1   **Ventral Pallidum GABA Neurons Mediate Motivation Underlying Risky Choice**

2   Running Title: VP GABA in Motivation During Risky Choice

3   [1]Farrell, M.R., [1]Esteban, J.S.D., [2]Faget, L., [3]Floresco, S.B., [2,4]Hnasko, T.S., & [1]Mahler, S.V.

4
5   **Affiliations:**
6   [1]Department of Neurobiology & Behavior
7   University of California, Irvine
8   1203 McGaugh Hall
9   Irvine, CA 92697
10
11   [2]Department of Neurosciences
12   University of California, San Diego
13   9500 Gilman Drive
14   La Jolla, CA 92093
15
16   [3]Department of Psychology
17   University of British Columbia
18   Vancouver Campus
19   2136 West Mall
20   Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4
21
22   [4]VASDHS Research Service
23   3350 La Jolla Village Dr
24   San Diego, CA 92161
25
26
27   **Corresponding Author:** Mitchell R. Farrell, M.S., Department of Neurobiology & Behavior. University of
28   California, Irvine, 1132A McGaugh Hall, Irvine, CA 92697, (O) (949) 824-6128, mrfarrel@uci.edu

30   **Abstract**

Pursuing rewards while avoiding danger is an essential function of any nervous system. Here, we

examine a new mechanism helping rats negotiate the balance between risk and reward when making

high-stakes decisions. Specifically, we focus on GABA neurons within an emerging mesolimbic circuit

nexus—the ventral pallidum (VP). These neurons play a distinct role from other VP neurons in simple

motivated behaviors in mice, but their roles in more complex motivated behaviors is unknown. Here, we

interrogate the behavioral functions of VP^{GABA} neurons in male and female transgenic GAD1:Cre rats

(and wildtype littermates), using a reversible chemogenetic inhibition approach. Employing a behavioral

assay of risky decision making, and of the food-seeking and shock-avoidance components of this task,

we show that engaging inhibitory G$_{i/o}$ signaling specifically in VP^{GABA} neurons suppresses motivation to

pursue highly salient palatable foods, and possibly also motivation to avoid being shocked. In contrast,

inhibiting these neurons did not affect seeking of low-value food, free consumption of palatable food, or

unconditioned affective responses to shock. Accordingly, when rats considered whether to pursue food

despite potential for shock in a risky decision-making task, inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons caused them to

more readily select a small but safe reward over a large but dangerous one—an effect not seen in the

absence of shock threat. Together, results indicate that VP^{GABA} neurons are critical for high-stakes

adaptive responding that is necessary for survival, but which may also malfunction in psychiatric

disorders.

Significance Statement: In a dynamic world, it is essential to implement appropriate behaviors under

circumstances involving rewards, threats, or both. Here, we demonstrate a crucial role for VP^{GABA}

neurons in high-stakes motivated behavior of several types. We show that this VP^{GABA} role in motivation

impacts decision making, as inhibiting these neurons yields a conservative, risk-averse strategy not seen

when the task is performed without threat of shock. These new roles for VP^{GABA} neurons in behavior may

inform future strategies for treating addiction, and other disorders of maladaptive decision making.

Introduction

Executing appropriate action under conflicting motivations is fundamental for survival in a

dynamic world. For example, balancing appetitive and aversive motivations is essential for most animals

to eat without being eaten. In humans, this interplay of motivations is required for appropriate decision

making, and inappropriately balancing reward and aversion likely contributes to a variety of psychiatric

disorders including addiction. Indeed, compulsive drug use and relapse in addiction can be

conceptualized as desire for drugs overcoming the perceived threat of consequences, leading to poor

decisions. Yet most preclinical studies explore reward in the absence of threat, or threat without

reward—conditions that rarely occur in the lives of opportunistic prey species like rodents.

Understanding how functionally distinct cell populations within brain motivation circuits participate in

appetitive, aversive, and also *mixed motivations* will provide novel insights into the neural substrates of

both adaptive and maladaptive decision making.

The ventral pallidum (VP) is at an anatomical interface of motivation and action (Heimer et al.,

1982), and is ideally positioned to contribute to behavioral responses to both rewards and threats.

Across species, VP neurons encode the motivational value of specific actions that result in reward, in a

manner that reflects whether such actions are worth generating (Pessiglione et al., 2007; Tindell et al.,

2009; Tachibana and Hikosaka, 2012; Richard et al., 2016; Fujimoto et al., 2019). VP also plays a causal

role in reward, as pharmacological stimulation enhances spontaneous food intake (Stratford et al., 1999;

Smith et al., 2009) and hedonic evaluations of tastes (Berridge and Kringelbach, 2015), whereas

perturbing VP disrupts conditioned motivation (McAlonan et al., 1993; Chang et al., 2015), and reward-

related working memory (Floresco et al., 1999). Notably, VP also plays a crucial role in seeking of

multiple classes of addictive drugs (Rogers et al., 2008; Mahler et al., 2014; Farrell et al., 2019;

Heinsbroek et al., 2019; Prasad and McNally, 2020).

However, it has become clear that VP not only contributes to reward, but also to aversive

motivational processes. Pharmacological disinhibition of VP neurons generates spontaneous defensive

behavior in rats (Smith and Berridge, 2005), and disrupts the ability of monkeys to avoid a cued aversive

airpuff (Saga et al., 2016). Perhaps relevant to this are recent reports revealing that a glutamatergic

subpopulation of VP neurons mediates aversive motivation and learning in mice, as they fire in response

to aversive stimuli, promote avoidance and curtail reward seeking when optogenetically stimulated, and

generally cause opposite effects when optogenetically inhibited (Faget et al., 2018; Tooley et al., 2018;

Heinsbroek et al., 2019; Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020).

In contrast to VP glutamate neurons, VP[GABA] neurons have instead been linked to reward seeking

and approach responses in mice. For example, photostimulating VP[GABA] neurons is reinforcing, and

induces food intake (Zhu et al., 2017; Faget et al., 2018; Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020). VP[GABA] neurons

also selectively fire to reward cues, and their activity is required for operant reward seeking, but not

avoidance responses (Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020). These results support the notion of extensive

functional heterogeneity amongst VP cell populations (Smith and Berridge, 2005; Kupchik and Kalivas,

2013; Mahler et al., 2014; Root et al., 2015), and show that VP[GABA] neurons play a distinct, though poorly

characterized role in behavior.

Here we systematically characterize the behavioral functions of VP[GABA] neurons, in transgenic

GAD1:Cre rats. Using validated, specific, and reversable chemogenetic inhibition of VP[GABA] neurons, we

show they mediate both highly motivated pursuit of salient foods, and avoidance of shocks. In contrast,

inhibiting these cells does not affect shock-induced aversion, low-motivation food seeking, free food

consumption, or locomotion. Notably, when rats made choices about food rewards under threat of

shock, VP[GABA] inhibition shifted choice bias towards a more risk averse strategy, increasing preference

for small/safe rewards over large/risky ones. Together, these results show that VP[GABA] neurons govern

high-stakes motivational processes underlying risky decision making.

101   **Methods**

Subjects

Male (*n* = 46) and female (*n* = 35) Long-Evans hemizygous GAD1:Cre rats (Sharpe et al., 2017; Gibson et

al., 2018; Wakabayashi et al., 2019) and their Cre-negative wildtype littermates (WT) were pair-housed

in polycarbonate tub-style cages (48 × 20 × 27 cm) with bedding and nesting material. Rats were

maintained on a reverse 12 hr light-dark cycle, with testing in the dark phase. Water was available *ad*

libitum and food was restricted to ~90% of free-feeding weight during behavioral testing (~6-9

g/day/rat), unless otherwise noted. During food restriction, food was placed in the homecage after each

behavioral testing session. The cohorts of rats used for each of the behavioral tasks, the sex distribution

of each cohort, and the chronological ordering of behavioral testing is presented in **Table 1**. All

procedures were approved by the University of California Irvine Institutional Animal Care and Use

Committee, and are in accordance with the NIH Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals.

Chemogenetic Methods

114
<u>Surgery and Viral Vectors</u>

Rats were anesthetized with ketamine (56.5 mg/kg) and xylazine (8.7 mg/kg), and treated for pain with

meloxicam (1.0 mg/kg). An adeno-associated vector containing double-floxed, inverted open reading

frame (DIO) mCherry-tagged hM4Di designer receptors (Armbruster et al., 2007) (DREADDs; AAV2-hSyn-

DIO-hM4D(Gi)-mCherry; titer: 1 x 10^{12} GC/mL; Addgene) was injected bilaterally into VP (relative to

bregma: AP 0.0 mm, ML ±2.0 mm, DV -8.2 mm; ~300 nL/hemisphere) using a Picospritzer and glass

micropipette. Injections occurred over 1 min, and the pipette was left in place for 5 min after injection

to limit spread. Both GAD1:Cre and WT rats were injected with the active hM4Di DREADD virus, and lack

of hM4Di/mCherry expression was confirmed in each WT rat.

<u>Drugs</u>

Clozapine-N-oxide (CNO) was obtained from NIDA, and subsequently stored at 4°C in powder aliquots

stored in desiccant, and protected from light. CNO was dissolved in a vehicle containing 5% dimethyl

sulfoxide (DMSO) in saline, and injected at 5 mg/kg intraperitoneally (IP), 30 min prior to tests. For

microinjections, bicuculline methiodide (Sigma) was dissolved in artificial cerebrospinal fluid

(Thermofisher), stored in aliquots at -20°C, and thawed just prior to use.

DREADD Validation

Localization of DREADD Expression to VP

Virus expression in GAD1:Cre rats was amplified with mCherry immunohistochemistry, and sections

were co-stained for substance P, an anatomical marker of VP borders. First, behaviorally-tested rats

were perfused with cold 0.9% saline and 4% paraformaldehyde after completion of experiments. Brains

were cryoprotected in 20% sucrose, sectioned at 40 μm, and blocked in 3% normal donkey serum PBST.

Tissue was incubated 16 hrs in rabbit anti-substance P (ImmunoStar; 1:5000) and mouse anti-mCherry

antibodies (Clontech; 1:2000) in PBST-azide with 3% normal donkey serum. After washing, slices were

incubated in the dark for 4 hrs in Alexafluor donkey anti-Rabbit 488 and donkey anti-Mouse 594

(Thermofisher), then washed, mounted, and coverslipped with Fluoromount (Thermofisher). mCherry

expression was imaged at 10x, and the zone of expression in each hemisphere of each rat was mapped

in relation to VP borders, and a rat brain atlas (Paxinos and Watson, 2006).

Localization of DREADDs Specifically to VP^{GABA} Neurons

Experimentally-naïve GAD1:Cre rats (*n* = 4) injected in VP with AAV2-hSyn-DIO-mCherry were

euthanized, and fresh brains were immediately extracted and frozen in isopentane before storage at

−80 °C. Brains were serially cut (20 μm) on a cryostat, and placed directly onto slides before returning to

storage at −80 °C. Three different coronal sections of the VP near the center of mCherry expression were

used per brain. In situ hybridizations were performed using the RNAscope Multiplex Fluorescent Assay

(Advanced Cell Diagnostics). RNA hybridization probes included antisense probes against rat *Gad1*

(316401-C1), rat *Slc17a6* (vglut2 gene; 317011-C3) and *mCherry* (431201-C2) (*n* = 2), or antisense probes

against rat *Gad1* (316401-C1), rat *Slc32a1* (vgat gene; 424541-C3) and *mCherry* (431201-C2) (*n* = 2), both

respectively labeled with alexa488, atto647, and atto550 fluorophores. DAPI was used to label nuclei

and identify cells. Three images/hemisphere/section were taken at 63x (1.4 NA) magnification using a

Zeiss AxioObserver Z1 widefield Epifluorescence microscope with a Zeiss ApoTome 2.0 for structured

illumination and Zen Blue software for counting. Wide-field images were taken at 20x (0.75 NA)

magnification. Cells that exhibited at least 4 puncta (RNA molecules) in addition to DAPI were counted

as expressing the respective gene.

<u>DREADD-Dependent Inhibition of VP[GABA] Neurons by CNO</u>

In order to verify the ability of CNO to inhibit VP neurons in a DREADD-dependent manner, we tested

the ability of systemic CNO to inhibit exogenously-stimulated VP neural activity. Experimentally-naïve

GAD1:Cre rats (*n* = 3) were injected unilaterally with the previously described AAV2 DIO-hM4Di-mCherry

vector in ipsilateral VP, and contralaterally in VP with a matched AAV2 DIO-mCherry control vector (4.7 x

10^{12} GC/mL, AddGene). Three weeks later, bilateral intracranial cannulae were implanted 2 mm dorsal to

the injection target, using previously described procedures (Mahler et al., 2013a; Mahler et al., 2014;

Mahler et al., 2019), and rats recovered for 5 d. Rats were then injected systemically with CNO, in order

to engage unilaterally expressed VP[GABA] hM4Di receptors. 30 min later, rats were bilaterally injected in

VP with 0.5 µL of bicuculline (0.01 µg/0.5 µL/50 sec), inducing neural activity in the local VP area in both

hemispheres. 90 min later, rats were perfused, and brains were processed for Fos and mCherry to

determine whether bicuculine-induced Fos was suppressed by hM4Di activation (i.e. if there was less

Fos expression in the hM4Di hemisphere than the mCherry hemisphere). VP sections near the center of

the microinjection sites were incubated overnight at room temperature in rabbit anti-Fos (1:5000;

Millipore) and mouse anti-DSRed (targeting mCherry; 1:2000; Clontech), washed, incubated in

Alexafluor donkey anti-Rabbit 488 and donkey anti-Mouse 594 in dark for 4 hrs at room temperature,

then coverslipped as above. For each rat, 2-3 brain sections/hemisphere/rat with VP-localized

microinjector tip damage were selected for manual quantification at 10x magnification by an observer

blind to experimental manipulation. mCherry-only, and mCherry/Fos co-expressing cells within VP

borders (Paxinos and Watson, 2006) were counted in both hemispheres. The percentage of mCherry

cells co-expressing Fos in each sample was calculated, and per-hemisphere averages were computed for

each rat for statistical analysis.

Behavioral Testing Methods

181
Risky Decision-Making Task

Operant Apparatus. All operant testing was performed in Med Associates operant chambers in sound-

attenuating boxes, equipped with two retractable levers with associated stimulus lights above them.

Between the two levers was a food magazine connected to a food pellet dispenser. Two nose-poke ports

were positioned on the opposite wall with a yellow light in one of the ports. Boxes were equipped with

tone/white noise and footshock generators.

Habituation Training. We adapted a previously-reported risky decision task and associated training

protocol (Simon et al., 2009; Simon and Setlow, 2012; Orsini et al., 2015a). Mildly food deprived male (*n*

= 23) and female rats (*n* = 22) were familiarized to highly palatable, banana-flavored, sucrose, fat, and

protein-containing pellets in their homecage (Bio-Serv, Ct # F0024), then on day 1 of training, 38 pellets

were delivered into the food magazine on a variable time 100 sec schedule (140 sec, 100 sec, 60 sec)

during a single ~60 min session. Rats that failed to eat >19 pellets were given a second day of magazine

training.

Lever Pressing Training. Next, rats were trained to lever press for the banana pellets in daily 30 min

sessions. Each session began with illumination of the house light, and extension of a single lever plus

illumination of the associated stimulus light (right or left, counterbalanced). One pellet and a brief

auditory tone cue (0.5 sec, 2.9 kHz) were delivered on a fixed ratio 1 (FR1) schedule, with a 10 sec

timeout period between pellet deliveries. Daily FR1 training continued until criterion was met (50

pellet/30 min session), followed by training on the alternate (left or right) lever, again until criterion.

Lever Choice Training. The next training phase consisted of daily 1 hr sessions that taught rats to press

levers within 10 sec of their extension. Sessions began with illumination of the houselight, and every 40

sec one lever (right or left) was extended for 10 sec, along with the associated stimulus light. Lever

presses yielded 1 food pellet, and the tone cue. If no press occurred during the 10 sec extension

window, the lever retracted and stimulus light extinguished, the trial was counted as an omission, and

rats were required to wait until the next lever extension trial. Each session consisted of 35 left lever, and

35 right lever extensions with a 40 sec intertrial interval, independent of the rats' pressing or omitting.

Rats that met criterion (<10 omissions) on two consecutive sessions were moved to the next phase of

the task. In this phase procedures were the same, except that now pressing one lever (left or right,

counterbalanced) delivered 1 pellet accompanied by the tone cue, and pressing the other lever

delivered 2 pellets and 2 tone cues. Rats were trained for at least 3 d in this manner, until 2 consecutive

days with <10 omissions.

Risky Decision Task. Rats were next trained on the risk task, in which the threat of shock was introduced.

At session start, as above one lever yielded 1 pellet, and the other 2 throughout the session. However,

now the 2-pellet option came with the chance of concurrently-delivered shock; the probability of which

increased over the course of the session. Sessions consisted of 5 blocks with 20 trials each, for a total of

66 min. Blocks represent changes in footshock probability associated with large/risky lever presses such

that in the first 20-trial block there was no chance of shock, and in each subsequent block shock

probability increased by 25% (Block 1: 0% probability, Block 2: 25%, Block 3: 50%, Block 4: 75%, Block 5:

100%). Each 20-trial block began with 8 'forced choice' trials in which a single lever was extended (4

large/risky and 4 small/safe lever extensions, random order) to establish the shock contingency for that

block. Following the 8 forced choice trials, 12 'free choice' trials commenced in which both the

large/risky and small/safe levers were extended simultaneously to allow choice of the preferred option

(small/safe; large/risky). If no lever press occurred within 10 sec, the lever(s) were retracted, stimulus

light(s) extinguished, and the trial was considered an omission. Footshock intensity (mA) was titrated

individually for each rat to ensure sufficient parametric space to observe either increases or decreases in

risky choice, as reported previously (Orsini et al., 2017). Footshock intensity started at 0.15 mA for each

rat upon beginning the risky decision task, and percent choice of the large/risky reward was monitored

daily for fluctuations in decision making. Footshock intensity was increased or decreased each day by

0.05 mA, until stable decision making behavior was achieved in all animals.

Stable Pre-Test Baseline Performance: Rats generally achieved stability within 10-20 sessions, with near-

exclusive choice of the "risky" 2 pellet option when chance of shock was zero, then a parametric shift to

the "safe" 1 pellet option as shock probability increased across blocks (interaction of block X lever: $F_{(4,}$

$_{132)}$ = 111.5, $p < 0.0001$). Rats were trained until performance was stable for 5 consecutive days (no

difference in 5 d average performance pre-vehicle/CNO: $F_{(1, 229)}$ = 0.45, n.s.; or interaction of block x

treatment: $F_{(4, 229)}$ = 0.023, n.s.), then were assigned to receive counterbalanced vehicle and CNO tests,

between which behavior was re-stabilized over ~5 days of training. Over the course of these

experiments, 6 rats made >50% omissions during vehicle treatment sessions (range 50-72 omissions

over 100 trials), making interpretation of their data problematic. Accordingly, their data were excluded

from risky decision analyses.

Reward Magnitude Discrimination

To characterize potential VP inhibition effects on mere preference for larger versus smaller rewards, a

separate cohort of GAD1:Cre rats (*n* = 8) were trained identically to above, except that shock was never

introduced. We then evaluated CNO effects (versus vehicle) on choice of the 2-pellet lever over the 1-

pellet lever, in the absence of shock. Rats required ~5-10 training sessions before displaying stable

preference for the larger reward, after which they received CNO and vehicle tests on separate days.

After the first test, rats received ~3 days of training to re-stabilize performance, then were given their

second counterbalanced treatment.

Spontaneous Palatable Food Intake

Ad libitum-fed rats (*n* = 18) were placed in polycarbonate cages (44.5 x 24 x 20 cm) with bedding and

~12 g of peanut butter M&M chocolates for 1 hr on 2 consecutive days, to habituate them to test

conditions. The next day, rats were administered CNO or vehicle (counterbalanced, separate days) 30

min prior to a 1 hr intake test. 48 hrs later the procedure was repeated with the other drug treatment.

Food intake (g) was measured.

High Effort Instrumental Responding for Palatable Food

To assess the involvement of the VP in food seeking under higher effort requirements, mildly food-

deprived rats (*n* = 39) were trained to nosepoke on a progressive ratio schedule of reinforcement.

Sessions began with illumination of the both the houselight and a light within the active nosepoke port.

When the required schedule was achieved, 3 banana pellets + 3 concurrently-delivered 0.5 sec white

noise pulses were delivered. The number of nosepokes required for reward increased each time the

prior requirement was achieved (FR 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, 32, 40, 50, 62, 77, 95, 118, 145, 178, 219, 268, 328,

402, 492, 603 (Smith and Aston-Jones, 2012)). Inactive port entries were inconsequential, but recorded.

Sessions lasted a maximum of 2 hrs, or less if the rat failed to reach the next ratio within 20 min of

achieving the prior one. Training continued until rats achieved stable performance for 2 consecutive

sessions (<25% change in active nosepokes). Pressing was re-stabilized between counterbalanced

vehicle/CNO tests.

Low Effort Instrumental Responding for Palatable Food or Conventional Chow

Mildly-food deprived rats or *ad libitum* fed rats (*n* = 16) were trained to nosepoke for palatable 45 mg

banana pellets on an FR1 schedule of reinforcement during daily 1 hr sessions. Separate animals (*n* = 8)

were trained to respond for 45 mg chow pellets (Bio-Serv, Ct # F0165) instead using the same

procedures. Sessions began with illumination of the houselight and active nosepoke port light. Active

nosepokes resulted in delivery of a pellet into the food cup, while inactive nosepokes were without

consequence. Rats were trained until achieving stability (<25% change in active nosepokes) for 2

consecutive sessions (2-7 sessions), then tested with counterbalanced vehicle/CNO, with 1+ days of re-

stabilization between tests.

<u>Operant Shock Avoidance/Escape Task</u>

Procedures were adapted from a previously described shock avoidance/escape task (Oleson et al.,

2012). Rats (n = 18 trained) that had previously performed the risky decision task, progressive ratio task,

and palatable food FR1 task were tested, and footshock intensity (mA) was the same as that used for the

rat during the previously-trained risk task (0.15-45 mA). Each 30 min session began with illumination of

the houselight, and every 20 sec an active and inactive lever were extended. Initial training taught rats

to press a lever to turn off a repeated foot shock. During this initial 'escape only' training, lever

extension was met with a concurrent footshock that repeated (0.1 sec footshock every 2 sec) until the

active lever was pressed, at which time footshock ceased, both active and inactive levers were

retracted, and a 20 sec white noise safety signal was played. Then the next trial began with re-extension

of both levers, a sequence that was repeated until the end of the 30 min session. Training proceeded for

at least 2 d, until consistent escape behavior was observed.

Next, rats were trained to avoid, as well as to escape shocks in 30 min sessions. In this phase, levers

were again extended at the start of each trial, but now this occurred 2 sec prior to initiation of shocks. If

the active lever was pressed in this 2 sec period (an avoid response), no shock occurred, levers

retracted, and the safety signal was played for 20 sec. If no press occurred before 2 sec elapsed,

repeating footshock commenced as above, until an active lever press occurred (escape response), at

which time levers were retracted and the safety signal was played for 20 sec. Inactive lever presses were

inconsequential but recorded. All rats with >5 avoidance lever presses on the vehicle test day were

included for analyses (n = 18). Rats were administered counterbalanced vehicle and CNO tests 30 min

prior to avoidance/escape sessions, with ~3 d between tests to re-stabilize behavior. Data were analyzed

by assessing 1) the change in the ratio of avoidance presses to escape presses from pre-test baseline

(i.e. change from baseline avoidance %), 2) the ratio of avoidance presses to escape presses on vehicle

and CNO tests (i.e. raw avoidance %), 3) latency to avoid footshock, and 4) latency to escape repeated

footshock.

Motor Responses to Shock

To query the role of VP^{GABA} in affective responses to shock itself, rats (n = 16) were tested for overt

motor reactions to shocks of ascending intensity in a chamber in which they had not been previously

tested. The houselight was illuminated and 2 min elapsed. This waiting period ended with one 0.30 mA

footshock to limit ongoing exploration. Following this shock, rats were administered 5 consecutive 1 sec,

0.05 mA shocks, each separated by 10 sec. After these 5 shocks, the procedure was repeated with blocks

of increasingly intense shocks, increasing by 0.05 mA with each block. Motor reactivity was evaluated

during testing, according to previously published criteria (Bonnet and Peterson, 1975). Briefly, motor

reactivity was separated into 4 categories: 0: no movement, 1: flinch of a paw or a startle response, 2:

elevation of one or two paws, 3: rapid movement of three or all paws. When 3 out of 5 shocks at a

particular intensity elicited level 3+ motor reactivity, the session was terminated. CNO/vehicle tests

were counterbalanced, and administered 48 hrs apart.

Ultrasonic Vocalization Responses to Shock

To further query affective shock responses, rats (n = 16) were administered 2 shock-induced ultrasonic

vocalization tests after counterbalanced vehicle or CNO, held 48 hrs apart. Recordings again occurred in

a chamber in which they had not been previously tested. Sessions began with illumination of the

houselight, and following a 2 min baseline period, rats received 5 unsignaled footshocks (1 sec, 0.75

mA), each separated by 1 min. Recordings were made with condenser ultrasound microphones

(frequency range: 10–200 kHz; CM16/CMPA, Avisoft Bioacoustics, Berlin, Germany) that were centered

atop the operant chamber and pointed directly toward the center of the chamber (~18 cm above the

floor). USV recordings were made on an UltraSoundGate 416H data acquisition device (Avisoft

Bioacoustics; sampling rate 250 kHz; 16-bit resolution), as reported previously (Mahler et al., 2013b).

Spectrograms were visualized using Avisoft software, and ultrasonic vocalizations (USVs) were manually

quantified by an observer blind to experimental conditions. Aversion-related 22 kHz USVs were

operationalized as 18-30 kHz with a duration greater than 10 ms, and positive affect-related high

frequency USVs were operationalized as those >30 kHz frequency, with a duration greater than 10 ms.

General Locomotor Activity

General locomotor activity was assessed in a locomotor testing chamber (43 × 43 × 30.5 cm) with

corncob bedding. Following two daily 2 hr habituation sessions, infrared beams captured horizontal

distance traveled and number of vertical rears following vehicle/CNO injections (counterbalanced tests,

48 hrs apart).

Statistics and Analyses

Graphpad Prism and SPSS were used for all statistical analyses. CNO and vehicle tests were

counterbalanced for each experiment. An independent samples *t*-test was used to compare %Fos in

ipsilateral mCherry+ VP neurons versus %Fos in contralateral hM4Di-mCherry neurons following

bicuculline microinjection and systemic CNO injection. Male and female footshock intensities required

on the risky decision task were compared with an independent samples *t*-test. For the risky decision

task, reward magnitude discrimination, and motor shock reactivity tasks, effects of drug and block were

analyzed with separate two-way ANOVAs in GAD1:Cre and WT rats, along with Sidak posthoc tests. Win-

stay and lose-shift behavior was characterized on choice trials, and analyzed with separate paired

sample *t*-tests for GAD1:Cre and WT rats. Win-stay was operationalized as the number of risky choices

after a non-shocked risky choice, divided by the total number of non-shocked risky choices, whereas

lose-shift was the number of safe choices followed by a shocked risky choice, divided by the total

number of shocked risky choices. In addition, we performed two-way ANOVAs with treatment (vehicle

and CNO) and genotype (WT and GAD1:Cre) as factors for relevant comparisons, along with a third

factor (bin) for risk task data. Pearson's correlation was used to determine whether footshock intensity

employed in the risky decision task correlated with pressing for the large/risky over the small/safe

option. Separate one-way ANOVAs were conducted to ask whether latency to press the small/safe or

large/risky options increased across the session when tested with vehicle treatment. Latency data for

the risky decision task excluded all trials in which omissions occurred. For avoidance/escape task, FR1,

and progressive ratio tasks, effects of CNO versus vehicle in GAD1:Cre and WT rats were analyzed with

paired sample t-tests. Due to the high variability in USV production among rats, all USV data were

analyzed as percent of vehicle test day, and compared to 100% with one-sample t-test. Sample sizes

were chosen based on those used in prior experiments (Simon and Setlow, 2012; Orsini et al., 2017;

Farrell et al., 2019). Two-tailed tests with a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ were used for all analyses.

357   **Results**

Selective, Functional hM4Di Expression in VP[GABA] Neurons

GAD1:Cre rats exhibited hM4Di-mCherry expression (n = 53) that was largely localized within substance

P-defined VP borders (**Fig 1A-B**). Specifically, at the center of expression, mean $\pm$ SEM = 68.9% ± 1.2 of

total viral expression area was localized within VP, and in behaviorally tested rats 68.8% ± 1.3 of VP area

contained mCherry expression. At least 55% of DREADD expressing cells were localized within VP

borders of included rats, though most animals also had at least some expression in adjacent GABAergic

structures. At least some extra-VP expression was observed in lateral preoptic area of 20.8% of rats, bed

nucleus of the stria terminalis (30.2%), horizontal limb of the diagonal band of Broca (66%), and globus

pallidus (15.1% of rats). Verifying specificity of expression, we used RNAscope to show that mCherry

mRNA was largely colocalized with GABA-specific markers *gad1* and *vgat* mRNA in VP (mCherry+gad1+:

m = 91.28 ± 2.6; mCherry+vgat+: m = 91.58 ± 2.75) (data not shown). The vast majority of these neurons

were triple labeled for *mCherry*, *gad1*, and *vgat* (mCherry+gad1+vgat+: m = 87.92 ± 2.58), indicating

robust expression in GABAergic VP neurons. Little mCherry expression was detected in vglut2+ neurons

(mCherry+vglut2+: m = 8.42 ± 3.42), and of these mCherry+vglut2+ cells, 40.6% also localized with *gad1*

(mCherry+vglut2+gad1+: m = 3.42 ± 1.08) (**Fig 1C-E**), possibly indicating co-expression of GABA and

glutamate in some pallidal neurons (Meye et al., 2016; Faget et al., 2018; Farrell et al., 2019).

To verify that hM4Di DREADDs measurably inhibit neural activity in VP^{GABA} neurons, we

administered CNO systemically to GAD1:Cre rats (*n* = 3) with unilateral VP GAD1-dependent expression

of hM4Di+mCherry, and contralateral VP GAD1-dependent mCherry only. We then pharmacologically

disinhibited VP neurons bilaterally, using microinjections of the GABA$_A$ antagonist, bicuculine (0.01

µg/0.5 µL), which robustly induces VP Fos (Smith and Berridge, 2005; Turner et al., 2008). As expected,

fewer mCherry+Fos VP neurons were found in the hM4Di-expressing hemisphere than the mCherry

hemisphere (**Fig 1F**; t_2 = 18.12, *p* = 0.003), despite the fact that cannulae localizations were equivalent in

each hemisphere. These results demonstrate that CNO, via actions at hM4Di, is capable of suppressing

Fos in pharmacologically disinhibited VP^{GABA} cells, presumably by recruiting endogenous G$_{i/o}$ signaling

(Pleil et al., 2015; Roth, 2016).

Inhibiting VP^{GABA} Neurons Reduces Risky Choices

Rats (*n* = 45) performed the risk task as expected, shifting their choices from the large reward when

chance of shock was low, to the smaller but unpunished reward as the probability of shock increased

(**Fig 2A**; GAD1:Cre rats main effect of block: $F_{(4, 96)}$ = 40.68, *p* < 0.0001; rats: $F_{(4, 32)}$ = 13.4, *p* < 0.0001).

Male rats required higher average shock intensities than female rats (**Fig 2B**, t_{40} = 5.6, *p* < 0.0001), as

reported previously (Orsini et al., 2016). However, after this individualized shock titration, males and

females performed equivalently on the task; similarly shifting their choice from the large/risky to the

small/safe reward option as shock probability increased (block: $F_{(4, 179)}$ = 76.5, p < 0.0001). Importantly,

no sex differences were detected for percent choice of the risky option (**Fig 2C**, sex: $F_{(1, 179)}$ = 0.19, n.s.;

block x sex interaction: $F_{(4, 179)}$ = 0.07, n.s.). Shock intensity required for stable behavior in each GAD1:Cre

rat did not predict the subsequent magnitude of VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition effects; i.e. shock intensity did

not correlate with CNO effects (CNO day - vehicle day) on large/risky lever pressing (r = 0.14, n.s.) nor on

small/safe pressing (r = -0.05, n.s.).

In GAD1:Cre rats (n = 30), CNO reduced choice of the large, risky reward option (**Fig 2D**,

treatment: $F_{(1, 24)}$ = 4.62, p = 0.042). Though no significant overall treatment x block interaction was

detected, block-specific comparisons revealed that suppression of choice of the large reward was

statistically different during the 50% (Sidak: p = 0.0014) and 75% (Sidak: p = 0.038) blocks, but not at the

0, 25, or 100% shock probability blocks (all n.s.). To further probe effects of VP^{GABA} inhibition on the

ability of positive or negative experiences to adjust ongoing behavior, we performed a win-stay/lose-

shift analysis (Onge et al., 2011). CNO, relative to vehicle, did not alter the proportion of trials in which

either win-stay (Vehicle: m ± SEM = 0.70 ± 0.055; CNO: m = 0.69 ± 0.036; t_{18} = 0.18, n.s.) or lose-shift

occurred (Vehicle: m = 0.42 ± 0.062; CNO: m = 0.49 ± 0.076; t_{18} = 0.71, n.s.), indicating that the effects of

VP^{GABA} inhibition on choice were not driven by altered sensitivity to outcomes of recent choices. As

expected, latency to press the large/risky reward option increased as the footshock probability

increased (one-way ANOVA for vehicle day data: $F_{(4, 118)}$ = 7.21, p < 0.0001), which did not occur for

latency to press the small/safe reward option ($F_{(4, 119)}$ = 1.44 n.s.). CNO selectively increased the latency

to press the large/risky reward option (**Fig 3A**, treatment: $F_{(1, 231)}$ = 13.5, p = 0.0003), especially when the

uncertainty of footshock was maximum; during the 50% footshock block (Sidak posthoc: p = 0.0053). In

contrast, CNO failed to impact latency to press the small/safe reward option (**Fig 3B**, $F_{(1, 237)}$ = 1.29, n.s.).

CNO also increased the total number of omitted trials, especially in the blocks with the highest

probability of shock (**Fig 3C**, treatment x block interaction: $F_{(4, 96)}$ = 11.91, p < 0.0001; Sidak posthoc: 50%

block: $p = 0.0006$; 75%: $p < 0.0001$; 100%: $p < 0.0001$). In addition, due to decreased pressing of the

large/risky option and increased omissions, CNO-treated GAD1:Cre rats obtained fewer rewards overall

than on vehicle day (treatment: $F_{(1, 24)} = 6.95$, $p = 0.015$, data not shown).

VP^{GABA} Inhibition Effects are Specific to Risky Choices: No Effect on Reward Magnitude Discrimination

Reward Magnitude Discrimination

A separate group of GAD1:Cre rats ($n = 8$) were trained as described above, but in the absence of shock,

to confirm their ability to discriminate reward magnitude after VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition. As expected,

rats nearly exclusively chose the large reward over the small one during training, and after vehicle

treatment (vehicle day: large versus small reward: $t_7 = 11.11$, p < 0.0001). After CNO, GAD1:Cre rats

showed a nearly identical preference as on their vehicle test day (**Fig 4A,** treatment: $F_{(1, 56)} = 1.08$, n.s.),

showing that VP^{GABA} inhibition does not affect rats' preference for a large reward over a small one. This

said, as in the task where the larger reward was associated with a probabilistic shock, CNO increased

omitted trials (**Fig 4B,** treatment x block interaction: $F_{(4, 24)} = 4.0$, $p = 0.013$), and decreased total rewards

obtained (**Fig 4C,** treatment x block interaction $F_{(4, 24)} = 3.73$, $p = 0.017$), consistent with an overall

reduction in motivation. Posthoc tests revealed that CNO increased omissions only in the 3rd block (Sidak

posthoc: $p < 0.01$) and 4th block ($p < 0.05$), and similarly only decreased rewards obtained in the 3rd

(Sidak posthoc: $p < 0.01$) and 4th ($p < 0.05$) blocks. Emergence of satiety in later blocks likely accounts for

why the 5th block of trials converged for both omissions and rewards obtained, as a significant main

effect of block was observed for both omissions ($F_{(4, 24)} = 21.4$, $p < 0.001$) and rewards obtained ($F_{(4, 24)} =$

19.4, $p < 0.001$). However, CNO did not impact choice latency relative to vehicle (treatment: $F_{(1, 59)} =$

0.86, n.s.), unlike in the shock version of the task where CNO selectively increased latency to press the

large/risky lever. The lack of effect on choice latencies induced by VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition in this

experiment suggest that the increased decision times observed on the risky decision task were not

attributable to a generalized psychomotor slowing, but rather to increased deliberation time in weighing

the costs and benefits of the risky choice.

Inhibiting VP^{GABA} Neurons Suppresses Instrumental Responding for High Value Foods, without

Impairing General Locomotion

<u>Similar Suppression of Palatable Food Responding During Hunger and Satiety</u>

We examined effects of inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons on low effort (FR1) operant responding for highly

palatable banana pellets. When GAD1:Cre rats (n = 10) were tested under mild food restriction, CNO

reduced active port responding (**Fig 5A**: t_9 = 2.58, p = 0.03), without affecting inactive port responding (t_9

= 0.79, n.s.). Effects of VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition were similar when rats were tested in the same manner

while maintained on *ad libitum* chow 23 hrs/day (**Fig 5B**, active port responses: t_9 = 2.65, p = 0.027,

inactive: t_9 = 0.97, n.s.), indicating that VP^{GABA} neurons are required for low effort instrumental pursuit of

a highly salient, palatable reward regardless of physiological need state.

<u>Suppression of Responding for Less-Palatable Chow Only During Hunger</u>

We next examined effects of inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons on low effort (FR1) operant responding for

standard chow pellets under hunger and satiety conditions (n = 8). Inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons reduced

active port responding for chow when rats were hungry (**Fig 5C**, t_6 = 3.12, p = 0.021), but not when they

were fed ad libitum (**Fig 5D**, t_6 = 0.89, n.s.), as shown by the significant interaction between hunger state

and vehicle/CNO treatment ($F_{1, 6}$ = 6.31, p = 0.046). However, we note that responding for chow during

satiety was quite low in some animals, raising the possibility of a floor effect.

<u>Robust Suppression of High-Effort Palatable Food Seeking</u>

When GAD1:Cre rats (n = 22) were trained on a progressive ratio to stably respond for palatable banana

pellets, CNO suppressed breakpoint (**Fig 6A-B**, t_{21} = 2.4, p = 0.026), and trended toward suppressing

active port responses (vehicle: m = 1050 ± 136.7, CNO: m = 847.5 ± 122.4; t_{21} = 2.0, p = 0.059). The low

number of inactive port responses was unaffected (vehicle: m = 15.8 ± 2.9, CNO: m = 18.3 ± 4.0; t_{21} =

0.53, n.s.).

<u>Non-Operant Spontaneous Intake of Palatable Food is Unaffected</u>

To determine effects of VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition on spontaneous intake of a highly palatable sweet and

fatty food meal (*n* = 12), we examined 2 hr intake of peanut butter M&M™ candies, placed directly on

the floor of a familiar testing chamber. CNO failed to affect intake (g) in GAD1:Cre rats (**Fig 6C**, t_{11} = 1.24,

n.s.).

<u>Locomotor Activity</u>

Effects of VP^{GABA} inhibition with CNO treatment failed to alter either horizontal locomotion or rearing

behavior in GAD1:Cre rats (*n* = 12) (Distance travelled: vehicle m = 12026 ± 1006 cm, CNO m = 13185 ±

1601 cm, t_{11} = 0.71, n.s.; Rearing: vehicle m = 183.6 ± 17.1 rears, CNO m = 188 ± 22.7 rears, t_{11} = 0.20,

n.s.).

Inhibiting VP^{GABA} Neurons Decreases Motivation to Avoid Footshock Without Impacting Motor or

Affective Reactions to Shock

<u>Latency to Avoid Footshock Increases after VP^{GABA} Neuron Inhibition</u>

VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition suppressed operant risky decision making and food seeking, so we next sought

to determine whether this manipulation also affects negatively reinforced operant responding (*n* = 11).

CNO did not affect the overall propensity of rats to avoid shocks rather than to escape them (**Fig 7A**,

change from baseline avoidance%: t_{10} = 1.50, n.s.; Vehicle: m = 38.82 ± 5.71; CNO: m = 28.96 ± 5.07; raw

%avoidance: t_{10} = 2.2, *p* = 0.053), suggesting that their general strategy was not altered by this

manipulation. However, CNO selectively increased latency to press to avoid shock in GAD1:Cre rats (**Fig**

7B, t_{10} = 2.60, *p* = 0.027), consistent with reduced motivation to avoid the impending, signaled shock.

Escape latency was not similarly impacted by CNO (**Fig 7C**, t_{10} = 1.36, n.s.), indicating that rats were still

fully capable of pressing to terminate an ongoing shock.

<u>No Effects on Motor or Affective Responses to Shock</u>

As expected, shock-induced motor reactivity scores parametrically increased with footshock intensity

(**Fig 8A,** GAD1:Cre block: $F_{(6, 112)}$ = 100.9, $p < 0.0001$). Motor reactivity scores were not affected by CNO in

GAD1:Cre rats (n = 11) (treatment: $F_{(1, 112)}$ = 0.27, n.s.), nor was the maximum shock intensity endured

altered (vehicle m = 0.27 ± 0.017 mA; CNO m = 0.29 ± 0.014 mA, t_{10} = 0.94, n.s.).

<u>No Effect on Shock-Induced Negative Affective Vocalizations</u>

We also examined aversion-related 22 kHz ultrasonic vocalizations emitted in response to repeated,

moderate intensity shocks (0.75 mA/1 sec, delivered every min for 5 min). These USVs were in the

frequency range of well-characterized aversion-related USVs (Knutson et al., 2002; Portfors, 2007;

Mahler et al., 2013b), with a mean frequency of m = 23.5 ± 1.1 kHz, and a mean duration of m = 1306.4

± 142.1 ms. CNO failed to alter the number of 22 kHz vocalizations emitted in GAD1:Cre rats (n = 10) (**Fig**

8C, % of vehicle day USVs, compared to 100% with one sample t-test: t_9 = 1.5, n.s.). We also observed

some vocalizations >30 kHz, linked to positive affect (Knutson et al., 2002; Portfors, 2007; Brudzynski,

2013). These vocalizations, however, occurred largely during the 2 min pre-footshock baseline (high

frequency USVs/min on vehicle test for GAD1:Cre and WT: m = 46.4 ± 14.8) compared to the subsequent

5 min intermittent footshock period (m = 9.6 ± 5.8; pre-footshock vs. footshock period: t_{14}=3.16, p =

0.0069). Production of these high frequency vocalizations was also unaffected by CNO treatment (% of

vehicle day USVs, compared to 100% with one sample t-test: t_9 = 1.74, n.s.).

Minimal DREADD-Independent Effects of CNO

Across all nine behavioral tasks implemented here, we saw few non-specific effects of CNO in WT rats

lacking DREADD expression. In the risky decision task, administering CNO to WT rats did not affect risky

choice (**Fig 2E**, treatment x block ANOVA, no main effect of treatment: $F_{(1, 8)}$ = 0.055, n.s.), though an

overall ANOVA did not reveal a significant three-way interaction of treatment, genotype, and block ($F_{(4,}$

$_{154)}$ = 0.47, n.s.), or a genotype x treatment interaction ($F_{(1,32)}$ = 0.61, n.s.), likely due to the relatively low

WT rat group size. In WT rats, CNO had no effect on total omissions (**Fig 3F**, treatment: $F_{(1, 8)} = 0.60$, n.s.),

total rewards obtained (treatment: $F_{(1, 8)} = 0.044$, n.s.), or latency to press for either large/risky (**Fig 3D**,

treatment: $F_{(1, 77)} = 2.68$, n.s.) or small/safe rewards (**Fig 3E,** treatment: $F_{(1, 77)} = 0.91$, n.s.), though no

significant genotype x treatment x block interactions were detected for these variables ($p > 0.05$).

CNO also failed to alter FR1 responding for palatable pellets in either food-deprived (**Fig 5E**, active

vehicle versus CNO: $t_5 = 0.036$, n.s.; inactive: $t_5 = 1.04$, n.s.) or sated WT rats (**Fig 5F**; active: $t_5 = 1.01$,

n.s.; inactive: $t_5 = 1.04$, n.s.), and a significant genotype x treatment interaction further demonstrate this

DREADD-specific effect in sated rats (genotype x treatment interaction; active lever: $F_{(1, 14)} = 5.70$, $p =$

0.032), though not significantly so for food-deprived ones (genotype x treatment interaction; active

lever: $F_{(1, 14)} = 1.89$, n.s.). Progressive ratio responding for palatable pellets was also unaffected by CNO

in WT rats (**Fig 6D-E**, breakpoint: $t_{16} = 0.63$, n.s.; active nosepokes: $t_{16} = 0.54$, n.s.; inactive nosepokes: t_{16}

$= 0.59$, n.s.), as was spontaneous M&M consumption (**Fig 6F**, $t_5 = 0.41$, n.s.). A significant genotype x

treatment interaction was found for breakpoint on the progressive ratio task (genotype x treatment

interaction breakpoint: $F_{(1, 37)} = 4.49$, $p = 0.041$), but this was not significant for spontaneous M&M

consumption (genotype x treatment interaction: $F_{(1, 16)} = 1.11$, n.s.). Likewise, CNO in WT rats did not

impact general locomotion (vehicle m = 13621 ± 2580 cm, CNO m = 16768 ± 3039 cm, $t_5 = 1.02$, n.s.) or

rearing (vehicle m = 197.8 ± 29.7 rears, CNO m = 174 ± 26.7 rears, $t_5 = 0.56$, n.s.), and the genotype x

treatment interactions were also non-significant (locomotion: $F_{(1, 16)} = 0.40$, n.s.; rearing: $F_{(1, 16)} = 0.42$,

n.s.).

Shock-related behaviors were also largely unaffected in WTs by CNO, including motor reactions

to shock (**Fig 8B**, treatment: $F_{(1, 33)} = 0.85$, n.s.), maximum shock intensity tolerated (vehicle: m = 0.22 ±

0.012; CNO: m = 0.21 ± 0.019; $t_4 = 1.0$, n.s.), avoidance propensity (**Fig 7D**, change from baseline

avoidance%: vehicle day raw percentage: m = 42.08 ± 10.73, CNO day raw percentage: m = 28.96 ± 9.07,

$t_6 = 1.54$, n.s.), or avoidance latency (**Fig 7E**, $t_6 = 0.064$, n.s.), though raw avoidance% was modestly

decreased by CNO in WT rats (t_6 = 2.9, p = 0.027). No significant genotype x treatment interaction was

found for either avoidance propensity ($F_{(1, 16)}$ = 0.0002, n.s.) or avoidance latency ($F_{(1, 16)}$ = 1.79, n.s.).

Both 22 kHz (aversion-related) and >30 kHz (positive affect-related) USVs were unchanged by CNO in WT

rats (**Fig 8C**, % of vehicle day USVs, compared to 100% with one sample t-test, 22kHz: t_4 = 1.0, n.s.; >30

kHz: t_4 = 0.96, n.s.). CNO in WT rats trended towards increasing latency to escape (**Fig 7F**, t_6 = 2.2, p =

0.07), though no genotype x treatment interaction was found ($F_{(1, 16)}$ = 0.14, n.s.).

540   **Discussion**

541   Here we show that VP^{GABA} neurons play a fundamental role in high-stakes motivation, and

thereby affect risky decision making strategies. Engaging G$_{i/o}$ signaling in VP^{GABA} neurons with DREADDs

interfered with both operant pursuit of desirable foods, as well as operant response to cancel an

impending shock. In contrast, VP^{GABA} neurons play no apparent role in pursuit of less valuable food, in

spontaneous food consumption, or in affective responses to shock itself. This selective VP^{GABA} neuron

involvement in motivated operant responding may therefore extend beyond the pursuit of rewards, into

avoidance of harm. Accordingly, when both opportunity and risk are present (as is usually the case in the

natural world), VP^{GABA} inhibition biased decision making toward a more conservative, risk-averse

strategy. Collectively, these results show that VP^{GABA} neurons crucially influence high-stakes decision

making, and thus likely contribute to both the normal desires of life, and to darker pursuits in those with

disorders of impaired judgement like addiction.

VP^{GABA} Neuron Inhibition Promotes Conservative Decision Making by Suppressing Motivation

553   In a risky decision making task, chemogenetically inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons promoted selection

of a small but safe option over a large but risky one, without impairing the ability to discriminate

between rewards of different magnitudes. VP^{GABA} inhibition also increased trial omissions and decreased

the number of rewards obtained in the presence or absence of shock—consistent with decreased

motivation for food. Similar increases in latency and omissions have been shown following optogenetic

inhibition of all VP neurons in operant assays of sucrose seeking (Richard et al., 2016). Yet VP[GABA]

inhibition effects were not merely motivational in nature—food seeking was not indiscriminately

suppressed. Instead, VP[GABA] inhibited rats shifted more readily to a small but safe reward option,

avoiding the large but risky one, even when the risk of shock was relatively low. Moreover, when rats

did select the large/risky choice, VP[GABA] inhibition caused them to deliberate longer—an effect which

was not present on trials when the small/safe option was chosen. In contrast, when VP[GABA] neuron

inhibition occurred in a low stakes (no shock) version of the task, no such effects on choice latency were

seen. In other words, inhibiting VP[GABA] neurons seemed to selectively promote a more conservative, risk-

averse decision making strategy by suppressing appetitive motivation.

567   Of course, VP does not act alone to influence risky choice, but rather within wider

mesocorticolimbic circuits that integrate motivational states with encountered opportunities and

threats, in pursuit of generating maximally adaptive behavior under motivational conflict. Indeed,

numerous brain regions contribute to risky decision making in rats, including prefrontal cortices,

basolateral amygdala, lateral habenula, ventral tegmental area, and nucleus accumbens (NAc) (Floresco

et al., 2008; Orsini et al., 2015b). Notably, lateral orbitofrontal cortex lesions have similar effects on

latency and propensity to make risky choices as VP[GABA] neuron inhibition did here (Orsini et al., 2015a),

implying functional, if not direct anatomical interactions between these structures (Simmons et al.,

2014). Interestingly, activating D2 dopamine receptors in VP's largest afferent input, the GABAergic NAc,

similarly promotes risk-averse behavior in adolescent rats (Mitchell et al., 2014). Though infusion of a D2

agonist in NAc would likely disinhibit (excite) VP neurons (Gallo et al., 2018), paradoxically we find here

that *inhibiting* VP[GABA] neurons with DREADDs causes a similarly risk-averse phenotype. Reconciling these

findings is an important future direction, and could involve experience-related plasticity in D1 (i.e.

"direct pathway") versus D2 (i.e. "indirect pathway") inputs from NAc (Kupchik et al., 2015; Creed et al.,

2016; Heinsbroek et al., 2017; O'Neal et al., 2019), differences between adolescent and adult decision

making processes (Spear, 2000), currently-unknown specificity of NAc inputs to VP cell subpopulations

(e.g. glutamate versus GABA), or potentially non-NAc inputs to VP that may influence reward-seeking

decisions (Richard et al., 2016; Ottenheimer et al., 2018).

Role for VP[GABA] Neurons in Seeking High Value Food, without Affecting Food Consumption

Having found that VP[GABA] neuron perturbation stifled risky choice, we next sought to determine

how inhibiting these neurons impacts "pure" tests of food seeking and intake, in the absence of

potential harm. VP's role in food ingestion and hedonics has been known for decades (Morgane, 1961;

Stratford et al., 1999; Castro et al., 2015), though how VP neuronal subtypes participate in this was

unclear. Here, we show that chemogenetically inhibiting VP[GABA] neurons suppresses operant pursuit of

high-value foods like palatable pellets under both low and high effort conditions. In contrast, pursuit of

less palatable chow was affected by VP[GABA] inhibition only when this food was valued because rats were

hungry. These results suggest that VP[GABA] neurons selectively promote seeking of high-value rewards,

regardless of whether value is instantiated by the inherent palatability of the food, by the presence of

hunger, or by the necessity to pay a cost such as effortful responding, or potential for shock.

Interestingly, whereas inhibiting VP[GABA] neurons decreased operant pursuit of valuable food

rewards, it did not impair spontaneous consumption of palatable chocolate, suggesting that these

neurons mediate instrumental *seeking* of high value rewards, but not necessarily *consumption* of the

reward, once obtained. Neurobiological dissociation between seeking and consumption has been

previously shown within ventral striatal networks (Berridge and Robinson, 2003). For example, intra-NAc

dopamine antagonism diminishes operant reward seeking, but leaves reward consumption unimpaired

(Kelley et al., 2005; Salamone and Correa, 2012). Similarly, inhibiting VP impairs conditioned food or salt

seeking, without impacting unconditioned consumption of these rewards (Farrar et al., 2008; Chang et

al., 2017). Our results extend these findings, showing that VP[GABA] neurons in particular are required for

pursuit, but not consumption of food. This said, VP stimulation with opioid agonist or GABA antagonist

drugs robustly increases chow consumption, and opioid drugs also enhance hedonic reactivity to sweet

tastes (Smith and Berridge, 2005, 2007). In addition, VP lesions suppress all food intake, and lesioned

animals will starve without forced feeding (Cromwell and Berridge, 1993). Given these findings, the

present results could suggest lack of VP^{GABA} neuron involvement in these consummatory effects, or they

could be a product of mechanistic differences between DREADDs and lesions, or other unknown factors.

VP^{GABA} Neurons and Appetitive versus Aversive Motivation

A recent surge of studies suggest that VP^{GABA} neurons promote appetitive behavior and reward,

whereas intermingled VP glutamate neurons instead mediate behavioral withdrawal and aversion. For

example, VP^{GABA} neurons fire in response to water rewards and their predictors in mice, especially when

those rewards are particularly valuable due to thirst (Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020). Optogenetic

activation of mouse VP^{GABA} neurons elicits food intake and operant water seeking (Zhu et al., 2017;

Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020) and is reinforcing (Zhu et al., 2017; Faget et al., 2018), while optogenetic

stimulation of VP glutamate neurons elicits aversive responses and promotes operant avoidance (Faget

et al., 2018; Tooley et al., 2018; Levi et al., 2019; Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020)—though a recent report

suggests that VP glutamate neurons may mediate salience irrespective of valence (Wang et al., 2020).

None of these prior mouse studies indicated a role for VP^{GABA} neurons in aversive motivation, but they

did not examine more complex types of aversive responding.

To address the function of VP^{GABA} neurons further, we examined the contribution of VP^{GABA}

neurons to shock-induced affective responses, and to instrumental responding to avoid or escape

shocks. Inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons failed to impact shock-induced motor reactions or ultrasonic

vocalizations, suggesting that these cells do not mediate aversion *per se*. However, when rats were

trained to press a lever either to avoid an impending shock or to escape an ongoing one, DREADD

inhibition revealed a hidden role for VP^{GABA} neurons in aversive motivation. Specifically, the latency to

629 press a lever in order to cancel an impending shock was increased by VP^{GABA} inhibition, while latency to

630 press to escape an ongoing shock was unaffected. Together, these data show that VP^{GABA} inhibition

631 affected neither affective reactions to shock itself, nor the ability of an ongoing shock to induce escape

632 responses. Instead, VP^{GABA}-inhibited rats simply appeared to less urgently avoid impending punishment

633 (though the proportion of trials escaped versus avoided was not altered). This increase in avoidance

634 latency represents a departure from the common notion that VP^{GABA} neurons are solely implicated in

635 appetitive behavior. Rather, these neurons seem instead to facilitate high-stakes instrumental behavior

636 of many types. This said, we note that when rats pressed to avoid footshock, they also received a 20 sec

637 signal indicating freedom from impending threat. It is therefore possible that DREADD inhibition did not

638 impact aversive motivation itself, but instead reduced the conditioned reinforcing properties of this

639 safety signal (Fernando et al., 2014). Dissociating avoidance of harm from pursuit of safety is famously

640 difficult (LeDoux et al., 2017; Sangha et al., 2020), so further work is needed to disambiguate this newly-

641 discovered role for VP^{GABA} neurons in aversive motivation.

642 <u>Specificity of Effects</u>

643  We found very little evidence of non-selective effects of CNO in WT rats without DREADDs. In

644 the absence of DREADDs, CNO can have off-target behavioral effects in some experiments (MacLaren et

645 al., 2016; Gomez et al., 2017; Manvich et al., 2018). Yet across the numerous behaviors tested here, we

646 identified only a trend towards an increase in escape latency in WT rats—indicating predominantly

647 DREADD-specific effects of CNO (Mahler and Aston-Jones, 2018). In addition, although VP is sometimes

648 considered a motor structure (Mogenson et al., 1980; Heimer et al., 1982), it is unlikely that VP^{GABA}

649 DREADD effects were due to nonspecific motoric inhibition. Neither horizontal locomotion nor rearing

650 behavior were affected by engaging VP^{GABA} DREADDs, and behavioral effects were specific to highly-

651 motivated instrumental contexts—other behaviors like spontaneous chocolate intake, and pressing for

652 chow in a sated state were unaffected.

VP DREADD expression was mostly localized within strictly-defined VP borders here, though in

most rats at least some expression encroached upon nearby subcortical structures containing GABAergic

neurons with important behavioral roles (Koob, 2004; Silberman et al., 2009; Jennings et al., 2013;

Barker et al., 2017; Saga et al., 2017; Gordon-Fennell et al., 2020), so we cannot definitively exclude

overlapping roles for these neurons in behavioral effects.

Similar to our prior findings (Farrell et al., 2019), we saw no evidence of sex-dependent

behavioral effects of chemogenetic VP manipulation, though we also cannot exclude this possibility

since studies were not powered to fully explore this variable.

We note that a portion of VP^{GABA} neurons also express other peptides such as parvalbumin and

enkephalin, and such co-expression may have functional implications. For example, VP parvalbumin

neurons, which consist of both GABAergic and glutamatergic neurons, are necessary for both alcohol

seeking and depression-like behavior (Knowland et al., 2017; Prasad et al., 2020). Moreover, VP^{GABA}

neurons that co-express enkephalin drive cue-induced cocaine seeking (Heinsbroek et al., 2019). A

significant portion of these VP subpopulations also express GABA markers, though others are

glutamatergic. Since VP glutamate and GABA neurons have dissociable roles in behavior (Faget et al.,

2018; Tooley et al., 2018; Stephenson-Jones et al., 2020), further work is needed to parse the relative

functional roles played by VP cells expressing GABA, glutamate, various co-expressed proteins, and

combinations thereof.

<u>Conclusion</u>

These results demonstrate an essential role for VP^{GABA} neurons in high-stakes motivated behavior—be it

to pursue valued rewards, to avoid impending harm, or to make important decisions when motivations

are mixed. We show for the first time that VP^{GABA} neurons' role in motivation impacts decision making,

since inhibiting these cells yields a conservative, risk-averse decision-making strategy rather than a

simple decrease in all reward seeking. If successfully harnessed therapeutically, we speculate that

suppressing VP^{GABA} neuron activity might be useful for treating addiction, or other disorders of

maladaptive, risky decision making.

Acknowledgements

We thank Erik Castillo and Christina Ruiz for technical assistance, Andrew M. Delamater for helpful

comments on these data, and Ronald E. See for assistance with data collection.

Figure 1. Anatomical, cellular, and functional characterization of hM4Di DREADDs in VP^{GABA} neurons. A) Localization of DIO-hM4Di-mCherry in substance P-defined VP borders. Top left panel: DIO-hM4Di-mCherry in VP. Top right panel: substance P demarcates VP from surrounding basal forebrain. Bottom: Merged DIO-hM4Di-mCherry and substance P image. AC = anterior commissure. Scale bar = 400 μm. **B)** Mapping of viral expression for each individual rat expressing hM4Di DREADDs. Numbers represent rostral/caudal coordinates relative to bregma. Green = substance P-defined VP. Red=DIO-hM4Di-mCherry expression. **C)** RNAscope fluorescent in situ hybridization for gad1, vglut2 and mcherry mRNA, with DAPI co-stain. Scale bar = 200 μm. **D)** Higher magnification of mRNA signal; Scale bar = 20 μm. Green star: mCherry+gad1; white star: mCherry+vglut2; yellow star: mCherry+gad1+vglut2. **E)** Identity of mCherry cells in VP. mCherry co-localized largely with gad1 mRNA (green bar), with few mCherry+ neurons expressing vglut2 mRNA. A small population of mCherry+ neurons expressed both gad1 and vglut2 (green+white gradient), and some cells lacked observable gad1 or vglut2 mRNA and only expressed mCherry (red). **F)** Schematic illustrating bilateral bicuculline (0.01 μg/0.5 μL) microinjection and systemic CNO (5 mg/kg) in rats with ipsilateral mCherry and contralateral hM4Di+mCherry in VP^{GABA} neurons (left image, Fos = green, red = mCherry; right image, Fos = green, red = hM4Di+mCherry). White arrows indicate colocalization of Fos in mCherry+ neurons. Scale bars = 40 μm. **G)** CNO reduced %mCherry+ cells colocalized with Fos in hM4Di+mCherry neurons, compared with contralateral mCherry only neurons. **$p < 0.01$, independent sample t-test. Each graph depicts mean + SEM, with dots representing individual rats.

Figure 2. Inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons reduces risky choice. A) Schematic of risky decision task modified from (Simon et al., 2009). Sessions consisted of forced choice trials (1 available option; small/safe or large/risky) and free choice trials (2 available options; small/safe and large/risky), with ascending footshock probability associated with selection of the large/risky reward option. **B)** Male rats required a higher shock intensity than females for appropriate performance of the risky decision task, as previously reported (Orsini et al., 2016). **C)** Equivalent average performance of male and female rats on the risky decision task with shock titration. **D)** GAD1:Cre rats administered CNO (red line) exhibit a decrease in %choice of the risky option relative to vehicle-treated rats (black line). **E)** No effect of CNO (teal line) in WT rats compared with vehicle treatment (black line). ***$p < 0.0001$, Independent sample t-test; *$p < 0.05$, treatment main effect. Semi-transparent lines represent data from individual rats tested with CNO (red/teal) or vehicle (black). Each graph depicts mean + SEM.

Figure 3. VP^{GABA} neuron inhibition increases latency to select the large/risky option, and trial omissions. A-C) In GAD1:Cre rats, CNO (red lines) increased the latency to press the large/risky reward lever, relative to vehicle day in the same rats (black lines; ###$p < 0.001$, treatment main effect). **B)** In contrast, CNO in GAD1:Cre rats did not affect latency to press the small/safe reward lever. **C)** CNO in GAD1:Cre rats increased the percentage of trials omitted on high-risk blocks (***$p < 0.001$, treatment x block interaction). **D-F)** In WT rats without VP DREADDs, CNO (teal lines) did not alter **D)** omissions, **E)** latency to press the large/risky reward lever, **F)** or latency to press the small/safe reward option, relative to vehicle day (black lines). Semi-transparent lines represent data from individual rats tested with CNO (red/teal) or vehicle (black). Each graph depicts mean + SEM.

Figure 4. Inhibiting VP^GABA neurons spares the ability to choose between large and small rewards, while decreasing motivation. A) In the absence of shock punishment, CNO-treated GAD1:Cre rats (red line) showed no change in percentage choice of the large (2 pellets) versus small (1 pellet) reward option, compared with vehicle treatment (black line). **B)** GAD1:Cre rats omitted more trials during CNO tests (red line) compared with vehicle treatment (black line). **C)** CNO treatment in GAD1:Cre rats (red line) reduced rewards obtained relative to vehicle (black line). Semi-transparent lines represent data from individual rats tested with CNO (red/teal) or vehicle (black). Each graph depicts mean + SEM. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, Sidak posthoc tests.

Figure 5. Inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons reduces responding for palatable food and chow in hungry rats, but only reduces responding for palatable food (not chow) in sated rats. A-B) In GAD1:Cre rats, CNO (red bars) reduced FR1 active nosepokes for palatable food in **A**) hungry and **B**) sated rats, relative to vehicle treatments (black bars). **C-D)** CNO in GAD1:Cre rats (red bars) reduced FR1 active nosepokes for chow relative to vehicle (black bars) in **C**) hungry , but not **D**) sated rats. **E-F**) No effect of CNO on active nosepokes in WT controls (teal bars) relative to vehicle treatment (black bars) under **E**) hungry or **F**) sated conditions. *$p < 0.05$, paired sample *t*-test. Each graph depicts mean + SEM, and dots represent individual rats.

Figure 6. Inhibiting VP^{GABA} neurons reduces progressive ratio motivation for palatable food, without impairing free access palatable chocolate intake. A) In GAD1:Cre rats, CNO (red bar) reduces breakpoint relative to vehicle (black bar). **B)** Cumulative nosepokes for a representative GAD1:Cre rat during vehicle (black line) and CNO (red line) progressive ratio tests are shown. **C)** CNO in GAD1:Cre rats (red bar) fails to alter 1 hr free access M&M consumption, relative to vehicle test (black bar). **D)** In WT controls, CNO (teal bar) does not affect breakpoint compared with vehicle day (black bar). **E)** Cumulative nosepokes for representative WT rat during vehicle (black line) and CNO (teal line) progressive ratio tests are shown. **F)** CNO in WT rats (teal bar) fails to alter 1 hr free access M&M consumption, relative to vehicle test (black bar). *$p < 0.05$, paired sample t-test. Each graph depicts mean + SEM, and dots represent individual rats.

Figure 7. Inhibiting VP^GABA neurons increases avoidance latency, without affecting avoidance propensity or escape latency. A) CNO did not affect avoidance% in GAD1:Cre rats (red bar) relative to vehicle treatment (black bar) (change in avoidance% on vehicle/CNO test from the day preceding each treatment). **B)** CNO increased latency to lever press to avoid being shocked in GAD1:Cre rats (red bar) compared with vehicle treatment (black bar). **C)** No effect of CNO on escape latency in GAD1:Cre rats. **D-F)** CNO in WT controls (teal bars) failed to impact **D)** avoidance%, **E)** avoidance latency, or **F)** escape latency relative to vehicle treatments (black bars). *$p < 0.05$, paired sample *t*-test. Each graph depicts mean + SEM, and dots represent individual rats.

Figure 8. Motor and affective reactions to footshock unaffected by inhibiting VP^GABA neurons. A) CNO in GAD1:Cre (red line) or in **B)** WT rats (teal line) did not impact shock reactivity index associated with ascending intensity footshocks, relative to vehicle rats (black lines). **C)** CNO in GAD1:Cre rats (red bar) or WT controls (teal bar) failed to alter aversion-related ultrasonic vocalizations during high intensity footshock (0.75 mA) sessions (percent of vehicle test day). Each graph depicts mean + SEM, and dots represent individual rats.

Risky Decision Task	Progressive Ratio	FR1 Palatable (hungry/ sated)	Avoidance/ Escape Task	Motor Reactivity	Ultrasonic Vocalizations	Reward Magnitude Discrimination	FR1 Chow (hungry/ sated)	M&M Free Access	Locomotion
Cohort 1	Cohort 1								
Cohort 2	Cohort 2		Cohort 2	Cohort 2					
Cohort 3	Cohort 3	Cohort 3	Cohort 3		Cohort 3				
	Cohort 4								
						Cohort 5	Cohort 5		
								Cohort 6	Cohort 6

Table 1. Chronological order of behavioral testing for each cohort of rats. Chronological order of behavioral testing for each cohort of rats organized left (first test) to right (last test), with each behavioral test indicated on the top row. Cohort sex breakdown (M=male, F=female): Cohort 1 (7M, 8F), 2 (11M, 5F), 3 (5M, 11F), 4 (4M, 4F), 5 (8M, 0F), 6 (11M, 7F).

References

Armbruster BN, Li X, Pausch MH, Herlitze S, Roth BL (2007) Evolving the lock to fit the key to create a
family of G protein-coupled receptors potently activated by an inert ligand. Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences 104:5163-5168.
Barker DJ, Miranda-Barrientos J, Zhang S, Root DH, Wang H-L, Liu B, Calipari ES, Morales M (2017)
Lateral preoptic control of the lateral habenula through convergent glutamate and GABA
transmission. Cell reports 21:1757-1769.
Berridge KC, Robinson TE (2003) Parsing reward. Trends in neurosciences 26:507-513.
Berridge KC, Kringelbach ML (2015) Pleasure systems in the brain. Neuron 86:646-664.
Bonnet KA, Peterson KE (1975) A modification of the jump-flinch technique for measuring pain
sensitivity in rats. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior 3:47-55.
Brudzynski SM (2013) Ethotransmission: communication of emotional states through ultrasonic
vocalization in rats. Current opinion in neurobiology 23:310-317.
Castro DC, Cole SL, Berridge KC (2015) Lateral hypothalamus, nucleus accumbens, and ventral pallidum
roles in eating and hunger: interactions between homeostatic and reward circuitry. Frontiers in
systems neuroscience 9:90.
Chang SE, Todd TP, Bucci DJ, Smith KS (2015) Chemogenetic manipulation of ventral pallidal neurons
impairs acquisition of sign-tracking in rats. European Journal of Neuroscience 42:3105-3116.
Chang SE, Smedley EB, Stansfield KJ, Stott JJ, Smith KS (2017) Optogenetic inhibition of ventral pallidum
neurons impairs context-driven salt seeking. Journal of Neuroscience 37:5670-5680.
Creed M, Ntamati NR, Chandra R, Lobo MK, Lüscher C (2016) Convergence of reinforcing and anhedonic
cocaine effects in the ventral pallidum. Neuron 92:214-226.
Cromwell HC, Berridge KC (1993) Where does damage lead to enhanced food aversion: the ventral
pallidum/substantia innominata or lateral hypothalamus? Brain research 624:1-10.
Faget L, Zell V, Souter E, McPherson A, Ressler R, Gutierrez-Reed N, Yoo JH, Dulcis D, Hnasko TS (2018)
Opponent control of behavioral reinforcement by inhibitory and excitatory projections from the
ventral pallidum. Nature communications 9:849.
Farrar AM, Font L, Pereira M, Mingote S, Bunce JG, Chrobak JJ, Salamone JD (2008) Forebrain circuitry
involved in effort-related choice: Injections of the GABAA agonist muscimol into ventral
pallidum alter response allocation in food-seeking behavior. Neuroscience 152:321-330.
Farrell MR, Ruiz CM, Castillo E, Faget L, Khanbijian C, Liu S, Schoch H, Rojas G, Huerta MY, Hnasko TS
(2019) Ventral pallidum is essential for cocaine relapse after voluntary abstinence in rats.
Neuropsychopharmacology:1-13.
Fernando ABP, Urcelay GP, Mar AC, Dickinson A, Robbins TW (2014) Safety signals as instrumental
reinforcers during free-operant avoidance. Learning & Memory 21:488-497.
Floresco SB, Braaksma DN, Phillips AG (1999) Involvement of the ventral pallidum in working memory
tasks with or without a delay. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 877:711-716.
Floresco SB, Onge JRS, Ghods-Sharifi S, Winstanley CA (2008) Cortico-limbic-striatal circuits subserving
different forms of cost-benefit decision making. Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience
8:375-389.
Fujimoto A, Hori Y, Nagai Y, Kikuchi E, Oyama K, Suhara T, Minamimoto T (2019) Signaling incentive and
drive in the primate ventral pallidum for motivational control of goal-directed action. Journal of
Neuroscience 39:1793-1804.
Gallo EF, Meszaros J, Sherman JD, Chohan MO, Teboul E, Choi CS, Moore H, Javitch JA, Kellendonk C
(2018) Accumbens dopamine D2 receptors increase motivation by decreasing inhibitory
transmission to the ventral pallidum. Nature communications 9:1086.

Gibson GD, Prasad AA, Jean-Richard-dit-Bressel P, Yau JOY, Millan EZ, Liu Y, Campbell EJ, Lim J, Marchant NJ, Power JM (2018) Distinct accumbens shell output pathways promote versus prevent relapse to alcohol seeking. Neuron 98:512-520.

Gomez JL, Bonaventura J, Lesniak W, Mathews WB, Sysa-Shah P, Rodriguez LA, Ellis RJ, Richie CT, Harvey BK, Dannals RF (2017) Chemogenetics revealed: DREADD occupancy and activation via converted clozapine. Science 357:503-507.

Gordon-Fennell AG, Will RG, Ramachandra V, Gordon-Fennell L, Dominguez JM, Zahm DS, Marinelli M (2020) The lateral preoptic area: a novel regulator of reward seeking and neuronal activity in the ventral tegmental area. Frontiers in neuroscience 13:1433.

Heimer L, Switzer RD, Van Hoesen GW (1982) Ventral striatum and ventral pallidum: Components of the motor system? Trends in Neurosciences 5:83-87.

Heinsbroek J, Bobadilla A-C, Dereschewitz E, Assali A, Chalhoub RM, Cowan CW, Kalivas PW (2019) Opposing Regulation of Cocaine Seeking by Glutamate and Enkephalin Neurons in the Ventral Pallidum. CELL-REPORTS-D-19-03631.

Heinsbroek JA, Neuhofer DN, Griffin WC, Siegel GS, Bobadilla A-C, Kupchik YM, Kalivas PW (2017) Loss of plasticity in the D2-accumbens pallidal pathway promotes cocaine seeking. Journal of Neuroscience 37:757-767.

Jennings JH, Sparta DR, Stamatakis AM, Ung RL, Pleil KE, Kash TL, Stuber GD (2013) Distinct extended amygdala circuits for divergent motivational states. Nature 496:224-228.

Kelley AE, Baldo BA, Pratt WE, Will MJ (2005) Corticostriatal-hypothalamic circuitry and food motivation: integration of energy, action and reward. Physiology & behavior 86:773-795.

Knutson B, Burgdorf J, Panksepp J (2002) Ultrasonic vocalizations as indices of affective states in rats. Psychological bulletin 128:961.

Koob GF (2004) A role for GABA mechanisms in the motivational effects of alcohol. Biochemical pharmacology 68:1515-1525.

Kupchik YM, Kalivas PW (2013) The rostral subcommissural ventral pallidum is a mix of ventral pallidal neurons and neurons from adjacent areas: an electrophysiological study. Brain Structure and Function 218:1487-1500.

Kupchik YM, Brown RM, Heinsbroek JA, Lobo MK, Schwartz DJ, Kalivas PW (2015) Coding the direct/indirect pathways by D1 and D2 receptors is not valid for accumbens projections. Nature neuroscience 18:1230.

LeDoux JE, Moscarello J, Sears R, Campese V (2017) The birth, death and resurrection of avoidance: a reconceptualization of a troubled paradigm. Molecular psychiatry 22:24-36.

Levi LA, Inbar K, Nachshon N, Bernat N, Gatterer A, Inbar D, Kupchik YM (2019) Projection-specific potentiation of ventral pallidal glutamatergic outputs after abstinence from cocaine. Journal of Neuroscience.

MacLaren DAA, Browne RW, Shaw JK, Radhakrishnan SK, Khare P, España RA, Clark SD (2016) Clozapine N-oxide administration produces behavioral effects in Long–Evans rats: implications for designing DREADD experiments. eneuro 3.

Mahler SV, Aston-Jones G (2018) CNO Evil? Considerations for the use of DREADDs in behavioral neuroscience. Neuropsychopharmacology 43:934.

Mahler SV, Smith RJ, Aston-Jones G (2013a) Interactions between VTA orexin and glutamate in cue-induced reinstatement of cocaine seeking in rats. Psychopharmacology 226:687-698.

Mahler SV, Moorman DE, Feltenstein MW, Cox BM, Ogburn KB, Bachar M, McGonigal JT, Ghee SM, See RE (2013b) A rodent "self-report" measure of methamphetamine craving? Rat ultrasonic vocalizations during methamphetamine self-administration, extinction, and reinstatement. Behavioural brain research 236:78-89.

Mahler SV, Vazey EM, Beckley JT, Keistler CR, McGlinchey EM, Kaufling J, Wilson SP, Deisseroth K,
Woodward JJ, Aston-Jones G (2014) Designer receptors show role for ventral pallidum input to
ventral tegmental area in cocaine seeking. Nature neuroscience 17:577.
Mahler SV, Brodnik ZD, Cox BM, Buchta WC, Bentzley BS, Quintanilla J, Cope ZA, Lin EC, Riedy MD,
Scofield MD (2019) Chemogenetic Manipulations of Ventral Tegmental Area Dopamine Neurons
Reveal Multifaceted Roles in Cocaine Abuse. Journal of Neuroscience 39:503-518.
Manvich DF, Webster KA, Foster SL, Farrell MS, Ritchie JC, Porter JH, Weinshenker D (2018) The DREADD
agonist clozapine N-oxide (CNO) is reverse-metabolized to clozapine and produces clozapine-like
interoceptive stimulus effects in rats and mice. Scientific reports 8:3840.
McAlonan GM, Robbins TW, Everitt BJ (1993) Effects of medial dorsal thalamic and ventral pallidal
lesions on the acquisition of a conditioned place preference: further evidence for the
involvement of the ventral striatopallidal system in reward-related processes. Neuroscience
52:605-620.
Meye FJ, Soiza-Reilly M, Smit T, Diana MA, Schwarz MK, Mameli M (2016) Shifted pallidal co-release of
GABA and glutamate in habenula drives cocaine withdrawal and relapse. Nature neuroscience
19:1019-1024.
Mitchell MR, Weiss VG, Beas BS, Morgan D, Bizon JL, Setlow B (2014) Adolescent risk taking, cocaine
self-administration, and striatal dopamine signaling. Neuropsychopharmacology 39:955.
Mogenson GJ, Jones DL, Yim CY (1980) From motivation to action: functional interface between the
limbic system and the motor system. Progress in neurobiology 14:69-97.
Morgane PJ (1961) Alterations in feeding and drinking behavior of rats with lesions in globi pallidi.
American Journal of Physiology-Legacy Content 201:420-428.
Oleson EB, Gentry RN, Chioma VC, Cheer JF (2012) Subsecond dopamine release in the nucleus
accumbens predicts conditioned punishment and its successful avoidance. Journal of
Neuroscience 32:14804-14808.
Onge JRS, Abhari H, Floresco SB (2011) Dissociable contributions by prefrontal D1 and D2 receptors to
risk-based decision making. Journal of Neuroscience 31:8625-8633.
Orsini CA, Trotta RT, Bizon JL, Setlow B (2015a) Dissociable roles for the basolateral amygdala and
orbitofrontal cortex in decision-making under risk of punishment. Journal of Neuroscience
35:1368-1379.
Orsini CA, Moorman DE, Young JW, Setlow B, Floresco SB (2015b) Neural mechanisms regulating
different forms of risk-related decision-making: Insights from animal models. Neuroscience &
Biobehavioral Reviews 58:147-167.
Orsini CA, Willis ML, Gilbert RJ, Bizon JL, Setlow B (2016) Sex differences in a rat model of risky decision
making. Behavioral neuroscience 130:50.
Orsini CA, Hernandez CM, Singhal S, Kelly KB, Frazier CJ, Bizon JL, Setlow B (2017) Optogenetic inhibition
reveals distinct roles for basolateral amygdala activity at discrete time points during risky
decision making. Journal of Neuroscience 37:11537-11548.
Ottenheimer D, Richard JM, Janak PH (2018) Ventral pallidum encodes relative reward value earlier and
more robustly than nucleus accumbens. Nature communications 9:4350.
O'Neal TJ, Nooney MN, Thien K, Ferguson SM (2019) Chemogenetic modulation of accumbens direct or
indirect pathways bidirectionally alters reinstatement of heroin-seeking in high-but not low-risk
rats. Neuropsychopharmacology:1-12.
Paxinos G, Watson C (2006) The rat brain in stereotaxic coordinates: hard cover edition: Elsevier.
Pessiglione M, Schmidt L, Draganski B, Kalisch R, Lau H, Dolan RJ, Frith CD (2007) How the brain
translates money into force: a neuroimaging study of subliminal motivation. Science 316:904-
906.

Pleil KE, Rinker JA, Lowery-Gionta EG, Mazzone CM, McCall NM, Kendra AM, Olson DP, Lowell BB, Grant
KA, Thiele TE (2015) NPY signaling inhibits extended amygdala CRF neurons to suppress binge
alcohol drinking. Nature neuroscience 18:545-552.
Portfors CV (2007) Types and functions of ultrasonic vocalizations in laboratory rats and mice. Journal of
the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science 46:28-34.
Prasad AA, McNally GP (2020) The ventral pallidum and relapse to alcohol seeking. British Journal of
Pharmacology.
Richard JM, Ambroggi F, Janak PH, Fields HL (2016) Ventral pallidum neurons encode incentive value and
promote cue-elicited instrumental actions. Neuron 90:1165-1173.
Rogers JL, Ghee S, See RE (2008) The neural circuitry underlying reinstatement of heroin-seeking
behavior in an animal model of relapse. Neuroscience 151:579-588.
Root DH, Melendez RI, Zaborszky L, Napier TC (2015) The ventral pallidum: Subregion-specific functional
anatomy and roles in motivated behaviors. Progress in neurobiology 130:29-70.
Roth BL (2016) DREADDs for neuroscientists. Neuron 89:683-694.
Saga Y, Hoshi E, Tremblay L (2017) Roles of multiple globus pallidus territories of monkeys and humans
in motivation, cognition and action: an anatomical, physiological and pathophysiological review.
Frontiers in neuroanatomy 11:30.
Saga Y, Richard A, Sgambato-Faure V, Hoshi E, Tobler PN, Tremblay L (2016) Ventral pallidum encodes
contextual information and controls aversive behaviors. Cerebral Cortex 27:2528-2543.
Salamone JD, Correa M (2012) The mysterious motivational functions of mesolimbic dopamine. Neuron
76:470-485.
Sangha S, Diehl MM, Bergstrom HC, Drew MR (2020) Know safety, no fear. Neuroscience &
Biobehavioral Reviews 108:218-230.
Sharpe MJ, Marchant NJ, Whitaker LR, Richie CT, Zhang YJ, Campbell EJ, Koivula PP, Necarsulmer JC,
Mejias-Aponte C, Morales M (2017) Lateral hypothalamic GABAergic neurons encode reward
predictions that are relayed to the ventral tegmental area to regulate learning. Current Biology
27:2089-2100.
Silberman Y, Bajo M, Chappell AM, Christian DT, Cruz M, Diaz MR, Kash T, Lack AK, Messing RO, Siggins
GR (2009) Neurobiological mechanisms contributing to alcohol–stress–anxiety interactions.
Alcohol 43:509-519.
Simmons WK, Rapuano KM, Ingeholm JE, Avery J, Kallman S, Hall KD, Martin A (2014) The ventral
pallidum and orbitofrontal cortex support food pleasantness inferences. Brain Structure and
Function 219:473-483.
Simon NW, Setlow B (2012) Modeling risky decision making in rodents. In: Psychiatric Disorders, pp 165-
175: Springer.
Simon NW, Gilbert RJ, Mayse JD, Bizon JL, Setlow B (2009) Balancing risk and reward: a rat model of risky
decision making. Neuropsychopharmacology 34:2208.
Smith KS, Berridge KC (2005) The ventral pallidum and hedonic reward: neurochemical maps of sucrose
"liking" and food intake. Journal of neuroscience 25:8637-8649.
Smith KS, Berridge KC (2007) Opioid limbic circuit for reward: interaction between hedonic hotspots of
nucleus accumbens and ventral pallidum. Journal of neuroscience 27:1594-1605.
Smith KS, Tindell AJ, Aldridge JW, Berridge KC (2009) Ventral pallidum roles in reward and motivation.
Behavioural brain research 196:155-167.
Smith RJ, Aston-Jones G (2012) Orexin/hypocretin 1 receptor antagonist reduces heroin self-
administration and cue-induced heroin seeking. European Journal of Neuroscience 35:798-804.
Spear LP (2000) The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations. Neuroscience &
biobehavioral reviews 24:417-463.

Stephenson-Jones M, Bravo-Rivera C, Ahrens S, Furlan A, Xiao X, Fernandes-Henriques C, Li B (2020)
Opposing contributions of GABAergic and glutamatergic ventral pallidal neurons to motivational
behaviors. Neuron 105:921-933.
Stratford TR, Kelley AE, Simansky KJ (1999) Blockade of GABAA receptors in the medial ventral pallidum
elicits feeding in satiated rats. Brain research 825:199-203.
Tachibana Y, Hikosaka O (2012) The primate ventral pallidum encodes expected reward value and
regulates motor action. Neuron 76:826-837.
Tindell AJ, Smith KS, Berridge KC, Aldridge JW (2009) Dynamic computation of incentive
salience:"wanting" what was never "liked". Journal of Neuroscience 29:12220-12228.
Tooley J, Marconi L, Alipio JB, Matikainen-Ankney B, Georgiou P, Kravitz AV, Creed MC (2018)
Glutamatergic ventral pallidal neurons modulate activity of the habenula–tegmental circuitry
and constrain reward seeking. Biological psychiatry 83:1012-1023.
Turner MS, Gray TS, Mickiewicz AL, Napier TC (2008) Fos expression following activation of the ventral
pallidum in normal rats and in a model of Parkinson's Disease: implications for limbic system and
basal ganglia interactions. Brain Structure and Function 213:197-213.
Wakabayashi KT, Feja M, Baindur AN, Bruno MJ, Bhimani RV, Park J, Hausknecht K, Shen R-Y, Haj-
Dahmane S, Bass CE (2019) Chemogenetic activation of ventral tegmental area GABA neurons,
but not mesoaccumbal GABA terminals, disrupts responding to reward-predictive cues.
Neuropsychopharmacology 44:372.
Wang F, Zhang J, Yuan Y, Chen M, Gao Z, Zhan S, Fan C, Sun W, Hu J (2020) Salience processing by
glutamatergic neurons in the ventral pallidum. Science Bulletin 65:389-401.
Zhu C, Yao Y, Xiong Y, Cheng M, Chen J, Zhao R, Liao F, Shi R, Song S (2017) Somatostatin neurons in the
basal forebrain promote high-calorie food intake. Cell reports 20:112-123.