Sciencexpress

and associated structures in the medial

temporal lobe (1-5), but the specific patterns of neural activity that support

these memory functions remain poorly understood. We know that, during exploration, individual neurons fire in specific regions of space (5, 6) known

as place fields. In contrast, during peri-

ods of slow movement, immobility and

slow-wave sleep, groups of neurons are

active during sharp-wave ripple (SWR) events (7, 8). This activity frequently represents a rapid timescale replay of a

past experience (9-13). SWRs that

occur during sleep contribute to

memory consolidation of preceding

experiences (14-18), and both changes in place fields and the intensity of

awake memory reactivation have been

correlated with memory performance

(19). Awake SWRs in particular can

reactivate sets of place fields encoding

forward and reverse paths associated

with both current and past locations (9-13). This reactivation has been hypothesized to contribute to multiple

Awake Hippocampal Sharp-Wave Ripples Support Spatial Memory

Shantanu P. Jadhav, Caleb Kemere, P. Walter German, Loren M. Frank*

Department of Physiology and Center for Integrative Neuroscience, University of California, San Francisco, CA 94143, USA.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: loren@phy.ucsf.edu

The hippocampus is critical for spatial learning and memory. Hippocampal neurons in awake animals exhibit place field activity that encodes current location, and sharp-wave ripple (SWR) activity during which representations based on past experiences are often replayed. The relationship between these patterns of activity and the memory functions of the hippocampus is poorly understood. We interrupted awake SWRs in animals learning a spatial alternation task. We observed a specific learning and performance deficit that persisted throughout training. This deficit was associated with awake SWR activity as SWR inerruption left place field activity and post-experience SWR reactivation intact. These results provide a link between awake SWRs and hippocampal memory processes, and suggest that awake replay of memory-related information during SWRs supports learning and memory-guided decision making.

Animals use past experience to guide decisions, an ability that requires storing memories for the events of daily life and retrieving those memories as needed. This storage and retrieval depends on the hippocampus functions including learning, retrieval, consolidation and trajectory planning (19-23). To investigate the role of awake hippocampal SWRs and to determine whether awake replay can be functionally dissociated from



Fig. 1. Experimental design and SWR disruption during behavior. (**A**) Schematic illustrating the W-track task. (**B**) Example of a normal SWR (top left), disrupted SWR (right) and control stimulation after SWR (bottom left). Each panel shows an online detected SWR in the broadband LFP (1-400 Hz). Cyan lines denote time of SWR detection; red lines denote time of vHC stimulation. The region in the gray box for the disrupted SWR is expanded below. Scale bars: 50 ms and 200 μ V. (**C**) (top) Mean normalized multiunit activity (5 ms bins) vs. stimulation intensity during calibration. Arrow denotes chosen amplitude. (bottom) Corresponding histogram for chosen amplitude with cyan line denoting baseline firing rate. Grey bar denotes spiking obscured by stimulation artifacts and fPSPs. (**D** and **E**) Z-scores of multi-unit firing rate aligned to stimulation for all sessions for the SWR disruption group (D) and the control stimulation group (E). Vertical red lines show the time of stimulation and horizontal cyan lines denote mean firing rates. (**F**) Sequence of rest and run sessions for each day.



Fig. 2. SWR disruption causes a specific impairment in the outbound, spatial working memory component of the W-track task. (**A**) Proportion correct vs. day number for outbound trials. Horizontal dotted line represents chance-level performance of 0.5. (**B**) Outbound learning curves with 90% confidence intervals for example control stimulation (left) and SWR disruption (right) animal. Background shaded areas denote days (numbers on top). Learning trial and learning day are highlighted in red. (**C**) Outbound learning day (left) and learning trial (right) for each animal (**D**) Average outbound performance on the last two days of testing (days 7-8) (**E** to **H**) Corresponding plots for inbound performance. *** represents p < 0.001, ** represents p < 0.01, * represents p < 0.05, error bars represent s.e.m.

place field activity, we selectively disrupted awake SWRs in rats learning a hippocampus-dependent W-track task (24). We have previously shown that the hippocampus frequently replays memories of past experience while animals learn this task (11).

Animals are rewarded on the W-track each time they visit the end of one of the three maze arms in the correct task sequence (center – left – center – right – center – ..., Fig. 1A). This task consists of two components: 1) "outbound" alternation component that specifies that when the animal is in the center arm, the next correct outer arm is the one opposite to the outer arm it most recently visited and 2) the "inbound" return-tocenter component that specifies that when the animal is in an outer arm it must then proceed to the center arm. Hippocampal damage impairs the rapid learning of both components, although hippocampal-lesion animals eventually learn the task (24), suggesting that other structures such as the basal ganglia and prefrontal cortex can support task performance following extended training.

We disrupted awake hippocampal SWRs on the W-track across eight days of learning using an online feedback system similar to that employed in previous studies that disrupted SWRs during post-behavior sleep (17, 18). SWRs in CA1 were detected by monitoring power in the ripple band (25) simultaneously across multiple tetrodes. Online detection of a SWR event triggered calibrated single-pulse electrical stimulation of CA3 afferents to CA1 using a bipolar stimulation electrode in the ventral hippocampal commissure (vHC, fig. S1). This terminated the ripple oscillation within 25 ms of SWR onset and transiently inhibited CA1 spiking (Fig. 1, B to E, and fig. S2) (25). We calibrated the stimulation magnitude for each animal to find the minimum current that inhibited multiunit spiking activity in CA1 for ~100 ms (Fig. 1, C to E, and fig. S2). To ensure that any observed effects were due to disruption of activity during SWRs, we used the same online detection protocol in a control group of animals, but delayed stimulation by 150-200 ms following detection (17) (Fig. 1, B and E, and fig. S2). This control stimulation left



Fig. 3. Intact place-field representations and unchanged PSPs in SWR disruption animals. (A) Place fields from SWR disruption animals across run sessions within a day. Color plots represent occupancy-normalized firing rates of place cells. Numbers on top right of each plot denote peak spatial firing rate. Cells are from days 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 (top to bottom) respectively. (B) Place field stability across days. (C) CDF of place field peak-rates. (D) CDF of place field sizes. (E) Evoked field responses during rest sessions. (Top) Example showing mean evoked field PSPs during rest sessions in a single day in a SWR disruption animal. Shaded areas represent s.e.m. Dotted black lines indicate time of stimulation. Slopes of field PSPs were measured in the 1.5-2 ms window illustrated by cyan area in the left panel. (Bottom) Slopes for the example above (left), and Z-scores of field PSP slopes in the Pre and Post rest sessions for the SWR disruption group (right).

SWR-associated spiking activity intact while still inhibiting a temporally equivalent period of hippocampal activity (Fig. 1E).

Animals in three groups, SWR disruption, control stimulation and an unimplanted, unstimulated group (n = 6, 4, 4 respectively), ran two 15 min sessions on the W-track with interleaving 15 min rest sessions (one "pre" rest session before behavior, and two "post" rest sessions after behavior) each day (Fig. 1F) for a total of eight days. Spiking activity in CA1 was monitored during all run and rest sessions in the SWR disruption and control stimulation groups. To control for the possibility that vHC stimulation could lead to changes in the synaptic strength of CA3 input to CA1, we also measured evoked field responses to 0.1 Hz probe stimulation in the intervening rest periods (Fig. 1F) (25).

SWR disruption animals were impaired on the outbound component of the task as compared to controls (Fig. 2, A to D). SWR disruption animals performed a lower proportion of correct outbound trials than the control animals across all eight days of learning (Fig. 2A; n = 6, 4, 4 animals, repeated measures (RM) ANOVA, main effect of group, p < 0.001, group x day interaction, p < 0.01; no differences between control and un-stimulated group, p's > 0.4). We also used a state-space model to estimate the trial and day on which performance was above chance for each animal (24-26) (Fig. 2B and figs. S3 to S5). SWR disruption animals learned later than controls in terms of both trials and days to criterion (Fig. 2C, rank-sum test, p's < 0.01). Further, all SWR disruption animals learned more slowly than all eight control animals and all SWR disruption animals had lower performance on days 7 and 8 than all eight control animals. These perfect separations in the rank order of learning rates and final performance would occur by chance with a probability < 0.0007. SWR disruption animals also had significantly lower performance levels on the final two days (Fig. 2D, rank-sum test, p < 0.01). Similar statistical results were obtained with the two control groups combined (25).

In contrast, SWR disruption animals performed normally in the inbound component of the task (Fig. 2E; n = 6, 4, 4 animals, RM ANOVA, main effect of group, p > 0.33, group x day interaction, p > 0.5) and had similar learning rates as compared to controls (Fig. 2F and figs. S6 to S8). Learning trial and day were similar among the SWR disruption and the control groups (Fig. 2G, rank-sum tests, p's > 0.5), and the final performance levels achieved by the animals in the last two days were also similar (Fig. 2H, rank-sum test, p > 0.48). The distinction between learning on the outbound and inbound tasks remained clear when learning curves were aligned by trial number for the three groups (fig. S9).

SWR disruption effectively suppressed hippocampal activity during SWRs but had no discernible effect on place cell representations. We examined the stability of CA1 place fields in run sessions (Fig. 3A and fig. S10), and computed the correlation between linearized place fields (11, 25, 27) of each cell across the two run sessions within each day (Fig. 3, A and B, and fig. S11). We found no difference in place field stability between place cells from the two groups (SWR disruption: n = 108 place cells, mean correlation = 0.80 ± 0.02 ; control stimulation: n = 96 cells, mean correlation = 0.81 ± 0.02 ; t test, p > 0.5) across all days (Fig. 3B; two-way ANOVA, main effect of group, p > 0.16, group x day interaction, p > 0.5; within day comparisons n.s., Bonferroni post-hoc tests). The distributions of peak rates and place field sizes for the two groups were also similar (Fig. 3, C and D; KS test, p's > 0.5). We also found no evidence that stimulation induced synaptic plasticity. We found no difference in field PSP (post-synaptic potential) slopes in response to 0.1 Hz probe stimulation between the "Pre" rest period before behavior and the "Post" rest periods after behavior compared on each day for all animals (example and Z-scores across all days in Fig. 3E, n.s., t test, p > t0.43). Further, differences in other behavior or stimulation parameters could not account for the learning deficit in the SWR disruption group. (figs. S12 to S17).

The deficit on outbound, but not inbound trials argues that loss of awake SWRs did not cause a global deficit in memory consolidation. Consistent with this, we found no evidence for alteration of the rest/sleep SWR activity associated with consolidation. Pairs of cells with overlapping place fields had theta-modulated correlations during run periods and showed increased correlations during SWRs in Post as compared to Pre rest periods (Fig. 4A), as has been observed in animals with intact hippocampal activity (14, 16, 28). For both SWR disruption and control stimulation groups, reactivation strength (Fig. 4B) was significantly correlated with place field overlap (linear regression, p's < 0.001) and with correlations during run (fig. S18; linear regression, p's < 0.001).



Fig. 4. Reactivation during SWRs in rest periods after behavior is intact. (**A**) Examples of reactivation from SWR disruption animals. (Left) Place fields for cells during run sessions. (Middle) Cross-correlations for the cell pairs during run. (Right) Cross-correlations during SWRs in rest periods. (**B**) Reactivation strength vs. place field overlap for all cell pairs in the two groups (n = 183 pairs for the SWR disruption group; n = 145 pairs for the control stimulation group). Line represents best linear fit corresponding to the r-value. (**C**) Mean SWR rate during the Pre and Post rest sessions. Error bars represent s.e.m.

SWR rates in the rest periods were also similar for the SWR disruption and control stimulation groups (Fig. 4C and fig. S18).

Our observation of intact place fields, intact reactivation during rest SWRs and intact inbound performance suggests that place fields and post-experience reactivation are sufficient to support learning and performance of the inbound trials. As hippocampal lesions disrupt learning on the inbound component, place cell activity may be important for learning and applying the inbound rule. More broadly, place cell activity could provide information about current position that promotes rapid learning and application of location-specific rules (fig. S19).

The specific performance deficit observed in SWR disruption animals provides a causal link between awake hippocampal SWRs and the spatial memory requirements of outbound trials. Learning of the outbound rule requires linking immediate and more remote past experience to reward (fig. S19), and the observed replay of both recent and remote experiences during awake SWRs (11-13) is well suited to contribute to this learning. Applying the outbound rule in the center arm requires knowledge of current location, memory for immediate past outer arm location and the ability to use that memory to plan and execute a movement to the opposite outer arm. This memory-guided decision making process has been referred to as "spatial working memory" (2, 4). Impaired outbound performance in the SWR disruption group on later days (Fig. 2), even after most animals performed above chance, suggests a spatial working memory impairment. Additional evidence for this was provided by a decline in performance in three of the animals from the control stimulation group which were switched to SWR disruption on days 9 and 10 (fig. S20). Forward and backward replay of both past and possible future trajectories during SWRs (9-13, 21) may therefore contribute to outbound performance. Conversely, we would predict that manipulations that cause selective spatial working memory deficits, such as the removal of parvalbumin positive interneurons in CA1 and GluR1 knockout at the CA3-CA1 synapse (29, 30), have their impact primarily as a result of disrupting awake replay processes. Thus, we hypothesize that the forward and reverse replay of local and spatially remote paths seen during awake replay provides information about past locations and possible future options (fig. S19) to structures such as the prefrontal cortex that use this information to learn the outbound alternation rule and to subsequently apply the learned rule to guide behavior.

References and Notes

- L. R. Squire, Memory and the hippocampus: A synthesis from findings with rats, monkeys, and humans. *Psychol. Rev.* 99, 195 (1992). <u>doi:10.1037/0033-295X.99.2.195 Medline</u>
- 2. H. Eichenbaum, N. J. Cohen, From Conditioning to Conscious Recollection (Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 2001).
- G. Riedel *et al.*, Reversible neural inactivation reveals hippocampal participation in several memory processes. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2, 898 (1999). <u>doi:10.1038/13202 Medline</u>
- D. S. Olton, J. T. Becker, G. E. Handelmann, Hippocampus, space, and memory. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 2, 313 (1979). <u>doi:10.1017/S0140525X00062713</u>
- J. O'Keefe, L. Nadel, *The Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map* (Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1978).
- M. A. Wilson, B. L. McNaughton, Dynamics of the hippocampal ensemble code for space. *Science* 261, 1055 (1993). <u>doi:10.1126/science.8351520</u> <u>Medline</u>
- G. Buzsáki, Hippocampal sharp waves: Their origin and significance. Brain Res. 398, 242 (1986). doi:10.1016/0006-8993(86)91483-6 Medline
- J. O'Neill, T. Senior, J. Csicsvari, Place-selective firing of CA1 pyramidal cells during sharp wave/ripple network patterns in exploratory behavior. *Neuron* 49, 143 (2006). <u>doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2005.10.037 Medline</u>
- D. J. Foster, M. A. Wilson, Reverse replay of behavioural sequences in hippocampal place cells during the awake state. *Nature* 440, 680 (2006). doi:10.1038/nature04587 Medline
- K. Diba, G. Buzsáki, Forward and reverse hippocampal place-cell sequences during ripples. *Nat. Neurosci.* 10, 1241 (2007). <u>doi:10.1038/nn1961 Medline</u>
- M. P. Karlsson, L. M. Frank, Awake replay of remote experiences in the hippocampus. *Nat. Neurosci.* 12, 913 (2009). doi:10.1038/nn.2344 Medline
- T. J. Davidson, F. Kloosterman, M. A. Wilson, Hippocampal replay of extended experience. *Neuron* 63, 497 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2009.07.027 Medline
- A. S. Gupta, M. A. van der Meer, D. S. Touretzky, A. D. Redish, Hippocampal replay is not a simple function of experience. *Neuron* 65, 695 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.01.034 Medline
- M. A. Wilson, B. L. McNaughton, Reactivation of hippocampal ensemble memories during sleep. *Science* 265, 676 (1994). <u>doi:10.1126/science.8036517 Medline</u>
- G. Buzsáki, The hippocampo-neocortical dialogue. Cereb. Cortex 6, 81 (1996). doi:10.1093/cercor/6.2.81 Medline
- H. S. Kudrimoti, C. A. Barnes, B. L. McNaughton, Reactivation of hippocampal cell assemblies: effects of behavioral state, experience, and EEG dynamics. J. Neurosci. 19, 4090 (1999). <u>Medline</u>
- G. Girardeau, K. Benchenane, S. I. Wiener, G. Buzsáki, M. B. Zugaro, Selective suppression of hippocampal ripples impairs spatial memory. *Nat. Neurosci.* 12, 1222 (2009). doi:10.1038/nn.2384 Medline
- V. Ego-Stengel, M. A. Wilson, Disruption of ripple-associated hippocampal activity during rest impairs spatial learning in the rat. *Hippocampus* 20, 1 (2010). <u>Medline</u>
- D. Dupret, J. O'Neill, B. Pleydell-Bouverie, J. Csicsvari, The reorganization and reactivation of hippocampal maps predict spatial memory performance. *Nat. Neurosci.* 13, 995 (2010). doi:10.1038/nn.2599 Medline
- J. O'Neill, B. Pleydell-Bouverie, D. Dupret, J. Csicsvari, Play it again: Reactivation of waking experience and memory. *Trends Neurosci.* 33, 220 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.tins.2010.01.006 Medline
- M. F. Carr, S. P. Jadhav, L. M. Frank, Hippocampal replay in the awake state: A potential substrate for memory consolidation and retrieval. *Nat. Neurosci.* 14, 147 (2011). <u>doi:10.1038/nn.2732 Medline</u>

- A. C. Singer, L. M. Frank, Rewarded outcomes enhance reactivation of experience in the hippocampus. *Neuron* 64, 910 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2009.11.016 Medline
- S. Cheng, L. M. Frank, New experiences enhance coordinated neural activity in the hippocampus. *Neuron* 57, 303 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2007.11.035 Medline
- 24. S. M. Kim, L. M. Frank, Hippocampal lesions impair rapid learning of a continuous spatial alternation task. *PLoS ONE* 4, e5494 (2009). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005494 Medline
- 25. See supplementary materials on Science Online.
- A. C. Smith *et al.*, Dynamic analysis of learning in behavioral experiments. J. Neurosci. 24, 447 (2004). doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2908-03.2004 Medline
- G. Dragoi, K. D. Harris, G. Buzsáki, Place representation within hippocampal networks is modified by long-term potentiation. *Neuron* 39, 843 (2003). <u>doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00465-3 Medline</u>
- 28. J. O'Neill, T. J. Senior, K. Allen, J. R. Huxter, J. Csicsvari, Reactivation of experience-dependent cell assembly patterns in the hippocampus. *Nat. Neurosci.* 11, 209 (2008). doi:10.1038/nn2037 Medline
- D. Reisel *et al.*, Spatial memory dissociations in mice lacking GluR1. *Nat. Neurosci.* 5, 868 (2002). <u>doi:10.1038/nn910 Medline</u>
- A. J. Murray *et al.*, Parvalbumin-positive CA1 interneurons are required for spatial working but not for reference memory. *Nat. Neurosci.* 14, 297 (2011). doi:10.1038/nn.2751 Medline
- Acknowledgments: This work was supported by a Wheeler Center Fellowship to S.P.J., a Helen Hay Whitney Foundation grant to C.K., and NIH grant RO1 MH080283. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Supporting Online Material

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/science.1217230/DC1 Materials and Methods SOM Text Figs. S1 to S20 References (*31–35*)

29 November 2011; accepted 16 April 2012

Published online 3 May 2012 10.1126/science.1217230



Awake Hippocampal Sharp-Wave Ripples Support Spatial Memory

Shantanu P. Jadhav, Caleb Kemere, P. Walter German and Loren M. Frank

published online May 3, 2012

ARTICLE TOOLS	http://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2012/05/02/science.1217230
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS	http://science.sciencemag.org/content/suppl/2012/05/02/science.1217230.DC1
RELATED CONTENT	http://science.sciencemag.org/content/sci/336/6087/1359.5.full
REFERENCES	This article cites 27 articles, 4 of which you can access for free http://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2012/05/02/science.1217230#BIBL
PERMISSIONS	http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions

Use of this article is subject to the Terms of Service

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. 2017 © The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.