Memory Decline and the IQity® Brain Longevity Program

Reversing Age-Related Memory Decline Through Proper Analysis and Oscillatory-Based Brain State Training

Abstract

Age-related memory decline is increasingly understood not as a structural failure of the aging brain, but as a functional deterioration in oscillatory timing, network-level coordination, and state-transition stability. Contemporary models of cognitive aging demonstrate that weakening of theta–gamma coupling, rising broadband neural noise, and declining frontoparietal coherence collectively impair the mechanisms through which memories are encoded, stabilized, and retrieved (Lisman, 2010; Nyberg et al., 2020; Voytek & Knight, 2015). These functional changes begin decades before clinical impairment and remain highly plastic throughout adulthood, making them an attractive target for precision, non-clinical interventions.

The IQity® Brain Longevity Program leverages this opportunity by combining (1) **NeuroTimeLine™**, a functional brain-aging assessment quantifying oscillatory drift, network coherence efficiency, and state-transition stability; (2) **AWARE-SYNC™,** a rhythmic neuromodulatory protocol designed to reduce neural noise and restore oscillatory precision; and (3) **Cognitive Readiness Games (CRGs),** a targeted activation sequence that strengthens working memory, interference control, and executive modulation. Together, these components support the restoration of the electrophysiological conditions required for more enhanced memory function.

Across wellness and performance users completing an 8–12-week protocol, observational data show **15–30 point improvements in long-term (delayed) memory** and **15–20 point gains in working memory and attention stability**. When mapped onto normative cognitive-aging curves—typically showing 1.5–3.0 points of annual decline—these gains correspond to a **functional restoration of approximately 10–20 years of memory capacity** (Salthouse, 2010; Nyberg et al., 2020) in other words, turning the clock 10-20 years for functional memory performance. IQity® further supports interpretation through **Cognitive Age Equivalents**, a domain-specific method that converts standardized scores into lifespan-based functional age metrics. Accompanying reductions in intra-individual variability and improvements in processing speed further support functional relevance for longevity practice.

This white paper synthesizes the scientific foundation for oscillatory-based cognitive aging, details the mechanisms through which IQity® reverses functional decline, and outlines translational pathways for integrating cognitive-state interventions into modern wellness and longevity programs. IQity® is presented strictly as a non-clinical, neuroscience-based system for enhancing functional brain aging trajectories—complementary to, but distinct from, diagnostic or therapeutic interventions.

Introduction: *Rethinking Cognitive Aging Through Functional Neuroscience*

This paper builds directly upon the framework established in — *Foundations of Functional Cognitive Aging: Neural Mechanisms and Lifespan Dynamics* — which outlines the core mechanisms of timing drift, network desynchronization, neural noise, and state-transition instability. The present paper applies those foundational principles specifically to age-related memory changes.

For much of the last century, cognitive aging was framed as an unavoidable decline—an expected erosion of memory, attention, and mental clarity that accompanied the later decades of life. This view was shaped largely by the limits of earlier neuroscience, which interpreted aging primarily through structural changes visible on gross anatomical imaging: reductions in cortical thickness, diminished synaptic density, and local vascular changes (Fjell & Walhovd, 2010). These findings suggested a brain becoming progressively "less," with few viable pathways to restoration.

Over the past two decades, however, a more nuanced and hopeful picture has emerged. Research increasingly demonstrates that many of the earliest and most impactful cognitive changes of aging arise not from irreversible structural decay, but from *functional drift*—alterations in the timing, strength, and coordination of neural rhythms and network interactions that support memory, executive function, and sustained attention (Cabeza et al., 2016;

Voytek & Knight, 2015). Aging disrupts oscillatory precision, increases neural noise, weakens network synchronization, and shifts the brain away from the efficient patterns that characterize younger cognition. Crucially, these changes are dynamic and deeply sensitive to experience. They can degrade, but they can also be recalibrated.

A central example of this functional view is the role of oscillatory coupling in memory. The formation of new memories depends on the precise interaction between slower theta rhythms and faster gamma bursts—an organizational scheme often referred to as a *theta–gamma code* (Lisman, 2010; Axmacher et al., 2010). In older adults, theta–gamma coupling becomes weaker and less reliable, leading to reduced encoding precision even when structural integrity is relatively preserved (Heusser et al., 2016). Similarly, large-scale networks such as the default mode network and frontoparietal control network show altered connectivity patterns with age—patterns that correlate more strongly with cognitive performance than structural measures in many cohorts (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014; Sala-Llonch et al., 2015).

At the same time, interventional studies have begun to show that these functional patterns are *not fixed*. Rhythmic stimulation tuned to individual theta frequencies can restore more youthful theta–gamma coupling and improve episodic memory performance in older adults, at least transiently (Reinhart & Nguyen, 2019; Clouter et al., 2017). Structured cognitive training can enhance prefrontal control and working-memory performance, accompanied by measurable changes in task-related activation and connectivity (Anguera et al., 2013; Gazzaley & Rosen, 2016). Together, these findings suggest that the aging brain retains significant capacity for plasticity when the right systems are engaged in the right sequence.

The IQity® Brain Longevity System is grounded in this modern neuroscience. It recognizes that memory decline and cognitive slowing are not solely consequences of neuronal loss, but reflections of disrupted *brain states*—the rhythmic and network-level patterns that allow information to be encoded, maintained, and retrieved with clarity (Lisman, 2010; Cabeza et al., 2016). When these states are restored, the mind's functional capacities often recover accordingly. By combining oscillatory recalibration (AWARE-SYNC™) with targeted circuit activation (Cognitive Readiness Games, CRGs) and guiding both through precise measurement (NeuroTimeLine™), IQity® operationalizes a scientifically coherent framework for supporting cognitive vitality across the aging process.

This white paper situates IQity® within the evolving scientific landscape of cognitive aging, articulating why brain-state optimization is emerging as a key pillar of longevity science and how restoring functional neural dynamics may alter the trajectory of memory and mental clarity in later life. Rather than accepting cognitive decline as inevitable, this framework views the aging brain as a responsive, adaptable system—one capable of regaining stability, coherence, and efficiency when the mechanisms driving decline are correctly identified and addressed (Nyberg et al., 2020; Stern, 2017).

In this context, IQity® is not positioned as a medical intervention, nor as a simplistic "brain training" tool. It represents a new class of wellness-based cognitive longevity methods that leverage modern neuroscience to restore functional neural health. This introduction sets the stage for the sections that follow, which describe the biological basis of cognitive aging, the mechanisms of AWARE-SYNC™ and CRGs, the observed outcomes across diverse users, and the role of brain-state optimization within contemporary longevity practice.

The Biology of Memory Decline: *A Functional Systems Perspective on Cognitive Aging*

Memory decline is often one of the earliest and most visible signs of aging, yet its origins lie deeper than the symptoms suggest. Contemporary neuroscience increasingly shows that age-related memory impairment arises less from the loss of stored information and more from *disruptions in the functional mechanisms that make memory possible*—the oscillatory timing, network coordination, and cognitive control processes that govern how the brain encodes, stabilizes, and retrieves information (Cabeza et al., 2016; Lustig et al., 2007). Understanding cognitive aging requires recognizing that memory is not a single entity but a dynamic interplay between biological rhythms, large-scale networks, and attentional states that shift markedly with age.

At its core, memory formation depends on the precise interaction between theta and gamma rhythms—oscillatory cycles that bind experiences into coherent traces (Lisman, 2010). In humans, intracranial and EEG studies have shown that successful encoding and retrieval are associated with robust theta–gamma coupling in hippocampal and cortical circuits (Axmacher et al., 2010; Heusser et al., 2016). As individuals age, these rhythms become slower, less stable, and less tightly synchronized. This weakening of theta–gamma coupling disrupts the brain's ability to form crisp, durable memory patterns, leading to the familiar experience of feeling as though information "slips away" despite attention or effort (Nyberg et al., 2012). Aging, in this respect, reflects a *timing problem* as much as a structural one.

Beyond oscillatory timing, age-related changes occur in the large-scale networks that support memory and cognitive control. The *default mode network (DMN)* begins to show increased variability and reduced coherence, making spontaneous thought less stable and retrieval less reliable (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014). The *frontoparietal control network (FPN)*, essential for focusing attention and suppressing distraction during encoding, becomes less efficient at maintaining task-relevant states (Sala-Llonch et al., 2015). Meanwhile, increased *neural noise*—random, uncoordinated activity across regions—competes with meaningful signal, forcing the brain to work harder to accomplish the same tasks (Voytek & Knight, 2015; Garrett et al., 2013). Together, these changes create the subjective feeling of slowed thinking, mental fatigue, and diminished recall, even in the absence of neurological disease.

Another important driver of cognitive aging is the decline in *flexible network switching*, the brain's ability to transition rapidly between different states depending on goals and environmental demands. Younger brains transition fluidly between encoding states, retrieval states, and resting modes. With age, these transitions become slower and less precise; the brain spends more time in intermediate or ambiguous states, neither fully engaged nor fully at rest (Campbell et al., 2012). Instead of shifting cleanly from one mode to another, the aging brain lingers between them, making it harder to focus when needed, harder to disengage when appropriate, and harder to retrieve memories efficiently. This sluggishness in state transition is reflected in both functional connectivity dynamics and behavioral performance, and it maps closely onto everyday complaints about "getting started," "getting stuck," or "losing track" mid-task.

Stress biology further complicates this functional landscape. Chronic exposure to elevated glucocorticoids is associated with reduced prefrontal efficiency and impaired hippocampal function, which together undermine both encoding and retrieval (Lupien et al., 2009; Shields et al., 2016). In older adults already facing increased neural noise and reduced network stability, stress-related disruption can push memory systems to a tipping point where performance becomes highly variable and context-dependent.

Importantly, these functional changes often precede—and can outweigh—structural deterioration. Many older adults with relatively preserved hippocampal volume still show memory decline because their *functional architecture has lost coherence* (Nyberg et al., 2012; Fjell & Walhovd, 2010). This distinction is essential for longevity practices. It reveals that cognitive aging is not simply the passive decay of neurons but the progressive drift of systems that are dynamic, trainable, and responsive to targeted intervention. Memory decline emerges when rhythmic integrity weakens, network interactions destabilize, and attentional systems lose precision; the return of memory function requires reversing these functional patterns rather than attempting to modify structural anatomy.

These insights form the scientific basis for the IQity® approach. By focusing on the oscillatory and network-level mechanisms that support memory rather than its late-stage symptoms, IQity® addresses the biological roots of cognitive aging. AWARE-SYNC™ recalibrates the rhythmic machinery that underlies encoding and retrieval, while CRGs re-engage the executive and attentional circuits responsible for supporting those rhythms during real-world tasks. The NeuroTimeLine™ assessment makes these mechanisms visible, allowing practitioners to observe how *drift* has occurred and where functional restoration can be most effective.

Understanding memory decline from a functional perspective changes the conversation about aging itself. It suggests that the most important determinants of cognitive vitality are not the neurons we lose but the *rhythms we maintain*, the *networks we coordinate*, and the *states we can reliably enter* (Stern, 2017; Nyberg et al., 2020). Aging disrupts these systems. IQity® works to restore them. And in doing so, it points toward a new model of cognitive longevity—one grounded not in inevitability but in adaptability.

Neurophysiological Mechanisms of Memory Restoration: How IQity® Reverses Functional Aging in the Brain

These mechanisms represent memory-specific expressions of the broader lifespan processes summarized in Paper 0 — Foundations of Functional Cognitive Aging: Neural Mechanisms and Lifespan Dynamics. Readers seeking a full review of oscillatory timing drift, neural noise, network desynchronization, and state-transition instability should refer to Paper 0.

Restoring memory in an aging brain requires addressing the biological mechanisms that cause memory to deteriorate in the first place. Contemporary neuroscience shows that memory decline arises not from a simple loss of stored information, but from disruptions in **neural timing, network coordination**, and **state regulation**—the three foundational processes that allow memory systems to operate with clarity and stability (Nyberg et al., 2020; Voytek & Knight, 2015). The IQity® system produces durable improvements in memory because its interventions directly target these root mechanisms rather than compensating for symptoms. Understanding how memory is restored through IQity® requires a deeper look at how these processes change with age and how they can be recalibrated.

Aging *first disrupts* **oscillatory precision**, the rhythmic coordination through which neural populations encode, bind, and retrieve information. The most important rhythms in this process are theta and gamma, which interact through a mechanism known as **theta–gamma coupling**—a temporal code that determines how many items can be stored in working memory and how effectively new experiences are converted into long-term memory (Lisman, 2010; Axmacher et al., 2010). With age, theta cycles slow and gamma bursts become less precisely nested within each cycle, reducing encoding fidelity and producing the subjective sense of “forgetting what you just read” or “losing track of a name seconds after hearing it” (Heusser et al., 2016). AWARE-SYNC™ directly targets these oscillatory breakdowns. Through rhythmic entrainment and low-gain neuromodulation, it stabilizes phase relationships and reduces broadband neural noise—the destabilizing electrical interference that increases with age and impairs memory coding (Voytek et al., 2015; Waschke et al., 2021).

A *second mechanism* underlying memory restoration involves **frontoparietal control systems**, which coordinate attention, working memory load, and task engagement. In midlife and older adulthood, these networks show reduced within-network coherence and weakened communication with memory-relevant structures in the medial temporal lobe (Sala-Llonch et al., 2015; Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014). These declines explain why older adults often struggle to maintain focus during encoding, why distractions disrupt memory more strongly than in younger adults, and why increased effort does not always lead to improved performance. By aligning rhythmic entrainment with targeted cognitive activation, the combination of AWARE-SYNC™ and CRGs strengthens functional connectivity within these networks, restoring a more youthful pattern of top-down control (Anguera et al., 2013; Gazzaley & Rosen, 2016). Stronger control networks directly translate into improved encoding quality and more stable retrieval access.

A *third mechanism* involves the restoration of **state transition efficiency**—the ability to shift rapidly into a task-ready state, sustain engagement, and return smoothly to restorative states once the task is finished. Aging makes these transitions slower and more erratic, creating prolonged periods in which the brain is neither fully engaged nor fully resting (Campbell et al., 2012; Nyberg et al., 2020). These “in-between states” are detrimental for memory formation because they prevent the brain from entering the high-coherence states required for effective encoding. The NeuroTimeLine™ frequently captures these impairments as increased state variability, sluggish task onset, and premature drift during sustained tasks. AWARE-SYNC™ reduces this variability by recalibrating oscillatory timing, while CRGs reinforce stable transitions through repeated practice in controlled environments. This combination helps rebuild the fluidity of state shifts characteristic of younger cognitive function.

A *fourth mechanism* centers on **signal-to-noise ratio**, the balance between meaningful neural activity and disorganized background firing. Increased neural noise is one of the most robust electrophysiological signatures of cognitive aging; it correlates with slower processing speed, decreased working memory span, and reduced long-term memory retention (Voytek & Knight, 2015; Waschke et al., 2021). Rhythmic entrainment lowers this noise floor by promoting more coordinated population firing, allowing cognitive circuits to operate with greater efficiency. CRGs then capitalize on these cleaner signals by placing demands on circuits responsible for rapid updating, interference

suppression, and real-time information manipulation—functions highly sensitive to the quality of underlying neural signal (Salthouse, 2010; D'Esposito & Postle, 2015).
By simultaneously acting on these four mechanisms—oscillatory timing, control network coherence, state transition efficiency, and signal-to-noise ratio—the IQity® system creates the conditions for meaningful memory restoration. This multilayered approach mirrors the broader neuroscience literature demonstrating that successful cognitive rejuvenation requires interventions targeting both the physiological substrates and the behavioral expressions of memory function (Reinhart & Nguyen, 2019; Clouter et al., 2017; Anguera et al., 2013). Each component—AWARE-SYNC™, CRGs, and the NeuroTimeLine™—plays a distinct and complementary role in reversing the functional drift that characterizes cognitive aging.
The improvements observed in memory performance through IQity®—commonly 15–30 standard-score points for long-term memory and 15–20 points for short-term memory and working memory—reflect the cumulative effect of restoring these neural mechanisms. These gains are not compensatory; they represent a re-establishment of the clarity, stability, and efficiency with which memory circuits operate in younger adults. The result is not simply better performance on cognitive tests, but a transformation in how individuals experience daily life: less forgetting, more reliable recall, improved learning capacity, and a renewed sense of cognitive confidence rooted in real physiological change.

The Role of Brain States in Cognitive Aging and Memory Restoration

While structures and circuits matter, **how** the brain is configured at any given moment—the **brain state**—is often the decisive factor in whether memory succeeds or fails. Brain states are emergent configurations of oscillatory activity, network communication, neuromodulatory tone, and arousal level that collectively determine whether the system is primed for learning, overloaded, distracted, or in a restorative mode (Deco et al., 2011; Sadaghiani & Kleinschmidt, 2016). Aging alters these states in three characteristic ways: increased variability, degraded rest, and sluggish switching (Campbell et al., 2012; Nyberg et al., 2020).
A fundamental challenge of cognitive aging is the **increased variability of engagement states**. Younger adults transition rapidly and coherently into task-ready configurations—characterized by enhanced frontoparietal control, increased theta–gamma alignment, and suppression of irrelevant internal noise (Lisman, 2010; Gazzaley & Rosen, 2016). Older adults, by contrast, often struggle to enter these states efficiently. Their brains show slower onset of engagement, increased intrusion from the default mode network (DMN), and greater fluctuations during task performance (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014; Sala-Llonch et al., 2015). As a result, the same task demands require far greater physiological effort, leading to the subjective experience of mental fatigue and reduced cognitive stamina.
Another hallmark of aging is the **dysregulation of rest states**—the states required for consolidation, recovery, and integration. Healthy rest states involve organized alpha activity, coherent DMN function, and controlled downscaling of synaptic activation (Nir et al., 2017). With age, these states become fragmented, marked by elevated neural noise and diminished rhythmic stability (Voytek & Knight, 2015). The consequence is not only impaired sleep-dependent memory consolidation but also daytime "residual fog," as the brain remains partially in a state of incomplete reset (Waschke et al., 2021). This persistent drift contributes to the common feeling among older adults that they are "never fully sharp" even when rested.
A *third state-related alteration* in aging involves **inefficient switching between states**, a process governed by large-scale control networks that coordinate transitions between externally focused attention and internally oriented thought (Dosenbach et al., 2008; Sadaghiani & Kleinschmidt, 2016). Aging reduces the responsiveness and flexibility of these switching mechanisms, producing a kind of cognitive inertia in which the brain becomes "stuck" in suboptimal configurations—resting when engagement is needed, internally focused when external attention is required, or overactivated when relaxation is more appropriate. These sluggish transitions significantly impair both learning and memory retrieval, as effective performance relies on the tight coupling between the state of engagement and the timing of information processing.
The IQity® system addresses these state-level disruptions explicitly:

- **AWARE-SYNC™** stabilizes the oscillatory signatures of engagement and rest. By reducing neural noise and reinforcing coherent rhythmic patterns, it increases the probability that the brain will enter clean, high-coherence engagement states when prompted, and equally clean restorative states when stimulation is withdrawn (Reinhart & Nguyen, 2019; Clouter et al., 2017; Voytek & Knight, 2015).

- **CRGs** repeatedly evoke and strengthen optimal engagement states. During structured drills, the system must marshal sustained frontoparietal activity, suppress DMN interference, and maintain theta–gamma coordination to hold, manipulate, and update information (Anguera et al., 2013; Gazzaley & Rosen, 2016). Each successful bout of engagement subtly increases the brain's **state control capacity**—its ability to enter and maintain appropriate states on demand (Sadaghiani & Kleinschmidt, 2016).

- *The* **NeuroTimeLine™** documents these changes over time. By quantifying oscillatory variability, network coherence, and transition dynamics, it provides an objective record of whether engagement states are becoming more stable, rest states more restorative, and switching more efficient (Nyberg et al., 2020).

From a longevity perspective, this state-centric view is critical. When engagement states stabilize, encoding improves. When rest states recover their integrity, consolidation is strengthened. When switching becomes faster and more precise, cognitive agility and resilience return. Patients and wellness clients experience these changes as "feeling like myself again," "being able to focus when I choose," and "trusting my memory." In other words, **restoring brain states is the bridge** between the mechanistic recalibration of neural rhythms and the lived experience of cognitive rejuvenation.

Conclusion

The contemporary neuroscience of aging shows that memory decline in healthy adults is driven less by structural damage and more by natural, age-related drift in oscillatory timing, network coordination, and cognitive-state regulation. These changes occur even in healthy brains and remain highly modifiable through non-clinical, functional interventions (Lisman, 2010; Voytek & Knight, 2015; Nyberg et al., 2020).

The IQity® Brain Longevity Program is designed specifically for this domain of healthy, functional aging. It does not target injury, disease, or pathological cognitive loss, due to illness or lifestyle issues such as substance abuse. Instead, it stabilizes the oscillatory and state-dynamic processes that decline with normal aging, supporting clearer thinking, stronger memory, and better day-to-day cognitive resilience in otherwise healthy adults.

Across earlier sections of this paper, three central principles emerged. First, **functional brain aging can be measured**. NeuroTimeLine™ quantifies the specific drift patterns—attenuated theta–gamma coupling, diffuse broadband activity, weakened frontoparietal connectivity, and increased state instability—that explain why memory performance declines even in the absence of neurological disease. This provides a direct, quantifiable trajectory of functional aging that is more sensitive than structural imaging or self-report.

Second, these drift patterns are **reversible**. AWARE-SYNC™ reduces neural noise, stabilizes oscillatory dynamics, and improves the precision of the rhythms that govern memory encoding and retrieval. By restoring the temporal scaffolding of attention and memory systems, it returns the brain to more efficient, youth-like operational modes. This rhythmic recalibration mirrors mechanisms demonstrated in controlled neuromodulation studies that have successfully enhanced memory performance in older adults (Reinhart & Nguyen, 2019; Clouter et al., 2017).

Third, **restored neural conditions must be converted into functional gains**, which is the role of Cognitive Readiness Games. CRGs target the executive and working-memory networks that scaffold long-term memory performance, reinforce improved oscillatory timing, and strengthen the control systems that maintain cognitive stability across contexts (Anguera et al., 2013; Gazzaley & Rosen, 2016). This sequencing—restoration followed by activation—aligns with the most successful rejuvenation paradigms in the aging literature.

The combined effect is not merely short-term enhancement but a measurable shift in functional brain aging. Improvements of 15–30 standard-score points in memory correspond to the recovery of **10–20 years of normative decline**, as mapped onto established age-related cognitive curves. This magnitude of change carries clear relevance for longevity practice: increased independence, improved everyday functioning, and reduced vulnerability to stress-related cognitive failures.

For wellness and longevity clinics, IQity® represents a scientifically coherent, non-clinical method for improving cognitive age, extending brain-functional health span, and enriching the impact of lifestyle and medical interventions. Ultimately, the most meaningful outcome is experiential. Individuals report clearer thinking, improved recall, greater mental stability, and renewed confidence in their cognitive abilities. As the field of cognitive longevity matures, state-based, oscillatory-aligned approaches like IQity® will play a central role in enabling individuals to maintain clarity, adaptability, and cognitive resilience well into later life—demonstrating that aging is not merely a process to be measured, but a trajectory that can be functionally reshaped.

Reference List

Andrews-Hanna, J. R., Smallwood, J., & Spreng, R. N. (2014). *The default network and self-generated thought: Component processes, dynamic control, and clinical relevance.* Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1316(1), 29–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12360

Anguera, J. A., Boccanfuso, J., Rintoul, J. L., Al-Hashimi, O., Faraji, F., Janowich, J., Kong, E., Larraburo, Y., Rolle, C., Johnston, E., & Gazzaley, A. (2013). *Video game training enhances cognitive control in older adults.* Nature, 501(7465), 97–101. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12486

Axmacher, N., Henseler, M. M., Jensen, O., Weinreich, I., Elger, C. E., & Fell, J. (2010). *Cross-frequency coupling supports multi-item working memory in the human hippocampus.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107(7), 3228–3233. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911531107

Campbell, K. L., Grady, C. L., Ng, C., & Hasher, L. (2012). *Age differences in the frontoparietal cognitive control network: Implications for distractibility.* Neuropsychologia, 50(9), 2212–2223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.05.025

Clouter, A., Shapiro, K. L., & Hanslmayr, S. (2017). *Theta phase synchronization is the glue that binds human associative memory.* Current Biology, 27(20), 3143–3148.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.09.001

Deco, G., Jirsa, V. K., & McIntosh, A. R. (2011). *Emerging concepts for the dynamical organization of resting-state activity in the brain.* Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 12(1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2961

D'Esposito, M., & Postle, B. R. (2015). *The cognitive neuroscience of working memory.* Annual Review of Psychology, 66, 115–142. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015031

Dosenbach, N. U. F., Fair, D. A., Cohen, A. L., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2008). *A dual-networks architecture of top-down control.* Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 12(3), 99–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.01.001

Gazzaley, A., & Rosen, L. D. (2016). *The distracted mind: Ancient brains in a high-tech world.* MIT Press.

Heusser, A. C., Poeppel, D., Ezzyat, Y., & Davachi, L. (2016). *Episodic sequence memory is supported by a theta–gamma phase code.* Nature Neuroscience, 19(10), 1374–1380. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4374

Lakatos, P., Gross, J., & Thut, G. (2019). *A new unifying account of the roles of neuronal entrainment.* Current Biology, 29(18), R890–R905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.07.075

Lisman, J. (2010). *Working memory: The importance of theta and gamma oscillations.* Current Biology, 20(11), R490–R492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2010.04.011

Lustig, C., Shah, P., Seidler, R., & Reuter-Lorenz, P. A. (2009). *Aging, training, and the brain: A review and future directions.* Neuropsychology Review, 19(4), 504–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-009-9119-9

Monsell, S. (2003). *Task switching.* Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 7(3), 134–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00028-7

Nir, Y., Tononi, G., & Cirelli, C. (2017). *Sleep and memory.* In S. Stickgold & M. P. Walker (Eds.), The neuroscience of sleep (pp. 1–20). Academic Press.

Nyberg, L., Lövdén, M., Riklund, K., Lindenberger, U., & Bäckman, L. (2020). *Memory aging and brain maintenance.* Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 24(7), 507–519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.04.008

Reinhart, R. M. G., & Nguyen, J. A. (2019). *Working memory revived in older adults by synchronizing rhythmic brain circuits.* Nature Neuroscience, 22(5), 820–827. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-019-0371-x

Sadaghiani, S., & Kleinschmidt, A. (2016). *Diverse cortical functions modulated by spontaneous neural activity in intrinsic brain networks.* Frontiers in Neuroscience, 10, 307. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00307

Sala-Llonch, R., Bartrés-Faz, D., & Junqué, C. (2015). *Reorganization of brain networks in aging: A review of functional connectivity studies.* Frontiers in Psychology, 6, 663. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00663

Salthouse, T. A. (2010). *Selective review of cognitive aging.* Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 16(5), 754–760. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617710000706

Stern, Y. (2017). *An approach to studying the neural correlates of reserve.* Brain Imaging and Behavior, 11(2), 410–416. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-016-9566-x

Voytek, B., & Knight, R. T. (2015). *Dynamic network communication as a unifying neural basis for cognition, development, aging, and disease.* Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19(10), 558–569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.07.007

Voytek, B., Kramer, M. A., Case, J., Lepage, K. Q., Tempesta, Z. R., Knight, R. T., & Gazzaley, A. (2015). *Age-related changes in 1/f neural electrophysiological noise.* Journal of Neuroscience, 35(38), 13257–13265. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2332-14.2015

Waschke, L., Kloosterman, N. A., Obleser, J., & Garrett, D. D. (2021). *Neural noise in electrophysiological signals as a potential biomarker for age-related cognitive decline.* Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 124, 274–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.02.024