Different complement immune pathways mediate innate anxiety and learned fear

Laura J. Westacott[1,4†], Trevor Humby[1,2†], Niels Haan[1,4], Sophie A. Brain[2], Emma-Louise Bush[2], Margarita Toneva[2], Andreea-Ingrid Baloc[2], Nicola Lander[7], Anna L. Moon[1], Jack Reddaway[1,4], Michael J. Owen[1,] Jeremy Hall[1,4], Timothy R. Hughes[3,4], B. Paul Morgan[3,4,6], William P. Gray[1,4,5$] & Lawrence S. Wilkinson[1,2,4*$]

[1] Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute, MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetic and Genomics, School of Medicine, Hadyn Ellis Building, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, UK. [2] Behavioural Genetics Group, Schools of Psychology and Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, UK. [3] Complement Biology Group, Systems Immunity Research Institute, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, CF14 4XW, Cardiff UK. [4] Hodge Centre for Neuropsychiatric Immunology, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff CF24 4HQ, UK. [5] Brain Repair and Intracranial Therapeutics (BRAIN) Unit, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, CF24 4HQ, UK. [6] UK Dementia Research Institute, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, UK. [7] School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, UK.

[†] These authors contributed equally to the work
[$] Joint senior authors: Lawrence S. Wilkinson & William P. Gray

[*] Corresponding author: Lawrence S. Wilkinson

Email address: WilkinsonL@cardiff.ac.uk

Address: Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, UK

Key words: *Neuroimmunology, Behaviour, Complement system, Anxiety, Fear, Stress response.*

Abstract

Complement is a key component of the immune system with roles in inflammation and

host-defence. Here we reveal unanticipated functions of complement pathways

impacting on emotional reactivity of relevance to the emerging links between

complement and risk for psychiatric disorder. We used mouse models to assess the

effects of manipulating components of the complement system on emotionality. *C3aR*$^-$

$^{/-}$ mice demonstrated a selective increase in unconditioned (innate) anxiety whilst *C3*$^-$

$^{/-}$ mice showed a selective increase in conditioned (learned) fear. The dissociable

behavioural phenotypes were linked to different signalling mechanisms. Effects on

innate anxiety were independent of C3a, the canonical ligand for C3aR, indicating the

existence of an alternative ligand mediating innate anxiety, whereas effects on learned

fear were due to loss of iC3b/CR3 signalling. Our findings show that specific elements

of the complement system and associated signalling pathways contribute differentially

to heightened states of anxiety and fear commonly seen in psychopathology.

The complement system is a key component of the immune system that plays a pivotal

role in inflammation and host-defence. Complement activation occurs via several

pathways, all of which lead to cleavage of the central protein, C3 (see Figure S1).

Activation of C3 generates the fragments C3a and C3b. C3a is an anaphylatoxin that

signals via its canonical G-protein coupled receptor C3aR[1]. Activation of this receptor

has been demonstrated to trigger calcium mobilization[2-4], stimulating an array of

intracellular signalling pathways to induce both pro- and anti-inflammatory effects[1,5].

C3b on the other hand propagates further complement activation by contributing to the

cleavage of complement component 5 (C5) downstream of C3 and, after further

cleavage to iC3b, plays a role in opsonisation by macrophages and microglia via

complement receptor 3 (CR3). Akin to C3, C5 cleavage generates C5a (another

anaphylatoxin and a ligand for the C5a receptor, C5aR) and C5b, which triggers the

terminal complement pathway by sequentially binding proteins C6, C7, C8 and C9.

These proteins subsequently congregate to assemble the membrane attack complex

(MAC) which ultimately results in destruction of the target cell or pathogen via cell

lysis[6].

In the central nervous system evidence is emerging that complement has functions

beyond its canonical immune roles[7]. Neurons, astrocytes and microglia express

complement receptors and regulators, and are also capable of synthesising

complement proteins[8,9]. The expression patterns of these vary over the course of brain

development[10]. Complement impacts a number of neurodevelopmental processes

including neurogenesis[11], migration[12] and synaptic pruning[13] as well as ongoing

synaptic plasticity processes underlying learning and memory in the adult brain[14].

Furthermore, there is increasing evidence that complement is causally involved in the

pathogenesis of neurodegenerative and psychiatric conditions. In Alzheimer's

disease, genetic variants in complement related loci have been associated with

increased disease risk[15,16], and complement knockout mice exhibit reduced age-

related synapse loss[17] and neuropathology[18]. Alterations in complement proteins and

activation have also been reported in sera from individuals with autism-spectrum

disorder[19] schizophrenia[20], major depressive disorder[21], bipolar disorder[22] and post-

traumatic stress disorder[23].

In the case of schizophrenia, an important finding comes from elegant genetic work

demonstrating that structural variation in the *C4* locus is associated with risk of

developing the disease[24]. C4 cleavage generates fragments that contribute to the

activation of C3, yielding C3a and C3b. Given the known roles for the iC3b/CR3

pathway in developmental synaptic pruning[13,25], it has been suggested that *C4*

variants may impact on psychiatric risk via this mechanism, with excessive synaptic

elimination leading to abnormal connectivity and disruption of neural networks[24].

Variants in *C3* and putative complement-control genes *CSMD1* and *CSMD2* have also

been implicated in genetic susceptibility for schizophrenia[26,27].

Altered emotional function, in particular maladaptive anxiety and fear, is a pervasive

and clinically important symptom that is comorbid across several of the DSM-5 and

ICD-11 defined disorders in which complement has been implicated. Anxiety and fear

are distinct aversive states elicited by differing environmental factors, that result in

distinguishable behavioural outputs[28]. Anxiety is characterised by sustained arousal,

hypervigilance and risk assessment surrounding anticipated or potential threats, while

fear is an acute response to an experienced, imminent danger resulting in immediate

avoidance, fight or freezing behaviour[29,30]. Whilst there is significant overlap in the

neurocircuitry underlying these states, there are also contributions from distinct

neuronal circuitries[28,31]. Although links between anxiety and inflammation have been

documented[32], there has been little investigation of the specific role of complement in

either anxiety or fear. In animal models, anxiety phenotypes arise from heightened

pre-natal complement activity[33] and complement inhibitors reduce anxiety associated

with neurodegeneration[34]. Furthermore, aged *C3* deficient mice exhibited lower levels

of anxiety alongside enhanced contextual fear responses[17]. These latter studies

suggest that complement can influence both innate and learned components of

aversive behaviours, however, the precise relationship between signalling within

discrete pathways of the complement system and their relationship to dissociable

aspects of emotionality and underlying brain function is unknown.

Utilising the central role of C3 in complement signalling, we used a combination of

complement knockout mice to functionally parse anxiety and fear related phenotypes.

In homozygous *C3* knockout mice ($C3^{-/-}$)[35] complement cannot be activated beyond

C3, and therefore these animals lack C3 activation fragments (C3a, C3b) and

downstream activation products (C5a, C5b) and thus cannot activate the terminal

complement pathway. Phenotypes in this model could therefore be the result of loss

of any of these downstream effector molecules. We compared the $C3^{-/-}$ model with

homozygous *C3aR* knockout mice ($C3aR^{-/-}$)[36]. In these mice, complement is intact

apart from the capacity for C3a to bind its canonical receptor C3aR and hence we

tested the extent to which phenotypic effects were the result specifically of disrupted

C3a/C3aR signalling. A priori, because C3a is an obligate cleavage fragment of C3,

we hypothesised that any phenotypes dependent on the binding of C3a to C3aR would

be apparent in both *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} models.

Contrary to our hypotheses we found clear phenotypic dissociations between the *C3*^{-/-}

and *C3aR*^{-/-} models which were dependent on the nature of the emotional behaviour.

C3aR^{-/-} mice displayed a profound innate anxiety phenotype that was lacking in the

C3^{-/-} model. In contrast, when we examined learned fear, where a previously neutral

cue generates a fear response as a result of predicting an aversive outcome, we found

that the dissociation was reversed with the *C3*^{-/-} mice exhibiting an enhanced fear

response to a conditioned cue, but no differences between wildtype and *C3aR*^{-/-}mice.

This observed double dissociation in emotionality was linked to distinct underlying

complement signalling mechanisms, with anxiety phenotypes in C3aR mice likely to

be independent of C3a/C3aR signalling raising the possibility of an alternative ligand

for C3aR, and *C3*^{-/-} effects on learned fear the result of alterations in iC3b-CR3

pathway activity. These findings point to a hitherto unrecognized complexity of

complement effects on brain function and behaviour of relevance to emotional

dysfunction in psychopathology.

Results

Increased innate anxiety in *C3aR*^{-/-} but not *C3* [-/-] mice

Full details of the complement knockout models used can be found in the Methods.

Using a cohort of male wildtype, *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice we first assessed emotional

reactivity in the elevated plus maze (EPM), a well-established test of innate anxiety in

rodents which exploits the conflict between the drive to explore novel environments

and the innate aversion towards open, brightly lit spaces[37,38]. Heatmaps indexing

overall maze exploration over a 5-minute session demonstrated major differences in

open arm exploration between genotypes (Figure 1A; see Supplementary Video 1 for

representative examples). Notably, in comparison to wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ mice, $C3aR^{-/-}$

mice took significantly longer to first enter the open arms (Figure 1B) and spent less

time on the open arm per entry (Figure S2A), leading to a reduced overall duration

spent in the open arms (Figure 1C), findings consistent with increased anxiety. The

ethological parameters head dips and stretch attend postures (SAPs) also differed

between genotypes (Figure 1D,E), with $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice exhibiting decreases in the

former and increases in the latter, a pattern of results again consistent with heightened

anxiety[39]. We also noted a significantly increased frequency of head dipping in $C3^{-/-}$

mice (Figure 1D), consistent with reduced levels of anxiety relative to both wildtype

and $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice[40].

These initial data were consistent with an anxiogenic phenotype present in $C3aR^{-/-}$

mice but absent in $C3^{-/-}$ mice. We confirmed the findings in two further independent

tests of anxiety using additional cohorts of animals. First we used the elevated zero

maze (EZM, see Methods), another test of anxiety-like behaviour which similarly

probes behavioural responses to exposed, illuminated spaces[41]. The data

recapitulated the pattern of findings seen in the EPM (Figure 1F-J). Additional data

from the open field test, where $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice were more likely to avoid the centre of the

arena, were also consistent in demonstrating a specific anxiety-like phenotype in

$C3aR^{-/-}$ but not $C3^{-/-}$ mice (Figure S3). Given that several of the measures indexing

anxiety were dependent on movement around the apparatus it was important to

eliminate potential locomotor confounds. To address this issue, we measured activity

independently in a non-anxiety provoking environment and found no differences in

locomotor activity between genotypes (Figure S2C), demonstrating that anxiety

measures were not influenced by movement confounds.

Neuroendocrine response and neuronal activation in *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} mice

following exposure to the elevated plus maze

We next tested whether the behavioural measures of anxiety were paralleled by

changes in plasma levels of the stress hormone corticosterone. In a separate cohort

of wildtype, *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice, we assayed plasma corticosterone 30 minutes after

exposure to the EPM and compared levels to those of a group of animals who

remained in their home-cages.   There were no genotype differences in basal

corticosterone levels; however, being placed on the EPM increased plasma

corticosterone 6-15-fold in all genotypes, demonstrating that the EPM was a potent

stressor (Figure 2A). *Post hoc* analyses showed a significantly greater EPM-evoked

corticosterone response in the *C3aR*^{-/-} animals, consistent with their increased

anxiety-like behaviour observed on the maze.

Neuronal activity within the ventral hippocampus (vHPC) has been linked to anxiety in

rodents[42,43] therefore we also investigated mRNA expression of two immediate early

genes (IEGs), *c-Fos* and *zif268,* in a further cohort of behaviourally naïve wildtype,

C3^{-/-} and C3aR^{-/-} animals. There were no effects on *zif268* expression but 5-minute

exposure to the EPM was found to significantly increase *c-Fos* expression 30 minutes

later, compared to animals who remained in their home-cages (Figure 2B). In wildtype

animals there was a 4.95-fold increase in *c-Fos* expression over baseline and

increases in EPM-evoked *c-Fos* expression in *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} models of 7.77-fold

and 6.54-fold, respectively (Figure 2B). Thus, whilst being placed on the EPM led to

significant general increases in *c-Fos* in vHPC, the enhanced activity seen in the

knockout models did not differentiate between *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} and did not predict the

observed dissociations in anxiety-related behaviours.

Altered sensitivity of *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} mice to diazepam in the elevated plus maze

In a further independent cohort of animals, we tested the sensitivity of EPM induced

anxiety-like behaviour to the benzodiazepine diazepam, an established clinically

effective anxiolytic drug[37,44]. Our initial behavioural findings were replicated in vehicle-

treated animals across all behavioural indices of anxiety, again showing an anxiogenic

phenotype in *C3aR*^{-/-} but not *C3*^{-/-} mice (Figure 3A). As anticipated, in wildtype mice

2mg/kg diazepam led to a trend for increased time on the open arms (Figure 3B) and

a significant reduction in SAPs which are considered to reflect risk assessment

behaviour[45-47](Figure 3C). These effects were therefore consistent with reduced

anxiety[40,47]. In contrast, the same dose of drug that was effective in eliciting anxiolysis

in wildtypes was without effects in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice (Figure 3A,B,C) and produced a

seemingly anxiogenic (increased anxiety) pattern of effects in *C3*^{-/-} mice (Figure 3A,B

and Figure S4B,C). Locomotor activity monitored across all the maze (Figure S4D)

indicated that wildtype and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice were unlikely to have been influenced by

diazepam-induced sedation. In *C3*^{-/-} mice however, activity was significantly

suppressed under drug conditions indicating a possible sedative effect. Together,

these data indicated a fundamentally altered reactivity to diazepam in both *C3*^{-/-} and

C3aR^{-/-} models.

Enhanced fear learning in *C3$^{-/-}$* but not *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice

Psychiatric disorders are associated with maladaptive responses to both innate, unconditioned and learned aversive stimuli[48,49]. We therefore extended our analysis to investigate whether the behavioural dissociations in innate anxiety observed between *C3$^{-/-}$* and *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice would also apply to learned or conditioned fear, where a previously neutral cue generates a fear response as a result of predicting an aversive outcome. In a further group of animals, we used the fear-potentiated startle (FPS) paradigm[30,50] a well-established method of generating learned fear responses to an acute and imminent danger signal that is characteristic of fear. In this paradigm (see Figure 4A and Methods) fear learning is indexed by an enhanced response to a startling noise in the presence of a cue (the conditioned stimulus or CS) previously paired with mild foot shock (the unconditioned stimulus). In the pre-conditioning session, pulse-alone trials revealed increased basal startle reactivity in both *C3aR$^{-/-}$* and *C3$^{-/-}$* animals relative to wildtype (Figure 4B). Increased reactivity to the unconditioned foot shock stimulus (in the absence of any startle stimulus) during the conditioning session was also observed in both knockouts (Figure 4C). However, these common effects of genotype were not seen in the fear-potentiated startle measures which index fear learning. Whilst all groups showed the expected enhancement of the startle response in the presence of the CS, the effect of the CS was significantly greater in *C3$^{-/-}$* animals relative to the *C3aR$^{-/-}$* and wildtype animals (Figure 4D), indicating enhanced learning of the fear related-cue by the *C3$^{-/-}$* mice. This was the opposite pattern of effects to those observed in the tests of innate anxiety and showed a double dissociation in the impact of manipulating C3 and C3aR function that depended fundamentally on the nature of the aversion.

Complement signalling pathways underlying abnormal learned fear phenotypes

in *C3^{-/-}* mice

Given the central role of C3 within the complement system, its deletion affects a

number of distal pathways (Figure 5A), with the activity of the C3a/C3aR, C3b/CR3,

C5a/C5aR and terminal pathways affected. Therefore, the loss of function of any of

these pathways may have contributed to the observed fear learning phenotype in *C3^-*

^{/-} mice. However, it is possible to exclude effects due to loss of the C3a/C3aR pathway

since the fear learning phenotype was specific to *C3^{-/-}* and not *C3aR^{-/-}* mice (Figure

4D). This left iC3b/CR3 signalling and/or pathways downstream of C5 (i.e. C5a/C5aR,

terminal pathway) as the remaining possibilities. In order to distinguish between these

pathways, we repeated the FPS experiment with the addition of *C5^{-/-}* mice. This model

has intact C3a/C3aR and iC3b/CR3 signalling, but lacks C5a/C5b and terminal

pathway activity, as do *C3^{-/-}* mice. We hypothesised that if C*5^{-/-}* mice also displayed

enhanced fear-potentiated startle, then the phenotype in *C3^{-/-}* mice would likely be due

to a loss of C5a/C5aR signalling or the terminal pathway. On the other hand, if *C5^{-/-}*

mice demonstrated normal fear-potentiated startle, this would confine the likely

mediating pathway in *C3^{-/-}* mice to iC3b/CR3 signalling.

Results from the pre-conditioning session demonstrated increases in the startle

response of C*5^{-/-}* mice, (Figure 5B) although in this instance the previously observed

enhanced startle reactivity in C*3^{-/-}* mice (Figure 4B) was not replicated. In the

conditioning session, there was again evidence of increased startle responses to

shock (Figure 5C) in C*3^{-/-}* mice and responses were of a similar magnitude in C*5^{-/-}*

mice, although these were not significantly different to wildtype. We replicated the

previous finding of enhanced fear-potentiated startle in *C3^{-/-}* mice (Figure 5D), but

critically *C5*^{-/-} mice showed no evidence of enhanced fear learning and were

comparable to wildtypes, indicating that loss of iC3b/CR3 signalling, but not loss of

C5a/C5aR and the terminal pathway, was involved in the *C3*^{-/-} fear learning phenotype.

Additionally, we did not observe innate anxiety-like phenotypes in *C5*^{-/-} mice (Figure

S5).

This pattern of effects allowed us to distinguish between the likely mechanisms

underlying the enhanced learned fear in *C3*^{-/-} mice, as we could exclude concomitant

loss of C5a/C5aR signalling or molecules downstream of C5, and hence also exclude

an explanation based on effects of C5a/C5aR signalling on developmental

neurogenesis[51,52]. Instead, these data raised the possibility of an explanation based

on the established effects of the iC3b/CR3 pathway on synaptic pruning, a mechanism

involving microglia mediated elimination of synapses impacting on neurodevelopment

and learning-related synaptic plasticity[13,14,53].

Differential expression of stress and anxiety related genes in *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-}
mice

We next sought to assess whether the dissociations in innate anxiety and learned fear

between *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} models were associated with differential gene expression in

brain regions associated with emotional behaviours. We assayed gene expression in

three regions with known roles in stress and anxiety; the medial prefrontal cortex

(mPFC), ventral hippocampus (vHPC) and cerebellum[28,54](Figure 6A). Given our

previous data showing differential corticosterone responses and altered sensitivity to

diazepam in both knockouts, we first measured expression of the glucocorticoid

receptor *Nr3c1* and the corticotrophin-releasing hormone receptor 1 *Crhr1*, together

with *Gabra2* which encodes the GABA$_A$ receptor α2 subunit responsible for mediating

benzodiazepine anxiolysis[55]. There were no effects of genotype on *Crhr1* and *Gabra2*

mRNA expression in any of the brain regions assayed (Figure 6B,C). *Nr3c1*

expression did however show effects of genotype with strong trends indicating specific

increases in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice in mPFC and vHPC and significantly increased expression

in cerebellum that was common to both knockouts (Figure 6D). As activation of C3aR

has been shown to stimulate calcium influx from the extracellular space[2-4,56,57] and

calcium channel subunit variants have strong links to risk for psychiatric and

neurological disorders, as well as anxiety phenotypes[58,59], we also investigated a

panel of voltage-gated calcium channels. Expression of *Cacna1d,* which encodes the

Cav1.3 channel of L-type calcium gated voltage channels, was increased in the mPFC

of *C3aR*^{-/-} mice (Figure 6E) and in both *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice there was upregulation

of cerebellar *Cacna1e,* which encodes the Cav2.3 channel of R-type voltage gated

calcium channels (Figure 6F). We also investigated the expression of *Cacna1c* which

encodes the $Ca_v1.2$ subunit of L-type voltage gated calcium channels that forms the

channel pore allowing calcium entry[60]. We found genotype and brain region specific

changes in *Cacna1c* expression, with selective increases in expression in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice

in the vHPC and cerebellum, but not the mPFC (Figure 6G).

Discussion

We have used knockout models manipulating specific complement proteins to reveal

dissociable effects of complement pathways on distinct elements of aversive

behaviours. A main finding was a profound innate anxiety phenotype in the *C3aR*^{-/-}

mice that was absent in *C3*^{-/-} mice. The specificity of the anxiety phenotype exhibited

by *C3aR*^{-/-} mice at the behavioural level was paralleled by EPM-evoked corticosterone

levels, confirming the validity of the EPM as an index of anxiety-like behaviour. A

second main finding was a double dissociation in terms of fear learning, whereby *C3*

/- and not *C3aR*^{-/-} mice displayed enhanced conditioned fear reactivity. Using *C5*^{-/-}

mice, we concluded that the mechanisms accounting for the fear learning phenotype

in *C3*^{-/-} mice are likely to arise from lack of iC3b/CR3 pathway activity. Although the

data presented here was in males, we can report that the same highly specific double

dissociation between innate anxiety and learned fear was also seen in females

(Supplementary Figures S6-9) extending the broader applicability of our findings.

These data indicate distinct effects mediated by closely related elements of the

complement system that differentially impact upon the neural mechanisms underlying

innate anxiety and learned fear.

Our use of specific complement knockout models allowed us to pinpoint the likely

complement pathways and potential mechanisms underlying the observed

phenotypes. Since C3a is solely produced via C3 cleavage, and C3aR is the canonical

receptor for C3a, we expected that any phenotypes dependent on the binding of C3a

to the C3aR would be apparent in both *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} models. However, this was

not borne out in our data. Given the divergence in innate anxiety phenotypes seen,

one explanation is that the *C3aR*^{-/-} phenotypes are independent of C3a and instead

mediated by an alternative ligand. It has long been speculated that there may be

promiscuity of the C3aR due to its unusually large second extracellular loop[61]. Indeed,

a cleavage fragment of the neuropeptide precursor protein VGF (non-acronymic),

TLQP-21, was recently reported to bind the C3aR[62,63]. This peptide has pleiotropic

roles including in the stress response[64] and its precursor VGF is widely expressed

throughout the CNS[65] and in regions associated with stress reactivity and C3aR

expression such as the hypothalamus[66,67]. Determining whether the mechanisms

underlying innate anxiety phenotypes in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice are dependent on TLQP-

21/C3aR interactions will be a priority for future work.

Whether the *C3aR*^{-/-} phenotypes described here are the result of ongoing effects of

C3aR deletion in the adult brain or instead the enduring consequence of

neurodevelopmental impacts of *C3aR* deficiency also remains to be determined. On

the basis of previous findings implicating C3aR in both developmental neurogenesis[68]

and in acute brain changes following behavioural manipulations[69], both are

possibilities. One strategy would be to test whether acute administration of the C3aR

antagonist SB290157[70] phenocopies the constitutive knockout of *C3aR*, though at

present no data is available on the CNS penetration of SB290157 and this molecule

has received criticism due to evidence of agonist activity[71].

We also probed mechanisms underpinning the *C3aR*^{-/-} innate anxiety phenotype by

assessing the effects of the anxiolytic drug diazepam. We found that a dose of

diazepam that was anxiolytic in wildtype mice had no effect in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice. Stretch

attend postures, postulated to reflect risk assessment behaviour[46], are highly sensitive

to pharmacological manipulation[40,72] and in agreement with our own findings,

diazepam has been shown to specifically decrease SAPs in the absence of effects on

open arm exploration[73]. Importantly, *C3aR*^{-/-} mice consistently performed more SAPs

than other genotypes, and therefore floor effects cannot account for the pattern of

results observed. Benzodiazepines act on $GABA_A$ receptors[55] however we found no

significant changes in expression of *Gabra2*, a $GABA_A$ receptor subunit responsible

for anxiolytic actions of benzodiazepines in tests of innate anxiety[55], in the brain

regions sampled. This raises the possibility of alternative molecular mechanisms

mediating the anxiety phenotypes seen in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ model. Whatever the molecular

underpinnings of the dissociable anxiety phenotypes, our data show a profoundly

altered effect of diazepam in both knockouts; a lack of response in $C3aR^{-/-}$ and an

apparent paradoxical anxiogenic effect of the drug in $C3^{-/-}$ mice, though this

interpretation needs to take into account an apparent selective sedative effect in $C3^{-/-}$

mice.

In contrast to innate anxiety, we observed a specific effect of *C3* knockout on

conditioned fear. The absence of a comparable phenotype in $C3aR^{-/-}$ and $C5^{-/-}$ mice

suggested that these effects were unlikely to be due to loss of either C3a/C3aR,

C5a/C5aR, or the terminal pathway, and instead that enhanced fear learning

phenotypes in $C3^{-/-}$ mice were likely dependent on loss of the iC3b/CR3 pathway. This

pathway has been strongly implicated in activity dependent synaptic elimination during

neurodevelopment[13,25] and in age-dependent synapse loss[74]. While demonstrations

of complement mediated synaptic pruning during development have centered on the

visual system, complement-mediated microglial phagocytosis of dopamine D1

receptors has been demonstrated in the nucleus accumbens with functional impacts

on social behaviour[75]. It remains to be seen whether complement mediated processes

of this nature, within brain regions linked to fear processing such as the ventral

hippocampus, amygdala and prefrontal cortex are responsible for enhanced fear

learning in $C3^{-/-}$ mice, or whether this phenotype is a general consequence of altered

synaptic elimination throughout the $C3^{-/-}$ brain. In addition to developmental processes,

the iC3b/CR3 pathway could also be involved acutely in fear learning. *C3* mRNA is

upregulated during discrete stages of fear learning[69] and microglial CR3 is implicated

in long term depression[76]. Furthermore, complement-mediated engulfment of

synapses by microglia may be important in the forgetting of fear memories[14].

At the gene expression level, we found some changes which were common to both

knockouts, and one result that was specific to *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice. Regarding the latter, there

was a highly specific increase in expression of *Cacna1c* in the ventral hippocampus

and cerebellum of *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice. This finding is of potential interest given the strong

evidence implicating *CACNA1C* variants in genetic risk for a broad spectrum of

psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia and bipolar disorder[58], with anxiety

phenotypes reported in both human risk variant carriers[77] and animal models[78-81].

Whether alterations in *Cacna1c* are of functional relevance to the *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ anxiety

phenotypes observed here remains to be determined. We also observed increased

cerebellar expression of the glucocorticoid receptor in both *C3*$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice,

suggesting that these alterations may result from the absence of C3a/C3aR signalling.

Expression of these genes did not differentiate between models and therefore were

unlikely to contribute to the dissociable effects of the knockouts on behaviour and

stress hormone physiology. Neuronal activity in the ventral hippocampus as indexed

by *c-Fos* gene expression after exposure to the EPM also failed to differentiate

between genotypes, and hence activity in other brain regions in particular the

amygdala and hypothalamus may be more informative in terms of functional

neuroanatomy underlying the anxiety-related behavioural and physiological

differences seen in the knockout models.

Anxiety and fear are commonly comorbid with depression and recent preclinical work

has suggested a protective role for C3a/C3aR in chronic-stress induced depressive-

behaviour[82]. Given the common co-occurrence of anxiety and depression, our findings

of enhanced anxiety in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice might seem at odds with the reported resilience

of this strain[-] to depression-related phenotypes[82]. However, the chronic unpredictable-

stress paradigm used in these studies is likely to evoke significant inflammation, and

therefore the extent to which our data in acutely stressed animals can be compared is

questionable. In summary, our findings add significantly to the evidence that

perturbations of the complement system, whether reduced complement activation as

in the present work or excessive activation as is predicted by *C4* genetic variants[24,83],

have major and dissociable effects on brain and behavioural phenotypes of relevance

to core clinical symptoms of psychiatric disease.

Materials and Methods

Mouse models and husbandry. Wildtype and *C3*^{-/-} strains were sourced in-house

from Professor B. Paul Morgan and Dr Timothy Hughes (strains originally from The

Jackson Laboratory; B6.PL-Thy1[a]/CyJ stock#000406 and B6;129S4-C3tm1Crr/J

stock#003641 respectively); *C3aR*^{-/-} mice were provided by Professor Craig Gerard of

Boston Children's Hospital, USA (strain originally from The Jackson Laboratory, strain

C.129S4-C3ar1[tm1Cge]/J, stock#005712, subsequently backcrossed to C57Bl/6J).

C5^{-/-} mice (as described in [84]) were kindly donated by Professor Marina Botto, Imperial

College London. This strain originated from naturally C5-deficient DBA/2J mice, that

had been backcrossed to C57Bl/6J. *C3*^{-/-}, *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C5*^{-/-} strains were maintained via

homozygous breeding on a C57Bl/6J background and in all experiments were

compared to wildtype mice also on a C57Bl/6J background. Male mice (3-8 months

old during experimental testing) were kept in a temperature and humidity-controlled

vivarium (21±2°C and 50±10%, respectively) with a 12-hour light-dark cycle (lights on

467 at 07:00hrs/lights off at 19:00hrs). Home cages were environmentally enriched with

468 cardboard tubes, soft wood blocks and nesting materials and animals were housed in

469 single sex littermate groups (2-5 mice/cage). Standard laboratory chow and water

470 were available *ad libitum*. All procedures were performed in accordance with the

471 requirements of the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act (1986).

473 **General behavioural methods.** Testing took place between the hours of 09:00 and

474 17:00, with random distribution of testing for subjects of different genotypes throughout

475 the day. Mice were habituated to the test rooms for 30 min prior to testing. All assays

476 involved individual testing of mice and apparatus was cleaned thoroughly with a 70%

477 ethanol solution between subjects.

479 **Data collection.** Data for the EPM, EZM and Open Field were collected using

480 EthoVision XT software (Noldus Information Technology, Netherlands) via a video

481 camera mounted above the centre of each piece of apparatus. Tracking of each

482 subject was determined as the location of the greater body-proportion (12 frames/s) in

483 the specific virtual zones of each piece of apparatus.

485 **The elevated plus maze (EPM).** The maze, positioned 300 mm above the floor and

486 illuminated evenly at 15 lux, was constructed of opaque white Perspex and consisted

487 of two exposed open arms (175 x 78 mm^2, length x width, no ledges) and two equally

488 sized enclosed arms, which had 150 mm high walls [85]. Equivalent arms were arranged

489 opposite one another. Subjects were placed at the enclosed end of a closed arm and

490 allowed to freely explore for 5 minutes. Data from each pair of arms were combined

491 to generate single open and closed arm values (number and duration of arm entries

and latency of first entry to each arm). In addition, the following parameters were

manually scored (by an experimenter positioned at a computer in the same room as

the maze, watching the live-video stream of the test); number of stretch-attend

postures (SAPs; defined as the animal slowly and carefully reaching towards the open

arms in a low, elongated body posture[86,87]) and number of head dips from the open

arms (looking down over the edge of an open arm).

The elevated zero maze (EZM). The maze, positioned 520 mm above the floor and

illuminated evenly at 15 lux, was constructed of wood and consisted of two exposed

open regions (without ledges; 52 mm wide) and two equally sized enclosed regions

(also 52 mm wide), which had 200 mm high grey opaque walls. The diameter of the

maze was 600mm. Equivalent regions were arranged opposite one another. Subjects

were placed at the border of one of the open and closed regions and allowed to freely

explore for 5 min. Data from each pair of regions were combined to generate single

open and closed region values (number and duration of region entries and latency of

first entry to each region). In addition, the number of head dips (as above) were

measured. Due to the high walls of the enclosed sections of the maze, subjects were

not visible to the experimenter when in the closed regions and therefore these

parameters were scored only when a subject was on the open regions.

Locomotor activity (LMA). LMA was measured in an apparatus consisting of twelve

transparent Perspex chambers (each 210 x 360 x 200 mm, width x length x height).

Two infrared beams were embedded within the walls of each chamber, which crossed

the chamber 30 mm from each end and 10 mm from the chamber floor. Individual

subjects were placed in a designated chamber for a 120 min duration on three

consecutive days.   Beam breaks were recorded as an index of activity, using a

computer running custom written BBC Basic V6 programme with additional interfacing

by ARACHNID (Cambridge Cognition Ltd, Cambridge, UK). Data were analysed as

the total number of beam breaks per session per day.

Fear-potentiated startle (FPS). FPS was assessed using startle chamber apparatus

which consisted of a pair of ventilated and soundproofed SR-LAB startle chambers

(San Diego Instruments, CA, USA) each containing a non-restrictive Plexiglas cylinder

(35 mm in diameter), mounted on a Perspex plinth, into which a subject was placed.

The motor responses of subjects to white noise stimuli (generated from a speaker 120

mm above the cylinder) were recorded via a piezoelectric accelerometer, attached

centrally below the Plexiglas cylinder, which converted flexion plinth vibration into

electrical signals.   The peak startle response, within 200ms from the onset of each

startle presentation, in each trial, was normalized for body weight differences using

Kleiber's 0.75 mass exponent[88] as per[85]. A computer running SR-Lab software

(Version 94.1.7.48) was used to programme trials and record data. A foot shock grid

connected to a shock generator (San Diego Instruments, CA, USA) was inserted into

the Plexiglas cylinder before conditioning sessions.

FPS consisted of three separate sessions presented over a two-day period (see Figure

4A). On the first day, mice were given a pre-conditioning session immediately followed

by the conditioning session. The pre-conditioning session started with a 5 min

acclimatisation phase followed by presentation of 3 no-stimulus trials, and then a block

of pulse-alone trials presented at 90, 100 and 110dB (5 of each at 40 ms duration).

Trials were randomly distributed throughout the session and presented with a 60 s

random interval (range 36 s to 88 s). After the pre-conditioning session was complete,

mice were removed from the startle chambers, restraint tubes cleaned, and shock

grids were placed into the Plexiglas cylinders prior to commencing the conditioning

session. The mice were then returned to the startle chambers and subjected to a

session consisting of a 5 min acclimatisation phase followed by 3 CS+shock trials, with

3 no stimulus trials before and after, presented with a 2min random interval (range 1.5

to 3min). The scrambled 0.14 mA, 0.5 s foot shock was delivered in the final 0.5 s of

the 30 s visual CS. Following a 24hr delay, subjects were assessed for FPS in the

post-conditioning session. This session followed the same format as the pre-

conditioning session (5 min acclimatisation phase followed by presentation of 3 no-

stimulus trials, and then a block of pulse-alone trials presented at 90, 100 and 110dB,

with 5 of each at 40 ms duration) however the final block of trials also included

pulse+CS trials at 90, 100 and 110 dB (5 of each), with the startle pulse presented in

the final 40 ms of the CS. FPS was determined as the fold change between pulse-

alone trials and pulse+CS trials within the post-conditioning session.

Corticosterone measurements. Testing took place between the hours of 10:00 and

14:00 to account for the diurnal pattern of corticosterone release[89]. Mice were allowed

to freely explore the EPM for 5 min, after which they were placed in a holding cage for

a further 25 min before being culled by cervical dislocation. Control mice were

removed from their home cage and immediately culled. There was an equal

distribution of subjects of different genotypes, counterbalanced between the two test

conditions and throughout the testing period. Trunk blood was collected into heparin

tubes (Becton Dickinson, USA) and immediately centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min,

and the supernatant removed and frozen at -80°c until further use. A corticosterone

ELISA was performed according to manufacturer's instructions (ADI-900-097, Enzo

Life Sciences, UK) and analysed using a four-parameter logistic curve plug in

(https://www.myassays.com/four-parameter-logistic-curve.assay).

Immediate early gene (IEG) experiment. Mice were allowed to freely explore the

EPM for 5 min, after which they were placed in a holding cage for a further 25 min

before being culled by cervical dislocation. Control mice were removed from their

home cage and immediately culled. Brains were removed and the ventral

hippocampus (vHPC; the whole hippocampus was dissected and the posterior third

was collected) was dissected and frozen at -80° until further use. Tissue was

processed for qPCR analyses as detailed below.

Diazepam study. Wildtype, $C3^{-/-}$ and $C3aR^{-/-}$ were used and were randomly assigned

to either vehicle or drug conditions within each genotype. A three-day dosing regimen

of diazepam (2 mg/kg, i.p., Hameln Pharmaceuticals, UK) or an equivalent volume of

vehicle (0.1 M phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4) was used. Following 2 days of pre-

treatment, diazepam or vehicle was administered 30 min prior to testing on the EPM

on the 3rd day.

Tissue for gene expression analysis. Mice were removed from their home cage and

immediately culled via cervical dislocation. Brains were removed from mice in both

conditions, and the following regions dissected: medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC),

ventral hippocampus (vHPC) and cerebellum (see Figure 6A) and frozen at -80° until

further use.

Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR). Gene expression was analysed

using standardised qPCR methods with quantification using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method[90].

Mouse brain tissue from the mPFC, vHPC and the cerebellum was analysed. RNA

was extracted using the RNeasy kit (QIAGEN) and was subsequently treated with

DNAse to remove genomic DNA (TURBO DNA-free kit, Thermo Fisher Scientific).

RNA was then converted to cDNA (RNA to cDNA EcoDry Premix, Random Hexamers,

Clontech, Takara). cDNA samples were run in triplicate in 96 well reaction plates using

SYBR-Green-based qPCR (SensiFast, HI-ROX, Bioline) according to manufacturer's

instructions using a StepOnePlus System (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher

Scientific). Genotypes were counterbalanced across plates and genes of interest were

run alongside housekeeping genes *Gapdh* and *Hrpt1* for each sample, within the same

reaction plate. All samples were run in triplicate and samples differing by >0.3 Cts

were excluded. The change in expression of genes of interest, after normalisation to

the two house-keeping genes (ΔCt) was transformed to yield $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ values. Relative

changes from wildtype animals were calculated for each gene of interest.

Primers

Primers were designed to span at least one exon-exon junction and to match the target

sequence only in mouse (Primer-Blast, NCBI) and were synthesised commercially

(Sigma Aldrich). Primer efficiency was determined separately through a dilution series

of cDNA samples from wildtype hippocampus, cerebellum and cortex. Primers with an

efficiency between 90-110% were selected.

Table 1. List of primer sequences used.

Gene	Species	Forward	Reverse
Gapdh	Mouse	GAACATCATCCCTGCATCCA	CCAGTGAGCTTCCCGTTCA
Hprt1	Mouse	TTGCTCGAGATGTCATGAAGGA	AATGTAATCCAGCAGGTCAGCAA
Gabra2	Mouse	AAGCCACTGGAGGAAAACATCT	TTAGCCAGCACCAACCTGAC
Crhr1	Mouse	CTTCAACTCTTTCCTGGAGTCCT	TGGCAGAGCGGACCTCA
Nr3c1	Mouse	AAACTCTGCCTGGTGTGCTC	GGTAATTGTGCTGTCCTTCCAC
Cacna1c	Mouse	ATGGTTCTTGTCAGCATGTTGCGG	TGCAAATGTGGAACCGGTAAGTG
Cacna1d	Mouse	AGAGGACCATGCGAACGAG	CCTTCACCAGAAATAGGGAGTCT
Cacna1e	Mouse	CTCATGTCACCACCGCTAGG	TCTGTCTGCACCACCTTTGG
cFos	Mouse	CTCCAAGCGGAGACAGATCAA	TCGGTGGGCTGCCAAAATAA
Zif268	Mouse	GACCACAGAGTCCTTTTCTGACA	CTGAAAAGGGGTTCAGGCCA

Genotyping Genotyping was performed on post-mortem tail tip samples. Qiagen

DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kits (Qiagen, Manchester, UK) were used to extract

genomic DNA (gDNA) as per the manufacturers standard protocol. For *C3*^{-/-} mice, JAX

protocol 27746 was used (common; ATCTTGAGTGCACCAAGCC, wildtype;

GGTTGCAGCAGTCTATGAAGG, mutant; GCCAGAGGCCACTTGTATAG) and for

C3aR^{-/-} JAX protocol 27638 was used (common; AGCCATTCTAGGGGCGTATT, wild

type reverse; CATGGTTTGGGGTTATTTCG, mutant reverse;

TTGATGTGGAATGTGTGCGAG). For both genotypes, a touchdown cycling protocol

was used (see JAX protocols for details). Genotyping for *C5*^{-/-} mice was performed as

described in [84].

Statistical analysis. All statistical analyses were carried out using GraphPad Prism

8.4.1 (GraphPad Software, CA, USA). Data was assessed for equality of variances

using the Brown-Forsythe test and then appropriate parametric (*t* test, one-way or two-

way ANOVA) or non-parametric (Kruskal-Wallis) tests used. *Post hoc* pairwise

comparisons were performed using the Tukey or Dunn's tests for parametric or non-

parametric analyses, respectively. For all analyses, alpha was set to 0.05 and exact p

values were reported unless p<0.0001. All p values were multiplicity adjusted[91]. Data

are expressed as mean ± standard error of the mean.

The main between-subjects' factor for all ANOVA analyses was GENOTYPE (WT, *C3⁻*

ᐟ⁻, *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻*, or *C5⁻ᐟ⁻*). For the EPM, LMA and FPS experiments, there were within-

subject factors of ZONE (open, closed, middle), DAY (1,2,3) and STIMULUS

INTENSITY (90, 100, 110 dB) respectively. Analysis of plasma corticosterone by two-

way ANOVA included an additional between subject factor of CONDITION (baseline,

EPM), and for the diazepam experiment, there was an additional between subject

factor of DRUG (diazepam, vehicle). For qPCR analyses, ΔCt values were analysed

by one-way ANOVA.

Author's contributions

The study was designed by LJW, TH, BPM, WPG and LSW. LJW and TH performed behavioural experiments with assistance from NH. Molecular analyses were performed by SAB, EB, MT, ALM, SAB, EB, MT, NL, AIB and LJW. Data interpretation were carried out by JH, MJO, JR, WPG, NH, TRH, BPM, LSW and TH. The manuscript was drafted by LJW, TH, WPG and LSW. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Professor Craig Gerard and Professor Marina Botto for provision of the $C3aR^{-/-}$ and $C5^{-/-}$ strains respectively, and to Rhys Perry, Pat Mason, Helen Read and other staff at JBIOS for their invaluable animal care and husbandry. Thanks also to Dr Emma Watts for her feedback on the manuscript. This work was supported by a Wellcome Trust Integrative Neuroscience PhD Studentship awarded to LJW (099816/Z/12/Z), a Waterloo Foundation Early Career Fellowship awarded to LJW, a Hodge Centre for Neuropsychiatric Immunology Seed Corn and Project grant awarded to LJW and a Wellcome Trust Strategic Award 100202/Z/12/Z (DEFINE) held by the Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute at Cardiff University.

Competing financial interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Materials and correspondence

All data from this study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

References

1. Coulthard, L. G. & Woodruff, T. M. Is the Complement Activation Product C3a a Proinflammatory Molecule? Re-evaluating the Evidence and the Myth. *J. Immunol.* **194,** 3542–3548 (2015).

2. Norgauer, J. *et al.* Complement fragment C3a stimulates Ca2+ influx in neutrophils via a pertussis-toxin-sensitive G protein. *Eur. J. Biochem.* **217,** 289–294 (1993).

3. Möller, T., Nolte, C., Burger, R., Verkhratsky, A. & Kettenmann, H. Mechanisms of C5a and C3a Complement Fragment-Induced [Ca2+]i Signalling in Mouse Microglia. *Journal of Neuroscience* **17,** 615–624 (1997).

4. Lian, H., Li, Y., Lu, H.-C. & Zheng, H. NFκB-Activated Astroglial Release of Complement C3 Compromises Neuronal Morphology and Function Associated with Alzheimer's Disease. *Neuron*, **85,** 101–115 (2015).

5. Sayah, S. *et al.* Two different transduction pathways are activated by C3a and C5a anaphylatoxins on astrocytes. *Molecular Brain Research* **112,** 53–60 (2003).

6. Morley, B. J. & Walport, M. J. *The Complement FactsBook.* (Academic Press, 1999).

7. Kemper, C. & Köhl, J. Back to the future – non-canonical functions of complement. *Seminars in Immunology* **37,** 1–3 (2018).

8. Nataf, S., Stahel, P. F., Davoust, N. & Barnum, S. R. Complement anaphylatoxin receptors on neurons: new tricks for old receptors? *Trends Neurosci.* **22,** 397–402 (1999).

9. Veerhuis, R., Nielsen, H. M. & Tenner, A. J. Complement in the brain. *Molecular Immunology* **48,** 1592–1603 (2011).

10. Bénard, M., Gonzalez, B. J., Biological, M. S. J. O.2004. Characterization of C3a and C5a receptors in rat cerebellar granule neurons during maturation neuroprotective effect of C5a against apoptotic cell death. *J Biol. Chem,* **42,** 43487-43496 (2004).

11. Rahpeymai, Y. *et al.* Complement: a novel factor in basal and ischemia-induced neurogenesis. *EMBO J* **25,** 1364–1374 (2006).

12. Gorelik, A. *et al.* Developmental activities of the complement pathway in migrating neurons. *Nature Communications* **8,** 15096 (2017).

13. Stevens, B. *et al.* The classical complement cascade mediates CNS synapse elimination. *Cell* **131,** 1164–1178 (2007).

14. Wang, C. *et al.* Microglia mediate forgetting via complement-dependent synaptic elimination. *Science,* **367,** 688-694 (2020).

15. Harold, D. *et al.* Genome-wide association study identifies variants at CLU and PICALM associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nature Genetics* **41,** 1088–1093 (2009).

16. Jansen, I. E. *et al.* Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies new loci and functional pathways influencing Alzheimer's disease risk. *Nature Genetics* **51,** 404–413 (2019).

17. Shi, Q. *et al.* Complement C3-Deficient Mice Fail to Display Age-Related Hippocampal Decline. *Journal of Neuroscience* **35,** 13029–13042 (2015).

18.   Zhou, J., Fonseca, M. I., Pisalyaput, K. & Tenner, A. J. Complement C3
and C4 expression in C1q sufficient and deficient mouse models of
Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Neurochemistry* **106,** 2080–2092 (2008).

19.   Corbett, B. A. *et al.* A proteomic study of serum from children with autism
showing differential expression of apolipoproteins and complement
proteins. *Mol. Psychiatry* **12,** 292 (2007).

20.   Maes, M., Delange, J., Ranjan, R., Meltzer, H. Y. & Desnyer, R. Acute
phase proteins in schizophrenia, mania and major depression:
modulation by psychotropic drugs. *Psychiatry Research,* **66,** 1–11 (1997).

21.   Ruland, T. *et al.* Molecular serum signature of treatment resistant
depression. *Psychopharmacology* 1–9 (2016).

22.   Song, Y. R. *et al.* Specific alterations in plasma proteins during
depressed, manic, and euthymic states of bipolar disorder. *Brazilian*
Journal of Medical and Biological Research **48,** 973–982, (2015).

23.   Oganesyan, L. P., Mkrtchyan, G. M., Sukiasyan, S. H. & Boyajyan, A. S.
Classic and alternative complement cascades in post-traumatic stress
disorder. *Bull. Exp. Biol. Med.* **148,** 859–861 (2009).

24.   Sekar, A. *et al.* Schizophrenia risk from complex variation of complement
component 4. *Nature,* **530,** 117–183 (2016).

25.   Schafer, D. P. *et al.* Microglia Sculpt Postnatal Neural Circuits in an
Activity and Complement-Dependent Manner. *Neuron* **74,** 691–705
(2012).

26.   Håvik, B. *et al.* The Complement Control-Related Genes CSMD1 and
CSMD2 Associate to Schizophrenia. *BPS* **70,** 35–42 (2011).

27.   Zhang, S. *et al.* Association Between Polymorphisms of the Complement
3 Gene and Schizophrenia in a Han Chinese Population. *Cell. Physiol.*
Biochem. **46,** 2480–2486 (2018).

28.   Tovote, P., Fadok, J. P. & Lüthi, A. Neuronal circuits for fear and anxiety.
Nat. Rev. **16,** 317–331 (2015).

29.   Perusini, J. N. & Fanselow, M. S. Neurobehavioral perspectives on the
distinction between fear and anxiety. *Learn. Mem.* **22,** 417–425 (2015).

30.   Davis, M. Neural systems involved in fear and anxiety measured with
fear-potentiated startle. *Am Psychol* **61,** 741–756 (2006).

31.   Engin, E. *et al.* Modulation of anxiety and fear via distinct
intrahippocampal circuits. *eLife,* **5:e14120**, (2016).

32.   Vogelzangs, N., Beekman, A. T. F., de Jonge, P. & Penninx, B. W. J. H.
Anxiety disorders and inflammation in a large adult cohort. *Translational*
Psychiatry **3,** e249–e249 (2013).

33.   Girardi, G. *et al.* Imaging of activated complement using ultrasmall
superparamagnetic iron oxide particles (USPIO)-conjugated vectors: An
in vivo in utero non-invasive method to predict placental insufficiency and
abnormal fetal brain development. *Mol. Psychiatry* **20,** 1017–1026 (2015).

34.   Kulkarni, A. P., Govender, D. A., Kotwal, G. J. & Kellaway, L. A.
Modulation of anxiety behavior by intranasally administered Vaccinia
virus complement control protein and curcumin in a mouse model of
Alzheimer's disease. *Current Alzheimer Research* **8,** 95–113 (2011).

35.   Fischer, M. B., Ma, M., Goerg, S., Zhou, X. & Xia, J. Regulation of the B
cell response to T-dependent antigens by classical pathway complement.
J.Immunol, **157,** 549-556, (1996).

36.   Humbles, A. A. *et al*. A role for the C3a anaphylatoxin receptor in the
779   effector phase of asthma. *Nature,* **406,** 998–1001 (2000).
780   37.   Pellow, S., Chopin, P., File, S. E. & Briley, M. Validation of open : closed
781   arm entries in an elevated plus-maze as a measure of anxiety in the rat.
782   *J. Neurosci. Methods* **14,** 149–167 (1985).
783   38.   Walf, A. A. & Frye, C. A. The use of the elevated plus maze as an assay
784   of anxiety-related behavior in rodents. *Nat Protoc* **2,** 322–328 (2007).
785   39.   Ennaceur, A. Tests of unconditioned anxiety - pitfalls and
786   disappointments. *Physiology & Behavior* **135,** 55–71 (2014).
787   40.   RODGERS, R. J. Anxiety, defence and the elevated plus-maze.
788   *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews,* **21,** 801-810, (1997).
789   41.   Braun, A. A., Skelton, M. R., Vorhees, C. V. & Williams, M. T.
790   Comparison of the elevated plus and elevated zero mazes in treated and
791   untreated male Sprague-Dawley rats: Effects of anxiolytic and anxiogenic
792   agents. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* **97,** 406–415 (2011).
793   42.   Kheirbek, M. A. *et al.* Differential Control of Learning and Anxiety along
794   the Dorsoventral Axis of the Dentate Gyrus. *Neuron* **77,** 955–968 (2013).
795   43.   Kubik, S., Miyashita, T. & Guzowski, J. F. Using immediate-early genes
796   to map hippocampal subregional functions. *Learning & Memory* **14,** 758–
797   770 (2007).
798   44.   Lepicard, E. M., Joubert, C., Hagneau, I., Perez-Diaz, F. & Chapouthier,
799   G. Differences in anxiety-related behavior and response to diazepam in
800   BALB/cByJ and C57BL/6J strains of mice. *Pharmacology Biochemistry*
801   *and Behavior* **67,** 739–748 (2000).
802   45.   Grewal, S. S., SHEPHERD, J. K., Bill, D. J., Fletcher, A. & Dourish, C. T.
803   Behavioural and pharmacological characterisation of the canopy
804   stretched attend posture test as a model of anxiety in mice and rats.
805   *Psychopharmacology* **133,** 29–38, (1997).
806   46.   Kaesermann, H. P. Stretched attend posture, a non-social form of
807   ambivalence, is sensitive to a conflict-reducing drug action.
808   *Psychopharmacology* **89,** 31–37, (1986).
809   47.   Albrechet-Souza, L., Cristina de Carvalho, M., Rodrigues Franci, C. &
810   Brandão, M. L. Increases in plasma corticosterone and stretched-attend
811   postures in rats naive and previously exposed to the elevated plus-maze
812   are sensitive to the anxiolytic-like effects of midazolam. *Hormones and*
813   *Behavior* **52,** 267–273 (2007).
814   48.   Holt, D. J., Coombs, G., Zeidan, M. A., Goff, D. C. & Milad, M. R. Failure
815   of neural responses to safety cues in schizophrenia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*
816   **69,** 893–903 (2012).
817   49.   Grillon, C., Morgan, C. A., Southwick, S. M., Davis, M. & Charney, D. S.
818   Baseline startle amplitude and prepulse inhibition in Vietnam veterans
819   with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychiatry Research* **64,** 169–178
820   (1996).
821   50.   Falls, W. A., Carlson, S., Turner, J. G. & Willott, J. F. Fear-potentiated
822   startle in two strains of inbred mice. *Behavioral Neuroscience* **111,** 855–
823   861 (1997).
824   51.   Coulthard, L. G. *et al.* Complement C5aR1 Signalling Promotes
825   Polarization and Proliferation of Embryonic Neural Progenitor Cells
826   through PKCζ. *J. Neurosci.* **37,** 5395–5407 (2017).

52. Hawksworth, O. A., Coulthard, L. G., Taylor, S. M., Wolvetang, E. J. & Woodruff, T. M. Brief Report: Complement C5a Promotes Human Embryonic Stem Cell Pluripotency in the Absence of FGF2. *Stem Cells,* **32,** 3278-3284, (2014).

53. Schafer, D. P. *et al.* Microglia sculpt postnatal neural circuits in an activity and complement-dependent manner. *Neuron* **74,** 691–705 (2012).

54. Apps, R. & Strata, P. Neuronal circuits for fear and anxiety - the missing link. *Nat. Rev.* **16,** 642 (2015).

55. Smith, K. S., Engin, E., Meloni, E. G. & Rudolph, U. Benzodiazepine-induced anxiolysis and reduction of conditioned fear are mediated by distinct GABAA receptor subtypes in mice. *Neuropharmacology* **63,** 250–258 (2012).

56. Ahamed, J., Venkatesha, R. T., Thangam, E. B. & Ali, H. C3a Enhances Nerve Growth Factor-Induced NFAT Activation and Chemokine Production in a Human Mast Cell Line, HMC-1. *J. Immunol.* **172,** 6961–6968 (2004).

57. Wu, F. *et al.* Complement component C3a plays a critical role in endothelial activation and leukocyte recruitment into the brain. *J Neuroinflammation* **13,** 23 (2016).

58. Hamshere, M. L. *et al.* Genome-wide significant associations in schizophrenia to ITIH3/4, CACNA1C and SDCCAG8, and extensive replication of associations reported by the Schizophrenia PGC. *Mol. Psychiatry* **18,** 708-712, (2019).

59. Kabir, Z. D. *et al.* Rescue of impaired sociability and anxiety-like behavior in adult *cacna1c*-deficient mice by pharmacologically targeting eIF2α. *Mol. Psychiatry* **22,** 1096–1109 (2017).

60. Simms, B. A. & Zamponi, G. W. Neuronal Voltage-Gated Calcium Channels: Structure, Function, and Dysfunction. *Neuron* **82,** 24–45 (2014).

61. Chao, T. H. *et al.* Role of the second extracellular loop of human C3a receptor in agonist binding and receptor function. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **274,** 9721–9728 (1999).

62. Hannedouche, S. *et al.* Identification of the C3a Receptor (C3AR1) as the Target of the VGF-derived Peptide TLQP-21 in Rodent Cells. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **288,** 27434–27443 (2013).

63. Cero, C. *et al.* The TLQP-21 peptide activates the G-protein-coupled receptor C3aR1 via a folding-upon-binding mechanism. *Structure* **22,** 1744–1753 (2014).

64. Razzoli, M. *et al.* Implication of the VGF-derived peptide TLQP-21 in mouse acute and chronic stress responses. *Behav. Brain Res.* **229,** 333–339 (2012).

65. van den Pol, A. N., Bina, K., Decavel, C. & Ghosh, P. VGF expression in the brain. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **347,** 455–469 (1994).

66. Lewis, B., Francis, K., Gasque, P., Scanlon, M. & Ham, J. Functional complement C3a receptors in the rat pituitary gland. *Endocrine Abstracts* **3,** 198 (2002).

67. Francis, K. Complement C3a receptors in the pituitary gland: a novel pathway by which an innate immune molecule releases hormones involved in the control of inflammation. *The FASEB Journal,* **17,** 2266-2268 (2003).

68. Coulthard, L. G., Hawksworth, O. A. & Woodruff, T. M. Complement: The
Emerging Architect of the Developing Brain. *Trends Neurosci.* **41,** 373–
384 (2018).
69. Scholz, B. *et al.* The Regulation of Cytokine Networks in Hippocampal
CA1 Differentiates Extinction from Those Required for the Maintenance
of Contextual Fear Memory after Recall. *PLoS ONE* **11,** e0153102–29
(2016).
70. Ames, R. S. *et al.* Identification of a selective nonpeptide antagonist of
the anaphylatoxin C3a receptor that demonstrates antiinflammatory
activity in animal models. *J. Immunol.* **166,** 6341–6348 (2001).
71. Therien, A. G., Baelder, R. & Köhl, J. Agonist Activity of the Small
Molecule C3aR Ligand SB 290157. *J. Immunol.* **174,** 7479–7480 (2005).
72. Holly, K. S., Orndorff, C. O. & Murray, T. A. MATSAP: An automated
analysis of stretch-attend posture in rodent behavioral experiments.
Scientific Reports **6,** (2016).
73. Genewsky, A. *et al.* How much fear is in anxiety? Preprint at
https://doi:10.1101/385823 (2018).
74. Hong, S. *et al.* Complement and microglia mediate early synapse loss in
Alzheimer mouse models. *Science* **352,** 712–716 (2016).
75. Kopec, A. M., Smith, C. J., Ayre, N. R., Sweat, S. C. & Bilbo, S. D.
Microglial dopamine receptor elimination defines sex-specific nucleus
accumbens development and social behavior in adolescent rats. *Nature
Communications* **9,** 3769 (2018).
76. Zhang, J. *et al.* Microglial CR3 Activation Triggers Long-Term Synaptic
Depression in the Hippocampus via NADPH Oxidase. *Neuron* **82,** 195–
207 (2014).
77. Roussos, P., Giakoumaki, S. G., Georgakopoulos, A., Robakis, N. K. &
Bitsios, P. The CACNA1C and ANK3 risk alleles impact on affective
personality traits and startle reactivity but not on cognition or gating in
healthy males. *Bipolar Disorders* **13,** 250–259 (2011).
78. Bader, P. L. *et al.* Mouse model of Timothy syndrome recapitulates triad
of autistic traits. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108,** 15432–15437 (2011).
79. Lee, A. S. *et al.* Forebrain elimination of cacna1c mediates anxiety-like
behavior in mice. *Nat.Neurosci* **17,** 1054–1055 (2012).
80. Dao, D. T. *et al.* Mood Disorder Susceptibility Gene CACNA1C Modifies
Mood-Related Behaviors in Mice and Interacts with Sex to Influence
Behavior in Mice and Diagnosis in Humans. *Biological Psychiatry* **68,**
801–810 (2010).
81. Dedic, N. *et al.* Cross-disorder risk gene CACNA1C differentially
modulates susceptibility to psychiatric disorders during development and
adulthood. *Nat.Neurosci* **23,** 533–543 (2018).
82. Crider, A. *et al.* Complement component 3a receptor deficiency
attenuates chronic stress-induced monocyte infiltration and depressive-
like behavior. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity* **70,** 246–256 (2018).
83. Sellgren, C. M. *et al.* Increased synapse elimination by microglia in
schizophrenia patient-derived models of synaptic pruning. *Nat.Neurosci*,
22, 374-385, (2019).
84. Wang, Y. *et al.* A role for complement in antibody-mediated inflammation:
C5-deficient DBA/1 mice are resistant to collagen-induced arthritis. *J.
Immunol.* **164,** 4340–4347 (2000).

85.   Mikaelsson, M. A., Constancia, M. C. A., Dent, C. L., Wilkinson, L. S. &
Humby, T. Placental programming of anxiety in adulthood revealed by
Igf2-null models. *Nature Communications* **4,** 1–9 (2013).
86.   Molewijk, H. E., van der Poel, A. M. & Olivier, B. The ambivalent
behaviour 'stretched approach posture' in the rat as a paradigm to
characterize anxiolytic drugs. *Psychopharmacology* **121,** 81–90, (1995).
87.   Mackintosh, J. H. & Grant, E. C. A Comparison of the Social Postures of
Some Common Laboratory Rodents. *Behaviour* **21,** 246–259 (1963).
88.   Kleiber, M. Body size and metabolism. *Hilgardia Journal of Agricultural*
Science, **6,** 315-353 (1932).
89.   Dickmeis, T. Glucocorticoids and the circadian clock. *Journal of*
Endocrinology **200,** 3–22 (2008).
90.   Livak, K. J. & Schmittgen, T. D. Analysis of Relative Gene Expression
Data Using Real-Time Quantitative PCR and the 2−ΔΔCT Method.
Methods **25,** 402–408 (2001).
91.   Wright, S. P. Adjusted p-values for simultaneous inference. *Biometrics*
48, 1005–1013 (1992).
944

Figure 1. *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻*, but not *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* mice show increased anxiety-like behaviour in the elevated plus maze (EPM;A-E) and elevated zero maze (EZM;F-J). (A) Heatmaps displaying relative time per zone of the EPM across genotypes **(B)** Latency to first open arm visit; wildtype 8.21±1.53s, *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* 14.1±2.52s, *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻* 27.6±8.31s, (H_2=10.5, p=0.005). *Post hoc* tests demonstrated that *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻* mice took significantly longer to

first enter the open arms than wildtype mice (p=0.0045). **(C)** *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice distributed

their time across the EPM differently to wildtype and *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (GENOTYPE×ZONE,

$F_{4,62}$=17.7, p=0.0001) spending less time in the open arms (*C3aR*$^{-/-}$ 16.70±3.73s vs.

wildtype 75.78±8.86s, p<0.0001, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ vs. *C3*$^{-/-}$ 93.86±9.59s p<0.0001) and

significantly more time in the closed arms (*C3aR*$^{-/-}$ 221.88±12.06s vs. wildtype

146.01±7.01s, p<0.0001, and *C3*$^{-/-}$ 140.04±8.61s p<0.0001). **(D)** *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ (14.90±2.22)

mice performed significantly fewer head dips than wildtype (37.92±2.53, p<0.0001)

and *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (49.17±2.37, p<0.0001), whereas *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice performed significantly

more head dips than wildtype mice (p=0.0061; overall ANOVA $F_{2,31}$=48.0, p<0.0001).

(E) *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice performed significantly more stretch attend postures (SAPs;

15.30±1.80) than wildtype (7.58±1.66, p=0.0042) and *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (5.67±0.94, p=0.0004;

overall ANOVA $F_{2,31}$=10.3, p=0.0004). **(F)** Heatmaps displaying relative exploration of

the open segments of the elevated zero maze, across genotypes. Note that due to the

height of the walls in the closed regions it was not possible to track mice or observe

ethological behaviours such as grooming or SAPs. **(G)** There was a significant

difference in the latency to first enter the open arms (wildtype 101.00±31.00s, *C3*$^{-/-}$

42.00±2.52s, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ 204.00±40.40s, H_2=8.13, p=0.0171). *Post hoc* tests revealed

that *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice took significantly longer than *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice to initially enter the open

region (p=0.0140). **(H)** The number of entries made to open regions differed between

genotypes (wildtype 7.69±1.69, *C3*$^{-/-}$ 11.5±1.43s, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ 2.10±1.15, $F_{2,30}$=8.96,

p=0.0009). *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice made significantly fewer entries to the open areas than

wildtype (p=0.0324) and *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (p=0.0006) and **(I)** spent significantly less time on

the open arms (1.77±1.29) compared to wildtype (35.7±8.43s, p=0.0132) and *C3*$^{-/-}$

(57.7±9.32s, p<0.0001; overall Kruskal-Wallis test H_2=19.2, p<0.0001). **(J)** *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice

performed significantly more head dips (20.7±1.62) than wildtype (13.9±1.89,

p=0.048) and *C3aR^{-/-}* mice (10.3±2.42, p=0.0034; overall ANOVA

$F_{2,27}$=6.86,p=0.0039). Data are mean ± S.E.M. *, **, *** and **** represent p≤0.05,

p≤0.01, p≤0.001 and p≤0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

1027
1028
1029

Figure 2. Neuroendocrine response and neuronal activation following exposure

to the elevated plus maze (A) 5-minute exposure to the EPM significantly elevated

corticosterone in all genotypes (main effect of CONDITION, $F_{1,54}$=143, p<0.0001;

baseline 344.66±63.70 vs. EPM 3553.84±274.13). There was a significant

GENOTYPE × CONDITION interaction ($F_{2,54}$=4.64, p=0.0138). *Post hoc* analysis

showed that after the EPM, *C3aR*^{-/-} mice demonstrated significantly higher

corticosterone levels (4640.27±376.13) than wildtype (3033.78±535.06, p=0.0127)

and *C3*^{-/-} mice (2948.00±374.87, p=0.0032). *Post hoc* tests also indicated that there

were no baseline differences between genotypes (wildtype 216.54±63.2 vs. *C3aR*^{-/-}

316.17±111.60 p>0.9999, wildtype vs. *C3*^{-/-} p=0.9927, and *C3*^{-/-} 485.60±130.35

vs.*C3aR*^{-/-} mice p=0.9992). **(B)** A separate group of animals were taken from their

home-cages and culled immediately or placed on the open arm of the EPM for 5

minutes and culled 25 minutes later. *c-Fos* mRNA was significantly upregulated after

exposure to the EPM across genotypes (main effect of CONDITION, $F_{1,46}$=45.4,

p<0.0001). There was no significant main effect of GENOTYPE ($F_{2,46}$=1.27, p=0.2894)

and no CONDITION × GENOTYPE interaction ($F_{2,46}$=0.0004, p=0.9996). *Zif268*

mRNA was not altered in EPM exposed animals, nor between genotypes. Data

represent mean + S.E.M or fold change from wildtype home-cage + SEM. *, **, and

**** represent p≤0.05, p≤0.01 and p≤0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons,

respectively.

Figure 3. Altered sensitivity to diazepam in *C3aR*-/- and *C3*-/- mice. Behaviourally

naïve mice were treated with either diazepam (2mg/kg, i.p) or vehicle injections once

daily for 2 days and then 30 minutes prior to testing. (**A**) Heatmaps demonstrating

duration spent in zones of the maze by vehicle treated and diazepam treated

animals (**B**) Plots showing duration spent on open arms in 1-minute time bins (start-

01:00 was excluded due to effect of diazepam in delaying initial entry to open arms

across genotypes, see Supplementary Figure 4a). There was a trend for wildtype

diazepam treated animals to spend more time on the open arms throughout the task

off

although this did not reach significance (main effect of DRUG, $F_{1,38}$=1.41, p=0.2462).

In *C3^{-/-}* mice there was a strong tendency for drug treated animals to explore the

open arms less than vehicle treated *C3^{-/-}* mice (main effect of DRUG, $F_{1,22}$=1.25,

p=0.2764). A similar, though less pronounced pattern was seen in *C3aR^{-/-}* mice

(main effect of DRUG, $F_{1,19}$=1.55, p=0.2284) **(C)** There were genotype differences in

SAPs (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,79}$=10.7, p<0.0001), a main effect of DRUG

($F_{1,79}$=4.13, p=0.0454) and a significant GENOTYPE × DRUG interaction ($F_{2,79}$=4.64,

p=0.0138). *Post hoc* tests showed that diazepam significantly reduced the number of

SAPs in wildtype mice only (wildtype vehicle 9.00±1.44 vs. wildtype diazepam

3.09±0.71, p=0.0006, *C3^{-/-}* vehicle 4.67±1.24 vs. *C3^{-/-}* diazepam 5.00±1.51,

p=0.9975, *C3aR^{-/-}* vehicle 11.45±1.49 vs. *C3aR^{-/-}* diazepam 10.50±1.34, p=0.9558).

Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, and *** represent p≤0.05, p≤0.01 and p≤0.001 for

post-hoc genotype comparisons, respectively.

1103

1104

Figure 4. Enhanced fear-potentiated startle in *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* but not *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻* mice. (A) Flow

chart depicting the FPS protocol used, which took place in three separate sessions

over two consecutive days. Baseline startle reactivity to a range of pulse intensities

was assessed in the pre-conditioning session, immediately preceding the conditioning

session in which a visual stimulus (light) was paired with 3 weak foot shocks. 24 hours

later, subjects were re-introduced to the same chamber and startle reactivity was

compared between pulse-alone trials and pulse+CS trials to determine the degree of

FPS. On all trials, the peak startle response was recorded and normalised for body

weight differences using Kleiber's 0.75 mass exponent, and fold-changes calculated.

(B) There was a significant main effect of GENOTYPE ($F_{2,66}$=9.04, p=0.0003) and a

significant GENOTYPE × STIMULUS INTENSITY interaction ($F_{4,132}$=7.55, p<0.0001).

C3⁻ᐟ⁻ and *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻* mice demonstrated increased levels of startle responding relative to

wildtype mice at 100dB (*C3⁻ᐟ⁻* 11.34±1.51 vs. wildtype 2.63±0.26, p<0.0001, *C3aR⁻ᐟ⁻*

9.12±2.63 vs. wildtype p=0.0174) and 110dB (*C3*$^{-/-}$ 12.69±1.55 vs. wildtype 3.74±0.50,

p<0.0001, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ 10.58±3.58 vs. wildtype p=0.0111) **(C)** *C3*$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice also

showed increased startle responding to the footshock+CS (*C3*$^{-/-}$ 75.18±5.73, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$

73.14±7.78) pairings relative to wildtype mice (44.34±5.29, *C3*$^{-/-}$ vs. wildtype p=0.0006,

C3aR$^{-/-}$ vs. wildtype p=0.0137, overall ANOVA $F_{2,66}$=8.7, p=0.0004), although it should

be noted that responses were much greater to these stimuli in all mice than to the

startle stimuli in the pre-conditioning session. **(D)** In the post-conditioning session, all

mice demonstrated increases to the pulse+CS stimuli in comparison to pulse-alone

stimuli, as demonstrated by the fold-change increase in startle responding, however,

this effect was significantly increased in *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (3.72±0.27) relative to wildtype

(1.99±0.11, p<0.0001) and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice (2.27±0.24, p=0.0056, overall Kruskal-Wallis

test H_2=27.7, p<0.0001). Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, *** and **** represent p≤0.05,

p≤0.01, p≤0.001 and p≤0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

1139

1140

1141

A

Figure 5. Pathways underlying fear learning phenotypes in *C3⁻/⁻* mice (A) C3

activation leads to generation of cleavage fragments C3a and C3b. The former signals

via C3aR whereas the latter signals via complement receptor 3 (CR3). C3b is also

necessary for forming the convertase enzyme that cleaves C5. Upon cleavage, C5

generates the fragments C5a and C5b (not shown). C5a signals via the C5aR,

whereas C5b propagates activity of the terminal complement pathway via C6. Since

C3 cannot be activated in *C3⁻/⁻* mice, the action of all these pathways (C3a/C3aR,

C3b/CR3, C5a/C5aR, terminal pathway) is absent. By using *C5⁻/⁻* mice, which lack

C5a/C5aR and terminal pathway activity, we examined whether lack of C3b/CR3,

C5a/C5aR or the terminal pathway was responsible for fear learning phenotypes in

C3$^{-/-}$ mice. **(B)** In the pre-conditioning session there were significant main effects of

GENOTYPE ($F_{2,27}$=18.4, p<0.0001) and STIMULUS INTENSITY ($F_{2,54}$=19.0,

p<0.0001) and a significant GENOTYPE × STIMULUS INTENSITY interaction

($F_{4,54}$=7.00, p<0.0001). *C5*$^{-/-}$ mice demonstrated increased levels of startle responding

relative to wildtype and *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice at all stimulus intensities (90dB; WT 2.55±0.26 vs.

C5$^{-/-}$ 13.92±3.14, p=0.0069, *C3*$^{-/-}$ 4.92±1.40 vs. *C5*$^{-/-}$ p=0.0405, WT vs. *C3*$^{-/-}$ p=0.7919;

100dB; WT 3.23±0.45 vs. *C5*$^{-/-}$ 20.83±4.07, p<0.0001, *C3*$^{-/-}$ 4.924.17±0.88 vs. *C5*$^{-/-}$

p<0.0001, WT vs. *C3*$^{-/-}$ p=0.9639; 110dB; WT 4.92±2.03 vs. *C5*$^{-/-}$ 29.78±4.29,

p<0.0001, *C3*$^{-/-}$ 8.07±2.76 vs. *C5*$^{-/-}$ p<0.0001, WT vs. *C3*$^{-/-}$ p=0.6643). **(C)** There were

no significant differences in startle responses to the footshock+CS pairings during the

conditioning session (WT 20.23±4.76, *C3*$^{-/-}$ 33.10±5.74, *C5*$^{-/-}$ 31.08±3.59, $F_{2,27}$=2.10,

p=0.1421). **(D)** In the post-conditioning session, all mice demonstrated increases to

the pulse+CS stimuli in comparison to pulse-alone stimuli, as demonstrated by the

fold-change increase in startle responding, however, this effect was again significantly

increased only in *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice (2.92±0.43) relative to wildtype (1.47±0.17, p=0.0020) and

C5$^{-/-}$ mice (1.23±0.08, p=0.0004, overall ANOVA $F_{2,27}$=11.5, p=0.0002). Data

represent mean + S.E.M. *, **, *** and **** represent p≤0.05, p≤0.01, p≤0.001 and

p≤0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

1171

1172

1173

1174

Figure 6. mRNA expression of stress and anxiety related genes. (A) Animals were

culled and the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), ventral hippocampus (vHPC) and

cerebellum were dissected. **(B)** There were no significant differences in the expression

of Corticotrophin releasing hormone receptor 1 (*Crhr1*) in any region, across

genotypes (mPFC $F_{2,53}$=0.587, p=0.5597, N wildtype=20, *C3*$^{-/-}$=17, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$= 19; vHPC

$F_{2,49}$=0.169, p=0.8450, N WT=20, *C3*$^{-/-}$=15, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$= 17; cerebellum $F_{2,47}$=0.0482,

p=0.8346, N WT=19, *C3*$^{-/-}$=17, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$= 14). **(C)** There were also no significant

changes in the expression of the GABA$_A$ receptor α2 subunit (*Gabra2*) in any region,

across genotypes (mPFC H_2=1.04, p=0.5939, N wildtype=20, *C3*$^{-/-}$=19, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$= 16;

vHPC $F_{2,49}$=0.721, p=0.4914, N WT=20, *C3*$^{-/-}$=13, *C3aR*$^{-/-}$= 19; cerebellum

$F_{2,47}$=0.221, p=0.8026, N WT=18, *C3$^{-/-}$*=17, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 15). **(D)** Expression of the

glucocorticoid receptor (*Nr3c1*) was significantly increased in the cerebellum of both

C3$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR$^{-/-}$* groups ($F_{2,61}$=10.3, p=0.0002, *C3$^{-/-}$* vs. wildtype p=0.0023, *C3aR$^{-/-}$* vs.

wildtype p=0.0002, N wildtype=19, *C3$^{-/-}$*=20, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 15). There were trends towards

increased expression of the glucocorticoid receptor gene *Nr3c1* in the mPFC and

vHPC of *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice but these were not significant (mPFC; $F_{2,56}$=1.33, p=0.2723, N

wildtype=20, *C3$^{-/-}$*=20, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 19, vHPC; $F_{2,62}$=1.11, p=0.3345, N wildtype=23, *C3$^{-/-}$*

=20, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 22). **(E)** Calcium voltage-gated channel subunit Alpha 1d (*Cacna1d*)

expression was changed in the mPFC ($F_{2,36}$=7.52, p=0.0407) owing to altered

expression between *C3$^{-/-}$* and *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice (p=0.0314; N wildtype=11, *C3$^{-/-}$*=13, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*

$^{-/-}$= 15). There were no differences in the vHPC ($F_{2,31}$=2.27, p=0.1199, N wildtype=14,

C3$^{-/-}$=10, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 10) or cerebellum ($F_{1,39}$=0.648, p=0.5286, N wildtype=14, *C3$^{-/-}$*=16,

C3aR$^{-/-}$= 12). **(F)** Expression of the Calcium voltage-gated channel subunit Alpha 1e

(*Cacna1e*) was significantly upregulated in the cerebellum of both knockouts

($F_{2,39}$=7.52, p=0.0017, wildtype vs. *C3$^{-/-}$* p=0.0082, wildtype vs. *C3aR$^{-/-}$* p=0.0032; N

wildtype=14, *C3$^{-/-}$*=16, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 12). There were borderline significant changes in

expression in the vHPC ($F_{2,32}$=3.15, p=0.0565, N wildtype=14, *C3$^{-/-}$*=11, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 10)

and no significant changes in the mPFC (H_2=3.43, p=0.1802, N wildtype=11, *C3$^{-/-}$*=12,

C3aR$^{-/-}$= 15).**(G)** Expression levels of the Calcium voltage-gated channel subunit

Alpha 1c (*Cacna1c*) were significantly increased in *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice in a regionally specific

manner in the vHPC ($F_{2,47}$=3.20, p=0.0496, *C3$^{-/-}$* vs. wildtype p=0.6895, *C3aR$^{-/-}$* vs.

wildtype p=0.0295, N wildtype=21, *C3$^{-/-}$*=13, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 16) and the cerebellum

($F_{2,54}$=5.84, p=0.0051, *C3$^{-/-}$* vs. wildtype p=0.1613, *C3aR$^{-/-}$* vs. wildtype p=0.0024, N

wildtype=20, *C3$^{-/-}$*=20, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 17). There were no significant changes in the mPFC

($F_{2,52}$=1.04, p=0.5939, N wildtype=20, *C3$^{-/-}$*=19, *C3aR$^{-/-}$*= 16). Data represent fold

change from wildtype + SEM. *, **, *** represent $p \leq 0.05$, $p \leq 0.01$ and $p \leq 0.001$ for *post-*

hoc genotype comparisons, respectively.

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221