Independence of Cued and Contextual Components of Fear Conditioning is Gated by the

Lateral Habenula

Short title: The Lateral Habenula Regulates Fear Conditioning.

Tomas E. Sachella [1], Marina R. Ihidoype [1], Christophe Proulx [2], Jorge H. Medina [3], Pablo Mendez [4],

Joaquin Piriz [1] †*.

[1] Grupo de Neurociencia de Sistemas, Instituto de Fisiología y Biofísica "Houssay" (IFIBIO "Houssay"),

Universidad de Buenos Aires, CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[2] CERVO Brain Research Center, Department of Psychiatry and Neurosciences, Université Laval.

[3] Instituto de Biología Celular y Neurociencia "Dr. Eduardo De Robertis" (IBCN), Universidad de Buenos

Aires, CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[4] Instituto Cajal, CSIC, Madrid, España.

† Present address: Instituto de Fisiología Biología Molecular y Neurociencias (IFIBYNE), Universidad de

Buenos Aires, CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

* Correspondence:

Joaquin Piriz

pirizjoaquin@gmail.com

<u>Abstract</u>

The lateral habenula (LHb) encodes aversive information. However, there is little understanding of how

the information provided by the LHb influences learning and memory processes. Fear conditioning (FC)

is probably the best understood model of aversive associative learning. Thus, FC constitutes a good

behavioral paradigm to analyze LHb function in associative learning. In the present work we studied in

rats the effect of interfering with neuronal activity of the LHb on FC using optogenetics and

pharmacological tools. We found that exciting or inhibiting the LHb during training, abolishes

independent expression of contextual and cued memories, yet memory is normally expressed when the

cue is played in the training context. Our results reveal that the formation of independent cued and

contextual FC memories requires intact signaling by the LHb assigning to this structure a previously

uncharacterized integrative role in brain circuits required for FC learning.

Introduction

The lateral habenula (LHb) is a central hub for the processing of aversive information in the

brain. Aversion related information reaches the LHb from numerous structures of the limbic system and

basal ganglia. In turn, the LHb projects to the brain stem, where it is one of the few structures that

control (directly and indirectly) both serotoninergic and dopaminergic systems (*1–3*). That connectivity

places the LHb in a central position to control aversive associative learning. However, how the LHb is

involved in that process is not clear.

Fear conditioning (FC) is probably the most studied model of aversive associative learning (4, 5).

In FC an association is made between a neutral stimulus and a biologically-relevant aversive stimulus

called unconditioned stimulus (US). Most frequently, FC training involves the pairing of a tone, named

cue, and an electric foot-shock US. It has long been known that such protocol leads to two independent

associations, one relating the cue to the US, and the other linking the context where the training took

place to the US (*6*, *7*). Consequently, subjects will display defensive responses, characterized by freezing

behavior, when re-exposed to the training context or to the cue presented in a novel and neutral

context.

In a previous work, using the Inhibitory Avoidance paradigm, we found that inactivation of the

LHb during training affects temporal stability of the memory but not its formation (*8*). To better

understand how the LHb influences aversive learning, in this work we studied its role in FC learning by

means of pharmacological and optogenetics manipulations. We show that interfering with neuronal

activity of the LHb during FC training severely impairs recall of contextual and cued FC memories.

However, when the cue is played in the training context, a conserved FC memory is evidenced. Thus, our

results suggest that the formation of two independent memory traces during FC requires an intact LHb

activity, placing this structure in a central position in the neuronal circuits mediating FC learning and

revealing a new aspect of that behavioral paradigm.

Results

Pharmacological inactivation of the LHb impairs contextual fear conditioning

To examine the role of the LHb in contextual FC, we analyzed the effect of its inactivation during training. For that purpose, we performed surgeries, in rats, to implant bilateral intracerebral cannulae aimed at the LHb. After a recovery time of 10 to 12 days, animals were bilaterally infused the GABA-A agonist muscimol or vehicle in the LHb, and were trained in contextual FC thirty minutes later. During training subjects were placed in a FC chamber and presented with four unsignaled mild foot-shocks (Figure 1A). In this and the following experiments we observed that the infusion of muscimol in the LHb did not modify freezing behavior during FC training (Figure 1B and Supplementary Figure 1). Also, in a separate cohort of animals, we observed that such procedure did not modify locomotion or exploratory behavior in an open field (OF; Supplementary Figure 2), indicating that inactivation of the LHb does not have a general effect over motility or context exploration. To evaluate contextual FC, animals were placed back in the conditioning chamber 7 days after training and freezing behavior was quantified. Muscimol group displayed significantly lower levels of freezing than the control group, suggesting that inactivation of the LHb during contextual FC training impairs long-term memory formation (Figure 1C).

Long-term memories tend to decay over time, a phenomenon that could already be evident 7 days after memory formation (*9*, *10*). To test whether an accelerated decay of contextual FC memory could account for the memory deficits that were observed, we repeated our previous experiment but tested contextual FC memory 24 hours after training. Contextual FC memory deficits were also evident 24 hours after training (Figure 1 D), further suggesting that inactivation of the LHb during contextual FC training has a detrimental effect over long-term memory formation.

Importantly, muscimol infusion in the LHb before exposure to an OF did not impact on the

decrease in exploratory behavior observed upon a subsequent re-exposure performed 48 hours later

(Supplementary Figure 2), which is acts as a measure of contextual memory on that test (*11*, *12*). That

observation suggests that the inactivation of the LHb by muscimol does not induce a general deficit in

context encoding.

Pharmacological inactivation of the LHb impairs cued fear conditioning

Having observed that inactivation of the LHb impairs the formation of contextual FC we

extended our experiments analyzing the effect of LHb inactivation on cued FC memory formation.

Animals were infused muscimol or vehicle in the LHb, and 30 minutes later were trained in cued FC, in

which each of the 4 foot-shocks was preceded by a 17 seconds long tone (Figure 2A). Cued FC memory

was tested 24 hours or 7 days later by exposing the animals to the tone in a novel context (Context B).

Behavior during training confirmed that inactivation of the LHb does not affect the surge of freezing

behavior elicited by shock exposure (Figure 2B, Supplementary Figure 1B). During tests, presentation of

the cue elicited a robust freezing in the vehicle groups that was markedly reduced in the muscimol

groups (Figure 2C, D). These results indicate that cued FC memory is also impaired by the inactivation of

the LHb during training. Thus, inactivation of the LHb during FC training impairs formation of both

contextual and cued FC long-term memories.

To control for spatial specificity of muscimol infusion we implanted cannulae targeting areas

around the LHb and infused muscimol before cued FC training (Supplementary Figure 3A, B). During

tests, performed 7 days later, we found that neither infusion of muscimol 1 mm lateral, dorsal or ventral

to the LHb affected freezing behavior (Supplementary Figure 3 B, C). Moreover, we did not see a

reduction in freezing behavior during cued FC test in muscimol infused animals implanted with cannulae

aimed at the LHb in which histological control showed cannulations bilaterally missed the LHb

(Supplementary Figure 3A, C).

To control for non-transient effects of muscimol infusion, we trained in cued FC the animals that

had previously undergone muscimol inactivation of the LHb before exposure to an OF (Supplementary

Figure 4A). In that group of animals, we found no differences in freezing behavior during either cued FC

training or testing (Supplementary Figure 4B, C), demonstrating the transient nature of that

manipulation. Thus, deficits in contextual and cued FC in the muscimol groups should be attributed to a

transient inactivation of the LHb during training.

<u>Context + tone test evidences a conserved fear conditioning memory</u>

To further investigate to what extent inactivation of the LHb impairs FC learning, we performed

additional experiments in which freezing to the cue was evaluated in the training context (Context A), a

condition we called context + tone (Figure 3A). In that test the pre-tone period is a readout of the

contextual component of the memory after a cued FC training. Indeed, we observed a clear reduction of

freezing in the muscimol group, confirming that inactivation of the LHb during training impairs

contextual FC (Figure 3B). Presenting the tone further increased freezing in the control group but, most

notably, also induced a robust freezing in the muscimol group, which reached freezing values equivalent

to the control group (Figure 3B). Thus, under inactivation of the LHb, a FC memory is formed that could

be effectively retrieved when the cue is presented in the conditioning context.

In a previous paper we demonstrated that the inactivation of the LHb impairs long-term stability

of the Inhibitory Avoidance memory (*8*). To investigate long-term stability of FC memory formed under

inactivation of the LHb, we evaluated freezing in context + tone conditions three weeks after training in

a new set of animals (Figure 3 A, C). Freezing levels of the muscimol group in context + tone condition

were lower than in the vehicle group three weeks after training (Figure 3C), showing that FC training

under inactivation of the LHb generates a weak memory that is harder to retrieve and is temporarily less

stable.

<u>Context + tone retrieval reconsolidates cued but not contextual memory</u>

In animals that were trained in FC under inactivation of the LHb we observed conserved freezing

responses in context + tone conditions. However, it could not be known if that freezing represents the

retrieval of the contextual memory, the cued memory, both or neither of them. To get an insight on

that, we analyzed if memory retrieval in context + tone conditions induces the reconsolidation of cued

and contextual memories. Animals were infused muscimol in the LHb and trained in cued FC as

described above. Seven days later they went through a recall session in which the cue was presented in

the training context (*i.e.* context + tone condition). Twenty-four hours later they went through a test

session in which we evaluated the cued memory, by re-exposing them to the tone in Context B

(reconsolidation group, Figure 4A), or the contextual memory, by re-exposing them to the training

context (Context A; Figure 4C). In addition, at the end of this latter experiment the cue was presented,

configuring a re-test in context + tone conditions (Figure 4C). A"no-reconsolidation" group was also

included as a control for cued memory tested "reconsolidation" group. In the no-reconsolidation group,

cued memory was tested 8 days after training in Context B without any recall session (Figure 4A).

Notably, during cued memory test, the reconsolidation group displayed higher levels of freezing to the

cue than the no-reconsolidation group (Figure 4B). In fact, in the reconsolidation group levels of freezing

to the tone during test session were equivalent to those shown during the recall session (Figure 4B). In

contrast, in the group in which we tested reconsolidation of contextual memory, we did not observe any

increase in freezing to the Context A during the test session (Figure 4D). Then, levels of freezing

remained low even though those animals effectively displayed freezing in context + tone condition in

the recall session (Figure 4D). Also, freezing in context + tone conditions was not different between the

recall and the test session and was high in both cases (Figure 4D). Those results suggest the recall

session reconsolidated the cued memory but not the contextual memory, arguing that freezing

observed during context + tone condition mainly reflects the reactivation of the cued memory trace.

Furthermore, they suggest that FC training under inactivation of the LHb creates a cued memory whose

retrieval depends on contextual information.

<u>Optogenetic inactivation of the LHb impairs cued fear conditioning</u>

To get a better spatial and temporal control of the interventions over the LHb we manipulated

its activity using optogenetic tools. To first confirm and support results obtained from muscimol

inactivation of the LHb, we injected an adeno-associated virus (AAV) encoding the inhibitory light-

dependent proton pump Archaerhodopsin (ArchT) fused to the fluorescent protein GFP (AAV-CamKIIα-

ArchT-GFP) bilaterally in the LHb of rats (Figure 5A). Control rats were injected with an AAV encoding the

fluorescent protein GFP (AAV-CamKIIα-GFP). In both groups, optic fiber cannulae were implanted with

the tip immediately above the LHb (Figure 5A, B). Whole cell patch-clamp recordings confirmed that LHb

neurons could be inhibited by ArchT (Supplementary Figure 5). Light was applied during the FC training

session starting at tone onset and stopping 5 s after shock termination (Figure 5A). We did not observe

differences in freezing between ArchT and GFP groups during FC training (Supplementary Figure 6A). In

accordance with pharmacological results, we found that freezing to the tone during cued memory test

was lower in the ArchT than in the GFP group. (Figure 5C, E). On the other hand, in contrast to

pharmacological manipulation, contextual memory was not affected by optogenetic inhibition of the

LHb during cue and US (Figure 5D, E). Additionally, as observed in pharmacological experiments, context

+ tone condition evoked similar freezing in ArchT and GFP groups (Figure 5D, E).

<u>Artificial activation of the LHb impairs cued and contextual fear conditioning</u>

To rigorously test the involvement of the LHb in contextual FC using optogenetic tools, it would

be necessary to disturb neuronal activity at the LHb during context encoding as well (*i.e.* during whole

training period). Optogenetic inhibition mediated by light activated hyperpolarizing pumps such as

ArchT or NpHR, require sustained illumination which could create confounding effects, such as

temperature changes, when prolonged for long periods like the one involved in our protocols

(Supplementary Figure 7). Also, sustained on-off patterns of optogenetic inhibition induce burst activity

of LHb neurons that induce depression-like symptoms (*13,* Supplementary Figure 5D). To avoid those

potential artifacts, we decided to take a different approach. We reasoned that neuronal encoding would

be disturbed by any major intervention over neuronal activity. Thus, we opted to disrupt endogenous

activity of the LHb by imposing an artificial excitation during the whole training. Animals were injected

with an AAV encoding the fast excitatory opsin oChIEF (14), and implanted with optic fibers bilaterally in

the LHb (Figure 6A, B). Three weeks later they were trained in cued FC under a sustained 20 Hz

excitation drive with light pulses of 5 ms (Figure 6A), which has been shown before not to induce

depression-like symptoms (13; Figure 6A, B). Modelling of light induced temperature changes supports

the idea that such protocol would result in minimal temperature changes in the illuminated tissue (15;

Supplementary Figure 7). We found that artificial stimulation of the LHb during FC training mostly

replicates results obtained by pharmacological inhibition (Figure 6). oChIEF activation did not modify

behavior during FC training (Supplementary Figure 6B). During cued memory test, oChIEF stimulated

animals showed lower freezing to the tone than the control group (Figure 6C, E). Next day, during

context + tone test session, oChIEF stimulated animals showed almost no freezing to the context but

displayed freezing to the cue, reaching levels higher than in cued memory test performed the previous

day (Figure 6D, E). Thus, disrupting the encoding of the LHb during whole training has a deleterious

effect over FC learning equivalent to that of pharmacological inhibition. Remarkably, AAVs did not infect

medial habenula (Figure 5B, 6B). Thus, results from optogenetics experiments could not be attributed to

an effect over that structure, a criticism valid for muscimol mediated inactivation.

Discussion

Previous reports indirectly suggested that the LHb could play a role in FC learning (*16*, *17*). However, the requirement of the LHb for FC learning was largely untested (*18*, *19*). In this work, we directly addressed that subject. Our findings reveal that the LHb is a relevant component in FC learning circuits, playing a role in the formation of both cued and contextual memories. In the following subsections we discuss our findings in detail.

Cued memory and the LHb

During FC training, subjects infer which stimuli have predictive value over the arrival of the US to organize proper defensive behavioral responses. In normal conditions, that processing leads to a double association that assigns a predictive value to both the context and the cues. Prevailing models postulate that context-US association involves context encoding circuits centered in the hippocampus which send contextual representation to the amygdala where the association takes place (*20*, *21*), and locate cue-US association in the amygdala (*22*). Particularly, solid evidence indicates that tone-US association takes place in cortical and thalamic auditory inputs to the lateral amygdala (*23–25*). Thus, as postulated in that model, cued memory is assumed to be intrinsically context-independent. However, our experiments suggest that the formation of a cued memory that could be expressed in a context-independent manner requires signaling by the LHb during memory formation.

Two observations lead us to reach that conclusion. First, we found that disrupting neuronal activity at the LHb during FC training, either by inhibition (pharmacological or optogenetic), or by sustained optogenetic activation, results in a condition in which retrieval of FC memory requires that the cue is presented in the training context. This observation implies an interaction between the context

and the cue in guiding memory retrieval. Second, in reconsolidation experiments we found that,

following retrieval in context + tone conditions, cued memory is reinstated. That result suggests that the

cued memory is reactivated when the cue is played in the training context. Moreover, since contextual

FC memory is not restored by the same manipulation, it could be inferred that freezing behavior during

context + tone is mostly attributable to the reactivation of the cued memory. In addition, the latter

observation argues that freezing in context + tone conditions does not reflect the retrieval of two weak

fear memories (contextual and cued) that have to add up to trigger freezing behavior. Altogether, those

two observations suggest that, under inactivation of the LHb, a cued FC memory is formed whose

retrieval depends on the context in which the cue is presented.

It has been shown that during FC training, activity of the LHb increases in response to cue

presentation, paralleling the appearance of conditioned responses (*16*, *17*). Though, no mechanistic

information about how the LHb influences cued memory formation could be inferred from the present

work, a tempting hypothesis is that the emergence of responses of the LHb to the cue acts as a

prediction error signal over the arriving of the US that, when confirmed, emancipates the cue-US

association from the context where it was formed.

Contextual memory and the LHb

Contextual FC is also blocked by pharmacological inactivation or artificial excitation of the LHb

during whole training. In contrast, temporally limited optogenetic inactivation of the LHb during cue and

US presentation did not affect contextual FC. The simplest explanation for this latter result is that

encoding of the US by the LHb is not involved in context-US association, which could be based on

representations of the US encoded in other structures, like the amygdala (*26*). Thus, deficits in

contextual FC induced by manipulations of the LHb might reflect disturbances in the encoding of the

context, or in the formation of the association between the context and the US.

In this regard, it has been proposed elsewhere that the LHb influences context encoding through

a functional interaction with the hippocampus (*27*, *28*). That hypothesis has received support from

physiological data generated by other authors and us showing that firing of the neurons of the LHb is

synchronized with hippocampal theta rhythm (*27*, *29*, *30*). In addition, two recent papers from Nyiri

group showed that LHb-innervated Nucleus Incertus (*31*) and Dorsal Raphe neurons (*32*) modulate

hippocampal theta. Thus, a considerable amount of data supports the hypothesis that the LHb

modulates context encoding, favoring the idea that disturbing neuronal activity of the LHb affects

context encoding and consequently the formation of contextual FC memory.

On the other hand, three results presented here suggest that deficits in contextual FC induced

by manipulation of the LHb reflect deficits in context-US association rather than in context

representation. First, freezing in context + tone conditions, evidences the retention and effective recall

of contextual information. Second, as discussed above, retrieval in context + tone conditions is not

sufficient to reconsolidate contextual FC memory, suggesting that the contextual memory retrieved is

not linked to fear response but facilitates expression of the cued memory. Third, inactivation of the LHb

does not affect the decrease in the exploration of an OF upon re-exposure, showing, in a different

paradigm, that inactivation of the LHb does not impede the formation of a contextual memory. More

experiments would be required to determine if the LHb participates in associative or representational

components of contextual FC.

Retrieval and temporal stability, two faces of memory strength

How easy a memory is retrieved could be read as a parameter of memory strength. Also, in

temporal dimension, the strength of a memory could be read from how long it lasts (*33*). In our

previous work we described that inactivation of the LHb before training in the Inhibitory Avoidance

generates a memory that is normally expressed 24 hours after training but could not be evidenced 7

days later (*8*). In that paradigm, temporal stability of the memory is defined by shock intensity (*i.e.* by

the salience of the US), thus it could be evaluated as a parameter of memory strength. There, we also

found that a series of manipulations known to extend temporal stability of weak Inhibitory Avoidance

memories did also extend temporal stability of the memory formed under inactivation of the LHb. Based

on those findings, we postulated that the main effect of the inactivation of the LHb was to reduce

memory strength. Our present results support and extend that hypothesis to the FC paradigm. In one

side, we found FC memory is harder to retrieve, since matching between training and testing conditions

should be increased in order to effective retrieval. In addition, we also found that the FC memory

expressed under context + tone conditions is temporarily less stable (Figure 3C). Thus, FC memory

formed under inactivation of the LHb could be considered weaker in those two aspects. Taken together

those results indicate a general role of the LHb in defining aversive memory strength.

Concluding Remarks

In summary, our results demonstrate that the LHb plays a role as a modulator of the associative

learning of FC. Notably, the expression of the memory formed under the inhibition of the LHb could be

described as an example of anti-generalization. Extrapolating that, it would be interesting to study

whether increased activity of the LHb could lead to a behavior prone to the generalization of fear, a

central characteristic of phobic and anxiety disorders.

Materials and Methods

Animals

Experiments were performed in male Wistar rats obtained from the vivariums of the Faculty of

Pharmacy and Biochemistry of the Buenos Aires University, Argentina, and Janvier Labs, France. Animals

were 5-6 weeks old at the time of surgery. Animals were housed 4 to 6 per cage, with *ad libitum* access

to food and water, under 12-hour light/dark cycle (lights on at 7:00 am), at constant temperature of 22 ±

2 °C. All the procedures where performed during light hours. Experimental procedures were approved

by the Animal Care and Use Committee of the University of Buenos Aires (CICUAL), and the Autonomous

Community of Madrid (PROEX 167/18).

Surgeries

Pharmacology: rats under deep ketamine/xylazine anesthesia (100 and 5 mg/kg respectively)

were bilaterally implanted with 22-Gauge guide cannulae aimed 2.0 mm above the LHb (AP -3.0 mm, ML

± 0.7 mm, DV -3.8 mm from Bregma), or 1.0 mm dorsal, ventral or lateral to LHb coordinates in specific

experiments. Cannulae were fixed to the skull with three surgical steel screws and dental acrylic. At the

end of surgery, animals received a dose of analgesic (meloxicam 0.6 mg/kg) and antibiotic (gentamicin 3

mg/kg). Behavioral procedures began 7-9 days after surgery.

Optogenetics: rats under deep isofluorane anesthesia (4 % induction, 1-2 % maintenance, in 0.8

L/minute oxygen) were bilaterally injected with 300 nl of viral vector (AAV8-CamKIIα-ArchT-GFP, 6.2 x

10^{12} viral particles/ml from UNC Vector Core, AAV8-CamKIIα-GFP, 6.3 x 10^{12} viral particles/ml from UNC

Vector Core, or AAV8-hSyn-oChIEF-tdTomato, homemade as described (*34*) per side at the LHb (AP -2.9

mm, ML ± 0.7 mm, DV -5.0 mm from Bregma). Subsequently, optical fiber implants (200 μm core, 0.45

NA) were bilaterally inserted with the tips aiming just above the LHb, with 4 degrees angle from the

sagittal plane (AP -3.0 mm, ML ± 1.05 mm, DV -4.5 mm from Bregma), and fixed to the skull with three

surgical steel screws and dental acrylic. During surgery, animals received a dose of analgesic (meloxicam

0.6 mg/kg) and antibiotic (gentamicin 3 mg/kg). Behavioral procedures began three weeks after surgery.

<u>Contextual and Cued Fear Conditioning Training</u>

For three consecutive days before the FC training, rats were habituated to handling once a day.

There, animals were grasped by hand and slightly restrained against the chest of the investigator for 1-3

minutes a manipulation similar to the one performed during intracerebral drug infusions. On training

day, animals were transferred inside their home cage to a room contiguous to the training room where

they acclimatized for 1 hour before the beginning of any other procedure. FC training took place in

Context A (electric foot-shock delivering grid floor, black plastic walls and ceiling with one transparent

plexiglass side, 50x25x30 cm wide, width and height, illuminated by white light). Cued FC protocol

consisted of a 180 s baseline period of free exploration followed by 4 tone-shock presentations (17 s, 3

kHz, 80 dB tone followed by 3 s, 0.60 mA, square monophasic 60 Hz electric shock) with an inter-

stimulus interval (ISI) of 70 s. Thirty seconds after the last shock, animals were returned to their home

cage in the acclimation room. When training session ended, home cages were left in the acclimation

room for at least one hour before returning them to the animal facility. Ethanol 50 % was used to clean

the conditioning cage between subjects. For contextual FC training procedures were equal but the tone

was omitted during conditioning. Training was always video recorded for posterior analysis.

Pharmacology experiments: after the acclimation period, rats were randomly assigned to

receive bilateral intra LHb infusions of GABAa agonist, muscimol (Sigma, 60 ng/μl in saline solution, 0.5

μl/side), or saline. Fluorescent green beads were added to both solutions to aid in checking the infusion

site (1:1000 dilution of concentrated 1 μm diameter fluorescent green beads, Bangs Laboratories, USA).

During infusions animals were grasped by hand and slightly restrained in the lap or the arm of the

investigator. Infusions were delivered at a rate of 0.5 μl/minute through a 30-Gauge needle extending

2.0 mm beyond the tip of implanted guide cannula and connected to a 10 μl Hamilton syringe by a

polyethylene tube. Infusion needle was left in place for an additional minute to minimize backflow. After

that was animals were returned to their home cage. FC training began 30 minutes later.

Optogenetics experiments: after the acclimation period, rats were taken to the FC room and

were bilaterally connected to 1 to 2 optic fiber branching patch-cords (200 μm core each, Doric Lenses,

Canada). The single end of the branching patch-cord (400 μm core) was connected to a rotary joint

(Doric Lenses, Canada) that was attached to the laser source by a simple patch-cord (400 μm core, 0.45

NA, ThorLabs, USA). FC chamber (Context A) had a modification in the ceiling (10 cm hole in the center)

to allow optic fiber patch-cord movement. For the ArchT experiment, continuous light of 532 nm at 10

mW at the tip of the fiber implant was delivered by a laser source (CNI, China), starting at tone onset

and stopping 5 s after shock termination. For the oChIEF experiment, 5 ms pulses of 447 nm at 20 Hz

with an intensity of 10 mW at the tip of the fiber implant, were delivered by laser source (Tolket,

Argentina) during the whole training. A mixed control group composed of oChIEF injected without light

stimulation and saline injected animals with light stimulation was used in that experiment since an AAV-

tdTomato was not available. At the end of FC training, patch-cord was disconnected from the fiber

implants and animals were returned to home cage.

Contextual FC Test

The contextual test was performed maintaining the same conditions of the FC training day (*e.g.*

acclimation room, FC chamber lights and investigator's nitrile gloves). During test, was animals were

placed in the training context (Context A) for 180 s and then returned to its home cage. Test was video

recorded for posterior analysis.

Cued FC Test

Several precautions were taken to avoid generalization during cued test. Home cages were

moved to a different acclimation room of the one used in the training day, the investigator used latex

gloves, animals were transported between the acclimatation room and the test chamber within a plastic

box, and acetic acid 1 % m/v was employed for cleaning between subjects. Test was performed in

Context B, a white acrylic box with a transparent plexiglass ceiling (25 x 25 x 40 cm wide, width and

height) with floor covered in wood shaving and lit up with red light. Cue test consisted of a pre-tone

period of 180 s during which animals could freely explore followed by 60 s tone (same as training tone)

and 30 s post-shock period. After that, animals were removed from the test cage and placed back in the

home cage. Test was video recorded for posterior analysis. 1 hour after finishing tests, home cages were

taken back to the animal facility.

Context + Tone Test

Context + tone test proceeded as contextual FC test but after 180 s in the test cage the tone was

presented for 60 s. 30 s after tone ending animals were returned to their home cage.

Open Field

Animals were placed for 15 minutes into an open field (OF; square grey plastic floor and walls 50

cm side x 35 cm height) and video recorded. Behavior during OF was analyzed offline with ANY-Maze

video tracking system (v4.82, Stoelting Co., Wood Dale, USA).

Histologic Control

Within a week after the end of behavioral procedures animals were euthanized with a lethal

dose of ketamine/xylazine, 50 ml of ice-cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) 0.1 M was transcardially

perfused, followed by 50 ml of paraformaldehyde 4 %. After that, the brain extracted and incubated at 4

°C in paraformaldehyde 4 % overnight. Then, brain was transferred to 30 % m/v sucrose in PBS 0.1 M,

incubated for three days at 4 °C and coronal sections (150 μm) were cut at a freezing microtome.

Sections were mounted with glycerol 50 % v/v in PBS 0.1 M, examined and photographed at 40X

magnification with GFP and DAPI filters. For the pharmacological experiments, injection sites were

determined by the presence of green beads. Animals in which both infusions were correct were included

in the analysis. Animals from the cohorts used in Figure 2B-C in which both infusions were outside the

LHb were included in the miss group presented in Figure S3. For the optogenetics experiments, animals

with transfection and/or optic fiber misses were not considered in the analysis.

Freezing analysis

Freezing was manually scored offline. Experimenter was blinded for animal´s treatment. An

Arduino custom system was used for the manual scoring. Briefly, a button was used to synchronize the

start of the video and another button was used to register the freezing state while pressed. The Arduino

system communicated time and freezing-button state at 10 Hz to the computer, and then saved as CSV

file for later analysis. For freezing over time graphs, data was binned in 5 s intervals, and inter-subjects´

mean and SEM was calculated.

<u>Statistical Analysis</u>

Each animal was taken as an independent measure. During test session of cued or context +

tone experiments, average freezing before and during tone presentation were treated as repeated

measures. Thus, in most experiments analysis was done using a two-way repeated measures design in

which the analyzed factors were "test stage" (pre-tone or tone) and "treatment" (muscimol,

optogenetic excitation or inhibition, or the corresponding control group). In experiments in which

subjects were tested more than one day, "testing day" was considered an additional factor. Freezing

during training session was analyzed separately. There the factor stage comprised freezing during the

tone or in the inter-tone period. Statistical analysis of FC experiments was done by generalized linear

mixed modelling (GzLMM). Typical distribution of individuals freezing values accumulated at lower and

higher values with few individuals freezing around the group mean, indicating a non-normal distribution.

We therefore compared models with beta and gaussian distribution (rescaling freezing to $y''=[y'(n-$

$1)+0.5]/n$ as suggested in *(35)*. For the model fitting in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,

Austria) we used the 'glmmTMB' package *(36)*. Beta distribution provided better adjustment and less

tendencies between group residues than gaussian distribution (data not shown). Logit link function was

employed. For the GzLMM we considered every interaction between the corresponding fixed factors

(test stage, treatment, testing day) and subject was treated as a random factor with random intercepts.

ANOVA and contrasts were done applying 'car' and 'emmeans' packages *(37, 38)* where GzLMM was

used. GzLMM ANOVAs used Wald χ^2 statistics for comparisons since neither likelihood ratio tests nor *F*

tests are supported. Assumptions of homoscedasticity and normal residues were met in the open field

experiment; therefore, it was analyzed via conventional two-way repeated measures ANOVA. Each

experiment was repeated at least twice in separate cohorts of animals. Each cohort included all the

treatments. Sample size calculations were done using power analysis. From pilot context test

experiments, we considered a standard deviation of aprox. 20 % aiming to detect a minimal difference

among groups of 50 %, with an 80 % power, and a type I error of 5 %. Based on these parameters and

first assuming gaussian distribution, initially we aimed at an n = 14. Later we readjusted to n = 6 on cued

memory tests, where the observed difference between vehicle and muscimol infused groups (aprox. 60

%), standard deviation (aprox. 25 %) and beta distribution at tone tests allowed to maintain about 80 %

power and 5 % type I error. For experiment in Figure 4C (reconsolidation of contextual memory)

statistical evaluation of the effect of the recall session was done following a within subject design since

recall session on 7th day and test session on 8th day were replicates. In bar graphs, freezing during

training is included as a parameter of the freezing of a naïve animal but, as mentioned above, freezing

during training was analyzed separately.

Supplementary Material:

Fig. S1. Freezing during training for experimental groups included in Figures 1-3.

Fig. S2. Inactivation of the LHb does not affect locomotion, exploration, or habituation to an Open Field.

Fig. S3. Controls of specificity of muscimol inactivation of the LHb.

Fig. S4. Inactivation of the LHb does not permanently block FC learning.

Fig. S5. Optogenetic inhibition of LHb neurons by ArchT.

Fig. S6. Freezing during training for experimental groups included in Figures 5 and 6.

Fig. S7. Modelling of temperature increase induced by optogenetic stimulation.

References

1.   O. Hikosaka, The habenula: from stress evasion to value-based decision-making. *Nat. Rev.*

Neurosci. **11**, 503–13 (2010).

2.   C. D. Proulx, O. Hikosaka, R. Malinow, Reward processing by the lateral habenula in normal and

depressive behaviors. *Nat. Neurosci.* **17**, 1146–1152 (2014).

3.   H. Hu, Y. Cui, Y. Yang, Circuits and functions of the lateral habenula in health and in disease. *Nat.*

Rev. Neurosci. **21**, 277–295 (2020).

4.   S. Maren, Pavlovian fear conditioning as a behavioral assay for hippocampus and amygdala

function: cautions and caveats. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **28**, 1661–1666 (2008).

5.   S. Maren, G. J. Quirk, Neuronal signalling of fear memory. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **5**, 844–852 (2004).

6.   J. E. LeDoux, R. Phillips, Differential contribution of amygdala and hippocampus to cued and

contextual fear conditioning. *Behav. Neurosci.* **106**, 274–285 (1992).

7.   J. Kim, M. Fanselow, Modality-specific retrograde amnesia of fear. *Science.* **256**, 675–677 (1992).

8.   M. Tomaiuolo, C. Gonzalez, J. H. Medina, J. Piriz, Lateral Habenula determines long-term storage

of aversive memories. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* **8**, 170 (2014).

9.   P. Bekinschtein, M. Cammarota, L. M. Igaz, L. R. M. Bevilaqua, I. Izquierdo, J. H. Medina,

Persistence of Long-Term Memory Storage Requires a Late Protein Synthesis- and BDNF-

Dependent Phase in the Hippocampus. *Neuron*. **53**, 261–277 (2007).

10.   J. I. Rossato, L. R. M. Bevilaqua, I. Izquierdo, J. H. Medina, M. Cammarota, Dopamine Controls

Persistence of Long-Term Memory Storage. *Science.* **325**, 1017–1020 (2009).

11.   M. R. M. Vianna, Role of Hippocampal Signaling Pathways in Long-Term Memory Formation of a

Nonassociative Learning Task in the Rat. *Learn. Mem.* **7**, 333–340 (2000).

12.   A. Etkin, J. M. Alarcón, S. P. Weisberg, K. Touzani, Y. Y. Huang, A. Nordheim, E. R. Kandel, A Role

in Learning for SRF: Deletion in the Adult Forebrain Disrupts LTD and the Formation of an

Immediate Memory of a Novel Context. *Neuron*. **50**, 127–143 (2006).

13.   Y. Yang, Y. Cui, K. Sang, Y. Dong, Z. Ni, S. Ma, H. Hu, Ketamine blocks bursting in the lateral

habenula to rapidly relieve depression. *Nature*. **554**, 317–322 (2018).

14.   J. Y. Lin, M. Z. Lin, P. Steinbach, R. Y. Tsien, Characterization of engineered channelrhodopsin

variants with improved properties and kinetics. *Biophys. J.* **96**, 1803–1814 (2009).

15.   J. M. Stujenske, T. Spellman, J. A. Gordon, Modeling the Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Light and

Heat Propagation for InVivo Optogenetics. *Cell Rep.* **12**, 525–534 (2015).

16.   M. Trusel, A. Nuno-Perez, S. Lecca, H. Harada, A. L. Lalive, M. Congiu, K. Takemoto, T. Takahashi,

F. Ferraguti, M. Mameli, Punishment-Predictive Cues Guide Avoidance through Potentiation of

Hypothalamus-to-Habenula Synapses. *Neuron*. **102**, 120-127.e4 (2019).

17.   D. Wang, Y. Li, Q. Feng, Q. Guo, J. Zhou, M. Luo, Learning shapes the aversion and reward

responses of lateral habenula neurons. *Elife*. **6**, e23045 (2017).

18.   Z. Wang, L. Wang, R. Yamamoto, T. Sugai, N. Kato, Role of the lateral habenula in shaping

context-dependent locomotor activity during cognitive tasks. *Neuroreport*. **24**, 276–280 (2013).

19.   J. Chan, X. Guan, Y. Ni, L. Luo, L. Yang, P. Zhang, J. Zhang, Y. Chen, Dopamine D1-like receptor in

lateral habenula nucleus affects contextual fear memory and long-term potentiation in

hippocampal CA1 in rats. *Behav. Brain Res.* **321**, 61–68 (2017).

20.   S. Maren, K. L. Phan, I. Liberzon, The contextual brain: Implications for fear conditioning,

extinction and psychopathology. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 417–428 (2013).

21.   W. Bin Kim, J.-H. Cho, Encoding of contextual fear memory in hippocampal-amygdala circuit. *Nat.*

Commun. **11**, 1382 (2020).

22.   M. Bocchio, S. Nabavi, M. Capogna, Synaptic Plasticity, Engrams, and Network Oscillations in

Amygdala Circuits for Storage and Retrieval of Emotional Memories. *Neuron*. **94**, 731–743 (2017).

23.   S. Rumpel, J. LeDoux, A. Zador, R. Malinow, Postsynaptic Receptor Trafficking Underlying a Form

of Associative Learning. *Science (80-.).* **308**, 83–88 (2005).

24.   S. Nabavi, R. Fox, C. D. Proulx, J. Y. Lin, R. Y. Tsien, R. Malinow, Engineering a memory with LTD

and LTP. *Nature.* **511**, 348–352 (2014).

25.   P. Sah, R. F. Westbrook, A. Lüthi, Fear Conditioning and Long-term Potentiation in the Amygdala.

Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **1129**, 88–95 (2008).

26.   B. F. Grewe, J. Gründemann, L. J. Kitch, J. A. Lecoq, J. G. Parker, J. D. Marshall, M. C. Larkin, P. E.

Jercog, F. Grenier, J. Z. Li, A. Lüthi, M. J. Schnitzer, Neural ensemble dynamics underlying a long-

term associative memory. *Nature.* **543**, 670–675 (2017).

27.   R. Goutagny, M. Loureiro, J. Jackson, J. Chaumont, S. Williams, P. Isope, C. Kelche, J.-C. Cassel, L.

Lecourtier, Interactions between the Lateral Habenula and the Hippocampus: Implication for

Spatial Memory Processes. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* **38**, 2418–2426 (2013).

28.   P. M. Baker, Y. Rao, Z. M. G. Rivera, E. M. Garcia, S. J. Y. Mizumori, Selective Functional

Interaction Between the Lateral Habenula and Hippocampus During Different Tests of Response

Flexibility. *Front. Mol. Neurosci.* **12**, 245 (2019).

29.   H. Aizawa, S. Yanagihara, M. Kobayashi, K. Niisato, T. Takekawa, R. Harukuni, T. J. McHugh, T.

Fukai, Y. Isomura, H. Okamoto, The synchronous activity of lateral habenular neurons is essential

for regulating hippocampal theta oscillation. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 8909–21 (2013).

30.   N. I. Bertone-Cueto, J. Makarova, A. Mosqueira, D. García-Violini, R. Sánchez-Peña, O. Herreras,

M. Belluscio, J. Piriz, Volume-Conducted Origin of the Field Potential at the Lateral Habenula.

Front. Syst. Neurosci. **13**, 78 (2020).

31. A. Szőnyi, K. E. Sos, R. Nyilas, D. Schlingloff, A. Domonkos, V. T. Takács, B. Pósfai, P. Hegedüs, J. B.

Priestley, A. L. Gundlach, A. I. Gulyás, V. Varga, A. Losonczy, T. F. Freund, G. Nyiri, Brainstem

nucleus incertus controls contextual memory formation. *Science.* **364**, eaaw0445 (2019).

32. A. Szőnyi, K. Zichó, A. M. Barth, R. T. Gönczi, D. Schlingloff, B. Török, E. Sipos, A. Major, Z.

Bardóczi, K. E. Sos, A. I. Gulyás, V. Varga, D. Zelena, T. F. Freund, G. Nyiri, Median raphe controls

acquisition of negative experience in the mouse. *Science.* **366**, eaay8746 (2019).

33. P. Bekinschtein, M. Cammarota, C. Katche, L. Slipczuk, J. I. Rossato, A. Goldin, I. Izquierdo, J. H.

Medina, BDNF is essential to promote persistence of long-term memory storage. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. **105**, 2711–2716 (2008).

34. C. D. Proulx, S. Aronson, D. Milivojevic, C. Molina, A. Loi, B. Monk, S. J. Shabel, R. Malinow, A

neural pathway controlling motivation to exert effort. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 5792–5797

(2018).

35. M. Smithson, J. Verkuilen, A better lemon squeezer? Maximum-likelihood regression with beta-

distributed dependent variables. *Psychol. Methods*. **11**, 54–71 (2006).

36. Mollie E. Brooks, Kasper Kristensen, Koen J. van Benthem, Arni Magnusson, Casper W. Berg,

Anders Nielsen, Hans J. Skaug, Martin Maechler and Benjamin M. Bolker (2017). glmmTMB

Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed

Modeling. *The R Journal*. **9** (2), 378-400 (2017).

37. John Fox and Sanford Weisberg. An {R} Companion to Applied Regression, Third Edition.

Thousand Oaks CA: Sage (2019). URL:https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/

38.   Russell Lenth. emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package

513   version 1.4.7 (2020). URL: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans

514   39.   T. Stefanelli, C. Bertollini, C. Lüscher, D. Muller, P. Mendez, Hippocampal Somatostatin

515   Interneurons Control the Size of Neuronal Memory Ensembles. *Neuron*. **89**, 1074–1085 (2016).

517   Acknowledgements

518   We would like to thank Dr. Roberto Malinow for his help in the generation of AAV vectors, to

Yamila Paez for her technical assistance, to Facundo Niklison for his help in experiments, and to Sadegh

Nabavi, Mariano Belluscio, Sebastian Giusti and Paula Ospital for their helpful comments. **Funding**: this

work was supported by the following grants: PICT 2016-0034 from the National Agency for Scientific and

Technological Promotion of Argentina (ANPCyT) to JM; I-COOP+(CSIC) ref COOPA20198 to PM; NARSAD,

Young Investigator Award 2015 (#23861) from the Brain and Behavior Foundation, PICT 2015-2609 and

PICT 2017-4594 from the ANPCyT to JP. TS was supported by a predoctoral fellowship from the

CONICET. **Authors contribution**: Design: TS, MI, JHM, PM, JP; Pilot experiments: CP; Experiments: TS, MI,

JP, PM; Analysis: TS, MI, PM, JP; Writing: TS, MI, CP, JP. **Competing interests**: the authors declare that

they have no competing interests. **Data and materials availability**: all data needed to evaluate the

conclusions in the paper are present in the paper and/or the Supplementary Materials. Additional data

are available from authors upon request.

530   Figures

Fig. 1

<u>534 Figure 1. Inactivation of the LHb blocks the formation of contextual FC long-term memory.</u>

A) Experiment diagram: bilateral vehicle/muscimol intra LHb infusions were performed 30 minutes

before training. Contextual FC was tested 24 hours or 7 days later. During training subjects were let to

freely explore the cage for a baseline period of 197 s. After that they were exposed to 4 foot-shocks (0.6

mA, 3 s) interspaced by 70 s. In the test session animals were re-exposed to the training context for 180

s and freezing was quantified.

B) Freezing during cued FC training for the group tested 7 days after training. Left panel: freezing over

time, shocks were presented at times indicated by the orange shaded areas. Right panel: average

freezing at inter-shock periods. Freezing in both groups was equivalent (GzLMM t test: $t_{(20)}$ = 0.046, p =

0.9635; $n_{vehicle}$ = 11, $n_{muscimol}$ = 12).

C, D) Seven days and 24 hours context tests. Left panels: freezing over time for groups tested at 7 days

(C) and 24 hours (D). Right panels: average freezing. In both experiments freezing in the muscimol group

was lower than in the control group (GzLMM t test for 7 days context test: $t_{(20)}$ = 4.294, p = 0.0004, $n_{vehicle}$

= 11, $n_{muscimol}$ = 12; GzLMM t test for 24 hours context test: $t_{(16)}$ = 3.964, p = 0.0011; $n_{vehicle}$ = 9, $n_{muscimol}$ =

10.

In freezing over time plots, lines represent intersubjects' mean, and shaded area represents +SEM. In

bar plots, each dot represents a subject and bars represent mean and errors bars +SEM. ns p > 0.05, ** p

< 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Fig. 2

<u>Figure 2. Inactivation of the LHb blocks the formation of cued FC long-term memory.</u>

A) Experiment diagram: bilateral vehicle/muscimol intra LHb infusions were performed 30 minutes

before training. Cued FC was tested 24 hour or 7 days later. During training, subjects were let to freely

explore the cage for a baseline period of 180 s that was followed by 4 tone-shock pairings (17 s of tone

followed by 3 s, 0.6 mA shock) interspaced by 70 s. During test, tone was presented for 60 s after a pre-

tone period of 180 s.

B) Freezing during cued FC training for the group tested 7 days after training. Left panel: freezing over

time. Tones were presented during the times indicated by the gray shaded areas. Shocks were

presented at times indicated by the orange shaded areas. Right panel: mean freezing during tone and

post-shock period. Freezing in both groups was equivalent. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA

of treatment, training stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.185, p = 0.6668; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 6.308, p =

0.0120; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.028, p = 0.8661. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing:

vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 0.430, p = 0.8912; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 0.297, p =

0.9463; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 9.

C, D) Seven days and 24 hours cued FC tests. Left panels: freezing over time for groups tested 7 days (C)

and 24 hours (D) after training. Gray areas indicate tone presentation. Right panels: average freezing for

pre- and tone period. Freezing during pre-tone period was not different between vehicle and muscimol

groups in either experiment. In contrast, during tone presentation, a highly significant reduction in

freezing was observed in the muscimol group in both experiments. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures

ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for 7 days experiment: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 2.157, p =

0.1420; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 19.100, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 32.939, p < 0.0001. Sidak's multiple

comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 1.469, p = 0.2828; Tone freezing: vehicle

vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 5.396, p < 0.0001; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 9. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures

ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for 24 hours experiment: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.024, p =

0.8781; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.108, p = 0.7428; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 12.447, p = 0.0004. Sidak's multiple

comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 0.153, p = 0.9854; Tone freezing: vehicle

vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 4.441, p = 0.0003; $n_{vehicle}$ = 9, $n_{muscimol}$ = 8.

In freezing over time plots, line represents intersubjects' mean, and shaded area represents SEM. In bar

plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent mean + SEM. ns p > 0.05, *** p < 0.001, **** p <

0.0001.

Fig. 3

<u>Figure 3. FC memory formed under inactivation of the LHb could be retrieved in context + tone</u>

<u>conditions and showed decreased temporal stability.</u>

A) Experiment diagram: bilateral intra LHb infusions of vehicle/muscimol were performed 30 minutes

before training. Animals were trained in cued FC. Test was performed 7 or 21 days later in the same

context used for training (Context A). The tone was presented for 60 s after a pre-tone period of 180 s.

B) Freezing during context + tone test 7 days after training. Left panel: freezing over time. Gray area

indicates tone presentation. Right panel: average freezing for pre- and tone period. Freezing to the

context was higher in vehicle group. However, tone elicited a robust freezing in the muscimol group that

reached values equivalent to the vehicle group. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of

treatment, test stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 6.830, p = 0.0090; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 44.992, p <

0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 3.161, p = 0.0754. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle

vs. muscimol: $t_{(46)}$ = 2.613, p = 0.0474; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(46)}$ = 0.899, p = 0.8460;

Vehicle: pre-tone vs. tone freezing: $t_{(46)}$ = 6.014, p < 0.0001; muscimol: pre-tone vs. tone freezing: $t_{(46)}$ =

6.708, p < 0.0001; $n_{vehicle}$ = 13, $n_{muscimol}$ = 13.

C) Freezing during context + tone test 21 days after training. Left panel: freezing over time. Gray area

indicates tone presentation. Right panel: average freezing for pre- and tone period. 21 days after

training freezing in context + tone condition in the muscimol group was lower than in the vehicle group

indicating a diminished temporal stability of context + tone memory. GzLMM Two-way repeated

measures ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 7.123, p = 0.0076; χ^2 stage

$_{(1)}$ = 41.364, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.176, p = 0.6751. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone

freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 2.669, p = 0.0508; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 2.683,

p = 0.0491; Vehicle: pre-tone vs. tone freezing: $t_{(26)}$ = 7.354, p < 0.0001; muscimol: pre-tone vs. tone

freezing: $t_{(26)}$ = 6.431, p < 0.0001; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 8.

In freezing over time plots, line represents intersubjects' mean, and shaded area represents +SEM. In

bar plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent mean + SEM. ns, p > 0.05, * p < 0.05.

Fig. 4

<u>Figure 4. Retrieval of FC memory in context + tone conditions reconsolidates cued but not contextual</u>

<u>memories.</u>

A) Diagram of reconsolidation experiment of cued FC memory: bilateral intra LHb muscimol infusions

were performed 30 minutes before cued FC training as described previously. Seven days later, animals

of the reconsolidation group were subjected to a recall session in which the cue was presented in the

training context. The following day, reconsolidation of cued memory was tested in context "B". The no-

reconsolidation group was not exposed to the recall session and was tested for cued memory in context

"B" 8 days after training.

B) Retrieval of FC memory in context + tone conditions restores cued FC memory. Left and center:

freezing over time for the recall and the cued memory test sessions, respectively. Animals of the no-

reconsolidation group showed very low levels of freezing, confirming the impairment in cued memory

induced by inactivation of the LHb during training. In contrast animals of the reconsolidation group

presented a marked freezing to the tone during the test session, reaching levels of freezing equivalent to

context + tone condition during the recall session. Right: quantification of freezing. Freezing to the tone

in the test session was significantly higher in the reconsolidation group. GzLMM Two-way repeated

measures ANOVA of reconsolidation, test stage, and interaction during tone test session: χ^2

reconsolidation $_{(1)}$ = 0.207, p = 0.6489; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.009, p = 0.9232; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 9.170, p =

0.0025. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: reconsolidation vs. no-reconsolidation: $t_{(18)}$

= 0.455, p = 0.8805; Tone freezing: reconsolidation vs. no-reconsolidation: $t_{(18)}$ = 4.219, p = 0.0010;

$n_{reconsolidation}$ = 6, $n_{NO-reconsolidation}$ = 6.

C) Diagram of the reconsolidation experiment of contextual FC memory: bilateral intra LHb muscimol

infusions were performed 30 minutes before cued FC training as described previously. Seven days later,

animals were subjected to a recall session in which the cue was presented in the training context. The

following day animals underwent the same procedure.

D) Retrieval of FC memory in context + tone conditions does not restore contextual FC memory. Left and

center: freezing over time for the recall and the test sessions, respectively. Right: paired comparison of

freezing for each subject on the recall and the test session. No differences in freezing were observed

between sessions indicating that retrieval of FC memory during the recall session did not restore

contextual FC memory, as it did with cued memory. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of

session day, test stage, and interaction: χ^2 day $_{(1)}$ = 0.514, p = 0.4732; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 20.398, p < 0.0001; χ^2

interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.240, p = 0.6240. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: recall vs. test

day: $t_{(26)}$ = 0.717, p = 0.7292; Tone freezing: recall vs. test day: $t_{(26)}$ = 0.088, p = 0.9952; n = 6.

In freezing over time plots, line represents intersubjects' mean and shaded area represents +SEM, and

gray area indicates tone presentation. In bar plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent

mean + SEM. ns p > 0.05, ** p < 0.01.

Fig. 5

Figure 5. Optogenetic inactivation of the LHb during cue and US, reduced cued but not contextual FC memories.

A) Experiment diagram: Top-Left: animals were bilaterally transfected with AAV-ArchT-GFP or AAV-GFP in the LHb and implanted with optic fibers above the LHb 4 weeks before training. Top-Right: during training, optogenetic light stimulation was delivered starting with the tone and stopping 5 seconds after the shock (tone and shock presentations were as previously described for cued FC). Bottom: diagram of training and tests. Cued memory was tested 7 days after training in Context B. The same animals were tested the following day in context + tone condition to evaluate contextual FC memory and freezing in context + tone condition.

B) Microphotographs of the AAV-ArchT-GFP infection (top, middle, bottom: DAPI, GFP, and merge respectively). Dashed white lines in the middle panel delimitates brain structures. * indicates the optic fiber tract. MHb: medial habenula, sm: stria medullaris, 3V: third ventricle. Scale bars: 1 mm.

C, D) Freezing over time during tone test at day 7 (C) and during context + tone test at day 8 (D). Gray area indicates tone presentation. Line represents intersubjects' mean, and shaded area represents +SEM.

E) Average freezing on tone test, and context + tone test sessions. During tone test ArchT group displayed lower levels of freezing to the tone than GFP group. The following day, during context + tone test, freezing levels of the ArchT group to both to the context and to the tone were equivalent to those of the GFP group.

GzLMM Three-way repeated measures ANOVA of test day, test stage, optogenetic inhibition and

interactions: χ^2 day $_{(1)}$ = 24.559, p < 0.0001; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 23.070, p < 0.0001; χ^2 inhibition $_{(1)}$ = 0.5568, p =

0.4555; χ^2 interaction(Day×Stage) $_{(1)}$ = 1.659, p = 0.1978; χ^2 interaction(Day×Inhibition) $_{(1)}$ = 0.294, p =

0.5879; χ^2 interaction(Stage×Inhibition) $_{(1)}$ = 5.006, p = 0.0253; χ^2 interaction(Day×Stage×Inhibition) $_{(1)}$ =

1.088, p = 0.2970. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Day7: Pre-tone freezing: GFP vs. ArchT: $t_{(66)}$ = 0.746,

p = 0.9747; Day 7: Tone freezing: GFP vs. ArchT: $t_{(66)}$ = 3.410, p = 0.0067; Day 8: Pre-tone freezing: GFP

vs. ArchT: $t_{(66)}$ = 0.178, p = 1.0000; Day 8: Tone freezing: GFP vs. ArchT: $t_{(66)}$ = 1.145, p = 0.8308; ArchT:

Tone freezing: Day 7 vs. Day 8: $t_{(66)}$ = 3.366, p = 0.0076; Day 8: ArchT: Pre-tone vs. Tone freezing: $t_{(66)}$ =

3.475, p = 0.0054; n_{GFP} = 9, n_{ArchT} = 10. In bar plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent

mean + SEM. ns p > 0.05, ** p < 0.01.

Fig. 6

<u>Figure 6. Disruption of LHb neuronal activity during complete FC training impairs contextual and cued FC</u>

<u>memories.</u>

A) Experiment diagram: Top-Left: animals were bilaterally infected with AAV-oChIEF-tdTomato in the

LHb and implanted with optic fibers above the LHb 4 weeks before training. Top-Right: during whole

training session the LHb was stimulated with 5 ms light pulses at 20 Hz to disrupt endogenous neuronal

activity. Bottom: diagram of training and tests. Cued memory was tested 7 days after training in Context

B. The same animals were tested the following day in context + tone condition to evaluate contextual FC

memory and freezing in context + tone condition.

B) Microphotographs of the AAV-oChIEF-tdTomato infection (top, middle, bottom: DAPI, tdTomato

fluorescence, and merge respectively). Dashed white lines in the middle panel delimitates brain

structures. * indicates the optic fiber tract. MHb: medial habenula, sm: stria medullaris, 3V: third

ventricle. Scale bars: 1 mm.

C, D) Freezing over time during cued test at day 7 (C) and during context + tone test at day 8 (D). Gray

area indicates tone presentation. Line represents intersubjects' mean, and shaded area represents +

SEM.

E) Average freezing of tone test and context + tone test sessions. Disruption of endogenous LHb activity

during training by optogenetic stimulation induced deficits in cued and contextual memories:

GzLMM Three-way repeated measures ANOVA of test day, test stage, optogenetic stimulation and

interactions: χ^2 day $_{(1)}$ = 20.439, p < 0.0001; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 100.217, p < 0.0001; χ^2 stimulation $_{(1)}$ = 5.135, p

= 0.0234; χ^2 interaction(Day×Stage) $_{(1)}$ = 5.805, p = 0.0160; χ^2 interaction(Day×stimulation) $_{(1)}$ = 2.048, p =

0.15237; χ^2 interaction(Stage×stimulation) $_{(1)}$ = 2.489, p = 0.1146; χ^2 interaction(Day×Stage×stimulation)

$_{(1)}$ = 4.905, p = 0.0268. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Day 7: Pre-tone freezing: Control vs. oChIEF:

$t_{(42)}$ = 2.266, p = 0.1601; Day 7: Tone freezing: Control vs. oChIEF: $t_{(42)}$ = 4.454, p = 0.0004; Day 8: Pre-

tone freezing: Control vs. oChIEF: $t_{(42)}$ = 3.874, p = 0.0022; Day 8: Tone freezing: Control vs. oChIEF: $t_{(42)}$ =

2.995, p = 0.0272; oChIEF: Tone freezing: Day 7 vs. Day 8: $t_{(42)}$ = 3.810, p = 0.0027; Day 8: oChIEF: Pre-

tone vs. Tone freezing: $t_{(42)}$ = 7.283, p < 0.0001; $n_{Control}$ = 7, n_{oChIEF} = 6. In bar plots, each dot represents a

subject and bars represent mean + SEM. ns p > 0.05, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001.

<u>Supplementary Material</u>

Suppl. Fig. 1

A Contextual FC Training - 24 h Context Test

B Cued FC Training - 24 h Tone Test

C Cued FC Training - 7 d Context + Tone Test

D Cued FC Training - 21 d Context + Tone Test

Supplementary Figure 1. Freezing during training for experimental groups included in Figures 1-3.

A-D) Left: temporal course of freezing during training in the experiments specified in the plot title. Right: average freezing of those experiments. In either condition no significant differences were observed between muscimol and vehicle group. In freezing over time plots orange shaded areas indicate shock presentation, gray shaded areas indicate tone presentation, line plots represent intersubjects' mean and shaded area over line plots represents +SEM. In bar plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent mean +SEM. ns p > 0.05.

Statistics:

- Contextual FC training – 24 hours test (A): GzLMM t test: $t_{(16)}$ = 1.217, p = 0.2414. $n_{vehicle}$ = 9, $n_{muscimol}$ = 10.

- Cued FC training – 24 hours test (B): GzLMM two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, training stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 3.796, p = 0.0514; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.550, p = 0.4584; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.852, p = 0.3560. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 1.948, p = 0.1192; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(28)}$ = 1.245, p = 0.3972. $n_{vehicle}$ = 9, $n_{muscimol}$ = 8. Stage factor refers to freezing between shock and tone, or during tone (post-shock or tone respectively).

- Cued FC training - 7 days context + tone test (C): GzLMM two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, training stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.037, p = 0.8471; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 8.741, p = 0.0031; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 8.674, p = 0.0032. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(46)}$ = 0.193, p = 0.9769; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(46)}$ =

749  2.216, p = 0.0624. $n_{vehicle}$ = 13, $n_{muscimol}$ = 13. Stage factor with above described post-shock or tone

750  levels.

751 - Cued FC training - 21 days context + tone test (D): GzLMMtwo-way repeated measures ANOVA of

752  treatment, training stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 3.723, p = 0.0537; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.023, p =

753  0.8802; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 4.535, p = 0.0332. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing:

754  vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 1.930, p = 0.1251; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 0.521, p =

755  0.8454. $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 8. Stage factor with above described post-shock or tone levels.

Suppl. Fig. 2

Supplementary Figure 2. Inactivation of the LHb does not affect locomotion, exploration, or habituation

to an Open Field.

A) Experiment diagram: bilateral intra LHb infusions of vehicle/muscimol were performed 30 minutes

before exposing the animals to an OF for 15 minutes. 48 hours later animals were exposed to the same

OF for a second time.

B) Distance traveled over time (60 s bins) during the first day (left) and the second day (right) in the OF.

Thin lines represent individuals, thick lines represent the average. Right: total distance traveled.

Distance traveled by both groups diminished the second day. No differences between groups were

observed (two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, day, and interaction: F treatment $_{(1, 10)}$ =

0.9320, p = 0.3571; F day $_{(1, 10)}$ = 15.92, p = 0.0026; F interaction $_{(1, 10)}$ = 0.2279, p = 0.6434. Sidak's

multiple comparisons test: Day 1: vehicle vs. muscimol: t = 0.9534, p = 0.5798; Day 2: vehicle vs.

muscimol: t = 0.1807, p = 0.9800).

C) Percentage of mobility time in the Open Field in each day. Left: percentage of mobility over time (60 s

bins) during the first day (left) and the second day (right). Thin lines represent individuals, thick lines

represent the average. Right: percentage of mobility time during whole OF assay. Mobility of both

groups diminished the second day. No differences between groups were observed (two-way repeated

measures ANOVA of treatment, day, and interaction: F treatment $_{(1, 10)}$ = 1.670, p = 0.2253; F day $_{(1, 10)}$ =

21.48, p = 0.0009; F interaction $_{(1, 10)}$ = 0.8727, p = 0.3722. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: First day:

vehicle vs. muscimol: t = 1.512, p = 0.2708; Second day: vehicle vs. muscimol: t = 0.005307, p > 0.9999).

D) Heat map representation of spatial occupancy during OF. Left: average heat maps vehicle (top) and

muscimol (bottom) groups on the first day (left), and the second day (right). The center zone is indicated

by the orange square. Right: percentage of time in the center zone in both groups at each day. Time in

the center did not change between days and was equivalent among groups (two-way repeated

measures ANOVA of treatment, day, and interaction: F treatment $_{(1, 10)}$ = 0.01082, p = 0.9192; F day $_{(1, 10)}$

= 0.0003566, p = 0.9853; F interaction $_{(1, 10)}$ = 0.05192, p = 0.8244. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Day

1: vehicle vs. muscimol: t = 0.1082, p = 0.9928; Day 2: vehicle vs. muscimol: t = 0.2416, p = 0.9645).

** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Suppl. Fig. 3

<u>Supplementary Figure 3. Controls of specificity of muscimol inactivation of the LHb.</u>

A) Photomicrographs of green beads fluorescence of a representative infusion on the LHb (left) or a

double miss infusion (right). References: Hb: habenula; 3V: third ventricle.

B) Diagram and representative photomicrographs of controls of specificity of muscimol infusion.

Infusions were aimed 1 mm dorsal (top right picture), ventral (bottom left picture) or lateral (bottom

right picture). References: Hb: habenula; 3V: third ventricle.

C) Freezing during cued memory testing in miss-LHb group, dorsal, ventral, and lateral controls. Miss-

LHb group was generated by selecting animals infused with muscimol in which both cannulae did not

target the LHb from the same cohorts included in Figure 2C. Dorsal, ventral, and lateral groups were

done as separate experiments. As in figure 2, infusions were done 30 minutes before training and test

was performed 7 days later. Miss-LHb group showed higher freezing to the tone than muscimol-LHb

group and equal freezing to the tone than the vehicle-LHb group. Muscimol infusion dorsal, ventral, or

lateral to the LHb did not affect tone evoked freezing. In bar plots each dot represents a subject and

bars represent mean + SEM. Muscimol-LHb and vehicle-LHb groups are taken from Figure 2C. ns p >

0.05, ** p < 0.001. Scale bars: 1 mm.

Statistics:

-   GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for miss

graph: χ^2 treatment $_{(2)}$ = 2.5079, p = 0.2854; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 85.1604, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(2)}$ =

33.459, p < 0.0001. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(40)}$ =

1.457, p = 0.6306; Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. miss: $t_{(40)}$ = 1.228, p = 0.7863; Pre-tone freezing:

muscimol vs. miss: $t_{(40)}$ = 0.168, p = 1.0000; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(40)}$ = 5.191, p <

0.0001; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. miss: $t_{(40)}$ = 1.550, p = 0.5636; Tone freezing: muscimol vs. miss:

$t_{(40)}$ = 3.559, p = 0.0058; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 9, n_{miss} = 7.

-    GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for dorsal

graph: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 1.7632, p = 0.1842; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 102.565, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ =

0.133, p = 0.7153. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ =

1.328, p = 0.3532; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 1.916, p = 0.1283; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ =

8.

-    GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for ventral

graph: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.525, p = 0.4689; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 165.9408, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ =

0.259, p = 0.6109. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(32)}$ =

0.724, p = 0.7235; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(32)}$ = 0.360, p = 0.9224; $n_{vehicle}$ = 10, $n_{muscimol}$ =

9.

-    GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, test stage, and interaction for lateral

graph: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.326, p = 0.5680; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 27.113, p < 0.0001; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ < 0.0001,

p = 0.9980. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 0.571, p

= 0.8176; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(26)}$ = 0.605, p = 0.7978; $n_{vehicle}$ = 8, $n_{muscimol}$ = 8.

Suppl. Fig. 4

Supplementary Figure 4. Inactivation of the LHb does not permanently block FC learning.

A) Experiment diagram: bilateral intra LHb infusions of vehicle/muscimol were performed in the animals

that went through the OF (Supplementary Figure 2). Seven days after the second exposure to the OF

animals were trained in cued FC. Memory was tested 7 days later.

B) Cued FC training of the animals that were previously exposed to the OF. Left panel: freezing over

time. Tones were presented at times indicated by the gray shaded areas. Shocks were presented at

times indicated by the orange shaded areas. Right panel: mean freezing during tone and post-shock

period. Freezing in both groups was equivalent. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of

treatment, training stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.685, p = 0.4077; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.050, p =

0.8231; χ^2 interaction $_{(1)}$ = 7.700, p = 0.0055. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing:

vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(18)}$ = 0.828, p = 0.6620; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(18)}$ = 1.265, p =

0.3945. $n_{vehicle}$ = 6, $n_{muscimol}$ = 6.

C) Test of cued FC memory on the same animals. Left panel: freezing over time. Gray area indicates tone

presentation. Right panels: average freezing for pre- and tone period. Freezing was not different

between vehicle and muscimol groups. GzLMM Two-way repeated measures ANOVA of treatment, test

stage, and interaction: χ^2 treatment $_{(1)}$ = 0.0697, p = 0.7918; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 15.254, p < 0.0001; χ^2

interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.103, p = 0.7478. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Pre-tone freezing: vehicle vs.

muscimol: $t_{(18)}$ = 0.264, p = 0.9579; Tone freezing: vehicle vs. muscimol: $t_{(18)}$ = 0.190, p = 0.9780; $n_{vehicle}$ =

6, $n_{muscimol}$ = 6.

In freezing over time plots, line represents intersubjects' mean and shaded area represents SEM. In bar

plots each dot represents a subject and bars represent mean + SEM. ns p > 0.05.

Suppl. Fig. 5

A

20 mV

0.5 s

Vm (mV)
-30
-40
-50
-60
-70

B

100 pA

1 s

Photocurrent (pA)
60
40
20
0

C

100 mV

2 s

Firing frequency (Hz)
30
20
10
0

****

D

50 mV

10 c

10 mV

0.25 s

Light induced ΔV
0
-5
-10
-15

<u>Supplementary Figure 5. Optogenetic inhibition of LHb neurons by ArchT.</u>

A) Example of membrane potential response to 600 ms current injection of an ArchT expressing LHb

neuron (-40, -10, 15, and 40 pA steps). Rebound spiking was observed after cessation of large

hyperpolarizing currents. Right graph: resting membrane potential of recorded neurons; n = 13 neurons

from 3 rats.

B) Light induced photocurrent. ArchT was activated with 590 nm LED for 1 s (orange line) with a nominal

power of 0.15 mW; n = 11 neurons from 3 rats.

C) Light induced action potential suppression in ArchT expressing LHb neurons. Light pulse (590 nm,

orange line) was applied every second time neurons were depolarized with positive current injection.

Left, representative recordings. Right, data summary. Light activation of ArchT significantly decreases

the number of action potentials evoked by current steps in LHb neurons (paired t test, $t_{(9)}$ = 6.25, p <

0.001); n = 9 neurons from 3 rats.

D) Membrane potential response to a 30 s light pulse (orange line) in LHb neurons. Rebound spiking was

observed after termination of light pulse, a representative trace is expanded in the middle traces. This

behavior confirms the reported rebound responses of the LHb neurons following long periods of

optogenetic inhibition reported previously (13). Right: quantification of the stationary light induced ΔVm

during the last 5 s of the 30 s pulse; n = 10 neurons from 3 rats.

Methods details for this experiment: Surgery was similar to the optogenetic manipulation experiments

with the following differences: 3 weeks old rats were employed, the viral vector injection sites were

adjusted according to Bregma-Lambda distance (Bλ) of each rat (AP = -2.9 × Bλ ÷ 8.5 mm, ML = ± 0.7 × Bλ

÷ 8.5 mm from Bregma and DV -4.3 mm from dura mater), no fiber optic implants, nor screws or acrylic

was used, and the skin was stitched at the end of surgery. Recordings were obtained from ArchT

expressing LHb neurons in acute brain slices prepared 3 weeks after infection. General methods for slice

preparation and recordings were replicated from previous publications of the group (*39*).

Suppl. Fig. 6

<u>Supplementary Figure 6. Freezing during training for experimental groups included in Figures 5 and 6.</u>

A-B) Left: temporal course of freezing during training in the ArchT (A) and oChIEF (B) stimulation

experiments. Right: average freezing on the same experiments. In freezing over time plots vertical

orange shaded areas indicate shock presentation, gray shaded areas indicate tone presentation, line

plots represent intersubjects' mean and shaded area over line plots represents +SEM. In either condition

no significant differences were observed between control and optogenetic stimulated groups. Stage

factor refers to freezing between shock and tone, or during tone (post-shock or tone respectively).

Statistics:

- For ArchT experiment: GzLMM two-way repeated measures ANOVA of optogenetic inhibition,

training stage, and interaction: χ^2 inhibition $_{(1)}$ = 0.002, p = 0.9631; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 3.173, p = 0.0749; χ^2

interaction $_{(1)}$ = 5.000, p = 0.0254. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing: GFP vs.

ArchT: $t_{(32)}$ = 0.046, p = 0.9987; Tone freezing: GFP vs. ArchT: $t_{(32)}$ = 2.098, p = 0.0859. n_{GFP} = 9, n_{ArchT} =

10.

- For oChIEF experiment: GzLMM two-way repeated measures ANOVA of optogenetic disruption,

training stage, and interaction: χ^2 disruption $_{(1)}$ = 0.007, p = 0.9358; χ^2 stage $_{(1)}$ = 0.018, p = 0.8946; χ^2

interaction $_{(1)}$ = 0.0650, p = 0.7988. Sidak's multiple comparisons test: Post-shock freezing: Control

vs. oChIEF: $t_{(20)}$ = 0.081, p = 0.9960; Tone freezing: Control vs. oChIEF: $t_{(20)}$ = 0.113, p = 0.9921. $n_{Control}$

= 7, n_{oChIEF} = 6.

Suppl. Fig. 7

<u>Supplementary Figure 7. Modelling of temperature increase induced by optogenetic stimulation.</u>

Simulation was implemented using the toolbox developed by Stujenske, Spellman and Gordon, (2015)

using parameters similar to the one used in our real experiments: optic fiber: radius = 0.2 mm, NA =

0.45, wavelength: 532 nm for ArchT and 447 nm for oChIEF, laser intensity 10 mW. Additional

parameters were taken from (*15*) (montecarlolight_function: modelnumber = 1; HeatDiffusionLight:

U_STEP = 0.03 mm, T_SAVE = 500, R_AVG = 0.25 mm).

A) Heat plot of predicted temperature changes at different distances from the optic fiber tip induced by

optogenetic stimulation during FC training. Left: temperature changes induced by constant light

stimulation required for inhibition with ArchT. Right: temperature changes induced by pulsed light

stimulation used for oChIEF activation.

B) Depth profile of temperature change in the steady state (calculated as the mean in the 250-300 s

interval). Constant light stimulation with 532 nm light would induce a significant temperature increase

that would extend over more than 1 mm and would induce non-controllable out of target changes in

neuronal activity. In contrast, pulsed activation of oChIEF would not induce physiologically relevant

temperature changes at any depth (*15*).

C) Temporal profile of temperature change at 0.25 and 1 mm from the fiber tip for both stimulation

protocols.