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# **ABSTRACT**
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# **INTRODUCTION**

Novel item presentation induces a mnemonic enhancement of salient items among lists of related items which is known as the Von Restorff effect (Von Restorff, 1933). Precisely, in the presence of an emotionally salient item the mnemonic enhancement is often accompanied by an anterograde (Angelini et al., 1994) and retrograde amnesic effect (Strange et al., 2003; Tulving, 1968). Memory enhancement for emotional words has been widely reported (Schmidt and Schmidt, 2016; Strange et al., 2003), however there have been mixed findings regarding the mnemonic effects on the words preceding and following the oddballs which has been shown to be modulated by SOA, retention intervals and arousal characteristics of the items (Schmidt and Schmidt, 2016). While some suggest that amnesic effects on items surrounding an oddball occur at very short SOAs (< 2 seconds) (Schmidt and Schmidt, 2016; Tulving, 1968) others have found this effect in longer SOAs (3 seconds) (Strange et al., 2003). These timing effects on oddball memory and its amnesic effects for surrounding items remain to be studied in oddball paradigms where the only manipulation is timing.

It has been proposed that this memory enhancement for oddballs arises as a result to increased arousal, via amygdalar-frontoparietal interactions which leads to increased attention to salient items at encoding that eventually leads to their enhanced recall (Mather and Sutherland, 2011). This memory enhancement they suggest often comes at the cost of lower memory for surrounding items that are not as relevant as the target (Mather and Sutherland, 2011; Strange et al., 2003), therefore, providing a framework by which arousal could explain the amnesic effects in oddball paradigms in items surrounding the oddball. Besides these behavioral theories, neurobiological approaches to explain the retrograde amnesic effects have centered around arousal, valence and the noradrenergic system as this effect is modulated by noradrenaline, specifically, it appears absent upon administration of a 12-adrenergic antagonist (Hurlemann et al., 2005; Strange et al., 2003). This has been proposed to occur as an encoding disruption at the synaptic and/or systems level (Strange et al., 2003; Strange and Galarza-Vallejo, 2016). Others, however, have proposed that the amnesic effects, specifically retrograde amnesic effects in free recall, could be due to item unavailability at retrieval and can be reversed by cueing recall (Detterman, 1976). Furthermore, it remains possible that pharmacological influences were still present at the time of retrieval (Hurlemann et al., 2005), complicating untangling encoding vs. retrieval effects on emotion-induced retrograde amnesia.

To provide more insight on free recall and interitem organization Kahana (1996) developed a quantitative method to analyze free recall data termed conditional response probability (CRP). CRP quantifies, under the fact that x is immediately followed by y, the probability of recalling item x, given that item y is recalled (Kahana, 1996) and is characterized by the generalizable findings that 1) recall transitions are more likely to be amongst contiguous items and 2) to occur in the forward direction (Kahana, 1996). These *lag contiguity* properties can be accounted for by considering a strengthening of inter-item associations and their shared context when they spend more time together in the short-term storage (Raaijmakers and Shiffrin, 1980). At time of recall, recollection of an item serves as a contextual cue for the recollection of related items explained by the *temporal context model* (Howard and Kahana, 1999)*.* More recently Polyn et al (2009) expanded this work, by developing the Context Maintenance and Retrieval (CMR) model, to distinguish between different types of contexts that affect item encoding and recall dynamics: temporal context refers to items that were studied close in time, source context which refers to the source commonalities among items and, lastly, semantic relatedness (Polyn et al., 2009).

Electrophysiological studies have further confirmed these theories and computational models by providing neural evidence of context reinstatement; specifically, patterns of neural activity when recalling an item are similar to those when studying the item itself as well as neighboring items and this similarity decreases the further away two items are from each other (Folkerts et al., 2018; Manning et al., 2011). Neural evidence of the behavioral lag contiguity effect as a recovery of temporal context during retrieval is present in both recordings from the hippocampus and amygdala (Folkerts et al., 2018).

To address enhanced memory for emotional items and an amnesic effect for its surrounding items in oddball tasks in the context of the CMR computational model, Talmi et al. (2019) developed a variation of the model: the emotional CMR (eCMR). Talmi et al. (2019) showed in simulated data, that increasing attention to the oddball at encoding would increase its link to temporal context and help promote its recall. However, due to the fact that the oddball has a different source context than the rest of items in a study list, there would be a decrease in source and semantic similarity between the oddball and the rest of items (Talmi et al., 2019).

At first glance, the core features of the lag contiguity effect are conflicting with the findings that recall of words nearby an oddball are less well-remembered (Strange et al., 2003). However, the eCMR model explained these effects by positing that the oddball presentation produced a source context switch which disrupts temporal context therefore, hindering the recall of the items near the oddball (Talmi et al., 2019). This was further explained by applying the model to simulated recall data in which they reported decreased CRP of items following the oddball i.e a decreased likelihood of retrieving items presented right after the oddball (Talmi et al., 2019). Although the eCMR model has provided a framework to expand the CMR model to the recall of lists containing an emotional oddball, this has yet to be investigated empirically.

In the context of the computational models of recall abovementioned, a strong contextual change, produced by an oddball presentation, would predict a contextual item association shift from the oddball presentation onwards. We would expect oddballs to be recalled early on (Elhalal et al., 2014; Talmi et al., 2019). Given the shift in source context, we would anticipate for items studied after the oddball at encoding to be strongly coupled with the oddballs at retrieval, and therefore, for items following the oddball to show enhanced CRP. Specifically, we hypothesize this forward lag contiguity enhancement to account for the retrograde amnesic effect.

All in all, in the present study we aim to investigate oddball effects, using emotional and perceptual oddballs, in a sample of 70 healthy young participants, on a Spanish version of the oddball free recall paradigm originally reported in Strange et al. (2003). Previously reported retrograde amnesia effects (Angelini et al., 1994; Schmidt and Schmidt, 2016; Tulving, 1968) were limited in temporal duration, spanning to the order of 1 second. Therefore, in the present task we aim at 1) investigating how recall patterns are modulated by timing (SOA) by introducing 5 different SOAs (1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 seconds) which were fixed within a list. Furthermore, we recorded the order in which nouns were recalled and studied in order to 2) apply computational models to empirical data to evaluate how the presentation of an oddball modulates recall and 3) investigate whether there is a forward-contiguity enhancement and how it influences the recall of the words preceding the oddball.

# **METHODS**

**Subjects.** Seventy healthy right-handed native Spanish-speaking subjects took part in this study [35 male, 35 female (age range, 18–32 yr; mean age, 22.5)]. All subjects gave informed consent and were free of neurological or psychiatric history. The study had full ethical approval from the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid ethics committee.

**Task.** Subjects were presented with forty lists of 14 nouns with the words ‘‘New List’’ presented between lists. For each list, 13 of the nouns were of the same semantic category, emotionally neutral, and were all presented in the same font. These are referred to as control nouns. To set the context, the first five nouns in each list were always control nouns. Twenty lists contained an emotional oddball, aversive in content but of the same category and perceptually identical to control nouns. The remaining 20 lists contained a perceptual oddball. All oddballs were presented at the 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th or 12th serial position. All nouns were presented in Times font, except for perceptual oddballs, which were presented in 20 different fonts. The order of oddball list type was random. Nouns were presented visually in lowercase for 800 ms. Subjects made a push-button response to indicate whether the first letter in each noun contained an enclosed space (shallow encoding task). The critical manipulation was that the rate of stimulus presentation was randomly varied at a stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 s. Thus, for each of the 20 lists for each oddball type, 4 of these lists were presented at a given SOA. Subjects were informed of the presentation rate in each forthcoming list, by presenting the SOA under the “New List” marker.

|  |
| --- |
| Descripción: Descripción: Descripción: Ejemplo de presentacion de palabras EXP |
| **Figure 1.** Example of items used in the task where E and P are the emotional and perceptual oddballs respectively. -2, -1 or +1 indicate the two (or one) items preceding the oddballs and +1 indicates the item following the oddball. |

The presentation of each 14-word list was followed immediately by a 30-s distraction task, during which subjects were instructed to count backwards in threes (out loud). The distractor task was followed immediately by instructions to free-recall the words presented in the preceding list. Recall performance in the experiment is expressed relative to one randomly selected control noun in each list. The chosen control nouns, like the oddballs, could not occur within the first five nouns of each list and were at least 3 serial positions apart from oddball nouns.

**Stimuli.** Lists were based on those presented in Strange et al. (2003), translated from English to Spanish, and normed for emotional valence and semantic relatedness by a separate group of 11 native Spanish-speaking subjects [Five male, six female (age range, 25-34 yr; mean age, 30.2)].

**Analyses.** Lists that contained data collecting errors (e.g missing data, repeats) were excluded from all analyses (11 emotional lists, 6 perceptual lists). All analyses were conducted using MATLAB (R2019b, The MathWorks, Inc). Statistical analyses and figures were conducted on Rstudio (version 1.3.1093) All data was tested for normal distribution using Shapiro-Wilk or QQ plots, Greenhouse-Geisser sphericity correction was applied when appropriate.

Conditional probability analyses were conducted using the Behavioral Toolbox for Matlab\_R2019b (<http://memory.psych.upenn.edu/Behavioral_toolbox>) or a variation of this toolbox manipulated by the experimenters in case of the cases where the CRPs were investigated for the words recalled one serial position before or after the oddball. All analyses and visualization were on lags 5 as done in (Healey et al., 2019; Michael J Kahana, 1996).

# **RESULTS**

## **Emotional and perceptual oddballs are remembered rather late during recall and primacy effects are preserved**

We assessed the overall probability of first recall in our dataset, including the first two recalled items. We conducted a three-way RM ANOVA (serial position x recall x oddball type). We aimed to investigate not only the effects of oddball type and serial position but also to assess whether recalling an oddball produced a change in the probability of first recall curves. There was a significant recall (F(1.00, 69.00)=5.19, p=0.03) but no significant main effect of oddball type (F(1.00, 69.00)=0.40, p=0.53); uncorrected post-hoc t-tests showed a primacy effect as words encoded in the first serial positions (specially 1 and 2) had a higher probability of recall compared to all other items in both list types (p<0.0001) (Fig. 2). Furthermore, we found a significant interaction between serial position\*recall (F(8.52, 590.75)=5.62, p<0.001) indicating that the probability of first recall only including trials in which the oddball recalled was enhanced compared to all trials (t(1959)=-1.44, p<0.0001). There was no significant interaction between oddball type \* serial position (F(8.08, 557.16)=0.71, p=0.69), oddball type\*recall (F(1.00, 69.00)=0.10, p=0.76) nor a significant three-way interaction between oddball type\*serial position\*recall (F(7.85, 541.90)=0.68, p=0.71). The counting backwards distractor task correctly abolished recency effects in all conditions.

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, histogram  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 2.** Graphs show probability of first recall; bars represent mean. Both graphs show a strong primacy effect in emotional and perceptual lists which is enhanced in trials in which the oddball was recalled. |

To further investigate whether the oddballs were recalled early-on we calculated the relative recall position of the oddballs to all the words recalled in each list across all trials in which the oddball was recalled. A Wilcoxon rank sum unpaired test showed that emotional oddballs were recalled significantly later than perceptual oddballs (W=395538; p<0.0001) (Fig. 3).

|  |
| --- |
| Diagram  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 3**. Bars show mean SEM. Graph shows the relative recall position of the E (emotional oddball) and P(perceptual oddball). Emotional items were recalled slightly later than perceptual oddballs (p<0.0001). |

We confirmed a primacy effect was maintained and enhanced in trials in which the oddball was recalled. However, contrary to what we expected, both emotional and perceptual oddballs were remembered later-on in recall at a relative recall position of approximately 0.6 [emotional oddballs (0.65); perceptual oddballs (0.59)]. Picture an item recalled on the 6th position out of a total of 6 items recalled; that would produce a relative recall position of 1; whereas an item recalled on the 1st position, would have a relative recall of 0.67.

## **Items preceding and following emotional and perceptual oddballs are less well-remembered than the oddballs**

We next sought to investigate overall recall of the oddballs and the items nearby to investigate whether the previously-reported retrograde and anterograde (Strange et al., 2003) amnesic effects in the words near the oddball were present in the present version of the task.

A repeated measures two-way ANOVA (word position x oddball type) showed a significant main effect of word position (F(3,207)=55.19, p<0.0001) and a trend towards significance in oddball type (F(1, 69)=3.44, p=0.07) as well a significant interaction between the two factors (F(3, 207)=3.61, p=0.01). Uncorrected post-hoc t-test showed a significant enhancement in oddball recall compared to its nearby items (vs. odd-1 t(139)=-10.75, p<0.0001; vs. odd-2 t(139)=-9.5, p<0.0001; vs. odd+1 t(139)=10.41, p<0.0001). Furthermore, emotional oddballs were significantly better recalled than perceptual oddballs (t(69)=3.93, p<0.001) (Fig. 4A).

To better investigate the retrograde amnesic effect and the pattern of recall of the items presented right before the oddballs at encoding (oddball-1) we conducted a contingency analysis to calculate the proportion of recalled/forgotten oddball-1 items upon recall of the oddballs. Both emotional and perceptual lists showed a significant item co-dependency (emotional lists 2 (1)=65.72, p<0.0001; perceptual lists 2(1)=11.76, p=0.0006 ) which show that memory for the oddball does not come at cost of memory for its preceding item but rather it enhances it (Fig. 4B, C).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chart, box and whisker chart  Description automatically generated  A | |
| Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated  B | Chart  Description automatically generated  C |
| **Figure 4.** All graphs show mean SEM.A) Graph showing the proportion of normalized recalled words (minus control) items across word positions, oddball (odd), -2 (item presented two serial positions preceding the oddball at encoding), -1 (item presented one serial position preceding the oddball at encoding), +1 (item presented one serial position after the oddball at encoding). B and C) Contingency analyses tables showing the proportion of words recalled in each condition for emotional and perceptual lists, respectively. Oddballs were better recalled than its surrounding items; recalling an oddball did not come at cost of recalling its surrounding items. | |

We found an overall mnemonic enhancement of both emotional and perceptual oddballs accompanied with an anterograde and retrograde amnesia for items preceding and following the oddballs at encoding. These effects are less pronounced than in the English and German versions of the same task in (Strange et al., 2003).

## **Recall patterns in an oddball task are modulated by SOA**

Previous literature had shown conflicting results regarding SOA manipulations and their effect on retrograde and anterograde amnesia. In the present study we modulated item presentation by variating SOAs to 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 seconds.

We ran a three-way RM ANOVA (oddball type x SOA x word position). There was a trend towards a significant main effect of oddball type (F(1,69)=3.33, p=0.07), indicating, at a trend level, that overall emotional lists were better remembered than perceptual ones. There was also a significant main effect of SOA (F(4, 276)=3.87, p=0.004) which showed, that at SOA 1 second all words were less well remembered than at SOAs 2, 3 and 6 (vs. 2 t(559)=-3.78, p<0.0001; vs. 3 t(559)=-3.76, p<0.0001; vs. 6 t(559)=-5.11, p<0.0001). Furthermore, words showed at SOA 4 were less well remembered than at SOAs 2 (t(559)=2.90, p<0.05), 3 (t(559)=2.81, p<0.05) and 6 (t(559)=-4.03, p<0.0001). The results showed a main effect of word position (F(3,207)=55.87, p<0.001) in which the oddball, regardless of oddball type and SOA, was always better remembered than its surrounding items (p<0.001 vs. all items). Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between oddball type\*word position (F(3,207)=3.55, p=0.02); showing that emotional oddballs were better recalled than perceptual ones (t(349)=3.34, p<0.001). Importantly there were no significant interactions between oddball type\*SOA (F(4,276)=1.50, p=0.20), SOA\*word position (F(12,828)=1.21, p=0.27) nor a significant three-way interaction between oddball type\*SOA\*word position (F(12,828)=1.14, p=0.33). All in all, these results indicate that longer SOAs show a trend to increased memory compared to shorter ones, however, since we found no significant interactions between SOA and oddball type or word position we did not further investigate the issue with follow-up post-hoc tests.

We conducted contingency analyses to evaluate whether enhanced memory for oddballs came at the expense of its preceding items i.e to investigate if the proportion of words recalled/forgotten depending on whether the oddballs were recalled/forgotten changed across SOAs and oddball types. Contingency analyses showed a co-dependency in emotional lists across all SOAs: SOA 1(2(1)=7.36, p=0.007), SOA 2 (2(1)=38.72, p<0.0001), SOA 3 (2(1)=4.55, p=0.03), SOA 4 (2(1)=7.15, p=0.008) and SOA 6 (2(1)=7.15, p=0.008). While at short SOAs there was a higher amount of forgotten E-1 items, this effect changed as SOA increased where there was a higher amount of recalled emotional oddballs. However, this co-dependency was not present in perceptual lists: SOA 1(2(1)=0.50, p=0.48), SOA 2 (2(1)=3.71, p=0.05), SOA 3 (2(1)=0.46, p=0.50), SOA 4 (2(1)=2.99 p=0.08), SOA 6 (2(1)=2.99 , p=0.08).

|  |
| --- |
| Chart  Description automatically generated  A |
| **Emotional Lists**  B   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated | Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated | | Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated | Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated | | Chart, bar chart  Description automatically generated | | |
| **Perceptual Lists**  C   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **A picture containing chart  Description automatically generated** | **Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated** | | **Chart  Description automatically generated** | **Chart, treemap chart  Description automatically generated** | | **Chart  Description automatically generated** | | |
| **Figure 5.** Modulation of normalized recall and contingency tables as a function of SOA. A) Bars show normalized recall (- control) with mean SEM by SOA. All contingency tables are shown to compare memory for oddballs and items at oddball-1 serial positions. B) Contingency tables that contain emotional lists across SOAs. C) Contingency tables that contain perceptual lists across SOAs. |

## **The influence of emotional and perceptual oddballs on Conditional Response Probability Curves**

Analyses focused on lags 5 for both statistical analyses as well as visualization purposes.

### **Do conditional response probability curves preserve a forward-contiguity effect?**

Firstly, we evaluated CRP curves in both emotional and perceptual oddball lists. A three-way RM ANOVA (oddball type x lag x direction) showed a significant main effect of oddball type (F(1,69)=4.07, p=0.048), lag (F(2.95,203.77)=105.11, p<0.0001) and lag x direction interaction (F(3.06, 210.95)=13.58, p<0.0001). Uncorrected post-hoc t-tests showed enhanced CRP for contiguous lags, specifically lags 1 and 2 as well as a significant forward effect for lags 1 (t(139)=-5.11, p<0.0001) and 5 (t(139)=4.15, p<0.0001). Consistently, we did not find a significant main effect of direction (F(1,69)=1.61, p=0.21), oddball type x lag (F(4, 276)=0.93, p=0.47), oddball x direction (F(1,69)=0.252, p=0.62) nor a significant 3-way interaction F(4,276)=0.54, p=0.71). Overall, CRP curves showed a preserved forward-contiguity effect i.e words nearby each other were more likely to be recalled and more so in the forwards direction.

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 6.** CRP curves show a preserved forward-contiguity effect for both emotional and perceptual oddball lists. |

### **Are conditional response probability curves modulated by oddball recall?**

We next investigated whether CRP curves were modulated depending on whether oddballs were remembered or forgotten. A 4-way RM ANOVA (oddball type x lag x direction x recall) showed a significant main effect of lag (F(3.24, 220.23)=96.75, p<0.0001) as well as lag x direction (F(3.24, 220.34)=10.20, p<0.0001). Post-hoc uncorrected t-tests showed that contiguity effect was preserved (specially at lags 1 and 2) as well as a forward effect at lags 1 (t(279)=-4.70, p<0.0001) and 5 (t(278)=3.64, p<0.001). Furthermore, we found a significant main effect of recall (F(1,68)=43.33, p<0.0001) which showed overall enhanced CRP curves for lists where oddballs were recalled (Fig. 7). We found no significant main effects of oddball types (F(1, 68)=0.91, p=0.35), direction (F(1, 68)=0.34, p=0.56), oddball x lag (F(4, 272)=1.51, p=0.20), oddball x direction (F(1, 68)=0.55, p=0.46), oddball x recall (F(1, 68)=0.77, p=0.38), lag x recall (F(4,272)=1.09, p=0.36) nor a significant direction x recall (F(1, 68)=1.19, p=0.28).

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 7.** CRP curves showed a preserved forward-contiguity effect both when items were recalled as well as forgotten. Lists in which emotional oddballs were recalled showed overall enhanced CRP curves compared to those that were not. |

### **Do transitions to and from oddballs modulate conditional response probability curves?**

Our main hypothesis was that transitions from the oddballs would show enhanced CRP curves due to a strong contextual change which would help as anchor to strongly move forwards in recall, thereby, contributing to the retrograde amnesic effect.

We calculated CRP curves in items right before oddballs (to evaluate transitions to the oddballs) or in items right after the oddballs (to evaluate transitions from the oddballs). Again, we found a significant main effect of lag (F(4, 36)=0.02, which showed a contiguity effect for lag 1 (p<0.001), a trend of direction (F(1,9)=4.63, p=0.06) and, importantly, a significant oddball x transition interaction (F(1,9)=14.34, p=0.004) which showed an enhancement in CRP in transitions from emotional oddballs compared to perceptual oddballs (t(573)=4.47, p<0.0001) as well as a significant difference in transitions to emotional oddballs vs. transitions from emotional oddballs (t(584)=4.18, p<0.0001) (Fig. 8). None of the other effects reached significant levels.

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 8.** CRP curves in transitions to and from emotional and perceptual oddballs. Transitions from emotional oddballs show enhanced CRP compared to perceptual oddball lists. |

## **Does enhanced forward contiguity in emotional oddball lists explain retrograde amnesia?**

In lists containing emotional and perceptual oddballs we found that while transitions to the oddballs preserved a contiguity effect, the forward effect was disrupted (Fig. 8). However, in transitions from emotional oddballs there was an enhancement in the CRP curves as we hypothesized. We next ought to test whether this CRP enhancement in transitions from emotional oddballs (specially at lag +1) explained retrograde amnesia for E-1 items. A Spearman’s rank correlation, however, did not show a significant relationship between the two variables (rho=-0.04, p=0.76) (Fig 9).

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, scatter chart  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 9.** Spearman’s correlation between normalized recall values of E-1 items and CRP values at lag +1 in transitions from emotional oddballs. |

Considering that, on average, contrary to what we expected, the relative recall positions of the oddballs was rather late (Fig. 3) we investigated whether E-1 recall changed depending on the recall position of emotional oddballs. Indeed, we found that when emotional oddballs were recalled at late positions, recall moved in the forwards direction from E-1 items to emotional oddballs. However, when oddballs were recalled early on, recall moved in the backwards direction (from emotional oddballs to E-1 oddballs) (Fig. 10).

|  |
| --- |
| Chart, scatter chart  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure 10.** Plot shows the recall pattern relationship between emotional oddballs and E-1 oddballs. X axis shows the recall position of emotional oddballs whilst y axis shows the recall position of emotional oddballs minus the recall position of E-1 items. Therefore, negative values show a *forwards recall* (E-1 to E) whilst positive values show a *backwards recall* (E to E-1). |

# **DISCUSSION**

* Previous studies (including Bryan) have focused on the noradrenergic system and encoding disruptions to explain retrograde amnesia. However, this suggest that the retrograde amnesia could also be due to retrieval effects.
* Arousal/valence differences in the Spanish version vs. English/German 🡪 we found less of a strong amnesia than in the English/German version (strange 2003).
* ‘’good memory for emotional stimuli often comes at the expense of poor memory for subsequent, and, to a lesser extent, preceding information.’’ 🡪 quote from Schmidt and Schmidt 🡪 this is opposite to what we find. Enhanced memory for the oddball does NOT come at the expense of memory for surrounding items except for short SOAs (1 second) in this version of the task.
* think about different types of salience and arousal/valence modulation as emotional odd could be ‘top-down’ modulated as salience is dependent on our previous world knowledge vs. perceptual odds ‘bottom-up’ as salience is given by the items perceptual characteristics.
* the eCRP model by Talmi predicted something different than what we found empirically (see Fig 8 from Talmi 2019). What she predicted is in line with our *perceptual* oddball findings? (I need to think more about this)
* bad memory overall (due to selection of control items? bryans previous 2003 paper had used 2 oddballs in one list).

## **Can retrograde amnesia be explained as competition between the items preceding and following the oddball at retrieval?**

Our initial hypothesis that oddballs would be recalled early-on and have enhanced forward contiguity which would explain retrograde amnesic effects was partly rejected.

Given that emotional oddballs are remembered late in recall and that we observed a disruption in forward contiguity in transitions to the emotional oddballs (Fig 1C), indicating that transitions to the oddball could equally occur from items preceding/following the oddball we decided to test the hypothesis that the induced retrograde amnesia could be explained as changes in recall transitions to the emotional oddballs. In the following analyses, unlike in the CRP analyses, we included the first two items recalled in order to investigate the true relative recall positions. The upcoming analyses were conducted on a list-by-list basis and, therefore, were corrected for multiple comparisons.

Firstly, we investigated the relative recall of E-1, E and E+1 in trials in which all three items were recalled. Friedman’s test showed a significant effect (p=0.0034) which we followed up with FDR t-tests which showed a significant difference between the relative recall of E-1 and E (p=0.001) as well as between E-1 and E+1 (p=0.02).

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Figure X.** Graphs represent the relative recall position (position recalled/total items recalled per list). Bars are meanSEM. E-1 (item preceding the emotional oddball at encoding), E (emotional oddball), E+1 (item following the emotional oddball at encoding). \*\* p<0.005, \*p<0.05 |

These results are consistent with the CRP graph (Fig 1C) which showed that transitions to the oddball were equally likely to occur from words preceding and words following the oddball at encoding. Visual inspection of Fig 1C shows a slight enhancement of lag -1; consistent with Fig X. which shows that E and E+1 items are recalled at the same relative position i.e higher probability of transitioning from serial position 8 to reach the oddball at serial position 7.

Considering the core-finding that there is forward contiguity in recall and consistent with our previous findings (Fig 1A, 1B) we next evaluated the relative recall positions of E-1, E and E+1 items excluding trials in which E-1 and E items were recalled last and, therefore, allowed ‘space’ for E+1 to be recalled. Friedman’s test showed a main effect (p<0.0001) and follow up FDR corrected multiple comparisons showed a significant difference in relative recall position between E-1 and E (p=0.0005), E-1 vs. E+1 (p<0.0001) and a tendency towards a significant difference between E and E+1 (p=0.09). The present results show a tendency for a forward contiguity effect at recall in lists where all three items E-1, E and E+1 were recalled.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Figure X.** Graphs represent the relative recall position (position recalled/total items recalled per list) excluding lists in which E-1 or E were recalled last i.e giving ‘space’ for E+1 to be recalled. Bars are meanSEM. E-1 (item preceding the emotional oddball at encoding), E (emotional oddball), E+1 (item following the emotional oddball at encoding). \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, \*\*\*p<0.001. |

Given the results in Fig 1C and Fig X we evaluated whether E-1 and E+1 were competing for recall to transition to the oddball. We hypothesized that if E+1 ‘wins’ the recall competition, recall of E+1 will be earlier and will not allow E-1 to be recalled, hence producing a retrograde amnesic effect. On the other hand, if E-1 ‘wins’ the recall competition, then recall occurs conserving forward-contiguity and transitions occur from E-1 to E to E+1, thereby not producing retrograde amnesia (Fig. X). We tested this hypothesis by comparing the relative recall position of the items when E-1 was not recalled, excluding the lists when E or E+1 were recalled last.

Wilcoxon test showed that in retrograde amnesia lists, E and E+1 items were roughly recalled at the same relative recall position (p=0.27), including trials in which E+1 was recalled last did not make a significant difference (p=0.35).

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Figure X.** Graphs represent the relative recall position (position recalled/total items recalled per list) excluding lists in which E+1 or E were recalled last. Bars are meanSEM. E (emotional oddball), E+1 (item following the emotional oddball at encoding) |

When there was a retrograde amnesia (E-1 was forgotten) E and E+1 were recalled at similar relative positions, however, when E-1 won the recall competition recall moved forwards from E-1 to E to E+1, pushing E+1 to be recalled later on.

Furthermore, we conducted contingency analyses to evaluate whether indeed there was a competition between E-1 and E+1 to test hypothesis that when the emotional oddballs were recalled the proportion of E-1 items recalled with E+1 items forgotten would not differ to the proportion of E+1 items recalled with E-1 items forgotten. Chi-squared results pointed in line of this hypothesis as there was no significant co-dependency between items E-1 and E+1 (2 =0.014, p=0.91).

|  |
| --- |
| Table  Description automatically generated |
| **Figure X.** Contingency analysis tables counting the proportion of E-1 and E+1 remembered/forgotten items when the emotional oddball was recalled. |

When the emotional oddball was recalled there were no significant differences in recalling E-1 and forgetting E+1 vs. forgetting E-1 and recalling E+1, which confirms that E-1 and E+1 equally competed for recall.

**PERCEPTUAL ODDBALLS**

The items are recalled at the same time aprox regardless.

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

# **CONCLUSION**

* Previous studies (including Bryan) have focused on the noradrenergic system and encoding disruptions to explain retrograde amnesia. However, this suggest that the retrograde amnesia could also be due to retrieval effects.
* Arousal/valence differences in the Spanish version vs. English/German 🡪 we found less of a strong amnesia than in the English/German version (strange 2003).
* ‘’good memory for emotional stimuli often comes at the expense of poor memory for subsequent, and, to a lesser extent, preceding information.’’ 🡪 quote from Schmidt and Schmidt 🡪 this is opposite to what we find. Enhanced memory for the oddball does NOT come at the expense of memory for surrounding items except for short SOAs (1 second) in this version of the task.
* think about different types of salience and arousal/valence modulation as emotional odd could be ‘top-down’ modulated as salience is dependent on our previous world knowledge vs. perceptual odds ‘bottom-up’ as salience is given by the items perceptual characteristics.
* the eCRP model by Talmi predicted something different than what we found empirically (see Fig 8 from Talmi 2019). What she predicted is in line with our *perceptual* oddball findings? (I need to think more about this)
* bad memory overall (due to selection of control items? bryans previous 2003 paper had used 2 oddballs in one list).
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