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20 **Abstract**

21 Habituating to the constant stimuli in the environment is a critical learning process conserved across species.

22 We use a larval zebraﬁsh visual response to sudden darkness as a model for studying habituation learning,

23 where zebraﬁsh reduce their responses to repeated stimulations. In this paradigm, treatment with estradiol

24 strongly increases learning rate, resulting in more strongly suppressed responses. We used mutant lines for the

25 Estrogen Receptors (*esr1*, *esr2a*, *esr2b*, *gper1*) in an attempt to identify the receptor(s) mediating these effects.

26 These experiments failed to identify a necessary receptor (or combination of receptors). Surprisingly, *esr1*, *esr2a*,

27 and *gper1* mutants showed weak but consistent increases in habituation, indicating these receptors suppress

28 habituation learning. These experiments demonstrate that estradiol is a complex modulator of learning in our

29 model, where the learning-promoting effects are mediated by an unidentiﬁed estradiol target, and the classical

30 Estrogen Receptors act in competition to subtly suppress learning.

31

32 **Introduction**

33 A primary function of the brain is to learn from experiences and adjust behavior in response. One aspect of

34 learned behaviour involves sharpening attention and behavioural resources toward salient cues by ignoring

35 irrelevant background stimuli. For instance, it may be critical to recognize the alarm calls of a nearby animal,

36 whereas continually registering the steady hum from distant traﬃc is far less important. The capacity to reduce

37 responses to repetitive, non-essential stimuli is known as habituation, which is considered the simplest form

38 of learning and memory [[1](#_bookmark0)].

39 We study a paradigm for long-term habituation where larval zebraﬁsh reduce their responsiveness

40 to sudden pulses of whole-ﬁeld darkness, or dark ﬂashes (DFs) [[2](#_bookmark1), [3](#_bookmark2), [4](#_bookmark3)]. We recently reported that

41 multiple hormonal signaling pathways show strong modulation of habituation learning performance, including

42 melatonin, progesterone, and estrogen [[4](#_bookmark3)]. The ability of these signaling pathways to modulate learning is

43 consistent with previous results in other systems and paradigms [[5](#_bookmark4), [6](#_bookmark5), [7](#_bookmark6), [8](#_bookmark7), [9](#_bookmark8), [10](#_bookmark9), [11](#_bookmark10)], and may be an important

44 mechanism to shift learning and memory performance or strategies based on biological rhythms or external

45 ﬂuctuations like seasons, weather or the day/night cycle.

46 In this project we have focused on estrogen signaling. We identiﬁed multiple estradiol analogs which

47 strongly increased habituation learning when bath applied at 5-10µM doses (ethinyl estradiol, estradiol valerate,

48 and hexestrol, [[4](#_bookmark3)]). 17β-estradiol (here referred to as estradiol) is the most potent and biologically active form

49 of estrogen, and is used in a variety of clinical contexts including contraception, hormone replacement therapy,

50 and feminizing hormone therapy [[12](#_bookmark11), [13](#_bookmark12), [14](#_bookmark13)].

51 Our discovery of a role for estradiol in promoting habituation learning is not surprising, as it has

52 well documented effects on other learning and memory processes [[15](#_bookmark14)]. This has been most extensively

53 characterized in the hippocampus, where estradiol promotes behavioural performance and the cellular/circuit

54 hallmarks of hippocampal plasticity, including Long-term potentiation (LTP) and modulation of dendritic spine

55 density [[16](#_bookmark15), [17](#_bookmark16), [18](#_bookmark17), [5](#_bookmark4)]. While the role of estradiol in habituation is less well explored, it has previously been

56 shown to increase memory retention for olfactory habituation in mice [[7](#_bookmark6)], indicating it plays conserved roles in

57 plasticity regulation across paradigms.

58 Estradiol signals via two established classes of Estrogen Receptors (ERs): the ligand-activated transcription

59 factors ERα, and ERβ, and the seven-transmembrane G-protein coupled receptor Gper1. ERα and ERβ mediate

60 long-term, genomic effects of estrogens through transcriptional regulation of target genes. However, both ERα

61 and ERβ are also present at the cell membrane, where they contribute to rapid, non-genomic, or membrane-

62 initiated estrogen signaling. Gper1 also mediates rapid estrogen-induced physiological responses via

63 membrane-initiated signaling pathways involving various G-proteins, and potentially through transactivation

64 of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) [[19](#_bookmark18), [20](#_bookmark19), [21](#_bookmark20)]. In this way, Gper1 signalling impacts multiple

65 core second-messenger systems, including: adenylyl cyclase, ERK, PI3K-Akt, and nitric oxide synthase. There

66 is evidence from receptor-speciﬁc pharmacology and genetic/mutant experiments in mice for a role of all of

67 these receptors in hippocampal plasticity [[18](#_bookmark17), [22](#_bookmark21), [23](#_bookmark22)].

68 Pharmacological experiments in adult zebraﬁsh indicate that ERα and ERβ are involved in the consolidation

69 of object recognition memory, while Gper1 is involved in the consolidation of object placement memory [[6](#_bookmark5)].

70 Therefore, both classes of receptors are good candidates for plasticity regulation in zebraﬁsh. However, we

71 are unaware of any previous studies using mutant lines to test for the function of zebraﬁsh ERs in learning or

72 memory.

73 In this project we aimed to identify the relevant ER(s) mediating the effects of estradiol on habituation using

74 mutant alleles. Zebraﬁsh have single gene encoding ERα (ER1, *esr1*) and Gper1 (*gper1*), and two homologs of

75 ERβ: ER2a (*esr2a*) and ER2b (*esr2a*) [[24](#_bookmark23), [25](#_bookmark24)]. We found that none of these mutants were insensitive to estradiol’s

76 effects, indicating that estradiol acts in this context via an alternative receptor or pathway. Surprisingly, our

77 experiments found that mutants for *esr1*, *esr2a*, and *gper1* actually habituate more than their sibling controls.

78 While the effect size is small and behavioural-genetic experiments can be variable, these data indicate that

79 these ERs actually act to inhibit habituation learning, rather than mediating the habituation-promoting effects

80 of estradiol that we observe pharmacologically.

81 **Materials and Methods**

82 **Animals**

83 All experiments were performed on larval zebraﬁsh at 5 days post fertilization (dpf), raised at a density of ≈1

84 larvae/mL of E3 media supplemented with 0.02% HEPES pH 7.2. Larvae were raised in a 14:10h light/dark

85 cycle at 28-29°C. Adult zebraﬁsh were housed, cared for, and bred at the following zebraﬁsh facilities: Plateau

86 de Recherche Expérimentale en Criblage In Vivo (PRECI, SFR Biosciences, Lyon) and the Animalerie Zebraﬁsh

87 Rockefeller (AZR, SFR Santé Lyon Est, Lyon). Adult zebraﬁsh used to generate larvae were housed in accordance

88 with regulations of the PRECI and AZR facilities, which are regulated by an internal animal wellbeing committee,

89 and were approved by the animal welfare committee (comité d’éthique en expérimentation animale de la

90 Région Rhône-Alpes: CECCAPP, Agreement # C693870602). Behaviour experiments were performed at the

91 5dpf stage, and are thus not subject to ethical review, but these procedures do not harm the larvae.

92 Mutant lines were obtained from D. Gorelick’s lab, and were of the following alleles:

93 *esr1uab118* is a 4bp deletion (ZDB-ALT-180420-2), yielding a predicted null frameshift/stop mutation,

94 conﬁrmed by a lack of estradiol responsiveness in the heart as assayed by *Tg(5xERE:GFP)c262* expression [[24](#_bookmark23)].

95 *esr2auab134* is a 2bp deletion (ZDB-ALT-180420-3), yielding a predicted null frameshift/stop mutation [[24](#_bookmark23)]

96 *esr2buab127* is a 4bp deletion (ZDB-ALT-180420-4), yielding a predicted null frameshift/stop mutation,

97 conﬁrmed by a lack of estradiol responsiveness in the liver as assayed by *Tg(5xERE:GFP)c262* expression [[24](#_bookmark23)].

98 *gper1uab102* is a 133bp deletion (ZDB-ALT-180420-1), yielding a predicted null frameshift/stop mutation,

99 conﬁrmed by a lack of estradiol responsiveness in heart beating rate in maternal-zygotic mutants [[24](#_bookmark23)].

100 **Genotyping**

101 *esr1uab118* was genotyped by PCR using the forward/reverse primer pair:

102 GCTGGTCACCTTGAATGCTT/TGAGATGTGAGAGATGACTAGGA with a TM of 58°C yielding a 381 bp PCR product

103 that was digested with the restriction enzyme ApeKI. The mutant product is not digested, and the wild type has

104 two bands at 177 and 204 bp.

105 *esr2auab134* was genotypes by PCR using the forward/reverse primer pair:

106 CTTCAGCTGCAGGAAGTGGA/AAAGTCGGGCTTAGCGACTG with a TM of 58°C yielding a 236 bp PCR product that

107 was digested with the restriction enzyme MboI. The mutant product is not digested, and the wild type has two

108 bands at 180 and 56 bp

109 *esr2buab127* was genotypes by PCR using the forward/reverse primer pair:

110 TGGGCCTGAGATGCAGTAGT/GTGTGTGTCTTGGCCTCCTC with a TM of 60°C yielding a 431 bp PCR product that

111 was digested with the restriction enzyme MbiI. The mutant product is digested into two bands of 150 and 281

112 bp and the wild type into 3 bands of 78, 150 and 198 bp.

113 *gper1uab102* was genotypes by PCR using the forward/reverse primer pair:

114 ATGGAGGAGCAGACTACCAATGTG/CCATCCAGATGAGGCTGCAA with a TM of 60°C yielding a mutant product of

115 372bp and a wild type product of 505 bp.

116 **Pharmacology**

117 β-Estradiol (Sigma E2758, here referred to as "estradiol") was dissolved in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and stored

118 at -20°C. Larvae were treated with estradiol immediately before the behavioural assay by pipetting 10-30uL of

119 10x solution directly into the behavioural wells, always with a ﬁnal concentration of 0.1% DMSO in E3.

120 **Habituation behaviour testing**

121 Larval behavior was evaluated in 300-well plates using an updated version of the experimental setup previously

122 described [[3](#_bookmark2), [4](#_bookmark3)]. Brieﬂy, 300-well plates were custom made using laser-cut acrylic sheets where each well

123 measures 8 mm in diameter and 6 mm in depth, corresponding to an approximate water volume of 300 µL.

124 These plates are suspended under a water bath held at 31°C, acting as a heated lid to minimize condensation

125 and maintain a 29°C water temperature within each well. Behavioral recordings were made using a Mikrotron

126 CXP-4 camera running at 444hz in conjunction with a Silicon Software frame grabber (Marathon ACX-QP, Basler),

127 illuminated by IR LEDs (TSHF5410, digikey.com). Visual stimuli were presented using a rectangular array of 155

128 WS2813 RGB LEDs (144LED/M, aliexpress.com). For the DF stimulus, the LEDs were brieﬂy switched off (1 s),

129 then linearly returned to the original brightness over a 20 s interval. Vibration/Tap stimuli were administered

130 using a solenoid (ROB-10391, Sparkfun). This behavioral paradigm was designed to be symmetrical: each 1

131 hr block of stimulation was followed by 1 hr of rest. During these rest periods, the camera was moves using

132 a stepper motor controlled linear actuator (Hanpose HPV4, 500cm), which moved the camera between two

133 plates, allowing us to screen up to 600 ﬁsh per experiment across two 300-well plates.

134 Control of the apparatus (RGB LEDs, solenoid, camera linear actuator) was implemented via a Raspberry

135 Pi Pico microcontroller running CircuitPython (https://circuitpython.org/) (code : [code.py](https://github.com/owenrandlett/2025_HabEstrogen/tree/main/code/RigControl/PiPicro)) and custom Python

136 software which handled the camera acquisition via the [Python wrapper of the Silicon Software Framegrabber](https://docs.baslerweb.com/frame-grabbers/python-wrapper)

137 [SDK](https://docs.baslerweb.com/frame-grabbers/python-wrapper), triggered stimuli via the Raspberry Pi Pico, and tracked the head and tail coordinates of the larvae across

138 the 300-wells at a baseline framerate of between 20-30hz (code : [Run\_BigRig2.py](https://github.com/owenrandlett/2025_HabEstrogen/blob/main/code/RigControl/Run_BigRig2.py)). When a stimulus is delivered

139 (DF or Vibration/Tap), a 1-second "Burst" video is recorded at the full frame rate as a Tiff ﬁle, from which the head

140 and tail coordinates are subsequently tracked oﬄine (code : [TrackBurst\_BigRig.py](https://github.com/owenrandlett/2025_HabEstrogen/blob/main/code/RigControl/TrackBurst_BigRig.py)). Larval zebraﬁsh tracking

141 was done via background subtraction and morphological operations implemented using multiple open-source

142 packages, including: OpenCV [[26](#_bookmark25)], scikit-image [[27](#_bookmark26)], NumPy [[28](#_bookmark27)], SciPy [[29](#_bookmark28)], and Numba [[30](#_bookmark29)].

143 **Data analysis**

144 Data was analyzed in Python using custom written analysis scripts (code : [Analyze\_EsrHab.py](https://github.com/owenrandlett/2025_HabEstrogen/blob/main/code/Analyze_EsrHab.py)). Responses to

145 DFs and vibration/taps were identiﬁed as movement events that had a cumulative tail bend angle greater than

146 3 radian (O-bend)and 1 radian (C-bend), respectively. Data was analyzed using multiple open-source packages,

147 including: NumPy [[28](#_bookmark27)], SciPy [[29](#_bookmark28)],Numba [[30](#_bookmark29)] and Pandas [[31](#_bookmark30)]. Data was plotted using Matplotlib [[32](#_bookmark31)] and

148 seaborn [[33](#_bookmark32)]. Statistical "signiﬁcance" between the distributions was tested using the Mann-Whitney U test

149 implemented in Scipy [[29](#_bookmark28)].

150 The cumulative difference plots to assess changes in habituation performance for the treatments were

151 calculated as previously [[3](#_bookmark2)], where we ﬁrst calculated the average response across larvae for each group for

152 each DF. This generated a mean vector for each group. These two vectors were normalized by dividing them

153 by the naive response (mean response to the ﬁrst 5 DFs), and then the treatment group was subtracted from

154 the control group, yielding a "mean difference" vector between stimulus and controls at each ﬂash. From this

155 mean difference vector we calculated the cumulative mean distribution using Numpy’s ’nancumsum’ function

156 divided by the number of stimuli experienced, or the index of the vector. To generate statistical conﬁdence

157 in these distributions, we bootstrapped 2000 replicates, and calculated the 99.5% conﬁdence intervals using

158 SciPy’s ’stats.norm.interval’ function. The assumption of this analysis is that if the two groups are habituating

159 similarly, then the "mean difference" vector will exhibit a noise distribution centered at a mean of 0, and

160 thus the cumulative mean distribution would remain near 0. Treatments that affect habituation will show

161 strong increasing or decreasing cumulative mean distributions, reﬂecting increased or decreased habituation

162 performance throughout training, respectively. We use an empirically deﬁned threshold of ±0*.*05 as the

163 statistically meaningful effect size in this analysis, as is reﬂected in the shaded gray regions in the plots [[3](#_bookmark2)].

164 **Software and Datasets**

165 Software and analysis code is available here: <https://github.com/owenrandlett/2025_HabEstrogen>. All datasets

166 used in these analyses are available here: [HabEstrogen\_Datasets](https://gofile.me/5sdws/xF6oQhqTA).

167 **Results**

# 168 Estradiol increases visual habituation learning

169 In response to a sudden global darkening stimulus, which we refer to as a dark ﬂash (DF), larval zebraﬁsh

170 execute an "O-bend" maneuver, characterized by a deep "O"-shaped bend and a high-amplitude turn ([[34](#_bookmark33)],

171 [***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)a). Habituation learning manifests as a progressive reduction in response to repeated stimuli, and this

172 learning can be retained for seconds/minutes, or hours/days for short-, and long-term habituation, respectively

173 [[1](#_bookmark0)]. We use high-speed cameras, machine-vision analysis, and 300-well plates to quantify habituation across

174 large populations of larvae to identify molecular/genetic mechanisms of long-term habituation ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)A,B, [[3](#_bookmark2),

175 [4](#_bookmark3)]). When stimulated with DFs repeated at 1-minute intervals in blocks of 60 stimuli, larval zebraﬁsh exhibit long-

176 term habituation, reducing not only the probability of executing a response, but also modulating the latency

177 and other kinematic aspects of the response [[3](#_bookmark2)].

178 Our previous small-molecule screening experiments identiﬁed multiple synthetic Estrogen Receptor

179 agonists as positive modulators of DF habituation learning at 5-10 µM doses, including ethinyl estradiol,

180 estradiol valerate, and hexestrol [[4](#_bookmark3)]. The major effect we observed was a stronger decrease in the probability

181 of executing a O-bend response during the training/learning blocks. We have conﬁrmed and extended these

182 results using estradiol, which is the major natural estrogen in vertebrates.

183 An acute dose of 10µM estradiol potently increases habituation learning, which is observable when the

184 response probability of the population of estradiol-treated larvae is compared with DMSO-treated vehicle

185 controls ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)C-H). Consistent with our previous experiments [[4](#_bookmark3)], there is a reduction in the naive

186 responsiveness of the estradiol-treated larvae to the ﬁrst DF stimuli ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)D), but the major effect is observed

187 during the training phase ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)C,E,F), as is revealed by the consistent positive deviation in the cumulative

188 mean difference (CMD) plots that are normalized to the naive response level in order to quantify response

189 suppression indicative of habituation performance ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)H, [[3](#_bookmark2)]). Importantly, the responsiveness of the

190 larvae to vibration stimuli delivered after the DF stimulation ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)Ci), which elicit c-bend escape responses

191 [[35](#_bookmark34)], is indistinguishable from controls ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49)G). From this we conclude that estradiol does not affect global

192 arousal levels but rather has speciﬁc effects on habituation learning.

# 193 Gper1 is dispensable for estradiol-promoted habituation learning

194 The effects of estradiol that we have observed occur very rapidly – larvae are only pretreated with estradiol

195 for ≈25min-1hr before the ﬁrst DF. This is the time necessary to set the apparatus and begin the experiment.

196 Since ERα and ERβ are thought to primarily exert their effects via transcriptional alterations, this necessitates a

197 delay in this aspect of their signaling. For this reason, we ﬁrst hypothesized that membrane-initiated signaling

198 through Gper1 was the most likely mechanism.

199 To test this we used the *gper1uab102* mutant [[24](#_bookmark23)], and generated larvae from *gper1uab102* heterozygous or

200 homo/heterozygous crosses to generate clutches of larvae of mixed genotypes. Larvae were treated with

201 estradiol during habituation, and were subsequently genotyped. We reasoned that if *gper1* is required for the

202 effect of estradiol on habituation, mutants would be insensitive to estradiol and habituate signiﬁcantly less than

203 sibling controls. Contrary to this hypothesis, we found that *gper1* mutants showed no deﬁcits in habituation

204 (***[Figure 2](#_bookmark50)***). Remarkably, rather than observing the anticipated inhibition of habituation, *gper1* mutants appeared

205 to habituate slightly more than controls, with the responsiveness level slightly but consistently below the sibling

206 controls across stimuli ([***Figure 2***](#_bookmark50)A). This is further supported by a weak but statistically signiﬁcant decrease

207 in the responsiveness of the larvae during the training period ([***Figure 2***](#_bookmark50)D), and a deviation towards positive

208 values in the CMD plot ([***Figure 2***](#_bookmark50)F). From these experiments we conclude that Gper1 agonism does not promote

209 habituation learning, but rather may act to suppress it.

# 210 ERα and ERβ are dispensable for estradiol-promoted habituation learning

211 Since we found that *gper1* was unnecessary for the habituating-promoting effects of estradiol, we next focused

212 on the three other ERs in the zebraﬁsh genome: *esr1*, *esr2a* and *esr2a*. While we initially prioritized Gper1 due to

213 its rapid signaling properties that aligned with the rapid actions of estradiol on habituation, it is equally possible

214 that the rapid membrane-initiated actions of ERα and/or ERβ could underlie these effects. Using the same

215 strategy as for *gper1*, we analyzed previously established mutants (*esr2auab134*, *esr2auab134*, and *esr2buab127*),

216 looking for a mutant with insensitivity to estradiol. However, we failed to identify any deﬁcits in habituation

217 (***[Figure 3](#_bookmark51)***). To our surprise, we again found that both *esr1* and *esr2a* mutants showed subtle increases in

218 habituation ([***Figure 3***](#_bookmark51)Avi,Bvi), similar in magnitude to what we had seen for *gper1* mutants ([***Figure 2***](#_bookmark50)F). From

219 these data we conclude that none of the identiﬁed ERs are required for the effects of estradiol on promoting

220 habituation. As for Gper1, ER1 and ER2a show a weak inhibitory effect on habituation, indicating that they also

221 act to suppress habituation learning.

# 222 ERα and ERβ are simultaneously dispensable for estradiol-promoted habituation

223 **learning**

224 While our experiments demonstrated that *esr1*, *esr2a* and *esr2a* mutants remain sensitive to estradiol, it is

225 plausible that they could act in a redundant fashion to mediate the effects of estradiol on habituation, perhaps

226 via co-expression in a critical cell type, or via genetic compensation [[36](#_bookmark35)]. To test for this possibility, we generated

227 combinations of mutants by crossing individual lines together ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)). A likely scenario could be that the two

228 ERβ paralogs, ER2a and ER2b, act redundantly. However, we found that double mutants for *esr2a;esr2b* did not

229 show habituation deﬁcits ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)A). Neither did we observe suppression of habituation in double mutants

230 for *esr1;esr2a* ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)B), or *esr1;esr2b* ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)C). Finally, we tested triple mutants (*esr1;esr2a;esr2b*), but again

231 failed to identify suppressions in habituation ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)D).

232 We note that we did see a statistically "signiﬁcant" increase in DF responsiveness in the *esr1;esr2b* double

233 mutants ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)Cii-iv). This is attributable to a small increase in naive responsiveness, and did not result

234 from habituation deﬁcits according to our normalized CMD analysis ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)Cvi). Considering that we did

235 not observe any increased responsiveness in the triple mutants ([***Figure 4***](#_bookmark52)D), we conclude that the observed

236 increased responsiveness in the double mutants is likely a result of biological noise, that only rose to statistical

237 "signiﬁcance" due to the very large number of larvae tested in our high-throughput experiments.

238 Consistent with the paradoxical effect of increased habituation in *esr1* and *esr2a* single mutants ([***Figure 3***](#_bookmark51)A,B),

239 we again observed that double and triple mutants containing these genes also showed a slight increase in

240 habituation (with the exception of the esr1;esr2b double mutants). This adds further support to the model in

241 which ER1 and ER2b act to suppress learning in this context, rather than promote it.

# 242 Gper1, ERα, and ERβ are simultaneously dispensable for estradiol-promoted

243 **habituation learning**

244 While it is unclear to us how Gper1 might act redundantly with ERα/β, we nevertheless decided to test this

245 possibility by combining the *gper1* and the *esr1*, *esr2a*, and *esr2b* mutations ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)). As with the previous

246 iterations of this experiment, we did not ﬁnd combinations of mutants with suppressed habituation ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)).

247 Consistent with our model of (*gper1*, *esr1* and *esr2a*) having inhibitory affects on learning, we again found

248 that most of these combinations of mutants showed evidence of increased habituation ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)i,vi). While

249 the responsiveness distributions did not show signiﬁcant differences ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)ii-iv), the normalized CMD plots

250 consistently showed positive deviations, which reﬂect increased habituation ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)vi).

251 Despite the fact that we analyzed the behaviour of 1152 larvae and successfully genotyping all 4 ER genes

252 in 373 individuals (after >4600 genotyping PCRs), we were only able to identify a single quadruple mutant

253 larva lacking all known ERs ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)E). This is likely simply due to the limitations of combinatorial Mendelian

254 inheritance, and the fact that *esr1* and *esr2a* are linked on chromosome 20. While it is dubious to conclude much

255 from an n = 1 experiment, we ﬁnd it remarkable that this larva exhibits the strongest increased habituation of

256 all of our experiments, with suppression of responses ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)Ei), and strong positive deviation in the CMD

257 plot ([***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)Evi).

258 **Discussion**

# 259 The promotion of habituation learning by estradiol is mediated by an unidentiﬁed

260 **target**

261 Our experiments indicate that Gper1, ER1, ER2a and ER2b do not mediate the positive effects of estradiol on

262 habituation learning. As this is fundamentally a negative result, it is diﬃcult to conclusively demonstrate this

263 beyond any doubt. One major caveat relates to the actual functional nature of the mutant alleles that we have

264 used. These are all Cas9-generated small deletions resulting in frameshift mutations that lead to early stop

265 codons, and are thus predicted null/knockout lines. Despite this genetic conﬁdence, it is always possible that

266 residual activity could still remain, perhaps via alternate splicing or alternate start codons. This could be further

267 complicated by genetic/transcriptional compensation, where frameshift alleles can lead to the upregulation of

268 paralogs in some circumstances [[36](#_bookmark35)]. As with all negative results, it is not possible to rule out all possible

269 alternative explanations. However, we recognize that this bias against publishing negative results is bad for

270 science. Negative results from well-designed and executed experiments are of value for the community and

271 making this knowledge public is our duty as responsible scientists [[37](#_bookmark36)].

272 While the possibility of "residual activity" in our mutants is a clear limitation of our approach, we argue

273 that this alternative interpretation is very unlikely. The *esr1uab118* and *esr2buab127* alleles both exhibited a lack of

274 estradiol responsiveness in other tissues [[24](#_bookmark23)], and *esr2buab127* mutants are female sterile/subfertile (D. Gorelick,

275 personal communication), indicating a non-functional receptor. Similarly, *gper1uab102* mutants show a lack of

276 estradiol responsiveness in heart rate modulation [[24](#_bookmark23)]. Interestingly this was only observed in maternal-zygotic

277 mutants. While it seems unlikely that suﬃcient maternal mRNA/protein for Gper1 could persist in 5dpf larvae,

278 we can formally rule this out with our current datasets. The *esr2auab134* mutants have no previously published

279 phenotype, and so we do not have an independent positive control for the nature of this allele. However, the

280 best evidence we have against the "residual activity" hypothesis is that we actually found phenotypes in our

281 assays for *esr1uab118*, *esr2auab134*, and *gper1uab102* mutants. These phenotypes are just of the unexpected sign,

282 where mutants show increased habituation (discussed below).

# 283 Candidate estradiol targets that could promote habituation learning

284 We have concluded that the lack of habituation deﬁcits in our mutants is due to the presence of an alternative

285 receptor or pathway that mediates the learning-promoting effects of estradiol. In support of this model, a very

286 recent study of estradiol-induced thrombosis came to the same conclusion, namely that an unidentiﬁed target

287 mediates this process in larval zebraﬁsh [[38](#_bookmark37)]. Importantly, these thrombosis experiments were performed

288 on different knockout alleles which are full genetic deletions, in which "residual activity" is not plausible.

289 Together with our observations, these data suggest that a novel estradiol target exists which has multiple critical

290 functions (at least in zebraﬁsh).

291 What might this unidentiﬁed target be? Various leads exist in the literature. One hypothesis posits the

292 existence of an unidentiﬁed “Gq-mER” (Gq-coupled membrane estrogen receptor) [[39](#_bookmark38), [40](#_bookmark39)], and therefore

293 estradiol may signal via additional GPCRs beyond Gper1. Another possibility is an interaction between estradiol

294 and other membrane receptors, for example: the Voltage-Gated Sodium Channel Nav1.2 [[41](#_bookmark40), [42](#_bookmark41)], transient

295 receptor potential (TRP) channels [[43](#_bookmark42), [44](#_bookmark43)], or various other ion channels [[45](#_bookmark44)]. The robust nature of our

296 "non-canonical" but clearly estradiol-dependent phenotype, combined with the high-throughput nature of our

297 behavioural assays, could be an ideal assay for future screening efforts to attempt to identify novel estradiol

298 target(s).

# 299 Multiple Estrogen Receptors act to suppress habituation learning.

300 While we were surprised to ﬁnd that the classical ERs do not promote habituation, we were shocked to ﬁnd

301 evidence of the opposite! We found that *esr1uab118*, *esr2auab134*, and *gper1uab102* mutants habituate more than

302 their sibling controls ([***Figure 1***](#_bookmark49), [***Figure 2***](#_bookmark50)), consistent with a role for these ERs in inhibiting habituation. While

303 effect sizes of these magnitudes border on those that are easily dismissible as "noise", they were not only

304 observed in the single mutants experiments, but also in the double and triple mutant combinations of these

305 alleles ([***Figure 3***](#_bookmark51)-[***Figure 5***](#_bookmark54)), providing good evidence that they are biologically meaningful effects. In fact, these

306 multi-mutants generally exhibited larger effect sizes, consistent with an additive interaction.

307 Untangling the mechanisms of ER1-, ER2a- and Gper1-dependent suppression of habituation will require

308 considerable further work. The additive interaction we observed genetically indicates that the ERs act

309 cooperatively to suppress habituation learning. All three receptors are expressed in the larval zebraﬁsh brain

310 [[46](#_bookmark45), [24](#_bookmark23)], but whether they are acting in the same or different cell types awaits characterization. The study of this

311 inhibitory pathway may be challenging since it opposes the major learning-promoting effect of estradiol, and

312 therefore may be more straightforward to study after the identiﬁcation and deletion of the estradiol target that

313 promotes habituation. One attractive hypothesis relates to the observation that estradiol exposure increases

314 aromatase expression in the zebraﬁsh brain [[47](#_bookmark46), [48](#_bookmark47)]. Since aromatase catalyzes the conversion of androgens

315 into estrogens, ER mutants may have reduced levels of endogenous endogeous estrogens in the brain, which

316 could lead to inhibited habituation. Future experiments aimed at manipulating the aromatase system in wild-

317 type and ER mutant backgrounds could be used to test this hypothesis.

318 **Conclusion**

319 What began as a straightforward study to identify the receptor(s) that mediate the habituation-promoting

320 effects of estradiol has instead led us to a surprising and paradoxical result; canonical ERs do regulate

321 habituation, but are suppressive and act in opposition to the habituation-promoting effects of estradiol. This

322 ﬁts with the general theme of our studies of this habituation paradigm – we ﬁnd increasing complexity

323 and contradiction within this "simple" learning process the deeper we look. This began with our detailed

324 observations of behaviour, leading us to conclude that habituation results from a distributed plasticity process

325 that adapts different aspects of behavior independently [[3](#_bookmark2)]. We believe that this property underlies our

326 subsequent discoveries of pharmacological and genetic manipulations that can result in either speciﬁc changes

327 in speciﬁc aspects of habituation (but not others), or even opposing effects, where a single manipulation can

328 simultaneously increase and decrease habituation, depending on which component of behavior is measured

329 [[3](#_bookmark2), [4](#_bookmark3)]. This complexity appears to be a fundamental property of habituation [[49](#_bookmark48)], and that the study of

330 habituation will likely continue to surprise us, hopefully leading to unexpected insights into the nature of

331 plasticity underlying learning and memory.
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**Figure 1. Estradiol increases habituation learning.**

1. In response to a dark ﬂash (DF), larval zebraﬁsh perform a large turning manoeuvre termed an "O-bend" response.
2. High-throughput setup for recording and quantifying responsiveness using a high-speed camera recording at 444hz observing larvae in 300-well plates. Scale bar = 10mm.
3. Treatment with estradiol (red) results in more rapid and profound decreases in the probability of response to DF

stimuli during habituation training relative to DMSO vehicle controls (black). DF stimuli are delivered at 1-minute intervals, in 4 blocks of 60 stimuli, separated by 1hr of rest (from 0:00-7:00). 1.5 hours later a block of 30 vibration stimuli are

delivered at 1-minute intervals (**i**). Each dot is the probability of response to one DF. Lines are smoothed in time with a

Savitzky–Golay ﬁlter (window = 15 stimuli, order = 2).

**D-G)** Distributions responsiveness for different epochs of the experiment. Each dot is the per-ﬁsh average of the epoch. Statistical signiﬁcance was calculated using Mann-Whitney U test, \*\*\* = p < 0.001. **D)** the naive response to the ﬁrst 5 DF stimuli; **E)** the mean response to the remaining DF stimuli in the Block 1 (DFs 6:60); **F)** the trained response to the last 45 DFs in all four training blocks (DFs 16:60,76:120,136:180,196:240); **G)** the 30 vibration stimuli delivered with a tap from a solenoid on the 300-well plate platform.

**H)** Cumulative mean difference (CMD) plot quantifying relative habituation performance after estradiol treatment. These plots display the cumulative average differences in the mean response across larvae of the treatment group (estradiol) relative to the control group (DMSO). Difference from 0 reﬂect a divergence in the change in responsiveness across the

240 DF stimuli in the 4 training blocks, with positive values reﬂecting increased habituation. The widths of the line is a bootstrapped 99.5% conﬁdence intervals. The gray boxed region reﬂects the expected non-signiﬁcant effect size [[3](#_bookmark2)].

Treatment groups are: Estradiol = 10µM estradiol treatment (n = 345 ﬁsh); DMSO = 0.1% DMSO vehicle controls (n = 548 ﬁsh)
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**Figure 2. *gper1* mutants do not show habituation deﬁcits after treatment with estradiol.**

**A)** Homozygous *gper1(-/-)* mutants (n = 81 ﬁsh, purple) do not show impaired habituation relative to sibling controls (*gper1(+/-)* and *gper1(+/+)*, n = 222 ﬁsh, red). Rather, there is a slight suppression of responsiveness in the mutant group (arrows), indicating weakly increased habituation. Each dot is the probability of response to one stimulus. Lines are smoothed in time with a Savitzky–Golay ﬁlter (window = 15 stimuli, order = 2).

**B-E)** No signiﬁcant differences are observed in the responsiveness distributions for the naive response to the ﬁrst 5 DF stimuli (**B**), during the ﬁrst training block (**C**), or the vibration response (**E**), while a subtle but statistically signiﬁcant

decrease in responsiveness is observed in the trained response (**D**). Statistical signiﬁcance was calculated using Mann-Whitney U test, \* = p < 0.05.

**F)** Cumulative mean difference (CMD) plot quantifying habituation performance of mutants relative to sibling controls, consistent with slightly increased habituation rate in mutant larvae.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 474 | **Figure 3. *esr1*, *esr2a* and *esr2a* mutants do not show habituation deﬁcits after treatment with estradiol.** |
| 475 | **A)** Homozygous *esr1(-/-)* mutants (n = 231 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to sibling controls (*esr1(+/-)* and |
| 476 | *esr1(+/+)*, n = 490 ﬁsh). |
| 477 | **B)** Homozygous *esr2a(-/-)* mutants (n = 214 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to sibling controls (*esr2a(+/-)* and |
| 478 | *esr2a(+/+)*, n = 128 ﬁsh). |
| 479 | **C)** Homozygous *esr2b(-/-)* mutants (n = 205 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to sibling controls (*esr2b(+/-)* and |
| 480 | *esr2b(+/+)*, n = 542 ﬁsh). |
| 481 | **i)-vi)** For each lettered section: |
| 482 | **i)** Responsiveness to stimuli comparing homozygous mutants to sibling controls (heterozygous or wild-type). Each dot is |
| 483 | the probability of response to one stimulus. Lines are smoothed in time with a Savitzky–Golay ﬁlter (window = 15 stimuli, |
| 484 | order = 2). Suppression of responsiveness is indicated by arrows, potentially reﬂecting increased habituation. |
| 485 | **ii)-v)** Distributions responsiveness for different epochs of the experiment. Each dot is the per-ﬁsh average of the epoch. |
| 486 | Statistical signiﬁcance was calculated using Mann-Whitney U test, \* = p < 0.05, \*\* = p < 0.01. **ii)** the naive response to the |
| 487 | ﬁrst 5 DF stimuli; **iii)** the mean response to the remaining DF stimuli in the Block 1 (DFs 6:60); **iv)** the trained response to |
| 488 | the last 45 DFs in all four training blocks (DFs 16:60,76:120,136:180,196:240); **v)** the 30 vibration stimuli delivered with a |
| 489 | tap from a solenoid on the 300-well plate platform. |
| 4901 | **vi)** Cumulative mean difference (CMD) plot quantifying habituation performance of mutants relative to sibling controls |
| 492 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 493 | **Figure 4. Double and triple mutant combinations of *esr1*, *esr2a* and *esr2a* do not show habituation deﬁcits after** |
| 494 | **treatment with estradiol.** |
| 495 | **A)** Homozygous *esr2a(-/-);esr2b(-/-)* double mutants (n = 109 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to double |
| 496 | heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (*(+/?);(+/?)*, n = 120 ﬁsh). |
| 497 | **B)** Homozygous *esr1(-/-);esr2a(-/-)* double mutants (n = 6 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to double |
| 498 | heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (*(+/?);(+/?)*, n = 95 ﬁsh). |
| 499 | **C)** Homozygous *esr1(-/-);esr2b(-/-)* double mutants (n = 90 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to double |
| 500 | heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (*(+/?);(+/?)*, n = 347 ﬁsh). |
| 501 | **D)** Homozygous *esr1(-/-);esr2a(-/-);esr2b(-/-)* triple mutants (n = 9 ﬁsh) do not show impaired habituation relative to triple |
| 502 | heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (*(+/?);(+/?);(+/?)*, n = 106 ﬁsh). |
| 503 | **i)-vi)** For each lettered section: |
| 504 | **i)** Responsiveness to stimuli comparing homozygous mutants to sibling controls (heterozygous or wild-type). Each dot is |
| 505 | the probability of response to one stimulus. Lines are smoothed in time with a Savitzky–Golay ﬁlter (window = 15 stimuli, |
| 506 | order = 2). |
| 507 | **ii)-v)** Distributions responsiveness for different epochs of the experiment. Each dot is the per-ﬁsh average of the epoch. |
| 508 | Statistical signiﬁcance was calculated using Mann-Whitney U test, \* = p < 0.05, \*\* = p < 0.01. **ii)** the naive response to the |
| 509 | ﬁrst 5 DF stimuli; **iii)** the mean response to the remaining DF stimuli in the Block 1 (DFs 6:60); **iv)** the trained response to |
| 510 | the last 45 DFs in all four training blocks (DFs 16:60,76:120,136:180,196:240); **v)** the 30 vibration stimuli delivered with a |
| 511 | tap from a solenoid on the 300-well plate platform. |
| 5123 | **vi)** Cumulative mean difference (CMD) plot quantifying habituation performance of mutants relative to sibling controls. |
| 514 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 515 | **Figure 5. Double, triple and quadruple mutant combinations of *esr1*, *esr2a*, *esr2a*, and *gper1* do not show** |
| 516 | **habituation deﬁcits after treatment with estradiol.** |
| 517 | **A)** Homozygous *esr1(-/-);gper1(-/-)* double mutants (n = 34 ﬁsh, purple) do not show impaired habituation relative to double |
| 518 | heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (n = 81 ﬁsh, red). **B)** Homozygous *esr2a(-/-);gper1(-/-)* double mutants (n = 27 |
| 519 | ﬁsh, purple) do not show impaired habituation relative to double heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (n = 81 |
| 520 | ﬁsh, red). **C)** Homozygous *esr2b(-/-);gper1(-/-)* double mutants (n = 24 ﬁsh, purple) do not show impaired habituation relative |
| 521 | to double heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (n = 81 ﬁsh, red). **D)** Homozygous *esr2a(-/-);esr2b(-/-);gper1(-/-)* triple |
| 522 | mutants (n = 35 ﬁsh, purple) do not show impaired habituation relative to heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (n |
| 523 | = 81 ﬁsh, red). **E)** A single homozygous *esr1(-/-);esr2a(-/-);esr2b(-/-);gper1(-/-)* quadruple mutant (n = 1 ﬁsh, purple) does not |
| 524 | appear to show impaired habituation relative to heterozygous or homozygous sibling controls (n = 81 ﬁsh, red). |
| 525 | **i)-vi)** For each lettered section: **i)** Responsiveness to stimuli comparing homozygous mutants to sibling controls |
| 526 | (heterozygous or wild-type). Each dot is the probability of response to one stimulus. Lines are smoothed in time with a |
| 527 | Savitzky–Golay ﬁlter (window = 15 stimuli, order = 2). **ii)-v)** Distributions responsiveness for different epochs of the |
| 528 | experiment. Each dot is the per-ﬁsh average of the epoch. Statistical signiﬁcance was calculated using Mann-Whitney U |
| 529 | test, \* = p < 0.05, \*\* = p < 0.01. **ii)** the naive response to the ﬁrst 5 DF stimuli; **iii)** the mean response to the remaining DF |
| 530 | stimuli in the Block 1 (DFs 6:60); **iv)** the trained response to the last 45 DFs in all four training blocks (DFs |
| 531 | 16:60,76:120,136:180,196:240); **v)** the 30 vibration stimuli delivered with a tap from a solenoid on the 300-well plate |
| 532 | platform. **vi)** Cumulative mean difference (CMD) plot quantifying habituation performance of mutants relative to sibling |
| 5334 | controls. As mutant larvae were all derived from the same experiments, the sibling control data (red) is the same in **A-E)**. |
| 535 |  |