

1 **Parallel cognitive maps for short-term statistical and long-term semantic relationships in**
2 **the hippocampal formation**

3
4 Xiaochen Y. Zheng¹, Martin N. Hebart², Raymond J. Dolan^{3,4}, Christian F. Doeller^{2,5,6}, Roshan
5 Cools^{1,7}, Mona M. Garvert²

6
7 1 Radboud University, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Nijmegen, the
8 Netherlands

9 2 Max-Planck-Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

10 3 Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, University College London, London WC1N 3AR,
11 UK

12 4 Max Planck University College London Centre for Computational Psychiatry and Ageing
13 Research, University College London, London WC1B 5EH, UK

14 5 Kavli Institute for Systems Neuroscience, Centre for Neural Computation, The Egil and
15 Pauline Braathen and Fred Kavli Centre for Cortical Microcircuits, Jebsen Centre for
16 Alzheimer's Disease, NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

17 6 Wilhelm Wundt Institute of Psychology, Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany

18 7 Radboud University Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

19

20

21

22 Correspondence to Xiaochen Y. Zheng, Donders Centre for Cognitive Neuroimaging,

23 Kapittelweg 29, 6525 EN, Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Email: xiaochen.zheng@donders.ru.nl

1 **Abstract**

2 The hippocampal-entorhinal system uses cognitive maps to represent spatial knowledge and other
3 types of relational information, such as the transition probabilities between objects. However,
4 objects can often be characterized in terms of different types of relations simultaneously, e.g.
5 semantic similarities learned over the course of a lifetime as well as transitions experienced over
6 a brief timeframe in an experimental setting. Here we ask how the hippocampal formation handles
7 the embedding of stimuli in multiple relational structures that differ vastly in terms of their mode
8 and timescale of acquisition: Does it integrate the different stimulus dimensions into one
9 conjunctive map, or is each dimension represented in a parallel map? To this end, we reanalyzed
10 functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data from Garvert et al. (2017) that had previously
11 revealed an entorhinal map which coded for newly learnt statistical regularities. We used a triplet
12 odd-one-out task to construct a semantic distance matrix for presented items and applied fMRI
13 adaptation analysis to show that the degree of similarity of representations in bilateral
14 hippocampus decreases as a function of semantic distance between presented objects. Importantly,
15 while both maps localize to the hippocampal formation, this semantic map is anatomically distinct
16 from the originally described entorhinal map. This finding supports the idea that the hippocampal-
17 entorhinal system forms parallel cognitive maps reflecting the embedding of objects in diverse
18 relational structures.

Introduction

1
2 The hippocampal-entorhinal system builds rich models of the world called cognitive maps that
3 account for the relationships between locations, events, and experiences (e.g., Behrens et al., 2018;
4 Moser, Kropff, & Moser, 2008; O’Keefe & Nadel, 1978; Tolman, 1948). Abstracting and
5 organizing relational information in this way facilitates flexible behavior, enabling generalization
6 and inference. Beyond classical findings on the importance of cognitive maps for spatial
7 navigation (e.g., Burgess, Maguire, & O’Keefe, 2002; Ekstrom & Ranganath, 2018; O’Keefe &
8 Nadel, 1978), they are also thought to organize the relationships between objects (Constantinescu,
9 O’Reilly, & Behrens, 2016; Garvert, Dolan, & Behrens, 2017; Garvert, Saanum, Schulz, Schuck,
10 & Doeller, 2021; Morton, Schlichting, & Preston, 2020, Theves, Fernandez, & Doeller, 2019,
11 2020; Viganò, Rubino, Di Soccio, Buiatti, & Piazza, 2021), to represent temporal distances
12 (Bellmund, Deuker, & Doeller, 2019; Bellmund, Deuker, Montijn, & Doeller, 2022; Burgess,
13 Maguire, & O’Keefe, 2002; Schapiro, Kustner, & Turk-Browne, 2012; Solomon, Lega, Sperling,
14 & Kahana, 2019), and to structure knowledge in the context of social cognition (Park, Miller, Nili,
15 Ranganath, & Boorman, 2020; Son, Bhandari, & Feldmanhall, 2021; Tavares et al., 2015). While
16 cognitive mapping is thus proposed to be a universal, domain-unspecific coding principle to
17 systematically organize knowledge (Behrens et al., 2018; Bellmund, Gärdenfors, Moser, &
18 Doeller, 2018; Stachenfeld, Botvinick, & Gershman, 2017), it is unclear how the brain handles
19 stimuli embedded in multiple relational structures that are very distinct in terms of their mode and
20 timescale of acquisition. Does the hippocampal-entorhinal system form one conjunctive map that
21 integrates similarities along the different stimulus dimensions or does it form anatomically
22 separable maps for each stimulus dimension?

1 In Garvert et al. (2017), participants acquired new relational knowledge about everyday
2 objects that were already embedded in semantic structures. Here, participants were trained on
3 object sequences generated from a pseudo-random walk along a hidden graph. Within the
4 hippocampal–entorhinal system, the neural representations of the presented objects reflected the
5 link distance on the graph (Garvert et al., 2017). In this situation, besides the newly learned
6 transitional probabilities between objects, participants can be assumed to have explicit knowledge
7 about the semantic relationships between the same objects (e.g., rabbit and dog are both animals)
8 as acquired over the course of their lifetime. We conjectured that prior semantic knowledge about
9 objects would be simultaneously mapped in the same system, which also represents knowledge
10 about transition probabilities.

11 Here we used a triplet odd-one-out task (Hebart, Zheng, Pereira, & Baker, 2020) to
12 construct a model of object similarity. We matched the stimuli used in Garvert et al. (2017) with
13 photographs of the same objects which have different visual features. This allowed us to isolate
14 the semantic relationships, which reflect high-level conceptual knowledge acquired from
15 experience, from low-level perceptual attributes of the specific objects (Rosch & Lloyd, 1978;
16 Tversky, 1977), while maintaining the richness of the visually perceived stimuli. Using fMRI
17 adaptation analysis on the data by Garvert et al. (2017), we found evidence consistent with a map
18 of semantic relationships between objects that precisely localized to the hippocampus. Although
19 both maps were represented in the hippocampal-entorhinal system, this semantic map was
20 anatomically distinct from the previously described entorhinal map, which coded for newly learnt
21 statistical regularities. By showing the hippocampal formation maps distinctive types of
22 relationships simultaneously in parallel maps, our results thus demonstrate that the hippocampal
23 formation does not form conjunctive maps that integrate similarities across distinct stimulus


1 dimensions. Instead – at least in situations where the mode and timescale of acquisition are very
2 distinct – different stimulus dimensions are organized in anatomically separable maps.

3

4

Results

5 23 human participants were trained on object sequences whose transition probabilities followed a
6 discrete, non-spatial graph (Figure 1A, Garvert et al. 2017). Without being consciously aware of
7 the statistical regularities, participants' neural activity in the hippocampus and entorhinal cortex
8 reflected the transitional relationships they had experienced between the objects on a subsequent
9 day (Figure 1B, 3A). However, the brain may not only represent the newly learned statistical
10 regularities, but also the semantic relationships between the objects acquired over the course of a
11 lifetime. Thus, we asked whether this information is also mapped in the same system.



12


13

1 **Figure 1. Experimental design.** (A) Graph structure used to generate stimulus sequences on day
2 1. Trial transitions were drawn from random walks along the graph. (B) Objects on reduced graph
3 presented to participants in the scanner on day 2. Trial transitions were random. In both sessions,
4 participants performed simple behavioral cover tasks. Figure adapted from Garvert et al. (2017).
5

6 To address this question, we measured the semantic relationship between these objects using a
7 triplet odd-one out task, where participants were shown three objects on each trial and asked to
8 select the image that was the least similar to the other two (Figure 2A, Hebart et al., 2020). By
9 repeatedly varying the third object for a pair of target objects, their similarity could be assessed
10 in a wide range of different contexts. We first asked a separate group of 128 participants online
11 to rate the similarities of all 31 objects used in the original study. We then computed object
12 similarity as the probability of participants choosing two objects together, irrespective of the
13 context imposed by the third object. To separate the semantic relationships between objects from
14 the perceptual similarities, we matched our objects (Figure 2B, top rows) to corresponding real-
15 world photographs of the same objects in the THINGS database (Figure 2B, bottom rows; Hebart
16 et al., 2019). The THINGS database shows photographs of objects embedded in a natural
17 environment as opposed to simple line drawings of stereotypical objects used in our fMRI study.
18 In this way, the shared perceptual similarity between objects in these two data sets should be
19 reduced. The similarity of objects in the THINGS database was assessed by 5,301 participants in
20 an independent study using the same triplet odd-one-out task, in the context of a total of 1,854
21 objects (Hebart et al., 2020). The similarity ratings obtained for our objects and the
22 corresponding objects in the THINGS database were highly correlated (Spearman's $Rho = .89, p$
23 $< .001$, Figure 2C) as expected if semantic relations are preserved across datasets.

24 We regressed the matched similarity matrix (x-axis, Figure 2C) onto our original
25 similarity matrix (y-axis, Figure 2C). By doing this, we were able to separate the variance into

1 two parts: (1) the part that could be explained by an independent measure of object similarity
2 obtained from a matched set of stimuli, and (2) the part that could not be explained by the
3 independent measure. Although semantic and perceptual features are unlikely to be fully
4 separable in this way, we consider the first part to primarily reflect the semantic relationships
5 between our objects that are preserved across different ways of visualizing objects (hereafter:
6 semantic distance); while the second part reflected a combination of features that are not
7 accounted for in terms of semantics, including perceptual similarities (hereafter: residual
8 distance). To visualize the most faithful two-dimensional representation of distances between
9 objects, we applied multidimensional scaling (MDS) to the two resulting distance matrices. The
10 semantic MDS reveals that the similarity ratings led to the emergence of object category clusters
11 (e.g., fruit, animals, man-made objects) and replicates well-known distinctions between
12 “animate-inanimate” and “natural - man-made” (Hebart et al. 2020, Figure 2D). The residual
13 distance continued to express differences between man-made and natural objects, however the
14 overall arrangement was less structured (Figure 2E). Neither the semantic distance nor the
15 residual distance was correlated with link distance (semantic: Spearman’s Rho mean = .03, SD
16 = .12, range = -.25 – .30, $t_{22} = 1.04$, $p = .31$); residual: Spearman’s Rho mean = -.03, SD = .09,
17 range = -.22 – .15, $t_{22} = -1.52$, $p = .14$).



1
2 **Figure 2. Semantic distance constructed using the triplet odd-one-out task.** (A) An example
3 trial of the triplet odd-one-out task. The task measures object similarity as the probability of
4 participants choosing two objects together, irrespective of the context imposed by the third object
5 (Hebart et al., 2020). (B) Stimuli used in the odd-one-out task. Top rows: all 31 stimuli from the
6 original study; bottom rows: a subset of stimuli from the THINGS database, matched with the 31
7 object stimuli used in the original study. The rating of the matched objects is done in the context
8 of a total of 1,854 objects (Hebart et al., 2020). (C) Correlation between similarity ratings based
9 on our own stimuli and ratings based on the corresponding stimuli from the THINGS database
10 (Spearman's $Rho = .70, p < .001$). (D) Visualization of the 31 objects' semantic distance in a two-
11 dimensional space according to multi-dimensional scaling (MDS). (E) 2D MDS visualization of
12 the 31 objects' residual distance.

1 Following the approach adopted in the original study, we exploited fMRI adaptation
2 (Barron, Garvert, & Behrens, 2016; Grill-Spector, Henson, & Martin, 2006) to investigate the
3 representational similarity for different objects. fMRI adaptation relies on the observation that the
4 repeated activation of the same population of neurons leads to a suppressed response. In this way,
5 the amount of suppression can serve as a proxy for the similarity of the underlying neural
6 representations. In line with the decrease in fMRI adaptation as a function of link distance observed
7 in the entorhinal cortex (Garvert et al. 2017), we reasoned that in areas representing object
8 relationships (e.g., semantic relationships), fMRI adaptation should scale with the corresponding
9 distance measures (i.e., semantic distance). We included link distances, semantic distance, and
10 residual distance as parametric regressors in the same GLM and looked for brain regions whose
11 fMRI responses to each object decreased as a linear function of these distance measures to the
12 preceding object.

13 We expected both the semantic information and the statistical regularities to be mapped in
14 the hippocampal formation. Therefore, we focused our analysis on regions within an anatomical
15 mask comprising bilateral entorhinal cortex, subiculum, and hippocampus (see mask used for
16 small-volume correction in Supplementary material S1). Areas outside these regions were only
17 considered significant if they survived whole-brain correction.


18 The results replicated our original finding of the link distance effect after accounting for
19 the semantic distance and the residual distance. The fMRI adaptation analysis showed a cluster
20 bilaterally in the entorhinal cortex (Figure 3A), with the left, but not the right peak surviving small-
21 volume correction within the entorhinal-hippocampal mask (family-wise error (FWE) corrected at
22 peak level, left peak $t_{22} = 4.44$, $p = .029$, [-18, -19, -25], right peak $t_{22} = 3.50$, $p = .17$, [21, -22, -
23 25]). Critically, we also observed a semantic distance effect in the bilateral hippocampus (Figure

1 3B), which was significant in the right hemisphere in the same entorhinal-hippocampal mask (left
2 peak $t_{22} = 4.10$, $p = .06$, [-27, -34, -10], right peak $t_{22} = 4.69$, $p = .019$, [24, -31, -10]). No region
3 showed fMRI adaptation effects covarying with residual distance (all $ps > .99$, FWE corrected on
4 the cluster level, no suprathreshold cluster).

5 When we assessed object dissimilarity using our own stimuli, a measure that encompasses
6 not only semantic, but also perceptual and other types of object relationships, and used this as a
7 predictor in our fMRI adaptation analysis, we identified a cluster in the visual cortex, whereas a
8 hippocampal cluster surpassed the cluster-defining threshold, but did not survive correction for
9 multiple comparisons (Supplementary Material S2). This is consistent with the view that object
10 similarity ratings are strongly influenced by both perceptual and semantic features (Rosch &
11 Lloyd, 1978; Tversky, 1977).

12 While the link distance and the semantic distance are both represented in the
13 hippocampal formation, they were located in two non-overlapping clusters within this region
14 (Figure 3C). To investigate this at a more fine-grained level, we defined two functional regions
15 of interest (ROIs): (1) a bilateral ROI in the entorhinal cortex defined by the link distance effect
16 (Figure 3A, hereafter: EC ROI), and (2) a bilateral ROI in the hippocampus defined by the
17 semantic distance effect (Figure 3B, hereafter: HC ROI). We used these two ROIs (both
18 thresholded at $p < .01$, uncorrected) to extract parametric estimates from the opposite contrast.
19 As shown in Figure 3D, the individual semantic distance effect extracted from the EC ROI and
20 the link distance effect extracted from the HC ROI were not significantly different from 0
21 (semantic: $t_{22} = -0.25$, $p = .81$; link: $t_{22} = 0.54$, $p = .60$).

1



2

3 **Figure 3. Statistical and semantic relationships are represented in non-overlapping clusters**
4 **in the hippocampal-entorhinal system.** (A) Whole-brain analysis showing a decrease in fMRI
5 adaptation with link distance in the entorhinal cortex, when link distance, semantic distance and
6 residual distance are included in the model. (B) Whole-brain analysis showing a decrease in fMRI
7 adaptation with semantic distance in the hippocampus, when link distance, semantic distance and
8 residual distance are included in the model. (C) Link distance effect (red) and semantic distance
9 effect (blue) are represented in non-overlapping clusters. Whole-brain results are displayed using
10 Slice Display (Zandbelt, 2017) using a dual-coding data visualization approach (Allen, Erhardt, &
11 Calhoun, 2012), with color indicating the parameter estimates and opacity the associated t
12 statistics. Solid and dotted contours outline statistically significant clusters for the link and the
13 semantic effects, respectively. (D) Bottom: The two ROIs defined based on the link distance effect

1 in the entorhinal cortex (in red) and the semantic distance effect in the hippocampus (in blue). Top:
2 boxplot of the parameter estimates for the link distance and semantic distance effects extracted
3 from the two ROIs. The thick horizontal line inside the box indicates the median, and the bottom
4 and top of the box indicate the first and third quartiles of each condition. Each dot represents one
5 participant. The plot is for visualization only, since the contrast used for defining the ROIs is not
6 independent from the interaction effect of interest here. Both (A) and (B) are thresholded at $p < .01$,
7 uncorrected for visualization.
8

9 Together, our results suggest that both recently learned statistical regularities of which
10 participants have no conscious awareness, as well as long-term semantic relationships that are
11 explicitly accessible and acquired over the course of a lifetime, are represented in the hippocampal
12 formation simultaneously, albeit in different subregions: While transition probabilities are
13 represented in more entorhinal regions, semantic relationships are represented in more
14 hippocampal regions.
15

16 Discussion

17 The brain forms cognitive maps of the relationships between landmarks that help an animal
18 navigate their physical environment (Burgess et al., 2002; Ekstrom & Ranganath, 2018; O'Keefe
19 & Nadel, 1978; Tolman, 1948). Previous studies have shown that the same organizing principle
20 also applies to other non-spatial types of relational information (Constantinescu et al., 2016;
21 Garvert et al., 2017; Garvert et al. 2021; Morton et al., 2020; Theves et al, 2019, 2020; Viganò et
22 al, 2021). For example, when participants acquire new knowledge about the relationships between
23 objects by being exposed to experimentally generated object sequences, the hippocampal
24 formation extracts the associated transition structure and stores it as a cognitive map (Garvert et
25 al. 2017). However, it is also the case that participants already have existing knowledge about the
26 semantic relationships between these objects acquired over an entire lifetime. Here we show that
27 this prior knowledge is also simultaneously mapped in the same neural system that codes for newly

1 learned structural information. This suggests a common framework for the representation of
2 relational knowledge that extends beyond relationships that can be extracted from the statistics of
3 sequences we experience in the short term, with knowledge acquired over vastly different time
4 frames (an hour on the previous day as opposed to an entire lifetime) organized in similar ways.

5 Cognitive mapping is proposed to be an organizing principle that underlies our ability to
6 generalize and make inferences (Behrens et al., 2018). Here we show that the hippocampal
7 formation extracts the embedding of a stimulus in multiple relational structures even when neither
8 stimulus feature is directly task relevant. The representation of both a statistical map and a semantic
9 map in the same system is remarkable, given their very different timescales and modes of
10 acquisition (i.e., implicit vs. explicit learning). However, while the two relational structures are
11 represented in the same neural system, they are not represented in overlapping voxels, suggesting
12 that the brain extracts separable relational structures in parallel rather than integrating multiple
13 structures in one compositional map (Spiers, 2020). A representation of separable maps could be
14 useful in situations where different stimulus dimensions can become relevant for generalization at
15 different times, enabling the hippocampus to guide generalization flexibly depending on the task
16 demands (Garvert et al., 2021). Our finding that a semantic map is represented in the hippocampus
17 is also consistent with previous findings that hippocampal activity reflects distances in semantic
18 spaces (Estefan et al., 2021; Romero, Barense, & Moscovitch, 2019; Solomon et al., 2019).
19 Notably, we decoded the semantic map even though we did not explicitly manipulate the semantic
20 similarity of the stimuli and this information was not task-relevant, demonstrating how prevalent
21 the representation of relational information is in the hippocampus.

22 Interestingly, the statistical map is found in the entorhinal cortex whereas the semantic map
23 is represented in the hippocampus. One potential reason for this segregation may relate to a

1 difference in the “age” of the acquired regularities. Whereas the statistical regularities were learnt
2 on the day prior to scanning, the semantic relationships were acquired over the course of one’s
3 lifetime. One possibility is that relational memories might transition from the entorhinal cortex
4 (“new” knowledge) to the hippocampus (“old” knowledge), a suggestion that however contradicts
5 the conventional view that memories are first encoded in hippocampus and later represented in the
6 neocortex in a more permanent form of storage (Dudai, Karni, & Born, 2015; Marr, 1971).
7 Alternatively, the segregation of the two maps might reflect differences in the learning process by
8 which statistical versus semantic relational knowledge is acquired. The formation of a statistical
9 map requires learning transitional probabilities between sequential states (Whittington,
10 McCaffary, Bakermans, & Behrens, 2022). Entorhinal grid cell activity has been suggested to
11 reflect a principal component decomposition of predictive maps, or successor representations
12 (Stachenfeld, Botvinick, & Gershman, 2014; Stachenfeld et al., 2017). A representation of the
13 transition structure in this region is consistent with this account of grid cell function. Conversely,
14 semantic knowledge is not necessarily acquired in a sequential fashion and might instead reflect
15 common associations or co-occurrences between objects, a representation much better suited to
16 putative coding principles underlying hippocampal place cell firing.

17 In sum, our study shows that the hippocampal-entorhinal system extracts diverse relational
18 structures in which a stimulus is embedded. Both the semantic and the statistical maps are
19 separately and simultaneously represented even when neither structure is task relevant. This allows
20 relevant knowledge to be flexibly selected at a later timepoint in order to guide goal-directed
21 behavior in novel situations (Behrens et al., 2018; Spiers, 2020; Whittington et al., 2020).

22

1 **Materials and Methods**

2 **fMRI study**

3 23 human participants (15 men, $mean_{age} = 23.5$, $SD_{age} = 3.7$, $range_{age}$ 18-31) were trained on object
4 sequences whose transitions followed a pseudo-random walk along a graph (Figure 1A). The graph
5 structure was the same for all participants, with the link distance between objects on the graph
6 ranging from one to four. For each participant, a subset of 12 objects were selected from a total of
7 31 objects used in the study, and randomly assigned to the 12 nodes on the graph. Objects within
8 the same semantic categories were avoided to be assigned to the same participant. In the scanning
9 session, 7 out of the 12 training objects were used (Figure 1B) to reduce the total number of
10 stimulus–stimulus transitions and thereby increase statistical power.

11

12 **Behavioral experiment of object similarity**

13 *Participants*

14 A separate group of 128 workers from the online crowdsourcing platform Amazon Mechanical
15 Turk took part in a triplet odd-one-out task (55 men, $mean_{age} = 42.6$, $SD_{age} = 11.9$, $range_{age}$ 20-70).
16 All workers were located in the United States and provided informed consent. The online research
17 was approved by the Office of Human Research Subject Protection and conducted following all
18 relevant ethical regulations, and the workers were compensated financially for their time.

19

20 *Stimuli and task*

21 The 31 objects in the original study (Garvert et al., 2017) were used in the triplet odd-one-out task.
22 All images depict colored and shaded objects and were selected from the “Snodgrass and
23 Vanderwart” database (Rossion & Pourtois, 2004).

1 The task was carried out in sets of 20 trials. Participants could choose how many sets they
2 would like to take part in. On average, participants performed 140.63 trials ($min = 20$, $max = 1460$),
3 with a median RT of 2221 ms. On each trial, participants were shown three object images side by
4 side and were asked to select the image that was the least similar to the other two (Figure 2A).
5 Each object triplet and the order of stimuli were chosen randomly, but such that after collection of
6 the entire data set each cell in the 31×31 similarity matrix had been sampled at least once. The
7 object similarity was defined as the probability $p(i,j)$ of the participants choosing objects i and j to
8 belong together, irrespective of context (Hebart et al., 2020).

9

10 **fMRI data analysis**

11 *Computation of the parametric regressors*

12 For each participant, we compute a link distance matrix and three matrices describing object
13 relations (i.e., object dissimilarity, semantic distance, residual distance, explained below).
14 Whereas the link distance matrix (values range from 1 to 4) was identical for all participants
15 (Figure S2A, left panel), the object similarity matrices were unique for each participant (Figure
16 S2A, right panel). To turn object similarities into a distance measure, we computed object
17 dissimilarities by subtracting the similarity values from 1. Therefore, a number close to 1 means
18 that two objects are dissimilar to each other, whereas a number close to 0 means the objects are
19 very similar to each other.

20 The object dissimilarity matrix was derived directly from the triplet odd-one-out task
21 described above. Given that each participant received a different set of object stimuli in the
22 training, we standardized the individual $12 * 12$ dissimilarity matrices for each participant and
23 used the z -score values as parametric regressors in the fMRI analysis.

1 To isolate semantic relationships, we made use of an independent similarity rating from a
2 different dataset (Hebart et al., 2020). The rationale is that the part of variance that can be explained
3 by an independent rating reflects prior semantic knowledge that is independent of the precise visual
4 display of a particular object. The independent rating is based on 1,854 images from the THINGS
5 database (Hebart et al., 2019) which depicts photographs of objects embedded in a natural
6 background, rated by a total of 5,301 participants using the same triplet odd-one-out task. From
7 the 1,854 images, we selected 31 pictures (Figure 2B) that depict the same objects as the 31 objects
8 in the original study of Garvert et al. (2017) and computed a sub-matrix of these 31 objects. Since
9 each fMRI participant was trained on 12 out of the total 31 stimuli, we linearly regressed for each
10 participant the 12×12 dissimilarity matrix based on object images from the THING database (X
11 in the regression below, Hebart et al., 2020) onto the 12×12 dissimilarity matrix based on object
12 images from the original fMRI experiment (Y in the regression, Garvert et al., 2017). Both matrices
13 were z-scored, therefore no intercept was included in the regression.

$$14 \quad Y \sim \beta * X + \text{residual}$$

15 We consider $\beta * X$ to reflect the variance of object dissimilarity that could be explained by
16 an independent rating, likely to capture mostly semantic relationships. In contrast, the residual
17 values reflect the variance that is not shared across different visual object stimuli, including
18 specific perceptual features.

19 To visualize the object relatedness acquired from the triplet odd-one-out task, we
20 performed multidimensional scaling (MDS) on the dissimilarity matrices. In the output MDS
21 (Figures 2D, 2E, S2B), objects are arranged on a two-dimensional space, where the Euclidean
22 distances reflect the dissimilarities between objects as well as possible. Note that MDS can only
23 be performed on matrices with positive entries. We therefore subtracted the minimum value of the

1 matrix and added 1. The addition of constants does not affect the resulting visualization of
2 distances.

3

4 *fMRI adaptation analysis*

5 We performed two event-related generalized linear models (GLMs) to analyze the fMRI data. In
6 the GLM for the main analysis, we included three parametric regressors which corresponded to
7 the link distance (defined as the minimum number of links between the pairs of objects; i.e.
8 distance 1, 2, or 3) and the semantic and residual distance derived from the ratings of the triplet
9 odd-one-out task between the object on trial t and the preceding object on trial $t-1$. In the GLM for
10 the supplementary analysis, we included the object dissimilarity regressor extracted from the odd-
11 one-out task performed on the original stimuli and the link distance regressor. All regressors were
12 standardized in the GLMs. No orthogonalization was applied.

13 Both GLMs contained separate onset regressors for each of the seven objects with a patch
14 and without a patch. Each onset regressor was accompanied by different parametric regressors. By
15 analogy to the original analysis, both GLMs included a button press regressor as a regressor of no
16 interest. Trials associated with a button press and the two subsequent trials were not included in
17 the main regressors in order to avoid button press-related artifacts. The same six motion regressors
18 and the 17 physiological regressors (ten for cardiac phase, six for respiratory phase and one for
19 respiratory) used in the original analysis were also included in the current GLMs. All regressors
20 were convolved with a canonical hemodynamic response function. Blocks were modeled
21 separately within the GLMs. Only the non-patch trials were included for our contrasts of interest.
22 The contrast images of all participants from the first level were analyzed as a second-level random
23 effects analysis. We report our results at a cluster-defining statistical threshold of $p < .01$

1 uncorrected, combined with small-volume correction (SVC) for multiple comparisons (peak-level
2 FWE corrected at $p < .05$). For the SVC procedure, we used an anatomically defined mask
3 comprising bilateral entorhinal cortex, subiculum, and hippocampus (Supplementary figure S1).
4 Activations in other brain regions were only considered significant at a level of $p < .001$
5 uncorrected if they survived whole-brain FWE correction at the cluster level ($p < .05$). All
6 statistical parametric maps presented in the manuscript are unmasked.

7 To illustrate the non-overlapping clusters for the link distance effect and the semantic
8 distance effect (Figure 3C), we defined two regions of interest (ROIs) based on the two parametric
9 estimations from non-patch trials in the main GLM. The link distance effect revealed a cluster in
10 bilateral entorhinal cortex, which we used to define the EC ROI; the semantic distance effect
11 revealed a cluster in bilateral hippocampus, which we used to define the HC ROI. For both ROIs
12 we included all the voxels exceeding a t value of 2.5, corresponding to $p < .01$. From the two ROIs,
13 we then extracted parameter estimates for each of the 23 participants for the two effects (Figure
14 3D). Due to the statistical dependence between the data and the ROI definition, no statistical
15 inference was made regarding the interaction.

16 The statistical analysis was done using SPM12 (Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging,
17 <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>) and visualization was done using FSLeys (Wellcome Centre
18 for Integrative Neuroimaging, <https://git.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/fsleyes/fsleyes/>). The dual coded
19 visualization of the fMRI data (Figure 3C) used a procedure introduced by Allen et al. (2012) and
20 implemented by Zandbelt (2017). Clusters in the dual-coded map show brain activities as a
21 function of the link distance (red) and the semantic distance (blue) simultaneously. The hue
22 indexes the size of the parameter estimate, and the opacity indexes the unthresholded t values.

1 Significant clusters (cluster-level corrected, FWE, $p < .05$) are encircled in solid (link distance) or
2 dotted (semantic distance) contours.

3

4 **Data and Code Availability**

5 Data and codes of the original study are available on datadryad
6 (<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.nk08s>).

7 Additional data and codes for the current follow-up study are available at the Donders Repository
8 (<https://doi.org/10.34973/8m6q-qj39>). They will be shared publicly upon manuscript acceptance.

9

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 This study was supported by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) under Gravitation grant number
12 (024.001.006) to the Language in Interaction Consortium.

13

14 **References**

15 Allen, E. A., Erhardt, E. B., & Calhoun, V. D. (2012). Data visualization in the neurosciences :
16 Overcoming the curse of dimensionality. *Neuron*, *74*(4), 603–608.

17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2012.05.001>

18 Barron, H. C., Garvert, M. M., & Behrens, T. E. J. (2016). Repetition suppression: A means to
19 index neural representations using BOLD? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*

20 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, *371*(1705). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0355>

21 Behrens, T. E. J., Muller, T. H., Whittington, J. C. R., Mark, S., Baram, A. B., Stachenfeld, K.

22 L., & Kurth-Nelson, Z. (2018). What is a cognitive map? Organizing knowledge for

23 flexible behavior. *Neuron*, *100*, 490–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2018.10.002>

- 1 Bellmund, J. L. S., Gärdenfors, P., Moser, E. I., & Doeller, C. F. (2018). Navigating cognition:
2 Spatial codes for human thinking. *Science*, *362*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat6766>
- 3 Bellmund, J. L., Deuker, L., & Doeller, C. F. (2019). Mapping sequence structure in the human
4 lateral entorhinal cortex. *eLife*, *8*, e45333. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.45333>
- 5 Bellmund, J. L., Deuker, L., Montijn, N. D., & Doeller, C. F. (2022). Mnemonic construction
6 and representation of temporal structure in the hippocampal formation. *Nature*
7 *Communications*, *13*(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30984-3>
- 8 Burgess, N., Maguire, E. A., & O'Keefe, J. (2002). The human hippocampus and spatial and
9 episodic memory. *Neuron*, *35*(4), 625–641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896->
10 [6273\(02\)00830-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00830-9)
- 11 Constantinescu, A. O., O'Reilly, J. X., & Behrens, T. E. J. (2016). Organizing conceptual
12 knowledge in humans with a gridlike code. *Science*, *352*, 1464–1468.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf0941>
- 14 Dudai, Y., Karni, A., & Born, J. (2015). The consolidation and transformation of memory.
15 *Neuron*, *88*, 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.004>
- 16 Ekstrom, A. D., & Ranganath, C. (2018). Space, time, and episodic memory: The hippocampus
17 is all over the cognitive map. *Hippocampus*, *28*(9), 680–687.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.22750>
- 19 Estefan, D. P., Zucca, R., Arsiwalla, X., Principe, A., Zhang, H., Rocamora, R., Axmacher, N.,
20 & Verschure, P. F. M. J. (2021). Volitional learning promotes theta phase coding in the
21 human hippocampus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
22 *States of America*, *118*(10), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021238118>
- 23 Garvert, M. M., Dolan, R. J., & Behrens, T. E. J. (2017). A map of abstract relational knowledge

- 1 in the human hippocampal–entorhinal cortex. *ELife*, 6, 1–20.
- 2 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.17086>
- 3 Garvert, M. M., Saanum, T., Schulz, E., Schuck, N. W., & Doeller, C. F. (2021). Hippocampal
4 spatio-temporal cognitive maps adaptively guide reward generalization. *bioRxiv*.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.465012>
- 6 Grill-spector, K., Henson, R., & Martin, A. (2006). Repetition and the brain : neural models of
7 stimulus-specific effects. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 10(1), 17–19.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.11.006>
- 9 Hebart, M. N., Dickter, A. H., Kidder, A., Kwok, W. Y., Corriveau, A., Wicklin, C. Van, &
10 Baker, C. I. (2019). THINGS : A database of 1,854 object concepts and more than 26,000
11 naturalistic object images. *PLoS One*, 14(10), e0223792.
12 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223792>
- 13 Hebart, M. N., Zheng, C. Y., Pereira, F., & Baker, C. I. (2020). Revealing the multidimensional
14 mental representations of natural objects underlying human similarity judgements. *Nature*
15 *Human Behaviour*, 4(11), 1173–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-00951-3>
- 16 Marr, D. (1971). Simple memory: a theory for archicortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
17 *Royal Society B*, 262, 23–81. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1971.0078>.
- 18 Morton, N. W., Schlichting, M. L., & Preston, A. R. (2020). Representations of common event
19 structure in medial temporal lobe and frontoparietal cortex support efficient inference.
20 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
21 117(47), 29338–29345. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912338117>
- 22 Moser, E. I., Kropff, E., & Moser, M. B. (2008). Place cells, grid cells, and the brain’s spatial
23 representation system. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 31, 69–89.

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.061307.090723>
- 2 O'Keefe, J., & Nadel, L. (1978). *The Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map*. Clarendon Press.
- 3 <https://doi.org/10.5840/philstudies19802725>
- 4 Park, S. A., Miller, D. S., Nili, H., Ranganath, C., & Boorman, E. D. (2020). Map Making:
5 Constructing, Combining, and Inferring on Abstract Cognitive Maps. *Neuron*, 1–13.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.06.030>
- 7 Romero, K., Barense, M. D., & Moscovitch, M. (2019). Coherence and congruency mediate
8 medial temporal and medial prefrontal activity during event construction. *NeuroImage*,
9 188(August 2018), 710–721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.12.047>
- 10 Rosch, E., & Lloyd, B. B. (1978). *Cognition and categorization*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 11 Rossion, B., & Pourtois, G. (2004). Revisiting Snodgrass and Vanderwart ' s object pictorial set :
12 The role of surface detail in basic-level object recognition \grave{A} . *Perception*, 33, 217–237.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5117>
- 14 Schapiro, A. C., Kustner, L. V., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2012). Shaping of object representations
15 in the human medial temporal lobe based on temporal regularities. *Current Biology*,
16 22(17), 1622–1627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.06.056>
- 17 Solomon, E. A., Lega, B. C., Sperling, M. R., & Kahana, M. J. (2019). Hippocampal theta codes
18 for distances in semantic and temporal spaces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
19 *Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(48), 24343–24352.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906729116>
- 21 Son, J., Bhandari, A., & Feldmanhall, O. (2021). Cognitive maps of social features enable
22 flexible inference in social networks. *PNAS*, 1–11.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021699118>

- 1 Spiers, H. J. (2020). The Hippocampal Cognitive Map: One Space or Many? *Trends in Cognitive*
2 *Sciences*, 24(3), 168–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.12.013>
- 3 Stachenfeld, K. L., Botvinick, M. M., & Gershman, S. J. (2014). *Design principles of the*
4 *hippocampal cognitive map*. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27.
- 5 Stachenfeld, K. L., Botvinick, M. M., & Gershman, S. J. (2017). The hippocampus as a
6 predictive map. *Nature Neuroscience*, 20, 1643–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4650>
- 7 Tavares, R. M., Mendelsohn, A., Grossman, Y., Williams, C. H., Shapiro, M., Trope, Y., &
8 Schiller, D. (2015). A Map for Social Navigation in the Human Brain. *Neuron*, 87(1),
9 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.06.011>
- 10 Theves, S., Fernandez, G., & Doeller, C. F. (2019). The hippocampus encodes distances in
11 multidimensional feature space. *Current Biology*, 29(7), 1226-1231.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.02.035>
- 13 Theves, S., Fernández, G., & Doeller, C. F. (2020). The hippocampus maps concept space, not
14 feature space. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 40(38), 7318-7325.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0494-20.2020>
- 16 Tolman, E. C. (1948). Cognitive maps in rats and men. *Psychological Review*, 55, 189–208.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061626>
- 18 Tversky, A. (1977). Features of Similarity. *Psychological Review*, 84(4), 327–352.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.4.327>
- 20 Viganò, S., Rubino, V., Di Soccio, A., Buiatti, M., & Piazza, M. (2021). Grid-like and distance
21 codes for representing word meaning in the human brain. *NeuroImage*, 232, 117876.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.117876>
- 23 Whittington, J. C. R., Muller, T. H., Mark, S., Chen, G., Barry, C., Burgess, N., & Behrens, T. E.

1 J. (2020). The Tolman-Eichenbaum Machine: Unifying Space and Relational Memory
2 through Generalization in the Hippocampal Formation. *Cell*, 183(5), 1249–1263.

3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.10.024>

4 Whittington, J. C., McCaffary, D., Bakermans, J. J., & Behrens, T. E. (2022). How to build a
5 cognitive map: insights from models of the hippocampal formation. *arXiv*.

6 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2202.01682>

7 Zandbelt, B. (2017) Slice display. figshare. Available at

8 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4742866>.


9

1

Supplementary Materials

2 **Supplementary Figure S1: Anatomically defined mask used for small-volume correction**

3 **(incl. bilateral entorhinal cortex, subiculum, and hippocampus)**



4


5 **Supplementary Material S2: Additional analysis of object similarity**

6 To explore the representation of stimulus dissimilarities for the objects we used in our study, we
7 ran a triplet odd-one-out task (Hebart et al., 2020) in a separate group of 128 participants.
8 Participants were instructed to select the object that was the least similar to the other two, without
9 a specific instruction as to whether specific stimulus features such as semantic or perceptual
10 similarities should guide this decision. Stimulus similarity ratings are therefore likely to be
11 influenced by both of those stimulus dimensions. We then computed object similarity as the
12 probability of participants choosing two objects together, irrespective of the context imposed by
13 the third object and transformed the similarity rating into an object dissimilarity measure by
14 subtracting each similarity measure from 1. Since every participant was only exposed to a unique
15 subset consisting of 12 of the 31 objects, the dissimilarity matrix was different for each participant
16 (Figure S2A, right panel). In contrast, the link distance between objects on the graph was the same

1 for all participants (Figure S2A, left panel). It is worth noting that the link distance matrix and the
2 object dissimilarity matrix did not correlate across participants (Spearman's Rho *mean* = .01, *SD*
3 = .11, *range* = -.20 – .25, $t_{22} = 0.34$, $p = .74$). We standardized each individual's 12 * 12 object
4 dissimilarity matrix based on the unique set of 12 objects each participant was trained on. A two-
5 dimensional representation of distances between objects in the dissimilarity matrix using MDS
6 confirms that the objects are closely grouped according to semantic features (e.g., natural - man-
7 made, Figure S2B). In addition, perceptual properties such as object color also influenced
8 similarity ratings to some degree, suggesting that object similarity ratings reflect a mixture of
9 perceptual and semantic relationships (Rosch & Lloyd, 1978; Tversky, 1977).

10 To investigate the representation of these dissimilarity structures in the brain, we set up a
11 GLM that included the link distance as well as this measure of object dissimilarity. We observed
12 that fMRI adaptation scaled as a function of object dissimilarity in the visual cortex (FWE
13 corrected at cluster-level, $K_E = 86$, $p = .004$, peak $t_{22} = 5.49$, [27, -76, 17]). Voxels in the
14 hippocampal formation also passed the cluster-defining threshold for both the object dissimilarity
15 effect (Figure S2C) and the link distance effect (Figure S2D). However, neither of them survived
16 small-volume correction using the hippocampal-entorhinal mask (link: right peak $t_{22} = 3.93$, p
17 = .08, [24, -25, -25] and left peak $t_{22} = 3.40$, $p = .21$, [-18, -19, -25]; object: right peak $t_{22} = 4.01$,
18 $p = .07$, [24, -31, -10] and left peak $t_{22} = 3.42$, $p = .21$, [-24, -31, -10]). We reason that this might
19 be due to similarity ratings in this setting reflecting a mixture of semantic and perceptual
20 similarities.

21



1
2 **Supplementary Figure S2. Additional analysis of object similarity.** (A) The link distance
3 matrix (left) and one example object dissimilarity matrix (right) corresponding to the graph
4 structure and the stimulus set used in the original fMRI study. The link distance matrix was the
5 same for all participants. The object dissimilarity matrix was unique for each participant. The
6 black frame indicates the subset of seven objects presented in the scanner and used in the fMRI
7 analysis. (B) Visualization of the object dissimilarity matrix in two dimensions, according to
8 multi-dimensional scaling (MDS). More similar objects are located near each other. (C, D) fMRI
9 adaptation effects of object dissimilarity (C) and link distance (D). Whole-brain analysis
10 showing a decrease in fMRI adaptation with object dissimilarity in the visual cortex, when link
11 distance and object dissimilarity are both included as parametric modulators in the model. All
12 images are thresholded at $p < .01$, uncorrected for visualization.