Phase-amplitude coupling and phase synchronization between medial temporal, frontal and posterior brain regions support episodic autobiographical memory recall

Nicolas Roehri^{1,*}, Lucie Bréchet^{2,3,4,*}, Martin Seeber¹, Alvaro Pascual-Leone^{3,4,5}, Christoph M. Michel^{1,2}

¹Functional Brain Mapping Laboratory, Department of Fundamental Neurosciences, Campus Biotech,
University of Geneva, 1201 Geneva, Switzerland.

²Center for Biomedical Imaging (CIBM), Lausanne and Geneva, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

³Hinda and Arthur Marcus Institute for Aging Research and Deanna and Sidney Wolk Center for
Memory Health, Hebrew SeniorLife, Boston, MA, USA

⁴Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁵Guttmann Brain Health Institute, Institut Guttmann de Neurorehabilitació, Barcelona, Spain

*The first two authors contributed equally.

Corresponding author:

Christoph M. Michel
Campus Biotech
Neuroscience Department
University of Geneva
9 chemin des Mines
1211 Genève 20, Switzerland
email:christoph.michel@unige.ch

Abstract

Episodic autobiographical memory (EAM) is a complex cognitive function that emerges from the coordination of specific and distant brain regions. Specific brain rhythms, namely theta and gamma oscillations and their synchronization, are thought of as putative mechanisms enabling EAM. Yet, the mechanisms of inter-regional interaction in the EAM network remain unclear in humans at the whole brain level. To investigate this, we analyzed EEG recordings of participants instructed to retrieve autobiographical episodes. EEG recordings were projected in the source space, and time-courses of atlas-based brain regions-of-interest (ROIs) were derived. Directed phase synchrony in high theta (7-10 Hz) and gamma (30-80 Hz) bands and high theta-gamma phase-amplitude coupling were computed between each pair of ROIs. Using network-based statistics, a graph-theory method, we found statistically significant networks for each investigated mechanism. In the gamma band, two sub-networks were found, one between the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) and the medial temporal lobe (MTL) and another within the medial frontal areas. In the high theta band, we found a PCC to ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) network. In phase-amplitude coupling, we found the high theta phase of the left MTL biasing the gamma amplitude of posterior regions and the vmPFC. Other regions of the temporal lobe and the insula were also phase biasing the vmPFC. These findings suggest that EAM, rather than emerging from a single mechanism at a single frequency, involves precise spatio-temporal signatures mapping on distinct memory processes. We propose that the MTL orchestrates activity in vmPFC and PCC via precise phase-amplitude coupling, with vmPFC and PCC interaction via high theta phase synchrony and gamma synchronization contributing to bind information within the PCC-MTL sub-network or valuate the candidate memory within the medial frontal sub-network.

Keywords: episodic autobiographical memory, phase synchronization, phase-amplitude coupling, EEG, network.

Abbreviations: EAM: episodic autobiographical memory, PAC: phase-amplitude coupling, ROI: region of interest, dPLI: directed Phase Lag Index, nMI: normalized Modulation Index, NBS: network-based statistic, dFPN: dorsal Frontoparietal Network, MTL: medial temporal lobe, ACC: anterior cingulate cortex, MCC: median cingulate cortex, PCC: posterior cingulate cortex, SFG: superior frontal gyrus, SFGmedOrb: medial orbital part of the SFG, pSFG: posterior superior frontal gyrus, vmPFC: ventromedial prefrontal cortex, SCG: subcallosal gyrus, Rec: gyrus rectus, STG: superior temporal gyrus, MTG: middle temporal gyrus, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, PrCu: precuneus, SPG: superior parietal gyrus, IPG: inferior parietal gyrus, SMG: supramarginal gyrus, PHG: parahippocampal gyrus, HIP: hippocampus, AMY: amygdala, Th: Thalamus.

Introduction

Episodic autobiographical memory (EAM) is a complex cognitive function that involves a specific large-scale network of interacting brain regions to store and later retrieve our lives' experiences. However, the precise mechanisms that enable the specialized brain areas to encode or retrieve EAM remain unclear. Brain oscillations and synchronization within and across large-scale networks facilitate long-distance communication and promote cognitive functions in the healthy human brain (Buzsáki 2006). Particularly, the slower theta (3-10Hz) and faster gamma (>25Hz) oscillations have been related to memory processes but likely play distinct mechanistic roles. Gamma oscillations have been suggested related to memory-related synaptic changes (Nakazono et al. 2018; Sederberg et al. 2007). Gamma phase synchrony in the neocortex is well-known to facilitate neuronal communication and functional integration thanks to the precise temporal coincidence of spiking activity (Fries 2009), and in turn binds distributed memory representations that are needed to retrieve episodic memories (Düzel, Penny, and Burgess 2010; Fell and Axmacher 2011). Theta oscillations are the dominant rhythms recorded in the hippocampus (Buzsaki 2002) and appear to serve as a mechanism of EAM memories constituted of shorter sub-episodes, whose temporal dynamics during recall are supported by the same mechanism as during encoding (Buzsaki 2002; Buzsáki and Moser 2013). Theta oscillations have been associated with both encoding and retrieval of episodic memories (Frieze et al. 2013; Osipova et al. 2006; Sederberg et al. 2003).

Generally, theta phase synchrony is supposed to coordinate the coactivation of distant regions whose local neuronal assembly would be synchronized in the gamma range (Fell and Axmacher 2011). This hypothesis can also be seen as cross-frequency phase-amplitude coupling (PAC); the gamma activity would occur at a specific phase of the low-frequency oscillation (Canolty and Knight 2010; Fell and Axmacher 2011; Florin and Baillet 2015; Sirota et al. 2008; Tort et al. 2008). The low-frequency oscillation here acts as a metronome that coordinates neural activity in the same region or a remote

region, making a putative mechanism for long-range communication. Using simultaneous recordings from both the hippocampus and neocortex in behaving rats and mice, Sirota et al. (Sirota et al. 2008) showed that the theta oscillations in the hippocampus modulate gamma oscillations in the neocortex through PAC. Thus, the coupling between hippocampal theta and neocortical gamma oscillations seems to be a critical mechanism supporting the large-scale memory network's interactions (Axmacher et al. 2010; Nyhus and Curran 2010).

Very few human studies to date have explored the complex communication within and between regions involved in EAM. A few recent magnetoencephalography (MEG) studies of personal memories have started to investigate the mechanisms for the organized communication within and between broad networks at different spatiotemporal scales (Fuentemilla et al. 2014; Hebscher, Meltzer, and Gilboa 2019). For example, Fuentemilla et al. (Fuentemilla et al. 2014) found selective phase-synchronization in theta frequency between the medial temporal lobe (MTL), medial prefrontal cortex, and precuneus that was higher during EAM than general semantic retrieval. In a follow-up study, Fuentemilla et al. (2018) sought to identify larger-scale patterns in higher frequencies and found neural synchrony, specifically in the gamma frequency range underlying episodic autobiographical recollection. Hebscher et al. (2019) used theta-burst transcranial magnetic stimulation to examine whether interactions between theta and gamma frequencies facilitate the recall of personal memories and found that memory retrieval is supported by MTL-cortical communication mediated by theta phase coupling and theta-gamma PAC. Although such research emphasizes the importance of brain oscillations in memory processing and integration, these studies relied either on seed-based methods calculating the phase-synchrony between a selected region and the rest of the brain, thus missing potential interactions between regions not interacting with the seed, or scalp level connectivity analysis without any consideration of the source-level network reconstruction. Therefore, there is a need to analyze the interactions both at the source level and between all brain regions without

selecting only some brain areas based on their coactivation during the EAM processes or a priori knowledge to obtain a complete picture of the interaction between brain regions.

In the present study, we investigated the dynamic interactions between neuronal networks during EAM retrieval, particularly in the gamma and high theta frequencies. We focused on the upper range of the theta band (7-10 Hz; high theta) because, while the frequency of the human hippocampal theta is rather controversial (Jacobs 2014; de la Prida 2019; Miller et al. 2018), Fuentemilla et al. (2014) found that when participants were asked to retrieve personal episodes and elaborate them during 30 s during MEG recording, the peak theta frequency linked to the MTL-Precuneus-mPFC phase synchronization was above 7 Hz. We assessed the directed phase connectivity and phase-amplitude coupling at play during EAM recollection, leveraging the high-temporal resolution of EEG and the 64 channels dataset reported in (Bréchet et al. 2019). We first computed the average power in high theta and gamma bands in the source space to investigate which parts of the brain were more active during the EAM retrieval than during a control task. We then applied two types of directed connectivity measures, the directed phase lag index (dPLI) (Stam and van Straaten 2012) and the normalized modulation index (nMI) (Özkurt and Schnitzler 2011; Tort et al. 2008) to quantify the coupling at the whole-brain level between 84 regions of interest (ROIs). The dPLI is a measure of phase-synchronization, which is robust to source leakage and analyzes the direction of the information flow. The nMI allows quantifying the PAC between the phase of low-frequency time-series and the amplitude of the high-frequency course.

Materials and Methods

Participants

15 healthy participants (30.5 ± 5.5 years, 10 female) were included in the study. The dataset was acquired and described in Bréchet et al. 2019. The local ethics committee's institutional review board approved this study, and all participants provided written informed consent prior to the experiment.

Experimental paradigm

Participants were instructed to either retrieve episodic, self-related memories ("memory condition") or perform arithmetic calculations ("math condition") while undergoing hd-EEG recording. There were 40 trials in total, each trial lasting 30 s. On each trial, a personal photograph (e.g., photo of a participant with a birthday cake) or a calculation (e.g., $447-7=$) was presented for 3 s, followed by 27 s period of closed eyes, during which participants either retrieved the EAM or subtracted/added numbers. Participants were asked to retrieve the personal events in as much detail as possible or fully focus on the calculations. At the end of each trial, participants were asked to rate how much they were able to either relive the past self-related events or pay attention to the self-unrelated calculation. The ratings were similar between the memory and math conditions. For more detail on the experimental paradigm, see (Bréchet et al. 2019).

EEG recording and preprocessing

EEG was recorded with a 64-channel BrainAmp EEG system (Brain Products, Munich, Germany) at 5000Hz. The EEG recording was down-sampled to 500Hz and filtered using a zero-phase digital 4th-order Butterworth bandpass filter between 1Hz and 80Hz. Infomax-based Independent Component Analysis (ICA) was applied to remove oculomotor, cardiac, and muscle artifacts based on the channels

with maximal amplitude, the topography, and time course of the component (as recommended in Jung et al. 2000). Particular attention was devoted to removing long-standing muscle artifacts, which may overlap and contaminate the genuine gamma activity produced by the brain in the same frequency band (30-80Hz). In other words, we removed independent components whose topographies were limited to one or two channels and whose time-courses showed strong activity in the gamma band (Jung et al. 2000). Bad electrodes were interpolated using a 3-D spherical spline (Perrin et al. 1989) and the data were re-referenced to the common average reference. Finally, the remaining artifacts were marked and excluded from further analysis. The pre-processing stages were performed using the Fieldtrip Toolbox (Oostenveld et al. 2011).

EEG source imaging

The forward model for source localization, based on realistic head geometry and conductivity data considering skull thickness (Locally Spherical Model with Anatomical Constraints [LSMAC]) (Brunet, Murray, and Michel 2011), was calculated for a standard set of 64-electrode positions co-registered to the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) atlas. The inverse solution space consisted of about 5000 point sources equally distributed in gray matter volume. We computed the inverse solution matrix using the linear distributed source localization procedure LAURA (Grave De Peralta Menendez et al. 2004). The lead-field matrix and the inverse matrix were computed using the freely available software Cartool (Brunet et al. 2011; Michel and Brunet 2019); <https://sites.google.com/site/cartoolcommunity/>.

Frequency-band power analyses

We computed the analytic signal of the EEG traces using the Hilbert transform and projected the real and imaginary parts in the inverse space using the inverse operator to obtain the average power in

high theta and gamma bands at each point source for the memory and math conditions. Before the Hilbert transform, the signals were bandpass filtered in either high theta (7-10Hz) or gamma (30-80Hz) bands. The square of the norm of the resulting three-dimensional complex signal was calculated to obtain a single real power time-course for each point source. A standardization across time was applied for each point source to eliminate activation biases (Bréchet et al. 2019; Michel and Brunet 2019). These values were then averaged across time and trials, resulting in an average power value at each participant's source location.

Whole-brain connectivity analysis

We used 84 regions of interest (ROIs) to build the connectivity matrices. In Cartool, each source was assigned to one of the ROIs defined by the second version of the AAL atlas (Rolls, Joliot, and Tzourio-Mazoyer 2015; Tzourio-Mazoyer et al. 2002). S1 Figure shows the position of the centroid of each ROI in a 3D brain mesh and S1 Table lists the abbreviations and anatomical descriptions of the AAL ROIs. Notably, the AAL atlas is an anatomical parcellation of the brain based on gyri and sulci rather than functional specificity. Therefore, we used several ROIs to describe functional brain areas. For example, the vmPFC was described as in Gilboa and Marlatte 2017 and McCormick et al. 2018 with the three following ROIs: the medial orbital part of the superior frontal gyrus, gyrus rectus and the subcallosal gyrus. We projected the filtered data in either high theta or gamma bands into the source space to obtain the different ROIs' time-courses. We took the first component of the singular value decomposition computed over all the time-series of every source (independently of their orientation) belonging to a given ROI. This method was described in Rubega et al. 2019 and used in several other studies (Carboni et al. 2019, 2020; Damborská et al. 2020). The singular value decomposition has a sign ambiguity, which can bias directed connectivity measures. To resolve this indeterminacy, we used the method proposed by Bro, Acar, and Kolda 2008, which allocates the sign based on the majority of

vectors represented by the component. The non-artifacts sections of the trials were concatenated, and the following connectivity measures were calculated.

We used two types of directed connectivity measures to quantify the coupling between ROIs: the directed Phase Lag Index [dPLI] (Stam and van Straaten 2012) and the normalized Modulation Index [nMI] (Canolty et al. 2006; Özkurt and Schnitzler 2011).

Directed Phase Lag Index: The dPLI measures the probability that the difference of the instantaneous phases of two signals is positive, i.e., the probability that one signal has its instantaneous phase leading the instantaneous phase of another signal. Formally:

$$dPLI_{xy} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N H(\varphi_x(t) - \varphi_y(t))$$

where H is the Heaviside step function, N is the number of samples, φ_x and φ_y are respectively the instantaneous phase of the time series x and y obtained after applying the Hilbert transform. $dPLI_{xy}$ is bounded between 0 and 1. By definition, x is phase leading compared to y when $dPLI_{xy} > 0.5$ and phase lagging when $dPLI_{xy} < 0.5$. This measure was applied to the high theta and gamma filtered time-series separately.

Normalized Modulation Index: The nMI quantifies the phase-amplitude coupling (PAC) between the phase of low-frequency time-series and the amplitude of the high-frequency course. Mathematically:

$$nMI_{xy} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{|\sum_{t=1}^N a_\gamma(t) e^{i\phi_{h\theta}(t)}|}{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^N a_\gamma(t)^2}}$$

a_γ is the amplitude of the analytic signal filtered in gamma, $\phi_{h\theta}$ is the instantaneous phase of the analytic signal filtered in high theta, and N is the number of samples. Note that the direction of the

connectivity does not carry the usual causality meaning but rather that the phase of region A is coupled to the amplitude of region B (i.e., $A \rightarrow B$ means that $\phi_{h\theta}^A$ is coupled to a_{γ}^B).

Statistical analysis

Activation maps: We applied a two-sided paired t-test to each point source's average power across participants to investigate which parts of the brain were more active during the memory than the math condition at the group level. A cluster-based permutation procedure implemented in FieldTrip (Maris and Oostenveld 2007; Oostenveld et al. 2011) was used to correct multiple comparisons. Clusters are formed by grouping together neighboring point sources whose t-values were higher than the initial threshold. The initial threshold for cluster definition was set to $p < 0.0005$, and the final threshold for significance of the summed t value within clusters was set to $p < 0.05$ with 5000 permutations.

Connectivity Networks: Networks are defined by nodes and links. In this study, the nodes are the ROIs, and the links are the values of the connectivity of each pair of nodes. We used the network-based statistic (NBS) (Zalesky, Fornito, and Bullmore 2010) to compare the connectivity matrices. First, the connectivity matrices were subjected to a t-test and then corrected for multiple comparisons using a connected-component-based permutation procedure. In graph theory, a connected component is a set of nodes where any two nodes (e.g., A and B) are connected either directly (A-B) or indirectly (i.e., via other nodes: A-C-D-B). As for the cluster-based statistics, one can derive a measure for each component present after the first level threshold, presently the number of links, and test this measure against values obtained after permutation. Importantly, NBS only works for undirected networks as it uses a breadth-first search (Hopcroft and Tarjan 1973). We modified this part to work with a directed network by searching for weakly connected components, i.e., seeking connected components while ignoring link direction as implemented in Matlab's *conncomp*. We chose weakly over strongly connected components because strongly connected components have a stricter definition, which may

not be realistic in terms of brain networks. A component is defined as strongly connected if and only if for every pair of nodes, there is a directed path between any two nodes. For instance, $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ is weakly connected because there is no directed path to go from B or C to A, while $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A$ is strongly connected, as there is a directed path that connects B to A ($B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A$) and C to A ($C \rightarrow A$).

As proposed by Zalesky and colleagues (Zalesky et al. 2010), the data can be transformed prior to the t-test to ensure a meaningful first level threshold. Both the nMI and dPLI are bounded by 0 and 1. Therefore we applied a logit transform. The logit transform is a monotonically increasing function and transforms values from (0,1) to $(-\infty, +\infty)$, specifically $\text{logit}(0.5) = 0$. The above inequalities relative to the dPLI are conserved except that the critical value became 0 instead of 0.5.

We directly contrasted the memory and math conditions through a paired t-test as the nMI matrices are non-symmetric ($nMI_{xy} \neq nMI_{yx}$). The permutations were obtained by randomly exchanging the conditions within subjects. However, the dPLI matrices are anti-symmetric ($dPLI_{xy} = -dPLI_{yx}$) and a direct comparison of the conditions is thus not possible. Therefore, we first applied a one-sample t-test against 0 to determine the presence of a preferred direction between nodes across participants and then removed the links present in both memory and math conditions. Here the permutations were obtained by randomly transposing the matrices, i.e., changing the direction of the links. The initial threshold for connected-component definition was set to $p < 0.005$. The final threshold for significance of the number of connections within connected components was set to $p < 0.05$ with 5000 permutations. We also defined three different types of nodes: a.) source nodes are nodes with only outgoing links, b.) sink nodes with only incoming links, and c.) intermediate nodes have incoming and outgoing links. When describing the significant networks, we will give their number of links and nodes and, for the sake of readability, only detail the connectivity of their strongest nodes, i.e., nodes with more than three links. The complete networks are shown in the respective figures and supplementary tables.

Comparison of the distance between connected regions: Finally, we calculated the distance between the centroids of pairs of connected ROIs for each connectivity type. We performed a one-way ANOVA to test whether there exists a difference in these profiles of distance. Post hoc t-tests were used to explore differences between all the pairs of connectivity types and were controlled for multiple comparisons by the Dunn-Sidák approach (Šidák 1967). All reported p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons by one of the above approaches.

Results

Power changes in source space

We found several statistically significant clusters of point sources in gamma and high theta bands when comparing the power in the memory condition to the control/math condition (**Fig. 1, Table 1**). Specific to the gamma frequency, we found 5 significant clusters (Fig. 1a, Table 1a). The first cluster (sum of t: 982.03, $p < 0.01$) had its maximum t-value located in the right superior temporal gyrus (STG), and the right temporal pole and supramarginal gyrus (SMG) were its anterior and posterior limits, respectively. It also included part of the right middle temporal gyrus (MTG), insula, rolandic operculum, and postcentral gyrus. The second cluster (sum of t: 624.44, $p < 0.01$) showed a maximum t-value in the left precuneus (PrCu) and included the PrCu bilaterally and the left superior parietal (SPG) and inferior parietal gyri (IPG). The third cluster (sum of t: 258.80, $p < 0.01$) bilaterally included the median cingulate cortex (MCC) and posterior superior frontal gyrus (pSFG), and its peak was in the left MCC. The peak of the fourth cluster was found in the left SMG, and this cluster (sum of t: 89.88, $p < 0.01$) was composed of the left SMG, IPG, and postcentral gyrus. The fifth cluster (sum of t: 32.29, $p < 0.05$) included the right caudate nucleus and thalamus with a peak in the right caudate nucleus.

We identified 4 significant clusters in the high theta frequency (Fig. 1b, Table 1b). The first cluster (sum of t: 204.54, $p < 0.01$) had its maximum t-value located in the left SPG and included the left postcentral gyrus, IPG, precentral gyrus, and the left PrCu. The second cluster (sum of t: 60.62, $p < 0.01$) showed a peak in the right superior frontal gyrus (SFG) and included the right pSFG. The third cluster (sum of t:

56.78, $p < 0.01$) bilaterally included part of the pSFG and the left SFG with a peak in the left pSFG. The fourth cluster (sum of t : 18.87, $p < 0.05$) showed a maximum t -value in the right SPG and partially included the postcentral gyrus.

Fig. 1 Significant clusters in a. gamma and b. high theta band when contrasting the memory vs. math conditions. Only slices containing significant clusters are shown. Numbers identify the different clusters and are detailed in Table 1

Table 1 Anatomical description of the statistically significant clusters obtained when contrasting memory and math condition in the a. gamma band and b. high theta band.

a. gamma band								
# Cluster	size	p	AAL regions	peak region	peak t	X	Y	Z
1	193	0.0014	R STG R MTG R insula R rolandic operculum R PostCG R Putamen R SMG R STGpole R MTGpole R heschl gyrus R ITG R Pallidum	R STG	6.51	55	-3	-3
2	128	0.0032	L precuneus R precuneus L SPG L IPG L SOG L MCC L cuneus R MCC L MOG	L precuneus	5.68	-3	-55	42
3	54	0.0056	L MCC R MCC L pSFG R pSFG	L MCC	5.29	-3	-10	42
4	19	0.0090	L SMG L IPG L PostCG	L SMG	5.27	-62	-29	36
5	7	0.0130	R Caudate R Thalamus	R Caudate	4.70	16	-3	23
b. high theta band								
# Cluster	size	p	AAL regions	peak region	peak t	X	Y	Z
1	37	0.0030	L SPG L PostCG L IPG L precuneus L PreCG	L SPG	7.10	-36	-62	62
2	13	0.0078	R SFG R pSFG	R SFG	4.89	29	-3	68
3	12	0.0080	L pSFG R pSFG L SFG	L pSFG	5.05	-10	-3	74
4	4	0.0120	R SPG R PostCG	R SPG	5.12	29	-55	68

The lists of AAL regions included in a cluster are sorted in a descending order according to their number of point sources within the cluster. Sum of t-values correspond to the summation of the t-values within

a cluster. The size corresponds to the number of point sources making up the cluster. The region where the peak t-value is found is given under the peak region column. X, Y and Z are MNI coordinates in mm of the peak. Only regions with more than 1% of their size included in the clusters are listed. Annotations: L: left, R: Right, STG: superior temporal gyrus, MTG: middle temporal gyrus, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, PreCG: precentral gyrus, PostCG: postcentral gyrus, SMG: supramarginal gyrus, SPG: superior parietal gyrus, IPG: inferior parietal gyrus, SOG: superior occipital gyrus, MOG: middle occipital gyrus, MCC: median cingulate cortex, SFG: superior frontal gyrus, pSFG: posterior superior frontal gyrus.

Directed functional connectivity

As shown in **Figure 2 and S2 Table**, the gamma band directed connectivity analysis revealed a network ($p < 0.01$) composed of 16 links and 16 nodes (including 9 source, 1 intermediate, and 6 sink nodes). No statistically significant network was found in the math condition, and therefore no link was removed in the network found in the memory condition as described in the Method section. Most of the links connected nodes in the frontoparietal midline and left MTL. Particularly, the amygdala (AMY) was the sink node with the most incoming links (4 links) originating from the hippocampus (HIP), parahippocampal gyrus (PHG), thalamus (Th), and left PCC. The right subcallosal gyrus (SCG) was the second strongest sink node with 3 links connected to the right PCC, pSFG, and left Th. With the same number of incoming links, the left anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) was connected to the left and right pSFG and the medial orbital part of the right SFG (SFGmedOrb). The pSFG was the source node with the most outgoing links, connecting the ACC and right SCG.

Fig. 2 Significant directed network in gamma in the memory condition. The statistically significant network (16 links and 16 nodes, $p < 0.01$) is represented in 3D along the a.) coronal, b.) sagittal and c.) axial axes. The connectivity matrix is shown in d. Triangles and squares encode nodes with only outgoing or incoming links, i.e., source or sink nodes, respectively. Circles correspond to intermediate nodes with both incoming and outgoing links. The normalized grand average of the connectivity is color-coded. One corresponds to the maximum value. The size of the node encodes its number of (outgoing or incoming) links. Annotations: L: left, R: Right, Th: thalamus, SCG: subcallosal gyrus, AMY: amygdala, HIP: hippocampus, PCC: posterior cingulate cortex, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, PHG: parahippocampal gyrus, SFG: superior frontal gyrus, pSFG: posterior SFG, ACC: anterior cingulate cortex, STGpole: polar part of the superior temporal gyrus, SFGmedOrb: medial orbital part of the SFG, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, MOG: middle occipital gyrus.

As shown in **Figure 3 and S3 Table**, the high theta directed connectivity analysis revealed the presence of a medial posterior-to-anterior network ($p < 0.01$) composed of 21 links and 18 nodes (including 4 source and 14 sink nodes). Only one link was present in both memory and math conditions and was removed only to keep links specific to the memory condition as described in the Methods section. The left PCC was the source region with the most outgoing links (9 links). This region drove the right ACC and bilaterally the gyrus rectus (Rec), SCG, Th, and MCC. The right PCC was driving 5 regions: the right Rec and bilaterally the Th and SCG. The right inferior temporal gyrus (ITG) led the right Rec, SFGmedOrb, opercular part of the IFG, and the orbital part of both SFG. Interestingly, the two strongest source nodes (left and right PCCs) were mostly connected to the nodes of the vmPFC (defined by the SFGmedOrb, Rec, and SCG nodes).

Fig. 3 Significant directed network in high theta in the memory condition. The statistically significant network (21 links and 18 nodes, $p < 0.01$) is represented in 3D along the a.) coronal, b.) sagittal and c.) axial axes. The connectivity matrix is shown in d. Triangles and squares encode nodes with only outgoing or incoming links, i.e., source or sink nodes, respectively. The normalized grand average of the connectivity is color-coded; one corresponds to the maximum value. The size of the node encodes its number of (outgoing or incoming) links. Annotations: L: left, R: Right, PCC: posterior cingulate cortex, SCG: subcallosal gyrus, Rec: gyrus rectus, ACC: anterior cingulate cortex, Th: thalamus, MCC: median cingulate cortex, PrCu: precuneus, SFG: superior frontal gyrus, pSFG: posterior SFG, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, SFGorb: orbital part of the SFG, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, SFGmedOrb: medial orbital part of the SFG.

Phase-amplitude coupled network

Compared to the gamma and high theta directed networks, the direction of the PAC-directed network links carries information about the phase to amplitude relationship. For a given pair of connected nodes, the high theta phase of the node with the outgoing link is coupled to the gamma amplitude of the node with the incoming link. We identified a statistically significant PAC network ($p < 0.05$) when comparing the memory to the math conditions (**Fig. 4 and S4 Table**). This network was composed of 20 links and 20 nodes (including 12 source, 3 intermediate, and 5 sink nodes). The left SFGmedOrb (part of the vmPFC) was the sink region with the most incoming links (5 links). Its gamma amplitude was coupled to the high theta phase of the left PHG, HIP, STG, ITG, and lingual gyrus. The right SPG was the second sink node with the most incoming links (4 links). It was coupled to the left HIP and MCC, and right AMY and superior occipital gyrus. The right Rec (also a node of the vmPFC) had 3 links coming from the right MTG pole, right insula, and left MTG. The left fusiform gyrus received 3 connections from the right STG, precentral gyrus, and angular gyrus. Interestingly, we found that the

left HIPP had its high theta phase coupled to gamma amplitude of the two sink nodes with the highest number of links, namely the SFGmedOrb (part of the vmPFC) and right SPG.

Fig. 4 Significant phase-amplitude coupling directed network when contrasting the memory and math conditions. The statistically significant network (20 links and 20 nodes, $p < 0.05$) is represented in 3D along the a.) coronal, b.) sagittal and c.) axial axes. The connectivity matrix is shown in d. Triangles and squares encode nodes with only outgoing or incoming links, i.e., source or sink nodes, respectively. Circles correspond to intermediate nodes with both incoming and outgoing links. The normalized grand average of the connectivity is color-coded. One corresponds to the maximum value. The size of the node encodes its number of (outgoing or incoming) links. Annotations: L: left, R: Right, INS: insula, MTG: middle temporal gyrus, ANG: angular gyrus, MTGpole: polar part of the MTG, PHG: parahippocampal gyrus, STG: superior temporal gyrus, FUSI: fusiform gyrus, Rec: gyrus rectus, SFG: superior frontal gyrus,

SFGorb: orbital part of the SFG, HIPp: hippocampus, SPG: superior parietal gyrus, SFGmed: medial part of the superior frontal gyrus, MCC: median cingulate cortex, ITG: inferior temporal gyrus, SFGmedOrb: medial orbital part of the SFG, AMY: amygdala, LING: lingual gyrus, PreCG: precentral cortex, SOG: superior occipital gyrus.

ROI to ROI distance profile in different connectivity type

We applied one-way ANOVA to test whether the distributions of the distances between two linked ROIs were different across connectivity types and found a significant result ($F = 11.32$, $p < 0.0001$, Fig. 5). Furthermore, the post-hoc t-test revealed that the distances were higher when the ROIs were connected by PAC than by high theta ($p < 0.05$) or gamma phase synchrony ($p < 0.001$).

Fig. 5 Boxplot of the distances between ROIs connected either by high theta, gamma phase synchrony, or phase-amplitude coupling. The one-way ANOVA showed that these distributions were not originating from the same distribution ($F = 11.32$, $p < 0.0001$). Post-hoc t-tests indicated that the distances between ROIs connected via phase-amplitude coupling (nMI) were longer than via phase synchrony. (*: $p < 0.05$, ***: $p < 0.001$, the reported p-value were adjusted after the Dunn-Sidák

procedure correcting for multiple comparisons). dPLI: directed phase lag index, nMI: normalized Modulation Index, $h\theta$: high theta, γ : gamma.

Discussion

A brief summary of main findings

Our results showed frequency-specific activation of PrCu, SMG, MCC, and STG in the gamma band and SPG, SFG, and pSFG in the high theta band. We also found a frequency-specific directed phase-synchrony network that highlighted the importance of frontoparietal midline and MTL interactions. Specifically, in the gamma band, the left AMY ROI was driven by other MTL regions (HIPPO, PHG) and left PCC, and the pSFG, ACC, and vmPFC were interconnected. In the high theta band, a posterior-to-anterior network was found with the PCC driving the vmPFC. Finally, the high theta-gamma PAC network was dense and showed that the MTL phase organized the left vmPFC and right SPG. Overall, the results reveal distinct spatio-temporal signatures in the high theta and gamma bands, with specific interactions that we hypothesize reflect distinct cognitive processes of self-referential autobiographical memory retrieval.

Increased gamma activity in regions linked to self-relevant processing

The brain regions with increased gamma activity were primarily found in the left PrCu, left SMG, right STG, and MCC. Generally, these gamma activity clusters seem to occur in regions whose role is related to the first-person perspective and self-orientation.

The PrCu and the SMG have been implicated in self-relevant processing. The PrCu is supposed to shift the frame of reference from an allocentric to an egocentric one (Hebscher, Levine, and Gilboa 2018), and stimulation of this region has been shown to alter the autobiographical memory retrieval

(Hebscher, Ibrahim, and Gilboa 2020; Hebscher et al. 2019). In a case report, it was reported that epileptic seizures involving the left SMG provoked autonomic hallucinations (i.e., seeing the double of oneself from an internal point of view) in a patient investigated with intracerebral EEG (Fonti et al. 2020). In addition, these two regions (PrCu and SMG) were also found in the fMRI analysis in the original paper of the analyzed dataset (Bréchet et al. 2019), strengthening the implication of these regions in EAM.

The MCC is known to be involved in the head and body's reflexive orientation in space (Vogt 2016). This region could work in concert with the PrCu and SMG areas to create an internal representation and sense of self-orientation during EAM recall. The right STG is often listed as activated during recollection of EAM (Boccia, Teghil, and Guariglia 2019; Bréchet et al. 2018) but does not belong to the core regions, unlike the anterior temporal area (Svoboda, McKinnon, and Levine 2006). Of note, it could be possible that, because of the lower spatial resolution of the EEG, the activation of the right temporal junction and the right anterior temporal area merged into a single cluster.

Activation of the dorsal Frontoparietal Network in high theta band

Increased activation of the SFG, pSFG, and SPG was found in a high theta band in the memory condition compared to the math condition. Because the clusters found in the SFG do not entirely delineate this gyrus, it can be further interpreted as belonging to the superior frontal sulcus. These regions are known to be part of the dorsal Frontoparietal Network (dFPN) (Petersen and Posner 2012; Ptak, Schnider, and Fellrath 2017). Its functions are diverse and include motor planning and imagery, mental rotation, spatial attention, and working memory (Ptak et al. 2017). At first, it could seem unexpected to find such a visual attentional network more active in the EAM condition than in the math condition. However, during the memory condition, the participants were asked to relive past events depicted on self-related photographs for more than twenty seconds. This requires manipulating and maintaining the scene internally, which is in line with functions attributed to the dFPN. Although the math condition

is a working memory task, the regions of the dFPN were less involved in that condition. Solving simple arithmetic operations rely more on the frontal network (Ishii et al. 2014). Our previous study showed that one specific microstate occurred more often during the math than memory condition (Bréchet et al. 2019). This microstate's source localization revealed activity in the dorsal ACC, IFG, and IPG, attributed to the executive control system (Ferris and Peterson 2012).

MTL organizes local gamma synchronization in prefrontal and parietal cortices

Our PAC result showed that the left hippocampus' high theta phase orchestrated the gamma activity in the medial orbital part of the superior frontal gyrus (belonging to vmPFC) and right superior parietal gyrus. According to the "reader-initiated" mechanism hypothesis (Buzsáki and Wang 2012; Sirota et al. 2008), the hippocampus through theta oscillations can initiate long-range reciprocal communication with neocortical gamma oscillations. In that case, the hippocampus would act as a metronome that coordinates neocortical gamma oscillators. Those gamma oscillations then locally, i.e., within the same region, synchronize to combine information sent back to the hippocampus. We determine that the left AMY node received information from the left PCC, Th, PHG, and HIPP via gamma phase synchrony. Because of the lower spatial resolution of EEG, it might be possible that the AMY node activity globally represents the activity of the anterior MTL rather than activity solely of the AMY. Similarly, we interpret the PHG and HIPP nodes as representing the MTL activity and only refer to their name to describe their connections within the network. This gamma phase synchrony could be the reciprocal connection initiated via PAC by the left MTL with the right superior parietal gyrus, which sends information back via the PCC to the anterior MTL.

A possible role of this reciprocal connection is to perform the high-resolution contextual binding to generate a coherent scene (Yonelinas 2013). Indeed the nodes of this gamma sub-network (AMY, HIPP, PHG, PCC) form the scene-reconstruction network (Andrews-Hanna et al. 2010; Axelrod, Rees, and Bar

2017; Hassabis and Maguire 2007), which was also found in the original paper's BOLD connectivity analysis and EEG microstate analysis (Bréchet et al. 2019). Furthermore, as defined in AAL, the PCC ROI contains part of the retrosplenial cortex (Rolls et al. 2015). This region works in concert with the Th, which sends head direction information, to switch between allocentric and egocentric perspective (Vann, Aggleton, and Maguire 2009). The anterior hippocampus, which is more engaged during scene and events reconstruction than the posterior hippocampus (Zeidman and Maguire 2016), reconstructs the scene from an allocentric viewpoint. This gamma connectivity from the PCC/retrosplenial cortex, Th, and PHG to anterior MTL could help orient EAM recollection to a personal view.

The second node entrained by the hippocampal phase was in the vmPFC. This node was part of a more extensive gamma phase synchrony sub-network constituted by the ACC, pSFG, and other nodes of the vmPFC. Fuentemilla et al. (2018) showed that large-scale gamma synchrony supports autobiographical recollection and that this synchrony also occurred in the midline frontal MEG sensor, in line with our findings. The putative role of the vmPFC is to monitor memory veracity and correctness (Barry and Maguire 2019; Eichenbaum 2017; Gilboa and Moscovitch 2017; Hebscher and Gilboa 2016; Ritchey and Cooper 2020). This frontal gamma phase synchronization could be the mechanism by which the vmPFC combines information from the prefrontal cortex to verify the retrieved memory's validity.

Finally, when analyzing the distance between the pairs of coupled ROIs, we showed that the distance between ROIs connected via PAC was higher than that via high theta or gamma phase synchronization. PAC thus seems to be the preferred mechanism for long-range coupling, while high theta or gamma phase synchronization appears to be the preferred mechanism for local coupling. Our results suggest that the MTL by entraining with its high theta phase local gamma synchronization in remote and functionally diverse regions, namely the medial prefrontal and the posterior associative cortex, permits to reconstruct a coherent and valid self-relevant episode.

PCC leads and vmPFC follows the network dynamics

On the one hand, we found nodes within the vmPFC as sink nodes in the high theta phase synchrony network and the PAC network. This result suggests that the vmPFC is driven via the high theta oscillations in the former network and that gamma activity is coupled to other regions' high theta phase in the latter network. On the other hand, we found the PCC to exclusively contain source nodes in high theta and gamma phase synchrony network, i.e., the PCC was phase leading other regions. Specifically, the network analysis revealed a PCC to vmPFC connection in the high theta band. This result is supported by anatomical connections, namely the cingulum bundle, between these two regions (Bubb, Metzler-Baddeley, and Aggleton 2018) and a recent paper showing the same link in the alpha band within the Default Mode Network (Wang et al. 2019). The PCC is supposed to play a critical role in integrating relevant episodic information emerging from posterior cortices (Andrews-Hanna, Saxe, and Yarkoni 2014; Bird et al. 2015). This directed connectivity suggests that once episodic elements are integrated within the PCC, they are sectioned within high theta cycles and sequentially made available via high theta phase synchrony to the vmPFC to either maintain or withhold a memory candidate.

Furthermore, the vmPFC's gamma activity was coupled to regions other than the left MTL (as discussed above), including the left STG, ITG, the right MTG pole, and the right insula. These regions are linked to either semantic memory processing or emotion processing and are known to contribute to EAM recollection by adding semantic and emotional features (Svoboda et al. 2006). This PAC relationship suggests that the vmPFC is phase-biased by these regions to constrain the memory validation procedure by the semantic features supporting the EAM.

The fact that the vmPFC was mainly a sink node seems to contradict the results of McCormick et al. (2020). While the memory and baseline conditions are relatively similar, our studies differ in several ways. First, they focused on the five first seconds of the trial while we analyzed the whole trial. Therefore, their finding could describe the construction phase of the EAM while ours encompasses

both the construction and elaboration of EAM. Moreover, the hippocampal and vmPFC ROIs in McCormick et al. (2020) were selected by contrasting the memory and math/baseline condition and corresponded to areas with attenuation or decrease of broadband (1-30 Hz) activity. Our ROIs were based on an anatomical atlas. Finally, in McCormick et al. (2020), dynamic causal modelling was used to determine which of the hippocampus or the vmPFC was driving the other regions, which, as far as we know, does not model phase-amplitude coupling or phase synchronization (i.e., the two mechanisms considered in our investigation). Rather than contradicting each other, our study expands the findings of McCormick et al. (2020) and conveys different, complementary information about the dynamic procedure of EAM recall.

Potential limitations and the curse of double-dipping

A recent paper from the OHBM COBIDAS committee (Pernet et al. 2020) emphasized the problem of double-dipping (Kriegeskorte et al. 2009, 2010). This problem could arise when secondary statistical analysis (in our case, the connectivity analysis) is applied to ROIs selected with the same statistical criterion using the same dataset. To avoid this issue, we could have selected ROIs with large power in both conditions or with larger power in the memory vs. math condition but using an independent dataset. Rather than selecting ROIs, we avoided double-dipping by applying whole-brain analyses. Interestingly, the regions with high theta or gamma power increase were almost not present in the three obtained networks. The PrCu, SMG, and MCC showed a greater gamma power in the memory than in the math condition, but they were absent in the gamma phase synchrony and PAC network. Likewise, the SPG and SFG were absent in the high theta phase network while showing a high theta power increase. The results would have been strikingly different if only the activated ROIs had been selected for the network analysis. In fact, ROIs with higher activity are not necessarily connected to each other as their activity could evolve independently of each other, especially in our case with trials lasting several tens of seconds. Moreover, brain areas that do not exhibit a difference in power

between the conditions could be differently connected in the two conditions. These interactions would be missed if connectivity analysis is applied only to ROIs with larger activity in the condition of interest. We thus believed that applying whole-brain connectivity analysis, as proposed here, is more appropriate to capture networks completely.

PAC integrates the gamma band's amplitude and thus could be biased by changes in amplitude. However, the regions whose gamma activity is synchronized to the high theta phase of another region are not present in the gamma's activation map, especially the vmPFC. Therefore, the PAC network cannot be uniquely attributed to differences in gamma power between the conditions.

Finally, gamma activity in scalp EEG can be highly influenced by noise or muscle artifacts. If such artifacts were still present after ICA denoising, they would generate zero-lag connectivity between regions affected by the artefact. As the dPLI is insensitive to zero-lag connectivity and no self-loop, i.e., a region is connected to itself, is present in the PAC network, it is unlikely that artifact bias the obtained networks.

Conclusion

In sum, our findings suggest that the left medial temporal lobe (Hipp, AMG and PHG), the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), and parietal regions (PCC and SPG) work in tandem during recall of self-relevant episodic memories. Importantly, this synergy occurs thanks to complex coordination via frequency-specific and cross-frequency coupling. The medial temporal lobe orchestrates the gamma activity in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and parietal regions with its high theta phase. These two areas synchronize in phase their gamma activity with neighboring regions to, possibly, value and construct the memory. Finally, a high theta synchronization occurs between the posterior cingulate cortex and medial prefrontal regions, which could show the transfer of sub-episodes of memory from posterior to frontal regions. Future studies should investigate these relationships utilizing a higher number of electrodes and a paradigm allowing the separation of the activity of regions related to semantic memory to refine these episodic autobiographical memory networks further.

Data and Code availability statement

The participants informed consent form did not include permission to allow data to be uploaded to an online repository. Data and materials are available upon direct request and are subject to anonymization to protect the privacy of participants. Requestors must sign a formal data sharing agreement.

Data were analyzed using open source and open access tools. EEG recording were analyzed using Fieldtrip (Oostenveld et al. 2011), available at: <https://github.com/fieldtrip/fieldtrip>. The lead-field matrix and the inverse matrix were computed using the freely available software Cartool (Brunet et al. 2011; Michel and Brunet 2019); available at <https://sites.google.com/site/cartoolcommunity/>. The Network Based Statistic toolbox (Zalesky et al. 2010) is available at <https://www.nitrc.org/projects/nbs>.

Acknowledgements

Funding: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation to LB (grant No. 187949) and CM (grant No. 320030_184677), and by the National Center of Competence in Research (NCCR) ‘SYNAPSY - The Synaptic Bases of Mental Diseases’ financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF, grant n° 51AU40_125759).

References

- Andrews-Hanna, Jessica R., Jay S. Reidler, Jorge Sepulcre, Renee Poulin, and Randy L. Buckner. 2010. “Functional-Anatomic Fractionation of the Brain’s Default Network.” *Neuron* 65(4):550–62.
- Andrews-Hanna, Jessica R., Rebecca Saxe, and Tal Yarkoni. 2014. “Contributions of Episodic Retrieval and Mentalizing to Autobiographical Thought: Evidence from Functional Neuroimaging, Resting-State Connectivity, and fMRI Meta-Analyses.” *NeuroImage* 91:324–35.

- 615 Axelrod, Vadim, Geraint Rees, and Moshe Bar. 2017. "The Default Network and the Combination of
616 Cognitive Processes That Mediate Self-Generated Thought." *Nature Human Behaviour*
617 1(12):896–910.
- 618 Axmacher, Nikolai, Melanie M. Henseler, Ole Jensen, Ilona Weinreich, Christian E. Elger, and Juergen
619 Fell. 2010. "Cross-Frequency Coupling Supports Multi-Item Working Memory in the Human
620 Hippocampus." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
621 *America* 107(7):3228–33.
- 622 Barry, Daniel N. and Eleanor A. Maguire. 2019. "Remote Memory and the Hippocampus: A
623 Constructive Critique." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 23(2):128–42.
- 624 Bird, Chris M., James L. Keidel, Leslie P. Ing, Aidan J. Horner, and Neil Burgess. 2015. "Consolidation
625 of Complex Events via Reinstatement in Posterior Cingulate Cortex." *Journal of Neuroscience*
626 35(43):14426–34.
- 627 Boccia, Maddalena, Alice Teghil, and Cecilia Guariglia. 2019. "Looking into Recent and Remote Past:
628 Meta-Analytic Evidence for Cortical Re-Organization of Episodic Autobiographical Memories."
629 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 107(March):84–95.
- 630 Bréchet, Lucie, Denis Brunet, Gwénaél Birot, Rolf Gruetter, Christoph M. Michel, and João Jorge.
631 2019. "Capturing the Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Self-Generated, Task-Initiated Thoughts with
632 EEG and FMRI." *NeuroImage* 194(February):82–92.
- 633 Bréchet, Lucie, Petr Grivaz, Baptiste Gauthier, and Olaf Blanke. 2018. "Common Recruitment of
634 Angular Gyrus in Episodic Autobiographical Memory and Bodily Self-Consciousness." *Frontiers in*
635 *Behavioral Neuroscience* 12(November):1–10.
- 636 Bro, R., E. Acar, and Tamara G. Kolda. 2008. "Resolving the Sign Ambiguity in the Singular Value
637 Decomposition." *Journal of Chemometrics* 22(2):135–40.
- 638 Brunet, Denis, Micah M. Murray, and Christoph M. Michel. 2011. "Spatiotemporal Analysis of

639 Multichannel EEG: CARTOOL.” *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* 2011.

640 Bubb, Emma J., Claudia Metzler-Baddeley, and John P. Aggleton. 2018. “The Cingulum Bundle:
641 Anatomy, Function, and Dysfunction.” *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*
642 92(January):104–27.

643 Buzsaki, Gyorgy. 2002. “Theta Oscillations in the Hippocampus.” *Neuron* 33:325–40.

644 Buzsáki, György. 2006. *Rhythms of the Brain*.

645 Buzsáki, György and Edvard I. Moser. 2013. “Memory, Navigation and Theta Rhythm in the
646 Hippocampal-Entorhinal System.” *Nature Neuroscience* 16(2):130–38.

647 Buzsáki, György and Xiao Jing Wang. 2012. “Mechanisms of Gamma Oscillations.” *Annual Review of*
648 *Neuroscience* 35:203–25.

649 Canolty, R. T., N. M. Barbaro, E. Edwards, H. E. Kirsch, S. S. Dalal, S. S. Nagarajan, R. T. Knight, M. S.
650 Berger, and M. Soltani. 2006. “High Gamma Power Is Phase-Locked to Theta Oscillations in
651 Human Neocortex.” *Science* 313(5793):1626–28.

652 Canolty, Ryan T. and Robert T. Knight. 2010. “The Functional Role of Cross-Frequency Coupling.”
653 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 14(11):506–15.

654 Carboni, M., M. Rubega, G. R. Iannotti, P. De Stefano, G. Toscano, S. Tourbier, F. Pittau, P. Hagmann,
655 S. Momjian, K. Schaller, M. Seeck, C. M. Michel, P. van Mierlo, and S. Vulliemoz. 2019. “The
656 Network Integration of Epileptic Activity in Relation to Surgical Outcome.” *Clinical*
657 *Neurophysiology* 130(12):2193–2202.

658 Carboni, Margherita, Pia De Stefano, Bernd J. Vorderwülbecke, Sebastien Tourbier, Emeline Mullier,
659 Maria Rubega, Shahan Momjian, Karl Schaller, Patric Hagmann, Margitta Seeck, Christoph M.
660 Michel, Pieter van Mierlo, and Serge Vulliemoz. 2020. “Abnormal Directed Connectivity of
661 Resting State Networks in Focal Epilepsy.” *NeuroImage: Clinical* 27(March):102336.

662 Damborská, Alena, Eliška Honzírková, Richard Barteček, Jana Hořínková, Sylvie Fedorová, Šimon
663 Ondruš, Christoph M. Michel, and Maria Rubega. 2020. "Altered Directed Functional
664 Connectivity of the Right Amygdala in Depression: High-Density EEG Study." *Scientific Reports*
665 10(1):1–14.

666 Düzel, Emrah, Will D. Penny, and Neil Burgess. 2010. "Brain Oscillations and Memory." *Current*
667 *Opinion in Neurobiology* 20(2):143–49.

668 Eichenbaum, Howard. 2017. "Prefrontal-Hippocampal Interactions in Episodic Memory." *Nature*
669 *Reviews Neuroscience* 18(9):547–58.

670 Fell, Juergen and Nikolai Axmacher. 2011. "The Role of Phase Synchronization in Memory Processes."
671 *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 12(2):105–18.

672 Ferris, Daniel P. and Steven M. Peterson. 2012. "Combined Head Phantom and Neural Mass Model
673 Validation of Effective Connectivity Measures." *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency*
674 *Syndromes* 59(2):593–600.

675 Florin, Esther and Sylvain Baillet. 2015. "The Brain's Resting-State Activity Is Shaped by Synchronized
676 Cross-Frequency Coupling of Neural Oscillations." *NeuroImage* 111:26–35.

677 Fonti, Davide, Stanislas Lagarde, Julia Scholly, Anne Lépine, Didier Scavarada, Monica Puligheddu,
678 Aileen McGonigal, and Fabrice Bartolomei. 2020. "Anatomical Electroclinical Correlations during
679 an SEEG-Recorded Seizure with Autosopic Hallucination." *Epileptic Disorders : International*
680 *Epilepsy Journal with Videotape* 22(6):817–22.

681 Fries, Pascal. 2009. "Neuronal Gamma-Band Synchronization as a Fundamental Process in Cortical
682 Computation." *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 32:209–24.

683 Frieze, Uwe, Moritz Köster, Uwe Hassler, Ulla Martens, Nelson Trujillo-Barreto, and Thomas Gruber.
684 2013. "Successful Memory Encoding Is Associated with Increased Cross-Frequency Coupling
685 between Frontal Theta and Posterior Gamma Oscillations in Human Scalp-Recorded EEG."

686 *NeuroImage* 66:642–47.

687 Fuentemilla, L., G. R. Barnes, E. Düzel, and B. Levine. 2014. “Theta Oscillations Orchestrate Medial
688 Temporal Lobe and Neocortex in Remembering Autobiographical Memories.” *NeuroImage*
689 85:730–37.

690 Fuentemilla, Lluís, Daniela J. Palombo, and Brian Levine. 2018. “Gamma Phase-Synchrony in
691 Autobiographical Memory: Evidence from Magnetoencephalography and Severely Deficient
692 Autobiographical Memory.” *Neuropsychologia* 110(August 2017):7–13.

693 Gilboa, Asaf and Hannah Marlatte. 2017. “Neurobiology of Schemas and Schema-Mediated
694 Memory.” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 21(8):618–31.

695 Gilboa, Asaf and Morris Moscovitch. 2017. “Ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex Generates Pre-Stimulus
696 Theta Coherence Desynchronization: A Schema Instantiation Hypothesis.” *Cortex* 87:16–30.

697 Grave De Peralta Menendez, Rolando, Micah M. Murray, Christoph M. Michel, Roberto Martuzzi, and
698 Sara L. Gonzalez Andino. 2004. “Electrical Neuroimaging Based on Biophysical Constraints.”
699 *NeuroImage* 21(2):527–39.

700 Hassabis, Demis and Eleanor A. Maguire. 2007. “Deconstructing Episodic Memory with
701 Construction.” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11(7):299–306.

702 Hebscher, Melissa and Asaf Gilboa. 2016. “A Boost of Confidence: The Role of the Ventromedial
703 Prefrontal Cortex in Memory, Decision-Making, and Schemas.” *Neuropsychologia* 90:46–58.

704 Hebscher, Melissa, Christine Ibrahim, and Asaf Gilboa. 2020. “Precuneus Stimulation Alters the
705 Neural Dynamics of Autobiographical Memory Retrieval.” *NeuroImage* 210(January):116575.

706 Hebscher, Melissa, Brian Levine, and Asaf Gilboa. 2018. “The Precuneus and Hippocampus Contribute
707 to Individual Differences in the Unfolding of Spatial Representations during Episodic
708 Autobiographical Memory.” *Neuropsychologia* 110(March 2017):123–33.

709 Hebscher, Melissa, Jed A. Meltzer, and Asaf Gilboa. 2019. "A Causal Role for the Precuneus in
710 Network-Wide Theta and Gamma Oscillatory Activity during Complex Memory Retrieval." *ELife*
711 8:1–20.

712 Hopcroft, J. E. and Robert Tarjan. 1973. "Efficient Algorithms for Graph Manipulations."
713 *Communication of the ACM* 16(6):372–78.

714 Ishii, Ryouhei, Leonides Canuet, Tsutomu Ishihara, Yasunori Aoki, Shunichiro Ikeda, Masahiro Hata,
715 Themistoklis Katsimichas, Atsuko Gunji, Hidetoshi Takahashi, Takayuki Nakahachi, Masao Iwase,
716 and Masatoshi Takeda. 2014. "Frontal Midline Theta Rhythm and Gamma Power Changes
717 during Focused Attention on Mental Calculation: An MEG Beamformer Analysis." *Frontiers in*
718 *Human Neuroscience* 8(JUNE):1–10.

719 Jacobs, Joshua. 2014. "Hippocampal Theta Oscillations Are Slower in Humans than in Rodents:
720 Implications for Models of Spatial Navigation and Memory." *Philosophical Transactions of the*
721 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 369(1635).

722 Jung, Tzyy Ping, Scott Makeig, Colin Humphries, Te Won Lee, Martin J. Mckeown, Vicente Iragui, and
723 Terrence J. Sejnowski. 2000. "Removing Electroencephalographic Artifacts by Blind Source
724 Separation." *Psychophysiology* 37(2):163–78.

725 Kriegeskorte, Nikolaus, Martin A. Lindquist, Thomas E. Nichols, Russell A. Poldrack, and Edward Vul.
726 2010. "Everything You Never Wanted to Know about Circular Analysis, but Were Afraid to Ask."
727 *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism* 30(9):1551–57.

728 Kriegeskorte, Nikolaus, W. Kyle Simmons, Patrick S. Bellgowan, and Chris I. Baker. 2009. "Circular
729 Analysis in Systems Neuroscience: The Dangers of Double Dipping." *Nature Neuroscience*
730 12(5):535–40.

731 de la Prida, Liset Menendez. 2019. "The Theta Stone: 3 to 10 Hz Oscillations to Decipher the Human
732 Brain Code." *Epilepsy Currents* 19(2):126–28.

733 Maris, Eric and Robert Oostenveld. 2007. "Nonparametric Statistical Testing of EEG- and MEG-Data."
734 *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 164(1):177–90.

735 McCormick, Cornelia, Daniel N. Barry, Amirhossein Jafarian, Gareth R. Barnes, and Eleanor A.
736 Maguire. 2020. "VmPFC Drives Hippocampal Processing during Autobiographical Memory Recall
737 Regardless of Remoteness." *Cerebral Cortex* 1–16.

738 McCormick, Cornelia, Elisa Ciaramelli, Flavia De Luca, and Eleanor A. Maguire. 2018. "Comparing and
739 Contrasting the Cognitive Effects of Hippocampal and Ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex Damage:
740 A Review of Human Lesion Studies." *Neuroscience* 374:295–318.

741 Michel, Christoph M. and Denis Brunet. 2019. "EEG Source Imaging: A Practical Review of the
742 Analysis Steps." *Frontiers in Neurology* 10(APR).

743 Miller, Jonathan, Andrew J. Watrous, Melina Tsitsiklis, Sang Ah Lee, Sameer A. Sheth, Catherine A.
744 Schevon, Elliot H. Smith, Michael R. Sperling, Ashwini Sharan, Ali Akbar Asadi-Pooya, Gregory A.
745 Worrell, Stephen Meisenhelter, Cory S. Inman, Kathryn A. Davis, Bradley Lega, Paul A. Wanda,
746 Sandhitsu R. Das, Joel M. Stein, Richard Gorniak, and Joshua Jacobs. 2018. "Lateralized
747 Hippocampal Oscillations Underlie Distinct Aspects of Human Spatial Memory and Navigation."
748 *Nature Communications* 9(1).

749 Nakazono, Tomoaki, Heechul Jun, Mathew Blurton-Jones, Kim N. Green, and Kei M. Igarashi. 2018.
750 "Gamma Oscillations in the Entorhinal-Hippocampal Circuit Underlying Memory and Dementia."
751 *Neuroscience Research* 129:40–46.

752 Nyhus, Erika and Tim Curran. 2010. "Functional Role of Gamma and Theta Oscillations in Episodic
753 Memory." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 34(7):1023–35.

754 Oostenveld, Robert, Pascal Fries, Eric Maris, and Jan Mathijs Schoffelen. 2011. "FieldTrip: Open
755 Source Software for Advanced Analysis of MEG, EEG, and Invasive Electrophysiological Data."
756 *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* 2011.

- Osipova, Daria, Atsuko Takashima, Robert Oostenveld, Guillén Fernández, Eric Maris, and Ole Jensen. 2006. "Theta and Gamma Oscillations Predict Encoding and Retrieval of Declarative Memory." *Journal of Neuroscience* 26(28):7523–31.
- Özkurt, Tolga Esat and Alfons Schnitzler. 2011. "A Critical Note on the Definition of Phase-Amplitude Cross-Frequency Coupling." *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 201(2):438–43.
- Pernet, Cyril, Marta I. Garrido, Alexandre Gramfort, Natasha Maurits, Christoph M. Michel, Elizabeth Pang, Riitta Salmelin, Jan Mathijs Schoffelen, Pedro A. Valdes-Sosa, and Aina Puce. 2020. "Issues and Recommendations from the OHBM COBIDAS MEEG Committee for Reproducible EEG and MEG Research." *Nature Neuroscience*.
- Perrin, F., J. Pernier, O. Bertrand, and J. F. Echallier. 1989. "Spherical Splines for Scalp Potential and Current Density Mapping." *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology* 72(2):184–87.
- Petersen, Steven E. and Michael I. Posner. 2012. "The Attention System of the Human Brain: 20 Years After." *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 35:73–89.
- Ptak, Radek, Armin Schnider, and Julia Fellrath. 2017. "The Dorsal Frontoparietal Network: A Core System for Emulated Action." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 21(8):589–99.
- Ritchey, Maureen and Rose A. Cooper. 2020. "Deconstructing the Posterior Medial Episodic Network." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 24(6):451–65.
- Rolls, Edmund T., Marc Joliot, and Nathalie Tzourio-Mazoyer. 2015. "Implementation of a New Parcellation of the Orbitofrontal Cortex in the Automated Anatomical Labeling Atlas." *NeuroImage* 122:1–5.
- Rubega, M., M. Carboni, M. Seeber, D. Pascucci, S. Tourbier, G. Toscano, P. Van Mierlo, P. Hagmann, G. Plomp, S. Vulliemoz, and C. M. Michel. 2019. "Estimating EEG Source Dipole Orientation Based on Singular-Value Decomposition for Connectivity Analysis." *Brain Topography* 32(4):704–19.

781 Sederberg, Per B., Michael J. Kahana, Marc W. Howard, Elizabeth J. Donner, and Joseph R. Madsen.
782 2003. "Theta and Gamma Oscillations during Encoding Predict Subsequent Recall." *Journal of*
783 *Neuroscience* 23(34):10809–14.

784 Sederberg, Per B., Andreas Schulze-Bonhage, Joseph R. Madsen, Edward B. Bromfield, David C.
785 McCarthy, Armin Brandt, Michele S. Tully, and Michael J. Kahana. 2007. "Hippocampal and
786 Neocortical Gamma Oscillations Predict Memory Formation in Humans." *Cerebral Cortex*
787 17(5):1190–96.

788 Šidák, Zbyněk. 1967. "Rectangular Confidence Regions for the Means of Multivariate Normal
789 Distributions." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 62(318):626–33.

790 Sirota, Anton, Sean Montgomery, Shigeyoshi Fujisawa, Yoshikazu Isomura, Michael Zugaro, and
791 György Buzsáki. 2008. "Entrainment of Neocortical Neurons and Gamma Oscillations by the
792 Hippocampal Theta Rhythm." *Neuron* 60(4):683–97.

793 Stam, C. J. and E. C. W. van Straaten. 2012. "Go with the Flow: Use of a Directed Phase Lag Index
794 (DPLI) to Characterize Patterns of Phase Relations in a Large-Scale Model of Brain Dynamics."
795 *NeuroImage* 62(3):1415–28.

796 Svoboda, Eva, Margaret C. McKinnon, and Brian Levine. 2006. "The Functional Neuroanatomy of
797 Autobiographical Memory: A Meta-Analysis." *Neuropsychologia* 44(12):2189–2208.

798 Tort, Adriano B. L., Mark A. Kramer, Catherine Thorn, Daniel J. Gibson, Yasuo Kubota, Ann M.
799 Graybiel, and Nancy J. Kopell. 2008. "Dynamic Cross-Frequency Couplings of Local Field
800 Potential Oscillations in Rat Striatum and Hippocampus during Performance of a T-Maze Task."
801 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
802 105(51):20517–22.

803 Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., B. Landeau, D. Papathanassiou, F. Crivello, O. Etard, N. Delcroix, B. Mazoyer,
804 and M. Joliot. 2002. "Automated Anatomical Labeling of Activations in SPM Using a

805 Macroscopic Anatomical Parcellation of the MNI MRI Single-Subject Brain.” *NeuroImage*
806 15(1):273–89.

807 Vann, Seralynne D., John P. Aggleton, and Eleanor A. Maguire. 2009. “What Does the Retrosplenial
808 Cortex Do?” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 10(11):792–802.

809 Vogt, Brent A. 2016. “Midcingulate Cortex: Structure, Connections, Homologies, Functions and
810 Diseases.” *Journal of Chemical Neuroanatomy* 74:28–46.

811 Wang, Regina W. Y., Wei Li Chang, Shang Wen Chuang, and I. Ning Liu. 2019. “Posterior Cingulate
812 Cortex Can Be a Regulatory Modulator of the Default Mode Network in Task-Negative State.”
813 *Scientific Reports* 9(1):1–12.

814 Yonelinas, Andrew P. 2013. “The Hippocampus Supports High-Resolution Binding in the Service of
815 Perception, Working Memory and Long-Term Memory.” *Behavioural Brain Research* 254:34–44.

816 Zalesky, Andrew, Alex Fornito, and Edward T. Bullmore. 2010. “Network-Based Statistic: Identifying
817 Differences in Brain Networks.” *NeuroImage* 53(4):1197–1207.

818 Zeidman, Peter and Eleanor A. Maguire. 2016. “Anterior Hippocampus: The Anatomy of Perception,
819 Imagination and Episodic Memory.” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 17(3):173–82.

820