

Projections from thalamic nucleus reuniens to medial septum enable extinction of remote fear memory

Authors

Kamil F. Tomaszewski, Magdalena Ziółkowska, Kacper Łukasiewicz, Anna Cały, Narges Sotoudeh, Monika Puchalska, Ahmad Salamian and Kasia Radwanska*

Affiliation

Laboratory of Molecular Basis of Behavior, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology of Polish Academy of Sciences, 3 Pasteur St., Warsaw 02-093, Poland.

***Corresponding author:** Kasia Radwanska, Ph.D., Laboratory of Molecular Basis of Behavior, the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology of Polish Academy of Sciences, 3 Pasteur St., Warsaw 02-093, Poland; e-mail: k.radwanska@nencki.edu.pl; tel: +48 501 736 942.

Abstract

Aversive experiences lead to the formation of long-lasting memories. Despite the need to better understand how enduring fear memories can be attenuated, the underlying brain circuits remain largely unknown. In this study, employing a combination of genetic manipulations, neuronal circuit mapping, and chemogenetics in mice, we identify a new projection from the thalamic nucleus reuniens (RE) to the medial septum (MS), and show that this circuit is involved in the extinction of remote (30-day old), but not recent (1-day old), fear memories. These findings provide the first functional description of the RE→MS circuit and highlight the significance of the thalamo-septal regions in memory organization as a function of memory age, a phenomenon known as systems consolidation.

Introduction

The distinction between dangerous and safe contexts, as well as the ability to update such information in a changing environment is crucial for animal survival, as mistakes can have costly consequences. Impairments in context-dependent behaviors have been associated with pathological conditions including post-traumatic stress disorder, schizophrenia, and substance abuse disorders ¹⁻⁴. Therefore, understanding the molecular and cellular mechanisms that underlie the updating of contextual memories is vital for developing new therapeutic approaches ⁵⁻⁷.

Contextual fear conditioning (CFC) represents a method to study contextual memories in laboratory animals ⁴. In this approach, a spatial context, the conditioned stimulus (CS), is repetitively paired with an aversive unconditioned stimulus (US), such as a mild electric shock. The observable freezing behavior serves as a measurable indicator of contextual fear memory. As exposure to the CS persists without the US, freezing behavior typically diminishes, accompanied by increased exploratory behavior. This process, known as fear extinction, unfolds as animals gradually recognize that the context no longer predicts impending shocks. To facilitate extinction, mice must actively retrieve and revise contextual memories, necessitating the presence of specific brain mechanisms. The “classic” neuronal circuit of contextual fear extinction includes medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), amygdala, and hippocampus ^{4,8}. However, the brain regions that contribute to memory recall may vary with memory age. In particular, memories for events initially depend upon the hippocampus, with time these memories become increasingly dependent upon the cortex for their expression ⁹⁻¹¹. Post-learning communication between the hippocampus and cortex, via the thalamus, is thought to drive this time-dependent reorganization process called systems consolidation ^{5,12-18}. This indicates that the extinction of remote memories may similarly rely on a re-distributed network, likely requiring additional players to the canonical extinction-mediating pathways of recent memories.

Calcium and calmodulin-dependent kinase II (CaMKII) is one of the key synaptic molecules that contributes not only to formation and updating of recent contextual memories but also to systems consolidation of remote memories ^{15,19-23}. In particular, knock-in mice with a targeted Threonine 286 mutation to Alanine (T286A), that prevents the autophosphorylation of α CaMKII, have impaired formation and extinction of contextual memories ²⁰⁻²⁵, while heterozygous α CaMKII knock-out mice (α CaMKII^{+/-}) have spared recent memory but severely impaired its long-term (>10 days) retention ¹⁹. Here, we tested the effect of heterozygous T286A mutation (T286A^{+/-}) on extinction of recent and remote contextual fear memory. As T286A^{+/-} mutant mice showed impaired extinction of remote, but not recent, contextual fear memory, we used c-Fos immunostaining in this mouse model to study neuronal correlates of remote memory extinction. The analysis revealed a number of regions hyper- or hypoactivated in the heterozygotes during extinction of remote memory, including cortical, thalamic, hippocampal and amygdalar areas. While the contributions of hippocampal and cortical regions have been studied in detail, much less is known about how thalamic regions contribute to this memory reorganization process at different post-encoding delays. Accordingly, we focus here on the thalamic nucleus reuniens (RE) and medial septum (MS). We identified projections from anterior RE to MS (RE→MS) and showed that RE, MS and the RE→MS pathway are necessary for extinction of the remote, but not recent, contextual fear memory. Previous studies identified RE projections to CA1 area that are involved in extinction of recent contextual fear memory ²⁶⁻²⁸ and RE projections to the basolateral nucleus of the amygdala (BLA) to be involved in extinction of remote fear memories ²⁹. Current results indicate a novel thalamo-septal pathway that is specifically engaged in the updating of remote memories.

Our discoveries suggest that, akin to memory consolidation, the brain circuits involved in fear extinction undergo a spatial reorganization over time.

Results

Role of α CaMKII autophosphorylation in extinction of recent and remote contextual fear memory.

We tested the effect of α CaMKII autophosphorylation of Threonine 286 on extinction of recent and remote contextual fear memory. To this end heterozygous autophosphorylation-deficient mutant mice (T286A^{+/-}) and their wild-type (WT) littermates underwent contextual fear conditioning (CFC) with 5 electric shocks (unconditioned stimuli, US) in novel context. Next day, they were re-exposed to the training context for extinction of recent fear memories. At the beginning of the CFC freezing levels were low but increased during the training. At the beginning of the Recent Extinction session freezing levels were high in both experimental groups indicating contextual fear memory formation, and decreased within the session. Fear extinction memory was tested on the next day. Mice of both genotypes significantly decreased the frequency of freezing during the Test (T) as compared to the beginning of the Extinction session (E5) indicating formation of fear extinction memory. No significant differences in fear extinction memory was observed between the genotypes (**Figure 1A-C**).

Next, we tested the effect of T286A^{+/-} mutation on the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. This time the Extinction session was conducted 30 days after CFC. As previously, at the beginning of the Extinction session freezing levels were high in both experimental groups, indicating contextual fear memory recall, and slightly decreased during the session. Fear extinction memory was tested on the next day. While WT mice significantly decreased the frequency of freezing during the Test as compared to E5 indicating formation of fear extinction memory, such an effect was not observed for T286A^{+/-} mutants. The freezing levels of the heterozygotes during the Test did not significantly differ from the levels observed during E5, indicating no extinction of remote contextual fear memory (**Figure 1D-F**). Hence higher levels of autophosphorylated α CaMKII are required for updating of remote vs recent contextual fear memory.




Figure 1. T286A^{+/-} mutation impairs extinction of remote, but not recent, contextual fear memory.

(A-C) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of recent contextual fear memory. T286A^{+/-} and WT mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 10) = 236$, $P < 0.001$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 10) = 0.293$, $P = 0.600$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 10) = 2.20$, $P = 0.169$), followed by recent fear memory extinction session 1 day later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1.24, 11.2) = 7.30$, $P = 0.016$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 9) = 1.25$, $P = 0.292$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(3, 27) = 0.078$, $P = 0.971$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(10) = 0.578$, $P = 0.576$). (B-C) Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 10) = 25.33$, $P < 0.001$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 10) = 0.519$, $P = 0.49$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 10) = 1.728$, $P = 0.22$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(10) = 1.314$, $P = 0.22$).

(D-F) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. T286A^{+/-} and WT mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 10) = 186$, $P < 0.001$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 10) = 6.56$, $P = 0.028$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 10) = 0.143$, $P = 0.713$), remote fear memory extinction session 30 days later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1.31, 13.1) = 2.06$, $P = 0.173$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 10) = 3.97$, $P = 0.074$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(3, 30) = 0.170$, $P = 0.916$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(10) = 3.271$, $P = 0.008$). (E-F) Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 10) = 28.48$, $P < 0.001$; effect of genotype: $F(1, 10) = 21.81$, $P < 0.001$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 10) = 3.880$, $P = 0.08$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(10) = 2.01$, $P = 0.036$).

Neuronal correlates of remote contextual fear memory extinction

As T286A^{+/-} mutant mice showed impaired extinction of remote contextual fear memory we assumed that this mouse model is an excellent tool to study neuronal correlates of this phenomenon. To this end T286A^{+/-} mutant mice and their WT littermates underwent CFC and Extinction session 1 or 30 days after CFC (Recent and Remote groups, respectively). The animals were sacrificed 70 minutes after the Extinction sessions. In addition, we used 3 control groups: naive mice taken from home cages, 5US groups sacrificed 1 day after CFC without Extinction session, and context controls (Ctx) that were exposed to the experimental context twice but never received USs and were sacrificed 70 minutes after the last context exposure (**Supplementary Figure 1A**). Mice brains were sliced and used for immunofluorescent staining to detect c-Fos, as a marker of neuronal activity. c-Fos expression was analyzed in 23 brain regions of the dorsal hippocampus, amygdala, cortex, thalamus, and septum (**Supplementary Figure 1B**).

Overall, for both WT and T286A^{+/-} mutant mice, we observed a significant elevation of c-Fos levels in many brain regions following Recent and Remote extinction, as compared to 5US animals (**Figure 2**). The changes were, however, more pronounced after Remote as compared to Recent extinction. A significant increase in c-Fos levels was found in 12 regions after Recent, and 15 after Remote extinction in WT animals (**Figure 2A-B**); and in 12 regions after Recent, and 17 after Remote extinction in T286A^{+/-} mutants (**Figure 2C-D**). In five brain regions (RSG, MS, PV, BLA and LA) c-Fos levels were significantly higher in Remote vs Recent groups in WT animals, and in 10 regions (V1, ENT, LS, MS, AD, AV, CM, MD, PV, BLA) in heterozygotes. In addition, c-Fos levels were significantly lower in CA1 in the Remote vs Recent group in T286A^{+/-} mutant mice (**Figure 2C-D**). Furthermore, when we compared c-Fos levels between WT and T286A^{+/-} mutant mice the biggest differences were observed between the Remote extinction groups, as compared to all other experimental groups (**Figure 2E-F**). In the Remote groups, c-Fos levels were significantly higher in the heterozygotes in 9 regions (CG, V1, Ent, LS, MS, AD, RE, CM and BLA), and downregulated in DG. c-Fos levels were affected by the mutation in 5 regions in the naive groups, in 3 regions in Recent and Ctx groups and no significant differences were observed between the genotypes in 5US groups. Hence, elevated c-Fos levels in the cortex, septum, thalamus and amygdala, and reduced levels in the hippocampus are the neural correlates of impaired extinction of remote contextual fear memory in T286A^{+/-} mutant mice. This observation suggests that αCaMKII activity in these regions contributes to systems consolidation and updating of the remote memory engram.




Figure 2. Summary of the c-Fos signal density profile comparison between groups for each structure within the brain region.

(A, C). Fold change of the c-Fos signal density for WT and T286A^{+/-} mice, where the recent (Rec) and remote (Rem) extinction groups are compared to mice sacrificed 24 hours after CFC (5US) or to each other.

(E) Fold change of c-Fos signal density for T286A^{+/-} mice as compared to WT animals. Naive, mice taken from home cages; Ctx, mice exposed twice to the novel context without US experience. See Supplementary Figure 1 for the experimental groups description.

(B, D, F) Significant change of the c-Fos signal density for WT and T286A^{+/-} mice (based on FDR results).

PrL, prelimbic cortex; IL, infralimbic cortex; CG, cingulate cortex; RSG, retrosplenial cortex, granular part; RSA, retrosplenial cortex, agranular part; V1, primary visual cortex; ENT, entorhinal cortex; LS, lateral septum; MS, medial septum; AD, anterodorsal nucleus of thalamus; AV, anteroventral nucleus of thalamus; AM, anteromedial

nucleus of thalamus; LD, laterodorsal nucleus of thalamus; RE, nucleus reuniens; CM, centromedial nucleus of thalamus; MD, mediodorsal nucleus of thalamus; PV, paraventricular nucleus of thalamus; CA1, dorsal hippocampus, CA1 area; CA3, dorsal hippocampus, CA3 area; DG, dentate gyrus; BLA, basolateral nucleus of the amygdala; LA, lateral nucleus of the amygdala; CeA, central nucleus of the amygdala, capsular and lateral divisions; CeM, central nucleus of the amygdala, centromedial division.

Validation of the chemogenetic tools

As our c-Fos analysis revealed multiple brain regions that are likely regulated during extinction of remote contextual fear memory by α CaMKII, in the following experiment we validated their function in the process using a chemogenetic approach relying on the combination of Gi-protein-coupled inhibitory DREADDs (Designer Receptors Exclusively Activated by Designer Drugs) (hM4Di) and hM4Di agonist, clozapine N-oxide (CNO)^{30,31}. As a recent study showed that CNO is reverse-metabolized to clozapine and produces clozapine-like effects³², we first tested the effect of CNO on remote fear memory extinction. C57BL/6J mice (without hM4Di expression) underwent CFC and 30 days later they were injected with CNO (0.5, 3 or 10 mg/kg) or saline. Thirty minutes later they were exposed to the training context for contextual fear memory extinction and fear extinction memory was tested in the same context one day later. We observed no effect of CNO on fear memory recall during the Extinction session, or fear extinction memory during the Test (**Supplementary Figure 2A-C**).

To test the efficiency of the chemogenetic manipulation to inhibit fear extinction-induced c-Fos expression, a new cohort of mice was injected into V1 with adeno-associated viral vectors (AAVs) encoding hM4Di and red fluorescent protein, mCherry, under human synapsin (*hSyn*) promoter allowing for neuron-specific transgene expression³³. As a control AAV encoding only mCherry was used. Three weeks post-surgery and viral transduction, mice underwent CFC, followed 30 days later by a contextual fear extinction session. Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/kg) 30 minutes prior to the Extinction and they were sacrificed 60 minutes after the Extinction session. Their brains were sliced and immunostained to detect c-Fos protein. The statistical analysis of the data revealed significantly lower frequency of c-Fos-positive nuclei among the cells transduced with hM4Di as compared to the mCherry controls indicating that chemogenetic manipulation effectively prevented c-Fos expression, hence blocked cell activity (**Supplementary Figure 2D-E**).

Contribution of RE to extinction of contextual fear memory

Activity of RE is synchronized with freezing bouts [23,24], suggesting that activity patterns in the RE are related to suppression of fear responses. As c-Fos mapping identified that increased c-Fos expression in RE correlated with impaired extinction of remote contextual fear memory in the T286A^{+/-} mutant mice in the following experiment we tested the role of RE in extinction of recent and remote memory.

C57BL/6J mice were injected into RE with AAVs encoding hM4Di or mCherry (**Figure 3A-B**). Three (for recent groups) or one (for remote groups) week post-surgery and viral transduction mice underwent CFC, followed by a Recent or Remote contextual fear extinction session (1 or 30 days post CFC, respectively). Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/kg) prior to the Extinction. The freezing levels increased within the conditioning session (pre- vs post-US) and did not differ between the drug groups. During the Recent extinction session, the hM4Di mice had overall lower freezing levels as compared to the mCherry animals. Consolidation of recent fear extinction memory was tested 24 hours after the Extinction session in the same context (Test). Mice from the hM4Di group had lower levels of freezing as compared to the mCherry animals, suggesting facilitated extinction of recent fear memory (**Figure 3C**). However, further analysis of the behavioral data revealed that mice in both groups similarly decreased freezing levels in the Test, as compared to E5 (**Figure 3D-E**). Hence, lower freezing in hM4Di mice during the Test

likely resulted from impaired recall of context fear memory during the Extinction session, rather than the effect on consolidation of fear extinction memory.

During the Remote extinction session, mice in both experimental groups significantly decreased freezing levels indicating successful within session fear extinction, and no significant effect of the virus was observed. However, when the fear extinction memory was tested, the hM4Di animals demonstrated higher levels of freezing (Figure 3F). Further analysis of the behavioral data revealed that although both hM4Di and mCherry mice had lower levels of freezing during the Test as compared to E5, the change was larger in the control group (Figure 3G-H). Hence, chemogenetic inhibition of RE during the Remote, but not Recent, extinction session impaired consolidation of fear extinction memory.




Figure 3. RE regulates extinction of remote contextual fear memory.

(A-B) Surgery schema and representative microphotographs of AAV:hM4Di_mCherry (hM4Di) and AAV:mCherry (mCherry) expression in RE.

(C-E) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of recent contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hM4Di or mCherry into RE, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 32) = 509$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 32) = 0.026$, $P = 0.871$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 32) = 0.018$, $P = 0.892$), followed by recent fear memory extinction session 1 day later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(3.28, 78.8) = 39.2$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 24) = 2.05$, $P = 0.165$; time \times virus interaction: $F(5, 120) = 2.16$, $P = 0.063$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(25) = 1.63$, $P = 0.116$). Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/kg) 30 minutes prior to the extinction session. (D-E) Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1,$

26) = 43.9, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 26) = 2.69$, $P = 0.113$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 26) = 2.53$, $P = 0.124$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(26) = 1.59$, $P = 0.124$). **(F-H)** Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hM4Di or mCherry into RE, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 31) = 443.8$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 31) = 3.680$, $P = 0.06$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 31) = 1.226$, $P = 0.28$), remote fear memory extinction session 30 days later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(3.97, 115) = 27.8$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 29) = 2.64$, $P = 0.115$; time \times virus interaction: $F(5, 145) = 1.98$, $P = 0.086$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(29) = 3.337$, $P = 0.002$). **(G-H)** Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 31) = 88.3$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 31) = 5.09$, $P = 0.031$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 31) = 5.66$, $P = 0.024$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(33) = 2.201$, $P = 0.03$).

Contribution of MS to extinction of contextual fear memory

While, former studies showed that MS contributes to recent fear memory formation and extinction^{34–38}, our analysis indicates that MS activity during extinction increases as the memory age. To test the role of MS in extinction of remote fear memory C57BL/6J mice were injected into MS with AAVs encoding hM4Di or mCherry (**Figure 4A-B**). Three weeks post-surgery and viral transduction mice underwent CFC, followed by a Recent or Remote contextual fear extinction session (1 or 30 days post CFC, respectively). Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/ kg) prior to the Extinction. The freezing levels increased during the CFC (pre- vs post-US) and did not differ between the drug groups. During the Recent extinction session, mice in both experimental groups decreased freezing levels and no significant effect of the virus was observed. Consolidation of recent fear extinction memory was tested 24 hours after the Extinction session in the same context (Test). Mice from the two experimental groups did not differ in freezing levels (**Figure 4C**). Both hM4Di and mCherry mice had lower levels of freezing during the Test as compared to E5, and the change was similar (**Figure 4D-E**), indicating that chemogenetic inhibition of MS during the Recent Extinction had no effect on the recall of contextual fear and consolidation of extinction memory.

During the Remote extinction session, mice in both experimental groups significantly decreased freezing levels, indicating successful within session fear extinction, and no significant effect of the virus was observed. However, when the fear extinction memory was tested, the hM4Di animals demonstrated higher levels of freezing (**Figure 4F**). Further analysis of the behavioral data revealed that although both hM4Di and mCherry mice had lower levels of freezing during the Test as compared to E5, the change was significantly greater in the control group (**Figure 4G-H**). Hence, chemogenetic inhibition of MS during the Remote, but not Recent, extinction session impaired consolidation of contextual fear extinction memory.




Figure 4. MS regulates extinction of remote contextual fear memory.

(A-B) Surgery schema and representative microphotographs of AAV:mCherry (mCherry) and AAV:hM4Di_mCherry (hM4Di) expression in MS.

(C-E) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of recent contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hM4Di or mCherry into MS, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 13) = 172, P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 13) = 2.37, P = 0.148$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 13) = 0.156, P = 0.699$), followed by recent fear memory extinction session 1 day later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(3.87, 62.0) = 26.3, P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 16) = 1.93, P = 0.184$; time \times virus interaction: $F(5, 80) = 0.689, P = 0.634$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(16) = 0.669, P = 0.513$). Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/kg) 30 minutes prior to the extinction session. **(D-E)** Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 16) = 21.5, P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 16) = 0.968, P = 0.340$; time \times genotype interaction: $F(1, 16) = 0.101, P = 0.755$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(16) = 0.669, P = 0.513$).

(F-H) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hM4Di or mCherry into MS, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 17) = 193, P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 17) = 0.061, P = 0.807$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 17) = 0.864, P = 0.366$), remote fear memory extinction session 30 days later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(2.83, 48.0) = 18.3, P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 17) = 0.819, P = 0.378$; time \times virus interaction: $F(5, 85) = 2.42$,

$P = 0.042$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(16) = 3.585$, $P = 0.002$). **(G-H)** Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 17) = 82.6$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 17) = 11.7$, $P = 0.003$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 17) = 13.9$, $P = 0.002$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(17) = 3.728$, $P = 0.002$).

RE→MS projections

We hypothesized that projections between RE and MS contribute to neuronal networks that support extinction of remote contextual fear memory. As the data about the direct projections between RE and MS (RE→MS) are controversial ^{39–43}, we first tested the presence of such projections using Ai14 mice that express Cre-dependent red fluorescent protein, tdTomato. Ai14 mice were stereotactically injected into MS with retro AAV (rAAV) encoding Cre recombinase allowing for transduction of axons terminating in MS and tdTomato expression in the cell bodies ^{44,45} (**Figure 5A-B**). tdTomato-positive cells were observed in the anterior (Bregma: 0.816 - 0.519 mm), but not the posterior part (Bregma: 0.473 to -0.586 mm) of RE (**Figure 5C**). We also observed tdTomato-positive cells in the brain regions well known to innervate MS, such as dCA1 and BLA ^{46,47} (**Figure 5C**). Similar results were observed when we injected rAAV encoding enhanced GFP (eGFP) to MS of C57BL/6J mice - eGFP-positive cells were found only in the anterior RE (data not shown). Hence, MS is innervated specifically by the anterior part of RE.

Contribution of RE→MS projections to extinction of contextual fear memory

To test whether RE→MS pathway affects extinction of contextual fear memory, C57BL/6J mice were stereotactically injected into RE with AAV encoding double-floxed inverted open reading frame (DIO) of hM4Di and mCherry, or just mCherry, under *camk2a* promoter (AAV:DIO_hM4Di_mCherry or AAV:DIO_mCherry), and into MS with rAAV encoding improved Cre recombinase (iCre) with eGFP under *camk2a* promoter (rAAV:iCre_eGFP). This combinatorial manipulation allowed for hM4Di expression specifically in RE neurons projecting to MS (RE→MS) (**Figure 6A-B**). Three weeks post-surgery and viral transduction, mice underwent CFC, followed by a Recent or Remote contextual fear extinction session. Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/ kg) 30 minutes prior to the Extinction. The freezing levels increased within the CFC session (pre- vs post-US) in all experimental groups and did not differ between the virus groups. During the Recent Extinction session, the mice from two experimental groups had similar freezing levels at the beginning of the session and decreased freezing during the session, indicating no impairment of fear memory recall and successful within-session fear extinction. Consolidation of long-term fear extinction memory was tested 24 hours after the Extinction session in the same context (Test) (**Figure 6C**). Mice from two experimental groups had lower freezing levels during the Test as compared to E5, indicating successful consolidation of fear extinction memory (**Figure 6D**). No difference in freezing levels were observed between the experimental groups (**Figure 6E**).

During the Remote extinction session, mice in both experimental groups significantly decreased freezing levels indicating successful within session fear extinction. The hM4Di groups showed, however, overall higher freezing levels. Moreover, the hM4Di animals also demonstrated higher levels of freezing when the fear extinction memory was tested (**Figure 6F**). Further analysis of the behavioral data revealed that although both hM4Di and mCherry mice had lower levels of freezing during the Test as compared to E5, the change was significantly greater in the control group (**Figure 6G-H**). Hence, chemogenetic inhibition of RE→MS projection during the Remote, but not Recent, extinction session impaired consolidation of fear extinction memory.




Figure 5. Identification of anatomical projections from anterior RE to MS.

Ai14 mice (with Cre-dependent tdTomato) were injected into MS with rAAV:Cre_GFP resulting in tdTomato expression in neurons projecting to MS.

(A-B) Surgery schema and representative microphotographs of rAAV:Cre_GFP expression in MS.

(C) Microphotographs of tdTomato expression in Ai14 mouse (bottom) along with microphotographs of Allen mouse brain atlas (top). RE is marked in pink. Brain coordinates according to Bregma are indicated for each set of pictures.




Figure 6. RE→MS projections regulate consolidation of remote contextual fear extinction memory.

AAV:DIO-hM4Di-mCherry (hM4Di) or control virus AAV: α CaMKII-DIO-mCherry (mCherry) were bilaterally injected to RE, while rAAV:iCre_eGFP- α CaMKII (eGFP) to MS of C57BL/6J male mice.

(A-B) Surgery schema and representative microphotographs of hM4Di and mCherry in RE, and eGFP expression in MS.

(C-E) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of recent contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hM4Di or mCherry into RE and eGFP into MS, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 15) = 414$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 15) = 0.056$, $P = 0.82$), followed by recent fear memory extinction session 1 day later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 15) = 19.68$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 15) = 0.648$, $P = 0.43$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(16) = 0.318$, $P = 0.75$). Mice were injected with CNO (i.p., 3 mg/kg) 30 minutes prior to the extinction session. (D-E) Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 15) = 19.7$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 15) = 0.405$, $P = 0.534$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 15) = 0.201$, $P = 0.660$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(15) = 0.448$, $P = 0.66$).

(F-H) Experimental timeline and summary of data for freezing levels during the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. After stereotactic injection of hm4Di or mCherry into MS, mice underwent CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 11) = 201.3$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 11) = 0.0190$, $P = 0.89$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 11) = 0.0057$, $P = 0.94$), remote fear memory extinction session 30 days later (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(5, 65) = 13.60$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 13) = 5.402$, $P = 0.04$; time \times virus interaction: $F(5, 65) = 1.465$, $P = 0.21$) and fear extinction test on the next day (Test: unpaired t-test: $t(12) = 2.88$, $P = 0.01$). **(G-H)** Summary of data showing freezing levels during the first 5 minutes of the extinction session (E5) and test (T) (RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 13) = 52.1$, $P < 0.001$; effect of virus: $F(1, 13) = 2.33$, $P = 0.151$; time \times virus interaction: $F(1, 13) = 3.77$, $P = 0.074$), and the change of freezing frequency during T as compared to E5 (unpaired t-test: $t(11) = 3.39$, $P = 0.006$).

Discussion

The current study identifies neuronal networks involved in the extinction of remote contextual fear memory. In particular, we characterize the role of RE, MS, and RE→MS projections in the extinction of contextual fear memory as the memories age.

In our experiments, we evaluated extinction of contextual fear memory at both short and long delays after training. We found that in the wild-type (WT) animals functional networks differed at these two time-points, consistent with the idea that memory organization changes as a function of memory age, a process known as systems consolidation¹². One prominent model of systems consolidation⁴⁸ proposes that memories are initially encoded in hippocampal-cortical networks, and that reactivation of these networks then leads to the incremental strengthening of inter-cortical connectivity, and an emergent role for cortical regions in memory expression coupled with disengagement of the hippocampus. In agreement with this model we see increased activity of the cortex (RSC and V1) in the remote time point. Furthermore, we see increased engagement of the septum (MS), thalamus (PV) and amygdala (BLA and LA) supporting the contribution of these regions in systems consolidation^{15,29}. However, we do not see significant change in the hippocampus engagement with time, possibly indicating differences between the contribution of this region in contextual fear memory formation, recall and extinction as the memory age. Interestingly, the role of some hotspots, including BLA, RSC, PV and PV→CeA projections, in remote memory processing has been already validated^{29,49,50}.

Overall, our data indicates that extinction of remote memory engages more brain regions than recent memory. Interestingly, although previous studies linked broader memory networks with higher stabilization of remote memory^{15,51,52}, in our experiments extinction of remote memory was more efficient. A remote extinction session resulted in WT mice in a reduction of freezing by 40-50% during the extinction test as compared to the beginning of the extinction session, while the recent extinction session reduced freezing by 20% measured during the test. Hence, increased stabilization of memories with time may be specific for traumatic and pathologic memories^{53,54}, while in case of physiologic process extinction of remote fear memory may be enhanced by natural forgetting of aversive experience. Alternatively, enhanced extinction observed in our model in the remote time point may reflect the fact that such a session engages more brain regions, hence, more efficiently remodels memory networks.

We show that α CaMKII autophosphorylation deficient heterozygous mice (T286A^{+/-}) have impaired extinction of remote memory while the extinction of recent contextual fear memory is spared. Accordingly, we use this model to look for neuronal correlates of remote memory extinction. Although previous studies showed that T286A mutation affects extinction of recent contextual fear memory (more training trials are required for efficient extinction)²⁰⁻²², this is the first demonstration showing that α CaMKII autophosphorylation affects remote memory

updating. This finding is reminiscent of former studies showing that $\alpha\text{CaMKII}^{+/-}$ mice show impairment of remote memory storage^{15,19}. Impaired remote memory extinction in T286A^{+/-} mice is accompanied with globally increased activity of the thalamus (RE, CM, AD), septum (LS and MS), cortex (CG, V1, ENT) and amygdala (BLA), and decreased activity of the hippocampus (DG). Hence, impaired fear memory extinction in heterozygous may result from aberrant connectivity of fear extinction network and impaired systems consolidation. It is also possible that the decreased function of the hippocampus in the mutants during the Remote extinction session reflects impaired recall and/or updating of contextual fear memory.

While correspondence between the predictions derived from the c-Fos analysis and these published findings provides some validation of our approach, perhaps greater value lies in using this approach for the identification of novel, candidate brain regions. In this regard, it is interesting that both septal (MS and LS) and thalamic (RE, CM, AD) regions were identified. These regions, by virtue of their widespread connectivity with both the hippocampus and neocortex, are ideally positioned to influence network function. In particular, thalamic regions strongly influence cortical activity and therefore may play central roles in coordinating memory retrieval and extinction.

Indeed, former studies demonstrated the role of the RE in fear memory encoding, retrieval, extinction and fear generalization⁵⁵⁻⁶⁰. Specifically, it has been demonstrated that RE is involved in the extinction of recent contextual and auditory fear memory^{61,62}. Administration of muscimol into the RE before the recent extinction session impairs within-session fear extinction as well as fear extinction memory tested on the following day^{61,62}. Administration of muscimol into the RE shortly after extinction training or extinction reconsolidation does not result in differences in freezing levels during the extinction memory test⁶³. In opposition to these findings our experiments indicate that the involvement of the RE in fear memory extinction depends on the length of the interval between training and extinction sessions. Chemogenetic inhibition of RE neurons during the extinction of recent contextual fear memory slightly increased freezing levels during the extinction session but did not affect the consolidation of extinction memory. Chemogenetic inhibition of RE neurons during the extinction of remote contextual fear memory impaired both within-session extinction and consolidation of extinction memory. Reminiscent of these observations, permanent lesion of the RE impaired remote, but not recent, contextual fear memory⁶⁴ and chemogenetic manipulation of RE bidirectionally affects extinction of the remote contextual fear memory²⁹. The discrepancy between our results and the work of Marren's group⁶³ may stem from differences in the location of RE inhibition along the anteroposterior axis and the methods used to inhibit RE activity as well as training protocol. From the above work, it can be inferred that the researchers primarily inhibited the posterior part of RE, whereas in our experiments, mainly the anterior part of RE was manipulated. Anatomical studies of RE indicate that its posterior part innervates mPFC, while the anterior RE innervates CA1 and ENT⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷. In addition, our work demonstrates projections of the anterior RE to MS that are specifically involved in the remote extinction. Furthermore, muscimol used by Ramanathan et al.⁵⁸ stimulates inhibitory GABAA receptors and strongly inhibits neuronal activity. Whereas, stimulation of the inhibitory hM4Di receptor results in a decrease rather than complete inhibition of neuronal activity⁶⁸. Finally, in the former studies, as compared to our experiments, the authors used a weaker training protocol (3US vs 5US) and extended extinction session (35 min vs 30 min) that resulted in more efficient contextual fear extinction (to 20% vs 50-60% freezing). Hence, high levels of freezing observed in our experiments in the control groups following a recent extinction session could mask the effect of RE inhibition on contextual fear extinction. In summary, our experiments suggest that the role of RE in extinction of contextual fear memory increases with time. Moreover, the extinction of remote and recent fear memory possibly involves different populations of RE neurons. The later hypothesis should be, however, validated in the future experiments.

Several reports demonstrate the involvement of MS in extinction of fear memory^{38,69,70}. In conjunction with anatomical data indicating dense connections of MS with the hippocampus^{71–74} and the medial prefrontal cortex⁷⁵, the above observations suggest the involvement of MS in processing spatial information related to environmental threats. In particular, cholinergic neurons of MS regulate the extinction of recent contextual fear memory when extinction training consists of seven sessions conducted over seven days⁷⁶. Lesions of MS and the adjacent nucleus of the diagonal band of Broca also led to impaired extinction of early fear memory dependent on auditory stimuli in rats⁷⁷. Here, we observed that c-Fos protein levels in MS are higher after the remote extinction session than after the recent extinction. Moreover, we did not observe a disruption of the extinction with chemogenetic inhibition of MS during the recent extinction session. However, we noticed that chemogenetic inactivation of MS during the remote extinction session impaired formation of the fear extinction memory. Thus, the changes in c-Fos expression and the results of chemogenetic manipulations are consistent and suggest that the involvement of MS in fear memory extinction changes as the memory age. These observations, however, seem to contradict the literature data cited above⁷⁶. Possible reasons for this discrepancy may include differences in the conditioning and fear memory extinction protocols, as well as in the method and extent of MS neuron inactivation. Although Tronson et al.⁷⁶ observed impaired recent fear memory extinction in mice with MS lesions compared to the control animals, these differences were only evident on the fourth day of extinction training. This observation is similar to the results of our experiment. Interestingly, this difference probably does not depend on the length of the extinction session (3 min in Tronson et al.⁷⁶ vs. 30 min here), as in the study by Knox and Keller³⁶, which used long extinction training, a similar pattern of changes in behavior was observed as after 3-minute extinctions. Therefore, the time from the conditioning to the extinction session seems to be crucial for the involvement of MS in fear memory extinction.

RE innervates many brain structures and is innervated by over 30 areas³⁹. It also has about 11% bifurcating neurons, which innervate both the cingulate cortex and the medial part of the prefrontal cortex, as well as the insular cortex⁷⁸. So far, the functionally best-understood neuronal circuit involving RE is the mPFC→RE→hippocampal axis. Both mPFC→RE and RE→CA1 projections mediate the fear extinction process^{26,27,61}. It has been shown that inhibiting RE→CA1 projections during the recall of recent fear memory leads to impaired fear memory extinction in subsequent days⁷⁹. Furthermore, RE→BLA projection participates in the extinction of remote contextual fear memory [16]. It has been shown that both the activity of excitatory RE→BLA projections and the activity of RE cells increase shortly before the end of the extinction episode. Moreover, chemogenetic inhibition of these projections during late fear extinction impairs the extinction of late fear memory. On the other hand, optogenetic stimulation of GABAergic or dopaminergic cells in the zone incerta (ZI)→RE neuronal pathway leads to enhanced extinction of early fear memory dependent on auditory stimuli⁸⁰, revealing a complex role of RE in the neuronal circuits of fear extinction. Here, we demonstrated that chemogenetic inhibition of the excitatory RE→MS projections during fear memory extinction impairs extinction of remote, but not recent, contextual fear memory. Considering the consequences of inhibiting RE→MS projections in the context of anatomical connections, it is worth mentioning that both these regions innervate the CA1 area of the hippocampus, which is involved in extinction of contextual fear memory^{28,81–84}. MS and RE synchronize theta rhythms in the hippocampus and influence local field potentials in the hippocampus→RE→mPFC circuit^{85,86}.

In summary, the results presented here reveal a new element of neuronal circuits responsible for the extinction of remote contextual fear memory and highlight the importance of thalamo-septal circuits in the systems consolidation of remote memories.

Materials and Methods

Animals. C57BL/6J male mice were purchased from the Medical University of Białystok, Poland. T286A^{+/-} and WT mice were obtained from crossing heterozygous α CaMKII autophosphorylation-deficient mutant mice (α CaMKII-T286A^{+/-})²³ and heterozygotes of Thy1-GFP(M) line (Thy1-GFP^{+/-})⁸⁷ at the Nencki Institute animal house, and genotyped as previously described^{23,87}. Homozygous Ai14 mice were genotyped as previously described⁴⁵ and crossed with C57BL/6J animals. Heterozygotes were used in the experiment. Mice were 10 weeks-old at the beginning of the training. The animals were maintained on a 12 h light/dark cycle with food and water *ad libitum*. Behavioral experiments were conducted in the light phase of the cycle. All procedures conducted in the study were approved by the 1st Local Ethical Committee, Warsaw, Poland (permission number: 261/2012 and 529/2018).

Contextual fear conditioning (CFC). Mice were trained in a conditioning chamber located in a soundproof box (Med Associates Inc, St Albans, VT, USA). The chamber floor had a stainless steel grid for shock delivery. Before and after each training session, chambers were cleaned with 70% ethanol, and paper towels soaked in ethanol were placed under the grid floor. A video camera was fixed inside the door of the sound attenuating box, for the behavior to be recorded. Freezing behavior (defined as complete lack of movement, except respiration) and locomotor activity of mice were automatically scored. The experimenters were blind to the experimental groups.

On the day of CFC, mice were brought to the conditioning room 30 minutes before the training. Animals were placed in the chamber, and after a 148-second introductory period, a foot shock (2 seconds, 0.70 mA) (US) was presented. The shock was repeated five times, with intertrial interval of 90 seconds. Thirty seconds after the last shock, mice were returned to the home cage. Mice of the 5US groups were sacrificed 24 hours after the initial training. For the extinction of contextual fear, mice were re-exposing to the conditioning chamber without US presentation for 20 (WT and T286A^{+/-} animals) or 30 minutes (C57BL/6J mice) either 1 or 30 days after the training (extinction of recent and remote memory, respectively). WT and T286A^{+/-} mice from the Extinction groups were sacrificed 70 minutes after the extinction session. To test the efficiency of extinction, mice were re-exposed to the training context 24 hours after the extinction session for an additional 5 minutes. The differences in the length of the extinction session used for T286A^{+/-} animals and C57BL/6J mice resulted from the fact that while for the WT/T286A^{+/-} mice a 20 minute-long extinction session efficiently decreased freezing during the test, we did not see such effect for the C57BL/6J mice. Accordingly, we had to adjust the extinction protocol for these mice.

CNO administration. For intraperitoneal (i.p.) injections, Clozapine N-Oxide (CNO) was dissolved in 0.9% saline. If not stated otherwise, CNO (3 mg/kg) was injected 30 minutes prior to the contextual fear memory extinction session.

c-Fos immunoreactivity. The mice were anesthetized with a mixture of Ketamine/Xylazine (90 mg/kg and 7,5 mg/kg respectively, (i.p.) Biowet Puławy) and next sedated with sodium pentobarbital (50 mg/kg intraperitoneal (i.p.) and perfused transcardially with 20 ml of PBS (Phosphate-buffered saline; POCH, Poland), followed by 50 ml of 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA; Sigma-Aldrich, Poland) in 0.1 M PBS, pH 7.5. Brains were stored in the same solution for 24 h at 4°C. Next, the brains were transferred to the solution of 30% sucrose in 0.1 M PBS (pH 7.5) and stored at 4°C for 72 h. Brains were frozen at -20°C and coronal sections (40 μ m) cut in the frontal plane on a cryostat microtome (YD-1900, Leica). Coronal slices were stored in -20°C in PBSAF (PBS, 15% sucrose, 30% ethylene glycol, 0.05% NaN₃). Every sixth section through the whole brain was used for immunostaining. Sections were washed three times for 6 min in PBS, followed by incubation in blocking solution (5% NDS; Jackson Immuno Research/0,3% Triton X-100; Sigma Aldrich) in PBS for 2 h at room temperature (RT). Next, sections were incubated with c-Fos polyclonal antibody (sc-52; Santa Cruz Biotechnology, 1:1000) for 12 h in 37°C, washed three times in TBS (0,3% Triton X-100 in PBS) and incubated with secondary antibody (1:500) conjugated with Alexa

Fluor-594 (Invitrogen A-11062) for 2 h at room temperature. After incubation with the secondary antibody sections were washed three times for 6 min in PBS and mounted on microscopic slides covered with mounting dye with DAPI (Invitrogen, 00-4959-52).

c-Fos quantification. c-Fos immunostaining was imaged under a confocal microscope (Leica TCS SP5; objective 10x). Cells were considered positive for c-Fos immunoreactivity if the nucleus had an area ranging from 5 to 160 μm^2 , and was significantly distinct from the background. c-Fos-positive cells were counted in 23 brain regions. We took 2 to 8 microphotographs for each animal per each brain region, resulting in 9 to 48 pictures per experimental group per brain region. Microphotographs were converted into an 8-bit grayscale and the same threshold used for a selected area of interest. The densities of the nuclei were counted with the ImageJ software (National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD) by an experimenter blind to the experimental condition. The position of the analyzed brain regions was determined according to the mouse brain atlas⁸⁸ (**Supplementary Figure 1B-C**).

Stereotactic surgery. Mice were anesthetized with isoflurane (5% for induction, 1.5-2.0% after) and fixed in the stereotactic frame (51503, Stoelting, Wood Dale, IL, USA). AAV_{2.1} viruses [camk2a_mCherry (titer 7.5×10^7 pc/μl, from Karl Deisseroth's Lab, Addgene plasmid #114469); hSyn_hM4D(Gi)_mCherry (4.59×10^9 pc/ul; Addgene plasmid #50475); were injected into RE (250 nl, coordinates from the Bregma: AP, -0.58 mm; ML, ± 0.1 mm; DV, -4.3 mm), MS (150 nl, coordinates from the Bregma: AP, -0.75 mm; ML, ± 0.0 mm; DV, -4.1 mm), hSyn_DiO_hM4Di-mCherry (3.3×10^9 pc/μl; constructed by the VVF [dlox-hM4D(Gi)_mCherry(rev)-dlox: Addgene #50461]) and hSyn_DIO_mCherry (3.4×10^9 pc/μl; constructed by the VVF) and camk2a_hM4D(Gi)_mCherry (4.4×10^9 pc/ul; Addgene plasmid #50477) were injected into RE; rAAV:iCre_eGFP (3.6×10^9 pc/μl) constructed by the VVF [iCre: Addgene #24593] was injected into the MS⁸⁸. We used beveled 26 gauge metal needle and 10 μl microsyringe (SGE010RNS, WPI, USA) connected to a microsyringe pump (UMP3, WPI, Sarasota, USA), and its controller (Micro4, WPI, Sarasota, USA) with an injection rate 0.1 μl/min. After injection, the needle was left in place for an additional 10 min to prevent unwanted spread of the vector. The AAVs were prepared by the Laboratory of Animal Models at Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, Polish Academy of Sciences and Viral Vector Facility of ETH Zurich. Efficient and specific viral expression was assessed on the brain sections after all experiments. Only mice with AAVs in the regions of interest were used in the statistical analyses.

Statistics. Analysis was performed using Graphpad Prism 10. All the statistical details of experiments can be found in the legends of the figures. Data with normal distribution are presented as mean \pm standard error of the mean (SEM) or as median \pm interquartile range (IQR) for the population with non-normal distribution. When the data met the assumptions of parametric statistical tests, results were analyzed by one- or repeated measures two-way ANOVA (RM ANOVA), followed by Tukey's or Fisher's *post hoc* tests, where applicable. Differences in means were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Acknowledgments, Funding and Disclosure

This work was supported by a National Science Center (Poland) [PRELUDIUM Grant No. 2019/35/N/NZ4/01910 to KFT; and MAESTRO grant No. 2020/38/A/NZ4/00483 to KR]. The project was carried out with the use of CePT infrastructure financed by the European Union - The European Regional Development Fund within the Operational Program "Innovative economy" for 2007-2013.

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Authors report no financial interests or conflicts of interest.

INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY

While citing references scientifically relevant for this work, we also actively worked to promote gender balance in our reference list. We support inclusive, diverse, and equitable conduct of research.

LITERATURE

1. Lissek, S., Kaczurkin, A.N., Rabin, S., Geraci, M., Pine, D.S., and Grillon, C. (2014). Generalized anxiety disorder is associated with overgeneralization of classically conditioned fear. *Biol Psychiatry* 75, 909–915. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.07.025.
2. Garfinkel, S.N., Abelson, J.L., King, A.P., Sripada, R.K., Wang, X., Gaines, L.M., and Liberzon, I. (2014). Impaired contextual modulation of memories in PTSD: an fMRI and psychophysiological study of extinction retention and fear renewal. *J Neurosci* 34, 13435–13443. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4287-13.2014.
3. Grodin, E.N., Sussman, L., Sundby, K., Brennan, G.M., Diazgranados, N., Heilig, M., and Momenan, R. (2018). Neural Correlates of Compulsive Alcohol Seeking in Heavy Drinkers. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging* 3, 1022–1031. 10.1016/j.bpsc.2018.06.009.
4. Maren, S., Phan, K.L., and Liberzon, I. (2013). The contextual brain: implications for fear conditioning, extinction and psychopathology. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 14, 417–428. 10.1038/nrn3492.
5. Ji, J., and Maren, S. (2007). Hippocampal involvement in contextual modulation of fear extinction. *Hippocampus* 17, 749–758. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20331>.
6. Maren, S., and Quirk, G.J. (2004). Neuronal signalling of fear memory. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 5, 844–852. 10.1038/nrn1535.
7. Myers, K.M., and Davis, M. (2002). Behavioral and Neural Analysis of Extinction. *Neuron* 36, 567–584. 10.1016/S0896-6273(02)01064-4.
8. Orsini, C.A., and Maren, S. (2012). Neural and cellular mechanisms of fear and extinction memory formation. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 36, 1773–1802. 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.12.014.
9. Kitamura, T., Ogawa, S.K., Roy, D.S., Okuyama, T., Morrissey, M.D., Smith, L.M., Redondo, R.L., and Tonegawa, S. (2017). Engrams and circuits crucial for systems consolidation of a memory. *Science* 356, 73–78. 10.1126/science.aam6808.
10. Tonegawa, S., Morrissey, M.D., and Kitamura, T. (2018). The role of engram cells in the systems consolidation of memory. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 19, 485–498. 10.1038/s41583-018-0031-2.
11. Buzsáki, G. (1996). The hippocampo-neocortical dialogue. *Cereb Cortex* 6, 81–92. 10.1093/cercor/6.2.81.
12. Frankland, P.W., and Bontempi, B. (2005). The organization of recent and remote memories. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 6, 119–130. 10.1038/nrn1607.
13. Moscovitch, M., Nadel, L., Winocur, G., Gilboa, A., and Rosenbaum, R.S. (2006). The cognitive neuroscience of remote episodic, semantic and spatial memory. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 16, 179–190. 10.1016/j.conb.2006.03.013.
14. Preston, A.R., and Eichenbaum, H. (2013). Interplay of hippocampus and prefrontal cortex in memory. *Curr Biol* 23, R764–773. 10.1016/j.cub.2013.05.041.
15. Wheeler, A.L., Teixeira, C.M., Wang, A.H., Xiong, X., Kovacevic, N., Lerch, J.P., McIntosh, A.R., Parkinson, J., and Frankland, P.W. (2013). Identification of a Functional Connectome for Long-Term Fear Memory in Mice. *PLOS Computational Biology* 9, e1002853. 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002853.
16. Tanaka, K.Z., Pevzner, A., Hamidi, A.B., Nakazawa, Y., Graham, J., and Wiltgen, B.J. (2014). Cortical Representations Are Reinstated by the Hippocampus during Memory Retrieval. *Neuron* 84, 347–354. 10.1016/j.neuron.2014.09.037.
17. Simons, J.S., and Spiers, H.J. (2003). Prefrontal and medial temporal lobe interactions in long-term memory. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 4, 637–648. 10.1038/nrn1178.
18. Vetere, G., Xia, F., Ramsaran, A.I., Tran, L.M., Josselyn, S.A., and Frankland, P.W. (2021). An

- inhibitory hippocampal–thalamic pathway modulates remote memory retrieval. *Nat Neurosci* 24, 685–693. 10.1038/s41593-021-00819-3.
19. Frankland, P.W., O'Brien, C., Ohno, M., Kirkwood, A., and Silva, A.J. (2001). α -CaMKII-dependent plasticity in the cortex is required for permanent memory. *Nature* 411, 309–313. 10.1038/35077089.
20. Radwanska, K., Medvedev, N.I., Pereira, G.S., Engmann, O., Thiede, N., Moraes, M.F.D., Villers, A., Irvine, E.E., Maunganidze, N.S., Pyza, E.M., et al. (2011). Mechanism for long-term memory formation when synaptic strengthening is impaired. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108, 18471–18475. 10.1073/pnas.1109680108.
21. Kimura, R., Silva, A.J., and Ohno, M. (2008). Autophosphorylation of α CaMKII is differentially involved in new learning and unlearning mechanisms of memory extinction. *Learn Mem* 15, 837–843. 10.1101/lm.1049608.
22. Radwanska, K., Schenatto-Pereira, G., Ziółkowska, M., Łukasiewicz, K., and Giese, K.P. (2015). Mapping fear memory consolidation and extinction-specific expression of JunB. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* 125, 106–112. 10.1016/j.nlm.2015.08.007.
23. Giese, K.P., Fedorov, N.B., Filipkowski, R.K., and Silva, A.J. (1998). Autophosphorylation at Thr286 of the alpha calcium-calmodulin kinase II in LTP and learning. *Science* 279, 870–873. 10.1126/science.279.5352.870.
24. Irvine, E.E., Vernon, J., and Giese, K.P. (2005). α CaMKII autophosphorylation contributes to rapid learning but is not necessary for memory. *Nat Neurosci* 8, 411–412. 10.1038/nn1431.
25. Irvine, E.E., von Herten, L.S.J., Plattner, F., and Giese, K.P. (2006). α CaMKII autophosphorylation: a fast track to memory. *Trends in Neurosciences* 29, 459–465. 10.1016/j.tins.2006.06.009.
26. Totty, M.S., Tuna, T., Ramanathan, K.R., Jin, J., Peters, S.E., and Maren, S. (2023). Thalamic nucleus reuniens coordinates prefrontal-hippocampal synchrony to suppress extinguished fear. *Nat Commun* 14, 6565. 10.1038/s41467-023-42315-1.
27. Ratigan, H.C., Krishnan, S., Smith, S., and Sheffield, M.E.J. (2023). A thalamic-hippocampal CA1 signal for contextual fear memory suppression, extinction, and discrimination. *Nat Commun* 14, 6758. 10.1038/s41467-023-42429-6.
28. Ziółkowska, M., Sotoudeh, N., Cały, A., Puchalska, M., Pagano, R., Śliwińska, M.A., Salamian, A., and Radwanska, K. (2024). Projections from thalamic nucleus reuniens to hippocampal CA1 area enable context value updating. Preprint at bioRxiv, 10.1101/2024.01.31.578155. 10.1101/2024.01.31.578155.
29. Silva, B.A., Astori, S., Burns, A.M., Heiser, H., van den Heuvel, L., Santoni, G., Martinez-Reza, M.F., Sandi, C., and Gräff, J. (2021). A thalamo-amygdalar circuit underlying the extinction of remote fear memories. *Nat Neurosci* 24, 964–974. 10.1038/s41593-021-00856-y.
30. Gomez, J.L., Bonaventura, J., Lesniak, W., Mathews, W.B., Sysa-Shah, P., Rodriguez, L.A., Ellis, R.J., Richie, C.T., Harvey, B.K., Dannals, R.F., et al. (2017). Chemogenetics revealed: DREADD occupancy and activation via converted clozapine. *Science* 357, 503–507. 10.1126/science.aan2475.
31. Jendryka, M., Palchadhuri, M., Ursu, D., van der Veen, B., Liss, B., Kätzel, D., Nissen, W., and Pekcec, A. (2019). Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic actions of clozapine-N-oxide, clozapine, and compound 21 in DREADD-based chemogenetics in mice. *Sci Rep* 9, 4522. 10.1038/s41598-019-41088-2.
32. Manvich, D.F., Webster, K.A., Foster, S.L., Farrell, M.S., Ritchie, J.C., Porter, J.H., and Weinshenker, D. (2018). The DREADD agonist clozapine N-oxide (CNO) is reverse-metabolized to clozapine and produces clozapine-like interoceptive stimulus effects in rats and mice. *Sci Rep* 8, 3840. 10.1038/s41598-018-22116-z.
33. Kügler, S., Kilic, E., and Bähr, M. (2003). Human synapsin 1 gene promoter confers highly neuron-specific long-term transgene expression from an adenoviral vector in the adult rat brain depending on the transduced area. *Gene Ther* 10, 337–347. 10.1038/sj.gt.3301905.
34. Tronson, N.C., Schrick, C., Guzman, Y.F., Huh, K.H., Srivastava, D.P., Penzes, P., Guede, A.L., Gao, C., and Radulovic, J. (2009). Segregated Populations of Hippocampal Principal CA1 Neurons Mediating Conditioning and Extinction of Contextual Fear. *Journal of Neuroscience* 29, 3387–3394. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5619-08.2009.
35. Jiang, L., Kundu, S., Lederman, J.D., López-Hernández, G.Y., Ballinger, E.C., Wang, S., Talmage, D.A., and Role, L.W. (2016). Cholinergic Signaling Controls Conditioned Fear Behaviors and Enhances Plasticity of Cortical-Amygdala Circuits. *Neuron* 90, 1057–1070. 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.04.028.
36. Knox, D., and Keller, S.M. (2016). Cholinergic neuronal lesions in the medial septum and vertical limb of the diagonal bands of Broca induce contextual fear memory generalization and impair

- acquisition of fear extinction: CHOLINERGIC NEURONS AND EMOTIONAL MEMORY. *Hippocampus* 26, 718–726. 10.1002/hipo.22553.
37. Knox, D. (2016). The Role Of Basal Forebrain Cholinergic Neurons In Fear and Extinction Memory. *Neurobiol Learn Mem* 133, 39–52. 10.1016/j.nlm.2016.06.001.
38. Calandrea, L., Jaffard, R., and Desmedt, A. (2007). Dissociated roles for the lateral and medial septum in elemental and contextual fear conditioning. 422–429. 10.1101/lm.531407.studies.
39. Cassel, J.-C., Ferraris, M., Quilichini, P., Cholvin, T., Boch, L., Stephan, A., and Pereira de Vasconcelos, A. (2021). The reuniens and rhomboid nuclei of the thalamus: A crossroads for cognition-relevant information processing? *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 126, 338–360. 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.03.023.
40. Cassel, J.-C., Pereira de Vasconcelos, A., Loureiro, M., Cholvin, T., Dalrymple-Alford, J.C., and Vertes, R.P. (2013). The reuniens and rhomboid nuclei: neuroanatomy, electrophysiological characteristics and behavioral implications. *Prog Neurobiol* 111, 34–52. 10.1016/j.pneurobio.2013.08.006.
41. Vertes, R.P., Hoover, W.B., Do Valle, A.C., Sherman, A., and Rodriguez, J.J. (2006). Efferent projections of reuniens and rhomboid nuclei of the thalamus in the rat. *J Comp Neurol* 499, 768–796. 10.1002/cne.21135.
42. McKenna, J.T., and Vertes, R.P. (2004). Afferent projections to nucleus reuniens of the thalamus. *J Comp Neurol* 480, 115–142. 10.1002/cne.20342.
43. Scheel, N., Wulff, P., and de Mooij-van Malsen, J.G. (2020). Afferent connections of the thalamic nucleus reuniens in the mouse. *J Comp Neurol* 528, 1189–1202. 10.1002/cne.24811.
44. Zingg, B., Chou, X.-L., Zhang, Z.-G., Mesik, L., Liang, F., Tao, H.W., and Zhang, L.I. (2017). AAV-Mediated Anterograde Transsynaptic Tagging: Mapping Corticocollicular Input-Defined Neural Pathways for Defense Behaviors. *Neuron* 93, 33–47. 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.11.045.
45. Madisen, L., Zwingman, T.A., Sunkin, S.M., Oh, S.W., Zariwala, H.A., Gu, H., Ng, L.L., Palmiter, R.D., Hawrylycz, M.J., Jones, A.R., et al. (2010). A robust and high-throughput Cre reporting and characterization system for the whole mouse brain. *Nat Neurosci* 13, 133–140. 10.1038/nn.2467.
46. Tao, S., Wang, Y., Peng, J., Zhao, Y., He, X., Yu, X., Liu, Q., Jin, S., and Xu, F. (2021). Whole-Brain Mapping the Direct Inputs of Dorsal and Ventral CA1 Projection Neurons. *Front Neural Circuits* 15, 643230. 10.3389/fncir.2021.643230.
47. Liu, J., Hu, T., Zhang, M.-Q., Xu, C.-Y., Yuan, M.-Y., and Li, R.-X. (2021). Differential efferent projections of GABAergic neurons in the basolateral and central nucleus of amygdala in mice. *Neurosci Lett* 745, 135621. 10.1016/j.neulet.2020.135621.
48. Squire, L.R., and Alvarez, P. (1995). Retrograde amnesia and memory consolidation: a neurobiological perspective. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 5, 169–177. 10.1016/0959-4388(95)80023-9.
49. Corcoran, K.A., Donnan, M.D., Tronson, N.C., Guzmán, Y.F., Gao, C., Jovasevic, V., Guedea, A.L., and Radulovic, J. (2011). NMDA Receptors in Retrosplenial Cortex Are Necessary for Retrieval of Recent and Remote Context Fear Memory. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 11655–11659. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2107-11.2011.
50. Do-Monte, F.H., Quiñones-Laracuente, K., and Quirk, G.J. (2015). A temporal shift in the circuits mediating retrieval of fear memory. *Nature* 519, 460–463. 10.1038/nature14030.
51. Frankland, P.W., Ding, H.-K., Takahashi, E., Suzuki, A., Kida, S., and Silva, A.J. (2006). Stability of recent and remote contextual fear memory. *Learn Mem* 13, 451–457. 10.1101/lm.183406.
52. Milekic, M.H., and Alberini, C.M. (2002). Temporally graded requirement for protein synthesis following memory reactivation. *Neuron* 36, 521–525. 10.1016/s0896-6273(02)00976-5.
53. Costanzi, M., Cannas, S., Saraulli, D., Rossi-Arnaud, C., and Cestari, V. (2011). Extinction after retrieval: effects on the associative and nonassociative components of remote contextual fear memory. *Learn Mem* 18, 508–518. 10.1101/lm.217581.
54. Kearns, M.C., Ressler, K.J., Zatzick, D., and Rothbaum, B.O. (2012). Early interventions for PTSD: a review. *Depress Anxiety* 29, 833–842. 10.1002/da.21997.
55. Ramanathan, K.R., Jin, J., Giustino, T.F., Payne, M.R., and Maren, S. (2018). Prefrontal projections to the thalamic nucleus reuniens mediate fear extinction. *Nat Commun* 9, 4527. 10.1038/s41467-018-06970-z.
56. Xu, W., and Sudhof, T.C. (2013). A Neural Circuit for Memory Specificity and Generalization. *Science* 339, 1290–1295. 10.1126/science.1229534.
57. Troyner, F., and Bertoglio, L.J. (2021). Nucleus reuniens of the thalamus controls fear memory reconsolidation. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* 177, 107343. 10.1016/j.nlm.2020.107343.
58. Ramanathan, K.R., and Maren, S. (2019). Nucleus reuniens mediates the extinction of contextual fear conditioning. *Behav Brain Res* 374, 112114. 10.1016/j.bbr.2019.112114.

59. Vasudevan, K., Ramanathan, K.R., Vierkant, V., and Maren, S. (2022). Nucleus reuniens inactivation does not impair consolidation or reconsolidation of fear extinction. *Learn Mem* 29, 216–222. 10.1101/lm.053611.122.
60. Vetere, G., Kenney, J.W., Tran, L.M., Xia, F., Steadman, P.E., Parkinson, J., Josselyn, S.A., and Frankland, P.W. (2017). Chemogenetic Interrogation of a Brain-wide Fear Memory Network in Mice. *Neuron* 94, 363–374.e4. 10.1016/j.neuron.2017.03.037.
61. Ramanathan, K.R., Jin, J., Giustino, T.F., Payne, M.R., and Maren, S. (2018). Prefrontal projections to the thalamic nucleus reuniens mediate fear extinction. *Nature Communications* 9, 4527. 10.1038/s41467-018-06970-z.
62. Ramanathan, K.R., and Maren, S. (2019). Nucleus reuniens mediates the extinction of contextual fear conditioning. *Behavioural Brain Research*. 10.1016/j.bbr.2019.112114.
63. Vasudevan, K., Ramanathan, K.R., Vierkant, V., and Maren, S. (2022). Nucleus reuniens inactivation does not impair consolidation or reconsolidation of fear extinction. *Learn Mem* 29, 216–222. 10.1101/lm.053611.122.
64. Quet, E., Majchrzak, M., Cosquer, B., Morvan, T., Wolff, M., Cassel, J.-C., Pereira de Vasconcelos, A., and Stéphan, A. (2020). The reuniens and rhomboid nuclei are necessary for contextual fear memory persistence in rats. *Brain Struct Funct* 225, 955–968. 10.1007/s00429-020-02048-z.
65. Hoover, W.B., and Vertes, R.P. (2012). Collateral projections from nucleus reuniens of thalamus to hippocampus and medial prefrontal cortex in the rat: a single and double retrograde fluorescent labeling study. *Brain Struct Funct* 217, 191–209. 10.1007/s00429-011-0345-6.
66. Varela, C., Kumar, S., Yang, J.Y., and Wilson, M.A. (2014). Anatomical substrates for direct interactions between hippocampus, medial prefrontal cortex, and the thalamic nucleus reuniens. *Brain Struct Funct* 219, 911–929. 10.1007/s00429-013-0543-5.
67. Dolleman-van der Weel, M.J., Griffin, A.L., Ito, H.T., Shapiro, M.L., Witter, M.P., Vertes, R.P., and Allen, T.A. (2019). The nucleus reuniens of the thalamus sits at the nexus of a hippocampus and medial prefrontal cortex circuit enabling memory and behavior. *Learn Mem* 26, 191–205. 10.1101/lm.048389.118.
68. Smith, K.S., Bucci, D.J., Luikart, B.W., and Mahler, S.V. (2016). DREADDs: Use and Application in Behavioral Neuroscience. *Behav Neurosci* 130, 137–155. 10.1037/bne0000135.
69. Xiao, C., Liu, Y., Xu, J., Gan, X., and Xiao, Z. (2018). Septal and Hippocampal Neurons Contribute to Auditory Relay and Fear Conditioning. *12*, 1–17. 10.3389/fncel.2018.00102.
70. Knox, D., Stanfield, B.R., Staib, J.M., David, N.P., Keller, S.M., and DePietro, T. (2016). Neural circuits via which single prolonged stress exposure leads to fear extinction retention deficits. *Learning & Memory* 23, 689–698. 10.1101/lm.043141.116.
71. Amaral, D.G., and Kurz, J. (1985). An analysis of the origins of the cholinergic and noncholinergic septal projections to the hippocampal formation of the rat. *J Comp Neurol* 240, 37–59. 10.1002/cne.902400104.
72. Nyakas, C., Luiten, P.G., Spencer, D.G., and Traber, J. (1987). Detailed projection patterns of septal and diagonal band efferents to the hippocampus in the rat with emphasis on innervation of CA1 and dentate gyrus. *Brain Res Bull* 18, 533–545. 10.1016/0361-9230(87)90117-1.
73. Müller, C., and Remy, S. (2018). Septo – hippocampal interaction. 565–575.
74. Khakpai, F., Nasehi, M., Haeri-Rohani, A., Eidi, A., and Zarrindast, M.R. (2013). Septo-hippocampo-septal loop and memory formation. *Basic and Clinical Neuroscience* 4, 5–23.
75. Unal, G., Joshi, A., Viney, T.J., Kis, V., and Somogyi, P. (2015). Synaptic Targets of Medial Septal Projections in the Hippocampus and Extrahippocampal Cortices of the Mouse.
76. Tronson, N.C., Schrick, C., Guzman, Y.F., Huh, K.H., Srivastava, D.P., Penzes, P., Guede, A.L., Gao, C., and Radulovic, J. (2009). Segregated populations of hippocampal principal CA1 neurons mediating conditioning and extinction of contextual fear. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 29, 3387–3394. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5619-08.2009.
77. Knox, D., and Keller, S.M. (2016). Cholinergic neuronal lesions in the medial septum and vertical limb of the diagonal bands of Broca induce contextual fear memory generalization and impair acquisition of fear extinction. *Hippocampus*. 10.1002/hipo.22553.
78. Yanakieva, S., Mathiasen, M.L., Amin, E., Nelson, A.J.D., O'Mara, S.M., and Aggleton, J.P. (2022). Collateral rostral thalamic projections to prelimbic, infralimbic, anterior cingulate and retrosplenial cortices in the rat brain. *Eur J Neurosci* 56, 5869–5887. 10.1111/ejn.15819.
79. Ratigan, H.C., Krishnan, S., Smith, S., and Sheffield, M.E.J. (2023). Direct Thalamic Inputs to Hippocampal CA1 Transmit a Signal That Suppresses Ongoing Contextual Fear Memory Retrieval. *bioRxiv*, 2023.03.27.534420. 10.1101/2023.03.27.534420.
80. Venkataraman, A., Hunter, S.C., Dhinojwala, M., Ghebzeziadi, D., Guo, J., Inoue, K., Young, L.J.,

- and Dias, B.G. (2021). Incerto-thalamic modulation of fear via GABA and dopamine. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 46, 1658–1668. 10.1038/s41386-021-01006-5.
81. Bissiere, S., Zelikowsky, M., Ponnusamy, R., Jacobs, N., Blair, H., and Fanselow, M.S. (2011). Electrical Synapses Control Hippocampal Contributions to Fear Learning and Memory.
82. LeDoux, J.E., and Phillips, R. (1992). Differential contribution of amygdala and hippocampus to cued and contextual fear conditioning. *Behavioral Neuroscience* 106, 274–285.
83. Maren, S., and Holt, W. (2000). The hippocampus and contextual memory retrieval in Pavlovian conditioning. *Behavioural Brain Research* 110, 97–108. 10.1016/S0166-4328(99)00188-6.
84. Maren, S., and Quirk, G.J. (2004). Neuronal signalling of fear memory. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 5, 844–852. 10.1038/nrn1535.
85. Roy, A., Svensson, F.P., Mazeh, A., and Kocsis, B. (2017). Prefrontal-hippocampal coupling by theta rhythm and by 2–5 Hz oscillation in the delta band: The role of the nucleus reuniens of the thalamus. *Brain Struct Funct* 222, 2819–2830. 10.1007/s00429-017-1374-6.
86. King, C., Recce, M., and O’Keefe, J. (1998). The rhythmicity of cells of the medial septum/diagonal band of Broca in the awake freely moving rat: relationships with behaviour and hippocampal theta. *Eur J Neurosci* 10, 464–477. 10.1046/j.1460-9568.1998.00026.x.
87. Feng, G., Mellor, R.H., Bernstein, M., Keller-Peck, C., Nguyen, Q.T., Wallace, M., Nerbonne, J.M., Lichtman, J.W., and Sanes, J.R. (2000). Imaging Neuronal Subsets in Transgenic Mice Expressing Multiple Spectral Variants of GFP. *Neuron* 28, 41–51. 10.1016/S0896-6273(00)00084-2.
88. Paxinos and Franklin’s the Mouse Brain in Stereotaxic Coordinates, Compact - 5th Edition <https://www.elsevier.com/books/paxinos-and-franklins-the-mouse-brain-in-stereotaxic-coordinates-compact/franklin/978-0-12-816159-3>.

Supplementary materials

Projections from thalamic nucleus reuniens to medial septum enable extinction of remote fear memory


Authors

Kamil F. Tomaszewski, Magdalena Ziółkowska, Kacper Łukasiewicz, Narges Sotoudeh, Anna Cały, Monika Puchalska, Ahmad Salamian and Kasia Radwanska*

Affiliation

Laboratory of Molecular Basis of Behavior, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology of Polish Academy of Sciences, 3 Pasteur St., Warsaw 02-093, Poland.

***Corresponding author:** Kasia Radwanska, Ph.D., Laboratory of Molecular Basis of Behavior, the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology of Polish Academy of Sciences, 3 Pasteur St., Warsaw 02-093, Poland; e-mail: k.radwanska@nencki.edu.pl; tel: +48 501 736 942.




Supplementary Figure 1. Experimental design for c-Fos analysis.

(A) Experimental groups. Naive mice were taken from their home cage. 5US group underwent CFC with 5 electric shocks in novel context and were sacrificed 1 day later. Ctx mice were exposed twice to the novel context without

US experience and were sacrificed 70 minutes after the last exposure. Recent groups underwent CFC and a contextual fear extinction session 1 day after CFC, and were sacrificed 70 minutes after the extinction. Remote groups underwent CFC and a contextual fear extinction session 30 days after CFC, and were sacrificed 70 minutes after the extinction. Mice brains were sliced and used for c-Fos immunostaining.

(B) Analysed brain regions. PrL, prelimbic cortex; IL, infralimbic cortex; CG, cingulate cortex; RSG, retrosplenial cortex, granular part; RSA, retrosplenial cortex, agranular part; V1, primary visual cortex; ENT, entorhinal cortex; LS, lateral septum; MS, medial septum; AD, anterodorsal nucleus of thalamus; AV, anteroventral nucleus of thalamus; AM, anteromedial nucleus of thalamus; LD, laterodorsal nucleus of thalamus; RE, nucleus reuniens; CM, centromedial nucleus of thalamus; MD, mediodorsal nucleus of thalamus; PV, paraventricular nucleus of thalamus; CA1, dorsal hippocampus, CA1 area; CA3, dorsal hippocampus, CA3 area; DG, dentate gyrus; BLA, basolateral nucleus of the amygdala; LA, lateral nucleus of the amygdala; CeA, central nucleus of the amygdala, capsular and lateral divisions; CeM, central nucleus of the amygdala, centromedial division.

(C) Representative microphotographs of c-Fos immunostaining in the analyzed brain regions.



Supplementary Figure 2. Validation of chemogenetic tools.

(A) Experimental timeline. C57BL/6J mice (without hM4Di expression) underwent CFC and 30 days later they were injected with CNO (0.5, 3 or 10 mg/kg) or saline. Thirty minutes later they were exposed to the training context for contextual fear memory extinction and fear extinction memory was tested in the same context one day later.

(B) Summary of data for freezing levels during CFC (CFC: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(1, 21) = 270$, $P < 0.001$), remote fear memory extinction session (Extinction: RM ANOVA, effect of time: $F(3.66, 69.5) = 11.2$, $P < 0.001$; effect of treatment: $F(3, 19) = 2.59$, $P = 0.083$) and fear extinction test (Test: one-way ANOVA, $F(3, 21) = 0.613$, $P = 0.614$).

(C) Summary of data showing the change of freezing frequency during Test (T) as compared to the first 5 minutes of the Extinction (E5) (unpaired t-test: one-way ANOVA, $F(3, 19) = 0.846$, $P = 0.486$).

(D-E) Analysis of the efficiency of chemogenetic inhibition. **(D)** Representative microphotographs of c-Fos immunostaining and hM4Di and mCherry expression in V1. **(E)** Summary of data analysis for the frequency of c-Fos-positive cells among the cells transduced with hM4Di or mCherry (Mann-Whitney U = 183, P = 0.005).