

Correlations between PRMQ scores (X-axis) and [Encoding – Control] activity (adjusted beta values at the peaks, Y-axis) in the whole sample. (a) Left hippocampus (head, peak coordinates [-26;-10;-12]) with t-value = 6.11; plot without controlling for sex (r = 0.79, p < 0.001; r after controlling for sex = 0.86, p one-tailed < 0.001). (b) Tail of the left hippocampus [-30;-36;-4] t = 7.88; plot without controlling for sex (r = 0.83, p < 0.001; r after controlling for sex = 0.91, p < 0.001). In the correlation analysis, the effect in the right hippocampal tail was smaller (r = 0.58, p = 0.01; r after controlling for sex = 0.63, p = 0.005). (c, d) There were 2 clusters in the left lateral temporal cortex. (c) [-46;-4;-40] t = 5.59; (d) [-44;14;-30] t = 5.39; plot without controlling for sex for (c) (r = 0.77, p < 0.001; r after controlling for sex = 0.84, p < 0.001), and (d) r = 0.76, p < 0.001 (r after controlling for sex = 0.83, p < 0.001). (e) Calcarine/precuneus [-8,-60,12] t = 4.18; plot without controlling for sex (r = 0.70, p = 0.002; r after controlling for sex = 0.76, p < 0.001). (f) Thalamus [-2;-12;2] t = 3.29; plot without controlling for sex (r = 0.62, p = 0.005; r after controlling for sex = 0.67, p = 0.003). (g) In the correlational analysis, there was a cluster close to the right parahippocampal cortex, but located more inferior to the cluster of the median-split analysis, in the fusiform and cerebellum. Plot for the right fusiform cortex [30;-30;-26] (close to the parahippocampal cortex) without controlling for sex (r = 0.78, p < 0.001; r after controlling for sex = 0.85, p < 0.001). (h) Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex [12;22;42] t = 3.65; plot without controlling for sex (r = -0.65, p = 0.003; r after controlling for sex = -0.71, p = 0.002).

In addition, a positive correlation between PRMQ and activity was found in the left occipital cortex [-42;-84;24] t = 6.59, k = 192; plot without controlling for sex (r = 0.81, p < 0.001; r = 0.001; after controlling for sex r = 0.88, r = 0.001). This correlation was driven by the outlier, however when computing the correlation without him, r = 0.66, p = 0.004 (and r = 0.67, p = 0.005 after controlling for sex). In the median-split analysis, this cluster appeared at p = 0.004, t = 3.16, t = 11, therefore it did not pass the threshold we set (t = 0.001).

Correlations between PRMQ and cognitive performance: Only the correlation between PRMQ and binding was significant (r after controlling for sex = -0.57, p two-tailed = 0.03), replicating the behavioral results based on median-split presented in the manuscript.