Title: Pairing-dependent plasticity in a dissected fly brain is input-specific and requires synaptic CaMKII enrichment and nighttime sleep

Abbreviated title: Associative memory formation in a dish

Mohamed Adel, Nannan Chen, Yunpeng Zhang, Martha L. Reed, Christina Quasney, and Leslie C. Griffith

Department of Biology and Volen National Center for Complex Systems, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02454-9110, USA

Corresponding author:

Leslie C. Griffith

Dept. of Biology MS008

Brandeis University

415 South St.

Waltham, MA 02454-9110

Tel: 781 736 3125

FAX: 781 736 3107

Email: griffith@brandeis.edu

Number of Pages: 42 pages

Number of Figures: 7 Figures

Abstract: 245 words

Introduction: 650 words

Discussion: 1151 words

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Acknowledgments: This work was funded by NIH R01 MH067284 to LCG. Stocks obtained from the Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center (NIH P40OD018537) were used in this study. The authors thank Dr. Kohei Ueno (Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Medical Science) for support, encouragement, and excellent advice during the development of this project.

Abstract

In *Drosophila*, *in vivo* functional imaging studies revealed that associative memory formation is coupled to a cascade of neural plasticity events in distinct compartments of the mushroom body (MB). In-depth investigation of the circuit dynamics, however, will require an *ex vivo* model that faithfully mirrors these events to allow direct manipulations of circuit elements that are inaccessible in the intact fly. The current *ex vivo* models have been able to reproduce the fundamental plasticity of aversive short-term memory, a potentiation of the MB intrinsic neurons (Kenyon cells; KCs) responses after artificial learning *ex vivo*. However, this potentiation showed different localization and encoding properties from those reported *in vivo* and failed to generate the previously reported suppression plasticity in the mushroom body output neurons (MBONs). Here, we develop an *ex vivo* model that recapitulates behaviorally evoked plasticity in the KCs and MBONs. We demonstrate that this plasticity accurately localizes to the MB α '3 compartment and is encoded by a coincidence between KCs activation and dopaminergic input. The formed plasticity is input-specific, requiring pairing of the conditioned stimulus (CS) and unconditioned stimulus (US) pathways; hence we name it pairing-dependent plasticity (PDP). PDP formation requires an intact *CaMKII* gene and is blocked by previous-night sleep deprivation but is rescued by rebound sleep. In conclusion, we show that our *ex vivo* preparation recapitulates behavioral and imaging results from intact animals and can provide new insights into mechanisms of memory formation at the level of molecules, circuits, and brain state.

Significance Statement

The mammalian *ex vivo* LTP model enabled in-depth investigation of the hippocampal memory circuit. We develop a parallel model to study the *Drosophila* mushroom body (MB) memory circuit. Pairing activation of the conditioned stimulus and unconditioned stimulus pathways in dissected brains induces a potentiation pairing-dependent plasticity (PDP) in the axons of $\alpha'\beta'$ Kenyon cells and a suppression PDP in the dendrites of their postsynaptic MB output neurons, localized in the MB $\alpha'3$ compartment. This PDP is input-specific and requires the 3' untranslated region of *CaMKII*. Interestingly, *ex vivo* PDP carries information about the animal's experience before dissection; brains from sleep deprived animals fail to form PDP while those from animals who recovered 2 hours of their lost sleep form PDP.

Introduction

A neutral experience (conditioned stimulus or CS) can be remembered as positive or negative if closely followed by rewarding or punishing reinforcement (unconditioned stimulus or US). The ability to form this type of “associative” memory is phylogenetically conserved; *Drosophila* form robust associative memories (Tully and Quinn, 1985), most of which are encoded and stored in the mushroom body (MB) (de Belle and Heisenberg, 1994). The MB is a higher brain structure made of 15 distinct compartments. Each compartment is built on a scaffold of axons of one of the three main types of Kenyon cells (KCs; $\alpha\beta$, $\alpha'\beta'$, and γ). The KCs connect to mushroom body output neurons (MBONs) which project out of the MB to bias behavior (Aso et al., 2014a; Aso et al., 2014b; Li et al., 2020). The KC→MBON synapses are modulated by dopaminergic neurons.

During aversive olfactory associative learning, an odor (the CS) activates a sparse group of KCs, such that this odor identity is represented across all MB compartments (Turner et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2014). Simultaneously, dopaminergic neurons from the protocerebral posterior lateral (PPL1) cluster are activated by the US, encoding negative prediction errors in MB compartments (Riemensperger et al., 2005; Schroll et al., 2006; Claridge-Chang et al., 2009; Mao and Davis, 2009; Aso et al., 2012). When a coincidence occurs between the KCs activation and the dopaminergic signal within a compartment, the KC→MBON synapses in that compartment are depressed, biasing the circuit output to aversion (Sejourne et al., 2011; Cohn et al., 2015; Hige et al., 2015; Oswald et al., 2015; Oswald and Waddell, 2015).

Many studies have investigated the properties of this circuitry using *in vivo* calcium imaging in intact animals (for review, see Adel and Griffith, 2021). In contrast, explanted brains have been used mostly for establishing connectivity between neurons or interrogating a specific biochemical pathway; only a few studies have attempted to understand memory circuit logic *ex vivo* (Wang et al., 2008; Ueno et al., 2013; 17; Suzuki-Sawano et al., 2017). In the best-developed paradigm, Ueno et al., 2013 observed a potentiation of KC responses in the tips of the MB vertical lobes which they termed “long-term enhancement” (LTE). This paradigm laid the groundwork for developing *ex vivo* models of this circuit, but there were major differences between LTE and associative memory observed in intact animals. The most significant were that the plasticity was not specific to the $\alpha'\beta'$ KCs and that dopamine release by the US was not observed; it was only seen after CS+US coincidence (Ueno et al., 2013; 2017).

In this study, we establish an *ex vivo* paradigm that resolves these discrepancies and exhibits the cardinal features of associative learning. We show that pairing odor and punishment pathway activation in dissected brains results in a localized potentiation of the $\alpha'\beta'$ KCs and suppression of their postsynaptic MBONs in the MB $\alpha'3$ compartment. Because both KC potentiation and MBON suppression are strictly dependent on temporal coincidence of the CS and US, we term this paradigm “pairing-dependent plasticity” (PDP). We show that like the CS-specificity of associative memories, PDP is specific to the subset of odor-representing projection neurons activated during the artificial training. We also provide evidence that dopamine is released by activation of the US pathway and does not require CS+US coincidence.

This *ex vivo* paradigm can be used for obtaining new mechanistic insight into memory formation at the molecular and circuit levels. We present data indicating that the 3'UTR of the *CaMKII* gene is critical for STM formation and that the primacy of α' compartment plasticity in learning is due to differences in input/response relationships between α and α' . Finally, we demonstrate that the ability of the *ex vivo* brain to be plastic can be influenced by prior *in vivo* experience, as we report that brains of sleep-deprived flies fail to form PDP, but as little as 2 hours of recovery sleep rescues this learning impairment.

Materials and Methods

Fly husbandry. All fly stocks were cultured on standard food at room temperature. Experimental flies were kept at 25°C and 70% relative humidity on a 12 hours light, 12 hours dark period. Fly lines used in this study include *VT030559-GAL4*, *MB027B split-GAL4* (Aso et al., 2014a), *GH146-GAL4*, *UAS-GCaMP6f*, *20x UAS-GCaMP6f*, *UAS-jRCaMP1a*, *LexAop-P2X₂*. *TH-lexA* was gifted to us from the Davis lab (Berry et al., 2015) and *UAS-GRAB^{DA2m}* was gifted from the Li lab (Sun et al., 2020). *CaMKII^{UDeI}* flies are described in (Chen et al., 2021).

Ex vivo imaging and electrical stimulations. Brains from 4-8 days old female flies were dissected in ice cold HL3 medium (NaCl, 70 mM; sucrose, 115 mM; KCl, 5 mM; MgCl₂, 20 mM; CaCl₂, 1.8 mM; NaHCO₃, 10 mM; trehalose, 5 mM; Hepes, 5 mM; osmolarity: 395.4 mOsm; pH 7.3) (Stewart et al., 1994). Brains were then transferred to an imaging chamber containing fresh HL3 saline and immobilized using tungsten pins

over the optic lobes. In the case of AL + AFV induction experiment, the brain was dissected with the ventral nerve cord attached. The ventral nerve cord was then cut using sharp scissors near its base, leaving one end of the AFV free. Glass suction microelectrodes were used to apply the electrical stimulation to either the AL or the AFV. Brains were always perfused with fresh saline throughout the experiment with a flow rate of ~2 drops per second.

In pre-induction and post-induction AL stimulations, 5 trains of 20 pulses at 100Hz were applied. Pulse width is 1 millisecond and inter-pulse interval is 9 milliseconds. Inter-train interval is 15 seconds. Stimulation strength is 100 (low input stimulation) or 200 (high input stimulation) μ Amps. During induction, 12 AL stimulation trains were applied with 5 seconds inter-train interval. AFV stimulation was similar to AL stimulation, but AFV stimulation strength was adjusted to be above the threshold of KCs responses; it varied between 500 to 1000 μ Amps. The diameter of the AFV stimulation electrode was large enough to suck in the free end of the AFV. Regarding the AL electrode size, we noticed a relationship between the diameter of the AL electrode tip and the input current such that applying a 100 μ Amps input stimulation via a large electrode tip diameter has a similar effect on baseline KCs calcium responses and on the resultant plasticity as applying a 200 μ Amps via a small electrode tip diameter. For example, with a 100 μ Amps input stimulation, PDP can be formed in the MB $\alpha 3$ compartment if the diameter of the AL electrode is significantly enlarged. Therefore, to minimize variability within the same dataset, all electrodes used in any experiment in this study were made at the same time using a p-97 micropipette puller (Sutter

Instruments) before data collection. To minimize variability across the different experiments, we kept the AL electrode size approximately one fourth of the AL size.

Images were captured using an ORCA Flash4.0 V3 sCMOS camera at 200 frames per second (except in the MBON imaging experiment using *MB027B split-GAL4>20x-UAS-GCaMP6f*, frame rate was reduced to 2 frames per second) with a 40x water immersion lens on an Olympus upright microscope BX50W1. Images were collected as 512x512 resolution and a binning factor of 2x2. Imaging was done using the HCLImage Live software. Excitation of the used florescent sensors was done using the CoolLED pE-4000 LED source. For GCaMP and GRAB_{DA2m}, the 470 nm LED channel was used with an excitation filter Chroma 450/50 and emission filter FF01-525/45-25. jRCaMP excitation was done using the 550 nm LED channel and the excitation filter FF01-530/43-25 and an emission filter FF01-607/36-25. Calcium traces at every frame were calculated as $\Delta F/F_0 = (F - F_0)/F_0$ where F is the florescence value at a given frame and F_0 is the florescence value at baseline. Peak response to a stimulation was calculated by subtracting the average $\Delta F/F_0$ during the last second before a stimulation from the peak $\Delta F/F_0$ during stimulation. The responses to AL stimulations before and 15 minutes after induction were averaged to calculate the pre and post responses, respectively. PDP values or $\Delta F/F$ relative change was calculated as (post-pre)/pre.

The isolated pulse stimulator model 2100 and the perfusion system ValveLink 8.2 were triggered using a custom program written and controlled by the pClamp 11 software and the Digidata1550A digitizer.

Behavioral experiments. Aversive learning experiments were performed in an environmental room in red light at 25°C with 65% humidity. Flies were between 4-14 days old. Flies were given at least 10 minutes acclimation period in room before training or testing. Data for each experiment was pooled from at least 3 independent experimental days. The learning assays were performed as described by the Quinn lab (Tully and Quinn, 1985). The US was provided as 12 1-second 90- or 60-volts shocks during the 1-min CS-US pairing. 10% 4-methylcyclohexanol (MCH) and 3-octanol OCT were used as the CS odors. Flies were then given a 2-minute rest. Testing involved 2 minutes of simultaneous exposure to CS odors, after which flies choosing either odor were counted. A performance index (PI) was calculated for each trial as (number of flies choosing the conditioned odor) - (number of flies choosing the not-conditioned odor) / (total number of flies). This PI was averaged between reciprocal trials where one of the odors was conditioned in one trial and the other odor was conditioned in the other to calculate the Learning Index (LI). To confirm the *CaMKII^{UDeI}* flies sensitivity to electric shock, 2-minute preference tests were performed during which flies chose between a stimulus vial (24 spaced 1-s 90 V shocks) and a neutral vial.

Sleep Assay. Sleep deprivation was done in 25°C incubators on a 12 h light, 12 h dark cycles. Flies were individually loaded into glass sleep tubes containing a food mixture of 5% sucrose and 2% agar. Drosophila Activity monitors (DAM) system (TriKinetics, Waltham) was used to measure sleep. Sleep was defined as inactivity bouts of 5 or more minutes (Hendricks et al., 2000; Shaw et al., 2000). Flies were sleep deprived by turning on the shaker between ZT12-ZT24. DAM data was analyzed using a custom MATLAB program (Donelson et al., 2012).

Immunostaining. Adult fly brains were dissected in cold Schneider's Insect Medium (Sigma, S0146), and then fixed in 4% PFA solution for 30 mins at room temperature. Fixed brains were washed 3x30 mins in 0.5% Triton-PBS (PBST) solution, blocked in 10% normal goat serum solution for 1 hour, and incubated in mouse anti-CaMKII antibody (1:10,000, Cosmo) for 3 days. CaMKII antibody solutions were removed, and samples washed in PBST solution for 3x30 mins. Samples were then incubated in Alexa Fluor 633 anti-mouse antibody (Invitrogen) overnight, then washed 3x30 mins in PBST solution and mounted in the Vectashield mounting medium. Images were taken under a 20x objective lens with the same settings using a Leica SP5 confocal microscope. The images were analyzed by ImageJ software. For the intensity of MB regions, the middle slices were selected as the representative pictures, and mean intensity of all MB lobes were quantified.

Immunoblotting. 100 5 day old *Canton-S* wildtype (WT) and *CaMKII^{UDeI}* flies were frozen on dry ice and vortexed to remove heads. Fly heads were separated from the fly bodies using a sieve. The heads were then homogenized in loading buffer (4X Bolt LDS, Invitrogen, Novex with 5% β -mercaptoethanol added) and heated for 10 min. Proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE (Bolt, Bis-Tris Protein Gels, Invitrogen) and transferred to a nitrocellulose membrane (GE Healthcare). Membrane was blocked (Blocking Buffer for Fluorescent Western Blotting, Rockland Immunochemicals) and then incubated with Anti-dCaMKII Clone 18 (1:1000, CosmoBio) and anti-actin mAb C4 (1:1000, Millipore). The secondary antibody used was, DyLight 680 mouse. Membrane was imaged using ChemiDoc system from Bio-Rad. Intensity of bands was calculated

using Adj. Volume (Int) within the ImageLab 6.0 software. Intensity of the CaMKII band was normalized to that of actin in the same lane.

Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis. Female flies were used in all imaging experiments due to their larger size. Both males and females aged 4 to 8 days were used in other experiments unless noted otherwise. All statistical analyses were performed in Prism 9 software. All tests were two tailed and confidence levels were set at $\alpha = 0.05$. Parametric tests were used for all experiments except the immunoblotting experiment where non-parametric tests were used. The statistical tests, p-values, and sample size for each experiment are listed in figure legends.

Results

Artificial aversive training induces a potentiation PDP in KCs

Previous studies had demonstrated that enhanced calcium responses similar to those reported in the MB *in vivo* after aversive training can be achieved in dissected brains (Wang et al., 2008; Tomchik and Davis, 2009; Ueno et al., 2013). To investigate whether this plasticity recapitulates the formation of aversive memory, and to optimize our protocol, we dissected the central nervous system (brain with attached ventral nerve cord) of 4-8 days old mated female flies expressing the Ca^{2+} indicator GCaMP6f in the MBs using the KCs driver (*VT030559-GAL4*). Dissected brains were pinned in an imaging bath chamber and the cervical connective towards the base of the ventral nerve cord was cut to allow electrical stimulation of the ascending fibers of the ventral nerve cord (AFV) connecting the ventral nerve cord to the brain (Figure 1A). We used glass

suction electrodes to stimulate the antennal lobe projection neurons and the AFV to activate the odor pathway and the electric shock pathway, respectively (Figure 1B). Given that *in vivo* aversive STM formation is correlated with enhanced calcium responses in the $\alpha'3$ MB compartment but not in the $\alpha3$ compartment (Krashes et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2008; Cervantes-Sandoval et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2019), we decided to focus our calcium imaging on these two regions (Figure 1C). We found that both $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha3$ compartments respond only to ipsilateral AL stimulation, but AFV stimulation generated a calcium response in both compartments of both MBs. Therefore, we imaged the MB ipsilateral to the stimulated AL.

To induce the formation of an aversive STM trace, we paired 12 trains of stimulation of both the AL electrode and the AFV electrode, thus activating the CS and the US pathways at the same time (paired induction). As controls, we repeated the same induction paradigm but separated the AL stimulation from the AFV stimulation by 30 seconds (unpaired induction) or omitted the AFV stimulation (AL alone induction) or omitted the AL stimulation (AFV alone induction) or simply allowed the brain to rest for 15 mins (no induction). We compared the change in calcium response to AL stimulation before induction and 15 mins post induction (Figure 1D). We predicted that if this *ex vivo* model truly recapitulated short-term aversive training, only the paired induction should produce an enhancement of the calcium responses in the $\alpha'3$ and none of the stimuli should potentiate $\alpha3$ (Krashes et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2008; Davis, 2011; Cervantes-Sandoval et al., 2013). Indeed, this was the result we obtained (Figure 1E,F). Interestingly, we noticed that the repetitive unpaired activation of KCs results in suppression of their calcium responses (Figure 1F). This is reminiscent of

desensitization or habituation; a non-associative plasticity/memory described as a decrement in neural responses to uninteresting, frequently-encountered stimuli whose predictive value is negligible (Wilson and Linster, 2008; Wilson, 2009). These non-associative processes have been documented in insects (Cho et al., 2004; Das et al., 2011; Semelidou et al., 2018), rodents (Wilson, 1998; Best and Wilson, 2004), and humans (Ferdenzi et al., 2014; Pellegrino et al., 2017).

Dopamine replaces the artificial US stimulus but does not replace the CS

Multiple behavioral and *in vivo* imaging studies have shown that dopaminergic neurons encode the US valence information in the MB, with PPL1s providing aversive reinforcement and PAMs providing appetitive reinforcement (Schwaerzel et al., 2003; Riemensperger et al., 2005; Schroll et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2007; Claridge-Chang et al., 2009; Mao and Davis, 2009; Aso et al., 2010; Aso et al., 2012; Pech et al., 2013; Aso et al., 2014b; Yamagata et al., 2016; Handler et al., 2019). These studies suggest that the US alone is sufficient to evoke dopamine release. However, mechanistic studies employing the LTE paradigm reported no dopamine release after US pathway stimulation alone. Strong dopamine release was only seen after coincident activation of both the CS and the US pathways, and it was concluded that dopamine release is downstream of the CS+US coincidence and does not encode the primary US information (Ueno et al., 2017; Ueno et al., 2020). To directly address this discrepancy, we expressed a G-protein-coupled receptor-activation-based dopamine sensor (*GRAB_{DA}*) (Sun et al., 2020) in the KCs. We then dissected the fly's central nervous system and activated the US pathway by stimulating the AFV. We also expressed the calcium indicator jRCaMP1a in the KCs to use as a reference for the strength of

activation (Figure 2A,B). We observed a robust dopamine release in the $\alpha'3$ and a much weaker release onto the $\alpha3$ compartment in response to the same AFV stimulation used in our induction experiments (Figure 2C,D). This result shows that dopamine release occurs in response to the US stimulus alone and does not require CS+US coincidence.

We next asked if dopamine perfusion can replace electrical stimulation of the AFV. We paired electrical stimulation of the AL with perfusion of different concentrations (1, 5 and 10 μ M) dopamine and analyzed the KC response to AL stimulation before and after the pairing (Figure 2E,F). Similar to the plasticity seen after AL+AFV induction, we found that only the paired AL+ DA (5 or 10 μ M) induction induced an enhancement PDP in the $\alpha'3$; pairing with 1 μ M DA was not sufficient to induce PDP (Figure 2G). Also, in agreement with our observation that dopamine release in $\alpha3$ was very weak compared to the $\alpha'3$ compartment upon AFV stimulation, our protocol did not induce *ex vivo* PDP in the $\alpha3$ compartment (Figure 2G). We also found that PDP (induced by AL + 10 μ M DA) lasts for at least one hour after induction (Figure 2H).

Although these results supported a PDP model with direct dopamine modulation of KCs, we were concerned with the lack of synaptic specificity in the AL+DA induction, as dopamine was perfused onto the whole preparation. To address this concern, we repeated the experiment but replaced dopamine perfusion with activation of the dopaminergic neurons in the PPL1 cluster, which carry the negative valence US information to the MB (Schroll et al., 2006; Claridge-Chang et al., 2009; Mao and Davis, 2009; Aso et al., 2010; Aso et al., 2012; Burke et al., 2012; Aso and Rubin, 2016). We expressed the ATP-gated channel *P2X₂* (Yao et al., 2012) in the PPL1 dopaminergic

cluster using the *TH-LexA* driver. We paired AL stimulation with application of 2.5 mM ATP to activate PPL1s (Figure 2J). Again, we observed an enhancement PDP in the α' 3 but not in the α 3 compartment (Figure 2K).

Taken together, our findings agree with previous behavioral studies and *in vivo* imaging studies and show that dopamine is released in response to the US alone and carries US valence information to the MB to allow associative learning. Potentiation PDP induced in our *ex vivo* paradigm also localizes to α' cells only, congruent with the memory traces reported *in vivo* with aversive short-term memory.

PDP *ex vivo* plasticity is input specific

Associative memory is CS-specific. A fly that is aversively trained against an odor shows aversive behavior to that odor and closely similar odors only, but does not generalize the aversion to all odors (Barth et al., 2014). Olfactory information is sparsely transmitted to KC dendrites, with the identity of the odor being determined by population coding (Marin et al., 2002; Perez-Orive et al., 2002; Wong et al., 2002; Murthy et al., 2008; Turner et al., 2008; Honegger et al., 2011). To mimic the application of 2 different odors to the fly brain, we placed two suction glass electrodes onto the same antennal lobe and spaced them as far as possible from each other to maximize the probability that each electrode stimulates a distinct subset of projection neurons. Theoretically, a certain degree of overlap between the two subsets could be allowed as long as the two activated populations are sufficiently distinct. To test if the two electrodes activated distinct populations of projection neurons, we expressed the calcium indicator (GCaMP6f) in the projection neurons and divided the antennal lobe into multiple regions

of interest asking if the pattern of responses were equivalent for the two electrodes (Figure 3-1 A,B in extended data). We found that spacing resulted in activation of distinct populations of projection neurons, allowing us to provide two hypothetical odors to the MB (Figure 3-1 C,D in extended data).

We then asked whether the observed *ex vivo* PDP is specific to the olfactory input activated during induction. To challenge the olfactory-input specificity of our preparation even more, we used the less specific induction method, AL+DA, in which dopamine is impartially perfused to the whole brain to eliminate any specificity on the US pathway side (Figure 3A). We recorded KC calcium responses to both electrode stimulations before induction (pre). Then, we delivered a train of stimulations through electrode #1, followed by a train of stimulations through electrode #2. Dopamine perfusion started 5 seconds before the stimulation train for only one of the two electrodes (paired) and stopped at the last pulse of the train, while normal HL3 saline was perfused during the activation of the other electrode (unpaired). We then allowed the brain to rest for 15 mins and tested the KC response to electrode #2 first then to electrode #1 to eliminate any bias due to the order of stimulation (Figure 3B). An increased calcium response was observed in $\alpha'3$ after activation of the paired subset compared to the unpaired one (Figure 3C,D). This result demonstrates that even with the broader bath-dopamine induction paradigm, the plasticity achieved in our paradigm is specific to the CS input activated during *ex vivo* training.

Artificial aversive training induces a suppression PDP in $\alpha'3$ MBONs

While the α' branches of the KCs are potentiated in response to an aversively trained odor in intact animals, responses in their postsynaptic MBONs are suppressed (Sejourne et al., 2011; Oswald et al., 2015; Oswald and Waddell, 2015; Zhang et al., 2019). To eliminate the possibility that our paradigm potentiates memory-relevant KCs via a memory-irrelevant epiphenomenon, we needed to demonstrate that our *ex vivo* training could produce a suppression PDP in MBONs. Therefore, we repeated the same AL+DA induction described previously (Figure 2F), but this time we expressed *20xGCaMP6f* with the *MB027b split-GAL4* driver to examine the responses in the $\alpha'3$ MBONs (MBON- $\alpha'3ap$ and MBON- $\alpha'3m$) (Tanaka et al., 2008; Sejourne et al., 2011; Aso et al., 2014a) (Figure 4A). We found that the $\alpha'3$ MBON response to AL stimulation is suppressed after our artificial learning paradigm (Figure 4 B,C), agreeing with *in vivo* results. These findings show that both the enhancement and suppression PDPs achieved in our paradigm are learning-specific and are encoded as enhancement in the presynaptic KCs and a suppression in the postsynaptic MBONs.

The 3'UTR mRNA of *CaMKII* is important for *ex vivo* PDP

We next turned our attention to exploring the utility of this paradigm for understanding memory formation, choosing problems at several different levels of analysis: molecular components of the memory machinery, organizational principles of the circuitry and the role of brain state in gating plasticity. At the molecular level, previous studies have demonstrated that CaMKII is important for synaptic plasticity and memory formation in many species (Kelleher et al., 2004; Giese and Mizuno, 2013) including *Drosophila melanogaster* (Griffith et al., 1993; Koh et al., 1999; Ashraf et al., 2006; Malik et al., 2013; Mitchell et al., 2021). Recently, we found that the long 3'UTR

region of *CaMKII* mRNA is responsible for the activity-dependent synthesis of CaMKII in presynaptic terminals at the larval neuromuscular junction (Kuklin et al., 2017) and for the basal accumulation of axonal CaMKII protein in MB (Chen et al., 2021). We hypothesized that the loss of the 3'UTR would impair associative plasticity by decreasing synaptic CaMKII protein levels and disrupting the signaling machinery that is triggered by the CS+US coincidence. We tested this idea and used our *ex vivo* PDP preparation to gain insight into whether this effect is upstream or downstream of the CS+US coincidence.

First, we asked if loss of the 3'UTR of *CaMKII* mRNA affects CaMKII levels. We used animals in which the *CaMKII* gene was engineered using CRISPR/Cas9 to lack the 3'UTR (*CaMKII^{Udel}*, Chen et al., 2021) (Figure 5A). Immunostaining to quantify CaMKII protein levels in the MB neuropil in both wildtype and *CaMKII^{Udel}* showed that CaMKII levels are specifically decreased in synaptic regions (Figure 5B,C). We also used western blotting to quantify total CaMKII levels and found a substantial decrease, normalized to actin, in *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies compared to wildtype (Figure 5-1A,B in extended data). This is in agreement with a previous study which found that mice expressing a mutant form of *CaMKII* lacking the 3'UTR show decreased levels of *CaMKII* mRNA in the dendritic, but not the somatic, region of hippocampal neurons (Miller et al., 2002).

We then tested the impact of the 3'UTR deletion on aversive STM. We found that *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies showed a significant impairment in immediate memory performance compared to wildtype flies (Figure 5D). This impairment was not due to sensorimotor dysfunctionalities as both wildtype and *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies respond to electric shock and odor (Figure 5-1C in extended data). We then tested the effect of the *CaMKII* mRNA

3'UTR deletion on potentiation PDP in KCs. We used the previously described AL+DA induction protocol and examined KC responses to AL stimulation both before and 15 mins after either paired or unpaired induction. In the α '3 compartment, although both wildtype and *CaMKII^{UDeI}* genotypes showed statistically significant PDP relative to the unpaired induction, the PDP in the wildtype flies was more than 5 times stronger than in the *CaMKII^{UDeI}* flies (Figure 5E). We also noticed that the change in signal in the α 3 compartment in wildtype flies after paired induction was statistically different from the unpaired induction. However, this does not translate into formation of PDP in that compartment as this change was not different from zero (one-sample t-test, p-value 0.947). This is likely due to a technical difference as the AL input stimulation in this experiment was stronger (200 μ Amps vs. 100 μ Amp in previous experiments) which led to a stronger suppression after the unpaired AL stimulation in the unpaired induction (see also below). These results show that the 3'UTR mRNA of *CaMKII* is important for memory and its loss impairs learning-induced plasticity. It also indicates that the effect on the learning circuit is downstream of the CS+US coincidence and does not block the CS+US coincidence detection machinery itself.

Stronger inputs to the MB can recruit the α 3 compartment into the short-term memory circuit

At the circuit level, it has been hypothesized that memory in flies, like humans (McClelland et al., 1995; Dudai, 2012), undergoes systems consolidation: initial potentiation of the α ' β ' lobes with a time-dependent transfer of potentiation to α β . The MB α '3 and α 3 compartments are adjacent to each other. Both respond to odor (Turner et al., 2008) and AL stimulation (Figure 6B), and both use the same coincidence

detector, *rutabaga* (Livingstone et al., 1984; Levin et al., 1992; Mao et al., 2004; Gervasi et al., 2010). This raises the question of how the two compartments are able to play different roles in the memory circuit and why only the $\alpha'\beta'$ cells show immediate PDP both *ex vivo* and *in vivo*. To determine if this might be due to differences in the intrinsic properties of the two classes of cells, we examined the basal responses of both compartments to a ramp of AL stimulations without any pairings (Figure 6A). We found that $\alpha'3$ axons are recruited first, with very weak AL stimulation, while $\alpha3$ only starts responding at higher stimulation strengths (Figure 6B). There was also a distinct difference in the maximum response levels: $\alpha'3$ compartment responses plateau at a much lower level than $\alpha3$ (Figure 6B), likely explained by the fact that the $\alpha3$ compartment receives more axons than $\alpha'3$ (Li et al., 2020). Previous studies reported that odors activate a small percentage of KCs (~5-12%), and that the odor responses in $\alpha'\beta'$ cells are stronger than those of $\alpha\beta$ cells (Turner et al., 2008; Inada et al., 2017). This suggests that actual odor encoding is similar to the weak AL stimulation used in our experiments (100 μ Amp), recruiting only $\alpha'3$ but insufficient to recruit $\alpha3$. We hypothesized that an increase in the AL stimulation intensity during *ex vivo* induction might be sufficient to recruit $\alpha3$ and allow PDP in that compartment as well. We repeated both AL+AFV and AL+DA inductions, but this time with a 200 μ Amp AL stimulation intensity. Indeed, under these conditions we found that PDP occurred in both the $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha3$ compartments (Figure 6C,D).

This result agrees with predictions from our previously published theoretical model of the associative learning circuit in which the CS+US coincidence triggers a recurrent loop between KCs and dopaminergic neurons which increases dopamine

release only onto cells receiving both inputs together (Adel and Griffith, 2021). The weak response of the $\alpha 3$ compartment to weak AL stimulation is subthreshold for the MB coincidence detector, and insufficient for forming PDP in $\alpha 3$. Stronger AL stimulation puts $\alpha 3$ over threshold and triggers the coincidence detector in α axons, thus increasing dopamine gain and forming PDP/memory.

Our model further predicts that there should be a certain dopamine concentration above which dopamine alone is sufficient to potentiate both $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha 3$ compartments without any need for pairing, as this hypothetical high dopamine concentration bypasses the need for CS+US coincidence detector activation of the gain control machinery that increases local dopamine release. To test this prediction, we applied either 10 μM dopamine (used in our previous experiments) or a high dopamine concentration (200 μM) to the dissected brains without pairing with AL stimulation. Indeed, 200 μM dopamine alone was sufficient to potentiate both $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha 3$ responses to AL stimulation (100 μAmps) 15 minutes post dopamine application (Figure 6E). A similar effect of high dopamine was reported by Ueno et al., 2013, but interpreted differently. We show that pairing-independent plasticity resulting from very high dopamine, while possibly implemented by the same machinery responsible for associative learning, does not truly represent a memory trace as it lacks specificity to CS-activated synapses, likely representing a generalized potentiated state of the MB. In contrast, the PDP seen with lower dopamine concentrations relies on an interplay between the CS and US signals to gate dopamine gain only at the synapses activated by the CS during training.

PDP is blocked by sleep deprivation and rescued by rebound sleep

Many of the most interesting questions about memory formation are ones that involve the interaction of plasticity with the animal's internal state. To test the ability of this preparation to retain traces of previous experience and allow interrogation of memory mechanisms at this level, we looked at the effect of sleep on subsequent *ex vivo* plasticity. Sleep is linked to memory across phyla. In *Drosophila*, perturbations of sleep have been shown to impair both memory formation (Bushey et al., 2007; Seugnet et al., 2008; Li et al., 2009; Seugnet et al., 2009; Donlea et al., 2014; Seidner et al., 2015) and consolidation (Ganguly-Fitzgerald et al., 2006; Donlea et al., 2009; Bushey et al., 2011; Dag et al., 2019); reviewed in (Goel et al., 2009; Diekelmann and Born, 2010; Dissel et al., 2015; Donlea, 2019). To determine whether the plasticity we observe in the MB is sleep-dependent, we mechanically sleep deprived entrained (12:12 light:dark) flies for 12 hours during the ZT12-24 night period. Control flies were housed on a different shaker in the same incubator, but the shaker was turned off. A third group of flies received shaking for only the last 2 hours of the night (ZT22-24) to control for the acute physical stress that may result from the shaker. The next morning (starting at ZT0), we used the AL+DA paradigm to induce the artificial memory (Figure 7A). We found that sleep-deprived flies did not exhibit KC enhancement PDP, while both the sleep control group and the stress control group had normal PDP (Figure 7C). We then asked if allowing sleep-deprived flies a period of recovery sleep could restore their ability to learn. As little as 2 hours of rebound sleep was sufficient to restore the ability to induce the same level of α' 3 PDP observed in the control groups (Figure 7C). Interestingly, this 2 hours minimum of rebound sleep that we found in our experiment to be required for rescuing the *ex vivo* plasticity is similar to the period reported *in vivo* to

be required for sleep-deprived flies to restore the ability to form short-term memory (Li et al., 2009). These findings demonstrate that our *ex vivo* paradigm not only forms the plasticity that is correlated with short-term memory, but also accurately recapitulates the dynamics of the learning memory circuit and its interplay with the sleep circuit. These data also suggest that the effect of sleep-deprivation on the memory circuit is downstream to sensory processing of both the CS and the US information and CS+US coincidence. This supports previous indications that sleep-deprivation likely impairs memory formation by downregulating dopamine receptors or other downstream molecules in the dopamine signaling pathway (Seugnet et al., 2008).

Discussion

Drosophila neural circuits are traditionally studied by relating *in vivo* genetic and chemical manipulations with their consequent behavioral outcomes, from which circuit information can then be inferred (Olsen and Wilson, 2008; Simpson, 2009). More recently, the advent of *in vivo* calcium imaging allowed for tracing neural activity in actively behaving flies. Over more than a decade of such *in vivo* studies, the general circuit mechanisms of associative memory have been discovered, but there are limitations imposed by imaging the brain of an active intact fly (for review, see Adel and Griffith, 2021). These include the relatively low signal to noise ratio, the inaccessibility of multiple brain regions due to restrictions on imaging angles, the difficulty of doing acute pharmacological studies, and the possible confounds of studying the brain of a movement-restricted fly experiencing on-going stress. Taking inspiration from the way the LTP hippocampal slice model revolutionized our understanding of mammalian memory (Bliss and Lomo, 1973), we provide here an *ex vivo* model of *Drosophila*

memory which can overcome these limitations and offer a powerful preparation for studying *Drosophila* memory circuits. Importantly, this model provides a framework for investigating the dynamics of neural circuits in the fly brain.

Most of the previous studies investigating the associative learning circuit *ex vivo* have focused on mapping connectivity (Cohn et al., 2015; Barnstedt et al., 2016; Felsenberg et al., 2017; Felsenberg et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2018) or characterizing a specific biochemical pathway (Tomchik and Davis, 2009; Handler et al., 2019; Ueno et al., 2020). Only a few *ex vivo* studies (Wang et al., 2008; Ueno et al., 2013; Suzuki-Sawano et al., 2017; Ueno et al., 2017) have focused on understanding MB circuit logic. In the LTE model developed by Ueno et al (2013), pairing a stimulation of the CS and US pathways induced a potentiation of KC responses in the tips of the MB vertical lobes, but LTE did not fully recapitulate other characteristics of associative memory observed in intact flies. Here we develop a modified *ex vivo* model that resolves these discrepancies, showing that the paired activation of odor and punishment pathways induces appropriate plasticity at multiple nodes in the circuit: potentiation of KCs and suppression of MBONs. PDP is also localized to the MB $\alpha'3$ compartment and not seen in $\alpha3$, in alignment with most imaging studies in intact flies. Importantly, in this *ex vivo* preparation, punishment information is relayed to the MB through dopaminergic release from the PPL1 subset. Bath application of dopamine in our preparation does not interfere with the specificity of associative learning since PDP is exclusively formed in the cells that were active during the dopamine application. These data settle several inconsistencies between previous *ex vivo* studies (Ueno et al., 2013; Ueno et al., 2017) and the majority of *in vivo* reports (Schwaerzel et al., 2003; Riemensperger et al., 2005;

Schroll et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2007; Claridge-Chang et al., 2009; Mao and Davis, 2009; Aso et al., 2010; Aso et al., 2012; Pech et al., 2013; Aso et al., 2014b; Yamagata et al., 2016; Cognigni et al., 2018; Handler et al., 2019). We suggest that the genesis of the discrepancies was not due to any inherent difference between intact and *ex vivo* brains but was rather a consequence of technical considerations including stimulation strength, dopamine concentration and the sensor tools employed (see Adel and Griffith, 2021 for a more complete discussion).

An *ex vivo* preparation that recapitulates the cardinal features of the circuits underlying associative memory formation should be useful for mechanistic studies at the molecular, cellular and systems levels. We used our model to ask a new question about the innerworkings of the circuit at each of these levels. At the molecular level we demonstrated the importance of normal levels of CaMKII by manipulating the 3'UTR of *CaMKII* mRNA. Deletion of this region of the *CaMKII* gene drastically reduces the amount of CaMKII protein in synaptic regions and blunts the ability to form STM and to generate a potentiation PDP in KC axons. Our data argues that the role of this molecule is downstream of the CS+US coincidence detector, as we observe a much weaker PDP in *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies. Whether the behavioral defect is due solely to the KC PDP defect is not completely clear since CaMKII likely has active roles at other circuit nodes (Mitchell et al., 2021).

At the cellular level we asked why STM and PDP form in the $\alpha'3$ but not the nearby $\alpha3$ compartment when both compartments respond to odors (Turner et al., 2008) and AL stimulation, and both receive dopaminergic input from the same PPL1 cluster (Masek et al., 2015). Previous work found that real odors cause activity in only 5-

12% of KCs and elicit a much higher spike rate in the $\alpha'\beta'$ KCs than in the $\alpha\beta$ KCs. We found that low-intensity AL stimulation (100 μ Amps) elicit a stronger response in the $\alpha'3$ than in the $\alpha3$ compartment, while high-intensity AL-stimulation (200 μ Amps) causes strong responses in the $\alpha3$ compartment and recruits it to the learning circuit. Coupling this with our observation of lower dopamine release in $\alpha3$, suggests a model in which odor presentation during associative learning causes subthreshold responses in $\alpha\beta$ cells such that the CS+US coincidence detector is not triggered, while the stronger responses in the $\alpha'\beta'$ cells bypass this threshold, allowing plasticity the $\alpha'\beta'$ cells only. This notion is in alignment with the previous finding that $\alpha'\beta'$ cells have a lower firing threshold than $\alpha\beta$ cells (Inada et al., 2017). Further, It is possible that long-term memory and the enhancement memory trace in the $\alpha\beta$ KCs after repetitive space training (Yu et al., 2006) require a gradual potentiation of the $\alpha\beta$ KCs responses with every training session such that the responses bypass the coincidence detection threshold after several training sessions. Whether repetition of AL+DA pairings recruits PDP in the $\alpha3$ compartment remains unclear. It is also yet to be determined whether shortcutting the circuit and recruiting $\alpha\beta$ cells in the first training session reduces the need for multiple spaced training sessions in long-term memory formation.

Lastly, we looked at the ability of the effects of prior experience, or brain state, on the memory circuit to be retained in the *ex vivo* preparation. Excitingly, we found that sleep deprived flies could not form PDP, but that as little as 2 hours of rest before dissection allowed the brain to recover PDP formation. The complete abolition of PDP in sleep deprived flies at first and the gradual recovery in plasticity afterwards (Figure 7D)

suggests that sleep converges on the memory circuit upstream of the CS+US coincidence detector. Whether this involves regulation of dopamine receptors in the MB during sleep remains to be determined. The ability to retain in some functional way the internal state of the brain will allow this preparation to be used to understand how memory formation is altered by global system alterations.

References

- Adel M, Griffith LC (2021) The Role of Dopamine in Associative Learning in *Drosophila*: An Updated Unified Model. *Neuroscience Bulletin* 37:831-852.
- Ashraf SI, McLoon AL, Sclarsic SM, Kunes S (2006) Synaptic protein synthesis associated with memory is regulated by the RISC pathway in *Drosophila*. *Cell* 124:191-205.
- Aso Y, Rubin GM (2016) Dopaminergic neurons write and update memories with cell-type-specific rules. *Elife* 5.
- Aso Y, Siwanowicz I, Bracker L, Ito K, Kitamoto T, Tanimoto H (2010) Specific dopaminergic neurons for the formation of labile aversive memory. *Curr Biol* 20:1445-1451.
- Aso Y, Herb A, Ogueta M, Siwanowicz I, Templier T, Friedrich AB, Ito K, Scholz H, Tanimoto H (2012) Three dopamine pathways induce aversive odor memories with different stability. *PLoS Genet* 8:e1002768.
- Aso Y, Hattori D, Yu Y, Johnston RM, Iyer NA, Ngo TT, Dionne H, Abbott LF, Axel R, Tanimoto H, Rubin GM (2014a) The neuronal architecture of the mushroom body provides a logic for associative learning. *Elife* 3:e04577.
- Aso Y et al. (2014b) Mushroom body output neurons encode valence and guide memory-based action selection in *Drosophila*. *Elife* 3:e04580.
- Barnstedt O, Oswald D, Felsenberg J, Brain R, Moszynski JP, Talbot CB, Perrat PN, Waddell S (2016) Memory-Relevant Mushroom Body Output Synapses Are Cholinergic. *Neuron* 89:1237-1247.
- Barth J, Dipt S, Pech U, Hermann M, Riemensperger T, Fiala A (2014) Differential associative training enhances olfactory acuity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J Neurosci* 34:1819-1837.

- 1 Berry JA, Cervantes-Sandoval I, Chakraborty M, Davis RL (2015) Sleep Facilitates
2 Memory by Blocking Dopamine Neuron-Mediated Forgetting. *Cell* 161:1656-
3 1667.
- 4 Best AR, Wilson DA (2004) Coordinate synaptic mechanisms contributing to olfactory
5 cortical adaptation. *J Neurosci* 24:652-660.
- 6 Bliss TV, Lomo T (1973) Long-lasting potentiation of synaptic transmission in the
7 dentate area of the anaesthetized rabbit following stimulation of the perforant
8 path. *J Physiol* 232:331-356.
- 9 Burke CJ, Huetteroth W, Oswald D, Perisse E, Krashes MJ, Das G, Gohl D, Silies M,
10 Certel S, Waddell S (2012) Layered reward signalling through octopamine and
11 dopamine in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 492:433-437.
- 12 Bushey D, Tononi G, Cirelli C (2011) Sleep and synaptic homeostasis: structural
13 evidence in *Drosophila*. *Science* 332:1576-1581.
- 14 Bushey D, Huber R, Tononi G, Cirelli C (2007) *Drosophila* Hyperkinetic mutants have
15 reduced sleep and impaired memory. *J Neurosci* 27:5384-5393.
- 16 Cervantes-Sandoval I, Martin-Pena A, Berry JA, Davis RL (2013) System-like
17 consolidation of olfactory memories in *Drosophila*. *J Neurosci* 33:9846-9854.
- 18 Chen N, Zhang Y, Adel M, Kuklin EA, Reed ML, Mardovin JD, Bakthavachalu B,
19 VijayRaghavan K, Ramaswami M, Griffith LC (2021) Specialized presynaptic
20 proteomes required for associative memory formation depend on enhanced
21 axonal translation of pre-localized mRNA. Submitted.
- 22 Cho W, Heberlein U, Wolf FW (2004) Habituation of an odorant-induced startle
23 response in *Drosophila*. *Genes Brain Behav* 3:127-137.
- 24 Claridge-Chang A, Roorda RD, Vrontou E, Sjulson L, Li H, Hirsh J, Miesenbock G
25 (2009) Writing memories with light-addressable reinforcement circuitry. *Cell*
26 139:405-415.
- 27 Cognigni P, Felsenberg J, Waddell S (2018) Do the right thing: neural network
28 mechanisms of memory formation, expression and update in *Drosophila*. *Curr*
29 *Opin Neurobiol* 49:51-58.
- 30 Cohn R, Morantte I, Ruta V (2015) Coordinated and Compartmentalized
31 Neuromodulation Shapes Sensory Processing in *Drosophila*. *Cell* 163:1742-
32 1755.
- 33 Dag U, Lei Z, Le JQ, Wong A, Bushey D, Keleman K (2019) Neuronal reactivation
34 during post-learning sleep consolidates long-term memory in *Drosophila*. *Elife* 8.

- 1 Das S, Sadanandappa MK, Dervan A, Larkin A, Lee JA, Sudhakaran IP, Priya R,
2 Heidari R, Holohan EE, Pimentel A, Gandhi A, Ito K, Sanyal S, Wang JW,
3 Rodrigues V, Ramaswami M (2011) Plasticity of local GABAergic interneurons
4 drives olfactory habituation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108:E646-654.
- 5 Davis RL (2011) Traces of *Drosophila* memory. *Neuron* 70:8-19.
- 6 de Belle JS, Heisenberg M (1994) Associative odor learning in *Drosophila* abolished by
7 chemical ablation of mushroom bodies. *Science* 263:692-695.
- 8 Diekelmann S, Born J (2010) The memory function of sleep. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 11:114-
9 126.
- 10 Dissel S, Melnattur K, Shaw PJ (2015) Sleep, Performance, and Memory in Flies. *Curr*
11 *Sleep Med Rep* 1:47-54.
- 12 Donelson NC, Kim EZ, Slawson JB, Vecsey CG, Huber R, Griffith LC (2012) High-
13 resolution positional tracking for long-term analysis of *Drosophila* sleep and
14 locomotion using the "tracker" program. *PLoS One* 7:e37250.
- 15 Donlea JM (2019) Roles for sleep in memory: insights from the fly. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*
16 54:120-126.
- 17 Donlea JM, Ramanan N, Shaw PJ (2009) Use-dependent plasticity in clock neurons
18 regulates sleep need in *Drosophila*. *Science* 324:105-108.
- 19 Donlea JM, Pimentel D, Miesenbock G (2014) Neuronal Machinery of Sleep
20 Homeostasis in *Drosophila*. *Neuron* 81:1442.
- 21 Dudai Y (2012) The restless engram: consolidations never end. *Annu Rev Neurosci*
22 35:227-247.
- 23 Felsenberg J, Barnstedt O, Cognigni P, Lin S, Waddell S (2017) Re-evaluation of
24 learned information in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 544:240-244.
- 25 Felsenberg J, Jacob PF, Walker T, Barnstedt O, Edmondson-Stait AJ, Pleijzier MW,
26 Otto N, Schlegel P, Sharifi N, Perisse E, Smith CS, Lauritzen JS, Costa M,
27 Jefferis G, Bock DD, Waddell S (2018) Integration of Parallel Opposing
28 Memories Underlies Memory Extinction. *Cell* 175:709-722 e715.
- 29 Ferdenzi C, Poncelet J, Rouby C, Bensafi M (2014) Repeated exposure to odors
30 induces affective habituation of perception and sniffing. *Front Behav Neurosci*
31 8:119.
- 32 Ganguly-Fitzgerald I, Donlea J, Shaw PJ (2006) Waking experience affects sleep need
33 in *Drosophila*. *Science* 313:1775-1781.

- 1 Gervasi N, Tchenio P, Preat T (2010) PKA dynamics in a Drosophila learning center:
2 coincidence detection by rutabaga adenylyl cyclase and spatial regulation by
3 dunce phosphodiesterase. *Neuron* 65:516-529.
- 4 Giese KP, Mizuno K (2013) The roles of protein kinases in learning and memory. *Learn*
5 *Mem* 20:540-552.
- 6 Goel N, Rao H, Durmer JS, Dinges DF (2009) Neurocognitive consequences of sleep
7 deprivation. *Semin Neurol* 29:320-339.
- 8 Griffith LC, Verselis LM, Aitken KM, Kyriacou CP, Danho W, Greenspan RJ (1993)
9 Inhibition of calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase in Drosophila disrupts
10 behavioral plasticity. *Neuron* 10:501-509.
- 11 Handler A, Graham TGW, Cohn R, Morantte I, Siliciano AF, Zeng J, Li Y, Ruta V (2019)
12 Distinct Dopamine Receptor Pathways Underlie the Temporal Sensitivity of
13 Associative Learning. *Cell* 178:60-75 e19.
- 14 Hendricks JC, Finn SM, Panckeri KA, Chavkin J, Williams JA, Sehgal A, Pack AI (2000)
15 Rest in Drosophila is a sleep-like state. *Neuron* 25:129-138.
- 16 Hige T, Aso Y, Modi MN, Rubin GM, Turner GC (2015) Heterosynaptic Plasticity
17 Underlies Aversive Olfactory Learning in Drosophila. *Neuron* 88:985-998.
- 18 Honegger KS, Campbell RA, Turner GC (2011) Cellular-resolution population imaging
19 reveals robust sparse coding in the Drosophila mushroom body. *J Neurosci*
20 31:11772-11785.
- 21 Inada K, Tsuchimoto Y, Kazama H (2017) Origins of Cell-Type-Specific Olfactory
22 Processing in the Drosophila Mushroom Body Circuit. *Neuron* 95:357-367 e354.
- 23 Kelleher RJ, 3rd, Govindarajan A, Tonegawa S (2004) Translational regulatory
24 mechanisms in persistent forms of synaptic plasticity. *Neuron* 44:59-73.
- 25 Kim YC, Lee HG, Han KA (2007) D1 dopamine receptor dDA1 is required in the
26 mushroom body neurons for aversive and appetitive learning in Drosophila. *J*
27 *Neurosci* 27:7640-7647.
- 28 Koh YH, Popova E, Thomas U, Griffith LC, Budnik V (1999) Regulation of DLG
29 localization at synapses by CaMKII-dependent phosphorylation. *Cell* 98:353-363.
- 30 Krashes MJ, Keene AC, Leung B, Armstrong JD, Waddell S (2007) Sequential use of
31 mushroom body neuron subsets during drosophila odor memory processing.
32 *Neuron* 53:103-115.
- 33 Kuklin EA, Alkins S, Bakthavachalu B, Genco MC, Sudhakaran I, Raghavan KV,
34 Ramaswami M, Griffith LC (2017) The Long 3'UTR mRNA of CaMKII Is Essential

1 for Translation-Dependent Plasticity of Spontaneous Release in *Drosophila*
2 *melanogaster*. *J Neurosci* 37:10554-10566.

3 Levin LR, Han PL, Hwang PM, Feinstein PG, Davis RL, Reed RR (1992) The
4 *Drosophila* learning and memory gene *rutabaga* encodes a Ca²⁺/Calmodulin-
5 responsive adenylyl cyclase. *Cell* 68:479-489.

6 Li F et al. (2020) The connectome of the adult *Drosophila* mushroom body provides
7 insights into function. *Elife* 9.

8 Li X, Yu F, Guo A (2009) Sleep deprivation specifically impairs short-term olfactory
9 memory in *Drosophila*. *Sleep* 32:1417-1424.

10 Lin AC, Bygrave AM, de Calignon A, Lee T, Miesenbock G (2014) Sparse, decorrelated
11 odor coding in the mushroom body enhances learned odor discrimination. *Nat*
12 *Neurosci* 17:559-568.

13 Livingstone MS, Sziber PP, Quinn WG (1984) Loss of calcium/calmodulin
14 responsiveness in adenylyl cyclase of *rutabaga*, a *Drosophila* learning mutant.
15 *Cell* 37:205-215.

16 Malik BR, Gillespie JM, Hodge JJ (2013) CASK and CaMKII function in the mushroom
17 body alpha'/beta' neurons during *Drosophila* memory formation. *Front Neural*
18 *Circuits* 7:52.

19 Mao Z, Davis RL (2009) Eight different types of dopaminergic neurons innervate the
20 *Drosophila* mushroom body neuropil: anatomical and physiological
21 heterogeneity. *Front Neural Circuits* 3:5.

22 Mao Z, Roman G, Zong L, Davis RL (2004) Pharmacogenetic rescue in time and space
23 of the *rutabaga* memory impairment by using Gene-Switch. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*
24 *S A* 101:198-203.

25 Marin EC, Jefferis GS, Komiyama T, Zhu H, Luo L (2002) Representation of the
26 glomerular olfactory map in the *Drosophila* brain. *Cell* 109:243-255.

27 Masek P, Worden K, Aso Y, Rubin GM, Keene AC (2015) A dopamine-modulated
28 neural circuit regulating aversive taste memory in *Drosophila*. *Curr Biol* 25:1535-
29 1541.

30 McClelland JL, McNaughton BL, O'Reilly RC (1995) Why there are complementary
31 learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex: insights from the successes
32 and failures of connectionist models of learning and memory. *Psychol Rev*
33 102:419-457.

34 Miller S, Yasuda M, Coats JK, Jones Y, Martone ME, Mayford M (2002) Disruption of
35 dendritic translation of CaMKIIalpha impairs stabilization of synaptic plasticity and
36 memory consolidation. *Neuron* 36:507-519.

- 1 Mitchell J, Smith CS, Titlow J, Otto N, van Velde P, Booth M, Davis I, Waddell S (2021)
2 Selective dendritic localization of mRNA in Drosophila mushroom body output
3 neurons. *Elife* 10.
- 4 Murthy M, Fiete I, Laurent G (2008) Testing odor response stereotypy in the Drosophila
5 mushroom body. *Neuron* 59:1009-1023.
- 6 Olsen SR, Wilson RI (2008) Cracking neural circuits in a tiny brain: new approaches for
7 understanding the neural circuitry of Drosophila. *Trends Neurosci* 31:512-520.
- 8 Oswald D, Waddell S (2015) Olfactory learning skews mushroom body output pathways
9 to steer behavioral choice in Drosophila. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 35:178-184.
- 10 Oswald D, Felsenberg J, Talbot CB, Das G, Perisse E, Huetteroth W, Waddell S (2015)
11 Activity of defined mushroom body output neurons underlies learned olfactory
12 behavior in Drosophila. *Neuron* 86:417-427.
- 13 Pech U, Pooryasin A, Birman S, Fiala A (2013) Localization of the contacts between
14 Kenyon cells and aminergic neurons in the Drosophila melanogaster brain using
15 SplitGFP reconstitution. *J Comp Neurol* 521:3992-4026.
- 16 Pellegrino R, Sinding C, de Wijk RA, Hummel T (2017) Habituation and adaptation to
17 odors in humans. *Physiol Behav* 177:13-19.
- 18 Perez-Orive J, Mazor O, Turner GC, Cassenaer S, Wilson RI, Laurent G (2002)
19 Oscillations and sparsening of odor representations in the mushroom body.
20 *Science* 297:359-365.
- 21 Riemensperger T, Voller T, Stock P, Buchner E, Fiala A (2005) Punishment prediction
22 by dopaminergic neurons in Drosophila. *Curr Biol* 15:1953-1960.
- 23 Schroll C, Riemensperger T, Bucher D, Ehmer J, Voller T, Erbguth K, Gerber B, Hendel
24 T, Nagel G, Buchner E, Fiala A (2006) Light-induced activation of distinct
25 modulatory neurons triggers appetitive or aversive learning in Drosophila larvae.
26 *Curr Biol* 16:1741-1747.
- 27 Schwaerzel M, Monastirioti M, Scholz H, Friggi-Grelín F, Birman S, Heisenberg M
28 (2003) Dopamine and octopamine differentiate between aversive and appetitive
29 olfactory memories in Drosophila. *J Neurosci* 23:10495-10502.
- 30 Seidner G, Robinson JE, Wu M, Worden K, Masek P, Roberts SW, Keene AC, Joiner
31 WJ (2015) Identification of Neurons with a Privileged Role in Sleep Homeostasis
32 in Drosophila melanogaster. *Curr Biol* 25:2928-2938.
- 33 Sejourne J, Placais PY, Aso Y, Siwanowicz I, Trannoy S, Thoma V, Tedjakumala SR,
34 Rubin GM, Tchenio P, Ito K, Isabel G, Tanimoto H, Preat T (2011) Mushroom
35 body efferent neurons responsible for aversive olfactory memory retrieval in
36 Drosophila. *Nat Neurosci* 14:903-910.

- 1 Semelidou O, Acevedo SF, Skoulakis EM (2018) Temporally specific engagement of
2 distinct neuronal circuits regulating olfactory habituation in *Drosophila*. *Elife* 7.
- 3 Seugnet L, Suzuki Y, Vine L, Gottschalk L, Shaw PJ (2008) D1 receptor activation in the
4 mushroom bodies rescues sleep-loss-induced learning impairments in
5 *Drosophila*. *Curr Biol* 18:1110-1117.
- 6 Seugnet L, Suzuki Y, Thimman M, Donlea J, Gimbel SI, Gottschalk L, Duntley SP, Shaw
7 PJ (2009) Identifying sleep regulatory genes using a *Drosophila* model of
8 insomnia. *J Neurosci* 29:7148-7157.
- 9 Shaw PJ, Cirelli C, Greenspan RJ, Tononi G (2000) Correlates of sleep and waking in
10 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Science* 287:1834-1837.
- 11 Simpson JH (2009) Mapping and manipulating neural circuits in the fly brain. *Adv Genet*
12 65:79-143.
- 13 Stewart BA, Atwood HL, Renger JJ, Wang J, Wu CF (1994) Improved stability of
14 *Drosophila* larval neuromuscular preparations in haemolymph-like physiological
15 solutions. *J Comp Physiol A* 175:179-191.
- 16 Sun F, Zhou J, Dai B, Qian T, Zeng J, Li X, Zhuo Y, Zhang Y, Wang Y, Qian C, Tan K,
17 Feng J, Dong H, Lin D, Cui G, Li Y (2020) Next-generation GRAB sensors for
18 monitoring dopaminergic activity in vivo. *Nature methods* 17:1156-1166.
- 19 Suzuki-Sawano E, Ueno K, Naganos S, Sawano Y, Horiuchi J, Saitoe M (2017) A
20 *Drosophila* ex vivo model of olfactory appetitive learning. *Sci Rep* 7:17725.
- 21 Tanaka NK, Tanimoto H, Ito K (2008) Neuronal assemblies of the *Drosophila* mushroom
22 body. *J Comp Neurol* 508:711-755.
- 23 Tomchik SM, Davis RL (2009) Dynamics of learning-related cAMP signaling and
24 stimulus integration in the *Drosophila* olfactory pathway. *Neuron* 64:510-521.
- 25 Tully T, Quinn WG (1985) Classical conditioning and retention in normal and mutant
26 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J Comp Physiol A* 157:263-277.
- 27 Turner GC, Bazhenov M, Laurent G (2008) Olfactory representations by *Drosophila*
28 mushroom body neurons. *J Neurophysiol* 99:734-746.
- 29 Ueno K, Naganos S, Hirano Y, Horiuchi J, Saitoe M (2013) Long-term enhancement of
30 synaptic transmission between antennal lobe and mushroom body in cultured
31 *Drosophila* brain. *J Physiol* 591:287-302.
- 32 Ueno K, Suzuki E, Naganos S, Ofusa K, Horiuchi J, Saitoe M (2017) Coincident
33 postsynaptic activity gates presynaptic dopamine release to induce plasticity in
34 *Drosophila* mushroom bodies. *Elife* 6.

- 1 Ueno K, Morstein J, Ofusa K, Naganos S, Suzuki-Sawano E, Minegishi S, Rezgui SP,
2 Kitagishi H, Michel BW, Chang CJ, Horiuchi J, Saitoe M (2020) Carbon
3 Monoxide, a Retrograde Messenger Generated in Postsynaptic Mushroom Body
4 Neurons, Evokes Noncanonical Dopamine Release. *J Neurosci* 40:3533-3548.
- 5 Wang Y, Mamiya A, Chiang AS, Zhong Y (2008) Imaging of an early memory trace in
6 the *Drosophila* mushroom body. *J Neurosci* 28:4368-4376.
- 7 Wilson DA (1998) Habituation of odor responses in the rat anterior piriform cortex. *J*
8 *Neurophysiol* 79:1425-1440.
- 9 Wilson DA (2009) Olfaction as a model system for the neurobiology of mammalian
10 short-term habituation. *Neurobiol Learn Mem* 92:199-205.
- 11 Wilson DA, Linster C (2008) Neurobiology of a simple memory. *J Neurophysiol* 100:2-7.
- 12 Wong AM, Wang JW, Axel R (2002) Spatial representation of the glomerular map in the
13 *Drosophila* protocerebrum. *Cell* 109:229-241.
- 14 Yamagata N, Hiroi M, Kondo S, Abe A, Tanimoto H (2016) Suppression of Dopamine
15 Neurons Mediates Reward. *PLoS Biol* 14:e1002586.
- 16 Yao Z, Macara AM, Lelito KR, Minosyan TY, Shafer OT (2012) Analysis of functional
17 neuronal connectivity in the *Drosophila* brain. *J Neurophysiol* 108:684-696.
- 18 Yu D, Akalal DB, Davis RL (2006) *Drosophila* alpha/beta mushroom body neurons form
19 a branch-specific, long-term cellular memory trace after spaced olfactory
20 conditioning. *Neuron* 52:845-855.
- 21 Zhang X, Noyes NC, Zeng J, Li Y, Davis RL (2019) Aversive Training Induces Both
22 Presynaptic and Postsynaptic Suppression in *Drosophila*. *J Neurosci* 39:9164-
23 9172.
- 24 Zhao X, Lenek D, Dag U, Dickson BJ, Keleman K (2018) Persistent activity in a
25 recurrent circuit underlies courtship memory in *Drosophila*. *Elife* 7.
- 26

27 **Figure Legends**

28 **Figure 1. Simultaneous activation of the odor and the electric shock pathways** 29 **induces an enhancement PDP in the KCs in the MB α '3 compartment. A,**

30 Schematic of the dissected adult fly's central nervous system showing the MBs and the
31 ALs in the central brain and the ventral nerve cord. The ventral nerve cord (VNC) is then

1 cut at the base of the cervical connective to free the afferent fibers of the VNC (AFV). **B**,
2 Schematic of the imaging chamber showing the placement of the first electrode on the
3 AL, and the second electrode on the free end of the AFV. **C**, Representative image of
4 the MB ipsilateral to the stimulated AL. The calcium indicator GCaMP6f is expressed in
5 the KCs (driven by *VT030559-GAL4*). The circles show the analyzed ROIs surrounding
6 the $\alpha'3$ and the $\alpha3$ compartments. Scale bar is 25 μ m. **D**, Paired and unpaired induction
7 protocols. Top, in the paired induction, the ipsilateral AL is activated by 5 stimulation
8 trains with 15 seconds intertrain interval followed by 1 minute rest (pre-induction). 12
9 trains of stimulations are then delivered to both the AL and the AFV simultaneously
10 (induction). The brain is then rested for 15 minutes before being tested by 5 trains of AL
11 stimulations like those applied during the pre-induction (post-induction). Bottom, the
12 unpaired induction: same as paired induction except that the AL and the AFV
13 stimulations are separated by 30 seconds during the induction stage. The stimulation
14 train is 20 pulses at 100 Hz; each pulse is 1 millisecond with 9 milliseconds inter-pulse
15 interval. AL stimulation strength: 100 μ Amps. AFV stimulation strength: 0.5-1 mAmps.
16 **E**, Example of the KC calcium response in the $\alpha'3$ compartment during pre (grey) and
17 post (black) stimulations. **F**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses calculated
18 as $(\text{mean post responses} - \text{mean pre responses}) / (\text{mean pre responses})$ in the $\alpha'3$ (left)
19 and the $\alpha3$ (right) compartments after no induction (white), AL activation alone (light
20 grey), AFV activation alone (dark grey), unpaired AL+AFV induction (green), and paired
21 AL+AFV induction (blue). Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; $\alpha =$
22 0.05; $n = 8$ in each condition. In the $\alpha'3$ compartment: A vs. A, $p > 0.05$; B vs. A, $p \leq$
23 0.05 (0.015, < 0.0001 , 0.0002, and < 0.0001 in paired vs. no induction, paired vs. AL

alone, paired vs. AFV alone, and paired vs. unpaired, respectively). No statistical significance across conditions in the $\alpha 3$ compartment (p-value > 0.05).

Figure 2. Electric shock pathway activation can be replaced by either dopamine perfusion or activation of dopaminergic neurons. A, Schematic of the dissected

adult central nervous system showing the placement of one electrode to activate the

AFV. **B,** Representative images showing the simultaneous expression of *UAS-GRAB*

DA2m (left; green) and *UAS-jRCaMP1a* (right; red) in the same neurons in the MB

(driven by *VT030559-GAL4*). Scale bar is 25 μ m. **C,** Time course of GRAB DA2m

responses in the $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha 3$ compartments upon AFV stimulation (green) or no stimulus

(grey). Traces show mean $\Delta F/F \pm$ SEM across the 6 flies tested. In each compartment, a

representative jRCaMP1a response is shown (red) as a reference for neural activity

upon AFV stimulation. **D,** Quantification of the GRAB DA2m responses in **C**. Two-way

ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; ****p<0.0001. **E,** Schematic of the AL+DA induction

protocol, showing electrode placement above the AL, and perfusion of dopamine. **F,**

Paired and unpaired induction protocols. Top, in the paired induction, the ipsilateral AL

is activated by 5 stimulation trains with 15 seconds intertrain interval followed by resting

for 1 minute (pre-induction). 12 trains of stimulations are then applied via the AL

electrode, coincident with 60 seconds of dopamine perfusion. The brain is then rested

for 15 minutes before being tested by 5 trains of AL stimulations like those applied

during the pre-induction (post-induction). Bottom, the unpaired induction: same as

paired induction except that the AL stimulation and dopamine perfusion are separated

by 30 seconds during the induction stage. The stimulation train is 20 pulses at 100 Hz;

each pulse is 1 millisecond with 9 milliseconds inter-pulse interval. AL stimulation

1 strength: 100 μ Amps. **G**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the α '3 (left)
2 and the α 3 (right) compartments after DA perfusion alone (grey), unpaired AL+DA
3 induction (green), and paired AL+DA induction (blue). Three different DA concentrations
4 were used: 1 μ M (left), 5 μ M (middle), and 10 μ M (right). Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA
5 with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 6 in each condition. In the α '3 compartment: A vs. A, p >
6 0.05; B vs. A, p $\leq$ 0.05 (<0.0001 when the paired induction is compared to the unpaired
7 induction in the 5 μ M DA and 10 μ M DA conditions). No statistical significance across
8 conditions in the α 3 compartment (p-value > 0.05). **H**, Mean relative change of the
9 calcium responses in the α '3 (left) and the α 3 (right) compartments pre induction and 30
10 or 60 minutes after paired AL+ 10 μ M DA induction (blue). Mean $\pm$ SEM. Repeated
11 Measures ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc tests (statistical analysis is applied to the raw
12 responses before normalization); n = 4 in each condition. In the α '3 compartment: A vs.
13 A, p > 0.05; B vs. A, p $\leq$ 0.05 (0.041 and 0.0416 when pre is compared to 30 mins and
14 to 60 mins after induction, respectively). No statistical significance across conditions in
15 the α 3 compartment (p-value > 0.05). **I**, Schematic of the AL+PPL1s induction protocol,
16 showing electrode placement above the AL, and perfusion of 2.5 mM ATP to activate
17 the P2X₂ channels expressed in the PPL1 dopaminergic neurons (driven by *TH-LexA*).
18 **J**, Paired and unpaired induction protocols. Top, in the paired induction, the ipsilateral
19 AL is activated by 5 stimulation trains with 15 seconds intertrain interval followed by
20 resting for 1 minute (pre-induction). We then apply 12 trains of stimulations to the AL
21 electrode, coincident with 60 seconds of 2.5 mM ATP perfusion. The brain is then
22 rested for 15 minutes before being tested by 5 trains of AL stimulations like those
23 applied during the pre-induction (post-induction). Bottom, the unpaired induction: same

as paired induction except that the AL stimulation and ATP perfusion are separated by 30 seconds during the induction stage. The stimulation train is 20 pulses at 100 Hz; each pulse is 1 millisecond with 9 milliseconds inter-pulse interval. AL stimulation strength: 100 μ Amps. **K**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the α '3 (left) and the α 3 (right) compartments after unpaired AL+ATP induction (green), and paired AL+ATP induction (blue). Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 8 in each condition. **p = 0.0036. No statistical significance across conditions in the α 3 compartment (p-value = 0.786).

Figure 3. PDP is CS-pathway input-specific. A, Schematic of the dissected adult brain showing the placement of two electrodes in the same AL. Figure 3-1 in extended data demonstrates that the two electrodes activate different subsets of projection neurons. **B**, induction protocol. The ipsilateral AL is activated by 3 stimulation trains with 15 seconds intertrain interval followed by resting for 1 minute (pre-induction). 12 trains of stimulations to electrode 1 (E1) are then delivered, followed by a 30-second rest, then 12 strains of stimulations to electrode 2 (E2). Dopamine [10 μ M] is perfused in the chamber for 60 seconds paired with either E1 or E2 stimulation. The brain is then rested for 15 minutes before being tested by 3 trains of E2 stimulation followed by 3 trains of E1 stimulation (post-induction). **C**, Representative trace of a prep in which dopamine perfusion is paired with E1 stimulations. **D**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the α '3 compartment. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Unpaired t-test, two tailed; n = 8. ***p = 0.0005.

Figure 3-1. Different electrodes in the same AL activate different subsets of Projection Neurons. A, Schematic showing the placement of electrode 1 (E1) and

electrode 2 (E2) in the same ALs. **B**, Basal calcium signals expressed in the AL projection neurons (genotype: *w⁻;GH146-GAL4/+;UAS-GCaMP6f/+*) showing two ROIs highlighted in blue (ROI near E1) and red (ROI near E2). **C**, calcium responses in each ROIs to E1 (blue trace) and E2 (red trace) stimulation. **D**, Quantification of **C**. Dashed line is plotted at $\Delta F/F = 0.05$.

Figure 4. α '3 MBONs dendrites show a suppression PDP. **A**, Representative image of the GCaMP6f signal expressed in the α '3 MBONs using the *MB027B* splitGAL4 line. The MB is outlined in white, showing the localization of the analyzed dendritic signal in the α '3 compartment. Scale bar is 25 μ m. **B**, Representative trace of the α '3 MBONs responses pre and post the AL+DA induction described in Figure 2F. **C**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the MBONs' dendrites in the α '3 compartment. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Unpaired t-test, two tailed; $n = 6$. $^{**}p = 0.0058$.

Figure 5. The 3'UTR region of *CaMKII* is important for PDP formation. **A**, Schematic of wildtype (top) and *CaMKII^{Udel}* where the 3'UTR is flipped out (bottom). **B**, Representative immunostaining images showing CaMKII protein levels in the MB in wildtype *CaMKII* flies (left) and in *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies (right). Scale bar is 20 μ m. **C**, Quantification of **B**. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Unpaired t-test, two tailed; $n = 20$ wildtype flies and 22 *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies. $^{****}p < 0.0001$. **D**, Learning index of wildtype and *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies after training with 90 volts or 60 volts. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; $n = 16, 15, 18$, and 12 (wildtype 90v, UDEL 90v, wildtype 60v, and Udel 60v, respectively). $^{****}p < 0.0001$. Figure 5-1 in extended data shows total CaMKII protein levels in wildtype and *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies and illustrates that both groups are similarly responsive to electric shock. **E**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the

$\alpha'3$ and the $\alpha3$ compartments after the unpaired AL+DA induction (green), and paired AL+DA induction (blue) as described in figure 2F. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 6 in each condition. In the $\alpha'3$ compartment: A vs. A, p > 0.05; B vs. A, p $\leq$ 0.0001; C vs. A, p=0.0048; C vs. B, p=0.0336. In the $\alpha3$ compartment: A vs. A, p > 0.05; B vs. A, p $\leq$ 0.05. Stripe bars indicate the *CaMKII^{Udel}* genotype.

Figure 5-1. Total CaMKII protein in *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies and their effect on sensitivity to electric shock. *A*, Western blot showing CaMKII and actin levels in wildtype or *CaMKII^{Udel}* adult female brains and in purified CaMKII samples. *B*, Quantification of *A*. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Mann-Whitney test; n = 4; *p=0.0286. *C*, Aversion of wildtype and *CaMKII^{Udel}* flies to electric shock. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Unpaired t-test; data collected across 11 trials of the wildtype group and 20 trials of the *CaMKII^{Udel}* group; number of flies per group ranged between 21 to 47 with an average of 29 flies per group; p=0.8518.

Figure 6. Increasing CS or US pathway activation recruits the $\alpha3$ compartment to the PDP circuit. *A*, Design of the AL ramp. AL input stimulation is increased by 30 μ Amps every 30 seconds. *B*, Unpaired calcium responses to AL stimulations in the $\alpha'3$ and $\alpha3$ compartments showing mean $\pm$ SEM. Unpaired t-test; n=6; *p<0.05. ***C and D***, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the $\alpha'3$ and the $\alpha3$ compartments after the unpaired (green) or paired (blue) AL+AFV induction in ***C*** and AL+DA induction in ***D*** when the AL input stimulation is increased to 200 μ Amps. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 8 in each condition. *p<0.05, **P<0.01, ****P<0.0001. *E*, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the $\alpha'3$ and the $\alpha3$ compartments after unpaired 10 μ M or 200 μ M DA perfusion alone, stimulation at 100

μAmps. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 6 in each condition. *p<0.05, **P<0.01.

Figure 7. Sleep deprivation blocks PDP and rebound sleep recovers it. A,

Schematic of the different sleep groups: Sleep Control, flies are undisturbed during night and tested between ZT0-ZT4 in the next day; Sleep Deprived, flies are kept on the shaker during between ZT12-ZT24 then tested between ZT0-ZT2 in the next day; Sleep Deprived + Recovery, same as Sleep Deprived but flies were allowed to recover sleep between ZT0-ZT2 then tested between ZT2-ZT4; Stress Control: flies are undisturbed during the night between ZT12-ZT22 and then the shaker was turned on between ZT22-ZT24 before testing between ZT0-ZT2 in the next day. Testing was done by the AL+DA induction described in Figure 2. **B**, Total sleep of the different groups at the different ZT windows. Mean ±SEM. One-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons. In the ZT12:22 comparison, B vs. A, p<0.0001; A vs A, p=0.4916. In the ZT22:24 comparison, B vs. A, p<0.0001; B vs B, p=0.7136. In the ZT0-2 window, B vs. A, p<0.0001. **C**, Mean relative change of the calcium responses in the α'3 (left) and the α3 (right) compartments after paired AL+DA induction. Mean ±SEM. Two-way ANOVA with Šídák post-hoc tests; n = 6 in each condition. In the α'3 compartment: A vs. A, p > 0.05; B vs. A, p ≤ 0.0001. No statistical significance across conditions in the α3 compartment (p> 0.05). **D**, PDP (mean relative change of dF/F) from individual animals plotted against the animal's time of dissection. White circles indicate control animals (allowed to sleep between ZT12-ZT24) and pink circles indicate sleep deprived animals (on the shaker between ZT12-ZT24).