

---

# Brain-Like Replay Naturally Emerges in Reinforcement Learning Agents

---

Jiyi Wang<sup>\*12</sup> Likai Tang<sup>\*1</sup> Huimiao Chen<sup>\*13</sup> Sen Song<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Can replay, as a widely observed neural activity pattern in brain regions, particularly in the hippocampus and neocortex, emerge in an artificial agent? If yes, does it contribute to the tasks? In this work, without heavy dependence on complex assumptions, we discover naturally emergent replay under task-optimized paradigm using a recurrent neural network-based reinforcement learning model, which mimics the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex, as well as their intercommunication and the sensory cortex input. The emergent replay in the hippocampus module, which results from the episodic memory and cognitive map as well as environment observations, well resembles animal experimental data and serves as an effective indicator of high task performance. The model also successfully reproduces local and nonlocal replay, which matches the human experimental data. Our work provides a new avenue for understanding the mechanisms behind replay.

## 1. Introduction

In neuroscience, replay is the reactivation of a sequence of place cells encoding recent experienced locations during rest or sleep, and has been found in many brain areas, from the hippocampus (Buzsáki, 1986; Nádasdy et al., 1999) to the neocortex, such as the prefrontal cortex (Peyrache et al., 2009; Kaefer et al., 2020), visual cortex (Ji & Wilson, 2007), and motor cortex (Eichenlaub et al., 2020). Hippocampal replay has been thought to mainly serve two functions: memory (Foster & Wilson, 2006; Cheng & Frank, 2008; O’Neill et al., 2010; Van de Ven & Tolias, 2018), and planning (Pfeiffer & Foster, 2013; Widloski & Foster, 2022). Due to the intriguing dynamic properties of replay and the multitude of functions it involves, it has attracted considerable attention in the field of neuroscience.

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Tsinghua University <sup>2</sup>Peking University <sup>3</sup>Johns Hopkins University. Correspondence to: Jiyi Wang <geertswon@gmail.com>, Sen Song <songsen@tsinghua.edu.cn>.

Neuroscientists have constructed many mechanistic models to explain the emergence of replay. They set specific circuit connections for spiking neural network which then produces replay and their results reduce the emergence of replay to the level of circuit structure (Yiu & Leibold, 2023). However, they do not focus on what the task goal and action selection has played in the formation of replay. To achieve this goal we have to put replay under the reinforcement learning (RL) framework. A series of algorithms including experience replay (Lin, 1992; Schaul et al., 2015) which improves performance in RL tasks can be good evidence that replay does promote learning. However, it is hardly a good way to explore the emergence condition of replay, as all of the replay of stored experiences are hard-coded and predefined. Recently, some articles work on explaining the emergence of replay under RL framework. Authors of (Mattar & Daw, 2018) propose that a special variable called expected value of backup (EVB) determines the replay priority of different parts. However, it suffers from the natural inability to know EVB in advance of replay (Gupta et al., 2010; Carey et al., 2019), and fails to reproduce shortcut replay, which is thought to be a substrate for flexible rerouting (Widloski & Foster, 2022) (see Appendix C for how another model tries to overcome these shortcomings and its deficits). More importantly, the EVB variable is also hard-coded and fails to provide a natural picture of the emergence of replay.

Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) has recently succeeded in modeling behaviors and representations of humans and animals (Banino et al., 2018; Momennejad et al., 2017). Remarkably, such biological representations can emerge naturally as a result of task-optimized training, suggesting that conditions, like reward maximization of certain tasks, are sufficient for specific biological structures or representations. This paradigm has been verified widely in the field of navigation (Banino et al., 2018), vision (Yamins & DiCarlo, 2016), audition (Kell et al., 2018; Drakopoulos et al., 2021) and motor control (Sussillo et al., 2015). An interesting question is: *whether replay, as a dynamic representation distinguished from static representations like grid cells or Gabor filters, could be realized under task-optimized paradigm.* We intend to use DRL to answer this question. However, employing DRL alone is insufficient, as brain-like replay requires specific constraints amidst the vast array of task-optimized sequences. Biologically speaking, replay

involves more than one brain area, and interaction between and within different regions requires more intricate and powerful understanding of the navigation system. In this study, we employ DRL to investigate what are the sufficient conditions that can lead to replay sequences emerging in recurrent neural network (RNN) hidden states which resembles those observed in biological experiments.

So what possibly are these conditions? Here we propose two conditions that could be operationally realized in RL agents:

*Condition 1. Replay serves for reward maximization.*


*Condition 2. Replay is a form of communication between the neocortex and hippocampus.*

To realize *Condition 1*, we use an end-to-end RL framework trained on flexible navigation tasks. Unlike previous replay models, we do not assume the parameters within the model or functions of replay, but allow them to be naturally determined during the training process, which eliminates the additional assumptions introduced during the complex design of manually designing models. To realize *Condition 2*, we add in the model an extra information flow, which is trained with the policy network simultaneously. Also, we do not assume in advance what kind of information should be conveyed. The agent adjusts the information flow only based on its impact on its action and eventually the impact on the expected reward it could get.

From the above two simple conditions, we build a model that could reproduce the replay distribution evolution during the learning period. The information flow carries necessary contexts for successful rerouting and resembles real biological replay without the need of hard-coding. The exploration efficiency of our model surpasses that without replay. Remarkably, we reproduce the emergence of representation of the “shortcut” (optimal solution in navigation), which supports high exploration efficiency but previous models struggled to explain. Further, we analyze the information being conveyed and find that our model updates the context and future direction intention during replay. During this process, the value map is modulated by different contexts for the agent to make flexible decisions. We also prove this through the analysis of neural manifold, in which we reveal that replay helps the model activity trajectories to switch from one context subspace to another. Moreover, we expand our model to human replay to verify it could provide a general framework to understand the neural information processing strategy underlying replay.

## 2. Methods

Here we illustrate how our model is constructed and trained. To test whether the two conditions are sufficient, the struc-



**Figure 1.** **A.** Model structure. The HPC module is RNN based which can output the present activation of every place cell, and previous rewards. These two outputs correspond to two terms in our loss function, i.e., path integration and episodic memory. The PFC module is also an RNN cell to output action, and is equipped with a value network to aid training. The input to the Encoder module includes the observation which is a masked version of the fully observed state, previous action and previous reward, and then is processed and shared between PFC and HPC modules. The bottleneck resembles the information communication passage between PFC and HPC, which will open only at rest and place cells will then reactivate to generate a trajectory. **B.** During mobility, the information passage will not open, and HPC and PFC module will operate independently. The place cells will activate to reflect the real present locations. **C.** During immobility, the information passage will open, and the HPC and PFC modules will communicate with each other. The place cells will reactivate to generate a virtual trajectory, which is recorded as a replay sequence.

ture of the model should resemble that of the biological brain. Specifically, our model mainly consists of two sub-modules: the hippocampus module (HPC) and the prefrontal cortex module (PFC), and replay is modeled as communication between the two modules.

a. The HPC serves as a cognitive map, into which the relationships among positions of the environment are baked, and meanwhile, as a short-term memory buffer which stores past experiences. These two functions are incorporated into our HPC module through well-designed loss functions. This setting borrows the neuroscientific findings.

We realize the HPC module using an RNN (Figure 1A), due to the recurrent connections in hippocampus CA3 (Le Duigou et al., 2014). The update of the HPC module can be written as:

$$h_t = f_{\text{HPC}}(W_h h_{t-1} + (1 - \mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}})W_{h,\text{in}}[o_t, r_{t-1}, a_{t-1}] + \mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}}W_{h,r} \theta_{t-1}) \quad (1)$$

$$[\hat{r}_{t-k:t}, \hat{G}(s = 1 : m)_t] = \sigma(W_{h,\text{out}} h_t) \quad (2)$$

where  $h_t, h_{t-1}$  are hidden states of HPC, and  $o_t, r_{t-1}, a_{t-1}$  are observations (the masked version of the fully observed

state), the previous reward, and the previous action, respectively.  $W_h, W_{h,r}, W_{h,in}$  and  $W_{h,out}$  are trainable parameters.  $\theta$  is the hidden state of PFC.  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}}$  is the indicator which means that during replay the input stops and communication happens.  $f_{\text{HPC}}$  is the activation function for the HPC module. The HPC module then anticipates perfect Gaussian bump peaked at next location  $G(s)(s = 1 : m)$  as well as rewards of recent steps  $\hat{r}_{t-k:t}$ .  $m$  is the number of possible positions and  $k$  is the number of steps the agent need to remember.

The hippocampus is well known for its ability of structural learning, and the learnt structure could act as a basis for knowledge generalization and flexible navigation (Whittington et al., 2018). In practice, the HPC module has to output the next location and reward using the history (hidden state) and environment information (input) (Figure 1, Equation 2). To resemble biological place cells, the HPC module has  $m$  place cells corresponding to  $m$  locations of the room, and the objective output should be a Gaussian bump centered at the given location. Therefore, the loss could be written as the cross-entropy between the activation of every place cells  $\hat{G}(s)(s = 1 : m)$  and the anticipated perfect Gaussian bump peaked at next location  $G(s)(s = 1 : m)$  Equation 3). To make it equipped with the reward structure of the environment, in addition to predict the next location, it also has to predict the reward at next location  $r_t$ , which is written as an L1 loss (Equation 4).

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pred-location},t} = - \sum_{s=1}^m \hat{G}(s) \log G(s) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pred-r},t} = \|\hat{r}_t - r_t\| \quad (4)$$

The hippocampus is also thought to store episodic memory (Whittington et al., 2018). More and more evidences point to the essential position the hippocampus has in the memory process (Battaglia et al., 2011). In practice, the HPC module has to output the previous rewards it has received. Therefore, the loss should be written as the L1 difference between the output rewards and the actual history rewards (Equation 5).

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{memory-r},t} = \sum_{i=1}^k \|\hat{r}_{t-i} - r_{t-i}\| \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{r,t} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{pred-r},t} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{memory-r},t} \quad (6)$$

where  $k$  is the number of steps the agent need to remember and  $i$  is the index of recent steps.

To manage the complexity of high-dimensional visual inputs, we employ an ancillary Encoder module modelled by convolutional neural network (CNN), simulating the sensory cortex (Figure 1A). HPC and Encoder are pretrained using supervised learning over random policy to be equipped with the general and policy-independent environment structure.

b. The PFC gathers information from the sensory cortex and HPC to make decisions. Prefrontal cortex has been thought to be the center for decision making (Barraclough et al., 2004), and in our task, it has to output the action to maximize the expected reward using the hidden state and the environment information. We realize the PFC module using another RNN cell (Figure 1), due to the abundant recurrent connection in prefrontal cortex and traditions to model PFC as RNN (Wang et al., 2018)

$$\theta_t = f_{\text{PFC}}(W_\theta \theta_{t-1} + (1 - \mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}})W_{\theta,in}[o_t, r_{t-1}, a_{t-1}] + \mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}}W_{\theta,r}h_{t-1}) \quad (7)$$

$$[a_t, v_t] = W_{\theta,out}\theta_t \quad (8)$$

where  $\theta_t, \theta_{t-1}$  are hidden states of PFC module, and  $o_t, r_{t-1}, a_{t-1}$ , and  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{replay}}$  are the same as in Equation 1.  $W_\theta, W_{\theta,r}, W_{\theta,in}$  and  $W_{\theta,out}$  are trainable parameters.  $f_{\text{PFC}}$  is the activation function for the PFC module.

We establish an information passage between the HPC and PFC, modeling replay as a form of ‘‘information flow’’ at rest. This information flow includes PFC’s accepting information from the HPC, providing instructions for the cognitive map, and receiving feedbacks, and is reflected in  $W_{h,r}$  (Equation 1) and  $W_{\theta,r}$  (Equation 7).

More detailedly, the information passage will keep closed during movement (Figure 1 B), and open when the agent receive a reward (Figure 1 C). During the agent’s movement, the PFC decides the agent’s next direction (i.e., north, south, east, or west) based on the compact environment information processed by the Encoder module. At this time it does not rely on direct information from the HPC module. Meanwhile, the HPC maintains its own dynamics for correct place cells’ activation and recent episodic memory. When the agent receives a reward, the two modules iterate for several steps and influence each other through the information passage. The reactivation of place cells in HPC is then probed and analyzed as replay. This setting is inspired by neuroscientific findings where the replay is always detected when the subject receives a reward and stops to consume it (Igata et al., 2021). The PFC module is trained online using proximal policy optimization (PPO) with the bidirectional information flow.

We conducted the following analysis with the model weights of both the PFC and HPC modules fixed after training.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Shortcut sequences emerge during replay as in biological experiments

We use the animal experiments from (Igata et al., 2021) as the reference, in which replay in hippocampus includes an optimized path that had never been exploited by the animals




Figure 2. Task setting illustration. **A.** The agent should start from S, first get to checkpoint C, consume a small amount of reward (0.5), and then arrive at goal G (1.0). Directly moving to G will not bring any rewards. **B.** A representative trajectory generated by the trained RL agent. First it reaches C and gets the small reward. The replay happens at this time. **C.** The replay trajectory during the representative event in B. The trained place cell decoder has been trained to describe the actual trajectory the agent is experiencing, and now it can describe the virtual trajectory the HPC activities are representing. The number of replay steps is set to be 4.




Figure 3. Performance of the AI agent when it comes across the new checkpoint. X-axis, times of meeting checkpoint 2 repeatedly. 0 indicates the reward still stays at checkpoint 1. Y-axis, number of agents’ average steps to get reward at checkpoint. In this task, the optimal number of steps is 3 (dashed line), because the reward at the checkpoint can be reached in 3 actions.

during dynamic change of reward location. In this experiment, researchers trained mice to navigate in an open arena (Figure 2). During the prelearning phase, the rats ran from starting point S to checkpoint 1 (C1) where they received a small reward, and then ran from C1 to G where they received a large reward. After the rats had learnt the optimal path (S-C1-G) to finish the task, the small reward was replaced at checkpoint 2 (C2), requiring the rats to learn new optimal path (S-C2-G), which was the beginning of learning stage. At first the rats insisted on taking S-C1-G and then adopted G-C2-G out of failure to get reward at G. Then they realized the existence of a better path (S-C2-G) and gradually settled on that path. Their objective was to investigate changes in the relative amount of replay sequences that represent different parts of the room (replay distribution) when the reward is replaced from C1 to C2. They found that the representation of the original trajectory (S-C1, C1-G) decayed rapidly, while the representation of the shortcut (S-C2) increased as




Figure 4. **A.** Illustration of the segments that replay trajectories can be attributed to. For each sequential event, we test whether it’s effective and attribute it to a segment that has the maximal spatial correlation. The colors correspond to other figures in this paper. **B.** Change of replay distribution representing different segments generated by the AI agent. It bears high similarity with the curve in C, which is from (Igata et al., 2021), in two important aspects: first, the amount of replay of S-C2 increases; second, the amount of replay of C2-G first increases and then drops down.

learning progressed even before the agent adopted it (Figure 4), which could be an evidence that replay could support flexible navigation by combination of old trajectories and searching in the cognitive map.

We conducted similar experiments using our model in a similar environment, to validate our hypothesis that change of replay distribution can be explained as a natural outcome of the communication between the PFC and HPC to maximize expected return. Similarly, in a simulated environment for agents, we positioned the small reward initially at C1 and replace it to C2. Without adjusting the model parameter and only by changing the ongoing activity of RNNs, the RL agent successfully learned to take shortcuts (Figure 3) to the new checkpoint, similar to the rat (Figure 4). More importantly, the replay sequences of our agents is highly similar with that of rats. These results preliminarily validate our hypothesis and emphasize the crucial role that replay distribution plays in successful flexible navigation.

### 3.2. Ablation study demonstrates the effectiveness of replay

To check whether brain-like replay distribution is necessary for the high efficiency exploration. We conduct ablation study which removes the two functions: path integration (no pred) and episodic memory (no mem) separately from HPC module during training, and observe the exploration performance and the similarity of replay distribution with biological data. Compared with Figure 4, the two curves in ablation experiments (Figure 5) are less similar to that in biological experiments (Figure 4 C). Considering that prelearning phase is less correlated with the cognitive map change, we only focus on the learning stage. The original curve is significantly more similar to the biological curve and its KL-divergence with biological distribution is less than ablation curves (Figure 5 B).

Moreover, we measure the number of exploration steps




Figure 5. **A.** Ablation studies of HPC function(episodic memory and path integration). After removal of either the memory or path-integrating term from the loss function, the replay curve is less similar to the original experimental curve (top: remove memory; bottom: remove path integration). The main difference is that the replay sequences representing shortcut to new checkpoint drops down, which indicates the failure of hippocampus activity to capture the new checkpoint. **B.** This effect is quantified by their step-by-step KL-divergence with biological data DKL(simulating data || biological data) at learning stage (Significance test, ANOVA,  $n = 10$ ). **C.** The number of seeking steps increases significantly (Significance test, ANOVA,  $n_{\text{original}} = 1193$ ,  $n_{\text{no-memory}} = 1200$ ,  $n_{\text{no-pred}} = 1192$ ,  $n_{\text{no-hpc}} = 1200$ ), indicating the lower efficiency to explore due to the damaged HPC cognitive map.

when the reward is replaced, and the agent still adopts S-C1 but cannot find the new small reward. The original exploration steps are significantly less than the ablation ones (Figure 5 C). The combination of the two functions gives HPC better ability to construct a better cognitive map, which benefits decision making in PFC. Here we also show the exploration steps when the total HPC is ablated (no HPC). The training curve of the model without HPC (Figure 13 in Appendices) also shows the agent achieves much worse performance than original agent. These findings highlight that brain-like replay is crucial to the task performance.

### 3.3. Information flow during replay entails information about context and action plan

We next investigate what is entailed in the information flow between the HPC module and the PFC module during the replay. We anticipate that the PFC initially lacks accurate context encoding after the switch of reward location from C1 to C2, and it will be equipped with context representation as a result of replay. To test this, we trained a Gaussian Naïve Bayes decoder to decode the context (the checkpoint location) from the PFC’s activities. 80% of all data is taken as training set and the remaining 20% as test set. There is a gradual increase in context decoding accuracy during the replay when the agent first arrived at the switched reward location. The decoding accuracy remains high when the agent meets the C2 for the second time. As the agent meets the checkpoint 2 repeatedly, the HPC and PFC keeps this location in their activities and their accuracies remain high




Figure 6. Correct context and future direction intention are updated during replay. Decoding accuracy for the correct reward location by the activities in HPC (**A**), PFC (**B**) and the information passage (**C**) at different steps (X-axis, initial: before replay, 1-4: different steps during replay, output: after replay. Y-axis, decoding accuracy). **D.** Decoding error of PFC activities for the correct actions of future steps following replay (X-axis, same as A-C, Y-axis, decoding error). 80% of the data is taken as the training set and the remaining 20% as the test set. The Gaussian Naïve Bayes and Ridge Regression method are used to decode the reward location and the future directions, respectively. Each step has an independent decoder, and they don’t share training sets. Shade indicates  $\pm 1$  standard error bar ( $n = 10$  for A-D). In A-C, the dark color denotes the first time meeting the location-altered checkpoint, and the lighter color denotes the second time meeting the location-altered checkpoint. Note that as the agent meets the checkpoint at the same location, the HPC and PFC keep this location in their activities and their accuracies remain high even till the next time before it meets the same checkpoint. In D, red, orange, yellow and brown represents the first, second, third and fourth future direction following replay. Note that the decoding errors after the first meeting are lower than the initial ones, indicating that it plans the future directions as a result of replay. The error curves of  $(t + 1)$  and  $(t + 2)$  steps are below the  $(t + 3)$  and  $(t + 4)$  steps, which means that more remote direction plans are more blurry.

even through the whole process (Figure 6 A and B). This demonstrates that replay contributes to the fast switch and identification of the new context. We developed another decoder to analyze the context directly from the HPC-PFC information passage. This analysis revealed that the information flow robustly encodes the reward’s location throughout the replay process (Figure 6 C). Combining these results, it becomes evident that the flow of information from the HPC to the PFC during replay is crucial in conveying the reward location. We next check if the action plan is also entailed in the information flow, which ultimately affects the behavior of agents. We trained a Ridge Classifier decoder to predict the specific action from PFC’s activities (Figure 6 D). It turns out that as the agent meets the new checkpoint, the decoding errors decrease significantly, indicating that it plans the future directions as a result of replay. So, replay processes reshape the action planning within the PFC, analogous to the formation of ‘options’ in hierarchical reinforcement learning frameworks.

### 3.4. Context change is reflected rapidly during replay

To explore the mechanism how replay influences the context and action information in PFC, we test the cognitive map in




Figure 7. In the agent’s estimation, a different set of values is attributed to the whole room as a result of switch of context. **A.** Value map as a result of “stop and scan” when the agent meets the checkpoint. The leftmost is the value map before the checkpoint change, and the others correspond to different times the agent meets the new checkpoint repeatedly. There is an obvious trend that the focus of the value map shifts from the original optimal path to the new optimal path. **B.** Value advantages of checkpoint 2 over checkpoint 1, calculated by the convolution of a DoG filter whose positive peak is located at C2 and negative peak at C1. Leftmost is the advantage before the checkpoint change, which is negative, indicating C1 advantage, and the others corresponds to different times the agent meets the new checkpoint repeatedly. (Significance test: ANOVA, 0 ~ 4,  $n = 1172$ ). **C.** Green line, differences of value advantages of checkpoint 2 over checkpoint 1 at different learning stages. Blue line, differences of advantages as a result of value map convoluted with DoG filters with randomly selected positive and negative peaks. Shade indicates  $\pm 1$  standard error bar. (Significance test: ANOVA, for checkpoint-focused DoG,  $n = 1172$ , for randomly focused DoG,  $n = 732500$ ). **D-E.** Value advantages at different segments. **D.** Consolidation advantage, corresponding to value of S-C2 minus value of S-C1. (Significance test, ANOVA. 0 ~ 4,  $n = 1172$ ).

PFC by “stop and scan” paradigm. When the agent finishes one time of replay at a step, we stop the real time clock and let the agent walk in the whole map randomly. We record the output of the value network as the PFC’s estimation of the goodness of each location. We predict that the high value area will be around path S-C1-G before context switch and S-C2-G after context switch (Figure 7). The high value area first centers around C1 (bottom right) and then around C2 (upper left). The convolution of Difference of Gaussian (DoG) filter and the value map produces the relative value advantage of C2 over C1. We find that the value advan-

tage changes significantly from negative (C1 advantage) to positive (C2 advantage). This demonstrates the qualitative change of the context modulation of the cognitive map. We further confirm this effect by comparing the difference of value advantage along the time axis of checkpoint DoG with other randomly-peaked DoGs. Figure 7 C proves that at the first time when the agent meets the C2 the difference of value advantage significantly surpasses random level, and then the difference drops back to random level as the agent meets C2 repeatedly, indicating that the context modulation has been stable. We also test whether the path value will change as a result of replay, which means that new optimal path S-C2 and C2-G should surpass S-C1 and C1-G, respectively (Figure 7 D and E). Considering that these two reversals of advantage correspond to the two main parts in the replay distribution, this phenomenon indicates that the replay of salient locations helps to update the value estimation of the cognitive map, by which it helps to adjust rapidly its context modulation.

A value-modulated cognitive map in PFC is reminiscent of the value representation (Enel et al., 2020) and task structure representation (Zhou et al., 2019) found in orbitofrontal cortex (OFC). Our work points out a way how these two kinds of representations could be combined as V function to guide future decision making. In fact, our PFC cognitive map is formed with the aid of HPC cognitive map, which has been proved in previous literature (Mızrak et al., 2021). Future work could design more intricate experiments to deepen the understanding how the cognitive maps in HPC and OFC interact and contribute to the learning of task structure and flexible credit assignments.

### 3.5. Manifolds reveal that replay promotes memory retrieval and alters PFC activities

To further reveal the dynamic change of PFC activities, we conduct principal component analysis (PCA) on PFC activity vectors remains at location C1 (pre-learning phase, see Figure 8 A), and the small reward switches from C1 to C2 including the agent first (learning phase, see Figure 8 B) and second (post-learning phase, see Figure 8 C) time meeting C2. We connect the centroids of each step’s multiple samplings and get average trajectories, shown in Figure 8. Trajectories in the context of C1 and C2 correspond to two different orbits, and replay during the context change helps the neural activity switch from orbits C1 to C2. We further analyze the dimensions of different subspaces by separating different parts of the whole trajectory. Figure 9 A is an illustrative example of accumulated explained variance (AEV) of PFC activities during context switch (first time meeting new small reward) that only include real experience activities but do not include replay. If we take 70% as the explanation threshold and the minimum number of the dimension whose AEV surpasses this threshold as the




Figure 8. Manifold analysis reveals the context switch process in detail. 3D-embedding of the “neural” manifold in PFC module when the small reward stays at C1 (highlighted trajectory in **A**), the small reward has switched from C1 to C2, and the agent meets C2 for the first time (highlighted trajectory in **B**) and meets C2 for the second time (highlighted trajectory in **C**) (Note: there are 3 trajectories in A, B, and C, and they are the same regardless of color). Green points correspond to replay steps (virtual experiences); 4 steps of replay are represented by 4 types of green. Light and dark red (blue) points correspond to steps (real experience) before and after replay, respectively, when the small reward stays at C1 (C2); 4 steps before and after replay are represented by 4 types of light and dark red (blue), respectively. Each plotted trajectory is an average of multiple samples. Highlighted trajectories in A and C (called orbits C1 and C2) correspond to two different contexts, and the one in B consists of the light red part of orbit C1, new replay steps (which is a bridge connecting orbits C1 and C2), and the dark blue part of orbit C2.

subspace dimension, we can conclude that the subspace dimension of PFC activities in this case is 3. Similarly, we can analyze the subspace dimension of PFC activities during replay (virtual experience). Figure 9 B can be intuitively understood if we take “staying on one orbit” as a straight line and “switching between two orbits” as a curve. We also analyze the subspace dimension of all PFC activities (real and virtual experience, see Figure 9 C). The dimension reduction intuitively illustrates the process of context switch. Meanwhile, we test the trajectory stability during context switch by calculating data points’ mean square distance to the KNN centroids (Figure 10). The variances increase shortly during context switch and then drop down when the agent meets C2 for the second time. The first meet causes an unstable trajectory and the second meet stabilizes it.

### 3.6. Verification on human experiments

To validate the expandability of our model, we apply it to new experiments in (Liu et al., 2021), where authors measure the whole-brain activity by MEG while subjects perform a dynamic decision-making task and train some logistic classifiers to decode the representational content from the activity. They successfully detect sequential reactivation of certain items that had been previously presented to the




Figure 9. Analysis of the subspace of neural activities reveals that replay connects two low-dimensional context subspace. **A**. Accumulated explained variance as a result of PCA of PFC activities during context switch when the agent do not replay (mobility, real experience). Three dimensions can explain 70% variances of the 32-dimension activities. **B**. The dimension of neural subspace of replay (virtual experience) activities if we take the threshold of AEV = 70%. **C**. The dimension of neural subspace of real and virtual experience activities if we take the threshold of AEV = 70%. Note that during context switch the subspace dimension of PFC activities under virtual (real and virtual) experience increase shortly to 2 (3) and then drop back to 1 (2), indicating the relatively complicated subspace occupied by transition from orbit C1 to orbit C2 compared to staying on one orbit. For both B and C, we measured 10 times using different seeds and all results are the same.




Figure 10. The trajectory becomes unstable suddenly during the context switch and then restores stability. The stability of the trajectory during learning stages is measured by data points’ mean square distance to the KNN centroids (number of centroids = 8). Note that the variances increase shortly during context switch and then drop down when the agent meets C2 for the second time. First meet causes an unstable trajectory. **A**. HPC activities. **B**. PFC activities. (Significance test, ANOVA,  $n = 10$ )

subjects (Figure 11), which they call replay. Moreover, they find that if different paths lead to the same ending, then an experience on one of them will be followed by not only local replay but also nonlocal replay that occupy other paths that lead to this ending. Specifically, the whole environment constitutes of three arms, each of which has two choices (0 and 1). Same choice on different arms will lead to the same ending (0 for X and 1 for Y), and each ending will produce reward according to a dynamically-changed reward probability (Gaussian random walk). In Figure 11 B, we show a replay example, a real experience of E1-E2-E3 is followed by local replay of E1-E2-E3 or/and nonlocal replay




Figure 11. (Adapted from (Liu et al., 2021)) **A.** Illustration of the setting of the adaptive decision-making task. Each dot represents a path state in (Liu et al., 2021). The states with the same color constitute an arm, and every arm has two segments dependent on the choice of the agent. **B.** A representative trajectory generated by the trained RL agent. Starting from the green “initial observation”, the agent observes E1-E2-E3 (green trajectory) and gets a reward (we think of both £1 and £0 as “get a reward”). The replay happens at this time. **C.** The replay trajectory during the representative event in B. The trained stimulus decoder has been trained to describe the actual trajectory the agent is experiencing, and now it can help to localize the stimulus and describe the virtual trajectory the HPC activities are representing. The number of replay steps is set to be 3.




Figure 12. Sequence strength of local and non-local backward replay in our model resembles that of 160-ms backward replay in human. Same analysis paradigm (TDLM, temporally delayed linear modelling) as the original article is used (Liu et al., 2021). This shows that the backward replay in our model also encodes nonlocal experiences as opposed to local experiences.

of start-A1-A2 (Figure 11 C). As the reward probability of both choices are changing independently and continuously, there is not a constant answer which choice is better, and the agent must keep estimating the different choices according to recently accumulated evidence.

Authors of (Liu et al., 2021) find a dominance of backward replay, which supports nonlocal updating by backpropagating reward information at nonlocal arms. One of the results that supports this conclusion is that such backward replay represents nonlocal paths more than local paths, measured by sequence strengths of different arms. We repeat this experiment using the same training paradigm as in the task of mice, and reproduce qualitatively same results (Figure 12).

Therefore, our model can be applied to both human and rodent subjects, and align well with both electrophysiological and MEG detection techniques, indicating that it can reveal the general principle of replay in updating the internal model.

## 4. Discussion

In this article, first, we observe that replay could naturally emerge from interacting cognitive map module (i.e., HPC) and decision making module (i.e., PFC) trained with DRL, and also reproduce biologically similar distribution represented by different replay sequences, thereby verifying two hypotheses as their sufficient conditions. The biological plausibility of our HPC and PFC module is further discussed in Appendix A.

Second, in ablation studies, we prove that highly efficient exploration performance can only emerge with an HPC module equipped with both path integration function and episodic memory function, therefore highlight the functional importance of brain-like replay.

Third, in further analysis, we verify that during replay, context information and future direction information are successfully updated in the decision making module, which can be explained as the memory consolidation and planning that are thought to be functions of replay. By measuring the estimated value of locations in decision making module, we show the context modulated cognitive map, which could provide a  $V$  function as a substrate for agents to make decisions. And the switch of different context modulation of the map is fast, robust and flexible, and after-switch modulation is stable, which is compared temporally (Figure 7 B) or spatially (Figure 7 C). Through the 3D embedding of PFC activities, we could understand intuitively the switch of context modulation as the switch from one context orbit to another, which is further supported by subspace dimension analysis. We also point out that update of the certain parts of cognitive map is accompanied by replay sequences and estimated value increasing of corresponding parts, which indicates the role that replay has in updating the internal model.

Finally, we extend the application of our model from rodent electrophysiological recording to human MEG recording, proving that our model bears universality and could reveal the general principle that is shared between different information processing systems. This is the original intention of this study and we expect more studies on this topic could bring us new understanding of intelligent agents and finally contribute to the development of high performance RL agents.

## References

- Ambrose, R. E., Pfeiffer, B. E., and Foster, D. J. Reverse replay of hippocampal place cells is uniquely modulated by changing reward. *Neuron*, 91(5):1124–1136, 2016.
- Banino, A., Barry, C., Uria, B., Blundell, C., Lillicrap, T., Mirowski, P., Pritzel, A., Chadwick, M. J., Degris, T., Modayil, J., et al. Vector-based navigation using grid-like representations in artificial agents. *Nature*, 557(7705): 429–433, 2018.
- Barracough, D. J., Conroy, M. L., and Lee, D. Prefrontal cortex and decision making in a mixed-strategy game. *Nature neuroscience*, 7(4):404–410, 2004.
- Battaglia, F. P., Benchenane, K., Sirota, A., Pennartz, C. M., and Wiener, S. I. The hippocampus: hub of brain network communication for memory. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 15(7):310–318, 2011.
- Bush, J. C., Pantelis, P. C., Morin Duchesne, X., Kagemann, S. A., and Kennedy, D. P. Viewing complex, dynamic scenes “through the eyes” of another person: The gaze-replay paradigm. *PloS one*, 10(8):e0134347, 2015.
- Buzsáki, G. Hippocampal sharp waves: their origin and significance. *Brain research*, 398(2):242–252, 1986.
- Carey, A. A., Tanaka, Y., and van Der Meer, M. A. Reward reevaluation biases hippocampal replay content away from the preferred outcome. *Nature neuroscience*, 22(9):1450–1459, 2019.
- Cheng, S. and Frank, L. M. New experiences enhance coordinated neural activity in the hippocampus. *Neuron*, 57(2):303–313, 2008.
- Davidson, T. J., Kloosterman, F., and Wilson, M. A. Hippocampal replay of extended experience. *Neuron*, 63(4): 497–507, 2009.
- Dickey, C. W., Verzhbinsky, I. A., Jiang, X., Rosen, B. Q., Kajfez, S., Stedelin, B., Shih, J. J., Ben-Haim, S., Raslan, A. M., Eskandar, E. N., et al. Widespread ripples synchronize human cortical activity during sleep, waking, and memory recall. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(28):e2107797119, 2022.
- Drakopoulos, F., Baby, D., and Verhulst, S. A convolutional neural-network framework for modelling auditory sensory cells and synapses. *Communications Biology*, 4(1): 827, 2021.
- Ego-Stengel, V. and Wilson, M. A. Disruption of ripple-associated hippocampal activity during rest impairs spatial learning in the rat. *Hippocampus*, 20(1):1–10, 2010.
- Eichenlaub, J.-B., Jarosiewicz, B., Saab, J., Franco, B., Kelemen, J., Halgren, E., Hochberg, L. R., and Cash, S. S. Replay of learned neural firing sequences during rest in human motor cortex. *Cell Reports*, 31(5), 2020.
- Enel, P., Wallis, J. D., and Rich, E. L. Stable and dynamic representations of value in the prefrontal cortex. *Elife*, 9: e54313, 2020.
- Erdem, U. M. and Hasselmo, M. A goal-directed spatial navigation model using forward trajectory planning based on grid cells. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(6): 916–931, 2012.
- Erdem, U. M. and Hasselmo, M. E. A biologically inspired hierarchical goal directed navigation model. *Journal of Physiology-Paris*, 108(1):28–37, 2014.
- Foster, D. J. and Wilson, M. A. Reverse replay of behavioural sequences in hippocampal place cells during the awake state. *Nature*, 440(7084):680–683, 2006.
- Gillespie, A. K., Maya, D. A. A., Denovellis, E. L., Liu, D. F., Kastner, D. B., Coulter, M. E., Roumis, D. K., Eden, U. T., and Frank, L. M. Hippocampal replay reflects specific past experiences rather than a plan for subsequent choice. *Neuron*, 109(19):3149–3163, 2021.
- Girardeau, G., Benchenane, K., Wiener, S. I., Buzsáki, G., and Zugaro, M. B. Selective suppression of hippocampal ripples impairs spatial memory. *Nature neuroscience*, 12(10):1222–1223, 2009.
- Gupta, A. S., Van Der Meer, M. A., Touretzky, D. S., and Redish, A. D. Hippocampal replay is not a simple function of experience. *Neuron*, 65(5):695–705, 2010.
- Igata, H., Ikegaya, Y., and Sasaki, T. Prioritized experience replays on a hippocampal predictive map for learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(1):e2011266118, 2021.
- Jackson, J. C., Johnson, A., and Redish, A. D. Hippocampal sharp waves and reactivation during awake states depend on repeated sequential experience. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(48):12415–12426, 2006.
- Jadhav, S. P., Kemere, C., German, P. W., and Frank, L. M. Awake hippocampal sharp-wave ripples support spatial memory. *Science*, 336(6087):1454–1458, 2012.
- Ji, D. and Wilson, M. A. Coordinated memory replay in the visual cortex and hippocampus during sleep. *Nature neuroscience*, 10(1):100–107, 2007.
- Kaefer, K., Nardin, M., Blahna, K., and Csicsvari, J. Replay of behavioral sequences in the medial prefrontal cortex during rule switching. *Neuron*, 106(1):154–165, 2020.

- Karlsson, M. P. and Frank, L. M. Awake replay of remote experiences in the hippocampus. *Nature neuroscience*, 12(7):913–918, 2009.
- Kell, A. J., Yamins, D. L., Shook, E. N., Norman-Haignere, S. V., and McDermott, J. H. A task-optimized neural network replicates human auditory behavior, predicts brain responses, and reveals a cortical processing hierarchy. *Neuron*, 98(3):630–644, 2018.
- Kumaran, D., Hassabis, D., and McClelland, J. L. What learning systems do intelligent agents need? complementary learning systems theory updated. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20(7):512–534, 2016.
- Le Duigou, C., Simonnet, J., Teleńczuk, M. T., Fricker, D., and Miles, R. Recurrent synapses and circuits in the ca3 region of the hippocampus: an associative network. *Frontiers in cellular neuroscience*, 7:262, 2014.
- Lin, L.-J. Self-improving reactive agents based on reinforcement learning, planning and teaching. *Machine learning*, 8:293–321, 1992.
- Liu, C., Todorova, R., Tang, W., Oliva, A., and Fernandez-Ruiz, A. Associative and predictive hippocampal codes support memory-guided behaviors. *Science*, 382(6668): eadi8237, 2023.
- Liu, Y., Mattar, M. G., Behrens, T. E., Daw, N. D., and Dolan, R. J. Experience replay is associated with efficient nonlocal learning. *Science*, 372(6544):eabf1357, 2021.
- Mattar, M. G. and Daw, N. D. Prioritized memory access explains planning and hippocampal replay. *Nature neuroscience*, 21(11):1609–1617, 2018.
- Michon, F., Sun, J.-J., Kim, C. Y., Ciliberti, D., and Kloosterman, F. Post-learning hippocampal replay selectively reinforces spatial memory for highly rewarded locations. *Current Biology*, 29(9):1436–1444, 2019.
- Mızrak, E., Bouffard, N. R., Libby, L. A., Boorman, E. D., and Ranganath, C. The hippocampus and orbitofrontal cortex jointly represent task structure during memory-guided decision making. *Cell reports*, 37(9), 2021.
- Momennejad, I., Russek, E. M., Cheong, J. H., Botvinick, M. M., Daw, N. D., and Gershman, S. J. The successor representation in human reinforcement learning. *Nature human behaviour*, 1(9):680–692, 2017.
- Nádasdy, Z., Hirase, H., Czurkó, A., Csicsvari, J., and Buzsáki, G. Replay and time compression of recurring spike sequences in the hippocampus. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 19(21):9497–9507, 1999.
- Ólafsdóttir, H. F., Carpenter, F., and Barry, C. Task demands predict a dynamic switch in the content of awake hippocampal replay. *Neuron*, 96(4):925–935, 2017.
- O’Neill, J., Pleydell-Bouverie, B., Dupret, D., and Csicsvari, J. Play it again: reactivation of waking experience and memory. *Trends in neurosciences*, 33(5):220–229, 2010.
- Peyrache, A., Khamassi, M., Benchenane, K., Wiener, S. I., and Battaglia, F. P. Replay of rule-learning related neural patterns in the prefrontal cortex during sleep. *Nature neuroscience*, 12(7):919–926, 2009.
- Pfeiffer, B. E. and Foster, D. J. Hippocampal place-cell sequences depict future paths to remembered goals. *Nature*, 497(7447):74–79, 2013.
- Romani, S. and Tsodyks, M. Short-term plasticity based network model of place cells dynamics. *Hippocampus*, 25(1):94–105, 2015.
- Schaul, T., Quan, J., Antonoglou, I., and Silver, D. Prioritized experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05952*, 2015.
- Singer, A. C., Carr, M. F., Karlsson, M. P., and Frank, L. M. Hippocampal swr activity predicts correct decisions during the initial learning of an alternation task. *Neuron*, 77(6):1163–1173, 2013.
- Stachenfeld, K. L., Botvinick, M., and Gershman, S. J. Design principles of the hippocampal cognitive map. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Stachenfeld, K. L., Botvinick, M. M., and Gershman, S. J. The hippocampus as a predictive map. *Nature neuroscience*, 20(11):1643–1653, 2017.
- Sussillo, D., Churchland, M. M., Kaufman, M. T., and Shenoy, K. V. A neural network that finds a naturalistic solution for the production of muscle activity. *Nature neuroscience*, 18(7):1025–1033, 2015.
- Tsodyks, M. V., Skaggs, W. E., Sejnowski, T. J., and McNaughton, B. L. Population dynamics and theta rhythm phase precession of hippocampal place cell firing: a spiking neuron model. *Hippocampus*, 6(3):271–280, 1996.
- Van de Ven, G. M. and Tolias, A. S. Generative replay with feedback connections as a general strategy for continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10635*, 2018.
- Wang, J. X., Kurth-Nelson, Z., Kumaran, D., Tirumala, D., Soyer, H., Leibo, J. Z., Hassabis, D., and Botvinick, M. Prefrontal cortex as a meta-reinforcement learning system. *Nature neuroscience*, 21(6):860–868, 2018.

- Whittington, J., Muller, T., Mark, S., Barry, C., and Behrens, T. Generalisation of structural knowledge in the hippocampal-entorhinal system. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Widloski, J. and Foster, D. J. Flexible rerouting of hippocampal replay sequences around changing barriers in the absence of global place field remapping. *Neuron*, 110(9):1547–1558, 2022.
- Wilson, M. A. and McNaughton, B. L. Reactivation of hippocampal ensemble memories during sleep. *Science*, 265(5172):676–679, 1994.
- Wu, C.-T., Haggerty, D., Kemere, C., and Ji, D. Hippocampal awake replay in fear memory retrieval. *Nature neuroscience*, 20(4):571–580, 2017.
- Yamins, D. L. and DiCarlo, J. J. Using goal-driven deep learning models to understand sensory cortex. *Nature neuroscience*, 19(3):356–365, 2016.
- Yiu, Y.-H. and Leibold, C. A theory of hippocampal theta correlations. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2023–02, 2023.
- Zhou, J., Montesinos-Cartagena, M., Wikenheiser, A. M., Gardner, M. P., Niv, Y., and Schoenbaum, G. Complementary task structure representations in hippocampus and orbitofrontal cortex during an odor sequence task. *Current Biology*, 29(20):3402–3409, 2019.

## APPENDICES

### A. Plausibility of settings

Our two sufficient conditions can find supporting evidence from former work. For the condition (1) (replay serves for reward maximization), previous literature has proved that block of replay can impair spatial learning (Jadhav et al., 2012) (Girardeau et al., 2009) (Ego-Stengel & Wilson, 2010). And loss of replay of novel routes is accompanied by impaired performance to learn the novel optimal trajectory (Liu et al., 2023). Moreover, the occurrence of task-focused reactivations predicted the accuracy of subsequent spatial decisions (Ólafsdóttir et al., 2017). A relatively indirect evidence is that hippocampus shows more coordinated replay before correct trials than before error trials (Singer et al., 2013). However, this evidence can only indicate dependency rather than direct function role – coordinated replay and accuracy may both result from focused attention. One classical idea of replay is that it serves value-based reinforcement learning (Liu et al., 2021) (Foster & Wilson, 2006) (Matar & Daw, 2018) (Ambrose et al., 2016). In fact, we provide an implementation at the model level to support this idea.

In addition to the relation of replay with performance, current evidences also support that replay is modulated by reward (Ambrose et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2021; Michon et al., 2019), and associated replay with reward-guided update of internal model using past experiences (Carey et al., 2019). Our model could provide a modelling verification of these claims.

For the condition (2) (replay is a form of communication between the neocortex and hippocampus), interaction between HPC and PFC during replay has been supported by a lot of evidences. For example, replay is accompanied by sharp-wave ripples that phase synchronize HPC and cortex activities. This synchronization enables long-distance integration (Dickey et al., 2022). And the idea that replay is the information flow between HPC and cortex actually corresponds to the theory of system memory consolidation: after the initial encoding of messages in HPC, continuous information exchange between hippocampus and neocortex promotes memory transition from hippocampus to neocortex where it becomes stable (Kumaran et al., 2016), and replay is thought to be one substrate of this information exchange (Foster & Wilson, 2006; Cheng & Frank, 2008; O’Neill et al., 2010; Van de Ven & Tolia, 2018). Correspondingly, in our model, the cognitive map modulation in PFC indeed changes as a result of replay and then stabilizes Figure 7. Apart from memory consolidation, planning is also correlated with HPC-PFC communication: during replay, the PFC as a decision-making module explores potential routes or extracts goal-directed heading vectors (Gupta et al., 2010; Erdem & Hasselmo, 2012; 2014; Bush et al., 2015) in HPC as a cognitive map, which is supported by experimental results demonstrating preferential replay of goal-oriented trajectories (Pfeiffer & Foster, 2013). Moreover, HPC replay is thought to have extrinsic (in our model, PFC signal) and intrinsic (in our model, the RNN history state) input components (Yiu & Leibold, 2023) which are also reflected in our model settings. However, there are still some evidences that do not support this hypothesis as the generating condition for replay. For example, (Kaefer et al., 2020) observed PFC replay that is strongly associated with rule-switching performance but is independent of HPC replay. However, as we do not measure PFC replay, maybe not replay but other PFC activities coordinate with HPC replay. Given many contradictory results here, our RL model could support the positive result that communication between HPC and PFC is necessary for the task-optimized and biologically similar replay.

### B. Context switch supporting planning by value map

Although replay has been thought to support navigation, equally often online replay is not navigationally relevant, depicting remote locations away from important goals (Davidson et al., 2009; Gupta et al., 2010; Gillespie et al., 2021), a portion of an environment being avoided (Wu et al., 2017), or even entirely distinct enclosures (Jackson et al., 2006; Karlsson & Frank, 2009). Thus a problem arises: could replay support planning even if it does not depict following actions?

RL theory can provide a unique view to classify the abundant experimental results into different planning theories and solve this problem. First we introduce the model-based/model-free dichotomy. Direct representation of future choices at decision time correspond to model-based control, where replay trajectories unfold on a cognitive map and compare outcomes of different possible routes (Widloski & Foster, 2022; Pfeiffer & Foster, 2013). Maintenance of value estimation of every state corresponds to model-free control, where the estimation is updated by mechanical reactivation of past experiences (Gupta et al., 2010). At decision time, the agent just compares the values of different immediate next states and plan greedily. This is an alternative strategy that replay could still supports planning without direct representing future choices. Another theory called successor representation (SR) (Stachenfeld et al., 2017) falls between these two extremes. It maintains the accumulated transition probability between states. The accumulation is closer to model-free control, but the expected

rewards of different states can be calculated by multiplying occupied probability with immediate rewards just met. The recombination is closer to model-based control. And the agent chooses the path with max expected rewards.

In our model, replay of certain parts updates the value representation of those parts, and finally finishes the switch of context modulation in PFC. As different modulation correspond to different sets of value estimation (different value maps, Figure 7), the agent can just plan greedily, which is more like model-free control. On the other hand, identification of contexts and fast switch of behaviors is more like model-based control. It also falls on the model-based/model-free axis.

The three mentioned theories all have their advantages and limitations. Model-based control is flexible because it recomputes the values every time, but suffers from high computational cost, and empirically, is not consistent with a series of findings that replay trajectories do not overlap with any future decisions (Gillespie et al., 2021; Carey et al., 2019). Model-free control possesses low computational burden, but suffers from slow update of the value estimation which may cause wrong habitual behaviors and low performance of flexible navigation. And pure model-free learning cannot explain the fast and flexible behaviors benefited from replay (Kaefer et al., 2020). It's said by the authors (Stachenfeld et al., 2014) that SR control is both flexible, due to the separation and recombination of transition probability and immediate rewards, and fast, due to the accumulation of probability resulting from different rewards. To sum up, it bears the advantage of both model-free and model-based control. However, the occupied probability estimation of different states is still hard to update, which means that strongly biased experiences make such policy-dependent representations less flexible for future decision-making if the context just switches abruptly. Instead, rodents in the lab (Igata et al., 2021) and our RL agent could find the optimal paths quickly even without relevant experiences. Thus, our model is more flexible than SR, and is located between SR and model-based control on the cost-flexibility axis. On the whole, our model also enriches the planning theories by a cognitive-map-aided decision-making model. Future work could formalize the RL models and propose a new kind of planning theory that better describes human behaviors.

### C. What should we expect of a model of replay? (Previous work's limitations)

Previously, mainstream models about replay are mechanistic. Theorists set specific circuit connections for spiking neuronal network which then reproduces replay, often accompanied by theta wave. Theta wave is online sequential activation of place cells during mobility rather than offline reactivation during immobility. They often hold the idea that theta wave is driven by both sensory signals and special HPC circuit structure (Yiu & Leibold, 2023), but replay is driven by the intrinsic structures (Tsodyks et al., 1996) and left traces (probably left by theta wave (Liu et al., 2023)) in the synapses. Their models are more and more intricate these years, from simple pure intrinsic and extrinsic mechanisms to a mixture of them through DG layers that could explain more details (Yiu & Leibold, 2023). Their conclusion is that, replay can be explained as the combination of past experiences and specific connection rule, like asymmetrical synapse connection (Tsodyks et al., 1996) and short-term depression (Romani & Tsodyks, 2015). On the whole, they reduce replay to the level of circuit structure.

However, they do not focus on the part the task goal and action selection has played in the formation of replay. The marriage of RL and deep learning provides an end-to-end framework for solving the this problem by linking information processing to reward maximization and action selection. Recent work (Matar & Daw, 2018) has started to explain replay using RL, and propose that the expected value of backup (EVB) determines the replay priority of different parts. However, it suffers from the natural inability to know EVB in advance of replay (Gupta et al., 2010; Carey et al., 2019), and fails to reproduce shortcut replay, which is thought to be a substrate for flexible rerouting (Widloski & Foster, 2022). Another article that criticizes this model proposes another model that is unrelated with reinforcement learning and thus excludes the reward as the determining condition of replay. Instead, replay results from sequential activation of contexts and their associated experiences. Although they could reproduce shortcut replay, the replay of non-recent experiences is due to the suppression mechanism that eliminates replay of the recent experiences. This mechanism is purely phenomenonal, lack direct support from biological evidences and provide little insights about how replay update the internal model. Given such deficits of mechanistic models, we continue to utilize first-principle RL model to reproduce replay. We remove an explicit EVB variable to explain replay. Instead, we point out that replay could naturally emerge from a task-optimized interacting dual-system.

What should we expect a model of replay? Given that replay is such a complex phenomenon that seems to serve various kinds of functions, it is necessary to explain not only how replay emerges in a mechanistic way, but also why replay emerges in a unifying functional way. (Matar & Daw, 2018) is a good attempt. Under the framework of Bellman updating, they point out EVB might be a general variable to govern the distribution of replay. However, their theories still have many deficits, like failure to explain the emergence of shortcut that has never been experienced and bears  $EVB = 0$ , the inability to know EVB in advance, and predictions that are inconsistent with empirical data. Our theory, instead, explains replay as the




Figure 13. Training curve of different models

task-optimized information flow. Our model can explain the emergence of never-experienced shortcut (optimal trajectory). As the analysis reveals that replay is accompanied by the context modulation switch of cognitive map, future experiments could prove this by testing the V (value) function in PFC-HPC circuits, especially OFC, which is believed to possess both value presentation and dynamic task structure representation.

From another view, our model connects the information processing procedure to the task goal: a certain kind of procedure is not out of coincidence at all. On the contrary, it bears some necessity because of some preconditions. This article works on finding what these preconditions are. The two preconditions verified on RL models could provide inspiration for future experimental work on what biological constraints lead to replay.

In addition to explaining the emergence of replay, a good first-principle replay model must also explain all kinds of functions under a unified framework. RL framework might be a good starting point in which all phenomena emerging from training (like the change of context and future direction information, Figure 6) can be explained as serving for task optimization. For example, in (Mattar & Daw, 2018), they state that replay serves Bellman updating of Q-table in RL. The more detailed functions of replay includes memory consolidation (Wilson & McNaughton, 1994) and planning (Gupta et al., 2010; Erdem & Hasselmo, 2012; 2014; Bush et al., 2015). Although they are supported by a lot of experimental evidences, there still lacks a framework to unify the various seemingly independent functions. Our model makes an attempt to resolve this problem. By analyzing the naturally emergent replay in RL model and finding it serves for memory and planning function (Figure 6), we propose that it finishes flexible planning by memory-aided update of value map (Appendix B).

#### D. Training curve of multiple agents

The RL agents are tested every 5000 steps. The training curves are as in Figure 13. The model without HPC obviously gets less rewards than other models.