

**Figure 5-Figure supplement 1**

Reacquisition to cues A and B provide a test of whether the successful blocking effect observed in the saline and muscimol groups was the result of different underlying attentional strategies. Down-regulation of attention to a cue can result in retardation of subsequent acquisition (REFS). There were no differences in the rates of learning to the blocked cue B or to the blocking cue A. **(A)** The rate of re-acquisition to cue B (day 17-19) and **(B)** cue A (day 20-21) did not differ between groups. This observation was supported by separate Group x Day mixed ANOVAs for each cue which revealed significant main effects of Day (cue B *F*(1, 22) = 9.54, *p* < .001, cue A *F*(1, 22) = 54.73, *p* < .001), but no effects of Group (cue B *F*(1, 22) = 0.13, *p* = .73, cue A *F*(1, 22) = 0.01, *p* = .92) or Group x Day interactions (cue B *F*(1, 22) = 1.99, *p* = .15, cue A *F*(1, 22) = 2.02, *p* = .17). Note: Due to experimenter error one animal in each group was tested with the wrong counterbalancing and excluded from the analysis of re-acquisition data (remaining *N* = 24, saline *n* = 12, muscimol *n* = 12). Error bars depict ± SEM.