Differential Conditioning Produces Merged Long-term Memory in *Drosophila*

Bohan Zhao[1,2,*], Jiameng Sun[1,2,*], Qian Li[1,2] & Yi Zhong[1,2,#]

[1]School of Life Sciences, IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research, and MOE Key

Laboratory for Protein Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China.

[2]Tsinghua-Peking Center for Life Sciences, Beijing 100084, China.

*These authors contributed equally

#Corresponding author: zhongyithu@tsinghua.edu.cn

<u>Abstract</u>

Multiple spaced trials of aversive differential conditioning can produce two

independent long-term memories (LTMs) of opposite valence. One is an aversive

memory for avoiding the conditioned stimulus (CS+), and the other is a safety memory

for approaching the non-conditioned stimulus (CS–). Here, we show that a single trial

of aversive differential conditioning yields one merged LTM (mLTM) for avoiding both

CS+ and CS–. Such mLTM can be detected after sequential exposures to the shock-

paired CS+ and unpaired CS–, and be retrieved by either CS+ or CS–. The formation of

mLTM relies on triggering aversive-reinforcing dopaminergic neurons and subsequent

new protein synthesis. Expressing mLTM involves αβ Kenyon cells and corresponding

approach-directing mushroom body output neurons (MBONs), in which similar-

amplitude long-term depression of responses to CS+ and CS– seems to signal the

mLTM. Our results suggest that animals can develop distinct strategies for occasional

and repeated threatening experiences.

Introduction

To survive in a complex environment, animals need to learn from threatening experiences to avoid potential dangers. From invertebrates to humans, aversive differential conditioning is widely used to study memories produced by threatening experiences (Carew et al., 1983; Corches et al., 2019; Gentile et al., 1986; Schneider et al., 1999; Tully and Quinn, 1985). After repetitive spaced trials of conditioning, animals form two complementary long-term memories (LTMs) of opposite valence (Jacob and Waddell, 2020; Pollak et al., 2008; Pollak et al., 2010), including the aversive memory to the conditioned stimulus (CS+) and the rewarding memory to the non-conditioned stimulus (CS−) (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1**). Such complementary LTMs result in enhanced long-lasting discrimination between CS+ and CS− through guiding avoidance to CS+ and approach to CS−. However, it remains unclear whether and how occasional threatening experiences, such as single-trial conditionings, would induce long-lasting changes in future escape behavior.

From invertebrates to humans, experience-dependent long-lasting behavioral modifications mainly rely on the formation of LTMs (Kandel et al., 2014). In *Drosophila*, there are at least two categories of aversive olfactory LTMs that last for more than 7 days. One is the spaced training-induced LTM that can be observed after repetitive spaced training with inter-trial rests (multiple trials with a 15-minute rest interval between each), but not after either single-trial training or repetitive massed training without interval (Tully et al., 1994). Forming such aversive LTM requires new protein synthesis and the paired posterior lateral 1 (PPL1) cluster of dopaminergic neurons (DANs) to depress the connection between odor-activated Kenyon cells (KCs) in the mushroom body (MB) αβ lobe and downstream α2sc (MB-V2) MB output neurons (MBONs) (Aso et al., 2014a; Aso et al., 2014b; Cognigni et al., 2018; Modi et al., 2020; Pascual and Preat, 2001; Placais et al., 2012). The other is a recently reported context-dependent LTM that forms after single-trial training, which does not require protein synthesis-dependent consolidation (Zhao et al., 2019). The expression of context-dependent LTM relies on multisensory integration in the lateral horn and is not affected by blocking KCs. However, all these observations derived from the same design principle that evaluates memory performance through testing the discrimination between CS+ and CS− (Tully and Quinn, 1985). Thus, direct responses to CS+ and CS− have been largely overlooked.

In the current study, we introduced a third-odor test, in which flies were given a

choice between either CS+ and a novel odor, or CS– and a novel odor. We therefore

identified that the single-trial differential conditioning produces a merged LTM (mLTM)

guiding avoidances of both CS+ and CS– for several days after training. The encoding

and expression of such mLTM involve new protein synthesis, PPL1 DANs, αβ KCs, and

α2sc MBONs. These findings suggest that animals utilize distinct escape strategies for

facing occasional and repeated dangers.

Results

Single-trial Training Produces Aversive LTMs to Both CS+ and CS–

We first plotted the memory retention curve at various time points after training

(**Figure 1A**). Consistent with previous reports (Davis and Zhong, 2017; Shuai et al., 2010;

Tully et al., 1994), flies exposed to single-trial conditioning rapidly lost their ability to

discriminate CS+ and CS– within 1 day. However, when trained flies were instead tested

between either CS+ and a novel odor, or CS– and a novel odor, they gradually exhibited

significant avoidances of both CS+ and CS– from 12 hours to more than 7 days after

training (**Figure 1B**). Consistently, testing CS+ or CS– versus Air also revealed training-

induced long-lasting avoidances of CS+ and CS– (**Figure 1-figure supplement 2**).

Based on these observations, we wondered whether such aversive LTMs require

new protein synthesis to consolidate. Results show that such avoidances resulted from

the formation of protein synthesis-dependent LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} because the

administration of cycloheximide (CXM), a protein synthesis inhibitor, prevented the

avoidances of both CS+ and CS– after 1 day (**Figure1C**). The time course of the

consolidation of such LTMs could be revealed by cold-shock treatment, which is known

to abolish labile memories but leave consolidated LTM intact (Krashes and Waddell,

2008; Li et al., 2016; Tully et al., 1994). As shown in **Figure 1D**, it takes more than 3 hours

for consolidation to be completed.

Figure 1. Long-term Avoidances of Both CS+ and CS− Induced by Aversive Differential Conditioning. **(A)** Single-trial differential conditioning induced discriminative memory that was forgotten within 1 day (n = 6-8). **(B)** Conditioned flies exhibited long-lasting avoidances of both CS+ and CS− (n = 8-10). **(C)** CXM treatment abolished 1-day avoidances of CS+ and CS− (n = 6). **(D)** The 1-day avoidances were tested after cold-shock anesthesia at different time points following training. Aversive memory to CS+ and CS− requires a multi-hour consolidation process (n = 6-8). All data shown are presented as mean ± SEM. *p < 0.05.

The Long-term Avoidances of CS+ and CS− Seem to Be Derived from the Same mLTM

The above results prompted us to investigate whether LTM^{CS+} and $LTM^{CS−}$ are based on two parallel LTMs of the same valence, or the same LTM that can be retrieved by either odor. Two lines of evidence suggested that LTM^{CS+} and $LTM^{CS−}$ are derived

from the same memory component.

First, LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} were both extinguished by the re-exposure to either CS+

or CS− alone (**Figure 2A**). Trained flies were re-exposed to 3 cycles of either CS+ or CS−

for 1 minute with 1-minute inter-trial intervals immediately before testing. Such

treatment significantly reduced both LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-}, as compared to those re-

exposed to air, suggesting the LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} are both retrievable for either one of

CS+ and CS−.

Second, LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} were both abolished when the temporal interval

between CS+ and CS− during training was prolonged to more than 5 minutes (**Figure**

2B), suggesting that the formation of LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} depends on the contiguity of

two shock-paired CS+ and CS− exposures, instead of temporally separated exposures.

In addition, changing the sequence of exposure to CS+ and CS− did not affect either

LTM^{CS+} or LTM^{CS-} (**Figure 2C**), but training with CS+ or CS− alone failed to induce the

LTM^{CS+} or LTM^{CS-} (**Figure 2-figure supplement 1**).

Together, these results strongly suggest that, instead of two parallel LTMs,

observed LTM^{CS+} and LTM^{CS-} are more likely to be derived from the same memory

component. Since it was observable after two separated memory curves (CS+ and CS−)

merged over time, we termed it as merged LTM (mLTM).

Figure 2. An mLTM Underlies the Long-term Avoidances of CS+ and CS–. (A) Three trials of re-exposure to either CS+ or CS– alone can impair both CS+ avoidance and CS– avoidance 1 day after training (n = 6). (B) Prolonging the inter-trial interval (ITI) between CS+ and CS– to more than 5 minutes significantly impaired 1-day avoidances (n = 6-8). (C) Changing the sequence of CS+ and CS– during training did not affect 1-day avoidances (n = 6). All data shown are presented as mean ± SEM. *p < 0.05. NS, non-significant.

The Encoding of mLTM Requires Aversive-reinforcing DANs

Then we further investigated the neural network mechanisms underlying such mLTM. In *Drosophila*, associative olfactory memories are mainly encoded by the of DANs (Aso and Rubin, 2016; Claridge-Chang et al., 2009; Cognigni et al., 2018) through alterations of the connections between KCs and MBONs (Aso et al., 2014a; Aso et al.,

2014b; Cognigni et al., 2018; Dubnau and Chiang, 2013; Modi et al., 2020; Pascual and

Preat, 2001; Placais et al., 2012). We therefore tested whether DANs involves in mLTM

encoding by comparing 24-h memory in control flies with that in flies whose synaptic

outputs from different clusters of DANs were blocked during training. For this purpose,

we expressed the dominant-negative temperature-sensitive *UAS-Shibire[ts1]* (*Shi[ts]*)-

encoded dynamin (Kitamoto, 2001) driven by *R58E02-Gal4*, which labels the

protocerebral anterior medial (PAM) cluster of DANs, and *R52H03-Gal4* and *TH-Gal4,*

which both labels PPL1 DANs (**Figure 3-figure supplement 1A, B, and C**). We specifically

blocked output from DANs during training by raising the temperature of flies from 23°C

to 32°C. Flies were then returned to 23°C and later tested for 1-day memory. The results

showed that blocking the release of neurotransmitter from PPL1 DANs, but not PAM

DANs, during training impaired mLTM (**Figure 3A**), suggesting that the

neuromodulation of PPL1 DANs is necessary for mLTM formation.

Figure 3. Expression of the mLTM Requires the αβ KCs. (A) Blocking PPL1 DANs (*R52H03-Gal4* or *TH-Gal4*) but not PAM DANs (*R58E02-Gal4*) during training significantly impaired mLTM (n = 6-8). (B) Blocking MB during testing using *R13F02-Gal4>UAS-Shi^ts* impaired the mLTM (n = 6-8). (C) The mLTM was impaired by blocking αβ KCs (*C739-Gal4*), but not that of α′β′ KCs (*VT30604-Gal4*) or γ KCs (*5-HT1B-Gal4*) (n = 6-8). All data shown are presented as mean ± SEM. *p < 0.05.

Retrieval of mLTM Requires Output of αβ KCs

We then examined the role of KCs in mLTM retrieval. We imposed the block by raising temperature to 32°C from 23°C, 15 minutes before the test. Inhibition of the synaptic output of all KCs (*R13F02-Gal4>UAS-Shi^ts*) through exposure to a restrictive

temperature during the test abolished mLTM (**Figure 3B and Figure 3-figure**
supplement 1D). We further tested the effects of blocking three distinct subgroups of
KCs (**Figure 3C**), namely, those located within the MB αβ lobe (αβ KCs), which were
labeled with *C739-Gal4*; those located within the α'β' lobe (α'β' KCs), which were
labeled with *VT30604-Gal4*; and those located within the γ lobe (γ KCs), which were
labeled with *5-HT1B-Gal4* (**Figure 3-figure supplement 1E to G**). The results showed
that mLTM did not express when the synaptic output of αβ KCs was blocked, whereas
inhibition of α'β' KCs and γ KCs had no significant effect (**Figure 3C**).

The α2sc Cluster of MBONs Are Required for mLTM Expression

Then we further tried to identify which cluster of MBONs from αβ lobe of MB is
required for mLTM. Prior studies on the structure of MB network have uncovered that
the PPL1 DANs mainly integrate to the α2 and α3 compartments of the vertical α lobe
of MB, and corresponding MBONs (α2sc and α3 clusters) have been reported to be
important to aversive spaced training-induced LTM expression (Aso et al., 2014a; Aso
et al., 2014b; Bouzaiane et al., 2015; Dubnau and Chiang, 2013; Jacob and Waddell,
2020; Modi et al., 2020; Pascual and Preat, 2001; Placais et al., 2012; Schwaerzel et al.,
2003). We therefore attempted to block α2sc MBONs (*R71D08-Gal4*) and α3 MBONs
(*G0239-Gal4*) during testing, respectively (**Figures 4-figure supplement 1A, B**). Results
showed that mLTM expression was significantly impaired by blocking α2sc MBONs, but
not α3 MBONs (**Figure 4A, B**). This conclusion was further strengthened by the result
that inhibiting the neural activity of α2sc MBONs using heat-inducible expression of
the potassium channel Kir2.1 decreased the mLTM retrieval (**Figures 4-figure**
supplement 2). Thus, these results suggest that retrieving mLTM specifically relies on
the output of α2sc MBONs.

Figure 4. Expression of the mLTM Requires α2sc MBONs. (A) Blocking α2sc MBONs using *R71D08-Gal4>UAS-Shi^ts* impaired mLTM expression (n = 6-10). **(B)** Blocking α3 MBONs using *G0239-Gal4>UAS-Shi^ts* did not affect mLTM expression (n = 6). All data shown are presented as mean ± SEM. *p < 0.05. NS, non-significant.

Differential Conditioning Induces Long-lasting Depression of CS+ and CS− Odor-evoked Responses in α2sc

We then imaged odor-evoked calcium responses in the dendritic field of α2sc MBONs to CS+ and CS− through expressing jGCaMP7f, a calcium-sensitive fluorescent protein (Dana et al., 2019), driven by *R71D08-Gal4*. To account for variance between different odors, the responses of trained flies were calibrated to the average responses of naïve flies to corresponding odors. Consistent with results of the behavioral assay, 1 day after training, odor-evoked calcium responses of α2sc MBONs to CS+ and CS− were both significantly reduced when compared to responses to the novel odor (**Figure 5A, B**). Moreover, such depression of CS+ and CS− odor-evoked responses can be abolished by prolonging the temporal interval between CS+ and CS− to 10 minutes during training (**Figure 5C**), which is consistent with the result of behavioral assay (**Figure 2B**). Interestingly, when we recorded the calcium responses immediately after training, the depressed responses to CS+ and CS− were observed, suggesting the

mLTM should be encoded during training (**Figure 5-figure supplement 1**). Together, our
data showed that the aversion to CS+ and CS− are both linked to the neural plasticity
conferred by the same MBON.

Figure 5. The mLTM Can Be Recorded as Depressed Odor-evoked Responses in α2sc
MBONs. (A) Left: training and imaging protocols. The imaging plane for α2sc MBONs
is shown. The novel odor-evoked response, CS+ odor-evoked response, and CS− odor-
evoked response were calibrated to the average responses of corresponding odors in
naïve flies. Right: the mLTM can be recorded as depressed odor-specific responses in
α2sc MBONs (n = 9). **(B)** Prolonging the ITI between CS+ and CS− during training
abolished the depressed odor-specific responses (n = 8). All data shown are presented
as mean ± SEM. *p < 0.05. NS, non-significant.

<u>Discussion</u>

In the current study, the use of third-odor test leads to a conclusion that single-
trial training produces an mLTM for guiding flies to avoid both CS+ and CS− for more
than seven days. Three categories of evidence in support of this conclusion are outlined
below.

First, throughout our study, the amplitudes of long-term avoidances of CS+ and
CS− are always at a similar level under various conditions, including pharmacological
treatment (**Figure 1C**), cold-shock treatment (**Figure 1D**), odor re-exposure (**Figure 2A**),
paradigm alteration (**Figures 2B** and **2C**), and neural circuitry manipulations (**Figures 3**
and **4**). Second, re-exposure to either one of CS+ and CS− alone can extinguish both
CS+ avoidance and CS− avoidance (**Figure 2A**). Third, the long-term avoidances of CS+

and CS– can be recorded as the depression of odor-evoked responses in the same α2sc
MBONs (**Figure 4**), meanwhile, CS+ avoidance and CS– avoidance both involve the
same PPL1 DANs, αβ KCs, and α2sc MBONs (**Figures 3** and **4A**). Thus, CS+ avoidance
and CS– avoidance derive from the same aversive mLTM, instead of two parallel LTMs
of the same valence. The significance of these findings is further discussed below.

Combining with a recent report that uses a similar third-odor test to dissect LTMs
induced by multi-trial spaced training (Jacob and Waddell, 2020), we are led to
conclude that spaced multi-trial aversive differential conditioning produces two
independent LTMs of opposite valence for avoiding CS+ and approaching CS–, whereas
single-trial aversive differential conditioning yields one merged LTM that guides
avoidances of both CS+ and CS–. Thus, animals can develop distinct escape strategies
for different categories of dangers. When the same dangerous situation has been
experienced repeatedly, animals would remember the detailed information to guide
behavior in the next similar situation. However, when the dangerous event has only
been experienced occasionally, animals would choose to avoid all potentially
dangerous cues as a more reserved survival strategy.

Moreover, the differences between single-trial training-induced mLTM and multi-
trial training-induced complementary LTMs lead us to ask: how these differences are
induced by different training sessions? Jacob and Waddell (2020) reported that multi-
trial spaced training induces depressed responses to CS+ in α2sc MBONs and α3
MBONs are required for aversive LTM to CS+, whereas the modulated responses to CS–
in β'2mp MBONs and γ3, γ3β'1 MBONs appears to be responsible for the safety-
memory to CS–. In contrast, here we found that single-trial training is sufficient to
induce the depressed responses to both CS+ and CS– in α2sc MBONs. Therefore, our
results suggest a lower threshold and specificity of the plasticity between KCs-α2sc
MBONs, compared to KCs-α3 MBONs, KCs-β'2mp MBONs, and KCs-γ3, γ3β'1 MBONs
connections. Consequently, changing these synaptic connections requires involving
more training sessions.

<u>**Methods**</u>

Fly strains

All flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) were raised on standard cornmeal medium at
23 °C and 60% relative humidity under a 12-hr light-dark cycle as described (Shuai et
al., 2010). The control strain was *w[1118](isoCJ1). UAS-Shibire[ts1]*, and *UAS-Kir2.1;tub-*

gal80^ts were extant stocks in the laboratory. Gal4 lines used have been described
previously: *TH-Gal4* (Friggi-Grelin et al., 2003), *C739-Gal4* (McGuire et al., 2001),
R58E02-Gal4, *R52H03-Gal4*, *R13F02-Gal4*, and *R71D08-Gal4* (Jenett et al., 2012),
5HT1b-Gal4 (Yuan et al., 2005), *G0239-Gal4* (Pai et al., 2013), and *VT30604-Gal4*
(#200228) (Wu et al., 2013). *UAS-GCaMP7f* was a gift from Yi Sun, Westlake University.

Behavioral assays

All flies were raised at 23 °C and mixed-sex populations of 2–5-day-old flies were
used in all experiments. The Pavlovian olfactory aversive conditioning procedure was
performed as described previously in a behavioral room at 23 °C and 60% relative
humidity described (Shuai et al., 2010).

During training, roughly 80 flies successfully received the following stimuli in a
training tube, which contained a copper grid: air for 90 s, an odor paired with 12 pulses
of 60 V electric shock (CS+) for 1 min, air for 45 s, a second odor without pairing the
electric shock (CS–) for 60 s, and finally air for 45 s. 3-octanol (OCT, 10-15 μl in 10 ml
mineral oil), 4-methylcyclohexanol (MCH, 10 μl in 10 ml mineral oil), and ethyl acetate
(EA, 10 μl in 10 ml mineral oil) were used as standard odorants. This process describes
a single training trial. Six sequential trials with 15-min intervals constitute spaced
training. For memory retrieval, trained flies were transferred into a T-maze, where they
were allowed 2 min to choose between two odors (CS+ and novel odor, or CS– and
novel odor).

Odor performance was quantified by a PI (performance index) calculated based
on the fraction of flies in the two T-maze arms. A PI of 100 indicated that all flies avoid
the odor exposed during training (either CS+ or CS–), while a PI of 0 indicated no odor
preference, as reflected by 50:50 distributions between the arms. To balance naïve odor
bias, two reciprocal groups were trained and tested simultaneously and the testing
odors were always OCT and MCH, one serves as the CS+ or CS– and the other serves
as the novel odor alternatively. One complete PI was generated from the average PI of
a couple of rotate training and testing. Specifically, for the testing of CS+ performance,
either OCT or MCH was alternately used as CS+, and EA was CS–; whereas for the
testing of CS– performance, either OCT or MCH was alternately used as CS–, and EA
was CS+. For 3-min memory, flies were tested immediately after training. For longer
memory retention, flies were placed in a fresh vial with the same contents as the vial
they had been kept in before the training until the test.

For odor avoidance testing, a similar PI was calculate based on the fraction of flies

in the two T-maze arms. A PI of 100 indicated that all flies choose the Air arm, while a
PI of 0 indicated no preference.

For cold-shock anesthesia, flies were transferred into pre-chilled plastic vials and
kept on ice for 2 min as described previously described (Shuai et al., 2010).

For cycloheximide (CXM) feeding, flies were provided food with (CXM+) or without
(CXM–) 35 mM CXM (Sigma-Aldrich) dissolved in control solution, and 5% (wt/vol)
glucose, for 16 hours before and after training until memory retention was tested.

For neural inactivation experiments using *UAS-Shi^ts*, crosses were reared at 23°C
to avoid unintended inactivation. Flies were shifted to 32°C 15 minutes in advance for
neural inhibition during training or test.

For odor re-exposure, flies were exposed to 3-cycles of conditioned odor (either
CS+ or CS–) for 1 minute with 1-min interval as described previously (Wang et al., 2019).
All mentioned re-exposure treatment were performed immediately before testing.

Immunohistochemistry

Flies were quickly anesthetized on ice and whole brains were dissected in ice-cold
PBS within 5 min, then stained as described (Shuai et al., 2010). Brains were fixed in 4%
paraformaldehyde in PBS for 30 min on ice. Brains were incubated for at least 72 h with
the primary antibodies anti-GFP (chicken, 1:2000; Abcam, Cambridge, UK), anti-nc82
(mouse, 1:10; Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, Iowa City, IA, USA) and anti-
DsRed (rabbit, 1:500; Takara Bio, Kyoto, JP). Brains were washed three times again in
PBS with 0.2% Triton X-100 and transferred into secondary antibody solution (anti-
chicken Alexa Fluor 488, 1:200; anti-mouse Alexa Fluor 647, 1:200; anti-rabbit Alexa
Fluor 647, 1:200; Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR, USA) and incubated for 48 h at 4°C.
Images were obtained using a Zeiss LSM710 confocal microscope (Carl Zeiss AG,
Oberkochen, Germany).

In vivo two-photon calcium imaging

Two- to five-day-old female flies were used. After anesthetized in a plastic vial on
ice for 15–20 s, flies were then gently inserted into a hole of a thin plastic rectangular
plate and stabilized in the hole by glue. In a saline bath, the area surrounding the region
of interest was surgically removed to expose the dorsal side of the brain. Fat and air
sacs were gently removed to give a clear view of the brain. For calcium- response
imaging, the 40× water immersion objective lens (NA=1.0; Zeiss) was lowered near the
exposed brain.

Imaging was performed on a Zeiss LSM 7MP two-photon laser scanning
microscope with an imaging wavelength at 910 nm (Carl Zeiss AG). The 512 × 512 pixel
images were acquired at 2.6 Hz. In each trial, 10 seconds of baseline was recorded,
followed by an odor-evoked response recording. Two to three minutes of rest were
given in between trials when multiple trials were applied. GCaMP responses and the
average value within 10 s before and during stimulus were quantified using custom
software written in MatLab (MathWorks, MA, USA). For the brain region of interest
during the experimental period, the average fluorescence value, F_{ave}, was then
converted to $\Delta F/F_0$ using the formula $\Delta F/F_0 = (F_{ave} - F_0)/ F_0$, where F_0 is the baseline
fluorescence value, measured as the average of 10 s before the stimulus. Flies were
trained using CS+ (OCT, 10 µl in 10 ml mineral oil) and CS– (MCH10 µl in 10 ml mineral
oil), and IA (10 µl in 10 ml mineral oil) was used as novel odor. To gain the calibrated
calcium responses of trained flies, the ratios of $\Delta F/F_0$ to different odors of trained and
naïve flies were calculated. Specifically, all odor-evoked responses after training were
divided to the mean responses to the same odors of same number naïve flies. Thus, a
calibrated $\Delta F/F_0$ of 1.0 indicated no difference in the odor-evoked responses to the
correspondence odor between trained and naïve group.

Statistics

Statistics were performed with GraphPad Prism software (version 7; GraphPad
Software, San Diego, CA, USA). All data satisfied the assumption of normal distribution
(one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test). Comparisons between two groups were
performed using two-tailed t-tests. Comparisons of multiple groups were performed
using one-way or two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests followed by Bonferroni
correction for multiple comparisons. P values less than 0.05 were considered
statistically significant and are marked with an asterisk in figures; NS indicates non-
significant differences ($P > 0.05$).

Acknowledgments

We thank BDSC and VDRC, and Dr. Yi Sun for fly stocks. We thank Bo Lei, Yijun Niu,
Dr. Xuchen Zhang, Dr. Wantong Hu, Dr. Dongqin Cai, Dr. Yunchuan Zhang, Ning Huang,
Shiqiang Hu, Yikai Tang, Shunan Wang, and Dr. Stella Christie for helpful discussions;
Bowen Chen for software supply; Lianzhang Wang for facility supply. This work was
supported by grants from the National Science Foundation of China (31970955, to Q.L.),
and the Tsinghua-Peking Center for Life Sciences.

<u>Declaration of interests</u>

The authors declare no competing interests.

<u>Reference</u>

Aso, Y., Hattori, D., Yu, Y., Johnston, R.M., Iyer, N.A., Ngo, T.T., Dionne, H.,
Abbott, L.F., Axel, R., Tanimoto, H.*, et al.* (2014a). The neuronal architecture of the
mushroom body provides a logic for associative learning. Elife *3*, e04577.

Aso, Y., and Rubin, G.M. (2016). Dopaminergic neurons write and update
memories with cell-type-specific rules. Elife *5*.

Aso, Y., Sitaraman, D., Ichinose, T., Kaun, K.R., Vogt, K., Belliart-Guerin, G.,
Placais, P.Y., Robie, A.A., Yamagata, N., Schnaitmann, C.*, et al.* (2014b). Mushroom
body output neurons encode valence and guide memory-based action selection in
Drosophila. Elife *3*, e04580.

Bouzaiane, E., Trannoy, S., Scheunemann, L., Placais, P.Y., and Preat, T. (2015).
Two independent mushroom body output circuits retrieve the six discrete components
of Drosophila aversive memory. Cell Rep *11*, 1280-1292.

Carew, T.J., Hawkins, R.D., and Kandel, E.R. (1983). Differential classical
conditioning of a defensive withdrawal reflex in Aplysia californica. Science *219*, 397-
400.

Claridge-Chang, A., Roorda, R.D., Vrontou, E., Sjulson, L., Li, H., Hirsh, J., and
Miesenbock, G. (2009). Writing memories with light-addressable reinforcement
circuitry. Cell *139*, 405-415.

Cognigni, P., Felsenberg, J., and Waddell, S. (2018). Do the right thing: neural
network mechanisms of memory formation, expression and update in Drosophila. Curr
Opin Neurobiol *49*, 51-58.

Corches, A., Hiroto, A., Bailey, T.W., Speigel, J.H., 3rd, Pastore, J., Mayford, M.,
and Korzus, E. (2019). Differential fear conditioning generates prefrontal neural
ensembles of safety signals. Behav Brain Res *360*, 169-184.

Dana, H., Sun, Y., Mohar, B., Hulse, B.K., Kerlin, A.M., Hasseman, J.P., Tsegaye,
G., Tsang, A., Wong, A., Patel, R.*, et al.* (2019). High-performance calcium sensors for
imaging activity in neuronal populations and microcompartments. Nat Methods *16*,
649-657.

Davis, R.L., and Zhong, Y. (2017). The Biology of Forgetting-A Perspective.
Neuron *95*, 490-503.

Dubnau, J., and Chiang, A.S. (2013). Systems memory consolidation in
Drosophila. Curr Opin Neurobiol *23*, 84-91.

Friggi-Grelin, F., Coulom, H., Meller, M., Gomez, D., Hirsh, J., and Birman, S.
(2003). Targeted gene expression in Drosophila dopaminergic cells using regulatory
sequences from tyrosine hydroxylase. J Neurobiol *54*, 618-627.

Gentile, C.G., Jarrell, T.W., Teich, A., McCabe, P.M., and Schneiderman, N.
(1986). The role of amygdaloid central nucleus in the retention of differential pavlovian
conditioning of bradycardia in rabbits. Behav Brain Res *20*, 263-273.

Jacob, P.F., and Waddell, S. (2020). Spaced Training Forms Complementary
Long-Term Memories of Opposite Valence in Drosophila. Neuron.

Jenett, A., Rubin, G.M., Ngo, T.T., Shepherd, D., Murphy, C., Dionne, H., Pfeiffer,
B.D., Cavallaro, A., Hall, D., Jeter, J.*, et al.* (2012). A GAL4-driver line resource for
Drosophila neurobiology. Cell Rep *2*, 991-1001.

Kandel, E.R., Dudai, Y., and Mayford, M.R. (2014). The molecular and systems
biology of memory. Cell *157*, 163-186.

Kitamoto, T. (2001). Conditional modification of behavior in Drosophila by
targeted expression of a temperature-sensitive shibire allele in defined neurons. J
Neurobiol *47*, 81-92.

Krashes, M.J., and Waddell, S. (2008). Rapid consolidation to a radish and protein
synthesis-dependent long-term memory after single-session appetitive olfactory
conditioning in Drosophila. J Neurosci *28*, 3103-3113.

Li, Q., Zhang, X., Hu, W., Liang, X., Zhang, F., Wang, L., Liu, Z.J., and Zhong,
Y. (2016). Importin-7 mediates memory consolidation through regulation of nuclear
translocation of training-activated MAPK in Drosophila. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *113*,
3072-3077.

McGuire, S.E., Le, P.T., and Davis, R.L. (2001). The role of Drosophila
mushroom body signaling in olfactory memory. Science *293*, 1330-1333.

Modi, M.N., Shuai, Y., and Turner, G.C. (2020). The Drosophila Mushroom Body:
From Architecture to Algorithm in a Learning Circuit. Annu Rev Neurosci *43*, 465-484.

Pai, T.P., Chen, C.C., Lin, H.H., Chin, A.L., Lai, J.S., Lee, P.T., Tully, T., and
Chiang, A.S. (2013). Drosophila ORB protein in two mushroom body output neurons
is necessary for long-term memory formation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *110*, 7898-
7903.

Pascual, A., and Preat, T. (2001). Localization of long-term memory within the
Drosophila mushroom body. Science *294*, 1115-1117.

Placais, P.Y., Trannoy, S., Isabel, G., Aso, Y., Siwanowicz, I., Belliart-Guerin, G.,
Vernier, P., Birman, S., Tanimoto, H., and Preat, T. (2012). Slow oscillations in two
pairs of dopaminergic neurons gate long-term memory formation in Drosophila. Nat
Neurosci *15*, 592-599.

Pollak, D.D., Monje, F.J., Zuckerman, L., Denny, C.A., Drew, M.R., and Kandel,
E.R. (2008). An animal model of a behavioral intervention for depression. Neuron *60*,
149-161.

Pollak, D.D., Rogan, M.T., Egner, T., Perez, D.L., Yanagihara, T.K., and Hirsch,
J. (2010). A translational bridge between mouse and human models of learned safety.
Ann Med *42*, 115-122.

Schneider, F., Weiss, U., Kessler, C., Muller-Gartner, H.W., Posse, S., Salloum,
J.B., Grodd, W., Himmelmann, F., Gaebel, W., and Birbaumer, N. (1999). Subcortical
correlates of differential classical conditioning of aversive emotional reactions in social
phobia. Biol Psychiatry *45*, 863-871.

Schwaerzel, M., Monastirioti, M., Scholz, H., Friggi-Grelin, F., Birman, S., and
Heisenberg, M. (2003). Dopamine and octopamine differentiate between aversive and
appetitive olfactory memories in Drosophila. J Neurosci *23*, 10495-10502.

Shuai, Y., Lu, B., Hu, Y., Wang, L., Sun, K., and Zhong, Y. (2010). Forgetting is
regulated through Rac activity in Drosophila. Cell *140*, 579-589.

Tully, T., Preat, T., Boynton, S.C., and Del Vecchio, M. (1994). Genetic dissection
of consolidated memory in Drosophila. Cell *79*, 35-47.

Tully, T., and Quinn, W.G. (1985). Classical conditioning and retention in normal
and mutant Drosophila melanogaster. J Comp Physiol A *157*, 263-277.

Wang, L., Yang, Q., Lu, B., Wang, L., Zhong, Y., and Li, Q. (2019). A behavioral
paradigm to study the persistence of reward memory extinction in Drosophila. J Genet
Genomics *46*, 599-601.

Wu, C.L., Shih, M.F., Lee, P.T., and Chiang, A.S. (2013). An octopamine-
mushroom body circuit modulates the formation of anesthesia-resistant memory in
Drosophila. Curr Biol *23*, 2346-2354.

Yuan, Q., Lin, F., Zheng, X., and Sehgal, A. (2005). Serotonin modulates circadian
entrainment in Drosophila. Neuron *47*, 115-127.

Zhao, B., Sun, J., Zhang, X., Mo, H., Niu, Y., Li, Q., Wang, L., and Zhong, Y.
(2019). Long-term memory is formed immediately without the need for protein
synthesis-dependent consolidation in Drosophila. Nat Commun *10*, 4550.

459