

Journal of Visualized Experiments

Olfactory context dependent memory: Direct presentation of odorants

--Manuscript Draft--

Article Type:	Invited Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
Manuscript Number:	JoVE58170R2
Full Title:	Olfactory context dependent memory: Direct presentation of odorants
Keywords:	Odor; memory; Context; Olfactometer; Recognition; Olfaction
Corresponding Author:	Ryan Hackländer Universität Hildesheim Fachbereich 1 Erziehungs- und Sozialwissenschaften Hildesheim, GERMANY
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universität Hildesheim Fachbereich 1 Erziehungs- und Sozialwissenschaften
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	hacklaen@uni-hildesheim.de
First Author:	Ryan Hackländer
Other Authors:	Christina Bermeitinger
Author Comments:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
If this article needs to be "in-press" by a certain date, please indicate the date below and explain in your cover letter.	

TITLE:**Olfactory Context Dependent Memory: Direct Presentation of Odorants****AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS:**

Ryan P M Hackländer, Christina Bermeitinger

Institut für Psychologie, Universität Hildesheim, Hildesheim, Germany

Corresponding author:

Ryan P M Hackländer (hacklaen@uni-hildesheim.de)

Tel: +49 5121 883 10956

Email Address of Co-author:

Christina Bermeitinger (bermeitinger@uni-hildesheim.de)

KEYWORDS:

Odor, memory, context, olfactometer, recognition, olfaction

SUMMARY:

The use of an olfactometer for directly presenting odorants opens exciting opportunities for researchers of olfactory memory. The current paper discusses issues related to this methodology as related to a previously published experiment on olfactory context dependent memory.

ABSTRACT:

Information is retrieved more effectively when the retrieval occurs in the same context as that in which the information was first encoded. This is termed context dependent memory (CDM). One category of cues that have been shown to effectively produce CDM effects are odors. However, it is unclear what the boundary conditions of these CDM effects are. In particular, given that olfaction has been called an implicit sense, it is possible that odors are only effective mnemonic cues when they are presented in the background. This assertion seems even more likely given that previous research has shown odors to be poor cues during paired associate memory tests, where odors are in the focus of attention as mnemonic cues for other information. In order to determine whether odors are only effective contextual mnemonic cues when presented outside the central focus of an observer, an olfactory CDM experiment was performed in which odorants were presented directly, rather than ambiently. Direct presentation was accomplished with the aid of an olfactometer. The olfactometer not only allows for direct presentation of odorants, but provides other methodological benefits, including the allowance of trial by trial manipulations of odorant presentations and, relatedly, time-specific releases of odorants. The presence of the same odor during both encoding and retrieval enhanced memory performance, regardless of whether the odor was presented ambiently or directly. This finding can serve as a basis for future olfactory CDM research which can utilize the benefits of direct presentation.

INTRODUCTION:

Retrieval is enhanced when it occurs in the same context as encoding^{1,2}; this is termed context dependent memory (CDM). Many stimuli have been shown to be effective contextual cues for

enhancing retrieval³. In line with this general research, it has been shown that information that is learned and retrieved in the presence of the same odor is remembered better than information that is retrieved in the presence of a different odor⁴ or information that is neither learned nor retrieved in the presence of an extra olfactory context⁵; this has been termed olfactory context dependent memory (OCDM).

The use of odors as contextual mnemonic cues provides researchers with new opportunities to investigate various questions related to both CDM and olfactory processing. Indeed, the relationship between olfaction and memory has been shown to be unique^{6,7,8}. Memories for odors seem to be more resistant to forgetting than memory for other stimuli⁶ (though this is not always found⁹). Furthermore, autobiographical memories that are cued by odors are experienced differently than autobiographical memories cued by other stimuli⁷.

There are other interesting differences between olfaction and the “major” (*i.e.*, visual and auditory) senses. For example, when humans see or hear stimuli, we are frequently able to explicitly identify them and we often consciously adjust our behavior in line with the information they present. However, we are frequently unable to identify odors¹⁰. Furthermore, although humans are constantly surrounded by odorous substances, we do not always have the conscious experience of perceiving an odor. Accordingly, it has been proposed that olfaction is an implicit sense, and that odors mostly influence our behavior when we do not consciously perceive them¹¹.

If olfaction truly is an implicit sense, it poses the question as to whether odors must necessarily be outside the focus of awareness for them to act as effective contextual mnemonic cues. Some evidence would suggest this is the case, as odors have been shown to be less effective cues in paired-associates paradigms than other stimuli^{12,13}. To this point all studies that have shown evidence of OCDM have utilized ambient presentation of odorants, whereby the odorants are presented in the background and subjects learn some other target information^{4,14}. Often, the subjects are never explicitly told about the odors.

The focus on ambient odorant presentation up to this point has been logical, as odorants are generally present in the background of an experience, but odors are infrequently at the center of our attentional focus. That being said, ambient odorant presentation necessarily means that researchers relinquish control over some aspects that may be of interest. Chief among these aspects is time. With ambient presentation odorants must be present for a long period of time, with no control over the moment of presentation or odor perception. However, presenting odorants directly, for example with the aid of an olfactometer, allows the researcher to manipulate the time of the odorant presentation in relation to the onset time of other stimuli. Further aspects of control that are gained through direct presentation include the ability to alternate between two or more odorants during a single session, presentation to one or both nostrils, presentation of “no odor” trials, and even the ability to manipulate the intensity of odor/concentration of odorant. In short, ambient odorant presentation limits experimenters to between subjects or block-wise manipulations, while direct odorant presentation allows for odor manipulations on a trial by trial basis.

Here the fundamentals of a method for testing OCDM using direct presentation of odorants with the aid of an olfactometer are presented¹⁵. An olfactometer is a machine that allows for the presentation of odorants at exact points in time (for example, contemporaneously with the onset of the presentation of a visual stimulus) and for a discrete amount of time (*e.g.*, the presentation of a puff of air for 2 s). Furthermore, the olfactometer allows for the presentation to be directed below the nostrils, directly in one nostril, or directly in both nostrils. Olfactometers have long been utilized in memory research^{16,17}. This protocol builds on previous research and applies it to the area of OCDM research.

PROTOCOL:

All data collection in the original experiment¹⁵ was performed in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association as well as the World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki. The experiment was preapproved by the local Ethik-Kommission (equivalent to an Institutional Review Board). All subjects were made aware that their participation was voluntary and could at any time and without fear of penalty be terminated. All subjects signed informed consent.

1. Participant Recruitment and Pre-Study Instructions

1.1. Recruitment:

1.1.1. Recruit participants who are native speakers (to ensure a comparable understanding of the instructions and comparable processing of target information) and who have normal or corrected to normal vision. Also, either a) exclude subjects who profess below average olfactory abilities or are smokers, or b) collect information about smoking habits and olfactory ability to use in later analyses.

1.1.2. Furthermore, given the frequency of sex differences found in olfactory studies¹⁸, either a) recruit equal numbers of males and females, to allow for comparisons, b) perform analyses separately for each sex to ensure no differences, or c) focus on a single sex. Finally, given that olfactory performance is age dependent¹⁹ either a) recruit all subjects from a single cohort, or b) specifically include age as a variable of interest.

Note: The final sample used in the current study included 60 subjects (56 females, $M_{\text{age}} = 22.05$ years, $SD = 4.86$), all of whom were students at the University of Hildesheim and who participated in exchange for partial course credit. Further information concerning the sample can be found in our previous article¹⁵.

1.2. Provide subjects with specific pre-study instructions. 1) Subjects must not smoke for the 24 hours prior to the beginning of the experiment, 2) Subjects must not eat or brush teeth for at least one hour prior to the beginning of the experiment.

1.3. When subjects arrive in the laboratory ensure that they have followed the pre-study instructions. This is best accomplished by having the experiment leader specifically ask the subjects whether they have complied with the instructions.

1.4. If they have complied, present subjects with information about the study and any ethical considerations. Have subjects sign informed consent.

1.5. Situate subjects in the experimental room.

Note: In the current experiment subjects were first placed in a cabin in which there was a monitor rested upon a table.

1.5.1. Seat subjects in a comfortable chair which they can adjust as needed. Have subjects place their chins in a chin rest (in which the tubes for presenting the odors are located). Adjust the height of the chin rest to make the seating comfortable for the subject.

1.5.2. Alternatively, use another method of presentation, including placing the tubes directly in the nostrils of the subjects or connecting the tube-ends to a mask, which ensures that the odorous material remains concentrated around the nose.

2. Experimental Design

Note: In the experiment outlined here (which corresponds to Experiment 1 from the original article¹⁵) the purpose was to determine whether the presence of an odor context during encoding and retrieval enhanced memory over a condition in which no extra odor context was present during both phases⁵. This is a variety of a CDM effect called context enhanced memory. The original experiment included more independent variables (odor valence and word valence) that are irrelevant for the current report. For details on the original experiment and specific information concerning the verbal material used, see the Supplementary Material from the original article¹⁵. The experiment is broken down into three different phases (See Table 1 for an overview).

2.1. For the first, encoding, encoding phase, have subjects encode the target material (words) in the presence of the contextual material (odors).

2.1.1. Present subjects with words (one at a time) on the screen. Subjects must categorize the words as abstract or concrete. Learning is incidental, as subjects are not informed of the later memory test.

2.1.2. Have subjects categorize 90 words in total.

2.1.3. Have each trial follow the same pattern.

2.1.3.1. Begin each trial with the presentation of a puff of air. The puff of air either contains

177 odorous material or not, depending on the group.

178
179 2.1.3.2. Couple the puff of air the presentation of a cross on the computer screen and have the
180 puff of air and the cross remain for 2000 ms.

181
182 2.1.3.3. Replace the cross is replaced with a target word, and have it remain for 2000 ms. Order
183 word presentation randomly for each subject.

184
185 2.1.3.4. Upon offset of the word, have subjects categorize the word as abstract or concrete by
186 button press. The response triggers the immediate onset of the next trial. Present the same
187 odorant on all 90 trials during the encoding phase.

188 189 2.1.4. Odor presentation.

190
191 2.1.4.1. Utilize an olfactometer to achieve direct presentation of odorants. Olfactometers come
192 in several different varieties. Purchase or build an olfactometer that will best meet the aims of
193 the researchers²⁵.

194
195 2.1.4.2. Ensure that the olfactometer design is appropriate to the research question.

196
197 2.1.4.3. Cut the tubes to the appropriate length and ensure that they are held in place and tightly
198 connected.

199
200 Note: The length of the tubes influences the delay between signal onset (*i.e.*, signal from program
201 to release an odorant) and actual arrival of odorous material to the nostrils. Researchers should
202 be aware of the delays between signals and actual presentation times, which will vary between
203 individual olfactometers. This information can usually be found in information provided by the
204 retailer or in instructions for building new olfactometers.

205 206 2.1.4.4. Be aware of potential issues involved with odorant presentation.

207
208 2.1.4.4.1. Ensure that the inter-stimulus interval (ISI; or the length of time between odorant
209 presentations) is appropriate for the research question. There is no standardized or suggested ISI
210 appropriate for all odor experiments. Conduct pilot tests to determine which ISI's are appropriate
211 for the experiment in question.

212
213 2.1.4.4.2. Control for tactile stimulation. Present the tubes inside a metal bar that supports the
214 chin rest. Have the tubes end approximately 2 cm below the nostrils. Cover the top of the metal
215 bar with a filter (*e.g.*, tissue). Replace the filter for each subject.

216
217 2.1.4.4.3. Control for auditory stimulation. Have subjects perform the experiment inside a sound-
218 reducing cabin with headphones on. Store the olfactometer itself in a sound-reducing container
219 unit stored outside of the experimental cabin.

220

2.1.5. For presentation control, use a standard experimental control software program (see **Table of Materials**) to control odorant presentation from the olfactometer.

2.1.6. Breathing instructions.

Note: When using an olfactometer, it is potentially important that subjects sniff (*i.e.*, sample the olfactory material) at the appropriate moment. This is particularly important in experiments where the odorant changes between trials.

2.1.6.1. To ensure that subjects sample the odorant at the appropriate time, present a visual cue (fixation cross) simultaneously with the onset of the puff of air. Furthermore, ensure that the puff of air is long enough to allow the subjects to register the visual cue and initiate inhalation (2000 ms). It should be noted here that the inhalation instruction might act as a second task, which could potentially interact with the task(s) of interest.

2.1.6.2. Alternatively, use one of several other methods for ensuring subjects sample the odorants at the appropriate time:

2.1.6.2.1. Present subjects with a countdown, so they can prepare to inhale when the countdown is completed

2.1.6.2.2. Present subjects with an initial cue alerting them to exhale followed by a second cue alerting them to inhale

2.1.6.2.3. If the tubes are presented directly in the nostrils, and a discrete presentation olfactometer is used, instruct subjects to inhale anytime they feel tactile stimulation inside the nostrils.

2.1.6.3. Regardless of which method is used, have subjects complete inhalation practice trials before beginning with the actual experiment.

2.1.6.4. For practice trials, instruct subjects to inhale whenever they see the appearance of the fixation cross. Present a fixation cross and an air puff for 2000 ms on each trial. Have subjects complete 10 practice trials.

2.1.7. Timing.

2.1.7.1. Present the odorous material two seconds prior to the onset of the visually presented word. This is done to ensure that the olfactory context is present during visual perception.

2.1.7.2. Other research questions may call for simultaneous perception. Olfactory perception takes longer than visual and auditory perception from the time of stimulus onset until perception²⁰, at least as measured by response times on detection tasks²¹. Therefore, depending on the manipulation, researchers must ensure that they choose appropriate inter-stimulus

intervals (ISIs). Note that this will also depend on the specifics of the olfactometer used (see 4.1.)

2.2. For the second phase, use a retention interval in which subjects complete a task that is unrelated to the actual memory task.

2.2.1. Have subjects leave the testing cabin and move to a different area, away from odorous material. This is an important step to ensure that the context is *reinstated* during the retrieval phase.

2.2.2. Air out the testing cabin during the retention interval with ventilators or fans.

2.2.3. Have subjects color in mandalas for 5 minutes.

Note: OCDM experiments have frequently, though not always¹⁴, utilized long retention intervals to avoid issues of adaptation and habituation. One potential benefit of direct presentation of discrete air puffs is that it may be more resistant to habituation than ambient presentation.

2.2.4. Alternative distractor tasks can be implemented in the retention interval to accomplish different goals.

2.3. For the third, retrieval phase, have subjects remember and retrieve the target information.

2.3.1. Have subjects return to the experimental cabin. Once again, seat subjects with their chins in the chin rest.

2.3.2. Have subjects complete an old/new recognition test with a total of 180 trials (90 old/90 new).

2.3.3. Have each trial follow the same pattern.

2.3.3.1. Begin each trial with the presentation of a puff of air. The puff of air either contains odorous material or not, depending on the group. As this is a context enhancement experiment, the odorant presented is always the same as that presented in the encoding phase.

2.3.3.2. Couple the puff of air with the presentation of a cross on the computer screen; have both the puff of air and the cross remain for 2000 ms.

2.3.3.3. Replace the cross with a word and have the subject respond (by button press) as to whether the word is old or new. The word remains until the subject responds. The order of word presentation is determined randomly for each subject.

2.3.3.4. Have the subject's response trigger the immediate onset of the next trial. There are no time limits during the retrieval phase.

3. Stimulus Selection

3.1. Target stimuli

3.1.1. Select target stimuli that best fit the exact research question or the type of memory test that the experimenter is planning. For the most basic design, choose stimuli that come from a non-olfactory modality (*e.g.*, words). For more information about the target stimuli used in the experiment reported here see the original article¹⁵.

3.2. Contextual stimuli

3.2.1. Select odorants that best fit the exact research question. Important attributes to take into account include 1) valence, 2) arousal, 3) intensity, 4) familiarity, and 5) identifiability.

3.2.2. There are several methods that can be used when choosing the appropriate odorants.

3.2.2.1. In one method, choose the odorants based on a pilot study. In this case, have external subjects (those not participating in the main experiment) rate a variety of potential odorants on various attributes. Based on the results, choose the odorants that best suit the needs of the experimental question. This was the method used in the original experiment using direct presentation and OCDM (see original article for details on chosen odorants)¹⁵.

3.2.2.2. Alternatively, choose the odorants based on a pre-existing database containing ratings²². Exercise caution with this method due to large potential cultural differences in odor perception²³.

3.2.2.3. Lastly, in certain cases, choose stimuli based on the subject's idiosyncratic odor ratings²⁴.

3.2.3. Choose the odorous material that is best suited for the olfactometer being used.

3.2.3.1. Decide on liquid or solid material—some olfactometers only allow for the use of liquid material, while others allow for the use of either liquid or solid material.

3.2.3.2. Obtain odorous material from a commercial supplier, either from companies that specifically produce odorants and chemicals for research purposes, or from companies that produce products (*e.g.*, essential oils, perfumes, scented candles, *etc.*) for use by the general public.

3.2.3.3. Alternatively, olfactometer permitting, collect odorous material from surrounding sources (*e.g.*, pine needles, sweaty t-shirts, fruits, *etc.*). This method may be appropriate for some research questions; exercise caution as it makes standardization (and therefore comparisons with other research projects) difficult.

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:

One of the main purposes of the current experiment was to determine whether OCDM effects could be found when the olfactory context was presented directly, rather than ambiently. There were three main dependent variables (in line with common signal detection theory analyses²⁶): the proportion of hits, the proportion of false alarms, and a corrected accuracy score termed d' . Given the focus of interest here, the data from the two odor groups from the original experiment¹⁵ (positive and negative odor) are combined and compared to the no odor group. Collapsing the data across these two groups provides the purest test of olfactory context enhancement.

As can be seen in **Table 2**, the olfactory context groups outperformed the no odor group in accuracy, by displaying more hits and significantly fewer false alarms as well as significantly higher d' . This is clear evidence that direct presentation of odorants can also lead to OCDM effects, as has been previously found for ambient presentation^{4,5}.

This finding is somewhat surprising, given that previous experiments have shown odors to be poorer cues of memory in paired-associates tests (where odors are presented in the foreground)^{12,13} and notions that olfaction is an implicit sense¹¹. Future research will be needed to determine what distinguishes using odors as paired-associates from using odors as contextual mnemonic cues.

FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:

Table 1. Overview of the experimental procedure.

Table 2. Means, significance test values, and effect sizes for comparisons between the control and olfactory context groups. Values in parentheses represent standard deviations.

DISCUSSION:

The method described here, in which an olfactometer is used to directly present odorants as contextual stimuli, represents an expansion of the utility of olfactometers in olfactory memory research^{16,17}. Specifically, this method allows for an expansion of the area of OCDM research. Previous research had shown that odors are indeed effective contextual mnemonic cues^{4,14}, but all research to this point has utilized ambient presentation of odors. By using the method described here, it was shown that OCDM effects can also be found when odorants are presented directly, by means of an olfactometer¹⁵.

This methodology, with appropriate modifications, provides several benefits over ambient presentation. For one, direct presentation allows for presentation of odorants at specific times. This can help researchers answer several questions, such as determining whether an odor must be present contemporaneously with target material in order to be bound together, and eventually act as an effective contextual mnemonic cue. Another benefit is that direct presentation allows for trial by trial manipulations of odorant presentation. This can help researchers learn whether odors function similarly to other stimuli, which can be effective cues when altered rapidly between trials²⁷. Other benefits include 1) allowing for presentation to a single nostril on one trial, 2) allowing for the presentation of multiple odorants on a single trial,

and 3) allowing for the presentation of different intensities across trials. This list of the benefits of this methodology is not exhaustive but highlights its potential utility to future researchers.

Another potential benefit of using an olfactometer in OCDM research is that direct presentation may be less susceptible to adaptation and habituation than ambient presentation of odorants. Past OCDM research, which has exclusively utilized ambient presentation, has frequently made use of short encoding phases and long retention intervals, potentially to avoid problems of adaptation and habituation¹⁴. Any procedure that would allow for longer encoding phases and shorter retention intervals could have large practical benefits for future research in terms of allowing for more encoding phase manipulations and making organization of subjects easier. Future research is needed to investigate whether direct presentation is, indeed, less susceptible to adaptation and habituation than ambient presentation.

The use of an olfactometer to directly present odorants also has several limitations. For one, directly presenting odorants to subjects increases the likelihood that olfaction is in the center of attention. Direct presentation is, therefore, not suited to OCDM research that attempts to investigate whether a subject must be consciously aware of the olfactory context for odors to serve as effective contextual mnemonic cues. Furthermore, given that odors are generally outside the focus of our awareness on a day to day basis, the direct presentation method probably provides less external validity than the ambient presentation method.

There are several issues that researchers should consider when determining which type of olfactometer to use or build and other issues that researchers should consider about their experiment, depending on the properties of the olfactometer they have. For example, the original experiment made use of a discrete presentation olfactometer with three separate channels¹⁵. This particular olfactometer had an estimated flow rate of 97.4 mL/s and the tubes that led from the odorant jar to the end just below the subject's nose was 4.3 m long. A discrete presentation olfactometer presents puffs of air at discrete times. This could potentially lead to issues related to tactile information, which need to be considered by the researcher when planning the experiment (see 2.1.4.4.2). The number of channels determines the number of different odorants that can be used in a single experiment. Some research questions may require a large number of odorants to be presented to a subject in a single experimental sitting, and researchers must therefore ensure that their olfactometer has the appropriate number of channels. One more issue to consider is the length of the tubes used in the olfactometer, which determine the delay between presentation trigger and actual delivery to the subject. Researchers should test to ensure that the timing is appropriate for their research question.

When a researcher investigating OCDM is deciding whether to utilize direct or ambient presentation of odors, we would suggest the following, based on the goals of the particular research project. Ambient odor presentation should generally be preferred when matters of ecological validity are of primary concern to the researcher. Direct presentation may be preferable when matters of experimental control are of primary importance. Specifically, direct presentation should be preferred when investigating topics such as a) the role of attention towards the olfactory context, b) inter-nasal differences, c) trial by trial manipulations of

presented context, and d) differences in presentation time of olfactory context. Of course, this list is not exhaustive, and there may be other situations where direct presentation of olfactory context is preferable to ambient presentation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The authors have no acknowledgements.

DISCLOSURES:

The authors have nothing to disclose.

REFERENCES:

1. Godden, D. R., Baddeley, A. D. Context-dependent memory in two natural environments: On land and underwater. *British Journal of Psychology*. 66, 325-331 (1975).
2. Smith, S. M., Vela, E. Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 8, 203-220 (2001).
3. Isarida, T, Isarida, T. K. Environmental context-dependent memory. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*. Thornton, A. J. NOVA Science Publishers. New York. 115-151 (2014).
4. Cann, A., Ross, D. A. Olfactory stimuli as context cues in human memory. *The American Journal of Psychology*. 102, 91-102 (1989).
5. Herz, R.S. Emotion experienced during encoding enhances odor retrieval cue effectiveness. *The American Journal of Psychology*. 110, 489-505 (1997).
6. Engen, T., Ross, B. M. Long-term memory of odors with and without descriptions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. 100, 221-227 (1973).
7. Larsson, M., Willander, J., Karlsson, K., Arshamian, A. Olfactory LOVER: Behavioral and neural correlates of autobiographical odor memory. *Frontiers in Psychology*. (2014). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00312
8. Lawless, H., Engen, T. Associations to odors: Interference, mnemonics, and verbal labeling. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*. 3, 52-59 (1977).
9. Kärnekull, S. C., Jönsson, F. U., Willander, J., Sikström, S., Larsson, M. Long-term memory for odors: Influences of familiarity and identification across 64 days. *Chemical Senses*. 40, 259-267 (2015).
10. Cain, W. S. To know with the nose: Keys to odor identification. *Science*. 203, 467-470 (1979).
11. Smeets, M. A. M., Dijksterhuis, G. B. Smelly primes – when olfactory primes do or do not work. *Frontiers in Psychology*. (2014). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00096

- 485
486 12. Davis, R. G. Acquisition of verbal associations to olfactory stimuli of varying familiarity and to
487 abstract visual stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*. 1,
488 134-142 (1975).
489
490 13. Davis, R. G. Acquisition and retention of verbal associations to olfactory and abstract visual
491 stimuli of varying similarity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and*
492 *Memory*. 3, 37-51 (1977).
493
494 14. Isarida, T, Sakai, T., Kubota, T., Koga, M., Katayama, Y., Isarida, T. K. Odor-context effects in
495 free recall after a short retention interval: A new methodology for controlling adaptation.
496 *Mem Cognit*. 42, 421-433 (2014).
497
498 15. Hackländer, R. P. M., Bermeitinger, C. Olfactory context-dependent memory and the effects
499 of affective congruency. *Chemical Senses*. 42, 777-788 (2017).
500
501 16. Frank, R. A., Rybalsky, K., Brearton, M., Mannea, E. Odor recognition memory as a function of
502 odor-naming performance. *Chemical Senses*. 36, 29-41 (2011).
503
504 17. Herz, R. S., Eliassen, J., Beland, S., Souza, T. Neuroimaging evidence for the emotional potency
505 of odor-evoked memory. *Neuropsychologia*. 42, 371-378 (2004).
506
507 18. Doty, R. L., Cameron, E. L. Sex differences and reproductive hormone influences on human
508 odor perception. *Physiology & Behavior*. 97, 213-228 (2009).
509
510 19. Doty, R. L., Shaman, P., Applebaum, S. L., Giberson, R., Siksorski, L., Rosenberg, L. Smell
511 identification ability: Changes with age. *Science*. 226, 1441-1443 (1984).
512
513 20. Herz, R., Engen, T. Odor memory: Review and analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 3, 300-
514 313 (1996).
515
516 21. Olofsson, J. K. Time to smell: A cascade model of human olfactory perception based on
517 response-time (RT) measurement. *Frontiers in Psychology*. (2014). doi:
518 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00033
519
520 22. Moss, A. G., Miles, C., Elsley, J. V., Johnson, A. J. Odorant normative data for use in olfactory
521 memory experiments: Dimension selection and analysis of individual differences. *Frontiers in*
522 *Psychology*. (2016). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01267
523
524 23. Ayabe-Kanamura, S., Schicker, I., Laska, M., Hudson, R., Distel, H., Kobayakawa, T., Saito, S.
525 Differences in perception of everyday odors: A Japanese-German cross-cultural study.
526 *Chemical Senses*. 23, 31-38 (1998).
527
528 24. Hermans, D., Baeyens, F., Eelen, P. Odours as affective-processing context for word

529 evaluation: A case of cross-modal affective priming. *Cognition & Emotion*. 12, 601-613 (1998).

- 530
531 25. Lundström, J. N., Gordon, A. R., Alden, E. C., Boesveldt, S., Albrecht, J. Methods for building
532 an inexpensive computer-controlled olfactometer for temporally precise experiments.
533 *International Journal of Psychophysiology*. 78, 179-189 (2010).

- 534
535 26. Stanislaw, H., Todorov, N. Calculation of signal detection theory measures. *Behavior Research*
536 *Methods, Instruments, & Computers*. 31, 137-149 (1999).

- 537
538 27. Isarida, T., Isarida, T. K., Sakai, T. Effects of study time and meaningfulness on environmental
539 context-dependent recognition. *Memory & Cognition*. 40, 1225-1235 (2012).

Figure 1





Figure 2



Pre-study	Encoding phase	Retention interval	Retrieval phase
1. Ensure pre-study instructions were follwed	1. Present words one at a time	1. 5 minute break in which subjects color in mandalas	1. Present words one at a time
2. Have subjects sign informed-concsent	2. Subjects complete abstract/concrete categorization task		2. Subjects complete old/new recognition test
3. Situate subjects in experimental room	3. Present odorants on each trial		3. Present odorants on each trial
4. Perform practice inhalation trials			

	<i>n</i>	<i>d'</i>	Hits	False Alarms
Control (no odor)	20	1.54 (1.62)	.67 (.25)	.25 (.25)
Olfactory context	40	2.18 (.50)	.75 (.13)	.13 (.05)
<i>t</i>		2.29	1.57	2.90
<i>p</i>		.026	.123	.005
Cohen's <i>d</i>		.53	.40	.67

Name of Material/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number	Comments/Description
Olfactometer	Burghart Messtechnik	OG001	Discrete presentation olfactometer
Odiferous material_Onion	Burghart Messtechnik	LA-13-00236	Liquid used in olfactometer to produce onion odor
Odiferous material_Peach	Burghart Messtechnik	LA-13-00245	Liquid used in olfactometer to produce peach odor
E-Prime 2.0	Psychology Software Tools		Experiment control software



1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article:

Olfactory context dependent memory: Direct presentation of odors

Author(s):

Ryan P.M. Hackländer, Christina Bermeitinger

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/author>) via: ☒ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

- ☒ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. **Defined Terms.** As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: "**Agreement**" means this Article and Video License Agreement; "**Article**" means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; "**Author**" means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; "**Collective Work**" means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; "**CRC License**" means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; "**Derivative Work**" means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; "**Institution**" means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; "**JoVE**" means MyJoVE Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; "**Materials**" means the Article and / or the Video; "**Parties**" means the Author and JoVE; "**Video**" means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. **Background.** The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. **Grant of Rights in Article.** In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4 and 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. Retention of Rights in Article. Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access. This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access. This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. Government Employees. If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. Likeness, Privacy, Personality. The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. Author Warranties. The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. JoVE Discretion. If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's

expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name: Ryan P M Hackländer
Department: Allgemeine Psychologie (General Psychology)
Institution: Universität Hildesheim
Article Title: Olfactory context dependent memory: Direct presentation of odors
Signature: Ryan Hackländer Date: 3/19/18

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pdf on the JoVE submission site;
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

Dear Dr. Steindel,

We would like to thank you for your rapid response and attention to our manuscript.

In line with the editorial comments and alterations, we have revised our manuscript to best follow the format for JoVE and to increase legibility. Below you can find our specific responses to the editorial comments.

Sincerely,

Ryan Hackländer and Christina Bermeitinger

Editorial comments:

Note that some formatting changes have been made. Also, it is acceptable to solely use a table for results.

We appreciate the editor's assistance with the formatting changes. Furthermore, we thank the editor for informing us about the ability to use a table to present our results.

1. It's fine to have the protocol sections on options in stimulus selection and odor presentation, but they must be in the imperative with occasional non-imperative 'Notes'. I've mostly changed section 3, but 4 was less clear—some of that information may better be in the discussion, and parts directly relevant to how the experiment in Section 2 was run (e.g., flow rates and presentation control) should probably be moved there. Other highlighted parts in 4 involve vague decision making, not discrete actions done in a real-world setting, and cannot be filmed.

We appreciate the editor's attention to our manuscript. We especially appreciate the improved legibility of section 3.

We appreciate the editor's suggestions concerning our formulations and formatting in section 4. We have now removed section 4 as an independent part of the paper and have moved the relevant information to other sections (section 2 and the discussion), based on where it was most appropriate. Furthermore, we have altered the wording to better reflect the language used in the other sections. Finally, we have revised our highlighting, so as to ensure that only clear and filmable sections are highlighted.

2. The link in reference 20 does not work.

We apologize for this inconvenience. We have now actually replaced the reference with a peer reviewed article which includes more of a focus on olfactory processing times:

Herz, R., Engen, T. Odor memory: Review and analysis. *Psychon Bull Rev.* 3, 300-313 (1996).

As a matter of completeness, we here include a working link to the originally cited paper:

<http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/rob/Courses/InformationInSpeech/CDROM/Literature/LOTwinterschool2006/biae.clemson.edu/bpc/bp/Lab/110/reaction.htm>