### **BRIEF REPORT**



# Memory augmentation with an adaptive cognitive interface

Brady R. T. Roberts<sup>1,3</sup> · Julia Pruin<sup>1</sup> · Wilma A. Bainbridge<sup>1,2,3</sup> · Monica D. Rosenberg<sup>1,2,3</sup> · Megan T. deBettencourt<sup>1,3</sup>

Accepted: 13 September 2024 © The Psychonomic Society, Inc. 2024

#### Abstract

What we remember reflects both what we encounter, such as the intrinsic memorability of a stimulus, and our internal attentional state when we encounter that stimulus. Our memories are better for memorable images and images encountered in an engaged attentional state. Here, in an effort to modulate long-term memory performance, we manipulated these factors in combination by selecting the memorability of presented images contingent on individuals' natural fluctuations in sustained attention. Can image memorability and attentional state be strategically combined to improve memory? Are memorable images still well remembered during lapses in sustained attention, and conversely, can attentive states rescue memory performance for forgettable images? We designed a procedure to monitor participants' sustained attention dynamics on the fly via their response time fluctuations during a continuous performance task with trial-unique scene images. When high- or low-attentional states were detected, our algorithm triggered the presentation of high- or low-memorability images. Afterwards, participants completed a surprise recognition memory test for the attention-triggered images. Results demonstrated that memory performance for memorable items is not only resistant to lapses in sustained attention but also that memory cannot be further improved by encoding memorable items in engaged attentional states. On the other hand, memory performance for low-memorability images can be rescued by attentive encoding states. In sum, we show that both memorability and sustained attention can be leveraged in real time to maximize memory performance. This approach suggests that adaptive cognitive interfaces can tailor *what* information appears *when* to best support overall memory.

Keywords Attentional dynamics · Memorability · Real-time triggering · Recognition memory

As we proceed through everyday life, we encounter a diverse range of visual information in a variety of attentional states, but only some fraction of that information is later remembered. Recent research has revealed that both *what* specific image we view and *when* we see it (namely, how attentive we are when we see it) predict the mnemonic fate of a stimulus. For example, an inherently memorable image is much more likely to be remembered (Bainbridge

Brady R. T. Roberts and Julia Pruin contributed equally to this work.

Brady R. T. Roberts bradyrtroberts@gmail.com

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Chicago, 940 East 57th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
- <sup>2</sup> Neuroscience Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA
- <sup>3</sup> Institute for Mind and Biology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

et al., 2013; Isola et al., 2011). An image encountered in an attentive state is also much more likely to be remembered (Chun & Turk-Browne, 2007; deBettencourt et al., 2018; Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). These findings suggest that both stimulus memorability and an individual's attention can be leveraged to improve memory.

The *intrinsic memorability* of an image refers to the likelihood that one will correctly remember having seen it previously (Bainbridge et al., 2013; Isola et al., 2011). Memorability is highly reliable across participants, even when controlling for visual features (e.g., spatial frequency, color; Bainbridge, 2020; Isola et al., 2014) or stimulus category (Kramer et al., 2023). New work has found that abstract visualizations (Borkin et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2023), words (Tuckute et al., 2018), drawings (Han et al., 2023), paintings (Davis & Bainbridge, 2023), and even dance moves (Ongchoco et al., 2023) are reliably remembered or forgotten across individuals. The intrinsic memorability of an image even predicts later recognition over longer time

scales (e.g., when tested after a 1-week retention interval; Goetschalckx et al., 2018), predicts memory in naturalistic museum settings (Davis & Bainbridge, 2023), and captures memory performance in children as young as 4 years old (Guo & Bainbridge, 2023). Intrinsic memorability, therefore, is widely considered to be a feature that is inherent to a stimulus, and that is predictive of memory across a range of contexts and populations. However, it remains an open question whether and how memorability might be influenced by one's internal state.

Our internal states—such as how attentive we are to a task at hand-vary considerably over time. Attention fluctuations can be measured with subjective approaches, such as intermittent thought probes (e.g., Smallwood et al., 2008) and continuous self-report ratings (e.g., Song et al., 2021), or with objective approaches, such as response times (RTs; e.g., Corriveau, Chao et al., 2024a, Corriveau, James et al., 2024b; deBettencourt et al., 2018), pupillary responses (e.g., Keene et al., 2022), and neural measures (e.g., deBettencourt et al., 2021; Jones et al., 2024). Specifically, prior work using continuous performance tasks have shown that sustained attention during a task correlates with RTs, such that slower RTs reflect higher attention (Cheyne et al., 2006, 2009; deBettencourt et al., 2018, 2019; Manly et al., 1999; Robertson et al., 1997; Zhang & Rosenberg, 2023). These attentional states influence memory performance, regardless of which stimulus appears. For example, memory performance is better when attention is more engaged during both memory encoding (Chun & Turk-Browne, 2007; deBettencourt et al., 2018, 2021; Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022) and memory retrieval (Madore et al., 2020; Madore & Wagner, 2022).

Although memorability is specific to a stimulus (e.g., an image), attentional states are comparatively idiosyncratic. That is, the memorability of a given image represents an aggregate factor that can be measured ahead of time through prior studies (e.g., Isola et al., 2011) or estimated via artificial neural networks (e.g., ResMem; Needell & Bainbridge, 2022), whereas sustained attention differs both between people and within a person over time. Prior research has shown that when memorability and sustained attention are manipulated separately, they both predict unique sets of variance in later memory performance (Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). This opens up the possibility of leveraging both factors simultaneously to maximize memory performance. Therefore, the challenge lies in creating a cognitive interface that can make use of both the stable, population-level measure of an image's memorability, while at the same time considering an individual's moment-to-moment changes in sustained attention. Recent studies have demonstrated how RTs can be used as an objective, real-time index of sustained attention to adaptively modify experiment parameters on the fly. In deBettencourt et al. (2018), participants classified scene images, the category of which-unbeknownst to them—varied depending on their real-time sustained attention. This study revealed that using RTs to index sustained attention was a viable way to predict subsequent memory on an image-by-image basis. More importantly, this work also demonstrated the feasibility of creating cognitive interfaces that dynamically adapt to the user's behavior on each trial.

In the current study, we aimed to create an adaptive cognitive interface that could track an individual's sustained attention, then leverage that information to dynamically present memorable or forgettable images, all in real time. By strategically inserting memorable or forgettable images when sustained attention is waxing and waning, one can not only maximize memory performance in ideal conditions, but can perhaps also 'rescue' memory for low-memorability images by inserting them when attention is high. Here, we explored whether real-time performance tracking could be used to create adaptive cognitive interfaces whereby images with known memorability characteristics are strategically presented to influence later memory performance. In other words, we asked: Can we modulate participants' recognition memory performance by presenting memorable or forgettable images depending on their attentional state?

# Methods

The procedures and materials for this study were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Chicago. All data, analysis code, experiment programs, and other materials are made available on the Open Science Framework (OSF; https://osf.io/9vc5a/).

#### Participants

The number of participants per condition was determined a priori using G\*Power (Version 3.1.9.6; Faul et al., 2007) with a power analysis based on the reported effect of attentional state on subsequent memory performance from prior work (Experiment 3 in Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). The parameters were as follows: one-group linear bivariate regression, two-tailed test, estimated slope = .18,  $\sigma_x =$ 1,  $\sigma_y = .34$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ , power = .8, indicating a minimum sample size of 23 participants in each group. Because two groups were to be collected ('congruent', e.g., pairing highattention states with high-memorability images, and conversely, 'incongruent', e.g., pairing high-attention states with low-memorability images), the minimum sample size was doubled to 46, while a target sample size was set at 64 to increase our chances of finding true effects if they exist.

In the end, a total of 68 participants ages 18–35 years were recruited using the University of Chicago SONA undergraduate recruitment system and completed the study in the laboratory. Participants were assigned to one

of two experimental conditions (Congruent or Incongruent) in alternating order. All participants were compensated for their time with either half a course credit or \$5 USD, provided written informed consent, and had self-declared normal or corrected-to-normal color vision, no prior major head injuries, and no diagnosis of psychiatric or neurological disorders. Data from four participants were excluded while data collection was ongoing: two participants switched the response mapping on the continuous performance task, one participant had continuous performance task data that were >3 standard deviations (SDs) below the group average up to that point, and one participant had memory task performance that was >3 SDs below the group average up to that point. The four excluded participants were replaced to ensure condition groups of an equal size. The final sample size used for analyses was 64, split evenly between two groups (Congruent and Incongruent). Both groups had similarly aged participants (Congruent:  $M_{age} = 20.80$  years,  $SD_{age} = 3.86$ ; Incongruent:  $M_{age} = 19.70$  years,  $SD_{age} = 1.36$ ), with similar sex ratios (Congruent: 17 women, 15 men; Incongruent: 20 women, 12 men).

#### Apparatus

The entire experiment was displayed on a 15-in. MacBook Pro laptop screen with a resolution of  $1,920 \times 1,080$  px running at 60-Hz refresh rate, while the experiment was presented using MATLAB (Version 2022b, The MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) and Psychtoolbox (Version 3.0.18; Kleiner et al., 2007). Participants were seated approximately 61 cm from the screen. Image stimuli subtended approximately 7.25° of visual angle on the screen with a black fixation dot subtending approximately 0.6°, centrally presented and overlaid on top of stimulus images during the continuous performance task (but absent during the memory test).

# Procedure

During the experiment, participants completed two tasks: first, a continuous performance task with trial-unique images, and then a recognition memory task to assess which images were later remembered (Fig. 1). The continuous performance task utilized a real-time triggering protocol which allowed us to tailor which images were presented to participants when, by tracking their attentional state in the moment and leveraging memorability scores collected previously.

#### **Continuous performance task**

The continuous performance task was designed to elicit and allow for the measure of sustained attentional fluctuations by presenting a stream of scene images. On each trial, a single, trial-unique image was centrally presented on a gray background overlayed with a black fixation dot for 1,000 ms. Participants categorized each image as indoor or outdoor by pressing the 'J' or 'H' keys on a keyboard (counterbalanced across participants). The fixation dot turned white after a response was recorded. Trials progressed regardless of whether a response was made, and there was no interstimulus interval. The proportion of indoor/outdoor images were imbalanced to better elicit natural fluctuations in sustained



**Fig. 1** Experiment procedure for participants in the congruent condition. When *high* attention was detected in this condition, a high-memorability image was triggered. Conversely, when *low* attention was detected in this condition, a low-memorability item was triggered. The opposite occurred in the incongruent condition. During the recognition memory test, all of the old, infrequent-category images were

presented (both high and low memorability, indicated here by blue and red borders, respectively), as well as an equal number of new images from the same scene category (medium memorability, indicated here by a yellow border). Images without borders here indicate trials in which the memorability was unconstrained. During the actual experiment tasks, images did not have borders. (Color figure online) attention. At least 90% of the images belonged to one 'frequent' category (either indoor or outdoor, counterbalanced across participants; M = 463 trials, SD = 4.37). The remaining images (M = 7.08% of trials, SD = 0.97%; but hard-capped at 10% of trials) belonged to the other stimulus category (i.e., the 'infrequent' category, either outdoor or indoor). Before starting the main continuous performance task, participants practiced 10 trials repeatedly until they reached 90% accuracy using different images that were not repeated in the main task. During the real continuous performance task, RTs for the first 50 trials were not used to trigger any infrequent-category images, so as to gain an accurate representation of baseline RTs before attention thresholding could be applied. Randomly interspersed within these 50 baselining trials were five infrequent-category images. There was no mention of a later memory test or of any instruction to remember the images for later. The continuous performance task went on without any breaks until all 500 trials were completed, for a total duration of 8 min and 20 s.

#### Image stimuli

This experiment used a set of 1,100 scene images from the Scene UNderstanding database (SUN; Xiao et al., 2010). These images depict a wide variety of representative real-world scenes from 281 subcategories, with 550 indoor scenes and 550 outdoor scenes, and were the same images used in prior related work (deBettencourt et al., 2018). We removed three images from the set (one indoor and two outdoor images) due to the presence of salient features, such as prominent faces or text. All images were cropped to be square, resized to  $450 \times 450$  px and were presented in full color.

#### Image memorability

The intrinsic memorability of each image was determined in prior work (Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). In that study, 706 online participants completed a continuous recognition test in which a stream of images appeared and their task was to detect repeated items (see Bainbridge, 2019). A response was considered a 'hit' when a subject correctly identified an image as a repeat, or a 'false alarm' when they incorrectly indicated that a novel image was a repeat. The memorability of each image was operationalized as the average corrected recognition (CR) rate by subtracting the mean false alarm rate from the mean hit rate across participants.

We began by sorting all images based on their CR rate as reported by Wakeland-Hart et al. (2022) and then selecting the 50 highest memorability and 50 lowest memorability images from each category, indoor and outdoor. To reduce any disproportionate representation of specific image subcategories (e.g., office, bar), we retained only one image per subcategory in each of the high- and low-memorability sets. For example, the high-memorability indoor set could only contain one image of an office. If, upon first pass, the high-memorability indoor set contained more than one image per subcategory (e.g., two images of offices), we retained the image with the most extreme memorability score. We replaced the other image(s) with the next most or least memorable item from a novel subcategory. As a result, high- and low-memorability image sets could have some overlap in subcategories, but no specific subcategory was overrepresented in either set. In the end, high-memorability images ranged in CR score from 0.75 to 0.95, whereas low-memorability images ranged in CR score from 0.26 to 0.56. Note that in all cases, triggered images with extreme memorability always belonged to the infrequent category, whereas images in the frequent category could be of any memorability (mean CR = 0.65, SD = 0.12).

We also selected an equal number of indoor and outdoor images of middle memorability (100 images total per scene category, 0.56 < CR < .75) to serve as new items during the surprise recognition memory test. These middle-memorability images were pseudorandomly selected using a similar procedure as described above, such that all subcategories were roughly equally well-represented. Middle memorability images (rather than high- or low-memorability images) were chosen to serve as new items as they provided the best case of a baseline level of memorability to compare against; we expect high-memorability images will be better remembered than the middle-memorability new items, while lowmemorability images will be worse remembered than them. Additionally, using high- and low-memorability images as new items on the recognition test could have inadvertently caused responses biases, leading to lower false-alarm rates for memorable new images and higher false-alarm rates for forgettable new images (Broers & Busch, 2021). Moreover, participants had slight variations in the number of high- and low-memorability 'old' items on the recognition test due to individual differences in attention triggering at encoding. As a consequence, using high- and low-memorability 'new' items to match would not have been straightforward as they would either need to also vary in quantity to match their respective 'old' counterparts, or would need to be equivalent in quantity to one another while introducing different denominators for hit and false-alarm rates.

To ensure low-level features did not significantly differ between high- and low-memorability images, we used the Natural Image Statistical Toolbox (Bainbridge & Oliva, 2015). We did not observe any reliable differences in color or spatial frequencies (p values  $\geq$  .5) between high- and low-memorability images. Images and their corresponding memorability scores are available at https://osf.io/6uc48/ (Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022), while a list of the specific images used in this experiment can be found at (https://osf. io/9vc5a/).

#### Real-time triggering based on attentional state

The goal of the real-time triggering procedure used in this experiment was to provide an adaptive encoding environment for each participant that integrated their natural fluctuations in attentional state with the intrinsic memorability of the images they were observing. The continuous performance task provided RTs that were used to track each participant's attentional state fluctuations in real time. For a trial *i*, we first calculated and subtracted the linear trend in RTs (Trials 1 to *i*) to remove general effects of fatigue or practice. Then, we calculated a real-time measure of attentional state,  $x_i$ , based on the trailing window average over the detrended RTs from the three most recent trials (Trials *i*-2, *i*-1, *i*). We defined a predetermined threshold,  $\pm 1$  standard deviation ( $\sigma_i$ ) from the mean ( $\mu_i$ ), both of which were calculated over detrended trials 1 to *i*. When the attentional state  $(x_i)$ exceeded our threshold ( $\sigma_i$ ), an image from the infrequent category was triggered (i.e., either an indoor or outdoor scene) for Trial i+1 (see Fig. 2). Thus, images triggered by especially slow RTs ( $x_i > \sigma_i + \mu_i$ ) were encoded during highattention states, whereas images triggered by especially fast RTs ( $x_i < \sigma_i - \mu_i$ ) were encoded during low-attention states. We also required that the three preceding trials (*i*-2, *i*-1, *i*) were correct frequent-category responses and that i > 50 to ensure no confounds due to lack of practice.

While our current experiment used detrended RTs as a measure of attention based on prior work (Cheyne et al., 2006, 2009; deBettencourt et al., 2018, 2019; Wakeland-Hart et al.,



**Fig. 2** An illustration of the attention triggering procedure with example data showing real-time event triggering dependent on states of high and low attention, as calculated based on trailing average RT. Dotted lines in blue and red represent the  $\pm 1$  SD threshold used to indicate states of high or low sustained attention, respectively. Blue and red dots correspond to trials when a participant's sustained attention is detected as being high or low, respectively, thus triggering an infrequent category image on the subsequent trial. (Color figure online)

2022; Zhang & Rosenberg, 2023), it is worthwhile noting that other work has used RT variability as an alternative way to index attention (Bastian & Sackur, 2013; Chidharom et al., 2024; Chidharom & Carlisle, 2024; Esterman et al., 2013; Karamacoska et al., 2018; Rosenberg et al., 2013). Recent data demonstrate that RT and RT variability both independently predict upcoming attentional lapses on a continuous performance task (Corriveau, Chao et al., 2024a, Corriveau, James et al., 2024b). But while both options are valid ways to index attention, RT variability calculations typically rely on calculating how much a trial's RT deviates from the mean correct-trial RT after completing the whole task. For realtime triggering to be possible, changes in attention needed to be detected before the full-task RT mean was determined. For this reason, RT-based real-time triggering was used here instead of RT variability. Moreover, one important yet underacknowledged feature of real-time triggering is that it forces one to 'preregister' the attention measure of interest before data collection occurs, as it is built into the experimental design itself. Thus RT- or RT-variability-based triggering would both be valid for detecting fluctuations in attention, but the former was a better fit for our current paradigm.

A post hoc analysis was conducted to examine whether RT deviance (the standard deviation of the 3 preceding trials before a triggered trial) differed significantly leading up to high- and-low attention-triggered trials. The results of a paired-samples *t* test confirmed that high-attention trials were preceded by less RT deviation (M = 0.059, SD = 0.022), compared with low-attention trials (M = 0.101, SD = 0.024), t(63) = -12.23, p < .001, d = -1.85,  $CI_{95}$  [-2.35, -1.36]. This finding is aligned with prior work suggesting that more stable RTs predict higher levels of attention, whereas variable RTs are predictive of attentional lapses (e.g., Chidharom & Carlisle, 2024; Rosenberg et al., 2013).

#### **Experimental conditions**

Participants were assigned to one of two experimental conditions in an alternating manner: Congruent and Incongruent. If a subject was in the Congruent condition, attention state and image memorability were matched such that, when a participant was in a high-attention state, a high-memorability image from the infrequent category was inserted. If they were in the Incongruent condition, attention state and image memorability were mismatched such that, when a participant was in a high-attention state, a low-memorability image from the infrequent category was inserted. Critically, for both conditions, while frequent-category images could have any memorability score, infrequent-category images were manipulated to be either high or low memorability only. The memorability of these infrequent-category images depended on the attentional state that triggered the infrequent trial, as well as the participant's congruency condition assignment.

#### Memory task

Immediately following the continuous performance task, participants performed a surprise image recognition memory test (self-paced, approximately 8 min to complete) consisting of all infrequent-category images seen during the continuous performance task ('old' images). Because attention varied by participant, so too did the number of infrequent trials that were available for use as 'old' items on the recognition test: overall (M = 31.9, SD = 4.37, range: 24–42), high attention (M = 20.6, SD = 4.09, range: 11–25), low attention (M = 11.3, SD = 5.50, range: 2–25). For each participant, there was also an equal number of new images randomly selected from the larger collection of 100 middlememorability images for the same scene category as the 'old' images. No images from the frequent category in the encoding phase were presented during the memory task. Images were presented in a random order. Participants were instructed to indicate their memory and confidence that each image had appeared in the continuous performance task on a scale of 1-4: '1' indicated high confidence that the image was new, '2' was low confidence that the image was new, '3' was low confidence that the image was old, and '4' indicated high confidence that the image was old. Participants were encouraged to use the entire response scale. High-confidence old responses (i.e., responses of '4') were later taken to indicate that an item was considered previously studied, whereas all other responses were taken to indicate that an item was not seen before (deBettencourt et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2014; Turk-Browne et al., 2006; Wagner et al., 1998; Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). However, we found that our results replicated even when using a more lenient threshold (a low-confidence threshold of '3' or '4' for 'old' responses; see Results section). After the participant made a response to an image, we updated the confidence rating scale to overlay a red dot so as to visually depict the response. The confidence scale, response dot, and image remained on the screen for 500 ms before the next image appeared; the answer could not be changed during this time. There was no interstimulus interval.

#### Statistical approach

A' (A-prime; Stanislaw & Todorov, 1999) was used to assess recognition memory performance due to its nonparametric assumptions. These nonparametric qualities are robust to violations of normality that are likely to be present when studying the extremes of memorability and sustained attention distributions. A' was calculated from the hit rate of triggered ('old') items on the recognition test (separately for images encoded in high- and low-attention states) and the false-alarm rate for new items. To examine memory performance across conditions, a mixed-effects logistic regression was formed using the lme4 package (Version 1.1-34; Bates et al., 2015) for R (Version 4.3.2; R Core Team, 2020), employing the Satterthwaite adjustment to degrees of freedom. Attention (high, low) and memorability (high, low) were entered as binary predictors regressed onto A' with a subject-level random factor included as well:

#### $A\prime \sim Attention \times Memorability + (1|Participant)$

We chose to report a model without random slopes in order to match the prior work we are directly extending (Wakeland-Hart et al., 2022). By not including random slopes for these factors, there is greater compatibility and ease of comparison between studies. To ensure that this decision did not impact our results, we compared two similar models that differ only in their inclusion of both Attention and Memorability as random slopes. Because using random slopes requires trial-level data, the dependent measure changed from A' to hit rate. The two models—one with Attention, Memorability, and Participant as random slopes, and one with only Participant as a random slope—did not differ significantly,  $\chi^2(5) = 0.81$ , p = .977.

To compare the relative contributions of attention and memorability in predicting later memory performance, a contrast was conducted using the multcomp package (Version 1.4-25; Hothorn et al., 2023). Between-group comparisons were then conducted via the emmeans package (Version 1.8.9; Lenth et al., 2023), while effect sizes (Cohen's d) and their 95% confidence intervals were determined with 10,000 bootstraps via the percentile method in the rstatix package (Version 0.7.2; Kassambara, 2021). Bayes factors were calculated using the BayesFactor package (Version 0.9.12-4.5; Morey et al., 2011), enlisting a default Jeffreys-Zellner–Siow (JZS) prior with a Cauchy distribution (center = 0, r = .707). This package compares the fit of various linear models. In the present case, Bayes factors for the alternative  $(BF_{10})$  are in comparison to null models containing participant as a random effect. Bayes factors for interactions are relative to models containing both main effects. Interpretations of Bayes factors follow the conventions of Lee and Wagenmakers (2013). Bayes factors in favor of the alternative  $(BF_{10})$  or null  $(BF_{01})$  models are presented in accordance with each preceding report of Null hypothesis significance testing (NHST) analyses (i.e., based on a p < .05 criterion) such that  $BF \ge 1$ .

Finally, receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) analyses were also conducted using the ROC Toolbox (Koen et al., 2017) for MATLAB, treating response decisions as continuous based on confidence ratings rather than as binary old/new decisions. Due to an insufficient number of trials in each condition per participant, however, we were unable

to compare results statistically. The pattern of results based on ROC analyses, however, matched the results presented here based on A' (see the Supplemental Materials for more details).

# Results

The goal of this study was to determine whether memory performance can be improved by first detecting real-time fluctuations in sustained attention and then using that information to present specific images with predetermined levels of intrinsic memorability. We expected both attention and memorability to each significantly predict later memory performance. We also reasoned that inserting high-memorability images could maximize performance when attention was high and rescue performance when attention was low. Analogously, we predicted that inserting low-memorability images would minimize performance when attention was low, but may rescue memory performance for impoverished items when attention was high.

## Verifying the adaptive cognitive interface

We first examined whether real-time triggering successfully captured fluctuations in sustained attention. Sustained attention was operationalized as the real-time RTs in the continuous performance task, after detrending and averaging over a trailing window. Indeed, our algorithm successfully differentiated states of sustained attention, with quicker RTs on low-attention triggered trials (mean centered RT = -0.159), and slower RTs on high-attention triggered trials (mean centered RT = 0.182; see Fig. 3A). Next, we examined the memorability of the images that appeared contingent to extreme attentional states. Memorability was operationalized as the CR scores for these images, as determined by testing with a separate sample of participants (see Methods). As can be seen clearly in Fig. 3B, our algorithm successfully displayed extremely low (average CR = 0.469) or extremely high (average CR = 0.834) memorability images, dependent on attentional state and congruency group assignment.

#### Memory performance

A mixed-effects logistic regression was used to assess the effects of image memorability and sustained attention on later memory performance. There were significant main effects of both attention,  $\beta = .49$ , SE = .23, t(118.22) = 2.09, p = .039,  $BF_{10} = 1.67$ , and memorability,  $\beta = .81$ , SE = .23, t(118.22) = 3.49, p < .001,  $BF_{10} = 1,565$  on memory, such that higher attention and intrinsic memorability predicted better memory performance (Fig. 4A). The interaction effect, representing the effect of Congruency group, was nonsignificant,  $\beta = -.28$ , SE = .36, t(62) = -0.77, p = .446,  $BF_{01} = 2.52$ . A contrast to compare the relative contributions of attention and memorability in predicting later memory performance revealed that the variance explained by the two factors were not reliably different, z = -1.58, SE = 0.02, p = .114.

A mixed-effects model was also conducted using a low confidence threshold (i.e., '3' and '4' were coded as 'old' responses), and the main findings did not change: Attention:  $\beta = .52$ , SE = .24, t(122) = 2.19, p = .031, Memorability:  $\beta = .79$ , SE = .24, t(122) = 3.32, p = .001, Interaction:  $\beta = -.40$ , SE = .37, t(122) = -1.08, p = .283.



**Fig.3 A** Histogram of all trials from the encoding phase with highattention trials in blue and low-attention trials in red, indicating successful implementation of the attention manipulation for slow and fast RTs, respectively. **B** Histogram of memorability scores for all scene

images in the stimulus set. Triggered images with low memorability are depicted in red, while triggered images with high memorability are depicted in blue. Example high- and low-memorability stimuli are displayed. (Color figure online)



**Fig. 4** Memory performance (A') modulations as a function of sustained attention and memorability. **A** Overall memory performance benefits for high relative to low levels of both attention and memorability within subject. **B** Between-subjects contrasts demonstrating that high attention 'rescues' performance for low-memorability images (left), and that having high attention does not improve performance

over and above high memorability (right). **C** Between-subjects contrasts demonstrating that high-memorability images improve performance even when attention is low (left), and that low memorability hurts performance even when attention is high (right). (Color figure online)

Next, the effects of high and low levels of attention and memorability were examined between groups. Planned comparisons revealed that memory performance was significantly greater for high-memorability images relative to low-memorability images when encoded under both high attention, t(118) = 2.29, p = .024, d = 1.01,  $CI_{95}$  [0.51, 1.67],  $BF_{10} = 160$ , and low attention, t(118) $= 3.49, p < .001, d = 0.67, CI_{95} [0.27, 1.08], BF_{10} = 4.98$ (Fig. 4C), demonstrating that the effects of memorability are relatively immune to fluctuations in sustained attention. Memory performance for high-memorability items did not differ as a function of sustained attention state,  $t(118) = 0.89, p = .374, d = 0.31, CI_{95} [-0.19, 0.75], BF_{01}$ = 2.06, suggesting that high memorability itself can keep performance levels high, even when attention wanes (see Table 1 and Fig. 4B, right). However, when testing low memorability (i.e., forgettable) images, memory was better for items encoded under high attention, t(118) = 2.09, p =.039, d = 0.43, CI<sub>95</sub> [-0.02, 0.77],  $BF_{10} = 0.88$ , suggesting that memory for forgettable images can be rescued if they are encoded in an attentive state (Fig. 4B, left).

Thus, recognition memory performance for high-memorability images was consistently better than for low-memorability images and was unaffected by attentional state at encoding. Memory for low-memorability images, on the other hand, was better when they were encoded in states of engaged attention. In other words, high memorability can improve memory for images encountered in disengaged attentional states, while engaged attention can improve memory for low-memorability images. Encoding highly memorable images in highly attentive states, however, does not confer additional benefits for memory.

# Discussion

In the current study, we designed an adaptive cognitive interface that strategically inserted specific images contingent on real-time detection of cognitive states. That is, we inserted high- or low-memorability images when participants were attentive or inattentive. Our goal was to directly manipulate the interplay between internal states (in this case, sustained attention) and external stimulusbased factors (in this case, intrinsic memorability). We measured sustained attention in real time via RTs on a continuous performance task. When a high- or low-attention state was detected, the algorithm triggered an image on the subsequent trial. The triggered image was either high or low memorability, depending on whether the participant was assigned to the congruent or incongruent condition. We observed that both high attention and high intrinsic memorability benefitted memory performance. In sum, we created adaptive encoding phases, whereby later memory performance could be examined to determine the maximally efficient combination of attention and memorability at encoding.

Memorable and forgettable images were differentially susceptible to sustained attentional state. Although there was no additive benefit of encoding memorable images while in a high-attentive versus a low-attentive state, forgettable images were better remembered when encoded in a highly attentive state. That is, when tasked with trying to remember an image that is known to be forgettable, it helps to be in an attentive state. So, while the intrinsic memorability of an image is an important determinant of later memory performance, there is still a memory benefit in trying to pay attention: Performance can be rescued when to-be-remembered stimuli are forgettable.

In contrast to the different effects of sustained attention on later recognition of memorable and forgettable images, the intrinsic memorability of an image impacted memory regardless of attentional state. Memorable images were better remembered than forgettable ones, regardless of whether participants were engaged or disengaged. Put another way, the benefits of encoding high-memorability images are immune to lapses in attention.

On the other hand, observing images in an attentive state did not significantly improve recognition of highly memorable images either. One possibility is that the locus of control for later recognition of high-memorability images is not

Condition Attention Memorability A' Hit Rate False Alarm Rate Corrected Recognition М SD М М М SDSD SDCongruent High High .87 .06 .54 .20 .03 .04 .51 .20 Low Low .76 .16 .31 .20 .28 .19 Incongruent High Low .81 .05 .38 .17 .04 .05 .33 .15 Low High .84 .08 .51 .21 .46 .19

 Table 1 Descriptive statistics for memory performance across groups and conditions

All performance metrics reported here refer to data from the memory test in our current study. Corrected recognition refers to hit rate minus false alarm rate

held by the observer, but is rather largely predetermined by features of the stimulus itself. For instance, recent work has shown that memorable items are processed more efficiently (Deng et al., 2024; Gedvila et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2024), and perhaps as a consequence of this efficiency, seem to be better than forgettable items at making it through the working memory bottleneck into long-term memory (Gillies et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2024). However, high-memorability items do not seem to elicit automatic attentional capture, as they do not gain a pop-out benefit in a visual search task (Bainbridge, 2020). Thus, it could be the case that memorable images are encoded so efficiently that they consistently enter longterm memory when attention is low, and therefore cannot be improved upon when attention is high.

A final possibility is that our attention-triggering algorithm did not sample the most extreme attentional states. Because we required the three trials preceding any triggered image to be correct frequent-category trial responses, we did not present triggered trials during lapses that were catastrophic enough to cause errors on frequent-category image classifications. Potentially supporting this notion, highly memorable images were numerically (but not significantly) better remembered when encoded in states of high relative to low attention.

Future work varying attentional-state-dependent triggering criteria and encoding task features (such as the degree to which they facilitate engaged vs. lapsing attention) can further characterize the relative strength of memorability and attentional state as predictors of subsequent memory. Later interfaces could be even more personalized, with specific tailoring of the image content to the participant to maximize its memorability. A triggering model that incorporates taskspecific information or a more nuanced attention index (such as one measured from the brain) could enhance our ability to elicit improved memories. However, one important factor to balance when utilizing an alternate sustained attention measure is that there must be sufficient moments of extremely high or low attention to elicit enough triggered trials.

Here, we have shown that people's memory performance can be altered without any intentional encoding or cognitive strategy (e.g., chunking, drawing). By simply taking advantage of natural fluctuations in attention and strategically presenting specific materials, we can ensure the best performance possible. This study supports both memorability as an intrinsic stimulus characteristic, and attentional state as being influential to memory encoding. In other words, we show how memorability and sustained attention jointly contribute to episodic remembering and therefore should both be considered when developing contemporary models of memory.

In the laboratory, this new technology allows for not only the tailoring of experiments and digital experiences to each individual, but also for the customization of parameters on a moment-by-moment basis, dependent on the individual's performance or feedback. Such tools can be used to examine the interplay of seemingly any cognitive process, allowing for the cross-examination of population-level phenomena with idiosyncratic cognitive and neural mechanisms. Employing such a tool in the present case, we were able to characterize the interplay of individual attention and image memorability on later memory performance and demonstrate that each factor is able to rescue memory when the other factor is diminished.

Adaptive cognitive interfaces also have numerous practical and translational applications. Our current approach could be employed in educational settings to present the least memorable concepts when students are most attentive (Guo & Bainbridge, 2023). For example, when learning a foreign language, memorable or forgettable vocabulary could be strategically presented contingent on the learner's attentional state. This approach could also be used to scaffold memory and learning for populations that have impairments in memory (e.g., Alzheimer's disease) or attention (e.g., attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder). Importantly, our approach uses measures that are relatively easy to capture-attention is simply measured by RT, while image memorability can be estimated in advance using neural networks (Needell & Bainbridge, 2022), making such innovations feasible to incorporate into any system.

# Conclusion

Recent work has established the contributions of two major factors that influence what information is likely to be remembered: intrinsic memorability and sustained attention. While both factors are known to influence memory individually, it was still unclear how their combination might alter memory, and whether they could be leveraged together to maximize overall performance. Here, we developed and validated an adaptive cognitive interface-customized for each participant on the fly-that allowed for consideration of both what information is presented and when to show it (based on intrinsic memorability and sustained attention, respectively). In so doing, we have shown that when participants are inattentive, encoding of highly memorable images reliably improves memory performance relative to forgettable images, despite participants' lack of focus. Memory for forgettable images, on the other hand, can be 'rescued' if shown when participants are in states of high attention. As a result, we have demonstrated that natural fluctuations in participants' attentional states and the intrinsic memorability of to-be-remembered stimuli can be strategically combined to bolster memory in any given situation.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-024-02589-y.

**Funding** This research was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) Postdoctoral Fellowship to B.R.T.R., National Eye Institute Grant R01-EY034432 to W.A.B., and National Science Foundation grant BCS-2043740 to M.D.R.

Availability of data, code, and materials All experiment programs, data, statistical code, and other materials are listed on the Open Science Framework (OSF): https://osf.io/9vc5a/

#### Declarations

**Competing interests** M.T.dB is an employee of and has equity in Ruby Neurotech, though this company was not involved in the current study.

**Ethics approval** This study was performed in line with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval was granted by the Social and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board at the University of Chicago.

**Consent to participate** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Consent for publication Not applicable.

# References

- Bainbridge, W. A. (2019). Memorability: How what we see influences what we remember. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 70, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2019.02.001
- Bainbridge, W. A. (2020). The resiliency of image memorability: A predictor of memory separate from attention and priming. *Neuropsychologia*, 141, 107408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsych ologia.2020.107408
- Bainbridge, W. A., & Oliva, A. (2015). A toolbox and sample object perception data for equalization of natural images. *Data in Brief*, 5, 846–851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2015.10.030
- Bainbridge, W. A., Isola, P., & Oliva, A. (2013). The intrinsic memorability of face photographs. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(4), 1323–1334. https://doi.org/10. 1037/a0033872
- Bastian, M., & Sackur, J. (2013). Mind wandering at the fingertips: Automatic parsing of subjective states based on response time variability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 573. https://doi.org/10. 3389/fpsyg.2013.00573
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using Ime4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67, 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- Borkin, M. A., Vo, A. A., Bylinskii, Z., Isola, P., Sunkavalli, S., Oliva, A., & Pfister, H. (2013). What makes a visualization memorable? *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 19(12), 2306–2315. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2013.234
- Broers, N., & Busch, N. A. (2021). The effect of intrinsic image memorability on recollection and familiarity. *Memory & Cognition*, 49(5), 998–1018. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-020-01105-6
- Cheyne, J. A., Carriere, J. S. A., & Smilek, D. (2006). Absent-mindedness: Lapses of conscious awareness and everyday cognitive failures. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 15(3), 578–592. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2005.11.009
- Cheyne, J. A., Solman, G. J. F., Carriere, J. S. A., & Smilek, D. (2009). Anatomy of an error: A bidirectional state model of task

engagement/disengagement and attention-related errors. *Cognition*, 111(1), 98–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.12.009

- Chidharom, M., & Carlisle, N. B. (2024). Why are some individuals better at using negative attentional templates to suppress distractors? Exploration of interindividual differences in cognitive control efficiency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*. https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0001214
- Chidharom, M., Bonnefond, A., Vogel, E. K., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2024). Objective markers of sustained attention fluctuate independently of mind-wandering reports. *bioRxiv*. https://doi.org/10. 1101/2024.07.08.602532
- Chun, M. M., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2007). Interactions between attention and memory. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 17(2), 177–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2007.03.005
- Corriveau, A., Chao, A., deBettencourt, M. T., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2024a). Recognition memory fluctuates with sustained attention regardless of task-relevance. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. https:// doi.org/10.3758/s13423-024-02560-x. Advance online publication.
- Corriveau, A., James, A. R. J., deBettencourt, M. T., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2024b). Sustained attentional state is a floodlight not a spot-light. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/k9cnm
- Davis, T. M., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2023). Memory for artwork is predictable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(28), e2302389120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2302389120
- deBettencourt, M. T., Norman, K. A., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2018). Forgetting from lapses of sustained attention. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(2), 605–611. https://doi.org/10.3758/ s13423-017-1309-5
- deBettencourt, M. T., Keene, P. A., Awh, E., & Vogel, E. K. (2019). Real-time triggering reveals concurrent lapses of attention and working memory. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(8), 8. https://doi. org/10.1038/s41562-019-0606-6
- deBettencourt, M. T., Williams, S. D., Vogel, E. K., & Awh, E. (2021). Sustained attention and spatial attention distinctly influence longterm memory encoding. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 33(10), 2132–2148. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\_a\_01748
- Deng, W., Federmeier, K. D., & Beck, D. M. (2024). Highly memorable images are more readily perceived. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 153(6), 1415–1424. https://doi.org/10.1037/ xge0001594
- Esterman, M., Noonan, S. K., Rosenberg, M., & Degutis, J. (2013). In the zone or zoning out? Tracking behavioral and neural fluctuations during sustained attention. *Cerebral Cortex*, 23(11), 2712– 2723. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs261
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191.
- Gedvila, M., Ongchoco, J. D. K., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2023). Memorable beginnings, but forgettable endings: Intrinsic memorability alters our subjective experience of time. *Visual Cognition*, 31(5), 380–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2023.2268382
- Gillies, G., Park, H., Woo, J., Walther, D. B., Cant, J. S., & Fukuda, K. (2023). Tracing the emergence of the memorability benefit. *Cognition*, 238, 105489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105489
- Goetschalckx, L., Moors, P., & Wagemans, J. (2018). Image memorability across longer time intervals. *Memory*, 26(5), 581–588. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2017.1383435
- Guo, X., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2023). Children develop adult-like visual sensitivity to image memorability by the age of 4. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001511
- Han, S., Rezanejad, M., & Walther, D. B. (2023). Memorability of line drawings of scenes: The role of contour properties. *Memory & Cognition*. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-023-01478-4
- Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., Westfall, P., Heiberger, R. M., Schuetzenmeister, A., & Scheibe, S. (2023). *Multcomp: Simultaneous inference in*

general parametric models (Version 1.4–25). https://cran.r-proje ct.org/web/packages/multcomp/index.html

- Isola, P., Xiao, J., Torralba, A., & Oliva, A. (2011). What makes an image memorable? *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (pp. 145–152). IEEE.
- Isola, P., Jianxiong, X., Parikh, D., Torralba, A., & Oliva, A. (2014). What makes a photograph memorable? *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 36(7), 1469–1482. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2013.200
- Jones, H. M., Yoo, K., Chun, M. M., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2024). Edgebased general linear models capture moment-to-moment fluctuations in attention. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 44(14), e1543232024.
- Karamacoska, D., Barry, R. J., & Steiner, G. Z. (2018). Electrophysiological underpinnings of response variability in the Go/NoGo task. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 134, 159–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2018.09.008
- Kassambara, A. (2021). Rstatix: Pipe-friendly framework for basic statistical tests (Version 0.7.2). https://cran.r-project.org/web/packa ges/rstatix/index.html
- Keene, P. A., deBettencourt, M. T., Awh, E., & Vogel, E. K. (2022). Pupillometry signatures of sustained attention and working memory. Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, 84(8), 2472–2482. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-022-02557-5
- Kim, G., Lewis-Peacock, J. A., Norman, K. A., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2014). Pruning of memories by context-based prediction error. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(24), 8997–9002. https://doi.org/10.1073/ pnas.1319438111
- Kleiner, M., Brainard, D., Pelli, D., Ingling, A., Murray, R., & Broussard, C. (2007). What's new in Psychoolbox-3. *Perception*, 36(14), 1–16.
- Koen, J. D., Barrett, F. S., Harlow, I. M., & Yonelinas, A. P. (2017). The ROC Toolbox: A toolbox for analyzing receiver-operating characteristics derived from confidence ratings. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(4), 1399–1406. https://doi.org/10.3758/ s13428-016-0796-z
- Kramer, M. A., Hebart, M. N., Baker, C. I., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2023). The features underlying the memorability of objects. *Science Advances*, 9(17), eadd2981. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.add2981
- Lee, M. D., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2013). Bayesian cognitive modeling: A practical course. Cambridge University Press. https://doi. org/10.1017/CBO9781139087759
- Lenth, R. V., Bolker, B., Buerkner, P., Giné-Vázquez, I., Herve, M., Jung, M., ..., Singmann, H.(2023). *emmeans* (Version 1.8.9). https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html
- Ma, A. C., Cameron, A. D., & Wiener, M. (2024). Memorability shapes perceived time (and vice versa). *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(7), 1296–1308. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01863-2
- Madore, K. P., Khazenzon, A. M., Backes, C. W., Jiang, J., Uncapher, M. R., Norcia, A. M., & Wagner, A. D. (2020). Memory failure predicted by attention lapsing and media multitasking. *Nature*, 587(7832), 7832. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2870-z
- Madore, K. P., & Wagner, A. D. (2022). Readiness to remember: Predicting variability in episodic memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 26(8), 707–723. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.05.006
- Manly, T., Robertson, I. H., Galloway, M., & Hawkins, K. (1999). The absent mind: Further investigations of sustained attention to response. *Neuropsychologia*, 37(6), 661–670. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/s0028-3932(98)00127-4
- Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N., Jamil, T., Urbanek, S., Forner, K., & Ly, A. (2011). BayesFactor: Computation of Bayes factors for common design (Version Version 0.9.12–4.5). https://cran.rstud io.com/web/packages/BayesFactor/
- Needell, C. D., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2022). Embracing new techniques in deep learning for estimating image memorability. *Computational Brain & Behavior*, 5(2), 168–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42113-022-00126-5

- Ongchoco, J. D. K., Chun, M. M., & Bainbridge, W. A. (2023). What moves us? The intrinsic memorability of dance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 49(6), 889–899. https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001168
- R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Version 4.3.2). http://www.r-project.org/
- Roberts, B. R. T., MacLeod, C. M., & Fernandes, M. A. (2023). Symbol superiority: Why \$ is better remembered than 'dollar.' *Cognition*, 238, 105435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105435
- Robertson, I. H., Manly, T., Andrade, J., Baddeley, B. T., & Yiend, J. (1997). 'Oops!': Performance correlates of everyday attentional failures in traumatic brain injured and normal subjects. *Neuropsychologia*, 35(6), 747–758. https://doi.org/10.1016/ s0028-3932(97)00015-8
- Rosenberg, M., Noonan, S., DeGutis, J., & Esterman, M. (2013). Sustaining visual attention in the face of distraction: A novel gradual-onset continuous performance task. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 75(3), 426–439. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-012-0413-x
- Smallwood, J., McSpadden, M., & Schooler, J. W. (2008). When attention matters: The curious incident of the wandering mind. *Memory & Cognition*, 36(6), 1144–1150. https://doi.org/10. 3758/MC.36.6.1144
- Song, H., Finn, E. S., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2021). Neural signatures of attentional engagement during narratives and its consequences for event memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(33), e2021905118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021905118
- Stanislaw, H., & Todorov, N. (1999). Calculation of signal detection theory measures. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 31*(1), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03207704
- Tuckute, G., Mahowald, K., Isola, P., Oliva, A., Gibson, E., & Fedorenko, E. (2018). Intrinsically memorable words have unique associations with their meanings. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10. 31234/osf.io/p6kv9
- Turk-Browne, N. B., Yi, D.-J., & Chun, M. M. (2006). Linking implicit and explicit memory: Common encoding factors and shared representations. *Neuron*, 49(6), 917–927. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. neuron.2006.01.030
- Wagner, A. D., Schacter, D. L., Rotte, M., Koutstaal, W., Maril, A., Dale, A. M., ...., & Buckner, R. L. (1998). Building memories: Remembering and forgetting of verbal experiences as predicted by brain activity. *Science*, 281(5380), 1188–1191. https://doi.org/ 10.1126/science.281.5380.1188
- Wakeland-Hart, C. D., Cao, S. A., deBettencourt, M. T., Bainbridge, W. A., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2022). Predicting visual memory across images and within individuals. *Cognition*, 227, 105201. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105201
- Xiao, J., Hays, J., Ehinger, K. A., Oliva, A., & Torralba, A. (2010). SUN database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. *Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (pp. 3485–3492). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2010.5539970
- Ye, C., Guo, L., Wang, N., Liu, Q., & Xie, W. (2024). Perceptual encoding benefit of visual memorability on visual memory formation. *Cognition*, 248, 105810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogni tion.2024.105810
- Zhang, Z., & Rosenberg, M. D. (2023). Assessing the impact of attention fluctuations on statistical learning. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-023-02805-2

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.