1 **Acute memory deficits in chemotherapy-treated adults**

2 Oana C. Lindner^{a*}, Andrew Mayes^a, Martin G. McCabe^b, Deborah Talmi^a

3

4

5 ^aDivision of Neuroscience and Experimental Psychology, School of Biological
6 Sciences, University of Manchester, Zochonis building, Oxford Road, Manchester, M139PL.

7 ^bDivision of Molecular& Clinical Cancer Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and
8 Health, University of Manchester

9 *Corresponding author: Oana C. Lindner, Patient Centred Outcomes Research Group,
10 Level 3, Bexley Wing, St. James's Institute of Oncology, Beckett Street, Leeds, LS8 7TF;
11 Tel: +44(0)113. 206. 7580; Email: o.c.lindner@leeds.ac.uk orcid.org/0000-0001-5442-8393

12

13

14 Deborah Talmi Deborah.talmi@manchester.ac.uk orcid.org/0000-0002-7720-2706

15 Andrew Mayes Andrew.Mayes@manchester.ac.uk

16 Martin McCabe Martin.McCabe@manchester.ac.uk

17 Conflict of interest statement: No conflicts of interest to declare.

18 Word count:8033

19

Abstract

Data from research on amnesia and epilepsy are equivocal with regards to the dissociation, shown in animal models, between rapid and slow long-term memory consolidation. Cancer treatments have lasting disruptive effects on memory and on brain structures associated with memory, but their acute effects on synaptic consolidation are unknown. We investigated the hypothesis that cancer treatment selectively impairs slow synaptic consolidation. Cancer patients and their matched controls were administered a novel list-learning task modelled on the Rey Auditory-Verbal Learning Test. Learning, forgetting, and retrieval were tested before, and one day after patients' first chemotherapy treatment. Due to difficulties recruiting cancer patients at that sensitive time, we were only able to study 10 patients and their matched controls. Patients exhibited treatment-dependent accelerated forgetting over 24 hours compared to their own pre-treatment performance and to the performance of control participants, in agreement with our hypothesis. The number of intrusions increased after treatment, suggesting retrieval deficits. Future research with larger samples should adapt our methods to distinguish between consolidation and retrieval causes for treatment-dependent accelerated forgetting. The presence of significant accelerated forgetting in our small sample is indicative of a potentially large acute effect of chemotherapy treatment on forgetting, with potentially clinically-relevant implications.

Key words: memory, forgetting, cognition, cancer, chemotherapy

1 **Introduction**

2 Many believe that early long-term memory (LTM) is initiated by rapid consolidation
3 triggered at encoding and that it lasts between ten minutes and several hours (Kandel, Dudai,
4 & Mayford, 2014; McGaugh, 2000). More slowly-triggered consolidation then enables
5 memories to last for hours, days, or longer (Wixted, 2004). Research in animal models has
6 revealed double dissociations between rapid and slow consolidation and provided substantial
7 evidence that drug-induced de-novo protein synthesis disruption impairs slow consolidation
8 and accelerates forgetting over 24 hours (Kandel et al., 2014; McGaugh, 2000). By contrast,
9 there is only sparse evidence for dissociation between fast and slow consolidation in humans.
10 Here we report results from the first study of the cognitive effects of acute cancer
11 chemotherapy treatment in humans, providing preliminary for this dissociation.

12 The canonical human memory literature does not currently distinguish between
13 minutes-long ‘early’ and hours-or-days long ‘delayed’ LTM. This is partly because human
14 forgetting curves (which depict performance on LTM tests as a function of time since
15 encoding) are typically monotonically decreasing, and described well by a power function
16 (Kahana & Adler, 2002; Rubin et al., 1996; Wixted, 1990). The single dissociation between
17 early and delayed LTM is well established. There is ample evidence that the hippocampus is
18 key to memory persistence, although exactly what that entails is still actively debated
19 (Carlesimo, Cherubini, Caltagirone, & Spalletta, 2010; Dewar, Della Sala, Beschin, &
20 Cowan, 2010; Gershman, Blei, & Niv, 2010; Hardt, Nader, & Nadel, 2013; Kopelman et al.,
21 2007; Mayes & Roberts, 2001). Damage to the hippocampus, other medial temporal lobe
22 structures and their connections, leads to an accelerated loss of the ability to freely recall
23 recent inputs. Free recall performance is decreased when tested within the first ten minutes,
24 after which free recall is usually poor (Isaac & Mayes, 1999a, 1999b). Evidence for the

reverse dissociation is less well-established. Some patients with temporal lobe epilepsy show normal free recall within the first ten minutes after encoding, but accelerated long-term forgetting (ALF) as indicated by free-recall measures in delayed tests (Alber, Della Sala, & Dewar, 2014; Elliott, Isaac, & Muhlert, 2014; Hoefijzers, Dewar, Della Sala, Butler, & Zeman, 2015; Isaac & Mayes, 1999a, 1999b). The strength of these dissociations between organic amnesia and ALF is disputed, but if replicated, these findings support a distinction between human rapid and slow LTM consolidation.

Determining whether there is more than one kind of consolidation in humans might be helped by directly manipulating the putative neurobiological processes, using distinct pharmacological treatments. Clearly, we cannot administer drugs to humans that may cause amnesia. In this study, we took a novel approach to address this challenge, by examining, for the first time, rapid and slow consolidation in non-Central Nervous System (nCNS) cancer patients who have undergone chemotherapy.

Cancer chemotherapy treatments are interesting for the study of memory consolidation for two reasons. First, chemotherapy treatment involves the delivery of drugs that are very toxic to humans. While not all cytotoxic drugs cross the blood-brain barrier, pro-inflammatory cytokines that are triggered by the treatment can reduce the protective capabilities of the barrier, allowing some of the cytotoxic drugs to cross it (Coussens & Werb, 2002; Pan et al., 2011; Terrando et al., 2010). The CNS effects of cytotoxic drugs may be due to the disruption of the blood-brain barrier itself, increase of cytokine expression in the CNS, or oxidative stress (Ahles & Saykin, 2007; Seigers & Fardell, 2011). For instance, while anthracyclines do not readily cross the blood-brain barrier (da Ros et al., 2015), in animals they have nevertheless been linked to apoptosis, inhibition of neuro- and gliogenesis

1 (Dietrich, Prust, & Kaiser, 2015; Kaiser, Bledowski, & Dietrich, 2014), and reductions in
 2 serotonin-induced long-term synaptic facilitation, required for the activation of LTM
 3 consolidation processes (Liu, Zhang, Coughlin, Cleary, & Byrne, 2014). These
 4 neurobiological effects have consequences for memory; for example, suppression of
 5 neurogenesis in the medial temporal lobe disrupts hippocampus-dependent memories
 6 (Arruda-Carvalho, Sakaguchi, Akers, Josselyn, & Frankland, 2011; Luu et al., 2012; Sahay et
 7 al., 2011; Zhang, Zou, He, Gage, & Evans, 2008). Indeed, research in animals shows that
 8 even the first chemotherapy treatment impairs memory; impairments can increase in severity
 9 as treatment progresses (Rzeski et al., 2004) and are associated with neuronal damage
 10 (Dietrich et al., 2015; Kaiser et al., 2014).

11 Second, although the acute effects of cancer chemotherapy treatment on memory are
 12 not known, it is well established that cancer survivors treated with chemotherapy exhibit
 13 chronic structural and functional brain damage and cognitive difficulties. This literature is
 14 heterogeneous, but most cross-sectional behavioural studies, recent longitudinal studies
 15 (Janelins, Kesler, Ahles, & Morrow, 2014), and structural and functional imaging evidence
 16 (de Ruiter & Schagen, 2013; Deprez, Billiet, Sunaert, & Leemans, 2013; Pomykala, de
 17 Ruiter, Deprez, McDonald, & Silverman, 2013) have consistently demonstrated
 18 chronic impairments in memory, executive functions, and the brain regions that subserve them.
 19 Declarative memory is one of the cognitive functions most frequently affected (Lindner et al.,
 20 2014; Saykin, de Ruiter, McDonald, Deprez, & Silverman, 2013). Crucially, these
 21 behavioural markers and structural/functional brain changes are independent of anxiety,
 22 depression, or any other patient-reported outcomes.

1 Taken together, cancer chemotherapy treatment is thought to induce changes in the
2 brain that impair memory acutely and chronically. This presents an interesting opportunity to
3 study consolidation causally, under controlled conditions, in a population without
4 neurological or psychiatric history. Beyond this theoretical interest, evidence for the acute
5 cognitive effects of chemotherapy has obvious clinical relevance, with potential impact on
6 patient-doctor communication practices. The reason the effects of acute chemotherapy on
7 cognition have not been studied until now has to do with the obvious challenges of
8 conducting experiments during a very sensitive time for patients, within weeks after
9 diagnosis and around the onset of a difficult treatment. We report the results of a small study,
10 with 10 non-CNS cancer patients (and their matched controls) where we examined 2-minute
11 and 24-hour delayed memory before, and immediately after patients' very first chemotherapy
12 treatment. We hypothesised that patients will exhibit accelerated forgetting following their
13 first treatment, both relative to their pre-treatment performance and to that of matched
14 controls. We suspected that cancer treatment may disrupt de-novo protein synthesis and
15 hence impede slower memory consolidation whether or not learning and/or retrieval are also
16 disrupted. Our results suggest that slow consolidation is impaired in this group, in agreement
17 with our hypothesis, but the small sample size means that they can only be considered
18 preliminary. We report them in order to encourage larger studies of this topic.

19 **Methods**

20 **Participants**

21 The study was approved by the National Research Ethics Services Committee North
22 West. Exclusion criteria common to all participants included a previous history of cancer
23 and/or chemotherapy, hormonal treatment, cranial irradiation, brain injury, a history of

1 mental health problems or substance abuse, previously exposed to mood altering drugs, or if
2 they were not proficient in English.

3 *Patients.* Cancer patients were recruited to the study between November 2011 and
4 April 2014. Patients were approached by their clinical team if they were between 16 and 50
5 years old and had been diagnosed with one of four cancers most prevalent in working
6 ageyoung and middle aged adults (CRUK, 2014): sarcoma, lymphoma, breast cancer, or germ
7 cell tumour. Because the mechanism with which cytotoxic drugs disrupt the CNS are varied
8 and ultimately not yet known, and because most chemotherapy regimens involve the
9 administration of multiple cytotoxic agents, we did not limit inclusion to patients receiving
10 drugs known to cross the blood brain barrier. To be included in the study, patients had to be
11 available to be evaluated before their adjuvant or neoadjuvant treatment.

12 Figure 1 depicts the recruitment process. The self-exclusion of unwell patients
13 suggests that the participants who completed Session 3 may have had a better health and
14 emotional status compared to decliners. Due to logistical difficulties, three participants could
15 not be tested using a computer in either Sessions 2 or 3. To be cautious, the final sample only
16 includes patients who were tested on the computerised version of the task, but we also
17 comment on any differences between the analyses of the two samples. All patients in the final
18 sample had received antiemetics as part of their first treatment. None had additional medical
19 co-morbidities. All women were pre-menopausal. There were no differences in the
20 distribution of diagnoses, demographic details, neuropsychological characteristics, or patient-
21 reported outcomes between the patients who took part in this study and those who did not
22 (Supplementary Tables S1-S2).

1 *Controls.* Control participants (N=10), recruited through adverts, were matched to
2 patients on education, sex, and age (+/- 5 years). There were no significant differences
3 between participants on any demographic variables (Table 1).

4 **Insert Figure 1**

5 **Insert Table 1**

6 **Instruments**

7 *Word lists.* Five different word lists were created in a pilot study using 60 young
8 adults. The words consisted of concrete nouns from the Snodgrass and Vanderwart (1980)
9 database. To limit proactive interference and list confusions each list contained 24 words
10 from two categories representing one natural and one man-made concept. Category names
11 were used as semantic cues for free recall in the beginning of each Session. Lists were
12 equivalent in familiarity and word frequency and were 4-10 letters in length (Supplementary
13 Table S3). The first two letters of each word were unique and served as a cue in the cued
14 recall test. Three lists were selected for each patient and one list allocated to each Session
15 through a balanced Latin square method (Reese, 1997).

16 *Distracter task.* The task consisted of two similar pictures containing 15 differences.
17 Participants were asked to find as many differences as they could within 2 minutes.

18 *Additional tests.* Education is often used as a proxy of general intellectual
19 performance to enable matching between groups (Neisser et al., 1996), although this may not
20 be sufficient in between-group cognitive studies (Deary & Johnson, 2010). Following on
21 from the discussion in Lindner et al. (2014) we attempted to match the groups better by
22 measuring full-scale IQ through the Wechsler Test of Adult Reading (WTAR, Strauss et al.,

2006), a good estimate general cognitive functioning. To control for potential confounders and adhere to the recommendations of the International Cognition and Cancer Task Force (ICCTF, Wefel et al., 2011) we attempted to evaluate patients' neuropsychological status with standardised measures. We also asked participants to fill in several questionnaires at home and send them back to us in a self-addressed envelope. Logistic difficulties, inherent to clinical settings, meant that not all patients were able to complete all the neuropsychological and patient-reported outcomes measures. Available results (Supplementary Table S2) suggest that our sample generally exhibited low level of emotional distress, and were not very different from controls on learning and memory measures. All participants completed the WTAR, which we were therefore able to include as a covariate in the analyses.

Procedure

A difficulty in carrying out repeated memory tests in clinical settings is that instruments recommended in neuropsychological studies of cancer patients (Vardy, Wefel, Ahles, Tannock, & Schagen, 2008) cannot longitudinally assess forgetting across a 24-hour period, a feature we particularly wanted to examine. To address this, we designed a new word-learning task. The specific testing procedure, has a strong theoretical justification to enable the investigation of learning, forgetting, and retrieval processes. Figure 2 provides a graphical summary of the procedure. The task was administered in three Sessions, one per day, over three consecutive days. Patients received the first treatment after the first two Sessions and before the third. Sessions were short (10-15 minutes) to facilitate the administration of this non-routine test before and after patients' first treatment.

The task was modelled after the Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT, Strauss, Sherman, Spreen, & Spreen, 2006). It was short and flexible enough to be

1 administered to patients before and immediately after their first treatment, and sensitive
 2 enough to capture and differentiate between potentially mild learning, consolidation, and
 3 retrieval deficits, which could all underlie impaired memory (Mayes, 1995; Mayes &
 4 Roberts, 2001). The differences between our task and RAVLT were the use of categorised
 5 words (limiting interference in a delayed recall context); the increased number of items and
 6 reduced number of learn/recall trials (limiting ceiling effects); the inclusion of an unrelated
 7 distracter task before the final free recall (limiting recall from working memory and potential
 8 interference inherent to verbal tasks); and the use of a cued recall test to tap into memory
 9 performance under aided retrieval conditions (avoiding potential ceiling effects expected in a
 10 recognition test). The exact instructions used for each session are provided in the
 11 Supplementary Material.

12 **Insert Figure 2**

13 In each Session, each word list was studied, tested through free recall, studied again,
 14 and tested again through free recall. During study, each word was presented on a screen for
 15 2.5 seconds. Participants produced a sentence out loud with the target word (e.g. “The
 16 **helicopter** is in the sky”), after which they pressed a key to proceed to the next word.
 17 Sentences were not recorded but participants adhered to the specific task instruction of not
 18 using the same sentence for different words; sentences could be the same for each learning
 19 occasion. Recall trials were terminated if participants stopped verbally recalling items for
 20 more than 20 seconds. The experimenter recorded both the words and intrusions produced by
 21 participants. After the second free-recall test, the list was studied a third time, the distractor
 22 task was administered, and the list was tested again. Memory for each list was tested a fourth

1 time in the next Session, 24 hours later. Finally, each list was tested for the fifth time with
2 cued recall.

3 *Testing flexibility.* Evaluations were performed non-routinely and at a sensitive time
4 for patients hence they had to be flexible, while maintaining an appropriate experimental
5 control. Patients and controls completed the task either in the hospital (university,
6 respectively) or at home, while using the same procedures (i.e. if a patient was tested at
7 home in Session 2 they were matched to a control who was also tested at home). When at
8 home, participants were tested using a CD on their own computer, while speaking to the
9 experimenter over the telephone. They entered a code to access the program, ensuring
10 participants were not exposed to the material prior to testing.

11 **Analyses**

12 An accelerated forgetting rate may be present on its own, or together with learning
13 and/or retrieval deficits. As the focus of this study is on forgetting, we will discuss that
14 measure first. Raw task performance scores are provided in supplementary Table S4.

15 *Forgetting.* Consolidation disruptions could be measured as an increase in forgetting
16 rates (Averell & Heathcote, 2011; Wixted, 2004). It is difficult to interpret the raw number of
17 words forgotten without accounting for how many words were remembered initially (Loftus et
18 al., 1985). Consider two participants who recall 10 and 15 words in the early test, and 5 and
19 10 in the late test. Both forgot 5 words, representing 50% and 33% of the words initially
20 recalled by the first and second participant, respectively. Forgetting rates were computed by
21 dividing the number of words recalled in the later test by the number of words recalled in the
22 earlier test, multiplied by 100. This measure compensates for initial recall levels and their
23 potential drivers, including contextual emotional distress, learning problems, or difficulties

1 with working memory, attention and concentration, factors which are therefore unlikely to
2 affect forgetting rates.

3 Changes in rapid consolidation were explored by measuring *immediate forgetting*
4 *rates*, namely, the difference between the second and third recall tests before (Session 2,
5 (FR23-FR22)/FR22*100) and after treatment (Session 3, (FR33-FR32)/FR32*100). Changes
6 in slow consolidation were explored by measuring *delayed forgetting rates*, namely the
7 difference between the third and fourth recall tests, which were separated by 24 hours: once
8 when both the study and the test occurred before treatment (Session 2 vs. Session 1, (FR14-
9 FR13)/FR13*100) and once when study occurred before treatment, but test occurred after
10 treatment (Session 3 vs. Session 2, (FR24-FR23)/FR23*100).

11 *Learning.* Learning scores were computed by averaging the percentage of words
12 recalled in the two immediate free-recall tests of the same list. Two learning scores were
13 computed: before treatment (Session 2, averaging FR21 and FR22) and after treatment
14 (Session 3, averaging FR31 and FR32).

15 *Retrieval.* Retrieval indices included retrieval scores and intrusions. Retrieval deficit
16 were suggested if cued recall improved performance relative to free recall more in patients
17 than in controls, because cued recall reduces the need for organised search during retrieval by
18 providing an aid. Scores were computed as the proportion of stimuli retrieved in the delayed
19 cued recall relative to the preceding delayed free recall test, multiplied by 100. Two retrieval
20 scores were computed: before treatment (Session 2, (CR15-FR14)/FR14*100) and after
21 treatment (Session 3, (CR25-FR24)/FR24*100). Similarly to forgetting rates, the retrieval
22 scores cannot be affected by initial learning difficulties, although lower retrieval scores could
23 indicate problems with executive control. Excessive intrusions could suggest non-adherence

1 to task instructions and a potential frontal-dependent memory disruption (Baddeley &
2 Wilson, 1988).

3 *Statistical analysis.* Learning, immediate and delayed forgetting rates, and delayed
4 retrieval rates were normally distributed, as evaluated with the Shapiro-Wilk test (Shapiro,
5 Wilk, & Chen, 1968). Data was analysed with repeated ANOVAs with the factors Group
6 (patients/controls) and Session (before/after treatment). For brevity, only significant results
7 are reported ($p < .05$). We examined forgetting with two planned one-tailed t-tests of the
8 difference between patients and controls following treatment, and for the difference between
9 patients before and after treatment. For all normally distributed data we report Hedge's g
10 effect size and its corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI, Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins,
11 & Rothstein, 2009). Intrusions produced before and after treatment were not normally
12 distributed, and were analysed with Mann-Whitney tests.

13 *Statistical Power.* Recruitment difficulties reduced our planned sample substantially.
14 We hence ran a compromise power analysis, in which the power is evaluated as a function of
15 effect size (set at minimum .20), sample size ($N=10$ per group), and an error-probability ratio
16 (β/α) of 1 (i.e. equal probability of obtaining a difference through error or otherwise). It
17 yielded a 71% probability of detecting small differences in our sample and a 61% probability
18 to detect small differences if one covariate were included in the analysis (Faul, Erdfelder,
19 Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

20 **Results**

21 *Group characteristics.* The three sessions took place approximately 24 hours apart.
22 There were no differences between groups on session-to-session intervals (first delay,

1 $t_{18}=1.95$, $p>.05$; second delay, $t_{18}=-.12$, $p>.05$). On the distracter task, no participant in either
2 group identified all the differences in the allocated time.

3 Matching groups on education resulted in an equal number of controls and patients
4 with college or university degrees. Despite that, patients had a lower FSIQ than controls,
5 albeit still in the normal range ($t_{18}=-3.02$, $p<.01$). Because these scores have a moderate
6 relationship with the Memory Quotient of the Wechsler Memory Scale, the lower score in
7 patients could give rise to impairment in our task. By controlling for FSIQ, we account for
8 any potential a-priori performance disadvantages in patients relative to controls. Similarly,
9 covarying FSIQ could remove important variance because of these expected correlations
10 (Miller & Chapman, 2001). We therefore report analyses with and without FSIQ as a
11 covariate.

12 For information purposes only, supplementary Table S2 describes the
13 neuropsychological performance of the final sample of patients versus controls. Available
14 pre-treatment results suggest that, as expected, patients may have experienced difficulties in
15 working memory and concentration as previously reported in pre-treatment cancer
16 patients (Cimprich et al., 2005). Also expected was the absence of group differences on
17 memory measures prior to treatment. Notably, the forgetting scores that we report below
18 were computed to minimise the influence of executive difficulties at the time of encoding by
19 computing them relative to baseline scores.

20 *Delayed forgetting (a measure of slow consolidation)*. All participants forgot over one
21 day. Figure 3 depicts a significant interaction between Session and Group ($F_{1,18}=7$, $p=.02$),
22 the only significant effect obtained in this analysis. This interaction remained significant
23 when controlling for FSIQ ($F_{1,17}=7.20$, $p=.02$). Patients forgot significantly faster than

controls after treatment ($t_{18}=2.64$, $p=.032$; $g=1.13$, 95% CI= .22 to 2.04). Patients also forgot more after treatment than before treatment ($t_9=2.12$, $p=.031$; $g=.75$, 95% CI = -.11 to 1.62). Individual participant data, depicted in Figure 3, shows that the patients' accelerated forgetting after treatment was not a result of outlier results. The same results were obtained in the extended sample of $N=13$ patients and their controls. This finding confirms our key hypothesis that the treatment delivered between the learning session and the delayed retrieval session would result in accelerated forgetting.

Insert Figure 3

Immediate forgetting (a measure of rapid consolidation). There was no forgetting across the 2-minute distractor task that separated the second and the third free recall tests in both the $N=10$ or $N=13$ samples; performance on the later test was numerically higher than performance on the earlier test, possibly due to retrieval practice (Nunes & Karpicke, 2015). No other effects were significant.

Learning. There was a significant Group effect ($F_{1,18}=5.10$, $p=.03$), indicative of learning difficulties in patients, which was maintained when including FSIQ as a covariate ($F_{1,17}=4.30$, $p=.05$). The same results were obtained in the extended sample of $N=13$, but after controlling for FSIQ the Group effect was only marginally significant, $p=0.054$. Note that forgetting scores could not be affected by these group differences in learning (see Methods). We have conducted additional analysis of the first and second learning trials in Session 1, and the first and second learning trials in the Sessions before and after treatment (Sessions 2 and 3). These analyses continued to show a main effect of Group which did not interact with any of the other factors. Hence, while the performance of patients, across learning trials, was generally lower than that of controls in all three sessions, we do not have evidence that

1 patients failed to benefit to the same degree as controls from additional learning and retrieval
2 experiences.

3 **Insert Figure 4**

4 *Delayed retrieval.* None of the groups performed at ceiling, although all participants
5 benefited from cues, suggesting that the cues were appropriate to the task but none of the
6 effects were significant. The same results were obtained in the extended sample of N=13,
7 although the interaction between Group and Session was marginally significant before
8 controlling for FSIQ, $p=0.06$.

9 **Insert Figure 5**

10 *Intrusions (a measure of Retrieval).* Patients produced more intrusions than controls, a
11 difference that was significant after treatment ($U=16.5$, $p<.01$), but not before treatment
12 ($U=35.5$, $p=.28$). The same results were obtained in the extended sample of N=13. This may
13 suggest a retrieval deficit, which was not captured by our retrieval score.

14 **Discussion**

15 This is the first investigation of acute memory impairments in nCNS cancer patients.
16 We report the results of a small study investigating learning, forgetting rates, and retrieval in
17 patients before and after their first dose of chemotherapy treatment. Recruiting to this
18 cognitive study within weeks of diagnosis presented formidable challenges, so that over a
19 period of three years we were only able to recruit a modest sample of 10 patients. Despite the
20 small sample, the study did reveal three significant differences between patients and controls.

1 Our key finding was a treatment-related modulation of forgetting. After treatment,
2 patients forgot more over a 24-hour period compared to controls, as measured by free recall.
3 We also observed a significant increase in the number of intrusions patients produced after
4 treatment. Finally, patients performed less well than controls on immediate free recall tests
5 both before and after treatment. We discuss these results below in light of the recruitment
6 challenges and reflect on how these could be overcome in future studies.

7 Across both pre- and post-treatment testing sessions, patients' ability to learn and
8 immediately recall what they have learned was poorer compared to that of controls. Previous
9 work has established that cognitive performance in cancer patients prior to their treatment is
10 decreased compared to controls (Ahles et al., 2008), with documented poorer attention,
11 executive functioning, or working memory (Cimprich et al., 2005; Menning et al., 2015).
12 These deficits could be caused by cancer-related frontal dysfunction (Rabbitt, Lowe, &
13 Shilling, 2001) or contextual, transient concentration problems due to anxiety (Hermelink et
14 al., 2015). Anxiety and post-traumatic stress, in particular, have been documented in post-
15 treatment cancer patients (Hermelink et al., 2015; Stark et al., 2002), and vary in prevalence
16 and severity along the disease trajectory (Traeger, Greer, Fernandez-Robles, Temel, & Pirl,
17 2012). Some subclinical, contextual anxiety is expected before treatment (Traeger et al.,
18 2012), but, in our sample of patients, anxiety was not particularly increased, so it is a less
19 likely cause for executive deficits. In summary, the learning difficulties patients demonstrated
20 were independent of treatment and are likely related to deficits in executive functions, which
21 have been previously documented in post-treatment patients. Importantly, our key measure of
22 delayed forgetting was independent of initial learning ability, because forgetting rates were
23 computed relative to immediate memory performance, thus controlling for baseline
24 performance differences.

1 Our main finding was that, in agreement with our hypothesis, delayed forgetting over
2 the course of 24 hours was increased in patients after their first treatment compared to
3 controls and their own pre-treatment performance. The fact that we have demonstrated
4 significantly accelerated forgetting in a relatively under-powered study suggests that the true
5 effect size in the population could be large. This is an important finding because delayed
6 forgetting is thought to be a marker of slow long-term memory consolidation (Hardt et al.,
7 2013). We could not assess changes in rapid consolidation because our participants did not
8 forget across a short 2-minute delay. Our finding suggests that cancer chemotherapy may
9 have acute effects on slow consolidation in humans. This is the first time that cancer
10 chemotherapy has been shown to have acute cognitive effects and that a drug treatment has
11 been shown to accelerate human forgetting. If our findings are corroborated in future studies
12 they could open up a new research avenue that will throw light on the nature of human long-
13 term memory consolidation.

14 We used a demanding memory test – free recall, because it provides the best marker of
15 accelerated forgetting in patients with hippocampal damage (Isaac & Mayes, 1999a, 1999b).
16 Yet the taxing nature of the task could lead to higher forgetting rates in the patient group due
17 to potential retrieval difficulties, namely difficulties in the executive control of the retrieval
18 process, rather than impaired consolidation that gives rise to weaker memory traces. To
19 distinguish between these two possibilities, the task included a measure of the retrieval
20 process (the degree to which cues facilitated retrieval of the studied material). This measure
21 did not differ between patients and controls, supporting the interpretation that accelerated
22 forgetting was caused by impaired slow consolidation rather than retrieval difficulties;
23 however, given the small sample size as well as the increased number of patient intrusions, null
24 effects should be interpreted with caution. The second retrieval measure we incorporated

1 (number of intrusions), demonstrated a treatment-dependent increase in patients, indicative of
2 potential executive control problems after treatment. If patients suffered from impaired
3 executive control after treatment they may have found it more difficult to access memory
4 traces, even if they were preserved. Differentiating between the two types of deficits, if at all
5 possible, would require a different experimental design with hypotheses that would build up
6 on our findings.

7 Taken together, increased retrieval difficulties after treatment, possibly related to
8 impaired executive functions, cannot be ruled out as an explanation of the observed
9 accelerated forgetting after treatment, indicating the need for future work on this topic. In
10 fact, recent work suggests that poor consolidation and retrieval difficulties are perhaps more
11 closely intertwined than previously thought. Studies in animal models suggests that protein
12 synthesis inhibition, which for many years was thought to cause amnesia by impairing slow
13 consolidation, may not damage the engram cells themselves, but makes it more difficult for
14 organisms to access those memories during memory tests (Ryan, Roy, Pignatelli, Arons, &
15 Tonegawa, 2015; Tonegawa, Pignatelli, Roy, & Ryan, 2015).

16 In conclusion, our findings indicate that patients forget faster than controls after their
17 first treatment either because of treatment-dependent impairment of slow consolidation or
18 because of retrieval difficulties associated with poorer executive functioning. Future studies
19 should take special care to differentiate between disruptions to synaptic consolidation in the
20 medial temporal lobe, and frontally-mediated retrieval problems. This could be explored in
21 imaging studies by adapting our task to compare changes in free and cued recall in immediate
22 versus delayed tests and by measuring attention-related imaging markers continuously
23 throughout the task. Future animal work could build on our findings to decide whether both

1 frontal and medial temporal lobe regions are affected following the first treatment through a
2 disruption of de novo protein synthesis, necessary in slower consolidation processes.

3 Other factors could be considered in interpreting the accelerated forgetting and the
4 larger number of intrusions in patients following treatment. First, these findings could be due
5 to increased emotional distress and fatigue after treatment (Cimprich et al., 2005). Our data
6 do not allow us to completely rule out this interpretation because many of our patients failed
7 to return the self-assessment questionnaires aimed at accounting for these effects. That said,
8 there is no a-priori reason to believe that patients were *more* distressed during the post-
9 treatment Session 3 than during the pre-treatment Session 2. Future studies should employ
10 frequent measures of psychological distress. Second, these findings could be related to
11 concomitantly administered medication, such as corticosteroids, administered for antiemetic
12 prophylaxis and known to have effects on medial temporal lobe structures as well as
13 consolidation (Brown, 2009). This possibility is unlikely because post-encoding
14 administration of cortisol is known to *attenuate* rather than accelerate forgetting (McGaugh,
15 2002). Finally, these findings could be due to the change of physiological context between
16 the Sessions. It is possible that memory for materials studied in Session 2 has been associated
17 with the treatment that was delivered soon afterwards, making it more difficult for patients
18 than controls to access Session 2 materials during Session 3 (Gisquet-Verrier et al., 2015;
19 McCullough & Yonelinas, 2013). This possibility is less likely given that the physiological
20 effects of the drugs would have continued to affect patients during Session 3. Putative effects
21 of context shifts could be evaluated in future studies by administering a fourth Session and
22 checking whether forgetting is accelerated also between Session 3 and Session 4. Larger
23 studies, with a more homogenous treatment regimen, would also help assess context effects
24 by utilizing designs that are informed by the time-course of drug action.

1 Significant restrictions were imposed from the outset by recruiting patients at an
2 emotionally stressful time, after diagnosis and before treatment onset. They were also posed
3 by the general difficulties in recruiting patients to psycho-social oncology studies in the UK
4 (Ashley et al., 2012), especially for cognitive studies (Shilling, Jenkins, Fallowfield,
5 &Howell, 2003). Recruitment difficulties meant that despite our best efforts over the course
6 of three years, we only achieved a final sample of 10 patients. Therefore, although we
7 attempted to evaluate patients' neuropsychological status and adhere to the recommendations
8 of the ICCTF (Wefel et al., 2011), not all of our patients completed the battery, and our
9 interpretation of the memory deficits we observed relies on the pattern of patients'
10 performance on our central memory task, which had its own in-built controls. Recruitment
11 challenges could be overcome in future research by investing more in raising awareness
12 about the scientific evidence for cancer and treatment-dependent cognitive impairments in
13 survivors. For us, recruitment difficulties were only partly overcome by our simplified and
14 brief testing procedure and the use of a flexible computerised task. Future studies could look
15 at further simplifying the delivery of tests by using pencil-and-paper instruments or online
16 assessments, depending on the demographic of the cancer group. Although our sample size
17 does not detract, but rather underscores, the magnitude of the significant effects we obtained,
18 it does mean that we cannot interpret null effects. Clearly, it is critically important to replicate
19 our findings in more highly powered studies.

20 Despite their limitations, our results are unique in highlighting treatment-related
21 cognitive deficits in working age cancer patients relative to controls. We hope that our results
22 will encourage others to pursue large sample investigations of memory processes that will
23 pinpoint the biological mechanisms underlying acute and long-term structural brain

- 1 treatment-related change in nCNS cancer patients, and encourage the development of
- 2 strategies to mitigate these effects on survivors' lives.
- 3

1 **Acknowledgements.**

2 This work was supported by the Medical Research Council (G1000399). The authors
3 thank all participants and NHS Trusts who contributed to this study. We also thank M Cohn,
4 G Winocur and L Fuentemilla, as well as the reviewers for their valuable comments on our
5 manuscript.

6

References

- Ahles, T. A., & Saykin, A. J. (2007). Candidate mechanisms for chemotherapy-induced cognitive changes. *Nature Reviews. Cancer*, 7(3), 192–201.
<http://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2073>
- Ahles, T. A., Saykin, A. J., McDonald, B. C., Furstenberg, C. T., Cole, B. F., Hanscom, B. S., ... Kaufman, P. A. (2008). Cognitive function in breast cancer patients prior to adjuvant treatment. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*, 110(1), 143–52.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-007-9686-5>
- Alber, J., Della Sala, S., & Dewar, M. (2014). Minimizing interference with early consolidation boosts 7-day retention in amnesic patients. *Neuropsychology*, 28(5), 667–675. <http://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000091>
- Arruda-Carvalho, M., Sakaguchi, M., Akers, K. G., Josselyn, S. A., & Frankland, P. W. (2011). Posttraining ablation of adult-generated neurons degrades previously acquired memories. *The Journal of Neuroscience* □: *The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 31(42), 15113–27. <http://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3432-11.2011>
- Ashley, L., Jones, H., Velikova, G., & Wright, P. (2012). Cancer patients' and clinicians' opinions on the best time in secondary care to approach patients for recruitment to longitudinal questionnaire-based research. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 20(12), 3365–3372. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-012-1518-4>
- Averell, L., & Heathcote, A. (2011). The form of the forgetting curve and the fate of memories. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 55(1), 25–35.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2010.08.009>

- 1 Baddeley, A., & Wilson, B. Frontal amnesia and the dysexecutive syndrome., 7Brain and
2 cognition 212–230 (1988). [http://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626\(88\)90031-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626(88)90031-0)
- 3 Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to*
4 *Meta-Analysis*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
5 <http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386>
- 6 Brearley, S. G., Stamataki, Z., Addington-Hall, J., Foster, C., Hodges, L., Jarrett, N., ...
7 Amir, Z. (2011). The physical and practical problems experienced by cancer survivors:
8 A rapid review and synthesis of the literature. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*,
9 15(3), 204–212. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2011.02.005>
- 10 Brown, E. S. (2009). Effects of glucocorticoids on mood, memory, and the hippocampus.
11 Treatment and preventive therapy. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1179,
12 41–55. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04981.x>
- 13 Carlesimo, G. A., Cherubini, A., Caltagirone, C., & Spalletta, G. (2010). Hippocampal mean
14 diffusivity and memory in healthy elderly individuals: A cross-sectional study.
15 *Neurology*, 74(3), 194–200. <http://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181cb3e39>
- 16 Cimprich, B., So, H., Ronis, D. L., & Trask, C. (2005). Pre-treatment factors related to
17 cognitive functioning in women newly diagnosed with breast cancer. *Psycho-Oncology*,
18 14(1), 70–78. <http://doi.org/10.1002/pon.821>
- 19 Coussens, L. M., & Werb, Z. (2002). Inflammation and cancer. *Nature*, 420(6917), 860–7.
20 <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature01322>
- 21 CRUK. (2014). Cancer survival by age. Retrieved from

1 <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/survival/age/>

2 da Ros, M., Iorio, A. L., Lucchesi, M., Stival, A., de Martino, M., & Sardi, I. (2015). The Use

3 of Anthracyclines for Therapy of CNS Tumors. *Anti-Cancer Agents in Medicinal*

4 *Chemistry*, 15(6), 721–727.

5 de Ruiter, M. B., & Schagen, S. B. (2013). Functional MRI studies in non-CNS cancers.

6 *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, 7(4), 388–408. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-013-9249-9>

7 Deary, I. J., & Johnson, W. (2010). Intelligence and education: causal perceptions drive

8 analytic processes and therefore conclusions. *International Journal of Epidemiology*,

9 39(5), 1362–9. <http://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyq072>

10 Deprez, S., Billiet, T., Sunaert, S., & Leemans, A. (2013). Diffusion tensor MRI of

11 chemotherapy-induced cognitive impairment in non-CNS cancer patients: a review.

12 *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, 7(4), 409–35. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-012-9220-1>

13 Dewar, M., Della Sala, S., Beschin, N., & Cowan, N. (2010). Profound Retroactive

14 Interference in Anterograde Amnesia: What interferes? *Neuropsychology*, 24(3), 357–

15 367. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018207>

16 Dietrich, J., Prust, M., & Kaiser, J. (2015). Chemotherapy, cognitive impairment and

17 hippocampal toxicity. *Neuroscience*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.06.016>

18 Elliott, G., Isaac, C. L., & Muhlert, N. (2014). Measuring forgetting: A critical review of

19 accelerated long-term forgetting studies. *Cortex*.

20 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.02.001>

- 1 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: a flexible statistical
2 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*
3 *Research Methods*, 39, 175–191. <http://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- 4 Gershman, S. J., Blei, D. M., & Niv, Y. (2010). Context, learning, and extinction.
5 *Psychological Review*, 117(1), 197–209. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0017808>
- 6 Gisquet-Verrier, P., Lynch, J. F., Cutolo, P., Toledano, D., Ulmen, A., Jasnow, A. M., &
7 Riccio, D. C. (2015). Integration of New Information with Active Memory Accounts for
8 Retrograde Amnesia: A Challenge to the Consolidation/Reconsolidation Hypothesis?
9 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(33), 11623–11633.
10 <http://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1386-15.2015>
- 11 Hardt, O., Nader, K., & Nadel, L. (2013). Decay happens: the role of active forgetting in
12 memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(3), 111–20.
13 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.01.001>
- 14 Hermelink, K., Voigt, V., Kaste, J., Neufeld, F., Wuerstlein, R., Bühner, M., ... Harbeck, N.
15 (2015). Elucidating pretreatment cognitive impairment in breast cancer patients: the
16 impact of cancer-related post-traumatic stress. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*,
17 107(7), djv099-. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djv099>
- 18 Hoefijzers, S., Dewar, M., Della Sala, S., Butler, C., & Zeman, A. (2015). Accelerated long-
19 term forgetting can become apparent within 3-8 hours of wakefulness in patients with
20 transient epileptic amnesia. *Neuropsychology*, 29(1), 117–25.
21 <http://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000114>
- 22 Isaac, C. L., & Mayes, A. R. (1999a). Rate of forgetting in amnesia: I. Recall and recognition

- 1 of prose. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,
2 25(4), 942–962. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.25.4.942>
- 3 Isaac, C. L., & Mayes, A. R. (1999b). Rate of forgetting in amnesia: II. Recall and
4 recognition of word lists at different levels of organization. *Journal of Experimental*
5 *Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25(4), 963–977.
6 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.25.4.963>
- 7 Kahana, M., & Adler, M. (2002). Note on the power law of forgetting. ... *of Pennsylvania*,
8 *Unpublished Note*, (1996), 1–15. Retrieved from
9 <https://memory.psych.upenn.edu/files/pubs/KahaAdle02.pdf>
- 10 Kaiser, J., Bledowski, C., & Dietrich, J. (2014). Neural correlates of chemotherapy-related
11 cognitive impairment. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System*
12 *and Behavior*, 54, 33–50. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.01.010>
- 13 Kandel, E. R., Dudai, Y., & Mayford, M. R. (2014). The molecular and systems biology of
14 memory. *Cell*. Cell Press.
- 15 Kopelman, M. D., Bright, P., Buckman, J., Fradera, A., Yoshimasu, H., Jacobson, C., &
16 Colchester, A. C. F. (2007). Recall and recognition memory in amnesia: Patients with
17 hippocampal, medial temporal, temporal lobe or frontal pathology. *Neuropsychologia*,
18 45(6), 1232–1246. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.10.005>
- 19 Lindner, O. C., Phillips, B., McCabe, M. G., Mayes, A., Wearden, A., Varese, F., & Talmi,
20 D. (2014). A meta-analysis of cognitive impairment following adult cancer
21 chemotherapy. *Neuropsychology*, 28(5), 726–40. <http://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000064>

- 1 Liu, R.-Y., Zhang, Y., Coughlin, B. L., Cleary, L. J., & Byrne, J. H. (2014). Doxorubicin
2 attenuates serotonin-induced long-term synaptic facilitation by phosphorylation of p38
3 mitogen-activated protein kinase. *The Journal of Neuroscience* □: *The Official Journal*
4 *of the Society for Neuroscience*, 34(40), 13289–300.
5 <http://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0538-14.2014>
- 6 Loftus, G. R., Bolles, R., Hunt, E., Loftus, E., Nelson, T., Nelson, W., ... Waggoner, W.
7 (1985). Evaluating Forgetting Curves. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
8 *Memory, and Cognition*, 11(2), 397–406. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0278-7393.11.2.397>
- 9 Luu, P., Sill, O. C., Gao, L., Becker, S., Wojtowicz, J. M., & Smith, D. M. (2012). The role
10 of adult hippocampal neurogenesis in reducing interference. *Behavioral Neuroscience*,
11 126(3), 381–91. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0028252>
- 12 MacLeod, C., & Mathews, A. (1988). Anxiety and the allocation of attention to threat. *The*
13 *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology. A, Human Experimental Psychology*,
14 40(4), 653–670. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14640748808402292>
- 15 Mayes, A. R. (1995). Memory and amnesia. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 66, 29–36.
16 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328\(94\)00120-5](http://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328(94)00120-5)
- 17 Mayes, A. R., & Roberts, N. (2001). Theories of episodic memory. *Philosophical*
18 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 356(1413),
19 1395–408. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2001.0941>
- 20 McCullough, A. M., & Yonelinas, A. P. (2013). Cold-pressor stress after learning enhances
21 familiarity-based recognition memory in men. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*,
22 106, 11–17. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2013.06.011>

- 1 McGaugh, J. L. (2000). Neuroscience - Memory - a century of consolidation. *Science*,
2 287(5451), 248–251. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.287.5451.248>
- 3 McGaugh, J. L. (2002). Memory consolidation and the amygdala: a systems perspective.
4 *Trends in Neurosciences*, 25(9), 456. Retrieved from
5 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12183206>
- 6 Menning, S., de Ruiter, M. B., Veltman, D. J., Koppelmans, V., Kirschbaum, C., Boogerd,
7 W., ... Schagen, S. B. (2015). Multimodal MRI and cognitive function in patients with
8 breast cancer prior to adjuvant treatment — The role of fatigue. *NeuroImage: Clinical*,
9 7, 547–554. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2015.02.005>
- 10 Menon, U., Gentry-Maharaj, A., Ryan, A., Sharma, A., Burnell, M., Hallett, R., ... Jacobs, I.
11 (2008). Recruitment to multicentre trials--lessons from UKCTOCS: descriptive study.
12 *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 337, a2079. <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a2079>
- 13 Miller, G.A., & Chapman, J. P. (2001). Misunderstanding analysis of covariance. *Journal of*
14 *Abnormal Psychology*, 110(1), 40–48. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.110.1.40>
- 15 Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T. J., Boykin, A. W., Ceci, S. J., Loehlin, J. C., &
16 Sternberg, R. J. (1996). Intelligence□: Knowns and Unknowns, 77–101.
- 17 Nunes, L. D., & Karpicke, J. D. (2015). Retrieval-based learning: Research at the interface
18 between cognitive science and education. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral*
19 *Sciences*, 1–16.
- 20 Pan, W., Stone, K. P., Hsueh, H., Manda, V. K., Zhang, Y., & Kastin, A. J. (2011).
21 Cytokine signaling modulates blood-brain barrier function. *Current Pharmaceutical*

- 1 *Design*, 17(33), 3729–40.
- 2 Pomykala, K. L., de Ruiter, M. B., Deprez, S., McDonald, B. C., & Silverman, D. H. S.
- 3 (2013). Integrating imaging findings in evaluating the post-chemotherapy brain. *Brain*
- 4 *Imaging and Behavior*, 7(4), 436–52. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-013-9239-y>
- 5 Rabbitt, P., Lowe, C., & Shilling, V. (2001). Frontal tests and models for cognitive ageing.
- 6 *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09541440125722>
- 7 Reese, H. (1997). Counterbalancing and other uses of repeated-measures Latin-square
- 8 designs: Analyses and interpretations. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 158,
- 9 137–158.
- 10 Richardson, A., Addington-Hall, J., Amir, Z., Foster, C., Stark, D., Armes, J., ... Sharpe, M.
- 11 (2011). Knowledge, ignorance and priorities for research in key areas of cancer
- 12 survivorship: findings from a scoping review. *British Journal of Cancer*, 105, 82–94.
- 13 <http://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2011.425>
- 14 Rubin, D. C., Wenzel, A. E., Anderson, J., Boneau, A., Cerella, J., Crovitz, H., ... Wixted, J.
- 15 (1996). One Hundred Years of Forgetting□: A Quantitative Description of Retention,
- 16 103(4), 734–760.
- 17 Ryan, T. J., Roy, D. S., Pignatelli, M., Arons, A., & Tonegawa, S. (2015). Engram cells
- 18 retain memory under retrograde amnesia. *Science*, 348(6238), 1007–1013.
- 19 <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa5542>
- 20 Rzeski, W., Pruskil, S., Macke, A., Felderhoff-Mueser, U., Reiher, A. K., Hoerster, F., ...
- 21 Ikonomidou, C. (2004). Anticancer agents are potent neurotoxins in vitro and in vivo.

1 *Annals of Neurology*, 56(3), 351–60. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ana.20185>

2 Sahay, A., Scobie, K. N., Hill, A. S., O’Carroll, C. M., Kheirbek, M. A., Burghardt, N. S., ...

3 Hen, R. (2011). Increasing adult hippocampal neurogenesis is sufficient to improve

4 pattern separation. *Nature*, 472(7344), 466–470. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature09817>

5 Saykin, A. J., de Ruiter, M. B., McDonald, B. C., Deprez, S., & Silverman, D. H. S. (2013).

6 Neuroimaging biomarkers and cognitive function in non-CNS cancer and its treatment:

7 current status and recommendations for future research. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*,

8 7(4), 363–73. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-013-9283-7>

9 Seigers, R., & Fardell, J. E. (2011). Neurobiological basis of chemotherapy-induced cognitive

10 impairment: a review of rodent research. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*,

11 35(3), 729–41. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.09.006>

12 Shapiro, S. S., Wilk, M. B., & Chen, H. J. (1968). A Comparative Study of Various Tests for

13 Normality. *J Am Stat Assoc*, 63, 1343–1372. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2285889>

14 Shilling, V., Jenkins, V., Fallowfield, L., & Howell, T. (2003). The effects of hormone

15 therapy on cognition in breast cancer. *The Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and*

16 *Molecular Biology*, 86(3–5), 405–412. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2003.07.001>

17 Snodgrass, J. G., & Vanderwart, M. (1980). A standardized set of 260 pictures: norms for

18 name agreement, image agreement, familiarity, and visual complexity. *Journal of*

19 *Experimental Psychology. Human Learning and Memory*, 6(2), 174–215. Retrieved

20 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7373248>

21 Stark, D., Kiely, M., Smith, A., Velikova, G., House, A., & Selby, P. (2002). Anxiety

- 1 disorders in cancer patients: Their nature, associations, and relation to quality of life.
- 2 *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 20(14), 3137–3148.
- 3 <http://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2002.08.549>
- 4 Terrando, N., Monaco, C., Ma, D., Foxwell, B. M. J., Feldmann, M., & Maze, M. (2010).
- 5 Tumor necrosis factor- α triggers a cytokine cascade yielding postoperative cognitive
- 6 decline. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
- 7 *America*, 107(47), 20518–22. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014557107>
- 8 Tonegawa, S., Pignatelli, M., Roy, D. S., & Ryan, T. J. (2015). Memory engram storage and
- 9 retrieval. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2015.07.009>
- 10 Traeger, L., Greer, J. A., Fernandez-Robles, C., Temel, J. S., & Pirl, W. F. (2012). Evidence-
- 11 based treatment of anxiety in patients with cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*.
- 12 <http://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2011.39.5632>
- 13 Vardy, J., Wefel, J. S., Ahles, T., Tannock, I. F., & Schagen, S. B. (2008). Cancer and
- 14 cancer-therapy related cognitive dysfunction: an international perspective from the
- 15 Venice cognitive workshop. *Annals of Oncology*: Official Journal of the European
- 16 Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO, 19(4), 623–9.
- 17 <http://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdm500>
- 18 Wefel, J. S., Vardy, J., Ahles, T., & Schagen, S. B. (2011). International Cognition and
- 19 Cancer Task Force recommendations to harmonise studies of cognitive function in
- 20 patients with cancer. *The Lancet. Oncology*, 12(7), 703–8. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70294-1)
- 21 [2045\(10\)70294-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70294-1)
- 22 Wixted, J. T. (1990). Analyzing the empirical course of forgetting. *Journal of Experimental*

- 1 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 16(5), 927–935.
- 2 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.16.5.927>
- 3 Wixted, J. T. (2004). The psychology and neuroscience of forgetting. *Annual Review of*
- 4 *Psychology*, 55, 235–69. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141555>
- 5 Zhang, C. L., Zou, Y., He, W., Gage, F. H., & Evans, R. M. (2008). A role for adult TLX-
- 6 positive neural stem cells in learning and behaviour. *Nature*, 451(7181), 1004–1007.
- 7 <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature06562>
- 8
- 9

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

Patients						Controls		
ID	Diagnosis	Treatment(Cycles)	Age	Sex	Education	Age	Sex	Education
1	Ewing sarcoma*	VIDE (6) VAI (8)	20	M	College	24	M	Degree
2	Osteosarcoma	MAP (4)	20	F	College	19	F	College
3	Germ cell tumour	BEP (3)	30	M	Degree	30	M	Degree
4	Osteosarcoma	MAP (6)	17	M	College	20	M	Degree
5	Hodgkin lymphoma	ABVD (2) AVD (4)	19	F	College	20	F	College
6	Ewing sarcoma*	VIDE (6) VAI (8)	17	F	College	21	F	College
7	Breast cancer	FEC-T (6)	46	F	Degree	46	F	College
8	Breast cancer	FEC-T (6)	45	F	Degree	46	F	Degree
9	Breast cancer	FEC-T (6)	45	F	Degree	46	F	Degree
10	Hodgkin lymphoma	ABVD (6)	22	F	Degree	20	F	College
M	30% Breast cancer		28.1	70% F	50%	29.2	70% F	50%
(S	40% Sarcoma		(12.44	30% M	College	0	30%	College
D)	20% Hodgkin's lymphoma		)		50%	(12.	M	50%
%	10% Germ cell tumour				Degree	01)		Degree

Note. Abbreviations: VIDE=vincristine, ifosfamide, doxorubicin, etoposide; VAI = vincristine, ifosfamide, actinomycin, doxorubicin; MAP= high dose methotrexate, cisplatin, doxorubicin, BEP=bleomycin, etoposide, cisplatin; FEC-T= fluorouracil, epirubicin, cyclophosphamide, docetaxel; ABVD=doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine; *Ewing sarcoma patients received VAI as part of neoadjuvant treatment, hence were evaluated pre-surgery. The remainder were due for adjuvant treatment and were evaluated post-surgery; M=mean, SD=standard deviation.

1 **Figure captions.**

2 *Figure 1. Flowchart of patients included in study and analyses.*

3 *Figure 2. Memory task procedure.* Each Session corresponds to a day of testing, on
 4 three consecutive days of testing. In patients, Sessions 1 and 2 take place before treatment
 5 and Session 3 after treatment. L: On-screen presentation (2.5 seconds) of each word in Lists
 6 1, 2, 3 (participants had to include each word in a verbalised sentence). FR11, 12, 13, 14:
 7 three immediate and a delayed oral Free Recall Test of List 1. FR21, 22, 23, 24: three
 8 immediate Free Recall Tests and a delayed free recall Test of List 2. FR31, 32, 33, 34: three
 9 immediate Free Recall Tests of List 3. In all Sessions the third free recall takes place after a
 10 2-minute distracter task. CR15, CR25: Cued recall tests of Lists 1 and 2. Forgetting rate 1 and
 11 2: proportion of information forgotten between 2-minute and 24-hour delayed FR tests before
 12 (FR13 and FR14) and after (FR23 and FR24) treatment. Encoding 1 and 2: learning
 13 performance between the two immediate FR tests before (FR21 and FR22) and after (FR31
 14 and FR32) treatment. Delayed Retrieval 1 and 2: proportion of information recalled between
 15 the 24-hour delayed free and cued recall tests before (FR14 and CR15) and after treatment
 16 (FR24 and FR25).

17 *Figure 3. Forgetting rates in patients and controls before and after treatment. A.*
 18 Error bars represent the standard deviation. B. Scatter plot depicting the percentage of words
 19 forgotten by controls and patients (light/dark grey) on Session 3 (after treatment). Each data
 20 point represents the individual forgetting rate of a participant.*p<.05, **p<.01.

1 **Figure 4. Learning rates in patients and controls before and after treatment.**

2 Total learning performance is the average percentage of words learnt over two immediate
3 free recall tests. Error bars represent the standard deviation. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

4 **Figure 5. Retrieval performance in patients and controls before and after**

5 **treatment.** A. Differences between delayed free and cued recall. B. Differences in the
6 average number of intrusions over all recall trials, between patients and controls, before and
7 after treatment. Error bars represent the standard deviation.

8

Figure 1. Flowchart of patients included in study and analyses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Figure 2. Memory task procedure. Each Session corresponds to a day of testing, on three consecutive days of testing. In patients, Sessions 1 and 2 take place before treatment and Session 3 after treatment. L: On-screen presentation (2.5 seconds) of each word in Lists 1, 2, 3 (participants had to include each word in a verbalised sentence). FR11, 12, 13, 14: three immediate and a delayed oral Free Recall Test of List 1. FR21, 22, 23, 24: three immediate Free Recall Tests and a delayed free recall Test of List 2. FR31, 32, 33, 34: three immediate Free Recall Tests of List 3. In all Sessions the third free recall takes place after a 2-minute distracter task. CR15, CR25: Cued recall tests of Lists 1 and 2. Forgetting rate 1 and 2: proportion of information forgotten between 2-minute and 24-hour delayed FR tests before (FR13 and FR14) and after (FR23 and FR24) treatment. Encoding 1 and 2: learning performance between the two immediate FR tests before (FR21 and FR22) and after (FR31

and FR32) treatment. Delayed Retrieval 1 and 2: proportion of information recalled between the 24-hour delayed free and cued recall tests before (FR14 and CR15) and after treatment (FR24 and FR25).

Figure 3. Forgetting rates in patients and controls before and after treatment. A. Error bars represent the standard deviation. B. Scatter plot depicting the percentage of words forgotten by controls and patients (light/dark grey) on Session 3 (after treatment). Each data point represents the individual forgetting rate of a participant.* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Figure 4. Learning rates in patients and controls before and after treatment.

Total learning performance is the average percentage of words learnt over two immediate free recall tests. Error bars represent the standard deviation. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

1

2

3

4 *Figure 5. Retrieval performance in patients and controls before and after*
5 **treatment.** A. Differences between delayed free and cued recall. B. Differences in the
6 average number of intrusions over all recall trials, between patients and controls, before and
7 after treatment. Error bars represent the standard deviation.

8

9

Supplementary material

Tables S1-S4.

Figure S1.

Appendix.

Table S1. Demographic characteristics of included and excluded patients.

	Included patients N, %/M (SD)	Excluded patients N, M (SD)	P
Age	10, 28.1 (12.44)	20, 34.1 (13.6)	.25
Sex	10, 70% Female	20, 75% female	NA

Table S2. Neuropsychological performance and patient-reported psychological status in patients and controls.

Function/Test	Score	Patients in study M (SD)	Controls M (SD)	Patients excluded M (SD)
---------------	-------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------

Neuropsychological battery.				
(Patients N=8; Controls N=7, except WTAR where both groups are N=10)				
Pre-morbid intellectual functioning (WTAR)	FSIQ	100.5 (6.26)	108.5** (5.48)	101.1 (10.29)
Attention (D2 Concentration-Endurance)	Items processed without errors	402.4 (60.69)	491.43* (53.18)	437.7 (62.78)
Executive function (Stroop, Verbal fluency, and DKEFS-TMT)	Stroop Interference	57.3 (13.79)	52.57 (3.41)	54.7 (8.04)
	Verbal fluency	12.09 (2.98)	14.38 (2.52)	11.94 (3.04)
	Category fluency	21.28 (7.4)	20.71 (4.38)	21.93 (3.12)
	DKEFS Total	11.11 (1.95)	9.43 (3.42)	11.92 (9.01)
Immediate memory (BMIPB)	Story memory immediate	27.8 (9.31)	27.43 (6.90)	27.56 (9.01)
	Figure memory immediate	80.36 (17.26)	91.8 (9.26)	73.16 (10.46)
Delayed memory	Story memory delayed	25.3 (7.54)	25.28 (8.36)	24.5 (8.98)

(BMIPB)	Figure memory delayed	73.79 (14.05)	84.73 (13.29)	70.3 (11.35)
Verbal recognition memory (BMIPB)	Item recognition	28.4 (1.9)	28.71 (1.11)	27.5 (2.16)
	List recognition (Temporal order)	27.42 (3.1)	29.14 (1.46)	29.00 (.96)
Visual recognition memory (BMIPB)	Design recognition	37.71 (2.75)	39.43 (1.13)	39.6 (.60)*
	Design identification (Temporal order)	9.14 (.89)	9.85 (.37)*	9.62 (.81)
Speed of information processing (BMIPB)	Information processing adjusted for motor speed	71.86 (21.15)	72.84 (10.86)	76.21 (17.03)
Working memory (WAIS-III Digit span)	Digit span Total	15.28 (2.75)	19.57* (3.78)	15.86 (3.38)
Patient-reported psychological status (Patients N=6; Controls N=9)				
	Fatigue	15.83 (1.72)	13.71 (1.25)	9, 16.5 (2.83)
	Anxiety	7.66 (2.33)	7.14 (2.34)	9, 7.22 (2.28)

	Depression	3.66 (2.25)	3.42 (3.31)	9, 3.78 (3.15)
--	------------	-------------	-------------	-------------------

1

2 *Note.* A subset of the 10 patients included in our final sample have completed the
3 neuropsychological battery and returned the psychological status questionnaires. The table
4 depicts their average performance and compares them to patients we excluded (N=18) who
5 completed the neuropsychological and psychological status measures. The tests included: the
6 Wechsler Test of Adult Reading (WTAR, (Strauss, Sherman, & Spreen, 2006), D2 Test of
7 Attention (Bates & Lemay, 2004), Stroop test (Golden, 1975), Test of Memory Malingering
8 (Rees, Tombaugh, Gansler, & Moczynski, 1998), the Birt Memory and Information
9 Processing Battery (BMIPB, Coughlan, Oddy, Crawford, 2007), Digit span from the
10 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – III (WAIS), Verbal fluency, and Trail Making Test of
11 the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (DKEFS-TMT, (Strauss et al., 2006). The self-
12 report measures included the EORTC Quality of Life Questionnaire (Aaronson et al., 1993),
13 Chalder Fatigue Scale (Dittner, Wessely, & Brown, 2004), Cognitive Failures Questionnaire
14 (Broadbent, Cooper, FitzGerald, & Parkes, 1982), and Hospital Anxiety and Depression
15 Scale (Zigmond & Snaith, 1983). Mean difference following Bonferroni corrections for
16 multiple comparisons **p<.01, *p<.05. Available results suggest minimal differences
17 between patients and controls on memory tests, no differences between patients included in
18 the analyses and those excluded, and low level of emotional distress. Excluded and included
19 patients were largely similar, with the exception of one difference on the Design recognition
20 test. Compared to controls, patients scored lower on Digit Span, Design identification test of
21 the BMIPB, and total attention without errors score of the D2.

1

2

1 **Table S3.** Characteristics of words used in memory task.

List	Word	Familiarity	Kucera-Francis Frequency	Summary
Animals & Vehicles	Camel	421	1	Familiarity M= 340.95 SD=231.02 Frequency M=20.21 SD=35.6
	Helicopter	0	1	
	Motorcycle	0	0	
	Elephant	459	7	
	Bicycle	0	5	
	Butterfly	481	2	
	Donkey	0	1	
	Lion	511	17	
	Train	548	82	
	Plane	558	114	
	Snail	489	1	
	Rabbit	523	11	
	Sheep	507	23	
	Bear	526	57	
	Ostrich	358	0	
	Horse	560	117	
	Sledge	0	0	
	Squirrel	511	1	
	Giraffe	381	0	
	Swan	0	3	

	Fish	548	35	
	Kangaroo	0	0	
	Goat	469	6	
	Zebra	333	1	
Fruits & Clothes	Dress	588	67	<p>Familiarity</p> <p>M=439.79</p> <p>SD=232.00</p> <p>Frequency</p> <p>M=12.58</p> <p>SD=15.99</p>
	Watermelon	0	0	
	Mitten	0	0	
	Jumper	0	1	
	Strawberry	539	0	
	Pear	567	6	
	Apple	598	9	
	Trousers	0	7	
	Pineapple	489	9	
	Orange	567	23	
	Lemon	518	18	
	Grapes	0	0	
	Cherry	514	6	
	Glove	575	9	
	Necklace	536	3	
	Banana	576	4	
	Shoe	569	14	
	Ring	589	47	

	Belt	550	29	
	Boot	566	13	
	Skirt	551	21	
	Sock	578	4	
	Umbrella	511	8	
	Tomato	574	4	
Vegetables & Kitchen objects	Asparagus	534	1	<p>Familiarity</p> <p>M=493.83</p> <p>SD=193.01</p> <p>Frequency</p> <p>M=28.63</p> <p>SD=46.34</p>
	Carrot	539	1	
	Spoon	612	6	
	Fridge	0	0	
	Corn	548	34	
	Glass	611	99	
	Table	599	198	
	Iron	555	43	
	Scissors	559	1	
	Toaster	520	0	
	Chair	617	66	
	Oven	577	7	
	Mushroom	0	2	
	Onion	550	15	
	Pepper	554	13	
	Potato	612	15	
	Kettle	551	3	

	Knife	573	76	
	Ladder	507	19	
	Bottle	591	76	
	Pumpkin	0	2	
	Broom	547	2	
	Stool	531	8	
	Lettuce	565	0	
Four- legged animals and Musical instruments	Alligator	442	4	Familiarity M=426.83 SD=170.33 Frequency M=8.33 SD=9.95
	Deer	509	13	
	Frog	507	1	
	Horn	498	31	
	Leopard	431	0	
	Violin	468	11	
	Monkey	531	9	
	Accordion	394	1	
	Turtle	509	8	
	Racoon	0	0	
	Trumpet	490	7	
	Bull	0	14	
	Ferret	0	1	
	Guitar	550	19	
	Rhinoceros	400	3	
	Flute	496	1	

	Gorilla	554	0	
	Seal	482	17	
	Harp	430	1	
	Piano	545	38	
	Tiger	513	7	
	Beaver	470	3	
	Skunk	519	0	
	Drum	506	11	
Birds and Toys	Chicken	544	37	Familiarity M=411.66 SD=198.12 Frequency M=35.54 SD=119.56
	Sailboat	0	0	
	House	600	591	
	Penguin	360	0	
	Rooster	385	3	
	Swing	0	24	
	Sparrow	523	0	
	Parrot	0	1	
	Crow	490	2	
	Wagon	443	55	
	Football	565	36	
	Eagle	465	5	
	Skate	534	1	
	Duck	529	9	
	Dove	415	4	

	Whistle	505	4
	Balloon	520	10
	Cannon	498	7
	Clown	511	3
	Stork	393	0
	Kite	481	1
	Truck	620	57
	Pigeon	499	3
	Snowman	0	0

1 *Note.* The unequal distribution of the words in the lists was determined by the number of
2 concepts in the database, which complied with our length, familiarity, and frequency
3 constraints. There were no significant differences between the familiarity and frequency of
4 words in different lists, List Familiarity $F_{4,115}=1.71$ ($p=.15$); List Frequency $F_{4,115}=.83$ ($p=.51$)
5

6 **Table S4.** Percentage recall on immediate and delayed free recall (FR) and delayed cued
7 recall (CR) tests in each Session and Group before controlling for FSIQ.

Session	Group	FR M (SD)	FR M (SD)	FR M (SD)	FR Delayed M (SD)	CR Delayed M (SD)
Session 1	Patient	46.66 (13.58)	61.66 (18.08)	66.24 (14.08)	52.07 (18.34)	67.08 (18.05)
	Control	61.59	77.49 (9.25)	87.07 (9.90)	64.57	76.66

		(12.97)			(11.82)	(11.32)
Session 2	Patient	47.49 (18.65)	64.16 (14.72)	68.33 (18.13)	42.91 (21.16)	62.08 (26.38)
	Control	57.49 (13.29)	71.66 (13.99)	79.99 (15.69)	67.08 (17.72)	74.99 (15.08)
Session 3	Patient	48.33 (10.05)	60 (13.91)	61.66 (16.53)		
	Control	59.74 (11.62)	77.49 (8.82)	87.07 (11.52)		

1 Abbreviations: M=mean; SD=standard deviation

2

3

4

5

1 **Figure S1.** A comparison of forgetting, learning and retrieval scores of the 10 patients
2 included in the manuscript (Top) and an extended sample of 13 patients, including 3 who
3 were tested without a computer in Session 3 (Bottom). The error bars represent standard
4 error.

1

Appendix: Memory task instructions

Session 1: Participants were given the following instructions before they studied the first list of words (List 1):

“On the screen you are going to see a list of words that I’d like you to remember. The list is quite long, so don’t try to remember all the words from the beginning. That is why we are going to go through the same list several times, for you to be able to remember more words each time. Whenever you see a word on the screen please tell me a sentence containing that word. The sentence can be simple (such as “Cats have fur”, if the word on the screen is “Cat”), but please make sure you use a different sentence for each word. After you see the entire list I will ask you to tell me what you remember from it. The list of words for today will be made out of categories A and B”.

List 1 was presented on the screen, following which participants were asked to Free recall the words they had learned in any order, whilst being reminded of the categories to which they belonged:

“Now tell me all the words you can remember, in any order”.

If participants paused for more than 20 seconds they were asked:

“Is that all you can remember?”

Upon confirming, FR11 was concluded, and the following instruction was given:

“Now we are going to go through the same list of words again just as we did before.

Again, tell me a sentence with each word. You can use the same sentence as before”.

1 The second on-screen presentation of List 1 commenced, which was followed by the second
2 Free recall test (FR12). Using the same instruction, after the test, they were shown the same
3 list for the third time, which was followed by the distracter task. The instructions for the
4 distracter task stated:

5 “Before you tell me what you remember, you will play a short game. On the screen,
6 you are going to see two pictures and I want you to tell me how many differences you
7 see between them. You will have 2 minutes to tell me as many differences as you
8 can”.

9 All the differences participants spotted during the task were recorded by the experimenter. At
10 the end of the 2-minute delay participants were given the same free recall instructions as
11 before:

12 “Now tell me all the words you can remember, in any order”.

13 If participants paused for more than 20 seconds they were asked:

14 “Is that all you can remember?”

15 If they confirmed, the Session was concluded.

16 **Session 2:** Participants were first administered a surprise free delayed test (FR14) for the list
17 they studied during Session 1. The instructions for that test were:

18 “Could you tell me what words you remember off the list of Categories A and B you
19 learned yesterday?

20 They were allowed to Free recall at their own pace, and the test was concluded if they could
21 not remember any more words for 20 seconds, as in the previous tests.

1 They were then administered a surprise cued recall test of the same list (CR15). The
2 instructions for that test were:

3 “Now we are going to do something a bit different. On the screen you are going to see
4 the first two letters of each of the words you learned in this list. They may help you
5 remember a few more words. Don’t think about it for too long – if the word comes
6 immediately to mind, tell me what it is. If it doesn’t, just say Pass.”

7 A second List of words was studied in a process identical to the one in Session 1, whilst
8 displaying the words on the screen:

9 “Now we are going to go through another list of words just as we did yesterday –
10 three consecutive times and with sentences. This time the list of words that you will
11 be learning is made out of Categories A and B”.

12 The remainder of Session 2 had the same instruction as Session 1, while Session 3 had the
13 same instructions as Session 2.

14