



HAL
open science

Shifting between response and place strategies in maze navigation: Effects of training, cue availability and functional inactivation of striatum or hippocampus in rats

Julien Gasser, Anne Pereira de Vasconcelos, Brigitte Cosquer, Anne-Laurence Boutillier, Jean-Christophe Cassel

► To cite this version:

Julien Gasser, Anne Pereira de Vasconcelos, Brigitte Cosquer, Anne-Laurence Boutillier, Jean-Christophe Cassel. Shifting between response and place strategies in maze navigation: Effects of training, cue availability and functional inactivation of striatum or hippocampus in rats. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 2020, 167, pp.107131. 10.1016/j.nlm.2019.107131 . hal-02406371

HAL Id: hal-02406371

<https://hal.science/hal-02406371>

Submitted on 22 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Shifting between response and place strategies in maze navigation: effects of**
2 **training, cue availability and functional inactivation of striatum or hippocampus**
3 **in rats**

4

5

6 Running title: Striatum, hippocampus, and navigation

7

8 Julien Gasser^{1,2}, Anne Pereira de Vasconcelos^{1,2}, Brigitte Cosquer^{1,2}, Anne-Laurence
9 Boutillier^{1,2}, Jean-Christophe Cassel^{1,2,3}

10

11

12 ¹ Université de Strasbourg, Laboratoire de Neurosciences Cognitives et Adaptatives
13 (LNCA), F-67000 Strasbourg, France

14

15 ² CNRS, LNCA UMR 7364, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

16

17

18 Number of manuscript pages: 45 (figures not counted)

19 Number of figures: 9

20 Number of supplementary figures: 16

21 Number of tables: 0

22 Number of supplementary tables: 4

23 Number of words in abstract: 253; introduction: 775; discussion: 2813

24

25

26

27 ³ **Corresponding author:** Dr. Jean-Christophe Cassel, Laboratoire de
28 Neurosciences Cognitives et Adaptatives (LNCA), UMR 7364, Université de
29 Strasbourg-CNRS, 12 rue Goethe, F-67000 Strasbourg, France. E-mail:
30 jcassel@unistra.fr

31 **Acknowledgments and support:** This work was supported by the University of
32 Strasbourg, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), and the
33 Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM). J. Gasser was
34 supported by a 3-year PhD fellowship from the French government. We are grateful
35 to O. Bildstein, D. Egesi, and G. Edomwonyi for their assistance in animal care. We
36 also thank Ms Delphine Cochand and Dr James Keaney for their editing of the
37 language of the manuscript.

38

39 **Compliance with ethical standards:** The authors have no conflict of interest to
40 declare.

41

42 **Abstract (273 words)**

43 Response and place memory systems have long been considered
44 independent, encoding information in parallel, and involving the striatum and
45 hippocampus, respectively. Most experimental studies supporting this view used
46 simple, repetitive tasks, with unrestrained access to spatial cues. They did not give
47 animals an opportunity to correct a response strategy by shifting to a place one,
48 which would demonstrate dynamic, adaptive interactions between both memory
49 systems in the navigation correction process. In a first experiment, rats were trained
50 in the double-H maze for different durations (1, 6, or 14 days; 4 trials/day) to acquire
51 a repetitive task in darkness (forcing a response memory-based strategy) or normal
52 light (placing response and place memory systems in balance), or to acquire a place
53 memory. All rats were given a misleading shifted-start probe trial 24-hr post-training
54 to test both their strategy and their ability to correct their navigation directly or in
55 response to negative feedback. Additional analyses focused on the dorsal striatum
56 and the dorsal hippocampus using c-Fos gene expression imaging and, in a second
57 experiment, reversible muscimol inactivation. The results indicate that, depending on
58 training protocol and duration, the striatum, which was unexpectedly the first to come
59 into play in the dual strategy task, and the hippocampus are both required when rats
60 have to correct their navigation after having acquired a repetitive task in a cued
61 environment. Partly contradicting the model established by Packard and McGaugh
62 (1996, *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, vol 65), these data point to memory
63 systems that interact in more complex ways than considered so far. To some extent,
64 they also challenge the notion of hippocampus-independent response memory and
65 striatum-independent place memory systems.

66

67

68

69

70 **Keywords:** hippocampus; spatial navigation; place memory; response memory; rat;
71 striatum

72

73 1. Introduction

74 When navigating toward a goal in a familiar environment, animals may use a
75 place strategy based on their cognitive map, pilot themselves toward an explicit cue
76 marking their goal, or repeat a response behavior consisting of a given sequence
77 of actions concatenated in a constant order (e.g., Chersi & Burgess, 2015; Tolman et
78 al., 1946). Research in rodents demonstrated a preferential role of the
79 hippocampus in place memory and of the striatum in response memory (DeCoteau
80 and Kesner, 2000; Gold, 2004; Packard & McGaugh, 1992, 1996; Packard, 1999,
81 Poldrack & Packard, 2003).

82 Currently it is thought that in the initial stages of learning a repetitive
83 navigation task with double solution (i.e., the goal can be reached either through
84 place or response strategy), the hippocampus memory system quickly integrates
85 information due to its “one-shot” incidental learning capabilities (Chersi and Burgess,
86 2015). With repetition, the striatal system takes over and starts to guide behavior, as
87 shown in e.g., rodents (e.g., Packard & McGaugh, 1996; Laria et al., 2003; but see
88 Asem & Holland, 2013; Martel et al., 2007). Importantly, even after automation due to
89 sustained practice, subjects may not lose the capacity to shift from response to place
90 strategy upon receiving negative feedback (e.g., when the usual route is
91 unexpectedly compromised or the goal is missed).

92 Many experiments exploring place and response memories in rodents tested
93 animals with unrestrained access to their environmental landmarks while running on
94 T- or cross-maze devices (McDonald and White, 1994; 1995; 2013; Mizumori et al.,
95 2004; Packard, 1999; Packard & McGaugh, 1992; 1996; Packard and White, 1991;
96 Tolman et al., 1946; White and McDonald, 2002; White et al., 2013). In these
97 experiments, their behavior was usually classified as egocentric (i.e., relying on
98 idiothetic cues) or allocentric (i.e., relying on allothetic cues) based on a single-
99 response probe test (e.g., Packard & McGaugh, 1996; Fouquet et al., 2013). When
100 the response strategy revealed inefficient, the shift to a place strategy was not
101 permitted. Such correction is crucial, however, because it would demonstrate a
102 capability to engage the hippocampal and striatal memory systems in dynamic,
103 interactive and situation-adapted ways (e.g., Berke et al., 2009; Chersi & Burgess,
104 2015; Eshenko & Mizumori, 2007; Mizumori et al., 2004; Regier et al., 2015).

105 Past research has suggested that the interaction between response and place

106 memory systems is modulated by saliency of intramaze and/or extramaze cues (e.g.,
107 Packard & Goodman, 2013), task complexity (e.g., Cassel et al., 2012; Ruprecht et
108 al., 2014), practice (e.g., Martel et al., 2007), and a few other factors, including stress
109 (e.g., Gardner et al., 2013; Packard and Goodman, 2013; Quaedflieg and
110 Schwabe, 2018; Schwabe, 2013). However, general conclusions regarding
111 hippocampal-striatal interactions cannot be drawn because the aforementioned
112 factors have most often been tackled by using a diversity of experimental devices,
113 protocols, training levels in different and separate experiments. In order to
114 investigate the dynamic interaction between dorsal striatum and hippocampus in
115 conditions that systematically control modulating factors, we used a repetitive task in
116 a single device with a single type of task motivation (escape from water), and varied
117 the experimental settings across three protocols and durations of training (1, 6 or 14
118 days). The training durations of 6 and 14 days were chosen to parallel Packard and
119 Mc Gaugh's study (1996). The apparatus was the double-H maze described by
120 Cholvin et al. (2013), and our experimental rats had to learn a unique pathway
121 between the same start arm and the same target arm. These experimental rats were
122 trained under normal illumination in a task with a dual response/place strategy (Lt-
123 ON-Dual). One control group was trained in darkness (to minimize perception of
124 allothetic cues) in a task promoting a response strategy (Lt-OFF-Resp). A second
125 control group was trained under normal illumination in a task promoting a place
126 strategy (Lt-ON-Place).

127 One day after the last training session, all rats were given a probe trial (same
128 illumination as for training) for which the start arm was changed in order to identify
129 the initial strategy - place or response - and to subsequently evaluate if an alternative
130 strategy could be adopted upon negative feedback (i.e., platform not found). Based
131 on the current understanding of memory systems and hippocampal-striatal
132 interactions (Chersi and Burgess, 2015; Packard and Goodman, 2013), the
133 predictions were that : **i)** Lt-OFF-Resp rats would favor a response strategy
134 based on the striatum memory system and would not construct a spatial map
135 enabling a strategy shift, whatever the training duration, **ii)** Lt-ON-Dual rats, which
136 would adopt a hippocampal-dependent spatial navigation strategy at the beginning of
137 training and change to a striatum-dependent response strategy with further training,
138 would be able to shift from a response to a place strategy, and **iii)** Lt-ON-Place rats

139 would favor a place strategy based on the hippocampus memory system
140 enabling a strategy shift either directly or after a mistake. We also investigated the
141 memory-based behaviors using c-Fos brain imaging and muscimol inactivation.

142

143 **2. Materials and methods**

144

145 **2.1. Animals**

146 Male Long-Evans rats (Janvier Labs, Le Genest-St-Isle, France) were used.
147 They were aged 6-7 weeks (body weight: 160-170g) at their arrival at the laboratory.
148 They were housed individually with ad libitum food and water in a temperature
149 (22 ± 1 °C) and humidity ($55 \pm 5\%$) controlled room under a 12-12 hr light–dark cycle
150 (lights on at 7.00 a.m.). The study respected the rules and guidelines of the
151 European Parliament 2010/63/UE of September 22, 2010, and of the French
152 Department of Agriculture. All experimental protocols used herein have been
153 validated a priori by a local ethical committee (CREMEAS, authorization no.
154 AL/17/24/02/13).

155

156 **2.2. Double-H maze**

157 The double-H testing device has been described in detail in previous articles
158 (e.g., Pol-Bodetto et al., 2011; Cassel et al., 2012; Kirch et al., 2013, 2015) along
159 with the characteristics of the room hosting it (Cholvin et al., 2013). Briefly, the
160 general layout of the apparatus corresponds to the shape of two contiguous capital
161 Hs. It is made of three parallel run arms, 160 cm in length and 18.8 cm wide (internal
162 measure), connected to each other at their center by a perpendicular arm. All side
163 walls, 35 cm high, are made of transparent Plexiglas to favor access to allothetic
164 cues. The two opposite arms in the middle are labeled north (N) and south (S),
165 respectively (see Figure 1). The four other arms are labeled south-east (SE), south-
166 west (SW), north-east (NE), and north-west (NW). For pre-training, training and
167 memory testing, the device was always kept at the same place (on a square table, 80
168 cm from the floor) and all cues in the room (two black disks on one wall, and one
169 large triangle on another wall, two orange-painted heating ducts above the maze,
170 one table, one chair, one computer desk, one boiler...) were left at their original
171 location for the entire duration of the experiments. Most of these landmarks were

172 located close to the maze, i.e., between 1.20 and 1.50 m from the closest maze wall
173 and between 86 and 140 cm above the water surface. To secure the locations of
174 objects, including the maze and its table, their positions were marked on the floor. In
175 the room, there was a small loudspeaker fixed on the wall, playing music at low
176 volume during the 12-h light period.

177

178 ***2.3. Pre-training and training protocols***

179 The double-H was filled with water (20 °C) to a height of 15 cm. A platform,
180 11 cm in diameter, 14 cm high, was ballasted with gravel and used as the escape.
181 For pre-training, the platform protruded 1 cm above the surface of the water at the
182 extremity of the SW arm, the water was left clear and the rats were given four
183 consecutive trials. On each trial, rats had to swim straight from the NW to the SW
184 arm in order to keep the cognitive demand at a low level. A transparent guillotine
185 door blocked the access to the central corridor and thus to all other places in the
186 maze. In all rats, pre-training was performed in a normally lit environment.

187 For the training sessions, the platform was moved to the NE arm and
188 immersed 1 cm under the water surface. Water was made opaque by addition of
189 powdered milk (about 1.5 g/L). Rats were given four daily trials. Each trial lasted a
190 maximum of 60 s. When the rat did not reach the platform within this time, it was
191 gently guided to the platform by the experimenter. Once a rat had climbed on the
192 platform, it was left there for 10 s, after what the next trial was started without delay.

193 Three training protocols were used (Figure 1). In the first protocol (Lt-OFF-
194 Resp), rats were tested in darkness: the only source of light was generated by six red
195 darkroom bulbs, type B22PF712B by Philips, 15 W each, placed near the maze at
196 the extremity of each arm; light intensity in and around the maze was of about 1 lux.
197 The rats were released from the S on all trials and had to swim to the NE, which they
198 reached most directly by a right turn immediately followed by a left turn. The N arm
199 was closed with a transparent guillotine door. The guillotine door prevented the
200 repetition of the straight swimming trajectory rats had to follow during the pre-training
201 phase of the protocol. In the second protocol (Lt-ON-Dual), the same procedure was
202 used except that the room was illuminated by neon lights (180 lux) to make all
203 landmarks easily visible. The N arm was closed with a guillotine door. In the third
204 protocol (Lt-ON-Place), the room was illuminated (180 lux) and rats were released

205 randomly from a different arm on each of the four daily training trials. The N arm was
206 closed.

207 Each trial was videotaped for subsequent off-line scoring. Variables collected
208 were: swim patterns, latencies (s) and distances (cm) to reach the platform, as well
209 as the number of errors. An error was counted each time a rat was swimming in a
210 segment (either in one of the arms with no platform or one of the segments of the
211 central alley to the left or right of the start arm) toward a direction opposite to that
212 leading most directly to the platform (see Pol-Bodetto et al., 2011, for detail). Each
213 time a rat had its head and 4 paws in one of those segments, it was considered to
214 have entered it. For each protocol, three subgroups of rats were constituted. The first
215 one was trained for 1 day (and thus received only four trials), the second one for 6
216 consecutive days (24 trials), and the last one for 14 consecutive days (56 trials).

217 *****

218 **Insert Figure 1 about here**

219 *****

220

221 **2.4. Probe trial**

222 The probe trial, for which the platform was removed from the water, was given
223 24 hr after the last trial of the last training day. Probe trial duration was of 60 s.
224 Regardless of their previous training protocol, all rats were released from the SW
225 arm, thus with a 60 cm translation to the left of their usual starting point. In Lt-ON-
226 Dual rats, this translation to the left was previously found to be misleading. Indeed,
227 more than 90% of the rats usually first repeated the right-left (R-L) body turns, ending
228 up in the N arm, instead of using a direct trajectory to the NE arm (Cassel et al.,
229 2012). This high misleading potential can be explained by the fact that the 60-cm
230 translation to the left only slightly alters room perspectives (Cassel et al., 2012). The
231 presence of the guillotine door in front of the arm from which the rat was released
232 possibly added to this misleading potential. Upon negative feedback (i.e., no platform
233 found in N), however, a number of rats leaving the N arm then entered the NE one,
234 where they searched for the platform for a longer time than chance level, further
235 supporting their ability to use a place strategy (Cassel et al., 2012). Variables
236 collected during the probe trial were **i)** type of swim trajectory displayed immediately
237 after the start (R-L turn and thus direct swim to the N, direct swim to the NE, or other)

238 and the capacity to shift to the NE arm after having visited the N one; **ii**) response
239 memory and place memory exploration times over the entire probe trial duration.
240 Response memory exploration time is defined as the cumulated time in any arm that
241 a rat entered after successive R-L turns. Place memory exploration time is defined as
242 the cumulated time in the NE arm. Because a trajectory going from the S to the NE
243 arm could be the result of either a response memory or a place memory, without any
244 possibility for the experimenter to know which strategy a rat had used, the times
245 spent in the NE arm when the rats came directly from the S were discarded from
246 statistical analyses. As a result, only times recorded in the NE arm when rats came
247 from SW, SE or N were considered for analyses. Additional variables analyzed were
248 the swim velocity, the time spent in the first visited arm before leaving it, as well as
249 the time spent in the N or NE arm after the rats had entered it for the first time.

250

251 ***2.5. Surgery and muscimol (MUSC) infusions***

252 For our second experiment, surgery was performed under aseptic conditions.
253 Rats were anesthetized with a ketamine (98 mg/kg)–xylazine (13 mg/kg) mixture
254 injected intraperitoneally. They were secured in a stereotaxic frame (incisor bar at –
255 3.0 mm). Stainless steel guide cannulas (external diameter 0.4 mm) were implanted
256 bilaterally in the dorsal hippocampus (DHip), targeting CA1 (AP –3.6 mm, ML \pm 2.4
257 mm, DV –2.4 mm from skull), or in the dorsal striatum (DStr; AP +0.72 mm, ML \pm 2.85
258 mm, DV –4.2 mm from skull). All coordinates are given from Bregma according to
259 Paxinos and Watson (2007). On the basis of the c-Fos expression patterns of our first
260 experiment (see below), we decided to infuse MUSC into a relatively central site of
261 the DStr, rather than separately into the DLS or DMS, where c-Fos expression levels
262 were in most instances not dramatically different between rats trained for 6 as
263 compared to 14 days under each training condition. Each guide cannula was secured
264 to the skull by acrylic dental cement and sterilized stainless steel screws. At the end
265 of surgery, a stainless steel mandrel (external diameter 0.28 mm) was inserted into
266 each guide cannula. Thereafter, rats were allowed to recover under a heating lamp
267 for 20–30 min before being placed back into their home cage. An 8-day
268 rest/manipulation time (for home-cage rats of experiment 1 as well) was given before
269 the start of the behavioral experiment.

270 In contrast to lidocaine or tetrodotoxin, MUSC reportedly induces an
271 inactivation of neurons in the diffusion radius of the drug without changing the
272 excitability of the fibers *en passage* therein (Edeline et al., 2002; Van Duuren et al.,
273 2007). Starting 3 days after surgery, rats were first habituated over 5 consecutive
274 days to being handled and maintained for drug infusions. For infusions, rats were
275 gently restrained by hand in a soft towel, the mandrels were removed, and an
276 infusion needle (external diameter 0.28 mm) was slowly lowered into each guide
277 cannula. The tip of each infusion needle protruded 1.0 mm beyond the tip of the
278 guide cannula into the DHip or the DStr. The other needle tip had been connected to
279 a 10 μ L Hamilton syringe by polyethylene tubing. Using a microinjection pump
280 (CMA/100), MUSC (Sigma, Saint-Louis, USA; dissolved in artificial cerebrospinal fluid
281 [aCSF]) was infused bilaterally (200 ng/ μ L in the DStr, and 250 ng/ μ L in the DHip,
282 each over 60 s; 1 μ L was infused, whatever the structure, in each hemisphere). In a
283 previous study, such small amounts were found to induce marked cognitive effects
284 when infused in the DHip, the prefrontal cortex, or the ventral midline thalamus
285 (Cholvin et al., 2013). Controls received a bilateral infusion of aCSF (same volume as
286 for inactivation). At the completion of infusion, the needles were left in place for 60 s
287 to allow drug diffusion into the parenchyma. Needles were then slowly retracted and
288 mandrels repositioned into the guide cannulas. Right after the infusion, rats were
289 returned to their home cage until the start of the probe trial, 30 min later. This delay of
290 30 min is within the time window of maximal effect of the drug (i.e., 25 to 90–120
291 min), as shown by electrophysiological (Arikan et al., 2002; Edeline et al., 2002) or
292 autoradiographic studies (using [3 H]-MUSC, Edeline et al., 2002; Martin & Ghez,
293 1999). The diffusion radius of MUSC at the time of the probe trial was estimated on
294 brain sections stained for c-Fos expression. Possible intergroup differences in the
295 inactivation extent might have induced differences in performance. Therefore, the
296 area covered by the absence of c-Fos expression was measured in both
297 hemispheres on coronal sections from both structures. Estimating the extent of a
298 pharmacologic inactivation remains a tricky issue. In previous studies (Cholvin et al.,
299 2013), we used fluorescent MUSC to localize the infusion site and efficiency of
300 diffusion into the parenchyma. The molecular weight of this molecule, however, is 5.3
301 times larger than its natural homologue. Therefore, we chose to measure the extent
302 of reduced c-Fos expression around the infusion site. Indeed, this immediate early

303 gene having a very low basal expression level, a region that should be active (as
304 seen in rats infused with aCSF) but would exhibit a very low or no c-Fos expression
305 can be considered efficiently inactivated. A similar approach on zif268 expression in
306 mice was used by Maviel et al. (2004) to assess the effects of lidocaine in the
307 hippocampus and neocortex. All inactivation areas were expressed as a % of the
308 surface of the DStr at about -0.1, 0.1, +0.5, +0.7, +0.8, +1.0, +1.4, and +1.7 mm
309 (ventral limits of the DStr are those shown in Supplementary Figure 1), and of the
310 DHip at -4.4, -4.2, -3.8, -3.6, -3.5, -3.4, -3.1, -2.9, and -2.6 mm, from Bregma
311 (Paxinos and Watson, 2007).

312

313 **2.6. Tissue preparation**

314 Ninety minutes after the probe trial, rats were injected with an overdose of
315 sodium pentobarbital (200 mg/kg i.p.) and perfused transcardially with 80mL of a 4%
316 phosphate-buffered (0.1 M) paraformaldehyde solution (PFA, 4°C). Brains were
317 removed, post-fixed for 2 hr in 4% PFA (4°C), and placed into a 20% sucrose
318 solution (in 0.1 M PBS) for 48 hr at 4 °C. They were then quickly frozen in isopentane
319 (-40 °C) and stored at -80°C. Floating coronal sections (40 µm) were cut using a
320 cryostat (MICROM HM 500M) in serial sections within a block of tissue extending
321 from +1.90 to -1.90 mm from Bregma for the DStr, and from -2.16 to -4.44 mm from
322 Bregma for the dHip (Paxinos & Watson, 2007).

323

324 **2.7. c-Fos immunohistochemistry, imaging and quantification**

325 All sections dedicated to c-Fos immunohistochemistry were processed in
326 separate rounds so as to have all between-subject factors equally represented in
327 each round ($n = 8$ rats for each group). These precautions minimized technical
328 biases. The sections were first rinsed three times during 10 min in PBS and soaked
329 for 1 hr in 5% normal donkey serum in PBS containing 0.5% Triton X-100. All
330 sections were subsequently transferred into the primary anti-Fos rabbit polyclonal
331 antibody solution (1:4,000, Rabbit anti-Fos polyclonal IgG; Santa Cruz, USA), where
332 they were left overnight at room temperature. Then, they were rinsed and soaked in a
333 buffer solution containing biotinylated goat anti-rabbit secondary antibody (1:500,
334 Biotin SP-conjugated affiniPure Goat anti-rabbit IgG; Jackson ImmunoResearch,
335 West Grove, PA, USA). Staining was revealed with the avidin–biotin peroxidase

336 method (Vectastain ABC kit; Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA, USA) coupled to
337 diaminobenzidine (Lopez et al., 2012). In rats subjected to a functional inactivation by
338 MUSC (see below), additional sections were stained with cresyl violet to make sure
339 that the location of the infusion sites was acceptable.

340

341 **2.8. Stereological analyses of c-Fos expression**

342 The quantitative analyses of c-Fos-positive nuclei were performed in the DStr
343 and DHip. As the dorsomedial striatum (DMS) contributes to setting up an
344 automatism by its implication in action outcome on a goal-directed navigation task,
345 and the dorsolateral striatum (DLS) to the automatism's storage (e.g., Packard &
346 McGaugh 1996; Thorn et al., 2010), quantifications were made separately in the
347 DMS and DLS. Additional quantifications were also made in CA1, CA3, and dentate
348 gyrus (DG), as c-Fos expression levels accompanying place memory retrieval may
349 differ between these hippocampal subregions (e.g., Lopez et al., 2012). A single
350 investigator, blind to the identity of the rats, analyzed all sections. The overall number
351 of c-Fos immunoreactive cells was estimated with the optical fractionator technique
352 using optical dissectors (45 x 45 μm) allowing unbiased counting (West et al., 1991;
353 West, 2013). For stereological counting we used a Leica DM5500B light microscope
354 coupled with a MicroFire CCD color camera (Optronics) equipped with a motorized
355 x-y stage control. Stereological analyses were performed using the Mercator
356 software (Explora Nova, La Rochelle, France) and all cell counts were processed
357 online on the video image. The same intensity of light in the microscope and the
358 same parameters in the exposure time of the digital camera were used for all
359 sections. Areas of interest in stained sections (see Supplementary Figure 1) were
360 first outlined using a 2.5x objective and c-Fos-positive cells were counted using a
361 100x (1.40 NA) oil-immersion objective. Counting grids (145 x 145 μm for the DStr
362 and 80 x 80 μm for DHip subregions) equidistant from each other were randomly
363 positioned within the area of interest using the Mercator software. The total number
364 of c-Fos positive nuclei/ mm^3 of cerebral tissue was estimated from six (for the DHip)
365 or seven (for the DStr) sections per animal (section sampling fraction (ssf) = 1/6 for
366 DHip or 1/12 for DStr, from the total number of nuclei counted in all optical
367 dissectors). Details of stereological parameters were as follows: section interval =
368 200 μm for DHip and 400 μm for DStr; dissector height = 12 μm and guard zone = 2

369 μm (corresponding to upper and lower border exclusion zone, mean section
370 thickness being at $16 \mu\text{m}$). Counting was performed in the DMS, the DLS, and the
371 DHip. Roughly, the DLS region was the one connected to the sensorimotor cortex
372 and the DMS region was the one connected with medial prefrontal regions (see
373 McGeorge & Faull, 1989; Voorn et al., 2004). The error coefficients (see Gundersen
374 et al., 1988) for each estimation and animal ranged from 0.09 to 0.11.

375 A group of never-tested rats taken from their home cage (HC) was used as a
376 baseline control for c-Fos quantification (see below). Our HC controls were handled
377 daily by the experimenter for the same time as the average duration the rats trained
378 and tested in the double-H maze took to complete four trials. The same was done on
379 the probe trial day. Swimming controls would have been acceptable for a training
380 duration of 1 day (four training trials). However, for 6 and 14 days of training, rats
381 would have received 24 and 56 trials, respectively, without any solution to escape
382 from the water. Typically, this situation is a learned helplessness one, which affects
383 c-Fos expression patterns in the hippocampus (e.g., Huang et al., 2004) or structures
384 innervating the hippocampus (Steciuk et al., 1999). Therefore, swimming-only rats
385 were not included in this study.

386

387 **2.9. Statistical analyses**

388 For the first experiment, analyses of acquisition scores used a Protocol x Trial
389 (1-day training) or Protocol x Day (6- or 14-day training) ANOVA. For analyses of the
390 corresponding probe trial performance, we considered qualitative and quantitative
391 variables. After having been released in the SW arm of the maze, rats could swim
392 directly to the NE arm, indicating an immediate engagement of place memory, or N
393 arm, indicating a direct engagement of response memory. All other swim patterns
394 (i.e., a first visit of any of the other arms) were considered in an 'Other' category. To
395 compare the number of rats in the response memory category among training
396 protocols (factor called 'Protocol' hereafter) and training durations (factor called
397 'Duration' hereafter), we used a non-parametric Chi² test. To refine this analysis, we
398 analyzed the latencies to the NE arm as they might provide precious information in
399 rats tested in light about the strategy they used. If this strategy relied on response
400 memory, the latency should be close to that found in rats tested in the absence of
401 light. We also compared the cumulated time spent in the NE arm or in any other arm

402 to which a R-L turn had led for each training protocol and duration. When post-hoc
403 comparisons were required and justified by the ANOVA, we used the Newman-Keuls
404 multiple range test. Exploration times in the R-L and NE arms were compared to
405 chance. As each arm had a surface representing 13.7% of the accessible surface of
406 the maze and as the probe trial duration was of 60 s, chance was computed as $60 \times$
407 $0.137 = 8.22$ s. Quantitative c-fos expression data were analyzed using a Protocol X
408 Duration ANOVA for each separate brain region (DMS, DLS, CA1, CA3, DG).

409 For our second experiment, we also used a χ^2 test to analyze the first arm
410 choice at the start of the probe trial, and an Inactivation (aCSF, MUSC) x Duration (6,
411 14 days) ANOVA for each protocol to analyze the behavioral consequence of
412 inactivating the DStr or DHip. Multiple comparisons were performed with the more
413 conservative Tuckey test, because, based on graphical observations, they were
414 occasionally run in the absence of significant interactions when a main effect of
415 MUSC was found. Performance was also compared to chance using a Student t-test.
416 To analyze the extent of inactivation (c-Fos imaging) at different anteriority levels, we
417 used a Protocol x Duration x Anteriority (6 or 7 levels) ANOVA. This was done for
418 each brain region (DStr, DHip).

419

420 3. Results

421

422 ***3.1. Experiment 1: Incremental training in the double-H maze and c-fos*** 423 ***expression patterns in the dorsal striatum vs. dorsal hippocampus***

424

425 **3.1.1. Comparable acquisition performance among training protocols**

426 Latencies to reach the platform in the NE arm are shown in Figure 2. Rats trained for
427 one day (four trials) showed performance improvement across trials. (Trial: $F_{(3,63)} =$
428 12.2 , $p < 0.001$). This improvement was comparable among the three training
429 protocols (interaction: $F_{(6,63)} = 0.33$). In the rats trained over 6 days (six trial blocks),
430 there was a significant Day effect ($F_{(5/105)} = 46.6$, $p < 0.001$), but no effect of Protocol
431 ($F_{(2/21)} = 0.1$) or of the interaction ($F_{(10/105)} = 0.23$). In the rats trained over 14 days,
432 only the Day effect was significant ($F_{(13,273)} = 43.1$, $p < 0.001$). For the two longest
433 training durations, significant improvements of performance were from day 1 to day 2

434 and then to day 3 ($p < 0.01$). Analyses of the distances (not illustrated) yielded strictly
435 comparable results, as was also the case for errors (see Supplementary Figure 2).

436

437 *****

438 **Insert Figure 2 about here**

439 *****

440

441 **3.1.2. A training-duration-dependent shift from response to place**
442 **memory in Lt-ON-Dual rats**

443 According to our current knowledge, Lt-OFF-Resp rats should form a
444 stimulus-response representation and favor a response strategy without
445 constructing a spatial map. Therefore, they should not shift to spatial navigation,
446 even in response to negative feedback. Conversely, Lt-ON-Dual rats should adopt a
447 hippocampal-dependent spatial navigation strategy after weak training (1 or 6 days),
448 but change to a striatum-dependent response strategy after sustained training (14
449 days). We hypothesized that they should nevertheless be able to shift from a
450 response strategy to a place strategy, either directly or upon negative feedback. In Lt-
451 ON-Place rats, for the three training durations, all behaviors should reflect a place
452 strategy. According to these predictions, our results showed that Lt-OFF-Resp rats
453 did not form a spatial map. However, and unexpectedly, Lt-ON-Dual rats started to
454 acquire the task by response learning, and acquired only later on a place memory
455 enabling a trajectory correction, either directly or in response to negative feedback.
456 Lt-ON-Place rats relied on a spatial map, as soon as after 1 day of training.

457

458 The data are illustrated in Figure 3. Whatever the training duration, almost all
459 Lt-OFF-Resp rats swam directly to the N, a proportion (20/23; 87%) largely above
460 chance (i.e., 25% as there were 4 accessible arms; start arm not considered). Most
461 Lt-ON-Place rats (16/23; 69%) also swam directly to the N. In Lt-ON-Dual rats, most
462 first swim paths ended in the N arm after 1 (100%) or 6 (87%) training days. After 14
463 training days, however, half the rats swam directly to the NE arm. The difference
464 between first choices after 1 and 14 training days was significant ($\text{Chi}^2 = 4.8$, $p <$
465 0.05), indicating a late emergence of spatial navigation capabilities. Supplementary

466 Table 1 shows the proportion of rats correcting their choice in response to negative
467 feedback, i.e., rats which swam to the NE arm next to having entered the N one.

468 *****

469 **Insert Figure 3 about here**

470 *****

471

472 To further analyze probe trial performance, and especially the shift capacity,
473 we considered three additional variables: latencies to the NE arm, cumulated time
474 spent in an arm to which a R-L turn had led (response memory-based behavior), and
475 cumulated time spent in the NE arm (place memory-based behavior). Latencies to
476 the NE arm (Supplementary Figure 3) provided additional information about the
477 nature of the strategy used by the rats. Overall, we found that latencies were
478 significantly reduced in the probe trial of the Lt-ON-Dual rats compared to the Lt-
479 OFF-Resp rats after 14 days of training, thus compatible with the progressive
480 formation of a cognitive map in this group. Swim velocities (see Supplementary Table
481 2) during the probe trial did not differ significantly among groups, allowing us to
482 compare latencies. Regarding the time to exit the first visited arm, there was no
483 significant difference among groups (Supplementary Figure 4). It is noteworthy that
484 when Lt-ON-Dual rats (after 14 days of training) and Lt-ON-Place rats (after 6 and 14
485 days of training) visited the NE or the N arm for the first time, the to exit was longer in
486 the former than in the latter (supplementary Figure 5), a difference not found in Lt-
487 OFF-Resp rats.

488

489 **3.1.2.1. Cumulated time in arms reached by R-L turns:**

490 This variable shows a response memory-based strategy in Lt-OFF-Resp rats,
491 a strategy abandoned by Lt-ON-Dual rats after the longest training duration, and not
492 existing in Lt-ON-Place rats. Data are shown in Figure 4. In the Lt-OFF-Resp rats, the
493 exploration time was above chance for the two longest durations ($p < 0.01$), and
494 larger after 14 training days than after 1 or 6 days ($p < 0.05$). In the Lt-ON-Place rats,
495 this time was neither significantly different from chance nor affected by training
496 duration. In Lt-ON-Dual rats, the time decayed as a function of training duration,
497 reaching chance level after 14 training days. The Protocol x Duration ANOVA
498 showed significant effects of the Protocol ($F_{(2,58)} = 17.4, p < 0.001$), Duration ($F_{(2,58)}$)

499 = 0.13, *ns*), and of the interaction between the two factors ($F_{(4,58)} = 3,19, p < 0.05$).
500 The Protocol effect was due to an overall exploration time (collapsed over training
501 durations) that was longest in the Lt-OFF-Resp rats, intermediate in the Lt-ON-Dual
502 rats, and lowest in the Lt-ON-Place ones (all differences were significant: $p < 0.01$).
503 The interaction reflected a time of exploration that increased with training duration in
504 Lt-OFF-Resp rats and decreased in Lt-ON-Dual rats.

505

506 **3.1.2.2. Cumulated time in NE arm:**

507 This variable shows no place memory-based strategy in Lt-OFF-Resp rats, a
508 place strategy which appeared in L-ON-Dual rats after the longest training duration
509 (14 days) and which was present in Lt-ON-Place rats already after 1 day of training.
510 Statistics for comparisons of performance to chance level are illustrated in Figure 4.
511 ANOVA of exploration time showed significant effects of Protocol ($F_{(2,58)} = 25,2, p <$
512 0.001), Duration ($F_{(2,58)} = 8,9, p < 0.001$), and of the interaction between the two
513 factors ($F_{(4,58)} = 2,5, p < 0.05$). The group effect was due to overall time of
514 exploration that was longest in Lt-ON-Place, intermediate in the Lt-ON-Dual rats, and
515 lowest in Lt-OFF-Resp rats (all differences were significant: $p < 0.01$). The low
516 exploration time in Lt-OFF-Resp rats and the high exploration time in Lt-ON-Place
517 rats were not affected by training duration. Conversely, in Lt-ON-Dual rats, this time
518 increased as a function of training duration, starting at the level of Lt-OFF-Resp rats
519 and ending up at that of Lt-ON-Place ones. This difference explains the interaction
520 between the two factors.

521

522 In summary, rats trained in the response strategy task developed a response
523 strategy and showed a bias towards the response arm during the probe trial. Rats
524 trained in the dual response/place strategy task performed comparably after 1 or 6
525 training days. However, after 14 days, half of them used an initial place strategy and,
526 at the group level, there was a clear cut bias towards the place (NE) arm in the probe
527 trial. Rats trained in the place strategy task did not use a place strategy for their initial
528 swim path, but over the probe trial they showed a clear bias towards the place arm,
529 whatever the training duration. The main result here is that when cues are visible in
530 the dual double-H maze task, rats first approach the task on the basis of response
531 learning and construct a cognitive map later on.

532

533

Insert Figure 4 about here

534

535

536

3.1.3. c-fos expression patterns in the dorsal striatum and dorsal

537

hippocampus

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

3.1.3.1. c-Fos quantification in the dorsal striatum:

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

Analyses of c-Fos positive neurons in the DMS showed significant Protocol ($F_{(3,72)} = 86.0, p < 0.001$), Duration ($F_{(2,72)} = 3.5, p < 0.05$), and interaction effects ($F_{(6,72)} = 2.7, p < 0.05$). The highest overall c-Fos expression was found in the DMS of Lt-OFF-Resp rats, the second highest one in Lt-ON-Dual rats, then in Lt-ON-Place rats, and finally in HC rats; all intergroup differences were significant ($p < 0.01$, at least). Multiple comparisons showed that the only group in which the number of c-Fos-positive neurons was significantly depending on the duration of training was the Lt-

565 ON-Dual group; this number was reduced significantly after 6 and 14 days compared
566 to 1 day ($p < 0.05$ in each case).

567 Analyses of the DLS data showed significant Protocol ($F_{(3,72)} = 87.2, p < 0.001$) and
568 Protocol X Duration interaction effects ($F_{(6,72)} = 2.7, p < 0.05$); the overall Duration
569 effect was not significant ($F_{(2,72)} = 1.5, p = 0.22$). The highest overall c-Fos
570 expression was found in Lt-OFF-Resp rats, the second highest one in Lt-ON-Dual
571 rats, then in Lt-ON-Place rats, and finally in HC rats; all intergroup differences were
572 significant ($p < 0.01$). The only group in which the number of c-Fos-positive neurons
573 was significantly depending on training duration was the Lt-OFF-Resp group; this
574 number was larger after 6 and 14 days than after 1 day ($p < 0.05$ in each case).

575

576 **3.1.3.2. c-Fos quantification in the dorsal hippocampus:**

577 Analyses of c-Fos positive neurons in CA1 showed significant Protocol ($F_{(3,72)}$
578 $= 17.9, p < 0.001$), Duration ($F_{(2,72)} = 16.1, p < 0.001$), and interaction effects ($F_{(6,72)}$
579 $= 11.1, p < 0.001$). The same effects were found in CA3 and in the DG, although with
580 less pronounced differences. In the DG, post hoc analyses indicated that overall c-
581 Fos expression was weaker after 14 than after 1 and 6 days of training ($p < 0.05$). In
582 CA1 and CA3, the highest overall c-Fos expression was found in Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-
583 ON-Place rats ($p < 0.001$), which did not differ from each other. The lowest one was
584 found in Lt-OFF-Resp and HC rats, which did not differ from each other. Regarding
585 training durations, the lowest overall c-Fos expression was found for the longest
586 duration in CA1, CA3, and DG ($p < 0.05$). In two groups, the number of c-Fos-positive
587 neurons was dependent on training duration: it was dramatically reduced between 1
588 and 6 days in CA1 of Lt-ON-Place rats ($p < 0.01$), and between 6 and 14 days of Lt-
589 ON-Dual rats ($p < 0.01$). In CA3, it was reduced between 1 and 6 days in Lt-ON-
590 Place rats ($p < 0.05$) and increased after 6 days of training in Lt-ON-Dual rats
591 compared to 1 and 14 days ($p < 0.01$). This was also the case in the DG ($p < 0.05$).

592

593 **Insert Figure 5 about here**

594

595

596 In summary, there was an increased c-Fos expression in the dorsal striatum of
597 Lt-OFF-Resp rats after all training durations, but after sustained training c-Fos levels

598 had decreased in the DMS and increased in the DLS. In Lt-ON-Place rats, c-Fos
599 expression was substantially lower and not dependent on training duration. Lt-ON-
600 Dual rats had c-Fos levels comparable to Lt-OFF-Resp rats after the shortest
601 training, and to Light-ON-Place rats after the longest training. In region CA1 of Lt-
602 OFF-Resp rats, c-Fos levels were close to those found in home cage rats. In Lt-ON-
603 Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats these levels were high after one day of training, but had
604 decayed to levels of home cage rats after 6 days of training in Lt-ON-Place rats, and
605 after 14 days of training in Lt-ON-Dual rats, when these were showing evidence for
606 place memory. It is noteworthy that some changes in c-Fos expression did not fit with
607 the literature-based expectations (e.g., Packard and McGaugh, 1996).

608

609 ***3.2. Experiment 2: 6- or 14-day training in the double-H maze and muscimol*** 610 ***inactivation before the probe trial***

611 Training conditions were the same as in the first experiment, but durations
612 were of 6 and 14 days only. Thirty minutes before the probe trial, rats were infused
613 with MUSC or aCSF into the DStr or the DHip. Based on the behavioral data of the
614 first experiment, our expectations were that intrastriatal MUSC would disrupt
615 response memory-based behavior, and hence disrupt performance in Lt-OFF-Resp
616 rats after 6 or 14 days of training, and in Lt-ON-Dual rats only after 14 days of
617 training. In Lt-ON-Place rats, striatal inactivation should have no effect. We also
618 expected that intrahippocampal infusions of MUSC would not affect performance in
619 Lt-OFF-Resp rats, but would alter it in Lt-ON-Dual rats after 14 days of training, and
620 in Lt-ON-Place rats after either training duration. Consideration of c-Fos data leave
621 our expectations unchanged for Lt-OFF-Resp rats. For the other groups, it is difficult
622 to make strong predictions because c-Fos expression data were not in line with our
623 behavioral observations.

624

625 **3.2.1. Muscimol infusion sites**

626 The cannulas/needles reached their intended target in most rats (otherwise,
627 the rats were discarded from analyses). The infusions sites are shown in Figure 6.
628 Briefly, when the cannulas were implanted in the DStr, the between-subject variability
629 of the infusion sites was of about 1.5 mm along the antero-posterior axis, 1.2 mm in
630 laterality, and 1.2 mm ventrally. When the cannulas were implanted in the DHip, the

631 variability of the infusion sites was of about 1.2 mm along the antero-posterior axis,
632 1.0 mm in laterality, and 1.0 mm ventrally.

633 *****

634 **Insert Figure 6 about here**

635 *****

636

637 **3.2.2. Inactivation radius in the dorsal striatum and dorsal hippocampus**
638 **as assessed by c-Fos expression**

639 The extent of inactivation was comparable among experimental conditions for each
640 structure. An overview of the diffusion of the MUSC effects as estimated from our c-
641 Fos expression material is shown in Supplementary Figure 11. The inactivation
642 extent was quantified based on c-Fos gene expression staining: Inactivation areas
643 were expressed as a percentage of the surface of the DHip or DStr at different levels
644 of anteriority. Data are shown in Supplementary Figure 12. ANOVA (Protocol X
645 Duration X Anteriority) showed no other significant effect than an effect of Anteriority
646 in the DStr ($F_{(6,252)} = 114.7, p < 0.001$) and DHip ($F_{(6,306)} = 136.1, p < 0.001$). This
647 effect reflected a diffusion decrease as a function of distance from the infusion site.
648 No other single factor effect (Protocol, Duration) and none of the different interactions
649 were significant. Typical examples of MUSC inactivation effects on c-Fos expression
650 are shown in Supplementary Figure 13.

651

652 **3.2.3. Drug infusion-free task acquisition regardless of training duration**

653 Acquisition performance was comparable among experimental conditions.
654 Data are shown in Figure 7. In the rats with intrastriatal cannulae and given 6 training
655 days, there was a significant Duration effect ($F_{(5/205)} = 124.6, p < 0.001$), but no effect
656 of Protocol ($F_{(2/41)} = 3.00$) on latencies; the interaction between the two factors was
657 significant ($F_{(10/205)} = 1.9, p < 0.05$). The Duration effect was due to overall
658 performance that improved significantly over the first three days. In the rats with
659 intrahippocampal cannulae, we only found a significant Duration effect ($F_{(5/300)} =$
660 $155.7, p < 0.001$) reflecting overall performance improvement over the first three
661 days, not afterwards. For the longest training period (14 days), there were significant
662 Protocol ($F_{(2/47)} = 6.7, p < 0.01$) and Duration ($F_{(13/611)} = 152.2, p < 0.001$) effects in
663 the rats with intrastriatal cannulae. The Duration effect reflected an improvement of

664 overall performance, mainly over the first four days. In the rats with the cannulae
665 implanted in the hippocampus, all factors produced significant effects (Protocol: F
666 $(2/46) = 8.1, p < 0.001$; Duration: F $(13/598) = 191.5, p < 0.001$; Protocol X Duration: F
667 $(26/598) = 1.6, p < 0.05$). The Duration effect was due to an overall improvement during
668 the first three days. The analysis of the distances (not illustrated) and of the number
669 of errors (see Supplementary Figure 14) pointed to **similar** conclusions.

670 *****

671 **Insert Figure 7 about here**

672 *****

673 **3.2.4. Effects of muscimol inactivation on double-H maze navigation**

674 MUSC altered performance in Lt-OFF-Resp rats, whether infused in the
675 striatum or the hippocampus. In Lt-ON-Dual rats, intrahippocampal MUSC infusion
676 disrupted the response memory after 6 training days and –at least to some extent–
677 the place memory after 14 days. In Lt-ON-Place rats, place memory was altered by
678 MUSC after 6 and 14 days of training. After sustained training, the place memory
679 system has become resistant to intrastriatal MUSC infusion. The data are illustrated
680 in Figures 8 and 9.

681 **3.2.4.1. Initial swimpaths**

682
683 In the Lt-OFF-Resp condition, almost all rats infused with aCSF in the striatum
684 first swam to the N (i.e., showed an egocentric strategy); their proportion did not differ
685 statistically from chance (i.e., from 25%) and was not influenced by training duration.
686 Very few of them subsequently shifted to the NE arm (see supplementary Table 3).
687 MUSC infusions reduced the number of rats swimming directly to the N arm ($\text{Chi}^2 =$
688 $4,7, p < 0.05$ whatever the duration of training). Almost none of these rats shifted to
689 the NE after their visit to the N arm. In the Lt-ON-Dual group, most first-swim paths
690 also consisted in R-L turns after aCSF infusion. The proportion of rats then shifting to
691 the NE was weak after 6 training days, and larger after 14 days (see supplementary
692 Table 3). In Lt-ON-Dual rats given intrastriatal MUSC, the proportion of direct swims
693 to the N was not affected after 6 training days, but it was significantly reduced after
694 14 days of training ($\text{Chi}^2 = 4.8, p < 0.05$). Finally, after intrastriatal aCSF infusion in
695 Lt-ON-Place rats, 3 out of 7 rats swam directly to the N arm (the others swimming to

697 the NE one) after 6 days of training, but after 14 days of training, all of them first
698 swam to the N arm. MUSC did not disrupt this proportion significantly. Under MUSC,
699 however, none of the rats that swam directly to the N shifted to the NE when tested
700 after 6 training days; this shift capability was not affected by MUSC after 14 days of
701 training. Regarding the time to exit the first visited arm, there was no significant
702 difference among groups (supplementary Figure 15).

703 When aCSF was infused in the dorsal hippocampus, a large majority of rats first
704 swam directly to the N arm, whatever the training condition. After intrahippocampal
705 MUSC, this behavior was significantly reduced in Lt-OFF-Resp rats (6 days: $\text{Chi}^2 =$
706 $8.8, p < 0.01$; 14 days: $\text{Chi}^2 = 6.5, p < 0.05$). The same was observed in Lt-ON-Dual
707 rats (6 days: $\text{Chi}^2 = 5.6, p < 0.05$; 14 days: $\text{Chi}^2 = 5.6, p < 0.05$). Finally, in Lt-ON-
708 Place rats, intrahippocampal MUSC reduced the number of rats swimming directly to
709 the N after 6 days of training ($\text{Chi}^2 = 4.7, p < 0.05$), but not after 14 days of training.

710 Overall, this analysis suggests that MUSC in one or the other memory
711 structure led a proportion of the rats toward the 'Other' category of behaviors (i.e.,
712 neither response nor place strategy), most probably pointing to a general disruption
713 of the memory-based performance, whatever the memory.

714 *****

715 **Insert Figure 8 about here**

716 *****

717

718 **3.2.4.2. Cumulated time in R-L turn and NE arms**

719 As in our first experiment, the probe trial performance analyses were refined
720 by considering quantitative variables: **i)** cumulated time spent in arms to which a R-L
721 turn had led regardless of which arm was entered (response memory variable), and
722 **ii)** cumulated time spent in the NE arm (place memory variable). Again, times
723 resulting from an entry in NE when a rat was coming from S were not considered.
724 Data are shown in Figure 9. As shown in Supplementary Table 4, swim velocities
725 during the probe trial did not differ among treatment groups. Time spent in the first
726 arm visited, and time spent in the N arm or in the NE one after the first visit is
727 illustrated in supplementary Figures 15 and 16.

728 Altogether, our data confirm that the possibility to shift to a spatial strategy
729 (and thus a strategy-correction capacity) emerges with increasing training duration

730 (data from aCSF-treated rats). In Lt-OFF-Resp rats, intrastriatal and
731 intrahippocampal MUSC infusions disrupted (or tended to do so) the response
732 memory-based behavior (time in arms after R-L turns); the place memory-based one
733 (time in NE arm) was not different from chance. In the Lt-ON-Dual rats, the
734 intrastriatal infusion of MUSC did not interfere with place memory after 14 days,
735 whereas intrahippocampal MUSC infusion disrupted the response memory after 6
736 and 14 days of training. In Lt-ON-Place rats, intrastriatal infusion of MUSC disrupted
737 the place memory system after 6 days of training, and intrahippocampal infusion did
738 so for both training durations.

739

740 **3.2.4.3. Cumulated time in arms reached by R-L turns:**

741 MUSC disrupted response memory performance, especially when infused into
742 the dHIP. Data are shown in Figure 9.

743 After intrastriatal infusions, the time spent in the R-L arm was above chance in aCSF-
744 treated Lt-OFF-Resp and Lt-ON-Dual rats after 6 days of training ($p < 0.05$), and only
745 in Lt-OFF-Resp rats after 14 days of training ($p < 0.05$). In rats infused with MUSC, it
746 never exceeded chance significantly. MUSC-induced effects were further analyzed
747 with a MUSC x Duration ANOVA for each training protocol. MUSC infusions into the
748 DStr induced an overall impairment of response-memory-based behavior only in Lt-
749 OFF-Resp rats ($F_{(1,28)} = 8.12, p < 0.05$). Multiple comparisons showed that the
750 difference was significant after 6 ($p < 0.05$; Tuckey test) not 14 days of training..

751

752 After intrahippocampal infusions, the time spent in the R-L arm was above
753 chance in aCSF-treated Lt-OFF-Resp and Lt-ON-Dual rats after 6 days of training (p
754 < 0.05), and in Lt-OFF-Resp rats after 14 days of training ($p < 0.05$). In rats infused
755 with MUSC, it never exceeded chance significantly. In Lt-ON-Place rats, MUSC had
756 no significant effect, whatever the training duration. When infused into the
757 hippocampus, MUSC altered the behavior in Lt-OFF-Resp rats ($F_{(1,31)} = 10.74, p <$
758 0.01) and in Lt-ON-Dual ones ($F_{(1,26)} = 18.34, p < 0.01$); there was no significant
759 effect of Duration and no interaction between both factors. Multiple comparisons
760 showed the MUSC effect to be significant after both training durations in Lt-OFF-
761 Resp rats ($p < 0.05$; Tuckey test). In Lt-ON-Dual rats, the difference was significant

762 after 6 days of training ($p < 0.05$; Tuckey test), and only tended towards significance
763 after 14 days ($p = 0.066$; Tuckey test).

764

765 *****

766 **Insert Figure 9 about here**

767 *****

768

769 **3.2.4.4. Cumulated time in NE arm:**

770 Overall, MUSC disrupted place memory performance. Data are shown in
771 Figure 9.

772 The time in the NE arm exceeded chance in aCSF-treated Lt-ON-Place rats
773 after 6 and 14 days of training ($p < 0.05$), whether subjected to intrastriatal or
774 intrahippocampal infusions. Only after 14 days of training did this time also exceed
775 chance in Lt-ON-Dual rats. After MUSC infusion, time in the NE arm did not differ
776 from chance, except when MUSC was infused in the striatum of Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-
777 ON-Place rats after 14 days of training. ANOVA showed that when infused into the
778 striatum, MUSC reduced place-memory-based performance (time in NE arm) in Lt-
779 ON-Place rats, but only after 6 days of training ($p < 0.001$). When MUSC was infused
780 into the hippocampus, there was a significant overall impairment in Lt-ON-Resp rats
781 ($F_{(1,31)} = 7.66, p < 0.05$) and Lt-ON-Place rats ($F_{(1,30)} = 24.5, p < 0.001$), but in Lt-
782 ON-Dual rats only a tendency was noticed ($F_{(1,26)} = 3.56, p = 0.07$). In Lt-ON-Resp
783 rats, the MUSC effect was significant only after 6 days of training ($p < 0.001$; Tuckey
784 test). In Lt-ON-Place rats, it was significant after both training durations ($p < 0.05$;
785 Tuckey test).

786

787 **4. Discussion**

788

789 In tasks with dual place/response solution, the place memory system is the
790 first to find the solution, the response memory system coming into play later on (e.g.,
791 Packard and McGaugh, 1996). We therefore expected Lt-ON-Dual rats to use their
792 place memory system first. Our results point to a different outcome. We also
793 expected that hippocampal c-Fos expression would increase when place memory is
794 used, thus at an early stage of training, and that striatal c-Fos expression would

795 increase later on when response memory is used. Our results only partly support
796 these expectations. We predicted that striatal blockade would affect response
797 memory, whereas hippocampal blockade would affect place memory, as e.g., in
798 Packard and McGaugh (1996). We found that striatal inactivation altered response
799 memory in Lt-OFF-Resp rats. Furthermore, for both training durations, hippocampal
800 inactivation affected performance in Lt-ON-Place and, although to a weaker degree,
801 in Lt-ON-Dual rats, as expected, but also surprisingly in Lt-OFF-Resp rats. These
802 data point to memory systems that interact in more complex ways than considered so
803 far. To some extent, they also challenge the notion of a hippocampus-independent
804 response memory and a striatum-independent place memory.

805

806 **4.1. In some conditions, the dorsal striatum memory system may guide** 807 **behavior faster than the hippocampal memory system**

808 Training in darkness promoted the use of response learning, while training in
809 light proposed a dual solution paradigm, in which rats used a response strategy at
810 the early stages of training and then switched to a place strategy. This result
811 contradicted predictions based on Packard and McGaugh (1996), who found in a
812 food-rewarded plus-maze dual solution task that rats tended to use a spatial strategy
813 before shifting to a response one. Our results, however, are in line with a report by
814 Asem and Holland (2013). In an escape-motivated, submerged T maze, rats had to
815 repeatedly swim to the same target. Their first approach of the task was egocentric;
816 spatial skills arose later on. Asem and Holland (2013) proposed that escaping from
817 water is more stressful than approaching food, and that stress-related mechanisms
818 may have disadvantaged hippocampal functions (Kim & Diamond, 2002; see also
819 Vogel et al., 2017 for data in humans). Interestingly, in mice trained in a water maze
820 with a cued platform, Martel et al. (2007) also found that “*the hippocampus was not*
821 *the first to provide solution*”. It is noteworthy that with a kind of appetitive and dry
822 variant of our double-H maze (alias the ‘Opposing Ts maze’), rats trained to reach the
823 same goal from the same start point first used an allocentric strategy and came to the
824 egocentric one in a second time (Gardner et al., 2013). Taken together, these
825 findings provide support to Asem and Holland’s proposal, as other studies also do
826 (e.g., Packard and Goodman, 2013; Schwabe, 2013). Because cues influence the
827 type of strategy adopted (e.g., Packard and Goodman, 2013), an alternative

828 explanation could be that allothetic cues were less salient in the environment of our
829 double-H apparatus than in that of Packard and McGaugh's elevated plus maze,
830 biasing the Lt-ON-Dual rats toward an egocentric solution. However, under exactly
831 the same illumination conditions, Lt-ON-Place rats used allothetic cues already after
832 1 day of training. It could also be that navigation of Lt-ON-Dual rats relied on
833 nonvisual cues such as music playing from the unique loudspeaker in the room (e.g.,
834 Save et al., 1998; Zhang & Manahan-Vaughan, 2015). If so, however, loudspeaker-
835 based guidance should also have been beneficial to Lt-OFF-Resp rats, which was
836 not the case.

837

838 ***4.2. c-Fos expression in the dorsomedial striatum is marked regardless of the*** 839 ***training protocol/duration***

840 In the current study, regardless of training duration, we found enhanced
841 expression of c-Fos in the DMS and DLS of Lt-OFF-Resp and Lt-ON-Dual rats, as
842 well as in the DMS of Lt-ON-Place rats (vs. HC). Using a striatum-dependent cued or
843 hippocampus-dependent spatial version of a water maze task, Teather et al. (2005)
844 found that the c-Fos expression increase in the DMS was undistinguishable between
845 cued and spatial rats, suggesting comparable impact of swimming behavior. In the
846 current study, part of the c-Fos expression in DMS could therefore be due to
847 swimming behavior, whatever the training conditions. In the dark condition, c-Fos
848 expression was highest in DMS and DLS, the absence of visual information from
849 allothetic cues leaving no alternative to the response memory-based strategy. Blind
850 rats (*Spalax ehrenbergi*) can form a primitive map by gradual calibrations over
851 progressive explorations of the perimeter of their testing environment (e.g., Avni et
852 al., 2008). Such rats, however, are blind at birth and develop navigation strategies
853 compensating for their congenital lack of vision, a huge difference with our sighted
854 Long-Evans rats trained and tested in darkness. Interestingly, in Lt-OFF-Resp rats, c-
855 Fos decreased after 14 compared to 6 days in the DMS, and increased after 6
856 compared to 1 training days in the DLS. Devan and White (1999; see also Devan et
857 al., 1999) were the first to show differences between the behavioral functions of the
858 DMS and DLS. Our results are compatible with i) DMS controlling action outcome
859 and participating in goal-directed actions, including navigation corrections and habit
860 formation, and ii) DLS supporting the storage of habits and stimulus-response

861 learning (e.g., Balleine & O'Doherty, 2010; Devan and White, 1999; Hawes et al.,
862 2015; Ito & Doya 2015; Pauli et al., 2012). Indeed, this view predicts a shift of the
863 highest activation from DMS to DLS over training in Lt-OFF-Resp rats. In the DHip of
864 our Lt-ON-Dual rats, a c-Fos increase was found in CA3 and the DG only after 6 days
865 of training. We do not know why, but it is tempting to speculate that these regions
866 could have contributed to the transition from a response memory-based behavior to a
867 place memory based one. CA1 was the only region to show a number of c-Fos-
868 positive neurons largely above controls. This difference, however, was found only
869 after 1 and 6 training days, suggesting that once navigation relied on a place
870 strategy, memory retrieval occurred at a substantially weaker neuronal activation cost
871 in the hippocampus (e.g., Bertaina-Anglade et al., 2000; Shires & Aggleton, 2008).
872 This possibility is compatible with the fact that in Lt-ON-Place rats, c-Fos levels were
873 not different from controls already after 6 days of training. An alternative explanation
874 would be that, over training, the task ceased to depend on the hippocampus, a
875 hypothesis contradicted by our MUSC data. Using a protocol close to that of Packard
876 and McGaugh (1996) in mice, Passino et al. (2002) observed a c-Fos expression that
877 was less pronounced in CA1 (about 45%) after a long training period (18 days; 72
878 trials) compared to a shorter one (9 days; 36 trials). Unfortunately, c-Fos counts were
879 not distinguished according to whether mice were response or place learners. This
880 study nevertheless indicates that well-trained performance is not necessarily
881 correlated with high neuronal activation indexes in the structure presumed to support
882 performance. Another point in Lt-ON-Dual rats was the high c-Fos expression level in
883 the DStr (DMS and DLS) after 1 day of training, which was associated with high c-
884 Fos expression in CA1. The DStr activation most probably reflected the predominant
885 engagement of the R-L turns the rats had learned on the previous day. Upon
886 negative feedback during the probe trial, these rats might have tried to shift to a
887 hippocampal-driven correction, which failed because after 1 day of training, the place
888 memory trace may have been too weak or absent. Indeed, we know that, in the water
889 maze, a 1-day training encompassing 4 consecutive trials does not enable above
890 chance performance in a probe trial given on the next day (e.g., Bousiges et al.,
891 2013, see Fig 1A). Another explanation for the decrease in hippocampal c-Fos
892 expression seen in Lt-ON-Dual rats (between 6 and 14 training days) could be that
893 rats have developed an alternative to the place memory strategy. For instance, they

894 might have learned to reach the NE arm by swimming in the central corridor until
895 facing a wall; once there, they just had to turn on their left. Finally, we cannot exclude
896 that stress inherent to our test has impacted the way rats have tried to solve their
897 respective task, hence their c-Fos activation patterns, and that this factor accounts
898 for differences between expected and observed results. Further experiments,
899 however, perhaps with modified testing device/protocols, are required to explore
900 these issues. Whatever may be, some of our functional imaging results suggest that,
901 in well-trained and well-performing rats, c-Fos expression within the behaviorally-
902 relevant structures may not accurately parallel performance.

903

904 ***4.3. Striatal-hippocampal interactions in supporting memory-based behavior***

905 Given the literature (e.g., Packard & Goodman, 2013), the disruption of **i)**
906 response memory-based strategy by intrastriatal infusions of MUSC in Lt-OFF-Resp
907 rats, and **ii)** place memory-based strategy by intrahippocampal infusions of MUSC in
908 Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats was expected. Because after 14 days of training
909 intrahippocampal infusions of MUSC disrupted the place memory-based strategy,
910 which intrastriatal MUSC infusions left unaltered, Lt-ON-Dual rats were relying on
911 hippocampal function after sustained training, as was the case for Lt-ON-Place rats.
912 Not expected – but observed – were **i)** the disruption of the response memory-based,
913 strategy by intrahippocampal MUSC in Lt-OFF-Resp rats after both training
914 durations, and **ii)** given Packard and McGaugh (1996), the absence of an egocentric
915 memory-based deficit in Lt-ON-Dual rats in response to intrastriatal MUSC after 14
916 days of training. The MUSC-induced alteration of performance in Lt-ON-Place after 6
917 days of training was also not expected. Taken together, these results suggest that, in
918 the double-H maze task, the use of a response strategy may depend on both the
919 dorsal striatum and the hippocampus, which do not become functionally independent
920 from each other in Lt-OFF-Resp rats, even after long training. The use of an
921 allocentric strategy also depends on both structures, but transiently. Indeed, following
922 sustained training, the DStr is no longer needed for navigation correction, but it
923 seems important for the acquisition of a spatial approach to a task (Jacobson et al.,
924 2012; Pooters et al., 2015, 2016). In case of a repetitive navigation task with full
925 access to allothetic cues, the DHip appears more crucial than the DStr, first to enable
926 a preferential engagement of the response memory-based system for up to 6 training

927 days, and later on, between 6 and 14 days, to use the place memory-based system.
928 In Lt-ON-Dual rats, the two systems could disengage from each other after sustained
929 training, but both seem to be needed during the first training days. These
930 observations are compatible with – and therefore reinforce – recent literature showing
931 engagements of the striatum and hippocampus for adapting behavior to navigation
932 task demands (e.g., Berke et al., 2009; Chersi & Burgess, 2015; Eshenko &
933 Mizumori, 2007; Mizumori et al., 2004; Regier et al., 2015). Yet, why the DStr
934 blockade altered spatial memory (even in Lt-ON-Place rats after 6 days of training)
935 and the DHip blockade altered procedural memory cannot be elucidated from our
936 present data. Alterations of spatial memory in a cross maze have been reported after
937 DStr lesions, and alterations of response memory have been observed after
938 hippocampal damage (Jacobson et al., 2012). Along this line, Kathirvelu and
939 Colombo (2013) reported that lentiviral-mediated increase of CREB expression in the
940 DStr enhanced memory for cue learning, but also for context in fear conditioning, and
941 context memory is typically hippocampus-dependent; place learning, however, was
942 impaired. In a recent study, Ferbinteanu (2016) trained rats in a hippocampus-
943 dependent spatial task or a dorsal striatum-dependent cue-response task, as
944 compared with rats that were trained in both. All rats were then subjected to
945 permanent excitotoxic lesions of the DMS or DLS, or of the hippocampus. DMS and
946 hippocampal lesions produced marked retention deficits in rats trained in only the
947 spatial task. In rats trained in only the cue-response task, both types of striatal
948 lesions, but not hippocampal ones, produced marked deficits. Most interestingly,
949 however, when both tasks were acquired concurrently, all lesions induced marked
950 deficits. These observations suggest that when a unique task is learned, the
951 corresponding memory is constructed in the most appropriate system (e.g., place)
952 and does not depend on the other system (e.g., response; see also White et al.,
953 2013). When the two tasks are learned concurrently, however, not only are memories
954 constructed in each memory system, but they also seem to be linked to each other in
955 a way that makes it possible to alter performance by obliterating either memory
956 system. Our results suggest that the same might be true in our Lt-ON-Dual rats
957 when, over learning, they shifted from one to the other memory system. Why, then,
958 could response memory in the double-H task be also depending on the dorsal
959 hippocampus? A possibility would be that the habit was processed by the striatum

960 (e.g., DMS to form it, DLS to store it) and the overall geometry (spatial calibration;
961 see Avni et al., 2008) of the maze by a mechanism partly implicating the
962 hippocampus. Both information aspects may have combined in a modular
963 representation (e.g., Tcheang et al., 2011).

964 Another possibility could be related to mechanisms of navigation in darkness,
965 which, regarding self-motion information in goal-directed behavior, involves the
966 cerebellum and its functional connection with the hippocampus (e.g., Rochefort et al.,
967 2011). This functional connection might have been disrupted by dorsal hippocampus
968 inactivation. Why could spatial memory be depending on the dorsal striatum after 6
969 (and not 14) days of training? Given its location, our MUSC inactivation affected
970 partly the DMS and partly the DLS (see supplementary figure 11). Furthermore,
971 correcting a response memory-based strategy by using a place memory-based one
972 requires behavioral flexibility driven by the prefrontal cortex (e.g., Cholvin et al.,
973 2013). Because the DMS is involved in action outcome and behavioral flexibility,
974 notably through its connections with the (pre)frontal cortex (e.g., Baker and
975 Ragozzino, 2014; Ragozzino et al., 2002), it is well possible that MUSC has affected
976 one or both of these functions, perhaps even without affecting hippocampus-
977 dependent spatial memory processes per se. Interestingly, Ragozzino (2003) found
978 that DMS cholinergic interneurons contributed to behavioral flexibility, which is further
979 supported in the studies by e.g., Aoki et al. (2013; but see Okada et al., 2014, or
980 Braun and Hauber, 2011; Braun et al., 2012). Still along these lines, we reported that
981 reversible inactivation of the prefrontal cortex, which did not alter spatial memory
982 retrieval in a water maze task, profoundly disrupted strategy adaptation in the double-
983 H maze (Cholvin et al., 2013). Indeed, after MUSC inactivation of the prefrontal
984 cortex, rats were unable to shift from the response-based to the place-based
985 strategy. A functional alteration of the prefrontal cortex being a potential
986 consequence of dorsal striatum inactivation, it is possible that something similar
987 occurred in our Lt-ON-Dual rats. This possibility is in line with a report showing that
988 the DMS plays a role in adapting a habitual strategy to a sudden modification of the
989 contingency in a spatial task (Regier et al., 2015).

990 Based on our findings, it is not possible to provide clear and solid arguments
991 to explain the discrepancy between our expectations and the observed results. It is
992 noteworthy that striatal inactivation affected the DMS and DLS, when previous

993 studies used inactivation of one or the other of these regions. Alterations of both the
994 DMS and DLS should conjointly disrupt control of action outcome, goal-directed
995 actions, habit retrieval, and expression of stimulus-response learning. These
996 modifications might have weakened the expression of place memory. Furthermore,
997 as many of the experiments leading to the view positing a functional dichotomy
998 between response and place memory systems have been carried out in appetitive
999 tasks, it cannot be excluded that stress linked to the aversive motivation in the
1000 double-H maze has been a major actor of this discrepancy. Addressing this
1001 possibility requires experiments in which, using a same device (e.g., double-H or
1002 cross maze), rats would be compared for c-Fos expression and inactivation effects
1003 according to whether training motivation is aversive or appetitive.

1004 In environments more complex than a T- or cross-maze, spatial calibration
1005 may remain necessary over repetitive tasks, even in the absence of visual cues (e.g.,
1006 based on perimeter exploration as in Avni et al., 2008). If so, this calibration might
1007 require, in addition to a contribution of the striatum, some mechanisms orchestrated
1008 by the hippocampus. From our inactivation approach, it is possible to speculate about
1009 some mechanisms compatible with our observations. When rats have to reach a goal
1010 in a maze like the double-H, their constrained navigation may be supported by a
1011 multimodal representation resulting from both allothetic visual inputs (when cues are
1012 visible) and idiothetic motion cues (of e.g., proprioceptive or kinesthetic nature),
1013 including experience of the borders of the maze (e.g., Tcheang et al., 2011). It is
1014 noteworthy that idiothetic cues can be used for path integration (Cheung et al., 2012).
1015 That the hippocampus contributes to the processing of allothetic visual cues and the
1016 striatum to that of idiothetic motion cues is not nonsense and, as such, both
1017 structures may conjointly participate in the construction of this multimodal
1018 representation. It is known that path integration and border information, when
1019 combined, can support hippocampus-dependent spatial representations in darkness
1020 (Zhang et al., 2014). This could be a reason why, in darkness, the inactivation of the
1021 hippocampus altered performance (time in R-L arm) similarly to striatal inactivation.
1022 Lt-ON-Dual rats roughly behaved as Lt-OFF-Resp rats after 6 days of training. At this
1023 time point, their navigation system may have been on the way to rely on the
1024 multimodal representation, from which it later on shifted to the visual representation,
1025 as there was no effect of intrastriatal MUSC after 14 days of training.

1026

1027 **5. Conclusion**

1028 In this study, predictions based on our current understanding of response and
1029 place memory systems have not been verified in extenso. Indeed, when cues were
1030 visible, the rats first acquired a response memory-based behavior and only later on
1031 could navigate by using place memory. Our results suggest that the striatum and the
1032 hippocampus are both required when rats have to retrieve a repetitive maze-
1033 navigation task in the double-H maze, be allothetic cues visible or not. In case of
1034 visible cues, however, with extensive training (14 days), retrieving the task is entirely
1035 hippocampus-dependent. Thus, the degree to which the striatum and the
1036 hippocampus contribute to navigation behavior, including navigation correction in
1037 response to negative feedback, depends on previous training level and cue
1038 availability. Our data point to related systems, in line with recent findings in both
1039 animals (Delcasso et al., 2014; Jacobson et al., 2012; Rice et al., 2015) and humans
1040 (e.g., Brown & Stern, 2014; Woolley et al., 2015). These systems may operate in a
1041 baton-passing way under some task constraints (task repetitiveness, cue availability,
1042 and training duration), and in a different way under other constraints. Disruption of
1043 the DStr affects place memory retrieval, and thus navigation correction capacities,
1044 following moderate training (6 days) in a spatial task, in line with a role of this
1045 structure in allocentric navigation. Inactivating the DHip affects retrieval of response
1046 memory following both moderate (6 days) and extensive (14 days) training in an
1047 egocentric task. These findings qualify our current knowledge and call for further
1048 research on the implication of striatal and hippocampal mechanisms in goal
1049 navigation and navigation correction; there might also be a need to consider the
1050 communication of these structures with other brain regions (e.g., prefrontal cortex;
1051 Cholvin et al., 2013; Dahmani & Bohbot, 2015).

1052

1053 **References**

1054

1055 Aoki, S., Liu, A.W., Zucca, A., Zucca, S., & Wickens, J.R. (2015). Role of striatal
1056 cholinergic interneurons in set-shifting in the rat. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1057 35,9424-9431.

1058 Arikan, R., Blake, N.M.J., Erinjeri, J.P., Woolsey, T.A., Giraud, L., & Highstein, S.M.
1059 (2002). A method to measure the effective spread of focally injected muscimol
1060 into the central nervous system with electrophysiology and light microscopy.
1061 *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 118,51–57.

1062 Asem, J.S.A., & Holland, P.C. (2013). Immediate response strategy and shift to place
1063 strategy in submerged T-maze. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 127,854–859.

1064 Avni, R., Tzvaigrach, Y., & Eilam, D. (2008). Exploration and navigation in the blind
1065 mole rat (*Spalax ehrenbergi*): global calibration as a primer of spatial
1066 representation. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 211, 2817-2826.

1067 Baker, P.M., & Ragozzino, M.E. (2014). Contralateral disconnection of the rat
1068 prelimbic cortex and dorsomedial striatum impairs cue-guided behavioral
1069 switching. *Learning & Memory*, 21,368-379.

1070 Balleine, B.W., & O'Doherty, J.P. (2010). Human and rodent homologues in action
1071 control: corticostriatal determinants of goal-directed and habitual action.
1072 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 35,48–69.

1073 Berke, J.D., Breck, J.T., & Eichenbaum, H. (2009). Striatal versus hippocampal
1074 representations during win-stay maze performance. *Journal of Neurophysiology*,
1075 101(3),1575-87.

1076 Bertaina-Anglade, V., Tramu, G., & Destrade, C. (2000). Differential learning-stage
1077 dependent patterns of c-Fos protein expression in brain regions during the
1078 acquisition and memory consolidation of an operant task in mice. *European*
1079 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 12,3803–3812.

1080 Bousiges, O., Neidl, R., Majchrzak, M., Muller, M.A., Barbelivien, A., Pereira de
1081 Vasconcelos, A., Schneider, A., Loeffler, J.P., Cassel, J.C., & Boutillier, A.L.
1082 (2013). Detection of histone acetylation levels in the dorsal hippocampus reveals
1083 early tagging on specific residues of H2B and H4 histones in response to
1084 learning. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e57816.

- 1085 Braun, A.A., Graham, D.L., Schaefer, T.L., Vorhees, C.V., & Williams, M.T. (2012).
1086 Dorsal striatal dopamine depletion impairs both allocentric and egocentric
1087 navigation in rats. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 97(4), 402-408.
- 1088 Braun, S., & Hauber, W. (2011). The dorsomedial striatum mediates flexible choice
1089 behavior in spatial tasks. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 220,288-293.
- 1090 Brown, T.I., & Stern, C.E. (2014). Contributions of medial temporal lobe and striatal
1091 memory systems to learning and retrieving overlapping spatial memories.
1092 *Cerebral Cortex*, 24,1906–1922.
- 1093 Cassel, R., Kelche, C., Lecourtier, L., & Cassel, J.C. (2012). The match/mismatch of
1094 visuo-spatial cues between acquisition and retrieval contexts influences the
1095 expression of response vs. place memory in rats. *Behavioural Brain Research*,
1096 230,333–342.
- 1097 Chersi, F., & Burgess, N. (2015). The Cognitive Architecture of Spatial Navigation:
1098 Hippocampal and Striatal Contributions. *Neuron*, 88(1),64-77
- 1099 Cheung, A., Ball, D., Milford, M., Wyeth, G., & Wiles, J. (2012). Maintaining a
1100 cognitive map in darkness: The need to fuse boundary knowledge with path
1101 integration. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 8 (8),e1002651.
- 1102 Cholvin, T., Loureiro, M., Cassel, R., Cosquer, B., Geiger, K., De Sa Nogueira, D.,
1103 Raingard, H., Robelin, L., Kelche, C., Pereira de Vasconcelos, A., & Cassel, J.C.
1104 (2013). The ventral midline thalamus contributes to strategy shifting in a memory
1105 task requiring both prefrontal cortical and hippocampal functions. *Journal of*
1106 *Neuroscience*, 33,8772–8783.
- 1107 Dahmani, L., & Bohbot, V.D. (2015). Dissociable contributions of the prefrontal cortex
1108 to hippocampus and caudate nucleus-dependent virtual navigation strategies.
1109 *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 117, 42-50.
- 1110 DeCoteau, W.E., & Kesner, R.P. (2000). A double dissociation between the rat
1111 hippocampus and medial caudoputamen in processing two forms of knowledge.
1112 *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 114,1096-1108.
- 1113 Delcasso, S., Huh, N., Byeon, J.S., Lee, J., Jung, M.W., & Lee, I. (2014). Functional
1114 Relationships between the Hippocampus and Dorsomedial Striatum in Learning
1115 a Visual Scene-Based Memory Task in Rats. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1116 34,15534–15547.

- 1117 Devan, B.D., McDonald, R.J., & White, N.M. (1999). Effects of medial and lateral
1118 caudate-putamen lesions on place- and cue-guided behaviors in the water maze:
1119 relation to thigmotaxis. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 100,5-14.
- 1120 Devan B.D., White N.M. (1999) Parallel information processing in the dorsal striatum:
1121 relation to hippocampal function. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 19, 2789-2798.
- 1122 Edeline, J.M., Hars, B., Hennevin, E., & Cotillon, N. (2002). Muscimol diffusion after
1123 intracerebral microinjections: a reevaluation based on electrophysiological and
1124 autoradiographic quantifications. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*,
1125 78,100–124.
- 1126 Eschenko, O., & Mizumori, S.J. (2007). Memory influences on hippocampal and
1127 striatal neural codes: effects of a shift between task rules. *Neurobiology of*
1128 *Learning and Memory*, 87(4),495-509.
- 1129 Ferbinteanu, J. (2016). Contributions of hippocampus and striatum to memory-guided
1130 behavior depend on past experience. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 36,6459-6470.
- 1131 Fouquet, C., Babayan, B.M., Watilliaux, A., Bontempi, B., Tobin, C., & Rondi-Reig, L.
1132 (2013). Complementary Roles of the Hippocampus and the Dorsomedial
1133 Striatum during Spatial and Sequence-Based Navigation Behavior. *PLoS ONE*,
1134 8(6), e67232.
- 1135 Gardner, R.S., Uttaro, M.R., Fleming, S.E., Suarez, D.F., Ascoli, G.A., & Dumas, T.C.
1136 (2013). A secondary working memory challenge preserves primary place
1137 strategies despite overtraining. *Learning & Memory*, 20,648-656.
- 1138 Gold, P.E. (2004). Coordination of multiple memory systems. *Neurobiology of*
1139 *Learning and Memory*, 82,230-242.
- 1140 Gundersen, H.J., Bagger, P., Bendtsen, T.F., Evans, S.M., Korbo, L., Marcussen, N.,
1141 Møller, A., Nielsen, K., Nyengaard, J.R., Pakkenberg, B., Vesterby, A., & West,
1142 M.J. (1988). The new stereological tools: disector, fractionator, nucleator and
1143 point sampled intercepts and their use in pathological research and diagnosis.
1144 *APMIS*, 96 (issue7-12), 857-881.
- 1145 Hawes, S.L., Evans, R.C., Unruh, B.A., Benkert, E.E., Gillani, F., Dumas, T.C., &
1146 Blackwell, K.T. (2015). Multimodal Plasticity in Dorsal Striatum While Learning a
1147 Lateralized Navigation Task. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35,10535-49.

- 1148 Huang, Y.H., Cheng, C.Y., Hong, C.J., & Tsai, S.J. (2004). Expression of c-Fos-like
1149 immunoreactivity in the brain of mice with learned helplessness. *Neuroscience*
1150 *Letters*, 363(3),280-283.
- 1151 Ito, M., & Doya, K. (2015). Distinct Neural Representation in the Dorsolateral,
1152 Dorsomedial, and Ventral Parts of the Striatum during Fixed- and Free-Choice
1153 Tasks. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35,3499–3514.
- 1154 Jacobson, T.K., Gruenbaum, B.F., & Markus, E.J. (2012). Extensive training and
1155 hippocampus or striatum lesions: Effect on place and response strategies.
1156 *Physiology & Behavior*, 105,645–652.
- 1157 Kathirvelu, B., & Colombo, P.J. (2013). Effects of lentivirus-mediated CREB
1158 expression in the dorsolateral striatum: memory enhancement and evidence for
1159 competitive and cooperative interactions with the hippocampus. *Hippocampus*,
1160 23,1066-1074.
- 1161 Kim, J.J., & Diamond, D.M. (2002). The stressed hippocampus, synaptic plasticity
1162 and lost memories. *Nature Reviews in Neuroscience*, 3,453–462.
- 1163 Kirch, R.D., Meyer, P.T., Geisler, S., Braun, F., Gehrig, S., Langen, K.J., von
1164 Hörsten, S., Nikkhah, G., Cassel, J.C., & Döbrössy, M.D. (2013). Early deficits in
1165 declarative and procedural memory dependent behavioral function in a
1166 transgenic rat model of Huntington’s disease. *Behavioural Brain Research*,
1167 239,15–26.
- 1168 Kirch, R.D., Pinnell, R.C., Hofmann, U.G., & Cassel, J.C. (2015). The Double-H
1169 Maze: A Robust Behavioral Test for Learning and Memory in Rodents. *Journal of*
1170 *Visualized Experiments*, e52667.
- 1171 Laria, G., Petrides, M., Dagher, A., Pike, B., & Bohbot, V.D. (2003). Cognitive
1172 strategies dependent on the hippocampus and caudate nucleus in human
1173 navigation: variability and change with practice. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
1174 23,5945-5952.
- 1175 Lopez, J., Herbeaux, K., Cosquer, B., Engeln, M., Muller, C., Lazarus, C., Kelche, C.,
1176 Bontempi, B., Cassel, J.C., & de Vasconcelos, A.P. (2012). Context-dependent
1177 modulation of hippocampal and cortical recruitment during remote spatial
1178 memory retrieval. *Hippocampus*, 22,827–841.
- 1179 Martel, G., Blanchard, J., Mons, N., Gastambide, F., Micheau, J., & Guilliou, J.L.
1180 (2007). Dynamic interplays between memory systems depend on practice: the

- 1181 hippocampus is not always the first to provide solution. *Neuroscience*, 150,743-
1182 753.
- 1183 Martin, J.H., & Ghez, C. (1999). Pharmacological inactivation in the analysis of the
1184 central control of movement. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 86,145–159.
- 1185 Maviel, T., Durkin, T.P., Menzaghi, F., & Bontempi, B. (2004). Sites of Neocortical
1186 Reorganization Critical for Remote Spatial Memory. *Science*, 305, 96-99.
- 1187 McDonald, R.J., & White, N.M. (1994). Parallel information processing in the water
1188 maze: evidence for independent memory systems involving dorsal striatum and
1189 hippocampus. *Behavioral and Neural Biology*, 61,260-270.
- 1190 McDonald, R.J., & White, N.M. (1995). Hippocampal and nonhippocampal
1191 contributions to place learning in rats. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 109,579-593.
- 1192 McDonald R.J., & White, N.M. (2013). A triple dissociation of memory systems:
1193 hippocampus, amygdala, and dorsal striatum. *Behavioral Neuroscience*,
1194 127,835-853.
- 1195 McGeorge, A.J., & Faull, R.L. (1989). The organization of the projection from the
1196 cerebral cortex to the striatum in the rat. *Neuroscience*, 29, 503-537.
- 1197 Moussa, R., Poucet, B., Amalric, M., & Sargolini, F. (2011). Contributions of dorsal
1198 striatal subregions to spatial alternation behavior. *Learning & Memory*, 18,444–
1199 451.
- 1200 Mizumori, S.J., Yeshenko, O., Gill, K.M., & Davis, D.M. (2004). Parallel processing
1201 across neural systems: implications for a multiple memory system hypothesis.
1202 *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 82(3),278-98.
- 1203 Okada, K., Nishizawa, K., Fukabori, R., Kai, N., Shiota, A., Ueda, M., Tsutsui, Y.,
1204 Sakata, S., Matsushita, N., & Kobayashi, K. (2014). Enhanced flexibility of place
1205 discrimination learning by targeting striatal cholinergic interneurons. *Nature*
1206 *Communications*, 5,3778.
- 1207 Packard, M.G. (1999). Glutamate infused posttraining into the hippocampus or
1208 caudate-putamen differentially strengthens place and response learning.
1209 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U S A*, 96,12881–12886.
- 1210 Packard, M.G., & Goodman, J. (2013). Factors that influence the relative use of
1211 multiple memory systems. *Hippocampus*, 23,1044–1052.

- 1212 Packard, M.G., & McGaugh, J.L. (1992). Double dissociation of fornix and caudate
1213 nucleus lesions on acquisition of two water maze tasks: further evidence for
1214 multiple memory systems. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 106,439–446.
- 1215 Packard, M.G., & McGaugh, J.L. (1996). Inactivation of hippocampus or caudate
1216 nucleus with lidocaine differentially affects expression of place and response
1217 learning. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 65,65–72.
- 1218 Packard, M.G., & White N.M. (1991) Dissociation of hippocampus and caudate
1219 nucleus memory systems by posttraining intracerebral injection of dopamine
1220 agonists. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 105,295-306.
- 1221 Passino, E., Middei, S., Restivo, L., Bertaina-Anglade, V., & Ammassari-Teule, M.
1222 (2002). Genetic approach to variability of memory systems: analysis of place vs.
1223 response learning and fos-related expression in hippocampal and striatal areas
1224 of C57BL/6 and DBA/2 mice. *Hippocampus*, 12,63–75.
- 1225 Pauli, W.M., Clark, A.D., Guenther, H.J., O'Reilly, R.C., & Rudy, J.W. (2012).
1226 Inhibiting PKM reveals dorsal lateral and dorsal medial striatum store the
1227 different memories needed to support adaptive behavior. *Learning & Memory*
1228 19,307–314.
- 1229 Paxinos, G., & Watson, C. (2007). *The Rat Brain in Stereotaxic Coordinates*. (6th
1230 Ed.). Academic Press, 456 pp.
- 1231 Pol-Bodetto, S., Jeltsch-David, H., Lecourtier, L., Rusnac, N., Mam-Lam-Fook, C.,
1232 Cosquer, B., Geiger, K., & Cassel, J.C. (2011). The double-H maze test, a novel,
1233 simple, water-escape memory task: acquisition, recall of recent and remote
1234 memory, and effects of systemic muscarinic or NMDA receptor blockade during
1235 training. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 218,138–151.
- 1236 Poldrack, R.A., & Packard, M.G. (2003). Competition among multiple memory
1237 systems: converging evidence from animal and human brain studies.
1238 *Neuropsychologia*, 41, 245-251.
- 1239 Pooters, T., Gantois, I., Vermaercke, B., & D'Hooge, R. (2016). Inability to acquire
1240 spatial information and deploy spatial search strategies in mice with lesions in
1241 dorsomedial striatum. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 298,134-41.
- 1242 Pooters, T., Van der Jeugd, A., Callaerts-Vegh, Z., & D'Hooge, R. (2015).
1243 Telencephalic neurocircuitry and synaptic plasticity in rodent spatial learning and
1244 memory. *Brain Research*, 1621,294-308.

- 1245 Quaedflieg, C.W.E.M., & Schwabe, L. (2018) Memory dynamics under stress.
1246 *Memory*, 26,364-376.
- 1247 Ragozzino, M.E. (2003). Acetylcholine actions in the dorsomedial striatum support
1248 the flexible shifting of response patterns. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*,
1249 80,257-267.
- 1250 Ragozzino, M.E., Ragozzino, K.E., Mizumori, S.J., & Kesner, R.P. (2002). Role of the
1251 dorsomedial striatum in behavioral flexibility for response and visual cue
1252 discrimination learning. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 116,105-115.
- 1253 Regier, P.S., Amemiya, S., & Redish, .AD. (2015). Hippocampus and subregions of
1254 the dorsal striatum respond differently to a behavioral strategy change on a
1255 spatial navigation task. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 114(3),1399-416.
- 1256 Rice, J.P., Wallace, D.G., & Hamilton, D.A. (2015). Lesions of the hippocampus or
1257 dorsolateral striatum disrupt distinct aspects of spatial navigation strategies
1258 based on proximal and distal information in a cued variant of the Morris water
1259 task. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 289,105–117.
- 1260 Rochefort, C., Arabo, A., André, M., Poucet, B., Save, E., & Rondi-Reig, L. (2011).
1261 Cerebellum shapes hippocampal spatial code. *Science*, 334(6054),385-389.
- 1262 Ruprecht, C.M., Taylor, C.D., Wolf, J.E., & Leising, K.J. (2014). Task complexity
1263 modifies the search strategy of rats. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 258, 208-217.
- 1264 Save, E., Cressant, A., Thinus-Blanc, C., & Poucet, B. (1998). Spatial firing of
1265 hippocampal place cells in blind rats. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 18,1818-1826.
- 1266 Shires, K.L., & Aggleton, J.P. (2008). Mapping immediate-early gene activity in the
1267 rat after place learning in a water-maze: the importance of matched control
1268 conditions. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 28,982–996.
- 1269 Schwabe, L. (2013). Stress and the engagement of multiple memory systems:
1270 Integration of animal and human studies. *Hippocampus*, 23,1035-1043.
- 1271 Steciuk, M., Kram, M., Kramer, G.L., & Petty, F. (1999). Decrease in stress-induced
1272 c-Fos-like immunoreactivity in the lateral septal nucleus of learned helpless rats.
1273 *Brain Research*, 822(1-2),256-9.
- 1274 Tcheang, L., Bülthoff, H.H., & Burgess, N., (2011). Visual influence on path
1275 integration in darkness indicates a multimodal representation of large-scale
1276 space. *PNAS*, 108,1152-1157.

- 1277 Teather, L.A., Packard, M.G., Smith, D.E., Ellis-Behnke, R.G., & Bazan, N.G. (2005).
1278 Differential induction of c-Jun and Fos-like proteins in rat hippocampus and
1279 dorsal striatum after training in two water maze tasks. *Neurobiology of Learning
1280 and Memory*, 84,75–84.
- 1281 Thorn, C.A., Atallah, H., Howe, M., & Graybiel, A.M. (2010). Differential Dynamics of
1282 Activity Changes in Dorsolateral and Dorsomedial Striatal Loops during
1283 Learning. *Neuron*, 66,781–795.
- 1284 Tolman, E.C., Ritchie, B.F., & Kalish, D. (1946). Studies in spatial learning; place
1285 learning versus response learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 36,221–
1286 229.
- 1287 Van Duuren, E., van der Plasse, G., van der Blom, R., Joosten, R.N.J.M.A., Mulder,
1288 A.B., Pennartz, C.M.A., & Feenstra, M.G.P. (2007). Pharmacological
1289 manipulation of neuronal ensemble activity by reverse microdialysis in freely
1290 moving rats: a comparative study of the effects of tetrodotoxin, lidocaine, and
1291 muscimol. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, 323,61–69.
- 1292 Vogel, S., Klumpers, F., Schröder, T.N., Oplaat, K.T., Krugers, H.J., Joëls, M.,
1293 Doeller, C.F., Fernandez, G. (2017). Stress induces a shift towards striatum-
1294 dependent stimulus-response learning via the mineralocorticoid receptor.
1295 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 42, 1262-1271.
- 1296 Voorn, P., Vanderschuren, L.J., Groenewegen, H.J., Robbins, T.W., Pennartz, C.M.
1297 (2004) Putting a spin on the dorsal-ventral divide of the striatum. *Trends in
1298 Neuroscience* 27(8):468-74.
- 1299 West, M.J. (2013). Getting started in stereology. *Cold Spring Harbor protocols*. 2013,
1300 287–297.
- 1301 West, M.J., Slomianka, L., & Gundersen, H.J. (1991). Unbiased stereological
1302 estimation of the total number of neurons in the subdivisions of the rat
1303 hippocampus using the optical fractionator. *The Anatomical Record*, 231,482–
1304 497.
- 1305 White, N.M., & Mc Donald, R.J. (2002) Multiple parallel memory systems in the brain
1306 of the rat. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 127,813-834.
- 1307 White, N.M., Packard, M.G., & McDonald, R.J. (2013). Dissociation of memory
1308 systems: the story unfolds. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 127,813-834.

- 1309 Woolley, D.G., Mantini, D., Coxon, J.P., D’Hooge, R., Swinnen, S.P., & Wenderoth,
1310 N. (2015). Virtual water maze learning in human increases functional
1311 connectivity between posterior hippocampus and dorsal caudate. *Human Brain*
1312 *Mapping*, 36,1265–1277.
- 1313 Zhang, S., & Manahan-Vaughan, D. (2015). Spatial olfactory learning contributes to
1314 place field formation in the hippocampus. *Cerebral Cortex*, 25,423-432.
- 1315 Zhang, S., Schönfeld, F., Wiskott, L., Manahan-Vaughan, D. (2014) Spatial
1316 representations of place cells in darkness are supported by path integration and
1317 border information. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 8,222.

1318 **Figure captions**

1319

1320 **Figure 1: Summary of the experimental protocol used in Experiment 1. (a)** Rats
1321 were trained for 1, 6 or 14 days in the double-H water maze. The escape platform
1322 was hidden at the extremity of the NE arm. Each trial lasted for a maximum of 60 s.
1323 **(b)** Three training protocols were used. In the first protocol (Lt-OFF-Resp; left), rats
1324 serving as controls were trained in a darkened room lit by red light (1 lux) to prevent
1325 the use of landmarks. On all trials, they were released from the S arm and had to
1326 swim to the NE arm. This protocol promoted a response memory-based body-turn
1327 strategy. In the second protocol (Lt-ON-Resp; middle), rats were trained in the same
1328 room but with normal neon light (180 lux) to enable the use of landmarks. This
1329 protocol proposed a task with a dual body-turn/spatial strategy. In the third protocol,
1330 which promoted a spatial strategy, another group of control rats were trained in the
1331 same lit environment but for each daily trial they were released from a different arm
1332 (Lt-ON-Place; right). In all training protocols, access to the N was blocked by a
1333 guillotine door. **(c)** Twenty-four hours after the last training trial (i.e., on day 2, 7 or
1334 15), all rats were given a probe trial which lasted 60 s. Light conditions were the
1335 same as for the training but there was no platform in the maze. All rats were released
1336 from the SW arm and the NW arm was blocked. Ninety minutes after the probe trial,
1337 the rats were killed and their brain processed for subsequent c-Fos immunostaining
1338 and stereological quantifications.

1339

1340 **Figure 2: Acquisition performance: similar performance in Lt-OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-**
1341 **Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats.** Whatever the training protocol, average latencies to
1342 platform are represented for the first training day (trials 1 to 4) and over the 6- and
1343 14-day training sessions (daily blocks of four trials). Statistical analyses showed no
1344 significant difference among training protocols. Note that the Y axis corresponding to
1345 the first training day indicates latencies for each trial, whereas in the other two panels
1346 on the right it indicates latencies for each 4-trial block, hence the different scale. The
1347 number of animals in each condition can be found in Figure 3 underneath each pie
1348 chart.

1349

1350 **Figure 3: Swim paths adopted by rats in the probe trial: response memory-**
1351 **based behavior in Lt-OFF-Resp rats for all training durations, place memory-**
1352 **based behavior in Lt-ON-Place rats for all training durations vs. a shift from**
1353 **response memory- to place memory-based behavior in Lt-ON-Dual rats.** In
1354 white: proportion of rats that swam directly to the NE arm. Percentages of rats that
1355 swam to the NE arm after having left the N one are shown in supplementary Table 1.
1356 Statistics: * significant modification of the proportion of rats that swam directly to the
1357 N arm as shown by a Chi² analysis, $p < 0.05$. The total number of rats tested with
1358 each protocol / training duration is indicated under the corresponding pie chart.

1359
1360 **Figure 4: Exploration time in R-L or NE arm during the probe trial: shift from**
1361 **response memory- to place memory-based is confirmed in Lt-ON-Dual rats.**
1362 Average cumulated times (+s.e.m.) in the arms rats had reached by successive right
1363 (R) and left (L) turns (white bars), or in the NE arm (greyish bars) for each training
1364 protocol and each training duration (1, 6, 14 days; indicated in the white bars). The
1365 probe trial was given with a 24-h delay after the last training trial. Times in the NE
1366 arm when coming from the S arm were discarded from the analysis (see Methods
1367 and Supplementary material for an explanation). The stippled lines indicate chance
1368 level (see Methods for precisions on its computation). Statistical analyses: *
1369 significantly different from chance, $p < 0.05$; # significantly different from Lt-ON-
1370 Place, $p < 0.05$; § significantly different from the corresponding 1-d training group, $p <$
1371 0.05 . The number of animals in each condition can be found in Figure 3.

1372
1373 **Figure 5: Quantification of c-Fos expression: increased c-Fos expression in the**
1374 **striatum of Lt-OFF-Resp and Lt-ON-Dual rats, and a transient increase in the**
1375 **dorsal hippocampus of Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place, but delayed decay in Lt-**
1376 **ON-Dual rats as compared to Lt-ON-Place rats.** Number of c-Fos positive neurons
1377 quantified stereologically in the dorsomedial (DMS) and dorsolateral (DLS) striatum,
1378 as well as in regions CA1, CA3, and dentate gyrus (DG) of the dorsal hippocampus
1379 after a probe trial for the different training durations (1, 6, and 14 days) and protocols.
1380 Statistical analyses: # significantly different from Lt-ON-Place, $p < 0.05$; § significantly
1381 different from the corresponding 1-d training group, $p < 0.05$.

1382

1383 **Figure 6: Location of the infusion sites ; the sites were located where expected**
1384 **(rats with misplaced sites were discarded from analyses and are not illustrated**
1385 **here).** The infusion sites are indicated on coronal sections through the striatum (left)
1386 and the dorsal hippocampus (right) at various levels of anteriority according to
1387 Bregma, for each training duration (6 and 14 days). Each site corresponds to the tip
1388 of the infusion needle as identified in Lt-OFF-Resp (open circles for aCSF, black
1389 circles for MUSC), Lt-ON-Dual (open squares for aCSF, black squares for MUSC),
1390 and Lt-ON-Place (open triangles for aCSF, black triangles for MUSC) rats.
1391 Coordinates are given in mm from Bregma according to Paxinos and Watson (2007).

1392
1393 **Figure 7: Acquisition performance: very similar performance in Lt-OFF-Resp,**
1394 **Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats.** In each of the three training protocols (**Lt-OFF-**
1395 **Resp, Lt-ON-Dual, Lt-ON-Place**), average latencies over the 6- and 14-day training
1396 sessions (daily blocks of four trials are presented). These rats had been implanted
1397 with intrastriatal (STRIATUM) or intrahippocampal (HIPPOCAMPUS) cannulas to be
1398 used for subsequent MUSC inactivation or control aCSF infusion. Statistical analyses
1399 did not show any significant difference among training protocols, nor among the
1400 different groups. The number of animals in each condition can be found in Figure 8.

1401
1402 **Figure 8: Initial swim paths adopted by rats at the start of the probe trial**
1403 **indicate that memory system-based behavior, whether response or place, is**
1404 **disrupted by MUSC.** In each of the three training protocols (**Lt-OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-**
1405 **Dual, Lt-ON-Place**), training lasted for 6 or 14 days and the probe trial was given 24
1406 hr after the last training day. Rats were subjected to bilateral intrastriatal
1407 (STRIATUM) or intrahippocampal (HIPPOCAMPUS) infusions of muscimol (MUSC)
1408 or artificial cerebrospinal fluid (aCSF) as control, 30 min before the probe trial. In
1409 white: proportion of rats that swam directly to the NE arm. Percentages of rats that
1410 swam to the NE arm after having left the N one are shown in supplementary Table 2.
1411 Statistics: * significant modification of the proportion of rats that swam directly to the
1412 N arm as shown by a Chi² analysis, $p < 0.05$. The total number of rats tested under
1413 each condition is indicated under the corresponding pie chart.

1414

1415 **Figure 9:** Response memory is disrupted by intrastriatal (STRIATUM) and
1416 intrahippocampal (HIPPOCAMPUS) MUSC in Lt-OFF-Resp rats; however, the
1417 shift to place memory-based behavior is resistant to intrastriatal MUSC after 14
1418 days of training in Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats. Average cumulated times
1419 (+s.e.m.) in the arms rats had reached by successive right (R) and left (L) turns
1420 (white bars), or in the NE arm (greyish bars) for each of the three training protocols
1421 (Lt-OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-Dual, Lt-ON-Place) and each training duration (6, 14 days).
1422 The probe trial was given with a 24-h delay after the last training trial. Times
1423 consecutive to swim paths ending in the NE arm when coming from the S arm were
1424 discarded from the analysis (see Methods). The stippled lines indicate chance level
1425 (see Methods for precisions on its computation). Statistical analyses: * significantly
1426 different from chance, $p < 0.05$; # significantly different from aCSF, $p < 0.05$. The total
1427 number of rats tested under each condition is indicated in Figure 8.
1428





Figure 1

1429

1430



1431

1432

1433

1434 Figure 2

1435





Figure 3

1436

1437





1438

1439

1440

1441 Figure 4

1442



1443
 1444
 1445
 1446

Figure 5





Figure 6

1447

1448



1449

1450

1451

1452 Figure 7

1453





Figure 8

1454

1455



1456

1457 Figure 9

1458

1459 **Shifting between response and place strategies in maze navigation: effects of**
1460 **training, cue availability and functional inactivation of striatum or hippocampus**
1461 **in rats**

1462

1463 Running title: Striatum, hippocampus and navigation

1464 Julien Gasser^{1,2}, Anne Pereira de Vasconcelos^{1,2}, Brigitte Cosquer^{1,2}, Anne-Laurence
1465 Boutillier^{1,2}, Jean-Christophe Cassel^{1,2,3}

1466

1467 ¹ Université de Strasbourg, Laboratoire de Neurosciences Cognitives et Adaptatives
1468 (LNCA), F-67000 Strasbourg, France

1469

1470 ² CNRS, LNCA UMR 7364, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

1471

1472 ³ **Corresponding author:** Dr. Jean-Christophe Cassel, Laboratoire de
1473 Neurosciences Cognitives et Adaptatives (LNCA), UMR 7364, Université de
1474 Strasbourg-CNRS, 12 rue Goethe, F-67000 Strasbourg, France. E-mail:
1475 jcassel@unistra.fr

1476

1477

1478 **Supplementary material (25 pages)**

1479

1480 **Number of supplementary text :** 2 (Methods and References)

1481 **Number of supplementary figures :** 16


1482 **Number of supplementary tables :** 4

1483 **Supplementary Methods:**

1484 A trajectory going from the S to the NE arm can reflect a response (successive R-L
1485 turns) memory or a place memory. In such case, it is not possible for the
1486 experimenter to know which strategy a rat has actually used. Therefore, the times
1487 spent in the NE arm when a rat was coming from the S were not considered. In fact,
1488 only times recorded in the NE arm when rats came from SW, SE or N were
1489 considered. This correction represented in average a subtraction of 2.34 ± 0.51 s
1490 (range 0-5.5 s) in experiment 1, and of 2.22 ± 0.56 (range 0-5.6) and 1.2 ± 0.32
1491 (range 0-3.8) in rats with intrastriatal and intrahippocampal cannulas, respectively, in
1492 experiment 2. The correction was applied whatever the training protocol and duration.
1493 It was computed for each rat and subtracted from its probe trial performance (i.e.,
1494 time in target after R-L turns, and time in NE) before statistical analyses of individual
1495 scores were performed.

1496

1497 **Supplementary Figure 1: Subregions of the dorsal striatum and of the dorsal**
1498 **hippocampus in which the number of c-Fos positive cells was quantified.**
1499 Abbreviations: DLS: dorsolateral striatum; DMS: dorsomedial striatum; CA1: region
1500 CA1 of the cornu Ammonis; CA3: region CA3 of the cornu Ammonis; DG: dentate
1501 gyrus. Anteriority levels under each plate are indicated in mm from Bregma (Paxinos
1502 and Watson, 2007). The distinction between DLS and DMS is based on the article by
1503 Voorn et al. (2004), with the DLS corresponding essentially to the afferents from the
1504 sensorimotor cortex, and the DMS to afferents from other cortical structures (e.g.,
1505 medial prefrontal cortex, visual cortex, auditory cortex, perirhinal cortex, and
1506 entorhinal cortex).




1510 **Supplementary Figure 2: Number of errors showed comparable acquisition**
 1511 **curves in Lt-OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats.** In each training
 1512 protocol of the first experiment (Lt-OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place), mean
 1513 numbers of errors (+ sem) are represented for the first training day (trial by trial) and
 1514 over the 6- and 14-day training sessions (in daily blocks of four trials). Statistical
 1515 analyses showed no significant difference between the training conditions. Notice
 1516 that the Y axis corresponding to the first training day indicates a number of errors for
 1517 each trial whereas in the two other panels (middle, right), it indicates the mean
 1518 number of errors for each 4-trial block, hence the different scales of the Y-axis. The
 1519 number of animals in each condition can be found in Figure 3 of the article. Statistical
 1520 analyses showed the same effect (Trial or Day) as for the latencies to reach the
 1521 platform. The same was true for distances.

1522

1523

1524



1525

1526 **Supplementary Table 1: Percent of rats shifting to the NE arm right after having**
 1527 **first visited the N arm was not (significantly) different among groups.** Number of
 1528 rats showing a direct swim to the N arm after having been released in the maze are
 1529 indicated between brackets as "(n/ N)", the "N" indicating the group size. The table
 1530 reads as follows : "of the N tested rats, % of the n rats first entering the N arm and
 1531 which then shifted to the NE one". For instance, regarding Lt-OFF-Resp rats after
 1532 one day of training : one should read 33% of the 6 rats out of the 8 which first entered
 1533 the N arm then shifted to the NE arm.

Training protocol	Training duration		
	1 day	6 days	14 days
Lt-OFF-Resp	33 % (6/8)	14 % (7/7)	29 % (7/8)
Lt-ON-Dual	14 % (7/7)	38 % (8/8)	50 % (4/8)
Lt-ON-Place	<u>83 % (6/8)</u>	60 % (5/7)	60 % (5/8)

1534 In Lt-ON-Place rats, this proportion was significantly higher than chance after 1 day
 1535 of training ($\text{Chi}^2 = 10.89$, $p < 0.01$), and tended to exceed chance after 6 or 14 days
 1536 of training ($\text{Chi}^2 = 3.27$, $p = 0.071$). The significant percentage is underlined. In the
 1537 other cells, there was no significant difference from chance.

1538

1539 **Supplementary Table 2: Average swim velocity were comparable during the**
 1540 **probe trial among protocols and training durations.** Data indicated in cm/s are
 1541 means (sem). Statistical analyses showed no significant difference among groups,
 1542 indicating that other variables were not biased by changes in swim velocity.

Training protocol	Training duration		
	1 day	6 days	14 days
Lt-OFF-Resp	24.6 (1.1)	25.6 (1.0)	24.7 (1.1)
Lt-ON-Dual	25.3 (1.6)	26.1 (1.2)	24.6 (1.4)
Lt-ON-Place	25.8 (1.2)	27.2 (1.0)	25.5 (1.6)

1543 An ANOVA of the average swim velocities showed that Protocol ($F_{(2,60)} = 0.7$, ns),
 1544 Duration ($F_{(2,60)} = 0.9$, ns) and their interaction ($F_{(4,60)} = 0.0$, ns) had no significant
 1545 effect.


1546

1547

1548 **Supplementary Figure 3: Latencies to the place target (i.e., the NE arm) in Lt-**
1549 **OFF-Resp, Lt-ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats during the probe trial are**
1550 **compatible with the progressive formation of a cognitive map in Lt-ON-Dual**
1551 **rats.** All means are given in seconds (+ sem). This variable was computed to refine
1552 the analysis of the training-dependent evolution of strategies. We reasoned that if Lt-
1553 ON-Dual rats behaved according to an egocentric strategy incompatible with
1554 navigation correction, their latencies should be close to those of Lt-OFF-Resp rats.
1555 On the contrary, if they behaved according to an allocentric strategy enabling
1556 correction, whether direct or indirect, their latencies should be close to that of Lt-ON-
1557 Place rats. The idea behind this reasoning is that if a Lt-ON-Dual rat entered the N
1558 arm by R-L turns, it would expect to find the platform here and, consequently, spend
1559 some time looking for it in this arm. If, however, it already had some capability for a
1560 spatial approach of the task, and thus for navigation correction, but entered the N
1561 arm due to repetition of the R-L turns after starting, it would immediately leave the
1562 arm and swim to the NE one, whereby its latency to enter the NE arm should be
1563 shorter than in Lt-OFF-Resp rats. A Protocol x Duration ANOVA showed significant
1564 overall Protocol ($F_{(2,60)} = 15.5, p < 0.001$) and Duration ($F_{(2,60)} = 3.9, p < 0.05$)
1565 effects, but no significant interaction between both factors ($F_{(4,60)} = 1.5, p = 0.22$). A
1566 Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons test showed that Lt-ON-Dual rats did not differ
1567 significantly from Lt-OFF-Resp rats after 1 or 6 training days, but their latencies were
1568 significantly below those of their Lt-OFF-Resp counterparts after 14 training days ($p <$
1569 0.05). Conversely, latencies of Lt-ON-Dual rats were significantly larger than those of
1570 Lt-ON-Place rats after 1 or 6 training days ($p < 0.05$), not after 14 days. Statistical
1571 analysis: # different from Lt-ON-Dual rats, $p < 0.05$.

1572 (see next page)

1573



1574

1575

1576

1577

1578


1579

1580

1581 **Supplementary Figure 4 : Average time to exit the arm which the rats from the**
1582 **different training protocols and durations have visited first, be it N, NE or any**
1583 **other arm.** Once having entered their first arm, the time spent therein was
1584 comparable among training protocols and duration conditions. The data illustrated
1585 are given in seconds (+ sem). Analysis of variance showed no significant Protocol (F
1586 $(_{2,60}) = 2.32, p = 0.11$) or Duration (F $(_{2,60}) = 1.21, p = 0.31$) effects, and no significant
1587 interaction between the two factors ($(F$ $(_{4,60}) = 0,37, p = 0.83$).

1588


1589



1590


1591 **Supplementary Figure 5** : Time to exit the N or NE arm after the rats had
1592 entered it for the first time is compatible with the progressive formation of a
1593 cognitive map in Lt-ON-Dual rats. All means are given in seconds (+ sem). White
1594 bars correspond to the N arm, grey ones to the NE arm. For each training protocol
1595 and duration (indicated by the numbers at the bottom of the white bars), time to exit
1596 the N arm was compared to time to exit the NE one using a Student's t-test for paired
1597 samples. Statistical analyses : * indicates a significant difference between time to exit
1598 N as compared to time to exit NE ; $p < 0.05$.

1599



1600

1601 **Supplementary Figure 6: c-Fos staining, 1 day of training.** Typical examples of
1602 c-Fos staining observed in the medial part of the dorsal striatum (A, C, E, G) and in
1603 region CA1 (B, D, F, H) of the dorsal hippocampus from rats tested in a probe trial 24
1604 hours after a 1-day training duration (4 trials/day) or taken from their home cage (A,
1605 B). C and D are from a Lt-OFF-Resp rat, E and F from a Lt-ON-Dual one, and G and
1606 H from a Lt-ON-Place one. Scale bar = 250 μ m.
1607



1608 **Supplementary Figure 7: c-Fos staining, 6 days of training.** Typical examples of
1609 c-Fos staining observed in the medial part of the dorsal striatum (A, C, E, G) and in
1610 region CA1 (B, D, F, H) of the dorsal hippocampus from rats tested in a probe trial 24
1611 hours after a 6-day training duration (4 trials/day) or taken from their home cage (A,
1612 B). C and D are from a Lt-OFF-Resp rat, E and F from a Lt-ON-Dual one, and G and
1613 H from a Lt-ON-Place one. Scale bar = 250 μ m.

1614

1615

1616

1617

1618

1619

1620

1621

1622

1623

1624

1625


1626

1627


1628

1629

1630



1631 **Supplementary Figure 8: c-Fos staining, 14 days of training.** Typical examples of
1632 c-Fos staining observed in the medial part of the dorsal striatum (A, C, E, G) and in
1633 region CA1 (B, D, F, H) of the dorsal hippocampus from rats tested in a probe trial 24
1634 hours after a 14-day training duration (4 trials/day) or taken from their home cage (A,
1635 B). C and D are from a Lt-OFF-Resp rat, E and F from a Lt-ON-Dual one, and G and
1636 H from a Lt-ON-Place one. Scale bar = 250 μ m.



1664

1665 **Supplementary Figure 9: c-Fos staining control (auditory cortex).** Typical
1666 examples of c-Fos staining observed in the primary auditory cortex of rats tested in a
1667 probe trial 24 hours after a 1- (left), 6- (middle) or 14-day (right) training duration (4
1668 trials/day) or taken from their home cage (A, B, C). D, E, F are from a Lt-OFF-Resp
1669 rat, G, H, I from a Lt-ON-Dual one, and J, K, L from a Lt-ON-Place one. Scale bar =
1670 250 μm .

1671

1672

1673

1674

1675

1676

1677

1678

1679

1680

1681

1682

1683

1684

1685

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691


1692

1693

1694


1695

1696



1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729

Supplementary Figure 10: c-Fos staining control (primary somatosensory cortex). Typical examples of c-Fos staining observed in the primary somatosensory cortex of rats tested in a probe trial 24 hours after a 1- (left), 6- (middle) or 14-day (right) training duration (4 trials/day) or taken from their home cage (A, B, C). D, E, F are from a Lt-OFF-Resp rat, G, H, I from a Lt-ON-Dual one, and J, K, L from a Lt-ON-Place one. Scale bar = 250 μ m.



1730

1731

1732 **Supplementary Figure 11: Diffusion of MUSC-induced inactivation around the**
1733 **infusion site was comparable among training protocols and durations.** Grey
1734 and black areas indicate the largest and smallest diffusion of the inactivation,
1735 respectively, in either the dorsal striatum (left panel) or the dorsal hippocampus (right
1736 panel). This diffusion radius of MUSC effects was estimated on coronal sections
1737 stained for c-Fos expression in Lt-OFF-Resp (left), Lt-ON-Dual (middle) and Lt-ON-
1738 Place rats (right). The rats were killed 90 min after the end of their 1-min probe trial.
1739 Before the probe trial, the rats had been trained for 6 (top) or 14 (bottom) days.
1740 Muscimol was infused 30 min before the probe trial. Coordinates are given in mm
1741 from Bregma (Paxinos and Watson, 2007).

1742 (see next page)

1743


1744

STRIATUM


HIPPOCAMPUS

Training : 6 days

1745



Training : 14 days




1746 **Supplementary figure 12: Quantification on coronal sections of the diffusion**
1747 **radius of the MUSC-induced inactivation around the infusion sites in the dorsal**
1748 **striatum and dorsal hippocampus provides evidence for comparable diffusion**
1749 **areas among experimental conditions.** All inactivation areas were expressed as a
1750 percentage of the surface of the region of interest at -0.1, +0.1, +0.5, +0.7, +0.8,
1751 +1.0, +1.4 and +1.7 mm (STRIATUM; dorso-ventral limits of the DStr are those
1752 shown in Supplementary Figure 1), and at -4.4, -4.2, -3.8, -3.6, -3.5, -3.4, -3.1, -2.9
1753 and -2.6 mm (HIPPOCAMPUS); all coordinates are given in mm from Bregma
1754 according to Paxinos and Watson (2007). Data illustrated are means (+ sem). The
1755 ANOVA only showed a significant Anteriority effect. All other effects (Protocol,
1756 Duration, or any of the second or third order interactions) were not significant. Notice
1757 that for the statistical analyses, anteriority levels where zero values were found in all
1758 rats have not been included in the analyses. This was the case for levels of -0.1 mm
1759 in the DStr, and -2.6 and -4.4 mm in the DHip.

1760 .

1761 (see next page)

1762




1763

1764

1765 **Supplementary Figure 13: Effect of MUSC infusion on c-Fos staining.** Typical
1766 examples of c-Fos staining observed in the medial part of the dorsal striatum (A, B)
1767 and in region CA1 (C, D) of the dorsal hippocampus from rats tested in a probe trial
1768 30 min after an intrastriatal or an intrahippocampal infusion of aCSF (A, C) or
1769 muscimol (B, D). Scale bar = 250 μ m.

1770


1771



1772

1773 **Supplementary Figure 14:** Number of errors was comparable among
1774 experimental conditions, indicating similar performance in all groups of rats. In
1775 each of the four training conditions of our second experiment (Protocol X Duration),
1776 mean numbers of errors (+ sem) are represented over the 6- and 14-day training
1777 sessions (daily blocks of four trials). Statistical analyses showed no significant
1778 difference between the training conditions. The same was true for distances. The
1779 number of animals in each condition can be found in Figure 8 of the article.

1780



1781

1782 **Supplementary Table 3: Percent of rats shifting to the NE arm right after**
 1783 **having first visited the N arm showed MUSC-induced disruption of**
 1784 **performance, except when infused in the striatum after 14 days of training in Lt-**
 1785 **ON-Dual and Lt-ON-Place rats. Number of rats showing a direct swim to the N arm**
 1786 **after having been released in the maze are indicated between brackets as "(n/ N)".**
 1787 aCSF stands for artificial cerebrospinal fluid, MUSC for muscimol. The table reads as
 1788 follows : "of the N tested rats, % of the n rats that first entered the N arm and which
 1789 then shifted to the NE one".

Training condition	Training duration	Infusion structure			
		Striatum		Hippocampus	
		aCSF	MUSC	aCSF	MUSC
Lt-OFF-Resp	6 days	38 % (8/9)	0 % (2/8)	0 % (9/9)	25 % (4/11)
	14 days	14 % (7/7)	20 % (5/8)	0 % (7/7)	33 % (3/8)
Lt-ON-Dual	6 days	14 % (7/8)	50 % (6/7)	43 % (7/7)	0 % (3/7)
	14 days	<u>71%</u> (7/7)	<u>100 %</u> (4/8)	<u>86 %</u> (7/7)	25 % (4/9)
Lt-ON-Place	6 days	66 % (3/7)	0 % (3/9)	<u>66 %</u> (6/8)	50 % (2/9)
	14 days	<u>71 %</u> (7/7)	<u>100 %</u> (6/8)	<u>100 %</u> (6/7)	38 % (8/10)

1790 The proportion of rats having first swum to the N arm and then shifted to the NE was
 1791 significantly higher than chance in the following groups : after 6 days of training, in Lt-
 1792 ON-Place rats subjected to intrahippocampal infusion of aCSF ; after 14 days of
 1793 training, in Lt-ON-Dual rats subjected to intrastriatal aCSF or MUSC infusions ($\text{Chi}^2 =$
 1794 8.05 , $p < 0.01$ and $\text{Chi}^2 = 18.0$, $p < 0.001$, respectively) or to intrahippocampal aCSF
 1795 infusions ($\text{Chi}^2 = 13,76$, $p < 0.001$), and in Lt-ON-Dual rats subjected to intrastriatal
 1796 aCSF or MUSC infusions ($\text{Chi}^2 = 8.05$, $p < 0.01$ and $\text{Chi}^2 = 12$, $p < 0,001$) or
 1797 intrahippocampal infusions of aCSF($\text{Chi}^2 = 18.00$, $p < 0.001$). The corresponding
 1798 percentages are underlined. In the other cells, there was no significant difference
 1799 from chance.

1800


1801 **Supplementary Table 4:** Average swim velocity during the probe trial was similar,
 1802 regardless of training protocol, duration and inactivation conditions. aCSF stands for
 1803 artificial cerebrospinal fluid, MUSC for muscimol. Data are indicated in cm/s as
 1804 means (sem). Statistical analyses showed no significant difference among groups.

Training protocol	Training duration	Infusion structure			
		Striatum		Hippocampus	
		aCSF	MUSC	aCSF	MUSC
Lt-OFF-Resp	6 days	26.3 (0.9)	27.2 (1.7)	26.4 (0.9)	24.7 (1.2)
	14 days	26.1 (1.6)	26.8 (1.6)	26.2 (1.3)	26.3 (1.7)
Lt-ON-Dual	6 days	24.0 (0.9)	23.6 (1.4)	26.0 (1.2)	26.3 (1.6)
	14 days	25.7 (1.2)	26.0 (1.0)	25.7 (1.4)	25.0 (0.5)
Lt-ON-Place	6 days	26.9 (0.7)	26.3 (0.5)	27.2 (1.0)	26.2 (1.0)
	14 days	26.4 (0.9)	26.5 (1.2)	25.6 (1.4)	26.8 (1.1)

1805 The 3 (Protocol) X 2 (Duration) X 2 (Inactivation) ANOVAs were performed
 1806 separately for rats infused into the striatum or the hippocampus. ANOVA of the
 1807 average swim velocities in rats subjected to intrastriatal infusions showed that
 1808 Protocol ($F_{(2,87)} = 0.4, ns$), Duration ($F_{(1,87)} = 0.1, ns$), Inactivation ($F_{(1,87)} = 0.2, ns$),
 1809 and the second or third order interactions ($F_{(2,87)}$ or $(1,87) < 1.0, ns$) had no significant
 1810 effect on swim velocities. ANOVA of the swim velocities in rats subjected to
 1811 intrahippocampal infusions supported similar conclusions.

1812


1813 **Supplementary Figure 15: Time to exit the first visited arm, be it N, NE or any**
 1814 **other arm, did not show any difference among experimental conditions (light,**
 1815 **training, inactivation).** All data illustrated are given in seconds (+ sem). Analysis
 1816 (ANOVA) of the data from rats subjected to intrastriatal infusions showed no
 1817 significant Protocol ($F_{(2,81)} = 2.61$, $p = 0.08$), Duration ($F_{(1,81)} = 0.08$, $p = 0.77$) or
 1818 Inactivation effects ($F_{(1,87)} = 1.74$, $p = 0.19$), and none of the second or third order
 1819 interactions was significant. Analysis of the data from rats subjected to
 1820 intrahippocampal infusions showed no significant Protocol ($F_{(2,87)} = 0.91$, $p = 0.40$),
 1821 Duration ($F_{(1,87)} = 1.17$, $p = 0.28$) or Inactivation effects ($F_{(1,87)} = 0.04$, $p = 0.83$), and
 1822 none of the second or third order interactions was significant.
 1823



1824

1825 **Supplementary Figure 16: Average time to exit the N or NE arm confirmed**
 1826 **MUSC-induced disruptions, although they were less marked than in Figure 9 of**
 1827 **the article.** Data are shown according to the different protocol, duration and
 1828 inactivation conditions. All means are given in seconds (+ sem). White bars
 1829 correspond to the N arm, grey ones to the NE arm. For each condition, time in the N
 1830 arm was compared to time in the NE arms using a Student's t-test for paired
 1831 samples. Statistical analysis : * indicates a significant difference between time in N
 1832 and time in NE ; $p < 0.05$.

1833



1834

1835 **Supplementary list of references**

1836 Paxinos G, Watson C (2007) The Rat Brain in Stereotaxic Coordinates, 6th Ed,
1837 Academic Press, 456 pp.

1838 Voorn P, Vanderschuren LJ, Groenewegen HJ, Robbins TW, Pennartz CM. (2004)
1839 Putting a spin on the dorsal-ventral divide of the striatum. Trends Neurosci. 2004
1840 Aug;27(8):468-74.

1841

1842

1843