Published in final edited form as:

Behav Neurosci. 2012 December ; 126(6): 772–780. doi:10.1037/a0030493.

Impairment in Delayed Non-Matching to Sample Following Lesions of Dorsal Prefrontal Cortex

Tara L. Moore^{A,B}, Stephen P. Schettler^A, Ronald J. Killiany^{A,B}, Douglas L. Rosene^{A,C}, and Mark B. Moss^{A,B,C}

^ADepartment of Anatomy & Neurobiology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA 02118

^BDepartment of Neurology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA 02118

^CYerkes National Primate Research Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322

Abstract

The prefrontal cortex has been identified as essential for executive function, as well as for aspects of rule learning and recognition memory. As part of our studies to assess prefrontal cortical function in the monkey, we evaluated the effects of damage to the dorsal prefrontal cortex (DPFC) on the Category Set Shifting Task (CSST), a test of abstraction and set-shifting, and on the Delayed Non Matching-to-Sample (DNMS) task, a benchmark test of rule learning and recognition memory. The DPFC lesions in this study included dorsolateral and dorsomedial aspects of the PFC. In a previous report, we published evidence of an impairment on the CSST as a consequence of DPFC lesions (Moore et al, 2009). Here we report that monkeys with lesions of the DPFC were also markedly impaired relative to controls on both the acquisition (rule learning) and performance (recognition memory) conditions of trial-unique DNMS. The presence and extent of the deficits that we observed were of some surprise and support the possibility that the dorsal prefrontal cortex plays a more direct role in learning and recognition memory than had been previously thought.

Keywords

Dorsal prefrontal cortex; Delayed Non-matching to Sample; Recognition memory; Rule learning; Rhesus monkey

Introduction

The work of Jacobsen (1936) using non-human primates was among the first to implicate the prefrontal cortex (PFC) in cognitive function in an animal model. During the past 70 years, this work was extended to show that the prefrontal cortices subserve several aspects of cognitive function, including aspects of executive functions such as abstraction, cognitive flexibility, category shifting (Pribram et al, 1952; Mishkin and Weiskrantz, 1958; Butter et al, 1968; Butters and Pandyda, 1969; Pohl, 1973; Mishkin and Manning, 1978; Oscar-Berman, 1978; Dias et al., 1996; Monchi et al, 2001; Buckley et al, 2009; Mansouri et al, 2009; Moore et al, 2009; Tsujimoto et al, 2011) as well as conditional associative learning and working memory (Passingham; 1985; Petrides, 1985a, 1985b; Bachevalier and Mishkin, 1986; Gaffan and Harrison, 1989; Kojima et al, 1982; Petrides, 1991; Levy and Goldman-

Rakic, 1999; 2000). Though the PFC has been implicated strongly with executive function and working memory, evidence for a role in rule learning and various aspects of recognition memory have also been well established. (Goldman-Rakic, 1990; Rowe and Passingham, 2001; Sakai et al, 2002; Passingham and Sakai; 2004; Passingham et al, 2005; Warden and Miller, 2010).

As part of our studies of prefrontal cortical function (see Moore et al, 2009), we assessed monkeys with lesions of the dorsal prefrontal cortex (DPFC) (included dorsolateral and dorsomedial aspects of the PFC, extending laterally from the ventral lip of sulcus principalis and to the dorsal lip of the cingulate sulcus) on the acquisition and delay conditions of trial-unique Delayed Non-Matching to Sample (DNMS). The acquisition phase of the DNMS task serves as a test of rule learning since it requires the monkey to learn to choose a novel object when presented together with a familiar one that had been originally presented 10 seconds earlier. The delay phase of the DNMS task serves as a test of recognition memory since the delay between the presentation of the sample stimulus and its re-presentation with the novel one is lengthened from 10 sec, to increasingly longer intervals. In the present study, the administration of the DNMS task was virtually identical to that used in previous studies assessing damage to various regions of the PFC (Bachevalier and Mishkin, 1986; Kowalska et al, 1991; Levy and Goldman-Rakic; 1999). It is important to note however, that in all of these prior studies, monkeys were trained on the acquisition phase of the DNMS task to a stringent learning criterion *prior* to surgery, and then tested for retention of the task and performance on the delay phase *after* surgery. In contrast, in our study monkeys were administered the DNMS task for the first time *after surgery* and thus acquired the task in the absence of prefrontal cortex, a paradigm unlike the previous studies where the monkeys first learned the task with an intact prefrontal cortex and were then tested for retention of the task following damage to the prefrontal cortex, producing a different set of test conditions.

Methods

The subjects were eight, behaviorally naive, young adult (5-10 yrs of age), male rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) weighing between 6.0 kg and 14.5 kg at the beginning of this study. All of the monkeys were obtained from a national primate research facility or breeding facility and had known birth dates and complete health records. Before entering the study, monkeys received medical examinations that included serum chemistry, hematology, urine analysis and fecal analysis. In addition, all monkeys underwent magnetic resonance imaging to ensure there was no occult neurological damage and to provide a baseline for lesion reconstruction. Results of the medical exams and MRIs revealed that all monkeys were healthy at the time of the study. While on study, monkeys were individually housed in colony rooms where they were in constant auditory and visual range of other monkeys in the Laboratory Animal Science Center (LASC) of Boston University School of Medicine. This facility is fully AAALAC approved and animal maintenance and research were conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the National Institutes of Health and the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* (2011). All procedures were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Boston University Medical Campus. Diet consisted of Purina Monkey Chow (Purina Mills Inc, St. Louis, MO) supplemented by fruit with feeding taking place once per day, immediately following behavioral testing. All monkeys were fed 12-15 biscuits per day based on their weight. During testing, raisins or small pieces of apple were used as rewards; as there were 20 trials per day, monkeys received approximately 30-60 rewards each day. Water was available continuously. The monkeys were housed under a 12-hour light/dark cycle with cycle changes occurring in a graded fashion over the course of an hour. Following a quarantine period and acclimation to the colony room, four monkeys were

randomly assigned to the surgical group for bilateral removal of the prefrontal cortex (PFC - 1, 2, 3, 4), and the remaining four monkeys served as unoperated controls.

Surgical Procedures

Monkeys were sedated with ketamine hydrochloride (10mg/kg) and cuff blood pressures and electrocardiograms were taken. An intravenous line was established via the saphenous vein and slow infusion of lactated Ringers solution was begun. A surgical level of anesthesia was induced with intravenous sodium pentobarbital (approximately 25 mg/kg) in titrated doses to effect. The monkeys were intubated and heart rate, respiration rate, and muscle tonus were continuously monitored throughout surgery to ensure that a deep surgical level of anesthesia was maintained. Body temperature was monitored and maintained with a heating pad.

After opening the skin and retracting fascia and muscle, a bone flap was opened bilaterally over the prefrontal cortex extending approximately 5 cm caudally from the frontal sinus and about 5 cm in width at its caudal margin. The dura was then opened and the cortical lesion accomplished in one stage by using a small glass pipette and subpial aspiration to separate the pia and its blood vessels from the underlying superficial layer of the cortex. This results in degeneration of the cortical gray matter without direct damage to underlying white matter tracks. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, the intended lesion was targeted to include all of area 46 in the banks and depths of the sulcus principalis as well as the more dorsally located area 9 beginning on the dorsal bank of sulcus principalis and continuing rostrally toward the frontal pole, first beneath the superior limb of the arcuate sulcus and to its tip and then extending medially to the cingulate sulcus. The lesion also targeted the adjacent parts of area 8 on the rostral lip of the arcuate sulcus. Care was taken to avoid extending the lesion into the bank of cingulate sulcus. Upon completion of the lesion within these boundaries, the dura was closed, the bone flap sutured back in place and the incision closed in layers.

At the conclusion of surgery, the monkeys were administered 600,000 units of Bicillin-LA intramuscularly to guard against infection, extubated and maintained in an incubator until they emerged from anesthesia. They were administered analgesic to treat post-operative pain (Banamine IM, 1.0 mg/kg). Analgesia was continued for 48 to 96 hours or longer if needed as determined by the veterinary staff. One week after surgery, the skin sutures were removed.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Prior to behavioral testing which began three to four weeks post-operatively, all monkeys underwent a magnetic resonance imaging scan in order to characterize the locus and extent of the lesion. For all MRI procedures, monkeys were anesthetized with a mixture of ketamine and xylazine and their head was stabilized in the coronal stereotactic plan using an MRI compatible stereotactic machine. A T1 weighted high-resolution anatomical scan (3-D SPGR with slice thickness of 1.5 mm) as well as a T2 weighted scan were acquired on a GE 1.5 Tesla Signa scanner.

Behavioral Training

Pre-operative Familiarization—Pre-operatively all monkeys were initially familiarized with behavioral testing in a Wisconsin General Testing Apparatus (WGTA). All monkeys were trained only to displace a single gray plaque placed pseudo-randomly over one of the three food wells to obtain a reward. Raisins or small pieces of apples were used as rewards during testing. Monkeys were trained until they responded for 20 consecutive trials on two successive days.

Post-operative Testing—Though changes in overt behaviors can occur following lesions to the PFC, throughout the post-operative period we did not see any overt changes in the disposition or day-to-day behavior/demeanor of any of the monkeys in this study. The monkeys continually demonstrated efficient attention and did not display evidence of abnormal disinhibition, perseveration or hyperactivity.

Delayed Non-matching-to-sample (DNMS)—Three to four weeks following surgery, all monkeys began the acquisition phase of the Delayed Non-Matching to Sample test in the WGTA. The DNMS task assesses the subject's ability to identify a novel from a familiar stimulus and was administered in two-parts. First, in the basic task or acquisition phase there is a short delay (10 seconds) between the sample and the non-match portion of each trial, the monkey over time and trials acquires the rule that was necessary for the successful completion of this task - i.e. the "novel" stimulus is always rewarded. Once criterion was reached on the basic task, (90% correct over 100 trials) the monkey was tested on two delay conditions with the intra-trial interval set at 120 second and then 600 second delays.

DNMS basic task—The trial begins with a sample object presented over the central baited food well. The monkey was permitted to displace the object and obtain the reward. The door was then lowered, and the original, now familiar, sample object was placed over an unbaited lateral well and a new, novel, unfamiliar object is placed over the other lateral well that was baited. Ten seconds after the original sample trial, this choice trial was begun and the monkey must choose the unfamiliar, novel object in order to obtain the reward. Twenty seconds later, the next trial was initiated with a new, novel sample object presented over the baited central well followed ten seconds later by another recognition trial using that second sample object and another new novel object. The position of the two objects on successive recognition trials was varied from left to right lateral wells in a pre-determined pseudorandom order. A non-correction procedure was used and thirty trials per day were given until the monkey reaches a learning criterion of 90 correct responses in 100 consecutive trials or a maximum of 1500 trials. Objects were drawn from a pool of 600 "junk" objects, and paired so that in each daily session of 30 trials, 60 of the objects were used. Once all of the initial pairings were used, (25 days of 30 trials per day), the 600 objects were randomly recombined to produce new pairs so that the pairings presented continued to be new and unique on each trial. The odds of getting any given pair of objects a first time in 2000 trials were 0.01 % and a second time were less than 0.0002%.

DNMS Delays—Following administration of the basic task, the 10 sec delay between the presentation of the sample object and the recognition trial was increased, in stages, first to 120 seconds and then to 600 seconds. Ten trials a day for 10 days at each delay interval were given with the monkey remaining in the testing apparatus during the delay interval. A total of 100 trials were given over five days at each of the two delays.

Perfusion and Lesion Reconstruction

Following completion of testing on DNMS monkeys were tested on other tasks that are reported elsewhere (Moore et al, 2009). After all testing was completed, monkeys were deeply anesthetized with IV sodium pentobarbital (25mg/kg to effect) and were killed by exsanguination during transcatheter perfusion of the brain with 4% paraformaldehyde. Following perfusion, both hemispheres of the brain were blocked, in situ in the coronal stereotactic plane for serial sectioning and transferred to cryoprotectant solution to eliminate freezing artifact (Rosene, et al., 1986). The cryoprotected blocks were then flash frozen and stored at -80 °C until they were cut on a microtome into nine interrupted series of 30- μ m thick frozen sections and one 60- μ m thick series. One 60- μ m series and one 30- μ m series

were immediately mounted on microscope slides, stained with thionin, and used to reconstruct the lesions.

For lesion reconstructions each monkey's pre-operative T1 weighted 3-D SPGR MRI scans (1.3 or 1.4 mm thick slices) were used with a standard rhesus monkey brain template to create an individualized coronal section atlas of the frontal lobe from the arcuate sulcus to the rostral extent of the frontal pole. Walker's cytoarchitectonic areas (as revised by Barbas and Pandya, 1989) were marked on each section of this individualized atlas. Area measurements (mm²) were determined each of the cytoarchitectonic areas on each section of the individualized map using NIH Image J software.

To reconstruct the lesions, thionin stained sections throughout the rostral/caudal extent of the lesion were superimposed onto the atlas sections and the extent of the lesion was marked. The borders of lesions were then checked at higher power under the light microscope and adjusted accordingly. Each section was then scanned into the computer and NIH Image J software was used to obtain area measurements of the lesion. The percent of cortical tissue damaged for each cytoarchitectonic areas was then calculated by dividing each area of damage by the baseline area established on the pre-operative MRI slices. These relative lesion sizes are shown in Figure 2 and the percent of tissue damaged is presented in Table 1.

Data Analysis

Acquisition scores for the DNMS basic task, both trials and errors to criterion, were analyzed separately with one-way analyses of variance. Performance scores for two and ten-minute delays were based on the percentage of correct responses for each delay condition. These scores were analyzed with a two-way, repeated measures analysis of variance with group as a between subjects variable and delay as a within subjects variable.

Results

Lesion Reconstructions

The results of the lesion reconstructions are tabulated in Table 1 and illustrated in drawings in Figure 2 and representative thionin sections from 1 monkey in Figure 3. These results show that, as intended, all monkeys had nearly complete damage to areas 46 and 9 where damage ranged from a low of about 71% up to a high of almost 95% of each area. In addition there was significant damage to area 8, largely on the surface and rostral bank of the arcuate sulcus, and this ranged from about 44% up to almost 66%. There was also some encroachment of the lesion into areas 10, 12 and 6 where the damage ranged from as little as 4% up to 32%. Due to the small group size in this study and the relative homogeneous performance on DNMS, it was not possible to determine if the variability in extraneous damage in areas 10, 6 or 12 was related to individual impairment on DNMS.

DNMS Basic Task

Individual data for both trials and errors to criterion for the DNMS basic task are shown in Table 2. Monkeys in the control group learned the basic task within an average of 213 trials, whereas monkeys in the lesion group required an average of 990 trials. Data for both trials and errors to criterion are shown in Figures 4 and 5. Separate one-way analyses of variance demonstrated that this was a significant difference between the control and lesion groups on the number of trials [$F(1, 6) = 53.70, p = 0.0003$] and also in the number of errors [$F(1, 6) = 50.16, p = 0.0004$] to criterion on the post-operative acquisition of DNMS task.

DNMS Delays

As shown in Table 2, monkeys in the control group performed at an 88% level of accuracy on the two-minute delay condition of DNMS, whereas those in the DPFC group performed at a 74% level of accuracy. On the ten-minute delay, performance of the control group dropped only slightly to 82% accuracy, while that of the DPFC group declined to levels of only 66%. Separate two way repeated measures analysis of variance revealed a significant overall effect of group [$F(1, 16) = 15.43, p = 0.008$], and delay [$F(1, 16) = 29.4, p = 0.002$] for the total percent correct for delay trials (Figure 6). There was no significant group by delay interaction [$F(1, 16) = 1.35, p = 0.289$] for the total percent correct for delay trials.

Discussion

Two principal findings emerged from this study: 1) Relative to the control group, monkeys with lesions of the DPFC were significantly impaired in the initial acquisition of the DNMS task (i.e. learning to choose a novel from a familiar stimulus); and 2) Monkeys with lesions of the DPFC evidenced a degradation in performance relative to controls when delays were increased between the sample and recognition trials. These findings are discussed in separate sections below.

Acquisition of Delayed Non-matching to Sample

Monkeys with DPFC lesions required an average of 990 trials to acquire the DNMS task, a level over four times greater than that of monkeys in the control group. In fact, this level of impairment is even greater than that observed in monkeys with selective hippocampal lesions who required an average of 650 trials to acquire the DNMS task post-operatively (Beason-Held et al, 1999). The severity of this effect was striking, and somewhat surprising given previous findings that suggested that the locus for impairment of acquisition of DNMS is the more ventral, but not dorsal, aspects of prefrontal cortex (Bachevalier and Mishkin, 1986; Kowalska et al, 1991). Bachevalier and Mishkin (1986) found that monkeys with damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, but not the dorsal prefrontal cortex, were markedly impaired in post-operative relearning of the basic DNMS task relative to controls. Kowalska et al (1991), using the same experimental paradigm as that of Bachevalier and Mishkin (1986), found that monkeys with lesions of the inferior convexity alone or in combination with the dorsal prefrontal cortex, evidenced a moderate degree of impairment on the post-operative retention of DNMS. Finally, Levy and Goldman-Rakic (1999) showed that monkeys with lesions restricted to either the dorsal prefrontal cortex (areas 46 and 8a) or the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (areas 9 and 8B), were unimpaired on the post-operative retention of the DNMS task.

The lesions in the present study were larger than those in the monkeys in the dorsal group of Levy and Goldman-Rakic (1999) and of those of the dorsal group of Bachevalier and Mishkin (1986). Unfortunately, a direct comparison of the lesion sizes across these studies is not possible, as the percent of damaged tissue is not presented in these publications. However, it would not appear that the striking magnitude of behavioral effects found in the present study could be attributed solely to the size of lesion. We believe the experimental paradigm represents a more parsimonious explanation to account for the differences in performance on the DNMS.

Monkeys in the studies cited above learned the rule of non-matching of DNMS to a stringent learning criterion *prior* to surgery (i.e. with an intact prefrontal cortex). They were then re-tested on the already learned DNMS task *following* damage to the prefrontal cortex (i.e., post-operative retention of the pre-operatively learned task). In the present study, monkeys first learned the DNMS task *without benefit of an intact prefrontal cortex* (i.e. post-operative

acquisition). The difference in the two paradigms should not be dismissed as an inconsequential difference in procedure, but rather should be viewed in the context of two very different brain states under which the DNMS task was acquired as has been postulated in the past to account for diverse findings about hippocampal lesions. Based on our findings, an intact DPFC is essential for the initial learning of DNMS, but as shown convincingly by the previous studies discussed above, it is not necessary for post-operative retention of the task. It would follow that once DNMS is learned with an intact DPFC, the representation of the non-matching rule must be distributed or localized to other cortical and/or subcortical neural circuitries.

Performance on DNMS Delays

The severity of deficits on the DNMS task by this group of monkeys is underscored not only by the impairment in acquiring the rule of non-matching, but also by poor performance when either short (120 sec) or longer (600 sec) delay intervals were interposed between the sample and recognition presentations. This reduction in accuracy by the monkeys with lesions of the DPFC occurred in spite of the fact that they had eventually learned the basic task to the same learning criterion as controls though admittedly with different neural systems. There are at least two possible explanations for this finding: First, the subjects may have a bona fide memory impairment (i.e. failing to remember which object had been seen before) as has been classically attributed to damage to hippocampus or adjacent medial temporal lobe structures (Zola-Morgan and Squire, 1985; 1986; Meunier et al, 1993; Beason-Held, 1999; Buffalo et al, 2000) and has been posited as the basis for the deficit on DNMS following removals of the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (Kowalska et al, 1991). A second possibility is that the monkeys with damage to the DPFC have difficulty with some aspect of rule-dependent processing (i.e., utilization of the non-matching rule acquired with a damaged DPFC) that is exacerbated by the demands of the delay condition. A third possibility is that both processes, memory and rule learning, are affected by damage to the DPFC.

We realize that the distinction between these two possibilities is indeterminate in the framework of the present study, but data from single unit studies of prefrontal cortex are beginning to shed some light on the issue. It has been shown that neurons in widespread regions of the PFC in the macaque appear to encode object identity during delay periods (Xiang and Brown 2004; Warden and Miller, 2010). Similarly, several studies have identified cells in the PFC as encoding abstract rules or reflecting the guidance of behavior for learned rules (Hoshi et al. 1998; White and Wise 1999; Asaad et al. 2000; Wallis et al. 2001; Wallis and Miller, 2003; Tsujimoto et al, 2011), as well as for assigning behavioral relevance to stimuli and task-related events (Miller et al. 1996; Everling et al. 2006). Together these single unit findings are consistent with the role of the PFC in memory and guidance of rule learning capacities. Recent work by Tsujimoto et al (2011) provides more insight into region specific roles of neurons in the PFC. They have found that neurons in the dorsal and orbital aspects of the PFC in the monkey both contribute to behaviors guided by abstract response strategies, but do so differently, with the former related more to encoding a response based on a strategy, and the latter more related to encoding a strategy. Such fine grained analysis of prefrontal cortical neuron activity as this will be crucial to understanding the nature of the deficit evidenced by monkeys with lesions of the DPFC on the delay condition of the DNMS.

Lesion Size and Location

The most striking methodological difference between the current study and previous studies investigating the role of the DPFC in performance on the DNMS task is the lack of pre-operative training on the task. However, there is also a difference in the size and location of

the lesions between studies. The lesion in the present study is relatively large and includes dorsolateral and dorsomedial aspects of the PFC and slight damage to areas 6, 10 and 12, while the lesions in other studies are smaller in comparison and are more limited to areas 9 and 46. This opens up the possibility that cortical regions included in this study but spared in prior studies are responsible for the deficits observed. However, a review of the literature does not support this view. Studies have demonstrated that damage to area 6 can cause impairments in sensory conditional motor learning, explicit learning and perhaps abstract learning (Kantak et al, 2012; Kayser and D'Esposito, 2012; Halsband and Freund, 1990). However, Amiez et al, 2012 suggest that the dorsal premotor area is more involved in the development of associations during sensory conditional motor learning while the DPFC is more involved in determining the correct response to an individual trial and therefore the slight damage in this area is not likely the cause of the significant impairment on the DNMS task observed in the present study.

Imaging studies with humans have demonstrated activation of areas 10 and 12 during the encoding phase of DNMS and therefore damage to these areas may have contributed to the impairment on task performance (de Zubicaray et al, 2001; Elliott and Dolan, 1999). While areas 6, 10 and 12 do serve a role in learning and likely some aspects of the acquisition of DNMS, it is unlikely that the slight damage to these areas that occurred in the monkeys in this present study would solely account for the significant impairment observed relative to other studies with lesions isolated to areas 9 and 46.

One cortical area that was not included in the lesions in this and in many of the other studies of prefrontal cortex is the orbitofrontal cortex, a region known to be involved in visual recognition memory (Meunier et al, 1997; Bachevalier and Mishkin, 1986; Mishkin, 1964) and specifically when familiar objects are used in testing (Schon et al, 2008). Meunier et al 1997 reports a level of performance on post-operative re-acquisition of DNMS that is similar to the post-operative acquisition performance of the monkeys in the present study. However, again due to the difference in pre-operative training, it is difficult to directly compare the effects of the lesions in different regions of the PFC on the DNMS task.

Conclusions

The main finding of this study was that monkeys with extensive damage to the DPFC were impaired in the acquisition of DNMS, a deficit that been typically reported following damage to the hippocampal formation when a post-operative acquisition paradigm is used (Zola-Morgan and Squire, 1986, Beason-Held et al. 1999). Together with recent findings in humans that both the prefrontal cortex and hippocampal formation are activated in various visual recognition memory paradigms (e.g., Kirwan et al, 2008; Trivedi et al, 2008), it is tempting to posit that both structures may participate in mediating recognition memory, at least that required in performing DNMS. Even more intriguing is the possibility that the two regions not only participate in subserving these functions (see Corkin, 2001), but that they do so in an interdependent fashion. Support for the notion of a functional relationship between the medial temporal lobe and prefrontal cortex has, in fact, begun to accumulate. Using post-operative retention paradigms, Gaffan et al. (2002) demonstrated impairments in object associative learning following crossed lesions of frontal and inferotemporal cortices in the monkey, and Bussey et al. (2002) have observed deficits in conditional visuomotor associations following crossed unilateral lesions of the orbital and ventral prefrontal cortices together with the inferotemporal cortex in the monkey. The nature and stage of cognitive processing of the prefrontal cortices, together with its interactions with the medial temporal lobe and its component structures in memory and rule learning await further delineation.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Jerry Edwards, Beverly Duryea-Steiger, and Dana Whitelaw for their valuable assistance with this project. The research was supported by NIH grant PO1-AG00001.

References

- Amiez C, Hadj-Bouziane F, Petrides M. Response selection versus feedback analysis in conditional visuo-motor learning. *Neuroimage*. Feb 15; 2012 59(4):3723–35. [PubMed: 22040737]
- Asaad WF, Rainer G, Miller EK. Task-specific neural activity in the primate prefrontal cortex. *J Neurophysiol*. 2000; 84:451–459. [PubMed: 10899218]
- Bachevalier J, Mishkin M. Visual recognition impairment follows ventromedial but not dorsolateral prefrontal lesions in monkeys. *Behav Brain Res*. 1986; 20:249–261. [PubMed: 3741586]
- Beason-Held LL, Rosene DL, Killiany RJ, Moss MB. Hippocampal formation lesions produce memory impairment in the rhesus monkey. *Hippocampus*. 1999; 9:562–74. [PubMed: 10560927]
- Buckley MJ, Mansouri FA, Hoda H, Mahboubi M, Browning PG, Kwok SC, Phillips A, Tanaka K. Dissociable components of rule-guided behavior depend on distinct medial and prefrontal regions. *Science*. 2009; 325:52–58. [PubMed: 19574382]
- Buffalo EA, Ramus SJ, Squire LR, Zola SM. Perception and recognition memory in monkeys following lesion of area TE and perirhinal cortex. *Learn Mem*. 2000; 7:375–382. [PubMed: 11112796]
- Bussey TJ, Wise SP, Murray EA. Interaction of ventral and orbital prefrontal cortex with inferotemporal cortex in conditional visuomotor learning. *Behav Neurosci*. 2002; 116:703–15. [PubMed: 12148937]
- Butter CM, Mishkin M, Mirsky AF. Emotional responses toward humans in monkeys with selective frontal lesions. *Physiol Behav*. 1968; 3:213–215.
- Butters N, Pandya D. Retention of Delayed Alteration: Effect of Selective Lesions of Sulcus Principalis. *Science*. 1969; 165:1271–1273. [PubMed: 4979528]
- Corkin S. Beware of frontal lobe deficits in hippocampal clothing. *Trends Cog Neurosci*. 2001; 5:321–323.
- de Zubicaray GI, McMahon K, Wilson SJ, Muthiah S. Brain activity during the encoding, retention, and retrieval of stimulus representations. *Learn Mem*. Sep-Oct;2001 8(5):243–51. 2001. [PubMed: 11584070]
- Dias R, Robbins TW, Roberts AC. Primate analogue of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test: Effects of excitotoxic lesions of the prefrontal cortex in the marmoset. *Behav Neurosci*. 1996; 110:872–86. [PubMed: 8918991]
- Elliott R, Dolan RJ. Differential neural responses during performance of matching and nonmatching to sample tasks at two delay intervals. *J Neurosci*. Jun 15; 1999 19(12):5066–73. [PubMed: 10366639]
- Everling S, Tinsley CJ, Gaffan D, Duncan J. Selective representation of task-relevant objects and locations in the monkey prefrontal cortex. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2006; 8:2197–2214. [PubMed: 16630066]
- Gaffan D, Easton A, Parker A. Interaction of inferior temporal cortex with frontal cortex and basal forebrain: double dissociation in strategy implementation and associative learning. *J. Neurosci*. 2002; 2002:7288–7296. [PubMed: 12177224]
- Gaffan D, Harrison S. A comparison of the effects of fornix transection and sulcus principalis ablation upon spatial learning by monkeys. *Behav Brain Res*. 1989; 31:207–220. [PubMed: 2914072]
- Goldman-Rakic PS. Cellular and circuit basis of working memory in prefrontal cortex of nonhuman primates. *Prog Brain Res*. 1990; 85:325–3356. [PubMed: 2094903]
- Halsband U, Freund HJ. Premotor cortex and conditional motor learning in man. *Brain*. Feb; 1990 113(Pt 1):207–22. [PubMed: 2302533]
- Hoshi E, Shima K, Tanji J. Task-dependent selectivity of movement-related neuronal activity in the primate prefrontal cortex. *J Neurophysiol*. 1998; 80:3392–3397. [PubMed: 9862940]

- Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources Commission on Life Sciences, National Research Council. Guide For the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. National Academies Press; Washington DC: 2011.
- Jacobsen CF. Studies of cerebral function in primates. I. The functions of the frontal association areas in monkeys. *Comp Psych Mono.* 1936; 13:1–60.
- Kantak SS, Mummidisetty CK, Stinear JW. Primary motor and premotor cortex in implicit sequence learning – evidence for competition between implicit and explicit human motor memory systems. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2012; 36(5):2710–5. [PubMed: 22758604]
- Kayser AS, D'Esposito M. Abstract Rule Learning: The Differential Effects of Lesions in Frontal Cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* Jan 31.2012
- Kirwin CB, Wixted JT, Squire LR. Activity in the medial temporal lobe predicts memory strength whereas activity in the prefrontal cortex predicts recollection. *J Neurosci.* 2008; 28:10541–10548. [PubMed: 18923030]
- Kojima S, Kojima M, Goldman-Rakic PS. Operant behavioral analysis of memory loss in monkeys with prefrontal lesions. *Brain Res.* 1982; 248:51–59. [PubMed: 7127142]
- Kowalska DM, Bachevalier J, Mishkin M. The role of the inferior prefrontal convexity in performance of delayed nonmatching-to-sample. *Neuropsychologia.* 1991; 6:583–600. [PubMed: 1944863]
- Levy R, Goldman-Rakic P. Association of storage and processing functions in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex of the nonhuman primate. *J Neurosci.* 1999; 19:5149–5158. [PubMed: 10366648]
- Levy R, Goldman-Rakic PS. Segregation of working memory functions within the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Exp Brain Res.* 2000; 133:23–32. [PubMed: 10933207]
- Meunier M, Bachevalier J, Mishkin M. Effects of orbital frontal and anterior cingulate lesions on object and spatial memory in rhesus monkeys. *Neuropsychologia.* Jul; 1997 35(7):999–1015. [PubMed: 9226661]
- Meunier M, Bachevalier J, Mishkin M, Murray EA. Effects on visual recognition of combined and separate ablations of the entorhinal and perirhinal cortex in rhesus monkeys. *J Neurosci.* 1993; 13:5418–5432. [PubMed: 8254384]
- Miller EK, Erickson CA, Desimone R. Neural mechanisms of visual working memory in prefrontal cortex of the macaque. *J Neurosci.* 1996; 16:5154–5167. [PubMed: 8756444]
- Mishkin M, Manning FJ. Non-spatial memory after selective prefrontal lesions in monkeys. *Brain Research.* 1978; 143:313–323. [PubMed: 415803]
- Mishkin M, Weiskrantz L. Effects of delayed reward on visual-discrimination performance in monkeys with frontal lesions. *J Comp Physiol Psych.* 1958; 51:276–281.
- Monchi O, Petrides M, Petre V, Worsley K, Dagher A. Wisconsin Card Sorting revisited: Distinct neural circuits participate in different stages of the task identified by event-related magnetic resonance imaging. *J Neuroscience.* 2001:7733–7741.
- Mansouri FA, Tanaka K, Buckley MJ. Conflict-induced behavioural adjustment: A clue to the executive functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2009; 10:141–152.
- Moore TL, Schettler SP, Killiany RJ, Rosene DL, Moss MB. Effects on Executive Function Following Damage to the Prefrontal Cortex in the Rhesus Monkey. *Behav Neurosci.* 2009; 123(2):231–41. [PubMed: 19331446]
- Oscar-Berman M. The effects of dorsolateral-frontal and ventrolateral-orbitofrontal lesions on nonspatial test performance. *Neuropsychologia.* 1978; 16:259–267. [PubMed: 100717]
- Passingham RE. Memory of monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) with lesions in prefrontal cortex. *Behav Neurosci.* 1985; 99:3–21. [PubMed: 4041231]
- Passingham RE, Sakai K. Working memory: physiology and brain imaging. *Current Opinion in Neurobiol.* 2004; 14:163–168.
- Passingham, RE.; Rowe, JB.; Sakai, K. Prefrontal cortex and attention to action. In: Humphreys, G.; Riddoch, MJ., editors. *Attention in Action.* Psychology Press; 2005. p. 263-286.
- Petrides M. Deficits in non-spatial conditional associative learning after periacuate lesions in the monkey. *Behav Brain Res.* 1985a; 16:95–101. [PubMed: 4041217]
- Petrides M. Deficits on conditional association learning tasks after frontal-and temporal-lobe lesions in man. *Neuropsychologia.* 1985b; 23:601–614. [PubMed: 4058706]

- Petrides M. Functional specialization within the dorsolateral frontal cortex for serial order memory. *Proc Biol Sci.* 1991; 246:299–306. [PubMed: 1686096]
- Pohl W. Dissociation of spatial discrimination deficits following frontal and parietal lesions in monkeys. *J Comp Physiol Psych.* 1973; 82:227–39.
- Pribram KH, Mishkin M, Rosvold HE, Kaplan SJ. Effects on delayed-response performance of lesions of dorsolateral and ventromedial frontal cortex of baboon. *J Comp Physiol Psych.* 1952; 45:565–575.
- Rosene DL, Roy NJ, Davis BJ. A cryoprotection method that facilitates cutting frozen sections of whole monkey brains for histological and histochemical processing without freezing artifact. *J Histochem Cytochem.* Oct; 1986 34(10):1301–15. 1986. PMID: 3745909. [PubMed: 3745909]
- Rowe J, Passingham RE. Working memory for location and time: activity in prefrontal area 46 relates to selection rather than to maintenance in memory. *NeuroImage.* 2001; 14:77–86. [PubMed: 11525340]
- Sakai K, Rowe JB, Passingham RE. Active maintenance creates distractor-resistant memory: critical role of sustained activity in prefrontal area 46. *Nat Neurosci.* 2002; 5:479–484. [PubMed: 11953754]
- Schon K, Tinaz S, Somers DC, Stern CE. Delayed match to object or place: an event-related fMRI study of short-term stimulus maintenance and the role of stimulus pre-exposure. *Neuroimage.* 2008; 39(2):857–72. [PubMed: 17950623]
- Tsuhimoto S, Genovesio A, Wise SP. Comparison of strategy signals in the dorsolateral and orbital prefrontal cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 2011; 31:4583–4592. [PubMed: 21430158]
- Trivedi MA, Murphy CM, Goetz C, Shah RC, Gabrieli JD, Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Turner DA, Stebbins GT. fMRI activation changes during successful episodic memory encoding and recognition in amnesic mild cognitive impairment relative to cognitively healthy older adults. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord.* 2008; 26:123–127. [PubMed: 18663302]
- Wallis JD, Anderson KC, Miller EK. Single neurons in prefrontal cortex encode abstract rules. *Nature.* 2001; 411:953–956. [PubMed: 11418860]
- Wallis JD, Miller EK. From rule to response: neuronal processes in the premotor and prefrontal cortex. *J Neurophysiol.* 2003; 90:1790–1806. [PubMed: 12736235]
- Warden MR, Miller EK. Task-dependent changes in short-term memory in the prefrontal cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 2010; 30:15802–15810.
- White IM, Wise SP. Rule-dependent neuronal activity in the prefrontal cortex. *Exp Brain Res.* 1999; 126:315–335. [PubMed: 10382618]
- Xiang JZ, Brown MW. Neuronal responses related to long-term recognition memory processes in prefrontal cortex. *Neuron.* 2004; 42:817–829. [PubMed: 15182720]
- Zola-Morgan S, Squire LR. Medial temporal lesions in monkeys impair memory on a variety of tasks sensitive to human amnesia. *Behavioral Neuroscience.* 1985; 99:22–3. [PubMed: 4041230]
- Zola-Morgan S, Squire LR. Memory impairment in monkeys following lesions limited to the hippocampus. *Behav Neurosci.* 1986; 100:155–160. [PubMed: 3964416]

Figure 1.
Lateral and medial view of the rhesus monkey brain. The intended area of the lesion is outlined.

Figure 2.

Lesion reconstructions of all four monkeys in the DPFC lesion group (From Moore, TL, Schettler, SP, Killiany, RJ, Moss, MB, and Rosene, DL. (2009). Effects on Executive Function Following Damage to the Prefrontal Cortex in the Rhesus Monkey. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 123 (2): 231-41. Copyright 2009 by American Psychological Association). Numerals indicate Walker cortical areas as modified by Petrides and Pandya (1991).

Figure 3.
Representative thionin sections from one monkey in the study. Level of sections approximately match those shown in Figure 2.

Figure 4. Group mean trials to criterion on the acquisition of the delayed non-matching to sample task. Asterisk indicates a significant group difference ($p < 0.0003$).

Figure 5. Group mean errors to criterion on the acquisition of the delayed non-matching to sample task. Asterisk indicates a significant group difference ($p < 0.0004$).

Figure 6. Group mean percent correct on the two delay conditions of the delayed non-matching to sample task. Asterisk indicates a significant group difference ($p<0.008$).

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

Table 1

Extent of damage in four monkeys with lesions of prefrontal cortex by cytoarchitectonic areas (From Moore, TL, Schettler, SP, Killiany, RJ, Moss, MB, and Rosene, DL. (2009). Effects on Executive Function Following Damage to the Prefrontal Cortex in the Rhesus Monkey. Behavioral Neuroscience, 123 (2): 231-41. Copyright 2009 by American Psychological Association). Values represent percent of damaged tissue bilaterally based on comparison of thionin stained sections with preoperative MRI scans.

Monkey	Area 46	Area 8	Area 9	Area 10	Area 12	Area 6
DPFC 1	70.8	65.73	79.27	4.03	18.30	31.63
DPFC 2	89.92	53.64	85.54	20.13	17.26	32.29
DPFC 3	87.47	45.70	84.30	24.35	3.18	31.55
DPFC 4	94.33	43.92	90.34	30.29	2.99	22.18

Table 2

Trials and errors for acquisition of DNMS, % correct performance on the two delay conditions and % loss across delays for each of the control and lesion monkey.

Monkey	Acquisition Trials	Acquisition Errors	120 Second Delay	600 Second Delay	% loss between delays
Control 1	200	52	0.83	0.79	4.8
Control 2	180	35	0.85	0.74	12.9
Control 3	210	60	0.90	0.88	2.2
Control 4	260	60	0.92	0.87	5.4
Mean	212.5	51.8	0.88	0.82	6.3
DPFC 1	960	247	0.70	0.61	12.9
DPFC 2	940	277	0.79	0.72	8.9
DPFC 3	1280	393	0.80	0.67	16.5
PFC 4	780	258	0.67	0.62	7.5
Mean	990.0	293.8	0.74	0.66	11.5