1   Persistently increased expression of PKMζ and unbiased gene expression profiles identify

2   hippocampal molecular traces of a long-term active place avoidance memory and 'shadow'

3   proteins

Jiyeon Han[1,2], Alejandro Grau-Perales[1], Rayna M. Harris[3], Hsin-Yi Kao[1], Asit Pal[2,4], Juan Marcos

Alarcon[5], Todd Sacktor[6], Stefano Martiniani[1,2,4,7], Hans A. Hofmann[3], Andre A. Fenton[1,8]

[1]Center for Neural Science, New York University

[2]Center for Soft Matter Physics, Department of Physics, New York University

[3]Department of Integrative Biology and Institute for Neuroscience, The University of Texas. Austin

[4]Simons Center for Computational Physical Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, New York University

[5]Department of Pathology. State University of New York, Downstate Health Sciences University, New

York

[6]Departments of Physiology and Pharmacology, Anesthesiology, and Neurology, State University of

New York, Downstate Health Sciences University, New York

[7]Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University

[8]Neuroscience Institute at the New York University Langone Medical Center, New York, NY 10016

Corresponding authors: Stefano Martiniani (stefano.martiniani@nyu.edu), Hans A. Hofmann

(hofmann@utexas.edu) and André A. Fenton (afenton@nyu.edu)

Keywords: transcriptome, immunohistochemistry, tri-synaptic pathway, gene co-expression networks

ABSTRACT

Long-term memory formation transiently activates Ca^{2+}-calmodulin kinase IIα (CaMKII) and atypical

protein kinase C isoform iota/lambda (PKCι/λ), whereas persistent activation of the other atypical

PKC, protein kinase M zeta (PKMζ), together with its interacting partner, the scaffolding-protein

KIBRA, is necessary for maintaining potentiated synapses and memory. Here, we use immediate early

gene (IEG) *Arc* activation during active place avoidance memory expression to tag memory-activated

neurons with EYFP, followed by PKMζ immunohistochemistry to learn which hippocampal synaptic

pathways are persistently altered. For at least 1 month, PKMζ and EYFP-PKMζ colocalization

persistently increase in the hippocampal tri-synaptic pathway (dentate gyrus (DG)→CA3→CA1). We

thus use DG, CA3, and CA1 transcriptional profiling to identify mRNAs for PKMζ and other molecules

that might contribute to maintaining the memory. We find that memory persistence correlates with

the upregulation of IEGs *Arc*, *Fos*, and *NPas4* in DG. In contrast, expression of CaMKII, PKMζ, PKCι/λ,

KIBRA, and most other LTP-associated proteins do not covary with memory. This result rules out

strong memory-related transcriptional regulation, but not regulation of mRNA translation or stability

of these "shadow proteins" that, despite being crucial for memory maintenance, evade detection by

unbiased transcriptome profiling. We further examine whether covarying gene expression defines

molecular ensembles that predict memory and *Prkcz* expression. Community detection, applied to

both linear and non-linear pairwise gene co-expression relationships, reveals gene co-expression

networks predictive of memory, memory-related IEGs, and *Prkcz* expression. These findings trace: i) a

PKMζ engram in the hippocampus; and highlight: ii) sustained IEGs upregulation in >24-h memory

maintenance; iii) the utility of investigating both linear and non-linear gene expression covariance

patterns; iv) limits of transcriptional profiling for identifying long-term memory molecules, most of

which appear to be "in shadow"; and demonstrates v) that weak pair-wise gene-gene correlations can

identify strong gene co-expression networks related to behavioral and shadow molecular estimates of

long-term memory.

INTRODUCTION

Learning about the significance of places empowers individuals to form and maintain (often for a

lifetime) adaptive and context-appropriate memories about locations associated with specific

experiences. The cognitive and neural processes underlying place preference and avoidance have

been examined in great detail (Jain et al., 2017), with much of this research focused on the rodent

hippocampus, which is a thoroughly studied model system for investigating how spatial memory is

formed and stored (O'Keefe and Nadel, 1978; Wilson and Tonegawa, 1997; Barry et al., 2012).

The active place avoidance task is used to assess spatial navigation and long-term memory in rodents.

The task crucially depends on intact hippocampus function and causes month-long changes in

hippocampal synaptic function at the level of the CA3-to-CA1 population of synapses and the medial

entorhinal cortex-to-suprapyramidal dentate gyrus (DG) population of synapses (Cimadevilla et al.,

2000; Cimadevilla et al., 2001; Park et al., 2015; Pavlowsky et al., 2017; Levy et al., 2019; Chung et al.,

2021). The task requires a rodent to explore a circular rotating arena while avoiding the location of a

mild footshock. Place avoidance learning causes the transient activation of several long-term

potentiation (LTP)-associated molecules in the dorsal hippocampus, including a number of kinases

such as the persistent kinases Ca^{2+}-calmodulin kinase IIα (CaMKII) and the atypical protein kinase C

isoform PKCɩ/λ for the acquisition of the conditioned avoidance (Tsokas et al., 2016; Rossetti et al.,

2017; Sacktor and Fenton, 2018). Importantly, these molecules are not critical for maintaining

memory. In contrast, the other atypical PKC, protein kinase M zeta (PKMζ), an autonomously active

kinase whose activity is regulated by its protein level (Sacktor et al., 1993), persistently increases and

is necessary for long-term memory for at least a month (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Tsokas et al., 2016;

Hsieh et al., 2017), as shown across diverse brain regions, species, and memory paradigms (Drier et

al., 2002; Shema et al., 2007; Serrano et al., 2008; Hardt et al., 2009; Madronal et al., 2010; Migues et

al., 2010; von Kraus et al., 2010; Asiedu et al., 2011; Cai et al., 2011; Laferriere et al., 2011; Li et al.,

2011; Shema et al., 2011; Barry et al., 2012; Velez-Hernandez et al., 2013; Li et al., 2014; Wang et al.,

2016). Several input-specific populations of synapses in the hippocampus undergo synaptic changes,

possibly to store memory and realize experience-dependent modifications of information processing

(Whitlock et al., 2006; Madronal et al., 2010; Park et al., 2015; Pavlowsky et al., 2017; Levy et al.,

2019; Chung et al., 2021). However, which synaptic populations persistently change with experience

remains an open question. One hypothesis is that these changes primarily occur in those synapses

that are relevant for the maintenance of the memory, in which case we can predict that they will be

expressed in distinct synaptic populations within the different hippocampal subfields (Whitlock et al.,

2006; Takeuchi et al., 2013; Pavlowsky et al., 2017). An alternative hypothesis posits that changes

occur everywhere in a non-specifically structured organization (Madar et al., 2025; Uytiepo et al.,

2025). The substantial recurrent connectivity of the CA3 subfield has motivated the theory that it

might act as a storage site with robust memory-related synaptic plasticity (Marr, 1971; Treves and

Rolls, 1992; Li et al., 2024). Studies of hippocampal neurons that express location-specific place cell

discharge identified the importance of the CA3-to-CA1 synapses in memory storage and recall. In

contrast, the entorhinal cortex layer III-to CA1 temporoammonic (TA) synaptic terminals are thought

to be relevant for encoding momentary information and computations (Marr, 1971; Colgin et al.,

2009; Dvorak et al., 2018; Grienberger and Magee, 2022). Inputs from layer II of the lateral entorhinal

cortex are thought to provide contextual information, while those from layer II of the medial

entorhinal cortex provide spatial signals. These pathways differentially target dendritic compartments

in the supra- and infra-pyramidal blades of dentate gyrus (Neunuebel et al., 2013; Nilssen et al., 2019;

Wang et al., 2023). The specific synaptic organization of the hippocampal circuit is likely to constrain,

and possibly predict, the functional organization of hippocampal information processing.

Molecules such as PKMζ that are crucial for memory maintenance, interact with other effector and

regulatory molecules in multiple ways that have yet to be completely identified, but likely are best

characterized as a network of interactions abstracted from the list of the molecular components (Kelly

et al., 2007a; Kelly et al., 2007b; Tian et al., 2008; Yao et al., 2008; Migues et al., 2010; Sacktor, 2011;

Kandel, 2012; Shao et al., 2012; Eom et al., 2014; Vogt-Eisele et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014; Tsokas et

al., 2016; Yu et al., 2017; Sacktor and Fenton, 2018; Tsokas et al., 2024). Although the complete

network of memory-mediating molecular interactions that maintain persistent place avoidance

memory is unknown, biochemical studies have shown that PKMζ associates with the kidney and brain

protein (KIBRA/WWC1) and potentiates synaptic transmission through the action of N-

ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor (NSF), which in turn increases the insertion of GluA2 subunit-

containing α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA)-type glutamate ionotropic

receptors into postsynaptic sites (Yao et al., 2008; Tsokas et al., 2024). This process further coincides

with a reduction in NUMB-mediated AMPA receptor endocytosis coordinated by protein interacting

with C-kinase 1 (PICK1) from the postsynaptic sites that are maintained by CaMKII-activity/structure

(Sacktor, 2011; Sacktor and Hell, 2017; Farah et al., 2019; Tsokas et al., 2024). It is not known,

however, whether these processes are largely regulated at the post-transcriptional level, including

regulation of mRNA translation and protein stability, or whether they are accompanied by changes in

the mRNA levels of these genes, possibly in opposing directions (e.g., PICK1 and NUMB functions are

anti-related to the memory-promoting cell biological functions of PKMζ, KIBRA, NSF, CaMKII, and

GluA2). Furthermore, LTP-induction is associated with transient upregulation of PKCι/λ, the other

atypical PKC, whereas genetic deletion of the PKMζ gene *Prkcz*, results in LTP- and memory-triggered

prolongation of compensatory upregulation of PKCι/λ and the conventional isoform PKCβ1 (Tsokas et

al., 2016). It is also unclear how this PKMζ-dependent memory-maintenance system interacts with

other molecular pathways that have been hypothesized to play a role in the early phases of memory

formation. These include mTOR, a master regulator of translation, insulin-like growth factor 2 (IGF2),

which promotes the strengthening of memory likely by an independent process (Chen et al., 2011;

Alberini and Chen, 2012), or Fragile X Messenger Ribonucleoprotein 1 (FMR1), which can lead to

dysregulated mRNA translation, altered synaptic function, abnormal protein synthesis-dependent

synaptic plasticity, and poorly coordinated neural discharge (Bassell and Warren, 2008; Thomson et

al., 2017; Talbot et al., 2018). These findings suggest that changes in both mRNA expression as well as

post-transcriptional regulation of genes involved in synaptic plasticity underlie memory maintenance.

Modern genomic techniques such as transcriptome profiling have made it possible to examine the

molecular underpinnings of plasticity in animal behavior and can be profitably used to test specific

hypotheses about the molecular underpinnings of memory maintenance as well as discover novel

pathways for subsequent experimental analysis (Harris and Hofmann, 2014).

In the present study, we used active place avoidance as an exemplar of long-term memory

maintenance in two separate experiments. Experiment 1 used immunohistochemistry to test the

hypothesis that PKMζ exerts its memory-maintaining role by localizing to specific cellular sub-

compartments of EYFP-tagged memory cells in the hippocampal subfields. Experiment 2 used RNA-

seq in specific hippocampal subfields to test the hypothesis that the transcriptional regulation of the

PKMζ system, along with several other candidate genes, are critical for memory maintenance in the

active place avoidance paradigm. We also tested the hypothesis that genes for the over 150

molecules implicated in the formation of LTP are associated with memory maintenance as well. Lastly,

we mined the RNA-seq data obtained from DG, CA3, and CA1 in search of covariant molecular

networks predictive of memory and PKMζ gene expression levels, used here as an exemplar of

proteins with crucial functions, such as in memory maintenance, but which are expressed at levels so

low that they escape detection. We refer to this class of molecules as the 'shadow proteome,' which

is distinct from the so-called 'dark proteome' (Wright et al., 2022). Using both linear and non-linear

methods to measure covarying expression levels, covarying gene co-expression networks were

identified that predict PKMζ gene expression and memory, pointing to the feasibility of detecting

shadow proteins and potentially identifying novel molecular interactions and pathways associated

with memory maintenance.

RESULTS

Experiment 1 – Tracing Memory

PKMζ protein is persistently increased for at least 30 days in memory-tagged cells

Trained and Untrained mice do not differ in entering the shock zone soon after being placed on the

arena during pretraining (Fig. 1c; t_7 = 0.42, p = 0.7), but only the Trained mice learn to delay entering

the shock zone for several minutes by the end of training (t_7 = 4.18, p = 0.006). This conditioned

avoidance persists and is expressed a month later in the retention test with no shock (Trained: 90 ±

51 s, Untrained: 5 ± 4 s). Despite the absence of shock, the time to enter the location of shock for the

second time is 254 ± 141 s in the Trained group and only 26 ± 17 s in the Untrained group (t_7 = 3.60, p

= 0.01), confirming place avoidance memory is maintained for a month in the Trained mice (Fig. 1c).

The EYFP label is detected throughout the principal cells of Ammon's horn, including the *strata*

radiatum and *lacunosum moleculare* dendritic compartments and the granule cell and the molecular

layers of the supra-DG and infra-DG of both Trained and Untrained mice (Fig. 1d). We first correlate

the somatic EYFP signal (in *stratum pyramidale* for CA1, CA2, and CA3 and in the granule cell layer for

DG) with the dendritic compartment signals to assess whether the EYFP label is distributed across the

strata that define synaptic compartments. Within each hippocampal subfield, we observe strong

positive correlations between somatic EYFP expression and each of the corresponding dendritic

compartments (0.34 ≥ r′s ≤ 0.90; 0.89 < t_6's < 5.1, 0.002 ≥ p's ≤ 0.4). These correlations are all

significant (p's < 0.05) except between the granule cell layer and the adjacent inner molecular layer of

infra-DG (r = 0.54, t_6 = 1.6, p = 0.2) and between the pyramidal cell layer of CA3 and the distant

stratum lacunosum moleculare compartment (r = 0.34, t_6 = 0.89, p = 0.4).

We next determine whether memory training causes elevated EYFP expression in each hippocampal

subregion. Relative to control expression values (Fig. 1d), EYFP expression is significantly increased in

the Trained group at CA1 (t_6 = 2.81, p = 0.03), CA3 (t_6 = 3.80, p = 0.008), supra-DG (t_6 = 8.61, p <0.001),

and infra-DG (t_6=2.58, p = 0.04), but not at CA2 (t_6 = 1.20, p = 0.3).

We can now investigate which EYFP-tagged synaptic populations persistently increase PKMζ

expression after memory training as an indicator of persistently potentiated memory-related

synapses. Compared to Untrained, PKMζ is significantly increased throughout the Trained supra-DG

(Fig. 1e). Although the M1 coefficients do not significantly differ (all p's > 0.1), the M2 coefficient

estimating PKMζ-EYFP overlap exclusively in EYFP expressing regions is significantly increased in

Trained mice at the granule cell layer (t_6 = 2.65, p = 0.02), the middle (t_6 = 3.11, p = 0.01), and the

outer molecular layers (t_6 = 4.11, p = 0.003), but not at the inner molecular layer (t_6 = 2.24, p = 0.06),

which only reaches 1-tailed significance. This suggests that synapses of the outer two-thirds of the

molecular layer of supra-DG are persistently potentiated a month after memory training, coinciding

with where the inputs from LECII and MECII terminate in supra-DG, consistent with

electrophysiological observations in freely-behaving mice (Chung et al., 2021).

The corresponding analysis of infra-DG finds Trained versus Untrained enhancement of PKMζ only at

the middle and outer molecular layers (Fig. 1f) and although there are also no group differences in M1

coefficients, the M2 measure of PKMζ-EYFP overlap is significantly increased in Trained compared to

Untrained mice at the middle (t_6 = 14.4, p < 0.01) and outer molecular layers too (t_6 = 4.15, p < 0.01)

but not elsewhere (Fig. 1f).

CA3 labeling for PKMζ is significantly increased in Trained compared to Untrained *stratum pyramidale*

(t_6 = 3.28, p = 0.01) and the *stratum radiatum* (t_6 = 3.18, p = 0.01), but not at *lacunosum moleculare* (t_6

= 0.49, p = 0.6). While we do not find any differences between groups in the Mander M1 coefficient

(all p's > 0.4), this coincides with increase of the M2 overlap coefficient at *stratum pyramidale* (t_6 =

2.80, p = 0.03), and *stratum radiatum* (t_6 = 2.59, p = 0.04), but not *lacunosum moleculare* (t_6 = 0.32 p =

0.8), suggesting persistent potentiation of synaptic inputs from DG, but not entorhinal cortex in

memory-tagged CA3 (Fig. 1g).

PKMζ in the CA1 subfield is significantly increased in Trained compared to Untrained mice at *stratum*

pyramidale (t_6 = 3.00, p = 0.01), and *stratum radiatum* (t_6 = 3.63, p = 0.01), but not *lacunosum*

moleculare (t_6 = 1.24, p = 0.3; Fig. 1h). Similar to CA3, we do not observe group differences in the

Mander M1 coefficient (p´s > 0.1), but the Mander M2 coefficient is increased at *stratum pyramidale*

(t_6 = 2.80, p = 0.03), and *stratum radiatum* (t_6 = 2.59, p = 0.04), but not *lacunosum moleculare* (t_6 =

0.32, p = 0.8) of the memory-tagged cells, which replicates a prior report (Hsieh et al., 2021) and is

consistent with persistent memory training causing persistent electrophysiological potentiation of the

Schaffer collateral population synapses (Pavlowsky et al., 2017).

Within CA2, we do not find any differences in the expression of PKMζ in any of the synaptic

compartments (Fig. 1i; p´s > 0.4), the Mander M1 (p´s ≥ 0.2), and the Mander M2 coefficients (p´s ≥

0.3) in any of the synaptic compartments of the CA2 region, consistent with observing no evidence of

training-associated *Arc* activation.

The overall hippocampal pattern of changes in PKMζ expression in memory-tagged cells is

remarkable. One month after memory training, the PKMζ increase traces the synaptic compartments

of the trisynaptic pathway through the hippocampal circuit (Fig. 1j).

Results motivating Experiment 2

These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that place avoidance training causes synaptic

potentiation in the hippocampal tri-synaptic "model" pathway thought to be associated with memory,

but not in the direct "data" inputs from entorhinal cortex though to be associated with sensory

information processing (Colgin et al., 2009; Fries, 2009; Dvorak and Fenton, 2014; Dvorak et al.,

2018). This PKMζ memory trace is selectively observed in the neurons that activate *Arc* during

expression of the established place avoidance memory, not merely during learning (Fig. 1), in line with

observations that memory training increases PKMζ in CA1 (Hsieh et al., 2017; Hsieh et al., 2021) and

changes synaptic function selectively at CA1 *stratum radiatum* (Pavlowsky et al., 2017) as well as

Supra-DG, which can be measured as early as after 30 min of memory training (Chung et al., 2021),

see also (Whitlock et al., 2006). The observed group differences in PKMζ predict that mice with better

memory will express more PKMζ in the memory-tagged cells. Despite there being only four Trained

mice, large Pearson correlations are observed between the M2 coefficients of PKMζ in EYFP-

expressing cells and the time to first enter into the shock zone on Trial 3 when memory was tagged.

Correcting for the two calculations (M1, and M2), the M2 coefficient is significant at the middle

molecular layer where the medial perforant path terminates in the supra-DG ($r = 0.98$, $t_2 = 7.0$, $p = $

0.02), the site where Chung et al. recorded memory-induced synaptic plasticity in freely-behaving

mice for up to 60 days; but the correlation is not significant at infra-DG ($r = 0.93$, $t_2 = 3.7$, $p = 0.06$),

mirroring the electrophysiological observations (Chung et al., 2021; Dvorak et al., 2021). There is

strong evidence that PKMζ protein expression is persistently and detectably elevated at synaptic

populations, specifically in the ChR2-EYFP-tagged neurons that are an enriched sample of memory-

related cells. Lastly, prior work showed that the training-induced persistent increase of PKMζ in

memory-tagged cells and the synaptic potentiation at CA1 *str. radiatum*, are both indistinguishable

whether or not memory retention is tested (Pavlowsky et al., 2017; Hsieh et al., 2021).

Experiment 2 – Transcriptional Profiling of Memory

Characterizing memory-related behavior

We first analyze active place avoidance behavior in the memory-trained and yoked-control groups, as

a prerequisite for investigating transcriptional profiles related to memory (Fig. 2). During the pre-

training test, when the shock was off, there are no differences between the groups, as expected

(Table 1). Avoidance is evaluated in multiple ways, including as a reduction in the number of

entrances into the shock zone (Fig. 3a), an increase in the time to first enter the shock zone (Fig. 3b),

and a decreased likelihood of being in the shock zone (Fig. 3c). As expected, the memory-trained

animals show a robust conditioned avoidance whereas the yoked-controls do not, although

corresponding pairs of Trained and Control mice experience identical physical conditions (Fig. 2b).

These observations are confirmed by two-way ANOVAs, with significant effects of training treatment,

trial, and their interaction (Table 1).

The conflict-trained animals show similarly rapid avoidance learning (T1-T3) as the standard-trained

mice (Figure 3a-c). Initial between-day recall (Rt) of the conditioned place avoidance is also

indistinguishable between the two Trained groups, and as expected, the Controls do not express an

avoidance. Place avoidance in the two trained groups differ when the shock zone was subsequently

relocated for the conflict group (T4-T6), specifically on the first trial with the new shock location (T4),

as expected (Figure 3a-c). The conflict-trained group rapidly learns to avoid the relocated shock zone

in subsequent trials, so that the ability to avoid shock cannot be distinguished between the two

Trained groups (Table 1). Compared to the standard-trained group, the conflict-trained group learns

to avoid two places in the same environment and extinguishes the avoidance of one location.

Similarly, behavior is indistinguishable between the two yoked controls (Table 1). The day after the

conditioning trials, on the memory retention test (Rn) with no shock, the conditioned avoidance

persists and is indistinguishable between the two Trained groups, and is not expressed in the

Controls, when tested the next day (Rn) under identical conditions for all mice.

Spatial memory is a complex phenomenon to which we aim to relate gene expression. In an effort to

identify a memory score that does not privilege one estimate of conditioned avoidance over another

we perform principal component analysis (PCA) on the 26 measures of behavioral space-use obtained

from the automated behavioral analysis of position tracking (Table S1). Measures related to shock

avoidance and avoidance conditioning are captured by PC1, which together reveals a "memory

syndrome" that explains 37.4% of the variance when all the data from pretraining to retention are

analyzed together. Following the experimental design, we focus the analysis on behavior during

retention when the conditions were identical for all the mice, which was also just prior to euthanasia.

At these times, PC1 explains 52.4% of the variance and PC2 explains 14.9% of the variance (Fig. 3d).

The variables with strongest loading on PC1 reflect avoidance behavior (Fig. 3e), whereas PC2

captures measures of locomotor activity (Fig. 3f), which can be considered an "activity syndrome."

PC1 significantly distinguishes Trained (n = 17) and Control (n = 17) mice (t_{32} = 6.8, p = 10^{-8}), but PC2

does not (t_{32} = 0.01, p = 0.99). We designate PC1 as $PC1_{mem}$ and use it as a comprehensive measure of

the behavioral expression of active place avoidance memory, and PC2 is designated $PC2_{act}$ (Table S1).

Spatial memory drives hippocampal-subfield specific patterns of transcriptome variation

Transcriptomes were obtained from a subset of the mice (Fig. S2). We begin by identifying

differentially expressed genes (DEGs) between the four groups of trained and yoked mouse samples

from the DG, CA3, and CA1 hippocampal subfields; 2 DG samples (1 standard-yoked and 1 conflict-

yoked), 1 CA3 sample (1 conflict-trained) and 2 CA1 samples (1 standard-yoked and 1 conflict-yoked)

are eliminated from analysis because of insufficient RNA reads. A total of 39 samples are analyzed

(Fig. S2). PCA shows it is possible to distinguish the trained and control DG transcriptomes, but not the

CA3 and CA1 transcriptomes (Fig. 4a). Few significant DEGs are found in any subfield between

standard- and conflict-trained groups (Fig. 4b,c) so we combine the data into one Trained (n = 9) and

one Control (n = 9) group (Fig. 4d). In the ~17,000 gene-transcriptomes we cannot detect any DEGs

between Trained and Control CA3 samples, and only 4 in CA1 samples, whereas 263 DEGs are

identified in the DG samples (Fig. 4), with more increased than decreased genes in Trained compared

to Control samples (Fig 4d). The total DEG list in DG, CA3, and CA1 is available (see Table in Fig. 4

legend).

While *Prkcz* and related transcripts are not found to be differentially expressed, the IEGs that are also

DEGs are significantly correlated with $PC1_{mem}$ (Fig. 5a), and their pairwise correlations are positive

(Fig. 5b). These relationships are not observed in CA3, which instead only identifies negative Pearson

correlations between memory and *Prkci* that codes for PKCɩ/λ and *Gria2*, the gene for the GluA2

AMPA receptor subunit (Fig. 5c). *Gria2* is also significantly correlated with *Gria1,* the GluR1 AMPA

receptor subunit, and *Grin1*, the NMDA receptor subunit GluN1 (Fig. 5d). Furthermore, within CA3,

the genes for all the candidate kinases forms a co-expression network (CaMKII, PKCβ, PKMζ, and

PKCι/λ) with *Wwc1*, the gene for KIBRA/WWC1 that targets PKMζ to activated synapses (Fig. 5d). In

CA1, while expression of none of the candidate genes is correlated with behavioral memory (Fig. 5e),

the pattern of significant pairwise correlations is intermediate to the DG and CA3 patterns, in part

because *Gria1* expression covaries with the mutually correlated IEGs and also covaries with *Prkcb* and

Wwc1 (KIBRA), which itself correlates with *Prkcz,* the gene for PKMζ (Fig. 5e).

Astrocytes contribute to synaptic function and long-term memory persistence (Henneberger et al.,

2010; Allen and Eroglu, 2017; Adamsky et al., 2018; Curreli et al., 2022) and indeed, several astrocyte-

associated genes are amongst the CA3 DEGs and some of their expression values in CA3 appear to

covary with PC1$_{mem}$ (Fig. S3). While this is not the case for these genes in the DG or CA1 samples,

nonetheless, many of the astrocytic genes are correlated with each other within the samples from

DG, CA3, and CA1 (Fig. S3).

The results of the preceding analyses vary substantially across the hippocampal subfields, so we

examine whether the findings are robust or spurious. For one, the above analyses assume linear

relationships between gene expression and memory or *bona fide* memory-related molecules like

PKMζ, but some of these relationships are known to be non-linear due to regulatory, feedback and

feedforward processes (Sacktor, 2011; Tsokas et al., 2016). We therefore investigate whether

associating these DEGs with memory is robust across three independent information-theoretic and

statistical measures for ranking genes in the DG samples according to their ability to differentiate

between Trained and Control median-of-ratio normalized gene expression levels. Indeed, Kullback-

Liebler Divergence (KLD), mutual information (MI), and the Mann-Whitney tests all identify the IEGs

and many of the DEGs identified by DESeq2, but not PKMζ (Fig. S4). In particular, the LTP-associated

genes *Arc*, *Egr1*, *Npas4*, and *Sgk1* all extremize these measures, indicating that they are most strongly

associated with memory persistence.

Might covarying gene co-expression networks predict shadow proteins better than individual genes?

Our observation that both the memory/LTP-related candidate genes, as well as the astrocytic

candidate genes form co-expression networks indicates that instead of defining a high-dimensional

state space of possible gene expression patterns, gene co-expression defines a lower dimensional

state space. The gene-gene correlations define the intrinsic dimensions of the state space within

which the Training and Control conditions are defined. We next ask whether such gene co-expression

networks can reveal molecules in the "shadow proteome" such as PKMζ.

While the results of linear Pearson and non-linear Spearman correlations are largely consistent, both

fail to detect non-linear but biologically meaningful relationships that can be measured by

Chatterjee's ξ (Fig. S5; Chatterjee, 2021). Since the DEGs distinguish Trained from Control samples, it

is not surprising that 94% of the DEGs have significant Pearson correlations with $PC1_{mem}$. We compare

Pearson, Spearman, and Xi (ξ) measures of relatedness to $PC1_{mem}$ (Fig. 6). While the relationship of

gene expression to $PC1_{mem}$ for some genes is well characterized by the three measures, for some it is

not. Because of its sensitivity to outliers, subsequent analyses use Spearman instead of Pearson

correlations, and because of its ability to capture non-linear relationships like sigmoids and

thresholds, we use ξ in subsequent analyses in a combined measure, Σ, that is the norm of the two

correlation measures (see Methods).

Shadow proteins: differential gene expression does not identify PKMζ *and related proteins in long-*

term *memory persistence*

Active place avoidance memory training increases PKMζ protein in specific hippocampal subfields (Fig.

1). This complements findings from biochemical and genetic manipulations that *de novo* synthesis of

PKMζ and its interactions with KIBRA and other proteins in hippocampus are crucial for the

persistence of the active place avoidance memory (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Tsokas et al., 2016; Tsokas

et al., 2024), as well as other types of memory (Shema et al., 2007; Serrano et al., 2008; Madronal et

al., 2010; Migues et al., 2010; von Kraus et al., 2010; Laferriere et al., 2011; Li et al., 2011; Sacktor,

2011; Shema et al., 2011; Barry et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016; Sacktor and Hell, 2017), even though

genetic deletion of PKMζ is compensated by increased expression of PKCι/λ (Lee et al., 2013; Volk et

al., 2013; Tsokas et al., 2016). Nonetheless, candidate LTP/memory-persistence genes that differ

significantly between the Trained and Control groups in the DG, CA3, or CA1 samples, are not related

to the behavioral measure of memory (PC1$_{mem}$), despite the memory-associated increases in the PKMζ

protein with large effect size (Cohen's d: DG = 1.3, CA3 = 1.5, CA1 = 2.5; power analysis with d = 1.5

predicts n's of 7 are sufficient to detect RNA differences at α = 0.05 and β = 0.8). These data indicate

that detection and discovery of such 'shadow' proteins is unlikely from standard transcriptomic

analyses, leading us to consider innovations that can detect memory-related expression of PKMζ, and

related molecules.

Weak-pairwise correlations amongst the many (i.e., high-dimensional) components of a system can

indicate strong low-dimensional network states, in which single components are not crucial, but the

collective interactions are strong determinants of function (Schneidman et al., 2006). Such low-

dimensional manifold interactions are a familiar feature in studies of correlated neuronal action and

field potentials (Schneidman et al., 2006; Levy et al., 2023; Fenton, 2024) that have been proposed to

replace the reliance on individual neurons (the neuron doctrine), with a population doctrine that

relies on neuronal interactions to explain system functions (Ebitz and Hayden, 2021). Accordingly, the

positive identification of PKMζ as a shadow protein motivates exploring whether networks of

transcriptomic interactions rather than single genes, may better predict the importance of proteins

for memory persistence.

To test this idea, we use the Louvain Method of community detection (Blondel et al., 2008) to define

gene co-expression networks (communities) of strongly correlated genes that are weakly correlated

across communities. We also employ weighted gene co-expression network analysis (WGCNA;

Langfelder and Horvath, 2008) to infer gene co-expression networks that predict the behavioral

Trained/Control group, and PKMζ; however the results are unstably sensitive to algorithm parameters

(data not shown). We use the norm of both Spearman's ρ and Chattejee's ξ correlation coefficients as

the relationship metric to PC1$_{mem}$, and perform the Louvain clustering analysis 1000 times with

randomly selected seeds. Figure 7a, shows the accumulated colors for a set of 714 genes (702 genes

significantly correlated with PC1$_{mem}$ using norm correlation-based p-value ≤ 0.05, as well as twelve

additional candidate genes to yield n = 714 unique genes). We find that these genes are reliably

assigned to one of the three groups, each defined by the presence of the genes *Arc*, *Nsf*, and *Prkcz*, to

which we assign red, green, and blue colors, respectively (Hanley et al., 2002; Sacktor and Hell, 2017;

Weng et al., 2018). The top-20 expressed genes in each of the three communities and their associated

candidate genes reveal three robust gene co-expression networks (Figs. 7a, S6). Specifically, the IEGs

are part of the red ensemble defined by *Arc* membership. Genes associated with early-LTP and the

trafficking and insertion of AMPA receptors associate within the green ensemble defined by *Nsf*

membership. Finally, the NMDA receptor gene *Grin1* is part of the blue ensemble defined by *Prkcz*

membership. Note that *Wwc1* (KIBRA) is uniquely yellow, indicating that it is assigned with similar

probability to the red ensemble enriched with IEGs, and the green ensemble enriched with genes

associated with early-LTP and AMPA receptor placement. Genes associated with PKMζ-mediated

effects on AMPA receptors, *Pick1, Gria1, and Prkcb* are identified as turquoise because they are

reliably assigned to either the green ensemble or the blue ensemble. It is also remarkable that *Fmr1* is

gray as it is assigned approximately equally to each of the three communities. This suggests there may

be a detectable logic to the organization of these gene ensembles.

We sought to further validate this network approach by using the 714 gene–gene norm score (Σ) as

edge weights to construct an undirected graph G with genes as nodes. To assess community stability,

we ran Louvain clustering 1,000 times with different random seeds. For each run, we recorded the co-

occurrence counts of gene pairs clustering together, accumulating these in an 714 by 714 'clustering

probability' matrix that is a gene-wise co-occurrence probability matrix. PCA analysis of the clustering

probability matrix was performed to embed the genes into a 3D space (PC1, PC2, and PC3). We

computed the clustering probability matrices for the separate yoked and trained subgraphs to assess

whether clustering probabilities changed with memory training. The separate yoked and trained

clustering probability matrices were projected into the 3D space using the same PCA loadings of the

total samples to ensure a common embedding for the comparison (Fig. 7b). To enhance visual

contrast, we normalized the raw PCA coordinates and linearly scaled them to hex color codes. The

trained and yoked gene-gene relations appear distinctive because the yoked gene set is compact

whereas the trained set is dispersed along triangular axes (Fig. 7b).

We also performed PCA on the raw expression matrix (genes × samples) after z-scaling each gene's

expression across all samples. This raw-expression PCA failed to reveal clear separation of either the

candidate genes or the two training conditions, underscoring the value of investigating gene-gene

relationships and the clustering probability approach to analyze those relationships (Fig. S7).

To compare whether co-clustering patterns of each gene are lost and gained between yoked and

training, we generated agglomerative cluster maps using the separate yoked and trained clustering

probability matrices (Fig. 7c). We first subtracted the yoked matrix from the trained matrix and

performed hierarchical clustering with the Pearson correlation as the distance metric. The range of

the heatmap is -1 to 1, which corresponds to losing and gaining co-cluster likelihood, respectively. In

the heatmap based on all 714 genes, *Prkcz* was grouped together with *Nsf* but not with *Numb*, which

corresponds to the synaptic plasticity related cellular biology that PKMζ and NSF together promote

synaptic potentiation whereas NUMB promotes depotentiation. In the total dataset for the 714-gene

heatmap, *Prkcz* was grouped together with the genes associated with the endoplasmic reticulum

related gene ontology terms.

To highlight the genes that are driving the differences between the yoked and trained conditions, we

computed for each gene the three-dimensional shift vector $\Delta C = PC_{tr} - PC_{yo}$ using the clustering

probability matrix matrices. From ΔC, we derived: (1) the Euclidean Distance ($\| \Delta C \|$) — overall

magnitude of each gene's shift; and (2) the Centroid Similarity ($\frac{\Delta C \cdot u}{\|\Delta C\|}, u = \frac{\mu_{tr} - \mu_{yo}}{\|\mu_{tr} - \mu_{yo}\|}$), which is the

cosine similarity between each gene's shift and the global centroid shift between the yoked and

trained conditions; and (3) the Gene Similarity ($\frac{PC_{yo} \cdot PC_{tr}}{\|PC_{yo}\|\|PC_{tr}\|}$) , which measures the cosine similarity

between the yoked and trained conditions for each gene (Fig. 7d). We observed that the genes are

distributed along a low-dimensional manifold defined over these three features (Fig. 7e), which we

confirm by t-SNE non-linear dimensionality reduction (Fig. 7f). The distribution along the manifold

reflects the Euclidean distance from the yoked condition. Notably, the KIBRA gene *Wwc1* is at the

extreme of the manifold, distinct from the other candidate genes that are separately distributed along

the manifold.

DISCUSSION

Summary and Limitations

To detect changes in the expression of genes for PKMζ and other proteins known to be important for

long-term memory, we first assessed gene expression changes at the individual-gene level by

identifying differentially expressed genes, few of which corresponded to proteins know to be

important for long-term memory (Fig. 4,5). Next, we examined gene expression shifts at the

population level, considering all genes significantly altered by training (Fig. 6) and a set of candidate

genes hypothesized to respond to memory training by observation or their biochemical relationship

with PKMζ. To capture these population-level changes, we clustered genes according to their pairwise

co-expression correlations across the two conditions rather than relying on individual gene-wise

differential expression. For each gene, we then estimated its cluster-membership probability and

compared how those probabilities differed between conditions. Overall, our results demonstrate that

active place avoidance memory training alters the covariance structure among individual gene

expression changes (Fig. 7).

We began by evaluating long-term memory for the conditioned avoidance response in active place

avoidance memory. We first measured that PKMζ protein is persistently increased in the

somatodendritic compartments of the tri-synaptic pathway for at least a month (Fig. 1). We then

quantified both recall of the conditioned behavior and the associated transcriptional changes in three

subfields of the hippocampus a day after the end of the training and 30-min after expression of the

avoidance memory. The behavioral similarities and differences between the Trained and Control

groups reflect knowledge about the location of shock rather than the experience of shock *per se*,

because the 24 hours before euthanasia were physically identical across the groups, constituting time

in the home cage and 10 minutes on the arena with no shock, and the comparison groups

experienced the identical physical conditions. We cannot assert that the gene expression findings

associated with active place avoidance memory are due to altered gene expression specifically in

neurons because we sampled bulk tissue, containing approximately equal numbers of neurons and

other cells that are largely the glial population (Herculano-Houzel et al., 2006).

We started with an unbiased data-driven approach to identify genes that are sensitive to the

maintenance of spatial memories across at least 24 h, then conducted a hypothesis-driven analysis of

the data to characterize whether the memory training is associated with altered expression of dozens

of genes that have been previously shown to be important for learning, memory, and the cellular

model LTP, including PKMζ that we confirmed is increased two-fold at each of the subfields we

sampled for transcriptional profiling. For this hypothesis-driven approach, we examined both

differential gene expression and its covariance with estimates of avoidance memory behavior and

with other candidate genes. Our RNA-seq methods could not detect ribosomal RNA, nor did we

perform protein sequencing, limiting the scope of this study to findings that may related to memory-

related transcriptional regulation.

The PKMζ engram

Richard Semon introduced the term "engram" to mean the physical trace that stores memory, which

is a concept that Plato introduced by proposing memory is like a block of wax in which perceptions

and thoughts are imprinted, "just as we make impressions from seal rings" (Plato et al., 1935; Josselyn

et al., 2017). We observed that PKMζ is persistently increased for at least 1 month, selectively in

memory-tagged cells and specifically at synaptic populations of the tri-synaptic pathway (Fig. 1). We

did not demonstrate if this PKMζ trace is necessary or sufficient for maintaining the conditioned place

avoidance behavior; however, prior work discovered place avoidance training potentiates the Schaffer

collateral synaptic population at CA1 *stratum radiatum* but not at CA1 *lacunosum moleculare*

(Pavlowsky et al., 2017) and at the middle molecular layer of supraDG, complementing our current

findings (Fig. 1; Chung et al., 2021; Hsieh et al., 2021). Notice that the compartment-specific

persistent increases of PKMζ in DG, CA3, and CA1 point to an active process targeting the protein,

since PKMζ is observed throughout the hippocampus circuit, but is elevated selectively by memory

training. The compartmentalization of the PKMζ increases that we observe is hard to reconcile with a

somatic synthesis of PKMζ and its free diffusion in cytosol to activated synapses. However,

compartmentalization is compatible with local translation and recent findings that PKMζ complexes

with the cytoskeleton-associated postsynaptic scaffolding protein KIBRA that persistently targets the

kinase's action to activated synapses to store memory (Muslimov et al., 2004; Tsokas et al., 2024).

These findings together suggest the PKMζ trace is a *bona fide* engram because i) PKMζ is both

necessary and sufficient for maintaining late-LTP in wild-type mice, and active place avoidance

memory in wild-type mice is eliminated by ii) inhibition of PKMζ synthesis during learning, and, for up

to a month after the avoidance memory is established, it is erased by iii) inhibition of PKMζ kinase

activity or iv) inhibition of PKMζ binding to KIBRA (Ling et al., 2002; Pastalkova et al., 2006; Serrano et

al., 2008; Tsokas et al., 2016; Tsokas et al., 2024). Systems consolidation, taken at face value, might

suggest that memory no longer depends on hippocampus after a month, but that is falsified by the

cited work as well as demonstration of a core and persistent hippocampal dependence of other forms

of memory, despite the possibility of systems consolidation (Sutherland et al., 2008; Hardt and Nadel,

2017; Tonegawa et al., 2018; Refaeli et al., 2023). Accordingly, the inability to detect simple

transcriptomic differences in LTP- and memory-associated genes cannot be attributed only to systems

consolidation at the early time points after training that we examined. Our observations of the PKMζ

trace are consistent with it being a memory trace by definition, and arguably a long-pursued engram.

Memory-associated Differentially Expressed Genes

Gene expression differences between trained and control groups are mostly observed in DG, with

substantially more increases of gene expression than decreases in the trained mice compared to the

yoked controls. Few genes were differentially expressed in Ammon's horn (Fig. 4), which is not

expected in light of theories of hippocampus memory and information processing (Marr, 1971; Treves

and Rolls, 1992; Lisman et al., 2017) and findings that maintenance of the active place avoidance

memory persistently enhances CA3-CA1 synaptic function for at least 30-days (Pavlowsky et al., 2017).

Nor did we find memory maintenance-related differential expression of genes for the molecular

translation machinery in the MEK/ERK and MTOR pathways, important for memory-related

transcription and translation during initial cellular memory consolidation (Adams and Sweatt, 2002;

Graber et al., 2013). Several genes that are differentially expressed in DG and are positively correlated

with avoidance behavior are IEGs, including *Arc* and the transcription factors *Fos*, *Jun*, and *Npas4*. In

addition to being differentially expressed, expression of these genes is highly correlated with one

another. In previous experiments, *Arc* was activated during contextual threat avoidance conditioning

and optogenetically silencing the *Arc*-activated DG neurons was sufficient to impair contextual fear

memory, whereas optogenetically stimulating neurons that activated *c-Fos* was sufficient for

expressing the memory (Liu et al., 2012). Indeed, as we also observed in DG, prior work showed that

Arc and *Fos* expression are correlated in active CA1 neurons (Mahringer et al., 2022). Because we

examined gene expression a day after training when training-associated IEG activation is not expected

(Pace et al., 2005; Pevzner and Guzowski, 2014), it is possible that the robust IEG activation we

observed is related to the mice learning about the absence of shock during the retention test.

However, this explanation predicts an inverse relationship between $PC1_{mem}$ and IEG expression,

because mice that expressed the weakest place avoidance by entering the shock zone the most

during the retention test (low $PC1_{mem}$ values) would have the greatest opportunity to learn that shock

was absent and the five mice that showed perfect avoidance by never entering during the retention

trial could not have learned that the shock was off. We reject this alternative because the correlations

between IEG expression in DG and $PC1_{mem}$ on the retention test are all positive. Instead, these

findings suggest that IEGs can respond not only to the novel experience of stimuli that are encoded

during the conditioning of a response, but that their activation in DG also corresponds to the

expression of long-term memory (O'Connell et al., 2012; Miller-Crews and Hofmann, 2024).

Gene ontology analysis revealed that many of the genes that are differentially expressed in the DG

exert their function in dendrites and are important for neuronal projections and cell-cell junctions,

including synapses, which is expected from the relationship between LTP and memory that forms the

basis of the widely-accepted synaptic plasticity and memory hypothesis (Table S2; Takeuchi et al.,

2013). Although, we cannot distinguish the contributions of neurons and glia to the memory-related

differential gene expression we observed, these findings suggest that the expression of the

conditioned place avoidance altered neural activity in a way that increases transcriptional activity,

perhaps for the purpose of promoting dendritic growth. Indeed, we note that expression of a number

of astrocyte-related genes, especially in CA3 were positively correlated with the $PC1_{mem}$ estimate of

memory expression, including *Aldh1a1*, *Aldh1l2*, *Gfap*, *Fgfr3*, and *Aqp4* (Fig. S3). Even though these

genes were not differentially expressed after avoidance training, the correlation with expression of

the conditioned avoidance behavior adds to the growing evidence that astrocytes also play an active

role in forming and/or stabilizing memory via a variety of potential mechanisms (Parpura et al., 1994;

Henneberger et al., 2010; Suzuki et al., 2011; Rusakov, 2015; Gao et al., 2016).

Synaptic reorganization requires that neurons polarize their dendrites to create new neural

connections and direct channels to specific regions within the synapse. Disruption of the processes

that regulate synaptic organization can impair memory or cause disease. Dysregulation of *Eif5* a DEG,

is associated with many neurodegenerative diseases (Kapur et al., 2017). *Cpeb4*, a DEG, encodes

cytoplasmic polyadenylation element binding protein 4, which regulates the translation of genes by

modulating their poly(A)-tail length and is a known regulator of genes associated with autism

spectrum disorder (Parras et al., 2018). Many of the genes that are mutated in autism spectrum

disorder are crucial components of the activity-dependent signaling networks that regulate synapse

development and plasticity (Ebert and Greenberg, 2013). Deletion of *Fmr1* can lead to dysregulated

mRNA translation, altered synaptic function, abnormal protein synthesis-dependent synaptic

plasticity, and poorly coordinated neural discharge (Bassell and Warren, 2008; Thomson et al., 2017;

Talbot et al., 2018).

Very few of the differentially expressed genes in our study overlapped with the LTP-related molecules

that were identified from review of the LTP literature (Table S3; Sanes and Lichtman, 1999). Some

classes of genes that are notably absent from the list of differentially expressed genes but present in

the LTP-related list are genes for receptors (calcium, glutamate, GABA, and serotonin), calcium or

calmodulin-binding proteins, and adhesion molecules. This is perhaps not surprising because the

review focused on literature examining LTP induction, the first minutes of long-term potentiation,

whereas our experiments were designed to investigate 24-h memory expression, which would be

expected to correspond to LTP maintenance. Thus, this work is consistent with the evidence (Table

S3; reviewed in Sacktor and Hell, 2017) that like LTP-induction, many molecules known to be crucial

for learning, are neither crucial nor expressed in LTP maintenance and as we observe, memory

persistence. This points to different molecular mechanisms for forming a memory and maintaining

and/or later expressing it days later.

Transcriptional profiling did not identify genes known to encode proteins crucial for LTP and memory

persistence

What then of the atypical PKCs and CaMKII, candidate molecules that are demonstrated to have

crucial roles in the maintenance of LTP and synaptic structure, as well as active place avoidance

memory, as demonstrated in Figure 1 (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Tsokas et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2016;

Hsieh et al., 2017; Rossetti et al., 2017; Sacktor and Fenton, 2018; Hsieh et al., 2021; Tsokas et al.,

2024)? We did not detect differential expression of these genes, nor did we detect correlations

between any of the corresponding mRNAs and the behavioral measures of avoidance memory

expression, whereas we did for IEGs as discussed above. It would, however, be naive and/or hasty to

conclude that despite being unbiased, this transcriptomic screen contradicts the findings of the

candidate molecule approaches that have identified a role for these molecules, especially in active

place avoidance memory. This highlights a major shortcoming of using transcriptional profiling to

identify molecular mechanisms of functions such as memory. First, the abundance of mRNA does not

relate in a straightforward way to the cellular abundance of protein because the relationship depends

on the translational regulation of the particular protein as well as protein translocation and stability

(Vogel and Marcotte, 2012; Liu et al., 2016). Indeed, as an example, while PKMζ is strongly regulated

by repressing translation at dendrites (Hernandez et al., 2003), there is no evidence that it is

transcriptionally regulated, either in late-LTP (Kelly et al., 2007a) or in active place avoidance

conditioning (Hsieh et al., 2017), in line with the present findings. While this highlights a limitation of

transcriptional profiling, it draws attention to the necessity of performing combined transcriptional

and proteomic profiling in tissue taken from the same subjects (Liu et al., 2016). In light of the present

findings, the hypothesis that PKMζ's molecular interactions maintain memory (Sacktor, 2011, 2012;

Sacktor and Fenton, 2018; Tsokas et al., 2024) predicts independence between *Prkcz* RNA, that

encodes PKMζ, and measures of memory in an unbiased screen that integrates memory-related

measures of behavior with circuit-specific transcriptional profiling (RNA), as we have done and

observed here. Somewhat unintuitively, the hypothesis also predicts that in the same tissue, memory

measures correlate positively with PKMζ protein levels and those of its interaction partners (e.g.,

KIBRA, NSF, NUMB, PICK1, GluA2), even though their RNA levels show little phenotypic variation

(Hanley et al., 2002; Yao et al., 2008; Makuch et al., 2011; Vogt-Eisele et al., 2014; Yu et al., 2017).

There is likely substantial utility in such analyses that use experimental design and concurrent multi-

scale measurements from single subjects to integrate information from across levels of biology (here

behavior, protein and gene expression), not only to discover unknown and unanticipated mechanisms

of complex, poorly-defined processes like memory, but to also test the validity of specific mechanistic

hypotheses. For example, the notion that the atypical PKCs may play complementary but competing

roles in the maintenance of LTP and memory, perhaps through binding to KIBRA, predicts anti-

correlation between *Prkcz* and *Prkci* and whichever isoform is more expressed, to be correlated with

KIBRA. This pattern was however not observed, suggesting a simple model of transcriptional

regulation does not map their functional protein-mediated functional relationships. Although we have

observed it is not straightforward, the findings nevertheless suggest that the transcriptional level of

biology can relate to biological function that is mediated by proteins, even rare ones like PKMζ.

Illuminating the shadow proteome

Taking a lesson from a major conceptual advance in analysis of neuronal spike train populations, we

also considered whether hypothesizing straightforward relationships between gene expression (or

even protein expression in principle) is conceptually fraught, in part because individual expression

changes can have manifold interactions with network-level consequences (Yuste, 2015; Ebitz and

Hayden, 2021). We first, demonstrated that non-linear measures of correlation like Chatterjee's ξ

identify *bona fide* relationships that the standard use of Pearson's correlation failed to identify (Fig.

6). We then used the combination of Spearman's ρ and ξ correlations to define ensembles of mutually

correlated genes (Figs. 5,7). Initial skepticism was assuaged because ensembles of mutually correlated

genes were reliably identified, i.e., their membership was meaningful according to known biochemical

function, and perhaps most significantly, this approach identified candidate genes independently

proven to be involved in memory. This last fact suggests it may be possible to identify both known (as

shown here) and unknown components of the shadow protein by challenging the conventional

hypothesis that there are unique, essential components for maintaining memory. Put simply, function

emerges from the subtle, cooperative tuning of many components, and not from a dramatic change

in any one, just as an arch bears a bridge's weight through the balanced interplay of all its stones, not

by any single one. Consider for example, the ongoing debate as to whether the persistent kinase

CaMKII or PKMζ is crucial for persistent memory storage, or whether some other molecule is crucial,

at the exclusion of all others (Frankland and Josselyn, 2013; Morris, 2016; Lisman, 2017). Neither

kinase, nor the gene for the compensating kinase *Prkci* were found to be differentially regulated

between the memory and control groups, nor did memory measures correlate with the expression of

these kinase genes or with the expression of their scaffolding partners that guide their function, like

KIBRA. However, by abstracting both linear and non-linear gene-gene relationships to define the

concept of a gene co-expression network, such distinct gene ensembles could be i) reliably defined,

and ii) were the dataset's best predictors of the involvement of genes that encode shadow

components, undetected but known proteins that are crucial for the memory being investigated (Figs.

1,7).

Conclusion

Our findings suggest a hypothesis, which contends that a low-dimensional manifold of molecular

interactions (genes, mRNAs, proteins) is embedded in the high-dimensional state space of biological

components. The manifold dimensions are defined by biological interactions/functions, not by the

biological components themselves. This view extends the manifold concept from our

electrophysiological studies to other levels of biology, where the high-dimensional space of potential

memory-maintaining biological components, in practice, collapses into a low-dimensional manifold of

biological solutions for maintaining memory (Levy et al., 2023; Fenton, 2024). In this view, the logic of

the functional implementation, rather than the traditional, parallel measurement of physical

components is best able to identify the solutions. Despite vast heterogeneity in biological elements

(genes, proteins, cell types with their own cell biology and electrophysiology that contribute to

memory), this view asserts there is a conserved computational logic to how these elements interact

to realize memory storage and expression. Innovative research programs will be required to validate

or refute this conjecture (Sinha et al., 2020), with important implications if it is supported. For

example, if key biological functions like memory are governed by a manifold of multiple replaceable

interacting genes and/or proteins, then the endeavor to find definitive "causal" biomarkers of

function and dysfunction is at best fraught, because key components can be replaced when they are

absent or defective (Harris and Hofmann, 2014; El-Brolosy and Stainier, 2017), as is the case when

PKMζ is genetically deleted and is certainly the case for neuronal circuit functions and the cell-specific

molecular phenotyping that has been compellingly demonstrated with the crustacean stomatogastric

ganglion (STG) model system (Tsokas et al., 2016; Northcutt et al., 2019; Tsokas et al., 2024). On the

other hand, as the STG as an archetype demonstrates, neuronal systems are robust and treatment

options can be plentiful when the system components are manifold, replaceable, and can be

coordinated (Goldman et al., 2001; Marder et al., 2014; Marder et al., 2015).

METHODS

Experimental Subjects

All animal care and use complied with the Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of

Laboratory Animals and were approved by the New York University Animal Welfare Committee and

the Marine Biological Laboratory IACUC. Transgenic ArcCreER^{T2} (originally purchased from The

Jackson Laboratories, Jax: 021881) and R26R-STOP^{flx}-ChR2-EYFP mice (a gift from Christine Denny)

were crossed to generate the ArcCreER^{T2}-ChR2-EYFP mice for Experiment 1, as previously described

(Denny et al., 2014; Lacagnina et al., 2019; Hsieh et al., 2021). Wildtype C57BL/6J mice (originally

purchased from The Jackson Laboratories, Jax: 000664) were used for Experiment 2.

Experiment 1 – Tracing Memory: Memory-induced increases of protein expression were studied to

identify changes in the strengthening of hippocampal synaptic populations that persist for a month

after memory training. We focused on PKMζ because it is both necessary and sufficient for the

maintenance of LTP in hippocampal slices over at least five hours, and PKMζ in hippocampus is

necessary for active place avoidance memory and its memory-initiated protein expression is

enhanced in CA1 for at least a month (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Tsokas et al., 2016; Hsieh et al., 2017;

Hsieh et al., 2021). PKMζ protein increases in synapses during memory storage, making this an ideal

method to investigate the subcellular distribution of the protein within the different regions of the

hippocampus (Hsieh et al., 2021). PKMζ visualization through immunohistochemistry (IHC) was

combined with Targeted Recombination in Active Populations (TRAP2) technology to identify neurons

that express a fluorescent marker (EYFP) once the expression is initiated by the external ligand, 4-

hydroxytamoxifen (TAM, Sigma, St. Louis, MO, H7904). The Cre-mediated recombination is directed

to neurons expressing high levels of the immediate early gene (IEG) *Arc* while TAM is circulating. The

combination of these two techniques allows us after a month's delay to identify the EYFP-expressing

neurons as likely to have been active during TAM administration, and to interpret the synaptic sites

within these neurons that exhibit elevated PKMζ levels as loci of persistent potentiation.

Thus the ArcCreER^{T2} x ChR2-EYFP TRAP2 mice (n=4 Trained and n=4 Untrained) were temporarily

housed in an experimental room with an isolation chamber (1 mouse/cage) on a 12:12 light/dark

cycle. These mice contained a ArcCreER^{T2} DNA sequence allowing initiation of transcription at the *Arc*

promoter to express Cre recombinase in the presence of TAM. The mice also contained a STOP codon

flanked by LoxP sites followed by the sequence for Channelrhodopsin 2 (ChR2) fused with EYFP (Fig.

1a). Thus, TAM will induce activation of Cre recombinase in *Arc* activated cells to remove the STOP

codon to cause perpetual membrane-targeted EYFP expression. These ArcCreER^{T2} x ChR2-EYFP mice

allowed us to tag neurons with EYFP if they activate *Arc* during expression of the conditioned place

avoidance, as in prior work (Denny et al., 2014; Hsieh et al., 2021).

To reduce spurious activation of *Arc* and EYFP tagging, 2-3 days before the initial exposure to the

behavioral arena, all mice began housing in a sound-insulated and light-controlled isolation chamber

that was approximately 1 m away from the behavioral apparatus. The mice remained housed in the

isolation chamber for two days after TAM administration and afterwards were returned to the

vivarium. This isolation limited the association of EYFP expression to the arena experience, as was

validated in prior work (Hsieh et al., 2021). Thirty minutes before the third training trial when the

mice expressed strong place avoidance memory (see below), all mice were injected with TAM (2 mg in

200 μl i.p.).

<u>Experiment 2 – Transcriptional Profiling of Memory</u>: The subjects for transcriptional profiling were a

subset of the 34 C57BL/6J mice that went through the behavioral training protocol. They were housed

at the Marine Biological Laboratory on a 12:12 (light: dark) cycle with continuous access to food and

water in home cages with up to five littermates. Only male mice were analyzed in this study to limit

gene expression variations due to estrus status.

The Active Place Avoidance Task

We used an active place avoidance paradigm to establish a hippocampal-, synaptic plasticity- and

PKMζ-dependent spatial memory that persists for months (Cimadevilla et al., 2000; Cimadevilla et al.,

2001; Pastalkova et al., 2006; Tsokas et al., 2016; Pavlowsky et al., 2017; Chung et al., 2021; Tsokas et

al., 2024). Briefly, an overhead digital video tracking system monitors the position of a mouse as it

moves on an elevated circular 40-cm diameter rotating (1 rpm) arena; the transparent arena wall

allows the mouse to observe the environment (Tracker, Bio-Signal Group Corp., Acton, MA). The

computer activates a mild constant current (0.2 mA, 500 ms, 60 Hz) foot shock across the parallel bars

of the floor whenever the mouse enters a 60° stationary sector that is designated to be the shock

zone. Mice rapidly learn to avoid the shock zone. Behavior in the arena is automatically quantified by

48 measures during each trial, as subset of which are used for formal analysis (Table S1; Tracker, Bio-

Signal Group Corp., Acton, MA).

712 <u>Experiment 1 – Tracing Memory</u>: Mice were removed from the isolation chamber and placed on the

713 behavioral arena and were subsequently returned to the chamber in a way that minimized novel or

714 distinctive extra-arena experience. Each mouse received a 30-min pretraining trial (Pretrain) with no

715 shock. After a 24-h interval back in isolation, each mouse received three 30-min training trials (Train

716 1-3), separated by 24-h intervals in isolation. Four Trained mice received memory training to avoid the

717 location of a mild foot shock in a 60° shock zone; these mice acquired a conditioned place avoidance.

718 Four other Untrained control mice received the identical experience except shock was never turned

719 on. Thirty minutes before Train 3, each animal was injected with TAM. This was intended to tag

720 conditioned avoidance memory-activated cells with ChR2-EYFP in the Trained group and control-

721 activated cells in the Untrained group. All mice were returned to their home cage for 30 days before

722 testing retention of the conditioned avoidance without shock.

723 <u>Experiment 2 – Transcriptional Profiling of Memory</u>: We used a three-day training protocol (Figs. 2a,

724 S2). On day 1, the mice (n = 34) were acclimated to the rotating arena during a 10-min pretraining

725 trial (P) with no shock. Each Trained mouse (n = 17) mouse then receives three 10-min training trials

726 (T1-T3), each separated by 2-h intervals, after which they are returned to their home cage. The next

727 day, the mice are retested (Rt), with the shock in the same location. This was followed by three

728 additional 10-min training trials (T4-T6), each separated by 2-h intervals. The shock zone remained in

729 the same location during T4-T6 for standard-trained animals (n = 8) but it was relocated $180°$ for the

730 conflict-trained mice (n = 9). The relocated position of shock coincides with the place the mice had

731 preferred to be during the T1-T3 trials (Fig. 2a). Each trained mouse (n's = 8, 9) was yoked to a Control

732 mouse (n's = 8, 9) that received the identical shock time series (Fig. 2b). Accordingly, Trained (n = 17)

733 and Control (n = 17) mice had the identical physical experiences of the environment, but the Trained

734 mice could learn to avoid the shock zone, and the Controls could not. On Day 3 all mice received a

735 memory retention trial (Rn) with no shock to evaluate the conditioned avoidance. The Trained and

736 Control mice were each divided into two groups that only differed during the T4-T6 trials on Day 2.

Littermates were randomly assigned to one of the 2 (Standard-Trained/Conflict-Trained) x 2

(Standard-Yoked/Conflict-Yoked) groups (Fig. 2a). Note that the shock is mild and compared to mice

on the arena but never shocked, we do not detect behavioral or plasma corticosterone expression

differences in these groups 24-h after the avoidance or yoked experience compared to the untrained

of walking on the rotating arena (Lesburgueres et al., 2016).

Immunohistochemistry and confocal microscopy (Experiment 1)

Detailed methods have been reported and are only briefly summarized here. Immediately after

testing retention, animals were anesthetized with 2% isoflurane for two minutes, and the brains were

fixed by cardiac perfusion then removed. Transverse 300-µm hippocampal slices were placed in ice-

cold 4% paraformaldehyde in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (PB, pH 7.4) and post-fixed for 48 h, as

previously described (Hsieh et al., 2021). Antibodies specific to EYFP (Abcam, #ab13970) and PKMζ

(C2 polyclonal antiserum from the Sacktor lab) were used. Slices were then washed with PBS (pH 7.4)

and 30-µm sections of the dorsal hippocampus were prepared using a Leica VT 1200S vibratome

(Leica Biosystems, Buffalo Grove, IL). Free-floating sections were permeabilized with PBS containing

0.1% Tween20 (PBS-T) for 1 h at room temperature and blocked with blocking buffer (BB; 10% normal

goat serum in PBS-T) for 2.5 h at room temperature. The sections were then incubated overnight at

4°C with primary antibody rabbit anti-PKMζ C-2 antisera (1:10,000) and chicken anti-EYFP (1:1,000) in

BB. After washing 6 times for 10 mins each in PBS-T, the sections were then incubated with the

secondary antibodies goat anti-chicken Alexa 488 and goat anti-rabbit-Alexa 647 (both 1:500 in BB;

Jackson ImmunoResearch, West Grove, PA) for 2 h at room temperature. After extensive washing

with PBS, the sections were mounted with 4′,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) Fluoromount-G

(Southern Biotech, Birmingham, AL) or Vectashield (Vector Laboratories, Newark, CA).

Three sections from each mouse were observed using an upright Leica SP8 confocal microscope (Leica

Biosystems, Buffalo Grove, IL) and analyzed using ImageJ (version 1.53a; Schneider et al., 2012). For

each section, 8.5 µm-thick Z-stacks of the dorsal CA1, CA2, CA3, supra-DG, and infra-DG were created

using the maximum intensity projection function in ImageJ. In each stack, two square regions of

interest were centered on *strata pyramidale*, *radiatum*, *lacunosum moleculare* for the CA1, CA2, and

CA3 subfields, and on the granule cell layer and molecular layer for both the supra- and infra-

pyramidal layers of DG. The molecular layer of the DG was further subdivided into three equal

compartments (inner, middle, and outer) along the dorsoventral axis. Measurements were made

from each mouse in each region of interest (ROI). The raw integrated density (defined as the sum of

the values for all pixels) of the Z-stack ROI expressing the fluorescent label was measured for the

green (EYFP), red (PKMζ), and yellow (overlap) volume of pixels, and the average of each of the 6 (2

ROI x 3 slices) measurements was taken as representative for the region for each mouse. These

measures account for the locations of the signal as well as their intensity. To rigorously compare the

overlap between EYFP and PKMζ signals in the Trained and Untrained brain regions, we computed the

Manders coefficients M1 and M2 using the JACOP plugin for ImageJ (Manders et al., 1993). M2

estimates how much PKMζ is in the memory-tagged cells by computing the proportion of the PKMζ

signal that co-localizes with the EYFP signal, while M1 estimates the proportion of EYFP signal that co-

localizes with the PKMζ signal. Based on prior work, the working hypothesis is that M2 will increase in

persistently potentiated populations of synapses in somato-dendritic compartments that are

maintained by a PKMζ-dependent mechanism (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Pavlowsky et al., 2017; Hsieh et

al., 2021).

Preparation of micro-dissected hippocampal subfields (Experiment 2)

A day after the last training session, and 30 min after the retention test without shock, mice were

anesthetized with 2% isoflurane and decapitated. Transverse 300-µm brain slices were prepared using

a vibratome (model VT1000 S, Leica Biosystems, Buffalo Grove, IL) and incubated at 36°C for 30 min

and then at room temperature for 90 min in oxygenated artificial cerebrospinal fluid (aCSF in mM:

125 NaCl, 2.5 KCl, 1 MgSO4, 2 CaCl2, 25 NaHCO3, 1.25 NaH2PO4, and 25 Glucose) as previously

prepared to measure LTP and place avoidance memory-induced synaptic plasticity (Pavlowsky and

Alarcon, 2012; Pavlowsky et al., 2017). Slices were cut in half so that one hemisphere could be used

for RNA-seq (see below) and one for *ex vivo* slice physiology (data not shown). The DG, CA3, and CA1

subfields were micro-dissected for later RNA extraction using a 0.25 mm punch tool and cold mat

(Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA) under a dissecting scope (Zeiss, Oberkochen, Germany;

Fig. 2c).

RNA-sequencing and quality control (Experiment 2)

RNA was isolated using the Maxwell 16 LEV RNA Isolation Kit (Promega, Madison, WI). Sequencing

libraries were prepared by the Genomic Sequencing and Analysis Facility at The University of Texas at

Austin and sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq platform following standard protocols. Reads were

processed on the Stampede cluster at the Texas Advanced Computing Center. The quality of raw and

filtered reads was checked using the program FASTQC (Wingett and Andrews, 2018) and visualized

using MultiQC (Ewels et al., 2016). We obtained 6.9 million ± 6.3 million reads per sample (Fig. S1a).

Next, we used Kallisto (Bray et al., 2016) to pseudo-align raw reads to a mouse reference

transcriptome (Gencode version 7; Waterston et al., 2002), which yielded 2.6 million ± 2.1 million

reads per sample (Fig. S1b). Mapping efficiency was about 42% (Fig. S1c).

Statistical analyses

To enhance statistical power and reduce the impact of low-abundance noise, we first applied gene-

level filtering prior to all statistical analyses. As the goals of differential expression and correlation

analyses differ, we employed distinct pre-processing strategies optimized for each.

For differential expression analysis, we followed DESeq2 guidelines to filter low-count genes by

retaining only those with a total count greater than 1 across all samples. Starting from 22,485 genes,

we retained 16,992, 16,481, and 16,840 genes in the DG, CA3, and CA1 subfields, respectively. In the

combined dataset, 17,911 genes remained. Variance-stabilizing transformation (VST) was applied

prior to downstream analyses to improve statistical inference.

In contrast, correlation-based analyses prioritized the inclusion of genes showing meaningful

variation. Gene expression values were normalized separately for each hippocampal subfield using

sample-wise size factor adjustment based on gene-wise geometric means. Genes were filtered to

exclude those with minimal expression variation, retaining only those expressed above the minimum

observed value in at least two samples. The final number of genes used for correlation analysis was

16,467 for DG, 15,778 for CA3, and 16,171 for CA1. Expression values were then log2-transformed to

stabilize variance and avoid undefined values during correlation calculations.

All statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.0.0 (2020-04-24)

(R_Development_Core_Team, 2013), and Python 3.12.6. For behavioral feature analysis, we use the

scikit-learn (v1.5.2; Pedregosa F, 2011), scipy (v 1.14.1; Virtanen et al., 2020) and Statsmodels

(v0.14.4; Seabold S, 2010) packages to conduct ANOVA and principal component analysis (PCA) . One-

and two-way ANOVAs were used to identify group differences in behavioral measures across one or

multiple trials, respectively (Stanley, 2018). PCA was conducted to reduce the dimensionality of the

data (Lê et al., 2008; Kassambara and Mundt, 2017). In particular, to define $PC1_{mem}$, we used

behavioral features from the retention phase, as they provided the best description of memory

performance. Transcript counts were imported into R and aggregated to yield gene counts using the

gene identifier from the Gencode transcriptome. Differential expression analysis was performed using

DESeq2 (Love et al., 2014) with support from tidyverse packages (Wickham, 2009; Wickham and

Grolemund, 2017). Genes were considered significant at a false discovery rate (FDR) adjusted p-value

threshold of < 0.1. Comparisons were made either among the four behavioral treatment groups

(standard-trained, standard-yoked, conflict-trained, and conflict-yoked) or between the combined

memory-trained and combined yoked-control groups.

Gene Ontology enrichment analysis was made using g:Profiler webserver/package (Kolberg et al.,

2023) and MGI webserver (Baldarelli et al., 2024) to identify biological terms associated with

hypothesized and differentially expressed genes.

For analysis of non-linear associations between gene expression values, as well as to $PC1_{mem}$ behavior,

we defined Xicor (ξ) according to Chatterjee's method (Chatterjee, 2021). Since several methods exist

for handling tied ranks, we tested multiple approaches and selected the 'dense' ranking method as

default (Fig. S5). Given our data limited sample size, we applied a correction to the observed Xicor

($\xi_{observed}$) using a scaling model (Eq. 1) with sample size (N) and a scaling factor (c) derived from

simulated linear data across varying sample sizes.

$$\xi_{scaled} = \frac{\xi_{observed}}{1 - \frac{c}{N}} \qquad (Eq.\ 1)$$

The newly generated norm score (Σ) from the Spearman and Xicor correlation values follows Eq. 2.

$$\Sigma = \sqrt{\xi_{scaled}^2 + \rho_s^2} \qquad (Eq.\ 2)$$

To calculate the p-value of Σ, we normalized both the observed Xicor ($\xi_{observed}$)) and Spearman

correlation, using their respective null variances:

$$z_\xi = \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{2/5n}} \ , \ z_{\rho_s} = \rho_s \cdot \sqrt{n-1} \qquad (Eq.\ 3)$$

Assuming z_ξ and z_{ρ_s} are independent standard normal variables, the combined statistic

$$z_\Sigma = \sqrt{z_\xi^2 + z_{\rho_s}^2} \qquad (Eq.\ 4)$$

follows a Rayleigh distribution. The p-value was computed as the upper tail probability of the Rayleigh

cumulative distribution function (CDF). Genes with p-values ≤ 0.05 were used for Louvain clustering.

Clustering and network analyses were performed through NetworkX (v3.4.2; Hagberg et al., 2008),

and its visualization was generated in Cytoscape (v3.10.2; Shannon et al., 2003). For visualization in R,

we relied on the packages ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009), cowplot (Wilke, 2016), and png. We used

Matplotlib (v3.9.2; Hunter, 2007) and Seaborn (v0.13.2; Waskom, 2021) packages in python. Final

illustrations were created using Adobe Illustrator and Canvas X Draw.

Data Availability

Raw sequence data and differential gene expression data are available in NCBI's Gene Expression

Omnibus Database (accession: GSE100225). All data, code, and results are publicly available on

GitHub (https://github.com/sommerJY/APA_PKMZ).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Supported by Chan Zuckerberg Initiative grant CP2-1-0000000614 (AAF/SM), and NIH grants

R01MH132204 (AAF) and R01MH115304 (AAF/TCS). We are grateful to the Simons Center for

Computational Physical Chemistry at NYU (Simons Foundation grant 839534, MT), Helmsley

Foundation, a E.E. Just Endowed Research Fellowship, the Fries Trust Research Awards, Hartline

MacNichol Research Awards, Great Generation Fund for Research, MGF Fuortes Memorial Research

Awards, Frank R. Lillie Quasi-Endowment Fund, and L. & A. Colwin Summer Research Fellowship that

provided the support, without which these data could not be collected. This work was supported in

part through the NYU IT High Performance Computing resources, services, and staff expertise.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Immunohistochemistry data analysis and analysis (AG-P), bioinformatic data analysis and presentation

(JH, AP), bioinformatic data curation and QC (RMH), data collection and analysis (H-YK, RMH, HAH,

AAF), experimental design (HAH, JMA, AAF), figure preparation and data summary (JH, RMH), project

management (SM, HAH, AAF), funding (SM, AAF), data interpretation (SM, HAH, AAF), and writing

(AAF, SM, TCS, HAH).

REFERENCES
879
Adams JP, Sweatt JD (2002) Molecular Psychology: Roles for the ERK MAP Kinase Cascade in
Memory. Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology 42:135-163.
Adamsky A, Kol A, Kreisel T, Doron A, Ozeri-Engelhard N, Melcer T, Refaeli R, Horn H, Regev L,
Groysman M, London M, Goshen I (2018) Astrocytic Activation Generates De Novo Neuronal
Potentiation and Memory Enhancement. Cell 174:59-71.e14.
Alberini CM, Chen DY (2012) Memory enhancement: Consolidation, reconsolidation and insulin-like
growth factor 2. Trends in Neurosciences 35:274-283.
Allen NJ, Eroglu C (2017) Cell Biology of Astrocyte-Synapse Interactions. Neuron 96:697-708.
Asiedu MN, Tillu DV, Melemedjian OK, Shy A, Sanoja R, Bodell B, Ghosh S, Porreca F, Price TJ (2011)
Spinal Protein Kinase M ζ Underlies the Maintenance Mechanism of Persistent Nociceptive
Sensitization. The Journal of Neuroscience 31:6646.
Baldarelli RM, Smith CL, Ringwald M, Richardson JE, Bult CJ, Mouse Genome Informatics G (2024)
Mouse Genome Informatics: an integrated knowledgebase system for the laboratory mouse.
Genetics 227.
Barry JM, Rivard B, Fox SE, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC, Muller RU (2012) Inhibition of protein kinase
Mzeta disrupts the stable spatial discharge of hippocampal place cells in a familiar
environment. J Neurosci 32:13753-13762.
Bassell GJ, Warren ST (2008) Fragile X syndrome: loss of local mRNA regulation alters synaptic
development and function. Neuron 60:201-214.
Blondel VD, Guillaume J-L, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E (2008) Fast unfolding of communities in large
networks. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2008:P10008.
Bray NL, Pimentel H, Melsted P, Pachter L (2016) Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq quantification.
Nat Biotechnol 34:525-527.
Cai D, Pearce K, Chen S, Glanzman DL (2011) Protein kinase M maintains long-term sensitization and
long-term facilitation in aplysia. J Neurosci 31:6421-6431.
Chatterjee S (2021) A New Coefficient of Correlation. Journal of the American Statistical Association
116:2009-2022.
Chen DY, Stern SA, Garcia-Osta A, Saunier-Rebori B, Pollonini G, Bambah-Mukku D, Blitzer RD,
Alberini CM (2011) A critical role for IGF-II in memory consolidation and enhancement.
Nature 469:491-497.
Chung A, Jou C, Grau-Perales A, Levy ERJ, Dvorak D, Hussain N, Fenton AA (2021) Cognitive control
persistently enhances hippocampal information processing. Nature 600:484-488.
Cimadevilla JM, Fenton AA, Bures J (2000) Functional inactivation of dorsal hippocampus impairs
active place avoidance in rats. Neurosci Lett 285:53-56.
Cimadevilla JM, Wesierska M, Fenton AA, Bures J (2001) Inactivating one hippocampus impairs
avoidance of a stable room-defined place during dissociation of arena cues from room cues
by rotation of the arena. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 98:3531-3536.
Colgin LL, Denninger T, Fyhn M, Hafting T, Bonnevie T, Jensen O, Moser MB, Moser EI (2009)
Frequency of gamma oscillations routes flow of information in the hippocampus. Nature
462:353-357.
Curreli S, Bonato J, Romanzi S, Panzeri S, Fellin T (2022) Complementary encoding of spatial
information in hippocampal astrocytes. PLOS Biology 20:e3001530.
Denny CA, Kheirbek MA, Alba EL, Tanaka KF, Brachman RA, Laughman KB, Tomm NK, Turi GF,
Losonczy A, Hen R (2014) Hippocampal memory traces are differentially modulated by
experience, time, and adult neurogenesis. Neuron 83:189-201.
Drier EA, Tello MK, Cowan M, Wu P, Blace N, Sacktor TC, Yin JC (2002) Memory enhancement and
formation by atypical PKM activity in Drosophila melanogaster. Nat Neurosci 5:316-324.
Dvorak D, Fenton AA (2014) On track with two gammas. Neuron 82:506-508.

Dvorak D, Chung A, Park EH, Fenton AA (2021) Dentate spikes and external control of hippocampal function. Cell Rep 36:109497.

Dvorak D, Radwan B, Sparks FT, Talbot ZN, Fenton AA (2018) Control of recollection by slow gamma dominating mid-frequency gamma in hippocampus CA1. PLoS Biol 16:e2003354.

Ebert DH, Greenberg ME (2013) Activity-dependent neuronal signalling and autism spectrum disorder. Nature 493:327-337.

Ebitz RB, Hayden BY (2021) The population doctrine in cognitive neuroscience. Neuron.

El-Brolosy MA, Stainier DYR (2017) Genetic compensation: A phenomenon in search of mechanisms. PLoS Genet 13:e1006780.

Eom T, Muslimov IA, Tsokas P, Berardi V, Zhong J, Sacktor TC, Tiedge H (2014) Neuronal BC RNAs cooperate with eIF4B to mediate activity-dependent translational control. J Cell Biol 207:237-252.

Ewels P, Magnusson M, Lundin S, Kaller M (2016) MultiQC: summarize analysis results for multiple tools and samples in a single report. Bioinformatics 32:3047-3048.

Farah CA, Dunn TW, Hastings MH, Ferguson L, Gao C, Gong K, Sossin WS (2019) A role for Numb in Protein kinase M (PKM)-mediated increase in surface AMPA receptors during facilitation in Aplysia. Journal of Neurochemistry 150:366-384.

Fenton AA (2024) Remapping revisited: how the hippocampus represents different spaces. Nature Reviews Neuroscience.

Frankland PW, Josselyn SA (2013) Neuroscience: Memory and the single molecule. Nature 493:312-313.

Fries P (2009) The model- and the data-gamma. Neuron 64:601-602.

Gao V, Suzuki A, Magistretti PJ, Lengacher S, Pollonini G, Steinman MQ, Alberini CM (2016) Astrocytic beta2-adrenergic receptors mediate hippocampal long-term memory consolidation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 113:8526-8531.

Goldman MS, Golowasch J, Marder E, Abbott LF (2001) Global structure, robustness, and modulation of neuronal models. J Neurosci 21:5229-5238.

Graber TE, McCamphill PK, Sossin WS (2013) A recollection of mTOR signaling in learning and memory. Learn Mem 20:518-530.

Grienberger C, Magee JC (2022) Entorhinal cortex directs learning-related changes in CA1 representations. Nature.

Hagberg AA, Schult DA, Swart P, Hagberg J (2008) Exploring Network Structure, Dynamics, and Function using NetworkX. Proceedings of the Python in Science Conference.

Hanley JG, Khatri L, Hanson PI, Ziff EB (2002) NSF ATPase and alpha-/beta-SNAPs disassemble the AMPA receptor-PICK1 complex. Neuron 34:53-67.

Hardt O, Nadel L (2017) Systems consolidation revisited, but not revised: The promise and limits of optogenetics in the study of memory. Neurosci Lett.

Hardt O, Migues PV, Hastings M, Wong J, Nader K (2009) PKMzeta maintains 1-day- and 6-day-old long-term object location but not object identity memory in dorsal hippocampus. Hippocampus 20:691-695.

Harris RM, Hofmann HA (2014) Neurogenomics of behavioral plasticity. Adv Exp Med Biol 781:149-168.

Henneberger C, Papouin T, Oliet SHR, Rusakov DA (2010) Long-term potentiation depends on release of d-serine from astrocytes. Nature 463:232-236.

Herculano-Houzel S, Mota B, Lent R (2006) Cellular scaling rules for rodent brains. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 103:12138.

Hernandez AI, Blace N, Crary JF, Serrano PA, Leitges M, Libien JM, Weinstein G, Tcherapanov A, Sacktor TC (2003) Protein kinase M zeta synthesis from a brain mRNA encoding an independent protein kinase C zeta catalytic domain. Implications for the molecular mechanism of memory. J Biol Chem 278:40305-40316.

Hsieh C, Tsokas P, Serrano P, Hernandez AI, Tian D, Cottrell JE, Shouval HZ, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC (2017) Persistent increased PKMzeta in long-term and remote spatial memory. Neurobiol Learn Mem 138:135-144.

Hsieh C, Tsokas P, Grau-Perales A, Lesburgueres E, Bukai J, Khanna K, Chorny J, Chung A, Jou C, Burghardt NS, Denny CA, Flores-Obando RE, Hartley BR, Rodriguez Valencia LM, Hernandez AI, Bergold PJ, Cottrell JE, Alarcon JM, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC (2021) Persistent increases of PKMzeta in memory-activated neurons trace LTP maintenance during spatial long-term memory storage. Eur J Neurosci 54:6795-6814.

Hunter JD (2007) Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. Computing in Science & Engineering 9:90-95.

Jain D, Jakhalekar IR, Deshmukh SS (2017) Navigational Strategies and Their Neural Correlates. J Indian Inst Sci 97:511-525.

Josselyn SA, Kohler S, Frankland PW (2017) Heroes of the Engram. J Neurosci 37:4647-4657.

Kandel ER (2012) The molecular biology of memory: cAMP, PKA, CRE, CREB-1, CREB-2, and CPEB. Mol Brain 5:14.

Kapur M, Monaghan CE, Ackerman SL (2017) Regulation of mRNA Translation in Neurons-A Matter of Life and Death. Neuron 96:616-637.

Kassambara A, Mundt F (2017) factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of Multivariate Data Analyses. In: Available at: https://cran.r-project.org/package=factoextra.

Kelly MT, Crary JF, Sacktor TC (2007a) Regulation of protein kinase Mzeta synthesis by multiple kinases in long-term potentiation. J Neurosci 27:3439-3444.

Kelly MT, Yao Y, Sondhi R, Sacktor TC (2007b) Actin polymerization regulates the synthesis of PKMzeta in LTP. Neuropharmacology 52:41-45.

Kolberg L, Raudvere U, Kuzmin I, Adler P, Vilo J, Peterson H (2023) g:Profiler-interoperable web service for functional enrichment analysis and gene identifier mapping (2023 update). Nucleic Acids Res 51:W207-W212.

Lacagnina AF, Brockway ET, Crovetti CR, Shue F, McCarty MJ, Sattler KP, Lim SC, Santos SL, Denny CA, Drew MR (2019) Distinct hippocampal engrams control extinction and relapse of fear memory. Nat Neurosci 22:753-761.

Laferriere A, Pitcher MH, Haldane A, Huang Y, Cornea V, Kumar N, Sacktor TC, Cervero F, Coderre TJ (2011) PKMzeta is essential for spinal plasticity underlying the maintenance of persistent pain. Mol Pain 7:99.

Langfelder P, Horvath S (2008) WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis. BMC Bioinformatics 9:559.

Lê S, Josse J, Husson F (2008) FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis. Journal of Statistical Software 25:1 - 18.

Lee AM, Kanter BR, Wang D, Lim JP, Zou ME, Qiu C, McMahon T, Dadgar J, Fischbach-Weiss SC, Messing RO (2013) Prkcz null mice show normal learning and memory. Nature 493:416-419.

Lesburgueres E, Sparks FT, O'Reilly KC, Fenton AA (2016) Active place avoidance is no more stressful than unreinforced exploration of a familiar environment. Hippocampus 26:1481-1485.

Levy ERJ, O'Reilly KC, Fenton AA (2019) Long-Lasting Input-Specific Experience-Dependent Changes of Hippocampus Synaptic Function Measured in the Anesthetized Rat. eNeuro 6.

Levy ERJ, Carrillo-Segura S, Park EH, Redman WT, Hurtado JR, Chung S, Fenton AA (2023) A manifold neural population code for space in hippocampal coactivity dynamics independent of place fields. Cell Reports 42.

Li W, Wang P, Li H (2014) Upregulation of glutamatergic transmission in anterior cingulate cortex in the diabetic rats with neuropathic pain. Neurosci Lett 568:29-34.

Li Y, Briguglio JJ, Romani S, Magee JC (2024) Mechanisms of memory-supporting neuronal dynamics in hippocampal area CA3. Cell 187:6804-6819.e6821.

Li YQ, Xue YX, He YY, Li FQ, Xue LF, Xu CM, Sacktor TC, Shaham Y, Lu L (2011) Inhibition of PKMzeta in
nucleus accumbens core abolishes long-term drug reward memory. J Neurosci 31:5436-
5446.
Ling DS, Benardo LS, Serrano PA, Blace N, Kelly MT, Crary JF, Sacktor TC (2002) Protein kinase Mzeta
is necessary and sufficient for LTP maintenance. Nat Neurosci 5:295-296.
Lisman J (2017) Criteria for identifying the molecular basis of the engram (CaMKII, PKMzeta). Mol
Brain 10:55.
Lisman J, Buzsaki G, Eichenbaum H, Nadel L, Ranganath C, Redish AD (2017) Viewpoints: how the
hippocampus contributes to memory, navigation and cognition. Nat Neurosci 20:1434-1447.
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.
Liu Y, Beyer A, Aebersold R (2016) On the Dependency of Cellular Protein Levels on mRNA
Abundance. Cell 165:535-550.
Love MI, Huber W, Anders S (2014) Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq
data with DESeq2. Genome Biol 15:550.
Madar AD, Jiang A, Dong C, Sheffield MEJ (2025) Synaptic plasticity rules driving representational
shifting in the hippocampus. Nature Neuroscience 28:848-860.
Madronal N, Gruart A, Sacktor TC, Delgado-Garcia JM (2010) PKMzeta inhibition reverses learning-
induced increases in hippocampal synaptic strength and memory during trace eyeblink
conditioning. PLoS One 5:e10400.
Mahringer D, Zmarz P, Okuno H, Bito H, Keller GB (2022) Functional correlates of immediate early
gene expression in mouse visual cortex. Peer Community J 2:e45.
Makuch L, Volk L, Anggono V, Johnson RC, Yu Y, Duning K, Kremerskothen J, Xia J, Takamiya K,
Huganir RL (2011) Regulation of AMPA receptor function by the human memory-associated
gene KIBRA. Neuron 71:1022-1029.
Manders EMM, Verbeek FJ, Aten JA (1993) Measurement of co-localization of objects in dual-colour
confocal images. Journal of Microscopy 169:375-382.
Marder E, O'Leary T, Shruti S (2014) Neuromodulation of circuits with variable parameters: single
neurons and small circuits reveal principles of state-dependent and robust
neuromodulation. Annu Rev Neurosci 37:329-346.
Marder E, Goeritz ML, Otopalik AG (2015) Robust circuit rhythms in small circuits arise from variable
circuit components and mechanisms. Curr Opin Neurobiol 31:156-163.
Marr D (1971) Simple memory: a theory for archicortex. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 262:23-81.
Migues PV, Hardt O, Wu DC, Gamache K, Sacktor TC, Wang YT, Nader K (2010) PKMzeta maintains
memories by regulating GluR2-dependent AMPA receptor trafficking. Nat Neurosci.
Miller-Crews I, Hofmann HA (2024) Single-nuclei transcriptomes in the hypothalamus and POA of a
highly social cichlid. bioRxiv:2024.2011.2007.622449.
Morris RG (2016) Forget me not. Elife 5.
Muslimov IA, Nimmrich V, Hernandez AI, Tcherepanov A, Sacktor TC, Tiedge H (2004) Dendritic
transport and localization of protein kinase Mzeta mRNA: implications for molecular
memory consolidation. J Biol Chem 279:52613-52622.
Neunuebel JP, Yoganarasimha D, Rao G, Knierim JJ (2013) Conflicts between local and global spatial
frameworks dissociate neural representations of the lateral and medial entorhinal cortex. J
Neurosci 33:9246-9258.
Nilssen ES, Doan TP, Nigro MJ, Ohara S, Witter MP (2019) Neurons and networks in the entorhinal
cortex: A reappraisal of the lateral and medial entorhinal subdivisions mediating parallel
cortical pathways. Hippocampus 29:1238-1254.
Northcutt AJ, Kick DR, Otopalik AG, Goetz BM, Harris RM, Santin JM, Hofmann HA, Marder E, Schulz
DJ (2019) Molecular profiling of single neurons of known identity in two ganglia from the
crab Cancer borealis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

O'Connell LA, Matthews BJ, Hofmann HA (2012) Isotocin regulates paternal care in a monogamous
cichlid fish. Horm Behav 61:725-733.
O'Keefe J, Nadel L (1978) The hippocampus as a cognitive map. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Pace TWW, Gaylord R, Topczewski F, Girotti M, Rubin B, Spencer RL (2005) Immediate–early gene
induction in hippocampus and cortex as a result of novel experience is not directly related to
the stressfulness of that experience. European Journal of Neuroscience 22:1679-1690.
Park EH, Burghardt NS, Dvorak D, Hen R, Fenton AA (2015) Experience-Dependent Regulation of
Dentate Gyrus Excitability by Adult-Born Granule Cells. J Neurosci 35:11656-11666.
Parpura V, Basarsky TA, Liu F, Jeftinija K, Jeftinija S, Haydon PG (1994) Glutamate-mediated
astrocyte-neuron signalling. Nature 369:744-747.
Parras A, Anta H, Santos-Galindo M, Swarup V, Elorza A, Nieto-Gonzalez JL, Pico S, Hernandez IH,
Diaz-Hernandez JI, Belloc E, Rodolosse A, Parikshak NN, Penagarikano O, Fernandez-Chacon
R, Irimia M, Navarro P, Geschwind DH, Mendez R, Lucas JJ (2018) Autism-like phenotype and
risk gene mRNA deadenylation by CPEB4 mis-splicing. Nature 560:441-446.
Pastalkova E, Serrano P, Pinkhasova D, Wallace E, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC (2006) Storage of spatial
information by the maintenance mechanism of LTP. Science 313:1141-1144.
Pavlowsky A, Alarcon JM (2012) Interaction between long-term potentiation and depression in CA1
synapses: temporal constrains, functional compartmentalization and protein synthesis. PLoS
One 7:e29865.
Pavlowsky A, Wallace E, Fenton AA, Alarcon JM (2017) Persistent modifications of hippocampal
synaptic function during remote spatial memory. Neurobiol Learn Mem 138:182-197.
Pedregosa F VG, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M, Prettenhofer P, Weiss R,
Dubourg V, Vanderplas J. (2011) Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. . The Journal of
machine Learning research 12:2825-2830.
Pevzner A, Guzowski JF (2014) Immediate-early gene transcriptional activation in hippocampus CA1
and CA3 does not accurately reflect rapid, pattern completion-based retrieval of context
memory. Learn Mem 22:1-5.
Plato, Cornford FM, Plato (1935) Plato's theory of knowledge; the Theaetetus and the Sophist of
Plato. London, New York,: K. Paul, Trench, Harcourt, Brace and company.
R_Development_Core_Team (2013) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In: R
Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available at: http://www.r-project.org (Team RDC, ed).
Vienna, Austria.
Refaeli R, Kreisel T, Groysman M, Adamsky A, Goshen I (2023) Engram stability and maturation
during systems consolidation. Curr Biol 33:3942-3950.e3943.
Rossetti T, Banerjee S, Kim C, Leubner M, Lamar C, Gupta P, Lee B, Neve R, Lisman J (2017) Memory
Erasure Experiments Indicate a Critical Role of CaMKII in Memory Storage. Neuron 96:207-
216 e202.
Rusakov DA (2015) Disentangling calcium-driven astrocyte physiology. Nature Reviews Neuroscience
16:226-233.
Sacktor TC (2011) How does PKMzeta maintain long-term memory? Nat Rev Neurosci 12:9-15.
Sacktor TC (2012) Memory maintenance by PKMzeta--an evolutionary perspective. Mol Brain 5:31.
Sacktor TC, Hell JW (2017) The genetics of PKMzeta and memory maintenance. Sci Signal 10.
Sacktor TC, Fenton AA (2018) What does LTP tell us about the roles of CaMKII and PKMzeta in
memory? Mol Brain 11:77.
Sacktor TC, Osten P, Valsamis H, Jiang X, Naik MU, Sublette E (1993) Persistent activation of the zeta
isoform of protein kinase C in the maintenance of long-term potentiation. Proc Natl Acad Sci
U S A 90:8342-8346.
Sanes JR, Lichtman JW (1999) Can molecules explain long-term potentiation? Nat Neurosci 2:597-
604.
Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis.
Nature Methods 9:671-675.

Schneidman E, Berry MJ, 2nd, Segev R, Bialek W (2006) Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly
1129    correlated network states in a neural population. Nature 440:1007-1012.
1130 Seabold S PJ (2010) Statsmodels: econometric and statistical modeling with python. SciPy 7:92-96.
1131 Serrano P, Friedman EL, Kenney J, Taubenfeld SM, Zimmerman JM, Hanna J, Alberini C, Kelley AE,
1132    Maren S, Rudy JW, Yin JC, Sacktor TC, Fenton AA (2008) PKMzeta maintains spatial,
1133    instrumental, and classically conditioned long-term memories. PLoS Biol 6:2698-2706.
1134 Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, Baliga NS, Wang JT, Ramage D, Amin N, Schwikowski B, Ideker T
1135    (2003) Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction
1136    networks. Genome Res 13:2498-2504.
1137 Shao CY, Sondhi R, van de Nes PS, Sacktor TC (2012) PKMZeta is necessary and sufficient for synaptic
1138    clustering of PSD-95. Hippocampus 22:1501-1507.
1139 Shema R, Sacktor TC, Dudai Y (2007) Rapid erasure of long-term memory associations in the cortex
1140    by an inhibitor of PKMzeta. Science 317:951-953.
1141 Shema R, Haramati S, Ron S, Hazvi S, Chen A, Sacktor TC, Dudai Y (2011) Enhancement of
1142    consolidated long-term memory by overexpression of protein kinase Mzeta in the
1143    neocortex. Science 331:1207-1210.
1144 Sinha S, Jones BM, Traniello IM, Bukhari SA, Halfon MS, Hofmann HA, Huang S, Katz PS, Keagy J,
1145    Lynch VJ, Sokolowski MB, Stubbs LJ, Tabe-Bordbar S, Wolfner MF, Robinson GE (2020)
1146    Behavior-related gene regulatory networks: A new level of organization in the brain.
1147    Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 117:23270-23279.
1148 Stanley D (2018) apaTables: Create American Psychological Association (APA) Style Tables. In:
1149    Available at: https://cran.r-project.org/package=apaTables.
1150 Sutherland RJ, O'Brien J, Lehmann H (2008) Absence of systems consolidation of fear memories after
1151    dorsal, ventral, or complete hippocampal damage. Hippocampus 18:710-718.
1152 Suzuki A, Stern SA, Bozdagi O, Huntley GW, Walker RH, Magistretti PJ, Alberini CM (2011) Astrocyte-
1153    neuron lactate transport is required for long-term memory formation. Cell 144:810-823.
1154 Takeuchi T, Duszkiewicz AJ, Morris RG (2013) The synaptic plasticity and memory hypothesis:
1155    encoding, storage and persistence. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 369:20130288.
1156 Talbot ZN, Sparks FT, Dvorak D, Curran BM, Alarcon JM, Fenton AA (2018) Normal CA1 Place Fields
1157    but Discoordinated Network Discharge in a Fmr1-Null Mouse Model of Fragile X Syndrome.
1158    Neuron 97:684-697.
1159 Thomson SR, Seo SS, Barnes SA, Louros SR, Muscas M, Dando O, Kirby C, Wyllie DJA, Hardingham GE,
1160    Kind PC, Osterweil EK (2017) Cell-Type-Specific Translation Profiling Reveals a Novel Strategy
1161    for Treating Fragile X Syndrome. Neuron 95:550-563 e555.
1162 Tian D, Dmitrieva RI, Doris PA, Crary JF, Sondhi R, Sacktor TC, Bergold PJ (2008) Protein kinase M zeta
1163    regulation of Na/K ATPase: a persistent neuroprotective mechanism of ischemic
1164    preconditioning in hippocampal slice cultures. Brain Res 1213:127-139.
1165 Tonegawa S, Morrissey MD, Kitamura T (2018) The role of engram cells in the systems consolidation
1166    of memory. Nature Reviews Neuroscience 19:485-498.
1167 Treves A, Rolls ET (1992) Computational constraints suggest the need for two distinct input systems
1168    to the hippocampal CA3 network. Hippocampus 2:189-199.
1169 Tsokas P, Hsieh C, Flores-Obando RE, Bernabo M, Tcherepanov A, Hernandez AI, Thomas C, Bergold
1170    PJ, Cottrell JE, Kremerskothen J, Shouval HZ, Nader K, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC (2024) KIBRA
1171    anchoring the action of PKMzeta maintains the persistence of memory. Sci Adv 10:eadl0030.
1172 Tsokas P, Hsieh C, Yao Y, Lesburgueres E, Wallace EJ, Tcherepanov A, Jothianandan D, Hartley BR,
1173    Pan L, Rivard B, Farese RV, Sajan MP, Bergold PJ, Hernandez AI, Cottrell JE, Shouval HZ,
1174    Fenton AA, Sacktor TC (2016) Compensation for PKMzeta in long-term potentiation and
1175    spatial long-term memory in mutant mice. Elife 5.
1176 Uytiepo M et al. (2025) Synaptic architecture of a memory engram in the mouse hippocampus.
1177    Science 387:eado8316.

Velez-Hernandez ME, Vazquez-Torres R, Velasquez-Martinez MC, Jimenez L, Baez F, Sacktor TC,
Jimenez-Rivera CA (2013) Inhibition of Protein kinase Mzeta (PKMzeta) in the mesolimbic
system alters cocaine sensitization in rats. J Drug Alcohol Res 2:235669.
Virtanen P et al. (2020) SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat
Methods 17:261-272.
Vogel C, Marcotte EM (2012) Insights into the regulation of protein abundance from proteomic and
transcriptomic analyses. Nat Rev Genet 13:227-232.
Vogt-Eisele A, Krüger C, Duning K, Weber D, Spoelgen R, Pitzer C, Plaas C, Eisenhardt G, Meyer A,
Vogt G, Krieger M, Handwerker E, Wennmann DO, Weide T, Skryabin BV, Klugmann M,
Pavenstädt H, Huentelmann MJ, Kremerskothen J, Schneider A (2014) KIBRA (KIdney/BRAin
protein) regulates learning and memory and stabilizes Protein kinase Mζ. Journal of
Neurochemistry 128:686-700.
Volk LJ, Bachman JL, Johnson R, Yu Y, Huganir RL (2013) PKM-zeta is not required for hippocampal
synaptic plasticity, learning and memory. Nature 493:420-423.
von Kraus LM, Sacktor TC, Francis JT (2010) Erasing sensorimotor memories via PKMzeta inhibition.
PLoS One 5:e11125.
Wang C, Lee H, Rao G, Doreswamy Y, Savelli F, Knierim JJ (2023) Superficial-layer versus deep-layer
lateral entorhinal cortex: Coding of allocentric space, egocentric space, speed, boundaries,
and corners. Hippocampus 33:448-464.
Wang DC, Liu PC, Hung HS, Chen TJ (2014) Both PKMzeta and KIBRA are closely related to reference
memory but not working memory in a T-maze task in rats. J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens
Neural Behav Physiol 200:77-82.
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.
Waskom ML (2021) seaborn: statistical data visualization. Journal of Open Source Software 6:3021.
Waterston RH, Lander ES, Sulston JE (2002) On the sequencing of the human genome. Proc Natl
Acad Sci U S A 99:3712-3716.
Weng F-J, Garcia RI, Lutzu S, Alviña K, Zhang Y, Dushko M, Ku T, Zemoura K, Rich D, Garcia-
Dominguez D, Hung M, Yelhekar TD, Sørensen AT, Xu W, Chung K, Castillo PE, Lin Y (2018)
Npas4 Is a Critical Regulator of Learning-Induced Plasticity at Mossy Fiber-CA3 Synapses
during Contextual Memory Formation. Neuron 97:1137-1152.e1135.
Whitlock JR, Heynen AJ, Shuler MG, Bear MF (2006) Learning induces long-term potentiation in the
hippocampus. Science 313:1093-1097.
Wickham H (2009) ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. New York: Springer-Verlag.
Wickham H, Grolemund G (2017) R for Data Science: Import, Tidy, Transform, Visualize, and Model
Data., 1st edn. Edition: O'Reilly Media, Inc.
Wilke CO (2016) cowplot: Streamlined Plot Theme and Plot Annotations for "ggplot2". In: Available
at: https://cran.r-project.org/package=cowplot.
Wilson MA, Tonegawa S (1997) Synaptic plasticity, place cells and spatial memory: study with second
generation knockouts. Trends Neurosci 20:102-106.
Wingett SW, Andrews S (2018) FastQ Screen: A tool for multi-genome mapping and quality control.
F1000Res 7:1338.
Wright BW, Yi Z, Weissman JS, Chen J (2022) The dark proteome: translation from noncanonical
open reading frames. Trends in Cell Biology 32:243-258.
Yao Y, Kelly MT, Sajikumar S, Serrano P, Tian D, Bergold PJ, Frey JU, Sacktor TC (2008) PKM zeta
maintains late long-term potentiation by N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor/GluR2-
dependent trafficking of postsynaptic AMPA receptors. J Neurosci 28:7820-7827.
Yu NK, Uhm H, Shim J, Choi JH, Bae S, Sacktor TC, Hohng S, Kaang BK (2017) Increased PKMzeta
activity impedes lateral movement of GluA2-containing AMPA receptors. Mol Brain 10:56.
Yuste R (2015) From the neuron doctrine to neural networks. Nat Rev Neurosci 16:487-497.

1229

1230

1232

Fig. 1. Persistently elevated PKMζ protein expression in dorsal hippocampus subcellular compartments that trace the trisynaptic pathway circuit after 1-mo active place avoidance memory. a) Schematic of the TRAP2 mouse that was engineered to permanently express the EYFP-ChR2 tag in neurons that activate the immediate early gene *Arc* that is expressed primarily in excitatory neurons. b) Schematic of the behavioral experimental design. After learning an active place avoidance, EYFP-ChR2 tagging was initiated by systemic injection of 4OH-tamoxifen (TAM) 30 min prior to the third training session of the place avoidance memory and untrained control groups. Thirty days later, memory retention is tested prior to euthanasia and collection of tissue for PKMζ immunohistochemistry (n's = 4). c) Example of spatial exploration on the arena for exemplar Trained and Untrained mice to illustrates the conditioned behavior, the summary plot quantitates the active

place avoidance. d) Merged EYFP-ChR2 (green) and PKMζ (red) immunofluorescent image of dorsal
hippocampus of a Trained mouse, with ROIs for quantifying Training 3 memory activation by
expression of EYFP-ChR2 and memory retention by PKMζ expression computed as the raw integrated
density (RID), each normalized by the control average. e) Summary of quantitation of EYFP expression.
f-i) Example ROI samples targeting specific subcellular tissue compartments of the dorsal
hippocamous circuit. Plots summarize control-normalized RID quantitation of PKMζ expression in each
subcompartment and co-expression of EYFP and PKMζ, estimated by the control-normalized
Mander's overlap coefficient (M2), which computes the ratio of PKMζ expression (RID) at image
elements that express EYFP. j) Graphical summary illustrating the hippocampal circuit compartments
that are persistently altered by increased PKMζ protein expression 1 month after memory training.
Scale bars in panel d: 300 μm; e-I: 50 μm.

1254

Fig. 2 Experimental Design. a) WT mice are assigned to one of four groups: standard-trained (red,
n=8), standard-yoked (dark grey, n=8), conflict-trained (peach, n=9), or conflict-yoked (light grey,
n=9). Mice were placed on the rotating arena for 10-min trials separated by 2-h or overnight (~17 h)
intervals. Behavior was tracked during the pretraining (P), initial training (T1-T3), retest (Rt), conflict
training (T4-T6), and retention (Rn) trials. In the trial schematics, the 60° sector represents the shock
zone or for the yoked groups, the equivalent region that is used for evaluating place avoidance.
Whereas trained mice receive shocks only in the shock zone, yoked mice experience shock
throughout the environment. b) Standard-trained and standard-yoked mice received an identical
number of shocks (and time series), with the most shocks occurring on trial 1. Conflict-trained and
conflict-yoked mice received an identical number of shocks (and time series), with the most shocks
occurring on trial 4, the first trial of conflict training. c) A schematic representation and a photo show
the size and location of tissue samples collected from the dorsal hippocampus for RNA-sequencing.
Tissues from five subfields (CA1, CA2, CA3, CA4, DG) were collected, but only the DG (orange), CA3
(teal), and CA1 (purple) subfields were processed for RNA-seq.

1269

Fig. 3. Characterizing and comparing behavior amongst the groups. Standard-trained and conflict-
trained groups rapidly learned to avoid the shock zone, whereas the yoked control groups did not
avoid the corresponding region measured by a) reduction in the number of entrances into the shock
zone, b) increased latency to enter the shock zone for the first time on each trial, and c) reduction in
the proportion of time spent in the shock zone and its equivalent. d) PCA performed on the 26
measures of behavior during retention, results in PC1 that distinguishes the Trained and Control
groups just prior to sacrifice when physical conditions are identical for all the mice because there is no
shock. Large dots indicate group averages on the retention test while transparency is highest for
pretraining and lowest for retention. Parameter loadings for e) PC1 and f) PC2 indicate that PC1 is
comprised of estimates of place avoidance and PC2 estimates of locomotor behavior. Comparison
statistics are provided in Table 1. MaxPathAvoid = maximum distance walked without entering the
shock zone; MaxTimeAvoid = maximum time (s) spent out of the shock zone; RayleighLength = the
Rayleigh vector length estimating the angular bias of the animal's dwell probability; Path2ndEntr =
distance (m) walked before entering the shock zone twice; pTimeOPP = proportion of time spent in
the quadrant opposite from the target quadrant; Time2ndEntr = amount of time it took the animal to
enter the shock zone for the second time; EntrPerDist = number of entrances per meter walked;
TimeShockZone = total time (s) spent in the shock zone; Speed = Average speed of the animal
throughout the session; TotalPath = total distance (m) walked; sdSpeed = standard deviation of the
speed estimates; Linearity = straightness of locomotion, estimated every 2 seconds as the ratio of the
end-to-end Euclidean distance divided by the integral of the path segments; Speed2ndEntr = speed
when entering the shock zone the second time; RayleighAngle = angle of the vector describing where
the animal spent most of its time (the angle describes the particular preferred location. Ranges 0-

 360); Speed1stEntr = speed when entering the shock zone the first time; NumEntrances = total

 number of entrances into the shock zone.

1294

1295

Fig. 4. Subfield and treatment-specific gene expression differences. a) PCA can only partly
distinguish trained and control DG transcriptomes. Volcano plots illustrating the significant and non-
significant differences in gene expression when b) the standard trained and yoked groups, c) the
conflict and yoked groups, d) the two trained groups, e) the two yoked groups, and f) the combined
trained and yoked groups are compared. Rows show gene expression differences by region from DG
where information enters the hippocampus, to CA3 and CA1, the output of the hippocampus. Each
dot represents a gene whose color corresponds to whether its expression increased, decreased, or
was not significantly different between the comparison pair. The total number of differentially
expressed genes (DEGs) are reported in the top left corner of each panel. The log-fold change,
adjusted p-value, log-transformed adjusted p-value, and directionality of significant gene expression
in the DG, CA3, and CA1 are available here: DEGlist.

1307

Fig. 5. Hippocampal subfield-specific LTP and memory-associated candidate gene analysis.

Pearson correlations of the expression levels between behavioral memory and candidate gene expression, as well as between pairs of candidate genes in a,b) DG, c,d) CA3, and e,f) CA1. Values are given for significant correlations (Absolute score ≥ 0.6). The correlation for the full set of analyzed genes is available here: PC1_DEGCorrData.

1313

1314

Fig. 6. Comparing Pearson (r_p, linear), and non-linear Spearman (ρ_s), and Chatterjee ξ_c
correlations of gene expression and memory. The relationship between gene expression and PC1$_{mem}$
was computed by the three correlation measures. Their significance (p ≤ 0.05) according to the norm
of both ξ and ρ is color-coded. Comparison of a) Spearman and ξ correlations, and b) Spearman and
Pearson correlations.

1320

Fig. 7. Three robust communities of gene-gene correlations detected by the Louvain Method of
community detection. 714 genes were organized into communities by 1000 iterations of the Louvain
Method of community detection, each seeded with a different random set of genes. The community
in which *Arc* is a member is always designated 'red', the community in which *Nsf* is a member is
always designated 'green,' and the community in which *Prkcz* is a member is always designated 'blue.'
Genes assigned to another community are designated 'gray.' After 1000 runs each gene has a red,

green, and blue score with brightness set by the gray score. a - left) gene network with community color-coded genes and edges coded according to correlation values. a - right) The top 20 genes in each community and some candidate genes are organized according to their community color-code and the set of correlation values. The candidate genes are marked by the diamond outline. b) Separate yoked and trained 714-D clustering probability matrices were computed to estimate the probability of all the gene – gene co-clustering probabilities. The two clustering probability matrices were then projected into a common 3-D PCA space. c) Hierarchical clustering of the difference between the trained and yoked clustering probability matrices, using Pearson correlations as the distance metric. d) Cartoons illustrate calculations of the Euclidean Distance, Centroid Similarity, and the Gene Similarity measures of how the yoked and trained genes changed within each condition's clustering probability matrix. e) Summary plot of how the 714 genes are distributed across the features depicted in panel d. Colors in panels b and e correspond to their positions within the value distributions. f) t-SNE plot derived from the three metrics for dimensionality reduction. The color bar represents the magnitude of Euclidean Distance changes from the yoked to the trained data set.

YOKED: Standard (n=8) vs. Conflict (n = 9)						
Trials	ANOVA	Predictor	df	F	p-value	Sig.
Pretraining (P)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	0.15	0.707	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	0.12	0.739	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	0.64	0.436	
Initial training (T1-T3)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 45	0.09	0.77	
		trial	2, 45	8.89	0.001	**
		treat x trial	2, 45	0.37	0.69	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 45	0.28	0.598	
		trial	2, 45	5.85	0.006	**
		treat x trial	2, 45	0.09	0.915	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 45	0.15	0.705	
		trial	2, 45	1.99	0.149	
		treat x trial	2, 45	0.25	0.779	
Initial recall (Rt)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	0.14	0.714	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	1.99	0.178	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	0.05	0.822	
Conflict training (T4-T6)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 45	0.29	0.59	
		trial	2, 45	0.49	0.617	
		treat x trial	2, 45	0.16	0.855	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 45	1.01	0.32	
		trial	2, 45	3.88	0.028	*
		treat x trial	2, 45	2.45	0.097	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 45	4.79	0.034	*
		trial	2, 45	1.25	0.296	
		treat x trial	2, 45	1.0	0.376	
Conflict recall (Rn)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	2.0	0.178	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	2.77	0.117	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	11.29	0.004	**
All trials (Pre-Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	treat	1, 151	4.47	0.036	*
	PC2 ~ treatment	treat	1, 151	2.97	0.087	
Retention (Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	treat	1, 15	4.71	0.046	*
	PC2 ~ treatment	treat	1, 15	0.91	0.356	

1341

Table 1. One-way and two-way ANOVA results of place avoidance behavior analysis of the yoked
groups. One-way ANOVAs were used to determine the effects of training treatment on behavior
during a single trial, including the pretraining and recall trails. Two-way ANOVAs were used to
determine the effects of treatment, training, and interaction across three trials, including the initial
training session and the conflict training session. Analyses were performed separately for the trained
and yoked groups. Key: NumEntrances = total number of entrances into the shock zone; Time1stEntr
= time (min) passes before entering the shock zone the first time; pTimeShockZone = proportion of
time spent in the shock zone relative to the total time spent in the four equivalent areas centered in
each quadrant. Treat = binary treatment condition (standard vs. conflict training). df: degrees of
freedom for treatment and residuals. Sig.: level of statistical significance indicated as * ($p < 0.05$), **
($p < 0.01$), and *** ($p < 0.001$).

TRAINED: Standard (n=8) vs. Conflict (n = 9)						
Trials	ANOVA	Predictor	df	F	p-value	Sig.
Pretraining (P)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	0.04	0.837	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	0.96	0.343	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	0.51	0.485	
Initial training (T1-T3)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 45	0.6	0.444	
		trial	2, 45	8.9	0.001	**
		treat x trial	2, 45	1.28	0.288	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 45	0.15	0.697	
		trial	2, 45	9.33	0.0	***
		treat x trial	2, 45	0.85	0.433	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 45	0.06	0.805	
		trial	2, 45	4.01	0.025	*
		treat x trial	2, 45	1.07	0.351	
Initial recall (Rt)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	0.97	0.341	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	0.72	0.411	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	2.38	0.144	
Conflict training (T4-T6)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 45	10.7	0.002	**
		trial	2, 45	5.68	0.006	**
		treat x trial	2, 45	4.61	0.015	*
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 45	4.56	0.038	*
		trial	2, 45	2.56	0.089	
		treat x trial	2, 45	1.51	0.233	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 45	13.31	0.001	**
		trial	2, 45	14.54	0.0	***
		treat x trial	2, 45	9.62	0.0	***
Conflict recall (Rn)	NumEntrances	treat	1, 15	0.96	0.342	
	Time1stEntr	treat	1, 15	0.82	0.381	
	pTimeShockZone	treat	1, 15	0.49	0.495	
All trials (Pre-Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	treat	1, 151	1.16	0.283	
	PC2 ~ treatment	treat	1, 151	0.0	0.980	
Retention (Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	treat	1, 15	1.48	0.243	
	PC2 ~ treatment	treat	1, 15	0.0	0.959	

1353

1354 Table 2. One-way and two-way ANOVA results of place avoidance behavior analysis of the trained
1355 groups.

YOKED (n=17) vs. TRAINED (n=17)						
Trials	ANOVA	Predictor	df	F	p-value	Sig.
Pretraining (P)	NumEntrances	train	1, 32	0.07	0.789	
	Time1stEntr	train	1, 32	1.49	0.231	
	pTimeShockZone	train	1, 32	1.24	0.274	
Initial training (T1-T3)	NumEntrances	train	1, 96	199.21	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	17.47	0.0	***
		train x trial	2, 96	0.85	0.431	
	Time1stEntr	train	1, 96	16.21	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	10.67	0.0	***
		train x trial	2, 96	8.27	0.0	***
	pTimeShockZone	train	1, 96	366.74	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	2.98	0.055	
		train x trial	2, 96	1.29	0.279	
Initial recall (Rt)	NumEntrances	train	1, 32	141.42	0.0	***
	Time1stEntr	train	1, 32	22.79	0.0	***
	pTimeShockZone	train	1, 32	411.4	0.0	***
Conflict training (T4-T6)	NumEntrances	train	1, 96	36.77	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	3.25	0.043	*
		train x trial	2, 96	3.27	0.042	*
	Time1stEntr	train	1, 96	27.9	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	2.7	0.073	
		train x trial	2, 96	2.01	0.14	
	pTimeShockZone	train	1, 96	251.64	0.0	***
		trial	2, 96	0.62	0.542	
		train x trial	2, 96	2.12	0.125	
Conflict recall (Rn)	NumEntrances	train	1, 32	49.7	0.0	***
	Time1stEntr	train	1, 32	16.36	0.0	***
	pTimeShockZone	train	1, 32	51.54	0.0	***
All trials (Pre-Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	train	1, 304	285.77	0.0	***
	PC2 ~ treatment	train	1, 304	28.61	0.0	***
Retention (Rn)	PC1 ~ treatment	train	1, 32	46.74	0.0	***
	PC2 ~ treatment	train	1, 32	0.0	0.99	

1369
1370
1371 Table 3. One-way and two-way ANOVA results of place avoidance behavior analysis comparing
1372 merged yoked and trained groups. The predictor term 'train' indicates the two binary training
1373 conditions (Yoked vs. Trained).
1374