Short Communication

Hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure does not explain individual differences in hippocampal-dependent task performance

Ian A. Clark[1], Martina F. Callaghan[1], Nikolaus Weiskopf[1,2,3], Eleanor A. Maguire[1*]

[1]Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

[2]Department of Neurophysics, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

[3]Felix Bloch Institute for Solid State Physics, Faculty of Physics and Earth Sciences, Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany

*Corresponding author
Eleanor A. Maguire
e.maguire@ucl.ac.uk

ORCID

Ian A. Clark https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5678-2190
Martina F. Callaghan https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0374-1659
Nikolaus Weiskopf https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5239-1881
Eleanor A. Maguire https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9470-6324

Abstract

Individual differences in scene imagination, autobiographical memory recall, future thinking and spatial navigation have long been linked with hippocampal structure in healthy people, although evidence for such relationships is, in fact, mixed. Extant studies have predominantly concentrated on hippocampal volume. However, it is now possible to use quantitative neuroimaging techniques to model different properties of tissue microstructure in vivo such as myelination and iron. Here we investigated whether performance on scene imagination, autobiographical memory, future thinking and spatial navigation tasks was associated with hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure. MRI data were collected using a multi-parameter mapping protocol from a large sample of 217 young, healthy adult participants with widely-varying task performance. We found little evidence that hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure was related to task performance. This was the case using different analysis methods (voxel-based quantification, partial correlations), when whole brain, hippocampal regions of interest, and posterior:anterior hippocampal ratios were examined, and across different participant sub-groups (divided by gender, task performance). Variations in hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure may not, therefore, explain individual differences in performance on hippocampal-dependent tasks in young, healthy individuals.

Keywords Hippocampus; Quantitative MRI; Scene construction; Autobiographical memory; Future thinking; Spatial navigation

Introduction

Variations in hippocampal structure within the healthy population have long been posited to influence performance on tasks known to be hippocampal-dependent, such as scene imagination, autobiographical memory recall, future thinking and spatial navigation. Extant studies have predominantly examined this relationship in terms of hippocampal grey matter volume. However, in reviewing the literature, Clark et al. (2020) found mixed evidence for an association between hippocampal grey matter volume and performance on tasks assessing these cognitive functions in healthy individuals. They then proceeded to examine this issue in-depth by collecting data from a large sample of 217 young, healthy, adult participants, but found little evidence that hippocampal grey matter volume was related to task performance.

It could be argued, however, that hippocampal volume is too blunt an instrument to consistently detect structure-function relationships in healthy people. By contrast, it is now possible to use quantitative neuroimaging techniques to model different properties of tissue microstructure (Weiskopf et al. 2015), using a multi-parameter mapping (MPM) quantitative neuroimaging protocol (Weiskopf et al. 2013; Callaghan et al. 2015; Callaghan et al. 2019). Processing of these images (using the hMRI toolbox; Tabelow et al. 2019) results in four maps that are differentially (but not solely) sensitive to specific aspects of tissue microstructure: magnetisation transfer saturation (MT saturation), sensitive to myelination; proton density (PD), sensitive to tissue water content; the longitudinal relaxation rate (R_1), sensitive to myelination, iron and water content (but primarily myelination); and the effective transverse relaxation rate (R_2^*), sensitive to tissue iron content. Extant studies have found relationships between myelination, iron and ageing (Draganski et al. 2011; Callaghan et al. 2014), verbal memory performance in older adults (Steiger et al. 2016), and meta-cognitive ability in young adults (Allen et al. 2017). However, as far as we are aware, no studies have investigated the relationship between hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure and scene imagination,

autobiographical memory recall, future thinking or navigation ability in healthy young people. Consequently, this is what we sought to examine in the current study.

We used the large dataset (n = 217) from the Clark et al. (2020) study which comprised an MPM quantitative imaging protocol (Weiskopf et al. 2013; Callaghan et al. 2015; Callaghan et al. 2019), and cognitive task performance with wide variability. While aspects of these data (hippocampal volume, cognitive task performance) have been reported before (Clark et al. 2019, 2020; Clark and Maguire 2020), the tissue microstructure MRI data have not been published previously. The mixed literature relating to hippocampal volume and the dearth of hippocampal tissue microstructure studies made the formulation of clear hypotheses difficult. As such, we focussed on conducting deep and wide-ranging data analyses to characterise any links between the microstructure measures and task performance in the same manner as Clark et al. (2020).

Materials and methods

Participants

Two hundred and seventeen people (mean age 29.0 years ± 5.60) were recruited from the general population, 109 females and 108 males. The age range was restricted to 20-41 years old to limit the possible effects of ageing. Participants had English as their first language and reported no psychological, psychiatric or neurological health conditions. People with hobbies or vocations known to be associated with the hippocampus (e.g. licensed London taxi drivers) were excluded. All participants gave written informed consent and the study was approved by the University College London Research Ethics Committee (project ID: 6743/001).

Procedure

Participants completed the study over three visits - structural MRI scans were acquired during the first visit, and cognitive testing was conducted during visits two and three.

Cognitive tasks and statistical analyses

All tasks are published and were performed and scored as per their published use. Full descriptions are also provided in Clark et al. (2019, 2020) and Clark and Maguire (2020). Details of the double scoring for the current study are provided in the Supplementary Methods Tables S1-S4. In brief, there were four tasks: (1) **Scene imagination** was tested using the scene construction task (Hassabis et al. 2007) which measures the ability to mentally construct visual scenes. The main outcome measure is the "experiential index", while the sub-measures of interest are content scores and a rating of the spatial coherence of scenes. (2) **Autobiographical memory recall** was tested using the autobiographical interview (AI; Levine et al. 2002), which measures the ability to recall past experiences over four time periods from early childhood to within the last year. The two main outcome measures are the number of "internal" and "external" details. Internal details are of interest here because they describe the event in question (i.e. episodic details) and are thought to be hippocampal-dependent. Sub-measures are the separate content categories that comprise the internal details outcome measure, and also AI vividness ratings. (3) The **Future thinking** task follows the same procedure as the scene construction task, but requires participants to imagine three plausible future scenes involving themselves (an event at the weekend; next Christmas; the next time they will meet a friend). (4) **Navigation** ability was assessed using the paradigm described by Woollett and Maguire (2010). A participant watches movie clips of two overlapping routes through an unfamiliar real town four times. The main outcome measure is the combined scores from the five sub-measures used to assess navigational ability which are: movie clip recognition, recognition memory for

scenes, landmark proximity judgements, route knowledge where participants place scene photographs from the routes in the correct order as if travelling through the town, and the drawing of a sketch map. Data were summarised using means and standard deviations, calculated in SPSS v22.

MRI data acquisition and preprocessing

Three Siemens Magnetom TIM Trio MRI systems with 32 channel head coils were used to collect the structural neuroimaging data. All scanners were located at the same imaging centre, running the same software.

Whole brain images at an isotropic resolution of 800μm were obtained using a MPM quantitative imaging protocol (Weiskopf et al. 2013; Callaghan et al. 2015; Callaghan et al. 2019). This consisted of the acquisition of three multi-echo gradient acquisitions with either PD, T1 or MT weighting. Each acquisition had a repetition time, TR, of 25 ms. PD weighting was achieved with an excitation flip angle of 6^0, which was increased to 21^0 to achieve T1 weighting. MT weighting was achieved through the application of a Gaussian RF pulse 2 kHz off resonance with 4ms duration and a nominal flip angle of 220^0. This acquisition had an excitation flip angle of 6^0. The field of view was 256mm head-foot, 224mm anterior-posterior (AP), and 179mm right-left (RL). The multiple gradient echoes per contrast were acquired with alternating readout gradient polarity at eight equidistant echo times ranging from 2.34 to 18.44ms in steps of 2.30ms using a readout bandwidth of 488 Hz/pixel. Only six echoes were acquired for the MT weighted volume to facilitate the off-resonance pre-saturation pulse within the TR. To accelerate the data acquisition, partially parallel imaging using the GRAPPA algorithm was employed in each phase-encoded direction (AP and RL) with forty integrated reference lines and a speed up factor of two. Calibration data were also acquired at the outset

of each session to correct for inhomogeneities in the RF transmit field (Lutti et al. 2010; Lutti et al. 2012).

Data were processed using the hMRI toolbox (Tabelow et al. 2019) within SPM12 (www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm). The default toolbox configuration settings were used, with the exception that correction for imperfect spoiling was additionally enabled (see also Callaghan et al. 2019). This processing results in the MT saturation, PD, R_1 and R_2^* maps which differentially reflect tissue microstructure (Fig. 1).

Each participant's MT saturation map was then segmented into grey and white matter probability maps using the unified segmentation approach (Ashburner and Friston 2005), but using the tissue probability maps developed by Lorio et al. (2016) and no bias field correction (since the MT saturation map shows negligible bias field modulation). The output grey and white matter probability maps were used to perform inter-subject registration using DARTEL, a nonlinear diffeomorphic algorithm (Ashburner 2007). The resulting DARTEL template and deformations were used to normalize the MT saturation, PD, R_1 and R_2^* maps to the stereotactic space defined by the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template (at 1 x 1 x 1mm resolution), but without modulating by the Jacobian determinants of the deformation field in order to allow for the preservation of the quantitative values. Finally, a tissue weighted smoothing kernel of 4mm full width at half maximum (FWHM) was applied using the voxel-based quantification approach (VBQ; Draganski et al. 2011), which again aims to preserve the quantitative values.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Primary VBQ analyses

Our analyses followed the exact same procedures as detailed in Clark et al. (2020) except that here we assessed each of the tissue microstructure maps using VBQ (Draganski et al. 2011). VBQ is a similar methodology to the voxel-based morphometry technique used to study grey matter volume (Ashburner and Friston 2000) but one that retains the quantitative values carrying information about the tissue microstructure.

First, we examined the relationship between hippocampal grey matter in each of the tissue microstructure maps and the main outcome measure for each of the cognitive tasks assessing scene imagination, autobiographical memory, future thinking and navigation. We then examined the associations between each of the sub-measures from these tasks and hippocampal grey matter in each of the four tissue microstructure maps. Statistical analyses were carried out using multiple linear regression models with cognitive task performance as the measure of interest, while including covariates for age, gender, total intracranial volume, and the different scanners. The dependent variable was the smoothed and normalised grey matter value from each tissue microstructure map.

Whole brain VBQ analyses were carried out for each tissue microstructure map. Two-tailed t-tests were used, with statistical thresholds applied at $p < 0.05$ family-wise error (FWE) corrected for the whole brain, and a minimum cluster size of 5 voxels.

We also performed region of interest (ROI) analyses on bilateral anterior, posterior and whole hippocampal masks using two-tailed t-tests. Voxels were regarded as significant when falling below an initial whole brain uncorrected voxel threshold of $p < 0.001$, and then a small volume correction threshold of $p < 0.05$ FWE corrected for each mask, with a minimum cluster size of 5 voxels.

Auxiliary analyses using extracted hippocampal microstructure measurements

These auxiliary analyses were performed using the hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure measurements that were extracted for each participant from each tissue microstructure map using 'spm_summarise'. Whole, anterior and posterior bilateral anatomical hippocampal masks were applied to each participant's smoothed and normalised grey matter MT saturation, PD, R_1, and R_2^* maps, and the average value within each mask extracted. We also calculated each participant's posterior:anterior hippocampal ratio for each tissue microstructure measurement (Poppenk and Moscovitch 2011).

We first performed partial correlations between the extracted tissue microstructure metrics and the cognitive task performance measures. Then, we investigated the effects of gender, used median split direct comparisons and partial correlations, and compared the best and worst performers (the top and bottom 10%). As in Clark et al. (2020), statistical correction was made using false discovery rate (FDR; Benjamini and Hochberg 1995), with a FDR of $p < 0.05$ allowing for 5% false positive results across the tests performed, and calculated using the resources provided by McDonald (2014). Age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner were included as covariates.

Validation across the tissue microstructure maps

The maps are not completely independent since they are estimated from the same three multi-echo gradient echo acquisitions. As such, relationships exist between the tissue microstructure maps, and a finding in one map can be used to validate a finding in another. For example, if a positive association is observed between task performance and the hippocampus in the MT saturation map, then a corresponding positive association would also be expected in the hippocampus when using the R_1 map (since increased macromolecular content will also increase R_1), and a corresponding negative association would be expected in the PD map (due

to a reduction in free water content as the macromolecular content increases; Mezer et al., 2013). Consequently, following the finding of a relationship in one map, we also examined whether corresponding relationships existed in the other maps, even at a more liberal statistical threshold ($p < 0.001$ uncorrected). Observing related associations across multiple maps was deemed supportive of a true result, while finding a correlation in only one of the tissue microstructure maps was regarded as unreliable.

Results

Cognitive task performance

A summary of the outcome measures for the cognitive tasks is shown in Table 1. A wide range of scores was obtained for all variables with the exception of navigation movie clip recognition, where performance was close to ceiling.

Insert Table 1 about here

Primary VBQ analyses

As our main focus was on the relationship between cognitive task performance and hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure, here we report findings pertaining to only the hippocampus – any regions identified outside the hippocampus are reported in the Supplementary Results.

No significant relationships between cognitive task performance and hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure were identified for any of the main outcome measures of the tasks assessing scene imagination, autobiographical memory, future thinking or navigation. This was also the case for the sub-measures of these tasks.

Hippocampal ROI VBQ

No relationships between cognitive task performance and hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure were identified using any of the hippocampal masks for the main outcome measures from the tasks examining scene imagination, autobiographical memory, future thinking or navigation. Considering the task sub-measures, it was either the case that they were not associated with any measure of hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure, or the results were not validated across the tissue microstructure maps – correlations associated with only one map are reported in the Supplementary Results.

Auxiliary analyses using extracted hippocampal microstructure measurements

No relationships were identified between any of the extracted hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure metrics and performance for any of the main or sub-measures of the tasks (see Supplementary Results Tables S5-S8 for details). These partial correlation findings therefore support those of the primary VBQ analyses.

Similarly, there were no significant effects of gender (Supplementary Results Tables S9-S16), no significant results using median split direct comparisons (Supplementary Results Tables 17-21) and partial correlations (Supplementary Results Tables S22-S29), and when the best and worst performers were compared (Supplementary Results Tables 30-34).

Discussion

In this study we moved beyond hippocampal grey matter volume to examine hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure, including quantitative neuroimaging biomarkers of myelination and iron, and whether they were linked with performance on tasks known to be hippocampal-dependent. We found little evidence for any associations between these measures and scene imagination, autobiographical memory recall, future thinking and spatial navigation. This is

despite having a large sample with wide-ranging performance on the cognitive tasks, using different analysis methods (voxel-based quantification, partial correlations), examining whole brain and hippocampal regions of interest, and different participant sub-groups (divided by gender, task performance). Variations in hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure, seem not, therefore, to be significantly related to hippocampal-dependent task performance in young, healthy individuals.

Quantitative MRI and the examination of tissue microstructure is a relatively new area of study and therefore comparison of our results with other studies in that domain is difficult. However, changes in tissue microstructure with ageing have been documented (e.g. Draganski et al. 2011; Callaghan et al. 2014; Carey et al. 2018), and hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure has also been associated with metacognitive ability (Allen et al. 2017). Grey matter tissue microstructure, including that of the hippocampus, has, therefore, been previously correlated with individual differences, even if none were identified here. While null results can, of course, be difficult to interpret and an absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence, we believe the depth and breadth of our analyses permit confidence in these results, aligning as they do with other null findings relating to hippocampal volume (e.g. Maguire et al. 2003; Van Petten 2004; Weisberg et al. 2019; Clark et al. 2020).

This is not to say that relationships between hippocampal structure and the cognitive tasks of interest here do not exist in the context of ageing (Moffat et al. 2006; Hedden et al. 2014), and brain lesions (e.g. Scoville and Milner 1957; Hassabis et al. 2007). Moreover, the extreme spatial navigation of licensed London taxi drivers results in increased posterior, but decreased anterior, hippocampal grey matter volume, findings that have been replicated numerous times (e.g. Maguire et al. 2000; Maguire et al. 2006; Woollett and Maguire 2009, 2011). Even in young healthy people, hippocampal subfield volumes may help to explain task performance (Chadwick et al. 2014; Palombo et al. 2018) as might structural connectivity (Iaria

et al. 2008; Metzler-Baddeley et al. 2011; Hodgetts et al. 2017; Williams et al. 2020), although studies with larger samples are required. Of particular interest, future investigations could look to combine quantitative neuroimaging techniques such as those used here with diffusion weighted imaging (e.g. the axonal g-ratio; Mohammadi et al. 2015), which may provide further insights into the neural basis of individual differences in cognition.

Acknowledgements Thanks to Anna Monk, Victoria Hotchin, Gloria Pizzamiglio and Alice Liefgreen for assistance with data collection and scoring.

Funding This work was supported by a Wellcome Principal Research Fellowship to EAM (101759/Z/13/Z) and the Centre by a Centre Award from Wellcome (203147/Z/16/Z). MFC is supported by the MRC and Spinal Research Charity through the ERA-NET Neuron joint call (MR/R000050/1). NW is supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 616905; the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the grant agreement No 681094; BMBF (01EW1711A & B) in the framework of ERA-NET NEURON.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

Ethics approval This study involving human participants was approved by the University College London Research Ethics Committee (project ID: 6743/001).

Informed consent Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

References

Allen M, Glen JC, Müllensiefen D, Schwarzkopf DS, Fardo F, Frank D, Callaghan MF, Rees G (2017) Metacognitive ability correlates with hippocampal and prefrontal microstructure. Neuroimage 149:415-423

Ashburner J (2007) A fast diffeomorphic image registration algorithm. Neuroimage 38:95-113

Ashburner J, Friston KJ (2000) Voxel based morphometry - The methods. Neuroimage 11:805-821

Ashburner J, Friston KJ (2005) Unified segmentation. Neuroimage 26:839-851

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B 57:289-300

Callaghan MF, Freund P, Draganski B, Anderson E, Cappelletti M, Chowdhury R, Diedrichsen J, FitzGerald THB, Smittenaar P, Helms G, Lutti A, Weiskopf N (2014) Widespread age-related differences in the human brain microstructure revealed by quantitative magnetic resonance imaging. Neurobiol Aging 35:1862-1872

Callaghan MF, Josephs O, Herbst M, Zaitsev M, Todd N, Weiskopf N (2015) An evaluation of prospective motion correction (PMC) for high resolution quantitative MRI. Front Neurosci 9

Callaghan MF, Lutti A, Ashburner J et al. (2019) Example dataset for the hMRI toolbox. Data in Brief 25:104132

Carey D, Caprini F, Allen M, Lutti A, Weiskopf N, Rees G, Callaghan MF, Dick F (2018) Quantitative MRI provides markers of intra-, inter-regional, and age-related differences in young adult cortical microstructure. Neuroimage 182:429-440

Chadwick MJ, Bonnici HM, Maguire EA (2014) CA3 size predicts the precision of memory recall. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 111:10720-10725

Clark IA, Hotchin V, Monk A, Pizzamiglio G, Liefgreen A, Maguire EA (2019) Identifying the cognitive processes underpinning hippocampal-dependent tasks. J Exp Psychol Gen 148:1861-1881

Clark IA, Maguire EA (2020) Do questionnaires reflect their purported cognitive functions? Cognition 195:104114

Clark IA, Monk AM, Hotchin V, Pizzamiglio G, Liefgreen A, Callaghan MF, Maguire EA (2020) Does hippocampal volume explain performance differences on hippocampal-dependent tasks? Neuroimage 221:117211

Draganski B, Ashburner J, Hutton C, Kherif F, Frackowiak RSJ, Helms G, Weiskopf N (2011) Regional specificity of MRI contrast parameter changes in normal ageing revealed by voxel-based quantification (VBQ). Neuroimage 55:1423-1434

Hassabis D, Kumaran D, Vann SD, Maguire EA (2007) Patients with hippocampal amnesia cannot imagine new experiences. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104:1726-1731

Hedden T, Schultz AP, Rieckmann A, Mormino EC, Johnson KA, Sperling RA, Buckner RL (2014) Multiple Brain Markers are Linked to Age-Related Variation in Cognition. Cereb Cortex 26:1388-1400

Hodgetts CJ, Postans M, Warne N, Varnava A, Lawrence AD, Graham KS (2017) Distinct contributions of the fornix and inferior longitudinal fasciculus to episodic and semantic autobiographical memory. Cortex 94:1-14

Iaria G, Lanyon LJ, Fox CJ, Giaschi D, Barton JJS (2008) Navigational skills correlate with hippocampal fractional anisotropy in humans. Hippocampus 18:335-339

Levine B, Svoboda E, Hay JF, Winocur G, Moscovitch M (2002) Aging and autobiographical memory: Dissociating episodic from semantic retrieval. Psychol Aging 17:677-689
Lorio S, Fresard S, Adaszewski S, Kherif F, Chowdhury R, Frackowiak RS, Ashburner J, Helms G, Weiskopf N, Lutti A, Draganski B (2016) New tissue priors for improved automated classification of subcortical brain structures on MRI. Neuroimage 130:157-166
Lutti A, Hutton C, Finsterbusch J, Helms G, Weiskopf N (2010) Optimization and validation of methods for mapping of the radiofrequency transmit field at 3T. Magn Reson Med 64:229-238
Lutti A, Stadler J, Josephs O, Windischberger C, Speck O, Bernarding J, Hutton C, Weiskopf N (2012) Robust and fast whole brain mapping of the RF transmit field B1 at 7T. PLoS One 7:e32379
Maguire EA, Gadian DG, Johnsrude IS, Good CD, Ashburner J, Frackowiak RSJ, Frith CD (2000) Navigation-related structural change in the hippocampi of taxi drivers. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 97:4398-4403
Maguire EA, Spiers HJ, Good CD, Hartley T, Frackowiak RSJ, Burgess N (2003) Navigation expertise and the human hippocampus: A structural brain imaging analysis. Hippocampus 13:250-259
Maguire EA, Woollett K, Spiers HJ (2006) London taxi drivers and bus drivers: A structural MRI and neuropsychological analysis. Hippocampus 16:1091-1101
McDonald JH (2014) Handbook of Biological Statistics. 3rd edn. Sparky House Publishing, Baltimore, Maryland http://www.biostathandbook.com/multiplecomparisons.html.
Metzler-Baddeley C, Jones DK, Belaroussi B, Aggleton JP, O'Sullivan MJ (2011) Frontotemporal connections in episodic memory and aging: A diffusion MRI tractography study. J Neurosci 31:13236-13245
Mezer A, Yeatman JD, Stikov N et al. (2013). Quantifying the local tissue volume and composition in individual brains with magnetic resonance imaging. Nat Med 19:1667-1672.
Moffat SD, Kennedy KM, Rodrigue KM, Raz N (2006) Extrahippocampal Contributions to Age Differences in Human Spatial Navigation. Cereb Cortex 17:1274-1282
Mohammadi S, Carey D, Dick F, Diedrichsen J, Sereno MI, Reisert M, Callaghan MF, Weiskopf N (2015) Whole-brain in-vivo measurements of the axonal g-ratio in a group of 37 healthy volunteers. Front Neurosci 9
Palombo DJ, Bacopulos A, Amaral RSC, Olsen RK, Todd RM, Anderson AK, Levine B (2018) Episodic autobiographical memory is associated with variation in the size of hippocampal subregions. Hippocampus 28:69-75
Poppenk J, Moscovitch M (2011) A hippocampal marker of recollection memory ability among healthy young adults: Contributions of posterior and anterior segments. Neuron 72:931-937
Scoville WB, Milner B (1957) Loss of recent memory after bilateral hippocampal lesions. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 20:11-21
Steiger TK, Weiskopf N, Bunzeck N (2016) Iron level and myelin content in the ventral striatum predict memory performance in the aging brain. J Neurosci 36:3552-3558
Tabelow K, Balteau E, Ashburner J et al. (2019) hMRI – A toolbox for quantitative MRI in neuroscience and clinical research. Neuroimage 194:191-210
Van Petten C (2004) Relationship between hippocampal volume and memory ability in healthy individuals across the lifespan: review and meta-analysis. Neuropsychologia 42:1394-1413
Weisberg SM, Newcombe NS, Chatterjee A (2019) Everyday taxi drivers: Do better navigators have larger hippocampi? Cortex 115:280-293

Weiskopf N, Mohammadi S, Lutti A, Callaghan MF (2015) Advances in MRI-based computational neuroanatomy: from morphometry to in-vivo histology. Curr Opin Neurol 28

Weiskopf N, Suckling J, Williams G, Correia M, Inkster B, Tait R, Ooi C, Bullmore E, Lutti A (2013) Quantitative multi-parameter mapping of R1, PD*, MT, and R2* at 3T: a multi-center validation. Front Neurosci 7

Williams AN, Ridgeway S, Postans M, Graham KS, Lawrence AD, Hodgetts CJ (2020) The role of the pre-commissural fornix in episodic autobiographical memory and simulation. Neuropsychologia 142:107457

Woollett K, Maguire EA (2009) Navigational expertise may compromise anterograde associative memory. Neuropsychologia 47:1088-1095.

Woollett K, Maguire EA (2011) Acquiring “the Knowledge” of London's layout drives structural brain changes. Curr Biol 21:2109-2114

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for the main outcome measures and sub-measures of the cognitive tasks.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Main outcome measures		
Scene construction experiential index (/60)	40.50	6.08
Autobiographical interview internal details (total number)	23.95	7.25
Future thinking experiential index (/60)	39.12	7.23
Navigation (/250)	143.46	35.83
Sub-measures		
Scene construction		
Spatial references (total number)	3.47	1.56
Entities present (total number)	9.90	2.92
Sensory descriptions (total number)	12.25	3.46
Thoughts/emotions/actions (total number)	3.36	1.70
Spatial coherence index (/6)	2.88	1.57
Autobiographical interview		
Internal events (total number)	11.02	3.88
Internal time (total number)	1.43	0.69
Internal place (total number)	2.23	0.63
Internal perceptual (total number)	5.91	3.07
Internal thoughts/emotions (total number)	3.37	1.69
Vividness ratings (/6)	4.62	0.74
Future thinking		
Spatial references (total number)	2.53	1.65
Entities present (total number)	10.31	3.28
Sensory descriptions (total number)	8.81	3.59
Thoughts/emotions/actions (total number)	5.18	2.28
Spatial coherence index (/6)	2.63	1.77
Navigation		
Movie clip recognition (/16)	15.44	0.86
Scene recognition (/32)	29.45	1.89
Proximity judgements (/10)	7.48	1.43
Route knowledge (/24)	11.98	4.62
Sketch map	79.11	30.91



Fig. 1 The averaged magnetisation transfer saturation (MT sat), proton density (PD), longitudinal relaxation rate (R_1) and effective transverse relaxation rate (R_2^*) tissue microstructure maps of the whole sample (n = 217) in MNI space. The scale bars are the estimated physical values of the tissue properties in each map quantified in standardised units. For the MT saturation and PD maps this is as percent units (p.u.) and for the R_1 and R_2^* maps this is per second (s^{-1}).

Journal: *Brain Structure and Function*

Supplementary Material for:

Hippocampal grey matter tissue microstructure does not explain individual differences in hippocampal-dependent task performance

Ian A. Clark[1], Martina F. Callaghan[1], Nikolaus Weiskopf[1,2,3], Eleanor A. Maguire[1*]

[1]Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

[2]Department of Neurophysics, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

[3]Felix Bloch Institute for Solid State Physics, Faculty of Physics and Earth Sciences, Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany

*Corresponding author:
Eleanor Maguire
e.maguire@ucl.ac.uk

Supplementary Methods

Double scoring was performed on 20% of the cognitive data. We took the most stringent approach to identifying across-experimenter agreement. Inter-class correlation coefficients with a two-way random effects model looked for absolute agreement among the experimenters. For reference, a score of 0.8 or above is considered excellent agreement beyond chance.

Table S1. Double scoring of the scene construction task.

	Rating				
	Spatial References	Entities Present	Sensory Descriptions	Thoughts/ Emotions/Actions	Quality Ratings
For each individual scene					
n = 308	0.90	0.96	0.94	0.90	0.90
For each individual participant (i.e. score is averaged across the seven scenes)					
n = 44	0.91	0.99	0.97	0.91	0.93

Note. Inter-class correlation coefficients from a two way random effect model looking for absolute agreement for each content score and for the quality ratings. Four experimenters scored the whole data set (n = 217 participants, 1519 individual scenes) with double scoring performed on 20% of the data (n = 44 participants, 308 scenes) proportionally for each original experimenter.

Table S2. Double scoring of the autobiographical interview.

	Rating					
	Internal Event	Internal Place	Internal Time	Internal Perceptual	Internal Emotion	Internal Sum
For each individual memory						
n = 215	0.92	0.85	0.94	0.92	0.86	0.94
For each individual participant (i.e. score is averaged across the five memories)						
n = 43	0.95	0.88	0.96	0.94	0.81	0.97

Note. Inter-class correlation coefficients from a two way random effects model looking for absolute agreement for each score on the autobiographical interview. Three experimenters scored the whole data set (n = 217 participants, 1085 individual memories) and double scoring was performed 20% of the data (n = 43 participants, 215 individual memories) proportionally for each original experimenter.

Table S3. Double scoring of the future thinking task.

	Rating				
	Spatial References	Entities Present	Sensory Descriptions	Thoughts/ Emotions/Actions	Quality Ratings
For each individual scene					
n = 132	0.90	0.94	0.93	0.88	0.90
For each individual participant (i.e. score is averaged across the three future scenes)					
n = 44	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.88	0.92

Note. Inter-class correlation coefficients from a two way random effects model looking for absolute agreement for each content score and for the quality ratings. Four experimenters scored the whole data set (n = 217 participants, 651 individual future scenes) with double scoring performed on 20% of the data (n = 44 participants, 132 future scenes) proportionally for each original experimenter.

Table S4. Double scoring of the navigation sketch maps.

	Rating					
	Road Segments	Road Junctions	Number of Landmarks	Landmark Placement	Map Orientation	Map Categorisation
n = 42	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.89

Note. Inter-class correlation coefficients from a two way random effects model looking for absolute agreement for each score on the navigation sketch maps. Three experimenters scored the whole data set (n = 217) and double scoring was performed on 20% of the data (n = 42 participants) proportionally for each original experimenter.

Supplementary Results

Primary analyses: VBQ results outside of the hippocampus

A small number of relationships were identified between cognitive task performance and grey matter microstructure outside of the hippocampus (when using a statistical threshold of $p < 0.05$ FWE whole brain corrected).

Within the scene construction outcome measures, one potential relationship was observed; a positive association between scene construction sensory details and 15 voxels in the left middle occipital cortex in the PD map (peak coordinates = -42 -87 17, peak t = 5.30, $p_{\text{FWE whole brain corrected}} = 0.018$). However, no corresponding negative associations with MT or R_1, nor any corresponding relationships with R_2^*, were identified, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

For future thinking, two potential associations were found. First, a positive relationship was observed in the PD map between 36 voxels in the right superior occipital gyrus and the future thinking experiential index (peak coordinates = 25 -90 33, peak t = 5.51, $p_{\text{FWE whole brain corrected}} = 0.007$). Reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected identified a corresponding negative association between the right superior occipital gyrus and the future thinking experiential index in the R_2^* map (cluster size = 808, peak coordinates = 25 -89 35, peak t = 4.53, $p_{\text{uncorrected}} < 0.001$). Overall, higher water content in the right superior occipital gyrus seems to be associated with greater future thinking experiential index scores.

Second, a positive correlation was found in the R_1 map between 5 voxels in the left middle cingulate cortex and the future thinking experiential index (peak coordinates = 0 -20 45, peak t = 5.19, $p_{\text{FWE whole brain corrected}} = 0.031$). Reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected identified a corresponding negative association between the left middle cingulate cortex and the future thinking experiential index in the PD map (cluster size = 28, peak coordinates = -1, -20, 45 peak t = 3.77, $p_{\text{uncorrected}} < 0.001$). An increase in macromolecular

content and corresponding reduction in free water content in the middle cingulate cortex, may, therefore, be associated with greater future thinking experiential index scores.

Considering navigation, for the navigation movie clip recognition task, two clusters were identified on the edge of the right occipital pole in both the PD and the R_2^* maps. In the PD map, these relationships were positive (Cluster 1: size = 7 voxels, peak coordinates = 32 -95 15, peak t = 5.23, p = 0.024; Cluster 2: size = 10 voxels, peak coordinates = 26 -97 20, peak t = 5.21, p = 0.026), while in the R_2^* map the corresponding negative relationships were observed (Cluster 1: size = 40 voxels, peak coordinates = 32 -95 15, peak t = 5.55, p = 0.006; Cluster 2: size = 18 voxels, peak coordinates = 25 -98 19, peak t = 5.48, p = 0.009). A decrease in iron and corresponding increase in free water content in the right occipital pole, may, therefore, be related to higher navigation movie clip recognition performance.

For the navigation scene recognition task, there was a positive relationship between performance and 36 voxels in the right cuneus in the R_2^* map (peak coordinates = 17 -60 10, peak t = 5.83, $p_{\text{FWE whole brain corrected}} = 0.002$). However, no corresponding associations in the MT saturation or PD or R_1 maps, were identified in the right cuneus, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Hippocampal ROI VBQ: significant results that were not validated across the tissue microstructure maps

Within the scene construction sub-measures one potential relationship was identified. A negative association was found between the scene construction spatial coherence index and 77 voxels in the left hippocampus in the PD map when using the bilateral posterior hippocampal mask (peak coordinates = -19 -41 4, peak z = 3.79, $p_{\text{FWE posterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.033$). However, this relationship was not significant when correcting for the bilateral whole hippocampal mask ($p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.054$). In addition, no corresponding

associations were identified between the scene construction spatial coherence index scores and the hippocampus in the MT saturation, R_1 or R_2^* maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Within the autobiographical memory sub-measures, three potential associations were observed. First, a positive association was identified between AI emotion and a cluster of 45 voxels in the left hippocampus in the PD map when using the bilateral anterior hippocampal mask (peak coordinates = -26 -9 -27, peak z = 3.64, $p_{\text{FWE anterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.033$). However, this relationship was not significant when correcting for the whole hippocampus mask ($p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.073$). In addition, no corresponding associations were observed in the hippocampus when using the MT saturation R_1 or R_2^* maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Second, a negative association was observed between AI vividness ratings and a cluster of 37 voxels in the right hippocampus in the MT saturation map when using the bilateral whole hippocampal mask (peak coordinates = 34 -20 -12, peak z = 4.11, $p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.018$), split approximately equally between the anterior and posterior hippocampal masks (anterior cluster: cluster size = 21 voxels, peak coordinates = 34 -20 -12, peak z = 4.11, $p_{\text{FWE anterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.008$; posterior cluster: cluster size = 16 voxels, peak coordinates = 34 -21 -12, peak z = 3.87, $p_{\text{FWE posterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.027$). However, no corresponding associations with the hippocampus were found in the R_1, PD or R_2^* maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

AI vividness was also negatively associated with a cluster of 56 voxels in the left hippocampus in the PD map following correction for the bilateral whole hippocampal mask (peak coordinates = -28 -27 -9, peak z = 4.12, $p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.014$), localised to the posterior hippocampus ($p_{\text{FWE posterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.008$). However, no corresponding associations were found between AI vividness and the hippocampus in the MT

saturation, R_1 or R_2^* maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Within the future thinking sub-measures, two potential relationships were identified. A positive association was observed between future thinking spatial references and 33 voxels in the left hippocampus in the R_1 map when using the bilateral posterior hippocampal mask (peak coordinates = -18 -22 -21, peak z = 3.75, $p_{\text{FWE posterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.032$). However, this relationship was not significant when correcting for the bilateral whole hippocampus mask ($p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.052$). Furthermore, no corresponding associations were observed in the hippocampus in any of the other tissue microstructure maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Second, a negative association was found between the future thinking spatial coherence index and a cluster of 54 voxels in the right posterior hippocampus in the MT saturation map when using the bilateral posterior hippocampus mask (peak coordinates = 35, -29, -13, peak z = 3.76, $p_{\text{FWE posterior hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.039$). However, this relationship was not significant when correcting for the bilateral whole hippocampus mask ($p_{\text{FWE whole hippocampus ROI corrected}} = 0.064$) and the corresponding associations were not observed in the hippocampus when using any of the other tissue microstructure maps, even when reducing the statistical threshold to $p < 0.001$ uncorrected.

Table S5. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter MT saturation with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.096	0.59	-0.097	0.59	-0.081	0.59	0.043	0.74
Spatial references	-0.087	0.59	-0.09	0.59	-0.072	0.63	0.049	0.73
Entities present	-0.067	0.66	-0.081	0.59	-0.045	0.73	0.072	0.63
Sensory descriptions	-0.12	0.59	-0.14	0.55	-0.084	0.59	0.11	0.59
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.05	0.73	-0.081	0.59	-0.014	0.91	0.10	0.59
Spatial coherence index	0.07	0.63	-0.027	0.83	-0.10	0.59	-0.085	0.59
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.005	0.99	0.002	0.99	-0.012	0.99	-0.026	0.99
Internal events	0.009	0.99	0.012	0.99	0.005	0.99	-0.016	0.99
Internal time	0.05	0.99	0.095	0.85	0.001	1.00	-0.15	0.75
Internal place	-0.066	0.93	-0.04	0.99	-0.083	0.88	-0.057	0.99
Internal perceptual	-0.006	0.99	-0.015	0.99	0.003	0.99	0.02	0.99
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.028	0.99	-0.013	0.99	-0.039	0.99	-0.032	0.99
Vividness rating	-0.10	0.85	-0.092	0.85	-0.10	0.85	0.007	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.14	0.31	-0.13	0.31	-0.13	0.31	0.05	0.81
Spatial references	-0.15	0.31	-0.14	0.31	-0.14	0.31	0.05	0.81
Entities present	-0.038	0.87	-0.032	0.90	-0.038	0.87	0.015	0.97
Sensory descriptions	-0.089	0.51	-0.11	0.38	-0.061	0.70	0.10	0.38
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.021	0.94	-0.043	0.87	0.002	0.99	0.049	0.81
Spatial coherence index	-0.10	0.38	-0.062	0.70	-0.13	0.31	-0.062	0.70
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.11	0.91	-0.071	0.96	-0.14	0.91	-0.058	0.96
Movie clip recognition	0.041	0.99	0.06	0.96	0.018	0.99	-0.057	0.96
Scene recognition	0.07	0.96	0.071	0.96	0.059	0.96	-0.033	0.99
Proximity judgements	-0.076	0.96	-0.054	0.96	-0.087	0.92	-0.016	0.99
Route knowledge	-0.002	0.99	0.008	0.99	-0.01	0.99	-0.033	0.99
Sketch map	-0.13	0.91	-0.087	0.92	-0.16	0.91	-0.058	0.96

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S6. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter PD with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.028	0.83	-0.044	0.73	-0.001	0.99	0.053	0.72
Spatial references	-0.025	0.83	-0.078	0.59	0.046	0.73	0.13	0.55
Entities present	-0.083	0.59	-0.085	0.59	-0.06	0.67	0.054	0.71
Sensory descriptions	0.02	0.86	0.002	0.99	0.038	0.77	0.029	0.82
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.036	0.77	-0.036	0.77	-0.027	0.83	0.022	0.85
Spatial coherence index	-0.042	0.74	-0.004	0.98	-0.078	0.59	-0.06	0.67
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.045	0.99	0.093	0.85	-0.026	0.99	-0.14	0.75
Internal events	0.051	0.99	0.097	0.85	-0.019	0.99	-0.14	0.75
Internal time	-0.084	0.88	-0.081	0.88	-0.067	0.93	0.039	0.99
Internal place	-0.005	0.99	0.00	1.00	-0.011	0.99	-0.012	0.99
Internal perceptual	0.025	0.99	0.048	0.99	-0.01	0.99	-0.068	0.93
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.066	0.93	0.12	0.77	-0.018	0.99	-0.16	0.75
Vividness rating	-0.11	0.80	-0.062	0.97	-0.15	0.75	-0.048	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.039	0.87	-0.031	0.90	-0.038	0.87	0.005	0.98
Spatial references	-0.052	0.81	-0.076	0.60	-0.01	0.97	0.083	0.55
Entities present	-0.015	0.97	-0.021	0.94	-0.005	0.98	0.021	0.94
Sensory descriptions	0.021	0.94	0.012	0.97	0.027	0.93	0.007	0.98
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.042	0.87	-0.003	0.98	-0.079	0.59	-0.063	0.70
Spatial coherence index	-0.016	0.97	0.00	1.00	-0.032	0.90	-0.026	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.012	0.99	-0.018	0.99	-0.001	0.99	0.022	0.99
Movie clip recognition	-0.13	0.91	-0.10	0.91	-0.14	0.91	0.012	0.99
Scene recognition	-0.064	0.96	-0.072	0.96	-0.039	0.99	0.055	0.96
Proximity judgements	0.12	0.91	0.091	0.91	0.12	0.91	-0.012	0.99
Route knowledge	-0.015	0.99	-0.05	0.99	0.032	0.99	0.087	0.92
Sketch map	-0.009	0.99	-0.01	0.99	-0.005	0.99	0.009	0.99

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S7. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_1 with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.092	0.59	0.11	0.59	0.065	0.67	-0.082	0.59
Spatial references	0.11	0.59	0.13	0.55	0.087	0.59	-0.07	0.63
Entities present	0.12	0.59	0.13	0.59	0.10	0.59	-0.044	0.73
Sensory descriptions	0.061	0.67	0.06	0.67	0.055	0.71	-0.018	0.87
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.16	0.55	0.15	0.55	0.15	0.55	-0.001	0.99
Spatial coherence index	-0.039	0.77	-0.035	0.77	-0.035	0.77	0.013	0.91
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.13	0.77	0.091	0.85	0.15	0.75	0.08	0.88
Internal events	0.14	0.75	0.088	0.88	0.16	0.75	0.11	0.85
Internal time	0.072	0.93	0.077	0.88	0.061	0.97	-0.036	0.99
Internal place	-0.003	0.99	-0.01	0.99	0.003	0.99	0.013	0.99
Internal perceptual	0.12	0.77	0.11	0.85	0.12	0.77	0.013	0.99
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.001	1.00	-0.03	0.99	0.023	0.99	0.084	0.88
Vividness rating	-0.034	0.99	-0.038	0.99	-0.027	0.99	0.008	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.13	0.31	0.12	0.34	0.13	0.31	0.006	0.98
Spatial references	0.18	0.31	0.17	0.31	0.17	0.31	-0.01	0.97
Entities present	0.16	0.31	0.16	0.31	0.14	0.31	-0.033	0.90
Sensory descriptions	0.11	0.38	0.11	0.38	0.098	0.40	-0.014	0.97
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.11	0.38	0.063	0.70	0.14	0.31	0.11	0.38
Spatial coherence index	-0.069	0.70	-0.064	0.70	-0.067	0.70	0.005	0.98
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.014	0.99	0.002	0.99	-0.026	0.99	-0.045	0.99
Movie clip recognition	0.021	0.99	0.056	0.96	-0.011	0.99	-0.11	0.91
Scene recognition	0.02	0.99	0.038	0.99	0.003	0.99	-0.055	0.96
Proximity judgements	-0.07	0.96	-0.052	0.98	-0.078	0.96	-0.033	0.99
Route knowledge	0.004	0.99	0.038	0.99	-0.025	0.99	-0.11	0.91
Sketch map	-0.015	0.99	-0.004	0.99	-0.023	0.99	-0.029	0.99

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S8. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_2* with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.082	0.59	0.059	0.67	0.086	0.59	0.004	0.98
Spatial references	0.12	0.59	0.076	0.60	0.13	0.55	0.026	0.83
Entities present	0.10	0.59	0.047	0.73	0.13	0.55	0.08	0.59
Sensory descriptions	0.05	0.73	0.024	0.83	0.065	0.67	0.047	0.73
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.081	0.59	-0.005	0.98	0.15	0.55	0.13	0.55
Spatial coherence index	-0.018	0.87	0.032	0.81	-0.064	0.67	-0.08	0.59
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.029	0.99	0.002	0.99	0.049	0.99	0.034	0.99
Internal events	0.028	0.99	-0.004	0.99	0.055	0.99	0.052	0.99
Internal time	-0.048	0.99	-0.079	0.88	-0.005	0.99	0.079	0.88
Internal place	-0.042	0.99	-0.043	0.99	-0.031	0.99	0.019	0.99
Internal perceptual	0.066	0.93	0.057	0.99	0.059	0.98	-0.019	0.99
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.027	0.99	-0.039	0.99	-0.01	0.99	0.021	0.99
Vividness rating	-0.04	0.99	-0.041	0.99	-0.029	0.99	0.025	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.12	0.35	0.11	0.37	0.099	0.40	-0.032	0.90
Spatial references	0.15	0.31	0.13	0.31	0.14	0.31	-0.014	0.97
Entities present	0.13	0.31	0.13	0.31	0.095	0.44	-0.049	0.81
Sensory descriptions	0.11	0.37	0.11	0.37	0.084	0.54	-0.025	0.94
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.01	0.97	-0.011	0.97	0.03	0.92	0.023	0.94
Spatial coherence index	0.078	0.59	0.10	0.40	0.038	0.87	-0.061	0.70
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.065	0.96	0.018	0.99	0.097	0.91	0.095	0.91
Movie clip recognition	0.01	0.99	0.023	0.99	-0.006	0.99	-0.015	0.99
Scene recognition	0.099	0.91	0.067	0.96	0.11	0.91	0.04	0.99
Proximity judgements	0.017	0.99	0.032	0.99	-0.002	0.99	-0.013	0.99
Route knowledge	0.016	0.99	-0.036	0.99	0.065	0.96	0.11	0.91
Sketch map	0.065	0.96	0.02	0.99	0.096	0.91	0.092	0.91

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S9. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter MT saturation in the male participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.18	0.70	-0.17	0.70	-0.16	0.70	0.072	0.83
Spatial references	-0.075	0.83	-0.094	0.76	-0.041	0.86	0.095	0.76
Entities present	-0.072	0.84	-0.089	0.79	-0.039	0.86	0.11	0.76
Sensory descriptions	-0.14	0.70	-0.16	0.70	-0.085	0.81	0.16	0.70
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.069	0.84	-0.097	0.76	-0.026	0.87	0.10	0.76
Spatial coherence index	-0.21	0.70	-0.12	0.70	-0.26	0.67	-0.089	0.79
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.017	1.00	-0.008	1.00	-0.022	1.00	-0.018	1.00
Internal events	-0.018	1.00	-0.011	1.00	-0.022	1.00	-0.008	1.00
Internal time	0.10	0.79	0.16	0.71	0.027	1.00	-0.20	0.71
Internal place	-0.064	0.94	-0.052	0.98	-0.065	0.94	-0.007	1.00
Internal perceptual	0.043	0.98	0.007	1.00	0.073	0.94	0.066	0.94
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.13	0.73	-0.067	0.94	-0.16	0.71	-0.082	0.90
Vividness rating	-0.24	0.71	-0.21	0.71	-0.23	0.71	0.052	0.98
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.22	0.35	-0.18	0.35	-0.21	0.35	0.045	0.92
Spatial references	-0.19	0.35	-0.16	0.35	-0.20	0.35	0.029	0.92
Entities present	-0.076	0.84	-0.055	0.87	-0.084	0.78	0.02	0.93
Sensory descriptions	-0.054	0.87	-0.071	0.85	-0.026	0.92	0.12	0.52
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.15	0.35	-0.14	0.42	-0.14	0.41	0.036	0.92
Spatial coherence index	0.20	0.35	-0.14	0.42	-0.23	0.35	-0.029	0.92
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.092	0.95	-0.057	0.95	-0.11	0.95	-0.039	0.95
Movie clip recognition	0.00	1.00	0.037	0.95	-0.039	0.95	-0.079	0.95
Scene recognition	0.11	0.95	0.11	0.95	0.087	0.95	-0.066	0.95
Proximity judgements	-0.014	0.95	0.002	1.00	-0.029	0.95	-0.018	0.95
Route knowledge	0.017	0.95	-0.021	0.95	0.054	0.95	0.083	0.95
Sketch map	-0.12	0.95	-0.071	0.95	-0.14	0.95	-0.052	0.95

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S10. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter PD in the male participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.073	0.83	0.034	0.86	0.098	0.76	0.038	0.86
Spatial references	0.045	0.85	-0.055	0.85	0.15	0.70	0.18	0.70
Entities present	0.005	0.97	-0.018	0.92	0.031	0.86	0.046	0.85
Sensory descriptions	-0.046	0.85	-0.046	0.85	-0.032	0.86	0.027	0.87
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.13	0.70	0.099	0.76	0.12	0.70	-0.019	0.92
Spatial coherence index	-0.052	0.85	-0.03	0.86	-0.062	0.85	-0.015	0.93
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.086	0.88	0.14	0.71	-0.007	1.00	-0.16	0.71
Internal events	0.088	0.86	0.14	0.71	0.00	1.00	-0.16	0.71
Internal time	-0.047	0.98	0.016	1.00	-0.11	0.79	-0.10	0.80
Internal place	0.063	0.94	0.044	0.98	0.067	0.94	0.001	1.00
Internal perceptual	0.065	0.94	0.089	0.86	0.017	1.00	-0.087	0.87
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.05	0.98	0.11	0.79	-0.032	1.00	-0.14	0.71
Vividness rating	-0.13	0.73	-0.077	0.92	-0.16	0.71	-0.04	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.033	0.92	0.056	0.87	-0.004	0.97	-0.066	0.86
Spatial references	-0.028	0.92	-0.052	0.89	0.01	0.94	0.063	0.86
Entities present	0.063	0.86	0.037	0.92	0.074	0.85	0.017	0.93
Sensory descriptions	-0.038	0.92	-0.009	0.94	-0.06	0.86	-0.036	0.92
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.07	0.85	0.13	0.46	-0.022	0.93	-0.16	0.35
Spatial coherence index	0.024	0.93	0.01	0.94	0.033	0.92	0.014	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.08	0.95	0.11	0.95	0.02	0.95	-0.10	0.95
Movie clip recognition	-0.17	0.95	-0.12	0.95	-0.19	0.95	-0.012	0.95
Scene recognition	0.013	0.95	0.052	0.95	-0.039	0.95	-0.086	0.95
Proximity judgements	0.18	0.95	0.12	0.95	0.20	0.95	0.024	0.95
Route knowledge	0.081	0.95	0.051	0.95	0.093	0.95	0.016	0.95
Sketch map	0.077	0.95	0.11	0.95	0.008	0.97	-0.12	0.95

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S11. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_1 in the male participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.055	0.85	0.072	0.83	0.034	0.86	-0.059	0.85
Spatial references	0.083	0.82	0.13	0.70	0.039	0.86	-0.13	0.70
Entities present	0.08	0.83	0.099	0.76	0.055	0.85	-0.066	0.84
Sensory descriptions	0.13	0.70	0.13	0.70	0.12	0.70	-0.03	0.86
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.15	0.70	0.094	0.76	0.17	0.70	0.11	0.73
Spatial coherence index	-0.053	0.85	-0.051	0.85	-0.049	0.85	0.014	0.93
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.18	0.71	0.14	0.71	0.19	0.71	0.06	0.95
Internal events	0.17	0.71	0.14	0.73	0.18	0.71	0.056	0.98
Internal time	0.15	0.71	0.12	0.75	0.15	0.71	0.044	0.98
Internal place	0.11	0.79	0.12	0.75	0.093	0.85	-0.051	0.98
Internal perceptual	0.18	0.71	0.16	0.71	0.17	0.71	0.00	1.00
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.022	1.00	-0.065	0.94	0.016	1.00	0.12	0.73
Vividness rating	-0.002	1.00	-0.017	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.026	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.16	0.35	0.12	0.48	0.17	0.35	0.063	0.86
Spatial references	0.17	0.35	0.15	0.37	0.17	0.35	0.024	0.93
Entities present	0.14	0.42	0.16	0.35	0.11	0.57	-0.072	0.85
Sensory descriptions	0.19	0.35	0.17	0.35	0.19	0.35	0.028	0.92
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.11	0.54	0.018	0.93	0.18	0.35	0.23	0.35
Spatial coherence index	-0.051	0.89	-0.038	0.92	-0.056	0.87	-0.015	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.034	0.95	-0.043	0.95	-0.022	0.95	0.029	0.95
Movie clip recognition	-0.012	0.95	0.017	0.95	-0.035	0.95	-0.075	0.95
Scene recognition	0.028	0.95	0.017	0.95	0.035	0.95	0.027	0.95
Proximity judgements	0.033	0.95	0.042	0.95	0.022	0.95	-0.02	0.95
Route knowledge	0.033	0.95	0.049	0.95	0.017	0.95	-0.052	0.95
Sketch map	-0.047	0.95	-0.061	0.95	-0.031	0.95	0.043	0.95

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S12. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_2* in the male participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.13	0.70	0.079	0.83	0.15	0.70	0.034	0.86
Spatial references	0.17	0.70	0.14	0.70	0.15	0.70	-0.046	0.85
Entities present	0.16	0.70	0.12	0.70	0.16	0.70	0.005	0.97
Sensory descriptions	0.12	0.70	0.069	0.84	0.15	0.70	0.052	0.85
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.12	0.70	0.011	0.94	0.20	0.70	0.14	0.70
Spatial coherence index	0.018	0.92	-0.003	0.98	0.037	0.86	0.067	0.84
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.14	0.71	0.098	0.84	0.15	0.71	-0.002	1.00
Internal events	0.13	0.73	0.076	0.92	0.15	0.71	0.036	1.00
Internal time	0.006	1.00	0.013	1.00	-0.004	1.00	-0.029	1.00
Internal place	0.10	0.79	0.062	0.94	0.12	0.73	0.016	1.00
Internal perceptual	0.14	0.71	0.13	0.73	0.11	0.78	-0.066	0.94
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.033	1.00	0.011	1.00	0.049	0.98	0.021	1.00
Vividness rating	-0.011	1.00	-0.095	0.84	0.089	0.86	0.20	0.71
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.18	0.35	0.14	0.42	0.18	0.35	-0.011	0.94
Spatial references	0.18	0.35	0.11	0.53	0.21	0.35	0.046	0.92
Entities present	0.21	0.35	0.21	0.35	0.15	0.35	-0.096	0.66
Sensory descriptions	0.19	0.35	0.18	0.35	0.16	0.35	-0.033	0.92
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.12	0.51	0.061	0.86	0.15	0.35	0.026	0.92
Spatial coherence index	0.17	0.35	0.13	0.47	0.17	0.35	0.018	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.006	0.97	-0.062	0.95	0.06	0.95	0.14	0.95
Movie clip recognition	-0.15	0.95	-0.091	0.95	-0.18	0.95	-0.026	0.95
Scene recognition	0.12	0.95	0.044	0.95	0.18	0.95	0.11	0.95
Proximity judgements	0.012	0.95	-0.021	0.95	0.045	0.95	0.096	0.95
Route knowledge	0.066	0.95	-0.022	0.95	0.15	0.95	0.16	0.95
Sketch map	-0.02	0.95	-0.068	0.95	0.041	0.95	0.13	0.95

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S13. Partial correlations between tasks performance and hippocampal grey matter MT saturation in the female participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.002	1.00	-0.005	1.00	0.001	1.00	-0.001	1.00
Spatial references	-0.076	0.95	-0.070	0.96	-0.074	0.95	0.004	1.00
Entities present	-0.048	0.96	-0.059	0.96	-0.034	0.96	0.035	0.96
Sensory descriptions	-0.084	0.94	-0.093	0.88	-0.067	0.96	0.034	0.96
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.002	1.00	-0.034	0.96	0.027	0.96	0.095	0.88
Spatial coherence index	0.065	0.96	0.081	0.95	0.044	0.96	-0.089	0.91
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.010	1.00	0.012	1.00	0.007	1.00	-0.023	1.00
Internal events	0.021	1.00	0.022	1.00	0.018	1.00	-0.020	1.00
Internal time	0.020	1.00	0.051	1.00	-0.009	1.00	-0.099	1.00
Internal place	-0.078	1.00	-0.050	1.00	-0.095	1.00	-0.069	1.00
Internal perceptual	-0.033	1.00	-0.030	1.00	-0.032	1.00	-0.009	1.00
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.084	1.00	0.062	1.00	0.096	1.00	0.033	1.00
Vividness rating	-0.011	1.00	0.000	1.00	-0.019	1.00	-0.044	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.035	0.97	-0.054	0.89	-0.015	1.00	0.054	0.89
Spatial references	-0.11	0.81	-0.123	0.81	-0.094	0.81	0.062	0.89
Entities present	0.001	1.00	-0.009	1.00	0.010	1.00	0.018	1.00
Sensory descriptions	-0.13	0.81	-0.146	0.81	-0.104	0.81	0.076	0.83
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.13	0.81	0.087	0.81	0.151	0.81	0.059	0.89
Spatial coherence index	0.019	1.00	0.047	0.93	-0.009	1.00	-0.104	0.81
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.10	0.71	-0.059	0.88	-0.13	0.65	-0.081	0.80
Movie clip recognition	0.087	0.79	0.091	0.76	0.075	0.82	-0.029	0.91
Scene recognition	0.047	0.91	0.042	0.91	0.047	0.91	-0.001	0.99
Proximity judgements	-0.13	0.65	-0.12	0.71	-0.13	0.65	0.008	0.97
Route knowledge	0.013	0.96	0.071	0.82	-0.040	0.91	-0.18	0.65
Sketch map	-0.12	0.71	-0.078	0.82	-0.15	0.65	-0.066	0.85

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S14. Partial correlations between tasks performance and hippocampal grey matter PD in the female participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.12	0.88	-0.12	0.88	-0.11	0.88	0.058	0.96
Spatial references	-0.080	0.95	-0.098	0.88	-0.044	0.96	0.094	0.88
Entities present	-0.16	0.77	-0.14	0.77	-0.15	0.77	0.060	0.96
Sensory descriptions	0.095	0.88	0.066	0.96	0.11	0.88	0.012	0.98
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.16	0.77	-0.14	0.77	-0.16	0.77	0.049	0.96
Spatial coherence index	-0.031	0.96	0.029	0.96	-0.098	0.88	-0.13	0.83
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.005	1.00	0.037	1.00	-0.036	1.00	-0.089	1.00
Internal events	0.013	1.00	0.051	1.00	-0.035	1.00	-0.11	1.00
Internal time	-0.11	1.00	-0.16	1.00	-0.033	1.00	0.19	1.00
Internal place	-0.074	1.00	-0.077	1.00	-0.057	1.00	0.048	1.00
Internal perceptual	-0.008	1.00	0.003	1.00	-0.021	1.00	-0.026	1.00
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.084	1.00	0.14	1.00	0.002	1.00	-0.19	1.00
Vividness rating	-0.095	1.00	-0.045	1.00	-0.14	1.00	-0.072	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.13	0.81	-0.14	0.81	-0.090	0.81	0.11	0.81
Spatial references	-0.068	0.87	-0.086	0.81	-0.033	0.98	0.088	0.81
Entities present	-0.12	0.81	-0.11	0.81	-0.11	0.81	0.046	0.93
Sensory descriptions	0.096	0.81	0.052	0.89	0.13	0.81	0.052	0.89
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.15	0.81	-0.13	0.81	-0.14	0.81	0.040	0.94
Spatial coherence index	-0.059	0.89	-0.012	1.00	-0.11	0.81	-0.085	0.81
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.10	0.71	-0.16	0.65	-0.022	0.92	0.19	0.65
Movie clip recognition	-0.11	0.71	-0.11	0.71	-0.096	0.75	0.058	0.88
Scene recognition	-0.13	0.65	-0.18	0.65	-0.044	0.91	0.21	0.65
Proximity judgements	0.049	0.91	0.042	0.91	0.050	0.91	-0.011	0.96
Route knowledge	-0.10	0.71	-0.15	0.65	-0.032	0.91	0.17	0.65
Sketch map	-0.093	0.76	-0.14	0.65	-0.017	0.95	0.18	0.65

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S15. Partial correlations between tasks performance and hippocampal grey matter R_1 in the female participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.13	0.88	0.15	0.77	0.094	0.88	-0.10	0.88
Spatial references	0.15	0.77	0.15	0.77	0.14	0.77	-0.019	0.96
Entities present	0.16	0.77	0.15	0.77	0.14	0.77	-0.024	0.96
Sensory descriptions	-0.017	0.96	-0.021	0.96	-0.012	0.98	0.007	1.00
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.18	0.77	0.20	0.77	0.145	0.77	-0.094	0.88
Spatial coherence index	-0.033	0.96	-0.040	0.96	-0.025	0.96	0.021	0.96
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.11	1.00	0.070	1.00	0.13	1.00	0.084	1.00
Internal events	0.11	1.00	0.045	1.00	0.15	1.00	0.16	1.00
Internal time	-0.010	1.00	0.022	1.00	-0.037	1.00	-0.10	1.00
Internal place	-0.022	1.00	-0.027	1.00	-0.016	1.00	0.014	1.00
Internal perceptual	0.10	1.00	0.093	1.00	0.10	1.00	0.001	1.00
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.032	1.00	0.019	1.00	0.041	1.00	0.033	1.00
Vividness rating	-0.082	1.00	-0.080	1.00	-0.077	1.00	0.000	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.12	0.81	0.13	0.81	0.094	0.81	-0.064	0.89
Spatial references	0.16	0.81	0.16	0.81	0.14	0.81	-0.030	0.99
Entities present	0.21	0.81	0.20	0.81	0.21	0.81	0.006	1.00
Sensory descriptions	-0.002	1.00	0.015	1.00	-0.016	1.00	-0.054	0.89
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.13	0.81	0.12	0.81	0.12	0.81	0.006	1.00
Spatial coherence index	-0.072	0.85	-0.077	0.83	-0.062	0.89	0.025	1.00
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.027	0.92	0.071	0.82	-0.012	0.96	-0.14	0.65
Movie clip recognition	0.069	0.83	0.12	0.71	0.024	0.92	-0.15	0.65
Scene recognition	0.034	0.91	0.076	0.82	-0.004	0.99	-0.13	0.65
Proximity judgements	-0.13	0.65	-0.099	0.73	-0.15	0.65	-0.081	0.80
Route knowledge	-0.018	0.95	0.034	0.91	-0.059	0.88	-0.16	0.65
Sketch map	0.035	0.91	0.072	0.82	0.001	0.99	-0.11	0.71

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S16. Partial correlations between tasks performance and hippocampal grey matter R_2* in the female participants with age, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.026	0.96	0.035	0.96	0.013	0.98	-0.047	0.96
Spatial references	0.075	0.95	0.025	0.96	0.11	0.88	0.074	0.95
Entities present	0.050	0.96	-0.018	0.96	0.10	0.88	0.14	0.77
Sensory descriptions	-0.034	0.96	-0.030	0.96	-0.032	0.96	0.017	0.96
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.041	0.96	-0.018	0.96	0.088	0.91	0.096	0.88
Spatial coherence index	-0.059	0.96	0.067	0.96	-0.17	0.77	-0.27	0.55
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.066	1.00	-0.090	1.00	-0.032	1.00	0.065	1.00
Internal events	-0.062	1.00	-0.092	1.00	-0.022	1.00	0.085	1.00
Internal time	-0.11	1.00	-0.19	1.00	-0.024	1.00	0.12	1.00
Internal place	-0.12	1.00	-0.11	1.00	-0.11	1.00	0.025	1.00
Internal perceptual	0.019	1.00	0.015	1.00	0.020	1.00	0.001	1.00
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.087	1.00	-0.084	1.00	-0.073	1.00	-0.006	1.00
Vividness rating	-0.065	1.00	0.001	1.00	-0.12	1.00	-0.14	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.042	0.94	0.076	0.83	0.003	1.00	-0.082	0.82
Spatial references	0.11	0.81	0.14	0.81	0.069	0.87	-0.091	0.81
Entities present	0.041	0.94	0.029	0.99	0.043	0.94	0.023	1.00
Sensory descriptions	0.011	1.00	0.020	1.00	0.00	1.00	-0.013	1.00
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.10	0.81	-0.087	0.81	-0.094	0.81	-0.003	1.00
Spatial coherence index	-0.014	1.00	0.077	0.83	-0.097	0.81	-0.19	0.81
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.13	0.65	0.12	0.71	0.12	0.71	0.006	0.98
Movie clip recognition	0.13	0.65	0.13	0.65	0.11	0.71	-0.029	0.91
Scene recognition	0.085	0.79	0.091	0.76	0.064	0.85	-0.029	0.91
Proximity judgements	0.039	0.91	0.11	0.71	-0.033	0.91	-0.15	0.65
Route knowledge	-0.043	0.91	-0.048	0.91	-0.031	0.91	0.024	0.92
Sketch map	0.15	0.65	0.13	0.65	0.13	0.65	0.014	0.96

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S17. Details of the groups created for each task when dividing by median performance.

Performance variable	Median performance	N (low performance)	N (high performance)
Scene construction			
Experiential index	41.2	109	108
Spatial references	3.29	112	105
Entities present	9.71	112	105
Sensory descriptions	12.14	112	105
Thoughts/emotions/actions	3.14	114	103
Spatial coherence index	3.0	112	105
Autobiographical interview			
Internal details	23.2	110	107
Internal events	10.6	111	106
Internal time	1.4	128	89
Internal place	2.2	123	94
Internal perceptual	5.4	109	108
Internal thoughts/emotions	3.2	111	106
Vividness rating	4.6	114	103
Future thinking			
Experiential index	39.8	111	106
Spatial references	2.3	123	94
Entities present	10.0	114	103
Sensory descriptions	8.67	117	100
Thoughts/emotions/actions	5.0	116	101
Spatial coherence index	2.67	115	102
Navigation			
Overall navigation score	144.0	109	108
Scene recognition	30.0	146	71
Proximity judgements	8.0	159	58
Route knowledge	11.0	114	103
Sketch map	81	111	106

Table S18. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter MT saturation when dividing the sample into two groups determined by their median performance on each cognitive task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.03	0.96	0.08	0.92	0.00	0.99	0.26	0.88
Spatial references	0.91	0.75	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.75	0.36	0.88
Entities present	0.15	0.88	0.31	0.88	0.03	0.96	0.73	0.75
Sensory descriptions	2.51	0.52	4.19	0.42	0.84	0.75	4.22	0.42
Thoughts/emotions/actions	1.06	0.75	0.48	0.84	1.48	0.74	0.05	0.96
Spatial coherence index	0.40	0.88	0.14	0.88	2.33	0.56	6.13	0.42
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.14	0.95	0.10	0.95	0.14	0.95	0.03	0.96
Internal events	0.82	0.95	0.89	0.95	0.56	0.95	0.11	0.95
Internal time	0.00	1.00	0.33	0.95	0.31	0.95	2.67	0.95
Internal place	0.97	0.95	0.51	0.95	1.23	0.95	0.27	0.95
Internal perceptual	0.03	0.96	0.40	0.95	0.09	0.95	1.35	0.95
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.09	0.95	0.17	0.95	0.02	0.98	0.34	0.95
Vividness ratings	1.22	0.95	2.22	0.95	0.33	0.95	1.59	0.95
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.27	0.95	0.46	0.95	0.08	0.95	0.39	0.95
Spatial references	1.59	0.83	1.10	0.86	1.66	0.83	0.04	0.97
Entities present	0.68	0.95	0.63	0.95	0.54	0.95	0.03	0.97
Sensory descriptions	0.03	0.97	0.54	0.95	0.16	0.95	2.77	0.54
Thoughts/emotions/actions	3.11	0.54	2.95	0.54	2.43	0.58	0.26	0.95
Spatial coherence index	1.36	0.83	0.25	0.95	2.75	0.54	1.54	0.83
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	6.28	0.37	4.75	0.40	6.08	0.37	0.07	0.96
Scene recognition	0.12	0.96	0.17	0.96	0.05	0.96	0.06	0.96
Proximity judgements	0.08	0.96	0.09	0.96	0.64	0.96	1.75	0.96
Route knowledge	0.04	0.96	0.07	0.96	0.01	0.98	0.07	0.96
Sketch map	5.25	0.37	2.92	0.79	6.44	0.37	0.26	0.96

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S19. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter PD when dividing the sample into two groups determined by their median performance on each cognitive task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.76	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.25	0.88	0.69	0.75
Spatial references	0.32	0.88	0.86	0.75	0.00	0.99	1.33	0.75
Entities present	1.75	0.72	2.00	0.66	0.78	0.75	1.04	0.75
Sensory descriptions	0.74	0.75	0.22	0.88	1.27	0.75	0.14	0.88
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.04	0.96	0.27	0.88	0.05	0.96	0.66	0.76
Spatial coherence index	0.44	0.85	0.01	0.97	1.44	0.74	0.79	0.75
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.20	0.95	1.64	0.95	0.45	0.95	4.70	0.95
Internal events	0.26	0.95	0.80	0.95	0.01	0.98	1.45	0.95
Internal time	1.87	0.95	1.03	0.95	2.12	0.95	0.00	1.00
Internal place	0.77	0.95	0.80	0.95	0.41	0.95	0.33	0.95
Internal perceptual	0.22	0.95	0.30	0.95	0.06	0.95	0.23	0.95
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.10	0.95	1.08	0.95	0.43	0.95	3.31	0.95
Vividness ratings	0.49	0.95	0.06	0.95	1.18	0.95	0.41	0.95
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.44	0.95	0.60	0.95	0.14	0.95	0.34	0.95
Spatial references	1.21	0.83	1.78	0.80	0.29	0.95	1.41	0.83
Entities present	0.01	0.98	0.01	0.98	0.01	0.98	0.00	0.99
Sensory descriptions	0.02	0.98	0.06	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.10	0.95
Thoughts/emotions/actions	2.92	0.54	1.22	0.83	4.11	0.48	0.13	0.95
Spatial coherence index	0.28	0.95	0.26	0.95	0.18	0.95	0.08	0.95
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.04	0.96	0.00	1.00	0.14	0.96	0.09	0.96
Scene recognition	0.12	0.96	0.00	0.98	0.38	0.96	0.20	0.96
Proximity judgements	1.99	0.96	2.40	0.89	0.80	0.96	1.25	0.96
Route knowledge	0.21	0.96	0.04	0.96	1.34	0.96	1.51	0.96
Sketch map	0.25	0.96	0.05	0.96	0.50	0.96	0.08	0.96

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S20. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter R_1 when dividing the sample into two groups determined by their median performance on each cognitive task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	2.75	0.50	3.60	0.47	1.68	0.72	0.92	0.75
Spatial references	4.13	0.42	4.83	0.42	2.88	0.50	0.64	0.76
Entities present	6.71	0.42	5.72	0.42	6.27	0.42	0.01	0.97
Sensory descriptions	0.09	0.92	0.18	0.88	0.03	0.96	0.18	0.88
Thoughts/emotions/actions	2.83	0.50	1.63	0.72	3.49	0.47	0.61	0.76
Spatial coherence index	0.24	0.88	0.20	0.88	0.23	0.88	0.00	0.99
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	7.60	0.41	3.72	0.95	10.23	0.20	2.75	0.95
Internal events	3.42	0.95	1.34	0.95	5.09	0.95	2.30	0.95
Internal time	3.73	0.95	2.47	0.95	4.20	0.95	0.31	0.95
Internal place	0.21	0.95	0.12	0.95	0.26	0.95	0.12	0.95
Internal perceptual	1.05	0.95	0.79	0.95	1.08	0.95	0.01	0.98
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.12	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.34	0.95	0.63	0.95
Vividness ratings	0.05	0.95	0.37	0.95	0.01	0.98	0.92	0.95
Future thinking								
Experiential index	1.04	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.99	0.88	0.00	1.00
Spatial references	4.19	0.48	4.00	0.48	3.56	0.53	0.06	0.95
Entities present	5.17	0.48	4.14	0.48	5.08	0.48	0.06	0.95
Sensory descriptions	0.41	0.95	0.26	0.95	0.47	0.95	0.06	0.95
Thoughts/emotions/actions	3.89	0.48	1.47	0.83	5.90	0.48	2.93	0.54
Spatial coherence index	0.24	0.95	0.11	0.95	0.34	0.95	0.08	0.95
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.30	0.96	0.33	0.96	0.23	0.96	0.03	0.96
Scene recognition	0.01	0.98	0.00	0.98	0.05	0.96	0.19	0.96
Proximity judgements	1.42	0.96	1.42	0.96	1.16	0.96	0.08	0.96
Route knowledge	0.06	0.96	0.31	0.96	0.83	0.96	5.45	0.37
Sketch map	0.11	0.96	0.10	0.96	0.10	0.96	0.00	1.00

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S21. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter R_2* when dividing the sample into two groups determined by their median performance on each cognitive task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	1.72	0.72	1.52	0.74	1.18	0.75	0.22	0.88
Spatial references	4.36	0.42	2.76	0.50	4.13	0.42	0.00	0.99
Entities present	3.06	0.50	1.38	0.75	3.71	0.47	0.36	0.88
Sensory descriptions	0.78	0.75	1.25	0.75	0.20	0.88	0.23	0.88
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.92	0.75	0.01	0.97	3.37	0.47	2.64	0.51
Spatial coherence index	0.02	0.96	0.12	0.89	0.01	0.97	0.09	0.92
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	1.07	0.95	0.17	0.95	2.08	0.95	0.38	0.95
Internal events	0.01	0.98	0.44	0.95	0.75	0.95	2.22	0.95
Internal time	0.08	0.95	0.74	0.95	0.14	0.95	1.49	0.95
Internal place	0.91	0.95	0.55	0.95	0.91	0.95	0.08	0.95
Internal perceptual	1.16	0.95	0.37	0.95	1.71	0.95	0.30	0.95
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.07	0.95	0.07	0.95	0.04	0.96	0.05	0.95
Vividness ratings	0.23	0.95	0.70	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.87	0.95
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.04	0.97	0.21	0.95	0.01	0.98	0.17	0.95
Spatial references	2.63	0.54	4.06	0.48	0.72	0.95	1.33	0.83
Entities present	2.67	0.54	4.27	0.48	0.67	0.95	1.97	0.74
Sensory descriptions	0.08	0.95	0.24	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.95
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.44	0.95	0.01	0.98	1.20	0.83	0.48	0.95
Spatial coherence index	0.57	0.95	0.75	0.95	0.22	0.95	0.10	0.95
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	1.25	0.96	0.16	0.96	2.53	0.89	1.40	0.96
Scene recognition	0.82	0.96	0.14	0.96	1.53	0.96	0.73	0.96
Proximity judgements	0.08	0.96	0.01	0.98	0.16	0.96	0.02	0.98
Route knowledge	0.11	0.96	0.01	0.98	0.44	0.96	0.71	0.96
Sketch map	1.38	0.96	0.06	0.96	3.50	0.72	3.11	0.79

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S22. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter MT saturation in the low performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.17	0.98	-0.15	0.98	-0.16	0.98	0.008	0.99
Spatial references	-0.22	0.59	-0.15	0.98	-0.24	0.52	-0.12	0.98
Entities present	-0.010	0.99	-0.009	0.99	-0.010	0.99	-0.019	0.99
Sensory descriptions	-0.12	0.98	-0.033	0.98	-0.19	0.96	-0.18	0.96
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.17	0.98	-0.16	0.98	-0.14	0.98	0.10	0.98
Spatial coherence index	-0.003	0.99	-0.044	0.98	0.038	0.98	0.092	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.10	0.78	-0.036	0.91	-0.16	0.78	-0.099	0.78
Internal events	0.14	0.78	0.15	0.78	0.11	0.78	-0.063	0.79
Internal time	0.035	0.90	0.060	0.79	0.005	1.00	-0.088	0.78
Internal place	0.010	0.98	0.053	0.79	-0.036	0.90	-0.13	0.78
Internal perceptual	-0.009	0.99	0.086	0.78	-0.11	0.78	-0.21	0.72
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.067	0.79	-0.012	0.98	-0.12	0.78	-0.088	0.78
Vividness ratings	-0.084	0.78	-0.004	1.00	-0.16	0.78	-0.16	0.78
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.095	0.79	-0.036	0.93	-0.14	0.78	-0.099	0.79
Spatial references	-0.087	0.79	-0.032	0.93	-0.13	0.78	-0.11	0.78
Entities present	-0.029	0.93	0.020	0.93	-0.070	0.79	-0.104	0.78
Sensory descriptions	-0.16	0.78	-0.13	0.78	-0.18	0.78	-0.018	0.93
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.012	0.95	-0.013	0.95	-0.009	0.95	-0.008	0.95
Spatial coherence index	-0.020	0.93	-0.031	0.93	-0.008	0.95	0.020	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.022	0.94	0.13	0.60	-0.083	0.71	-0.27	0.46
Scene recognition	0.13	0.60	0.13	0.60	0.11	0.60	-0.054	0.74
Proximity judgements	-0.088	0.60	-0.11	0.60	-0.056	0.74	0.092	0.60
Route knowledge	0.059	0.75	0.10	0.60	0.013	0.94	-0.13	0.60
Sketch map	-0.071	0.74	0.016	0.94	-0.15	0.60	-0.18	0.60

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S23. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter PD in the low performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.052	0.98	0.047	0.98	0.045	0.98	-0.016	0.99
Spatial references	0.002	0.99	-0.024	0.99	0.033	0.98	0.052	0.98
Entities present	0.072	0.98	0.079	0.98	0.044	0.98	-0.054	0.98
Sensory descriptions	0.044	0.98	0.055	0.98	0.021	0.99	-0.052	0.98
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.063	0.98	-0.068	0.98	-0.036	0.98	0.046	0.98
Spatial coherence index	0.069	0.98	0.11	0.98	0.002	0.99	-0.13	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.076	0.79	-0.094	0.78	-0.029	0.94	0.086	0.78
Internal events	-0.092	0.78	-0.057	0.79	-0.11	0.78	-0.013	0.98
Internal time	-0.059	0.79	-0.088	0.78	0.00	1.00	0.092	0.78
Internal place	-0.12	0.78	-0.10	0.78	-0.13	0.78	0.033	0.91
Internal perceptual	-0.13	0.78	-0.13	0.78	-0.086	0.78	0.089	0.78
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.12	0.78	0.089	0.78	0.12	0.78	-0.006	1.00
Vividness ratings	-0.20	0.77	-0.15	0.78	-0.22	0.72	-0.002	1.00
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.073	0.79	0.12	0.78	0.00	1.00	-0.15	0.78
Spatial references	0.11	0.78	0.098	0.78	0.098	0.78	-0.040	0.91
Entities present	0.041	0.91	0.041	0.91	0.030	0.93	-0.026	0.93
Sensory descriptions	0.10	0.78	0.10	0.78	0.071	0.79	-0.064	0.82
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.085	0.79	0.12	0.78	0.008	0.95	-0.13	0.78
Spatial coherence index	0.083	0.79	0.12	0.78	0.022	0.93	-0.12	0.78
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.066	0.74	-0.11	0.60	0.002	0.99	0.12	0.60
Scene recognition	-0.15	0.60	-0.13	0.60	-0.12	0.60	0.055	0.74
Proximity judgements	0.085	0.60	0.023	0.93	0.13	0.60	0.085	0.60
Route knowledge	-0.12	0.60	-0.098	0.60	-0.11	0.60	0.017	0.94
Sketch map	0.003	0.98	-0.053	0.78	0.062	0.74	0.11	0.60

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S24. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_1 in the low performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.007	0.99	0.036	0.98	-0.018	0.99	-0.076	0.98
Spatial references	0.013	0.99	0.039	0.98	-0.008	0.99	-0.073	0.98
Entities present	-0.006	0.99	0.025	0.99	-0.030	0.99	-0.075	0.98
Sensory descriptions	-0.042	0.98	-0.040	0.98	-0.042	0.98	-0.001	0.99
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.061	0.98	0.058	0.98	0.052	0.98	-0.004	0.99
Spatial coherence index	-0.080	0.98	-0.11	0.98	-0.053	0.98	0.093	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.087	0.78	0.10	0.78	0.061	0.79	-0.069	0.79
Internal events	0.277	0.35	0.25	0.43	0.27	0.35	0.005	1.00
Internal time	0.066	0.79	0.090	0.78	0.032	0.91	-0.085	0.78
Internal place	-0.011	0.98	-0.022	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.039	0.89
Internal perceptual	0.14	0.78	0.15	0.78	0.12	0.78	-0.065	0.79
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.021	0.98	0.029	0.94	0.010	0.98	-0.018	0.98
Vividness ratings	0.042	0.89	0.054	0.79	0.027	0.94	-0.054	0.79
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.17	0.78	0.14	0.78	0.18	0.78	0.082	0.79
Spatial references	0.13	0.78	0.10	0.78	0.14	0.78	0.075	0.79
Entities present	0.050	0.89	0.055	0.88	0.042	0.91	-0.028	0.93
Sensory descriptions	0.062	0.82	0.070	0.79	0.050	0.89	-0.041	0.91
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.16	0.78	0.11	0.78	0.17	0.78	0.059	0.85
Spatial coherence index	-0.13	0.78	-0.15	0.78	-0.11	0.78	0.069	0.79
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.038	0.87	0.016	0.94	-0.079	0.72	-0.13	0.60
Scene recognition	0.049	0.77	0.059	0.74	0.036	0.84	-0.042	0.79
Proximity judgements	0.010	0.94	0.043	0.78	-0.018	0.94	-0.091	0.60
Route knowledge	0.12	0.60	0.093	0.63	0.14	0.60	0.077	0.72
Sketch map	-0.065	0.74	-0.013	0.94	-0.10	0.60	-0.12	0.60

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S25. Partial correlations between task performance and hippocampal grey matter R_2* in the low performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.063	0.98	0.053	0.98	0.059	0.98	-0.014	0.99
Spatial references	0.23	0.52	0.14	0.98	0.24	0.52	0.047	0.98
Entities present	0.11	0.98	0.11	0.98	0.079	0.98	-0.045	0.98
Sensory descriptions	0.006	0.99	-0.012	0.99	0.018	0.99	0.037	0.98
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.13	0.98	0.11	0.98	0.11	0.98	-0.041	0.98
Spatial coherence index	-0.10	0.98	-0.074	0.98	-0.11	0.98	-0.033	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.080	0.79	0.071	0.79	0.075	0.79	-0.014	0.98
Internal events	0.18	0.78	0.19	0.78	0.13	0.78	-0.12	0.78
Internal time	-0.012	0.98	-0.067	0.79	0.058	0.79	0.15	0.78
Internal place	0.082	0.78	0.057	0.79	0.091	0.78	0.041	0.89
Internal perceptual	0.17	0.78	0.19	0.78	0.10	0.78	-0.10	0.78
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.091	0.78	0.084	0.78	0.080	0.79	-0.021	0.98
Vividness ratings	0.016	0.98	-0.015	0.98	0.047	0.86	0.097	0.78
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.12	0.78	0.10	0.78	0.12	0.78	0.012	0.95
Spatial references	0.16	0.78	0.11	0.78	0.16	0.78	0.076	0.79
Entities present	0.046	0.91	0.052	0.89	0.033	0.93	-0.008	0.95
Sensory descriptions	0.070	0.79	0.027	0.93	0.086	0.79	0.069	0.79
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.082	0.79	-0.062	0.82	-0.089	0.79	-0.020	0.93
Spatial coherence index	-0.084	0.79	-0.080	0.79	-0.073	0.79	0.021	0.93
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.16	0.60	0.12	0.60	0.16	0.60	0.019	0.94
Scene recognition	0.12	0.60	0.094	0.60	0.11	0.60	0.008	0.95
Proximity judgements	0.072	0.67	0.075	0.66	0.057	0.74	-0.014	0.94
Route knowledge	0.10	0.60	0.067	0.74	0.11	0.60	0.034	0.88
Sketch map	0.14	0.60	0.14	0.60	0.11	0.60	-0.049	0.79

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S26. Partial correlations between performance and hippocampal grey matter MT saturation in the high performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.13	0.77	-0.14	0.77	-0.10	0.77	0.090	0.77
Spatial references	0.001	1.00	-0.045	0.91	0.051	0.91	0.11	0.77
Entities present	-0.12	0.77	-0.13	0.77	-0.099	0.77	0.099	0.77
Sensory descriptions	-0.036	0.96	-0.095	0.77	0.027	0.99	0.17	0.77
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.18	0.77	-0.22	0.77	-0.12	0.77	0.19	0.77
Spatial coherence index	-0.13	0.77	-0.14	0.77	-0.10	0.77	0.11	0.77
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.009	0.99	-0.013	0.99	0.027	0.95	0.047	0.93
Internal events	0.086	0.81	0.088	0.81	0.074	0.81	-0.043	0.93
Internal time	0.14	0.75	0.16	0.75	0.10	0.81	-0.091	0.81
Internal place	-0.073	0.81	-0.10	0.81	-0.040	0.94	0.078	0.81
Internal perceptual	0.016	0.99	0.011	0.99	0.019	0.99	0.008	0.99
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.032	0.94	-0.062	0.82	-0.001	1.00	0.096	0.81
Vividness ratings	-0.043	0.93	-0.076	0.81	-0.011	0.99	0.087	0.81
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.28	0.17	-0.32	0.11	-0.20	0.36	0.25	0.28
Spatial references	-0.17	0.49	-0.20	0.39	-0.122	0.74	0.15	0.59
Entities present	-0.22	0.34	-0.23	0.32	-0.19	0.39	0.15	0.54
Sensory descriptions	-0.10	0.79	-0.089	0.80	-0.097	0.79	0.061	0.84
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.21	0.35	0.16	0.49	0.24	0.29	0.053	0.84
Spatial coherence index	-0.12	0.74	-0.098	0.79	-0.12	0.74	0.031	0.88
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.077	0.99	0.059	0.99	0.084	0.99	0.000	1.00
Scene recognition	0.22	0.99	0.24	0.99	0.17	0.99	-0.14	0.99
Proximity judgements	-0.090	0.99	-0.055	0.99	-0.12	0.99	-0.047	0.99
Route knowledge	-0.10	0.99	-0.11	0.99	-0.069	0.99	0.065	0.99
Sketch map	0.062	0.99	0.017	1.00	0.097	0.99	0.074	0.99

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S27. Partial correlations between performance and hippocampal grey matter PD in the high performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.005	1.00	-0.010	0.99	0.024	0.99	0.024	0.99
Spatial references	0.017	0.99	-0.048	0.91	0.092	0.77	0.14	0.77
Entities present	-0.074	0.77	-0.075	0.77	-0.056	0.88	0.045	0.91
Sensory descriptions	-0.11	0.77	-0.12	0.77	-0.070	0.79	0.083	0.77
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.075	0.77	-0.11	0.77	-0.015	0.99	0.14	0.77
Spatial coherence index	-0.094	0.77	-0.12	0.77	-0.042	0.91	0.11	0.77
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.12	0.81	0.15	0.75	0.062	0.82	-0.13	0.75
Internal events	0.10	0.81	0.17	0.65	0.003	1.00	-0.24	0.55
Internal time	0.017	0.99	-0.011	0.99	0.046	0.93	0.065	0.83
Internal place	-0.034	0.94	-0.048	0.93	-0.011	0.99	0.038	0.94
Internal perceptual	0.072	0.81	0.13	0.75	-0.011	0.99	-0.16	0.74
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.085	0.81	0.14	0.75	0.00	1.00	-0.18	0.65
Vividness ratings	0.052	0.90	0.075	0.81	0.013	0.99	-0.087	0.81
Future thinking								
Experiential index	-0.11	0.74	-0.11	0.74	-0.082	0.81	0.053	0.84
Spatial references	-0.044	0.88	-0.071	0.83	0.004	0.98	0.083	0.81
Entities present	-0.061	0.84	-0.080	0.81	-0.023	0.90	0.076	0.81
Sensory descriptions	-0.039	0.88	-0.087	0.80	0.030	0.88	0.14	0.65
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.069	0.83	0.071	0.83	0.055	0.84	-0.043	0.88
Spatial coherence index	-0.057	0.84	-0.026	0.88	-0.080	0.81	-0.041	0.88
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.033	0.99	0.009	1.00	0.058	0.99	0.038	0.99
Scene recognition	0.056	0.99	0.067	0.99	0.027	1.00	-0.065	0.99
Proximity judgements	0.022	1.00	0.036	1.00	-0.001	1.00	-0.049	0.99
Route knowledge	-0.041	0.99	-0.042	0.99	-0.030	1.00	0.023	1.00
Sketch map	0.049	0.99	0.035	0.99	0.058	0.99	0.002	1.00

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S28. Partial correlations between performance and hippocampal grey matter R_1 in the high performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.008	0.99	-0.004	1.00	-0.010	0.99	-0.019	0.99
Spatial references	-0.007	0.99	0.000	1.00	-0.013	0.99	-0.019	0.99
Entities present	-0.055	0.88	-0.020	0.99	-0.080	0.77	-0.10	0.77
Sensory descriptions	0.17	0.77	0.15	0.77	0.17	0.77	0.008	0.99
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.13	0.77	0.15	0.77	0.11	0.77	-0.095	0.77
Spatial coherence index	0.075	0.77	0.083	0.77	0.058	0.88	-0.048	0.91
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.084	0.81	-0.082	0.81	-0.080	0.81	0.006	1.00
Internal events	-0.056	0.86	-0.081	0.81	-0.031	0.94	0.098	0.81
Internal time	-0.12	0.81	-0.073	0.82	-0.15	0.75	-0.16	0.75
Internal place	0.15	0.75	0.11	0.81	0.16	0.75	0.077	0.81
Internal perceptual	0.090	0.81	0.068	0.81	0.097	0.81	0.038	0.94
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.029	0.94	-0.064	0.82	0.001	1.00	0.13	0.75
Vividness ratings	-0.21	0.65	-0.18	0.65	-0.20	0.65	-0.072	0.81
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.042	0.88	0.047	0.88	0.033	0.88	-0.026	0.88
Spatial references	0.12	0.74	0.12	0.74	0.094	0.80	-0.037	0.88
Entities present	0.066	0.84	0.096	0.79	0.032	0.88	-0.088	0.80
Sensory descriptions	0.17	0.49	0.18	0.47	0.14	0.61	-0.057	0.84
Thoughts/emotions/actions	-0.065	0.84	-0.072	0.83	-0.055	0.84	0.034	0.88
Spatial coherence index	0.000	1.00	-0.005	0.98	0.004	0.98	0.014	0.95
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.11	0.99	-0.10	0.99	-0.11	0.99	-0.013	1.00
Scene recognition	-0.13	0.99	-0.074	0.99	-0.15	0.99	-0.11	0.99
Proximity judgements	-0.15	0.99	-0.13	0.99	-0.15	0.99	0.001	1.00
Route knowledge	-0.054	0.99	-0.064	0.99	-0.039	0.99	0.023	1.00
Sketch map	-0.059	0.99	-0.058	0.99	-0.056	0.99	0.000	1.00

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S29. Partial correlations between performance and hippocampal grey matter R_2* in the high performing participants only (as determined by a median split for each task) with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	-0.057	0.88	-0.11	0.77	0.008	0.99	0.13	0.77
Spatial references	-0.080	0.77	-0.083	0.77	-0.062	0.86	0.021	0.99
Entities present	-0.018	0.99	-0.074	0.77	0.044	0.91	0.15	0.77
Sensory descriptions	-0.002	1.00	-0.077	0.77	0.091	0.77	0.15	0.77
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.009	0.99	-0.085	0.77	0.081	0.77	0.18	0.77
Spatial coherence index	0.023	0.99	0.13	0.77	-0.12	0.77	-0.22	0.77
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	-0.16	0.75	-0.15	0.75	-0.13	0.75	0.010	0.99
Internal events	-0.081	0.81	-0.072	0.81	-0.069	0.81	-0.001	1.00
Internal time	-0.10	0.81	-0.014	0.99	-0.15	0.75	-0.15	0.75
Internal place	-0.038	0.94	-0.065	0.82	-0.002	1.00	0.070	0.82
Internal perceptual	-0.069	0.81	-0.031	0.94	-0.094	0.81	-0.084	0.81
Internal thoughts/emotions	-0.10	0.81	-0.15	0.75	-0.044	0.93	0.11	0.81
Vividness ratings	-0.14	0.75	0.029	0.94	-0.26	0.55	-0.28	0.55
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.18	0.39	0.16	0.49	0.16	0.49	-0.099	0.79
Spatial references	0.091	0.80	0.021	0.91	0.16	0.54	0.065	0.84
Entities present	0.077	0.81	0.044	0.88	0.10	0.79	0.038	0.88
Sensory descriptions	0.20	0.39	0.19	0.39	0.17	0.49	-0.087	0.80
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.007	0.98	0.027	0.88	-0.010	0.98	-0.033	0.88
Spatial coherence index	0.25	0.29	0.28	0.17	0.13	0.66	-0.22	0.35
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	-0.085	0.99	-0.092	0.99	-0.063	0.99	0.060	0.99
Scene recognition	-0.023	1.00	-0.035	1.00	-0.008	1.00	0.024	1.00
Proximity judgements	-0.097	0.99	0.003	1.00	-0.21	0.99	-0.15	0.99
Route knowledge	-0.11	0.99	-0.15	0.99	-0.046	0.99	0.134	0.99
Sketch map	-0.084	0.99	-0.068	0.99	-0.084	0.99	0.00	1.00

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S30. Details of the groups created for each task when taking only the best and worst performers.

Performance variable	Worst performers maximum	Best performers minimum	N (worst performers)	N (best performers)
Scene construction				
Experiential index	32.66	48.49	20	20
Spatial references	1.57	5.57	21	22
Entities present	6.29	13.86	20	20
Sensory descriptions	7.71	17.0	21	21
Thoughts/emotions/actions	1.29	6.14	19	18
Spatial coherence index	0.71	5.0	23	25
Autobiographical interview				
Internal details	15.20	34.60	22	21
Internal events	6.20	16.60	21	21
Internal time	2.20	10.0	18	15
Internal place	1.40	3.0	26	32
Internal perceptual	0.40	2.60	20	21
Internal thoughts/emotions	1.20	6.0	19	18
Vividness rating	3.40	5.60	19	20
Future thinking				
Experiential index	30.13	47.33	21	21
Spatial references	0.67	4.33	32	30
Entities present	6.67	14.67	23	22
Sensory descriptions	4.33	13.33	21	21
Thoughts/emotions/actions	2.33	8.33	22	22
Spatial coherence index	0.0	5.0	23	29
Navigation				
Overall navigation score	95.0	191.0	21	21
Scene recognition	27.0	32.0	34	28
Proximity judgements	5.0	10.0	18	13
Route knowledge	6.0	19.0	23	22
Sketch map	39.0	121.0	21	21

Table S31. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter MT saturation when taking the best and worst performing participants for task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	2.95	0.62	2.96	0.62	1.86	0.74	0.18	0.85
Spatial references	0.76	0.74	0.57	0.75	0.69	0.74	0.00	0.98
Entities present	0.26	0.82	0.68	0.74	0.00	0.98	0.96	0.74
Sensory descriptions	8.64	0.35	8.03	0.35	7.20	0.35	1.38	0.74
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.91	0.74	1.47	0.74	0.37	0.78	0.96	0.74
Spatial coherence index	0.69	0.74	0.32	0.79	1.07	0.74	0.00	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.02	0.99	0.08	0.97	0.00	0.99	0.17	0.97
Internal events	0.17	0.97	0.01	0.99	0.42	0.92	0.56	0.92
Internal time	1.00	0.92	2.24	0.92	0.22	0.97	1.40	0.92
Internal place	0.27	0.93	0.47	0.92	0.09	0.97	0.64	0.92
Internal perceptual	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.99	0.01	0.99	0.03	0.99
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.00	0.99	0.02	0.99	0.00	0.99	0.04	0.99
Vividness ratings	2.34	0.92	2.03	0.92	2.04	0.92	0.03	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	3.77	0.48	5.01	0.30	2.30	0.59	0.88	0.76
Spatial references	1.11	0.73	1.09	0.73	0.87	0.76	0.08	0.90
Entities present	0.24	0.84	0.09	0.90	0.43	0.82	0.03	0.95
Sensory descriptions	0.43	0.82	0.23	0.84	0.65	0.82	0.14	0.88
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.62	0.82	1.12	0.73	0.24	0.84	0.77	0.80
Spatial coherence index	0.02	0.95	0.00	0.99	0.08	0.90	0.02	0.96
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	2.69	0.50	0.63	0.76	4.84	0.48	3.07	0.50
Scene recognition	3.35	0.48	6.75	0.48	1.19	0.70	5.20	0.48
Proximity judgements	1.58	0.68	1.04	0.73	1.89	0.62	0.44	0.80
Route knowledge	0.33	0.86	0.03	0.92	0.76	0.76	0.87	0.73
Sketch map	3.82	0.48	2.87	0.50	3.42	0.48	0.07	0.91

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S32. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter PD when taking the best and worst performing participants for task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	0.02	0.96	0.01	0.98	0.15	0.86	0.35	0.79
Spatial references	0.13	0.88	1.55	0.74	0.37	0.78	2.71	0.62
Entities present	2.69	0.62	3.42	0.62	1.04	0.74	1.86	0.74
Sensory descriptions	0.48	0.77	0.76	0.74	0.08	0.88	0.66	0.74
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.45	0.77	0.09	0.88	1.17	0.74	0.44	0.77
Spatial coherence index	0.04	0.94	0.47	0.77	0.11	0.88	1.49	0.74
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.06	0.98	0.48	0.92	0.21	0.97	1.51	0.92
Internal events	1.30	0.92	1.74	0.92	0.45	0.92	1.34	0.92
Internal time	3.76	0.92	3.44	0.92	2.43	0.92	1.05	0.92
Internal place	0.15	0.97	0.09	0.97	0.20	0.97	0.00	0.99
Internal perceptual	0.54	0.92	0.73	0.92	0.19	0.97	0.70	0.92
Internal thoughts/emotions	1.06	0.92	1.25	0.92	0.28	0.93	0.56	0.92
Vividness ratings	2.16	0.92	1.17	0.92	2.12	0.92	0.00	0.99
Future thinking								
Experiential index	0.87	0.76	0.97	0.76	0.42	0.82	0.50	0.82
Spatial references	2.45	0.59	1.95	0.59	2.07	0.59	0.37	0.82
Entities present	0.38	0.82	0.31	0.84	0.27	0.84	0.03	0.95
Sensory descriptions	0.38	0.82	0.40	0.82	0.20	0.84	0.29	0.84
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.07	0.90	0.15	0.88	0.00	0.98	0.22	0.84
Spatial coherence index	0.16	0.87	0.42	0.82	0.00	0.98	0.41	0.82
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.87	0.73	1.48	0.68	0.07	0.91	1.82	0.62
Scene recognition	0.02	0.92	0.06	0.91	0.00	1.00	0.08	0.91
Proximity judgements	1.34	0.68	0.49	0.80	1.95	0.62	0.08	0.91
Route knowledge	0.72	0.76	1.72	0.63	0.00	0.99	2.63	0.50
Sketch map	0.20	0.89	0.00	0.99	0.87	0.73	0.60	0.76

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S33. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter R_1 when taking the best and worst performing participants for task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	1.43	0.74	2.25	0.74	0.74	0.74	1.60	0.74
Spatial references	2.89	0.62	3.62	0.62	1.91	0.74	0.23	0.82
Entities present	0.08	0.88	0.00	0.98	0.23	0.82	0.88	0.74
Sensory descriptions	0.76	0.74	1.53	0.74	0.33	0.79	0.64	0.74
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.41	0.78	0.93	0.74	0.12	0.88	3.63	0.62
Spatial coherence index	1.23	0.74	1.09	0.74	1.21	0.74	0.00	0.98
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	2.41	0.92	1.66	0.92	2.40	0.92	0.12	0.97
Internal events	3.22	0.92	1.70	0.92	4.21	0.92	0.84	0.92
Internal time	0.05	0.99	0.33	0.93	0.00	0.99	0.43	0.92
Internal place	0.58	0.92	0.81	0.92	0.38	0.92	0.40	0.92
Internal perceptual	3.99	0.92	5.06	0.92	2.74	0.92	0.66	0.92
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.42	0.92	0.07	0.97	0.69	0.92	0.45	0.92
Vividness ratings	0.57	0.92	0.31	0.93	0.72	0.92	0.12	0.97
Future thinking								
Experiential index	2.04	0.59	2.57	0.59	1.24	0.73	0.22	0.84
Spatial references	8.47	0.25	7.62	0.25	8.00	0.25	0.00	0.98
Entities present	6.57	0.30	6.04	0.30	5.08	0.30	0.38	0.82
Sensory descriptions	3.00	0.59	2.44	0.59	2.79	0.59	0.03	0.95
Thoughts/emotions/actions	1.09	0.73	0.23	0.84	1.82	0.59	2.23	0.59
Spatial coherence index	0.71	0.82	0.66	0.82	0.63	0.82	0.01	0.98
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.03	0.92	0.04	0.92	0.18	0.89	0.91	0.73
Scene recognition	0.06	0.91	0.25	0.88	0.00	0.99	0.65	0.76
Proximity judgements	1.35	0.68	0.89	0.73	1.31	0.68	0.07	0.91
Route knowledge	0.43	0.80	1.06	0.73	0.10	0.91	1.34	0.68
Sketch map	3.97	0.48	3.54	0.48	3.62	0.48	0.06	0.91

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.

Table S34. Comparison of hippocampal grey matter R_2* when taking the best and worst performing participants for task, with age, gender, total intracranial volume and MRI scanner included as covariates.

Performance variable	Whole hippocampus		Anterior hippocampus		Posterior hippocampus		Posterior/Anterior hippocampus ratio	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Scene construction								
Experiential index	5.19	0.56	4.04	0.62	4.24	0.62	0.09	0.88
Spatial references	3.02	0.62	0.46	0.77	5.61	0.56	1.98	0.74
Entities present	1.03	0.74	0.23	0.82	1.78	0.74	0.61	0.74
Sensory descriptions	0.51	0.77	0.00	0.98	1.55	0.74	1.87	0.74
Thoughts/emotions/actions	0.02	0.96	0.17	0.85	0.27	0.82	0.89	0.74
Spatial coherence index	0.01	0.98	0.67	0.74	1.02	0.74	3.23	0.62
Autobiographical interview								
Internal details	0.40	0.92	0.12	0.97	0.61	0.92	0.15	0.97
Internal events	0.45	0.92	0.08	0.97	0.86	0.92	0.63	0.92
Internal time	2.30	0.92	2.27	0.92	1.08	0.92	0.29	0.93
Internal place	0.30	0.93	0.75	0.92	0.07	0.97	0.60	0.92
Internal perceptual	2.91	0.92	4.19	0.92	0.96	0.92	2.09	0.92
Internal thoughts/emotions	0.03	0.99	0.07	0.97	0.37	0.92	0.75	0.92
Vividness ratings	0.95	0.92	0.37	0.92	1.01	0.92	0.08	0.97
Future thinking								
Experiential index	5.16	0.30	2.96	0.59	5.15	0.30	0.20	0.84
Spatial references	2.02	0.59	2.16	0.59	1.24	0.73	0.13	0.88
Entities present	4.31	0.39	2.53	0.59	5.71	0.30	0.09	0.90
Sensory descriptions	1.91	0.59	1.42	0.71	1.76	0.60	0.05	0.94
Thoughts/emotions/actions	1.82	0.59	0.90	0.76	2.43	0.59	0.53	0.82
Spatial coherence index	0.47	0.82	1.38	0.71	0.00	1.00	1.16	0.73
Navigation								
Overall navigation score	0.24	0.88	0.20	0.89	1.98	0.62	4.93	0.48
Scene recognition	2.19	0.58	0.59	0.76	3.07	0.50	0.60	0.76
Proximity judgements	0.03	0.92	0.11	0.91	0.81	0.75	0.31	0.86
Route knowledge	0.42	0.80	0.16	0.90	2.97	0.50	3.75	0.48
Sketch map	0.42	0.80	2.23	0.58	0.25	0.88	4.54	0.48

Note. P values are Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate corrected at $p < 0.05$.