Enhancing associative learning in rats with a computationally designed training

protocol

Xu O. Zhang; Yili Zhang; Claire E. Cho; Douglas S. Engelke; Paul Smolen; John H Byrne;

Fabricio H. Do-Monte[#].

Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy, McGovern Medical School, The University of

Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, Texas 77030

#Corresponding author:

Fabricio H. Do Monte, DVM, PhD.

Phone: 713-500-5613

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

Abbreviated title: Enhancing learning with a computational model

Conflict of Interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

22 **Keywords:** Associative memory, fear conditioning, fear extinction, long-term potentiation,

23 computational model, spaced learning.

Abstract

Learning requires the activation of protein kinases with distinct temporal dynamics. Nonassociative learning in *Aplysia* can be enhanced by a computationally designed learning protocol with intertrial intervals (ITIs) that maximize the interaction between fast-activated protein kinase A (PKA) and slow-activated extracellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK). We tested whether associative learning in mammals can be enhanced by an optimal learning protocol with irregular ITIs, predicted computationally to increase the overlap between PKA and ERK signaling in rat hippocampus. We simulated 1,000 training protocols with varying ITIs to predict this optimal protocol. With auditory fear conditioning, we found that male adult rats exposed to the optimal protocol with irregular ITIs exhibited impaired extinction memory acquisition within the session with a standard footshock intensity, and stronger fear memory retrieval and spontaneous recovery with a weaker footshock intensity, when compared to rats that received either massed or spaced conditioning protocols with the same number of footshocks and fixed ITIs. With fear extinction stimuli, we likewise observed that rats exposed to the optimal protocol showed improved extinction of contextual fear memory and attenuated spontaneous recovery, compared to rats that received standard extinction protocols. Immunohistochemistry confirmed that the optimal conditioning protocol increased phosphorylated cAMP responsive element binding (pCREB) protein levels in the dentate gyrus (DG) of the dorsal hippocampus, suggesting higher levels of LTP induction. 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, preventing or hindering translation to humans.

An alternative approach to enhance learning and memory is to develop computational models to predict optimal learning 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 CREB, which subsequently induce expression of multiple plasticity-related genes during LTF induction (Dash et al., 1990; Bartsch et al., 1995; Liu et al., 2011; Guan et al., 2002; Mohamed et al., 2005). The observation 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 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 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 are required for CREB phosphorylation, induction

of plasticity-related genes, and LTP induction (Adams and Sweatt, 2002; Impey et al.,

1998; Bambah-Mukku et al., 2014; Tao et al., 1998). Although the temporal dynamics of

ERK and PKA activation in mammals differ from those in invertebrates (Roberson and

Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2014), their common requirement for

LTP/LTM suggests that a protocol designed to maximize their activity overlap, with

irregular ITIs, may enhance memory formation in mammals.

Therefore, we tested if our invertebrate LTF model (Zhang et al., 2011) can be

adapted to computationally design an optimal associative learning protocol in mammals.

Because the majority of the above literature on LTP induction in mammals has focused

on fear conditioning experiments, we employed this well-established paradigm to

investigate associative learning (Johansen et al., 2011) and used empirical data from

the literature 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). We simulated 1,000 different training protocols with

varying ITIs to identify an optimal protocol with irregular ITIs that maximizes the overlap

of PKA and ERK activities and predicts the formation of stronger memory than training

protocols with the same number of stimuli and fixed ITIs. We then tested this optimal

protocol by using auditory fear conditioning and auditory fear extinction paradigms in

rats.

RESULTS

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

optimal fear conditioning protocol

The model in (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**). To the best of our

knowledge, hippocampus is the only rat brain region in which ERK dynamics has been

measured with a temporal resolution of minutes following a stimulus. In this model, the

stimulus (variable *Stim*) 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 simulated fear conditioning in rats, in which the pairing of a conditioned

stimulus (CS) with an unconditioned stimulus (US) is represented by *Stim*. The

conditioned responses are assumed to be 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 1,000 fear conditioning protocols, with 4 trials

and both fixed and irregular ITIs, to identify one predicted to have optimal ITIs for

triggering downstream gene activation. These simulations included a Short Conditioning

(SC) protocol with 4 trials and a fixed ITI of 270 s. We also simulated, as a reference

control, a Regular Conditioning (RC) protocol with 8 trials and the same ITI of 270 s.

These protocols respectively resemble previous protocols used for short and regular fear

conditioning in rats (Detert et al., 2008; Fanselow, 1980; Do-Monte et al., 2015). Our

simulations identified an optimal conditioning protocol with 4 trials and irregular ITIs of 8,

8, and 16 min (**Fig. 1B2-1B4**). Because the optimal protocol, like the SC protocol, has 4

trials, we term it Optimal Short Conditioning (OSC). Comparing OSC and SC in Fig. 1B3-

B4, both protocols produced pERK curves with similar peak levels (orange). However,

PKA activity induced by the last trial of OSC had a much larger overlap with the pERK

curve than did PKA induced by SC. Therefore, OSC induced a much higher peak level of

inducer (red). We therefore predicted the OSC protocol would produce stronger long-term

memory in rats than the standard SC protocol.

Figure 1. Computational simulations of PKA and ERK pathways predict an optimal protocol

for fear conditioning. A, Schematic of the model. Stimulus (*Stim*, μM) 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, μM) and activated PKA (PKAc,

μM) in response to one trial of *Stim*. **B2**, Simulated time courses of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* in

response to a 4-trial protocol with regular ITIs of 4.5 min (short conditioning, SC). **B3**, Simulated

time courses of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* (nM) in response to a 4-trial protocol with

computationally designed intervals (optimal short conditioning, OSC).

B4, Simulated time courses of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* (nM) in response to an 8-trial protocol

with regular ITIs of 4.5 min (regular conditioning, RC).

The optimal short conditioning protocol induces an increase in fear memory when

compared to the standard short conditioning protocol

To test if the OSC 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 (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. Based on their baseline freezing and locomotor activity during the familiarization

session, rats were pre-assigned to one of the three experimental groups described above

in our simulations: Short Conditioning (SC), Optimal Short Conditioning (OSC), and

Regular Conditioning (RC). No significant difference was found among their baseline

freezing level (SC: 2.84%, OSC: 2.96%, RC: 3.05%, one-way ANOVA, $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.018, *P*

= 0.982), average speed (SC: 0.025 m/s, OSC: 0.025 m/s, RC: 0.023 m/s, one-way

ANOVA, $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.062, *P* = 0.939), and maximum speed (SC: 0.424 m/s, OSC: 0.446

m/s, RC: 0.439 m/s, one-way ANOVA, $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.044, *P* = 0.956). 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 (a total of 44 min duration, **Fig. 2B**).

The SC group received four presentations of CS (3 kHZ tone, 75 dB, 30 s) that co-

terminated with a US (footshock, 0.7 mA, 0.5 s) with ITIs of 270 s, and remained in the

chamber until the end of the session to equate the total context exposure time. The OSC

group received four similar CS-US pairings with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min. The RC group

received eight similar CS-US pairings with ITIs of 270 s. 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 where no pre-tone freezing was observed in any of the groups

(Kruskal-Wallis's test. $H(2)$ = 3.887, P = 0.143). Compared to the RC group, both SC and

OSC 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; a, OSC vs. SC: p = 0.527; b, OSC vs. RC: p = 0.029; c, SC vs. RC: p = 0.002).

Yet, both RC and OSC groups showed reduced average speed during the retrieval test

compared to the SC group, suggesting generalized fear responses in a novel context (SC:

0.018 m/s, OSC: 0.013 m/s, RC: 0.01 m/s**;** One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post

hoc test. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 10.87, P < 0.001; a, OSC vs. SC: p = 0.024; b, OSC vs. RC: p = 0.131;

c, SC vs. RC: p < 0.001;).

On Day 3, rats were returned to context A for a retrieval and extinction training

session where they received twelve CS presentations (ITIs of 150 s, 37 min duration).

Prior to the first CS presentation, only the RC group showed a significantly higher pre-

tone freezing level (Kruskal-Wallis's test followed by Dunn's post hoc test. $H(2)$ = 13.93,

$P < 0.001$; a, OSC vs. SC, p > 0.999; b, OSC vs. RC, p = 0.020; c, SC vs. RC, p = 0.001),

suggesting a robust contextual fear memory. However, the three groups exhibited the

same levels of freezing during the first two CS presentations, suggesting that tone-evoked

fear retrieval was comparable among the groups (Two-way RM ANOVA. $F_{(22, 407)}$ = 1.169,

$P = 0.271$). Nevertheless, a within session extinction analysis comparing the first four CSs

to the last four CSs revealed impaired extinction learning in the OSC and RC groups,

when compared to the SC group. This impairment in the acquisition of extinction in the

OSC and RC groups was characterized by sustained freezing levels within the session,

which differed from the SC group that showed reduced freezing levels from the first to the

last CS presentation (**Fig. 2D *left***; Paired Student's t-test. d, OSC: t_{13} = 0.869, p = 0.400;

e, SC: t_{11} = 4.191, p = 0.001; f, RC: t_{13} = 2.153, p = 0.051**)**. Interestingly, the OSC 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 SC group (**Fig. 2D *center***; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post-

hoc test. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 3.315, $P = 0.047$; a, OSC vs. SC: p = 0.037; b, OSC vs. RC: p = 0.487;

c, SC vs. RC: p = 0.320). In contrast, the SC group exhibited faster extinction acquisition

compared to the OSC and RC groups, as fewer CS presentations were required to

achieve 50% of reduction in the initial freezing levels (**Fig. 2D *right***; Kruskal-Wallis's test

followed by Dunn's multiple comparisons test. $H(2)$ = 7.08, $P = 0.029$; a, OSC vs. SC: p

= 0.039; b, OSC vs. RC: p > 0.999; c, SC vs. RC: p = 0.095). Despite the persistent

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

significant differences were found between the OSC and the SC 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; RC vs. OSC: p = 0.027; RC

vs. SC: p = 0.038; OSC vs. SC: p = 0.999; context B: $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.774, P = 0.469). Taken

together, these data demonstrate that the computationally designed OSC protocol is able

to produce a modest enhancement of fear acquisition in rats, as indicated by reduced

locomotion speed in a new environment and stronger CS-evoked fear memory that is

more resistant to within-session extinction, although the enhancement did not persist

during the extinction retrieval and spontaneous recovery test.

Figure 2. Computationally designed protocol partially 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 SC (n = 12), OSC (n = 14), and RC (n = 14) groups. Following a

habituation (Hab.) tone, rats received multiple trials of a CS (3 kHz tone, 30 s) that co-terminated

with a 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*, OSC vs. SC; *b*,

OSC vs. RC; *c*, SC vs. RC. '×' denotes the pre-tone freezing levels. **D,** OSC group is resistant to

extinction while SC group shows significantly more extinction. *Left*, freezing levels during the first

4 and last 4 CS presentations. Paired Student's t-test. Letter *e* indicates test with $p < 0.05$: SC,

Last 4 CS vs. First 4 CS. *Center*, 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 ((Last 4 CS – First 4 CS)/First 4

CS). One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test. * $p<0.05$. Letter *a* indicates pairwise

test with $p < 0.05$: OSC vs. SC. *Right*, the number of cues required to reach to a 50% reduction

of the original freezing level (average of freezing level during the first two cues). Kruskal-Wallis's

test followed by Dunn's multiple comparisons test. * $p<0.05$. Letter *a* indicates pairwise test with

$p < 0.05$: OSC vs. SC. Data shown here and in the next illustrations as mean ± SEM.

The optimal short conditioning protocol induces stronger fear memory than a

spaced short conditioning protocol

Spaced learning protocols result in stronger memories than 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 OSC group in Fig.

2 could be simply trial-spacing effect, because our standard SC group used massed CS-

US pairings (i.e., briefer ITIs in SC than in OSC). In our simulations, both protocols

produced similar peak values of the pERK curves, but different degrees of overlap of PKA

and ERK activities, suggesting a way in which appropriately spaced protocols might

advantageously enhance overlap of kinase activities with distinct dynamics.

Indeed, there was a broad range of effective simulated 4-trial protocols (**Fig. 3**).

One protocol with relatively long, fixed ITIs of 11 min 10 s (i.e., 670 s) produced a nearly

identical peak level of *inducer* as the OSC protocol, and a higher peak level of *inducer*

than other protocols with fixed ITIs from 1 min to 21 min (**Fig. 3A, Fig. 4A1**). We termed

this protocol the Spaced Short Conditioning (SSC) protocol. We then examined the

effects of different stimulus intensities on predicting optimal training trials to address the

potential ceiling effect in these simulations. The 1,000 different protocols were re-

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

irregular ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min still produced the greatest peak level of *inducer* (**Fig. 3B,**

Fig. 4A2). Equally interesting was that with weaker stimuli, the OSC protocol became

relatively more effective (higher peak *inducer*) than the SSC protocol. Therefore, we

predicted that the irregular intervals of the OSC may produce more effective conditioning

than the SSC protocol.

Figure 3. **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 – 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 short conditioning (SC), spaced short conditioning (SSC), and optimal short

conditioning (OSC) protocols. **B,** Reduced intensity stimulus (*Stim* = 200 μM). The range of peak

levels of *inducer* (0 – 160 nM) was subdivided into 14 bins, and the number of simulations that

produced a peak concentration of *inducer* in each subdivision was plotted. Insets below the main

plots illustrate in detail the difference in peak *inducer* for SSC *vs*. OSC, which is negligible in **A**.

To test this prediction, we empirically compared the SSC and OSC protocols using

a reduced shock intensity (0.5 mA instead of the 0.7 mA used in Fig. 2) (**Fig. 4B**). Rats

were pre-assigned to SSC or OSC groups based on their baseline freezing and locomotor

activity during the familiarization session. No significant difference was found between

their baseline freezing level (SSC: 3.72%, OSC: 5.21%, Unpaired Student's t-test, t_{16} =

0.988, P = 0.337), average speed (SSC: 0.016 m/s, OSC: 0.015 m/s, one-way ANOVA,

$F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.062, P = 0.939), and maximum speed (RC: 0.439 m/s, SC: 0.424 m/s, OSC:

0.446 m/s, one-way ANOVA, $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.044, P = 0.956). During the fear acquisition, the

SSC group received 4 CS-US pairings with ITIs of 11 min 10 s, whereas the OSC 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. 4C**). We found that the difference in the ITIs between the OSC and SSC

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

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

acquisition session (**Fig. 4D Day 1;** Two-way RM ANOVA followed by Tukey's planned

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

retrieval was increased when rats in the OSC 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 SSC group (**Fig. 4D Inset;** Welch's t-test. $t_{12.43}$ = 2.227,

p = 0.045). Both OSC and SSC groups exhibited the same levels of freezing by the end

of the extinction training session (**Fig. 4D Day 3;** Two-way RM ANOVA followed by

Tukey's post hoc test. $F_{(11, 176)}$ = 2.997, P = 0.001; Tone 12, OSC vs. SSC: p > 0.999), as

well as during the extinction retrieval tests performed in context A (**Fig. 4D Day 4;** Two-

way RM ANOVA. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 0.097, P = 0.907) or context B (**Fig. 4D Day 5;** Two-way RM

ANOVA. $F_{(2, 37)}$ = 2.984, P = 0.629). However, the OSC group showed greater

spontaneous recovery of fear memory in context A approximately 3 weeks later, as

indicated by higher freezing during the first CS presentation compared to SSC-trained

rats (**Fig. 4D Day 29;** Two-way RM ANOVA followed by Tukey's planned comparison. $F_{(2,}$

$_{32)}$ = 1.809, P = 0.180; OSC vs. SSC: p = 0.030). In summary, these data suggest that the

enhancement in fear memory acquisition observed with our computationally designed

OSC 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 4. **Optimal short conditioning protocol induced stronger fear memory than spaced**

short conditioning protocol in rats. **A**, *Inducer* peak levels from the RC, SC, and OSC protocols,

compared to peak levels from short 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 RC, SC, and OSC are labeled by dashed lines (black: RC; red: OSC; purple:

SC). 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 SSC protocol with equal ITIs of 11 min

10s. **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 SSC (n = 10, ITI = 11 min 10 s) and OSC (n = 8) groups. Following a habituation

(Hab.) tone, rats received 4 trials of a CS (3 kHz tone, 30 s) that co-terminated with a US

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

experiment; '×' denotes the pre-tone freezing levels. 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 optimal short conditioning protocol induces greater levels of phosphorylated

CREB in DG than a spaced short conditioning protocol

The computational model predicts that the increased overlap of PKA and ERK activation

in OSC protocol leads to greater LTP induction (*inducer*) in rat hippocampus. One of the

mechanisms that may enhance LTP is increased convergence of the PKA and ERK

pathways to induce phosphorylation of CREB (Impey et al., 1998), a transcription factor

required for synaptic plasticity and LTP (Liu et al., 2011; Bourtchuladze et al., 1994; See

review by Kida, 2012). We therefore used immunohistochemistry to quantify the levels of

pCREB in rat dorsal hippocampus following fear conditioning in OSC versus SSC groups

(**Fig. 5A**), predicting the augmentation of fear conditioning in the OSC group would

correlate with increased pCREB. Rats were pre-assigned to OSC or SSC groups based

on their baseline freezing and locomotor activity during the familiarization session. No

significant difference was found between their baseline freezing level (SSC: 5.90%, OSC:

8.53%, Unpaired Student's t-test, $t_5 = 0.677$, p = 0.528), average speed (SSC: 0.014 m/s,

OSC: 0.015 m/s, Unpaired Student's t-test, $t_5 = 0.239$ p = 0.820), and maximum speed

(SSC: 0.272 m/s, OSC: 0.367 m/s, Unpaired Student's t-test, $t_5 = 1.697$, p = 0.150). During

the fear acquisition session, rats exposed to the OSC protocol showed freezing levels

similar to the SSC group during each CS presentation (**Fig. 5B**, Two-way RM ANOVA.

$F_{(4, 20)} = 0.848$, $P = 0.5112$.), but a significantly higher averaged freezing level across the

session (**Fig. 5B** Inset, Unpaired Welch's t-test, $t_{4.89} = 2.602$, p = 0.049). Approximately

15 min after the end of fear acquisition, rats were perfused and brains collected for

subsequent analyses. Immunohistochemistry revealed high levels of pCREB expression

across different hippocampal subfields in both OSC and SSC groups, with the highest

expression level being observed in the DG (**Fig. 5C**; Two-way ANOVA followed by

Tukey's post-hoc test. $F_{(3, 20)} = 4.533$, $P = 0.014$; CA1 vs. DG: p < 0.001; CA2 vs. DG: p

< 0.001; CA3 vs. DG: p < 0.001). Interestingly, rats exposed to the OSC protocol exhibited

increased pCREB expression in the DG when compared to the SSC group (**Fig. 5C-D;**

Two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's post-hoc test. $F_{(3, 20)} = 4.533$, $P = 0.014$; OSC

vs. SSC: p = 0.004). Given that increased pCREB in the DG has been associated with

the induction efficiency of LTP in rodents (Davis et al., 2000), these data support the

hypothesis that the augmentation in fear memory acquisition observed with the OSC

protocol is mediated by higher levels of LTP induction in the rat hippocampus. Notably,

no group differences in pCREB expression were identified in other brain regions known

for being involved in fear memory acquisition such as the lateral, basal, and central nuclei

of the amygdala (Two-way ANOVA. $F_{(2, 15)}$ = 1.674, *P* = 0.22) and the paraventricular

nucleus of the thalamus (PVT, unpaired Student's t-test, t_5 = 1.697, p = 0.150) (Fanselow

and LeDoux, 1999; Penzo et al., 2015).

Figure 5. **Immunohistochemistry quantification of pCREB in hippocampus of rats exposed**

to optimal versus spaced short conditioning protocols. **A,** Schematic of the

immunohistochemistry procedure. **B,** Freezing levels during CS presentation for SSC (n = 4) and

OSC (n = 3) groups during fear conditioning; Two-way RM ANOVA followed by Bonferroni

correction. Inset, averaged freezing level for the 4 CS presentations; Welch's t-test, * p<0.05. **C,**

Left, Average pCREB density across hippocampal subfields for SSC (n = 4) and OSC (n = 3)

groups; Two-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's Bonferroni correction. *p < 0.05**; *Right***,

Representative images of pCREB immunostaining in distinct subfields of the dorsal hippocampus

(*left*) in the SSC group (*center*) and OSC group (*right*). **D,** Average pCREB density in the lateral

(LA), basolateral (BLA), and central (CeA) subregions of amygdala for SSC (n = 4) and OSC (n

= 3) groups; Two-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's Bonferroni correction. All p values > 0.05**; E**,

Average pCREB density in the paraventricular nucleus of the thalamus (PVT) for SSC (n = 4) and

OSC (n = 3) groups; unpaired Student's t-test, p = 0.150.

The optimal short protocol also induced an enhancement in 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 fear extinction learning also relies on PKA and ERK signaling to

induce plasticity-related gene transcription (Flood et al., 1977; Szapiro et al., 2003;

Tronson et al., 2008), we predicted that the computationally designed protocol would also

enhance the acquisition of extinction, thereby suppressing the original fear memory (**Fig.**

6A-B1). We therefore used the OSC protocol with 4 trials and irregular ITIs of 8, 8, and

16 min as an Optimal Short Extinction (OSE) protocol (**Fig. 6B3**). We compared the OSE

protocol with a Regular Extinction (RE, **Fig. 6B4**) protocol using 12 trials and ITIs of 150

s, and a Short Extinction (SE, **Fig. 6B2**) protocol using 4 trials and the same ITIs of 150

s, which resemble previous protocols used for regular and short 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 OSE protocol triggered higher peak

inducer than the SE protocol, and was comparable to the RE protocol (**Fig. 6B1-3**). We

thus predicted the OSE protocol would result in stronger extinction of fear memory than

the standard SE protocol.

Figure 6. Prediction of enhanced protocol for fear extinction. A, Schematic of the model. **B1**,

Simulated time courses of activated ERK (pERK, μM) and activated PKA (PKAc, μM) in response

to one trial of *Stim* (μM). **B2**, Simulated time courses of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* in response to

4-trial protocol with regular intervals of 2.5 min (short extinction, SE). **B3**, Simulated time courses

of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* in response to 4-trial protocol with computationally designed intervals

(optimal short extinction, OSE). **B4**, Simulated time courses of pERK, PKAc, and *inducer* (nM) in

response to 12-trial protocol with regular intervals of 2.5 min (regular extinction, RE).

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

different extinction protocols (**Fig. 7A**). 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.

On Day 8, rats 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). We 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 pre-assigned to three

experimental groups based on their freezing and lever presses during the fear

conditioning session: Short Extinction (SE), Optimal Short Extinction (OSE), and Regular

Extinction (RE) (One-way ANOVA. $F_{(14, 231)}$ = 0.404, P = 0.973). No significant difference

were observed among the groups' freezing levels (SE: 4.43%, OSE: 3.07%, RE: 3.20%,

Kruskal-Wallis's test $H(2)$ = 0.188, P = 0.910), average speeds (SE: 0.036 m/s, OSE:

0.037 m/s, RE: 0.036 m/s, one-way ANOVA, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 0.042, P = 0.958), or lever presses

(SE: 9.64 presses/min, OSE: 9.603 presses/min, RE: 11.13 presses/min, one-way

ANOVA, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 0.480, P = 0.622). On Day 10, rats were returned to the same chamber

for a fear extinction session (39 min duration). The SE group received four CSs with ITIs

of 150 s and remained in the chamber until the end of the session; the OSE group

received four CSs with ITIs of 8, 8, and 16 min; and the RE group received twelve CSs

with ITIs of 150 s (**Fig. 7B**). At the end of the CS presentations, freezing levels reduced

from ~50% to ~20% in the RE group, whereas the SE and OSE groups maintained the

same levels of freezing throughout the four CSs (**Fig. 7C**, Day 9). Similarly, the RE 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 SE and OSE groups (**Fig. 7D *left***. Paired Student's t-test; SE,

first 2 CS lever presses: 0 presses/min, last CS lever presses: 0.18 presses/min, t_{10} =

1.000, p = 0.341; OSE, first 2 CS lever presses: 0.46 presses/min, last CS lever presses:

1.23 presses/min, t_{12} = 1.237, p = 0.239; RE, first 2 CS lever presses: 0.08 presses/min,

last CS lever presses: 1.5 presses/min, t_{11} = 2.837, p = 0.016). However, the OSE 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. 7D *right***; Paired Student's t-test; SE: t_{10} = 1.111, p = 0.293; OSE: t_{12} = 3.773, p = 0.003; RE: t_{11} = 0.994, p = 0.341), 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. 7C, 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 OSE group showed increased pre-CS lever pressing rate in the first pre-CS period (Two-way RM ANOVA followed by Tukey's planned comparison, $F_{(2, 33)}$ = 2.897, P = 0.069; Tone 1, *a*, OSE vs. SE, p = 0.005; *b*, OSE vs. RE, p = 0.025; *c*, SE vs. RE, p = 0.791) and also upon averaging the two pre-CS periods during the spontaneous recovery test (**Fig. 7E *right***; Kruskal-Wallis's test followed by Dunn's post hoc test. *H(2)* = 6.414, P = 0.041; a: OSE vs. SE, p = 0.035; b: OSE vs. RE, p = 0.531; c: SE vs. RE, p = 0.709), when compared to the SE and RE groups on day 35. These results suggest that, although the tone-associated memory was similar among the groups, the computationally designed OSE 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.

483 **Figure 7. The computationally designed protocol partially enhanced fear extinction in rats**.

484 **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 SE (n = 11), OSE (n = 13), and FE (n = 12) groups, during which rats received multiple trials of a 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. '×' denotes the pre-tone freezing levels. **D,** Lever press rates during the first two and the last CS presentation (*left*) or the 30 s before the first two and the last CS presentation (pre-CS period) of each group. OSE 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. Letters *f* and *d* indicate tests with p < 0.05: *f*, RE, Last CS vs. First 2 CS; *d*, OSE, Last pre-CS vs. First 2 pre-CS. **E,** OSE group shows higher lever presses during pre-CS period compared to SE group in spontaneous recovery test. No difference was found for the CS lever presses among the three groups (*H(2)* = 2.102, *P* = 0.349). Kruskal-Wallis's test followed by Dunn's post hoc test. Letter *a* indicates pairwise comparison with *p<0.05: OSE vs. SE.

DISCUSSION

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 the available empirical data in the literature (Wang et al., 2014; Roberson and Sweatt, 1996; Vázquez et al., 2000). After simulating 1,000 different training protocols of auditory fear conditioning, we identified an optimal protocol with irregular ITIs which resulted in extinction-resistant

memory formation using a standard footshock intensity, or stronger fear acquisition using

a weaker footshock intensity in rats, as compared to either massed or spaced training

protocols with the same number of trials, fixed ITIs, and comparable footshock intensities.

Immunohistochemistry demonstrated that the augmented fear memory induced by the

optimal protocol was associated with increased expression levels of pCREB in the DG

subfield of the dorsal hippocampus. Using a separate fear extinction paradigm, we also

showed that the optimal learning protocol was sufficient to induce a modest enhancement

in extinction memory in rats characterized by reduced expression of contextual fear, when

compared to regular or short 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.

Training protocols using spaced ITIs result in stronger memory acquisition than

those using standard massed ITIs, a well-established phenomenon described as the

"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 (Barela, 1999; Verkoeijen et

al., 2005), consistent with our simulated results (**Fig. 4A**). 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 example, 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 predicted 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, this optimal protocol induced stronger and

persistent fear memory in rats, when compared to a spaced protocol that had been

predicted to be the most effective among protocols with equal ITIs. These results suggest

that the 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. Although the activation levels of PKA and ERK may vary across different brain

subregions and behavioral protocols, the chronological order of activation for these two

intracellular molecules is very well-conserved across species with a PKA peak preceding

the nuclear translocation of ERK and the subsequent activation of CREB in Aplysia

(Muller and Carew, 1998; Philips et al., 2007), mice (Impey et al., 1998), and rats (Vossler

et al., 1997; Roberson et al., 1999; Ahmed and Frey, 2005). Therefore, this evolutionarily-

conserved sequence of molecular events provides strong support for our model.

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

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

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

comparable performance when strong stimuli are used (**Fig. 4A**). 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 short conditioning protocol to a massed short

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. 4**) to compare the optimal short conditioning

protocol to a spaced short conditioning protocol, we found a significant increase in CS

freezing in the OSC group during fear acquisition, retrieval, and spontaneous recovery

tests. Considering the robustness of the spacing effect, it is possible that differences

between the OSC and the massed SC groups at the higher footshock intensity were in

part masked by a "ceiling effect". Alternatively, previous studies in rats have demonstrated

that the hippocampus is required for tone-evoked fear memory when a weak (0.4 mA) but

not a strong (0.9 mA) footshock is used (Quinn et al., 2008), which could also explain the

differences we observed at the two intensities. Either way, our 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 governs 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 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; Sotres-Bayon et al., 2012; Mast et al., 1982). These results are consistent with current empirical data from rat hippocampus, on which our model is based. 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). Accordingly, our immunohistochemical results showed greater pCREB expression specifically in the DG of the dorsal hippocampus, a region implicated in the acquisition and extinction of contextual fear memory (Kheirbek et al., 2013; Bernier et al., 2017). Increasing CREB expression in DG neurons using a viral approach has been demonstrated to improve contextual fear acquisition (Restivo et al., 2009), whereas chemogenetically or optogenetically inactivating DG neurons that overexpress CREB disrupts contextual fear retrieval (Park et al., 2016).

Another hippocampal subregion implicated in contextual fear is the CA1 (Hunsaker

and Kesner, 2008). Although the OSC and SSC groups displayed similar levels of pCREB

expression in CA1, the single post-training time point we used does not suffice to rule out

the possibility of distinct pCREB dynamics in CA1 compared to DG. Indeed, prior reports

have shown that CA1 pCREB expression peaks at 30 min and disappears at 90 min

following fear conditioning (Sindreu et al., 2007; Chaaya et al., 2019), a timeframe that

differs from the 15 min post-training interval we used to detect group differences in

pCREB expression. Further experiments comparing distinct post-training intervals may

better reveal the dynamics of pCREB expression in different hippocampal subregions, as

well as in non-hippocampal areas involved in fear acquisition (e.g., amygdala, PVT),

which in the present study exhibited similar levels of pCREB expression in the OSC and

SSC groups. The observation that the dynamics of ERK pathways differ across brain

regions involved in fear memory, with peaks occurring at 20 min after a single 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 and the medial prefrontal cortex to preferentially target the acquisition and

extinction of CS-associated memories, respectively.

Our model is an obvious simplification of the mechanisms underlying fear

conditioning and extinction. It does not include other molecular cascades critical for LTP

and memory formation, due to the lack of empirical data for simulating their dynamics of

activation. 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. Furthermore, the model assumes that the molecular

mechanisms for fear memory acquisition are similar to those for extinction. However,

despite these limitations, the simplified model using essential biochemical cascades for

learning and memory was sufficient to predict enhanced activation of the LTP-related

transcription factor CREB in the DG and to facilitate associative learning in three different

experiments. A more complex model that incorporates a wider range of intracellular and

extracellular processes based on *in vivo* real-time data would likely strengthen the

predictive ability of simulations. Further experiments should also investigate the memory

enhancing effects of computationally designed training protocols in different types of

associative memories, including discrimination learning and backwards conditioning. In

addition, it will be important to test whether the effects observed with optimal protocols

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, as well as to improve

extinction-based exposure therapies in patients with anxiety 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 LTM was

modified from a previous model of the signaling cascades for the induction of LTF (Zhang

et al., 2011). As mentioned above, the induction of LTM for fear conditioning requires

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 activate kinase cascades.

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

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

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

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

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).

696
$$\frac{d[Raf^p]}{dt} = k_{f,Raf}[Raf][Stim] - k_{b,Raf}[Raf^p] \qquad \text{(Eq. 5)}$$

697
$$[Raf] = [Raf]_{total} - [Raf^p] \qquad \text{(Eq. 6)}$$

698
$$\frac{d[MEK]}{dt} = \frac{k_{b,MEK}[MEK^p]}{[MEK^p] + K_{MEK,2}} - \frac{k_{f,MEK}[Raf^p][MEK]}{[MEK] + K_{MEK,1}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 7)}$$

699
$$\frac{d[MEK^{pp}]}{dt} = \frac{k_{f,MEK}[Raf^p][MEK^p]}{[MEK^p] + K_{MEK,1}} - \frac{k_{b,MEK}[MEK^{pp}]}{[MEK^{pp}] + K_{MEK,2}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 8)}$$

700
$$[MEK^p] = [MEK]_{total} - [MEK] - [MEK^{pp}] \qquad \text{(Eq. 9)}$$

701
$$\frac{d[ERK]}{dt} = \frac{k_{b,ERK}[ERK^p]}{[ERK^p] + K_{ERK,2}} - \frac{k_{f,ERK}[MEK^{pp}][ERK]}{[ERK] + K_{ERK,1}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 10)}$$

702
$$\frac{d[ERK^{pp}]}{dt} = \frac{k_{f,ERK}[MEK^{pp}][ERK^p]}{[ERK^p] + K_{ERK,1}} - \frac{k_{b,ERK}[ERK^{pp}]}{[ERK^{pp}] + K_{ERK,2}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 11)}$$

703
$$[ERK^p] = [ERK]_{total} - [ERK] - [ERK^{pp}] \qquad \text{(Eq. 12)}$$

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

$k_{f,MEK}$ = 0.41 min^{-1}, $k_{b,MEK}$ = 0.04 $\mu M/min$, $K_{MEK,1}$ = 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 $\mu M/min$, $K_{ERK,1}$ = 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.

712
$$\text{inducer} = k_{inducer} [PKA_C] [ERK^{pp}] \qquad \text{(Eq. 13)}$$

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 1,000 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 for optimal conditioning and extinction.

Numerical methods. 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 basal 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 striped 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 pre-assigned to three experimental groups based on their baseline freezing and

locomotor activity during the familiarization session: Regular Conditioning (RC), Short

Conditioning (SC), and Optimal Short Conditioning (OSC). 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 RC 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 SC group received four CS-US pairings with the same ITIs of 270 s, and

remained in the chamber until the end of the session. The OSC group received the

computationally designed optimal protocol of four 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 Short Conditioning

Apparatus and Procedures

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

on Day 0, rats were pre-assigned to two experimental groups based on their baseline

freezing and locomotor activity during the familiarization session: Optimal Short

Conditioning (OSC) and Spaced Short Conditioning (SSC). 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 SSC group received

four CS-US pairings with ITIs of 11 min 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 pre-assigned to three experimental groups

based on their freezing and lever presses during the fear conditioning session: Regular

Extinction (RE), Short Extinction (SE), and Optimal Short Extinction (OSE). On day 9, rats

were returned to the same chamber for a fear extinction session (39 min duration). The

RE group received twelve CSs with ITIs of 150 s; the SE group received four CSs with

ITIs of 150 s and remained in the chamber until the end of the session; and the OSE

group received the computationally designed optimal protocol of 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.

Immunohistochemistry

Rats were perfused with 200 ml of 0.1 M potassium phosphate buffer (KPBS) followed by

500 ml of 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in 0.1 M sodium phosphate buffer 15 min after day

1 of conditioning. Brains were removed from the skull, transferred to a 20% sucrose

solution in PFA for 24 h, and stored in a 30% sucrose solution in PFA for another 24 h.

Next, coronal brain sections (40 µm thick) were cut with a cryostat (CM1860, Leica) and

stored in an antifreeze solution overnight. Sections were blocked in 20% normal goat

serum, 0.3% Triton X-100, and 3% hydrogen peroxide in KPBS at room temperature for

1 h. Brain sections were then incubated with anti-pCREB serum raised in rabbit (1:1000;

EMD Millipore 06-519) overnight at room temperature. After sections were washed with

KPBS five times, they were incubated with biotinylated goat anti-rabbit IgG antibody

(1:200, Vector Labs, BA-1000-1.5) for 2 h, followed by incubation in ABC kit (1:50, Vector

Labs, PK-6100) for 90 min and DAB-Ni solution (Vector Labs, SK-4100) for 25 min.

Sections were washed with KPBS and mounted on Superfrost Plus slides. After three

days, sections were serially dehydrated with alcohol (Epredia; 50 and 70% for 5min each,

95 and 100% for 10 min each) and defatted with Citrisolv (Decon Labs) for 30 min.

Sections were then cover-slipped with mounting medium (Permount, Fisher Scientific)

before being analyzed microscopically.

Microscopy and image analysis

Images were generated with a Nikon microscope (Eclipse NiE Motorized Upright Microscope) equipped with a fluorescent lamp (X-Cite, 120 LED) and a digital camera (Andor Zyla 4.2 PLUS sCMOS). Counts of pCREB-positive cells were performed at 20 x magnification. Cell detection and quantification for the immunohistochemistry experiment were performed automatically using QuPath (Bankhead et al., 2017) by an experimenter blind to the experimental groups. pCREB-positive cell detection was performed using QuPath's optical density sum with a requested pixel size of 0.5 µm. Nucleus parameters included a background radius of 6 µm, median filter radius of 0 µm, sigma of 1.5 µm, minimum area of 2 µm^2, and maximum area of 250 µm^2. Cell expansion was set to 0 µm. Intensity parameters included a threshold of 0.15 and maximum background intensity of 5, and intensity threshold parameters were threshold 1 of 0.2, threshold 2 of 0.4, and threshold 3 of 0.6. pCREB-positive cells were automatically counted with a circular region of interest (0.228 mm^2) in each subfield of rat dorsal hippocampus including CA1, CA2, CA3, and DG, as well as in the lateral nucleus of the amygdala (LA), the basal nucleus of the amygdala (BA), the central nucleus of the amygdala (CeA) and the paraventricular nucleus of the thalamus (PVT) according to the rat brain atlas (Paxinos and Watson, 2014), and averaged for both hemispheres at 2-3 different antero-posterior levels from -2.4 mm to -4.2 mm from bregma. These brain regions were selected because they have been previously implicated in the acquisition of conditioned fear responses (Herry and Johansen, 2014; Do-Monte et al., 2015). The density of pCREB-positive cells (cells per mm^2) was calculated by dividing the number of pCREB-positive cells by the area of the circular region of interest.

Quantification and statistical analysis

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

were measured using an 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' tests (Grubbs, 1969)

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

removed after identification by the test. Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed to determine

whether the data have a normal distribution. F tests before pair-wise comparison and

Brown-Forsythe tests 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 (Software 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

(https://github.com/Owenxz/Zhang-XO-Enhanced-Learning-2022.git).

Author Contributions: X.O.Z, D.S.E., and C.E.C performed and analyzed the behavioral

experiments. X.O.Z and C.E.C performed and analyzed the immunohistochemistry

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.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the Russell and Diana Hawkins Family

Foundation Discovery Fellowship and the Dr. John J. Kopchick Fellowship to X.O.Z, 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. We thank Nikita Watson and Sharon

Gordon for their technical and administrative assistance. We also thank current members

of the Byrne and Do Monte labs for their valuable comments on the manuscript.

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.

Ahmed T, Frey JU (2005) Plasticity-specific phosphorylation of camkii, map-kinases and

creb during late-ltp in rat hippocampal slices in vitro. Neuropharmacology 49:477-

492.

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.

Bambah-Mukku D, Travaglia A, Chen DY, Pollonini G, Alberini CM (2014) A positive

autoregulatory bdnf feedback loop via c/ebpbeta mediates hippocampal memory

consolidation. J Neurosci 34:12547-12559.

Bankhead P, Loughrey MB, Fernandez JA, Dombrowski Y, McArt DG, Dunne PD,

McQuaid S, Gray RT, Murray LJ, Coleman HG, James JA, Salto-Tellez M,

Hamilton PW (2017) Qupath: Open source software for digital pathology image

analysis. Scientific reports 7:16878.

Barela PB (1999) Theoretical mechanisms underlying the trial-spacing effect in

pavlovian fear conditioning. J Exp Psychol Anim Behav Process 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.

Bernier BE, Lacagnina AF, Ayoub A, Shue F, Zemelman BV, Krasne FB, Drew MR

(2017) Dentate gyrus contributes to retrieval as well as encoding: Evidence from

context fear conditioning, recall, and extinction. J Neurosci 37:6359-6371.

Bourtchuladze R, Frenguelli B, Blendy J, Cioffi D, Schutz G, Silva AJ (1994) Deficient

long-term memory in mice with a targeted mutation of the camp-responsive

element-binding protein. Cell 79:59-68.

Bouton ME, Maren S, McNally GP (2021) Behavioral and neurobiological mechanisms

of pavlovian and instrumental extinction learning. Physiol Rev 101:611-681.

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.

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.

Chaaya N, Jacques A, Belmer A, Beecher K, Ali SA, Chehrehasa F, Battle AR, Johnson

LR, Bartlett SE (2019) Contextual fear conditioning alter microglia number and

morphology in the rat dorsal hippocampus. Front Cell Neurosci 13:214.

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.

Davis S, Vanhoutte P, Pages C, Caboche J, Laroche S (2000) The mapk/erk cascade

targets both elk-1 and camp response element-binding protein to control long-

term potentiation-dependent gene expression in the dentate gyrus in vivo. J

Neurosci 20:4563-4572.

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.

Fanselow MS (1980) Conditioned and unconditional components of post-shock

freezing. Pavlov J Biol Sci 15:177-182.

Fanselow MS, LeDoux JE (1999) Why we think plasticity underlying pavlovian fear

conditioning occurs in the basolateral amygdala. Neuron 23:229-232.

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.

Grubbs FE (1969) Procedures for detecting outlying observations in samples.

Technometrics 11:1-21.

Guan Z, Giustetto M, Lomvardas S, Kim JH, Miniaci MC, Schwartz JH, Thanos D,

Kandel ER (2002) Integration of long-term-memory-related synaptic plasticity

involves bidirectional regulation of gene expression and chromatin structure. Cell

111:483-493.

Herry C, Johansen JP (2014) Encoding of fear learning and memory in distributed

neuronal circuits. Nat Neurosci 17:1644-1654.

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.

Hunsaker MR, Kesner RP (2008) Dissociations across the dorsal-ventral axis of ca3

and ca1 for encoding and retrieval of contextual and auditory-cued fear.

Neurobiol Learn Mem 89:61-69.

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 ca^{2+} 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

1016   learning and memory. Cell 147:509-524.

1017 Kandel ER (2001) The molecular biology of memory storage: A dialogue between genes

1018   and synapses. Science 294:1030-1038.

1019 Kheirbek MA, Drew LJ, Burghardt NS, Costantini DO, Tannenholz L, Ahmari SE, Zeng

1020   H, Fenton AA, Hen R (2013) Differential control of learning and anxiety along the

1021   dorsoventral axis of the dentate gyrus. Neuron 77:955-968.

1022 Kida S (2012) A functional role for creb as a positive regulator of memory formation and

1023   ltp. Exp Neurobiol 21:136-140.

1024 Lauterborn JC, Palmer LC, Jia Y, Pham DT, Hou B, Wang W, Trieu BH, Cox CD,

1025   Kantorovich S, Gall CM, Lynch G (2016) Chronic ampakine treatments stimulate

1026   dendritic growth and promote learning in middle-aged rats. J Neurosci 36:1636-

1027   1646.

1028 Liu RY, Cleary LJ, Byrne JH (2011) The requirement for enhanced creb1 expression in

1029   consolidation of long-term synaptic facilitation and long-term excitability in

1030   sensory neurons of *aplysia*. J Neurosci 31:6871-6879.

1031 Lynch G, Cox CD, Gall CM (2014) Pharmacological enhancement of memory or

1032   cognition in normal subjects. Front Syst Neurosci 8:90.

1033 Lynch MA (2004) Long-term potentiation and memory. Physiol Rev 84:87-136.

1034 Malenka RC, Kauer JA, Perkel DJ, Mauk MD, Kelly PT, Nicoll RA, Waxham MN (1989)

1035   An essential role for postsynaptic calmodulin and protein kinase activity in long-

1036   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. The Psychological Record 32:151.
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.
Mohamed HA, Yao W, Fioravante D, Smolen PD, Byrne JH (2005) Camp-response
elements in aplysia creb1, creb2, and ap-uch promoters: Implications for
feedback loops modulating long term memory. The Journal of biological
chemistry 280:27035-27043.

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.

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.

Park S, Kramer EE, Mercaldo V, Rashid AJ, Insel N, Frankland PW, Josselyn SA (2016)

Neuronal allocation to a hippocampal engram. Neuropsychopharmacology

41:2987-2993.

Paxinos G, Watson C (2014) Paxino's and watson's the rat brain in stereotaxic

coordinates, Seventh edition. Edition. Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier/AP,

Academic Press is an imprint of Elsevier.

Penzo MA, Robert V, Tucciarone J, De Bundel D, Wang M, Van Aelst L, Darvas M,

Parada LF, Palmiter RD, He M, Huang ZJ, Li B (2015) The paraventricular

thalamus controls a central amygdala fear circuit. Nature 519:455-459.

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.

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.

Quinn JJ, Wied HM, Ma QD, Tinsley MR, Fanselow MS (2008) Dorsal hippocampus

involvement in delay fear conditioning depends upon the strength of the tone-

footshock association. Hippocampus 18:640-654.

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.

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.

Restivo L, Tafi E, Ammassari-Teule M, Marie H (2009) Viral-mediated expression of a

constitutively active form of creb in hippocampal neurons increases memory.

Hippocampus 19:228-234.

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.

Roberson ED, English JD, Adams JP, Selcher JC, Kondratick C, Sweatt JD (1999) The

mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade couples pka and pkc to camp

response element binding protein phosphorylation in area ca1 of hippocampus. J

Neurosci 19:4337-4348.

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.

Sindreu CB, Scheiner ZS, Storm DR (2007) Ca2+ -stimulated adenylyl cyclases

regulate erk-dependent activation of msk1 during fear conditioning. Neuron

53:79-89.

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.

Tao X, Finkbeiner S, Arnold DB, Shaywitz AJ, Greenberg ME (1998) Ca2+ influx

regulates bdnf transcription by a creb family transcription factor-dependent

mechanism. Neuron 20:709-726.

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.

Vossler MR, Yao H, York RD, Pan MG, Rim CS, Stork PJ (1997) Camp activates map

kinase and elk-1 through a b-raf- and rap1-dependent pathway. Cell 89:73-82.

Wang S, Sheng T, Ren S, Tian T, Lu W (2016) Distinct roles of pkcι/λ and pkmζ 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)

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

1173