Tracking the impact of retrieval suppression on neural memory representations

Ann-Kristin Meyer & Roland G. Benoit



MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN COGNITIVE AND BRAIN SCIENCES

Max Planck Research Group: Adaptive Memory, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig annmeyer@cbs.mpg.de



Sometimes we experience negative events that we would rather forget. Simple reminders can elicit the unwanted retrieval of such memories and thereby induce aversive emotional responses. However, previous research indicates that we can intentionally suppress such involuntary retrieval, a process that eventually can cause forgetting¹⁻³.



Hypotheses

Retrieval suppression weakens the

- i. perceived vividness,
- ii. neural representation, and
- iii. affective response of an aversive memory.



ii. Neural representation



Assessing reinstatement using representational similarity analysis ^{4,6}





- Support vector machine training: aversive vs. morphed scenes on localizer data
- Leave-one-out cross-validation, mean accuracy: 80%
- Resulting weight map applied to single-trial t-maps, indicating scene reactivation

Weaker scene reactivation for suppressed memories



• Similarity between single trial *t*-maps in pre and post phase

• Reinstatement = Same-item > Between-item similarity (i.e. all other scenes from the same condition)

A greater reduction in vividness is associated with weaker pattern reinstatement in right parahippocampal cortex



iii. Affective response

The reduction in vividness is accompanied by a reduction in the affective response

Discussion

The results extend prior evidence by showing that suppression renders aversive memories less vivid.

They also show that such impoverished recall is associated with a simultaneous decline in affect. Retrieval suppression thus does not just impair the declarative component of a memory but also attenuates its affective component^{8,9}. Critically, the neuroimaging results relate the effect of suppression to a reduced cortical reinstatement of the memory. By this, they tie the phenomenological consequence of retrieval suppression to its neural basis.



[1] Anderson, M.C., & Green, C. (2001). Nature, 410(6826), 366-369. [2] Benoit, R.G., & Anderson, M.C. (2012). Neuron, 76(2), 450-460. [3] Küpper, C.S., Benoit, R.G., Dalgleish, T., & Anderson, M.C. (2014). Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143(4), 1443. [4] Poppenk, J., & Norman, K.A. (2014). Journal of Neuroscience, 34(23), 010-8020. [5] Hebart, M.N., Görgen, K., & Haynes, J.D. (2015). Frontiers in neuroinformatics, 8, 88. [6] Kriegeskorte, N., Mur, M., & Bandettini, P.A. (2008). Frontiers in SystemsNeuroscience, 2, 4. [7] Staresina, B.P., Henson, R.N., Kriegeskorte, N., & Alink, A. (2012). The Journal of Neuroscience, 32(50), 18150-18156. [8] Gagnepain, P., Hulbert, J., & Anderson, M.C. (2017). The Journal of Neuroscience, 37 (27) 6423-644.

[9] Depue, B.E., Curran, T., & Banich, M.T. (2007). Science, 317(5835), 215-219.