (e.g. the animal's location in a maze) fire sequentially along a theta cycle, with their order of firing mirroring trajectories the animal has taken in the past [76-78]. Such firing occurs in so called **gamma bursts** which group together the cells that constitute a

neural assembly [76]. A distinct spatial mnemonic code has thus been identified in rodents that consists of sequential gamma bursts nested into slower theta oscillations.

Based on this animal literature, theta phase coding has been proposed as a computationally efficient mechanism for the ordering and linking of discrete events within a sequence [79, 80]. Direct evidence in humans that elements of a reactivated episodic memory are grouped by theta-nested gamma bursts is still missing. During offline periods following learning, replay has been shown to coincide with hippocampal ripples in the gamma band [66], and human iEEG recordings provide initial evidence for ripple-bound memory reinstatement during awake recall [36] (see Box 2). The missing link, at current, is the demonstration that ripple events are clocked by the hippocampal theta rhythm during active recall. A recent iEEG study provides encouraging evidence for such clocking in working memory. While participants were mentally rehearsing letter sequences, the elements constituting a sequence could be decoded from neighbouring gamma bursts (> 80 Hz) along the theta cycle [81]. In long-term memory, it has been demonstrated that the human brain deploys a theta-gamma code for the encoding of novel event sequences [82], and for binding memories to their encoding context [83]. Theta-to-gamma coupling also generally increases during recall [80], for example when participants recognize a stimulus as old [84] or recall autobiographical events [85]. It is therefore conceivable that theta oscillations clock the timing of memory recall signals in human long-term memory.

The most direct demonstration for a theta clocking function in humans comes from recent EEG work, using time-resolved decoding of memory reinstatement following the presentation of a reminder [86] (Figure 3b). As expected, decoding of reactivated mnemonic content was maximal 500-1000 ms after cue onset, consistent with the literature reviewed earlier.

Critically, within this time window the neural signatures of memory reinstatement fluctuated rhythmically, waxing and waning at a theta frequency of 8 Hz (Figure 3b, *bottom left*). The decodability of perceived vs. recalled objects was maximal at opposite phases of the theta cycle (Figure 2b, *upper middle*), consistent with computational models that predict a phase separation of information flowing into the hippocampus during encoding, and out of the hippocampus during retrieval [87]. This work allows for the intriguing possibility that in between those theta states that are optimal for encoding and retrieval, respectively, a transition phase exists that provides the optimal time point for the perception-to-memory flip discussed in the previous section.

Related to the critical time point of this reversal, the same study [86] also suggests an interesting temporal relationship between theta phase and neocortical reinstatement. Timepoints of maximal memory reactivation were preceded by a theta phase-locked signal by approximately 250 ms (Figure 3b, *bottom right*). The delay is indicative of an upstream region (e.g., hippocampus) initiating the recall process at the optimal retrieval phase of the theta cycle, followed by neocortical reactivation of mnemonic content 200-300 ms later, an interpretation corroborated by **source analysis** (Figure 3b, *bottom right*). This observation is of interest because human iEEG work points to a similar offset between processing of a memory cue and hippocampal recall processes. For instance, one study recorded field potentials in hippocampus and anterior temporal lobe (ATL) while participants encoded and later recalled cross-category associations [27]. The directionality of oscillatory coupling between these regions changed during recall relative to encoding, with ATL engagement following a hippocampal recall signal with a delay of ~250 ms. A study using single neuron recordings examined the delay between visually selective (VS) and memory-selective (MS) MTL neurons during recognition [29] and found that VS neurons responded approximately

200 ms earlier (from ~250 ms) than MS neurons (from ~450 ms). Similar effects were found in a cued recall paradigm, where neuron-population based decodability of the cue emerged 140 ms before decodability of the reactivated memory [25]. Finally, a third single unit study found that the spiking of neurons that code for the identity of a reminder peaks at ~400 ms, while neurons coding an associated (not visually presented) stimulus spike around 600 ms, again suggesting an offset of 200 ms [88].

Together, electrophysiological recordings support the idea that content reinstatement during memory recall follows reminder-specific processing with a latency of ~200 ms, roughly corresponding to one theta cycle. Some temporal variability is of course to be expected empirically, and it is also unlikely that perceptual vs. mnemonic processes occur in an all-or-none fashion at a single instance of a theta cycle. Instead, there might be a gradual build-up of both cue processing (within the first 500 ms) and target reinstatement (> 500 ms), but this build-up might still contain discrete volleys of information, progressing via theta rhythms. It could be speculated that these volleys take the form of rapid forward sweeps of incoming sensory information and rapid backward sweeps of mnemonic information (i.e., replay events) during opposing phases of a theta cycle. Once a reminder has been sufficiently processed to initiate a pattern completion process, each retrieval phase of a theta cycle provides a time window for the hippocampus to coordinate reinstatement of discrete 'parcels' of content in neocortex, presumably during ripple events. Neocortical areas including the parietal lobe (see Box 1) then accumulate this mnemonic evidence, yielding the phenomenology of reinstatement once the evidence surpasses a given threshold [89]. While speculative at this point, the idea is consistent with observations of theta-clocked memory signatures during episodic recall [86], during spatial navigation [90] and during working memory maintenance [91]. It is also consistent with evidence that the theta rhythm is not

limited to the hippocampus [75], but rather synchronizes larger neocortical networks during both encoding and recall [85, 92], presumably facilitating inter-regional communication. During cued recall, coupled theta oscillations in hippocampal-neocortical circuits might thus gate the information flow out of the hippocampus, constituting a clocking mechanism that times retrieval operations in order to minimize their temporal overlap with concurrent sensory processing (Key Figure).

Concluding Remarks

We reviewed recent progress in elucidating the neural chronometry of memory recall. Intriguingly, most of a memory cue's mnemonic fate is sealed within a single second (see Key Figure): For the first ~500 ms, sensory cue information progresses towards the hippocampus. Auto-associative processes within the hippocampus then reactivate the cell assembly assigned to the particular experience. This pattern completion process leads to the reinstatement of mnemonic content in high-level cortical sites from 500 ms onwards. Recent work has now begun to unveil the dynamic principles governing this reinstatement cascade. First, mirroring the (re)constructive nature of memory retrieval, the flow of information appears to reverse during recall (feed-back) compared to encoding (feed-forward). Moreover, the speed of feed-back communication might deviate from its encoding counterpart, including temporal compression and jumps at event boundaries. Lastly, theta rhythms play an integral part in coordinating hippocampal-neocortical communication, effectively gating sensory (external) vs. mnemonic (internal) representations and providing discrete time windows for the progression of information from one level to the next.

We assembled much of this intricate clockwork from different experimental approaches across different study populations and species. However, recent advances in our understanding of oscillatory dynamics [93] in conjunction with improved source reconstruction algorithms and wide-spread application of multivariate analysis techniques have kick-started a renaissance of non-invasive human electrophysiology. These developments will spawn a new generation of studies, capturing the brain-wide dynamics between the hippocampus and neocortex and opening fine-tuned temporal windows for experimental control of memory recall (Outstanding Questions).

Acknowledgements: This research was supported by a Wellcome Trust/Royal Society Sir Henry Dale Fellowship to B.P.S. (107672/Z/15/Z) and an ERC Starting Grant awarded to M.W. (ERC-STG-2016-715714)

References

1. Scoville, W.B. and Milner, B. (1957) Loss of recent memory after bilateral hippocampal lesions. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 20 (1), 11-21.
2. Marr, D. (1971) Simple memory: a theory for archicortex. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 262 (841), 23-81.
3. McNaughton, B.L. and Morris, R.G. (1987) Hippocampal synaptic enhancement and information storage within a distributed memory system. *Trends in neurosciences* 10 (10), 408-415.
4. Norman, K.A. and O'reilly, R.C. (2003) Modeling hippocampal and neocortical contributions to recognition memory: a complementary-learning-systems approach. *Psychological review* 110 (4), 611.
5. Teyler, T.J. and DiScenna, P. (1986) The hippocampal memory indexing theory. *Behav Neurosci* 100 (2), 147-54.
6. Lavenex, P. and Amaral, D.G. (2000) Hippocampal-neocortical interaction: A hierarchy of associativity. *Hippocampus* 10 (4), 420-430.
7. Tonegawa, S. et al. (2015) Memory engram cells have come of age. *Neuron* 87 (5), 918-931.
8. Norman, K.A. et al. (2006) Beyond mind-reading: multi-voxel pattern analysis of fMRI data. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 10 (9), 424-430.
9. Bosch, S.E. et al. (2014) Reinstatement of associative memories in early visual cortex is signaled by the hippocampus. *Journal of Neuroscience* 34 (22), 7493-7500.
10. Gordon, A.M. et al. (2013) Cortical reinstatement mediates the relationship between content-specific encoding activity and subsequent recollection decisions. *Cerebral Cortex* 24 (12), 3350-3364.
11. Ritchey, M. et al. (2012) Neural similarity between encoding and retrieval is related to memory via hippocampal interactions. *Cerebral Cortex* 23 (12), 2818-2828.
12. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2012) Episodic reinstatement in the medial temporal lobe. *Journal of Neuroscience* 32 (50), 18150-18156.
13. Tompary, A. et al. (2016) High-resolution investigation of memory-specific reinstatement in the hippocampus and perirhinal cortex. *Hippocampus* 26 (8), 995-1007.
14. Kok, P. and Turk-Browne, N.B. (2018) Associative prediction of visual shape in the hippocampus. *Journal of Neuroscience* 38 (31), 6888-6899.
15. Grande, X. et al. (2019) Holistic recollection via pattern completion involves hippocampal subfield CA3. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 0722-19.
16. Yonelinas, A.P. (2002) The nature of recollection and familiarity: A review of 30 years of research. *Journal of memory and language* 46 (3), 441-517.
17. Rugg, M.D. and Curran, T. (2007) Event-related potentials and recognition memory. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 11 (6), 251-257.
18. Parvizi, J. and Kastner, S. (2018) Promises and limitations of human intracranial electroencephalography. *Nature neuroscience* 21 (4), 474.
19. Fernández, G. and Tendolkar, I. (2006) The rhinal cortex: 'gatekeeper' of the declarative memory system. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 10 (8), 358-362.
20. Ludowig, E. et al. (2008) Intracranially recorded memory-related potentials reveal higher posterior than anterior hippocampal involvement in verbal encoding and retrieval. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience* 20 (5), 841-851.

21. Merkow, M.B. et al. (2015) The human hippocampus contributes to both the recollection and familiarity components of recognition memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (46), 14378-14383.
22. Mormann, F. et al. (2005) Phase/amplitude reset and theta–gamma interaction in the human medial temporal lobe during a continuous word recognition memory task. *Hippocampus* 15 (7), 890-900.
23. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2012) Memory signals are temporally dissociated in and across human hippocampus and perirhinal cortex. *Nature neuroscience* 15 (8), 1167.
24. Stark, C.E. and Okado, Y. (2003) Making memories without trying: medial temporal lobe activity associated with incidental memory formation during recognition. *Journal of Neuroscience* 23 (17), 6748-6753.
25. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2019) Recollection in the human hippocampal-entorhinal cell circuitry. *Nature Communications* 10 (1), 1503.
26. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2016) Hippocampal pattern completion is linked to gamma power increases and alpha power decreases during recollection. *Elife* 5, e17397.
27. Griffiths BJ, P.G., Roux F, Michelmann S, van der Plas M, Kolibius LD, Chelvarajah R, Rollings DT, Sawlani V, Hamer H, Gollwitzer S, Kreiselmeyer G, Staresina BP, Wimber M, Hanslmayr S (in press) Directional coupling of slow and fast hippocampal gamma with neocortical alpha/beta oscillations in human episodic memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
28. Buzsáki, G. et al. (2012) The origin of extracellular fields and currents—EEG, ECoG, LFP and spikes. *Nature reviews neuroscience* 13 (6), 407.
29. Rutishauser, U. et al. (2015) Representation of retrieval confidence by single neurons in the human medial temporal lobe. *Nature neuroscience* 18 (7), 1041.
30. Mormann, F. et al. (2008) Latency and selectivity of single neurons indicate hierarchical processing in the human medial temporal lobe. *Journal of Neuroscience* 28 (36), 8865-8872.
31. Chrobak, J.J. et al. (2000) Physiological patterns in the hippocampo-entorhinal cortex system. *Hippocampus* 10 (4), 457-465.
32. Teyler, T.J. and Rudy, J.W. (2007) The hippocampal indexing theory and episodic memory: updating the index. *Hippocampus* 17 (12), 1158-69.
33. O'Reilly, R.C. and Norman, K.A. (2002) Hippocampal and neocortical contributions to memory: Advances in the complementary learning systems framework. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 6 (12), 505-510.
34. Yaffe, R.B. et al. (2014) Reinstatement of distributed cortical oscillations occurs with precise spatiotemporal dynamics during successful memory retrieval. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (52), 18727-18732.
35. Jang, A.I. et al. (2017) Human cortical neurons in the anterior temporal lobe reinstate spiking activity during verbal memory retrieval. *Current Biology* 27 (11), 1700-1705. e5.
36. Vaz, A.P. et al. (2019) Coupled ripple oscillations between the medial temporal lobe and neocortex retrieve human memory. *Science* 363 (6430), 975-978.
37. Jafarpour, A. et al. (2014) Replay of very early encoding representations during recollection. *Journal of Neuroscience* 34 (1), 242-248.
38. Johnson, J.D. et al. (2015) Episodic retrieval involves early and sustained effects of reactivating information from encoding. *Neuroimage* 106, 300-310.
39. Kurth-Nelson, Z. et al. (2015) Temporal structure in associative retrieval. *Elife* 4, e04919.
40. Sutterer, D.W. et al. (2019) Alpha-band oscillations track the retrieval of precise spatial representations from long-term memory. *Journal of neurophysiology*.

41. Pu, Y. et al. (2018) Non-invasive investigation of human hippocampal rhythms using magnetoencephalography: a review. *Frontiers in neuroscience* 12, 273.
42. Jacobs, J. et al. (2016) Direct electrical stimulation of the human entorhinal region and hippocampus impairs memory. *Neuron* 92 (5), 983-990.
43. Goyal, A. et al. (2018) Electrical stimulation in hippocampus and entorhinal cortex impairs spatial and temporal memory. *Journal of Neuroscience* 38 (19), 4471-4481.
44. Suthana, N. et al. (2012) Memory enhancement and deep-brain stimulation of the entorhinal area. *New England Journal of Medicine* 366 (6), 502-510.
45. Fell, J. et al. (2013) Memory modulation by weak synchronous deep brain stimulation: a pilot study. *Brain stimulation* 6 (3), 270-273.
46. Fernández-Ruiz, A. et al. (2019) Long-duration hippocampal sharp wave ripples improve memory. *Science* 364 (6445), 1082-1086.
47. Girardeau, G. et al. (2009) Selective suppression of hippocampal ripples impairs spatial memory. *Nature neuroscience* 12 (10), 1222.
48. Norman, Y. et al. (2019) Hippocampal sharp-wave ripples linked to visual episodic recollection in humans. *Science* 365 (6454), eaax1030.
49. Craik, F.I. et al. (1996) The effects of divided attention on encoding and retrieval processes in human memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 125 (2), 159.
50. Gelbard-Sagiv, H. et al. (2008) Internally generated reactivation of single neurons in human hippocampus during free recall. *Science* 322 (5898), 96-101.
51. Linde-Domingo, J. et al. (2019) Evidence that neural information flow is reversed between object perception and object reconstruction from memory. *Nature communications* 10 (1), 179.
52. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2013) Reversible information flow across the medial temporal lobe: the hippocampus links cortical modules during memory retrieval. *Journal of Neuroscience* 33 (35), 14184-14192.
53. Koyano, K.W. et al. (2016) Laminar module cascade from layer 5 to 6 implementing cue-to-target conversion for object memory retrieval in the primate temporal cortex. *Neuron* 92 (2), 518-529.
54. Takeda, M. et al. (2018) Dynamic laminar rerouting of inter-areal mnemonic signal by cognitive operations in primate temporal cortex. *Nature communications* 9 (1), 4629.
55. Takeuchi, D. et al. (2011) Reversal of interlaminar signal between sensory and memory processing in monkey temporal cortex. *Science* 331 (6023), 1443-1447.
56. Carlson, T. et al. (2013) Representational dynamics of object vision: the first 1000 ms. *Journal of vision* 13 (10), 1-1.
57. Cichy, R.M. et al. (2014) Resolving human object recognition in space and time. *Nature neuroscience* 17 (3), 455.
58. Schultz, C. and Engelhardt, M. (2014) Anatomy of the hippocampal formation. In *The Hippocampus in Clinical Neuroscience*, pp. 6-17, Karger Publishers.
59. Hassabis, D. et al. (2007) Patients with hippocampal amnesia cannot imagine new experiences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104 (5), 1726-1731.
60. Dijkstra, N. et al. (2018) Differential temporal dynamics during visual imagery and perception. *Elife* 7, e33904.
61. Dijkstra, N. et al. (2017) Distinct top-down and bottom-up brain connectivity during visual perception and imagery. *Scientific reports* 7 (1), 5677.
62. Kriegeskorte, N. (2015) Deep neural networks: a new framework for modeling biological vision and brain information processing. *Annual review of vision science* 1, 417-446.

63. Horner, A.J. and Burgess, N. (2014) Pattern completion in multielement event engrams. *Current Biology* 24 (9), 988-992.
64. Horner, A.J. et al. (2015) Evidence for holistic episodic recollection via hippocampal pattern completion. *Nature communications* 6, 7462.
65. Carr, M.F. et al. (2011) Hippocampal replay in the awake state: a potential substrate for memory consolidation and retrieval. *Nature neuroscience* 14 (2), 147.
66. Liu, Y. et al. (2019) Human Replay Spontaneously Reorganizes Experience. *Cell*.
67. Schuck, N.W. and Niv, Y. (2019) Sequential replay of nonspatial task states in the human hippocampus. *Science advances* 364 (6447), eaaw5181.
68. Michelmann, S. et al. (2018) Replay of stimulus-specific temporal patterns during associative memory formation. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience* 30 (11), 1577-1589.
69. Michelmann, S. et al. (2019) Speed of time-compressed forward replay flexibly changes in human episodic memory. *Nature Human Behaviour* 3 (2), 143.
70. Yaffe, R.B. et al. (2017) Cued memory retrieval exhibits reinstatement of high gamma power on a faster timescale in the left temporal lobe and prefrontal cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience* 37 (17), 4472-4480.
71. Antony, J.W. et al. (2017) Retrieval as a fast route to memory consolidation. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 21 (8), 573-576.
72. Jacobs, J. (2014) Hippocampal theta oscillations are slower in humans than in rodents: implications for models of spatial navigation and memory. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 369 (1635), 20130304.
73. Lega, B.C. et al. (2012) Human hippocampal theta oscillations and the formation of episodic memories. *Hippocampus* 22 (4), 748-761.
74. Watrous, A.J. et al. (2013) A comparative study of human and rat hippocampal low-frequency oscillations during spatial navigation. *Hippocampus* 23 (8), 656-661.
75. Ketz, N.A. et al. (2015) Thalamic pathways underlying prefrontal cortex–medial temporal lobe oscillatory interactions. *Trends in neurosciences* 38 (1), 3-12.
76. Dragoi, G. and Buzsáki, G. (2006) Temporal encoding of place sequences by hippocampal cell assemblies. *Neuron* 50 (1), 145-157.
77. Gupta, A.S. et al. (2012) Segmentation of spatial experience by hippocampal theta sequences. *Nature neuroscience* 15 (7), 1032.
78. Skaggs, W.E. et al. (1996) Theta phase precession in hippocampal neuronal populations and the compression of temporal sequences. *Hippocampus* 6 (2), 149-172.
79. Lisman, J.E. and Idiart, M.A. (1995) Storage of 7+/-2 short-term memories in oscillatory subcycles. *Science* 267 (5203), 1512-1515.
80. Lisman, J.E. and Jensen, O. (2013) The theta-gamma neural code. *Neuron* 77 (6), 1002-1016.
81. Bahramisharif, A. et al. (2018) Serial representation of items during working memory maintenance at letter-selective cortical sites. *PLoS biology* 16 (8), e2003805.
82. Heusser, A.C. et al. (2016) Episodic sequence memory is supported by a theta–gamma phase code. *Nature neuroscience* 19 (10), 1374.
83. Staudigl, T. and Hanslmayr, S. (2013) Theta oscillations at encoding mediate the context-dependent nature of human episodic memory. *Current Biology* 23 (12), 1101-1106.
84. Köster, M. et al. (2019) Memory entrainment by visually evoked theta-gamma coupling. *NeuroImage* 188, 181-187.
85. Hebscher, M. et al. (2019) A causal role for the precuneus in network-wide theta and gamma oscillatory activity during complex memory retrieval. *ELife* 8, e43114.

86. Kerrén, C. et al. (2018) An optimal oscillatory phase for pattern reactivation during memory retrieval. *Current Biology* 28 (21), 3383-3392. e6.
87. Hasselmo, M.E. et al. (2002) A proposed function for hippocampal theta rhythm: separate phases of encoding and retrieval enhance reversal of prior learning. *Neural computation* 14 (4), 793-817.
88. Ison, M.J. et al. (2015) Rapid Encoding of New Memories by Individual Neurons in the Human Brain. *Neuron* 87 (1), 220-30.
89. Cabeza, R. et al. (2008) The parietal cortex and episodic memory: an attentional account. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 9 (8), 613.
90. Kunz, L. et al. (2019) Hippocampal theta phases organize the reactivation of large-scale electrophysiological representations during goal-directed navigation. *Science advances* 5 (7), eaav8192.
91. Fuentemilla, L. et al. (2010) Theta-coupled periodic replay in working memory. *Current Biology* 20 (7), 606-612.
92. Solomon, E. et al. (2017) Widespread theta synchrony and high-frequency desynchronization underlies enhanced cognition. *Nature communications* 8 (1), 1704.
93. Hanslmayr, S. et al. (2016) Oscillations and episodic memory: addressing the synchronization/desynchronization conundrum. *Trends in neurosciences* 39 (1), 16-25.
94. Hutchinson, J.B. et al. (2009) Posterior parietal cortex and episodic retrieval: convergent and divergent effects of attention and memory. *Learning Memory* 16 (6), 343-356.
95. Nelson, S.M. et al. (2010) A parcellation scheme for human left lateral parietal cortex. *Neuron* 67 (1), 156-170.
96. Sestieri, C. et al. (2017) The contribution of the human posterior parietal cortex to episodic memory. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 18 (3), 183.
97. Wagner, A.D. et al. (2005) Parietal lobe contributions to episodic memory retrieval. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 9 (9), 445-453.
98. Sestieri, C. et al. (2010) Attention to memory and the environment: functional specialization and dynamic competition in human posterior parietal cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience* 30 (25), 8445-8456.
99. Xiao, X. et al. (2017) Transformed neural pattern reinstatement during episodic memory retrieval. *Journal of Neuroscience* 37 (11), 2986-2998.
100. Favila, S.E. et al. (2018) Parietal representations of stimulus features are amplified during memory retrieval and flexibly aligned with top-down goals. *Journal of Neuroscience* 38 (36), 7809-7821.
101. Baddeley, A. (2000) The episodic buffer: a new component of working memory? *Trends in cognitive sciences* 4 (11), 417-423.
102. Vilberg, K.L. and Rugg, M.D. (2012) The neural correlates of recollection: transient versus sustained fMRI effects. *Journal of Neuroscience* 32 (45), 15679-15687.
103. Guidotti, R. et al. (2019) Choice-predictive activity in parietal cortex during source memory decisions. *NeuroImage* 189, 589-600.
104. Bergström, Z.M. et al. (2013) Multimodal imaging reveals the spatiotemporal dynamics of recollection. *Neuroimage* 68, 141-153.
105. Gonzalez, A. et al. (2015) Electrocorticography reveals the temporal dynamics of posterior parietal cortical activity during recognition memory decisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (35), 11066-11071.

106. Foster, B.L. et al. (2012) Neural populations in human posteromedial cortex display opposing responses during memory and numerical processing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (38), 15514-15519.
107. Kuhl, B.A. et al. (2013) Dissociable neural mechanisms for goal-directed versus incidental memory reactivation. *Journal of Neuroscience* 33 (41), 16099-16109.
108. Wang, J.X. et al. (2014) Targeted enhancement of cortical-hippocampal brain networks and associative memory. *Science* 345 (6200), 1054-1057.
109. Raichle, M.E. et al. (2001) A default mode of brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98 (2), 676-682.
110. Schmahmann, J.D. et al. (2007) Association fibre pathways of the brain: parallel observations from diffusion spectrum imaging and autoradiography. *Brain* 130 (3), 630-653.
111. Silson, E.H. et al. (2019) Distinct subdivisions of human medial parietal cortex support recollection of people and places. *eLife* 8, e47391.
112. Buzsáki, G. (1989) Two-stage model of memory trace formation: a role for “noisy” brain states. *J Neuroscience* 31 (3), 551-570.
113. Buzsáki, G. (2015) Hippocampal sharp wave-ripple: A cognitive biomarker for episodic memory and planning. *Hippocampus* 25 (10), 1073-1188.
114. Rasch, B. and Born, J. (2013) About sleep's role in memory. *J Physiological reviews* 93 (2), 681-766.
115. Buzsaki, G. et al. (1992) High-frequency network oscillation in the hippocampus. *Science* 256 (5059), 1025-1027.
116. Axmacher, N. et al. (2008) Ripples in the medial temporal lobe are relevant for human memory consolidation. *Brain* 131 (7), 1806-1817.
117. Staresina, B.P. et al. (2015) Hierarchical nesting of slow oscillations, spindles and ripples in the human hippocampus during sleep. *Nature neuroscience* 18 (11), 1679.
118. Frankland, P.W. and Bontempi, B. (2005) The organization of recent and remote memories. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 6 (2), 119.
119. Roumis, D.K. and Frank, L.M. (2015) Hippocampal sharp-wave ripples in waking and sleeping states. *Current opinion in neurobiology* 35, 6-12.
120. Karpicke, J.D. and Roediger, H.L. (2008) The critical importance of retrieval for learning. *Science* 319 (5865), 966-968.
121. Rowland, C.A. (2014) The effect of testing versus restudy on retention: a meta-analytic review of the testing effect. *J Psychological Bulletin* 140 (6), 1432.

BOX 1: Parietal cortex contributions to memory recall

Neuroimaging work has consistently shown engagement of medial and lateral posterior parietal cortex (PPC) in episodic memory retrieval [94]. Although beyond the scope of the current Review, it deserves mention that PPC consists of structurally and functionally distinct subregions [95-98]. Recall/reinstatement effects in PPC seem to qualitatively differ from those in occipito-temporal regions [99, 100], and prominent views hold that parts of PPC serve as an amodal **episodic buffer** [97, 101] or are deployed for working with memories in a goal-directed fashion once they are recalled [89, 96]. Common to these accounts is that PPC responds to a bottom-up mnemonic signal, and as reviewed in the main text, the most likely candidate to generate this signal is the hippocampus. Indeed, by varying the interval of maintaining a recalled episodic detail, fMRI data suggest that hippocampal engagement during successful recall is transient, whereas PPC engagement is sustained and covaries in time with the maintenance interval [102]. Moreover, a recent fMRI study found that mnemonic decodability in PPC correlated with that in MTL regions [103]. Both these results are consistent with the notion that a hippocampal memory signal precedes and influences PPC engagement, though it is difficult to infer the exact temporal relationship between these regions based solely on fMRI dynamics. One recent study used fMRI in conjunction with source-reconstructed EEG/MEG and revealed a recall effect in left precuneus from 600-1600 ms after cue onset [104]. Human intracranial recordings from parietal regions are relatively rare compared to MTL coverage. Apart from two studies using simple old/new recognition memory paradigms [29, 105], one study [106] used an autobiographical memory task, more strongly reliant on recall processes. Pronounced engagement of PPC was observed (high gamma signal, 70-180 Hz), with an average onset of the parietal response at 600 ms. Together, these studies suggests that PPC contributions unfold after the hippocampal recall process has

begun. We speculate that there might be a push-pull relationship between hippocampus and PPC. In particular, hippocampus initiates cortical reinstatement in a bottom-up, holistic fashion [64], whereas PPC aids and refines recall by deploying working memory/attentional resources to recover the task-relevant mnemonic features [107] (see Outstanding Questions). Given the extent of structural and functional connectivity of PPC not only with the hippocampus [108], but also with a wide network of high-level cortical regions [109-111], this region might be thought of as an additional, third layer in the multiplexed index for memory reinstatement (hippocampus → EC → PPC). This notion is corroborated by a recent MEG study showing enhanced connectivity between the MTL and precuneus during autobiographical memory retrieval [85]. In fact, experimental disruption of the precuneus via continuous theta burst stimulation diminished both MTL-cortical coupling and memory vividness, pointing to a potential role of PPC in maintaining hippocampal-cortical communication in service of successful recall.

BOX 2: Ripples during awake reactivation and their potential role in memory

strengthening

One exciting recent development with respect to the timing of memory signatures is the discovery of sharp-wave ripples (SWRs) during awake recall. Ripples are bursts of coordinated neural activity in the high gamma band (80-120 Hz in humans, 150-250 Hz in rodents), originating in the hippocampus, and thought to play a prominent role in memory consolidation by coordinating hippocampal-neocortical memory replay [112-114]. Hippocampal ripples were initially identified during sleep and states of immobility in rodents [115], and later also in humans [66, 116, 117]. According to two-stage models of memory formation [112, 118], an initially labile memory is reinforced by repeated replay in hippocampal-neocortical circuits. The fast time-scale of ripples enables spike-timing dependent plasticity, resulting in synaptic strengthening of the connections between co-active neural assemblies that represent the different elements of a memory [114]. A very recent study found that ripple events in the human brain are not limited to sleep and rest, but additionally occur during cued recall [36]. In this study, MTL ripples in a frequency range from 80 to 120 Hz showed a relative increase during recall periods of a memory task, were coupled to ripples in lateral temporal association cortex, and temporally co-occurred with the reinstatement of encoding-specific neural patterns (Figure 2b, *bottom*). These findings strongly suggest a role of ripples in orchestrating the reinstatement of memories between the hippocampus and neocortex, and indicate an important parallel between animal and human memory replay and consolidation [117]. The results also open up the compelling possibility that memory reinstatement serves a common function irrespective of whether it occurs during sleep or wake, namely the stabilization and reorganization of memories [71, 119]. If ripple-mediated plasticity can be induced via awake cued recall, this might provide a

plausible physiological basis for why repeatedly recalling a memory is such a powerful means to make memories last, thereby bridging between low-level physiology and cognitive theories of the **'testing effect'** [120, 121]. One fruitful avenue for future work is thus to further investigate the role of SWRs for retrieval-mediated learning, stabilization and reorganization, to identify the parallels as well as the functional differences between sleep and wake ripples [119], and to describe the timing of ripples relative to slower (e.g., theta) oscillations in hippocampal-neocortical circuits.

Glossary

Auto-associative processes: Intra-hippocampal network dynamics based on recurrent connections among neurons, thought to enable pattern completion. We refer to auto-associative process in the hippocampus as pattern completion and to the ensuing activation of the cortical engram as reinstatement, though the hippocampal pattern could also be described as (part of) the engram and a cortical pattern is completed during reinstatement.

BOLD signal: Blood-oxygenation-level-dependent signal, reflecting indirect and delayed metabolic effects of neuronal activity (leading to certain temporal ambiguity). Main dependent measure in functional magnetic resonance imaging.

Cued recall: Experimental paradigm in which participants initially learn stimulus associations (e.g., word/image pairs). Memory is then queried by presenting one stimulus only, with the task to recall the associated material.

Dynamic Causal Modelling (DCM): Analytical approach to infer a causal relationship among two or more brain regions.

Encoding Retrieval Similarity (ERS): Correlation of distributed activation patterns (e.g., across voxels, sensors) between study (encoding) and test (retrieval) of particular stimuli, used to assess memory reinstatement.

Engram: The neurophysiological representation of a memory trace underlying its phenomenology.

Episodic buffer: A component of Baddeley's working memory model, integrating external (perceptual) and internal (mnemonic) information in a limited-capacity temporary store.

Gamma bursts: Brief bouts of neural activity in the gamma frequency range (> 30 Hz), assumed to synchronize cells that code the same content at a given moment in time, and therefore assumed to represent mnemonic content during cued recall.

Hippocampal index: Theoretical account, positing that hippocampal cell assemblies formed during an experience point to neocortical representations of that experience.

Intracranial EEG: Invasive recordings of electrical brain activity via cortical grids or depth electrodes.

Machine learning: Multivariate classifiers (e.g., support vector machines or linear discriminant analysis) are trained to distinguish e.g. two activation profiles during encoding. The training weights can then be used to assess the extent of reactivation of encoding patterns during retrieval.

Pattern completion: A partial activation pattern elicits activation of an entire ensemble of previously linked neurons via auto-associative recurrent connections in the CA3 subfield. Used here to denote reactivation processes in the hippocampus.

Reinstatement: Used here to denote the reactivation of the cortical engram induced by hippocampal pattern completion.

Replay: Dynamic reactivation of temporal activation profiles, initially observed in rodent recordings during post-learning rest intervals. Can occur in a forward or backward fashion and at different compression rates.

Representational similarity analysis: Analysis approach correlating activation patterns across features (e.g., voxels in fMRI, electrodes in EEG) between different experimental conditions or trials.

Source Analysis: Umbrella term to describe methods that project electrode (EEG) or sensor (MEG) data onto brain space, generating a model of the most likely source of activity observed over the scalp.

Testing effect: The finding that long-term retention is strongly enhanced when memories are repeatedly recalled, as opposed to repeatedly re-studied.