Complement C3 and C3aR differentially impact on learned fear and innate anxiety

Laura J. Westacott[1,4], Niels Haan[1,4], Sophie A. Brain[2], Emma-Louise Bush[2], Margarita Toneva[2], 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], Trevor Humby[1,2,4*] & 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.

*Corresponding authors: Lawrence S. Wilkinson and Trevor Humby

Email addresses: WilkinsonL@cardiff.ac.uk, HumbyT@cardiff.ac.uk

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

Abbreviations: C3, complement component 3; C3aR, Complement C3a Receptor; C3aRA, C3a Receptor antagonist; C6, Complement component 6; EPM, elevated plus maze; EZM, elevated zero maze; FPS, fear potentiated startle; HPA, hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (axis); SAP, stretch attend posture; WT, wildtype.

Keywords: Complement system, Anxiety, Fear, Stress response

Abstract

Recent findings implicate complement, a key component of the innate immune system, in brain function and risk for neuropsychiatric disorders. We reveal novel functions and unexpected dissociations of complement pathways impacting on emotional behaviours. First, we showed profound anxiety phenotypes, indexed by behaviour and physiological measures, in $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice but not $C3^{-/-}$ mice across several tests of innate anxiety. Administration of the C3aR antagonist SB290157 did not phenocopy $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice, consistent with $C3aR$ knockout influencing adult behaviour via developmental mechanisms. In contrast to the findings on innate anxiety, $C3^{-/-}$ mice, but not $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice, showed behaviour indicative of greater learned fear. We probed downstream complement pathways responsible for the C3-specific effects on learned fear and excluded contributions from the terminal pathway, C6 to C9. Our data provide evidence for dissociable effects of complement pathways in aspects of affective function relevant to psychiatric disorder.

Recent evidence suggests that the complement system has unexpected versatility

beyond canonical immune functions[1]. An implication of these findings is that separate

pathways and proteins of the complement system may have unique, non-immune

roles in different contexts. A prominent example of this functional promiscuity is the

role of complement in neurodevelopment where distinct pathways such as the

C3a/C3aR and the C5a/C5aR axes (Figure 1) differentially influence neuronal

progenitor proliferation and migration[2]. In the postnatal brain, complement partakes in

activity-dependent synaptic refinement via the C3b/CR3 axis[3,4] and the C3a/C3aR axis

has a role in regulating neurogenesis in the adult hippocampus[5].

63   [Figure 1 about here]

Complement has been implicated in the pathogenesis of both neurodegenerative and

psychiatric conditions. In Alzheimer's disease, genetic variants in complement related

loci have been associated with increased disease risk[6,7], and in preclinical models

complement knockout mice exhibit reduced age-related synapse loss[8] and

neuropathology[9]. Complement system alterations have also been reported in the

serum of patients with schizophrenia[10], major depressive disorder[11], bipolar disorder[12]

and post-traumatic stress disorder[13]. In the case of schizophrenia, an important finding

comes from elegant genetic work demonstrating that structural variation in the *C4*

locus is associated with greater risk of developing the disease[14]. C4 cleavage

generates C4b fragments that, in collaboration with cleaved C2, activate C3, yielding

the fragments C3a and C3b (Figure 1). Given the known roles for C3b/CR3 in synaptic

pruning[3,4], it has been suggested that *C4* variants may impact on psychiatric risk via

this mechanism, leading to abnormal connectivity and disruption of neural networks[14].

Recent *in vitro* evidence has supported this idea, showing that *C4A* variants that

increase C4A protein levels contribute to increased C3 deposition and greater synaptic

elimination[15].

Altered emotional function, in particular anxiety, is a pervasive and clinically important

symptom that is comorbid across several DSM-5 and ICD-11 defined disorders with

growing social, economic and health consequences[16]. In schizophrenia, anxiety can

precede the onset of psychotic symptoms; hence, it has been suggested that anxiety

may be part of the pathogenesis of the disorder rather than simply a comorbidity[17].

While the links between anxiety and inflammation have been well documented [18], there

has been little investigation of the role of complement in anxiety disorders in humans.

In animal models, prenatal manipulations increasing C3 deposition in the fetal brain

are associated with anxiety phenotypes in adulthood[19]. Additionally, complement

inhibitors reduce anxiety in models of Alzheimer's disease[20] and aged *C3* deficient

mice exhibit reduced anxiety[8]. These studies suggest that complement activation can

influence anxiety; however, the precise relationship between signalling within discrete

pathways of the complement system and their relationship to dissociable aspects of

anxiety-related behaviours and underlying brain function is unknown.

Here we use knockout mouse models to manipulate C3 and C3aR signalling in order

to functionally parse anxiety-related phenotypes. We focused on C3 due to its central

role within the complement system and the requirement for C3 breakdown products to

propagate complement activation downstream (Figure 1). In the homozygous *C3*

knockout mice[21] (Figure 2) complement cannot be activated beyond C3, and therefore

these animals lack activation fragments (C3a, C3b) and thus cannot activate the

terminal complement pathway. Phenotypic effects in this model could therefore be the

result of disturbance to any downstream effector molecule(s). We compared the $C3^{-/-}$

model with homozygous *C3aR* knockout mice[22] (Figure 2). In these mice the

complement system is intact apart from the capacity for C3a to bind to its canonical

receptor C3aR. Here, we tested the extent to which phenotypic effects were the result

specifically of C3a/C3aR axis 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.

108   [Figure 2 about here]

Interestingly, we found completely different effects of the two models on aversive

behaviours. *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice displayed a profound innate anxiety phenotype across

several tests that was lacking in the *C3$^{-/-}$* model, a dissociation that was mirrored by

plasma levels of the stress hormone corticosterone. Furthermore, the anxiety

phenotype in the *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice was resistant to systemic treatment with diazepam at

doses with an anxiolytic effect in wildtype mice. Moreover, acute administration of the

selective C3aR antagonist SB290157[23] did not phenocopy *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice, consistent

with the absence of *C3aR* influencing adult behaviour via developmental effects. When

we examined learned fear, we found that the dissociation was reversed, with the *C3$^{-/-}$*

mice exhibiting an enhanced response to a conditioned cue, but no difference between

wildtype and *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice. We probed downstream complement pathways responsible

for the C3-specific effects on learned fear and excluded contributions from the terminal

pathway by using *C6$^{-/-}$* mice. These findings point to a hitherto unrecognized

complexity of complement effects on brain function and behaviour and inform debate

regarding complement in psychopathology.

Results

High levels of unconditioned anxiety in *C3aR*^{-/-} but not *C3*^{-/-} mice

We first assessed emotional reactivity in the elevated plus maze (EPM), a well-

established task that assays the conflict between motivation to explore novel

environments and the innate anxiety evoked by open, brightly lit spaces[24,25]. Wildtype

animals showed the typical pattern of behaviour in exploring all areas of the maze, but

with relatively less exploration of the open arms compared to the closed arms.

Comparison of the heat maps in Figure 3a, indexing overall maze exploration,

demonstrated that whilst the *C3*^{-/-} animals showed a similar pattern of behaviour to

wildtype animals, *C3aR*^{-/-} mice were markedly different in essentially avoiding the open

arms completely (see Supplementary File 1 for representative videos). The breakdown

of the individual behavioural measures taken on the maze (Figure 3 b-g) revealed that

in comparison to wildtype and *C3*^{-/-} mice, *C3aR*^{-/-} mice took longer to first enter the

open arms (Figure 3b) and spent less time there per entry (Figure 3c), leading to a

markedly reduced overall open arm duration (Figure 3d). Ethological parameters

(head dips and stretch attend postures; SAPs) were also different in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice

(Figure 3e, f), exhibiting a significant reduction in the former and significant increase

in the latter, a pattern consistent with anxiogenic effects[26]. During the task, *C3aR*^{-/-}

mice more frequently engaged in grooming which may be considered a displacement

behaviour when displayed in conflict situations[27] (Supplementary Figure 1a, b). We

also noted that in comparison to wildtype and *C3aR*^{-/-} animals, there was a significantly

increased prevalence of head dipping in *C3*^{-/-} mice (Figure 3e) which may indicate

anxiolysis[28]. These initial data were consistent with an anxiogenic phenotype present

in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice but absent in *C3*^{-/-} mice. As might be predicted from a heighted state

of anxiety in the EPM, we observed reduced activity in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice (Figure 3g). Given

that several measures were dependent on movement around the maze 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 group differences (Figure 3h) indicating the EPM measures were not influenced by

movement confounds.

[Figure 3 about here]

Next it was important to establish that the anxiety phenotype was not task-specific, i.e.

confined to a single behavioural task. Using a separate cohort of animals, we

assessed behaviour in the elevated zero maze (EZM), another established assay of

anxiety related-behaviour which differs from the EPM in the absence of a central zone,

allowing a more definitive quantification of behaviour that is confined solely to open

and closed regions[29]. Heat maps showing overall exploratory behaviour on the EZM

are shown in Figure 4a. These data recapitulated the pattern of findings seen in the

EPM with the $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice avoiding the open arms of the maze to a much greater

extent than the wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ animals. Quantification of the maze behaviour

confirmed the specificity of the effects to the $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice in showing that these

animals took longer to first enter the open regions (Figure 4b) and made fewer entries

to the open regions (Figure 4c). On the few occasions they did enter, $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice

spent less time per visit (Figure 4e) and consequently spent considerably less time

overall in the open regions (Figure 4d). In contrast to the EPM, there was no difference

in head dips between the $C3aR^{-/-}$ and wildtype animals, but again $C3^{-/-}$ mice performed

significantly more head dips (Figure 4f). We carried out additional analyses in the open

field test of emotional reactivity and noted, consistent with the maze data, indices of

enhanced anxiety in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice (Supplementary Figure 2). Finally, we observed

bald patches due to an excessive-grooming phenotype in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice

(Supplementary Figure 1c) that was present in all *C3aR*^{-/-} cohorts. Over-grooming has

been associated with enhanced stress and anxiety[23,25] and has previously been linked

to the immune system and microglial dysfunction[30].

179   [Figure 4 about here]

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

In a separate cohort of animals we repeated the EPM experiment and in addition

tested sensitivity of anxiety-related behaviours to 2mg/kg diazepam, an established

clinically effective anxiolytic drug[24,31]. Vehicle treated animals replicated the initial

findings across all behavioural indices of anxiety, again showing a dissociation

between the *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} mice (Figure 5a). Challenge with diazepam led to a

complex pattern of effects. Apart from a drug-induced increase in the latency to initially

enter the open arms that was common to all genotypes (Figure 5b), the drug was

essentially without effects in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice (Figure 5a, c, d & e) whereas there was

evidence of an anxiogenic effect of diazepam in *C3*^{-/-} mice (Figure 5c & e). In

diazepam-treated wildtype animals there was a trend for increased time on the open

arms (Figure 5c), an effect often held to index reduced anxiety[24,32,33], however these

effects did not reach statistical significance. In contrast, we did observe effects of

diazepam on SAPs, specifically a highly significant reduction in wildtype animals

consistent with the anticipated reduction in anxiety. This reduction in SAPs was

completely absent in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice (Figure 5d). Differences in the sensitivity of open

arm and ethological measures to benzodiazepines has been noted previously[26] and it

has been suggested that SAPs offer a more sensitive indication of anxiolysis[34].

Locomotor activity monitored across all areas of the maze indicated that the drug

effects in wildtype and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice were unlikely to have been influenced by sedation

(Figure 5e). In $C3^{-/-}$ mice however, activity was significantly suppressed under drug

conditions indicating a possible sedative effect, consequently, $C3^{-/-}$ diazepam effects

should be interpreted with caution.

203   [Figure 5 about here]

Enhanced corticosterone response in $C3aR^{-/-}$ compared to $C3^{-/-}$ and wildtype

mice

In a sub-cohort of wildtype, $C3^{-/-}$ and $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice treated with vehicle in the diazepam

study, 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

(baseline condition).   There were no genotype differences in basal levels of

corticosterone (Figure 6), however, being placed on the EPM increased plasma

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

stressor. *Post hoc* analyses indicated a significantly greater EPM-evoked

corticosterone response in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ animals. Given the relationship between

behavioural indices of anxiogenesis and activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary

adrenal (HPA) axis[35,36], these data were consistent with the behavioural findings

showing markedly increased levels of unconditioned anxiety in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ animals.

217   [Figure 6 about here]

Administration of the C3aR antagonist SB290157 did not phenocopy $C3aR^{-/-}$

mice

The specific effects of $C3aR$ knockout on unconditioned anxiety could have been due

to developmental changes leading to enduring effects on behaviour and/or effects

mediated acutely in the adult brain. To distinguish between these possibilities we

examined the extent to which systemic administration of the C3aR antagonist

SB290157[23] to wildtype mice at doses which have been shown to influence brain

phenotypes[5,37] would phenocopy *C3aR*^{-/-} mice. Two dosing regimens were used; a

single injection of SB290157 (i.p,10mg/kg) 60 minutes prior to testing on the EPM and

a chronic regime of twice daily injections (i.p, 10mg/kg) for 5 days with EPM testing 24

hours after the last treatment. Again, the finding of enhanced anxiety was replicated

in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice in both acute (Supplementary Figure 3) and chronic regimens (Figure

7). However, neither the acute nor chronic dosing with SB290157 had any effects on

behaviour in the EPM. *A priori*, these data were most consistent with *C3aR* knockout

influencing adult behaviour via developmental effects resulting in long term effects in

the adult brain.

[Figure 7 about here]

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

We next assessed the effects of *C3/C3aR* manipulations on conditioned, (i.e., learnt)

fear in a separate group of animals using the fear potentiated startle (FPS)

paradigm[38,39]. In the FPS task a conditioned stimulus (CS, in our case a 30sec light

stimulus previously associated with a mild foot shock) presented simultaneously with

a startle (pulse-alone) stimulus (Figure 8a) leads to an augmented or 'potentiated'

startle response. The index of learning is generated by the difference between the

startle response to pulse-alone trials relative to pulse+CS trials and is an established

means of assaying conditioned fear employed extensively in human and animal model

investigations of fear learning[40,41]. In the pre-conditioning session, pulse-alone trials

indicated increased basal startle reactivity in both *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} animals relative to

wildtype (Figure 8b). Increased reactivity was also demonstrated by both knockouts

with regard to the effects of the unconditioned foot shock stimulus (in the absence of

any startle stimulus) during the conditioning session, as shown in Figure 8c. The

potentiation of the startle response by the CS in the post-conditioning session is

illustrated in Figure 8d. Here, in contrast to the previous assays of unconditioned

anxiety an opposite pattern of effects was observed, with *C3*$^{-/-}$ animals showing a

selective enhancement of conditioned fear relative to the *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ and wildtype animals.

It is important to note that the enhanced fear learning in *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice was completely

dissociated and therefore not confounded by the underlying effects on basal startle

reactivity and/or sensitivity to the foot shock alone, since these effects were common

to both knockouts yet only *C3*$^{-/-}$ animals showed the effect on fear learning. These data

showing opposing effects of *C3*$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ on innate anxiety-inducing stimuli and

learned anticipatory fear suggested differential impact of the knockouts on associated

brain circuitries.

260   [Figure 8 about here]

No effects on conditioned fear in *C6*$^{-/-}$ mice

The demonstration of enhanced fear learning in *C3*$^{-/-}$, but not *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice suggested

that the effects in *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice were mediated by molecules downstream of C3,

independent from C3a/C3aR. As *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice cannot activate complement beyond C3

and therefore lack terminal pathway (C6-C9) activation, it is possible that the indirect

loss of function of these molecules may contribute to the fear learning phenotype. We

therefore compared *C3*$^{-/-}$ with *C6*$^{-/-}$ mice and hypothesised that should *C6*$^{-/-}$ mice show

comparable behaviour to *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice then the phenotype would likely be due to a loss

of terminal pathway activity. On the other hand, if *C6*$^{-/-}$ mice demonstrated no fear

learning phenotype, this would confine the likely mediating molecules to either C3b or

the downstream protein C5 and its breakdown products. Using a separate cohort of

mice, we replicated the previous $C3^{-/-}$ finding (Figure 9) demonstrating that relative to

wildtype mice, $C3^{-/-}$ mice showed enhanced basal startle responses (Figure 9a),

increased reactivity to the foot shock alone (Figure 9b) and a significant enhancement

in conditioned fear (Figure 9c). However, across all these measures the $C6^{-/-}$ mice

were not different to wildtypes, a pattern of effects consistent with the involvement of

C3b/CR3 or C5a/C5aR signalling in the $C3^{-/-}$ phenotype. Additionally, we did not

observe any innate anxiety-like phenotypes in $C6^{-/-}$ mice (Supplementary Figure 4).

279   [Figure 9 about here]

Discussion

We have used a number of *in vivo* knockout models manipulating specific complement

proteins to reveal dissociable effects on innate and conditioned emotional behaviours.

A main finding was a profound innate anxiety phenotype in the $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice manifest

across independent behavioural tasks, and repeated assays, that was absent in the

$C3^{-/-}$ animals. 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. A second main finding was a double

dissociation in terms of learned fear. Here, using potentiated startle, we observed the

opposite pattern of effects whereby $C3^{-/-}$ and not $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice displayed enhanced fear

reactivity to a conditioned light cue. Taken together, these data are strongly suggestive

of distinct functional effects mediated by closely related elements of the complement

system. The mechanistic basis of these distinct effects is unknown at present, but they

suggest fundamentally different impacts of C3 and C3aR signalling on the brain

mechanisms underlying innate anxiety and learned fear.

A major implication of our findings relates to the unexpected specificity of the effects

of C3aR on unconditioned anxiety and corticosterone levels. Since C3a can only be

produced via C3 cleavage and C3aR is the canonical receptor for C3a, *a priori* we

expected that any phenotypes dependent on the binding of C3a to C3aR would be

apparent in both *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} models. Given the divergence in innate anxiety

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

instead mediated by an alternative ligand. A potential molecular promiscuity of C3aR

arises from its long extracellular loop, unique among GPCRs[42] but so far, only one

alternative ligand has been identified, a cleavage fragment of the neuropeptide

precursor protein VGF (non-acronymic), TLQP-21[43,44]. This peptide has highly

pleiotropic roles including in the stress response[45], though few of these roles have, to

date, been directly attributed to C3aR signalling. VGF is widely expressed throughout

the CNS with high levels found in the hypothalamus, a region associated with stress

reactivity and abundant C3aR expression[46,47]. Interestingly, there is further potential

for interaction between complement and TLQP-21 in that C3a stimulates nerve growth

factor (NGF) expression by glial cells[48], which in turn triggers VGF synthesis, the

source of TLQP-21[49]. TLQP-21 may also bind the Complement component 1q

receptor, gC1qR[50]. TLQP-21 will therefore be an important target in future

investigations of the mechanistic basis of C3aR dependent anxiety phenotypes.

Evidence of elevated plasma corticosterone levels in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice after exposure to

the EPM, but not at baseline, suggests the anxiety phenotype observed corresponds

to 'state' rather than 'trait' anxiety. State anxiety occurs acutely and is enhanced by

anxiogenic stimuli, whereas trait anxiety is an enduring characteristic[51]. We were

interested in the stress response not only due to the inherent link between stress and

anxiety, but also due to the known synergy between the immune and endocrine

systems[52]. C3aR is expressed at particularly high levels in endocrine tissues and

dosing of C3a stimulates hormone secretion via C3aR[46,47], suggesting it is highly likely

that the phenotypes observed in *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice involve perturbations in the HPA axis.

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

assessing the effects of the anxiolytic diazepam on EPM behaviour. Under our test

conditions, measures of open arm exploration were insensitive to diazepam treatment

but there were specific effects on SAPs, whereby a dose of diazepam that was

anxiolytic (i.e., reduced SAPs) in wildtype mice had no effects in *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice. SAPs

are highly sensitive to pharmacological manipulation[28,53] and in agreement with our

own findings, diazepam has been shown to specifically decrease SAPs in the absence

of effects on open arm exploration[54]. Importantly, *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice consistently displayed

the greatest number of SAPs compared to other genotypes, and therefore the lack of

drug effects were not due to floor effects. Hence, we propose that SAPs constitute a

valid, sensitive index of drug action and that our findings of altered reactivity to

diazepam in the *C3aR$^{-/-}$* are most likely indicative of altered underlying neurobiology.

Since benzodiazepine action is dependent on GABA$_A$ receptor function[55], the

expression of GABA$_A$ receptor subunits in C3aR$^{-/-}$ mice would be a high priority for

future work.

Another question relating to potential mechanisms was whether anxiety phenotypes

seen in the *C3aR$^{-/-}$* mice were a result of acute, ongoing effects of *C3aR* deletion in

the adult brain or instead the consequence of neurodevelopmental impacts of C3aR

deficiency. At the outset, both were possibilities on the basis of previous findings

implicating C3aR in developmental neurogenesis[56] and acute changes in C3aR

expression in the adult brain after behavioural manipulations[57]. The C3aR antagonist

SB290157 had no effects on behaviour in wildtype animals in either dosing regimen

used and hence the data were most consistent with *C3aR* knockout influencing adult behaviour via developmental mechanisms, resulting in enduring effects in the adult brain. It should be noted that SB290157 has attracted criticism due to evidence suggesting agonist activity at certain doses and in particular cell types[58]. However, the negative results seen here were not consistent with agonist effects, which one may hypothesize would lead to reduced anxiety in the EPM.

Previously, aged *C3*^{-/-} mice have been reported to demonstrate less anxiety in the EPM[8]. While we did not test aged mice, we did observe a subtle anxiolytic effect of *C3* deficiency. In maze-based tasks, *C3*^{-/-} mice consistently performed the greatest number of head dips, and the least SAPs. We also saw a trend towards increased open arm exploration (see Figure 4c, d and vehicle-treated *C3*^{-/-} mice in Figure 5c) and greater duration in the central zone of the open field (Supplementary Figure 2d). It is possible that these effects would be more pronounced if aged animals had been tested, and again suggests opposing effects of *C3* and *C3aR* knockout on innate anxiety. However, we also observed an anxiogenic effect of *C3*^{-/-} on baseline acoustic startle responses (Figure 8b), a phenotype that was shared with *C3aR*^{-/-} mice. While it may be expected that animals displaying greater anxiety-like behaviour in a maze-based task may also display enhanced baseline startle reactivity, as seen in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice, a disconnect between exploration-based tasks and startle responses has been reported in rats selectively bred for low or high-anxiety like behaviour[59]. Our results suggest that C3 may have differential effects upon brain circuitries that mediate approach/avoidance behaviours versus those that mediate reflexes such as the startle response.

In contrast to innate anxiety, we observed a specific effect of *C3* knockout in regard to conditioned fear. Lack of a comparable phenotype in *C6*^{-/-} mice confirmed that the

effects were independent of terminal pathway activation and membrane attack

complex formation (see Figure 1). Similarly, the lack of effects in *C3aR*^{-/-} mice relative

to wildtype indicated that the phenotype was unlikely to be C3a/C3aR dependent.

These observations lead to three possibilities regarding the mediating pathways.

Firstly, effects could be mediated via altered C3b/CR3 dependent synaptic

elimination[3,4], suggesting a developmental mechanism. In support, complement

mediated synaptic pruning has now been demonstrated in brain regions relevant to

fear learning such as the amygdala[60] and alterations in glutamatergic synapses within

the hippocampus have been reported in *C3*^{-/-} mice[61]. The C3b/ CR3 pathway could

also be involved acutely in learning within the adult brain, as *C3* mRNA is upregulated

during discrete stages of fear learning[57] and microglial CR3 is implicated in long term

depression[62]. The second possibility is that C5a/C5aR, which have a range of

developmental roles[56], mediate enhanced fear-learning phenotypes in *C3*^{-/-} mice,

although there is less evidence currently for a role of C5a/C3aR in this realm. As a

third possibility, there is also evidence for interaction between C3a breakdown product

(C3aDesArg) and C5L2, a receptor sharing similar sequence homology with C5aR and

C3aR whose function has not yet been fully elucidated[63]. Further investigation of the

signalling pathways contributing to the conditioned fear phenotype will be a priority for

future research. It will also be necessary to determine whether the phenotype applies

to aversive stimuli specifically or whether *C3*^{-/-} mice show enhanced learning generally,

irrespective of motivation.

The functional consequences of complement are dependent on the location of

complement activation and receptor expression. Whether differential expression of C3

and C3aR in the brain circuitries and cell types underlying innate anxiety and learned

fear contribute to the behavioural dissociations we observe is difficult to ascertain at

present. C3aR is expressed primarily by neurons but is also found in astrocytes,

microglia and oligodendrocytes [64,65] and C3 is synthesized by most cell types at low

constitutive levels throughout the CNS[66,67]. The neural substrates of innate anxiety

behaviours overlap to an extent with learned fear circuits[68]. Given there is currently no

systematic data comparing and contrasting C3 with C3aR expression across these

circuits, an unbiased approach may be the most immediately informative. For

example, neuronal activity markers such as immediate early genes could be used to

assess circuit and cellular activation, at baseline and subsequent to aversive challenge

in *C3^{-/-}* and *C3aR^{-/-}* mice, where the prediction would be that the patterns of activation

would be different in the two models despite exposure to identical aversive stimuli.

While our experiments using *C3^{-/-}* and *C3aR^{-/-}* mouse models have focused on aspects

of anxiety and learned fear, these endophenotypes are commonly comorbid with

depression, and recent work has suggested a role for C3a/C3aR in the

pathophysiology of major depressive disorder resulting from chronic stress[69]. 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 *C3aR^{-/-}* mice

to chronic-stress induced depressive behaviour[69]. However, Crider et al (2018) used

a chronic unpredictable-stress paradigm[69] likely to evoke significant inflammation, and

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

questionable.

Finally, it is of interest to consider the degree to which our findings relate to the genetic

data implicating *C4* in the pathogenesis of schizophrenia[14]. The *C4* variants identified

were predicted to increase C4 expression and therefore increase activation of C3[15],

and thus our data from *C3^{-/-}* mice is not immediately applicable. Nonetheless, it is

possible that both excessive or reduced complement activation could lead to

dysfunction, implicating complement as a potential mediator of abnormal fear learning

in schizophrenia [70]. Similarly, it is difficult at present to draw links between *C4* and our

results demonstrating a role of C3aR in innate anxiety, firstly because of the

independence of the phenotype to C3 signalling and secondly due to the current lack

of data linking other elements of the complement system beyond C4 to psychiatric

disorder. Irrespective of the exact mechanisms that link C3/C3aR and their

dissociable effects on emotionality, our findings highlight novel functions of these

complement pathways on innate anxiety and conditioned fear that are of relevance to

core clinical symptoms of psychiatric disease. Abnormal reactivity to innate anxiety-

provoking stimuli and conditioned aversive cues are common and clinically important

psychiatric symptoms[17,71] and our data suggest a hitherto unrecognized complexity of

complement in mediating these distinct aspects of emotionality.

Author's contributions

LJW, TH and LSW designed the study. LJW and TH performed behavioural

experiments with assistance from NH, SAB, EB and MT. BPM and TRH provided

animals. JH, MJO, JR, WPG, NH, TRH, BPM, LSW and TH assisted in data

interpretation and conceptualisation of experiments. LJW, TH and LSW drafted the

manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Professor Craig Gerard for providing the *C3aR^{-/-}* mice, and Rhys

Perry and staff at JBIOS for their invaluable animal care and husbandry. 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.   Kemper, C. & Köhl, J. Back to the future – non-canonical functions of
complement. *Seminars in Immunology* **37,** 1–3 (2018).
2.   Coulthard, L. G., Hawksworth, O. A., Conroy, J., Lee, J. D. & Woodruff, T. M.
Complement C3a receptor modulates embryonic neural progenitor cell
proliferation and cognitive performance. *Molecular Immunology* **101,** 176–181
(2018).
3.   Stevens, B. *et al.* The classical complement cascade mediates CNS synapse
elimination. *Cell* **131,** 1164–1178 (2007).
4.   Schafer, D. P. *et al.* Microglia Sculpt Postnatal Neural Circuits in an Activity
and Complement-Dependent Manner. *Neuron* **74,** 691–705 (2012).
5.   Rahpeymai, Y. *et al.* Complement: a novel factor in basal and ischemia-
induced neurogenesis. *EMBO J* **25,** 1364–1374 (2006).
6.   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).

7.   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).

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

9.   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).

10.   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).

11.   Ruland, T. *et al.* Molecular serum signature of treatment resistant depression.
Psychopharmacology **233,** 3051-3059 (2016).

12.   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).

13.   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).

14.   Sekar, A. *et al.* Schizophrenia risk from complex variation of complement
component 4. *Nature* **530(7589),** 177–183 (2016).

15.   Sellgren, C. M. *et al.* Increased synapse elimination by microglia in
schizophrenia patient-derived models of synaptic pruning. *Nat.Neurosci* **22,**
374-385 (2019).

16.   Wittchen, H. U. Generalized anxiety disorder: Prevalence, burden, and cost to
society. *Depress Anxiety* **16,** 162–171 (2002).

17.   Hall, J. Schizophrenia - an anxiety disorder? *Br J Psychiatry* **211,** 262–263
(2017).

18.   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).

19.   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).

20.   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).

21.   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).

22.   Humbles, A. A. *et al.* A role for the C3a anaphylatoxin receptor in the effector

phase of asthma. *Nature,* **406,** 998–1001 (2000).

23.   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).

24.   Pellow, S., Chopin, P., File, S. E. & Briley, M. Validation of open:closed arm

entries in an elevated plus-maze as a measure of anxiety in the rat. *J.*

Neurosci. Methods **14,** 149–167 (1985).

25.   Walf, A. A. & Frye, C. A. The use of the elevated plus maze as an assay of

anxiety-related behavior in rodents. *Nat Protoc* **2,** 322–328 (2007).

26.   Ennaceur, A. Tests of unconditioned anxiety - pitfalls and disappointments.

Physiology & Behavior **135,** 55–71 (2014).

27.   Fernández Espejo, E. Structure of the mouse behaviour on the elevated plus-

maze test of anxiety. *Behav. Brain Res.* **86,** 105–112 (1997).

28.   Rodgers, R. J. Anxiety, defence and the elevated plus-maze. *Neuroscience*

and Biobehavioral Reviews, **21,** 801-810 (1997).

29.   Braun, A. A., Skelton, M. R., Vorhees, C. V. & Williams, M. T. Comparison of

the elevated plus and elevated zero mazes in treated and untreated male

Sprague-Dawley rats: Effects of anxiolytic and anxiogenic agents.

Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior **97,** 406–415 (2011).

30.   Chen, S.-K. *et al.* Hematopoietic origin of pathological grooming in Hoxb8

mutant mice. *Cell* **141,** 775–785 (2010).

31.   Hidalgo, R. B., Tupler, L. A. & Davidson, J. R. T. An effect-size analysis of

pharmacologic treatments for generalized anxiety disorder. *J.*

Psychopharmacol. **21,** 864–872 (2007).

32.   Lepicard, E. M., Joubert, C., Hagneau, I., Perez-Diaz, F. & Chapouthier, G.
537   Differences in anxiety-related behavior and response to diazepam in
538   BALB/cByJ and C57BL/6J strains of mice. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and*
539   *Behavior* **67,** 739–748 (2000).

540   33.   Albrechet-Souza, L., Cristina de Carvalho, M., Rodrigues Franci, C. &
541   Brandão, M. L. Increases in plasma corticosterone and stretched-attend
542   postures in rats naive and previously exposed to the elevated plus-maze are
543   sensitive to the anxiolytic-like effects of midazolam. *Hormones and Behavior*
544   **52,** 267–273 (2007).

545   34.   Wall, P. M. & Messier, C. Methodological and conceptual issues in the use of
546   the elevated plus-maze as a psychological measurement instrument of animal
547   anxiety-like behavior. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **25,** 275–286
548   (2001).

549   35.   File, S. E., Zangrossi, H., Sanders, F. L. & Mabbutt, P. S. Raised
550   corticosterone in the rat after exposure to the elevated plus-maze.
551   *Psychopharmacology* **113,** 543–546 (1994).

552   36.   Rodgers, R. *et al.* Corticosterone response to the plus-maze: High correlation
553   with risk assessment in rats and mice. *Physiology & Behavior* **68,** 47–53
554   (1999).

555   37.   Lian, H. *et al.* NFκB-Activated Astroglial Release of Complement C3
556   Compromises Neuronal Morphology and Function Associated with Alzheimer's
557   Disease. *Neuron,* **85,** 101–115 (2015).

558   38.   Risbrough, V. B. & Geyer, M. A. Anxiogenic treatments do not increase fear-
559   potentiated startle in mice. *BPS* **57,** 33–43 (2005).

560   39.   Falls, W. A., Carlson, S., Turner, J. G. & Willott, J. F. Fear-potentiated startle in
561   two strains of inbred mice. *Behavioral Neuroscience* **111,** 855–861 (1997).

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

564   41.   Cryan, J. F. & Holmes, A. The ascent of mouse: advances in modelling human
565   depression and anxiety. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* **4,** 775–790 (2005).

566   42.   Chao, T. H. *et al.* Role of the second extracellular loop of human C3a receptor
567   in agonist binding and receptor function. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **274,**
568   9721–9728 (1999).

43. 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).

44. 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).

45. 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).

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

47. 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).

48. Heese, K., Hock, C. & Otten, U. Inflammatory signals induce neurotrophin
expression in human microglial cells. *Journal of Neurochemistry* **70,** 699–707
(1998).

49. Ferri, G.-L., Noli, B., Brancia, C., D'Amato, F. & Cocco, C. VGF: An inducible
gene product, precursor of a diverse array of neuro-endocrine peptides and
tissue-specific disease biomarkers. *Journal of Chemical Neuroanatomy* **42,**
249–261 (2011).

50. Chen, Y.-C. *et al.* Identification of a receptor for neuropeptide VGF and its role
in neuropathic pain. *J. Biol. Chem.* **288,** 34638–34646 (2013).

51. Lister, R. G. Ethologically-based animal models of anxiety disorders.
Pharmacol. Ther. **46,** 321–340 (1990).

52. Verburg-van Kemenade, B. M. L., Cohen, N. & Chadzinska, M.
Neuroendocrine-immune interaction: Evolutionarily conserved mechanisms
that maintain allostasis in an ever-changing environment. *Dev. Comp.*
Immunol. **66,** 2–23 (2017).

53. 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).

54. Genewsky, A. *et al.* How much fear is in anxiety? Pre-print at
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/385823v1 (2019).

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.   Coulthard, L. G., Hawksworth, O. A. & Woodruff, T. M. Complement: The
Emerging Architect of the Developing Brain. *Trends Neurosci.* **41,** 373–384
(2018).

57.   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).

58.   Therien, A. G., Baelder, R. & Köhl, J. Agonist Activity of the Small Molecule
C3aR Ligand SB 290157. *J. Immunol.* **174,** 7479–7480 (2005).

59.   Yilmazer-Hanke, D. M., Wigger, A., Linke, R., Landgraf, R. & Schwegler, H.
Two Wistar Rat Lines Selectively Bred for Anxiety-Related Behavior Show
Opposite Reactions in Elevated Plus Maze and Fear-Sensitized Acoustic
Startle Tests. *Behav Genet* **34,** 309–318

60.   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).

61.   Perez-Alcazar, M. *et al.* Altered cognitive performance and synaptic function in
the hippocampus of mice lacking C3. *Experimental Neurology* **253,** 154–164
(2013).

62.   Zhang, J. *et al.* Microglial CR3 Activation Triggers Long-Term Synaptic
Depression in the Hippocampus via NADPH Oxidase. *Neuron* **82,** 195–207
(2014).

63.   Zhang, T., Garstka, M. A. & Li, K. The Controversial C5a Receptor C5aR2: Its
Role in Health and Disease. *Journal of Immunology Research,* **2017,** 1–16
(2017).

64.   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).

65.   Davoust, N., Jones, J., Stahel, P. F., Ames, R. S. & Barnum, S. R. Receptor
for the C3a anaphylatoxin is expressed by neurons and glial cells. *Glia* **26,**
201–211 (1999).

66. Morgan, B. P. & Gasque, P. Expression of complement in the brain: role in
health and disease. *Immunol. Today* **17,** 461–466 (1996).

67. Beek, J., Elward, K. & Gasque, P. Activation of Complement in the Central
Nervous System. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **992,** 56–71 (2003).

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

69. 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).

70. Holt, D. J. *et al.* Extinction Memory Is Impaired in Schizophrenia. *Biological*
Psychiatry **65,** 455–463 (2009).

71. Lissek, S. *et al.* Classical fear conditioning in the anxiety disorders: a meta-
analysis. *Behav Res Ther* **43,** 1391–1424 (2005).

72. Mikaelsson, M. A., ncia, 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).

73. Carter, R. J. *et al.* Characterization of Progressive Motor Deficits in Mice
Transgenic for the Human Huntington's Disease Mutation. *Journal of*
Neuroscience **19,** 3248–3257 (1999).

74. Kleiber, M. Body size and metabolism. *Hilgardia Journal of Agricultural*
Science, **6,** 315-353 (1932).

75. Dickmeis, T. Glucocorticoids and the circadian clock. *Journal of Endocrinology*
200, 3–22 (2008).

76. Wright, S. P. Adjusted p-values for simultaneous inference. *Biometrics* **48,**
1005–1013 (1992).

Methods

Animals. All animals were provided by B. Paul Morgan and Timothy R. Hughes of Cardiff University, UK. Wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ strains were originally sourced from The Jackson Laboratory (strain B6.PL-Thy1^a/CyJ stock #000406 and B6;129S4-C3tm1Crr/J stock #003641 respectively), whereas the $C3aR^{-/-}$ model was provided by Craig Gerard of Boston Children's Hospital, USA, as a collaboration via B. Paul Morgan and Timothy R. Hughes. $C3^{-/-}$ and $C3aR^{-/-}$ strains were maintained via homozygous breeding on a C57Bl/6J background.

Husbandry Male mice between 3-8 months of age were used in the experiments and were kept in littermate groups through the duration of study (2-5 mice per cage). Animals 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 at 07:00 hours/lights off at 19:00 hours). Home cages featured dust-free woodchip bedding and were environmentally enriched with cardboard tubes, soft wood blocks and nesting materials. Standard rodent laboratory chow and water were available *ad libitum*. All strains were kept in one room under the same housing conditions (conventional, open top caging) within a standard vivarium, although they were isolated from other mice to limit exposure to potential pathogens. All procedures were performed in accordance with the requirements of the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act (1986).

General behavioural methods. Testing took place between the hours of 09:00 and 17:00, with random distribution of testing for subjects of different genotypes throughout the day. Mice were habituated to the test rooms for 30 min prior to testing. Each of the test methods used involved individual testing of mice, hence apparatus was cleaned thoroughly with a 70% ethanol solution and antimicrobial cleanser (VetTech

Solutions Ltd UK) between subjects. Data for the EPM and EZM were collected using

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

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

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

the specific virtual zones of each piece of apparatus (see Figure 3 for EPM and Figure

4 for EZM). Tracking was calibrated for each piece of apparatus prior to testing using

mice of the same body size and fur colour as the experimental subjects.

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

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

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

sized enclosed arms, which had 150 mm high walls [72]. Equivalent arms were arranged

opposite one another (see Figure 3). Subjects were placed at the enclosed end of a

closed arm and allowed to freely explore for 5 min. Data from each pair of arms were

combined 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: number of stretch-attend postures (SAPs; defined as an animal

keeping its hindquarters in the closed arms but stretching forwards onto an open arm),

number of head dips from the open arms (looking over the edge of an open arm) and

time spent grooming.

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 (see

Figure 4). 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) and time spent grooming 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.

Assessment of 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

single mouse 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[73]. 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[74]. 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

8a). 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 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.

Pharmacological manipulations

For each drug treatment, separate groups of wildtype, *C3*$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ were used and were randomly assigned to either vehicle or drug conditions within each genotype.

Diazepam 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. A subset of mice receiving vehicle injections in the diazepam experiment were used for assaying plasma corticosterone (see below).

C3aR antagonist SB290157 Two dosing regimens were used to assess acute and chronic effects of SB290157[23] (N2-[2-(2,2-Diphenylethoxy)acetyl]-L-arginine trifluoroacetate salt; 10 mg/kg, i.p, Sigma Aldrich, UK) or equivalent volume of vehicle (0.1 M phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4, with 1% DMSO) on EPM behaviour. In the acute experiment, SB290157 or vehicle was administered 1 hour prior to testing on the EPM. In the chronic experiment, the drug or vehicle was injected twice daily for five days and subjects were tested on the EPM on the 6th day.

Corticosterone measurements in mice subjected to the EPM. Testing took place between the hours of 10:00 and 14:00 to account for the diurnal pattern of corticosterone release[75]. Mice were allowed to freely explore the EPM for 5 min, after which they were placed in a holding cage for a further 20 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 required. 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).

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

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

using the Brown-Forsythe test and then appropriate parametric (1-way or 2-way

ANOVA) or non-parametric (Kruskal-Wallis) tests used. The main between subjects'

factor for all 1-way ANOVA analyses was GENOTYPE (WT, $C3^{-/-}$, $C3aR^{-/-}$, or $C6^{-/-}$).

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 2-way ANOVA included an

additional between subject factor of CONDITION (baseline, EPM), and for the acute

and chronic diazepam experiments, there was an additional between subject factor of

DRUG (diazepam, vehicle). A between subject factor of TREATMENT (WT+vehicle,

WT+C3aRA and $C3aR^{-/-}$+vehicle) and within subject factor of ZONE (open, middle,

closed) was used to analyse the data from the C3aR antagonist experiment. *Post hoc*

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

or non-parametric analyses, respectively. Alpha values of <0.05 were regarded as

significant. Exact p values were reported unless p<0.0001. All p values were

multiplicity adjusted[76]. Data are expressed as mean + s.e.m.

Figures and legends

Figure 1. Overview of the complement system. The complement system consists

of over 30 circulating and cell-surface proteins, cell surface receptors and regulatory

proteins, which interact via a cascade of enzymatic activation, ultimately leading to the

destruction of pathogens and elimination of cellular debris. The classical pathway is

activated upon recognition of antibody-antigen complexes by the C1 complex,

whereas the lectin pathway is activated by recognition of carbohydrate residues on

pathogen surfaces. The alternative pathway is continually activated in a 'tick-over'

manner by spontaneous hydrolysis of the internal thioester within C3. Upon activation,

the three pathways lead to assembly of C3 convertases that can cleave the central

molecule C3, generating C3b and C3a activation products. C3a is an anaphylatoxin

that exerts pro and anti-inflammatory actions upon binding to its canonical receptor,

the G-protein coupled C3a Receptor (C3aR). The larger cleavage fragment, C3b, acts

as an opsonin which attracts phagocytic cells such as macrophages and microglia

when deposited on cell surfaces. C3b also contributes to assembly of the C5

convertase which subsequently cleaves C5, resulting in formation of cleavage

fragments C5a and C5b, the former of which is an anaphylatoxin that binds to the C5a

receptor (C5aR). C5b triggers the terminal complement pathway by binding proteins

C6 and C7, inducing conformational change that leads to recruitment of C8 and C9.

These molecules aggregate to form the membrane attack complex (MAC) which

embeds into the lipid bilayer to create a pore in the target cell membrane, resulting in

rapid lysis and cell death.

Figure 2. Schematic of knockout mouse models. C3 activation yields the cleavage

fragment C3a, which binds to its canonical receptor C3aR, a member of the GPCR

superfamily, characterised by seven transmembrane domains and a large second

extracellular loop. This signaling pathway is preserved in wildtype (WT) mice, whereas

homozygous *C3* knockout mice lack a functional C3 molecule. Therefore, C3 cannot

be cleaved by C3 convertase and thus complement cannot be activated beyond C3,

and C3a cannot be generated. While *C3*$^{-/-}$ mice have a functional C3aR, there is no

C3a present to bind the receptor. On the other hand, homozygous *C3aR* knockout

mice lack only the C3aR and therefore have a functional complement system other

than the ability for C3a to bind to C3aR.

Figure 3. *C3aR^-/-*, but not *C3^-/-* mice show increased anxiety-like behaviour in the elevated plus maze. (a) Heatmaps, displaying relative time per zone across genotypes, illustrate that *C3aR^-/-* mice spent less time exploring the open arms than

wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ mice. (**b**) $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice were slower to enter the anxiety-provoking open arms than wildtype mice (H_2=10.5, p=0.005) and spent significantly less time on the open arms per entry (**c**) than wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ mice ($F_{2,31}$=11.1, p=0.0002). (**d**) $C3aR^{-/-}$ 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 (*post hoc:* wildtype vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p<0.0001, $C3^{-/-}$ vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p<0.0001), and significantly more time in the closed arms (*post hoc:* wildtype vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ <0.0001, $C3^{-/-}$ vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p<0.0001). (**e**) $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice made fewer head dips over the edge of the open arms, a further measure of increased anxiety, than wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ mice, whereas $C3^{-/-}$ mice performed more head dips than wildtype and $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice ($F_{2,31}$=48.0, p<0.0001). (**f**) $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice performed significantly more SAPs than wildtype (p=0.0042) and $C3^{-/-}$ mice (p=0.0004) (**g**) $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice were less active in the EPM than wildtype and $C3^{-/-}$ mice, making significantly fewer entries to all of the zones of the maze (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,31}$=29.4, p<0.0001), however demonstrated a similar pattern to the other groups with increased transitions through the middle zone (main effect of ZONE, $F_{2,62}$=384.0, p<0.0001). (**h**) To demonstrate that the reduced activity in the EPM was task/situation specific, locomotor activity was measured in a separate non-anxiety provoking environment, over three days. There were no differences between wildtype, $C3aR^{-/-}$ and $C3^{-/-}$ mice in total activity in these sessions (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,31}$=0.344, p=0.712), and all mice demonstrated normal habituation to the test environment between sessions (main effect of DAY, $F_{2,62}$ =61.9, p<0.001). 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.

Figure 4. The elevated zero maze elicited anxiety-like behaviour in *C3aR⁻/⁻*, but not *C3⁻/⁻* mice. **(a)** Heatmaps, displaying relative exploration of the open segments across genotypes, illustrate that the *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice explored these regions less than *C3⁻/⁻* and wildtype mice. Note: due to the height of the walls in the closed regions it was not possible to track the mice or observe ethological behaviours such as grooming or SAPs. **(b)** *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice were slower than *C3⁻/⁻* and wildtype subjects to enter the open areas of the EZM (H_2=8.13, p=0.0171), but only reaching significance in comparison with the *C3⁻/⁻* mice (*post hoc* tests wildtype vs. *C3aR⁻/⁻*, p=0.2012 and *C3⁻/⁻* vs. *C3aR⁻/⁻* p=0.0140). **(c)** *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice made significantly fewer entries to the open areas ($F_{2,30}$=8.96, p=0.0009), spent less time on the open arms **(d)** throughout the 5 minute test than wildtype or *C3⁻/⁻* mice (H_2=19.2, p<0.0001) and less time per open arm visit **(e)** than *C3⁻/⁻* subjects ($F_{2,26}$=4.56, p=0.0201). **(f)** As in the EPM, *C3⁻/⁻* mice performed more head dips than wildtype or *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice ($F_{2,27}$=6.86,p=0.0039).

Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, ***, and **** represent p$\leq$0.05, p$\leq$0.01, p$\leq$0.001and

p$\leq$0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

Figure 5. Altered sensitivity to diazepam in *C3aR*^{-/-} and *C3*^{-/-} mice. A separate cohort of 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)** Across genotypes, diazepam treatment significantly

increased latency to first open arm visit compared to vehicle treated animals (main

effect of DRUG, $F_{1,73}=23.6$, $p<0.0001$). As previously, $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice took significantly

longer than other groups to initially enter the open arm (main effect of GENOTYPE,

$F_{2,69}=10.6$, $p<0.0001$). **(c)** Plots showing duration spent on open arms in 1-minute time

bins (start-01:00 excluded due to initial effect of diazepam in delaying initial entry to

open arms). There was a trend for wildtype diazepam treated animals to spend more

time on the open arms throughout the task 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, $F_{1,19}=1.55$, $p=0.2284$) **(d)**

There were genotype differences in SAPs (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,79}=10.7$,

$p<0.0001$) and a main effect of DRUG ($F_{1,79}=4.13$, $p=0.0454$). Diazepam significantly

reduced the number of SAPs in wildtype mice only (GENOTYPE $\times$ DRUG interaction,

$F_{2,79}=4.64$, $p=0.0138$, *post hoc* tests wildtype vehicle vs. wildtype diazepam

$p=0.0006$). There were also genotype differences in distance moved around the maze

(e) (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,79}=32.1$, $p<0.0001$) and a GENOTYPE $\times$ DRUG

interaction approaching significance ($F_{2,79}=2.85$, $p=0.0640$). Diazepam treatment

significantly reduced distance moved in $C3^{-/-}$ mice only (*post hoc* $C3^{-/-}$ vehicle vs. $C3^{-/-}$

diazepam $p=0.0006$). Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, and *** represent $p\leq0.05$, $p\leq0.01$

and $p\leq0.001$ for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

Figure 6. Elevated corticosterone response to the elevated plus maze in *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice. Corticosterone was measured in plasma, using sandwich ELISA, from previously behaviourally naïve mice that were either tested on the EPM for 5 minutes and culled 30 minutes later, or were culled swiftly after being removed from their home cage (baseline group). Exposure to the EPM significantly elevated corticosterone in all genotypes (main effect of CONDITION, $F_{1,54}$=143, p<0.0001), but was more pronounced in *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice (GENOTYPE $\times$ CONDITION interaction, $F_{2,54}$=4.64, p=0.0138). *Post hoc* analysis showed that in the EPM condition, *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice demonstrated significantly higher corticosterone levels than wildtype (p=0.0127) and *C3⁻/⁻* mice (p=0.0032). *Post hoc* tests also indicated that there were no baseline differences between the groups of mice (wildtype and *C3aR⁻/⁻* p>0.9999, wildtype and *C3⁻/⁻* p=0.9927, and *C3⁻/⁻* and *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice p=0.9992). Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, and **** represent p≤0.05, p≤0.01 and p≤0.00)1 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

Figure 7. Pharmacological C3aR blockade in wild types does not recapitulate *C3aR⁻/⁻* phenotypes in the elevated plus maze. (a) Heatmaps demonstrating a further replication of the previously shown anxiety phenotype in *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice but no effect of chronic administration of the C3aR antagonist (C3aRA; SB290157, i.p. 10mg/kg, twice daily for five days) in wildtype mice (Note: *C3aR⁻/⁻* mice received vehicle injections). **(b)** There was a trend for greater latencies to first open arm visit

in $C3aR^{-/-}$ ($F_{2,18}$=2.73, p=0.0923). **(c)** $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice spent significantly less time on the open arms per entry than wildtype-vehicle and wildtype-C3aRA treated mice ($F_{2,18}$=13.4, p=0.0003) **(d)** $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice again distributed their time across the EPM differently to wildtype-vehicle and wildtype-C3aRA (GENOTYPE×ZONE, $F_{4,54}$=5.67, p=0.0007) spending less time in the open arms (*post hoc:* wildtype-vehicle vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p=0.0157, wildtype-C3aRA vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p=0.0007), and significantly more time in the closed arms than wildtype-C3aRA mice (*post hoc:* wildtype-C3aRA vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p=0.0363, wildtype-vehicle vs. $C3aR^{-/-}$ p=0.1667). $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice made fewer head dips **(e)** ($F_{2,18}$=13.4, P = 0.0003) and displayed more SAPs **(f)** ($F_{2,18}$=8.50, P = 0.0025) than wildtype-vehicle and wildtype-C3aRA treated mice. **(g)** There was a significant GROUP×ZONE interaction, ($F_{4,36}$=3.35, p=0.0199) which demonstrated that $C3aR^{-/-}$ mice made fewer entries to the open arm than wildtype-C3aRA mice (p=0.456). They also made fewer entries to the middle region than wildtype-C3aRA mice (p=0.0012). For all measures, there were no significant differences between wildtype-vehicle and wildtype-C3aRA mice. 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.

Figure 8. Enhanced fear-potentiated startle in *C3*^{-/-} but not *C3aR*^{-/-} 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 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[74], and fold-changes calculated. **(b)** Both *C3*^{-/-} and *C3aR*^{-/-} mice demonstrated increased levels of startle responding relative to wildtype mice at all pulse intensities

(main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,66}=9.04$, p=0.0003), although this was greatest at 100dB and 110dB (GENOTYPE $\times$ STIMULUS INTENSITY interaction, $F_{4,132}=7.55$, p<0.0001). **(c)** *C3*$^{-/-}$ and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ mice also showed increased startle responding to the footshock+CS pairings relative to wildtype mice ($F_{2,66}=8.7$, 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 relative to wildtype and *C3aR*$^{-/-}$ subjects ($H_2=27.7$, p<0.0001). Data are mean + S.E.M. *, **, *** and **** represent p$\leq$0.05, p$\leq$0.01, p$\leq$0.001 and p$\leq$0.0001 for *post-hoc* genotype comparisons, respectively.

Figure 9. Enhanced fear-potentiated startle in *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* but not *C6⁻ᐟ⁻* mice. Using the same FPS protocol as before (Figure 9), a separate cohort of wildtype and *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* mice were assessed in comparison with a group of *C6⁻ᐟ⁻* mice. **(a)** *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* mice demonstrated elevated startle responding relative to wildtype, as shown previously, and also *C6⁻ᐟ⁻* mice at all pulse-alone intensities used (main effect of GENOTYPE, $F_{2,20}=5.87$, p=0.0098). **(b)** Although not significant, *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* mice also demonstrated a trend towards greater startle reactivity to the footshock+CS pairings during the conditioning phase of training ($H_2=4.66$, p=0.0971). **(c)** Post-conditioning, *C3⁻ᐟ⁻* mice showed the greatest fold change in startle responding between pulse-alone stimuli and pulse+CS stimuli, which was significantly greater than that shown by wildtype and *C6⁻ᐟ⁻* mice ($F_{2,29}=8.08$, p=0.0016). In each of phase of this experiment, there were no differences in responding between *C6⁻ᐟ⁻* and wildtype mice. 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.