Title

Amnesia for early life stress does not preclude the adult development of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in rats.

Journal

Biological Psychiatry, 76(4)

Authors

Poulos, Andrew
Reger, Maxine
Mehta, Nehali
et al.

Publication Date

2014-08-15

DOI

10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.10.007

Peer reviewed

Published in final edited form as:
Biol Psychiatry. 2014 August 15; 76(4): 306–314. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.10.007.

AMNESIA FOR EARLY LIFE STRESS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE ADULT DEVELOPMENT OF PTSD SYMPTOMS IN RATS

Andrew M. Poulos[1,2,3], **Maxine Reger**[1,2,5], **Nehali Mehta**[1,2], **Irina Zhuravka**[1,2,3], **Sarah S. Sterlace**[1,2], **Camille Gannam**[1,2], **David A. Hovda**[1,5], **Christopher C. Giza**[1,5,6], and **Michael Fanselow**[1,2,3,4]

[1]University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

[2]Department of Psychology

[3]UCLA Behavioral Testing Core, Brain Research Institute

[4]Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, UCLA Integrative Center for Learning and Memory

[5]UCLA Brain Injury Research Center, Department of Neurosurgery, David Geffen School of Medicine

[6]Department of Pediatrics, Division of Pediatric Neurology, Mattel Children's Hospital; and Department of Medical and Molecular Pharmacology

Abstract

Background—Traumatic experience can result in life-long changes in the ability to cope with future stressors and emotionally salient events. These experiences, particularly during early development are a significant risk factor for later life anxiety disorders such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). However, because traumatic experience typically results in strong episodic memories, it is not known whether such long-term memories are necessary for particular features of PTSD such as enhanced fear and anxiety. Here we used a fear conditioning procedure in juvenile rats prior to maturation of the neural systems supporting declarative memory to assess the necessity of early memory to the later life development of PTSD related symptoms.

Methods—Nineteen-day old rats were exposed to unpredictable and inescapable footshocks and fear memory for the shock context was assessed during adulthood. Thereafter, adult animals were either exposed to single-trial fear conditioning, elevated plus-maze or sacrificed for basal diurnal corticosterone and quantification of neuronal glucocorticoid (G-R) and Neuropeptide Y receptors.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Andrew Poulos, Department of Psychology, University at Albany, Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Life Sciences 1058, Albany, New York 12222. apoulos@albany.edu.

All authors report no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

Results—Early trauma exposed rats displayed stereotypic footshock reactivity, yet by adulthood, hippocampus-dependent contextual fear related memory was absent. However, adult rats showed sensitized fear learning, aberrant basal circadian fluctuations of corticosterone, increased amygdalar G-R, decreased time spent in the open arm of an elevated plus maze and an odor aversion associated with early-life footshocks.

Conclusions—These results suggest that traumatic experience during developmental periods of hippocampal immaturity can promote lifelong changes in symptoms and neuropathology associated with human PTSD even if there is no explicit memory of the early trauma.

Keywords

fear conditioning; early life stress; development; hippocampus; rat; amnesia

INTRODUCTION

Flashback memories of a traumatic experience are a prevalent and distressing component of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), which is further compounded by a persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma and often comorbid with increased states of anxiety and chronic depression. In the adult human and rodent, memories established within an emotionally charged environment are generally robust and not readily forgotten (1,2) and thus may provide important insights into the link between trauma related memory and PTSD. This link has been primarily explored in patients with mild traumatic brain injury and/or traumatic asphyxiation injury with post-traumatic amnesia (3,4,5) as well as in subjects with early life trauma occurring during the period of infantile amnesia (6). Despite this, the link between trauma-related memory and PTSD remains a point of controversy (3,4).

To investigate this potential link, we used a Pavlovian fear conditioning approach in young rats at a developmental age characterized by infantile amnesia (38,8,21) when declarative hippocampal memory systems are not fully mature (39,40) and then examined its long-term mnemonic and non-mnemonic impact on adult PTSD related symptomatology. Juvenile rats at post-natal day age (P) 19 and younger have difficulty learning and remembering contextual-spatial features of the environment, but generally having little difficulty acquiring and retaining memories of more discrete sensory signals of danger (7,8,9). In fear conditioning, the associative relationships between environmental stimuli and footshocks are established and maintained within the amygdala (10,11,12), while the hippocampus is crucial for encoding and maintaining a memory of the features of the training context (13,14). Thus, P19 rats are capable of acquiring and retaining cue-based fear memories, while having difficulty with more contextual-spatial fear memories.

Prior animal models focused on efforts to examine early life stress (ELS) during the first 2 weeks of life have mainly used non-painful stressors, such as mother-pup separation procedures, and have uncovered varying results on adult learning, anxiety and neuroendocrine function (15,16,17). Alternatively a large body of work by Sullivan and colleagues using pain related procedures during the same period of development that include odor-footshock / tail pinch pairings and maternal maltreatment procedures attenuate adult

fear learning, reducing amygdala neural activity and promoting depressive-like behaviors (37). These studies have shed important light into the role of attachment and maternal behavior on the maturation of cognitive and emotional systems. However, relatively little is known about how painful experiences just prior to weaning could impact the maturation of neural circuits central to fear and stress regulation. This disparity between physical trauma, and the animal mother-pup separation paradigm, which is not amenable to mnemonic analysis, poses a significant hurdle in determining a relationship and/or potential mechanism between early trauma-related memory and adult PTSD.

Here, we describe a rodent model of ELS amenable to mnemonic analysis and the examination of key features of PTSD. Nineteen-day-old rat pups were exposed to a highly stressful event, repeated footshocks during a single session. We have previously shown that in adults this procedure causes a sensitized state that models several components of PTSD (18) and therefore it served as our model of trauma. In the present experiments following ELS, adult fear memory of trauma-related memory was assessed 2 months after footshock trauma. At this time we also determined the acquisition of a novel fear memory. Anxiety in adults was measured by an elevated plus maze procedure, while avoidance behavior related to trauma was assessed by a modified odor choice task. Next, basal levels of corticosterone (CORT) were measured at 4-hour intervals over a 24-hour period to assess homeostatic levels of CORT. Lastly, we measured glucocorticoid (GR) and Neuropeptide Y (NPY-R) receptors, which are implicated in stress reactivity and resilience within brain regions critical in fear, memory and stress regulation.

METHODS

Subjects

Male Long-Evans rats (14–16 days old) arrived in litters of eight with surrogate dams (Charles River, Hollister, California, USA). Each litter and dam were housed in plastic cages on a 12:12 light/dark cycle and provided with ad libitum access to food and water. Rats were weaned at 21 days and housed in groups of 4 and at 50–55 days of age rats were pair-housed. All experimental procedures were approved by the UCLA Animal Research Committee.

Behavioral Contexts

ELS occurred in individual conditioning boxes (32cm × 25cm × 25cm) housed in light and sound attenuating chambers (Med Associates, Georgia Vermont, USA). Video Freeze software (Med Associates) automatically scored behavior. During each session the conditioning boxes were configured into 1 of 3 distinct contexts based on olfactory, auditory, visual and tactile stimuli and the method of transport also varied (see Table 1).

Procedures

Figure 1 depicts the overall experimental design for each of the experiments conducted in the present study.

Early Life Stress (ELS)—In Context A, P19 rat pups were given either 15 unsignaled footshocks (1ma, 1sec) with a variable inter-shock interval or no footshocks (18). The duration of each session was 93 minutes.

Adult Memory for Early Life Stress (CXT A)—Fifty-nine to 61 days later, rats (P78 or P80) were returned for 8 minutes to the ELS context (see figure 1).

Sensitization of 1-Trial Fear Conditioning (CXT B)—Either 1 day before or after ELS testing rats (P78 or P79) were placed in a novel context (B) and 3 min later received a single footshock (1mA, 2sec). One minute later were returned to the vivarium. Twenty-four hours later a test for sensitization of this mild fear conditioning occurred.

Fear Sensitization Test (CXT B)—Rats (P79 or P80) were returned to the 1-shock context (B) for an 8 minute test to determine if ELS sensitized the development of this mild contextual fear.

Fear Generalization Test (CXT C)—Half of the rats (P81), 24 hours following the Fear Sensitization Test, were exposed to a novel (C) for an 8-minute test of generalized contextual fear.

Odor Choice Test

Sixty days following the 0 or 15-shock conditioning procedure, another set of pair housed adult rats (P78) were transported to a light and sound attenuating room, lit only by a red incandescent light bulb. In the center of the room, an acrylic opaque box was divided into 3 compartments by 2, transparent, slotted walls that permitted subjects to move freely between compartments. The lateral compartments were scented with an odor present during P19 context training (Simple Green), or a familiar odor new cage bedding, while the central compartment was considered neutral and did not contain an odor source. To assess odor choice, each subject was run on 4 consecutive, 2-minute, trials with the location of the odor source counter-balanced. An experimenter blind to the subjects' prior experimental condition used a stopwatch to determine total seconds spent in each of the compartments. Total percent time in each compartment, was used to assess odor aversion.

Elevated Plus Maze

Sixty days following the 0 or 15-shock procedure, a third set of pair housed adult rats (P78) were transported to a sound attenuating room, lit by a dim yellow incandescent light. An experimenter blind to the experimental conditions measured the total time each subject spent in the central, open and closed areas.

Diurnal Corticosterone Levels

Sixty days following a 0 or 15-shock fear conditioning procedure, pair housed rats (P78) were moved into a quiet room and maintained on a 12:12 light/dark cycle 24 hours prior to blood collection. Every 4 hours, separate groups of rats were moved to an adjacent room and rapidly decapitated. Trunk blood was collected in a heparinized 500 μL tube and then

centrifuged (1400 rpm, 3 min) for plasma extraction. Plasma was stored at −80° C and thawed to room temperature prior to CORT quantification by immunoassay.

ELISA

Corticosterone enzyme-linked immunoassay kits were purchased from Assay Designs (Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA). Plasma samples were diluted into assay buffer solution at a 1:40 ratio. Thereafter, we followed the procedures provided by the manufacturer.

Western Blotting

Fifty-nine days following a 0 or 15-footshock fear conditioning procedure, subjects (P78) were sacrificed for immunoblotting of basal GR and NPY1-Rs. Glucocorticoid receptors bind the stress related and regulatory steroid, CORT, while NPY-R bind the anxiety and feeding regulatory peptide, Neuropeptide Y. We quantified each of these proteins in the amygdala, hippocampus and medial prefrontal cortex (PFC). Whole brains were immediately flash frozen and subsequently stored at −80° C. Brains were thawed by immersion in Allprotect tissue reagent (Qiagen, Germantown, Maryland, USA) at −20° C for 7 days. Bilateral amygdala (lateral, basolateral and central), dHIP and mPFC (anterior cingulate, prelimbic and infralimbic cortices) tissues were dissected on a cold plate and stored in Allprotect prior to homogenization in a buffer. Immunoblots were performed from crude homogenates using an antibody concentration of 1:1000 GR (H-300) and NPY1-R (H-91) (Santa Cruz Biotechnologies, Dallas, Texas, USA). Total protein controlled for receptor values from each individual sample were then normalized to the mean of Un-shocked controls, such that the average Un-shocked control value equaled 100%. Receptor levels are represented as the percent change from the Un-shocked group.

RESULTS

Experiment 1: Long-Term Memory and Sensitization of Early life Trauma

In this experiment, adult rats (ELS N=9; No ELS N=7) previously exposed to strong early-life fear conditioning, exhibited little or no fear of the ELS context (figure 2A). Similarly, subsequent exposure to a novel context (B) failed to elicit freezing (data not shown). However, one-trial fear conditioning in this novel context resulted in significantly greater freezing in *P19 shocked* versus *unshocked* controls (see figure 2A, ANOVA, F (1, 14) = 6.804, p = .021). The following day in both *P19 shocked* and *un-shocked* controls displayed similar levels of generalization to novel Context C (figure 2A) as confirmed by a ANOVA, F (1, 14) = 1.338, p = .67.

In a second group of rats (ELS N=6, No ELS N=6), the order of the trauma-related memory test and single-shock trials were reversed. Again, adult Fear conditioning in *P19-shocked* animals resulted in a significantly greater freezing, than in un-shocked controls replicating the first set of results (F (1, 10) = 19.962, p = .001; figure 2B). Upon return to the environment associated with early-life *P19*-shock (Context A), animals froze significantly more then un-shocked controls (ANOVA, F (1, 10) = 6.98, p = .025) but this freezing was similar to the first set of rats tested in a novel context (C). This result suggests that such freezing was not due to fear directly conditioned by ELS but rather was indicative of context

fear generalized from being shocked in Context B. In other words, ELS did not result in an enduring associative context fear memory but left rats in a sensitized state that enhanced subsequent adult fear conditioning. This greater level of adult fear conditioning resulted in more fear to generalize to a novel context.

Experiment 2: Long-Term Anxiety and Avoidance Following ELS

Adult rats exposed to P19-shocks displayed a long-lasting anxiety like phenotype as measured by the elevated plus maze task. Shocked-rats (N=6) spent significantly less time in the open arms of an elevated plus maze than unshocked rats (N=6; ANOVA F (1, 10) = 5.468, $p = .041$). As shown in figure 3, this corresponded with ELS animals spending a significantly greater percentage of time in the closed arms, as compared to un-shocked rats (ANOVA F (1, 10) = 5.370, $p = .043$). No significant differences were detected in time spent in the central portion of the maze (ANOVA F (1, 10) = .268, $p = .617$).

Next, to examine any potential associative learning that persisted from P19 shocks, adult animals were tested in an odor choice task. Un-shocked controls (N=7) gradually increased time spent in the compartment baited with the early life odor (Simple Green), whereas P19-shocked subjects (N=7) decreased time in the same compartment over the final two trials (figure 4). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed a significant decrease in percent time P19-shocked animals spent in the early life odor compartment on the third trial (F (1, 12) = 7.378, $p = .019$), but not at other trials (Trial 1: F (1, 12) = 0.00, $p = 1.00$, Trial 2: F (1, 12) = .221, p = .647, Trial 4: F (1, 12) = .970, p = .360) as compared un-shocked controls. This change corresponded with P19 un-shocked animals showing a gradual decline in percent time in the compartment with the familiar odor (new cage bedding), while P19-shocked animals gradually increased their time in this compartment. This increase in the familiar odor compartment was statistically significant at trial 3 (F (1, 12) = 6.153, p = .029). No group differences in the percent time spent in the neutral, non-odor baited compartment were detected at any trials between groups (Trial 1: F (1, 12) = .145, p = .710, Trial 2: F (1, 12) = .004, p = .950, Trial 3: F (1, 12) = .037, p = .851, Trial 4: F (1, 12) = .250, p = .626). At best the odor aversion to the original early life contextual odor was weak, yet these rats failed to display freezing to the P19-shocked context that had been scented with this odor. However, as demonstrated in Experiment 1, P19-shocked animals showed increased adult contextual fear conditioning (ANOVA F (1, 14) = 5.560, p = .033; figure 4B).

Experiment 3: Long-Term Neuroendocrine Effects of ELS

We examined the impact of P19-fear conditioning on adult basal plasma levels of CORT over a 24-hour period. Plasma CORT data were analyzed using a ANOVA. Figure 5 represents the diurnal cycle for basal measurements of CORT in rats that either received ELS (N=41) or not (N=40). Fifty-nine days later control rats displayed basal CORT levels that peaked just prior to lights-off and troughed prior to the lights-on period during a 12:12 light-dark cycle. In contrast, P19-shocked rats displayed basal CORT levels that peaked at 4 PM and 12 AM. Overall, a heightened level of basal CORT was observed in P19-shocked versus Un-shocked rats. A 2 × 6 factorial ANOVA detected main effects of an Early-life experience (F (1,80) = 4.462, p = .038) and Time of day (F (5,80) = 2.854, p = .021), and a significant interaction (F (5, 80) = 2.954, p = .002). When the data from the two groups were

analyzed separately using a trend analysis, a significant quartic function for P19-shocked (F (1,40) = 5.0042, p = .03) confirmed a double peak diurnal profile, while a significant quadratic function for Un-shocked controls (F (1,39) = 10.8100, p < .01) indicated a single peak diurnal profile.

Experiment 4: Glucocorticoid and Neuropeptide Y Receptors

In the final experiment, we examined GR and NPY1-R receptor protein levels within context fear-related brain regions: amygdala, hippocampus and mPFC. As shown in figure 6A, adult amygdala levels of G-R were altered by early-life experience (Shocked N=10, Un-shocked N=12). A ANOVA revealed ELS significantly increased amygdala levels of GR (F (1, 19) = 5.520, p = .007) and marginally decreased NPY1-R (F (1, 20) = 1.832, p = .053; Figure 6B). Even though hippocampal receptor protein levels tended to be greater in P19 shocked subjects these changes were not statistically significant (GR: F (1, 20) = 1.604, p = .220, NPY1-R: F (1, 20) = 3.227, p = .088). Lastly, both GR and NPY1-R levels within the mPFC were not altered by P19 footshocks (GR: F (1, 20) = .014, p =.908, NPY1-R: F (1, 20) = .001, p = .976).

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between GR and NPY1-R with in each brain region (see figure 7). No significant correlations were found between receptors within the amygdala (shocked R = −.0366, n = 10, p = .6021, un-shocked R = −.064, n = 11, p = .425) or hippocampus (shocked: R = .0407, n = 10, p = .455, un-shocked R = .1382, n = 11, p = .342). However, within the mPFC there was a strong negative correlation between GR and NPY1-R in the P19 shocked (R = −.8077, n = 10, p = .002) but not in un-shocked group (R = −.0508, n = 11, p = .441).

DISCUSSION

It has been argued that the lack of memories about a trauma may be protective against the development of PTSD, as observed in traumas resulting from brain injury (3). The present results suggest that in a developmental animal model of early-life trauma amenable to mnemonic analysis, trauma-related memory is not essential to produce an adult PTSD-like phenotype. Adult animals that failed to retrieve a hippocampal-dependent memory of early-life trauma displayed increased anxiety, a mild trauma related odor avoidance, disregulation of diurnal CORT and sensitization to novel fear experiences. This sensitization of fear and altered CORT corresponded to an amygdala specific increase in GRs and small decrease in NPY1-Rs.

Juvenile, 19 day old rats exposed to a 15-shock fear conditioning procedure, which in adults normally results in a robust lifelong fear memory (2,20), failed to produce a lasting contextual fear memory of early-life experience in adulthood (P78-80). The absence of contextual fear conditioning at this age is consistent with prior studies indicating that hippocampal dependent memory systems are not functionally mature until 21 to 24 days of age (8,21). This transitional phase in rodent memory development has been described to be analogous to a period of infant / childhood amnesia for episodic hippocampal-dependent memories in humans (8).

This normally potent conditioning procedure in rats 21 days and older, failed in P19 pups to result in a context fear memory, yet still resulted in an increased vulnerability or predisposition to future fear experiences. This was evident as pups exposed to repeated footshocks showed greater adult fear conditioning without an increase in pain sensitivity (figure S1) to a single shock in a novel context, than previously un-shocked animals. In contrast, Sullivan and colleagues have demonstrated rats exposed to repeated footshocks at an earlier age (P8-12), fail to acquire contextual fear and as adults display suppressed amygdala activity and attenuated fear conditioning (37). We have previously shown that in adults, pharmacological blockade of trauma-related memory by the amnestic NMDA antagonist, AP-5 failed to disrupt subsequent fear sensitization (18). In both of these cases a specific memory for the trauma context is not necessary for sensitization of subsequent fear learning. This augmented fear conditioning is consistent with reports from PTSD patients exhibiting a greater propensity to develop new phobias and a greater reactivity to emotionally salient stimuli even under conditions in which patients may fail to remember the precipitating trauma (4).

Odor aversions related to traumatic events have been long noted by clinicians as potential triggers of fear-related memories and anxiety (23). In the present experiments even though ELS rats failed to display a long-term conditional fear response to an odor that composed part of the trauma environmental context, these same rats displayed a mild avoidance of this odor that persisted into adulthood. Importantly, both groups were exposed to the environmental odor (Simple Green), but it was only animals paired with shock that resulted in a mild odor avoidance as an adult. This avoidance corresponded with shocked-exposed animals spending more time in the vicinity of a familiar odor (new cage bedding), as compared to un-shocked rats. A possible explanation for the decreased time in the Simple Green scented compartment is that early-life footshocks may have facilitated neophobia (24). However, this was not supported here as P19 shocked adults did not differ in time spent in the Simple Green scented compartment during the initial 2 trials as compared to un-shocked controls. Alternatively, it has been hypothesized that the mature dorsal hippocampus (dHIP) encodes a unified multimodal sensory representation of the fear context that includes odor (41,45). Because of the immature status of the dHIP at P19 (21), the fear context may not have been encoded as a unified representation by the hippocampus. Rather a specific element of the context (i.e., odor) may have become associated with the shock. Such an elemental association would not require hippocampal processing (e.g., 25,46) but would still depend on the amygdala (25,26). Consistent with this it has been demonstrated that the emergence of amygdala-dependent odor-shock aversions are the earliest forms of associative learning to develop (27).

Amygdalar CORT is important for the acquisition of context fear memories (27,28) and altered peripherally in patients with PTSD (29). As shown in the present studies, adult rats exposed to early-life footshocks displayed an overall basal increase in circulating CORT across the diurnal cycle. This is particularly evident in shocked animals at 4PM (3 hours prior to lights off in the vivarium) and 12AM (5 hours post lights off). However, though not statistically significant a small dip in CORT was detected at 8PM (1 hour post lights off), which coincides with the beginning of the active phase in the nocturnal rat. This time period maybe analogous to the waking period in humans and is normally when CORT peaks.

Interestingly, Yehuda and colleagues have reported persons with PTSD, while not having increased levels of cortisol have decreased morning basal levels of cortisol (29,30). Here we provide evidence of large diurnal fluctuations in CORT that are consistent with decreased morning cortisol in PTSD patients and increased CORT particularly evident at transitional phases between nadir and peak. These collective changes in basal diurnal CORT could represent deficiencies in HPA activity, feedback inhibition and/or changes in glucocorticoid metabolism (42) that are reflected in region specific changes in neuronal receptors.

Here we identified amygdala specific increases in GR of subjects exposed to early-life footshocks. Recently, Heijnen and colleagues (31) showed that high GR number is not only a vulnerability factor for the development of PTSD, but may also lead to increased amygdala activity, following a severe stress. In rodents, peripheral and amygdala targeted injections of CORT increase BLA neural activity (32) and fear conditioning (33). This increase in amygdala GR, but not within the hippocampus or mPFC, suggests amygdala neurons containing GR are particularly sensitive and persistently affected by a single ELS. Additionally, ELS rats displayed a trend toward reduced NPY1-R in the amygdala. In humans, decreased levels peripheral Neuropeptide Y are correlated with increased vulnerability to develop PTSD (43,44). In rats, BLA targeted antagonism or genetic deletion of NPY1-R enhanced fear conditioning (34), while NPY agonists decrease fear conditioning (35). Even though, amygdala NPY1-Rs in early-life shocked rats were not statistically lower (p = .053) than un-shocked controls this subtle decrease in NPY1-R and increased GR may act either individually or synergistically to enhance vulnerability and/or conditionability to emotionally salient events. Another result of interest, even though no changes in GR and NPY1-R were found in either the hippocampus and PFC as a result of ELS, a robust negative correlation in GR to NPY1-Rs were found in the PFC of ELS rats. This correlation at the exclusion of an overall change in receptor number could reflect differential changes in the ratio of NPY1-R to GR within subregions such as the prelimbic and infralimbic cortices that play heterogeneous roles in stress and emotion regulation. Herman and colleagues recently demonstrated that viral knockdown of GR within infralimbic, but not prelimbic cortices caused stress sensitization and depressive like behaviors (36). Studies dissecting regional changes of both GR and NPY1-R to early-life footshock could shed further light into the source of the present PFC correlations.

Collectively, these results suggest that in pre-adolescent animals normally painful, stressful and aversive stimuli fail to result in a long-lasting contextual fear memory, yet behaviorally potentiates new adult fear conditioning, induces anxiety and promotes trauma related odor avoidance. Physiologically this corresponds to a disregulation of circadian entrained levels of circulating CORT and a selective increase in amygdala GR. Importantly, this behavioral and physiological characterization of an ELS model may in the near future promote a greater mechanistic understanding of the neuroendocrine changes resulting from juvenile aversive experiences as well as refining future pharmacological treatments for PTSD.

Conclusion

A potent ELS did not result in a specific context memory of the trauma. However, it left rats in a sensitized state that persisted into adulthood. This state consisted of increased

susceptibility to acquiring new fears, anxiety, a disturbed circadian rhythm for basal CORT, and increased GR in the amygdala.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health: MH 60093 to AMP and MH 62122 to MSF. We thank laboratory members for their helpful discussion of the results. We especially thank Yan Cai for performing and analyzing the western blots.

References

1. Cahill L. The neurobiology of emotionally influenced memory. Implications for understanding traumatic memory. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 1997; 821:238–246. [PubMed: 9238208]
2. Gale GD, Anagnostaras SG, Godsil BP, Mitchell S, Nozawa T, Sage JR, Wiltgen B, Fanselow MS. Role of the basolateral amygdala in the storage of fear memories across the adult lifetime of the rat. Journal of Neuroscience. 2004; 24:3810–3815. [PubMed: 15084662]
3. McNeil JE. Can PTSD Occur with Amnesia for the Precipitating Event? Cognitive neuropsychiatry. 1996; 1(3):239–246.10.1080/135468096396532 [PubMed: 16571489]
4. Layton BS, Krikorian R, Dori D, Martin GA, Wardi K. Post-traumatic Stress Disorder with amnesia following asphyxiation. Annals of New York Academy of Sciences. 2006; 1071:488–490.
5. Bryant RA, Creamer M, O'Donnell M, Silove D, Clark CR, McFarlane AC. Post-traumatic amnesia and the nature of post-traumatic stress disorder after mild traumatic brain injury. Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society: JINS. 2009; 15(6):862–867.10.1017/S1355617709990671 [PubMed: 19703323]
6. Cordón IM, Pipe ME, Sayfan L, Melinder A, Goodman GS. Memory for traumatic experiences in early childhood. Developmental Review. 2004; 24(1):101–132.10.1016/j.dr.2003.09.003
7. Rudy JW. Contextual conditioning and auditory cue conditioning dissociate during development. Behavioral neuroscience. 1993; 107(5):887–891. [PubMed: 8280399]
8. Rudy JW, Morledge P. Ontogeny of contextual fear conditioning in rats: implications for consolidation, infantile amnesia, and hippocampal system function. Behavioral neuroscience. 1994; 108(2):227–234. [PubMed: 8037868]
9. Esmorís-Arranz FJ, Méndez C, Spear NE. Contextual fear conditioning differs for infant, adolescent, and adult rats. Behavioural processes. 2008; 78(3):340–350.10.1016/j.beproc.2008.01.010 [PubMed: 18343048]
10. Ehrlich I, Humeau Y, Grenier F, Ciocchi S, Herry C, Luthi A. Amygdala inhibitory circuits and the control of fear memory. Neuron. 2009; 62(6):757–771. [PubMed: 19555645]
11. Johansen JP, Cain CK, Ostroff LE, LeDoux JE. Molecular mechanisms of fear learning and memory. Cell. 2011; 147(3):509–524.10.1016/j.cell.2011.10.009 [PubMed: 22036561]
12. Tronson NC, Corcoran KA, Jovasevic V, Radulovic J. Fear conditioning and extinction: emotional states encoded by distinct signaling pathways. Trends in neurosciences. 2012; 35(3):145–155.10.1016/j.tins.2011.10.003 [PubMed: 22118930]
13. Maren S, Quirk GJ. Neuronal signalling of fear memory. Nature reviews. Neuroscience. 2004; 5(11):844–852.10.1038/nrn1535
14. Fanselow MS, Poulos AM. The neuroscience of mammalian associative learning. Annual review of psychology. 2005; 56:207–234.10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070213
15. Ladd CO, Huot RL, Thrivikraman KV, Nemeroff CB, Meaney MJ, Plotsky PM. Long-term behavioral and neuroendocrine adaptations to adverse early experience. Progress in brain research. 2000; 122:81–103. [PubMed: 10737052]

16. McEwen BS. Physiology and neurobiology of stress and adaptation: central role of the brain. Physiological reviews. 2007; 87(3):873–904.10.1152/physrev.00041.2006 [PubMed: 17615391]
17. Kosten TA, Lee HJ, Kim JJ. Early life stress impairs fear conditioning in adult male and female rats. Brain research. 2006; 1087(1):142–150.10.1016/j.brainres.2006.03.009 [PubMed: 16626646]
18. Rau V, DeCola JP, Fanselow MS. Stress-induced enhancement of fear learning: an animal model of posttraumatic stress disorder. Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews. 2005; 29(8):1207–1223.10.1016/j.neubiorev.2005.04.010 [PubMed: 16095698]
19. Reger ML, Poulos AM, Buen F, Giza CC, Hovda DA, Fanselow MS. Concussive brain injury enhances fear learning and excitatory processing in the amygdala. Biological Psychiatry. 2012; 71(4):335–343. [PubMed: 22169439]
20. Poulos AM, Li V, Sterlace S, Tokushige F, Ponnusamy R, Fanselow MS. Persistence of Fear Memories Across Time Requires the Basolateral Amygdala Complex. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2009; 106(28):11737–41.10.1073/pnas.0905257106
21. Raineki C, Holman P, Debiec J, Bugg M, Beasley A, Sullivan RM. Functional Emergence of the Hippocampus in Context Learning in Infant Rats. Hippocampus. 2010; 20(9):1037–1046. [PubMed: 19739248]
22. Korte SM, De Boer SF, Bohus B. Fear-potentiation in the elevated plus-maze test depends on stressor controllability and fear conditioning. Stress (Amsterdam, Netherlands). 1999; 3(1):27–40.10.3109/10253899909001110
23. Vermetten E, Bremner JD. Olfaction as a traumatic reminder in posttraumatic stress disorder: case reports and review. The Journal of clinical psychiatry. 2003; 64(2):202–207. [PubMed: 12633130]
24. Bowers WJ, Gingras MA, Amit Z. Time-dependent exacerbation of amphetamine-induced taste aversion following exposure to footshock. Psychopharmacology. 1996; 125(1):43–49. [PubMed: 8724447]
25. Kim JJ, Fanselow MS. Modality-specific retrograde amnesia of fear. Science. 1992; 256(5057):675–677. [PubMed: 1585183]
26. Phillips RG, LeDoux JE. Differential contributions of amygdala and hippocampus to contextual fear conditioning. Behavioral Neuroscience. 1992; 106(2):274–285. [PubMed: 1590953]
27. Sullivan RM, Landers M, Yeaman B, Wilson DA. Good memories of bad events in infancy. Nature. 2000; 407(6800):38–39.10.1038/35024156 [PubMed: 10993064]
28. Pugh CR, Tremblay D, Fleshner M, Rudy RW. A selective role for corticosterone in contextual-fear conditioning. Behavioral Neuroscience. 1997; 111(3):503–511. [PubMed: 9189265]
29. Yehuda R, Teicher MH, Levengood RA, Trestman RL, Siever LJ. Circadian regulation of basal cortisol levels in posttraumatic stress disorder. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 1994; 746:378–380. (n.d.). [PubMed: 7825891]
30. Lanius RA, Frewen PA, Vermetten E, Yehuda R. Fear conditioning and early life vulnerabilities: two distinct pathways of emotional dysregulation and brain dysfunction in PTSD. European journal of psychotraumatology. 2010:1.10.3402/ejpt.v1i0.5467
31. Geuze E, van Wingen GA, van Zuiden M, Rademaker AR, Vermetten E, Kavelaars A, Heijnen CJ. Glucocorticoid receptor number predicts increase in amygdala activity after severe stress. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2012; 37(11):1837–1844.10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.03.017 [PubMed: 22503140]
32. Kavushansky A, Richter-Levin G. Effects of stress and corticosterone on activity and plasticity in the amygdala. Journal of neuroscience research. 2006; 84(7):1580–1587.10.1002/jnr.21058 [PubMed: 16998919]
33. Conrad CD, MacMillan DD, Tsekhanov S, Wright RL, Baran SE, Fuchs RA. Influence of chronic corticosterone and glucocorticoid receptors antagonism in the amygdala on fear conditioning. Neurobiology of Learning and Memory. 2004; 81(3):185–199. [PubMed: 15082020]
34. Verma D, Tasan RO, Herzog H, Sperk G. NPY controls fear conditioning and fear extinction by combined action on Y_1 and Y_2 receptors. British journal of pharmacology. 2012; 166(4):1461–1473.10.1111/j.1476-5381.2012.01872.x [PubMed: 22289084]
35. Gutman AR, Yang Y, Ressler KJ, Davis M. The role of neuropeptide Y in the expression and extinction of fear-potentiated startle. The Journal of neuroscience: the official journal of the

Society for Neuroscience. 2008; 28(48):12682–12690.10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2305-08.2008 [PubMed: 19036961]

36. McKlveen JM, Myers B, Flak JN, Budzikova J, Solomon MB, Seroogy KB, Herman JP. Role of the Prefrontal Cortex Glucocorticoid Receptors in Stress and Emotion. Biological Psychiatry. 2013 S0006-3223(13)00310-7. Epub ahead of print. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.03.024
37. Landers MS, Sullivan RG. The development and neurobiology of infant attachment and fear. Developmental Neuroscience. 2012; 34(2–3):101–114. [PubMed: 22571921]
38. Campbell BA, Campbell EH. Retention and extinction of learned fear in infant and adult rats. Journal of Comparative Physiological Psychology. 1962; 55:1–8. [PubMed: 13876002]
39. Mckee RD, Squire LR. On the development of declarative memory. Journal of Experimental Learning Memory and Cognition. 1993; 19(2):397–404.
40. Josselyn SA, Frankland PW. Infantile amnesia: a neurogenic hypothesis. Learning and Memory. 2012; 10(9):423–433. [PubMed: 22904373]
41. Rudy JW, Sutherland RJ. The hippocampal formation is necessary for rats to learn and remember configural discriminations. Behavioral Brain Research. 1989; 34(1–2):978–109.
42. Yehuda R, Seckl J. Minireview: Stress-related psychiatric disorders with low cortisol levels: a metabolic hypothesis. Endocrinology. 2011; 152(12):4496–4503. [PubMed: 21971152]
43. Rasmussen AM, Hauger RL, Morgan CA, Bremner JD, Charney DS, Southwick SM. Low baseline and yohimbine-stimulated plasma neuropeptide Y (NPY) levels in combat-related PTSD. Biological Psychiatry. 2000; 47(6):526–539. [PubMed: 10715359]
44. Sah R, Ekhator NN, Strawn JR, Sallee FR, Baker DG, Horn PS, Geracioti TD Jr. Low cerebrospinal fluid neuropeptide Y concentrations in posttraumatic stress disorder. Biological Psychiatry. 2009; 66(7):705–707. [PubMed: 19576571]
45. Young SL, Bohenek DL, Fanselow MS. NMDA processes mediate anterograde amnesia of contextual fear conditioning induced by hippocampal damage: immunization against amnesia by context preexposure. Behavioral Neuroscience. 1994; 108(1):19–29. [PubMed: 8192845]
46. Rudy JW, Sutherland RJ. Configural association theory and the hippocampal formation: an appraisal and reconfiguration. Hippocampus. 1995; 5(5):375–389. [PubMed: 8773252]



Figure 1.

Experimental Design: Post-natal (P) 19 rats, were placed in a conditioning context and received No shock (Un-Shk) or 15 Shks and tested 2 months later. *Experiment 1* – At P78-81 subjects were tested for Context fear memory (CXT), sensitization (SEN) and generalization (GEN). *Experiment 2* – At P78-81 in separate group of animals, subjects were tested in Elevated plus maze or Odor Aversion and CXT and SEN. *Experiment 3* – At P78-79 in separate group of animals, subjects were sacrificed and trunk blood was collected to analyze plasma CORT. *Experiment 4* – At P78-79 in a portion of animals sacrificed in experiment 3, brains were removed for western blot analysis for glucocorticoid (GR) and neuropeptide Y1 (NPY1-R) receptor proteins.



Figure 2.

Percent freezing was used to assess trauma related context fear memory (CXT), sensitization (SEN) and generalization (GEN) of fear. a) Group 1 – Initially tested for CXT, followed by SEN and then GEN. b) Group – Initially tested for SEN, followed by CXT. (* denotes $p < .05$)



Figure 3.

Total time (sec) spent in the open arms of an elevated plus maze was used to assess anxiety. Also, depicted is total time closed arm and central portion of maze. (* denotes $p < .05$)



Figure 4.

Percent time was used to assess odor aversion across 4 trials. Plotted are the mean percent time each group explored 1 of 3 compartments baited with: a) Early Trauma Odor (simple green), b) Familiar Odor (new cage bedding) and c) Neutral (no odor). (* denotes $p < .05$). d) Percent freezing was used to assess fear during CXT and SEN.



Figure 5.

Total plasma concentration of CORT across 24 hours: Light Phase (7AM – 7PM) and Dark Phase (7PM – 7AM). Each data point represents mean CORT collected from trunk blood at 1 of 4 time points.



Figure 6.

Percent change in protein levels in Shocked from Un-Shocked within the Amygdala, Hippocampus and Medial Prefrontal cortex. a) The Glucocorticoid receptor (GR) b) The Neuropeptide Y1 receptor (NPY1-R). (* denotes $p < .05$)



Figure 7.

Scatter plot of Normalized (to Un-shocked controls) level of total GR as compared to NPY1 R for individual subjects. a) Amygdala: Shocked, b) UnShocked, Hippocampus: Shocked, c) Un-Shocked, d) Medial Prefrontal Cortex: e) Shocked f) Un-Shocked. (* denotes $p < .05$)

Table 1

Fear Conditioning		Context Configuration			
	Context	**Visual/Tactile**	**Auditory**	**Odor**	**Transport**
P19-Fear Conditioning (15 trials) **Adult**-TrM Test	**"A"**	• Light • Evenly spaced floor bars	Internal Ventilation fan	Simple Green	Homecage + Cart + Black Plastic cover
Adult- Sensitization Trial **Adult**-Sensitization Test	**"B"**	• No Light • A frame insert • Vertically staggered floor bars	None	Acetic Acid	Black box + Cart+ Opaque Cover
Adult- Context Generalization Test	**"C"**	• Blue light • Oval background • Solid white floor	External Fan	Windex	Homecage + Cart + White sheet cover