

Post-encoding Reactivation Is Related to Learning of Episodes in Humans

Xiongbo Wu^{1,2}, Xavier Viñals², Aya Ben-Yakov³,
Bernhard P. Staresina⁴, and Lluís Fuentemilla^{1,2}

Abstract

■ Prior animal and human studies have shown that post-encoding reinstatement plays an important role in organizing the temporal sequence of unfolding episodes in memory. Here, we investigated whether post-encoding reinstatement serves to promote the encoding of “one-shot” episodic learning beyond the temporal structure in humans. In Experiment 1, participants encoded sequences of pictures depicting unique and meaningful episodic-like events. We used representational similarity analysis on scalp EEG recordings during encoding and found evidence of rapid picture-elicited EEG pattern reinstatement at episodic offset

(around 500 msec post-episode). Memory reinstatement was not observed between successive elements within an episode, and the degree of memory reinstatement at episodic offset predicted later recall for that episode. In Experiment 2, participants encoded a shuffled version of the picture sequences from Experiment 1, rendering each episode meaningless to the participant but temporally structured as in Experiment 1, and we found no evidence of memory reinstatement at episodic offset. These results suggest that post-encoding memory reinstatement is akin to the rapid formation of unique and meaningful episodes that unfold over time. ■

INTRODUCTION

In episodic encoding, an experienced event is rapidly transformed into a memory trace that has the potential to be consciously recollected at long term (Tulving, 1983). Prior research has largely focused on examining how the brain contributes to successful encoding of individual trial information, such as single images (Paller & Wagner, 2002) or single item–context associations (Davachi, 2006). However, in natural settings, an episode is better characterized by a collection of successive elements that become contextually meaningful as they unfold over time. To be accessible for future retrieval, these elements have to be associatively linked into a bound memory trace. Discerning “when” the brain binds the continuous experience input into a cohesive episodic memory trace and “how” the brain undergoes this rapid transformation is essential to understand memory formation.

Human neuroimaging studies examining memory formation during a continuous stream of stimuli, such as naturalistic video clips, have shown that a distributed network of brain regions comprising the hippocampus and neocortex increased activity at the end of an event (Ben-Yakov & Henson, 2018; Baldassano et al., 2017; Ben-Yakov, Eshel, & Dudai, 2013). This event offset brain signal has been shown to reflect a binding operation of the just-encoded event elements into a specific spatio-temporal context

(Ritchey & Cooper, 2020), which aligns well with the notion that the hippocampus is crucial for binding elements of our experience with contextual information (Ranganath, 2010; Diana, Yonelinas, & Ranganath, 2007; Eichenbaum, Yonelinas, & Ranganath, 2007; Davachi, 2006). In real life, episodic encoding relies on the possibility to form a coherent memory trace that integrates the temporally evolving sequence of elements into a meaningful context, so that if there is a shift in contextual information, this is perceived as the end of one episode and the beginning of another (Zacks, Speer, Swallow, Braver, & Reynolds, 2007). These episodic boundaries are thought to support the segmentation of the continuous experience into discrete episodes (Zacks et al., 2007), and their detection has a direct impact on how events are organized into meaningful units in long-term memory (DuBrow & Davachi, 2013, 2014; Radvansky, 2012; Ezzyat & Davachi, 2011; Kurby & Zacks, 2008).

Work in rodents has provided evidence that memory replay at event offset plays a critical role in stabilizing a temporal memory organization beyond initial learning processes (Carr, Jadhav, & Frank, 2011; Karlsson & Frank, 2008; Diba & Buzsáki, 2007; Foster & Wilson, 2006). In humans, rapid event offset memory reinstatement has been shown to be induced at the detection of context shifts during encoding of sequences of episodes and to predict their temporal order memory accuracy of the encoded sequential episodes in a later memory test (Silva, Baldassano, & Fuentemilla, 2019; Sols, DuBrow, Davachi, & Fuentemilla, 2017). These findings suggest that the reactivation of an event contemporaneously with the experience of a subsequent adjacent event could

¹Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, Spain, ²University of Barcelona, Spain, ³Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel, ⁴University of Oxford, United Kingdom

theoretically result in the co-activation of the past and present events, promoting the binding of sequential events in their temporal order. In the real world, however, the recall of encoded episodes does not always depend on maintaining the exact order of the sequential representations, which can be fragile in many situations. Instead, it has been shown that when individuals are asked to recall episodes encoded in naturalistic conditions, they structured the recall along the causal (Brownstein & Read, 2007), semantics (Baldassano, Hasson, & Norman, 2018; van Kesteren et al., 2013), and the relations between the elements embedded in the episodes (Lee & Chen, 2021). In fact, psychological models of event comprehension have emphasized that as the experience unfolds, memory is carved by how people construct a coherent model of a situation, which consists of agents and objects, semantic and spatiotemporal contexts, and the relations between them (Radvansky & Zacks, 2011). Notably, neuroimaging studies using video clips involving multiple consecutive episodes have started to find evidence that brain activity is naturally structured into events organized along these representational dimensions (e.g., Heusser, Fitzpatrick, & Manning, 2021; Lee & Chen, 2021; Reagh & Ranganath, 2021; Bird, 2020; Baldassano et al., 2017). Thus, if memory reactivation at episodic offset is an important neural signature of the rapid—“one-shot”—learning of an unfolding realistic episode in humans, it is important to clarify whether it is concomitant to the encoding of episodes that included sequence of elements depicting coherent relations between them.

To address the issue, we designed a task that required participants to encode and later recall sequences of pictures depicting unique episodic-like events followed by a delay period with no stimulus. We used representational similarity analysis (RSA) of scalp EEG recordings during encoding and found evidence for memory reactivation of the sequence elements of the episode after encoding, that is, at the offset of the episode, and the degree of memory reinstatement at the offset predicted later memory recall for the specific episode. Memory reinstatement was not observed between successive elements within an episode, indicating that memory reactivation was specifically induced once participants perceived the unfolding episode to be completed. In a separate experiment, we also found that offset memory reinstatement was not present when participants encoded sequences of pictures that were not perceived as meaningful episodes. These results suggest that rapid memory reinstatement at episodic offset may be a neural signature engaged to integrate elements of the unfolding experience into a coherent memory for the just-encoded episode.

METHODS

Participants

Participants were native Spanish speakers who were recruited for pay (10€/hr). All participants had normal

or corrected-to-normal vision and reported no history of medical, neurological, or psychiatric disorders. Twenty-five participants (17 women; age range 18–29 years) were recruited for Experiment 1. In addition, 28 new participants (15 women; age range 19–35 years) were recruited for Experiment 2. The sample size is based on similar studies in the literature (Silva et al., 2019; Sols et al., 2017; Ben-Yakov et al., 2013). We used data from Silva et al. (2019) to perform a power analysis, and the results indicated the required sample size to achieve 80% power for detecting an effect, at a significance criterion of $\alpha = .05$, was $n = 23$. Informed consent was obtained from participants in accordance with procedures approved by the ethics committee of the University of Barcelona.

Experimental Procedure

Both experiments (Figure 1) consisted of an encoding and a retrieval phase, separated by a 10- to 15-min break in the middle. Task timing and visual stimulus presentation were under the control of commercially available software e-Prime 2.0 (Psychology Software Tools).

The encoding phase of Experiment 1 included 100 different sequences, each consisting of six pictures that each was presented to participants only once. All pictures depicted emotionally neutral events and were controlled for saliency. All sequences of pictures described day life routine circumstances such as shopping, reading a book at home, or frying an egg in the kitchen. The pictures of each of the series were related to each other as in a story presented chronologically ordered. The order of pictures within each sequence was the same across participants, but the order of the sequence presentation was counter-balanced across participants. Before the encoding phase, participants were taught to attend to the picture series for a subsequent cue-recalled test yet not to engage in active rehearsal, especially when the blue fixation cross at the end of the series appeared. They were informed beforehand about the format of the subsequent test, entailing cued-recall of the images of each series. Participants were encouraged to memorize as many pictures as possible in a narrative form. The experiment only began when the examiner made sure that the participants fully understood the task. During the task, participants were encouraged to minimize eye movements and blinking. Each trial began with the presentation of text “New Episode” for 2000 msec, which marked the start of a new sequence. This was followed by a fixation screen with a red asterisk lasting 2500 msec. Each picture was then presented sequentially on a white screen for 2500 msec and followed by a 1500-msec black fixation cross. Immediately after the presentation of the last picture in each series, a blue asterisk was presented on the screen, indicating a post-episode offset period of 4000 msec during which participants were previously instructed to avoid rehearsing the just-encoded picture sequence. The asterisk remained visible on the screen during the offset period. Immediately after the




Figure 1. The experimental design. (A) Task design in Experiment 1. During encoding, 100 different sequences were presented only once. Each sequence included six different pictures that unfold a life-like coherent narrative episode. After each sequence of images, there was an offset period (4 sec) during which participants were instructed to avoid rehearsing the just-encoded picture sequence. Participants were asked to provide a subjective rating of episodic coherence to the just-encoded picture sequence at the end of each trial. During retrieval, the first picture of each sequence was presented, and a message prompted at the screen instructing to report the associated episode during encoding. Participants were asked to verbally report within 20 sec their memory-associated episode or to indicate whether no memory came up associated to that picture cue. (B) Task design in Experiment 2. Pictures were shuffled across sequences so that no meaningful story could be constructed after each sequence presentation. The procedure was identical to Experiment 1 except three adjustments for task difficulty: (1) Time duration for the presentation of each picture during encoding was increased to 3000 msec. (2) The total number of sequences presented to the participants was 60. (3) After each cued-picture recall task, participants were requested to perform a sequence order recognition task within 30 sec, during which all six pictures from the same sequence series (including the cue picture) were presented on the screen in random positions and participants were asked to type the order of them as the original sequence presented during encoding phase.

offset period, participants were asked to provide a subjective rating of coherence for the just-encoded sequence. A rating scale ranged from 1 to 4, where 1 stood for “not coherent” and 4 stood for “very coherent.” The next trial began after a fixed time interval of 2000 msec.

For the retrieval phase, each trial started after the presentation of text “New Recall” for 2000 msec on the screen. This was followed by a fixation screen with a red asterisk lasting 2500 msec. After the asterisk, the first picture of one sequence was presented to the participant for 3500 msec on the screen serving as a cue to prompt the free verbal recall for the rest of the pictures in that sequence. Participants were instructed to start the verbal recall once the text “Explain the story” was presented on the screen following a 1000-msec fixation cross. The verbal recall was limited to 20 sec, and participants could stop the recall when finished by pressing the space bar. The order of the picture cues was randomized before their presentation at the retrieval phase.

In Experiment 2, we shuffled the pictures across sequences from Experiment 1 so that each sequence was formed by six pictures from different sequences. Thus, each sequence no longer depicted a meaningful episodic sequence. As in Experiment 1, the order of pictures within each sequence was kept the same across participants but the order of the sequence was randomized

between participants. The general experimental settings for the encoding and retrieval phases and the instructions to participants were identical to Experiment 1. However, three adjustments were made: (i) the presentation time of each picture during encoding was 3000 msec; (ii) the total number of sequences presented to the participants was 60; and (iii) we added an order recognition task after each cued-picture recall task. During the sequence order recognition task, all six pictures from the same sequence (including the cue picture) were presented on the screen in random positions and participants were asked to type the order in which they appeared in the encoding phase. Participants had 30 sec to type the order of the pictures, and they could skip to the next trial when finished by pressing the space bar. These changes were motivated by previous pilot studies with a small sample of participants that ensured this number of sequences provided a balanced outcome between picture sequences whose order memory was relatively preserved or not.

EEG Recording

For both experiments, EEG was recorded using a 31-channel system at a sampling rate of 500 Hz, using a BrainAmp amplifier and Ag/AgCl electrodes mounted in an electrocap (EasyCap) located at 28 standard positions

(Fp1/2, Fz, F7/8, F3/4, Fc1/2, Fc5/6, Cz, C3/4, T3/4, Cp1/2, Cp5/6, Pz, P3/4, T7/9, P7/8, O1/2, Oz) and at the left and right mastoids. An electrode placed at the lateral outer canthus of the right eye served as an on-line reference. EEG was rereferenced off-line to the linked mastoids. Vertical eye movements were monitored with an electrode at the infraorbital ridge of the right eye. Electrode impedances were kept below 3 k Ω . A band-pass filter (0.1–20 Hz) was implemented off-line before the analysis.

Verbal Recall Analysis

During the retrieval phase of Experiments 1 and 2, participants were asked to verbally recall in the form of a “narrative” as many pictures as possible within each sequence corresponding to the cue. Free verbal recall of each trial was recorded through an audio recorder, and the audio files were later analyzed by a native Spanish speaker in the laboratory. Within each retrieval trial, a picture was considered as successfully retrieved when the precise details of the picture were described, or its core feature was mentioned during recall. Memory for each sequence was then quantified by the number of pictures (excluding the cue) correctly recalled.

Sequence Order Analysis

For Experiment 1, the order of the verbally recalled items in each trial was analyzed. A trial was considered in order when all recalled items followed the same sequential order as the encoding sequence. For Experiment 2, the temporal order memory for picture sequences recognition was compared with the true order of the sequence, and the result for each trial was coded as the maximum number of pictures (including the cue) correctly ordered in a row.

EEG Data Analysis

For each participant, we first used EEG data of the encoding phase to extract epochs for each item within the sequence, namely, an EEG epoch for the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth picture. Each epoch had a duration of 2500 msec and was baseline corrected to the prestimulus interval (–100 to 0 msec). We then extracted epochs for the post-episode offset signals after each sequence with duration of 4000 msec and baseline corrected to the time interval (–100 to 0 msec) before its onset. Finally, we repeated the procedure to extract epochs for the post-item offset of 1500 msec (with baseline corrected to –100 to 0 msec), that corresponded to the ISI separating each item presentation during episodic sequence encoding phase.

Time-resolved RSA

For RSA, each EEG epoch data were smoothed by averaging data via a moving window of 100 msec throughout the

EEG epoch (excluding the baseline period) and then down-sampled by a factor of 5. RSA was performed at individual level and included spatial features (i.e., scalp voltages from all the 28 electrodes; Silva et al., 2019). The similarity analysis was calculated using Pearson correlation coefficients, which are insensitive to the absolute amplitude and variance of the EEG response.

For both Experiments 1 and 2, we conducted a trial-based RSA between the EEG signal elicited by each encoding item (first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth) and the EEG signal elicited during immediate post-episode offset. RSA involved the correlation of each temporal point to point from the picture encoding period (i.e., 2.5 sec) to all the temporal point from the offset period (i.e., 4 sec). After data smoothing and down-sampling, EEG epoch data for each item encoding contained 250 time points (given the 500-Hz EEG recording sampling rate) covering the 2500 msec of item picture presentation, and EEG data for each post-episode offset contained 400 time points, equivalent to 4000 msec. Point-to-point correlation values were then calculated, resulting in a single-trial 2-D similarity matrix with the size of 250 \times 400, where the *x*-axis represented the offset time points and the *y*-axis represented the encoding time points. A trial-based RSA was computed between EEG patterns elicited by the encoding of first to fourth and first to fifth picture and the EEG patterns elicited at the immediate post-fourth and post-fifth picture ISI interval (i.e., 1500 msec), respectively. More concretely, we conducted RSA between EEG signal elicited at post-stimulus period after the fourth item and EEG patterns triggered during the encoding of each of the preceding first, second, third, and fourth items. Then, we repeated the same RSA but between EEG signal elicited at poststimulus period after the fifth item and EEG patterns triggered during the encoding of each of the preceding first, second, third, fourth and fifth items. This resulted in nine similarity matrices in total for each participant. The resulting similarity matrices were then averaged, which resulted in a single 2-D matrix with a size of 250 \times 150 (i.e., 2500 msec of picture encoding \times 1500 msec of poststimulus offset or ISI), depicting the overall degree of similarity between EEG patterns elicited during item encoding and post-item offset.

Nonparametric Cluster-based Permutation Test

To account for RSA differences between conditions, we employed a nonparametric statistical method (Maris & Oostenveld, 2007), which identifies clusters of significant points on the resulting 2-D similarity matrix and corrects for multiple comparison based on cluster-level randomization testing to control the FWE rate. Statistics were computed on values between conditions for each time point, and based on adjacency in the 2-D matrix, adjacent points that passed the significance threshold ($p < .05$, two-tailed) were selected and grouped together as a cluster. The cluster-level statistics were then calculated by summing up the statistics of all time points within in each

identified cluster. The procedure was then repeated 1000 times with randomly shuffled labels across conditions to simulate the null hypothesis. For each permutation, the cluster-level statistics with the highest absolute value was registered to construct a distribution of the cluster-level statistics under the null hypothesis. The nonparametric statistical test was calculated by the proportion of permuted test statistics that exceeded the true observed cluster-level statistics.

Bayes Factor Statistical Analysis

To further evaluate the power of the RSA effects that could be observed between conditions, we implemented the Bayes factor statistical analysis (Kass & Raftery, 1995) in the point-to-point 2-D similarity matrix. Bayes factor was computed using MATLAB Toolbox (Bart, 2021, bayesFactor, <https://github.com/klabhub/bayesFactor>) on RSA values between conditions for each point of the resulting 2-D similarity matrix (250 × 400). A Bayes factor greater than 10 indicates strong evidence for difference between conditions comparing to the null hypothesis.

Linear Mixed Effect Model

To investigate the relationship between EEG similarity values and behavioral memory on a trial basis, we implemented a linear mixed effect model (LMM), which accounts for intra- and inter-individual variances. This analysis would also allow scrutinize the extent to which possible differences in EEG similarity results when comparing high and low accuracy trials observed with a median-split approach were independent on the partitioning trial strategy implemented at the participant level. Thus, we specified in our LMM the correlation values for one specific point on the resulting 2-D similarity matrix as the dependent variable and included the following factors as fixed effect variables: the number of items correctly recalled (which ranged from 0 to 5, without counting the picture cue present at the recall task); the index of an item's order in each sequence (first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth), and the coherence rating provided by the participant to each sequence at encoding (which ranged from 1 to 4). Participant number was introduced into the model as the grouping variable, with random intercept and a fixed slope for each of the fixed-effect variables. To balance the requirement for computational power and signal-to-noise ratio, we further smoothed the resulting 2-D similarity matrix for each item–offset pair by averaging over a moving window of 200 msec and then down-sampled by the factor of 5; both smoothing and down-sampling were conducted two-dimensionally across the *x* and *y* axes. We applied the model fitting analysis independently for each position on the resulting 2-D similarity matrix (50 × 80) and then returned the 2-D statistics map of the same size for each fixed-effect variable. Here to control for a multicomparison problem, the nonparametric

cluster-based permutation test cannot be applied because each permutation represents a sample from the null distribution, which is not the case in LMM where it contains a covariance structure induced by multiple levels of relatedness among the individuals. Therefore, we implemented a Bonferroni correction to the statistical threshold to correct for the multiple-comparison problem in the resulting statistical maps for each fixed-effect variable. Thus, the resulting statistical map was thresholded with an adjusted alpha level of $\alpha = 1.25 \times 10^{-5}$ (0.05/4000).

RESULTS

Experiment 1: Meaningful Episodic Sequence Encoding

Free Recall for Meaningful Episodes

In Experiment 1, participants were able to recall, on average, 2.32 items ($SD = .456$) in each series out of the total possible five items included in episodic sequence. Participants tended to recall encoded sequences in the form of “narrative” (e.g., “this is a party, there are balloons, the cake, and after the cake a piñata is broken and a gift comes out, but I don't remember what it was”), and we counted the number of picture items included in their recall. The mean percentage of trials across participants that successfully recalled zero, one, two, three, four, and five items after the retrieval cue were, respectively, 24.89% ($SD = 9.34\%$), 8.65% ($SD = 3.41\%$), 14.14% ($SD = 4.94\%$), 24% ($SD = 5.68\%$), 18.91% ($SD = 6.49\%$), and 9.41% ($SD = 6.35\%$; Figure 2A). To increase the signal-to-noise ratio, for later RSA on EEG data, we first adopted a median split approach to separate the trials based on the corresponding task performance. Sequences with two or fewer items recalled during the retrieval phase were labeled as low memory trials, and sequences with equal or more than three items recalled were labeled as high memory trials. The threshold was selected by its relatively well-balanced separation for number of trials at subject level, as the average percentage of trials after the median split separation was, respectively, 47.64% ($SD = 12.51\%$) for low memory condition and 52.36% ($SD = 12.51\%$) for high memory condition (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: $z = 0.821, p = .412$; Figure 2B).

For each participant, we then calculated recall accuracy for each of the items in the sequence. The results showed a gradual decrease in accuracy for items as a function of their order position in the sequence during encoding: mean = 65.09% and $SD = 10.44\%$ for Item 2, mean = 56.48% and $SD = 10.92\%$ for Item 3, mean = 51.76% and $SD = 10.43\%$ for Item 4, mean = 50.06% and $SD = 11.57\%$ for Item 5, and mean = 42.91% and $SD = 11.35\%$ for Item 6 (Figure 2C). We also assessed how well item order was preserved during recall by counting, for each trial sequence, the number of items recalled in correct order as a function of the total number of recalled items for that sequence. We found that participants were accurate in recalling in order the items, independent of the




Figure 2. Behavioral results for Experiment 1. (A) Percentage of trials at the cued recall task as a function of number of items recalled in each sequence. (B) Percentage of trials included in the high (High Mem) and low memory (Low Mem) condition in Experiment 1 after implementing the median-split approach. Series with at least three item pictures correctly retrieved after cue were counted as high memory trials; otherwise the series were counted as low memory trials. (C) Percentage of trials as a function of the item across sequence order being recalled. (D) Percentage of trials with recall in-order as a function of number of items recalled. A recall trial was considered as in-order when its items were recalled following the same sequential order as the true sequence. (E) Percentage of trials as a function of the participants' degree of subjective coherence rating. (F) Mean coherence rating score for trials included in the high and low memory conditions, separated by median-split verbal recall memory. In (A–E), bars represent the average across participants. Each black dot represents values for an individual participant. For all boxplots in (F), the central mark is the median and the edges of the box are the 25th and 75th percentiles. $*p < .05$.

total number of items included in their recall, $F(3, 71) = 1.464$, $p = .231$ (mean = 97.17% and $SD = 5.40\%$ for two items, mean = 95.89% and $SD = 5.51\%$ for three items, mean = 98.79% and $SD = 5.36\%$ for four items, mean = 98.01% and $SD = 3.26\%$ for five items; Figure 2D).

Subjective Ratings of Episodic Coherence

The coherence rating provided a subjective measure of the degree of perceived narrative of each sequence.

Because of technical issues, data for coherence ratings of four participants were not registered and they could not be included in the analysis. On average, for the remaining 21 participants, sequences were rated as 2.6 ($SD = .41$; on a scale that ranged from 1 to 4), and the mean percentage of trials rated as 1, 2, 3, and 4 were, respectively, 15.34% ($SD = 13.63\%$), 26.79% ($SD = 11.67\%$), 40.36% ($SD = 17.04\%$), and 17.51% ($SD = 14.58\%$; Figure 2E). After median splitting the trials based on verbal recall performance, trials with high memory showed significantly higher coherence ratings (mean = 2.79, $SD = .45$) compared with trials with low memory (mean = 2.40, $SD = .45$; paired Student t test: $t(20) = 6.166$, $p < .001$, two-tailed; Figure 2F).

RSA between Picture Sequence Encoding and at Episodic Offset

We first asked whether EEG patterns induced at the post-episode offset period correlated to EEG patterns elicited by the just-encoded picture items within the episodic sequence and, if so, whether the magnitude of such correlation was associated to memory recall at the test. To address this issue, we implemented a trial-based RSA between EEG data elicited at picture item encoding (first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth) with EEG data immediately following the episode offset period. For each participant, the resulting trial-based RSA values were averaged separately according to two memory conditions: those associated with the participants' ability to recall picture items with high memory (three or more items) and those with low memory (less than three items). To account for enough number of EEG trials to be included in both conditions and to ensure these trials included all items (1–6) and post-episode offset EEG signal cleaned of artifacts, we set a post hoc criteria to exclude participants that did not reach a minimum of $>15\%$ number of trials in either condition, resulting in 15 participants for the current analysis (average percentage of trials remained well-balanced between conditions with 35.04% [$SD = 8.06\%$] of total trials included in analysis for low memory condition and 32.75% [$SD = 11.29\%$] of total trials for high memory condition; Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: $z = 0.597$, $p = .551$).

In both high and low memory conditions, the results of this analysis revealed an increase in similarity between EEG patterns induced ~ 400 –800 msec at the post-episode offset period and EEG signal elicited ~ 400 –1300 msec at the picture item sequence encoding period (Figure 3A). However, the nonparametric cluster-based permutation analysis identified one statistically significant cluster where similarity values were higher in the high than in the low memory trials ($p = .001$; mean t value = 3.242, peak t value = 5.473; Figure 3B). We next evaluated whether the similarity between item encoding and post-episode offset period was driven by EEG patterns elicited by specific picture items within the just-encoded sequence. We




Figure 3. Neural similarity results at post-encoding period for Experiment 1. (A) Time-resolved degree of neural similarity between item picture encoding and post-encoding offset for events with high or low memory at test. (B) Difference between similarity values for the two conditions. Statistically significant ($p < .05$, cluster-based permutation test) higher similarity value ~ 400 – 800 msec at the post-episode offset period with ~ 400 – 1300 msec at item picture encoding period found for events with higher recall performance (indicated by a black thick line). (C) In all boxplots, the central mark is the median across participants and the edges of the box are the 25th and 75th percentiles. They depict the degree of similarity within the identified cluster for each item encoding with its corresponding offset period. Each black dot represents values for an individual participant. High memory sequence showed significantly greater similarity across encoding items. (D) Bayes factor of the difference between similarity values for the two conditions. A Bayes factor greater than 10 indicates strong evidence for difference between high and low memory conditions. (E) t value map of the variable numbers of item recalled reveals the area that exceeded the significance threshold after Bonferroni correction with adjusted alpha level of $\alpha = 1.25 \times 10^{-5}$ (one-tailed). No area exceeding the significance threshold was found for the t value map of the variable serial position of item in sequence neither for that of the variable coherence rating.

extracted the mean similarity values within the identified cluster for each item–offset pair and computed a repeated-measures ANOVA with two factors: Trial Condition (high vs. low memory) and Encoding Item (first, second, third,

fourth, fifth, and sixth). The results of this analysis showed a significant main effect for both Trial Condition, $F(1, 14) = 15.407$, $p = .002$, and Encoding Item, $F(5, 70) = 2.677$, $p = .028$, but no significant interaction, $F(5, 70) = 0.315$,

$p = .902$ (Figure 3C), indicating that episodic offset increase in similarity was not driven by EEG patterns elicited by specific items from the encoded item sequence. To further evaluate the power of the effect of the difference between high and low memory conditions, we calculated the Bayes factor on similarity values of each point on 2-D similarity matrix. The results showed strong evidence (Bayes factor greater than 10) for difference between conditions overlapping the area where significant higher similarity values were found on nonparametric cluster-based permutation analysis (Figure 3D).

Having shown that neural similarity increases of the just-encoded sequence elements was elicited at episodic offset and that it was functionally associated to later memory recall, we then leveraged this to explore the relationship between the magnitude of memory reinstatement and the numbers of items to be recalled correctly later. At the same time, we asked whether the observed effects could be simply explained by the participants' subjective feeling of coherence of the episode, as we found that subjective ratings of coherence were higher for high than for low memory condition. To address these issues, we applied an LMM to our trial-based RSA data (see Methods section). Two participants from the previous RSA were not included here because of the missing data for coherence rating, resulting in 13 participants in total for the LMM analysis. Given that previous median-split analysis showed an increase similarity magnitude associated with higher recall performance, we specifically focused on this trend for LMM analysis. The result revealed one time interval that survived the statistical threshold for the fixed effect variable total number of items correctly recalled (one-tailed, mean t value = 5.032, peak t value = 5.621, $p < 1.25 \times 10^{-5}$, Bonferroni corrected; Figure 3E). The time interval, which covered ~300–700 msec of post-episode offset and ~300–900 msec of item encoding, indicated the region where the degree of neural similarity of each item elicited during post-episode offset was significantly positively correlated with total number of items to be recalled in the corresponding sequence. However, no significant point exceeding the statistical threshold was identified on the statistical map accounting for the variable indexing order position in sequence nor for the variable indexing coherence rating.

To examine the extent to which the results from the previous LMM analysis were not because of a limited sample size, we repeated the analysis including the participants that did not reach the criteria for median-split analysis. This led to an increase of sample size from 13 to 21 (4 out of the total 25 participants have missing data for coherence rating). The analysis yielded similar results as the previous ones: RSA data of ~300–700 msec from post-episode offset and of ~300–800 msec from item encoding of the fixed effect variable total number of items correctly recalled survived the statistical threshold (one-tailed, mean t value = 5.076, peak t value = 5.757, $p < 1.25 \times 10^{-5}$, Bonferroni corrected), indicating the

association between RSA magnitude with higher recall performance on a trial basis. Again, no significant point exceeding the statistical threshold was identified on the statistical map accounting for the variable indexing order position in the sequence nor for the variable indexing participants' coherence rating.

RSA Effects at Episodic Offset Are Condition-specific but Not Trial-specific

We next explored if the increase in RSA between EEG patterns elicited by picture sequence and offset period were trial specific. To do so, for each participant, we first selected the trials with high memory performance (sequences with equal or more than three items recalled). We then shuffled the offset epochs across trials so that each episodic sequence was paired with a random event offset. RSA was then computed on a trial level between each stimulus epoch with their new random offset epoch. To avoid possible baseline effects for offset epoch, the last stimulus epoch (the sixth picture) of each episodic sequence was not included in the analysis. For the resulting 2-D similarity matrix, we extracted the mean correlation value within the cluster where the significant memory effect was found in our original analysis (i.e., Figure 3B). This procedure was repeated 100 permutation times, each with a randomly generated shuffling index. The results were then averaged across permutations and compared with the true value yielded from the original analysis. Finally, we submitted the results into a repeated-measure ANOVA with Condition (true vs. shuffle) and Stimulus (S1–S5) as well as their interaction as main effects. The results showed that neither of the main effects was found significant (Condition: $F[1, 14] = 0.049$, $p = .828$; Stimulus: $F[4, 56] = .852$, $p = .499$; Condition \times Stimulus: $F[4, 56] = 0.802$, $p = .529$).

Post-encoding EEG Properties at the Offset Period

We next assessed whether RSA differences found at post-encoding for events with high and low memory at the test were in fact explained by differences in univariate ERP features between conditions at the offset period. The relevance of addressing this issue resides in that a plausible explanation for why RSA effects were not trial- but condition specific would be that general neurocognitive processes engaged at the offset period associated with successful encoding (e.g., attention) were reflected as a systematic univariate ERP change in high but not in the low memory offset ERP trials. To address this issue, we compared three different ERP properties of the EEG signal at the offset period: amplitude, topography, and variance. The results of this analysis revealed that none of these EEG properties differed significantly at the offset period between conditions ($p > .05$ corrected for multiple comparison, in the three analyses; Figure 4A–C). These results




Figure 4. EEG properties from the offset period for high and low memory conditions. (A) Participants' averaged ERPs elicited at the offset period for each memory condition. Thick blue and red lines represent averaged ERPs from all scalp electrodes. Shaded lines around ERPs depict the standard error of the mean. (B) A 2-D map of t values resulting from comparing individual EEG electrode amplitudes by each memory condition. (C) Thick blue and red lines represent participants' averaged scalp EEG amplitude variance for each memory condition. Shaded lines around ERPs depict the standard error of the mean. (D) A 2-D map of t values resulting from comparing high and low memory autocorrelation maps across participants.

support the notion that the RSA effects seen at the offset period could be mediated by systematic condition-related univariate ERP signal differences between memory conditions in our study.

Yet, it could still be the case that post-encoding RSA differences between memory conditions at the offset period were not seen as systematic univariate but at multivariate level (i.e., spatiotemporal features) in EEG trials from the high and low memory conditions. We assessed this possibility by implementing a time-to-time Pearson autocorrelation analysis of an individual's EEG trial data at the offset for each condition and then compared the degree to which they differed between memory conditions. The results of this analysis revealed similar spatiotemporal autocorrelation EEG throughout the 4-sec offset period between memory conditions (i.e., no clusters resulted

significant at cluster level when corrected for multiple comparison with an $\alpha < .05$; Figure 4D).

RSA between Item Encoding and Sequence Item Immediate Offset

Next, we asked whether the increases in neural similarity between EEG patterns elicited at item sequence encoding and encoding offset were specific to post-episode period, or alternatively, whether they could be also found at offset periods immediately following picture encoding. To address this issue, we implemented the RSA between EEG pattern elicited by each item in the encoding sequence and the EEG signal pattern induced during the immediate post-item offset period. The current analysis was centered in

the post-item offset period after the fourth and fifth item as this represented a delay period, as in episodic offset period, that is preceded by the encoding of multiple items from a sequence but differed in that the encoding of episode is not completed yet. At the same time, this research strategy allowed us to implement the same median split analysis used in our previous analysis (i.e., whether or not at least three items after the picture cue were correctly remembered), thereby enabling the comparison of the RSA results from the two conditions later on. Eight out of the total 25 participants were excluded for this analysis because of insufficient number of clean EEG trials in either condition (i.e., at least 15% of total number of trials in either encoding item of either condition), and the remaining participants maintained the balanced separation of trials between conditions with 41.06% ($SD = 12.89\%$) of total trials included in analysis for low memory condition and 37.44% ($SD = 9.05\%$) of total trials for high memory condition (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: $z = .355$, $p = .722$). The result of this analysis showed no clear increases in neural similarity in either high or low memory conditions (Figure 5A) and that no cluster of similarity values were accounted when the two conditions were compared with a cluster-based permutation test (Figure 5B). With the aim to further examine that the increase in neural similarity was specific to the episodic offset period, we directly compared the neural similarity findings at the first 1500 msec of the episodic offset versus at the 1500 msec of the fourth and fifth post-item offset. The results of this analysis confirmed a cluster of significantly higher neural similarity at the episodic offset condition (Figure 5C), thereby corroborating the notion that the increase in neural similarity was specific to post-episodic encoding delay period.

Experiment 2: Nonmeaningful Episodic Sequence Encoding

Behavioral Results

In general, participants were able to recall, on average, 0.14 items ($SD = .176$) out of the possible five (picture cue was not included in the counting) in each series. The mean percentage of trials across participants to successfully recall zero, one, two, three, four, and five items after the cue were, respectively, 89.23% ($SD = 11.92\%$), 7.98% ($SD = 8.27\%$), 1.96% ($SD = 3.14\%$), 0.77% ($SD = 1.84\%$), 0.06% ($SD = .32\%$), and 0% ($SD = 0\%$), $F(5, 135) = 795.913$, $p < .001$ (Figure 6A). Although participants were unable to verbally recall almost any item from an encoded sequence, they showed above chance performance in the order item sequence recognition task.

We analyzed these data by quantifying the maximum number of pictures correctly ordered consecutively for each given trial sequence. A trial was considered to have been recognized if the participant reported at least three items in correct order from the sequence. On average, the percentage of trials to have scored less than 3, equal to 3, 4, and 5 (i.e., all pictures in order following the cue), were, respectively, 49.11% ($SD = 17.31\%$), 21.85% ($SD = 4.72\%$), 7.26% ($SD = 3.55\%$), and 21.79% ($SD = 17.62\%$), $F(3, 81) = 39.777$, $p < .001$ (Figure 6B). The participants provided correct order recognition for 50.89% ($SD = 17.31\%$) of the trials, which is statistically significantly above chance (chance level = 15%, $t(27) = 10.975$; $p < .001$, two-tailed). Finally, the average coherence rating for sequences in Experiment 2 was 1.79 ($SD = .48$), and the mean percentage of trials rated as 1, 2, 3, and 4 were, respectively, 45.71% ($SD = 25.96\%$), 33.15%




Figure 5. Similarity data at intertrial interval within pictures from a sequence. (A) Time-resolved degree of similarity between item picture encoding and fourth and fifth post-item following the events that were later recalled with high or low memory. (B) Difference (expressed in t values, uncorrected) between similarity values for the fourth and fifth post-item high and low memory conditions. No cluster indicated significantly different similarity values between conditions (two-tailed, $p < .05$, cluster-based permutation test). (C) Difference (expressed in t values, uncorrected) between similarity values for episodic offset and the fourth and fifth post-item offset in the high memory condition. Higher neural similarity was found during the episodic offset compared with item-offset. The significant cluster is indicated by a black thick line. $p < .05$, corrected with a cluster-based permutation test.




Figure 6. Behavioral results for Experiment 2. (A) Percentage of trials separated by number of pictures correctly recalled after the picture. (B) A temporal order sequence recognition memory test was added after the cued recall task. In the recognition memory task, all six pictures from the sequence were presented in random positions at the screen, including the cue, and participants had 30 sec to order the correct temporal structure of the encoded sequences. The figure showed percentage of trials separated by the sequence recognition score. The score is quantified as the maximum number of pictures correctly ordered consecutively in one trial. A trial with less than two correct pictures consecutively ordered following either the cue, the second, the third, or the fourth picture (score less than 3) was counted as no sequence recognized. (C) Percentage of trials separated by degree of coherence rating. (D) Mean coherence rating score of sequences in Experiment 1 versus Experiment 2. In (A–C), bars represent the average across participants. Each black dot represents values for an individual participant. For all boxplots in (D), the central mark is the median and the edges of the box are the 25th and 75th percentiles. $*p < .05$.

($SD = 14.20\%$), 17.14% ($SD = 14.68\%$), and 3.99% ($SD = 8.31\%$), $F(3, 81) = 24.108$, $p < .001$ (Figure 6C). In general, sequences in Experiment 1 were rated significantly higher than sequences in Experiment 2, $t(47) = 6.164$, $p < .001$, two-tailed (Figure 6D), which suggested that the subjective feeling of coherence matched the general manipulation of the experiment.

RSA between Item Sequence and Episodic Offset at Encoding

As in Experiment 1, we computed a trial-based RSA between 2500-msec EEG patterns elicited by each sequence picture item and the corresponding EEG data induced at the 4000 msec episodic offset. The parameters for data smoothing and down sampling were kept the same as Experiment 1. For each participant, the resulting 2-D similarity matrix was first averaged within each item–offset pair and then across pairs. Ten out of the total 28 participants were excluded for this analysis because of insufficient number of clean trials for all items (at least 15% of total number of trials in each item–offset pair). Thus, a total of 18 participants were included in the analysis. However, and contrary to as in Experiment 1, the result of RSA for Experiment 2 did not show any observable neural similarity increase at the offset period (Figure 7A). To assess the extent to which neural similarity patterns seen in Experiment 1 differed from those obtained in Experiment 2, we separately compared the neural similarity values for high and for low memory conditions in Experiment 1 with those obtained in Experiment 2. The results of these analyses revealed that neural similarity increase found at early offset period in Experiment 1, for both high and low memory conditions, was statistically different from similarity values at the offset period in Experiment 2 (Figure 7B). More concretely, this analysis




Figure 7. Neural similarity in Experiment 2. (A) Neural similarity between item picture encoding at post-encoding period for Experiment 2. (B) Higher neural similarity was found during the offset period in high memory trials in Experiment 1 when compared with the offset period in Experiment 2 (the significant cluster is indicated by a black thick line. $p < .05$, corrected with a cluster-based permutation test).

returned one significant cluster ($p = .022$ [corrected], mean t value = 3.354, peak t value = 5.059), which comprised higher neural similarity values for EEG data within ~400- to 1000-msec time range from post-episode offset period and ~200- to 1400-msec time range from item picture encoding from high memory trials in Experiment 1 over trials from Experiment 2. A similar cluster in its timing (~450–1000 msec of post-episode offset and ~200–1100 msec of item encoding) with significantly higher neural similarity values was found when comparing low memory trials from Experiment 1 with trials from Experiment 2 ($p = .026$ [corrected], mean t value = 2.928, peak t value = 4.237).

Finally, we assessed whether the participants' ability to preserve a temporal order memory, irrespective of their lack of episodic recall, could still be associated to increases in neural similarity at the picture sequence offset period. For each individual, we split the encoding trials as a function of whether they were accurate in the temporal order recognition test (defined by trials with three items in correct order) and those trials where the participant showed poor temporal order accuracy (i.e., < 3 elements in correct order). In this analysis, four more participants were excluded because of insufficient number of clean EEG trials in either condition. The results of this analysis revealed no significant differences at cluster level ($p > .05$ two-tailed; permutation test) between the two conditions.

DISCUSSION

Here, we investigated in healthy human participants whether memory reinstatement of a just-encoded sequence of episodic items is a mechanism selectively engaged to support episodic memory formation. In two separate experiments, we examined whether memory reinstatement at encoding offset was concomitant to meaningful and/or to nonmeaningful sequence of episodic items. In a first experiment, we used RSA of scalp EEG recordings during the encoding of sequences of pictures depicting episodic-like events and we found that EEG patterns elicited during picture viewing correlated with EEG patterns at the episode offset. The degree of episodic offset-reactivation predicted later memory recall of the encoded picture sequence. In a second experiment, we used a similar analytical approach on EEG recordings whereas a different set of participants encoded sequences of pictures that were unrelated to each other, thereby preserving similar temporal encoding structure on meaningless episodic sequences. In this experiment, we did not find evidence of post-encoding memory reactivation at the offset. These results suggest that post-encoding memory reinstatement is akin to the rapid formation of temporally coherent sequence of images that unfold over time.

Given the unfolding nature of our experience, researchers have started to focus the attention to brain encoding mechanisms that followed on-line encoding, as this may offer an “optimal” window whereby an unfolding

episode can be registered as a bound representation once the ongoing inputs have concluded (Lu, Hasson, & Norman, 2020). fMRI studies using short video clips (Ben-Yakov et al., 2013; Ben-Yakov & Dudai, 2011; Zacks et al., 2001), sequence learning tasks alternating picture categories (DuBrow & Davachi, 2014), and, more recently, using long movie clips (Ben-Yakov & Henson, 2018; Baldassano et al., 2017) offered converging evidence that the brain is sensitive to episodic boundaries during encoding. In line with these findings, we recently showed that event boundaries, operationalized as transition points in the encoding time whereby one episode ends and new one starts, triggered the rapid memory reinstatement of the just-encoded event information upon context shifts, and that the degree of memory reinstatement predicted the participants' ability to preserve temporally adjacent events in a later test (Silva et al., 2019; Sols et al., 2017). The current results extend previous findings in several important ways.

If memory reactivation at episodic offset serves to promote the encoding of events into memory, we reasoned, then, it should be observable at the end of an episode and not contemporarily to the beginning of another episodic input. Our results from Experiment 1 showed that this is the case, as EEG patterns elicited during sequence encoding correlated to EEG patterns at immediate offset periods that did not contain any stimuli input. Importantly, memory reinstatement was not observed in transition points between pictures of an episode. These findings lend support the notion that memory reinstatement does not merely reflect an ongoing mechanism that links items associated during encoding. Instead, it suggests that episodic offset memory reactivation is a specific neural signature induced once an individual perceives an unfolding episode concluded.

We also found that post-encoding memory reinstatement followed the encoding of picture sequences that were perceived by individuals as depicting a meaningful episode (i.e., Experiment 1) but not after the encoding of sequences of pictures that were unrelated to each other (i.e., Experiment 2). Why would post-encoding reactivation be important for the formation of memories of meaningful episodes? Previous research has shown that the recall of life-like episodes is organized along representational dimensions beyond their temporal structure, such as the causal (Brownstein & Read, 2007), semantic (Baldassano et al., 2018; van Kesteren et al., 2013), and the relations between the elements embedded in the episodes (Lee & Chen, 2021). This research aligns well to psychological research that emphasized that memory is carved by how people construct a high-order model of the ongoing experience and that the detection of an episodic boundary triggers a set of neural and cognitive processes that would allow the integration of the just-encoded episodic model in memory (Radvansky & Zacks, 2011). Importantly, for this resulting model to be effectively recalled later, it should include several components that

vary in the representational hierarchy: from object features to semantics (Radvansky & Zacks, 2011). Recent fMRI research has provided evidence that such representational structure is well reflected along cortical hierarchy during on-line encoding of realistic stream of stimuli (e.g., Heusser et al., 2021; Lee & Chen, 2021; Reagh & Ranganath, 2021; Bird, 2020; Baldassano et al., 2017) and that such cortical patterns are coupled to hippocampal activity at the detection of high-order event boundaries during encoding to account for later recall (Baldassano et al., 2017). Our current findings contribute to this literature by indicating that memory reactivation is a neural signature by which this high-order episodic models can be stored rapidly at episodic encoding offset.

The fact that memory reactivation was found during a delay period immediately following encoding can be seen as a reflection of a mechanism inherently linked to the working memory (WM) maintenance of the encoded sequence of pictures. However, several observations in our results suggest the reinstatement at the episode offset cannot be explained solely by WM processes. First, post-encoding memory reinstatement predicted participants' ability to recollect the episodic picture content in a later test but not their subjective rating of coherence that immediately followed the delay period. Should post-encoding memory reinstatement be a mechanism supporting WM maintenance, we would expect it to be at least partially associated with the individual's ability to evaluate the episodic coherence of the encoded picture sequence after the delay period. Second, post-encoding memory reinstatement in our study was circumscribed to the beginning but not throughout the post-encoding delay period. Studies investigating the neural substrates of WM have shown that delay maintenance is associated with a sustained increase in activation of neocortical structures (Fuster & Alexander, 1971). Should post-encoding memory reinstatement be associated with the sustained increase neural activity during the delay, we would expect it to be observed over extended portions of the offset delay period and not only at the beginning of it. More recently, it has been argued that such above-threshold delay-period activity may support functions other than information storage per se (D'Esposito & Postle, 2015) and the existence of other neural coding mechanisms such as "activity-silent" states (Stokes, 2015) and dynamic coding schemes (Liu et al., 2020). However, these neural representational formats are still susceptible to be identified with the implementation of multivariate decoding approaches, such as the one implemented in the current design, thereby rendering unlikely they were unobservable throughout the delay period in our study. Third, recent findings from direct recordings at hippocampal and neocortical regions in epileptic human patients showed that the hippocampus marks the conversion from external (perceptual) to internal (mnemonic) representations by signaling cortical reinstatement at ~500 msec after the onset of a retrieval cue (Treder et al., 2021). Our study

showing that memory reinstatement detected from scalp EEG signal emerged transient and of a relatively brief duration at ~500 msec at post-episodic encoding period may result from a switch from perception to memory process during encoding itself, which would help bind the unfolding information into a memory episode.

Our findings that increased neural similarity between EEG patterns elicited at sequence encoding and the immediate offset period were not trial specific lends support to the notion that the identified post-encoding memory reactivation may reflect gist-based or schematic memory representations of temporally coherent memory events. Indeed, in our study, the encoding of picture sequences as they unfolded relied on the narrative aspect of each stimulus surrounding the schema. Therefore, the encoding may put more weight on the gist-like information of each stimulus rather than its perceptual features. As a consequence, the representational format to be reinstated at event offset would rely more on event-general or schematic information than item-specific per se. Importantly, the episodic events included in our experimental design were constructed in a way that the same actor was present in all the episodes, and although each of them depicted different narratives, they shared very similar contextual perspectives (i.e., they all occurred at the same house layouts—kitchen, living room, bedroom). Such a high degree of contextual overlap of the encoded material may have complicated the sensitivity of our analysis to identify trial-unique memory reinstatement at the offset. Alternatively, the degree of episodic overlap during encoding cannot preclude the possibility that already encoded sequences may induce a certain degree of interference to the subsequent encoding trials, and their reactivation may overlap with the reinstatement of the ongoing encoding captured by RSA at event offset, making it difficult to disassociate one trial from the others. For example, in the work of Koen and Rugg (2016), using an AB/AC source memory interference paradigm, the authors found that reactivation of neural activity features shared across numerous events in the same category, and task-level reactivation was higher for subsequently remembered AB encoding trials. However, pattern similarity analysis could only reveal item-level reactivation of AB trials during AC encoding task when the strength of interference across events was low. Thus, an issue that remains to be further explored in future studies relates to the representational nature of post-encoding memory reactivation.

A pressing question derived from the findings of our second experiment is why post-encoding memory reactivation was absent when participants encoded sequences of pictures depicting unrelated content. Although the statistical absence of an effect cannot guarantee the absence of the effect, our results lend support to the notion that that post-encoding reactivation strength may not be an automatic mechanism that links items associated during encoding. Instead, it suggests that it contributes to the integration of event components into long-term memory

once an individual perceives a meaningful episode is concluded. Previous fMRI research has highlighted the primary role of hippocampal offset signal in reflecting binding operations of stimuli that just co-occurred within the same spatial-temporal context (Ritchey & Cooper, 2020; Staresina & Davachi, 2009). Similarly, fMRI studies (Baldassano et al., 2017) and electroencephalographic recordings from implanted electrodes in epileptic patients (Michelmann et al., 2021) revealed that the degree to which offset hippocampal activity couples with cortical patterns of activity during a continuous stream of stimuli predicts pattern reinstatement during later recall, thereby indicating that the hippocampus may be responsible for binding cortical representations into a memory trace online during encoding (Moscovitch et al., 2005; Norman & O'Reilly, 2003; McClelland, McNaughton, & O'Reilly, 1995). The fact that current results relayed on identifying the reactivation of neural patterns distributed over the scalp (i.e., 28 electrodes) may also hinder the possibility of detecting instances of neural replay that were less widespread in the brain. Indeed, single-cell recordings from the rodent hippocampus during navigational tasks have shown that neural replay can be observed after the first lap on a novel track (Foster & Wilson, 2006). More strikingly, this research has shown that post-encoding replay may preserve the temporal structure of the encoded event sequence in a compressed time-manner (Gupta, van der Meer, Touretzky, & Redish, 2010; Karlsson & Frank, 2009; Csicsvari, O'Neill, Allen, & Senior, 2007; Diba & Buzsáki, 2007; Foster & Wilson, 2006), thereby suggesting that awake neural replay after single-shot learning may reflect the encoding of a model of the experience in long-term memory (Foster, 2017). Our findings based on scalp EEG recordings are blind to whether memory reinstatement at episodic offset period relies on memory replay of a temporally preserved structure of the encoded sequence. Future studies using brain acquisition approaches more sensitive to hippocampal activity, such as magnetoencephalography (e.g., Liu, Dolan, Kurth-Nelson, & Behrens, 2019) or intracortical recordings directly from the human hippocampus (e.g., Vaz, Wittig, Inati, & Zaghoul, 2020), may help disambiguate whether the compressed episodic offset memory reinstatement preserves a temporal structure of an encoded sequence episode.

To conclude, we have shown that episodic offset memory reinstatement is selectively engaged to support successful encoding of sequential picture series with a coherent structure. These results shed light on the neural mechanisms that support the rapid learning of novel episodes that unfold over time in humans and how they serve to selectively transform experiences into long-term memory representations that can be later recalled.

Acknowledgments

We thank Íria Rodríguez for assistance in data collection and David Cucurell in technical assistance. This work was supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y

Universidades, which is part of Agencia Estatal de Investigación (AEI), through the project PID2019-111199GB-I00 (Co-funded by European Regional Development Fund. ERDF, a way to build Europe) and by ICREA Academia, to L. F. We thank CERCA Programme/Generalitat de Catalunya for institutional support. B. P. S. is supported by European Research Council Grant 101001121.

Reprint requests should be sent to Lluís Fuentemilla, Department of Cognition, Development and Educational Psychology, University of Barcelona. Feixa Llarga s/n, 08907, L'Hospitalet (Barcelona), Spain, or via e-mail: llfuentemilla@ub.edu.

Author Contributions

Xiongbo Wu: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Writing—Original draft; Writing—Review & editing. Xavier Viñals: Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology. Aya Ben-Yakov: Conceptualization; Investigation; Writing—Review & editing. Bernhard Staresina: Investigation; Methodology; Writing—Review & editing. Lluís Fuentemilla: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Supervision; Writing—Original draft; Writing—Review & editing.

Funding Information

Lluís Fuentemilla, Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (<https://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100004837>), grant number: PID2019-111199GB-I00.

Diversity in Citation Practices

Retrospective analysis of the citations in every article published in this journal from 2010 to 2021 reveals a persistent pattern of gender imbalance: Although the proportions of authorship teams (categorized by estimated gender identification of first author/last author) publishing in the *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience (JoCN)* during this period were $M(\text{an})/M = .407$, $W(\text{oman})/M = .32$, $M/W = .115$, and $W/W = .159$, the comparable proportions for the articles that these authorship teams cited were $M/M = .549$, $W/M = .257$, $M/W = .109$, and $W/W = .085$ (Postle and Fulvio, *JoCN*, 34:1, pp. 1–3). Consequently, *JoCN* encourages all authors to consider gender balance explicitly when selecting which articles to cite and gives them the opportunity to report their article's gender citation balance. The authors of this article report its proportions of citations by gender category to be as follows: $M/M = .756$; $W/M = .073$; $M/W = .073$; $W/W = .098$.

REFERENCES

- Baldassano, C., Chen, J., Zadbood, A., Pillow, J. W., Hasson, U., & Norman, K. A. (2017). Discovering event structure in continuous narrative perception and memory. *Neuron*, 95, 709–721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.06.041>, PubMed: 28772125

- Baldassano, C., Hasson, U., & Norman, K. A. (2018). Representation of real-world event schemas during narrative perception. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *38*, 9689–9699. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0251-18.2018>, PubMed: 30249790
- Bart, K. (2021). *bayesFactor*. GitHub. Retrieved December 11, 2021, <https://github.com/klabhub/bayesFactor>. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5707551>
- Ben-Yakov, A., & Dudai, Y. (2011). Constructing realistic engrams: Poststimulus activity of hippocampus and dorsal striatum predicts subsequent episodic memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *31*, 9032–9042. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0702-11.2011>, PubMed: 21677186
- Ben-Yakov, A., Eshel, N., & Dudai, Y. (2013). Hippocampal immediate poststimulus activity in the encoding of consecutive naturalistic episodes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *142*, 1255–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033558>, PubMed: 23815458
- Ben-Yakov, A., & Henson, R. N. (2018). The hippocampal film editor: Sensitivity and specificity to event boundaries in continuous experience. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *38*, 10057–10068. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0524-18.2018>, PubMed: 30301758
- Bird, C. M. (2020). How do we remember events? *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *32*, 120–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.01.020>
- Brownstein, A. L., & Read, S. J. (2007). Situation models and memory: The effects of temporal and causal information on recall sequence. *Memory*, *15*, 730–745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701539596>, PubMed: 17852724
- Carr, M. F., Jadhav, S. P., & Frank, L. M. (2011). Hippocampal replay in the awake state: A potential substrate for memory consolidation and retrieval. *Nature Neuroscience*, *14*, 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2732>, PubMed: 21270783
- Csicsvari, J., O'Neill, J., Allen, K., & Senior, T. (2007). Place-selective firing contributes to the reverse-order reactivation of CA1 pyramidal cells during sharp waves in open-field exploration. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *26*, 704–716. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2007.05684.x>, PubMed: 17651429
- Davachi, L. (2006). Item, context and relational episodic encoding in humans. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *16*, 693–700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2006.10.012>, PubMed: 17097284
- Diana, R. A., Yonelinas, A. P., & Ranganath, C. (2007). Imaging recollection and familiarity in the medial temporal lobe: A three-component model. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 379–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.08.001>, PubMed: 17707683
- Diba, K., & Buzsáki, G. (2007). Forward and reverse hippocampal place-cell sequences during ripples. *Nature Neuroscience*, *10*, 1241–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1961>, PubMed: 17828259
- DuBrow, S., & Davachi, L. (2013). The influence of context boundaries on memory for the sequential order of events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *142*, 1277–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034024>, PubMed: 23957281
- DuBrow, S., & Davachi, L. (2014). Temporal memory is shaped by encoding stability and intervening item reactivation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*, 13998–14005. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2535-14.2014>, PubMed: 25319696
- D'Esposito, M., & Postle, B. R. (2015). The cognitive neuroscience of working memory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015031>, PubMed: 25251486
- Eichenbaum, H., Yonelinas, A. P., & Ranganath, C. (2007). The medial temporal lobe and recognition memory. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *30*, 123–152. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.30.051606.094328>, PubMed: 17417939
- Ezzyat, Y., & Davachi, L. (2011). What constitutes an episode in episodic memory? *Psychological Science*, *22*, 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610393742>, PubMed: 21178116
- Foster, D. J. (2017). Replay comes of age. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *40*, 581–602. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-072116-031538>, PubMed: 28772098
- Foster, D. J., & Wilson, M. A. (2006). Reverse replay of behavioural sequences in hippocampal place cells during the awake state. *Nature*, *440*, 680–683. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04587>, PubMed: 16474382
- Fuster, J. M., & Alexander, G. E. (1971). Neuron activity related to short-term memory. *Science*, *173*, 652–654. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.173.3997.652>, PubMed: 4998337
- Gupta, A. S., van der Meer, M. A., Touretzky, D. S., & Redish, A. D. (2010). Hippocampal replay is not a simple function of experience. *Neuron*, *65*, 695–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.01.034>, PubMed: 20223204
- Heusser, A. C., Fitzpatrick, P. C., & Manning, J. R. (2021). Geometric models reveal behavioural and neural signatures of transforming experiences into memories. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*, 905–919. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01051-6>, PubMed: 33574605
- Karlsson, M. P., & Frank, L. M. (2008). Network dynamics underlying the formation of sparse, informative representations in the hippocampus. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *28*, 14271–14281. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4261-08.2008>, PubMed: 19109508
- Karlsson, M. P., & Frank, L. M. (2009). Awake replay of remote experiences in the hippocampus. *Nature Neuroscience*, *12*, 913–918. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2344>, PubMed: 19525943
- Kass, R. E., & Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *90*, 773–795. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1995.10476572>
- Koen, J. D., & Rugg, M. D. (2016). Memory reactivation predicts resistance to retroactive interference: Evidence from multivariate classification and pattern similarity analyses. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *36*, 4389–4399. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4099-15.2016>, PubMed: 27076433
- Kurby, C. A., & Zacks, J. M. (2008). Segmentation in the perception and memory of events. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *12*, 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.11.004>, PubMed: 18178125
- Lee, H., & Chen, J. (2021). Narratives as networks: Predicting memory from the structure of naturalistic events. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.441287>
- Liu, J., Zhang, H., Yu, T., Ni, D., Ren, L., Yang, Q., et al. (2020). Stable maintenance of multiple representational formats in human visual short-term memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.*, *117*, 32329–32339. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2006752117>, PubMed: 33288707
- Liu, Y., Dolan, R. J., Kurth-Nelson, Z., & Behrens, T. E. (2019). Human replay spontaneously reorganizes experience. *Cell*, *178*, 640–652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.06.012>, PubMed: 31280961
- Lu, Q., Hasson, U., & Norman, K. A. (2020). When to retrieve and encode episodic memories: A neural network model of hippocampal–cortical interaction. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.15.422882>
- Maris, E., & Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG- and MEG-data. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *164*, 177–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.03.024>, PubMed: 17517438
- McClelland, J. L., McNaughton, B. L., & O'Reilly, R. C. (1995). Why there are complementary learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex: Insights from the successes and failures of connectionist models of learning and memory. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 419–457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.3.419>, PubMed: 7624455

- Michelmann, S., Price, A. R., Aubrey, B., Strauss, C. K., Doyle, W. K., Friedman, D., et al. (2021). Moment-by-moment tracking of naturalistic learning and its underlying hippocampo-cortical interactions. *Nature Communications*, *12*, 5394. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25376-y>, PubMed: 34518520
- Moscovitch, M., Rosenbaum, R. S., Gilboa, A., Addis, D. R., Westmacott, R., Grady, C., et al. (2005). Functional neuroanatomy of remote episodic, semantic and spatial memory: A unified account based on multiple trace theory. *Journal of Anatomy*, *207*, 35–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2005.00421.x>, PubMed: 16011544
- Norman, K. A., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2003). Modeling hippocampal and neocortical contributions to recognition memory: A complementary-learning-systems approach. *Psychological Review*, *110*, 611–646. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.4.611>, PubMed: 14599236
- Paller, K. A., & Wagner, A. D. (2002). Observing the transformation of experience into memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *6*, 93–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01845-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01845-3), PubMed: 15866193
- Radvansky, G. A. (2012). Across the event horizon. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*, 269–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412451274>, PubMed: 23082236
- Radvansky, G. A., & Zacks, J. M. (2011). Event perception.. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *2*, 608–620. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.133>, PubMed: 23082236
- Ranganath, C. (2010). A unified framework for the functional organization of the medial temporal lobes and the phenomenology of episodic memory. *Hippocampus*, *20*, 1263–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20852>, PubMed: 20928833
- Reagh, Z. M., & Ranganath, C. (2021). A cortico-hippocampal scaffold for representing and recalling lifelike events. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.16.439894>
- Ritchey, M., & Cooper, R. A. (2020). Deconstructing the posterior medial episodic network. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *24*, 451–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.03.006>, PubMed: 32340798
- Silva, M., Baldassano, C., & Fuentemilla, L. (2019). Rapid memory reactivation at movie event boundaries promotes episodic encoding. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *39*, 8538–8548. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0360-19.2019>, PubMed: 31519818
- Sols, I., DuBrow, S., Davachi, L., & Fuentemilla, L. (2017). Event boundaries trigger rapid memory reinstatement of the prior events to promote their representation in long-term memory. *Current Biology*, *27*, 3499–3504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.09.057>, PubMed: 29129536
- Staresina, B. P., & Davachi, L. (2009). Mind the gap: Binding experiences across space and time in the human hippocampus. *Neuron*, *63*, 267–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2009.06.024>, PubMed: 19640484
- Stokes, M. G. (2015). ‘Activity-silent’ working memory in prefrontal cortex: A dynamic coding framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 394–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.05.004>, PubMed: 26051384
- Treder, M. S., Charest, I., Michelmann, S., Martín-Buro, M. C., Roux, F., Carceller-Benito, F., et al. (2021). The hippocampus as the switchboard between perception and memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.*, *118*, e2114171118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2114171118>, PubMed: 34880133
- Tulving, E. (1983). *Elements of episodic memory*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- van Kesteren, M. T., Beul, S. F., Takashima, A., Henson, R. N., Ruiters, D. J., & Fernández, G. (2013). Differential roles for medial prefrontal and medial temporal cortices in schema-dependent encoding: From congruent to incongruent. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*, 2352–2359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.05.027>, PubMed: 23770537
- Vaz, A. P., Wittig, J. H., Inati, S. K., & Zaghoul, K. A. (2020). Replay of cortical spiking sequences during human memory retrieval. *Science*, *367*, 1131–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba0672>, PubMed: 32139543
- Zacks, J. M., Braver, T. S., Sheridan, M. A., Donaldson, D. I., Snyder, A. Z., Ollinger, J. M., et al. (2001). Human brain activity time-locked to perceptual event boundaries. *Nature Neuroscience*, *4*, 651–655. <https://doi.org/10.1038/88486>, PubMed: 11369948
- Zacks, J. M., Speer, N. K., Swallow, K. M., Braver, T. S., & Reynolds, J. R. (2007). Event perception: A mind-brain perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*, 273–293. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.2.273>, PubMed: 17338600