Dynamic Causal Modeling of Load-Dependent Modulation of Effective Connectivity Within the Verbal Working Memory Network

Danai Dima,^{1,2} Jigar Jogia,¹ and Sophia Frangou²

¹Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York

²Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

Abstract: Neuroimaging studies have consistently shown that working memory (WM) tasks engage a distributed neural network that primarily includes the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, the parietal cortex, and the anterior cingulate cortex. The current challenge is to provide a mechanistic account of the changes observed in regional activity. To achieve this, we characterized neuroplastic responses in effective connectivity between these regions at increasing WM loads using dynamic causal modeling of functional magnetic resonance imaging data obtained from healthy individuals during a verbal *n*-back task. Our data demonstrate that increasing memory load was associated with (a) right-hemisphere dominance, (b) increasing forward (i.e., posterior to anterior) effective connectivity within the WM network, and (c) reduction in individual variability in WM network architecture resulting in the right-hemisphere forward model reaching an exceedance probability of 99% in the most demanding condition. Our results provide direct empirical support that task difficulty, in our case WM load, is a significant moderator of short-term plasticity, complementing existing theories of task-related reduction in variability in neural networks. *Hum Brain Mapp* 35:3025–3035, 2014. © 2013 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Key words: neuroimaging; fMRI; *n*-back task; dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; short-term plasticity; parietal; anterior cingulate

INTRODUCTION

Working memory (WM) refers to the ability to maintain, update, and manipulate goal-relevant information (Baddeley, 1992). WM tasks consistently recruit cortical regions within the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC, Brodmann area

9/46), the parietal cortex (PAR, BA7/40) and the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (ACC, BA32; Fletcher and Henson, 2001; Nee et al., 2013; Wager and Smith, 2003). Within this network, there is evidence for relative functional specialization according to process; the DLPFC has been intimately linked to encoding, setting attentional priorities, and manipulating information (D'Esposito et al., 2000; Narayanan et al., 2005), the PAR has been associated with maintaining attentional focus and storing information (Guerin and Miller, 2011; Jonides et al., 1998), and the ACC has been implicated in error detection and performance adjustment (Carter et al., 1999). Regional activation within this network responds to WM load (i.e., the total demand on maintenance, updating, and manipulation processes) (Braver et al., 1997; Callicott et al., 1999; Owen et al., 1999; Volle et al., 2008) and may be sensitive to content being left-lateralized for verbal and right-lateralized for spatial and object information (Fletcher and Henson, 2001; Nee et al., 2013; Wager and Smith, 2003).

Contract grant sponsor: NARSAD Independent Investigator Award 2008 (SF)

*Correspondence to: Sophia Frangou, Icahn Medical Institute, 1425 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10128, USA. E-mail: sophia.frangou@mssm.edu

Received for publication 23 May 2013; Revised 17 July 2013; Accepted 18 July 2013.

DOI 10.1002/hbm.22382

Published online 18 October 2013 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com).

However, measures of regional engagement are not sufficient to characterize the dynamic architecture of the WM network. To date, attempts to model inter-regional relationships within the WM network have been based on minimizing the discrepancy between observed and implied correlations between hemodynamic activations (Axmacher et al., 2008; Esslinger et al., in press; Honey et al., 2002; Narayanan et al., 2005). Although useful, this approach provides limited information about specific mechanisms through which neuronal circuits respond to WM demands (Kim et al., 2007; Ramnani et al., 2004). Of particular relevance is the potential role of short-term plasticity given the confluence of evidence that abnormalities in short-term plasticity underlie WM impairment across a range of conditions from normal aging (Sala-Llonch et al., 2012) to the major mental disorders (Cramer et al., 2011; Stephan et al., 2006). Short-term plasticity is conceptualized in many ways, but as used here it refers to altered functional coupling within cortical circuits as a function of experience and in response to external and internal cues (Salinas and Sejnowski, 2001; Stephan et al., 2009). Dynamic causal modeling (DCM; Friston et al., 2003) currently represents one of the most plausible methods for estimating the effective strength of connections among neuronal ensembles and their context-dependent (e.g., experimental) modulation (Stephan et al., 2010).

The aim of the current study was to determine the role of WM load on short-term plasticity. To achieve this, we combined Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM; www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm) with DCM analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data derived from forty healthy adults performing the verbal *n*-back task. This task involves maintenance and updating of information at increasing levels of memory load and has been previously shown to engage robustly the DLPFC, PAR, and ACC (Owen et al., 2005; Wager and Smith, 2003). DCM analysis of individual responses to this task allowed us to estimate the strength, laterality, and directionality of the effective functional coupling between these key nodes of the WM network and, crucially how these connection strengths were modulated by memory load.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Forty healthy right-handed adults were recruited via advertisement in the local press and were included if they (i) had no personal lifetime history of mental disorders or substance use as assessed after personal interview using the Structured Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders, non-patient edition (First et al., 2002), (ii) had no history of head injury or medical disorders, and (iii) did not take any prescribed medication. An estimate of current intellectual function (IQ) was obtained using the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (Wechsler, 1981). The sample details are shown in Table I. The study was approved by

TABLE I. Demographic and behavioral data of study participants (*N* = 40)

Demographic data	
Sex (male:female)	20:20
Age (years)	31.5 (10.4)
WAIS-R IQ	115.5 (15.9)
Behavioral performance on the <i>n</i> -back task	
Response time, 1 back (ms)	596 (210)
Accuracy, 1 back (% correct)	100
Response time, 2 back (ms)	659 (196)
Accuracy, 2 back (% correct)	91.2 (13.85)
Response time, 3 back (ms)	748 (224)
Accuracy, 3 back (% correct)	72.8 (16.1)

Continuous variables are presented as mean and standard deviation; WAIS-R, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised.

the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Psychiatry and the South London and Maudsley National Health Service Trust. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Experimental Design

The *n*-back task was used in a block design incorporating alternating experimental and baseline conditions. A series of letters in yellow font were displayed on a blue screen for 2 s each. The 0-back condition was used as baseline to control for task engagement and vigilance. In the 0-back condition participants were instructed to respond by button press whenever the target letter "X" was displayed on screen. In the experimental conditions (1, 2, and 3 back), the target letter was defined as any letter that was identical to the one presented 1, 2, or 3 trials back. There were 18 epochs in all, each lasting 30 s, comprising 14 letters with a ratio of target to nontarget letters ranging from 2:12 to 4:10 per epoch. The entire experiment lasted 9 min and included a total of 49 target and 203 nontarget stimuli. To avoid any systematic order effects, the conditions were pseudorandomized. Performance was evaluated in terms of reaction time to target letters and accuracy (% correct responses).

Image Acquisition

Gradient echo planar magnetic resonance (MR) images were acquired using a 1.5-T GE Neurooptimized Signa MR system (General Electric, Milwaukee, WI) fitted with 40 mT/m high-speed gradients, at the Maudsley Hospital, London. Foam padding and a forehead strap were used to limit head motion. A quadrature birdcage head coil was used for radio frequency transmission and reception. A total of 180 T2*-weighted MR brain volumes depicting blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) contrast were acquired at each of 36 near-axial, noncontiguous planes parallel to the intercommissural (AC-PC) plane; repetition time (TR) = 3,000 ms, echo time (TE) = 40 ms, slice thickness = 3 mm, voxel dimensions = 3.75 mm × 3.75 mm × 3.30 mm,

matrix size = 64×64 , and flip angle = 90° . Before each acquisition sequence, four dummy data acquisition scans were performed to allow the scanner to reach a steady state in T1 contrast.

During the same session, a high-resolution T1-weighted structural image was acquired in the axial plane (inversion recovery prepared, spoiled gradient-echo sequence; TR = 18 ms, TE = 5.1 ms, inversion time = 450 ms, slice thickness = 1.5 mm, voxel dimensions = $0.9375 \text{ mm} \times 0.9375 \text{ mm} \times 1.5 \text{ mm}$, matrix size 256×192 , field of view = $240 \times 180 \text{ mm}$, flip angle = 20° , and number of excitations = 1) for subsequent coregistration.

Image Processing

All analyses were implemented using Statistical Parametric Mapping software, version 8 (SPM8) (www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm8/). The BOLD images were realigned to the fifth volume to correct for interscan movements by means of a rigid body transformation with three rotation and three translation parameters. Subsequently, the 180 fMRI images were spatially normalized to the standard template of the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) and resampled to a voxel size of $2 \text{ mm} \times 2 \text{ mm} \times 2 \text{ mm}$. Finally, the images were smoothed using an 8-mm full-width half maximum Gaussian kernel.

The smoothed single-participant images were analyzed via multiple regressions using the linear convolution model, with vectors of onset representing the experimental conditions (1, 2, and 3 back) and the 0-back condition as a baseline. Six movement parameters were also entered as nuisance covariates. Serial correlations were removed using an AR(1) model. A high pass filter (128s) was applied to remove low-frequency noise. Contrast images of each memory load condition versus baseline were produced for each participant.

Conventional fMRI Analysis

Group-level analyses were based on random-effects analyses of the single-participant contrast images using the summary statistic approach. Regions showing significant task effect across all participants were identified using one-sample t tests against zero. The statistical threshold was set to $P < 0.05$ with familywise error (FWE) correction on a voxelwise basis and minimum cluster size 20 voxels. For all analyses, results are reported in MNI space.

Dynamic Causal Modeling

Selection of volumes of interest

Volumes of interest (VOIs) were defined bilaterally in the PAR, ACC, and DLPFC based on evidence from previous studies demonstrating robust and consistent involvement of these regions in WM (Glahn et al., 2005; Owen et al., 2005) and based on the results from the cur-

rent analyses that found significant effects of WM load in these regions. The coordinates for the VOIs were based on the group maxima from the contrast of 1-, 2-, and 3-back minus 0-back condition after conjunction analysis. The coordinates of the group maxima were DLPFC (left: $x = -48, y = 36, z = 30$; right: $x = 48, y = 38, z = 30$), PAR (left: $x = -38, y = -56, z = 42$; right: $x = 36, y = -52, z = 44$), and ACC (left: $x = -10, y = 26, z = 28$; right: $x = 12, y = 24, z = 28$). For each participant, VOIs of 5 mm radius were defined centered on participant-specific maxima in these regions that were (i) within 4 mm from the group maxima, (ii) within the same anatomical area, as defined by the PickAtlas toolbox (Maldjian et al., 2003), and (iii) adjusted using the effect of interest F-contrast. Regional time series were summarized with the first eigenvariate of all activated (at $P < 0.01$) voxels within the participant-specific VOIs.

Specification of model architecture

For each experimental condition (1, 2, and 3 back), we used the VOIs defined above (L-PAR and R-PAR, L-ACC and R-ACC, and L-DLPFC and R-DLPFC) to specify a six-area DCM in all participants. Within each hemisphere, we defined bidirectional connections between these regions. Bidirectional connections were also specified between homologous regions in each hemisphere. For each experimental condition, 18 endogenous connections were specified in total with the main effect of memory as the driving input entering the L-PAR and R-PAR (Fig. 1A). This architecture served as our base model which was then elaborated systematically to produce 18 alternative variants for each experimental condition to test how WM load could modulate the 18 connections (Fig. 1B). In total, 54 models were constructed, fitted and compared in the 40 study participants.

Model comparison

Model comparison was implemented using random-effects (RFX) Bayesian model selection (BMS) in DCM10 to compute exceedance and posterior probabilities at the group level (Stephan et al., 2009). The exceedance probability of a model denotes the probability that this model is more likely than any other in a given dataset. In addition to testing individual models, we also made inferences about families of models (Penny et al., 2010; Stephan et al., 2010).

Families were specified based on the laterality and direction of WM information. To test for hemispheric laterality, models were divided into a left-sided (Models 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11) and a right-sided family (Models 2, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18). To test for directionality of WM information three families were created for each experimental condition, forward (Models 3, 5, 10, 14, 16, and 17), backwards (Models 4, 6, 9, 13, 15, and 18), and lateral (Models 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, and 12). All models were included in the BMS procedure, both when comparing individual models and model families. Finally, to

Figure 1.

Model specification: The sources comprising the models were DLPFC, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; PAR, parietal cortex; ACC, dorsal anterior cingulate cortex; left and right. Schematically, the modulations are represented as one memory load (•), but correspond to the three distinct modulations: 1-back, 2-back, and 3-back. **(A)** A six-area DCM was specified with

bidirectional endogenous connections between all regions (PAR, ACC, and DLPFC) in each hemisphere and lateral connections between homologous areas. Driving input of “1-, 2-, and 3-back” modeled into the left and right PAR. **(B)** For each memory load (1-, 2-, and 3-back condition) 18 models were constructed.

summarize the strength of effective connectivity and quantify its modulation, we used random effects Bayesian model averaging (BMA) to obtain average connectivity estimates (weighted by their posterior model probability) across all models for each participant (Penny et al., 2010). The implementation of RFX BMA in SPM8 uses an Occam’s window for computational efficiency, excluding from the average those models whose probability ratio (compared to the best model) is below 0.05.

Relationship to behavioral measures

We subjected participant-specific BMA parameter estimates to one-sample tests to assess their consistency across participants. Behavioral data and DCM parameter estimates were analyzed in SPSS 20 (SPSS, Chicago, IL) and statistical inference was set at a threshold of $P < 0.002$ after Bonferroni-correction for multiple comparisons.

RESULTS

Behavioral Data

Details of participants’ performance in the n -back task are shown in Table I.

Conventional fMRI Analysis

Task-related activation was evident within the predicted WM network including the DLPFC, PAR, and ACC. Details of the regional maxima are provided in Figure 2 and Table II.

DCM Analysis

Familywise comparisons

We applied random effects BMS at the family level to clarify the contribution of each hemisphere (left: Models 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11; right: Models 2, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18) and to elucidate the direction of information (forward, backward, or lateral) at different memory loads. The left-sided family showed the highest exceedance probability (65%; Fig. 3A) in the 1-back modulation. This pattern reversed in the 2- and 3-back modulations where the right-sided family showed exceedance probabilities of 60 and 98%, respectively (Fig. 3B and C).

With regard to directionality, in the 1-back modulation the forward family showed an exceedance probability of 52% followed by the backward family with an exceedance probability of 32% (Fig. 3A). In the 2- and 3-back modulations, the forward family outperformed all others with an exceedance probability of 99% (Fig. 3B and C).

Figure 2.

(A) Image showing task-related brain activation in the group ($N = 40$) during the working memory n -back task (FWE, corrected at $P < 0.05$ on a voxelwise basis, minimum cluster size 20 voxels; image created with MRIcron <http://www.mccauslandcenter.sc.edu/mricro/mricron/index.html>). (B) The effect of the

1-, 2-, and 3-back conditions on the left and right parietal cortex (PAR), the left and right anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and left and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) in healthy participants ($N = 40$).

Comparing individual models

Comparing the individual models in each memory load, did not reveal an optimal model for the 1-back modulation (Fig. 4A). On the contrary, for the 2-back memory load, Model 16 was the best fitting model with exceedance probability of 60%, where the modulation was placed from the R-PAR to the R-DLPFC (Fig. 4B). Model 5 was the second best model with exceedance probability of 40%. In Model 5, 2-back modulated the forward connection from L-PAR to L-DLPFC (Fig. 4B).

For the 3-back task, Model 16 outperformed all other models with an exceedance probability of 96%, where the 3-back memory load is modulating significantly the forward connection from the R-PAR to the R-DLPFC (Fig. 4C).

Bayesian model averaging

The results from the BMA across all subjects and across all fifty four models (18 models for each experi-

mental condition) are shown in Table III. All connections between the six areas of the WM network were significant. BMA parameter estimates of the endogenous connections were found to be significantly consistent across participants. The task condition significantly modulated the forward connection from the R-PAR to the R-DLPFC (Table III).

Behavioral correlations

Based on the robust modulation of the connection from the R-PAR to the R-DLPFC by increasing memory load, we performed correlations between the DCM parameters for this connection in the 3-back condition with response time and accuracy. The WM modulation of this connection negatively correlated with response time ($r = -0.331$, $P = 0.04$) but not accuracy in the 3-back condition.

As expected, there were more errors in the 3-back than the 2-back condition. To examine the effect of performance, we compared high performers (upper quartile;

TABLE II. Voxel-based whole brain SPM analysis: brain regions showing significant main effects in terms of hemodynamic responses to different working memory loads; 1, 2, and 3 back ($P < 0.05$, FWE cluster-level corrected across the whole brain with minimum cluster size 20 voxels)

Brain region	BA	Laterality	Coordinates			Cluster size (voxels)	Z value
			x	y	z		
1 back > 0 back							
Inferior parietal lobule	40	R	46	-46	44	121	6.61
	40	L	-44	-42	38	754	6.31
Middle frontal gyrus (dorsolateral PFC)	46	L	-46	32	30	153	6.42
		R	52	36	30	256	6.30
Middle frontal gyrus	6	R	32	6	62	47	5.97
2 back > 0 back							
Inferior parietal lobule	40	R	40	-48	44	231	7.90
		L	-36	-52	46	190	7.75
Middle frontal gyrus (dorsolateral PFC)	46	R	46	32	28	544	7.03
	9	L	-42	8	28	968	6.64
Anterior cingulate gyrus	32	R	8	18	48	354	6.88
		L	-4	10	58		
Insula	13	R	34	24	-2	151	6.47
Middle frontal gyrus	6	R	30	8	58	414	6.12
3 back > 0 back							
Inferior parietal lobule	40	R	50	-42	42	287	8.01
		L	-48	-48	48	263	7.98
Middle frontal gyrus (dorsolateral PFC)	9	L	-48	26	30	800	8
	46	R	48	40	30	542	7.99
Anterior cingulate gyrus	32	L	-10	26	30	333	7.53
		R	8	20	28		
Insula	13	L	-34	22	0	680	6.99
Thalamus	N/A	L	-12	-10	6	142	6.44
Inferior frontal gyrus	10	L	-44	46	2	319	5.98
Inferior frontal gyrus	47	R	34	20	0	572	5.67

MNI coordinates denote the distance in mm from the anterior commissure, with positive x = right of midline, positive y = anterior to the anterior commissure, and positive z = dorsal to a plane containing both the anterior and the posterior commissures. BA, Brodmann area; L, left; R, right; N/A, not applicable; PFC, prefrontal cortex; SPM, Statistical Parametric Mapping.

$n = 5$), to low performers (bottom quartile; $n = 6$). The results remained the same, as both high and low performers preferred Model 16 with an exceedance probability > 92%, where the 3-back memory load is modulating significantly the forward connection from the R-PAR to the R-DLPFC.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess effective connectivity during WM processing using DCM. DCM is currently one of the most plausible methods for inferring neuroplastic changes in the strength of connections between neuronal populations (Stephan et al., 2010). There are three key findings from our study. First, we demonstrated that increasing memory load was associated with increasing

dominance of right-hemisphere models suggesting greater right hemisphere contribution to the most demanding WM conditions. Second, increasing memory load was associated with increased forward (i.e., posterior to anterior) effective connectivity within the WM network. Third, increasing memory load dramatically reduced individual variability in WM network architecture with the right-hemisphere forward model reaching an exceedance probability of 99% in the 3-back condition.

Early fMRI studies have lent support to the notion that processing within the WM network is left-lateralized for verbal and right-lateralized for spatial material (Fletcher and Henson, 2001). Recent quantitative meta-analyses have shown that engagement during verbal WM tasks can be seen bilaterally within the DLPFC, PAR, and ACC (Wager and Smith, 2003; Nee et al., 2013), although left-sided involvement was more common (Nee et al., 2013).

A. 1-back

B. 2-back

C. 3-back

Figure 3.

(A) Family exceedance probability for the left- and right-sided family, as well as the forward, backward, and lateral family in the 1-back condition ($N = 40$). (B) Family exceedance probability for the left and right-sided family, as well as the forward, backward,

and lateral family in the 2-back condition ($N = 40$). (C) Family exceedance probability for the left- and right-sided family, as well as the forward, backward, and lateral family in the 3-back condition ($N = 40$).

However, previous studies (Altamura et al., 2007; Kirschen et al., 2005) as well as the current study suggest that the key driver of lateralization within the verbal WM network

is memory load. In the 1-back condition the left-sided model family showed an aggregate exceedance probability of 65%, whereas in the 2-back condition the right-sided

A. 1-back

B. 2-back

C. 3-back

Figure 4.

(A) Exceedance probability for the 18 models specified ($N = 40$) in the 1-back condition. Yellow lines represent the models that have exceedance probability above 5%. (B) Exceedance probability for the 18 models specified ($N = 40$) in the 2-back condition.

Yellow lines represent the two winning models, Model 5 and Model 16. (C) Exceedance probability for the 18 models specified ($N = 40$) in the 3-back condition. Yellow line represents the optimal Model 16.

TABLE III. Dynamic causal modeling endogenous parameter and modulatory estimates for all connections across all subjects and across all models

Connection type	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	<i>T</i> value	<i>P</i> value
Endogenous parameters						
L-PAR → R-PAR	0.012	0.322	−1.876	1.007	2.727 ^a	0.000 ^b
R-PAR → L-PAR	0.008	0.162	−1.049	0.120	2.639 ^a	0.000 ^b
L-PAR → L-ACC	0.091	0.086	−0.159	0.266	7.154	0.000 ^b
L-ACC → L-PAR	0.006	0.012	−0.024	0.047	3.294	0.002 ^b
L-PAR → L-DLPFC	0.239	0.150	−0.039	0.654	10.818	0.000 ^b
L-DLPFC → L-PAR	0.017	0.050	−0.049	0.305	2.413	0.020 ^c
L-ACC → R-ACC	0.017	0.023	−0.005	0.090	5.106	0.000 ^b
R-ACC → L-ACC	0.020	0.034	−0.001	0.150	4.119	0.000 ^b
L-DLPFC → L-ACC	0.028	0.033	−0.015	0.095	5.910	0.000 ^b
L-ACC → L-DLPFC	0.021	0.047	−0.218	0.127	3.115	0.003 ^c
L-DLPFC → R-DLPFC	0.099	0.086	−0.025	0.304	7.809	0.000 ^b
R-DLPFC → L-DLPFC	0.119	0.100	−0.025	0.304	8.003	0.000 ^b
R-DLPFC → R-ACC	0.047	0.049	−0.071	0.158	6.519	0.000 ^b
R-ACC → R-DLPFC	0.039	0.042	−0.022	0.157	6.384	0.000 ^b
R-DLPFC → R-PAR	0.043	0.109	−0.082	0.685	1.936 ^a	0.001 ^b
R-PAR → R-DLPFC	0.281	0.147	−0.111	0.493	12.982	0.000 ^b
R-PAR → R-ACC	0.098	0.084	−0.048	0.282	7.930	0.000 ^b
R-ACC → R-PAR	0.006	0.023	−0.085	0.086	1.948	0.05
Modulatory parameters in 3 back						
R-PAR → R-DLPFC	0.102	0.073	−0.039	0.292	9.431	0.000 ^b

SD, standard deviation.

^aMann–Whitney *U* test.

^b*P* < 0.02 corrected for multiple comparisons.

^c*P* < 0.05 uncorrected for multiple comparisons.

model family showed an aggregate exceedance probability of 60%. These exceedance probabilities are moderate and may be best interpreted as evidence that right or left hemispheric involvement is nearly equally plausible at low to moderate WM demands. By contrast, in the 3-back condition, that places the highest demands on maintenance and updating processes, the right-sided model family was dominant with an exceedance probability of 98%.

Previous literature has established that during a variety of WM tasks ipsilateral frontoparietal cortical regions are functionally coupled (Cole and Schneider, 2007; Esslinger et al., in press; Schlosser et al., 2006). The current study provides new evidence regarding the directionality of effective coupling within the verbal WM network. We found that WM information follows a posterior to anterior direction at moderate and high WM load as the forward model family showed an exceedance probability of 99% in the 2- and 3-back conditions. In particular the connection from the right PAR to the ipsilateral DLPFC was most consistently modulated by WM across all participants; the strength of the modulation increased with WM demands and was associated with reduced response time. Our findings receive significant support from transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) studies (Esslinger et al., in press; Meiron and Lavidor, 2013; Mottaghy et al., 2003); TMS induced increase in frontoparietal coupling improved response time without a significant effect on accuracy.

Correspondingly, we observed a significant correlation between response time (but not accuracy) and the strength of the WM modulation of the frontoparietal effective connectivity. Mottaghy et al. (2003) were also able to determine using TMS at variable time points and at different cortical sites that during the verbal *n*-back task information propagated from posterior to anterior regions (parietal to prefrontal) and from the right to the left prefrontal cortex. This observation is consistent with our findings regarding the dominance of the forward right hemisphere model Families and the importance of the connection between right PAR and right DLPFC. Moreover, our data further support the proposal of Mottaghy et al. (2003) that verbal WM performance may rely on successful coding of the visual input of letters first as objects in the right hemisphere and then as verbal concepts in the left hemisphere. However, the DCM models in the current study were constructed to probe cognitive control in the WM brain network rather than specific regions associated with verbal processing (Rottschy et al., 2012).

Finally, we found that increasing WM load dramatically reduced variability in the dynamic architecture of the WM network. The interest in short-term plasticity has generated much research on the effect of task on neural variability at all levels. Task-related reduction in variability has been observed throughout the cortex at the intracellular and intercellular level affecting membrane potential as

well as individual and correlated neuronal firing (Churchland et al., 2010). Theoretical models have suggested similar properties for large-scale neural networks (Rajan et al., 2010; Sussillo and Abbott, 2009). Our results provide direct empirical support for these models with regard to WM and further suggest that task difficulty is a significant additional moderator of short-term plasticity.

REFERENCES

- Altamura M, Elvevag B, Blasi G, Bertolino A, Callicott JH, Weinberger DR, Mattay VS, Goldberg TE (2007): Dissociating the effects of Sternberg working memory demands in prefrontal cortex. *Psychiatry Res* 154:103–114.
- Axmacher N, Schmitz DP, Wagner T, Elger CE, Fell J (2008): Interactions between medial temporal lobe, prefrontal cortex and inferior temporal regions during visual working memory: A combined intracranial EEG and functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *J Neurosci* 28:7304–7312.
- Baddeley A (1992): Working memory: The interface between memory and cognition. *J Cogn Neurosci* 4:281–288.
- Braver TS, Cohen JD, Nystrom LE, Jonides J, Smith EE, Noll DC (1997): A parametric study of prefrontal cortex involvement in human working memory. *Neuroimage* 5:49–62.
- Callicott JH, Mattay VS, Bertolino A, Finn K, Coppola R, Frank JA, Goldberg TE, Weinberger DR (1999): Physiological characteristics of capacity constraints in working memory as revealed by functional MRI. *Cereb Cortex* 9:20–26.
- Carter CS, Botvinick MM, Cohen JD (1999): The contribution of the anterior cingulate cortex to executive processes in cognition. *Rev Neurosci* 10:49–57.
- Churchland MM, Yu BM, Cunningham JP, Sugrue LP, Cohen MR, Corrado GS, Newsome WT, Clark AM, Hosseini P, Scott BB, Bradley DC, Smith MA, Kohn A, Movshon JA, Armstrong KM, Moore T, Chang SW, Snyder LH, Lisberger SG, Priebe NJ, Finn IM, Ferster D, Ryu SI, Santhanam G, Sahani M, Shenoy KV (2010): Stimulus onset quenches neural variability: A widespread cortical phenomenon. *Nat Neurosci* 13:369–378.
- Cole MW, Schneider W (2007): The cognitive control network: Integrated cortical regions with dissociable functions. *Neuroimage* 37:343–360.
- Cramer SC, Sur M, Dobkin BH, O'Brien C, Sanger TD, Trojanowski JQ, Rumsey JM, Hicks R, Cameron J, Chen D, Chen WG, Cohen LG, deCharms C, Duffy CJ, Eden GF, Fetz EE, Filart R, Freund M, Grant SJ, Haber S, Kalivas PW, Kolb B, Kramer AF, Lynch M, Mayberg HS, McQuillen PS, Nitkin R, Pascual-Leone A, Reuter-Lorenz P, Schiff N, Sharma A, Shekim L, Stryker M, Sullivan EV, Vinogradov S (2011): Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. *Brain* 134:1591–1609.
- D'Esposito M, Postle BR, Rypma B (2000): Prefrontal cortical contributions to working memory: Evidence from event-related fMRI studies. *Exp Brain Res* 133:3–11.
- Esslinger C, Schöler N, Sauer C, Gass D, Mier D, Braun U, Ochs E, Schulze TG, Rietschel M, Kirsch P, Meyer-Lindenberg A: Induction and quantification of prefrontal cortical network plasticity using 5 Hz rTMS and fMRI. *Hum Brain Mapp* (in press).
- First MB, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JBW. 2002. Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders, Research Version, Non-patient Edition (SCID-I/NP). New York, NY: Biometrics Research, New York State Psychiatric Institute.
- Fletcher PC, Henson RN (2001): Frontal lobes and human memory: Insights from functional neuroimaging. *Brain* 124: 849–881.
- Friston KJ, Harrison L, Penny WD (2003): Dynamic causal modeling. *Neuroimage* 19:1273–1302.
- Glahn DC, Ragland JD, Abramoff A, Barrett J, Laird AR, Bearden CE, Velligan DI (2005): Beyond hypofrontality: A quantitative meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of working memory in schizophrenia. *Hum Brain Mapp* 25:60–69.
- Guerin SA, Miller MB (2011): Parietal cortex tracks the amount of information retrieved even when it is not the basis of a memory decision. *Neuroimage* 55: 801–807.
- Honey GD, Fu CH, Kim J, Brammer MJ, Croudace TJ, Suckling J, Pich EM, Williams SC, Bullmore ET (2002): Effects of verbal working memory load on corticocortical connectivity modeled by path analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging data. *Neuroimage* 17:573–582.
- Jonides J, Schumacher EH, Smith EE, Koeppel RA, Awh E, Reuter-Lorenz PA, Marshuetz C, Willis CR (1998): The role of parietal cortex in verbal working memory. *J Neurosci* 18:5026–5034.
- Kim J, Zhu W, Chang L, Bentler PM, Ernst T (2007): Unified structural equation modeling approach for the analysis of multisubject, multivariate functional MRI data. *Hum Brain Map* 28: 85–93.
- Kirschen MP, Chen ASH, Schraedley-Desmond P, Desmond JE (2005): Load- and practice-dependent increases in cerebrocerebellar activation in verbal working memory: An fMRI study. *Neuroimage* 24:462–472.
- Maldjian JA, Laurienti PJ, Kraft RA, Burdette JH (2003): An automated method for neuroanatomic and cytoarchitectonic atlas-based interrogation of fMRI data sets. *Neuroimage* 19:1233–1239.
- Meiron O, Lavidor M (2013): Unilateral prefrontal direct current stimulation effects are modulated by working memory load and gender. *Brain Stimul* 6:440–447.
- Mottaghy FM, Gangitano M, Krause BJ, Pascual-Leone A (2003): Chronometry of parietal and prefrontal activations in verbal working memory revealed by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuroimage* 18:565–575.
- Narayanan NS, Prabhakaran V, Bunge SA, Christoff K, Fine EM, Gabrieli JDE (2005): The role of the prefrontal cortex in the maintenance of verbal working memory: An event-related fMRI analysis. *Neuropsychology* 19:223–232.
- Nee DE, Brown JW, Askren MK, Berman MG, Demiralp E, Krawitz A, Jonides J (2013): A meta-analysis of executive components of working memory. *Cereb Cortex* 23:264–282.
- Owen AM, Herrod NJ, Menon DK, Clark JC, Downey SPMJ, Carpenter TA, Minhas PS, Turkheimer FE, Williams EJ, Robbins TW, Sahakian BJ, Petrides M, Pickard JD (1999): Redefining the functional organization of working memory processes within human lateral prefrontal cortex. *Eur J Neurosci* 11:567–574.
- Owen AM, McMillan KM, Laird AR, Bullmore ET (2005): N-back working memory paradigm: A meta-analysis of normative functional neuroimaging studies. *Hum Brain Mapp* 25: 46–59.
- Penny WD, Stephan KE, Daunizeau J, Rosa MJ, Friston KJ, Schofield TM, Leff AP (2010): Comparing families of dynamic causal models. *PLoS Comput Biol* 6:1–14.
- Rajan K, Abbott LF, Sompolinsky H (2010): Stimulus-dependent suppression of chaos in recurrent neural networks. *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys* 82:011903.

- Ramnani N, Behrens T, Penny WD, Matthews PM (2004): New approaches for exploring anatomical and functional connectivity in the human brain. *Biol Psychiatry* 56:613–619.
- Rottschy C, Langner R, Dogan I, Reetz K, Laird AR, Schulz JB, Fox PT, Eickhoff SB (2012): Modelling neural correlates of working memory: A coordinate-based meta-analysis. *Neuroimage* 60:830–846.
- Salinas E, Sejnowski TJ (2001): Gain modulation in the central nervous system: Where behavior, neurophysiology, and computation meet. *Neuroscientist* 7:430–440.
- Sala-Llonch R, Peña-Gómez C, Arenaza-Urquijo EM, Vidal-Piñeiro D, Bargalló N, Junque Carme, Bartres-Faz D (2012): Brain connectivity during resting state and subsequent working memory task predicts behavioural performance. *Cortex* 48:1187–1196.
- Schlosser RG, Wagner G, Sauer H (2006): Assessing the working memory network: Studies with functional magnetic resonance imaging and structural equation modeling. *Neuroscience* 139: 91–103.
- Stephan KE, Baldeweg T, Friston KJ (2006): Synaptic plasticity and dysconnection in schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry* 59:929–939.
- Stephan KE, Penny WD, Daunizeau J, Moran RJ, Friston KJ (2009): Bayesian model selection for group studies. *Neuroimage* 15: 1004–1017.
- Stephan KE, Penny WD, Moran RJ, den Ouden HEM, Daunizeau J, Friston KJ (2010): Ten simple rules for dynamic causal modeling. *Neuroimage* 49:3099–3109.
- Sussillo D, Abbott LF (2009): Generating coherent patterns of activity from chaotic neural networks. *Neuron* 63:544–557.
- Volle E, Kinkingnéhun S, Pochon JB, Mondon K, Thiebaut de Schotten M, Seassau M, Duffau H, Samson Y, Dubois B, Levy R (2008): The functional architecture of the left posterior and lateral prefrontal cortex in humans. *Cereb Cortex* 18:2460–2469.
- Wager TD, Smith EE (2003): Neuroimaging studies of working memory: A meta-analysis. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci* 3:255–274.
- Wechsler D. 1981. Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. New York, NY: Psychological Corporation.