

Full title: Mediodorsal thalamus is critical for updating during extra-dimensional shifts but not reversals in the attentional set-shifting task

Abbreviated title: Mediodorsal thalamus and choice response strategy updating

Authors: Zakaria Ouhaz^{1,2}, Brook AL Perry¹, Kouichi Nakamura³, Anna S Mitchell¹

1 – Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, The Tinsley Building, Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3SR, United Kingdom

2 – Institut Supérieur des Professions Infirmières et Techniques de la Santé, Marrakech, Morocco

3 – Medical Research Council Brain Network Dynamics Unit, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, OX1 3TH, United Kingdom

Author contributions: ZO and ASM designed research; ZO performed research; KN and BALP contributed unpublished reagents/ analytic tools; ZO, BALP, ASM analyzed data; ZO, BALP, KN, ASM wrote the paper.

Correspondence should be addressed to ASM. anna.mitchell@psy.ox.ac.uk

Number of Figures: 4 and a figure in Extended Data Figure 1-1

Number of Tables: 1

Number of words for Abstract: 146 words

Number of words for Significance: 120 words

Number of words for Introduction: 769 words

Number of words for Discussion: 3178 words

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for support received from Professor Verity Brown and Dr David Tait, who taught ZO to perform the ID/ED attentional set-shifting task during an extended visit to their research lab at St Andrews University.

Funding sources: ZO was supported by a Royal Society Newton International Fellowship, NF160862. ASM was funded by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number WT110157/Z/15/Z]. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Authors report no conflict of interest

Abstract

Cognitive flexibility, attributed to frontal cortex, is vital for navigating the complexities of everyday life. The mediodorsal thalamus (MD), interconnected to frontal cortex, may influence cognitive flexibility. Here, male rats performed an attentional set-shifting task measuring intra-dimensional and extra-dimensional shifts in sensory discriminations. MD lesion rats needed more trials to learn the rewarded sensory dimension. However, once the choice response strategy was established, learning further two-choice discriminations in the same sensory dimension, and reversals of the reward contingencies in the same dimension, were unimpaired. Critically though, MD lesion rats were impaired during the extra-dimensional shift, when they must rapidly update the optimal choice response strategy. Behavioral analyses showed MD lesion rats had significantly reduced correct within-trial second choice responses. This evidence shows that transfer of information via the MD is critical when rapid within-trial updates in established choice response strategies are required after a rule change.

Significance statement

We demonstrate for the first time that rodent mediodorsal (MD) thalamus is a critical node when choice response strategies need to change rapidly after a within-session rule change during reward-guided learning. MD interactions with orbitofrontal cortex are critical for value-based learning, while MD interactions with medial prefrontal cortex are critical for rapid within-trial updating of optimal choice response rules. MD interactions with the orbitofrontal cortex are not always necessary for reversal learning. These results indicate that the MD also contributes to attentional set-shifting. Our evidence advocates for studies investigating deficits in updating optimal choice response strategies due to potentially

65 disrupted cortico-thalamocortical transfer of information in people diagnosed with
66 Alzheimer's disease combined with more frontal pathology, Parkinson's disease, or
67 schizophrenia.

68

Introduction

Cognitive flexibility describes our ability to quickly and selectively switch our thoughts, responses, or behavior to everyday dynamic situations. This capacity to rapidly update or alter one's actions conveys evolutionary benefit and is key to survival (Koechlin et al., 2003; Rougier et al., 2005). Cognitive flexibility shows marked changes or declines in neurodegenerative disorders, like Parkinson's disease, in patients with ventral prefrontal cortex (PFC) damage, and in neurodevelopmental diseases, like schizophrenia (Andrews et al., 2006; Barch et al., 2009; Clark et al., 2004; Giraldo-Chica et al., 2018).

Cognitive flexibility is not unique to primates. Studies show that rats can readily switch between attentional sets to optimise reward outcome (Birrell and Brown, 2000; McAlonan and Brown, 2003; Newman and McGaughy, 2011). Typically, these studies have focussed on various frontal cortex subregions. Yet, it is becoming increasingly clear that the cortex does not function in isolation, but rather, relies heavily on subcortical and peripheral inputs supplied by the thalamus (Sherman and Guillery, 2002; Guillery and Sherman, 2011; Halassa and Kastner, 2017). The mediodorsal thalamus (MD) has a critical role in functions of frontal cortex during higher order cognitive processes across mammalian species (Alcaraz et al., 2018; Browning et al., 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Chakraborty et al., 2019; DeNicola et al., 2020; Ferguson and Gao, 2018; Miller et al., 2017; Mitchell and Dalrymple-Alford, 2005; Mitchell et al., 2007a,b; Mitchell and Gaffan, 2008; Parnaudeau et al., 2013; Pergola et al., 2018; Perry et al., 2021; Schmitt et al., 2017). This evidence highlights that the MD and PFC are working in partnership, contributing different but complementary roles to goal-directed behaviors (Mitchell, 2015; Perry et al., 2021).

In mammals, the MD is densely interconnected with areas of frontal cortex involved in various aspects of cognitive flexibility. Recent work shows MD projections to frontal cortex allow for the simultaneous sharing of information across multiple cortical regions.

This distributed pattern of frontal innervation by the MD appears to be especially true for the central (MDc) and medial (MDm) subdivisions, which have projections to the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), medial PFC, and frontal association areas (Alcaraz et al., 2016; Dajani and Uddin, 2015; Groenwegen, 1988; Kuramoto et al., 2017; Perry et al., 2021). Although phylogenetic differences exist in the organisation of rodent and primate frontal cortex (Preuss, 1995), similar functional contributions to aspects of cognitive flexibility are observed in monkeys and rodents after perturbations to similar areas of agranular frontal cortex (Birrell and Brown, 2000; Bissonette et al., 2008; Dias et al., 1996; Dias et al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003). Given there are similarities in neuroanatomical connectivity between agranular frontal cortex and MD in rodents and primates, it seems that cognitive flexibility and rapid updating deficits observed in monkeys with excitotoxic MD lesions (Browning et al., 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Mitchell et al., 2007a; Mitchell and Gaffan, 2008) may also extend to rodents.

Thus, in the current study, rats with excitotoxic lesions to the MD or MD Sham controls were run on a well-established test of cognitive flexibility - the intra-dimensional (ID)/ extra-dimensional (ED) attentional set-shifting task (Birrell and Brown, 2000). To test this premise and investigate any deficits in choice responding, we used the standard 7-stage version comprising of multiple subtasks all conducted within a single testing session (Birrell and Brown, 2000; Chase et al., 2012). In rats, the ID/ED task has produced dissociable deficits after permanent cortical or limbic thalamic lesions, or neuropharmacological manipulations (e.g., Linley et al., 2016; McGaughy et al., 2008; Tait et al., 2014; Tait et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2015).

In the current experiment, we predicted MD lesion rats would show deficits during the initial sensory acquisition (simple discrimination, SD) and the ED shift. Both the SD and ED subtasks require rapid, within trial learning or updating of choice response strategies.

Therefore, impaired SD and ED performance would be consistent with the selective learning deficits observed in other rodent studies after MD perturbations (Chakraborty and Mitchell, 2013, for review; Courtiol et al., 2019; Ferguson et al., 2017; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998; Mitchell and Dalrymple-Alford, 2005; Perry et al., 2021). In addition, we predicted our MD lesion rats may show deficits during reversal subtasks. MD lesions in rodents can produce reversal learning deficits, although the evidence is mixed (see Chakraborty and Mitchell, 2013 for review). However, given the reciprocal direct MD connectivity with the OFC (Groenwegen, 1988; Krettek and Price, 1977; Ray and Price, 1992), and the selective deficits observed in rodents and monkeys with OFC manipulations performing the reversal subtasks during the ID/ED attentional set-shifting task (Dias et al., 1996, McAlonan and Brown, 2003), it remained an open question.

Materials and Methods

Animals: Twenty-five Lister hooded male rats weighing between 420 and 480 gm at time of surgery (Charles River, UK) were group housed in a temperature and humidity-controlled environment ($21 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$). The housing and husbandry complied with the ARRIVE guidelines of the European Directive (2010/63/EU) for the care and use of laboratory animals. Testing was conducted in the light phase of a 12hr light/dark cycle (lights on at 7am). The rats were maintained on a controlled feeding schedule (20 g/rat/day) with water freely available in the home cage. All experimental procedures were performed in compliance with the United Kingdom Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act of 1986. A project license authorized all procedures after review by the university animal care and ethical review committee and Home Office Inspectorate.

Surgery: Rats were anesthetized by isoflurane and oxygen mix (4% induction, 1.8–2% maintenance), and given analgesia in subcutaneous injections of 0.05mg/kg buprenorphine

144 (Vetergesic; 0.3 mg/ml) and 1 mg/kg Metacam (Meloxicam; 5 mg/ml). Rats were secured in
145 a stereotaxic frame (Kopf) with atraumatic ear bars and the nose bar set to +3.3 mm to
146 achieve a level skull. A subcutaneous injection of 2 mg/kg bupivacaine (Marcaine; 2.5
147 mg/ml) was administered into the scalp in the location of the midline incision. Viscotears was
148 applied to keep the eyes moist. During surgery, each rat was placed on a heat pad and
149 covered in bubble wrap with an internal rectal thermometer probe to monitor and maintain
150 normal body temperature. Warmed sterile saline (1 ml/100 gm) was administered
151 subcutaneous into the scruff of the neck after one hour. A midline incision was performed.
152 Bregma and lambda coordinates were determined. A dental drill with a trephine head was
153 used to create a craniotomy over the midline. To maximize lesion accuracy, anterior and
154 posterior injection sites were calculated according to the bregma–lambda distance in each rat.
155 Coordinates were for anterior MD injection: anterior–posterior (AP) = – 0.395 mm, medial-
156 lateral (ML) = – 0.1 (avoiding the superior sagittal sinus, which was visible within the dura
157 inside the craniotomy) and dorsal-ventral (DV) = 0.56 mm (from dura), volume of
158 excitotoxin = 0.20 μ l; for posterior MD: AP = – 0.435 mm, ML = + 0.1 and DV = 0.57 mm
159 (from dura), volume of excitotoxin = 0.18 μ l. Fifteen rats (MD lesion) received 0.12M of
160 NMDA (N-methyl-D-Aspartate) dissolved in phosphate buffer (pH 7.20) in each hemisphere
161 from a 1 μ l-gauge Hamilton bevelled-tip syringe. The injections were performed manually,
162 taking 3 min each, and after injection the needle was left in situ for a further 3 min to allow
163 diffusion and to limit wicking of the NMDA. A further 10 rats (MD Sham controls) received
164 injections of sterile phosphate buffer instead of NMDA using the same injection coordinates.
165 Injections were given bilaterally in the MD. Upon completion of surgery, wounds were
166 sutured with Vicryl 4.0. Rats were housed singly during recovery for up to three days and
167 were then returned to their pre-surgery housing cohort. Postoperative oral analgesia, 1mg/kg
168 Metacam (Meloxicam, 1.5 mg/ml) dissolved and set in jelly was provided in individual bowls

to each rat daily for three days. Behavioral and physiological evidence showed that all rats recovered well, with normal eating and pre-surgery weights returning within 24h. Food regulation (20 gm/day/rat) started again 10d after recovery. Postoperative testing began at least 15d after surgery. The researcher was blind to the lesion group of each animal until all tests were completed.

ID/ED Attentional Set Shifting paradigm

Apparatus: The test chamber consisted of a modified Plexiglass home cage ($40 \times 70 \times 18$ cm) with Perspex dividers separating the cage into a large start chamber (40×46 cm) and two identically sized (24×20 cm) choice chambers to which access was controlled by removable Perspex doors. The digging bowls were ceramic (internal diameter 7 cm, depth 4 cm) and were placed within the choice chambers. The bowls were filled with digging media of different textures, and the digging media were scented with different spices (see **Table 1** for examples). The odor or digging media discriminations, pairs of stimuli used, and the correct stimulus within pairs were counter-balanced across subtasks and matched between groups. The bowls were baited with Honey Nut Cheerios (Nestle®), each bowl contained a hidden (securely fixed under a metal grid) Honey Nut Cheerio to serve as an odor mask. During testing, only one of the bowls was baited and rats determined which bowl was baited using either the texture of the digging medium or the odor as cues. Prior to testing, rats were taught to dig in bowls filled with home-cage bedding material to retrieve one half of a Honey Nut Cheerio. The task was performed as previously described in Birrell and Brown (2000) and divided into two phases administered on two consecutive days.

Preoperative and Postoperative Training Day: On the day before testing, each rat learnt one simple two-choice discrimination (SD) using either of the two sensory dimensions: odor (mint vs oregano), or digging media (shredded paper vs cotton pads), to a criterion of six

consecutive correct trials. The rewarded odors or digging media were counterbalanced across the two groups, and these exemplars were not used again throughout testing. Digging was defined as active digging with both front paws or active foraging with the snout in the digging media. Sniffing or touching the media with the paws was not scored as a dig.

Preoperative and Postoperative Testing paradigm: The following day, each rat was given a series of seven two-choice discriminations (subtasks) in the following order: a new simple discrimination (SD) using either of two sensory dimension (odor or digging media); a compound discrimination (CD) using the same rewarded sensory dimension and two-choice discrimination as the SD, combined with the other irrelevant sensory dimension; first reversal (REV1), in which the exemplars remained the same as in the CD but the correct (rewarded) and incorrect exemplars were reversed; intra-dimensional shift (ID), in which new exemplars were used, but the relevant sensory dimension remained the same as in the previous subtasks; second reversal (REV2), where exemplars in the ID remained the same but the reward contingencies of the two exemplars were reversed; extra-dimensional shift (ED), where new exemplars were used and the previously irrelevant sensory dimension becomes relevant; and a third reversal (REV3), where exemplars in the ED subtask remained the same but the reward contingencies of the two exemplars were reversed.

The task is self-paced and relies on the natural foraging behaviors of the rats. The first five two-choice discrimination subtasks (SD, CD, REV1, ID, REV2) must be solved by discriminating between exemplars from the same sensory dimension. In this stage of the task, the rat is rewarded for choices based on specific perceptual features of the stimuli, while ignoring other features that also distinguish the stimuli. After acquiring each set of two-choice discriminations to a performance criterion of six correct consecutive trials, the rats encounter a reversal of the reward contingencies associated with the exemplars (a reversal subtask: REV1 and REV2). For the final two subtasks (ED and REV3), exemplars from the

previously irrelevant sensory dimension become relevant. Therefore the rat must shift its attention (and adjust its choice response strategy) to the previously irrelevant sensory dimension and perceptual feature to receive reward (ED subtask). The attentional set-shifting cost is calculated by comparing trials to criterion during the intra-dimensional shift, where the sensory dimension is consistent with previous subtasks, and the extra-dimensional shift, where the now relevant sensory dimension had been previously ignored and thus requires a shift to optimise continuing to retrieve rewards.

Odor detection test: At the completion of ID/ ED testing, the olfactory abilities of the rat to smell the odor of the buried half-Honey Nut Cheerio were assessed. This task consisted of 10 consecutive trials where the rat was exposed to bowls containing similar bedding. The rat was placed in the waiting area of the set-shifting apparatus. Similar bedding-filled bowls were placed, one in each of the choice chambers, only one bowl contained half a Honey Nut Cheerio at the bottom (pseudorandomly assigned to avoid the rat developing a response strategy). The barrier was raised, allowing the rat access to both bowls. The rat had to choose to dig into one bowl and had up to 15 minutes to make a digging response on each trial. If the rat dug in the correct bowl, the trial was recorded as correct and the rat was returned to the waiting area and the barrier lowered to block access to both choice chambers. If the rat dug in the incorrect bowl, the trial was marked as incorrect. The rat was permitted to continue to explore the incorrect bowl; the trial was terminated when the rat returned to the waiting area. In all cases, the ability of each rat to detect the reward location was no different to chance guessing.

Perfusion and histology: At the end of all experimental testing, rats were deeply anaesthetized with sodium pentobarbital (Euthanol 1.0 ml/rat, 200 mg/ml: Merial, Harlow, UK), and perfused transcardially with 0.9% (w/v) saline and 4% (w/v) paraformaldehyde in 0.1M phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Brains were then removed and post-fixed overnight

(4°C), then incubated using 30% (w/v) sucrose in 0.1M PBS over 48h (4°C). Free floating sections (40 µm) were cut on a freezing microtome, the slices were then preserved in cryoprotectant (0.1M PBS containing 24% (v/v) glycerol and 24% (v/v) ethylene glycol) and stored at -20°C until required. MD thalamus lesion locations were histologically verified from cresyl violet stained brain sections.

Lesion extent: Photomicrographs of the Nissl-stained MD sections were captured using a camera mounted on a freestanding Leica DMR microscope (Leica Microsystems) using a 1.6× objective so that the whole section could be visualised in the photomicrograph. MD volumes were measured using the NIH software ImageJ (<http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/>). In each rat, the intact MD volume from both the left and the right hemisphere was assessed. The final reading was calculated according to the Cavalieri principle (Regeur and Pakkenberg, 1989) and expressed as the percentage of MD Sham controls.

Behavioral data analysis: In the behavioral experiments, all rats performed a preoperative and postoperative session, and they completed the seven two-choice discrimination subtasks in an identical order. Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation. Preoperative and postoperative mean trials to criterion, shift cost, percent correct 2nd choice within trial responses, and latency to dig (seconds) were analysed using repeated measures ANOVAs with Stage (comprising the 7 subtasks) as the within-group repeated measure and Lesion_type (MD lesion or MD Sham control) as the between-group factor. For significant interactions, posthoc simple main effects analyses were performed using additional two-way ANOVAs for repeated measures (e.g., ID/ED shift) or independent t-tests for relevant subtasks (corrected for multiple comparisons). Univariate ANOVA was used to determine if the Shift between the two sensory dimensions between the MD lesion or MD Sham control

had an effect on the number of errors performed in the ED subtask. All statistical analyses were calculated using SPSS 24 software. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

MD lesion site

Of the 25 adult rats involved in this experiment, 15 sustained MD lesions and 10 were MD Sham controls (see Materials and Methods for details). All 15 MD lesion rats had extensive excitotoxic (NMDA) lesion damage (see **Fig. 1**) within the medial and central subdivisions of the MD, as intended. In all cases the lesion affected between 80–90% of the central and medial MD, sparing only the lateral portions. The MD was consistently shrunken, and at the lesion site there was significant cell loss. In all cases, the adjacent anterior thalamic nuclei (ATN) were spared. In two cases, there was unilateral (right-sided) damage in the lateral habenulae (LHb) and some damage to the central medial nucleus lying underneath the MD.

Include Figure 1 here

The MD and attentional set-shifting

Preoperatively, rats were pseudo-randomly assigned to either of two groups: MD lesion or MD Sham control, based on the number of trials needed to reach the learning criterion (six correct consecutive trials in nine trials) during the simple discrimination (SD) subtask. Preoperative data from one MD Sham control rat had to be discarded. An independent samples t-test confirmed there was no significant difference between the two groups during preoperative learning of the SD, $t(22) = 0.095$, $p > 0.05$, with rats from both groups requiring a similar number of trials to reach criterion, MD lesion (Mean = 9.67, S.D. = 2.44) and MD

Sham control (Mean = 9.78, S.D.= 3.31). Overall trials to criterion during the preoperative training session are presented in **Fig. 2A**.

Postoperatively, a repeated measures ANOVA with Stage (7 subtasks: SD, CD, REV1 ID, REV2, ED, REV3) as the within-group factor and Lesion_type (MD lesion vs MD Sham control) as the between-group factor revealed a significant interaction, Stage \times Lesion_type, $F(6,138) = 63.65$, $p < 0.001$, a significant main effect of Stage, $F(6,138) = 184.73$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant main effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,23) = 20.22$, $p < 0.001$ (see **Fig. 2B**). To explore the interaction effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects of Stage (corrected for multiple comparisons, $p < 0.007$; alpha = 0.05 divided by 7 tests) were computed. For the SD subtask, MD lesion rats required more trials to criterion ($M = 16.67$, S.D. = 1.23) compared with MD Sham controls ($M = 9.50$; S.D. = 2.07), indicating that the rats with the MD lesion were slower to acquire the new sensory discrimination. An independent samples t-test confirmed this difference was significant, $t(23) = 10.88$, $p < 0.001$. However, once the rats with MD lesion acquired the rewarded sensory dimension (to respond either to the digging media, or to the odor), they were unimpaired in subsequent subtasks that maintained the same rewarded sensory dimension, namely concurrent discrimination (CD): $t(23) = 0.00$, $p = 1.0$, and intra-dimensional shift (ID): $t(23) = 1.08$, $p < 0.291$. MD lesion rats were also not impaired in the reversals (REV1 and REV2) of the reward contingencies associated with the learned exemplars completed after the CD subtask, REV1: $t(23) = 2.31$, $p < 0.030$, or after the ID subtask, REV2: $t(23) = 1.34$, $p < 0.192$, although, all rats were familiar with the reversal rule as they had completed the ID/ED task preoperatively (see Materials and Methods). **Extended Data Figure 1-1** shows the mean and 1st and 3rd quartile box plots with the smallest and largest numbers of postoperative trials to criterion (whiskers) for the individual rats during each of the subtasks.

Include Figure 2 here

For the extra-dimensional (ED) subtask, the rats had to shift their attention to the previously irrelevant (unrewarded) sensory dimension. Thus, given the rats had acquired the attentional set strategy, as expected, all rats required more trials to criterion to learn the ED subtask. MD Sham controls required ($M = 15.70$; $S.D. = 1.64$) more trials to learn the ED when compared to trials required to learn the ID ($M = 12.5$; $S.D. = 1.84$). Similarly, the MD lesion rats required more trials ($M = 23.47$, $S.D. = 2.07$) compared with trials to learn the ID ($M = 11.73$; $S.D. = 1.67$; see **Fig. 2B**). A repeated measures ANOVA computing the trials to criterion for these two subtasks (ID vs ED) showed a significant Stage x Lesion_type interaction, $F(1,23) = 99.96$, $p < 0.001$, a significant effect of Stage, $F(1,23) = 306.11$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,23) = 32.83$, $p < 0.001$ (see **Fig. 2B**). The interaction occurred as the MD lesion rats required significantly more trials to criterion to consistently implement a new choice strategy in order to learn which of two stimuli was rewarded from the previously ignored sensory dimension compared to the MD Sham controls, $t(23) = 10.00$, $p < 0.001$.

Interestingly, for REV3, the reversal subtask that occurred after the ED shift, MD lesion rats required fewer trials to criterion ($M = 12.13$, $S.D. = 1.25$) compared with the MD Sham controls ($M = 16.7$; $S.D. = 2.26$; see **Fig. 2B**). An independent samples t-test confirmed this difference was significant, $t(23) = 6.51$, $p < 0.001$, suggesting a facilitation in performance as a consequence of over-training experienced during the ED subtask (see discussion for interpretation).

The additional repeated measures ANOVA of Session (Preoperative vs Postoperative) shift cost (see **Fig. 3A**) between Lesion_type computed as the number of trials to criterion for the ED subtask minus the number of trials to criterion for the ID subtask for each session

showed a significant Session x Lesion_type interaction, $F(1,22) = 44.06, p < 0.001$, a significant effect of Session, $F(1,22) = 38.27, p < 0.001$, and a significant effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,22) = 15.46, p = 0.001$ (see **Fig. 3A**). The significant interaction occurred as there was a small shift cost for both groups during the preoperative test session. However, during the postoperative test session only the MD lesion rats showed a significant shift cost as a consequence of the task demands changing that required an adjustment to the previously well-established response strategy ($p < 0.001$). By contrast, the MD Sham controls showed a similar shift cost to their preoperative performance.

Insert Figure 3 here

Within trial choice responses as a measure of rapid adaptability after MD lesion

Given the observed deficits in the MD lesion group, we investigated the behavioral responses made in the MD lesion or MD Sham control rats. Given the task design and a criterion of six consecutive correct responses before switching to the next stage, overall during testing, the rats do not complete many trials. Nevertheless, we could determine whether the rats rapidly adapted their choice responses in the here and now (within trial choice responses) as measured by the number of correct 2nd choice within trial responses made, i.e. when the rat dug from the correct bowl only after visiting the incorrect bowl first but without digging in it, divided by the total number of correct responses (correct 1st and 2nd choice responses combined) for each session. During each subtask of the session, we recorded if the rat made a correct choice, either on the first attempt ('1st choice response'), or on the 2nd attempt ('2nd choice within trial response'). We did not include error trials in this analysis.

A repeated measures ANOVA of total percent correct 2nd choice within trial responses was conducted with Session (Preoperative vs Postoperative) as the repeated measure \times Lesion_type revealed a significant interaction of Session \times Lesion_type, $F(1,21) = 9.40, p = 0.006$, a significant main effect of Session, $F(1,21) = 57.06, p < 0.001$, and a significant main effect of Lesion_type, $F(1,21) = 7.18, p = 0.014$ (see **Fig. 3B**). To investigate the interaction effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects showed that the MD lesion rats ($M = 28.18, SD = 7.61$) made fewer correct 2nd choice within trial responses compared to the MD Sham controls ($M = 35.23, SD = 8.46$). This deficit suggests the MD lesion rats had a diminished ability to rapidly bind together their previous choice about what stimuli are worth sampling in order to update their choice response strategy within the trial, rather than a deficit in perseverative responding, or an inability to respond to negative feedback.

In addition, we analyzed the rats' errors made reaching criterion during the ED subtask, as a consequence of whether they experienced a sensory dimension shift from odor to digging medium or digging medium to odor, which indicated that the increase in errors occurs irrespective of the direction of the attentional shift. The univariate ANOVA with Lesion_type and Sensory Shift as the between-subject factors and errors to criterion for the ED subtask as the dependent measure revealed a main effect of Lesion_type, $F(1, 21) = 106.03, p < 0.001$, but no main effect of Sensory Shift, $F(1, 21) = 3.84, p = 0.063$ and no interaction effect, $F(1, 21) = 0.19, p = 0.666$.

Latency to dig changes

Latency to dig (in seconds) for error trials and correct trials were also computed for each rat in preoperative (see **Fig. 4A; 4C**) and postoperative (see **Fig. 4B; 4D**) analyses. Separate repeated measures ANOVAs were used to assess the latency to dig for the preoperative or

postoperative sessions for either error trials or correct trials with Stage (7 subtasks: SD, CD, REV1 ID, REV2, ED, REV3) as the within-group factor and Lesion-type (MD lesion vs MD Sham control) as the between-group factor.

For error trials (**Fig 4C**), the repeated measures ANOVA for the preoperative session revealed a significant main effect of Stage, $F(1,21) = 23.99$, $p < 0.001$, but no effect of lesion, and no interaction, F 's < 1.0 . This result indicates there was no difference in response times between the pseudo-randomly assigned groups (MD lesion and MD Sham controls) preoperatively and that all rats responded quicker on errors trials as they moved through subsequent subtasks within the session.

In contrast, the repeated measures ANOVA of latency to dig during postoperative error trials (**Fig. 4D**) revealed a significant interaction of Stage \times Lesion_type, $F(6,132) = 26.81$, $p < 0.001$, a significant main effect of Stage, $F(6,132) = 22.45$, $p < 0.001$, and a significant main effect of Lesion-type, $F(1,22) = 57.15$, $p < 0.001$. To investigate the interaction effect, *posthoc* comparisons of the simple main effects (corrected for multiple comparisons) were computed. Postoperatively, MD lesion rats responded slower on error trials during the SD subtask, $t(22) = 10.09$, $p < 0.001$, the CD subtask, $t(22) = 7.65$, $p < 0.001$, and the REV1 subtask, $t(22) = 4.44$, $p < 0.001$. However, for the final reversal subtask, REV3, completed after the ED shift, MD lesion rats were quicker on the error trials than MD Sham controls, $t(22) = 3.53$, $p = 0.002$. This result in combination with the reduced trials to criterion required to complete this subtask (see **Fig. 2A**) suggests that the MD lesion rats may have experienced overtraining due to the number of additional trials to criterion required to adapt their choice responding in the ED subtask (Dhawan et al., 2019). For correct trials, repeated measures ANOVAs for the preoperative or postoperative session showed no significant main effects and no significant interaction (p 's > 0.05).

412

413 *Insert Figure 4 here*

414

415 **4.0 Discussion**

416 This set of experiments investigated the active influence of rat mediodorsal thalamus (MD) in
417 cognitive flexibility. More specifically, we examined whether rats with excitotoxic lesions of
418 the central and medial MD were impaired in performing an attentional set-shifting task that
419 measures intra-dimensional (ID) and extra-dimensional (ED) shifts in attention to sensory
420 discriminations (digging media or odors). Our new results indicate that rats with MD lesions
421 required more trials to criterion to learn the optimal response strategy during the initial
422 simple discrimination (SD). Although, once this stable response strategy had been learnt, MD
423 lesion rats were able to attain an attentional set strategy as they acquired further two-choice
424 discriminations involving the same sensory dimension during the CD and ID shifts, and
425 during reversals (REV1 and REV2) of the reward contingencies associated to the exemplars.
426 However, when the relevant sensory dimension was switched, for the ED subtask, the MD
427 lesion rats were markedly impaired and required many more trials to update their choices
428 using a new response strategy, as measured by the significant ED shift cost. Further, for
429 REV3, the third reversal performed after the ED shift, the MD lesion rats showed facilitated
430 learning, suggesting they had received ‘overtraining’ as a consequence of completing many
431 more trials to reach criterion in the ED subtask (see below). The analyses of behavioral
432 responses indicated that the MD lesion rats made significantly fewer correct 2nd choice
433 within-trial responses suggesting that information transfer via the MD is critical for the rapid,
434 within-trial monitoring and updating of an optimal choice response. Interestingly, similar
435 updating deficits in choice responding have been previously reported in rhesus macaques
436 with magnocellular MD excitotoxic lesions (Chakraborty et al., 2016).

Learning and updating

These behavioral data accord somewhat with previous studies conducted in different species. For example, marmosets with lateral PFC lesions (Dias et al., 1996) or rats with medial PFC lesions (equivalent frontal regions; Birrell and Brown, 2000) are also impaired at the ED subtask, showing a similar ED shift cost as our MD lesion rats. However, unlike our MD lesion rats, these marmosets and rats did not need more trials to reach criterion during the SD subtask. Instead, the MD lesion rats' learning deficit during the SD subtask accords with rats that had anterior thalamic nuclei (ATN) lesions, who similarly required more trials to acquire the SD subtask (Wright et al., 2015), although these ATN lesion rats were not impaired during the ED subtask. Instead, and in contrast to our MD lesion rats, rats with ATN lesions continued to be impaired during the CD subtask and subsequent ID shifts (Wright et al., 2015) indicating that they never properly learnt the discrimination rule, which suggests an intact ATN (a brain structure adjacent to the MD but with markedly different cortico-thalamo-cortical connectivity) is important for supporting the formation of an attentional set strategy.

As already indicated, with more trials, our rats with MD lesions were able to learn the SD subtask to criterion and apply the optimal rule during subsequent subtasks. For the SD subtask, trials revert back to presenting only one sensory dimension and two stimulus exemplars. Other studies also confirm MD lesion rats are impaired in acquisition of an initial task rule (e.g. Hunt and Aggleton, 1998). Other rodent studies causing temporary perturbations to the MD also show impaired discrimination learning (Ferguson and Gao, 2018; Courtiol et al., 2019). Thus these results from across species reinforce the notion that the MD is not simply mimicking the PFC (DeNicola et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2007; Mitchell and Gaffan 2008; Mitchell et al., 2014). Consequently the influence of other cortico-cortical interactions that also indirectly transfer information to the cortex via the

MD and other thalamic structures, e.g. those PFC interactions with limbic structures in the temporal lobes and sensory association areas are also critical during learning sensory discriminations (Banjeree et al., 2020; Bueno-Junior et al., 2018; Chakraborty et al., 2019; Floresco and Grace, 2003; Mitchell, 2015; Pelekanos et al., 2020).

However, during the ED subtask, our MD lesion rats were markedly impaired at rapidly adapting this now well-established choice response strategy when they had to attend to the previously irrelevant (non-rewarded) sensory dimension. The demands on cognitive flexibility, response inhibition, and adapting behavioral responses after negative feedback are increased when the animals must make an ED shift (Dhwana et al., 2019). The increased effort involved in adapting to these changes in attention is measured by a shift cost, and it is expected that more trials to criterion are required during learning the ED than during learning the ID shift. While the ID/ED shift cost was higher for both groups (Fig. 2B), it was significantly increased for the MD lesion rats compared to the MD Sham controls. As indicated, increased shift costs have also been observed in marmosets and rats with lesions to the comparative PFC regions (Dias et al., 1996; Birrell and Brown, 2000). Surprisingly though, rats with damage to the nucleus reuniens (Re), another thalamic structure located near the MD, which interconnects the medial PFC and hippocampus (Hoover and Vertes, 2007; Hoover and Vertes, 2011; Vertes et al., 2015) do not cause deficits in the ED subtask or produce a significant ED shift cost. Instead, rats with NRe damage are impaired at acquiring the attentional set strategy, similar to rats with ATN lesions (Linley et al., 2016). Thus, our MD thalamus results are unique.

Evidence from studies in mice suggests the MD supports the frontal cortex to sustain intra-cortical attentional control without transferring categorical information about a particular task rule (Schmitt et al., 2017), or that medial PFC-MD projections are important for behavioral flexibility but not task engagement (Marton et al., 2018; Nakayama et al.,

2018). Further, the MD has been shown to have a critical role in maintaining the balance between excitation and inhibition in dorsomedial PFC via its influence on interneurons (Anastasiades et al., 2021; Ferguson and Gao, 2018) and pyramidal neurons (Collins et al., 2018; Delevich et al., 2015). Our results are supportive of these circuit level interactions, although our deficits indicate the influence of MD on frontal circuits is specific to certain aspects of the attentional set-shifting task, e.g. linked to the ED shift and learning the optimal choice response strategy, but not to the ID shift or completing reversals. However, our study involved permanent MD lesions, which are likely to have caused some adaptations across the network, while the studies in mice likely involve short-term changes as temporary inactivation of the MD was employed. Nevertheless, it may be proposed that after MD perturbations, while the animal is still able to detect a change in the task demands (i.e. they are responsive to negative feedback), they are impaired at rapidly adapting their behavior and coordinating correct choice responses within a trial after a change to the already established choice response strategy (Block et al., 2007; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998; Chakraborty et al., 2016). Interestingly though, in both these rodent studies (Block et al., 2007; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998), the learning deficits were attributed to increased perseverative responding. Others have also observed increased perseverative responding after MD perturbations (Ferguson and Gao, 2018). In contrast, our current rodent work and previous work in rhesus macaques has shown an intact MDmc is necessary for rapid reward guided learning of complex discriminations (Mitchell et al., 2007a; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Chakraborty et al., 2019), although the deficits linked to learning in monkeys are attributed to increased response switching (Mitchell et al., 2007a; Chakraborty et al., 2016). These congruent results across species after MD damage suggest that cortical information transfer via the MD is particularly important when rapid, within a trial changes in choice response strategies linked to establishing a new rule are required.

Reversal learning

For the reversal subtasks (REV1 and REV2), somewhat surprisingly, our MD lesion rats were unimpaired during reversals in the reward contingencies. Rats and marmosets with comparable medial PFC damage are also not impaired in reversal learning subtasks (Dias et al., 1996; Birrell and Brown, 2000). Instead, OFC perturbations cause deficits in the reversal subtasks, while leaving performance intact during the SD and ED subtasks of the ID/ED task (Dias et al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003; Chase et al., 2012). These observations accord with a large body of research indicating that separate mammalian PFC subregions differentially contribute to learning, memory, and other cognitive functions (e.g. Clark et al., 2004; Rudebeck et al., 2008; for review, see Dalley, Cardinal and Robbins, 2004; Uylings, Groenewegen and Kolb, 2003; Izquierdo et al., 2017).

MD is reciprocally connected to the OFC and medial PFC (Groenewegen, 1988; Preuss, 1995; Ray and Price, 1992). Thus this double dissociation in deficits between these reciprocally interconnected MD-OFC and MD-medial PFC brain regions needs to be reconciled. First, it must be noted that the MD rats had experienced all of the subtasks (and thus were familiar with the concept of reversal learning and that it can appear in the task structure) during their preoperative test session, which may have reduced or eliminated the reversal learning deficit (Costa et al., 2015; Jang et al., 2015). Further, for the MD, while previous evidence of reversal learning deficits are reported for some tasks after MD perturbations (Block et al., 2007; Chudasama et al., 2001; Ferguson and Gao, 2018; Hunt and Aggleton, 1998; Ostlund and Balliène, 2008; Parnaudeau et al., 2013, 2015), the evidence is mixed (Beracochea et al., 1989; Alcaraz et al., 2018; Fresno et al., 2019). These mixed effects may be the consequence of differences in task structure and the way that the reversal is introduced. Other factors, including the extent of disruption caused to thalamic structures adjacent to the MD may also be a factor (Mitchell and Chakraborty, 2013; Wolff and Vann,

2019). Indeed, one recent study has identified that another thalamic structure nearby to the MD - the submedial thalamus - may contribute a role in reversal learning, instead of the MD (Fresno et al., 2019). Consequently, our current results and this above evidence highlights that the information transfer between OFC and MD is not always critical for reversal learning per se. Taken together, it is clear that the MD is not simply mimicking the behavioral deficits observed after PFC damage, and instead shows that the MD and different subregions of PFC are supporting different aspects of cognitive flexibility. At least in monkeys, OFC-MDmc interactions are critical for adaptive, value based decision-making (Browning et al., 2015; Izquierdo and Murray, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2007b), while in rodent studies, the OFC-striatal part of the cortico-striatal-thalamic neural circuits have been implicating in reversal learning (Gremel and Costa, 2013; Izquierdo et al., 2017; Nakayama et al 2018; Yang et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2005) or OFC-submedial thalamus circuits (Fresno et al., 2019). Other OFC-striatal-thalamic and OFC-thalamic interactions are potentially more involved in supporting reversal learning. In addition, thalamic inputs from the intralaminar thalamic nuclei and motor thalamus to the striatum contribute a selective role in inhibitory control and behavioral flexibility (e.g. Saund et al., 2017).

Intriguingly, our additional analyses used to investigate the types of behavioral deficits occurring after MD lesions showed that our rats made fewer correct 2nd choice within-trial responses. Given that our MD lesion rats required more trials to criterion to learn the SD and ED subtasks, this change in behavioral responses suggests that without the MD thalamus, our rats could not rapidly adapt their choice responses as the trial was progressing (within-trial) after the changed task demands. However, this reduced correct 2nd choice within-trial responding does not suggest the rats adopted perseverative responding (they would have potentially been impaired in reversal learning if they had) or were not learning about the stimulus and associated rewards. We can conclude this because, after acquiring the

ED shift, the MD lesion rats required fewer trials to criterion to learn the final reversal subtask, REV3. This facilitation of learning during the final reversal subtask suggests that the MD lesion rats had experienced ‘overtraining’ on all of the stimulus features associated with each sensory dimension as they required more trials to learn the ED subtask (Dhawan et al., 2019). It is well established that overtraining rats during discrimination learning can eliminate any reversal learning deficits (Reid, 1953; Lovejoy, 1966; Nilsson et al., 2015 for review). As Pearce and Mackintosh (2010) indicate, until learning is fully consolidated, all stimulus features continue to be attended to and this seemed to be so for our rats, even with the MD lesion. Thus, we propose, in accord with others, that through experiencing these extra trials during the ED subtask, the MD lesion group may have developed a greater understanding of the rewarded and unrewarded stimulus dimensions, thus increasing the salience of the predictive cues and reducing/eliminating the number of factors that can lead to an error. In essence, these extra trials in the ED subtask helped our MD lesion rats to slowly learn the optimal response strategy so when the final reversal was encountered, they were readily able to continue to implement this optimal response strategy for the sensory dimension while simply reversing the two stimulus exemplars (something they were already well-practiced at doing). An MD lesion does not render an animal or human densely amnesic or cause them to be insensitive to the receipt of rewards (Mitchell, 2015). Instead, we are proposing that after the loss of the MD, an animal or human is unable to rapidly learn a new choice response strategy or rapidly update a well-established optimal one.

However, in the Birrell and Brown (2000) study, rats with medial PFC lesions did not show a facilitation of learning during the final reversal subtask after showing a similar ED shift cost to our MD lesion rats. We cannot be certain why medial PFC lesion rats also did not show a facilitation of learning in the final reversal subtask, although exploring whether they experience overtraining is worthy of further investigation. What is known is that the

medial PFC is proposed to contribute to learning via supporting the processing of error feedback related to adapting stimulus-action selection. For example, during instrumental learning, medial PFC lesions in rats contribute to the acquisition but not the expression of goal-directed actions (Ostlund and Balleine, 2005).

There may be other explanations for the SD and ED impairments observed in our MD lesion rats. With the ID/ ED task, it is important to establish that the animals understand the relevant sensory dimension that is rewarded across the related subtasks within the session. Fortunately, in our animals, this transfer of knowledge was evident as the MD lesion rats showed reliable learning in the subtasks, CD, REV1, ID and REV2, that required the implementation of choice responses (follow the same rule) to the same sensory dimension as the SD to receive reward. Further, both Sham controls and MD lesion rats showed similar numbers of trials to criterion during the REV1 and REV2 subtask, which indicates that they did not favor one feature of the stimulus dimension more than the other or that they were insensitive to negative feedback. However, we only used male rats in this current study so the results might not transfer to female rats. Additionally, the MD is a subcortical node in the olfactory neural circuitry that also includes the OFC (Courtiol et al., 2015; Veldhuizen et al., 2020). However, evidence collected from rodents with MD perturbations or humans with strokes affecting the MD indicates that changes to the MD do not impair olfactory discriminations (Courtiol et al., 2019; Tham et al., 2011). Moreover, our MD lesion rats showed similar levels of olfactory discriminations as the MD Sham controls (see Material and Methods for further details).

Finally, the diffuse influence of the MD thalamocortical inputs to several frontal cortex structures (Alcaraz et al., 2016; Kuramoto et al., 2017; Mitchell, 2015; Wolff and Vann, 2019) supports previous findings implicating medial PFC-MD connectivity in flexible behaviors (Marton et al., 2018; Nakayama et al., 2018). Furthermore, the MD along with the

OFC provides additional evidence for the contribution of these areas in supporting online, ‘here and now’ reward-guided learning and decision-making (Gardner et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2019; Schoenbaum et al., 2011; Wallis, 2007). Intact OFC connectivity is essential to the animals’ ability to perform reward-guided learning in order that other interconnected neural networks, likely including cortico-cortical, cortico-striatal, and cortico-thalamo-cortical connectivity, can determine the optimal choice responses and implement the appropriate actions (Browning et al 2015; Chakraborty et al 2016; Nakayama et al 2018; Perry et al., 2021; Rushworth et al., 2011).

The ID/ ED task is analogous to the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST) in humans. In healthy humans performing the WCST during neuroimaging, the MD is activated during responding to negative feedback after the choice has been executed (Monchi et al., 2001). Unfortunately, thus far, humans with stroke damage in the MD have cognitive deficits that are clinically very poorly defined (Pergola et al., 2018). However, people diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease (AD), Parkinson’s disease (PD), or schizophrenia show impaired attentional set-shifting performance (e.g. Barch et al., 2009; Monchi et al., 2004; Owen et al, 1993). Neuroimaging and post-mortem studies show marked changes in the MD and/ or ATN in these diseases (Hornberger et al., 2012; Ouhaz et al., 2018; Pergola et al., 2015; Perry et al., 2018). Our current evidence advocates for studies investigating cortico-thalamocortical transfer of information in people diagnosed with AD combined with more frontal pathology, or PD, or schizophrenia.

To conclude, excitotoxic damage to the rodent central and medial MD selectively increased the trials to criterion on the ED subtask, producing a shift cost. This selective performance deficit is similar to monkeys with lateral PFC inactivation (Dias et al., 1996; Dias et al., 1997) and rats with medial PFC lesions (Birrell and Brown, 2000). Further, this deficit after MD lesions contrasts with monkeys or rats with perturbations to the OFC, who

637 are selectively impaired on reversal learning, but not on ED shifts (Chase et al., 2012; Dias et
638 al., 1997; McAlonan and Brown, 2003). As evidenced, the frontal cortex is critically involved
639 in value-based decision-making and reward-guided learning (Miller, 2000; Rushworth et al.
640 2011; Wallis, 2007). However, cortico-thalamocortical connections also contribute a role
641 (Browning et al. 2015; Chakraborty et al., 2016; Izqueirido and Murray, 2010; Mitchell et al.,
642 2014; Pelekanos et al., 2020). In rodents, the MD and the medial PFC together appear crucial
643 for binding reward information and behavior (Bradfield et al., 2013; Corbit et al., 2003), as
644 inhibition of dorsomedial PFC-projecting MD neurons results in rats having difficulties with
645 tracking changes in action-outcome contingencies (Alcaraz et al., 2018). In the current study,
646 we show that rat medial and central MD are critical for rapidly updating an optimal choice
647 response strategy. That is, when the MD is damaged, there is a diminished ability to rapidly
648 learn (within a trial) a choice response strategy, as well as update a well-established one as
649 task demands change. Behaviorally, our MD lesion rats made less correct 2nd choice within-
650 trial responses, suggesting they could not rapidly alter their choice response strategy when
651 they encountered the unrewarded stimuli on a given trial.

References

- Alcaraz F, Fresno V, Marchand AR, Kremer EJ, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2018) Thalamocortical and corticothalamic pathways differentially contribute to goal-directed behaviors in the rat. *eLife*, 7, e32517. 10.7554/eLife.32517
- Alcaraz F, Marchand AR, Courtand G, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2016) Parallel inputs from the mediodorsal thalamus to the prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Eur J Neurosci*. 44(3):1972-1986. 10.1111/ejn.13316.
- Andrews J, Wang L, Csernansky JG, Gado MH, Barch DM (2006) Abnormalities of thalamic activation and cognition in schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*. 163(3):463-469. 10.1176/appi.ajp.163.3.463.
- Banerjee A, Parente G, Teutsch J, Lewis C, Voigt FF, Helmchen F (2020) Value-guided remapping of sensory cortex by lateral orbitofrontal cortex. *Nature* 585, 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2704-z>
- Barch DM, Braver TS, Carter CS, Poldrack RA, Robbins TW (2009) CNTRICS Final Task Selection: Executive Control, *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 35: 115–135, 10.1093/schbul/sbn154
- Beracochea DJ, Jaffard R, Jarrard LE (1989) Effects of anterior or dorsomedial thalamic ibotenic lesions on learning and memory in rats. *Behav Neural Biol*. 51(3):364-376. 10.1016/s0163-1047(89)91000-5.
- Birrell JM, Brown VJ (2000) Medial frontal cortex mediates perceptual attentional set shifting in the rat. *J Neurosci*. 20(11):4320-4324.
- Bissonette GB, Martins GJ, Franz TM, Harper ES, Schoenbaum G, Powell EM (2008) Double dissociation of the effects of medial and orbital prefrontal cortical lesions on attentional and affective shifts in mice. *J Neurosci*. 28:11124-11130. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2820-08.2008.

676 Block AE, Dhanji H, Thompson-Tardif SF, Floresco SB (2007) Thalamic–Prefrontal Cortical–
677 Ventral Striatal Circuitry Mediates Dissociable Components of Strategy Set
678 Shifting, *Cerebral Cortex*. 17(7): 1625-1636, 10.1093/cercor/bhl073

679 Bradfield LA, Hart G, Balleine BW (2013) The role of the anterior, mediodorsal, and
680 parafascicular thalamus in instrumental conditioning. *Front Systems Neurosci*. 7, 51.
681 10.3389/fnsys.2013.00051

682 Brown VJ, Tait DS (2016) Attentional Set-Shifting Across Species. *Curr Top Behav*
683 *Neurosci*. 28:363-395. 10.1007/7854_2015_5002.

684 Browning PGF, Chakraborty S, Mitchell AS (2015) Evidence for mediodorsal thalamus and
685 prefrontal cortex interactions during cognition in macaques. *Cereb Cortex*. 25, 4519-
686 4534.

687 Bueno-Junior LS, Leite JP (2018) Input Convergence, Synaptic Plasticity and Functional
688 Coupling Across Hippocampal-Prefrontal-Thalamic Circuits. *Front Neural*
689 *Circuits*, 12, 40. 10.3389/fncir.2018.00040

690 Chakraborty S, Kolling N, Walton ME, Mitchell AS (2016) Critical role for the mediodorsal
691 thalamus in permitting rapid reward-guided updating in stochastic reward environment.
692 *eLife*, 5:e13588. 10.7554/eLife.13588

693 Chakraborty S, Ouhaz Z, Mason S, Mitchell AS (2019) Macaque parvocellular mediodorsal
694 thalamus: dissociable contributions to learning and adaptive decision-making. *Eur J*
695 *Neurosci*. 49: 1041-1054. doi: 10.1111/ejn.14078.

696 Chase EA, Tait DS, Brown VJ (2012) Lesions of the orbital prefrontal cortex impair
697 the formation of attentional set in rats. *Eur J Neurosci*. 36:2368-2375.
698 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08141.x.

699 Chudasama Y, Bussey TJ, Muir JL (2001) Effects of selective thalamic and prelimbic cortex
 700 lesions on two types of visual discrimination and reversal learning. *Eur J Neurosci.* 14:
 701 1009-1020. 10.1046/j.0953-816x.2001.01607.x.

702 Clark L, Cools R, Robbins TW (2004) The neuropsychology of ventral prefrontal cortex:
 703 decision-making and reversal learning. *Brain Cogn.* 55: 41-53. doi: 10.1016/S0278-
 704 2626(03)00284-7.

705 Costa VD, Tran VL, Turchi J, Averbeck BB (2015) Reversal Learning and Dopamine: A
 706 Bayesian Perspective. *J. Neurosci.* 35: 2407-2416; DOI:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1989-
 707 14.2015

708 Collins DP, Anastasiades PG, Marlin JJ, Carter AG (2018) Reciprocal circuits linking the
 709 prefrontal cortex with dorsal and ventral thalamic nuclei. *Neuron*, 98: 366–379.e4.
 710 10.1016/j.neuron.2018.03.024

711 Corbit LH, Muir JL, Balleine BW (2003) Lesions of mediodorsal thalamus and anterior
 712 thalamic nuclei produce dissociable effects on instrumental conditioning in rats. *Eur. J.*
 713 *Neurosci.* 18, 1286–1294. 10.1046/j.1460-9568.2003.02833.x

714 Courtiol E, Neiman M, Fleming G, Teixeira CM, Wilson DA (2019) A specific olfactory
 715 cortico-thalamic pathway contributing to sampling performance during odor reversal
 716 learning. *Brain Struct Funct.* 224, 961-971. 10.1007/s00429-018-1807-x

717 Courtiol E, Wilson DA (2015) The olfactory thalamus: unanswered questions about the role
 718 of the mediodorsal thalamic nucleus in olfaction. *Front Neural Circuits.* 9, 49.
 719 10.3389/fncir.2015.00049

720 Dajani DR, Uddin LQ (2015) Demystifying cognitive flexibility: Implications for clinical and
 721 developmental neuroscience. *Trends Neurosci.* 8: 571-578. doi:
 722 10.1016/j.tins.2015.07.003

723 Dalley JW, Cardinal RN, Robbins TW (2004) Prefrontal executive and cognitive functions in
 724 rodents: neural and neurochemical substrates. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 28: 771-84. doi:
 725 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.09.006.

726 DeNicola AL, Park MY, Crowe DA, MacDonald AW 3rd, Chafee MV (2020) Differential
 727 Roles of Mediodorsal Nucleus of the Thalamus and Prefrontal Cortex in Decision-
 728 Making and State Representation in a Cognitive Control Task Measuring Deficits in
 729 Schizophrenia. *J Neurosci.* 40, 1650-1667. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1703-19.2020

730 Dhawan SS, Tait DA, Brown VJ (2019) More rapid reversal learning following overtraining
 731 in the rat is evidence that behavioural and cognitive flexibility are dissociable.
 732 *Behavioural Brain Research*, 363: 45-52. 10.1016/j.bbr.2019.01.055

733 Dias R, Robbins TW, Roberts AC (1996) Dissociation in prefrontal cortex of affective and
 734 attentional shifts. *Nature* 380: 69–72. 10.1038/380069a0

735 Dias R, Robbins TW, Roberts AC (1997) Dissociable forms of inhibitory control within
 736 prefrontal cortex with an analog of the Wisconsin Card Sort Test: restriction to novel
 737 situations and independence from “on-line” processing. *J Neurosci* 17: 9285–97

738 Ferguson BR, Gao WJ (2018) PV Interneurons: Critical Regulators of E/I Balance for
 739 Prefrontal Cortex-Dependent Behavior and Psychiatric Disorders. *Front Neural*
 740 *Circuits.* 12:37. 10.3389/fncir.2018.00037

741 Floresco SB, Grace AA (2003) Gating of hippocampal-evoked activity in prefrontal cortical
 742 neurons by inputs from the mediodorsal thalamus and ventral tegmental area. *J*
 743 *Neurosci.* 23: 3930-3943. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-09-03930.2003

744 Fresno V, Parkes SL, Faugère A, Coutureau E, Wolff M (2019) A thalamocortical circuit for
 745 updating action-outcome associations. *Elife.* 8:e46187. doi: 10.7554/eLife.46187

746 Gardner MPH, Conroy JC, Sanchez DC, Zhou J, Schoenbaum G (2019) Real-Time Value
 747 Integration during Economic Choice Is Regulated by Orbitofrontal Cortex. *Curr Biol.*
 748 29: 4315-4322 .e4. 10.1016/j.cub.2019.10.058
 749 Gardner MPH, Conroy JS, Shaham MH, Styer CV, Schoenbaum G (2017) Lateral
 750 Orbitofrontal Inactivation Dissociates Devaluation-Sensitive Behavior and Economic
 751 Choice. *Neuron.* 96: 1192-1203.e4. 10.1016/j.neuron.2017.10.026
 752 Giraldo-Chica M, Rogers BP, Damon SM, Landman BA, Woodward ND (2018) Prefrontal-
 753 thalamic anatomical connectivity and executive cognitive function in
 754 schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry.* 83: 509-517. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.09.022
 755 Gremel C, Costa R (2013) Orbitofrontal and striatal circuits dynamically encode the shift
 756 between goal-directed and habitual actions. *Nat Commun* 4: 2264
 757 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3264>
 758 Groenewegen HJ (1988) Organisation of the afferent connections of the mediodorsal thalamic
 759 nucleus in the rat, related to the mediodorsal prefrontal topography. *Neuroscience* 24,
 760 379–431. 10.1016/0306-4522(88)90339-9
 761 Guillery RW, Sherman SM (2011) Branched thalamic afferents: what are the messages that they
 762 relay to the cortex? *Brain Res Rev.* 66: 205-219. 10.1016/j.brainresrev.2010.08.001
 763 Halassa MM, Kastner S (2017) Thalamic functions in distributed cognitive control. *Nat*
 764 *Neurosci.* 20: 1669-1679. doi: 10.1038/s41593-017-0020-1.
 765 Hoover WB, Vertes RP (2007) Anatomical analysis of afferent projections to the medial
 766 prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Brain Struct Funct.* 212: 149-79. 10.1007/s00429-007-
 767 0150-4.
 768 Hoover WB, Vertes RP (2011) Projections of the medial orbital and ventral orbital cortex in
 769 the rat. *J Comp Neurol.* 519:3766–3801. 10.1002/cne.22733 pmid:21800317

770 Hornberger M, Wong S, Tan R, Irish M, Piguet O, Kril J, Hodges JR, Halliday G (2012) In
 771 vivo and post-mortem memory circuit integrity in frontotemporal dementia and
 772 Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*. 135: 3015-3025. 10.1093/brain/aws239
 773 Hunt PR, Aggleton JP (1998) Neurotoxic lesions of the dorsomedial thalamus impair the
 774 acquisition but not the performance of delayed matching to place by rats: a deficit in
 775 shifting response rules. *J Neurosci*, 18: 10045–10052.
 776 Izqueirido A, Brigman JL, Radke AK, Rudebeck PH, Holmes A (2017) The neural basis of
 777 reversal learning: An updated perspective. *Neuroscience*. 345, 12-26.
 778 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.03.021
 779 Izquierdo A, Murray EA (2010) Functional interaction of medial mediodorsal thalamic
 780 nucleus but not nucleus accumbens with amygdala and orbital prefrontal cortex is
 781 essential for adaptive response selection after reinforcer devaluation. *J Neurosci*. 30:
 782 661-669. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3795-09.2010.
 783 Jang AI, Costa VD, Rudebeck PH, Chudasama Y, Murray EA, Averbeck BB (2015) The
 784 Role of Frontal Cortical and Medial-Temporal Lobe Brain Areas in Learning a
 785 Bayesian Prior Belief on Reversals. *J Neurosci*. 35: 11751-11760.
 786 DOI:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1594-15.2015
 787 Krettek JE, Price JL (1977) Cortical projections of the mediodorsal nucleus and adjacent
 788 thalamic nuclei in the rat. *J Comp Neurol*. 171: 157–191. doi:10.1002/cne.901710204
 789 Koechlin E, Ody C, Kouneiher F (2003) The architecture of cognitive control in the human
 790 prefrontal cortex. *Science*, 302: 1181-1185.
 791 Linley, SB, Gallo, MM, Vertes, RP (2016) Lesions of the ventral midline thalamus produce
 792 deficits in reversal learning and attention on an odor texture set shifting task. *Brain*
 793 *Res*, 1649: 110–122. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2016.08.022
 794 Lindgren HS, Wickens R, Tait DS, Brown VJ, Dunnett SB (2013) Lesions of the

795 dorsomedial striatum impair formation of attentional set in rats.

796 *Neuropharmacology*. 71: 148-153. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.03.034.

797 Lovejoy E (1966) Analysis of the overlearning reversal effect. *Psychological Review*, 73: 87–

798 103, doi:10.1037/h0022687.

799 Marton TF, Seifikar H, Luongo FJ, Lee AT, Sohal VS (2018) Roles of Prefrontal Cortex and

800 Mediodorsal Thalamus in Task Engagement and Behavioral Flexibility. *J Neurosci*. 38:

801 2569-2578. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1728-17.2018.

802 McAlonan K, Brown VJ (2003) Orbital prefrontal cortex mediates reversal learning and not

803 attentional set shifting in the rat. *Behav Brain Res*. 146: 97-103.

804 10.1016/j.bbr.2003.09.019 pmid:14643463

805 McGaughy J, Ross RS, Eichenbaum H (2008) Noradrenergic, but not cholinergic,

806 deafferentation of prefrontal cortex impairs attentional set- shifting. *Neuroscience*. 153:

807 63–71. 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.01.064

808 Miller EK (2000) The prefrontal cortex and cognitive control. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci*. 1, 59–65

809 Miller RLA, Francoeur MJ, Gibson BM, Mair RG (2017) Mediodorsal Thalamic Neurons Mirror

810 the Activity of Medial Prefrontal Neurons Responding to Movement and Reinforcement

811 during a Dynamic DNMTTP Task. *eNeuro*. 4(5):ENEURO.0196-17.2017.

812 10.1523/ENEURO.0196-17.2017.

813 Mitchell AS (2015) The mediodorsal thalamus as a higher order thalamic relay nucleus

814 important for learning and decision-making. *Neurosci BioBehav Rev* 54: 76-88

815 Mitchell AS, Baxter MG, Gaffan D (2007a) Dissociable performance on scene memory

816 learning and strategy implementation after lesions to magnocellular mediodorsal

817 thalamic nucleus. *J. Neurosci*, 27: 11888-11895.

818 Mitchell AS, Browning PGF, Baxter MG (2007b) Neurotoxic lesions of the medial
819 mediodorsal nucleus of the thalamus disrupt reinforcer devaluation effects in rhesus
820 monkeys. *J. Neurosci*, 27: 11289-11295.

821 Mitchell AS, Dalrymple-Alford JC (2005) Dissociable memory effects after medial thalamus
822 lesions in the rat. *Eur J Neurosci*, 22: 973-985.

823 Mitchell AS, Gaffan D (2008) The primate magnocellular mediodorsal thalamus is necessary
824 for memory acquisition, not for retrieval. *J Neurosci*, 28: 258-263.

825 Mitchell AS, Sherman SM, Sommer M, Mair R, Vertes R, Chudasama Y (2014) Advances in
826 understanding mechanisms of thalamic relays in cognition and behavior. *J Neurosci* 34:
827 15340-15346.

828 Monchi O, Petrides M, Petre V, Worsley K, Dagher A (2001) Wisconsin Card Sorting
829 revisited: distinct neural circuits participating in different stages of the task identified
830 by event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging. *J Neurosci*. 21: 7733-7741.
831 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.21-19-07733.2001.

832 Monchi O, Petrides M, Doyon J, Postuma RB, Worsley K, Dagher A (2004) Neural bases of
833 set-shifting deficits in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurosci*. 24: 702-710.
834 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4860-03.2004.

835 Nakayama H, Ibañez-Tallon I, Heintz N (2018) Cell-Type-Specific Contributions of Medial
836 Prefrontal Neurons to Flexible Behaviors. *J Neurosci*. 38: 4490-4504. doi:
837 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3537-17.2018.

838 Newman LA, McGaughy J (2011) Attentional effects of lesions to the anterior cingulate
839 cortex: how prior reinforcement influences distractibility. *Behav Neurosci*. 125: 360-
840 371. doi:10.1037/a0023250

841 Nilsson SRO, Alsiö J, Somerville EM, Clifton PG (2015) The rat's not for turning:
 842 Dissociating the psychological components of cognitive inflexibility. *Neurosci*
 843 *Biobehav Rev*, 56: 1-14, doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.06.015.
 844 Ouhaz Z, Fleming H, Mitchell AS (2018) Cognitive functions and neurodevelopmental
 845 disorders involving the prefrontal cortex and mediodorsal thalamus. *Front Neurosci*, 12,
 846 33. 10.3389/fnins.2018.00033
 847 Ostlund SB, Balleine BW (2005) Lesion of the medial prefrontal cortex disrupt the
 848 acquisition but not the expression of goal-directed learning. *J. Neurosci.* 25, 7763-7770.
 849 Ostlund SB, Balleine BW (2008) Differential involvement of the basolateral amygdala and
 850 mediodorsal thalamus in instrumental action selection. *J. Neurosci.* 28, 4398–4405.
 851 10.1523/jneurosci.5472-07.2008
 852 Owen AM, Roberts AC, Hodges JR, Summers BA, Polkey CE, Robbins TW (1993)
 853 Contrasting mechanisms of impaired attentional set-shifting in patients with frontal lobe
 854 damage or Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 116: 1159-1175. 10.1093/brain/116.5.1159.
 855 Parnaudeau S, O'Neill PK, Bolkan SS, Ward RD, Abbas AI, Roth BL, Balsam PD, Gordon
 856 JA, Kellendonk C (2013) Inhibition of mediodorsal thalamus disrupts thalamofrontal
 857 connectivity and cognition. *Neuron*. 77: 1151-1162. 10.1016/j.neuron.2013.01.038.
 858 Parnaudeau S, Taylor K, Bolkan SS, Ward RD, Balsam PD, Kellendonk C (2015)
 859 Mediodorsal thalamus hypofunction impairs flexible goal-directed behavior. *Biol*
 860 *Psychiatry*. 77: 445-453. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.03.020.
 861 Paxinos G, Watson C (2008) *The rat brain in stereotaxic coordinates*. Academic Press;
 862 Sydney.
 863 Pearce JM, Mackintosh NJ (2010) Two theories of attention: a review and a possible
 864 integration. In CJ Mitchell, ML Le Pelley (Eds). *Attention and Associative*
 865 *Learning: From Brain to Behaviour*. Oxford University Press.

866 Pelekanos V, Premereur E, Mitchell DJ, Chakraborty S, Mason S, Lee ACH, Mitchell AS
867 (2020) Cortico-cortical and thalamocortical changes in functional connectivity and
868 white matter structural integrity after reward guided learning of visuospatial
869 discriminations in rhesus monkeys. *J Neurosci.* 40: 7887-7901.
870 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0364-20.2020

871 Pergola G, Danet L, Pitel AL, Carlesimo GA, Segobin S, Pariente J, Suchan B, Mitchell AS,
872 Barbeau EJ (2018) The human mediodorsal thalamus: a regulator of prefrontal activity
873 patterns and cognition. *Trends Cogn Sci.* pii: S1364-6613(18)30205-5.
874 10.1016/j.tics.2018.08.006.

875 Pergola G, Selvaggi P, Trizio S, Bertolino A, Blasi G (2015) The role of the thalamus in
876 schizophrenia from a neuroimaging perspective. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 54: 57-75.
877 doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.01.013

878 Perry BAL, Lomi E, Mitchell AS (2021) Thalamocortical interactions in cognition and
879 disease: The mediodorsal and anterior thalamic nuclei. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 130:
880 162-177. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.05.032.

881 Perry JC, Pakkenberg B, Vann SD (2019) Striking reduction in neurons and glial cells in
882 anterior thalamic nuclei of older patients with Down syndrome. *Neurobiology of*
883 *aging*, 75: 54-61.

884 Preuss TM (1995) Do Rats Have Prefrontal Cortex? The Rose-Woolsey-Akert Program
885 Reconsidered. *J Cog Neurosci.* 7: 1-24

886 Ray JP, Price JL (1992) The organization of the thalamocortical connections of the
887 mediodorsal thalamic nucleus in the rat, related to the ventral forebrain-prefrontal
888 cortex topography. *J Comp Neurol.* 323: 167-197.

889 Regeur L, Pakkenberg B (1989) Optimizing sampling designs for volume measurements of
890 components of human brain using a stereological method. *J Microsc.* 155: 113-121.
891 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2818.1989.tb04300.x.

892 Reid LS (1953) The development of noncontinuity behavior through continuity learning. *J*
893 *Exp. Psyc.* 46: 107–112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0062488>

894 Rougier NP, Noelle DC, Braver TS, Cohen JD, O'Reilly RC (2005) Prefrontal cortex and
895 flexible cognitive control: Rules without symbols. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 102: 7338-
896 7343.

897 Rudebeck PH, Behrens TE, Kennerley SW, Baxter MG, Buckley MJ, Walton ME,
898 Rushworth MF (2008) Frontal cortex subregions play distinct roles in choices between
899 actions and stimuli. *J Neurosci*, 28: 13775-13785. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3541-
900 08.2008.

901 Rushworth MFS, Noonan MP, Boorman ED, Walton ME, Behrens TE (2011) Frontal cortex
902 and reward-guided learning and decision-making. *Neuron* 70: 1054–1069.

903 Saund J, Dautan D, Rostron C, Urcelay GP, Gerdjikov TV (2017) Thalamic inputs to
904 dorsomedial striatum are involved in inhibitory control: evidence from the five-choice
905 serial reaction time task in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 234: 2399-2407.
906 doi:10.1007/s00213-017-4627-4

907 Schmitt L, Wimmer R, Nakajima M, Happ M, Mofakham S, Halassa MM (2017) Thalamic
908 amplification of cortical connectivity sustains attentional control. *Nature*. 545: 219–
909 223. 10.1038/nature22073

910 Schoenbaum G, Takahashi Y, Liu TL, McDannald MA (2011) Does the orbitofrontal cortex
911 signal value?. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1239: 87-99. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06210.x

912 Sherman SM, Guillery RW (2002) The role of the thalamus in the flow of information to the
 913 cortex. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond Ser B Biol Sci.* 357: 1695–1708.
 914 10.1098/rstb.2002.1161

915 Tait DS, Chase EA, Brown VJ (2014) Attentional set-shifting in rodents: a review of
 916 behavioural methods and pharmacological results. *Curr Pharm Des.* 20(31):5046-59.

917 Tait DS, Bowman EM, Neuwirth LS, Brown VJ (2018) Assessment of intradimensional/
 918 extradimensional attentional set-shifting in rats. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 89: 72-84. doi:
 919 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.02.013.

920 Tham WWP, Stevenson RJ, Miller LA (2011) The role of the mediodorsal thalamic nucleus
 921 in human olfaction. *Neurocase* 17: 148–159. 10.1080/13554794.2010.504728

922 Uylings HB, Groenewegen HJ, Kolb B (2003) Do rats have a prefrontal cortex? *Behav Brain*
 923 *Res.* 146: 3-17. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2003.09.028.

924 Vertes RP, Linley SB, Hoover WB (2015) Limbic circuitry of the midline thalamus. *Neurosci*
 925 *Biobehav Rev.* 54: 89-107. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.01.014.

926 Wallis JD (2007) Orbitofrontal cortex and its contribution to decision-making. *Annu. Rev.*
 927 *Neurosci.* 30: 31–56.

928 Wright NF, Vann SD, Aggleton JP, Nelson AJ (2015) A critical role for the anterior thalamus
 929 in directing attention to task-relevant stimuli. *J Neurosci.* 35: 5480-5488.
 930 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4945-14.2015

931 Yang Z, Wu G, Liu M, Sun X, Xu Q, Zhang C, Lei H (2020) Dysfunction of orbitofrontal
 932 GABAergic interneurons leads to impaired reversal learning in a mouse model of
 933 obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Curr Biol*, 31: 381-393.e4.
 934 doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.10.045.

935 Yin HH, Ostlund SB, Knowlton BJ, Balleine BW (2005) The role of the dorsomedial
936 striatum in instrumental conditioning. *Eur J Neurosci.* 22: 513–523. 10.1111/j.1460-
937 9568.2005.04218.x

Figure Legends

Figure 1. A. Photomicrographs of the thalamus in a MD Sham control rat (top) and a MD lesion rat (bottom). **B.** A series of coronal schematics throughout the mediodorsal thalamus showing the area of cell loss in the MD lesion group. Numbers refer to the distance from bregma (Paxinos and Watson, 2008). Abbreviations: 3V: third ventricle; dLGN: dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus; LHb: lateral habenula; LD: laterodorsal thalamus; MD: mediodorsal thalamus; MHb: medial habenula; PV: paraventricular nucleus; VPM: ventral posterior medial thalamus.

Figure 2. Mean (+SEM) trials to criterion data for the attentional set-shifting task. **(A)** Preoperative test session. **(B)** Postoperative test session. MD lesion rats were significantly slower to learn the SD and the ED subtasks compared to MD Sham controls ($*p < 0.001$). MD Sham control rats, like MD lesion rats, needed more trials to learn the ED, as expected. However, the MD lesion rats required significantly fewer trials to criterion to learn REV3, the reversal occurring immediately after the ED, compared to the MD Sham controls ($*p < 0.001$). Also see the **Extended Data Figure 1-1** showing boxplots of the mean trials to criterion for individual rats during the postoperative session of the attentional set-shifting task.

Extended Data Figure 1-1 showing boxplots of the mean trials to criterion for individual rats during the postoperative session of the attentional set-shifting task. MD lesion rats took significantly more trials to learn the SD and the ED subtasks compared to MD Sham controls ($*p < 0.001$). MD Sham control rats also needed more trials to learn the ED, as expected. The MD lesion rats required significantly fewer trials to learn REV3, the reversal occurring

immediately after the ED, compared to the MD Sham controls ($*p < 0.001$). Box shows 1st and 3rd quartile and whiskers are the minimum and maximum trials to criterion for individual rats.

Figure 3. (A) Mean (+SEM) trials to criterion shift cost data for the ED stage for preoperative (Pre) and postoperative (Post) testing sessions. The shift cost is computed as the number of trials to criterion in the ED minus the number of trials to criterion in the ID. Both groups of rats showed a shift cost during the ED, when they had to learn to attend to the previously irrelevant dimension. However, the shift cost for the MD lesion rats in the postoperative test session was significantly different to the MD Sham controls. (B) Mean (+SEM) percent correct 2nd choice within trial responses made during the preoperative and postoperative performance sessions of the attentional set-shifting task. MD lesion rats made fewer correct 2nd choice within trial responses than MD Sham controls ($*p's = 0.001$).

Figure 4. Mean (+SEM) latencies to dig (secs) for MD Sham controls and MD lesion rats during each subtask of the ID/ED attentional set shifting task (A) Preoperative correct trials. (B) Postoperative correct trials. (C) Preoperative error trials. (D) Postoperative error trials ($**p < 0.001$; $*p = 0.002$).




Figure 1





Figure 2



Extended Data Figure 1-1




Figure 3




Figure 4