JNeurosci
THE JOURNAL OF NEUROSCIENCE

Research Articles: Behavioral/Cognitive

Negative memory engrams in the hippocampus enhance the susceptibility to chronic social defeat stress

https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1958-18.2019

Cite as: J. Neurosci 2019; 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1958-18.2019

Received: 31 July 2018
Revised: 15 July 2019
Accepted: 19 July 2019

Negative memory engrams in the hippocampus enhance the susceptibility to chronic social defeat stress

Tian Rui Zhang[1,2†], Amanda Larosa[1,2†], Marie-Eve Di Raddo[2], Vanessa Wong[2], Alice S. Wong[2] and Tak Pan Wong[2,3]*

Running title: Negative memory engrams and stress susceptibility

[1]Integrated program in Neuroscience, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada;

[2]Basic Neuroscience Division, Douglas Hospital Research Centre, Montreal, QC, Canada;

[3]Dept. of Psychiatry, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada;

† These authors contributed equally to this work

***Corresponding Authors:** Dr Tak Pan Wong

Address: Douglas Hospital Research Centre, 6875 LaSalle Blvd., Montreal, QC, H4H 1R3, Canada.

Tel.: 514-761-6131, x 2929

Fax: 514-762-3034

Email: takpan.wong@mcgill.ca

This work is supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (137003) and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (241148).

Abstract

The hippocampus has been highly implicated in depression symptoms. Recent findings suggest that the expression and susceptibility of depression symptoms are related to the enhanced functioning of the hippocampus. We reasoned that hippocampal engrams, which represent ensembles of neurons with increased activity after memory formation, could underlie some contributions of the hippocampus to depression symptoms. Using the chronic social defeat stress (CSDS) model, we examined social defeat-related hippocampal engrams in mice that are either susceptible or resilient to the stressor. TetTag mice were used to label social defeat-related hippocampal ensembles by LacZ. Engram cells correspond to ensembles that were reactivated by the same stressor.

Compared to resilient and non-stressed control mice, susceptible mice exhibited a higher reactivation of social defeat-related LacZ-labeled cells (i.e. engram cells) in both the dorsal and ventral hippocampal CA1 regions. The density of CA1 engram cells correlated with the level of social avoidance. Using DREADD and optogenetic approaches to activate and inactivate social defeat-related CA1 engram cells enhanced and suppressed social avoidance, respectively. Increased engram cells in susceptible mice could not be found in the dentate gyrus. Susceptible mice exhibited more negative stimuli-, but not neutral stimuli-, related CA1 engram cells than resilient mice in the dorsal hippocampus. Finally, chronic, but not a short and subthreshold, social defeat protocol was necessary to increase CA1 engram cell density. The susceptibility to CSDS is regulated by hippocampal CA1 engrams for negative memory. Hippocampal negative memory engrams may underlie the vulnerability and expression of cognitive symptoms in depression.

Significance statement

We provided evidence that negative memory hippocampal engrams contribute to the susceptibility to developing depression-related behavior after chronic social defeat stress. The activation of positive memory engrams have been shown to alleviate depression-related behaviors, while our findings reveal the pathological roles of negative memory engrams that could lead to those behaviors. Increased negative memory engrams could be a downstream effect of the reported high hippocampal activity in animal models and patients with depression. Unlike affective symptoms, we know much less about the cellular mechanisms of the cognitive symptoms of depression. Given the crucial roles of hippocampal engrams in memory formation, enhanced reactivation of negative memory engrams could be an important cellular mechanism that underlies the cognitive symptoms of depression.

Introduction

Apart from affective symptoms like sad mood, anhedonia, hopelessness and low self-esteem, cognitive symptoms are common in depression. A prominent cognitive symptom of depression is the negative bias in cognitive processing and memory formation (for review, see (Disner et al., 2011; Joormann and Quinn, 2014)). Depressed patients show enhanced encoding and recall of mood-congruent negative memory (Koster et al., 2010), less forgetting of negative memory (Hertel and Gerstle, 2003), and impaired recall of positive memory (Gaddy and Ingram, 2014). Rumination, which is related to repetitive recall of negative memory (Lyubomirsky et al., 1998), is also common in depression (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000). Increasing findings suggest that biases in cognitive processing in depression could be associated with changes in the hippocampus, a brain region that is known for its role in memory formation (Squire, 1992).

The hippocampus has long been implicated in the manifestation of depression symptoms. Meta analyses have revealed reduced hippocampal volume in depressed patients (Videbech and Ravnkilde, 2004; McKinnon et al., 2009). Therapeutic effects of classical (e.g. fluoxetine) and fast-acting (e.g. ketamine) antidepressants have been associated with hippocampal neurogenesis (Santarelli et al., 2003) and altered hippocampal glutamate receptor function (Maeng et al., 2008; El Iskandrani et al., 2015), respectively. Recent findings suggest that increased hippocampal function could contribute to the biased cognitive processing in depression. Imaging studies revealed increased hippocampal responses to sad faces (Fu et al., 2004) and stronger hippocampus-amygdala connectivity during negative information encoding (Hamilton and Gotlib, 2008) in depressed patients. Moreover, attenuated hippocampal responses to

84 negative stimuli could be induced by antidepressants (Mayberg et al., 2000; Fu et al.,
85 2004) and observed in remitted depressed patients (Thomas et al., 2011). Using chronic
86 social defeat stress (CSDS) as an animal model for depression-related behaviors
87 (Krishnan et al., 2007), the expression of these behaviors has been associated with
88 increased activity of the ventral hippocampal dentate gyrus (DG) region (Anacker et al.,
89 2018). Suppressing ventral hippocampal glutamatergic inputs to the nucleus accumbens
90 can enhance stress resilience of this model (Bagot et al., 2015). Increased hippocampal
91 activity could affect the formation of engrams, which are ensembles of neurons that
92 showed increased activity during memory formation and recall (Josselyn et al., 2015;
93 Tonegawa et al., 2015). Apart from being a substrate for memory, hippocampal engrams
94 have been associated with the expression of depression-related behaviors, so that
95 reactivating positive memory-related hippocampal engrams can induce antidepressant
96 effects (Ramirez et al., 2015). Increased hippocampal activity could also facilitate the
97 formation and enhance the activity of negative memory engrams. Whether negative
98 memory engrams contribute to the expression of depression-related behaviors warrants
99 further investigations.

100 In the current study, we investigated the formation and activity of social defeat-
101 related hippocampal engrams in mice that were stressed under the CSDS protocol. We
102 used TetTag mice to tag hippocampal neurons that were activated by social defeat with
103 LacZ (Reijmers et al., 2007). Engram cells were examined and defined as those LacZ
104 labeled cells which were reactivated by the same stressor. The CSDS model allows us to
105 separate mice according to their individual differences in stress susceptibility. We found
106 that mice that were susceptible to CSDS had more social defeat-related engram cells in

the hippocampal CA1 region than non-stressed control mice and mice that were resilient to this stressor.

Materials and Methods

Animals

Male TetTag mice were obtained from the *Jackson Laboratory* (stock no. 008344, (Reijmers et al., 2007)). Bi-transgenic TetTag mice with a C57 background carry a cFos-driven tetracycline-controlled transactivator (tTA) protein construct and a tetracycline-responsive regulatory element (tetO) driven beta-galactosidase (LacZ) construct. The cFos promoter can be activated by neuronal activity. This strain has been used for labeling activated neurons by the expression of LacZ via a doxycycline off (Dox-off) mechanism as previously described (Reijmers et al., 2007). Double hemizygote TetTag mice were bred with wild type C57 mice (*Charles River*). Only male double hemizygote offspring (approximately 1/8 of all offspring) were used in this study. Breeding pairs and offspring were fed with Dox-containing food (40 mg/kg, *Envigo*) *ad libitum* in a 12 hour light/dark cycle (light on from 8AM to 8PM). LacZ labeling can be induced by feeding TetTag mice with Dox-free food (Dox off), which allows the cFos-driven expression of tTA to activate the tetO-LacZ construct. The activation of tetO during Dox off also triggered the expression of a tetracycline-insensitive tTA (with a H100Y point mutation), which sustained the expression of LacZ even after the reintroduction of Dox to maintain long-term labeling of activated neurons. The average age of the mice was 3 months. Offspring of TetTag mice that expressed only the cFos-tTA construct were used in the DREADD experiment (see below). Finally, male retired breeders of the CD1 strain

(*Charles River*) were used for defeating mice of C57 strains. All experiments were approved by the Facility Animal Care Committee at Douglas Hospital Research Centre and followed the guidelines from Canadian Council on Animal Care (protocol no.: 2010-5935).

Viral vectors

AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry was a gift from William Wisden (Addgene plasmid # 66795; http://n2t.net/addgene:66795; RRID:Addgene_66795) (Zhang et al., 2015). AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-ArchT-WPREpA (Addgene plasmid # 84472; http://n2t.net/addgene:84472; RRID:Addgene_84472) and AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-EGFP-WPREpA (Addgene plasmid # 84469; http://n2t.net/addgene:84469; RRID:Addgene_84469) were gifts from Yingxi Lin (Sorensen et al., 2016). Virus was injected into the dorsal CA1 region using the following coordinates from bregma: anterior/posterior: -2.06; lateral: ±1.40; dorsal/ventral: -1.50.

Chronic Social Defeat Stress (CSDS)

TetTag mice were defeated by male retired breeders of the CD1 strain during social defeat. Resident CD1 mice were housed in a partitioned compartment of a rat cage, like the type of cage used for habituation, before social defeat. Each CD1 mouse was screened for its aggressiveness by attacking intruders and only those with a <60 seconds latency were selected. The CSDS paradigm consisted of 8 episodes of defeat. In each defeat episode, a CD1 mouse was allowed to attack a TetTag mouse for up to 12 attacks in a maximum period of 5 minutes. Following each social defeat episode, each TetTag mouse was housed next to the CD1 mouse in the neighboring compartment separated by a perforated partition for 24 hours. Without physical contacts, TetTag mice

were stressed during cohousing by the presence of visual and odor stimuli from the CD1 mouse. Each TetTag mouse was paired with a new CD1 mouse in each of the 8 episodes of social defeat to prevent reduced number of attacks due to repeated cohousing. Control non-stressed mice, which were only handled and weighted daily, were pair-housed in neighbor partitions in a rat cage for 8 days. After 8 daily episodes of defeat or pair-housing, social behavior of stressed and control mice were examined by a social interaction (SI) test.

Social Interaction (SI) Test

The SI test consisted of two 150 seconds long sessions of exploration in a Plexiglas open field (44 cm x 44 cm). An empty perforated enclosure (10 cm x 5 cm x 30 cm) was placed in the center of the north side of the open field during the first open field session. After the end of the first open field session, a CD1 mouse was put into the enclosure before the second open field session began. Both open field sessions were performed under ambient red light, with static white noise at 60 dB. Time spent in the interaction zone (10 cm around the enclosure) during the first (empty) and second (with a CD1 mouse) open field sessions were estimated from recorded videos of these sessions using the software TopScan LITE (*Clever system Inc.*). The SI ratio was calculated by dividing the time mice spent in the interaction zone in the second open field session with the time they spent in the interaction zone in the first open field session. We also measured time TetTag mice spent in the two corners zones (10 cm x 10 cm) on the opposite side of the enclosure, which were farthest away from the enclosure. Corner ratios were calculated by dividing time TetTag mice spent in those corners in the second open field session by the time they spent there in the first session. Susceptible mice were

defined as animals having a social interaction ratio of less than 1, indicating they spent less time in the interaction zone when a CD1 mouse was present. Resilient mice were defined as having a social interaction ratio of greater than 1 and spent at least 50 seconds in the social interaction zone during the second open field session.

Ensembles reactivation

After the SI test, both stressed and control mice were housed singly in mouse cages. To reactivate ensembles that were related to social defeat in stressed mice, we gave stressed mice an extra episode of social defeat, followed by co-housing in the neighbor compartment with a CD1 mouse in a partitioned rat cage for 90 minutes to trigger cFos expression. Ensembles related to contextual information of the rat cage were reactivated in control mice to express cFos by co-housing them with another control mouse in neighbor compartments of a partitioned rat cage for 90 minutes. After ensemble reactivation, mice were anesthetized and perfused by heparin-containing phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and 4% paraformaldehyde solution (PFA). Brains were extracted from the skulls, post-fixed in PFA overnight and cryoprotected in 30% sucrose-containing PBS.

Immunohistochemistry

Unless indicated otherwise, all reagents were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. Fixed brains were snap-frozen in dry ice-chilled isopentane before being cut into 35 µm-thick sections using a cryostat (*Leica*). Brain sections were washed with PBS (five 5-minute washes; a similar washing procedure was used between all antibody incubations), followed by a 30 minutes incubation in 0.3% $NaBH_4$ to quench endogenous fluorescence. After PBS washes, sections were incubated for one hour in a blocking solution (3%

normal goat serum and 0.1% Triton in PBS (PBS-T), this blocking solution was also used for diluting antibodies). For triple immunofluorescent staining, sections were incubated overnight at 4˚C with the first primary antibody (mouse monoclonal LacZ antibody, 1:2000 (*MP Biomedicals*, 08633651)). The next day sections were washed by PBS-T and incubated with the first secondary antibody (donkey anti-mouse Alexa 674 antibody, 1:2000 (*Abcam*, Ab150107)) for three hours at room temperature. In the same fashion, incubations were done for the second primary antibody (rabbit polyclonal cFos antibody, 1:40,000 (*Sigma*, F137)) and the corresponding secondary antibody (goat anti-rabbit Alexa 488 antibody, 1:4000 (*Life Technologies*, A11034)). Finally, sections were incubated with 600 nM 4',6-Diamidino-2-Phenylindole (DAPI, *Life Technologies*, D3571) for 10 minutes. Triple-labeled sections were mounted on a slide, covered with VectaShield anti-fade mounting medium (*Vector Laboratories*) and sealed with nail polish. The stained sections were scanned using a slide scanner (*Olympus* VS120) with the VS-ASW acquisition software to a magnification of 20X with eleven 15 µm-thick z-sections. Sections were stitched together by the VS-ASW software (*Olympus*).

For 3,3'diaminobenzidine (DAB) staining of cFos, after primary antibody incubation and washes, slices were incubated for 1 hour with a biotinylated goat anti-rabbit antibody (1:500, *Vector Laboratories*, BA-1000), followed by an hour long incubation with the ABC reagent (1:250, *Vector Laboratories*, PK-7200). Sections were finally incubated with DAB (0.6%) and H_2O_2 for 2 minutes to visualize staining.

Cell counting

Analysis of the digital slides from the slide scanner were done manually with the help of Fiji (*ImageJ*). As there are regional differences in inputs, projections and

functions between dorsal and ventral and hippocampus (Fanselow and Dong, 2010), cell counting was performed in both regions. For CA1 counting, a 400 μm (width) by 200 μm (height) counting window was used for counting LacZ-, cFos- and DAPI-labeled cells in the dorsal and ventral hippocampus. Only neurons in the *stratum pyramidale* were counted. Since we found no LacZ cells in the pyramidal layer of the CA2 and CA3 region in both control and stressed mice, this hippocampal region was excluded from further analysis. Finally, for cell counting in the dentate gyrus (DG) region, due to the low number of double labeled cells in the DG, the entire DG granule cell layer in the dorsal and ventral hippocampus in each section was counted. Unless specified otherwise, all staining data were presented as the density of single (LacZ or cFos)- or double (LacZ and cFos)-labeled cells by dividing their numbers with the number of DAPI-labeled cells in the counting window. Exceptions are the density of DAPI-labeled cells (all DAPI-labeled cells in the counting window) and the normalized engram cells (density of engram cells/density of LacZ- or cFos-labeled cells). To compare the density of DAPI cells in the DG between animal groups, we controlled for the differences in the size of DG between sections by normalizing the density of DAPI cells by the length of the granule cell layer. Three to five sections from each hippocampal region of each mouse were used for counting. Data from these sections were averaged and only the mean densities of single and double labeled cells of each mouse were used for statistical analysis.

Experimental design and statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 7. Normality of data was examined by the Shapiro-Wilk's test. All data were presented as mean ± SEM.

Experiment 1: Social defeat-related hippocampal engrams in mice with different stress susceptibility

Adult male TetTag mice were off Dox for 4 days during habituation before being stressed by 8 episodes of social defeat (Figure 1A). Habituation has been shown to reduce the labeling of hippocampal neurons from being housed in a novel environment (Radulovic et al., 1998). During habituation, two TetTag mice were housed in neighboring compartments of a rat cage. We found that 2 social defeat episodes were sufficient to induce cFos (Figure 1B) and LacZ expression (Figure 1C) in the hippocampus. LacZ labeling was therefore stopped after 2 episodes of social defeat by Dox (1 g/kg) for 1 day, followed by regular Dox food (40 mg/kg) to prevent further LacZ labeling. Note that there was no neuronal LacZ expression in the hippocampus of TetTag mice that were always on Dox (Figure 1C). While the expression of LacZ decreased in the first few days after resuming the Dox diet, we observed stable LacZ expression up to 8 days after social defeat (Figure 1D, E). After a total 8 episodes of social defeat, TetTag mice were examined by the SI test. One day after the SI test, social defeat-related ensembles of stressed mice were reactivated by another defeat episode. Control TetTag mice were treated similarly as stressed mice, but they were only handled after habituation and during ensemble reactivation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after ensemble reactivation for immunostaining. There were 29 stressed and 9 control mice in this experiment. Stressed mice were furthered divided into susceptible and resilient mice according to their SI ratios (Figure 2). Due to the distinct roles of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus in spatial and emotional functions, data from dorsal and ventral hippocampus were separately compared. Density of LacZ, cFos, engram and DAPI cells

were separately compared between the three mouse groups using one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's test (Figure 4 and 8).

Experiment 2: Impact of activating social defeat-related engrams on social interaction

Adult male cFos-tTA mice were on Dox while they were bilaterally injected into the dorsal hippocampus with 0.5 µl AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry (Zhang et al., 2015). One week after virus injection, they were off Dox while they were habituated in pairs in partitioned rat cages. Some mice (n = 22) were stressed by a short and subthreshold social defeat protocol, which consists of only 2 episodes of social defeat described in *Experiment 1*. Other mice (n = 16) served as controls and were only weighed and handled daily for 2 days. One day after defeat or handling, mice were examined by the SI test. One hour before the SI test, stressed and control mice were randomly selected to receive i.p. injection of either saline or clozapine-N oxide (3 mg/kg). Mice were sacrificed and perfused after the SI test to examine virus expression, only data from mice that show expression of DREADD (mCherry) in the CA1 region were used (5 mice were removed). SI ratios from these four mouse groups were compared using two-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's test (Figure 7).

Experiment 3: Impact of inactivating social defeat-related engrams on social interaction

Adult male C57 mice were on Dox while they were bilaterally injected into the dorsal hippocampus with 0.5 µl AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-ArchT-WPREpA or AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-EGFP-WPREpA (Sorensen et al., 2016). A week later, fiber-optic cannulas, which were constructed in our laboratory using a short segment of multimode optical fiber (200 µm dia, 0.39 NA) and a ceramic ferrule (1.25 mm dia, 230 µm bore size), were implanted above the CA1 region of the dorsal hippocampus of virus injected

mice (coordinates from bregma: anterior/posterior: -2.06; lateral: ±1.40; dorsal/ventral: -1.30). One week after fiber-optic cannulas implantation, mice were off Dox while they were habituated in pairs in partitioned rat cages. Some mice (n = 10) were stressed by the standard CSDS protocol, which consists of 8 episodes of social defeat described in *Experiment 1*. Other mice (n = 12) served as controls and were only weighed and handled daily for 8 days. One day after defeat or handling, mice were attached by two patch cables to continuously deliver 520 nm (15 mW) green laser to their dorsal hippocampi during the second session of SI test (with a CD1 mouse in the enclosure). Mice were sacrificed and perfused after the SI test to examine virus expression. Only mice with virus expression and proper placement of the optic fibers in the CA1 region were included in the analysis (3 mice were removed). SI ratios from these 4 mouse groups were log transformed and compared using two-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's test (Figure 7).

Experiment 4: Neutral contextual stimuli-related hippocampal engrams in mice with different stress susceptibility

To label neutral contextual stimuli-related engrams, adult male TetTag mice were off Dox for 6 days during habituation before being stressed by 8 episodes of social defeat (Figure 9A). LacZ expression was arrested one day before social defeat by 1 g/kg Dox, followed by 40 mg/kg Dox throughout the 8 episodes of social defeat. One day after the last episode of defeat, TetTag mice were examined by the SI test, followed one day later with the reactivation of ensembles by another episode of social defeat. Control TetTag mice were treated similarly as stressed mice, but were only handled after habituation and during ensemble reactivation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after ensemble

314 reactivation for immunostaining. We had a total 34 stressed and 19 control mice.
315 Stressed mice were furthered divided into susceptible and resilient mice according to
316 their SI ratio (Figure 2). Due to the distinct roles of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus
317 in spatial and emotional functions, data from the dorsal and ventral hippocampus were
318 separately compared. Density of LacZ, cFos, engram and DAPI cells were separately
319 compared between the three mouse groups using one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's
320 test (Figure 9).

321 *Experiment 5: Impact of subthreshold social defeat on hippocampal engrams*

322 Adult male TetTag mice were off Dox for 4 days during habituation before being
323 stressed by 2 episodes of social defeat (Figure 10A). LacZ labeling was stopped by
324 putting mice on Dox after the second social defeat episode. Stressed mice were
325 examined by the SI test either 1 day (n = 8; defeated no delay) or 7 days (n = 9; defeated
326 with delay) after social defeat, followed by the reactivation of ensembles one day after
327 the SI test by another social defeat episode. Control TetTag mice (n = 8) were treated
328 similarly as stressed mice but were only weighed and handled after habituation and
329 during ensemble reactivation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after ensembles
330 reactivation for immunostaining. Data from the dorsal and ventral hippocampus were
331 separately compared. Density of LacZ, cFos, engram and DAPI cells were separately
332 compared between the three mouse groups using one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's
333 test (Figure 10).

334

335 **Results**

Using the CSDS protocol (Figure 1A), we identified 17 susceptible mice that displayed social avoidance (i.e. social interaction ratio (SI ratio) < 1) and 12 resilient mice that showed normal social behavior after stress (Figure 2A, B). In addition, 9 control non-stressed mice were habituated and fed with Dox and normal food like the stressed mice. These mice were pair-housed with another TetTag or nontransgenic littermates for 8 days after habituation and were only handled daily. One-way ANOVA revealed a significant difference in SI ratio between animal groups ($F(2,35) = 15.7$; $p = 1.37E-05$) with susceptible mice having lower SI than control (post-hoc Tukey's test: $p = 5.24E-04$) and resilient mice ($p = 4.28E-05$).

We also examined the time mice spent in the corners of the open field during the SI tests (Figure 2A, B). Susceptible mice spent significantly more time in corner zones than control and resilient mice in the second open field session when a social object was present in the enclosure. Comparing the corner ratios revealed a significant between group difference ($F(2,35) = 4.56$; $p = 0.0173$). The corner ratio of susceptible mice was significantly higher than control ($p = 0.0319$). Although susceptible and resilient mice displayed distinct behaviors during the SI test, we did not observe differences in the number of attacks (11.8 ± 0.2 for susceptible mice vs. 11.5 ± 0.3 for resilient mice) and the duration of social defeat (i.e. time used for all attacks: 153.4 ± 13.0 seconds for susceptible mice vs. 143.6 ± 13.9 seconds for resilient mice) between these two groups. Finally, all three mouse groups showed similar weight gain before and after social defeat (1.44 ± 0.30 g for control mice; 1.85 ± 0.34 g for resilient mice; 1.38 ± 0.39 g for susceptible mice).

Susceptible mice displayed more engram cells in the hippocampal CA1 region than resilient and control mice

To find out if stress susceptibility is related to the reactivation of hippocampal ensembles that were labeled during social defeat, we examined the reactivation of LacZ ensembles that were formed during the first 2 episodes of social defeat by an extra episode of social defeat one day after the SI test in stressed mice (see Figure 1A). After 90 minutes following the extra episode of social defeat, stressed mice were sacrificed for immunostaining of LacZ and cFos to reveal activated ensembles. Control mice were only exposed to the context during LacZ expression (i.e. pair-housed in a partitioned rat cage) for 90 minutes to examine the reactivation of neutral context-related LacZ ensembles. Reactivated engram cells in ensembles were represented by double labeled cells that expressed both LacZ and cFos (Figure 3, 5). The formation of these double labeled engram cells cannot be explained by probabilistic reasons, since the density of double labeled cells in all mouse groups was significantly higher than chance (LacZ/DAPI x cFos/DAPI) in both the dorsal (control: $t(8) = 4.23$, $p = 2.87E-03$; resilient: $t(11) = 7.63$, $p = 1.03E-05$, susceptible: $t(15) = 7.45$, $p = 2.06E-05$) and the ventral hippocampus (control: $t(8) = 5.10$, $p = 9.35E-04$; resilient: $t(11) = 3.87$, $p = 2.62E-03$, susceptible: $t(15) = 6.62$, $p = 8.13E-06$).

Densities of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the dorsal and ventral hippocampus were separately compared in order to reveal region specific differences. Although only resilient and susceptible mice were stressed by CSDS, we did not observe significant differences in the density of LacZ (Figure 4A) and cFos cells (Figure 4B) between the three mouse groups in both the dorsal and ventral hippocampal CA1 regions. However,

we found that the density of engram cells in susceptible mice was significantly higher than control and resilient mice in both the dorsal (Figure 4C, $F(2,35) = 18.4$; $p = 3.54E-06$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 8.88E-05$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 2.21E-05$) and the ventral hippocampus ($F(2,35) = 16.2$; $p = 1.07E-05$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 1.79E-03$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 1.52E-05$). Since we have previously shown that CSDS has different impacts on hippocampal volume in susceptible and resilient mice (Tse et al., 2014), we asked if changes in the density of CA1 neurons were responsible for the increase in engram cell density in susceptible mice (Figure 4D). However, we did not observe differences in the density of DAPI CA1 cells between these mouse groups. Figure 5 shows representative images of the staining of LacZ, cFos and DAPI in the dorsal CA1 region of control, resilient and susceptible mice.

Although we did not observe significant changes in the density of LacZ cells between the three animal groups, when we analyzed data from the dorsal and ventral hippocampus separately, two-way ANOVA analysis of the effect of dorsal and ventral regions and the animal group on the density of LacZ cells revealed a significant effect of animal group (Effect of animal groups: $F(2,70) = 4.23$, $p = 0.0185$), and a significantly higher LacZ cell density in susceptible mice than in resilient mice when both dorsal and ventral data were pooled together (post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 0.104$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 0.025$). Similarly, two-way ANOVA of pooled dorsal and ventral data of the density of cFos cells revealed a significant animal group effect ($F(2,70) = 3.27$, $p = 0.0438$). Post-hoc Tukey's test revealed a higher density of cFos cells in susceptible mice when compared to resilient mice ($p = 0.0401$). The need of

pooling dorsal and ventral hippocampal data together to reveal a significant group effect suggests the increase in LacZ and cFos cell density in susceptible mice is modest. Similar changes in LacZ and cFos, which were labeled at different time points, suggest a long-lasting increase in neuronal activation in susceptible mice.

The increase in LacZ and cFos cell density may underlie the increased engram cell formation in susceptible mice. To test this, we normalized the engram cell density with the density of LacZ cells or cFos cells and compared the data between the 3 animal groups. After LacZ normalization, susceptible mice (24.8 ± 0.968%) still have more engram cells than both control (22.2 ± 1.78%) and resilient mice (21.8 ± 1.46%) in the dorsal hippocampus ($F(2,35) = 9.06$; $p = 6.72E-04$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 2.56E-03$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 4.23E-03$). Susceptible mice (23.1 ± 1.10%) also have more normalized engram cells than resilient mice (19.8 ± 1.10%) only in the ventral hippocampus ($F(2,35) = 6.78$; $p = 3.26E-03$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control (20.4 ± 1.13%) vs. susceptible, $p = 0.0738$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 3.21E-03$). After cFos normalization, susceptible mice (45.0 ± 1.93%) still have more engram cells than both control (31.4 ± 3.00%) and resilient mice (32.3 ± 1.56%) in the dorsal hippocampus ($F(2,35) = 14.3$; $p = 2.90E-05$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 2.84E-04$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 2.20E-04$). In the ventral hippocampus ($F(2,35) = 7.31$; $p = 2.22E-03$), susceptible mice (40.2 ± 1.58%) have more engram cells than resilient mice (28.6 ± 2.84%) but not than control mice (32.5 ± 3.05%; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 0.0740$, resilient vs. susceptible, $p = 2.03E-03$).

The higher engram cell density in susceptible mice than resilient and control mice suggests that engram cell density is related to the expression of depression-related behavior of these mice. We separated control and stressed mice and correlated their engram cell density with their performances in the SI test. We found that CA1 engram cell density in both the dorsal (Figure 6A, R^2 = 0.431, p = 1.10E-04) and ventral hippocampus (Figure 6B, R^2 = 0.295, p = 2.32E-03) of stressed mice correlated negatively with the SI ratio. However, no significant correlation between CA1 engram cell density and SI ratio was found in control mice. When we examined the relationship between CA1 engram cell density and the corner ratio, we also found a significant correlation between dorsal CA1 engram cell density and corner ratios in stressed mice (Figure 6C, R^2 = 0.187, p = 0.0191) and between dorsal (Figure 6C, R^2 = 0.446, p = 0.0493) and ventral CA1 engram cell density and corner ratios in control mice (Figure 6D, R^2 = 0.580, p = 0.0171). Interestingly, the engram cell density of stressed and control mice correlated positively and negatively with the corner ratio, respectively. These findings suggest that high CA1 engram cell density in susceptible mice is related to the expression of social avoidance.

Effect of manipulating the activity of engram cells on mouse performance in the SI test

Findings from the correlation analyses suggest that reactivating CA1 engram cells can trigger social avoidance. To test that, we used the cFos-tTA offspring from TetTag mice that lack the LacZ construct (Figure 7A). While these mice were fed with Dox, we bilaterally injected AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry into the dorsal hippocampi of adult cFos-tTA mice (Figure 7B). After one week, we put these mice off Dox for two days before stressing mice with a subthreshold social defeat protocol with only 2

episodes of defeat. tTA from activated neurons will bind to TRE to trigger the expression of excitatory DREADD hM3Dq in these neurons, which can be activated by a DREADD ligand clozapine N-oxide (CNO). cFos-tTA mice that have received AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry injection but no social defeat served as controls. One day after the last social defeat episode, we injected stressed and control mice with either vehicle or CNO (3 mg/kg) at 1 hour before the SI test. Two-way ANOVA analysis of the effect of drug treatment and stress revealed a significant effect of drug treatment (Figure 7C, $F(1,34) = 10.8$; $p = 2.32E-03$), no effect of stress ($F(1,34) = 0.737$; $p = 0.397$) and a significant interaction between drug treatment and stress ($F(1,34) = 8.08$; $p = 7.51E-03$). Pairwise comparisons (post-hoc Tukey's test) revealed significant differences between the defeated CNO group and the control saline group ($p = 0.0251$); the defeated CNO group and the control CNO group ($p = 5.25E-04$); the defeated CNO group and the defeated saline group ($p = 0.0358$). These findings suggest the activation of social defeat-related hippocampal CA1 engrams reduces social interaction.

If CNO promotes social avoidance by activating CA1 engram cells, inactivating CA1 engram cells that were labeled during social defeat could reduce social avoidance resulting from an 8-day CSDS protocol. To test this, we employed the newly developed Robust Activity Marking (RAM) system to express ArchT in activated CA1 neurons during the first 2 days of social defeat (Figure 7D). The RAM system consists of an engineered activity-regulated promotor that triggers tTA expression in activated neurons and a TRE domain that is driven by tTA to express effector proteins such as ArchT or GFP. Expression of ArchT or GFP can be arrested by Dox, which prevents tTA from binding the TRE. We injected mice with AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-ArchT-WPREpA or

a control virus AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-EGFP-WPREpA during Dox on. After mice recovered from fiber-optic cannula implantation, we allowed the expression of ArchT or GFP during the first 2 episodes of social defeat (see example of ArchT expression in figure 7E). After the end of the 8-day long standard CSDS, we examined the behavioral effect of optogenetic stimulation using a green laser (520 nm) during the SI test. Mice receiving the GFP control virus (i.e. expressing only GFP in activated neurons) were either handled (non-stressed) or stressed by the standard CSDS to examine the impact of virus injection and optogenetic stimulation on mouse performance in the SI test. We also added control and defeated mice that received the ArchT virus to examine the impact of inhibiting activated CA1 neurons on the SI ratio. We log transformed the SI ratio data of this experiment into normality and compared the effects of virus expression and stress on the SI ratio using two-way ANOVA. We found a significant effect of virus expression (Figure 7F, $F(1,18) = 6.87$; $p = 0.0191$), a significant effect of stress ($F(1,18) = 4.66$; $p = 0.0457$) and a significant interaction between virus expression and stress ($F(1,18) = 5.32$; $p = 0.0332$). Post-hoc comparison revealed a significant difference between GFP expressing control and defeated mice ($p = 0.0348$), a significant difference between GFP expressing defeated mice and ArchT expressing defeated mice ($p = 0.0186$), and a significant difference between GFP expressing defeated mice and ArchT expressing control mice ($p = 0.0131$). These findings suggest that inactivating CA1 engram cells by ArchT prevents social avoidance after CSDS.

CSDS reduced engram cell density in the hippocampal dentate gyrus region

Fear memory formation and recall have been associated with engrams in the DG (Liu et al., 2012; Deng et al., 2013; Denny et al., 2014). We next examined if susceptible

mice also express more DG engram cells than other mouse groups. Similar to findings we observed from the CA1 region, we did not find changes in the density of LacZ (Figure 8A) and cFos cells (Figure 8B) in the DG between the three mouse groups. Interestingly, we found engram cell density in control mice to be higher than both resilient and susceptible mice in the ventral DG (Figure 8C, $F(2,34) = 5.59$; $p = 7.97E-03$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. resilient, $p = 0.0263$, control vs. susceptible, $p = 8.40E-03$). The fact that both the resilient and susceptible groups displayed similar changes in engram cell density suggests an effect due to stress. Similar to our prediction, engram cell density in the ventral DG of control mice remained higher than pooled data from the susceptible and resilient groups (control vs. stressed mice: $t(35) = 3.33$, $p = 2.04E-03$). Similarly, in the dorsal hippocampus, we observed a trend where engram cell density in stressed mice is lower than control mice (control vs. stressed mice: $t(36) = 1.86$, $p = 0.0717$). Finally, we compared the density of DAPI-labeled neurons in the DG of the three mouse groups and observed no difference between groups (Figure 8D), even after data of susceptible and resilient mice were pooled together. DG engram cells therefore may not contribute to the susceptibility to CSDS.

Engram cell formation in susceptible mice caused by neutral stimuli

Even after habituation, we saw overlapping LacZ and cFos ensembles in control non-stressed mice. The density of engram cells was higher than the chance levels (i.e. LacZ/DAPI vs. LacZ/DAPI x cFos/DAPI; dorsal hippocampus: $t(8) = 4.23$, $p = 2.87E-03$; ventral hippocampus: $t(8) = 5.10$, $p = 9.35E-04$). These findings suggested that during Dox off, the exposure to neutral contextual information triggered the formation of LacZ ensembles in the CA1 region. These ensembles were reactivated by re-exposure to the

same context. Engram cells observed in stressed mice in Figure 4 were likely due to the reactivation of ensembles that are related to both neutral (contextual information) and negative (social defeat) stimuli. To find out whether susceptible mice also exhibited higher reactivation of neutral stimuli-related LacZ ensembles than other mouse groups, we stopped LacZ labeling before social defeat and studied ensembles reactivation (Figure 9A). Both control and stressed mice were habituated off Dox in the partitioned rat cage for 6 days to maintain a similar duration of LacZ expression as in previous experiments (see Figure 4, 4 days habitation plus 2 days of social defeat). LacZ expression was stopped one day before social defeat by Dox, followed by similar procedures we used for CSDS and SI test in Figure 1A (Figure 9A). We identified 13 susceptible mice and 5 resilient mice in this experiment. Compared with control mice (n = 10), we again did not observe differences in the density of LacZ (Figure 9B) and cFos cells (Figure 9C) between the 3 animal groups. Interestingly, we also did not find significant differences in the density of engram cells in the dorsal hippocampus between the animal groups. However, we found that susceptible mice expressed more engram cells in the ventral CA1 region than control mice (Figure 9D, $F(2,22) = 5.05$; $p = 0.0156$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. susceptible, $p = 0.0259$). When we compared the density of DAPI neurons in the CA1 of the three mouse groups, we found no difference between-groups (Figure 9E), suggesting no changes in neuronal density. Thus, enhanced engram cell formation in the dorsal hippocampus of susceptible mice was largely limited to those that respond to negative- but not neutral stimuli. However, these findings also suggest that stress susceptibility could be related to an overall enhancement in engram cells formation for both neutral and negative stimuli in the ventral hippocampus.

Engram cell formation caused by subthreshold social defeat

Exposure to chronic, but not acute, stressors is crucial for the development of depression-related behaviors (McGonagle and Kessler, 1990; McEwen, 2004). Indeed, we showed that stressing mice with only 2 episodes of social defeat did not result in social avoidance (Figure 7). To find out if this subthreshold number of defeat episodes is too weak to induce engram cell formation, we examined LacZ, cFos, and engram cell density in non-stressed mice and mice that were stressed by 2 episodes of social defeat (Figure 10A). In addition to examining the SI ratio of stressed mice 1 day after social defeat (no delay), we examined SI ratio of another group of mice that were stressed by the subthreshold protocol 7 days after social defeat (with delay), which corresponds to the time point when engram cells were examined in other experiments (see Figure 1A). This control group could reveal whether engram cell density remains stable under delayed observation. Similar to what we showed in Figure 7, this subthreshold social defeat paradigm did not result in social avoidance if SI was examined 1 day after defeat (no delay). Surprisingly, when SI was examined 7 days after defeat (with delay), we found that defeated mice exhibited social avoidance (Figure 10A, $F(2,22) = 5.51$, $p = 0.0115$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. defeated with delay, $p = 0.0142$, defeated no delay vs. defeated with delay, $p = 0.0494$). When we compared ensemble activity in these mice, we found that density of LacZ cells in both the dorsal and ventral hippocampus was significantly higher in defeated no delay mice than other mouse groups (Figure 10B. Dorsal hippocampus: $F(2,21) = 11.4$, $p = 4.50E-04$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs. defeated no delay, $p = 6.77E-04$, defeated no delay vs. defeated with delay, $p = 3.27E-03$. Ventral hippocampus: $F(2,22) = 6.18$, $p = 7.41E-03$; post-hoc Tukey's test: control vs.

564 defeated no delay, p = 7.09E-03, defeated no delay vs. defeated with delay, p = 0.0475).
565 The increase in LacZ cell density one day after defeat revealed the activation of CA1
566 neurons induced by this stressor. The decrease in LacZ cell density caused by the delay
567 may be due to the dissipation of LacZ signals we showed in Figure 1D. Unlike these
568 changes in LacZ cells, we did not observe changes in the density of cFos (Figure 10C),
569 engram (Figure 10D), and DAPI cells (Figure 10E) between these three groups. Our
570 findings suggest that a subthreshold social defeat paradigm does not increase the density
571 of CA1 engram cells in the hippocampus. The expression of social avoidance after a
572 delay from subthreshold social defeat is likely related to non-CA1 mechanisms.
573
574 **Discussion**
575 Our findings suggest that social defeat-related negative memory engrams in the
576 hippocampal CA1 region are closely related to the expression of social avoidance in mice
577 that are susceptible to CSDS. We found that susceptible, but not resilient, mice exhibited
578 a higher density of CA1 engram cells than non-stressed control mice. Social avoidance
579 not only correlated with the density of CA1 engram cells, but also was facilitated and
580 suppressed by activating and inactivating social defeat-related dorsal CA1 engram cells,
581 respectively. Finally, a subthreshold social defeat protocol that failed to induce social
582 avoidance did not increase engram cell density. Taken together, our findings suggest that
583 the reactivation of stress-related negative memory engram cells in the CA1 region
584 contributes to the susceptibility to CSDS.
585 Using social defeat to induce the labeling (LacZ by the first 2 defeat episodes) and
586 the reactivation (cFos by an extra defeat episode one day after the SI test) of hippocampal

587 engrams, susceptible mice showed higher CA1 engram cell reactivation than resilient and
588 control mice. Previous findings strongly suggest that the reactivation of CA1 engram
589 cells are related to memory retrieval that was triggered by contextual information (Deng
590 et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2016; Roy et al., 2017). Higher engram cell density in susceptible
591 mice therefore may be due to the facilitated retrieval of memory that is related to the
592 defeat experience. Contextual information related to social defeat in the SI test, such as
593 the presence of a CD1 aggressor, may be sufficient to reactivate social defeat-related
594 engrams in susceptible mice to enhance avoidance behavior. Since pooling dorsal and
595 ventral hippocampal data together could reveal a modest but significant increase in the
596 density of LacZ and cFos cells in susceptible mice, stress susceptibility may also be
597 related to enhanced hippocampal encoding of negative stimuli during CSDS. Taken
598 together, increased activation and reactivation of CA1 neurons in susceptible mice make
599 CA1 engram cell a potential cellular substrate for negative memory bias in stress-related
600 mood disorders.

601 A potential mechanism to increase engram cell formation and reactivation in
602 susceptible mice is the increase in neuronal excitability. Increase in neuronal activation
603 could facilitate the formation of social defeat-related engrams and their reactivation. In
604 parallel to this hypothesis, Anacker et al (2018) have shown that social defeat can
605 enhance the excitability of ventral hippocampal DG neurons. In addition, DG
606 neurogenesis confers mouse resilience to CSDS by inhibiting ventral DG neuronal
607 activity. Although we did not observe increased labeling of activated DG neurons in our
608 study, probably due to differences in the CSDS protocols with fixed number of attacks
609 but shorter defeat duration in the present study when compared to Anacker et al, both

studies suggest the importance of high hippocampal activity to stress susceptibility. Mechanisms underlying the increased neuronal activity and excitability in susceptible mice could be due to reduced neurogenesis as suggested by Anacker et al. However, changes in inhibitory neuronal function within the hippocampus could also be responsible. It has been shown that both parvalbumin (Morrison et al., 2016) and somatostatin (Stefanelli et al., 2016) expressing GABAergic neurons can regulate engram activities. One possibility is that susceptible mice show higher hippocampal activity because of reduced interneuron function. Stress has been shown to decrease the number and function of parvalbumin neurons in the hippocampus (Czeh et al., 2005). Reduced inhibitory neuronal function in the hippocampus could be an intrinsic mechanism for enhancing CA1 neuronal excitability and engram formation in the both the dorsal and ventral hippocampus.

Resilient mice may be able to cope with CSDS by suppressing negative memory engram reactivation. Retrieval of mood congruent memory, which is commonly found in depression, has been suggested to reduce the ability of depressed patients for problem solving and sparing attention to positive information and memory (Conway and Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). Persistent recall of negative memory underlies rumination, which has been associated with the vulnerability to depression and the severity of depression symptoms (Alloy et al., 1999; Rude et al., 2003; Abela and Hankin, 2011) and perhaps most importantly, hippocampal activation (Denson et al., 2009; Mandell et al., 2014). Resilient mice may be able to suppress negative memory engram reactivation through a top down inhibitory control from the frontal lobe (Disner et al., 2011; Kircanski et al., 2012).

633 Ventral hippocampal activation has been proposed to underlie the susceptibility to
634 CSDS, so that enhanced and suppressed ventral hippocampal activity could confer to the
635 expression of susceptibility phenotypes (Anacker et al., 2018) and stress resilience (Bagot
636 et al., 2015), respectively. Ventral hippocampal CA1 neurons bidirectionally connect to
637 the amygdala (Petrovich et al., 2001; Cenquizca and Swanson, 2007), which plays an
638 important role in fear learning. The ventral CA1 is also known for its roles in social
639 memory (Okuyama et al., 2016) and social information processing (Rao et al., 2019).
640 Enhanced excitability of ventral CA1 neurons in susceptible mice may underlie the
641 expression of social avoidance after aversive experience such as CSDS. In addition, the
642 ventral CA1 projects directly to the shell of the nucleus accumbens (Groenewegen et al.,
643 1996) and various hypothalamic nuclei (Watts et al., 1987; Kishi et al., 2000), which are
644 known for their regulation of reward processing and circadian regulation, respectively.
645 Enhanced ventral CA1 activity may underlie anhedonia (Krishnan et al., 2007) and sleep
646 disturbance in susceptible mice (Wells et al., 2017).

647 Our findings suggest the dorsal hippocampus also regulates stress susceptibility.
648 Both dorsal and ventral CA1 neurons show more CA1 engram cells in susceptible mice.
649 Stress susceptibility has been associated with alterations in microRNA expression
650 (Munoz-Llanos et al., 2018) and microstructural alterations in the dorsal hippocampus
651 (Liu et al., 2018). We have recently shown that the dorsal hippocampus expresses fewer
652 NMDA receptors in the extrasynaptic location (Tse et al., 2019). Activating dorsal
653 hippocampal extrasynaptic NMDA receptors alone can reduce social avoidance in
654 defeated mice. Cognitive factors, such as social defeat-related contextual information,
655 are important for the expression of social avoidance. For instance, defeated mice

656 exhibited lower levels of avoidance if an anesthetized aggressive mouse or a non-CD1
657 strain mouse was used in a social interaction test (Krishnan et al., 2007; Venzala et al.,
658 2012). The dorsal hippocampus, which is important for associative learning of contextual
659 fear, may contribute to stress susceptibility by encoding contextual information during
660 social defeat. Our findings from manipulating dorsal hippocampal engram cell activity
661 support this hypothesis.

662 We found that susceptible mice show higher engram cell density in the dorsal
663 hippocampus when they were exposed to negative stimuli only (Figure 9). This bias in
664 engram formation cannot be found in the ventral hippocampus, where enhanced neutral-
665 and negative-stimuli related engrams were found in susceptible mice. What causes the
666 dorsal ventral differences in neutral-stimuli related engram cells in susceptible mice
667 remains unclear. Although the ventral hippocampus is known for its roles in emotional
668 control, it also participates in contextual encoding. Using Arc or cFos to tag activated
669 neurons, behavior-driven activation of ventral hippocampal neurons was observed after
670 spatial exploration (Chawla et al., 2018), radial arm maze (Vann et al., 2000), Morris
671 water maze (Gusev et al., 2005) and recognition memory tasks (Beer et al., 2014).
672 Notably, significantly fewer ventral hippocampal neurons than dorsal hippocampal
673 neurons were activated in these studies. Ventral hippocampal neurons may provide a
674 coarse representation of space when compared to dorsal hippocampal neurons, which are
675 essential for precise spatial navigation by showing smaller firing fields and greater spatial
676 resolution (Jung et al., 1994). It is possible that an increase in neuronal excitability in
677 susceptible mice is sufficient to reactivate coarsely encoded contextual information in the
678 ventral hippocampus, but not precisely encoded contextual information in the dorsal

hippocampus. Alternatively, the importance of the ventral hippocampus in emotional control may facilitate the crosstalk between the processing of neutral and negative stimuli, so that neurons that are activated by general arousal or context exposure can be used to encode stress cues during social defeat.

Our findings that subthreshold social defeat failed to increase hippocampal CA1 engram cell density could have several implications. We found that stressed mice at one day after the subthreshold defeat protocol exhibited a significant increase in CA1 LacZ cell density, but no change in the SI ratio (Figure 10, the defeated no delay group), suggesting that without the formation of engram cells, high CA1 neuronal activation in both the dorsal and ventral hippocampus alone is not sufficient to induce social avoidance. When social behavior of a separate group of mice stressed by subthreshold social defeat was examined a week after defeat, we observed social avoidance but no change in the density of CA1 LacZ, cFos and engram cells. It remains unclear why social avoidance occurs after a delay. The lack of engram cell formation in mice that show delayed expression of social avoidance suggests the involvement of non-CA1 mechanisms. Given the well-known effect of time to generalize fear memory (Wiltgen and Silva, 2007), the delayed expression of social avoidance in mice stressed by subthreshold social defeat may be due to fear generalization. However, we found that examining the density of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the DG, which plays important roles in fear generalization (Yokoyama and Matsuo, 2016), revealed no differences in engram cell density between animal groups (dorsal hippocampus: $F(2,22) = 0.408$, $p = 0.670$; ventral hippocampus: $F(2,21) = 0.221$, $p = 0.804$). Alternatively, the need of a delay for the expression of a fear response may be related to fear incubation. For

instance, electric shocks and cues pairing has revealed an increase in fear responses at 1 and 2 months when compared to 2 days after conditioning (Pickens et al., 2009). Although social avoidance was observed at 1 month after CSDS (Krishnan et al., 2007), whether an incubation effect of time to worsen avoidance after CSDS remains to be determined. Future studies could also examine if changes in neuronal activation in non-hippocampal regions that are involved in fear incubation (e.g. medial amygdala (Tsuda et al., 2015)) or fear generalization (central amygdala (Botta et al., 2015); nucleus reuniens and PFC (Xu and Sudhof, 2013)) are responsible for the delayed expression of social avoidance after a subthreshold social defeat. Finally, our findings suggest that a chronic stressor, which is closely associated to the etiology of depression (McGonagle and Kessler, 1990; McEwen, 2004), rather than a short subthreshold stressor, is needed to induce changes in engram cells. Persistent plastic changes at the synaptic and cellular levels may be induced by repeated stress exposure to facilitate the reactivation of engram cells in susceptible mice.

Unlike the CA1 region, we did not find differences in DG engrams between susceptible and resilient mice. Instead, we observed lower engram cell density in stressed mice when compared to non-stressed control mice. DG plays important roles in pattern separation and is likely sensitive to changes in context (Leutgeb et al., 2007). Using TetTag mice, it has been shown that while engram cells were formed in both the CA1 and DG during contextual learning, subsequent exposure to the same context favored the reactivation of CA1, but not DG engram cells (Deng et al., 2013). Since mice were kept in a similar context for multiple days during CSDS, CA1 instead of DG ensembles may be preferentially reactivated under this behavioral paradigm. Indeed,

compared to 4-9% reactivation of DG cells in a relatively short behavioral task such as fear conditioning (Liu et al., 2012; Denny et al., 2014; Stefanelli et al., 2016), only ~0.5% of DG cells were reactivated by social defeat in the current study.

Similar to a recent report using the same mouse model (Deng et al., 2013), we were not able to detect CA3 engram cells in TetTag mice due to low LacZ expression in this hippocampal region (Figure 3). In the experiment for detecting the duration of LacZ expression after social defeat, we found a large number of LacZ cells in the CA3 region 1 day after social defeat. However, LacZ signals seemed to disappear quickly in the CA3 region so that almost no LacZ cells were found in the pyramidal layer of the CA3 region at 4 days after social defeat. Indeed, we saw high levels of cFos expression in the CA3 region during reactivation of CA1 and DG engram cells, suggesting the activation of CA3 cells during memory recall. It is unclear why long-term LacZ expression can be found in the CA1 and DG regions, but not in the CA3 region. Since LacZ expression is sustained by the tetracycline-insensitive tTA after the reintroduction of Dox food, the lack of CA3 LacZ signal may be due to poor expression of this mutated tTA in the CA3 region. The role of CA3 engrams in stress susceptibility cannot be ruled out, since CA3 engrams have been shown to be more sensitive to fear-related contextual information than neutral novel context (Denny et al., 2014). Using the Cre-dependent ArcCreER^{T2} mouse line may reveal the contribution of CA3 neurons to stress susceptibility.

The difference in negative memory engrams between susceptible and resilient mice has important implications for depression. Changes in these memory functions could be related to the bottom up changes from a hypersensitive medial temporal lobe, including hyperfunctioning of the amygdala and the hippocampus. Our findings that

748 negative memory engrams are increased in mice that are susceptible to CSDS suggested
749 that these engrams could mechanistically contribute to the negative bias of memory
750 formation in depression. Negative memory engrams correlated with the expression of
751 social avoidance, suggesting their roles in mediating cognitive symptoms of depression.
752 Inhibiting negative memory engrams in the hippocampus could be a novel therapeutic
753 approach for treating cognitive symptoms in depression.
754
755

Figure legends

Figure 1: *Social defeat triggers the formation of hippocampal ensembles.* **(A)** A schematic diagram of the experimental design. TetTag mice were off Dox for 4 days. After two episodes of social defeat (SD) on day 1 and 2, labeling was blocked by putting mice on Dox-containing food (Dox). Mice were then stressed by 6 more episodes of SD. The interaction between TetTag mice and aggressors of the CD1 strain was examined in a social interaction (SI) test. One day after the SI test, mice underwent one more episode of SD to trigger ensembles reactivation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after the last episode of SD. Cartoons above the experimental plan depict the labeling of activated neurons during the first two episodes of CSDS (red, LacZ), during the last episode of SD (green, cFos), and engram cells that expressed both signals (red/green). **(B)** cFos stained dorsal hippocampal sections from a control mouse that was housed in its home cage (*Left*). (*Right*) cFos stained dorsal hippocampal sections from another control mouse that was defeated by a single episode of SD one day earlier. Scale bar = 200 µm. **(C)** LacZ staining of ventral hippocampal neurons from TetTag mice that were off doxycycline-containing food during labeling (Dox off, *right*). A stained section from a mouse that was on doxycycline-containing food during labeling was shown on the *Left* (Dox on). Note that apart from non-specific staining near the hippocampal fissure, LacZ cells and processes cannot be found in tissue from the Dox on mouse. Scale bar = 200 µm. **(D)** A schematic diagram of the experimental design for testing the stability of LacZ expression after Dox on. TetTag mice were off Dox for 4 days. After two episodes of social defeat (SD), labeling was blocked by putting mice on Dox. TetTag mice were sacrificed 1 day,

779 4 days and 10 days later (white arrows). **(E)** Scatter plots summarize the density of LacZ
780 positive neurons in the CA1 region of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus of TetTag mice
781 at different time points after labeling (Dorsal hippocampus: 1 day after defeat: n = 5; 4
782 days after defeat: n = 6; 8 days after defeat: n = 6. Ventral hippocampus: 1 day after
783 defeat: n = 5; 4 days after defeat: n = 6; 8 days after defeat: n = 4). * $p < 0.05$, post hoc
784 Tukey's test vs. data from day 3 group in each hippocampal region after ANOVA.
785
786 **Figure 2:** *Susceptible but not resilient mice expressed social avoidance after chronic*
787 *social defeat stress.* **(A)** Histograms summarize the social interaction ratio (*Left*) and the
788 corner ratio (*Right*) of susceptible (n = 17), resilient (n = 12) and non-stressed control
789 mice (n = 9). * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$, post hoc Tukey's test after
790 ANOVA. **(B)** Example tracks of a susceptible (*Left*) and a resilient mouse during the
791 second open field session of the SI test. The pink and purple zones are the virtual
792 interaction and corner zones, respectively. Note the cluster of tracks in the interaction
793 and corner zones for the resilient and susceptible mice, respectively.
794
795 **Figure 3:** *Hippocampal LacZ and cFos staining of a TetTag mouse.* **(A)** Fluorescent
796 micrographs of dorsal hippocampal CA1 neurons that were stained for LacZ (red) and
797 cFos (green). Part of the CA1 (dotted line square) was enlarged to show LacZ **(B)**, cFos
798 **(C)** and the overlapping of LacZ and cFos in engram cells **(D)**. Scale bars = 250 μm **(A)**
799 and 40 μm **(B** to **D)**.
800

Figure 4: *Expression of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the CA1 region of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus of control, resilient and susceptible mice.* **(A)** Histograms show the density of LacZ cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control (n = 9), resilient (n = 12) and susceptible mice (n = 17). **(B)** Histograms show the density of cFos cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. **(C)** Histograms show the density of engram cells (double labeled for both LacZ and cFos) in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. ** $p < 0.01$, **** $p < 0.0001$, Tukey's test after ANOVA. **(D)** Histograms show the density of DAPI cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice.

Figure 5: *Engram cells in control, resilient and susceptible mice.* Representative fluorescent micrographs of dorsal hippocampal CA1 neurons that were stained for LacZ (red), cFos (green) and DAPI (blue). White arrowheads represent engram cells with colocalized LacZ and cFos signals. Scale bars = 40 µm.

Figure 6: *Density of CA1 engram cells correlates with depression-related behaviors.* Scatter plots of CA1 engram cells density vs. social interaction ratio of stressed (*left*, include both susceptible and resilient mice, n = 29) and control mice (*right*, n = 9) in the dorsal **(A)** and ventral hippocampus **(B)**. Scatter plots of CA1 engram cells density vs. corner ratio of stressed and control mice in the dorsal **(C)** and ventral **(D)** hippocampus.

Figure 7: *Effect of manipulating social defeat-related CA1 engram cells on social interaction ratio.* **(A)** A schematic diagram of the experimental design. cFos-tTA mice were bilaterally injected with AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry into the dorsal hippocampal CA1 region. One week later, they were off Dox for 2 days before being stressed by a subthreshold social defeat protocol, which consisted of two episodes of social defeat (SD). One day after defeat, mice were injected by either clozapine-N oxide (CNO, 3 mg/kg) or saline at 1 hour before the social interaction (SI) test. **(B)** Fluorescent micrographs show the expression of AAV-PTRE-tight-hM3Dq-mCherry in the dorsal hippocampal CA1 region under low (scale bar = 200 μm) and high magnification (scale bar = 50 μm). **(C)** Histograms show the social interaction ratio of mice from different groups (control saline: n = 8; control CNO: n = 8; defeated saline: n = 10; defeated CNO: n = 12). *** $p < 0.001$, * $p < 0.05$, Tukey's test after two-way ANOVA. **(D)** A schematic diagram of the experimental design. Wild type mice were bilaterally injected with AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-ArchT-WPREpA (ArchT) or AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-EGFP-WPREpA (GFP) into the dorsal hippocampal CA1 region. One week later, they were implanted with fiber-optic cannulas. After a week, they were off Dox for 2 days before being stressed by a chronic social defeat protocol (8 episodes of SD). Control non-stressed mice were only handled while the stressed mice were defeated. One day after the end of handling (control) or SD (defeated), mice were examined in the SI test with light on (520 nm, 15 mW, continuously on during the second session of social interaction with a CD1 mouse inside the enclosure). **(E)** Fluorescent micrographs show the expression of AAV-RAM-d2TTA::TRE-ArchT-WPREpA in the dorsal hippocampal CA1 region under low (*i.* scale bar = 200 μm) and high magnification (*ii.* scale bar = 50

μm). *iii.* Fast red stained section shows the placement of a fiber-optic cannula (scale bar = 400 μm). **(F)** Histograms show the log transformed social interaction ratio of mice from different groups (GFP control: n = 5; GFP defeated: n = 5; ArchT control: n = 7; ArchT defeated: n = 5). * $p < 0.05$, Tukey tests after two-way ANOVA.

Figure 8: *Expression of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the dentate gyrus (DG) region of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus of control, resilient and susceptible mice.* **(A)** Histograms show the density of LacZ cells in the DG region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control (n = 9), resilient (n = 12) and susceptible mice (n = 17). **(B)** Histograms show the density of cFos cells in the DG region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. **(C)** Histograms show the density of engram cells (double labeled for both LacZ and cFos) in the DG region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. * $p < 0.05$, Tukey's test after ANOVA. **(D)** Histograms show the density of DAPI stained cells in the DG region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice.

Figure 9: *Expression of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the CA1 region of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus of control, resilient and susceptible mice, when labeling was stopped before social defeat.* **(A)** A schematic diagram of the experimental design. Tet-Tag mice were off Dox for 4 days. Labeling of neurons was stopped a day before the beginning of social defeat by feeding TetTag mice with doxycycline-containing food. Mice were then stressed by 8 episodes of social defeat (SD). The interaction between

TetTag mice and a CD1 mouse, the strain of aggressive mice used for SD, was examined in a social (SI) interaction test. One day after the SI test, mice underwent one more episode of SD to trigger neuronal activation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after the last episode of social defeat. Cartoons above the experimental plan depict the labeling of activated neurons during the first two days of chronic SD (red, LacZ), during the last episode of SD (green, cFos), and engram cells that expressed both signals (red/green). **(B)** Histograms show the density of LacZ cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control (n = 10), resilient (n = 5) and susceptible mice (n = 11). **(C)** Histograms show the density of cFos cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. **(D)** Histograms show the density of engram cells (double labeled for both LacZ and cFos) in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice. * $p < 0.05$, Tukey's test after ANOVA. **(E)** Histograms show the density of DAPI cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of control, resilient and susceptible mice.

Figure 10: *Expression of LacZ, cFos and engram cells in the CA1 region of the dorsal and ventral hippocampus of mice that were stressed by a subthreshold social defeat protocol.* **(A)** *Left:* A schematic diagram of the experimental design. Tet-Tag mice were off Dox for 4 days. Some mice were stressed by 2 episodes of social defeat (SD). Other mice were only handled when stressed mice were defeated. Labeling was blocked by putting mice on Dox-containing food after defeat. The interaction between TetTag mice and a CD1 mouse was examined in a social (SI) interaction test on 1 day (no delay) or 7

days (with delay) after SD. One day after the SI test, mice underwent one more episode of SD to trigger neuronal activation. Mice were sacrificed 90 minutes after the last episode of social defeat. *Right:* Histograms show the social interaction ratio of non-stressed control (n = 7) and defeated mice when SI tests were done either 1 day (no delay, n = 8) or 7 days (with delay, n = 9) after SD. * $p < 0.05$, Tukey's test after ANOVA. **(B)** Histograms show the density of LacZ cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of non-stressed control and defeated mice when SI tests were done either 1 day (no delay) or 7 days (with delay) after SD. * $p < 0.05$, Tukey's test after ANOVA. **(C)** Histograms show the density of cFos cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of non-stressed control and defeated mice when SI tests were done either 1 day (no delay) or 7 days (with delay) after SD. **(D)** Histograms show the density of engram cells (double labeled for both LacZ and cFos) in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of non-stressed control and defeated mice when SI tests were done either 1 day (no delay) or 7 days (with delay) after SD. **(E)** Histograms show the density of DAPI cells in the CA1 region of dorsal (*left*) and ventral hippocampus (*right*) of non-stressed control and defeated mice when SI tests were done either 1 day (no delay) or 7 days (with delay) after SD.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Dr. Frédéric Manseau from Dr. Sylvain Williams's laboratory, Dr. Jennifer Robinson from Dr. Mark Brandon's laboratory and Dr. Rosemary Bagot for their advices for the optogenetic experiment. The present study used the services of the Molecular and Cellular Microscopy Platform in the Douglas Hospital Research Centre. We also like to thank the help from Ms. Melina Jaramillo Garcia for setting up the imaging experiments and the analysis.

References

Abela JR, Hankin BL (2011) Rumination as a vulnerability factor to depression during the transition from early to middle adolescence: a multiwave longitudinal study. J Abnorm Psychol 120:259-271.

Alloy LB, Abramson LY, Whitehouse WG, Hogan ME, Tashman NA, Steinberg DL, Rose DT, Donovan P (1999) Depressogenic cognitive styles: predictive validity, information processing and personality characteristics, and developmental origins. Behav Res Ther 37:503-531.

Anacker C, Luna VM, Stevens GS, Millette A, Shores R, Jimenez JC, Chen B, Hen R (2018) Hippocampal neurogenesis confers stress resilience by inhibiting the ventral dentate gyrus. Nature 559:98-102.

Bagot RC, Parise EM, Pena CJ, Zhang HX, Maze I, Chaudhury D, Persaud B, Cachope R, Bolanos-Guzman CA, Cheer JF, Deisseroth K, Han MH, Nestler EJ (2015) Ventral hippocampal afferents to the nucleus accumbens regulate susceptibility to depression. Nat Commun 6:7062.

Beer Z, Chwiesko C, Sauvage MM (2014) Processing of spatial and non-spatial information reveals functional homogeneity along the dorso-ventral axis of CA3, but not CA1. Neurobiol Learn Mem 111:56-64.

Botta P, Demmou L, Kasugai Y, Markovic M, Xu C, Fadok JP, Lu T, Poe MM, Xu L, Cook JM, Rudolph U, Sah P, Ferraguti F, Luthi A (2015) Regulating anxiety with extrasynaptic inhibition. Nat Neurosci 18:1493-1500.

Cai DJ et al. (2016) A shared neural ensemble links distinct contextual memories encoded close in time. Nature 534:115-118.

Cenquizca LA, Swanson LW (2007) Spatial organization of direct hippocampal field CA1 axonal projections to the rest of the cerebral cortex. Brain Res Rev 56:1-26.

Chawla MK, Sutherland VL, Olson K, McNaughton BL, Barnes CA (2018) Behavior-driven arc expression is reduced in all ventral hippocampal subfields compared to CA1, CA3, and dentate gyrus in rat dorsal hippocampus. Hippocampus 28:178-185.

Conway MA, Pleydell-Pearce CW (2000) The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. Psychol Rev 107:261-288.

Czeh B, Simon M, van der Hart MG, Schmelting B, Hesselink MB, Fuchs E (2005) Chronic stress decreases the number of parvalbumin-immunoreactive interneurons in the hippocampus: prevention by treatment with a substance P receptor (NK1) antagonist. Neuropsychopharmacology 30:67-79.

Deng W, Mayford M, Gage FH (2013) Selection of distinct populations of dentate granule cells in response to inputs as a mechanism for pattern separation in mice. Elife 2:e00312.

Denny CA, Kheirbek MA, Alba EL, Tanaka KF, Brachman RA, Laughman KB, Tomm NK, Turi GF, Losonczy A, Hen R (2014) Hippocampal memory traces are

differentially modulated by experience, time, and adult neurogenesis. Neuron 83:189-201.

Denson TF, Pedersen WC, Ronquillo J, Nandy AS (2009) The angry brain: neural correlates of anger, angry rumination, and aggressive personality. J Cogn Neurosci 21:734-744.

Disner SG, Beevers CG, Haigh EA, Beck AT (2011) Neural mechanisms of the cognitive model of depression. Nat Rev Neurosci 12:467-477.

El Iskandrani KS, Oosterhof CA, El Mansari M, Blier P (2015) Impact of subanesthetic doses of ketamine on AMPA-mediated responses in rats: An in vivo electrophysiological study on monoaminergic and glutamatergic neurons. J Psychopharmacol 29:792-801.

Fanselow MS, Dong HW (2010) Are the dorsal and ventral hippocampus functionally distinct structures? Neuron 65:7-19.

Fu CH, Williams SC, Cleare AJ, Brammer MJ, Walsh ND, Kim J, Andrew CM, Pich EM, Williams PM, Reed LJ, Mitterschiffthaler MT, Suckling J, Bullmore ET (2004) Attenuation of the neural response to sad faces in major depression by antidepressant treatment: a prospective, event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging study. Arch Gen Psychiatry 61:877-889.

Gaddy MA, Ingram RE (2014) A meta-analytic review of mood-congruent implicit memory in depressed mood. Clin Psychol Rev 34:402-416.

Groenewegen HJ, Wright CI, Beijer AV (1996) The nucleus accumbens: gateway for limbic structures to reach the motor system? Prog Brain Res 107:485-511.

Gusev PA, Cui C, Alkon DL, Gubin AN (2005) Topography of Arc/Arg3.1 mRNA expression in the dorsal and ventral hippocampus induced by recent and remote spatial memory recall: dissociation of CA3 and CA1 activation. J Neurosci 25:9384-9397.

Hamilton JP, Gotlib IH (2008) Neural substrates of increased memory sensitivity for negative stimuli in major depression. Biol Psychiatry 63:1155-1162.

Hertel PT, Gerstle M (2003) Depressive deficits in forgetting. Psychol Sci 14:573-578.

Joormann J, Quinn ME (2014) Cognitive processes and emotion regulation in depression. Depress Anxiety 31:308-315.

Josselyn SA, Kohler S, Frankland PW (2015) Finding the engram. Nat Rev Neurosci 16:521-534.

Jung MW, Wiener SI, McNaughton BL (1994) Comparison of spatial firing characteristics of units in dorsal and ventral hippocampus of the rat. J Neurosci 14:7347-7356.

Kircanski K, Joormann J, Gotlib IH (2012) Cognitive Aspects of Depression. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Cogn Sci 3:301-313.

997 Kishi T, Tsumori T, Ono K, Yokota S, Ishino H, Yasui Y (2000) Topographical
998 organization of projections from the subiculum to the hypothalamus in the rat. J
999 Comp Neurol 419:205-222.

1000 Koster EH, De Raedt R, Leyman L, De Lissnyder E (2010) Mood-congruent attention
1001 and memory bias in dysphoria: Exploring the coherence among information-
1002 processing biases. Behav Res Ther 48:219-225.

1003 Krishnan V et al. (2007) Molecular adaptations underlying susceptibility and resistance to
1004 social defeat in brain reward regions. Cell 131:391-404.

1005 Leutgeb JK, Leutgeb S, Moser MB, Moser EI (2007) Pattern separation in the dentate
1006 gyrus and CA3 of the hippocampus. Science 315:961-966.

1007 Liu X, Yuan J, Guang Y, Wang X, Feng Z (2018) Longitudinal in vivo Diffusion Tensor
1008 Imaging Detects Differential Microstructural Alterations in the Hippocampus of
1009 Chronic Social Defeat Stress-Susceptible and Resilient Mice. Front Neurosci
1010 12:613.

1011 Liu X, Ramirez S, Pang PT, Puryear CB, Govindarajan A, Deisseroth K, Tonegawa S
1012 (2012) Optogenetic stimulation of a hippocampal engram activates fear memory
1013 recall. Nature 484:381-385.

1014 Lyubomirsky S, Caldwell ND, Nolen-Hoeksema S (1998) Effects of ruminative and
1015 distracting responses to depressed mood on retrieval of autobiographical
1016 memories. J Pers Soc Psychol 75:166-177.

1017 Maeng S, Zarate CA, Jr., Du J, Schloesser RJ, McCammon J, Chen G, Manji HK (2008)
1018 Cellular mechanisms underlying the antidepressant effects of ketamine: role of
1019 alpha-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methylisoxazole-4-propionic acid receptors. Biol
1020 Psychiatry 63:349-352.

1021 Mandell D, Siegle GJ, Shutt L, Feldmiller J, Thase ME (2014) Neural substrates of trait
1022 ruminations in depression. J Abnorm Psychol 123:35-48.

1023 Mayberg HS, Brannan SK, Tekell JL, Silva JA, Mahurin RK, McGinnis S, Jerabek PA
1024 (2000) Regional metabolic effects of fluoxetine in major depression: Serial
1025 changes and relationship to clinical response. Biol Psychiatry 48:830-843.

1026 McEwen BS (2004) Protection and damage from acute and chronic stress: allostasis and
1027 allostatic overload and relevance to the pathophysiology of psychiatric disorders.
1028 Ann N Y Acad Sci 1032:1-7.

1029 McGonagle KA, Kessler RC (1990) Chronic stress, acute stress, and depressive
1030 symptoms. Am J Community Psychol 18:681-706.

1031 McKinnon MC, Yucel K, Nazarov A, MacQueen GM (2009) A meta-analysis examining
1032 clinical predictors of hippocampal volume in patients with major depressive
1033 disorder. J Psychiatry Neurosci 34:41-54.

1034 Morrison DJ, Rashid AJ, Yiu AP, Yan C, Frankland PW, Josselyn SA (2016)
1035 Parvalbumin interneurons constrain the size of the lateral amygdala engram.
1036 Neurobiol Learn Mem 135:91-99.

1037 Munoz-Llanos M, Garcia-Perez MA, Xu X, Tejos-Bravo M, Vidal EA, Moyano TC,
1038 Gutierrez RA, Aguayo FI, Pacheco A, Garcia-Rojo G, Aliaga E, Rojas PS,
1039 Cidlowski JA, Fiedler JL (2018) MicroRNA Profiling and Bioinformatics Target
1040 Analysis in Dorsal Hippocampus of Chronically Stressed Rats: Relevance to
1041 Depression Pathophysiology. Front Mol Neurosci 11:251.

1042 Nolen-Hoeksema S (2000) The role of rumination in depressive disorders and mixed
1043 anxiety/depressive symptoms. J Abnorm Psychol 109:504-511.

1044 Okuyama T, Kitamura T, Roy DS, Itohara S, Tonegawa S (2016) Ventral CA1 neurons
1045 store social memory. Science 353:1536-1541.

1046 Petrovich GD, Canteras NS, Swanson LW (2001) Combinatorial amygdalar inputs to
1047 hippocampal domains and hypothalamic behavior systems. Brain Res Brain Res
1048 Rev 38:247-289.

1049 Pickens CL, Golden SA, Adams-Deutsch T, Nair SG, Shaham Y (2009) Long-lasting
1050 incubation of conditioned fear in rats. Biol Psychiatry 65:881-886.

1051 Radulovic J, Kammermeier J, Spiess J (1998) Relationship between fos production and
1052 classical fear conditioning: effects of novelty, latent inhibition, and unconditioned
1053 stimulus preexposure. J Neurosci 18:7452-7461.

1054 Ramirez S, Liu X, MacDonald CJ, Moffa A, Zhou J, Redondo RL, Tonegawa S (2015)
1055 Activating positive memory engrams suppresses depression-like behaviour.
1056 Nature 522:335-339.

1057 Rao RP, von Heimendahl M, Bahr V, Brecht M (2019) Neuronal Responses to
1058 Conspecifics in the Ventral CA1. Cell Rep 27:3460-3472 e3463.

1059 Reijmers LG, Perkins BL, Matsuo N, Mayford M (2007) Localization of a stable neural
1060 correlate of associative memory. Science 317:1230-1233.

1061 Roy DS, Kitamura T, Okuyama T, Ogawa SK, Sun C, Obata Y, Yoshiki A, Tonegawa S
1062 (2017) Distinct Neural Circuits for the Formation and Retrieval of Episodic
1063 Memories. Cell 170:1000-1012 e1019.

1064 Rude SS, Valdez CR, Odom S, Ebrahimi A (2003) Negative cognitive biases predict
1065 subsequent depression. Cognit Ther Res 27:415-429.

1066 Santarelli L, Saxe M, Gross C, Surget A, Battaglia F, Dulawa S, Weisstaub N, Lee J,
1067 Duman R, Arancio O, Belzung C, Hen R (2003) Requirement of hippocampal
1068 neurogenesis for the behavioral effects of antidepressants. Science 301:805-809.

1069 Sorensen AT, Cooper YA, Baratta MV, Weng FJ, Zhang Y, Ramamoorthi K, Fropf R,
1070 LaVerriere E, Xue J, Young A, Schneider C, Gotzsche CR, Hemberg M, Yin JC,
1071 Maier SF, Lin Y (2016) A robust activity marking system for exploring active
1072 neuronal ensembles. Elife 5.

1073 Squire LR (1992) Memory and the hippocampus: a synthesis from findings with rats,
1074 monkeys, and humans. Psychol Rev 99:195-231.

1075 Stefanelli T, Bertollini C, Luscher C, Muller D, Mendez P (2016) Hippocampal
1076 Somatostatin Interneurons Control the Size of Neuronal Memory Ensembles.
1077 Neuron 89:1074-1085.

1078 Thomas EJ, Elliott R, McKie S, Arnone D, Downey D, Juhasz G, Deakin JF, Anderson
1079 IM (2011) Interaction between a history of depression and rumination on neural
1080 response to emotional faces. Psychol Med 41:1845-1855.

1081 Tonegawa S, Liu X, Ramirez S, Redondo R (2015) Memory Engram Cells Have Come of
1082 Age. Neuron 87:918-931.

1083 Tse YC, Lopez J, Moquin A, Wong SA, Maysinger D, Wong TP (2019) The
1084 susceptibility to chronic social defeat stress is related to low hippocampal
1085 extrasynaptic NMDA receptor function. Neuropsychopharmacology 44:1310-
1086 1318.

1087 Tse YC, Montoya I, Wong AS, Mathieu A, Lissemore J, Lagace DC, Wong TP (2014) A
1088 longitudinal study of stress-induced hippocampal volume changes in mice that are
1089 susceptible or resilient to chronic social defeat. Hippocampus 24:1120-1128.

1090 Tsuda MC, Yeung HM, Kuo J, Usdin TB (2015) Incubation of Fear Is Regulated by
1091 TIP39 Peptide Signaling in the Medial Nucleus of the Amygdala. J Neurosci
1092 35:12152-12161.

1093 Vann SD, Brown MW, Erichsen JT, Aggleton JP (2000) Fos imaging reveals differential
1094 patterns of hippocampal and parahippocampal subfield activation in rats in
1095 response to different spatial memory tests. J Neurosci 20:2711-2718.

1096 Venzala E, Garcia-Garcia AL, Elizalde N, Delagrange P, Tordera RM (2012) Chronic
1097 social defeat stress model: behavioral features, antidepressant action, and
1098 interaction with biological risk factors. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 224:313-325.

1099 Videbech P, Ravnkilde B (2004) Hippocampal volume and depression: a meta-analysis of
1100 MRI studies. Am J Psychiatry 161:1957-1966.

1101 Watts AG, Swanson LW, Sanchez-Watts G (1987) Efferent projections of the
1102 suprachiasmatic nucleus: I. Studies using anterograde transport of Phaseolus
1103 vulgaris leucoagglutinin in the rat. J Comp Neurol 258:204-229.

1104 Wells AM, Ridener E, Bourbonais CA, Kim W, Pantazopoulos H, Carroll FI, Kim KS,
1105 Cohen BM, Carlezon WA, Jr. (2017) Effects of Chronic Social Defeat Stress on
1106 Sleep and Circadian Rhythms Are Mitigated by Kappa-Opioid Receptor
1107 Antagonism. J Neurosci 37:7656-7668.

1108 Wiltgen BJ, Silva AJ (2007) Memory for context becomes less specific with time. Learn
1109 Mem 14:313-317.

1110 Xu W, Sudhof TC (2013) A neural circuit for memory specificity and generalization.
1111 Science 339:1290-1295.

1112 Yokoyama M, Matsuo N (2016) Loss of Ensemble Segregation in Dentate Gyrus, but not
1113 in Somatosensory Cortex, during Contextual Fear Memory Generalization. Front
1114 Behav Neurosci 10:218.

1115 Zhang Z, Ferretti V, Guntan I, Moro A, Steinberg EA, Ye Z, Zecharia AY, Yu X,
1116 Vyssotski AL, Brickley SG, Yustos R, Pillidge ZE, Harding EC, Wisden W,
1117 Franks NP (2015) Neuronal ensembles sufficient for recovery sleep and the
1118 sedative actions of alpha2 adrenergic agonists. Nat Neurosci 18:553-561.