Full title: Mediodorsal thalamus is critical for updating during extra-dimensional shifts but

not reversals in the attentional set-shifting task

Abbreviated title: Mediodorsal thalamus and choice response strategy updating

Authors: Zakaria Ouhaz[1], Brook AL Perry[1], Kouichi Nakamura[2], Anna S Mitchell[1]

1 Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, The Tinsley Building,

Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3SR, United Kingdom

2 Medical Research Council Brain Network Dynamics Unit, Nuffield Department of Clinical

Neurosciences, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, OX1 3TH, United Kingdom

Author contributions:

ZO and ASM designed research; ZO performed research; KN and BALP contributed

unpublished reagents/ analytic tools; ZO, BALP, ASM analyzed data; ZO, BALP, ASM

wrote the paper.

Correspondence should be addressed to ASM. anna.mitchell@psy.ox.ac.uk

Authors report no conflict of interest

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for support received from Professor Verity Brown and Dr David Tait,

who taught ZO to perform the ID/ED attentional set-shifting task during an extended visit to

their research lab at St Andrews University.

Funding sources: ZO was supported by a Royal Society Newton International Fellowship,

NF160862. ASM was funded by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number 110 157/Z/15/Z].

Key words: updating, cognitive flexibility, learning, cognitive state, orbitofrontal cortex,

anterior cingulate cortex, anterior thalamus, medial prefrontal cortex, prelimbic cortex, c-Fos

Abstract

Cognitive flexibility, attributed to frontal cortex, is vital for navigating the complexities of everyday life. The mediodorsal thalamus (MD), interconnected to frontal cortex, may influence cognitive flexibility. Here rats performed an attentional set-shifting task measuring intra-dimensional and extra-dimensional shifts in sensory discriminations. MD lesion rats needed more trials to learn the rewarded sensory dimension. However, once the choice response strategy was established, learning further two-choice discriminations in the same sensory dimension, and reversals of the reward contingencies in the same dimension, were unimpaired. Critically though, MD lesion rats were impaired during the extra-dimensional shift, when they must rapidly update the optimal choice response strategy. Behavioral analyses showed MD lesion rats had significantly reduced 'on-the-fly' correct second choice responses. Diminshed c-Fos expression in the prelimbic and orbitofrontal cortex was also documented. This evidence shows transfer of information via the MD is critical when monitoring and rapid updates in established choice response strategies are required.

Introduction

Cognitive flexibility describes our ability to quickly and selectively switch our thoughts, responses, or behavior to everyday dynamic situations. This capacity to rapidly update or alter one's actions conveys evolutionary benefit and is key to survival (Koechlin et al., 2003; Rougier et al., 2005). Cognitive flexibility shows marked changes or declines in neurodegenerative disorders, like Parkinson's disease, and in neurodevelopmental diseases, like schizophrenia (Andrews et al., 2006; Barch et al., 2009; Giraldo-Chica et al., 2018).

Cognitive flexibility is not unique to primates. Studies investigating the neural underpinnings of cognitive flexibility show that rats also can readily switch between attentional sets to optimise reward outcome (Birrell and Brown, 2000; McAlonan and Brown, 2003; Newman and McGaughy, 2011). Typically, these studies have focussed on various frontal cortex subregions. Yet, it is becoming increasingly clear that the cortex does not function in isolation, but rather, relies heavily on subcortical and peripheral inputs supplied by the thalamus (Sherman and Guillery, 2002; Guillery and Sherman, 2011; Halassa and Kastner, 2017). Clearly, the mediodorsal thalamus (MD) has a critical role in functions of frontal cortex during higher order cognitive processes across mammalian species (Alcaraz et al., 2018; Browning et al., 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016, 2019; DeNicola et al., 2020; Ferguson and Gao, 2018; Miller et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2007a; Mitchell et al., 2007b; Pergola et al., 2018; Parnaudeau et al., 2013; Schmitt et al., 2017). Monkeys with MD lesions were found to have deficits when required to rapidly update 'on-the-fly' task-relevant information during complex visuospatial associative tasks (Browning et al., 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Mitchell et al., 2007a) but not during recognition of the visuospatial associations (Mitchell and Gaffan, 2008). Thus the integrity of MD is particularly important for rapid reward-guided learning and implementing consistent choice strategies (Chakraborty et al., 2016). In monkeys and humans, the MD is densely interconnected with frontal cortex

areas involved in various aspects of cognitive flexibility, namely the dorsolateral and

dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (PFC), equivalent to the medial PFC (prelimbic (PrL) and

infralimbic) in rodents, the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), ventrolateral PFC, and the dorsal

anterior cingulate cortex (Dajani and Uddin, 2015; Preuss, 1995). Recent neuroanatomical

work in rodents has shown the arrangement of MD projections to the frontal cortex allow for

the simultaneous sharing of information across multiple PFC cortical regions (Alcaraz et al.,

2016; Kuramoto et al., 2017). This distributed pattern of prefrontal innervation by the MD

appears to be especially true for the central (MDc) and medial (MDm) subdivisions, which

have mixed projections to OFC, medial PFC, and frontal association areas (Alcaraz et al.,

2016; Groenwegen, 1988). Although phylogenetic differences exist in the organisation of

rodent and primate frontal cortex, similar functional contributions to aspects of cognitive

flexibility are observed in monkeys and rodents after perturbations to similar areas of

agranular frontal cortex (Birrell and Brown, 2000; Bissonette et al., 2008; Dias et al., 1996;

Dias et al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003). Given there are similarities in

neuroanatomical connectivity between agranular frontal cortex and MD in rodents and

primates, it seems that cognitive flexibility and rapid updating deficits observed in monkeys

with MD lesions may also extend to rodents.

Thus, in the current study, rats with excitotoxic lesions to the MD or MD Sham

controls were run on a well-established test of cognitive flexibility – the intra-dimensional

(ID)/ extra-dimensional (ED) attentional set-shifting task (Birrell and Brown, 2000; Tait et

al., 2014; Tait et al., 2018) to test this premise and investigate any deficits in choice

responding. We used the standard 7-stage version comprising of multiple subtasks all

conducted within a single testing session (Birrell and Brown, 2000; Chase et al., 2012). In

rats, the ID/ED task has produced dissociable deficits after permanent cortical or thalamic

lesions, or neuropharmacological manipulations (e.g., Linley et al., 2016; McGaughy et al.,

2008; Tait et al., 2014; Tait et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2015).

In the current experiments, we predicted rats with MD lesions would show deficits

during the initial sensory acquisition (simple discrimination, SD) and the ED shift. Both the

SD and ED subtasks present online task changes that require rapidly altering response

strategies. Therefore, impaired SD and ED performance would be consistent with the

selective deficits in learning observed in other MD lesion rats (Hunt and Aggleton, 1998;

Mitchell and Dalrymple-Alford, 2005), or in primates with damage to the magnocellular

mediodorsal thalamic nucleus (MDmc: Browning et al., 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016;

Chakraborty et al., 2019; Mitchell, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2007a). We also predicted our MD

lesion rats may show deficits during reversal subtasks given the reciprocal direct connectivity

with the OFC (Groenwegen, 1988; Krettek and Price, 1977; Ray and Price, 1992).

In addition to our behavioral analyses, we examined c-Fos immunoreactivity in the

interconnected OFC and PrL cortex after rats re-performed either the SD or ED subtasks to

establish the extent of changes in cortical neural activation after the MD lesion.

2.0 Results

2.1 MD lesion site

Of the 25 adult rats involved in this experiment, 15 sustained MD lesions and 10 were MD

Sham controls (see Materials and Methods for details). All 15 MD lesion rats had extensive

excitotoxic (NMDA) lesion damage (see **Fig. 1**) within the medial and central subdivisions of

the MD, as intended. In all cases the lesion affected between 80–90% of the central and

medial MD, sparing only the lateral portions. The MD was consistently shrunken, and at the

lesion site there was significant cell loss. In all cases, the adjacent anterior thalamic nuclei

 (ATN) were spared. In two cases, there was unilateral (right-sided) damage in the lateral

126 habenulae (LHb) and some damage to the central medial nucleus lying underneath the MD.

Figure 1. A. Photomicrographs of the thalamus in a MD Sham control rat (top) and a MD lesion rat
(bottom). **B.** A series of coronal schematics throughout the mediodorsal thalamus showing the area of
cell loss in the MD lesion group. Numbers refer to the distance from bregma (Paxinos and Watson,
2008). Abbreviations: 3v: third ventricle; dLGN: dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus; LHb: lateral
habenula; LD: laterodorsal thalamus; MD: mediodorsal thalamus; MHb: medial habenula; PV:
paraventricular nucleus; VPM: ventral posterior medial thalamus.

2.2   The MD and attentional set-shifting

Preoperatively, rats were pseudo-randomly assigned to either of two groups: MD lesion or

MD Sham control, based on the number of trials needed to reach the learning criterion (six

correct consecutive trials in nine trials) during the simple discrimination (SD) subtask.

Preoperative data from one MD Sham control rat had to be discarded. An independent

samples t-test confirmed there was no significant difference between the two groups during

preoperative learning of the SD, $t(22) = 0.095$, $p > 0.05$, with rats from both groups requiring

a similar number of trials to reach criterion, MD lesion (Mean = 9.67, S.D. = 2.44) and MD

Sham control (Mean = 9.78, S.D.= 3.31).

Postoperatively, a repeated measures ANOVA with Stage (7 subtasks: SD, CD, REV1

ID, REV2, ED, REV3) as the within-group factor and Lesion_type (MD lesion vs MD Sham

control) as the between-group factor revealed a significant interaction, Stage × Lesion_type,

$F(6,138) = 63.65$, $p < 0.001$, a significant main effect of Stage, $F(6,138) = 184.73$, $p < 0.001$,

and a significant main effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,23) = 20.22$, $p < 0.001$ (see **Fig. 2A**). To

explore the interaction effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects of Stage

(corrected for multiple comparisons, $p < 0.007$; alpha = 0.05 divided by 7 tests) were

computed. For the SD subtask, MD lesion rats required more trials to criterion (M = 16.67,

S.D. = 1.23) compared with MD Sham controls (M = 9.50; S.D. = 2.07), indicating that the

rats with the MD lesion were slower to acquire the new sensory discrimination. An

independent samples t-test confirmed this difference was significant, $t(23) = 10.88$, $p < 0.001$.

However, once the rats with MD lesion acquired the rewarded sensory dimension (to respond

either to the digging media, or to the odor), they were unimpaired in subsequent subtasks that

maintained the same rewarded sensory dimension, namely concurrent discrimination (CD):

$t(23) = 0.00$, $p = 1.0$, and intra-dimensional shift (ID): $t(23) = 1.08$, $p < 0.291$. MD lesion rats

were also not impaired in the reversals (REV1 and REV2) of the reward contingencies

associated with the learned exemplars completed after the CD subtask, REV1: $t(23) = 2.31$, p

< 0.030, or after the ID subtask, REV2: $t(23) = 1.34$, $p < 0.192$, although, all rats were

familiar with the reversal rule as they had completed the ID/ED task preoperatively (see

Materials and Methods). **Supplementary Figure 1** shows the mean and 1st and 3rd quartile

box plots with the smallest and largest numbers of postoperative trials to criterion (whiskers)

for the individual rats during each of the subtasks.

Figure 2. (A) Mean (+SEM) trials to criterion data for the attentional set-shifting task. MD lesion rats
were significantly slower to learn the SD and the ED subtasks compared to MD Sham controls (*p
<0.001). MD Sham control rats also needed more trials to learn the ED, as expected. The MD lesion
rats required significantly fewer trials to criterion to learn REV3, the reversal occurring immediately
after the ED, compared to the MD Sham controls (*p <0.001). **(B)** Mean (+SEM) trials to criterion
shift cost data for the ED stage for preoperative (Pre) and postoperative (Post) testing sessions. The
shift cost is computed as the number of trials to criterion in the ED minus the number of trials to
criterion in the ID. Both groups of rats showed a shift cost during the ED, when they had to attend to
the previously irrelevant dimension. The shift cost for the MD lesion rats in the postoperative test
session was significantly different to the MD Sham controls.

For the extra-dimensional (ED) subtask, the rats had to shift their attention to the

previously irrelevant sensory dimension. Thus, given the rats had acquired the attentional set

strategy, as expected, all rats required more trials to criterion to learn the ED subtask. MD

Sham controls required (M = 15.70; S.D. = 1.64) more trials to learn the ED when compared

to trials required to learn the ID (M = 12.5; S.D. = 1.84). Similarly, the MD lesion rats

required more trials (M= 23.47, S.D. = 2.07) compared with trials to learn the ID (M = 11.73;

S.D. = 1.67; see **Fig. 2A**). A repeated measures ANOVA computing the trials to criterion for

these two subtasks (ID vs ED) showed a significant Stage x Lesion_type interaction, $F(1,23)$

= 99.96, p <0.001, a significant effect of Stage, $F(1,23)$ = 306.11, p <0.001, and a significant

effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,23)$ = 32.83, p <0.001 (see **Fig. 2A**). The interaction occurred as

the MD lesion rats required significantly more trials to criterion to consistently implement a

new choice strategy in order to learn which of two stimuli was rewarded from the previously

ignored sensory dimension compared to the MD Sham controls, $t(23) = 10.00$, $p < 0.001$.

The additional repeated measures ANOVA of Session (Preoperative vs Postoperative)

shift cost (see **Fig. 2B**) between Lesion_type computed as the number of trials to criterion for

the ED subtask minus the number of trials to criterion for the ID subtask for each session

showed a significant Session x Lesion_type interaction, $F(1,22) = 44.06$, $p < 0.001$, a

significant effect of Sesion, $F(1,22) = 38.27$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant effect of

Lesion_type, $F(1,22) = 15.46$, $p = 0.001$ (see **Fig. 2B**). The significant interaction occurred as

there was a small shift cost for both groups during the preoperative test session. However,

during the postoperative test session only the MD lesion rats showed a significant shift cost

as a consequence of the task demands changing that required an adjustment to the previously

well-established response strategy ($p < 0.001$). By contrast, the MD Sham controls showed a

similar shift cost to their preoperative performance.

Interestingly, for REV3, the reversal subtask that occurred after the ED shift, MD

lesion rats required fewer trials to criterion (M = 12.13, S.D. = 1.25) compared with the MD

Sham controls (M = 16.7; S.D. = 2.26; see **Fig. 2A**). An independent samples t-test

confirmed this difference was significant, $t(23) = 6.51$, $p < 0.001$, suggesting a facilitation in

performance as a consequence of over-training experienced during the ED subtask.

2.3   'On the fly' choice responses as a measure of rapid adaptability after MD lesion

Given the observed deficits in the MD lesion group, we investigated the behavioral responses

made in the MD lesion or MD Sham control rats. Given the task design and a criterion of six

consecutive correct responses before switching to the next stage, overall during testing the

rats do not complete many trials. Nevertheless, we could determined whether the rats rapidly

adapted their choice responses in the here and now ('on the fly' choice responses) as

measured by the number of correct 2nd choice responses made, i.e. when the rat dug from the

correct bowl only after visiting the incorrect bowl first but without digging in it, divided by

the total number of correct responses (correct 1st and 2nd choice responses combined) for each

session. During each subtask of the session, we recorded if the rat made a correct choice,

either on the first attempt ('1st choice response'), or on the 2nd attempt ('2nd choice response').

We did not include error trials in this analysis.

A repeated measures ANOVA of total percent correct 2nd choice responses was

conducted with Session (Preoperative vs Postoperative) as the repeated measure ×

Lesion_type revealed a significant interaction of Sesssion × Lesion_type, $F(1,21) = 9.40$, $p =$

0.006, a significant main effect of Session, $F(1,21) = 57.06$, $p <0.001$, and a significant main

effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,21) = 7.18$, $p = 0.014$ (see **Fig. 3A**). To investigate the interaction

effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects showed that the MD lesion rats (M =

28.18, SD = 7.61) made fewer correct 2nd choice responses compared to the MD Sham

controls (M = 35.23, SD = 8.46). This deficit suggests the MD lesion rats had a diminished

ability to fluidly bind together 'on-the-fly' their previous choice about what stimuli are worth

sampling in order to rapidly update their choice response strategy, rather than a deficit in

perseverative responding, or an inability to respond to negative feedback.

Figure 3. (**A**) Mean (+SEM) percent correct 2nd choice responses made during the preoperative and
postoperative performance sessions of the attentional set-shifting task. MD lesion rats made fewer
correct 2nd choice responses than MD Sham controls (* p's = 0.001).

2.4   Reaction time changes

Reaction times (in seconds) for errors were also computed for each rat in separate (preoperative (see **Fig. 4A**) and postoperative (see **Fig. 4B**)) analyses. Preoperatively, a repeated measures ANOVA with Stage (7 subtasks: SD, CD, REV1 ID, REV2, ED, REV3) as the within-group factor and Lesion-type (MD lesion vs MD Sham control) as the between-group factor revealed a significant main effect of Stage, $F(1,21) = 23.99$, $p <0.001$, but no effect of lesion, and no interaction, F's <1.0. This result indicates there was no difference in response times between the pseudo-randomly assigned groups (MD lesion and MD Sham controls) preoperatively and that all rats responded quicker on errors trials as they moved through subsequent subtasks within the session.

However, a separate repeated measures ANOVA of reaction times during postoperative error trials revealed a significant interaction of Stage × Lesion_type, $F(6,132) = 26.81$, $p <0.001$, a significant main effect of Stage, $F(6,132) = 22.45$, $p <0.001$, and a significant main effect of Lesion-type, $F(1,22) = 57.15$, $p <0.001$ (see **Fig. 4B**). To investigate the interaction effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects (corrected for multiple comparisons) were computed. Postoperatively, MD lesion rats responded slower on error trials during the SD subtask, $t(22) = 10.09$, $p <0.001$, the CD subtask, $t(22) = 7.65$, $p <0.001$, and the REV1 subtask, $t(22) = 4.44$, $p <0.001$. However, for the final reversal subtask, REV3, completed after the ED shift, MD lesion rats were quicker on the error trials than MD Sham controls, $t(22) = 3.53$, $p = 0.002$. This result in combination with the reduced trials to criterion required to complete this subtask (see **Fig. 2A**) suggests that the MD lesion rats may have experienced overtraining due to the number of additional trials to criterion required to adapt their choice responding in the ED subtask (Dhawan et al., 2019).

Figure 4. (**A**) Mean (+SEM) reaction time (secs) for preoperative error trials for MD Sham controls and MD lesion rats during each subtask of the ID/ED attentional set shifting task. (**B**) Mean (+SEM) reaction time (secs) for postoperative error trials for MD Sham controls and MD lesion rats during each subtask of the ID/ED attentional set shifting task (** $p < 0.001$; * $p = 0.002$).

2.5 Prefrontal cortex c-Fos immunolabeling

2.5.1 c-Fos expression after completing the simple discrimination (SD) subtask

Ten rats (five with MD lesion and five with MD Sham control) re-ran the SD subtask and were then placed into a dark holding cage for 90 mins prior to being perfused to detect changes in c-Fos expression levels in orbitofrontal (OFC) and prelimbic (PrL) cortex of the PFC. For these analyses, we used the raw cell counts (see Materials and Methods for further details). A 2×2 repeated measures ANOVA with PFC subregion (OFC, PrL) as the within-subject factor and Lesion_type (MD lesion vs MD Sham control) as the between-group factor showed no significant interaction, $F(1,8) = 3.33$, $p = 0.105$, although there was a significant main effect of subregion, $F(1,8) = 674.87$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant main effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,8) = 313.98$, $p < 0.001$ (see **Fig. 5A**). The MD lesion rats had reduced raw cell counts of c-Fos expression in both the OFC (M = 961.60, S.D. = 29.61) and PrL (M = 2316.80, S.D. = 144.51) compared to cell counts for the MD Sham controls (OFC: M = 1875.20, S.D. = 179.65; PrL: M = 3435.20, S.D. = 101.60; see **Fig. 5A and 6**).

Figure 5. **(A)** Mean (+SEM) raw cell counts in two prefrontal cortex (PFC) subregions: orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) and prelimbic cortex (PrL) of c-Fos (immediate early gene marker of neural activity) expression in neurons in MD Sham controls and MD lesion rats, 90 mins after learning the simple discrimination (SD). **(B)** Mean (+SEM) raw cell counts of c-Fos expressing neurons in MD Sham controls and MD lesion rats, 90 mins after learning the extra-dimensional shift (ED).

Figure 6. Example photomicrographs from a representative MD Sham control (left three panels) and a MD Lesion rat (right three panels) demonstrating the between group differences in c-Fos expression in two regions of the prefrontal cortex after completing the simple discrimination (SD) subtask. Images taken from the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) are shown in the top row and images from the prelimbic cortex (PrL) are shown in the bottom row. DAPI was used to visualise the location of cell nuclei. Red arrows indicate locations of some of the c-Fos immunoreactive cells. The merged images combine both DAPI and c-Fos images together. See Materials and Methods for further details. Scale bar is 100 μm.

2.5.2   c-Fos expression after completing the extra-dimensional (ED) subtask

Ten rats (five with MD lesion and five with MD Sham control) were re-ran in 6 subtasks: SD,

CD, REV1, ID, REV2, and ED, and were then placed into a dark holding cage for 90 mins

prior to being perfused to detect changes in c-Fos expression levels in the OFC and PrL

subregions after the ED subtask. We cannot attribute the changes in c-Fos expression to

performance in the ED subtask alone as all subtasks were completed in the 90 mins prior to

perfusion. Raw cell counts were also computed for this analysis (see Materials and Methods

for further details). A 2 × 2 repeated measures ANOVA showed that there was no significant

interaction of subregion x Lesion_type, $F(1,8) = 1.09$, $p = 0.327$, but there was a significant

main effect of subregion, $F(1,8) = 361.45$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant main effect of

Lesion_type, $F(1,8) = 151.47$, $p < 0.001$ (see **Fig. 5B**). After completing the ED subtask, the

rats with MD lesions had reduced c-Fos expression in the OFC (M = 947.20, S.D. = 37.35)

and PrL (M = 2654.40, S.D. = 167.66) compared to MD Sham controls (OFC: M = 1929.60,

S.D. = 286.91; PrL: M = 3459.20, S.D. = 115.60; see **Fig. 7**).

316
Figure 7. Example photomicrographs from a representative MD Sham control (left three panels) and
a MD Lesion rat (right three panels) demonstrating the between group differences in c-Fos expression
in two regions of the prefrontal cortex after completing the extra-dimensional discrimination (ED)
subtask. Images taken from the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) are shown in the top row and images from
the prelimbic cortex (PrL) are shown in the bottom row. DAPI was used to visualise the location of
cells. Red arrows indicate the locations of some c-Fos immunoreactive cells. The merged images
combine both DAPI and c-Fos images together. See Materials and Methods for further details. Scale
bar is 100 μm.

325
326
327

3.0   Discussion

This set of experiments investigated the active influence of rat mediodorsal thalamus (MD) in

cognitive flexibility. More specifically, we examined whether rats with excitotoxic lesions of

the central and medial MD were impaired in performing an attentional set-shifting task that

measures intra-dimensional (ID) and extra-dimensional (ED) shifts in attention to sensory

discriminations (digging media or odors). Our new results indicate that rats with MD lesion

required more trials to criterion to learn the optimal response strategy during the initial

simple discrimination (SD). Once this stable response strategy is learnt though, MD lesion

rats were able to attain an attentional set strategy as they acquired further two-choice

discriminations involving the same sensory dimension during the CD and ID shifts, and

during reversals (REV1 and REV2) of the reward contingencies associated to the exemplars.

However, when the relevant sensory dimension was switched, during the ED subtask, the

MD lesion rats were markedly impaired and required many more trials to update their choices

using a new response strategy, as measured by the significant ED shift cost. Further, for

REV3, the third reversal performed after the ED shift, the MD lesion rats showed facilitated

learning, suggesting they had received 'overtraining' as a consequence of completing many

more trials to reach criterion in the ED subtask. The analyses of behavioral responses

indicated that the MD lesion rats made significantly fewer correct 2nd choice responses

suggesting that information transfer via the MD is critical for the monitoring and updating of

choice response rules. Interestingly, similar updating deficits in choice responding have been

previously reported in rhesus macaques with magnocellular MD excitotoxic lesions

(Chakraborty et al., 2016). Finally, decreased c-Fos expression (an immediate early gene

marker of neuronal activity) was observed in the OFC and in PrL after re-running the rats in

the SD and ED subtasks, providing imaging evidence for the widespread influence of the MD

on cortical areas.

These behavioral data accord somewhat with previous studies conducted in several

species that targeted equivalent frontal regions. For example, marmosets with lateral PFC

lesions (Dias et al., 1996) or rats with medial PFC lesions (Birrell and Brown, 2000) are also

impaired at the ED subtask, showing a similar ED shift cost as our MD lesion rats.

Conversely though, lesions to these comparative PFC regions in marmosets and rats did not

cause more trials to criterion during acquisition of the initial choice response strategy in the

SD subtask, indicating frontal regions contribute to different aspects of cognitive flexibility.

In contrast, while rats with anterior thalamic nuclei (ATN) lesions are not impaired in the ED

shift, they are impaired at acquiring the SD subtask (Wright et al., 2015). However, in

contrast to our MD lesion rats, rats with ATN lesions continued to be impaired during the CD

subtask and subsequent ID shifts (Wright et al., 2015) suggesting an intact ATN (a brain

structure adjacent to the MD but with markedly different cortico-thalamo-cortical

connectivity) is important in supporting the formation of an attentional set strategy.

Conversely, with more trials, our rats with MD lesions were able to acquire the

optimal choice response strategy during the SD subtask and apply this optimal rule during

subsequent subtasks, but they were markedly impaired at rapidly adapting these now well-

established choice responses when they had to now attend to the previously irrelevant sensory

dimension during the ED shift. The demands on cognitive flexibility, response inhibition, and

adapting behavioral responses after negative feedback are increased when the animals must

make an ED shift, assuming they have acquired the ID attentional set strategy in the first

place (Dhwana et al., 2019). The increased effort involved in adapting to these changes in

attention is measured by a shift cost, and it is expected that more trials to criterion are

required during learning the ED than during learning the ID shift. While the ID/ED shift cost

was higher for both groups (Fig. 2B), it was significantly increased for the MD lesion rats

compared to the MD Sham controls. As indicated, increased shift costs have also been

observed in marmosets and rats with lesions to the medial PFC (Dias et al., 1996; Birrell and

Brown, 2000). Surprisingly though, rats with damage to the nucleus reuniens (Re), another

thalamic structure located near the MD, which interconnects the medial PFC and

hippocampus (Hoover and Vertes, 2007; Hoover and Vertes, 2011; Vertes et al., 2015) do not

cause deficits in the ED subtask or produce a significant ED shift cost. Instead, rats with NRe

damage are impaired at acquiring the attentional set strategy, similar to rats with ATN lesions

(Linley et al., 2016). Thus, our MD thalamus results are unique.

Other researchers using mice have proposed the MD supports the frontal cortex to

sustain intra-cortical attentional control without transferring categorical information about a

particular task rule (Schmitt et al., 2017), while others have shown medial PFC-MD

projections are important for behavioral flexibility but not task engagement (Marton et al.,

2017; Nakayama et al., 2018). Further, the MD has been shown to have a critical role in

maintaining the balance between excitation and inhibition in dorsomedial PFC via its

influence on interneurons (Anastasiades et al., 2021; Ferguson and Gao, 2018) and pyramidal

neurons (Collins et al., 2018; Delevich et al., 2015). Our results are supportive of these circuit

level interactions, although our deficits indicate the influence of MD on frontal circuits is

specific to certain aspects of the attentional set-shifting task, e.g. linked to the ED shift and

learning the optimal choice response strategy, but not to the ID shift or completing reversals.

However, our study involved permanent MD lesions, which are likely to have caused some

adaptations across the network, while the other studies likely involve short-term changes after

temporary inactivation of the MD. Nevertheless, it may be proposed that after MD

perturbations, while the animal is still able to detect a change in the task demands (i.e. they

are responsive to negative feedback), they are impaired at rapidly adapting their behavior and

coordinating correct choice responses after a change to the already established choice

response strategy (Block et al., 2007; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998). However, in both of these

studies, the deficits were attributed to increased perseverative responding. In contrast, our

current work and previous work in rhesus macaques has similarly shown an intact MDmc is

necessary for rapid reward guided learning of complex visual discriminations (Mitchell et al.,

2007a; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Chakraborty et al., 2019), although the deficits linked to

learning in monkeys are attributed to increased response switching (Mitchell et al., 2007a;

Chakraborty et al., 2016). These congruent results across species after MD damage suggest

that cortical information transfer via the MD is particularly important when 'on-the-fly'

changes in choice response strategies linked to establishing a new rule are required.

In addition, while the selectivity of the deficits after MD lesion are in some ways

comparative to medial PFC perturbations on attentional set-shifting, i.e. both have a

significant ED shift cost, our MD lesion rats also took more trials to criterion during the

simple discrimination (SD) subtask. Other studies also confirm MD lesion rats are impaired

in acquisition of an initial task rule (Hunt and Aggleton, 1998). Thus these results from

across species reinforce the notion that MD is not simply mimicking the PFC (DeNicola et

al., 2020; Miller et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2007; Mitchell and Gaffan 2008; Mitchell et al.,

2014). Consequently the influence of other cortico-cortical interactions that also indirectly

transfer information to the cortex via the MD and other thalamic structures, e.g. those PFC

interactions with limbic structures in the temporal lobes and sensory association areas must

also be important during learning sensory discriminations (Banjeree et al., 2020; Bueno-

Junior et al., 2018; Chakraborty et al., 2019; Floresco and Grace, 2003; Mitchell, 2015;

Pelekanos et al., 2020).

For the reversal subtasks (REV1 and REV2), surprisingly, MD lesion rats were

unimpaired during reversals in the reward contingencies. In contrast, rats or monkeys with

OFC perturbations are impaired in the reversal subtasks of the ID/ED task but conversely do

not show an ED shift cost (Dias et al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003; Chase et al.,

2012). MD is reciprocally connected to the OFC (Groenwegen, 1988; Preuss, 1995; Ray and

Price, 1992). Thus this double dissociation in deficits between these two reciprocally

interconnected brain regions needs to be reconciled. While previous evidence of reversal

learning deficits are reported in some tasks after MD lesion (Block et al., 2007; Chudasama et

al., 2001; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998; Ostlund and Balliene, 2008), the evidence is mixed

(Beracochea et al., 1989; Fresno et al., 2019). Our result and this evidence suggests the

information transfer between OFC and MD is not critical for reversal learning per se. Instead,

at least in monkeys, OFC-MDmc interactions are critical for adaptive, value based decision-

making (Browning et al., 2015; Izquierdo and Murray, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2007b).

Conversely, in rodent studies the OFC-striatal part of the cortico-striatal-thalamic neural

circuits are implicating in reversal learning (Gremel and Costa, 2013; Izqueirdo et al., 2017;

Nakayama et al 2018; Yang et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2005). Consequently other OFC-striatal-

thalamic and OFC-thalamic interactions are potentially involved in supporting reversal

learning. Thus far, it has been reported that thalamic inputs from the intralaminar thalamic

nuclei and motor thalamus to the striatum contribute a selective role in inhibitory control and

behavioral flexibility (e.g. Saund et al., 2017) and direct OFC connections to the submedius

thalamic nucleus contribute to updating action-outcome reversals (Fresno et al., 2019).

Intriguingly, our behavioral analyses showed that our MD lesion rats made fewer

correct 2nd choice responses. Given that MD lesion rats required more trials to criterion to

learn the SD and ED subtasks, this change in behavioral responses suggests that without the

MD thalamus, our rats could not rapidly adapt their initial choice responses after the changed

task demands. Interestingly though, this reduced correct 2nd choice responding does not

suggest the rats adopted perseverative responding or were not learning about the stimulus and

associated rewards. For example, after acquiring the ED shift, the MD lesion rats required

fewer trials to criterion to learn the final reversal, REV3. Instead, this facilitation of learning

during the final reversal subtask suggests that the rats had experienced 'overtraining' on the

stimulus features associated with each sensory dimension during learning the ED subtask

(Dhawan et al., 2019). As Pearce and Mackintosh (2010) propose, until learning is fully

consolidated, all stimulus features continue to be attended to and this is so for our rats even

with the MD lesion.

There may be other explanations for the SD and ED impairments observed in our MD

lesion rats. For example, with the ID/ ED task, it is important to establish that the animals

understand the relevant sensory dimension that is rewarded across the related subtasks within

the session. Fortunately, in our animals, this transfer of knowledge was evident as the MD

lesion rats showed reliable learning in the subtasks, CD, REV1, ID and REV2, that required

the implementation of choice responses (follow the same rule) to the same sensory dimension

as the SD to receive reward. Furthermore, both Sham controls and MD lesion rats showed

similar numbers of trials to criterion during the REV1 and REV2 subtask, which indicates

that they did not favor one feature of the stimulus dimension more than the other or that they

were insensitive to negative feedback. Finally, the MD is a subcortical node in the olfactory

neural circuitry that also includes the OFC (Courtiol et al., 2015; Veldhuizen et al., 2020).

However, evidence collected from rodents with MD perturbations or humans with strokes

affecting the MD indicates that changes to the MD do not impair olfactory discriminations

(Courtiol et al 2019; Tham et al., 2011). Moreover, our MD lesion rats showed similar levels

of olfactory discriminations as the MD Sham controls (see Material and Methods for further

details).

Finally, the reduced c-Fos counts in the OFC and medial PFC after MD lesion provide

additional support that MD-PFC interactions contribute to learning and cognitive flexibility.

Importantly, these changes highlight the diffuse influence of the MD thalamocortical inputs

to several frontal cortex structures (Alcaraz et al., 2016; Kuramoto et al. 2017; Mitchell,

2015; Wolff and Vann, 2019). Specifically, the reduction in c-Fos immunopositive counts in

the PrL, following MD lesion supports previous findings implicating medial PFC-MD

connectivity in flexible behaviors (Marton et al 2017; Nakayama et al., 2018). Furthermore,

the MD related reduction of c-Fos counts in the OFC provides additional evidence for the

contribution of this area in supporting online, 'here and now' reward guided learning and

decision-making (Gardner et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2019; Schoenbaum et al., 2011; Wallis,

2007). Intact OFC connectivity is essential to the animals' ability to perform reward-guided

learning in order that other interconnected neural networks, likely including cortico-cortical,

cortico-striatal, and cortico-thalamo-cortical connectivity, can determine the optimal choice

responses and implement the appropriate actions (Browning et al 2015; Chakraborty et al

2016; Nakayama et al 2018; Rushworth et al., 2011).

The ID/ ED task is analogous to the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST) in humans.

In healthy humans performing the WCST during neuroimaging, the MD is activated during

responding to negative feedback after the choice has been executed (Monchi et al., 2001).

Unfortunately, thus far, humans with stroke damage in the MD have cognitive deficits that

are clinically very poorly defined (Pergola et al., 2018). However, people diagnosed with

Alzheimer's disease (AD), Parkinson's disease (PD), or schizophrenia show impaired

attentional set-shifting performance (e.g. Barch et al., 2009; Monchi et al., 2004; Owen et al,

1993). Neuroimaging and post-mortem studies show marked changes in the MD and/ or ATN

in these diseases (Hornberger et al., 2012; Ouhaz et al., 2018; Pergola et al., 2015; Perry et

al., 2018). Our current evidence advocates for studies investigating cortico-thalamocortical

transfer of information in people diagnosed with AD combined with more frontal pathology,

or PD, or schizophrenia.

To conclude, excitotoxic damage to the rodent central and medial MD selectively

increased the trials to criterion on the ED subtask, producing a shift cost. This selective

503 performance deficit is similar to monkeys with lateral PFC inactivation (Dias et al., 1996;

504 Dias et al., 1997) and rats with medial PFC lesions (Birrell and Brown, 2000). Further, this

505 dissociable deficit after MD lesion contrasts with monkeys or rats with perturbations to the

506 OFC, who are selectively impaired on reversal learning, but not on ED shifts (Chase et al.,

507 2012; Dias et al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003). As evidenced, the frontal cortex is

508 critically involved in value based decision-making and reward guided learning (Miller, 2000;

509 Rushworth et al. 2011; Wallis, 2007). However, cortico-thalamo-cortical connections also

510 contribute a role (Browning et al. 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Izqueirdo and Murray,

511 2010; Mitchell et al., 2014; Pelekanos et al., 2020). In rodents, the MD and the medial PFC

512 together appear crucial for binding reward information and behavior (Bradfield et al., 2013;

513 Corbit et al., 2003), as inhibition of dorsomedial PFC-projecting MD neurons results in rats

514 having difficulties with tracking changes in action-outcome contingencies (Alcaraz et al.,

515 2018). In the current study, we show the rat medial and central MD is critical for

516 implementing and updating an optimal choice response strategy. That is, when the MD is

517 damaged, there is a diminished ability to rapidly learn a choice response strategy, as well as

518 update a well-established choice response strategy as task demands change within a session.

519 Reduced c-Fos expression observed in both the OFC and PrL support this evidence.

520 However, instead of increased perseverative errors as observed in other rodent studies with

521 MD lesions, our MD lesion rats made less correct 2nd choice responses, suggesting they were

522 unable to rapidly monitor and update 'on-the-fly' change of mind decisions when they

523 encountered the unrewarded stimuli on a given trial.

526 **4.0  Materials and Methods**

Animals: Twenty-five Lister hooded male rats weighing between 420 and 480 gm at time of

surgery (Charles River, UK) were group housed in a temperature and humidity-controlled

environment (21 ± 1°C). The housing and husbandry compiled with the ARRIVE guidelines

of the European Directive (2010/63/EU) for the care and use of laboratory animals. Testing

was conducted in the light phase of a 12hr light/dark cycle (lights on at 7am). The rats were

maintained on a controlled feeding schedule (20 g/rat/day) with water freely available in the

home cage. All experimental procedures were performed in compliance with the United

Kingdom Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act of 1986. A Home Office (UK) Project License

authorized to Dr AS Mitchell licensed all procedures after review by the University of Oxford

Animal Care and Ethical Review committee and Home Office Inspectorate.

Surgery: Rats were anesthetized by isoflurane and oxygen mix (4% induction, 1.8–2%

maintenance), and given analgesia in subcutaneous injections of 0.05mg/kg buprenorphine

(Vetergesic; 0.3 mg/ml) and 1 mg/kg Metacam (Meloxicam; 5 mg/ml). Rats were secured in

a stereotaxic frame (Kopf) with atraumatic ear bars and the nose bar set to +3.3 mm to

achieve a level skull. A subcutaneous injection of 2 mg/kg bupivacaine (Marcaine; 2.5

mg/ml) was administered into the scalp in the location of the midline incision. Viscotears was

applied to keep the eyes moist. During surgery, each rat was placed on a heat pad and

covered in bubble wrap with an internal rectal thermometer probe to monitor and maintain

normal body temperature. Warmed sterile saline (1 ml/100 gm) was administered

subcutaneous into the scruff of the neck after one hour. A midline incision was performed.

Bregma and lambda coordinates were determined. A dental drill with a trephine head was

used to create a craniotomy over the midline. To maximize lesion accuracy, anterior and

posterior injection sites were calculated from Mitchell et al. (2005) according to the bregma–

lambda distance in each rat. Coordinates were for anterior MD injection: anterior–posterior

(AP) = – 0.395 mm, medial-lateral (ML) = – 0.1 (avoiding the superior sagittal sinus, which

was visible within the dura inside the craniotomy) and dorsal-ventral (DV) = 0.56 mm (from

dura), volume of excitotoxin = 0.20 μl; for posterior MD: AP = – 0.435 mm, ML = + 0.1 and

DV = 0.57 mm (from dura), volume of excitotoxin = 0.18 μl. Fifteen rats (MD lesion)

received 0.12M of NMDA (N-methyl-D-Aspartate) dissolved in phosphate buffer (pH 7.20)

in each hemisphere from a 1 μl-gauge Hamilton bevelled-tip syringe. The injections were

performed manually, taking 3 min each, and after injection the needle was left in situ for a

further 3 min to allow diffusion and to limit wicking of the NMDA. A further 10 rats (MD

Sham controls) received injections of sterile phosphate buffer instead of NMDA using the

same injection coordinates. Injections were given bilaterally in the MD. Upon completion of

surgery, wounds were sutured with Vicryl 4.0. Rats were housed singly during recovery for

up to three days and were then returned to their pre-surgery housing cohort. Postoperative

oral analgesia, 1mg/kg Metacam (Meloxicam, 1.5 mg/ml) dissolved and set in jelly was

provided in individual bowls to each rat daily for three days. Behavioral and physiological

evidence showed that all rats recovered well, with normal eating and pre-surgery weights

returning within 24h. Food regulation (20 gm/day/rat) started again 10 d after recovery.

Postoperative testing began at least 15 d after surgery. The researcher was blind to the lesion

group of each animal until all tests were completed.

ID/ED Attentional Set Shifting paradigm

Apparatus: The test chamber consisted of a modified Plexiglass home cage (40 × 70 × 18

cm) with Perpex dividers separating the cage into a large start chamber (40 × 46 cm) and two

identically sized (24 × 20 cm) choice chambers to which access was controlled by removable

Perspex doors. The digging bowls were ceramic (internal diameter 7 cm, depth 4 cm) and

were placed within the choice chambers. The bowls were filled with digging media of

different textures, and the digging media were scented with different spices (see **Table 1** for

the examples used). The odor or digging media discriminations, pairs of stimuli used, and the

correct stimulus within pairs were counter-balanced across subtasks and matched between

groups. The bowls were baited with Honey Nut Cheerios (Nestle®), each bowl contained a

hidden (securely fixed under a metal grid) Honey Nut Cheerio to serve as an odor mask.

During testing, only one of the bowls was baited and rats determined which bowl was baited

using either the texture of the digging medium or the odor as cues. Prior to testing, rats were

taught to dig in bowls filled with home-cage bedding material to retrieve one half of a Honey

Nut Cheerio. The task was performed as previously described in Birrell and Brown (2000)

and divided into two phases administered on two consecutive days.

Table 1. Sensory dimensions (odors and digging media) and stimulus features (O1–O6;

M1–M6) used in the ID/ED attentional set-shifting task.

Odors		Digging media	
O1 - Cinnamon	O2 - Ginger	M1 – Coarse tea	M2 – Fine tea
O3 - Sage	O4 - Paprika	M3 - Sand	M4 - Grit
O5 - Turmeric	O6 - Cloves	M5 - Coarse shavings	M6 – Fine shavings

Training: On the day before testing, each rat learnt one simple two-choice discrimination

(SD) using either of the two sensory dimensions: odor (mint vs oregano), or digging media

(shredded paper vs cotton pads), to a criterion of six consecutive correct trials. The rewarded

odors or digging media were counterbalanced across the two groups, and these exemplars

were not used again throughout testing. Digging was defined as active digging with both

front paws or active foraging with the snout in the digging media. Sniffing or touching the

media with the paws was not scored as a dig.

Testing paradigm: The following day, each rat was given a series of seven two-choice

discriminations (subtasks) in the following order: a new simple discrimination (SD) using

either of two sensory dimension (odor or digging media); a compound discrimination (CD)

using the same rewarded sensory dimension and two-choice discrimination as the SD,

combined with the other irrelevant sensory dimension; first reversal (REV1), in which the

exemplars remained the same as in the CD but the correct (rewarded) and incorrect

exemplars were reversed; intra-dimensional shift (ID), in which new exemplars were used,

but the relevant sensory dimension remained the same as in the previous subtasks; second

reversal (REV2), where exemplars in the ID remained the same but the reward contingencies

of the two exemplars were reversed; extra-dimensional shift (ED), where new exemplars

were used and the previously irrelevant sensory dimension becomes relevant; and a third

reversal (REV3), where exemplars in the ED subtask remained the same but the reward

contingencies of the two exemplars were reversed.

The task is self-paced and relies on the natural foraging behaviors of the rats. The first

five two-choice discrimination subtasks (SD, CD, REV1, ID, REV2) must be solved by

discriminating between exemplars from the same sensory dimension. In this stage of the task,

the rat is rewarded for choices based on specific perceptual features of the stimuli, while

ignoring other features that also distinguish the stimuli. After acquiring each set of two-

choice discriminations to a performance criterion of six correct consecutive trials, the rats

encounter a reversal of the reward contingencies associated with the exemplars (a reversal

subtask: REV1 and REV2). For the final two subtasks (ED and REV3), exemplars from the

previously irrelevant sensory dimension become relevant. Therefore the rat must shift its

attention (and adjust its choice response strategy) to the previously irrelevant sensory

dimension and perceptual feature to receive reward (ED subtask). The attentional set-shfiting

cost is calculated by comparing trials to criterion during the intra-dimensional shift, where

the sensory dimension is consistent with previous subtasks, and the extra-dimensional shift,

where the now relevant sensory dimension had been previously ignored and thus requires a

shift to optimise continuing to retrieve rewards.

Odor detection test: At the completion of ID/ ED testing, the olfactory abilities of the rat to

smell the odor of the buried half-Honey Nut Cheerio were assessed. This task consisted of 10

consecutive trials where the rat was exposed to bowls containing similar bedding. The rat was

placed in the waiting area of the set-shifting apparatus. Similar bedding-filled bowls were

placed, one in each of the choice chambers, only one bowl contained half a Honey Nut

Cheerio at the bottom (pseudorandomly assigned to avoid the rat developing a response

strategy). The barrier was raised, allowing the rat access to both bowls. The rat had to chose

to dig into one bowl and had up to 15 minutes to make a digging response on each trial. If the

rat dug in the correct bowl, the trial was recorded as correct and the rat was returned to the

waiting area and the barrier lowered to block access to both choice chambers. If the rat dug in

the incorrect bowl, the trial was marked as incorrect. The rat was permitted to continue to

explore the incorrect bowl; the trial was terminated when the rat returned to the waiting area.

In all cases, the ability of each rat to detect the reward location was no different to chance

guessing.

c-Fos immunohistochemistry: After completion of either the SD or ED subtasks, the rats

were placed in a dark holding environment for 90 minutes before being deeply anaesthetized

with sodium pentobarbital (Euthanol 1.0 ml/rat, 200 mg/ml: Merial, Harlow, UK), and

perfused transcardially with 0.9% (w/v) saline and 4% (w/v) paraformaldehyde in 0.1M

phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Brains were then removed and post-fixed overnight (4˚C),

then incubated using 30% (w/v) sucrose in 0.1M PBS over 48h (4˚C). Free floating sections

(40 μm) were cut on a freezing microtome, the slices were then preserved in cryoprotectant

(0.1M PBS containing 24% (v/v) glycerol and 24% (v/v) ethylene glycol) and stored at

−20°C until processing for immunohistochemistry.

Sections containing frontal cortex were processed to assess the expression of the

immediate early gene *c-Fos* in the prelimbic (PrL) and OFC. After being removed from the

−20°C freezer, free floating sections were washed three times, for 10 minutes each, in 0.1M

phosphate buffered saline containing 0.2 % (v/v) Triton X-100 (PBS-Tx). Following

washing, non-specific binding was blocked by incubating the sections in 20% (v/v) normal

goat serum (NGS) in PBSTx for an hour at room temperature with gentle agitation. Sections

were then incubated in the primary antibody (rabbit antibody to human c-Fos: Catalog

#ABE457, Merck Millipore, 1:1000) in PBSTx with 1% (v/v) NGS for 48h at 4˚C. Sections

were then washed three times for 10 minutes each in PBSTx and then incubated, for four

hours in the dark at room temperature, in the secondary antibody (goat anti-rabbit IgG,

Cyanine3, Catalog #A-10520, Thermo Fisher, 1:1000) in PBSTx containing 1% (v/v) NGS.

Sections were washed three times for 10 mins in PBS before being mounted to glass slides

and cover slipped using VECTASHIELD (Vector Laboratories, Catalog #H-1200-10)

containing DAPI, a DNA stain to visualise cell nuclei. The slides dried and were then stored

in the dark at 4°C until visualized.

Immunohistochemical data collection: *Identification of regions of interest:* The slides

containing the two areas in frontal cortex: PrL and OFC cortex were determined according to

the atlas of Paxinos and Watson (2008). Confocal images were acquired with an

LSM880/Axio.Imager Z2 (Zeiss) the 20x objective was used and all imaging settings (laser

%, pinhole/optical section, pixel size, gain, and scanning speed) were kept constant between

animals. All cell counts were conducted blind to the experimental group. Cell counting and

image analysis were performed with a computer-assisted image analysis system (Neurolucida

Software, MicrobrightField). Double counting of the same cell was minimized using thin

sections (40 μm) and non-consecutive section collection (every fourth section). Three

bilateral sections per brain region per animal were counted and averaged to give the number

of c-Fos immunopositive cells. An analysis of the number of immunopositive cells was

determined using Abercrombie's formula (Abercrombie, 1946): $p = (1/f) AM/ (D + M)$,

where p is the total number of positive stained cells in the region of interest, f is the

frequency of the selected sections used for immunostaining (1/4), A is the gross cell count, M

is the thickness of the sections (40 μm), and D, (20 μm) is the average diameter of cell nuclei.

The same counting procedure was applied to both groups. Unbiased stereology was not used

in this study, so the results reported here represent relative, not absolute changes in c-Fos

immunoreactivity. The researchers were blinded to the photos that were being processed.

Lesion extent: Photomicrographs of the Nissl-stained MD sections were captured using a

camera mounted on a freestanding Leica DMR microscope (Leica Microsystems) using a

1.6× objective so that the whole section could be visualised in the photomicrograph. MD

volumes were measured using the NIH software ImageJ (http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/). In each

rat, the intact MD volume from both the left and the right hemisphere was assessed. The final

reading was calculated according to the Cavalieri principle (Regeur and Pakkenberg, 1989)

and expressed as the percentage of MD Sham controls.

Behavioral data analysis: In the behavioral experiments, all rats performed a preoperative

and postoperative session, and they completed the seven two-choice discrimination subtasks

in an identical order. Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation. Postoperative mean

trials to criterion, shift cost, percent correct 2nd choice responses, and reaction time (seconds)

were analysed using repeated measures ANOVAs with Stage (comprising the 7 subtasks) as

the within-group repeated measure and Lesion_type (MD lesion or MD Sham control) as the

between-group factor. For significant interactions, posthoc simple main effects analyses were

performed using additional two-way ANOVAs for repeated measures (e.g., ID/ED shift) or

independent t-tests for relevant subtasks (corrected for multiple comparisons). All statistical

analyses were calculated using SPSS 24 software. The significance level was set at $p <0.05$.

References

References

Abercrombie M (1946) Estimation of nuclear population from microtome sections. *The*

anatomical record, *94*(2), 239-247.

Alcaraz F, Fresno V, Marchand AR, Kremer EJ, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2018)

Thalamocortical and corticothalamic pathways differentially contribute to goal-directed

behaviors in the rat. *eLife*, *7*, e32517. 10.7554/eLife.32517

Alcaraz F, Marchand AR, Courtand G, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2016) Parallel inputs from the

mediodorsal thalamus to the prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Eur J Neurosci*. 44(3):1972-86.

10.1111/ejn.13316.

Andrews J, Wang L, Csernansky JG, Gado MH, Barch DM (2006) Abnormalities of thalamic

activation and cognition in schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*. 163(3):463-9.

10.1176/appi.ajp.163.3.463.

Banerjee A, Parente G, Teutsch J, Lewis C, Voigt FF, Helmchen F (2020) Value-guided

remapping of sensory cortex by lateral orbitofrontal cortex. *Nature* 585**,** 245–250.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2704-z

Barch DM, Braver TS, Carter CS, Poldrack RA, Robbins TW (2009) CNTRICS Final Task

Selection: Executive Control, *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 35: 115–135, 10.1093/schbul/sbn154

Beracochea DJ, Jaffard R, Jarrard LE (1989) Effects of anterior or dorsomedial thalamic ibotenic

lesions on learning and memory in rats. *Behav Neural Biol*. 51(3):364-76. 10.1016/s0163-

1047(89)91000-5.

Birrell JM, Brown VJ (2000) Medial frontal cortex mediates perceptual attentional set shifting

in the rat. *J Neurosci*. 20(11):4320-4.

Bissonette GB, Martins GJ, Franz TM, Harper ES, Schoenbaum G, Powell EM (2008) Double

dissociation of the effects of medial and orbital prefrontal cortical lesions on attentional

and affective shifts in mice. *J Neurosci*. 28:11124-30. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2820-

08.2008.

Block AE, Dhanji H, Thompson-Tardif SF, Floresco SB (2007) Thalamic–Prefrontal Cortical–

Ventral Striatal Circuitry Mediates Dissociable Components of Strategy Set

Shifting, *Cerebral Cortex*, 17(7): 1625-1636, 10.1093/cercor/bhl073

Bradfield LA, Hart G, Balleine BW (2013) The role of the anterior, mediodorsal, and

parafascicular thalamus in instrumental conditioning. *Front Systems Neurosci*, *7*, 51.

10.3389/fnsys.2013.00051

Brown VJ, Tait DS (2016) Attentional Set-Shifting Across Species. *Curr Top Behav*

Neurosci. 28:363-95. 10.1007/7854_2015_5002.

Browning PGF, Chakraborty S, Mitchell AS (2015) Evidence for mediodorsal thalamus and

prefrontal cortex interactions during cognition in macaques. *Cereb Cortex* 25, 4519-

4534

Bueno-Junior LS, Leite JP (2018) Input Convergence, Synaptic Plasticity and Functional

Coupling Across Hippocampal-Prefrontal-Thalamic Circuits. *Front Neural*

Circuits, *12*, 40. 10.3389/fncir.2018.00040

Chakraborty S, Kolling N, Walton ME, Mitchell AS (2016) Critical role for the mediodorsal

thalamus in permitting rapid reward-guided updating in stochastic reward environment.

eLife, 5:e13588. 10.7554/eLife.13588

Chakraborty S, Ouhaz Z, Mason S, Mitchell AS (2019) Macaque parvocellular mediodorsal

thalamus: dissociable contributions to learning and adaptive decision-making. *Eur J*

Neurosci doi: 10.1111/ejn.14078.

Chase EA, Tait DS, Brown VJ (2012) Lesions of the orbital prefrontal cortex impair

the formation of attentional set in rats. *Eur J Neurosci*. 36:2368-75.

10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08141.x.

Chudasama Y, Bussey TJ, Muir JL (2001) Effects of selective thalamic and prelimbic cortex

lesions on two types of visual discrimination and reversal learning. *Eur J Neurosci.*

14(6):1009-20. 10.1046/j.0953-816x.2001.01607.x.

Collins DP, Anastasiades PG, Marlin JJ, Carter AG (2018) Reciprocal circuits linking the

prefrontal cortex with dorsal and ventral thalamic nuclei. *Neuron*, *98:* 366–379.e4.

10.1016/j.neuron.2018.03.024

Corbit LH, Muir JL, Balleine BW (2003) Lesions of mediodorsal thalamus and anterior

thalamic nuclei produce dissociable effects on instrumental conditioning in rats. *Eur. J.*

Neurosci. 18, 1286–1294 10.1046/j.1460-9568.2003.02833.x

Courtiol E, Neiman M, Fleming G, Teixeira CM, Wilson DA (2019) A specific olfactory

cortico-thalamic pathway contributing to sampling performance during odor reversal

learning. *Brain Struct Funct.* 224, 961-971. 10.1007/s00429-018-1807-x

Courtiol E, Wilson DA (2015) The olfactory thalamus: unanswered questions about the role

of the mediodorsal thalamic nucleus in olfaction. *Front Neural Circuits.* 9, 49.

10.3389/fncir.2015.00049

Dajani DR, Uddin LQ (2015) Demystifying cognitive flexibility: Implications for clinical and

developmental neuroscience. Trends Neurosci. 38(9):571-8. doi:

10.1016/j.tins.2015.07.003.

DeNicola AL, Park MY, Crowe DA, MacDonald AW 3rd, Chafee MV (2020) Differential

Roles of Mediodorsal Nucleus of the Thalamus and Prefrontal Cortex in Decision-

Making and State Representation in a Cognitive Control Task Measuring Deficits in

Schizophrenia. *J Neurosci.* 40, 1650-1667. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1703-19.2020

Dhawan SS, Tait DA, Brown VJ (2019) More rapid reversal learning following overtraining

in the rat is evidence that behavioural and cognitive flexibility are dissociable.

Behavioural Brain Research, 363: 45-52. 10.1016/j.bbr.2019.01.055.

Dias R, Robbins TW, Roberts AC (1996) Dissociation in prefrontal cortex of affective and

attentional shifts. *Nature* 380:69–72. 10.1038/380069a0

Dias R, Robbins TW, Roberts AC (1997) Dissociable forms of inhibitory control within

prefrontal cortex with an analog of the Wisconsin Card Sort Test: restriction to novel

situations and independence from "on-line" processing. *J Neurosci* 17:9285–97.

Ferguson BR, Gao WJ (2018) PV Interneurons: Critical Regulators of E/I Balance for

Prefrontal Cortex-Dependent Behavior and Psychiatric Disorders. *Front Neural*

Circuits. 12:37. 10.3389/fncir.2018.00037.

Floresco SB, Grace AA (2003) Gating of hippocampal-evoked activity in prefrontal cortical

neurons by inputs from the mediodorsal thalamus and ventral tegmental area. *J*

Neurosci. 23(9):3930-3943. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-09-03930.2003

Fresno V, Parkes SL, Faugère A, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2019) A thalamocortical circuit for

updating action-outcome associations. *Elife.* 8:e46187. doi: 10.7554/eLife.46187.

Gardner MPH, Conroy JC, Sanchez DC, Zhou J, Schoenbaum G (2019) Real-Time Value

Integration during Economic Choice Is Regulated by Orbitofrontal Cortex. *Curr Biol*.

29(24):4315-4322.e4. 10.1016/j.cub.2019.10.058.

Gardner MPH, Conroy JS, Shaham MH, Styer CV, Schoenbaum G (2017) Lateral

Orbitofrontal Inactivation Dissociates Devaluation-Sensitive Behavior and Economic

Choice. *Neuron*. 96(5):1192-1203.e4. 10.1016/j.neuron.2017.10.026

Giraldo-Chica M, Rogers BP, Damon SM, Landman BA, Woodward ND (2018) Prefrontal-

thalamic anatomical connectivity and executive cognitive function in

schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry*. 83(6):509-517. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.09.022

Gremel C, Costa R (2013) Orbitofrontal and striatal circuits dynamically encode the shift

between goal-directed and habitual actions. *Nat Commun* **4,** 2264

https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3264

Groenewegen HJ (1988) Organisation of the afferent connections of the mediodorsal thalamic

nucleus in the rat, related to the mediodorsal prefrontal topography. *Neuroscience* 24,

379–431 10.1016/0306-4522(88)90339-9

Guillery RW, Sherman SM (2011) Branched thalamic afferents: what are the messages that they

relay to the cortex? *Brain Res Rev.* 66(1-2):205-19. 10.1016/j.brainresrev.2010.08.001

Halassa MM, Kastner S (2017) Thalamic functions in distributed cognitive control. *Nat*

Neurosci. 20(12):1669-1679. doi: 10.1038/s41593-017-0020-1.

Hoover WB, Vertes RP (2007) Anatomical analysis of afferent projections to the medial

prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Brain Struct Funct.* 212(2):149-79. 10.1007/s00429-007-

0150-4.

Hoover WB, Vertes RP (2011) Projections of the medial orbital and ventral orbital cortex in

the rat. *J Comp Neurol* 519:3766–3801. 10.1002/cne.22733 pmid:21800317

Hornberger M, Wong S, Tan R, Irish M, Piguet O, Kril J, Hodges JR, Halliday G (2012) In

vivo and post-mortem memory circuit integrity in frontotemporal dementia and

Alzheimer's disease. *Brain.* 135, 3015-3025. 10.1093/brain/aws239

Hunt PR, Aggleton JP (1998) Neurotoxic lesions of the dorsomedial thalamus impair the

acquisition but not the performance of delayed matching to place by rats: a deficit in

shifting response rules. *J Neurosci,* 18(23), 10045–10052.

https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.18-23-10045.1998

Izqueirdo A, Brigman JL, Radke AK, Rudebeck PH, Holmes A (2017). The neural basis of

reversal learning: An updated perspective. *Neuroscience.* 345, 12-26.

10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.03.021

Izquierdo A, Murray EA (2010) Functional interaction of medial mediodorsal thalamic

nucleus but not nucleus accumbens with amygdala and orbital prefrontal cortex is

822 essential for adaptive response selection after reinforcer devaluation. *J Neurosci.*

823 30(2):661-9. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3795-09.2010.

824 Krettek JE, Price JL (1977) Cortical projections of the mediodorsal nucleus and adjacent

825 thalamic nuclei in the rat. *J Comp Neurol.* 171, 157–91 10.1002/cne.901710204

826 Koechlin E, Ody C, Kouneiher F (2003) The architecture of cognitive control in the human

827 prefrontal cortex. *Science,* 302:1181-1185.

828 Linley, SB, Gallo, MM, Vertes, RP (2016) Lesions of the ventral midline thalamus produce

829 deficits in reversal learning and attention on an odor texture set shifting task. *Brain*

830 *Res*, *1649*(Pt A), 110–122. 10.1016/j.brainres.2016.08.022

831 Lindgren HS, Wickens R, Tait DS, Brown VJ, Dunnett SB (2013) Lesions of the

832 dorsomedial striatum impair formation of attentional set in rats.

833 *Neuropharmacology*. 71:148-53. 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.03.034.

834 Marton TF, Seifikar H, Luongo FJ, Lee AT, Sohal VS (2018) Roles of Prefrontal Cortex and

835 Mediodorsal Thalamus in Task Engagement and Behavioral Flexibility. *J Neurosci.*

836 38(10):2569-2578. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1728-17.2018.

837 McAlonan K, Brown VJ (2003) Orbital prefrontal cortex mediates reversal learning and not

838 attentional set shifting in the rat. *Behav Brain Res* 146:97- 103.

839 10.1016/j.bbr.2003.09.019 pmid:14643463

840 McGaughy J, Ross RS, Eichenbaum H (2008) Noradrenergic, but not cholinergic,

841 deafferentation of prefrontal cortex impairs attentional set- shifting. *Neuroscience*, *153*(1),

842 63–71. 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.01.064

843 Miller EK (2000) The prefrontal cortex and cognitive control. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 1, 59–65

844 Miller RLA, Francoeur MJ, Gibson BM, Mair RG (2017) Mediodorsal Thalamic Neurons Mirror

845 the Activity of Medial Prefrontal Neurons Responding to Movement and Reinforcement

during a Dynamic DNMTP Task. *eNeuro*. 4(5):ENEURO.0196-17.2017.

10.1523/ENEURO.0196-17.2017.

Mitchell AS (2015) The mediodorsal thalamus as a higher order thalamic relay nucleus

important for learning and decision-making. *Neurosci BioBehav Rev* 54, 76-88

Mitchell AS, Baxter MG, Gaffan D (2007a) Dissociable performance on scene memory

learning and strategy implementation after lesions to magnocellular mediodorsal

thalamic nucleus. *J. Neurosci*, 27: 11888-11895.

Mitchell AS, Browning PGF, Baxter MG (2007b) Neurotoxic lesions of the medial

mediodorsal nucleus of the thalamus disrupt reinforcer devaluation effects in rhesus

monkeys. *J. Neurosci*, 27: 11289-295.

Mitchell AS, Dalrymple-Alford JC (2005) Dissociable memory effects after medial thalamus

lesions in the rat. *Eur J Neurosci*, 22:973-985.

Mitchell AS, Gaffan D (2008) The primate magnocellular mediodorsal thalamus is necessary

for memory acquisition, not for retrieval. *J Neurosci*, 28: 258-263.

Mitchell AS, Sherman SM, Sommer M, Mair R, Vertes R, Chudasama Y (2014) Advances in

understanding mechanisms of thalamic relays in cognition and behavior. *J Neurosci*

34,15340-6

Monchi O, Petrides M, Petre V, Worsley K, Dagher A (2001) Wisconsin Card Sorting

revisited: distinct neural circuits participating in different stages of the task identified

by event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging. *J Neurosci*. 21(19):7733-41.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.21-19-07733.2001.

Monchi O, Petrides M, Doyon J, Postuma RB, Worsley K, Dagher A (2004) Neural bases of

set-shifting deficits in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurosci*. 24(3):702-10.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4860-03.2004.

Nakayama H, Ibañez-Tallon I, Heintz N (2018) Cell-Type-Specific Contributions of Medial

Prefrontal Neurons to Flexible Behaviors. *J Neurosci*. 38:4490-4504. doi:

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3537-17.2018.

Newman LA, McGaughy J (2011) Attentional effects of lesions to the anterior cingulate

cortex: how prior reinforcement influences distractibility. *Behav Neurosci*. 125(3):360-

371. doi:10.1037/a0023250

Ouhaz Z, Fleming H, Mitchell AS (2018) Cognitive Functions and Neurodevelopmental

Disorders Involving the Prefrontal Cortex and Mediodorsal Thalamus. *Front*

Neurosci, *12*, 33. 10.3389/fnins.2018.00033

Ostlund SB, Balleine BW (2008) Differential involvement of the BLA and MD in

instrumental action selection. *J. Neurosci*. 28, 4398–4405 10.1523/jneurosci.5472-

07.2008

Owen AM, Roberts AC, Hodges JR, Summers BA, Polkey CE, Robbins TW (1993)

Contrasting mechanisms of impaired attentional set-shifting in patients with frontal lobe

damage or Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 116:1159-75. 10.1093/brain/116.5.1159.

Parnaudeau S, O'Neill PK, Bolkan SS, Ward RD, Abbas AI, Roth BL, Balsam PD, Gordon

JA, Kellendonk C (2013) Inhibition of mediodorsal thalamus disrupts thalamofrontal

connectivity and cognition. *Neuron*. 77(6):1151-62. 10.1016/j.neuron.2013.01.038.

Paxinos G, Watson C (2008) *The rat brain in stereotaxic coordinates*. Academic Press;

Sydney.

Pearce JM, Mackintosh NJ (2010) Two theories of attention: a review and a possible

integration. In CJ Mitchell, ML Le Pelley (Eds). *Attention and Associative*

Learning: From Brain to Behaviour. Oxford University Press.

Pelekanos V, Premereur E, Mitchell DJ, Chakraborty S, Mason S, Lee ACH, Mitchell AS

(2020) Cortico-cortical and thalamocortical changes in functional connectivity and

white matter structural integrity after reward guided learning of visuospatial

discriminations in rhesus monkeys. *J Neurosci*. 40 (41) 7887-7901.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0364-20.2020

Pergola G, Danet L, Pitel AL, Carlesimo GA, Segobin S, Pariente J, Suchan B, Mitchell AS,

Barbeau EJ (2018) The human mediodorsal thalamus: a regulator of prefrontal activity

patterns and cognition. *Trends Cogn Sci.* pii: S1364-6613(18)30205-5.

10.1016/j.tics.2018.08.006.

Pergola G, Selvaggi P, Trizio S, Bertolino A, Blasi G (2015) The role of the thalamus in

schizophrenia from a neuroimaging perspective. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 54, 57-75.

doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.01.013

Perry JC, Pakkenberg B, Vann SD (2019) Striking reduction in neurons and glial cells in

anterior thalamic nuclei of older patients with Down syndrome. *Neurobiology of*

aging, *75*, 54-61.

Preuss TM (1995) Do Rats Have Prefrontal Cortex? The Rose-Woolsey-Akert Program

Reconsidered. *J Cog Neurosci*. 7:1, 1-24

Ray JP, Price JL (1992) The organization of the thalamocortical connections of the

mediodorsal thalamic nucleus in the rat, related to the ventral forebrain-prefrontal

cortex topography. *J Comp Neurol* 323:167-197.

doi:10.1002/cne.903230204 pmid:1401255

Regeur L, Pakkenberg B (1989) Optimizing sampling designs for volume measurements of

components of human brain using a stereological method. *J Microsc*. 155(Pt 1):113-21.

doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2818.1989.tb04300.x.

Rougier NP, Noelle DC, Braver TS, Cohen JD, O'Reilly RC (2005) Prefrontal cortex and

flexible cognitive control: Rules without symbols. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA,* 102:7338-

7343.

Rushworth MFS, Noonan MP, Boorman ED, Walton ME, Behrens TE (2011) Frontal cortex

and reward-guided learning and decision-making. *Neuron* 70, 1054–1069.

Saund J, Dautan D, Rostron C, Urcelay GP, Gerdjikov TV (2017) Thalamic inputs to

dorsomedial striatum are involved in inhibitory control: evidence from the five-choice

serial reaction time task in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 234(16):2399-2407.

doi:10.1007/s00213-017-4627-4

Schmitt L, Wimmer R, Nakajima M, Happ M, Mofakham S, Halassa MM (2017) Thalamic

amplification of cortical connectivity sustains attentional control. *Nature* **545,** 219–223.

10.1038/nature22073

Schoenbaum G, Takahashi Y, Liu TL, McDannald MA (2011) Does the orbitofrontal cortex

signal value?. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1239:87-99. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06210.x

Sherman SM, Guillery RW (2002) The role of the thalamus in the flow of information to the

cortex. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond Ser B Biol Sci*. 357, 1695–1708.

10.1098/rstb.2002.1161

Tait DS, Chase EA, Brown VJ (2014) Attentional set-shifting in rodents: a review of

behavioural methods and pharmacological results. *Curr Pharm Des*. 20(31):5046-59.

Tait DS, Bowman EM, Neuwirth LS, Brown VJ (2018) Assessment of intradimensional/

extradimensional attentional set-shifting in rats. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 89:72-84. doi:

10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.02.013.

Tham WWP, Stevenson RJ, Miller LA (2011) The role of the mediodorsal thalamic nucleus

in human olfaction. *Neurocase* 17, 148–159. 10.1080/13554794.2010.504728

Vertes RP, Linley SB, Hoover WB (2015) Limbic circuitry of the midline thalamus. *Neurosci*

Biobehav Rev. 54:89-107. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.01.014.

Wallis JD (2007) Orbitofrontal cortex and its contribution to decision-making. *Annu. Rev.*

Neurosci. 30, 31–56.

Wright NF, Vann SD, Aggleton JP, Nelson AJ (2015) A critical role for the anterior thalamus

in directing attention to task-relevant stimuli. *J Neurosci*. 35(14):5480-5488.

doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4945-14.2015

Yang Z, Wu G, Liu M, Sun X, Xu Q, Zhang C, Lei H (2020) Dysfunction of Orbitofrontal

GABAergic Interneurons Leads to Impaired Reversal Learning in a Mouse Model of

Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Current Biology*, doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.10.045.

Yin HH, Ostlund SB, Knowlton BJ, Balleine BW (2005) The role of the dorsomedial

striatum in instrumental conditioning. *Eur J Neurosci*. 22, 513–523 10.1111/j.1460-

9568.2005.04218.x