

Title	Loss of remembering intentions after damage to the prefrontal cortex
Sub Title	
Author	梅田, 聰(Umeda, Satoshi) 寺澤, 悠理(Terasawa, Yuri) 黒崎, 芳子(Kuroasaki, Yoshiko)
Publisher	Centre for Advanced Research on Logic and Sensibility The Global Centers of Excellence Program, Keio University
Publication year	2012
Jtitle	CARLS series of advanced study of logic and sensibility Vol.5, (2011. ) ,p.15- 28
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	I. Study of Logic and Sensibility  Part 1: Brain and Evolution
Genre	Research Paper
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=KO12002001-20120224-0015">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=KO12002001-20120224-0015</a>

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

# Loss of Remembering Intentions after Damage to the Prefrontal Cortex

*Satoshi Umeda<sup>1,2</sup>, Yuri Terasawa<sup>2,3</sup>, and Yoshiko Kurosaki<sup>4</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Keio University

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Advanced Research on Logic and Sensibility (CARLS), Keio University Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

<sup>3</sup> National Center of Neurology and Psychiatry

<sup>4</sup> Department of Rehabilitation, Ohtawara Red Cross Hospital

## I. Introduction

Research on prospective memory (PM), representing memory involving future intentions or plans, can be divided into two types. The first involves studies into neurological examinations of various types of disorders, including Alzheimer's disease (AD) or mild cognitive impairment (MCI) (Blanco-Campal, Coen, Lawlor, Walsh, & Burke, 2009; Costa et al, 2010; Thompson, Henry, Rendell, Withall, & Brodaty, 2010; Troyer & Murphy, 2007), Parkinson's disease (Costa, Peppe, Caltagirone, & Carlesimo, 2008; Foster, McDaniel, Repovs, & Hershey, 2009), multiple sclerosis (MS) (West, McEnery, & Krauss, 2007), schizophrenia (Henry, Rendell, Kliegel, & Altgassen, 2007; Kumar, Nizamie, & Jahan, 2005; Woods, Twamley, Dawson, Narvaez, & Jeste, 2007), developmental disorders (Brandimonte, Filippello, Coluccia, Altgassen, & Kliegel, 2011; Jones et al., 2010). Although most of these studies intended to investigate the neural substrates of prospective memory, some studies aimed to determine whether PM performance could be a diagnostic criterion for AD, MCI and other types of dementia (Blanco-Campal et al., 2009; Huppert & Beardsall, 1993; Maylor, 1995). The weight of evidence seems to support the positive position that PM performance

could be a diagnostic criterion (Jones, Livner, & Bäckman, 2006), although some evidence supports the negative position (Livner, Laukka, Karlsson, & Bäckman, 2009).

The second type of research involves participants with focal damage to certain areas in the brain. Several studies have shown that the frontal and medial temporal lobes are necessary for successful prospective remembering (Cockburn, 1995; Umeda, Nagumo, & Kato, 2006). To investigate PM performance in participants with brain damage, two different types of experimental paradigm, event-based PM and time-based PM, have often been used, along with behavioral experiments (Einstein & McDaniel, 1990). Participants are generally instructed to busily engage in a background task during which words are presented on a computer screen, and they are asked to recall them after all of the words have been presented. Participants in the event-based PM task are then instructed to press a pre-determined key on a keyboard whenever a target word that was learned prior to the task appears, while participants in time-based PM tasks are instructed to press a pre-determined key after a certain time has elapsed. These experimental frameworks generate highly controlled data that allow discussion of the mechanisms underlying prospective remembering. An early neuropsychological study using event-based and time-based PM tasks found that one patient with a frontal lobe lesion had no difficulties in event-based tasks, but showed a decline in some time-based tasks (Cockburn, 1995). That patient thus failed to recall intended actions spontaneously within an appropriate time after the frontal lobe was damaged.

The same deficits have been found by other tests in patients with frontal lobe damage (Shallice & Burgess, 1991). These deficits have been explained from various perspectives, such as loss of ability to plan, spontaneous processing, and use of a retrieval strategy (Burgess & Shallice, 1997; Worthington, 1999).

Behavioral studies have revealed many distinctive characteristics of PM (Brandimonte, Einstein & McDaniel, 1996). The most prominent appears to be the component division involved in PM (Einstein & McDaniel, 1990). The first component is a process for *remembering to remember* or *prospective memory component (PMC)*: the individual who intends to do something in the future must first remember that this action needs to be taken. Spontaneous retrieval with appropriate timing is necessary for successful remem-

bering to remember, since there are no obvious cues for directly remembering intended actions in usual everyday situations. Prospective memory is also described as “more than just memory,” as sensitivity to the passage of longer periods of time and timing-based spontaneous retrieval is crucial to allow intentions to come to mind. The second component is a process for *remembering content* or *retrospective memory component (RMC)*: even when the individual remembers to remember, they still have to remember what needs to be done in order to fulfill the intention properly, and some external memory cues or devices are useful for remembering content. An intention can be realized only when these two components are appropriately processed.

A number of neuropsychological findings also support this division. An early study examined prospective remembering in older adults by assessing frontal lobe function and medial temporal lobe function using an event-based prospective memory task. The results showed that high-functioning frontal participants showed better prospective remembering than low-functioning frontal participants and no significant difference was found in prospective memory performance for medial temporal functioning (McDaniel, Glisky, Rubin, Guynn, & Routhieaux, 1999). A number of previous psychophysiological studies using event-related brain potentials (ERPs) have indicated that the realization of delayed intentions is associated with distinct components of ERPs that are related with the detection of a PM cue in the environment (N300), the retrieval of an intention from memory, signaling the need to switch from the ongoing activity (frontal positivity), and configuration of the PM task set (parietal positivity) (West, 2011; West & Bowry, 2005; West, Bowry, & Krompinger, 2006; West, McNerney, & Travers, 2007). These data support the PMC-RMC distinction and the notion that some components involved in PMC depend on frontal lobe functions.

As a neuroimaging approach to prospective memory, an early positron emission tomography (PET) study showed that some brain regions, including the right dorsolateral and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, the left frontal pole, and the left parahippocampal gyrus in the medial temporal lobe, were activated when subjects were engaged in a prospective memory task (Okuda et al., 1998). The involvement of the prefrontal cortex including the rostral PFC (BA10) was also observed in other PET studies (Burgess, Quayle, & Frith, 2001; Burgess, Scott, & Frith, 2003) Another functional magnetic

resonance imaging (fMRI) study indicated that PM success was predicted by activations in the left rostralateral PFC and right parahippocampal gyrus (Poppen et al., 2010).

These findings provide evidence supporting the independent neural contributions of the PMC-RMC division and the involvement of multiple areas within bilateral prefrontal and medial temporal areas in prospective remembering. From a more detailed perspective, however, the question of whether damage to part of the prefrontal and medial temporal areas affects attenuated performance for PMC remains unresolved. The main goal of the present study was to identify a more precise neural basis for PMC. To obtain reliable results for this type of neuropsychological study, a large number of patients with focal brain damages must be recruited. The present study included a total of 74 patients with TBI showing focal damages to the frontal or temporal lobe area. Based on findings for the damaged area in each participant, we used discriminant function analysis to identify the responsible neural bases for PMC.

## II. Methods

### **1. Participants**

We first recruited a total of 81 patients with TBI showing focal damage to the frontal or temporal lobe area. Patients selection was based on a consecutive series of clinical investigations and nearly half of the patients were tested as in-patients. The inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) high onset arousal level (mean Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score was 13.0), 2) the presence of focal damage in the frontal or temporal lobe area, not only the presence of diffuse axonal injury (DAI), 3) no other neurological or psychiatric history, 4) no history of drug abuse, and 5) no previous participation in rehabilitation.

All participants were administered the PM task and only 7 participants showed difficulty in recalling the contents of the action required at the beginning of the experimental session, even after being given multiple retrieval cues. We then removed those 7 participants to concentrate on the neural substrates of PMC.

Mean age of the 74 participants was 39.5 years (range, 15–67 years), and

mean duration of education was 11.8 years. All patients had traumatic brain injuries in focal regions involving the frontal or temporal lobe area. The participants were in stable or chronic status from the onset of injury (mean duration from onset of injury to testing, 35.0 days). No significant correlation was identified between score for the PM task and the duration from onset of the injury ( $r=-.006$ ,  $p>.10$ ). All participants gave their informed consent prior to participation in this study.

## **2. Neuropsychological Assessment**

---

All participants were administered standard neuropsychological tests to assess intelligence quotient (IQ), general memory, attention and other higher cognitive functions. These tests included: 1) Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (RCPM) Set B; 2) Kohs Block Design Test; 3) Hasegawa Dementia Scale - Revised (HDS-R): a) Total score, b) Orientation, and c) Repeating 3 words; 4) Digit span (in WMS-R): a) Forward, and b) Backward; 5) Visual memory span (in WMS-R): a) Forward, and b) Backward; 6) 7 Words memory test; 7) Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST): a) Categories Achieved (CA), b) Perseveration Errors (PE), and c) Difficulty of Maintaining Set (DMS); 8) Verbal fluency: a) Category ("vegetable"), and b) Initial letter ("ta"); and 9) Serial Seven Subtraction Test (in MMSE). All tests including the subsequent PM task were administered by the same experimenter.

## **3. Evaluation of Prospective Memory Performance**

---

To assess PM performance in participants, a simple PM task similar to the subtest for "belonging" in the Rivermead Behavioural Memory Test (RBMT) was embedded in the neuropsychological assessment tests (Wilson, Cockburn, & Baddeley, 1985). At the beginning of the standard neuropsychological test session, participants were handed a number-card ("18" on it) and asked to return the card at the end of the experiment. At that point, we confirmed that they placed the card into their pocket or bag, out of the participant's fields of view.

At the end of the tests, which lasted approximately one hour, we stated the tests had ended and checked whether the participant spontaneously correctly remembered the PM task to return the number-card. If the required action was not performed, Prompt A was given, as "Didn't you forget to do

something?”. If no response was made within 10 s, Prompt B was given, as “I handed you something to return.” As stated above, 74 of 81 participants were able to perform the required action (returning the number-card) either without or with prompting.

A result of “success” was recorded when the patient performed the action within the appropriate time with no prompt and “failure” when they performed the correct action with Prompt A or B. Thus, spontaneous prospective memory retrieval with no prompt reflects the PMC component, whereas cued retrieval with Prompt A only or Prompts A and B reflects the RMC component. The test-retest reliability of this task has already been examined (Umeda, Kato, Mimura, Kashima, & Koyazu, 2000). The rate of agreement between the score on the first test and that of the second test, which was administered three months after the first test, was .86, which is considered to be high.

### III. Results

#### 1. Prospective Memory Performance and Neuropsychological Test Profile

---

Among all 74 participants, 32 participants were sorted into the “success” group, performing the required action within the appropriate time. The remaining 42 were sorted into the “failure” group, unable to perform the action spontaneously, but able to perform it with Prompt A or B.

To compare differences in neuropsychological test scores between groups, we calculated average scores for the tests. Statistical testing revealed significant differences between two groups only for total and orientation scores of the HDS-R, with higher scores in the “success” group (total score:  $t(72)=2.21, p<.05$ ; orientation score:  $t(72)=2.95, p<.01$ ). Careful observation of the data seemed to show no specific pattern of ceiling or floor effects. Although age was not found to be a significant variable that explains the differences in performance in the prospective memory task, we investigated whether participant age is a predictor of performance on the prospective memory task in all participants. However, no significant correlation was observed between age and performance ( $r=-0.162, p>.10$ ).

## 2. Discriminant Function Analysis for Prospective Memory

### Performance

To identify variables contributing to performance in the PM task, discriminant function analysis was conducted, using damage to each participant in the twelve specific areas as independent variables, and group “success” or “failure” in the PM task as the grouping variable. Stepwise discriminant function analysis indicated three variables that minimized Wilk’s lambda value. Analysis identified the following areas as highly contributing functions: “right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex” in Step 1, “right ventromedial prefrontal cortex” in Step 2, and “left dorsomedial prefrontal cortex” in Step 3 (Figure 1). Overall, these three variables accounted for 67.6% of the correct classification matrix.

In order to evaluate the specificity of the results obtained, multiple linear regression analysis using Hayashi’s quantification method type-I (Hayashi, 1952) was conducted separately for the following sixteen neuropsychological tests measures, using damage to each participant in the twelve specific areas as independent variables, and score of each neuropsychological test as the dependent variable: 1) RCPM, 2) Kohs, 3) HDS-R Total score, 4) HDS-R Orientation, 5) HDS-R Repeating 3 words, 6) Digit span Forward, 7) Digit span Backward, 8) Visual memory span Forward, 9) Visual memory span Backward, 10) 7 Words memory test, 11) WCST Categories Achieved, 12) WCST Perseveration Errors, 13) WCST Difficulty of




Figure 1. Areas identified as contributing significantly to performance in the prospective memory task: 1) right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, 2) right ventromedial prefrontal cortex, and 3) left dorsomedial prefrontal cortex.

Maintaining Set, 14) Verbal fluency Category, 15) Verbal fluency Initial letter, and 16) Serial Seven Subtraction Test. Analysis identified the following areas as having a significant contribution: “left medial temporal cortex” on test 3), 5), 7), and 14); “right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex” on test 2), 11), and 16); “right dorsomedial prefrontal cortex” on test 3), and 5); “left ventrolateral prefrontal cortex” on test 5); and “right ventrolateral prefrontal cortex” on test 11) (all  $p < .05$ ). The pattern of these results was not similar to the finding of the discriminant function analysis. It is important to note that a set of three areas (right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, right ventromedial prefrontal cortex, and left dorsomedial prefrontal cortex) were identified by the discriminant function analysis as being significantly involved in PM performance.

## IV. Discussion

The main goal of the present study was to identify the neural bases responsible for PMC using discriminant function analysis. This analysis revealed three areas as highly contributing factors to PM performance. The pattern of these results obtained for PM performance, was not similar to the finding from the multiple linear regression analysis for other neuropsychological tests. This difference suggests that these three areas are specifically involved in PMC. Therefore, based on previous neuroimaging and neuropsychological findings, we consider that cognitive functions are located in each area.

Results indicated that the right DLPFC was the primary factor influencing PM task performance. Past neuroimaging studies have shown that the right DLPFC is highly correlated with working memory performance (Braver et al., 1997). In a subsequent study, the right DLPFC was proposed to have a function in working memory selection from memory to guide a response (Rowe, Toni, Josephs, Frackowiak, & Passingham, 2000). Similarly, the area was considered to be involved in task switching based on the fact that task switching yielded activation of this area (Sohn, Ursu, Anderson, Stenger, & Carter, 2000). Neural substrates for supporting PMC are considered to share in the maintenance of information for intended actions, selection of the required action among candidate actions, and sensitivity to the context or cue that may have changed over time.

Discriminant function analysis yielded the right VMPFC as a secondary factor influencing PM performance. According to classical studies on the VMPFC, most cases with damage to this area show inappropriate social behavior, including emotionally insensitive social interaction, unexpected wandering, alcohol abuse, and confabulation. Despite these sociopathic psychopathological changes, higher-order cognitive functions including general memory performance are largely preserved. The somatic marker hypothesis proposes that damage to the VMPFC precludes the ability to use somatic signals that are necessary for guiding decisions in a positive direction (Bechara, Damasio, Damasio, & Anderson, 1994; Damasio, 1996). Sensitivity to appropriate contexts or cues for proper timing seem likely to depend on signals from autonomic (somatic) bodily responses.

Several other studies have indicated that the right VMPFC supports judgments of familiarity. Direct evidence from a neuroimaging study indicated that the right VMPFC is highly correlated with familiarity judgment (Umeda et al., 2005). Morris, Cleary, & Still (2008) revealed a relationship between recognition ratings and temporal characteristics of the skin conductance responses (SCR), supporting the idea that feelings of familiarity are indeed feelings, in that they stem from autonomic arousal. As another interesting finding, a PM training study for two brain-damaged cases demonstrated no marked improvements in PMC in a case with damage to the right VMPFC (T.K.), although another patient with damage to the medial temporal lobe (Y.O.) showed marked improvements with training (Umeda et al., 2006). These data suggest that cognitive function in the right VMPFC is not easily recovered with PM training. This appears reasonable if the area is correlated with processing regarding autonomic arousal. A recent neuropsychological study indicated that patients with damage to the VMPFC experience a faster subjective sense of time (overestimated and underproduced time intervals) compared to normal healthy controls (Berlin, Rolls, & Kischka, 2004). This may be more evidence that the VMPFC is highly correlated with PM retrieval.

In terms of the DMPFC as the third key factor influencing PM performance, a great number of studies have been reported. Regarding the area inside this region, located in the vicinity of the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), many neuroimaging studies have suggested that this area is highly correlated with mentalising or theory of mind reasoning (Gilbert et al., 2007;

Frith & Frith, 1999; Umeda, Mimura, & Kato, 2010). In contrast, regarding the area outside this region, many neuroimaging studies have reported involvement in PM (Burgess et al., 2001, 2003; den Ouden, Frith, Frith, & Blakemore, 2005; Hashimoto, Umeda, & Kojima, 2010; Okuda et al., 2007) or in multi-task coordination (Gilbert et al., 2007). Most of those studies involving PM have found activation in the rostral PFC (BA10), particularly for maintenance of intentions (Burgess et al., 2007) or sustained responses (Reynolds et al., 2009). Another study reported that recognizing the appropriate context to act (“cue identification”), which is similar to PMC, is associated with lateral BA10 activation accompanied by medial BA10 deactivation (Simons et al., 2006). Similar results were obtained in another study, with responses to targets under self-initiated and cued conditions yielding greater activity in the lateral and medial BA10, respectively (Gilbert, Gollwitzer, Cohen, Burgess, & Oettingen, 2009).

Of note is the finding that BA10 was included in eight of the twelve areas for discriminant function analysis in the present study, if we disregard the position (superior or inferior, right or left) in BA10. Identifying the exact role of BA10 in the present study is difficult. At the very least, our findings support the involvement of BA10 in PMC, but careful examinations of which parts in BA10 are activated during tasks must be examined in future neuroimaging studies (Gilbert et al., 2009; Simons et al., 2006). As pointed out by Burgess et al. (2007), rostral PFC (BA10) lesions typically do not cause widespread cognitive decline, even in traditional tests of frontal lobe functions. Burgess et al. presume that rostral PFC lesions cause impairments, for instance, in self-initiated multitasking (see “the gateway hypothesis”). Further closer scrutiny of the function of BA10 will provide novel insights into the neural substrates of PMC and related components.

To investigate the functional characteristics of PMC, we first compared neuropsychological test scores between “success” and “failure” groups. Significant differences between these groups were found only in total and orientation scores of the HDS-R, with both scores higher in the “success” group. Total and orientation scores of HDS-R are broadly used as diagnostic criteria for AD and other types of dementia, so these correlations suggest PMC as another potential measure to predict demented or pre-demented status. This also suggests that PMC is an integrated memory function, associated with awareness of the current status. The overall lack of significant

differences between PM performance and most neuropsychological test was consistent with the previous finding showing that PMC is separable from functionings in other neuropsychological tests (Henry, Rendell, et al., 2007).

Overall findings from this study suggest that PMC, as timing-based spontaneous prospective memory retrieval, requires integrated memory function implemented by areas within the prefrontal cortex. The discriminant function analysis enabled us to understand the neural substrates of PMC to support the notion.

## References

Bechara, A., Damasio, A. R., Damasio, H., & Anderson, S. W. (1994). Insensitivity to future consequences following damage to human prefrontal cortex. *Cognition*, 50, 7–15.

Berlin, H. A., Rolls, E. T., & Kischka, U. (2004) Impulsivity, time perception, emotion and reinforcement sensitivity in patients with orbitofrontal cortex lesions. *Brain*, 127, 1108–1126.

Blanco-Campal, A., Coen, R. F. , Lawlor, B. A., Walsh, J. B., & Burke, T. E. (2009). Detection of prospective memory deficits in mild cognitive impairment of suspected Alzheimer's disease etiology using a novel event-based prospective memory task. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 15, 154–159.

Brandimonte, M. A., Einstein, G. O., & McDaniel M. A. (Eds.) (1996). *Prospective Memory: Theory and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brandimonte, M. A., Filippello, P., Coluccia, E. Altgassen, M. Kliegel, M. (2011). To do or not to do? Prospective memory versus response inhibition in autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Memory*, 19, 56–66.

Braver, T. S., Cohen, J. D., Nystrom, L. E., Jonides, J., Smith, E. E., & Noll, D. C. (1997). A parametric study of prefrontal cortex involvement in human working memory. *Neuroimage*, 5, 49–62.

Burgess, P. W., Dumontheil, I., & Gilbert, S. J. (2007). The gateway hypothesis of rostral prefrontal cortex (area 10) function. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 290–298.

Burgess, P. W., Quayle, A., & Frith, C. D. (2001). Brain regions involved in prospective memory as determined by positron emission tomography. *Neuropsychologia*, 39, 545–555.

Burgess, P. W., Scott, S. K., & Frith, C. D. (2003). The role of the rostral frontal cortex (area 10) in prospective memory: a lateral versus medial dissociation. *Neuropsychologia*, 41, 906–918.

Burgess, P. W., & Shallice, T. (1997). The relationship between prospective and retrospective memory: Neuropsychological evidence. In M. A. Conway (Ed.), *Cognitive models of memory*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press. Pp. 247–272.

Cohen, J. D., Perlstein, W. M., Braver, T. S., Nystrom, L. E., Noll, D. C., Jonides, J., & Smith, E. E. (1997). Temporal dynamics of brain activation during a working memory task. *Nature*, 386, 604–608.

Costa, A., Peppe, A., Caltagirone, C., & Carlesimo, G. A. (2008). Prospective memory impairment in individuals with Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychology*, 22, 283–292.

Costa, A., Perri, R., Serra, L., Barban, F., Gatto, I., Zabberoni, S., Caltagirone, C., & Carlesimo, G. A. (2010). Prospective memory functioning in mild cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychology*, 24, 327–335.

Cockburn, J. (1995). Task interruption in prospective memory: A frontal lobe function? *Cortex*, 31, 87–97.

Damasio, A. R. (1996). The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions in the Royal Society of London, Series B, Biological Sciences*, 351, 1413–1420.

den Ouden, H. E., Frith, U., Frith, C., & Blakemore, S. J. (2005). Thinking about intentions. *Neuroimage*, 28, 787–796.

Einstein, G. O., & McDaniel, M. A. (1990). Normal aging and prospective memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 16, 717–726.

Foster, E. R., McDaniel, M. A., Repovs, G., & Hershey, T. (2009). Prospective memory in Parkinson disease across laboratory and self-reported everyday performance. *Neuropsychology*, 23, 347–358.

Frith, C. D., & Frith, U. (1999). Interacting minds: A biological basis. *Science*, 286, 1692–1695.

Gilbert, S. J., Gollwitzer, P. M., Cohen, A. L., Burgess, P. W., & Oettingen, G. (2009). Separable brain systems supporting cued versus self-initiated realization of delayed intentions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35, 905–915.

Gilbert, S. J., Williamson, I. D., Dumontheil, I., Simons, J. S., Frith, C. D., & Burgess, P. W. (2007). Distinct regions of medial rostral prefrontal cortex supporting social and nonsocial functions. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 2, 217–226.

Hashimoto, T., Umeda, S., & Kojima, S. (2010). Neural substrates of implicit cueing effect on prospective memory. *Neuroimage*, 54, 645–652.

Hayashi, C. (1952). On the prediction of phenomena from qualitative data and the quantification of qualitative data from the mathematico-statistical point of view. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 3, 69–98.

Henry, J. D., Rendell, P. G., Kliegel, M. & Altgassen, M. (2007). Prospective memory in schizophrenia: Primary or secondary impairment? *Schizophrenia Research*, 95, 179–185.

Huppert F. A., & Beardsall L. (1993). Prospective memory impairment as an early indicator of dementia. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 15, 805–821.

Jones, C. R., Happé, F., Pickles, A., Marsden, A. J., Tregay, J., Baird, G., Simonoff, E., Charman, T. (2010) 'Everyday Memory' Impairments in Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 41, 455–464.

Jones, S., Livner, Å., & Bäckman, L. (2006). Patterns of prospective and retrospec-

tive memory impairment in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychology*, 20, 144–152.

Kumar, D., Nizamie, H. S., & Jahan, M. (2005) Event-based prospective memory in schizophrenia. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 27, 867–872.

Lezak, M. D., (1995). *Neuropsychological assessment*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Livner, Å., Laukka, E. J., Karlsson, S., & Bäckman, L. (2009). Prospective and retrospective memory in Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia: similar patterns of impairment. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 283, 235–239.

Maylor, E. A. (1995). Prospective memory in normal ageing and dementia. *Neurocase*, 1, 285–289.

McDaniel, M. A., Glisky, E. L., Rubin, S. R., Guynn, M. J., & Routhieaux, B. C. (1999). Prospective memory: A neuropsychological study. *Neuropsychology*, 13, 103–110.

Morris, A. L., Cleary, A. M., & Still, M. L. (2008). The role of autonomic arousal in feelings of familiarity. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 17, 1378–1385.

Okuda, J., Fujii, T., Ohtake, H., Tsukiura, T., Yamadori, A., Frith, C. D., & Burgess, P. W. (2007). Differential involvement of regions of rostral prefrontal cortex (Brodmann area 10) in time- and event-based prospective memory. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 64, 233–246.

Okuda, J., Fujii, T., Yamadori, A., Kawashima, R., Tsukiura, T., Fukatsu, et al. (1998). Participation of the prefrontal cortices in prospective remembering: Evidence from a PET study in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, 253, 127–130.

Poppenk, J., Moscovitch, M., McIntosh A. R., Ozcelik, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2010). Encoding the future: Successful processing of intentions engages predictive brain networks. *Neuroimage*, 49, 905–913.

Reynolds, J. R., West, R., & Braver, T. (2009). Distinct neural circuits support transient and sustained processes in prospective memory and working memory. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 1208–1221.

Rowe, J. B., Toni, I., Josephs, O., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Passingham, R. E. 2000 The prefrontal cortex: Response selection of maintenance within working memory. *Science*, 288, 1656–1660.

Shallice, T. & Burgess, P. W. (1991). Higher order cognitive impairments and frontal lobe lesions in man. In H. S. Levin, H. M. Eisenberg & A. L. Benton (Eds.) *Frontal lobe function and dysfunction*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 125–138.

Simons, J. S., Scholvinck, M. L., Gilbert, S. J., Frith, C. D., & Burgess, P. W. (2006). Differential components of prospective memory? Evidence from fMRI. *Neuropsychologia*, 44, 1388–1397.

Sohn, M. H., Ursu, S., Anderson, J. R., Stenger, V. A., & Carter, C. S. (2000). The role of prefrontal cortex and posterior parietal cortex in task switching. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 97, 13448–13453.

Thompson, C., Henry, J. D., Rendell, P. G., Withall, A., & Brodaty, H. (2010). Prospective memory function in mild cognitive impairment and early dementia. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 16, 318–325.

Troyer, A. K., & Murphy, K. J. (2007). Memory for intentions in amnestic mild cognitive impairment: Time- and event-based prospective memory. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 13, 365–369.

Umeda, S., Akine, Y., Kato, M., Muramatsu, T., Mimura, M., Kandatsu, S., Tanada, S., Obata, T., Ikehira, H., & Suhara, T. (2005). Functional network in the prefrontal cortex during episodic memory retrieval. *Neuroimage*, 26, 932–940.

Umeda, S., Kato, M., Mimura, M., Kashima, H., & Koyazu, T. (2000). Prospective memory in patients with Korsakoff syndrome. *Japanese Journal of Neuropsychology*, 16, 193–199.

Umeda, S., Mimura, M., & Kato, M. (2010). Acquired personality traits of autism following damage to the medial prefrontal cortex. *Social Neuroscience*, 5, 19–29.

Umeda, S., Nagumo, Y., & Kato, M. (2006). Dissociative contributions of medial temporal and frontal regions to prospective remembering. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 17, 267–278.

West, R. (2011). The temporal dynamics of prospective memory: A review of the ERP and prospective memory literature. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 2233–2245.

West, R., & Bowry, R. (2005). Effects of aging and working memory demands on prospective memory. *Psychophysiology*, 42, 698–712.

West, R., Bowry, R., & Krompinger, J. (2006). The effects of working memory demands on the neural correlates of prospective memory. *Neuropsychologia*, 44, 197–207.

West, R., Mc너너, M. W., & Krauss, I. (2007). Impaired strategic monitoring as the locus of a focal prospective memory deficit. *Neurocase*, 13, 115–126.

West, R., Mc너너, M. W., & Travers, S. (2007). Gone but not forgotten: The effects of cancelled intentions in the neural correlates of prospective memory. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 64, 215–225.

Wilson, B., Cockburn, J., & Baddeley, A. D. (1985). *The Rivermead Behavioural Memory Test*. Suffolk, England: Thames Valley Test Company.

Woods, S. P., Twamley, E. W., Dawson, M. S., Narvaez, J. M., & Jeste, D. V. (2007). Deficits in cue detection and intention retrieval underlie prospective memory impairment in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, 90, 344–350.

Worthington, A. (1999). Dysexecutive paramnesia: Strategic retrieval deficits in retrospective and prospective remembering. *Neurocase*, 5, 47–57.