MIT Libraries | DSpace@MIT

MIT Open Access Articles

Preplay of future place cell sequences by hippocampal cellular assemblies

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Preplay of future place cell sequences by hippocampal cellular assemblies

George Dragoi and Susumu Tonegawa

The Picower Institute for Learning and Memory, RIKEN-MIT Center for Neural Circuit Genetics, Department of Biology and Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

During spatial exploration, hippocampal neurons display a sequential firing pattern in which individual neurons fire specifically at the animal's locations along the trajectory (place cells[1,2]). According to the dominant model of hippocampal cell assembly activity, place cell firing order is established for the first time during the exploration to encode the spatial experience and is subsequently replayed during rest[3-6] or slow-wave sleep[7-10] for consolidation of the encoded experience[11,12]. Here, we report that temporal sequences of firing of place cells expressed during a novel spatial experience occurred in a significant number of occasions during the resting or sleeping period *preceding* the novel experience. This phenomenon called "preplay" occurred in disjunction with sequences of replay of a familiar experience. These results suggest that internal neuronal dynamics during resting or sleep organize hippocampal cellular assemblies[13-15] into temporal sequences that contribute to the encoding of a related novel experience occurring in the future.

Neuronal firing sequences from the CA1 area of the hippocampus (Fig. S1) were determined during periods of awake rest (Fam-Rest) alternating with periods of run (Fam-Run) on a familiar track (Fam session, Fig. S2a) which preceded the exploration of a novel linear arm in contiguity with the familiar track (Contig-Run on L-shaped track, Figs. 1a-e, S2a; Methods). All the place cells active on the novel arm during Contig-Run, whether previously silent[16] (19% in both directions and 31% in at least one direction; Methods; SOM/Table) or active during Fam-Run (Fig. 1a1-e1), fired during Fam-Rest at the ends of the familiar track (range 0.17-11.7 Hz, Fig. S3) as part of a number of *spiking events*. The spiking events were defined as epochs composed of multiple individual spikes from at least four different place cells active on the novel arm or familiar track separated by less than 50-ms inter-spike interval, flanked by at least 50 ms of silence[3,4]. More importantly, the temporal sequence in which the cells active on the novel arm fired during Fam-Rest (Fig. 1a2-e2) was significantly correlated with the spatial sequence in which they fired later as place cells on the novel arm during Contig-Run (Fig. 1a3-e3), while being uncorrelated with their spatial sequence as place cells on the familiar track during Fam-Run. This is illustrated as place cell sequences during Contig-Run (Fig. 1a3-e3) and Fam-Run (Fig. 1a1-e1) compared to the firing sequences of these cells within individual spiking events observed during Fam-Rest (Fig. 1a2-e2). We refer to this process as "preplay" of place cell sequences because the temporal sequence of firing during Fam-Rest had occurred *prior* to the actual exploration of the novel arm in the subsequent Contig-Run and was not a replay of the place cell sequences from the previous Fam-Run.

To quantify the significance of preplay and to compare it with replay, we created place cell sequence templates according to the spatial order of the peak firing of place cells[3,4,10] on the novel arm during Contig-Run (novel arm templates; Fig. 1a3-e3; Methods) and on the familiar track during Fam-Run (familiar track templates) for each run direction. The spikes of all the place cells used to construct the novel arm or

familiar track templates that were emitted during Fam-Rest were sorted by time, and spiking events were determined as explained above (Fig. 1a2-e2). For each spiking event, we calculated a rank-order correlation between the novel arm templates and the temporal sequence of firing of the corresponding cells in the spiking events during Fam-Rest. The event correlation was considered significant if it exceeded the 97.5^{th} percentile of a distribution of correlations resulting from randomly shuffling 200 times the order of place cells in the novel arm templates, $p<0.025$. Forward[4] and reverse[3,4] preplay refers to the cases in which the sequence of place cells during Contig-Run and the firing order of the corresponding cells in the Fam-Rest were in the same and opposite direction, respectively. In 91% of the preplay cases the spiking events were correlated with the novel arm template in one direction only. The distribution of event correlation values obtained using the original novel arm templates was significantly shifted toward higher positive or negative values compared to the distribution of correlation values obtained using shuffled templates (Fig. 2a, S4). Figure 2a also shows the distribution of significant preplay events (in red). Of all the spiking events detected as above and in which at least four novel arm place cells were active, 14.2% were significant preplay events for the place cell sequence on the novel arm ($p<10^{-32}$, binomial probability test[4]) in the forward or reverse order (Fig. 2b).

The occurrence of significant preplay events was correlated with the occurrence of high-frequency ripple oscillations in CA1 (Fig. 2c). The majority of the significant preplay events (81.1%, Fig. 2d, total, blue) took place at the junction between the familiar and novel arm, while the remaining 18.9% took place at the free end of the familiar track (Fig. 2d, total, red). The proportion of significant preplay events among the total events at each of the two track ends was higher at the junctional end (15.2%, $p<10^{-26}$) compared to the free end (8.5%, $p<10^{-4}$) of the familiar track (Fig. 2d, normalized; $p<0.035$, Z-test).

We found a relatively high correlation between the place field maps (Figs. 1a-b; S5) of the familiar track before and after the novel experience (median r=0.66; Fig. 2e, familiar track, blue), significantly higher than the correlations obtained when the cell identities were shuffled (median r=0.23; Fig 2e, familiar track, black; $p<10^{-4}$). A similar correlation analysis revealed a relatively high stability of the newly formed place fields on the novel arm from the beginning to the end of Contig-Run (median r=0.62 vs. median r shuffle=0.21, Fig. 2e, novel arm, blue vs. black; $p<10^{-3}$). These results suggest that preplay of the novel arm does not occur over an entirely new (i.e., remapped) representation of the whole L-shaped track but rather benefits from the relative stability of the familiar track representation across sessions and perhaps facilitates the rapid, stable encoding of the novel arm experience.

Using the familiar track templates and spiking events during Fam-Rest constructed as above, we determined that 16.2% ($p<10^{-91}$; data not shown) were significant replay events[3-6,17] among the spiking events in which a minimum of four familiar track place cells were active. All significant preplay events occurring during Fam-Rest (n=75) were tested for possible replay of the familiar track spatial sequence: these spiking events were more correlated with the novel arm template (red) than the familiar track template (blue) (Fig. 2f). Seventy-two percent (n=54) of the significant events previously considered to be preplay had no significant correlation with the familiar track template. An additional 16% (n=12) of those events were better correlated with the novel arm templates (mean absolute r=0.92) than with the familiar track template (mean absolute r=0.67, $p<10^{-3}$). Altogether, these findings reject the hypothesis that the preplay events simply represent a replay of the familiar track activity (see additional controls in SOM). Moreover, we found the proportion of events exclusively composed of silent cells that perfectly matched the novel arm spatial templates was 0.67 (16/24 triplets), significantly greater ($p < 0.025$) than the proportion of by-chance perfect matches (0.33).

To illustrate the distribution and relative proportions of preplay and replay events among all significant spiking events during Fam-Rest a "template specificity index" (Fig 2g; Methods) was calculated for each event. Pure preplay events (red) and pure replay events (blue) were segregated (Fig. 2g), and only a minority of events were significant for both preplay and replay (yellow). Consistent with this segregation of preplay and replay events, the novel arm and the "corresponding familiar track" templates were not significantly correlated (Fig. 2h; Methods). The ratio between the number of pure replay events (n=171) and the number of pure preplay events (n=54) during Fam-Rest was about 3.1 (Fig. 2g inset; SOM for proportions of events). Preplay and replay events were distributed in time across Fam-Rest (Fig. S6a-c) and their occurrences were generally uncorrelated (Fig. S6d). The majority (79.9%) of the spiking events during Fam-Rest did not significantly correlate with either of the two templates (data not shown).

We used a Bayesian reconstruction algorithm[2,5,6,18,19] (Methods) to decode the animals' position from the spiking activity during Fam-Run (Fig. 3a) or Fam-Rest (Fig. 3b-c). For all original and shuffled[6] probability distributions a line was fit to the data using a line-finding algorithm[6] to represent the decoded virtual trajectory (Methods; SOM). In 16.36% of cases representing trajectories, the reconstructed trajectory during spiking events in Fam-Rest was contained within the novel arm (Fig. 3c, top), a place the animal had not yet visited (i.e., trajectory preplay). Moreover, in 79.8% of the trajectory preplay cases the shuffling procedures resulted in lines that were significantly less or not at all contained within the novel arm (i.e., not preplay, SOM). The remaining trajectories decoded during Fam-Rest represented replay of the familiar track (64.15%; Fig. 3c, middle) or spanned the joint familiar track–novel arm space (19.49%; Fig. 3c, bottom). Means of absolute rank-order correlations between spiking activity and novel arm templates (Fig. 2a) restricted during epochs of trajectory preplay were significantly larger than those between spiking activity and familiar track templates calculated during

the same epochs (0.75 versus 0.59; $p<10^{-4}$). Overall, these results support the existence of the preplay phenomenon.

To investigate the possibility that preplay of novel arm place cell sequences during Fam-Rest depends on the prior run experience on the familiar track, mice with no prior experience on any linear track were placed in a high-walled sleep box and recorded while resting/sleeping. The animals were then transferred to a novel isolated linear track that was in the same room but could not be seen from inside the box, and the recording continued during *de novo* formation of place cells (Fig. S2b, de novo session). We found that in a relatively large proportion (16.1%) of spiking events identified during sleep/rest in the sleep box the neuronal firing sequences were significantly correlated with the place cell sequences observed during the first run session on the novel track (Fig. 4a1-2, b; Methods); this was the case in all four individual mice (Fig. S7). Preplay events were associated with the ripple occurrence (Fig. 4c). The place cells established on the novel track in the de novo session were more dynamic (median r=0.42; Fig. 4d, blue) than in the Contig session (median r=0.62; Fig. 2e right, blue; p<0.016).

We have demonstrated that a significant number of temporal firing sequences of CA1 cells during resting periods of a familiar track exploration that *preceded* a novel track exploration in the same general environment were correlated with the place cell sequences of the novel rather than the familiar track. We refer to this phenomenon as preplay. Preplay is temporally opposite to the process of replay[3-10,19,20], when activity during rest or sleep periods recapitulates place cell sequences that have already occurred during previous explorations. Preplay differs fundamentally from replay because it occurs prior to exploration of *novel* tracks.

While our recordings were carried out in CA1, we believe that what we observed could be a reflection of the output of the recurrent cellular assemblies from upstream regions (CA3 or entorhinal cortex). During run on a familiar track, some of the cells in the postulated upstream cellular assemblies fire sequentially at spatial locations while others, though connected anatomically to these cells, remain silent. The lack of expression of preplay sequences during Fam-Run may reflect their state-dependent suppression or subthreshold activation during these exploratory behaviours. Due to increased net excitation during rest periods predominantly during ripples[21], some of these silent cells together with some of the familiar track cells are activated above threshold and fire in a certain sequence. Their sequence of activation may be determined in part by their functional connectivity within the hippocampal formation network. Some of these sequences may in turn be activated on a novel track as place cell sequences (Fig. S8). The activation of the novel place cell sequences during run may strengthen their pre-existing assembly organization manifested during preplay.

It could be argued that in the Contig session the animals simply considered the novel arm as an extension of the familiar arm and thus what we considered as preplay events were replays of the previous runs on the familiar track. If this was the case, preplay events would not be expected to be found when the experience of the familiar track run is eliminated. This idea was refuted by the demonstration of frequent preplay events in the sleep box before the mice were transferred onto a novel linear track (de novo condition). Under this condition, the place cell sequences were more dynamic while a higher proportion of all spiking events correlated with the place cell sequences in these runs compared to the later runs on novel linear tracks. These suggest a shift in the relative contribution of internal[22,23] and external drives in the formation of place cell sequences upon encounter with a novel track. At the early phase, internal drives originating from the dynamic cellular assembly activities, which likely reflect numerous past experiences distinct from the current one and expressed as preplay, may play a

greater role while at the late phase, external drives that come from the specific set of stimuli of the current experience may dominate. Thus, place cell sequences on novel tracks seem to be products of a dynamic interplay between the internal and external drives.

Several previous studies did not reveal preplay[7,8,10,20]. Although it is difficult to pinpoint the apparent discrepancies between these studies and our present one, we can suggest that the use of insufficiently sensitive methods (pair-wise correlations) by some studies[7,8,20] and small sample sizes by others[10] might have precluded detection of preplay in previous work (SOM for details). Data from the de novo condition (Fig. 4), in which we observed an even higher proportion of preplay events, have not been reported previously.

Our data showed that novel-preplay events co-exist in disjunction with familiar-replay events during the rest periods on the familiar track. This and the finding that these preplay and replay events altogether make up less than one-quarter of all detected spiking events suggest they are part of a dynamic repertoire of temporal sequences in the hippocampus that are past-experience dependent (replay) or future-experience expectant[24] (preplay). Post-experience replay of place cell sequences during resting[3-6] or slow-wave sleep[8-10] has been hypothesized to play an important role in memory consolidation[11,12]. The temporal preplay of new place cell sequences during resting or sleep, is consistent with a predictive function for the hippocampal formation[25] and may contribute to accelerating learning[26] when a new experience is introduced in multiple steps of increasing novelty.

Supplementary Information is linked to the online version of the paper at www.nature.com/nature

Author Contributions S.T. and G.D. conceived the project jointly. G.D. designed and performed the experiments and the analyses. G.D. and S.T. wrote the paper.

Author Information Reprints and permissions information is available at npg.nature.com/reprintsandpermissions. The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to G.D. (gdragoi@mit.edu) or S.T. (tonegawa@mit.edu).

Figure Legends

Figure 1 Preplay of novel place cell sequences. a-e, Fam-Run and Fam-Rest, run and rest sessions on the familiar linear track before barrier removal; Contig-Run, run sessions on the L-shaped track after barrier removal. The L-shape track was linearized for display/analysis. **a, b**; mouse 1, **c, d**; mouse 2, **e**; mouse 3. **a1-e1**, Spatial activity on the familiar track during Fam-Run of the cells that had place fields in Contig-Run and preplayed during Fam-Rest (one cell/row); activity on the novel arm and familiar track are on the same scale. Horizontal arrows: run directions. Vertical gray bars: barrier location during Fam-Run/Fam-Rest. **a2-e2**, Examples of representative spiking events in the forward or reverse direction during Fam-Rest in 250 ms time windows (350 ms for panels 2 and 4 from the left in e2). Tick marks: individual spikes. Spikes in red: preplay events for place cell sequences in the novel arm. Spikes in blue (in

a2-b2): additional spikes from the familiar track place cells participating in the spiking event (not shown in c2-e2). Numbers on the left denote cell numbers and correspond to the place cell numbers in a1-e1. Square boxes: ends of the familiar track where preplay events occurred. Local field potentials recorded simultaneously with the spikes are shown above spiking events. **a3-e3**, Place cell sequences in the novel arm (red) (c3-e3) or in both the novel (red) and familiar (blue) arms (a3-b3) in Contig-Run.

Figure 2 Quantification of the preplay phenomenon and comparison with replay. a, Distribution of correlations between spiking events in Fam-Rest and spatial templates of the novel arm. Open bars: spiking events vs. the original (unshuffled) templates. Filled bars: spiking events vs. 200 shuffled templates scaled down 200 times. Red bars: distribution of preplay (i.e., significant) events. Similar distributions of corresponding spiking events were obtained when spatial templates were constructed using all place cells active on the L-shaped track (not shown). **b**, Proportion of all, forward, and reverse preplay events among the spiking events in Fam-Rest. Dotted line: chance level (3.2%). **c**, Cross-correlation between preplay events and ripple epochs. **d**, Location of preplay events on the track. Total: proportions of preplay events at ends of the track. Normalized: proportion of preplay events normalized by the number of spiking events at each end of track. Preplay events represented a trajectory running from the free end of the novel arm toward the junctional end (40%) or initiated from near the familiar track (60%); the latter suggests that in some cases preplay events could be triggered by the activity of the familiar track place cells during Fam-Rest. **e**, Stability of place cell spatial tuning across the novel experience. Familiar track: stability of the place fields active on the familiar track

before (Fam-Run) vs. after (Contig-Run) barrier removal. Novel arm: stability of the place fields active on the novel arm at the beginning (first four laps of run) vs. the end (last four laps) of the Contig-Run session. Data (blue): within-cell correlation of place cell spatial tuning for the corresponding track/arm. Shuffle (black): cell identity shuffle (SOM). **f**, Distribution of preplay events correlations (red) vs. distribution of these events correlations with the familiar track template (blue). Spiking events were detected using all place cells from the familiar track and novel arm templates (>1 Hz). Red bars are the same as in Figure 2a. Correlation is strong with the novel arm template (preplay) and weak with the familiar arm template (replay). P-value: significant difference between the two distributions. **g**, Disjunctive distribution of pure preplay (red), pure replay (blue) and preplay/replay (yellow) events during Fam-Rest over their template specificity index (TSI) (SOM). Inset: The pie chart shows the proportions of pure preplay events (red), pure replay events (blue), and preplay/replay events (yellow) among all of the spiking events that were significantly correlated with at least familiar track templates or novel arm templates. **h,** Lack of correlation between the novel arm template and the "corresponding familiar track template". Each of the six dots represents either a forward or a reverse run direction of one of the three mice analyzed. Red horizontal line denotes P-value of 0.05. The correlation values were not significant in any of the cases (SOM).

Figure 3 Bayesian reconstruction of the animal's trajectory in the familiar track (replay) and novel arm (preplay). a, Example of position reconstruction of a one-lap run on the familiar track from the ensemble place cell activity during Fam-Run. The heat map displays the reconstructed position of the animal using ensemble place cell activity during run (250 ms bins, animal velocity >5 cm/s).

Yellow line: actual trajectory of the animal during Fam-Run. Colours reflect probability of reconstruction (see colour bar). **b**, Example of virtual trajectory reconstruction (familiar track and novel arm) from the ensemble place cell activity during Fam-Rest at the ends of the familiar track (20 ms bins, animal velocity <5 cm/s) before barrier removal and novel arm exploration. The yellow line reflects the spatial location of the animal in time. The animal was immobile at the junction end of the familiar track. Note that the time-compressed (~5 m/s) trajectory reconstruction often "jumps" over the barrier (top of the figure) into the novel arm area. At around 0.5 s, note a preplay of the novel arm initiated from the distal (free) end of the novel arm that "propagates" toward the location of the animal. **c**, Examples of preplay of the novel arm (top), replay of the familiar track (middle), and preplay of the novel arm together with replay of the familiar track (bottom) during Fam-Rest. All conditions are the same as in b. The white line shows the linear fit maximizing the likelihood along the virtual trajectory.

Figure 4 Preplay of novel place cell sequences prior to any linear track experience. a, A sleep/rest session in the sleep box (Pre-Run sleep/rest) prior to the first run session on a linear track (De novo-Run). Display format is the same as in Figure 1. **a1**, Examples of representative spiking events in the forward or reverse order during Pre-Run sleep/rest in 400-ms time windows. **a2**, Place cell sequences on the novel track (red) during the De novo Run session. Each row represents one cell in which the activity was normalized to the maximum firing rate. One run direction in one animal is shown. The median number of place cells active on the novel track in 4 animals is 6. **b**, Distribution of spiking events in Pre-Run sleep/rest across the rank-order correlation with the place cell sequence template of the novel track. Display format is the same

as in Figure 2a. **c**, Cross-correlation between preplay events and ripple epochs during Pre-Run sleep/rest. **d**, Stability of place cell spatial tuning across the novel track experience. Display format is the same as in Figure 2f right panel (Novel arm).

METHODS SUMMARY

Place cells were recorded with six independently movable tetrodes from the CA1 area of the hippocampus in four mice during sleep/rest sessions in the sleep box prior to any experience on linear tracks and during the first run session on a novel track. Following familiarization with the linear track, animals were subsequently allowed to explore a continuous (L-shaped) track in which the now familiar track and a new novel arm were made contiguous. To quantify the significance of the preplay and replay processes, spiking events in which at least four cells were active were detected during sleep/rest (speed < 1 cm/s) periods in the sleep box or awake rest (speed < 2 cm/s) periods at the ends of the familiar track and novel arm, predominantly during ripple epochs. Statistical significance was calculated at the p<0.025 level for each event by comparing the rank-order correlation between the event sequence and the place cell sequence (template) with the distribution of correlation values from 200 templates obtained by shuffling the original order of the place cells. Proportions of significant events were calculated as the ratio between the number of significant events and the total number of spiking events. Overall significance of preplay or replay processes was calculated by comparing the distribution of correlation values of all events with the distribution of correlation values of shuffled templates (Kolmogorov–Smirnov test). Significance of the proportion of significant events out of the total number of spiking events was determined as the binomial probability of observing the number of significant events (as successes) from the total number of spiking events (as independent trials), with 0.025 probability of

success in any given trial. The position of the animal was reconstructed from the spiking activity emitted during resting periods using Bayesian decoding procedures[6].

Reference List

1. O'Keefe,J. & Nadel,L. The hippocampus as a cognitive map. Oxford University Press, Oxford (1978).

2. Wilson,M.A. & McNaughton,B.L. Dynamics of the hippocampal ensemble code for space. *Science* **261**, 1055-1058 (1993).

3. Foster,D.J. & Wilson,M.A. Reverse replay of behavioural sequences in hippocampal place cells during the awake state. *Nature* **440**, 680-683 (2006).

4. Diba,K. & Buzsaki,G. Forward and reverse hippocampal place-cell sequences during ripples. *Nat. Neurosci.* **10**, 1241-1242 (2007).

5. Karlsson,M.P. & Frank,L.M. Awake replay of remote experiences in the hippocampus. *Nat. Neurosci.* **12**, 913-918 (2009).

6. Davidson,T.J., Kloosterman,F. & Wilson,M.A. Hippocampal replay of extended experience. *Neuron* **63**, 497-507 (2009).

7. Wilson,M.A. & McNaughton,B.L. Reactivation of hippocampal ensemble memories during sleep. *Science* **265**, 676-679 (1994).

8. Skaggs,W.E. & McNaughton,B.L. Replay of neuronal firing sequences in rat hippocampus during sleep following spatial experience. *Science* **271**, 1870-1873 (1996).

9. Nadasdy,Z., Hirase,H., Czurko,A., Csicsvari,J. & Buzsaki,G. Replay and time compression of recurring spike sequences in the hippocampus. *J. Neurosci.* **19**, 9497-9507 (1999).

10. Lee,A.K. & Wilson,M.A. Memory of sequential experience in the hippocampus during slow wave sleep. *Neuron* **36**, 1183-1194 (2002).

11. Buzsaki,G. Two-stage model of memory trace formation: a role for "noisy" brain states. *Neuroscience* **31**, 551-570 (1989).

12. Nakashiba,T., Buhl,D.L., McHugh,T.J. & Tonegawa,S. Hippocampal CA3 output is crucial for ripple-associated reactivation and consolidation of memory. *Neuron* **62**, 781-787 (2009).

13. Hebb,D.O. The Organization of Behavior: A Neuropsychological Theory. Wiley, New York (1949).

14. Harris,K.D., Csicsvari,J., Hirase,H., Dragoi,G. & Buzsaki,G. Organization of cell assemblies in the hippocampus. *Nature* **424**, 552-556 (2003).

15. Dragoi,G. & Buzsaki,G. Temporal encoding of place sequences by hippocampal cell assemblies. *Neuron* **50**, 145-157 (2006).

16. Thompson,L.T. & Best,P.J. Place cells and silent cells in the hippocampus of freely-behaving rats. *J. Neurosci.* **9**, 2382-2390 (1989).

17. O'Neill,J., Senior,T. & Csicsvari,J. Place-selective firing of CA1 pyramidal cells during sharp wave/ripple network patterns in exploratory behavior. *Neuron* **49**, 143-155 (2006).

18. Zhang,K., Ginzburg,I., McNaughton,B.L. & Sejnowski,T.J. Interpreting neuronal population activity by reconstruction: unified framework with application to hippocampal place cells. *J. Neurophysiol.* **79**, 1017-1044 (1998).

19. Johnson,A. & Redish,A.D. Neural ensembles in CA3 transiently encode paths forward of the animal at a decision point. *J. Neurosci.* **27**, 12176-12189 (2007).

20. Kudrimoti,H.S., Barnes,C.A. & McNaughton,B.L. Reactivation of hippocampal cell assemblies: effects of behavioral state, experience, and EEG dynamics. *J. Neurosci.* **19**, 4090-4101 (1999).

21. Csicsvari,J., Hirase,H., Czurko,A., Mamiya,A. & Buzsaki,G. Oscillatory coupling of hippocampal pyramidal cells and interneurons in the behaving Rat. *J. Neurosci.* **19**, 274-287 (1999).

22. Dragoi,G., Harris,K.D. & Buzsaki,G. Place representation within hippocampal networks is modified by long-term potentiation. *Neuron* **39**, 843-853 (2003).

23. Pastalkova,E., Itskov,V., Amarasingham,A. & Buzsaki,G. Internally generated cell assembly sequences in the rat hippocampus. *Science* **321**, 1322-1327 (2008).

24. Black,J.E. & Greenough,W.T. Advances in developmental psychology. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, (1986).

25. Hassabis,D., Kumaran,D., Vann,S.D. & Maguire,E.A. Patients with hippocampal amnesia cannot imagine new experiences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **104**, 1726-1731 (2007).

26. Tse,D. *et al.* Schemas and memory consolidation. *Science* **316**, 76-82 (2007).

Methods

Surgery and experimental design

Electrophysiological recordings were performed on four C57BL/6 mice (strain NR1-floxed[27]) with ages between 18-22 weeks. All animals were implanted under *Avertin* anaesthesia with six independently movable tetrodes aiming for the CA1 area of the right hippocampus (1.5-2 mm posterior to bregma and 1-2 mm lateral to the midline, Fig. S1). The reference electrode was implanted posterior to lambda over the cerebellum. During the following week of recovery, the electrodes were advanced daily while animals rested in a small walled sleeping box (12 x 20 x 35 (h) cm). The animal position was monitored via two infrared diodes attached to the headstage.

The experimental apparatus consisted of a 90x65 cm rectangular, walled linear track maze. All tracks were 4 cm wide at the bottom and 8-9 cm at the top, and all linear track walls were 10 cm high. Experimental sessions were conducted while the animals explored for chocolate sprinkle rewards placed always at the ends of the corresponding linear tracks (one sprinkle at each end of the track on each lap). Neuronal activity was recorded in naïve animals (four mice) during the sleep/rest session in the sleep box immediately preceding the first experience on linear tracks and continued (Fig. 4) during the first run session on a novel track. After familiarization with the linear track, the animals went through a recording session of 15-60 min (Fam session), and the recordings continued for the next 34-42 min (Contig session) while the animals explored an L-shaped track for the first time, in which the familiar and the novel arm were made contiguous by removing the barrier that had separated the two arms (Fig. 1). For the purpose of the analysis of the recording data, the Fam session was further divided into Fam-Run in which the animals ran through the track (velocity of animal's

movement higher than 5 cm/s) and Fam-Rest where the animals took awake rests at the ends of the track (velocity of animal's movement less than 2 cm/s). During resting periods, the animals consumed the chocolate sprinkle and groomed, but mostly they were still until they self-initiated the next lap of run on the linear track. After completion of the experiments, the brains of all mice were perfused, fixed, sectioned, and stained using Nuclear fast red (Fig. S1) or Cresyl violet for electrode track reconstruction.

Recordings and single unit analysis

A total of 87 neurons were recorded from the CA1 area of the hippocampus in four mice during the Fam and Contig sessions (see table). A total of 69 CA1 neurons were recorded from the four mice in the De novo condition (26, 20, 10, and 13 cells, respectively). Single cells were identified and isolated using the manual clustering method Xclust[2] and the application of cluster quality measurements[28]. Pyramidal cells were distinguished from interneurons based on spike width, average rate and autocorrelations[22].

Place fields were computed as the ratio between the number of spikes and the time spent in 2 cm bins along the track, smoothed with a Gaussian kernel with a standard deviation of 2 cm. Bins where the animal spent a total of less than 0.1 s and periods during which the animal's velocity was below 5 cm/s were excluded. Place field length and peak rate were calculated after separating the direction of movement and linearizing the trajectory of the animal. Linearized place fields were defined as areas with a localized increase in firing rate above 1 Hz for at least five contiguous bins (10 cm). The place field peak rate and location were given by the rate and location of the bin with the highest ratio between spike counts and time spent. Place field borders were defined as the points

where the firing rate became less than 10% of the peak firing rate or 1 Hz (whichever was bigger) for at least 2 cm.

Local field potential analysis

Ripple oscillations were detected during sleep/rest periods in the sleep box and during rest periods at the ends of the tracks. The EEG signal was filtered (120-200 Hz) and ripple-band amplitude was computed using the Hilbert transform. Ripple epochs with maximal amplitude higher than 5 standard deviations (std) above the mean, beginning and ending at 1 std were detected. The time of ripple occurrence (Fig. 2c, 4c) was the time of its maximal amplitude. The proportion of ripples with which cells with place fields on the novel arm of the L-shaped track fired in the preceding session (Fig. S3) was calculated for each qualifying cell as the ratio between the number of ripples during which the cell fired at least one spike and the total number of ripples during the corresponding exploratory session.

Preplay and replay analyses

In order to analyze the preplay and replay processes, spiking events were detected during Pre-Run sleep/rest periods in the sleep box (De novo condition, velocity < 1 cm/s) or during awake rest periods at the ends of the running tracks (Contig condition, velocity < 2 cm/s). A spiking event was defined as a transient increase in the firing activity of a population of at least four different place cells within a temporal window preceded and followed by at least 50 ms of silence. Overall, similar results were obtained using 50, 60, 75, and 100 ms time windows. The spikes of all the place cells active on the novel track that were emitted during the Pre-Run sleep/rest in the box for

the De novo condition as well as the spikes of all the place cells active on the familiar track or the novel arm that were emitted during Fam-Rest session at the two ends of the familiar track for Contig condition, respectively were sorted by time and further used for the detection of the spiking events. All four animals exhibited a significant number of spiking events in the Pre-Run session of De novo condition. Three out of the four animals (mice 1 through 3) exhibited a significant number of spiking events in the Contig condition, the remaining animal (mouse 4) having a below-threshold number of simultaneously active CA1 place cells. The time of the spiking event used to compute the cross-correlation with the ripple epoch occurrence (Fig. 2c, 4c) was the average time of all spikes composing the spiking event. The place cell sequences (templates) were calculated for each direction of the animal's movement and for each run session (De novo run, Fam-Run and Contig-Run) by ordering the spatial location of the place field peaks that were above 1 Hz. For place cells with multiple place fields above 1 Hz on a particular arm or track in the Contig condition (6 out of 52 place cells active on the novel arm in the two directions, or 12%: 2 for each direction in Mouse1, 1 in Mouse 2, and 1 in Mouse 3), only the place field corresponding to the peak firing rate of the place cell on that arm or track was considered for the construction of the template of that particular arm or track, to be consistent with all the previous studies that used spatial templates to demonstrate replay during sleep or awake rest[3,4,10]. Place cells with fields on both the novel arm in the Contig-Run session and the familiar track in the Fam-Run session participated in the construction of both the novel arm and familiar track templates. Statistical significance was calculated for each event by comparing the rank-order correlation between the sequence of cells' firing in the event (i.e., event sequence) and the place cell sequence (template) on one hand and the distribution of correlation values between the event sequence and 200 surrogate templates obtained by shuffling the order of place cells on the other[4] (Fig. 2a). The significance level was set at 0.025 to control for multiple comparisons (two directions of run). The proportions of significant

events (preplay novel track, preplay novel arm (Fig. 2b), replay novel arm, and replay familiar track) were calculated as the ratio between the number of significant events and the total number of spiking events in which at least four corresponding place cells were active[4]. "Corresponding familiar track templates" (Fig. 2h) were constructed by ordering the location of peak firing on the familiar track during Fam-Run (no minimum threshold of firing) of all place cells that subsequently fired on the novel arm. Cells composing the familiar track templates are the same as the ones composing the novel arm templates. Note these corresponding familiar track templates are different from the ones used in Figs. 1, 2a-g, which were constructed by ordering the peak firing of all place cells active on the familiar track >1 Hz.

The overall significance of the preplay (Fig. 2a) or replay process was calculated by comparing the distribution of correlation values of all events relative to the original template with the distribution of correlation values relative to the shuffled surrogate templates using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test[3]. Quantification of the replay versus preplay events during the Fam-Run session (Fig. 2f, g) was performed as described above using different spatial templates for familiar track and novel arm. All spiking events were correlated with both the novel arm and the familiar track templates. Events significantly correlated only with familiar track or with novel arm templates were considered pure replay and pure preplay, respectively. The template specificity index (TSI) was calculated for each event as the difference between the absolute value of the event's correlation with the novel arm template (preplay, high positive index) and event's correlation with the familiar track template (replay, high negative index). For the purpose of displaying the TSI, events correlated with the novel arm but not with the familiar track templates were considered preplay while events correlated with the familiar track but not novel arm templates were considered replay (Fig. 2g). Additionally, events correlated with both the familiar track and the novel arm templates formed a third group, preplay/replay events, displayed in yellow in the inset of Fig. 2g.

Correlations between pairs of familiar track and novel arm templates (Fig. 2h) were performed using modified familiar track templates that were constructed using the location of peak firing (>0 Hz) of only those cells that had place fields on the novel arm (peak rate >1Hz). The lack of significant correlation in this case demonstrates that the novel arm place cell sequence is not simply a transposition of a familiar track place cell sequence on the novel arm.

We also identified neurons that did not fire during Fam-Run, that activated during Fam-Rest events, and corresponded to trajectories on the novel arm during Contig-Run (silent cells). We calculated the correlation between the order in which they fired during Fam-Rest events and their spatial sequence as new place cells on the novel arm during Contig-Run, as previously explained. Due to the low absolute number of silent neurons, only triplets of cells were available for further analysis (n = 24). The proportion of events perfectly matching the spatial template was compared with the proportion of by-chance perfect matching (0.33).

Stability of place cell maps

Stabilities of place cell firing on the familiar track before and after barrier removal as well as on the novel track (De novo condition) and novel arm (Contig condition) in the beginning versus the end of the run session were assessed by calculating, for each place cell and each direction, a correlation between the spatial firing in the corresponding paired situations (before vs. after barrier removal for the familiar track or the first four laps vs. the last four laps of the De novo run or Contig-Run session for the novel track or arm, respectively). The place cell activity was not partitioned in place fields, rather the whole activity on the particular track or arm was considered separately for each cell and direction (average correlations are shown in Fig. 2e and 4d, blue bars). In addition,

we performed the same type of correlations while shuffling the identity of the cell in one member of the correlation (once for each different cell; average correlations are in Fig. 2e and 4d, black bars). Shuffle results (Fig. 2e and 4d, black bars) were computed as correlation between spatial tuning of cells on the familiar track during Fam-Run and spatial tuning of all other simultaneously recorded cells on the familiar arm during Contig-Run (Familiar track group, Fig. 2e, left), or correlation between spatial tuning of cells on the novel arm (or novel track) during the beginning of Contig-Run (or De novo run) and spatial tuning of all the other simultaneously recorded cells on the novel arm (or novel track) during the end of Contig-Run (Novel arm group, Fig. 2e, right) or De novo run (Fig. 4d). Original and shuffled correlations were compared using the rank sum test. The average number of laps (traversal of the novel track in both directions) per session was 20.5 in the De novo run (21, 16, 27, 18 in the four mice) and 16.3 in the Contig-Run (13, 14, 22 in the three mice).

Bayesian reconstruction of actual and virtual trajectories

For each cell we calculated a linearized spatial tuning curve on the familiar track during the Fam-Run session and a linearized spatial tuning curve on the novel arm during the Contig-Run session. The tuning curves were constructed in 2 cm bins from spikes emitted in both run directions at velocities higher than 5 cm/s, and were smoothed with a Gaussian kernel with a standard deviation of 2 cm. We constructed a joint spatial tuning curve for each cell by juxtaposing the spatial tuning curve on the familiar track during the Fam-Run session and the spatial tuning curve on the novel arm during the Contig-Run session. We also detected for each cell all the spiking activity emitted at velocities below 5 cm/s during the Fam-Rest session, where replay and preplay events where shown to occur using the rank order correlation method. We used a Bayesian reconstruction algorithm[6,18] to decode the virtual position of the animal from the spiking

activity during Fam-Rest (Fig. 3b) in non-overlapping 20 ms bins using the joint spatial

tuning curves. We then extracted epochs of reconstructed trajectory matching the time

of the spiking events as detected using multiunit activity of place cells from the familiar

track and novel arm (rank-order correlation method, see the "Preplay and replay

analyses" section, above). We have used 2 shuffling procedures to measure the quality

of the Bayesian decoding. In the first shuffling procedure, for each event, the original

time-bin columns of the probability distribution function (PDF) were replaced with an

equal number of time-bin columns randomly extracted from a pool containing the time-

bin columns of all PDFs of all detected events[6]. The shuffling procedure was repeated

500 times. In the second shuffling procedure the identity of the place cells has been

randomly shuffled 100 times and new PDFs were calculated for all events. For all

original and shuffled PDFs a line was fit to the data using a previously described line-

finding algorithm[6]. Lines fitted to the original and shuffled data were compared using

slope, spatial extent, location on the track, and probability score. We defined replay and

preplay as the epochs of Fam-Rest in which the reconstructed trajectory is located on

the familiar track or the novel arm, respectively. The trajectory was defined across a set

of position estimates during the corresponding epoch (Fig. 3c). Only epochs that lasted

at least 60 ms long (3 bins) and which contained reconstructed trajectories spanning at

least 10 cm were considered for further analysis. Trajectories for which 75% or more of

their length was located on the familiar track were considered to represent replay of an

animal's trajectory on the familiar track (Fig. 3c middle) while trajectories for which

75% or more of their length was located in the novel arm were considered to represent

preplay of the animal's future trajectory on the novel arm (Fig. 3c top). The remaining

events were considered preplay-replay (Fig. 3c bottom). An epoch was considered

significant if the new line was less than 75% contained in the familiar track for replay or

novel arm for preplay in at least 95% of the shuffled cases. For each epoch that was

significant for replay or preplay using the reconstruction method, we retrieved the value

of the rank-order correlation between the neuronal firing sequences and the familiar

track and novel arm spatial templates as calculated using the rank-order correlation

method. We compared the absolute correlation values between the epoch's firing

sequences and familiar track templates with the absolute correlation values between the

same epoch's firing sequences and novel arm templates. We also reconstructed the

trajectory of the animal on the familiar track from the spiking activity during the Fam-

Run session at velocities above 5 cm/s in 250 ms bins using the spatial tuning curves on

the familiar track[6,18] (Fig. 3a) to validate the decoding procedure.

27.   Tsien,J.Z., Huerta,P.T. & Tonegawa,S. The essential role of hippocampal CA1
      NMDA receptor-dependent synaptic plasticity in spatial memory. *Cell* **87**, 1327-
      1338 (1996).

28.   Schmitzer-Torbert,N., Jackson,J., Henze,D., Harris,K. & Redish,A.D. Quantitative
      measures of cluster quality for use in extracellular recordings. *Neuroscience* **131**,
      1-11 (2005).