Enhancing associative learning in rats with a computationally designed training

protocol

Zhang, Xu O; Zhang, Yili; Engelke, Douglas S; Cho, Claire E; Smolen, Paul; Byrne,

John H; Do-Monte, Fabricio H[#].

#Corresponding author:

Fabricio H. Do Monte, DVM, PhD.

Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy

McGovern Medical School

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

Houston, Texas 77030

Phone: 713-500-5613

Email: fabricio.h.domonte@uth.tmc.edu

Keywords: Associative memory, fear conditioning, fear extinction, long-term

potentiation, learning model, spaced learning.

ABSTRACT

Associative learning requires the activation of protein kinases with distinct temporal

dynamics. Learning protocols with computationally designed intertrial intervals (ITIs)

that maximize the interaction between fast-activated protein kinase A (PKA) and slow-

activated extracellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK) enhance nonassociative learning

in *Aplysia*. Here, we tested whether an optimal learning protocol with irregular ITIs,

predicted computationally to increase the overlap between PKA and ERK signaling in

rat hippocampus, would enhance associative learning in mammals. We simulated

~1000 training protocols with irregular ITIs and identified an optimal protocol, predicted

to induce stronger associative learning than standard protocols with fixed ITIs. With

auditory fear conditioning, we showed that male adult rats exposed to the optimal

conditioning protocol exhibited stronger fear memory retrieval and impaired fear

memory extinction, compared to rats that received either massed or spaced

conditioning protocols with fixed ITIs. With fear extinction, we likewise observed that

fear conditioned rats exposed to the optimal extinction protocol showed improved

extinction of contextual fear memory, compared to rats that received standard extinction

protocols. Together, these findings demonstrate the capacity of a behavioral

intervention driven by a computational model of memory-related signaling pathways to

enhance associative learning in mammals and may provide greater insight into

strategies to improve cognition in humans.

INTRODUCTION

Long-term memory (LTM) formation that lasts for days to years is believed to be

mediated by synaptic plasticity including long-term potentiation (LTP) or its invertebrate

analogue long-term facilitation (LTF), which require gene expression and protein

synthesis (Martin et al., 2000; Kandel, 2001; Lynch, 2004; Alberini, 2009; Byrne and

Hawkins, 2015). Studies in the last decades have investigated LTP/LTF and their

underlying molecular processes as potential targets to enhance learning or restore

memory deficits in laboratory animals. However, traditional interventions using systemic

cognitive enhancers or intracerebral pharmacological manipulations (Sharif et al., 2021;

Lauterborn et al., 2016; McGaugh and Petrinovich, 1965; Lynch et al., 2014; Fernandez

et al., 2008) are either based on trial-and-error approaches in specific model systems or

are highly invasive, making the translation of such interventions difficult for human

applications. The recent development of neural recording and optogenetic techniques

has enabled precise control of neurons based on their intrinsic firing rates in order to

enhance learning or modify memories (Brown et al., 2012; Nabavi et al., 2014; Lee et

al., 2017; Liu et al., 2012), but the use of these techniques in humans remains

unforeseeable in the near future.

An alternative approach to enhance learning and memory is to develop computational

models to predict optimal training protocols based on the intracellular molecular

cascades that underlie LTM formation and LTP/LTF induction (Smolen et al., 2016;

Smolen et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). Previous studies have identified activation of

PKA (Schacher et al., 1988; Goldsmith and Abrams, 1991; Muller and Carew, 1998)

and of the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) isoform ERK (Martin et al., 1997;

Sharma and Carew, 2004; Sharma et al., 2003) as essential cascades for LTF. These

two pathways converge to phosphorylate transcriptional factors such as cAMP

responsive element binding protein (CREB), which subsequently induce expression of

multiple plasticity-related genes (Dash et al., 1990; Bartsch et al., 1995; Liu et al.,

2011). The observation that that these two pathways exhibit distinct kinetics of

activation (Muller and Carew, 1998; Philips et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2021), suggests

that the temporal activity patterns, and activation overlap, of these pathways may

constitute an important target to enhance associative learning. Accordingly, our

previous study demonstrated that a computationally designed protocol with irregular ITIs

predicted to maximize the overlap of PKA and ERK activities enhances LTF and

nonassociative learning, specifically the long-term sensitization of the tail elicited

siphon-withdrawal reflex in *Aplysia* (Zhang et al., 2011).

Substantial similarities between molecular processes of LTF in invertebrates and LTP in

mammals make it plausible that the same strategies used to enhance LTF and

nonassociative learning in invertebrates could enhance LTP and associative learning in

mammals. PKA activation in rodent hippocampus and amygdala is required for LTP and

LTM (Schafe and LeDoux, 2000; Abel et al., 1997). Similarly, activation of ERK/MAPK

cascades and their cross-talk with PKA kinase are required for the phosphorylation of

CREB and LTP induction (Adams and Sweatt, 2002; Impey et al., 1998). Albeit with

different kinetics than observed in invertebrates, PKA and ERK activation in mammals

also differ considerably in temporal dynamics (Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et

al., 2000; Wang et al., 2014), providing a similar opportunity to maximize their overlap

with irregular ITIs in an attempt to enhance memory formation.

Here, we tested if the invertebrate LTF model (Zhang et al., 2011) can be adapted to

computationally design an optimal associative learning protocol in mammals. Empirical

data from the literature were used to model PKA and ERK dynamics in rat hippocampus

(Wang et al., 2014; Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000), a critical brain

region implicated in the formation of associative memories in mammals (Milner et al., 1998; Mayes et al., 2007; Nakazawa et al., 2002). Then we simulated ~1000 different training protocols with irregular ITIs and identified an optimal protocol, predicted to induce stronger memory than standard training protocols with fixed ITIs. Using auditory fear conditioning and fear extinction paradigms in rats, we confirmed that our computationally designed protocol enhanced the acquisition as well as the extinction of fear memories in mammals. This strategy may have potential clinical relevance for interventions aiming at facilitating memory formation in psychiatric disorders associated with cognitive impairment in humans, as well as to enhance extinction-based therapies in patients suffering from fear-related disorders.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals

All experimental procedures were approved by the Center for Laboratory Animal Medicine and Care of The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston. National Institutes of Health guidelines for the care and use of laboratory animals were strictly followed in order to minimize any potential discomfort and suffering. A total of 120 male Long-Evans hooded adult rats (Charles Rivers Laboratories) 3-5 months of age and weighing 330-450 g were used. Rats were kept in a 12-hour light/12-hour dark cycle with food and water *ad libitum*. Experiments were conducted during the light phase. For the Optimal Extinction experiment, animals were maintained on a restricted diet of 18 g per day of standard laboratory rat chow to increase their motivation during

the lever press training. Rats' weights were monitored weekly to make sure that all

animals maintained their weight under food restriction.

Model Development

The mathematical model for the activation of kinase cascades critical for long-term

memory (LTM) was modified from a previous model of the signaling cascades for the

induction of long-term synaptic facilitation (Zhang et al., 2011). As mentioned above, the

induction of LTM for fear conditioning is known for requiring the activation of multiple

kinase cascades with different temporal dynamics. In the model, the cyclic AMP (cAMP)-

PKA pathway is rapidly activated after training, whereas the Raf- MEK-ERK pathway is

slowly activated, and both are required for the induction of LTM after fear conditioning

and extinction (**Fig. 1A, Fig. 4A**).

PKA Pathway. The dynamics of cAMP activation upstream of PKA following

training and the cAMP-dependent activation of PKA are described by Eqs. 1-4. Inactive

PKA is a holoenzyme (PKA_{RC}, Eq. 2), consisting of regulatory (PKA_R, Eq. 3) and catalytic

(PKA_C, Eq. 4) subunits.   In response to training, represented by the variable *Stim* in Eq.

1, cAMP is activated (Eq. 1). Active cAMP binds to the regulatory subunit of PKA, leading

to the release of free, active catalytic subunit (Fig. 1A) (Eqs. 2-4). '*Stim*' represents the

neurotransmitters released by training that function to activate kinase cascades.

138
$$\frac{d[cAMP]}{dt} = \lambda \frac{[Stim]}{[Stim] + K_{Stim}} - k_{b,cAMP}[cAMP] \qquad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

139
$$\frac{d[PKA_{RC}]}{dt} = k_{b,PKA}[PKA_C][PKA_R] - k_{f,PKA}[PKA_{RC}][cAMP]^2 \qquad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

$$\frac{d[PKA_R]}{dt} = k_{f,PKA}[PKA_{RC}][cAMP]^2 - k_{b,PKA}[PKA_C][PKA_R]$$ (Eq. 3)

$$\frac{d[PKA_C]}{dt} = k_{f,PKA}[PKA_{RC}][cAMP]^2 - k_{b,PKA}[PKA_C][PKA_R]$$ (Eq. 4)

Parameter values are modified from Zhang et al. (2011) to activate PKA immediately

after training, but with PKA activity quickly returning to the basal in ~5 min (Fig. 1B)

(Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000): λ = 14.6 μM/min, K_{STIM} = 85 μM,

$k_{b,cAMP}$ = 4 min^{-1}, $k_{f,PKA}$ = 20 μM^{-2}min^{-1}, $k_{b,PKA}$ = 12 μM^{-1}min^{-1}

ERK Pathway. The activation of ERK by training '*Stim*' is via sequential activation

of the upstream kinases Raf and MEK (Fig. 1A). Raf activates the MAP kinase kinase

MEK, MEK in turn activates the MAP kinase ERK. The differential equations describing

the activation of Raf, MEK, and ERK (Eqs. 5-12) are similar to those in Zhang et al. (2011).

However, a discrete time delay in activation of Raf was removed from the phosphorylation

of Raf (Eq. 5). Instead, based on empirical data (Wang et al., 2014; Ajay and Bhalla,

2004), parameters describing the activation of Raf were adjusted from Zhang et al. (2011)

so that the ERK activation curve reached the peak around 20 min post-training (Fig. 1B).

$$\frac{d[Raf^p]}{dt} = k_{f,Raf}[Raf][Stim] - k_{b,Raf}[Raf^p]$$ (Eq. 5)

$$[Raf] = [Raf]_{total} - [Raf^p]$$ (Eq. 6)

$$\frac{d[MEK]}{dt} = \frac{k_{b,MEK}[MEK^p]}{[MEK^p] + K_{MEK,2}} - \frac{k_{f,MEK}[Raf^p][MEK]}{[MEK] + K_{MEK,1}}$$ (Eq. 7)

158
$$\frac{d[MEK^{pp}]}{dt} = \frac{k_{f,MEK}[Raf^{p}][MEK^{p}]}{[MEK^{p}]+K_{MEK,1}} - \frac{k_{b,MEK}[MEK^{pp}]}{[MEK^{pp}]+K_{MEK,2}}$$ (Eq. 8)

159
$$[MEK^{p}] = [MEK]_{total} - [MEK] - [MEK^{pp}]$$ (Eq. 9)

160
$$\frac{d[ERK]}{dt} = \frac{k_{b,ERK}[ERK^{p}]}{[ERK^{p}]+K_{ERK,2}} - \frac{k_{f,ERK}[MEK^{pp}][ERK]}{[ERK]+K_{ERK,1}}$$ (Eq. 10)

161
$$\frac{d[ERK^{pp}]}{dt} = \frac{k_{f,ERK}[MEK^{pp}][ERK^{p}]}{[ERK^{p}]+K_{ERK,1}} - \frac{k_{b,ERK}[ERK^{pp}]}{[ERK^{pp}]+K_{ERK,2}}$$ (Eq. 11)

162
$$[ERK^{p}] = [ERK]_{total} - [ERK] - [ERK^{pp}]$$ (Eq. 12)

Parameter values: $k_{f,Raf}$ = 0.001 μM^{-1}min^{-1}, $k_{b,Raf}$ = 0.05 min^{-1}, $[Raf]_{total}$ = 0.5 μM,

$k_{f,MEK}$ = 0.41 min^{-1}, $k_{b,MEK}$ = 0.04 μM/min, $K_{MEK,1}$ = 0.20 μM,

$K_{MEK,2}$ = 0.19 μM, $[MEK]_{total}$ = 0.5 μM, $k_{f,ERK}$ = 0.41 min^{-1},

$k_{b,ERK}$ = 0.12 μM/min, $K_{ERK,1}$ = 0.19 μM,

$K_{ERK,2}$ = 0.21 μM, $[ERK]_{total}$ = 0.5 μM.

As in Zhang et al. (2011), a variable '*inducer*' was used to quantify the overlap of

activation between PKA and ERK, which together regulate the gene expression

necessary for the induction of LTM.

171   *inducer* = $k_{inducer}$ [PKA$_C$] [ERK^{pp}]   (Eq. 13)

where $k_{inducer}$ = 1 μM^{-1}.

To determine which protocols could more effectively activate *inducer,* four-trial

protocols with three ITIs, each ranging from 2–20 min in steps of 2 min, were simulated.

Combining these permutations yielded 10^3 protocols. For each protocol, the maximal

(peak) overlap between PKA and ERK was quantified as the peak level of *inducer*

produced. Also, the value of *Stim* was varied from 100 to 300 μM to represent weak and

strong trainings and to test the robustness of protocols. Based on the maximal overlap,

a protocol with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min was selected and was denoted optimal partial

conditioning (OPC). We assumed that fear conditioning and extinction activate the same

signaling pathways, so we predicted this protocol would similarly enhance extinction.

<u>Numerical methods.</u> Fourth-order Runge-Kutta integration was used for

integration of all differential equations with a time step of 3 s. Further time step reduction

did not lead to significant improvement in accuracy. The steady-state levels of variables

were determined after at least one simulated day, prior to any manipulations. The model

was programmed in XPPAUT (http://www.math.pitt.edu/~bard/xpp/xpp.html) (Ermentrout,

2002) and simulated on Dell Precision T1700 microcomputers.

Behavioral Tasks

Optimal Conditioning

Apparatuses

Two distinct chambers (context A and context B) positioned inside sound attenuating

boxes were used during the Optimal Conditioning experiments. Context A consisted of a

small operant chamber (34 cm high x 25 cm wide x 23 cm deep, 200 lux, Med

Associates, see schematic drawing in Fig. 2A top) with one of the two aluminum walls

covered by black adhesive paper and two transparent acrylic walls, and a metal grid

floor beneath which a microcentrifuge tube (Eppendorf) containing 50 µl of 10% amyl

acetate (Sigma-Aldrich) was positioned. Context B consisted of a larger acrylic operant

chamber (40 cm high x 50 cm wide x 26 cm deep, 20 lux, Med Associates, see

schematic drawing in Fig. 2A bottom) with one of its walls covered by a black and white

stripped paper, and a floor made of a white acrylic board beneath which a

microcentrifuge tube (Eppendorf) containing 50 µl of deionized water was positioned.

Procedures

On day 0, rats were placed in context A for a 20-min familiarization session. Next, rats

were assigned to three experimental groups by matching their baseline freezing and

locomotor activity during the familiarization session: Full Conditioning (FC), Partial

Conditioning (PC), and Optimal Partial Conditioning (OPC). On day 1, rats were placed

into context A and exposed to one nonreinforced habituation tone (3 kHz, 75 dB, 30 s)

followed by distinct fear conditioning protocols (44 min duration). The FC group received

eight presentations of a conditioned stimulus (CS, 3 kHz tone, 75 dB, 30 s) that co-

terminated with an unconditioned stimulus (US, footshock, 0.7 mA, 0.5 s), with fixed ITIs

of 270 s. The PC group received four similar CS-US pairings with the same ITIs of 270

s, and remained in the chamber until the end of the session. The OPC group received

four similar CS-US pairings with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min. On day 2, rats were placed in

context B and given two CS presentations (ITI of 150 s, 7 min duration) in the absence

of US to test the retrieval of tone-associated fear memory in a novel context. On day 3,

rats were returned to context A for an extinction training session where they received

twelve CS presentations (ITIs of 150 s, 37 min duration). The first four CSs were

compared to the last four CSs to assess extinction learning within the same session. On

day 4 and 5, rats were placed back in context A and B, respectively, and exposed to an

extinction retrieval session (similar to day 2). On day 29 and 30, rats were placed back

in context A and B, respectively, and exposed to a spontaneous recovery session

(similar to day 2). On day 1 and day 2, rats in the same group were trained

simultaneously in four chambers with the group order counterbalanced to avoid

interference from different protocols in neighboring chambers. On the following days,

rats were simultaneously tested in four chambers regardless of the group assignment.

Each rat was tested in the exact same chamber across the days. Footshocks, tones,

intertrial intervals, and session duration were controlled by an automated video tracking

system (ANY-maze, Stoelting), which also quantified the percentage of time freezing,

distance traveled, average speed and maximum speed. All rats passed the criteria of

20% of freezing during at least one CS of the fear conditioning session and the first two

CSs of the extinction session.

Optimal vs. Spaced Partial Conditioning

Apparatus and Procedures

The same apparatus and contexts described above were used. Following familiarization

on Day 0, rats were randomly assigned to two groups: Optimal Partial Conditioning

(OPC) and Spaced Partial Conditioning (SPC). The same procedures described above

were used here, except that: *i)* the footshock intensity was reduced from 0.7 mA to 0.5

mA to decrease the possibility of ceiling effects; *ii)* the SPC group received four CS-US

pairings with ITIs of 11 min and 10 s. The same automated video tracking system (ANY-

maze, Stoelting) described above was used for protocol control and behavioral

quantification. One rat that failed the criteria of 20% of freezing during at least one CS of

the fear conditioning session and the first two CSs of the extinction session was

excluded from the analyses.

Optimal Extinction

Lever-press training

Rats were placed in an acrylic/aluminum operant chamber (34 cm high x 25 cm wide x

23 cm deep, Med Associates, see schematic drawing in Fig. 4A) and trained to press a

lever for sucrose on a fixed ratio of one pellet for each press. Next, animals were trained

in a variable interval schedule of reinforcement that was gradually reduced across the

days (one pellet every 15 s, 30 s, or 60 s) until they reached a minimum criterion of 10

presses/min after 7 days of training. All sessions lasted 30 min and were performed on

consecutive days. Sucrose pellet delivery, variable intervals, and session duration were

controlled by an automated video tracking system (ANY-maze, Stoelting).

Apparatus and Procedure

On day 8, rats were placed into the same chamber where they had previously

undergone lever presses training. Animals were exposed to five nonreinforced

habituation tones (3 kHZ, 75 dB, 30 s duration) followed by seven CS-US pairings (ITIs

of 150 s, 37 min duration). The footshock intensity was increased from 0.7 mA to 1.0-

1.2 mA to result in stronger fear acquisition and consequently higher freezing levels

during the extinction training session in the next day. Rats were assigned to three

experimental groups by matching their freezing and lever presses during the fear

conditioning session: Full Extinction (FE), Partial Extinction (PE), and Optimized Partial

Extinction (OPE). On day 9, rats were returned to the same chamber for a fear

extinction session (39 min duration). The FE group received twelve CSs with ITIs of 150

s; the PE group received four CSs with ITIs of 150 s and remained in the chamber until

the end of the session; and the OPE group received four CSs with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16

min. On day 10 and 35, rats were placed into the same chamber and received two CSs

with an ITI of 150 s to test the strength of fear extinction memory during extinction

retrieval and spontaneous recovery tests, respectively. The same automated video

tracking system (ANY-maze, Stoelting) described above was used for protocol control

and behavioral quantification. Two rats that never reached the criterium of 20% of

freezing during at least one CS of the fear conditioning session and the first two CSs of

the extinction session were excluded from the analyses.

Quantification and statistical analysis

Rats were recorded with digital video cameras (Logitech C920) and behavioral indices

were measured using automated video-tracking system (ANY-maze). Lever presses per

minute were calculated by measuring the number of presses during the 30 s cue (or 30

s pre-cue) multiplied by two. All graphics and numerical values reported in the figures

are presented as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM). Grubbs's tests were used

to identify outliers ($p < 0.05$) in each experiment and one rat in Fig. 2 was removed after

identified by the test. Shapiro-wilk test was performed to determine whether the data

have a normal distribution. F test before pair-wise comparison and Brown-Forsythe test

before multiple group comparison were performed to test if groups have the same

variance. Statistical significance for parametric distributions was determined with paired

Student's t test, Welch's t test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or two-way

repeated-measures ANOVA followed by Tukey post-hoc comparisons, whereas

Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's post-hoc test was used for non-parametric

distributions (Prism 7), as indicated for each experiment. Sample size was based on

estimations from previous literature and experience.

Data availability

All data that support the findings presented in this study are available from the

corresponding author on reasonable request. Source codes will be submitted to the

ModelDB database (McDougal et al., 2015), and to GitHub (link to be updated).

RESULTS

A computational model based on PKA and ERK dynamics in rats identified an

optimal partial fear conditioning protocol

Our model previously used in *Aplysia* (Zhang et al., 2011) was adapted to simulate the

dynamics of PKA and ERK during the process of LTP induction in rat hippocampus

(**Fig. 1A**). In this model, the stimulus (*Stim*), which represents tetanic stimuli, rapidly

activates PKA via the cAMP pathway and slowly activates ERK via the Raf-MEK

pathway. The synergistic interaction between PKA and ERK pathways is quantified by a variable *inducer*, which corresponds to the efficacy of the stimulus in inducing LTP. ERK kinetics were described by differential equations (see Methods) with parameter values reproducing empirical findings that ERK activity reaches peak levels 15~20 min after BDNF treatment or tetanic stimuli in rat hippocampus acute slices (Wang et al., 2014; Ajay and Bhalla, 2004). Equations describing PKA kinetics simulated data showing that PKA is transiently activated within 2 min after LTP induction in slices from rat hippocampus or within 5 min *in vivo* after spatial discrimination task training (Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000). We used this model to simulation fear conditioning in rats, in which the pairing of a conditioned stimulus (CS) with an unconditioned stimulus (US) is represented by *Stim*, and the conditioned responses are proportional to the peak value of *inducer*. We observed that a single CS-US pairing produced little overlap between PKA and ERK pathways (**Fig. 1B1**). We then simulated ~1000 partial fear conditioning protocols, with 4 trials and varying ITIs, to identify one predicted to have optimal ITIs for triggering downstream gene activation. To compare, we also simulated a Full Conditioning (FC) protocol with 8 trials and a fixed ITI of 270 s, and a Partial Conditioning (PC) protocol with 4 trials and the same ITI of 270 s, which resemble previous protocols used for full and partial fear conditioning in rats (Detert et al., 2008; Lonsdorf et al., 2017). Our simulation identified an Optimal Partial Conditioning (OPC) protocol with 4 trials and irregular ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min, which was able to produce higher peak *inducer* than the standard PC protocol (**Fig. 1B2-1B4**). Based on our simulation, we predicted that the computationally designed OPC protocol would produce stronger long-term memory in rats than the standard PC protocol.

Figure 1. Computational simulations of PKA and ERK pathways predict an optimal protocol for fear conditioning. A, Schematic of the model. Stimulus (*Stim*) activates PKA via cAMP and activates ERK via Raf-MEK. The variable *inducer* quantifies the PKA/ERK interaction (activity overlap). **B1**, Simulated time courses of activated ERK (pERK, orange traces, μM) and activated PKA (PKAc, red traces) in response to one trial of *Stim* (μM). **B2**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces, μM), PKAc (red traces) and *inducer* (violet traces, nM) in response to an 8-trial protocol with regular ITIs of 4.5 min (full conditioning, FC). **B3**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces), PKAc (red traces), and *inducer* (violet traces) in response to a 4-trial protocol with regular ITIs of 4.5 min (partial conditioning, PC). **B4**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces), PKAc (red traces) and *inducer* (violet traces)

in response to a 4-trial protocol with computationally designed intervals (optimal partial conditioning,

OPC).

The optimal partial conditioning protocol induces stronger fear memory than a

standard partial conditioning protocol

To test if the computationally designed OPC protocol could enhance associative

learning in rats, we used a classical auditory fear conditioning paradigm. Because the

hippocampus is required for context encoding during fear conditioning (Phillips and

LeDoux, 1992; Selden et al., 1991; Maren et al., 2013), we used two different chambers

(context A and context B) to assess the contribution of the context to the auditory fear

memory. The two contexts differed in size, floor texture, visual decoration of the walls,

and odor cues (**Fig. 2A**). On Day 0, rats were pre-exposed to context A for 20 min to

familiarize with the chamber where fear conditioning took place in the following day.

After matching their baseline freezing and locomotor activity during the familiarization

session (**Fig. S1**), rats were assigned to one of the three experimental groups described

above in our simulation experiments: Full Conditioning (FC), Partial Conditioning (PC),

and Optimal Partial Conditioning (OPC). On Day 1, rats were placed into context A and

exposed to one nonreinforced habituation tone (3 kHZ, 75 dB, 30 s) followed by distinct

fear conditioning protocols (44 min duration, **Fig. 2B**). The FC group received eight

presentations of CS (3 kHZ tone, 75 dB, 30 s) that co-terminated with an US (footshock,

0.7 mA, 0.5 s) with ITIs of 270 s. The PC group received four similar CS-US pairings

with the same ITIs of 270 s, and remained in the chamber until the end of the session to

equate the total context exposure time. The OPC group received four similar CS-US

pairings with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min. All groups reached high levels of freezing (> 65%,

Fig. 2C) and reduced locomotion at the end of the fear acquisition session. On Day 2,

rats were placed in context B and given two CS presentations (ITI of 150 s, 7 min

duration) in the absence of US to test the retrieval of tone-associated fear memory in a

novel context. Compared to the FC group, both PC and OPC groups exhibited less

freezing during the second CS presentation (Two-way repeated measures (RM)

ANOVA followed by Tukey's post-hoc test. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 3.751, P = 0.033; FC vs. OPC: p =

0.029; FC vs. PC: p = 0.002; OPC vs. PC: p = 0.527). Nevertheless, both FC and OPC

groups showed reduced average speed during the retrieval test compared to the

standard PC group, suggesting stronger fear retrieval in a novel context (**Fig. 2D;** One-

way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 10.87, P < 0.001; FC vs. OPC:

p = 0.131; FC vs. PC: p < 0.001; OPC vs. PC: p = 0.024). On Day 3, rats were returned

to context A for an extinction training session where they received twelve CS

presentations (ITIs of 150 s, 37 min duration). Although no significant differences in

freezing levels were observed among the groups during each CS presentation (Two-

way RM ANOVA. $F_{(22, 407)}$ = 1.169, P = 0.271), a within session extinction analysis

comparing the first four CSs to the last four CSs revealed impaired extinction learning in

the FC and OPC groups, when compared to the PC group. This impairment in the

acquisition of extinction in the FC and OPC groups was characterized by sustained

freezing levels across the session, which differed from the PC group that showed

reduced freezing levels from the first to the last CSs presentation (**Fig. 2E left;** Paired

Student's t test. FC: t_{13} = 2.153, p = 0.051; PC: t_{11} = 4.191, p = 0.001; OPC: t_{13} = 0.869,

p = 0.400). Interestingly, the OPC group exhibited persistent freezing levels during the

extinction training session as indicated by a reduced relative change in freezing from

the beginning to the end of the session, when compared to the PC group (**Fig. 2E right;**

One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post-hoc test. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 3.315, P = 0.047; FC vs.

OPC: p = 0.487; FC vs. PC: p = 0.320; OPC vs. PC: p = 0.037). Despite the persistent

freezing levels across the extinction training session observed in the OPC group, no

significant differences were found between the OPC and the PC groups during either

the extinction retrieval tests performed on Days 4 and 5 (Two-way RM ANOVA. context

A: $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.097, P = 0.907; context B: $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 2.984, P = 0.063) or the spontaneous

recovery tests performed on Days 29 and 30 (**Fig. 2C;** Two-way RM ANOVA followed

by Tukey's post hoc test. context A: $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 3.259, P = 0.049; FC vs. OPC: p = 0.027;

FC vs. PC: p = 0.038; OPC vs. PC: p = 0.999; context B: $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.774, P = 0.469).

Taken together, these data demonstrate that the computationally designed training

protocol (OPC) is able to enhance fear acquisition in rats, thereby resulting in a stronger

fear memory that is more resistant to extinction.

Figure 2. Computationally designed protocol enhanced fear conditioning in rats. **A,** Schematics of the enhanced fear conditioning experimental procedures. Top: tests that were conducted in Context A. Bottom: tests that were conducted in Context B. **B,** Schematics of the fear conditioning protocols for full conditioning (FC, n = 14), partial conditioning (PC, n = 12), and optimal partial conditioning groups (OPC, n = 14). Following a habituation (Hab.) tone, rats received multiple trials of a conditioned stimulus (CS, 3

kHz tone, 30 s) that co-terminated with an unconditioned stimulus (US, footshock, 0.7 mA, 0.5 s). **C,**

Freezing levels during CS presentations of each group across the experiment. Two-way Repeated-

Measure ANOVA for each day followed by Tukey's post hoc test. Letters a, b, and c indicate pairwise

post hoc tests with $p < 0.05$: a, FC vs. OPC; b, FC vs. PC; c, OPC vs. PC. **D,** OPC group shows lower

average speed compared to PC group. One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey post hoc test. Letters b and c

indicate pairwise tests with $p < 0.05$: b, FC vs. PC ; c, OPC vs. PC. **E,** OPC group is resistant to extinction

while PC group shows significantly more extinction. Left, the freezing levels during the first 4 and last 4

CS presentations. Paired Student's t test. Letter e indicates test with $p < 0.05$: PC, Last 4 CS vs. First 4

CS. Right, normalized change of the freezing level during extinction, as indicated by the difference of the

freezing levels between last 4 and first 4 CS presentations as a percentage of the freezing level of the

first 4 CS presentations. One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test. * $p<0.05$. Letter c indicates

pairwise test with $p < 0.05$: OPC vs. PC. Data shown here and in subsequent illustrations as mean ±

SEM.

The optimal partial conditioning protocol induces stronger fear memory than a

spaced partial conditioning protocol

Previous studies have demonstrated that spaced learning protocols result in stronger

memories than standard (i.e., massed) learning protocols in both humans (Cepeda et

al., 2006; Raman et al., 2010) and rodents (Anderson et al., 2008; Jiang et al., 2019;

Scharf et al., 2002; but also see Cain et al., 2003). Thus, an alternative explanation for

the augmented fear memory observed in the OPC group in Fig. 2 could be simply a

trial-spacing effect, because our standard PC group used massed CS-US pairings.

Indeed, there was a broad range of effective 4-trial protocols (**Fig. S2**), with one

protocol with fixed 11 min 10 s ITIs producing a nearly identical peak level of inducer as

the OPC protocol, and a higher peak level of inducer than other protocols with fixed ITIs

from 1 min to 21 min (**Fig. 3A1, Fig. S2A**). We termed this protocol the spaced partial

conditioning (SPC) protocol. We also examined the effects of different stimulus

intensities on predicting optimal training trials. The 1,000 different protocols were re-

simulated with a reduced intensity of stimulus. Interestingly, the protocol with 4 trials

and irregular ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min still produced the greatest peak level of inducer

(**Fig. 3A2, Fig. S2B**). Equally interesting was that with weaker stimuli, the OPC protocol

became relatively more effective than the SPC protocol. Therefore, we predicted that

empirically, the irregular intervals of the OPC may produce more effective conditioning

than the SPC protocol. To test this hypothesis, we conducted an experiment to compare

the OPC and SPC protocols using a reduced shock intensity (0.5 mA instead of the 0.7

mA used in Fig. 2) (**Fig. 3B**). Rats were assigned to OPC or SPC groups by matching

their baseline freezing and locomotor activity during the familiarization session

(**Supplementary Fig. 1B**). During the fear acquisition, the SPC group received 4 CS-

US pairings with ITIs of 11 min and 10 s, whereas the OPC group was exposed to the

same protocol as in Fig. 2 (*i.e.*, 4 CS-US pairings with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min) (**Fig.**

3C). We found that the difference in the ITIs between the OPC and SPC groups was

sufficient to result in distinct levels of fear memory acquisition. Rats exposed to OPC

showed higher CS freezing levels during the third CS-US pairing of the fear acquisition

session (**Fig. 3D Day 1;** Two-way RM ANOVA followed by Tukey's planned

comparison. $F_{(4, 64)}$ = 1.550, P = 0.339; OPC vs. SPC: p = 0.019). In addition, fear

memory retrieval was increased when rats in the OPC group were returned to context A

for an extinction training session on Day 3, as indicated by higher freezing during the

first two CS presentations, compared to the SPC group (**Fig. 3D Inset;** Welch's t test.

$t_{12.43}$ = 2.227, p = 0.045). Both OPC and SPC groups exhibited the same levels of

freezing by the end of the extinction training session (**Fig. 3D Day 3;** Two-way RM

ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test. $F_{(11, 176)}$ = 2.997, P = 0.001; Tone 12, OPC

vs. SPC: p > 0.999), as well as during the extinction retrieval tests performed in context

A (**Fig. 3D Day 4;** Two-way RM ANOVA. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.097, P = 0.907) or context B (**Fig.**

3D Day 5; Two-way RM ANOVA. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 2.984, P = 0.629). However, fear memory

spontaneously recovered when rats in the OPC group were retested in context A

approximately 3 weeks later, as indicated by higher freezing during the first CS

presentation compared to SPC-trained rats (**Fig. 3D Day 29;** Two-way RM ANOVA

followed by Tukey's planned comparison. $F_{(2, 32)}$ = 1.809, P = 0.180; OPC vs. SPC: p =

0.030). In summary, these data suggest that the enhancement in fear memory

acquisition observed with our computationally designed OPC protocol cannot simply be

attributed to a trial-spacing effect or differences in the delay to remove the animals from

the chamber, but it is rather associated with the maximized overlap between PKA and

ERK signaling.

Figure 3. **Optimal partial conditioning protocol induced stronger fear memory than spaced partial**

conditioning protocol in rats. **A**, *Inducer* peak levels from the FC, PC, and OPC protocols, compared to

peak levels from partial conditioning protocols of 4 trials with regular ITIs varying from 1 to 21 min, using

standard intensity stimulus (**A1**) or reduced intensity stimulus (**A2**). The peak *inducer* values of FC, PC,

and OPC are labeled by dashed lines (black: FC; red: OPC; purple: PC). The blue curve gives peak

inducer values for the protocols with regular ITIs, and the curve peaks at the dark blue dot and arrow,

representing the SPC protocol with equal ITIs of 11 min and 10 s. **B,** Schematics of the fear conditioning

procedures. Top: tests that were conducted in Context A. Bottom: tests that were conducted in Context B.

C, Schematics of the fear conditioning protocols for optimal partial conditioning (OPC, n = 8), and spaced

partial conditioning groups (SPC, n = 10, ITI = 670 s). Following a habituation (Hab.) tone, rats received 4

trials of a conditioned stimulus (CS, 3 kHz tone, 30 s) that co-terminated with an unconditioned stimulus

(US, footshock, 0.5 mA, 0.5 s). **D,** Freezing levels during CS presentations of each group across the

experiment; Two-way repeated-measure ANOVA for each day followed by Tukey's pairwise post hoc test,

* p<0.05. Inset: the average freezing level during the first two CS presentations; Welch's t test, * p<0.05.

The computationally designed optimal partial conditioning protocol also

enhanced fear extinction

Extinction is a new learning that temporarily inhibits the initial associative memory (de

Oliveira Alvares and Do-Monte, 2021; Quirk and Mueller, 2008). Because previous

studies suggest that the molecular mechanisms underlying fear extinction learning are

similar to those underlying fear acquisition (Berman and Dudai, 2001; Flood et al., 1977;

Radulovic and Tronson, 2010; Santini et al., 2001; Szapiro et al., 2003; Tronson et al.,

2008), we hypothesized that the computationally designed protocol would also enhance

the acquisition of extinction, suppressing the original fear memory. We therefore used

the OPC protocol with 4 trials and irregular ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min as an Optimal Partial

Extinction (OPE) protocol (**Fig. 4B4**). We compared the OPE protocol with a Full

Extinction (FE, **Fig. 4B2**) protocol using 12 trials and ITIs of 150 s, and a Partial

Extinction (PE, **Fig. 4B3**) protocol using 4 trials and the same ITIs of 150 s, which

resemble previous protocols used for full and partial fear extinction in rats (Santini et al.,

2004; Holmes and Quirk, 2010; Do-Monte et al., 2015). Similar to the simulation results

for the conditioning protocols, the OPE protocol triggered higher peak *inducer* than the

PE protocol with equal ITIs of 150 s, and was comparable to the FE protocol (**Fig. 4B**).

We thus predicted the OPE protocol would result in stronger extinction of fear memory

than the standard PE protocol.

Figure 4. Prediction of enhanced protocol for fear extinction. A, Schematic of the model. **B1**,

Simulated time courses of activated ERK (pERK, orange traces, μM) and activated PKA (PKAc, red

traces) in response to one trial of *Stim* (μM). **B2**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces, μM),

PKAc (red traces) and *inducer* (violet traces, nM) in response to 12-trial protocol with regular intervals of

2.5 min (full extinction, FE). **B3**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces), PKAc (red traces) and

inducer (violet traces) in response to 4-trial protocol with regular intervals of 2.5 min (partial extinction,

PE). **B4**, Simulated time courses of pERK (orange traces), PKAc (red traces) and *inducer* (violet traces) in

response to 4-trial protocol with computationally designed intervals (optimal partial extinction, OPE).

To test this prediction, we designed an experiment comparing the efficacy of different

extinction protocols (**Fig. 5A**). We used conditioned suppression of reward-seeking

behavior as an additional measure of fear memory because lever-press suppression is

more sensitive than freezing during fear extinction paradigms (Mast et al., 1982; Sotres-

Bayon et al., 2012). In addition, lever presses help to maintain a constant level of

activity so that freezing can be more reliably measured along the session (Quirk et al.,

2000). Since lever presses for reward are trained in a specific context, and extinction

memory is context-dependent (Podlesnik et al., 2017; Goode and Maren, 2014), we

used only one context in this experiment so that lever press suppression can be

consistently assessed across sessions and the extinction memory can be retrieved after

the extinction learning. Rats were initially trained to press a lever to receive sucrose

pellets in a variable interval schedule of 60 s. After 7 days of training, rats reached the

same levels of lever pressing (~10 presses/min) and locomotor activity (**Supplementary**

Fig. 1C). On Day 8, they underwent a fear conditioning session which included five

nonreinforced habituation tones (3 kHZ, 75 dB, 30 s duration) followed by seven CS-US

pairings (ITIs of 150 s, 37 min duration). In simulations, the OPE group showed peak

levels of *inducer* comparable to the FE group and higher than the PE group when strong

stimuli were used. We therefore increased the footshock intensity from 0.7 mA to 1.0

mA, which resulted in stronger fear acquisition and consequently higher freezing levels

during the extinction session. This stimulus intensity also helped to avoid a "floor effect"

in the following tests. On Day 9, rats were assigned to three experimental groups by

matching their freezing and lever presses during the fear conditioning session: Full

Extinction (FE), Partial Extinction (PE), and Optimal Partial Extinction (OPE) (One-way

ANOVA. $F_{(14, 231)}$ = 0.404, P = 0.973). On Day 10, rats were returned to the same

chamber for a fear extinction session (39 min duration). The FE group received twelve

CSs with ITIs of 150 s; the PE group received four CSs with ITIs of 150 s and remained

in the chamber until the end of the session; and the OPE group received four CSs with

ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min (**Fig. 5B**). Our results revealed that at the end of the CS

presentations, freezing levels reduced from ~50% to ~20% in the FE groups, whereas

the PE and OPE groups maintained the same levels of freezing throughout the four CSs

(**Fig. 5C, Day 8**). Similarly, the FE group showed a significant increase in lever presses

(from 0.1 to 1.5 press/min) during the CS presentations from the beginning to the end of

the session, whereas CS lever presses remained unaltered in the PE and OPE groups

(**Supplementary Fig. 3A&B**; Paired Student's t test; FE: t_{11} = 2.837, p = 0.016; PE: t_{10}

= 1.000, p = 0.341; OPE: t_{12} = 1.237, p = 0.239). However, the OPE group showed a

significant increase in lever presses during the 30-s periods that preceded the CS

presentations (pre-CS) when comparing the first two pre-CS periods to the last pre-CS

period of the extinction training session (**Fig. 5D&E**; Paired Student's t test; FE: t_{11} =

0.994, p = 0.341; PE: t_{10} = 1.111, p = 0.293; OPE: t_{12} = 3.773, p = 0.003), suggesting

enhanced within-session extinction of contextual fear memory (Morgan and LeDoux,

1995). On Days 10 and 35, rats were returned to the same chamber and received two

CSs with an ITI of 150 s to test the strength of fear extinction memory during extinction

retrieval and spontaneous recovery tests, respectively. No significant difference in CS

freezing or CS lever presses were observed among the three groups during these tests

(**Fig. 5C, Day 10&35;** Two-way RM ANOVA. Day 10: Freezing, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 0.207, P =

0.814; Lever Presses, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 0.069, P = 0.933; Day 35: Freezing, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 0.535, P =

0.591; Lever Presses, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 1.085, P = 0.350). However, the OPE group showed

increased pre-CS lever pressing rate either in the first pre-CS period (**Fig. 5D;** Two-way

RM ANOVA followed by Tukey's planned comparison. $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 2.897, P = 0.069; Tone

1, a, FE vs. PE, p = 0.791; b, FE vs. OPE, p = 0.025; c, OPE vs. PE, p = 0.005) or

when averaging the two pre-CS periods during the spontaneous recovery test (**Fig. 5F**;

Kruskal-Wallis's test followed by Dunn's post hoc test. $H(2)$ = 6.414, P = 0.041; a: FE

vs. OPE, p = 0.531; b: FE vs. PE, p = 0.709; c: OPE vs. PE, p = 0.035), when compared

to the FE and PE groups on day 35. These results suggest that, although the tone-

associated memory was similar among the groups, our computationally designed OPE

protocol was able to enhance the extinction of contextual fear memory, as indicated by

enhanced within-session extinction of conditioned suppression and by reduced

conditioned suppression approximately 3 weeks after the extinction training session.

Figure 5. Computationally designed protocol enhanced fear extinction in rats. **A.** Schematic of the

enhanced fear extinction experimental procedures. Rats were trained to constantly press a lever to

retrieve sucrose pellets in a variable interval 60 (VI60) schedule, where the average interval between

each sucrose delivery is 60 s. **B,** Schematics of the fear extinction protocols for full extinction (FE, n =

12), partial extinction (PE, n = 11), and optimal partial extinction groups (OPE, n = 13), during which rats

received multiple trials of a conditioned stimulus (CS, 3 kHz tone, 30 s). **C,** Freezing levels during CS

presentations of each group across the experiment. No significant difference between groups was found

by Two-way RM ANOVA. **D,** Lever presses rates during the 30s of each CS presentation (pre-CS period)

of each group across the experiment. Two-way repeated-measure ANOVA for each day followed by

Tukey's pairwise post hoc test. Letters a and c indicate pairwise tests with $p < 0.05$: a, FE vs. OPE ; c,

OPE vs. PE. **E,** OPE group shows significant increase of pre-CS lever presses comparing the last CS

presentation to the average lever press rate of the first two CS presentations. Paired Student's t test.

Letter f indicates test with $p < 0.05$: OPC, Last 4 CS vs. First 4 CS. **F,** OPE group shows higher lever

presses during pre-CS period compared to PE group in spontaneous recovery test. One-way ANOVA

followed by Tukey's post hoc test. Letter c indicates pairwise comparison with * $p<0.05$: OPE vs. PE.

DISCUSSION

Studies on nonassociative learning in invertebrates have provided significant insights

about the molecular mechanisms of learning and memory due to their simplicity and

tractability (Byrne and Hawkins, 2015; Kandel, 2001; Carew and Sahley, 1986). Long-

term nonassociative learning in different regions of the nervous system or across

different species shares many intracellular molecular cascades including cAMP-PKA

and Raf-MEK-ERK signaling (Bartsch et al., 1995; Martin et al., 1997). These two

pathways are also required for associative learning in invertebrates and mammals

(Hawkins and Byrne, 2015; Schafe and LeDoux, 2000; Adams and Sweatt, 2002). The

conservation of these mechanisms makes these molecular cascades potential

candidates for a universal intervention to enhance learning and memory. We have

previously demonstrated that a computationally designed protocol that maximizes the

interaction between PKA and ERK pathways enhances LTF and nonassociative

learning in *Aplysia* (Zhang et al., 2011). Here, we extended the feasibility of this

computational approach to associative learning in mammals by adapting the simplified

mathematical model used in *Aplysia* to simulate the dynamics of PKA and ERK in rat

hippocampus based on empirical data available in the literature (Wang et al., 2014;

Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000). After simulating ~1000 different

training protocols of auditory fear conditioning, we identified an optimal protocol with

irregular ITIs which resulted in stronger fear acquisition and extinction-resistant memory

formation in rats, when compared to either massed or spaced training protocols with

equal ITIs. Using a separate fear extinction paradigm, we also showed that an optimal

training protocol was sufficient to induce enhanced extinction of contextual fear memory

in rats, when compared to standard or partial extinction protocols with equal ITIs. Our

results demonstrate the power of a simplified model of intracellular signaling cascades

in guiding associative learning across species, attesting the essential role of the

interaction between PKA and ERK pathways in both nonassociative and associative

learning. In addition, our findings highlight the potential clinical relevance of using

computational modeling to enhance associative learning in patients with memory

deficits, as well as to enhance extinction-based exposure therapies in patients with

anxiety disorders.

Pioneering studies have demonstrated that training protocols using spaced ITIs result in

stronger memory acquisition than those using standard massed ITIs, a well-established

phenomenon described as the "trial-spacing effect" (see review by Smolen et al., 2016).

Data demonstrating this effect in animals and humans illustrate the relationship between

the duration of the ITIs and the strength of memory formation as an inverted-U-shape

curve (Verkoeijen et al., 2005; Barela, 1999), consistent with our simulated results (Fig.

1C). Previous findings have attributed this spacing effect to the different efficacy of

massed vs. spaced protocols in inducing LTP/LTF through plasticity-related signaling.

For instance, spaced training protocols in rodents lead to increased activation of ERK

(Ajay and Bhalla, 2007), followed by CREB phosphorylation and the expression of

downstream genes, which have not been reported following massed training protocols

in the same species (Genoux et al., 2002). A computational model based on slice

electrophysiology from rat hippocampal data has found that the peak of ERK activation

aligns with the optimal ITI for LTP induction (Ajay and Bhalla, 2004). Although that study

provided a possible mechanism for the trial-spacing effect and a potential approach to

identify more effective protocols for associative learning, it relied on fixed ITIs that are

not necessarily the optimal intervals to induce synaptic plasticity and LTM. In fact, our

simulations showed that an optimal protocol with irregular ITIs was superior to most

spaced protocols with the same number of trials and equal ITIs. In the fear conditioning

experiment, the optimal protocol induced stronger and persistent fear memory in rats,

when compared to a spaced protocol predicted to be the most efficient among protocols

with equal ITIs. These results suggest that the trial-spacing effect in mammals can be at

least partially explained by enhanced overlap between PKA and ERK pathways, which

are critical for CREB activation (Impey et al., 1998). More importantly, our findings

demonstrate that protocols that include irregular ITIs can be a better approach to

enhance learning than previous protocols using equal ITIs.

The enhanced performance of our optimal protocol (OPC) compared to a spaced

protocol (SPC) during fear conditioning appears constrained by the intensity of stimuli.

The model predicts higher performance for OPC when weak stimuli are used, but

comparable performance when strong stimuli are used (**Fig. 3A**). Drawing a line to

distinguish weak and strong footshock intensities is not straightforward because the

relationship between fear memory and footshock intensity is neither monotonic nor

linear (Davis and Astrachan, 1978). Nevertheless, we observed clear differences in the

efficacy of the optimal fear conditioning protocol when using footshocks of different

intensities. When we compared the optimal partial conditioning protocol to a massed

partial conditioning protocol using a standard footshock intensity (0.7 mA, **Fig.2**)

commonly used in previous studies (Abel et al., 1997), we found only small differences

in the conditioned responses (CS freezing) between the two protocols. However, when

we used a lower footshock intensity (0.5 mA, **Fig.3**) to compare the optimal partial

conditioning protocol to a spaced partial conditioning protocol, we found a significant

increase in CS freezing in the OPC group during fear acquisition, retrieval, and

spontaneous recovery tests. Considering the robustness of the trial-spacing effect, it is

possible that differences between the OPC and the massed PC groups at the higher

footshock intensity were masked by a "ceiling effect". These data suggest that our

approach could be more beneficial for learning protocols relying on relatively weak

stimuli. Additional studies need to be conducted to understand the mechanism by which

the intensity of stimuli determines the enhanced performance of protocols with irregular

ITIs compared to protocols with fixed ITIs.

The association between the CS and US is primarily mediated by the lateral amygdala

where LTP induces enhanced CS responses (see review by Maren, 2005; Johansen et

al., 2011). Nevertheless, another important and distinguishable component of fear

memory formation is the context in which the association has occurred. In the fear

conditioning experiment, enhanced CS freezing by our computationally designed

protocol was only observed in the same context where fear conditioning took place,

suggesting that the memory facilitation effect induced by our optimal protocol is context

dependent. Similarly, in the fear extinction experiment, enhancement by the optimal

protocol was only observed during the pre-CS lever pressing, a more sensitive index of

contextual fear memory during extinction and spontaneous recovery (Morgan and

LeDoux, 1995; Padilla-Coreano et al., 2012; Woods and Bouton, 2008; Mast et al.,

1982; Sotres-Bayon et al., 2012). These results are consistent with the fact that the

model is based on empirical data from rat hippocampus currently available in the

literature. The hippocampus plays major roles in context encoding during fear

conditioning, fear extinction, and the time-dependent reappearance of fear following

extinction training (*i.e.*, spontaneous recovery) (see reviews by Maren et al., 2013;

Bouton et al., 2021). The observation that the temporal dynamics of ERK pathways

differ across brain regions involved in fear memory, with peaks occurring at 20 min after

stimulation in the hippocampus versus 60 min after fear conditioning in the lateral

amygdala (Schafe et al., 2000; Di Benedetto et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2014) , suggests

that the model may be able to predict optimal protocols targeting specific components of

fear memory based on the dynamics of intracellular signaling cascades in distinct brain

regions. Future studies will test this possibility by modeling the molecular cascades in

the lateral amygdala to preferentially target the acquisition and extinction of CS-

associated memories.

It is worth noting that the model is an extremely simplified one. We did not consider

many other important molecular cascades important for LTP and memory formation. For

example, calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II (CaMKII) and protein kinase C

(PKC) are also required for LTP induction (Smolen et al., 2020; Malenka et al., 1989;

Wang et al., 2016). In addition, we built the model with empirical data of PKA and ERK

dynamics from the literature, which are based on *ex vivo* analyses and have limited

temporal resolution. However, despite these limitations, we demonstrated that the

simplified model using essential biochemical cascades for learning and memory was

sufficient to enhance associative learning in three different experiments in mammals. A

more complex model that incorporates a wider range of intracellular and extracellular

processes based on *in vivo* real-time data may strengthen the predictive ability of

simulations. Further experiments should also investigate whether the memory

enhancing effects of our optimal protocol vary across subjects of different sexes and

ages, as well as its efficacy in animal models of cognitive impairment. Together, our

results suggest the possibility of using similar model-driven, non-invasive behavioral

approaches in preclinical and clinical studies aimed at enhancing learning or restoring

memory deficits in humans.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

X.O.Z, D.S.E., and C.E.C performed and analyzed the behavioral experiments. Y.Z.

implemented the computational model and ran all simulations. P.S. helped design and

implement the computational model. F.H.D-M and J.H.B supervised and contributed to

all aspects of this study. All the authors participated in the design of the experiments.

X.O.Z. and F.H.D-M interpreted the data and prepared the manuscript with comments

from all the co-authors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Nikita Watson and Sharon Gordon for their technical and administrative

assistance. We also thank current members of the Byrne and Do Monte and Labs for

their valuable comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by NIH grant

R01-NS102490 to J.H.B, and NIH grant R00-MH105549, NIH grant R01-MH120136, a

Brain & Behavior Research Foundation grant (NARSAD Young Investigator), and a

Rising STARs Award from UT System to F.H.D-M.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

Abel T, Nguyen PV, Barad M, Deuel TA, Kandel ER, Bourtchouladze R (1997) Genetic
demonstration of a role for pka in the late phase of ltp and in hippocampus-based
long-term memory. Cell 88:615-626.

Adams JP, Sweatt JD (2002) Molecular psychology: Roles for the erk map kinase
cascade in memory. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol 42:135-163.

Ajay SM, Bhalla US (2004) A role for erkii in synaptic pattern selectivity on the time-
scale of minutes. Eur J Neurosci 20:2671-2680.

Ajay SM, Bhalla US (2007) A propagating erkii switch forms zones of elevated dendritic
activation correlated with plasticity. HFSP J 1:49-66.

Alberini CM (2009) Transcription factors in long-term memory and synaptic plasticity.
Physiol Rev 89:121-145.

Anderson MJ, Jablonski SA, Klimas DB (2008) Spaced initial stimulus familiarization
enhances novelty preference in long-evans rats. Behav Processes 78:481-486.

Barela PB (1999) Theoretical mechanisms underlying the trial-spacing effect in
pavlovian fear conditioning. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal
Behavior Processes 25:177.

Bartsch D, Ghirardi M, Skehel PA, Karl KA, Herder SP, Chen M, Bailey CH, Kandel ER
(1995) Aplysia creb2 represses long-term facilitation: Relief of repression
converts transient facilitation into long-term functional and structural change. Cell
83:979-992.

Berman DE, Dudai Y (2001) Memory extinction, learning anew, and learning the new:
Dissociations in the molecular machinery of learning in cortex. Science
291:2417-2419.

Bouton ME, Maren S, McNally GP (2021) Behavioral and neurobiological mechanisms
of pavlovian and instrumental extinction learning. Physiol Rev 101:611-681.

Brown MT, Tan KR, O'Connor EC, Nikonenko I, Muller D, Luscher C (2012) Ventral
tegmental area gaba projections pause accumbal cholinergic interneurons to
enhance associative learning. Nature 492:452-456.

Byrne JH, Hawkins RD (2015) Nonassociative learning in invertebrates. Cold Spring
Harb Perspect Biol 7.

Cain CK, Blouin AM, Barad M (2003) Temporally massed cs presentations generate
more fear extinction than spaced presentations. J Exp Psychol Anim Behav
Process 29:323-333.

Carew TJ, Sahley CL (1986) Invertebrate learning and memory: From behavior to
molecules. Annu Rev Neurosci 9:435-487.

Cepeda NJ, Pashler H, Vul E, Wixted JT, Rohrer D (2006) Distributed practice in verbal
recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. Psychol Bull 132:354-380.

Dash PK, Hochner B, Kandel ER (1990) Injection of the camp-responsive element into
the nucleus of aplysia sensory neurons blocks long-term facilitation. Nature
345:718-721.

Davis M, Astrachan DI (1978) Conditioned fear and startle magnitude: Effects of
different footshock or backshock intensities used in training. J Exp Psychol Anim
Behav Process 4:95-103.

de Oliveira Alvares L, Do-Monte FH (2021) Understanding the dynamic and destiny of

memories. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 125:592-607.

Detert JA, Kampa ND, Moyer JR, Jr. (2008) Differential effects of training intertrial

interval on acquisition of trace and long-delay fear conditioning in rats. Behav

Neurosci 122:1318-1327.

Di Benedetto B, Kallnik M, Weisenhorn DM, Falls WA, Wurst W, Holter SM (2009)

Activation of erk/mapk in the lateral amygdala of the mouse is required for

acquisition of a fear-potentiated startle response. Neuropsychopharmacology

34:356-366.

Do-Monte FH, Manzano-Nieves G, Quinones-Laracuente K, Ramos-Medina L, Quirk GJ

(2015) Revisiting the role of infralimbic cortex in fear extinction with optogenetics.

J Neurosci 35:3607-3615.

Ermentrout B (2002) Simulating, analyzing, and animating dynamical systems : A guide

to xppaut for researchers and students. Philadelphia: Society for Industrial and

Applied Mathematics.

Fernandez SM, Lewis MC, Pechenino AS, Harburger LL, Orr PT, Gresack JE, Schafe

GE, Frick KM (2008) Estradiol-induced enhancement of object memory

consolidation involves hippocampal extracellular signal-regulated kinase

activation and membrane-bound estrogen receptors. J Neurosci 28:8660-8667.

Flood JF, Jarvik ME, Bennett EL, Orme AE, Rosenzweig MR (1977) Protein synthesis

inhibition and memory for pole jump active avoidance and extinction. Pharmacol

Biochem Behav 7:71-77.

Genoux D, Haditsch U, Knobloch M, Michalon A, Storm D, Mansuy IM (2002) Protein

phosphatase 1 is a molecular constraint on learning and memory. Nature

418:970-975.

Goldsmith BA, Abrams TW (1991) Reversal of synaptic depression by serotonin at

aplysia sensory neuron synapses involves activation of adenylyl cyclase. Proc

Natl Acad Sci U S A 88:9021-9025.

Goode TD, Maren S (2014) Animal models of fear relapse. ILAR J 55:246-258.

Hawkins RD, Byrne JH (2015) Associative learning in invertebrates. Cold Spring Harb

Perspect Biol 7.

Holmes A, Quirk GJ (2010) Pharmacological facilitation of fear extinction and the search

for adjunct treatments for anxiety disorders--the case of yohimbine. Trends

Pharmacol Sci 31:2-7.

Impey S, Obrietan K, Wong ST, Poser S, Yano S, Wayman G, Deloulme JC, Chan G,

Storm DR (1998) Cross talk between erk and pka is required for ca2+ stimulation

of creb-dependent transcription and erk nuclear translocation. Neuron 21:869-

883.

Jiang L, Wang L, Yin Y, Huo M, Liu C, Zhou Q, Yu D, Xu L, Mao R (2019) Spaced

training enhances contextual fear memory via activating hippocampal 5-ht2a

receptors. Front Mol Neurosci 12:317.

Johansen JP, Cain CK, Ostroff LE, LeDoux JE (2011) Molecular mechanisms of fear

learning and memory. Cell 147:509-524.

Kandel ER (2001) The molecular biology of memory storage: A dialogue between genes

and synapses. Science 294:1030-1038.

Lauterborn JC, Palmer LC, Jia Y, Pham DT, Hou B, Wang W, Trieu BH, Cox CD,

Kantorovich S, Gall CM, Lynch G (2016) Chronic ampakine treatments stimulate

dendritic growth and promote learning in middle-aged rats. J Neurosci 36:1636-

1646.

Lee K, Holley SM, Shobe JL, Chong NC, Cepeda C, Levine MS, Masmanidis SC (2017)

Parvalbumin interneurons modulate striatal output and enhance performance

during associative learning. Neuron 93:1451-1463 e1454.

Liu RY, Cleary LJ, Byrne JH (2011) The requirement for enhanced creb1 expression in

consolidation of long-term synaptic facilitation and long-term excitability in

sensory neurons of aplysia. J Neurosci 31:6871-6879.

Liu X, Ramirez S, Pang PT, Puryear CB, Govindarajan A, Deisseroth K, Tonegawa S

(2012) Optogenetic stimulation of a hippocampal engram activates fear memory

recall. Nature 484:381-385.

Lonsdorf TB et al. (2017) Don't fear 'fear conditioning': Methodological considerations

for the design and analysis of studies on human fear acquisition, extinction, and

return of fear. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 77:247-285.

Lynch G, Cox CD, Gall CM (2014) Pharmacological enhancement of memory or

cognition in normal subjects. Front Syst Neurosci 8:90.

Lynch MA (2004) Long-term potentiation and memory. Physiol Rev 84:87-136.

Malenka RC, Kauer JA, Perkel DJ, Mauk MD, Kelly PT, Nicoll RA, Waxham MN (1989)

An essential role for postsynaptic calmodulin and protein kinase activity in long-

term potentiation. Nature 340:554-557.

Maren S (2005) Synaptic mechanisms of associative memory in the amygdala. Neuron

47:783-786.

Maren S, Phan KL, Liberzon I (2013) The contextual brain: Implications for fear

conditioning, extinction and psychopathology. Nat Rev Neurosci 14:417-428.

Martin KC, Michael D, Rose JC, Barad M, Casadio A, Zhu H, Kandel ER (1997) Map

kinase translocates into the nucleus of the presynaptic cell and is required for

long-term facilitation in aplysia. Neuron 18:899-912.

Martin SJ, Grimwood PD, Morris RG (2000) Synaptic plasticity and memory: An

evaluation of the hypothesis. Annu Rev Neurosci 23:649-711.

Mast M, Blanchard RJ, Blanchard DC (1982) The relationship of freezing and response

suppression in a cer situation. In, pp 151-167. US: Kenyon Coll Psychology Dept.

Mayes A, Montaldi D, Migo E (2007) Associative memory and the medial temporal

lobes. Trends Cogn Sci 11:126-135.

McDougal RA, Morse TM, Hines ML, Shepherd GM (2015) Modelview for modeldb:

Online presentation of model structure. Neuroinformatics 13:459-470.

McGaugh JL, Petrinovich LF (1965) Effects of drugs on learning and memory. Int Rev

Neurobiol 8:139-196.

Milner B, Squire LR, Kandel ER (1998) Cognitive neuroscience and the study of

memory. Neuron 20:445-468.

Morgan MA, LeDoux JE (1995) Differential contribution of dorsal and ventral medial

prefrontal cortex to the acquisition and extinction of conditioned fear in rats.

Behav Neurosci 109:681-688.

Muller U, Carew TJ (1998) Serotonin induces temporally and mechanistically distinct

phases of persistent pka activity in aplysia sensory neurons. Neuron 21:1423-

1434.

Nabavi S, Fox R, Proulx CD, Lin JY, Tsien RY, Malinow R (2014) Engineering a

memory with ltd and ltp. Nature 511:348-352.

Nakazawa K, Quirk MC, Chitwood RA, Watanabe M, Yeckel MF, Sun LD, Kato A, Carr

CA, Johnston D, Wilson MA, Tonegawa S (2002) Requirement for hippocampal

ca3 nmda receptors in associative memory recall. Science 297:211-218.

Padilla-Coreano N, Do-Monte FH, Quirk GJ (2012) A time-dependent role of midline

thalamic nuclei in the retrieval of fear memory. Neuropharmacology 62:457-463.

Philips GT, Tzvetkova EI, Carew TJ (2007) Transient mitogen-activated protein kinase

activation is confined to a narrow temporal window required for the induction of

two-trial long-term memory in aplysia. J Neurosci 27:13701-13705.

Phillips RG, LeDoux JE (1992) Differential contribution of amygdala and hippocampus

to cued and contextual fear conditioning. Behav Neurosci 106:274-285.

Podlesnik CA, Kelley ME, Jimenez-Gomez C, Bouton ME (2017) Renewed behavior

produced by context change and its implications for treatment maintenance: A

review. J Appl Behav Anal 50:675-697.

Quirk GJ, Mueller D (2008) Neural mechanisms of extinction learning and retrieval.

Neuropsychopharmacology 33:56-72.

Quirk GJ, Russo GK, Barron JL, Lebron K (2000) The role of ventromedial prefrontal

cortex in the recovery of extinguished fear. J Neurosci 20:6225-6231.

Radulovic J, Tronson NC (2010) Molecular specificity of multiple hippocampal

processes governing fear extinction. Rev Neurosci 21:1-17.

Raman M, McLaughlin K, Violato C, Rostom A, Allard JP, Coderre S (2010) Teaching in

small portions dispersed over time enhances long-term knowledge retention.

Med Teach 32:250-255.

Roberson ED, Sweatt JD (1996) Transient activation of cyclic amp-dependent protein

kinase during hippocampal long-term potentiation. The Journal of biological

chemistry 271:30436-30441.

Santini E, Muller RU, Quirk GJ (2001) Consolidation of extinction learning involves

transfer from nmda-independent to nmda-dependent memory. J Neurosci

21:9009-9017.

Santini E, Ge H, Ren K, Pena de Ortiz S, Quirk GJ (2004) Consolidation of fear

extinction requires protein synthesis in the medial prefrontal cortex. J Neurosci

24:5704-5710.

Schacher S, Castellucci VF, Kandel ER (1988) Camp evokes long-term facilitation in

aplysia sensory neurons that requires new protein synthesis. Science 240:1667-

1669.

Schafe GE, LeDoux JE (2000) Memory consolidation of auditory pavlovian fear

conditioning requires protein synthesis and protein kinase a in the amygdala. J

Neurosci 20:RC96.

Schafe GE, Atkins CM, Swank MW, Bauer EP, Sweatt JD, LeDoux JE (2000) Activation

of erk/map kinase in the amygdala is required for memory consolidation of

pavlovian fear conditioning. J Neurosci 20:8177-8187.

Scharf MT, Woo NH, Lattal KM, Young JZ, Nguyen PV, Abel T (2002) Protein synthesis

is required for the enhancement of long-term potentiation and long-term memory

by spaced training. J Neurophysiol 87:2770-2777.

Selden NR, Everitt BJ, Jarrard LE, Robbins TW (1991) Complementary roles for the

amygdala and hippocampus in aversive conditioning to explicit and contextual

cues. Neuroscience 42:335-350.

Sharif S, Guirguis A, Fergus S, Schifano F (2021) The use and impact of cognitive

enhancers among university students: A systematic review. Brain Sci 11.

Sharma SK, Carew TJ (2004) The roles of mapk cascades in synaptic plasticity and

memory in aplysia: Facilitatory effects and inhibitory constraints. Learn Mem

11:373-378.

Sharma SK, Sherff CM, Shobe J, Bagnall MW, Sutton MA, Carew TJ (2003) Differential

role of mitogen-activated protein kinase in three distinct phases of memory for

sensitization in aplysia. J Neurosci 23:3899-3907.

Smolen P, Zhang Y, Byrne JH (2016) The right time to learn: Mechanisms and

optimization of spaced learning. Nat Rev Neurosci 17:77-88.

Smolen P, Baxter DA, Byrne JH (2020) Comparing theories for the maintenance of late

ltp and long-term memory: Computational analysis of the roles of kinase

feedback pathways and synaptic reactivation. Front Comput Neurosci

14:569349.

Sotres-Bayon F, Sierra-Mercado D, Pardilla-Delgado E, Quirk GJ (2012) Gating of fear

in prelimbic cortex by hippocampal and amygdala inputs. Neuron 76:804-812.

Szapiro G, Vianna MR, McGaugh JL, Medina JH, Izquierdo I (2003) The role of nmda

glutamate receptors, pka, mapk, and camkii in the hippocampus in extinction of

conditioned fear. Hippocampus 13:53-58.

Tronson NC, Schrick C, Fischer A, Sananbenesi F, Pages G, Pouyssegur J, Radulovic

J (2008) Regulatory mechanisms of fear extinction and depression-like behavior.

Neuropsychopharmacology 33:1570-1583.

Vázquez SI, Vázquez A, Peña de Ortiz S (2000) Different hippocampal activity profiles

for pka and pkc in spatial discrimination learning. Behavioral Neuroscience

114:1109-1118.

Verkoeijen PP, Rikers RM, Schmidt HG (2005) Limitations to the spacing effect:

Demonstration of an inverted u-shaped relationship between interrepetition

spacing and free recall. Exp Psychol 52:257-263.

Wang S, Sheng T, Ren S, Tian T, Lu W (2016) Distinct roles of pkciota/lambda and

pkmzeta in the initiation and maintenance of hippocampal long-term potentiation

and memory. Cell Rep 16:1954-1961.

Wang Y, Zhu G, Briz V, Hsu YT, Bi X, Baudry M (2014) A molecular brake controls the

magnitude of long-term potentiation. Nature communications 5:3051.

Woods AM, Bouton ME (2008) Immediate extinction causes a less durable loss of

performance than delayed extinction following either fear or appetitive

conditioning. Learn Mem 15:909-920.

Zhang Y, Smolen PD, Cleary LJ, Byrne JH (2021) Quantitative description of the

interactions among kinase cascades underlying long-term plasticity of aplysia

sensory neurons. Scientific reports 11:14931.

Zhang Y, Liu RY, Heberton GA, Smolen P, Baxter DA, Cleary LJ, Byrne JH (2011)

970   Computational design of enhanced learning protocols. Nat Neurosci 15:294-297.

   SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Supplementary Figure 1. No difference of baseline activity between groups. A, No differences in

total freezing level (left), average speed (middle), and maximum speed (right) between the three groups

were observed during familiarization of the enhanced conditioning experiment. **B,** No differences in total

freezing level (left), average speed (middle), and maximum speed (right) were seen between the three

groups during familiarization of the enhanced vs. spaced conditioning experiment. **C,** No differences in

total freezing level (left), average speed (middle), and rate of lever presses (right) were observed between

the three groups during the last day of lever presses training of the enhanced extinction experiment. One-

way ANOVA. Data shown as mean ± SEM.

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

Supplementary Figure 2. **Histogram of peak levels of inducer from 1,000 protocols.** (A) Standard

intensity stimulus (*Stim* = 300 μM). The range of peak levels of inducer (0 nM - 220 nM) was subdivided

into 14 bins, and the number of simulations that produced a peak concentration of inducer in each

subdivision was plotted. The arrows indicate which bins contained the peak concentrations produced by

the partial conditioning, spaced partial conditioning (SPC), and the optimal partial conditioning (OPC)

protocols. (B) Reduced intensity stimulus (*Stim* = 200 μM). The range of peak levels of inducer (0 nM -

160 nM) was subdivided into 14 bins, and the number of simulations that produced a peak concentration

of inducer in each subdivision was plotted.

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

Supplementary Figure 3. Lever press during CS presentations in enhanced extinction experiment.

A, Lever presses rates during CS presentations of each group across the experiment. Two-way repeated-

measure ANOVA for each day found no difference among groups. **B,** FE group shows significant

increase of CS lever presses comparing the last CS presentation to the average lever press rate of the

first two CS presentations. Paired Student's t test. Letter d indicate test with $p < 0.05$: d, FE: Last 4 CS vs.

First 4 CS.

1043