

A Neural Circuit Mechanism Integrating Motivational State with Memory Expression in *Drosophila*

Michael J. Krashes,^{1,4,5} Shamik DasGupta,^{1,5} Andrew Vreede,² Benjamin White,² J. Douglas Armstrong,³ and Scott Waddell^{1,*}

¹Department of Neurobiology, University of Massachusetts Medical School, 364 Plantation Street, Worcester, MA 01605, USA

²Laboratory of Molecular Biology, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA

³Institute for Adaptive and Neural Computation, School of Informatics, 5 Forrest Hill, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH1 2QL, UK

⁴Department of Medicine, Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes and Metabolism, Harvard Medical School, 330 Brookline Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, USA

⁵These authors contributed equally to this work

*Correspondence: scott.waddell@umassmed.edu

DOI 10.1016/j.cell.2009.08.035

SUMMARY

Behavioral expression of food-associated memory in fruit flies is constrained by satiety and promoted by hunger, suggesting an influence of motivational state. Here, we identify a neural mechanism that integrates the internal state of hunger and appetitive memory. We show that stimulation of neurons that express neuropeptide F (dNPF), an ortholog of mammalian NPY, mimics food deprivation and promotes memory performance in satiated flies. Robust appetitive memory performance requires the dNPF receptor in six dopaminergic neurons that innervate a distinct region of the mushroom bodies. Blocking these dopaminergic neurons releases memory performance in satiated flies, whereas stimulation suppresses memory performance in hungry flies. Therefore, dNPF and dopamine provide a motivational switch in the mushroom body that controls the output of appetitive memory.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation provides behavior with purpose and intensity and ensures that particular motor actions are expressed at the appropriate time. Although the concept of motivation has interested psychologists and ethologists for decades (Hull, 1951; Tolman, 1932; Thorpe, 1956; Bindra, 1959; Hinde, 1966; Lorenz, 1950; Dethier, 1976; Toates, 1986; Kennedy, 1987), a detailed neurobiological perspective of the mechanisms underlying state-dependent changes in behavior is lacking. Understanding how motivational systems are organized in the brain and how they impact neural circuits that direct behavior is a major question in neurobiology and addresses the functional connection between body and mind.

Hunger is perhaps the most heavily studied of the regulatory, or homeostatic, motivational drive states because food avail-

ability is easily manipulated in the laboratory. Hunger results from internally generated metabolic deficit signals, and these signals in turn increase the likelihood that the animal initiates food-seeking behavior (Dethier, 1976; Saper et al., 2002; Abizaid and Horvath, 2008). Models of motivation include learned representations of cues associated with food, such as smell and taste, that provide additional incentive and direction to locate a particular food source (Hull, 1951; Toates, 1986). When the food is located and consumed, the homeostatic process comes full-circle and the motivational drive to feed is neutralized. However, it is unclear how neural systems representing hunger and satiety are integrated with those of memory.

The idea that motivation could be approached experimentally in insects followed seminal studies of food-seeking behavior in the blowfly *Phormia regina* (Dethier, 1976). It was noted that although exposing gustatory receptor neurons on the proboscis to sugar always generated an electrophysiological response, the blowfly did not consistently respond by extending the proboscis. However, a food-deprived blowfly was more likely to respond with proboscis extension. A sophisticated genetic toolkit for manipulating neural circuits (Keene and Waddell, 2007) coupled with robust behaviors makes the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* ideal to understand the physiological mechanism that underlies such state-dependent behavior.

Drosophila can be efficiently trained to associate odorants with sucrose reward (Tempel et al., 1983; Krashes and Waddell, 2008). Importantly, fruit flies have to be hungry to effectively express appetitive memory performance (Krashes and Waddell, 2008). This apparent state dependence implies that signals for hunger and satiety may interact with memory circuitry to regulate the behavioral expression of learned food-seeking behavior. The mushroom body (MB) in the fly brain is a critical site for appetitive memory (Schwaerzel et al., 2003; Keene et al., 2006; Krashes and Waddell, 2008). Synaptic output from the MB $\alpha'\beta'$ neurons is required to consolidate appetitive memory whereas output from the $\alpha\beta$ subset is specifically required for memory retrieval (Krashes et al., 2007; Krashes and Waddell, 2008). This anatomy provides a foundation for understanding neural circuit integration

between systems representing a motivational state and those for memory.

neuropeptide Y (NPY) is a highly conserved 36 amino acid neuromodulator that stimulates food-seeking behavior in mammals (Tatemoto et al., 1982; Clark et al., 1984; Kalra, 1997). NPY messenger RNA (mRNA) levels are elevated in neurons in the arcuate nucleus of the hypothalamus of food-deprived mice (Sahu et al., 1988; Sanacora et al., 1990), and injection of NPY into the paraventricular nucleus increases feeding (Stanley and Leibowitz, 1985). Most impressively, ablation of NPY-expressing neurons from adult mice leads to starvation (Bewick et al., 2005; Gropp et al., 2005; Luquet et al., 2005). NPY exerts its effects through a family of NPY receptors and appears to have inhibitory function (Colmers et al., 1988, 1991; Klapstein and Colmers, 1993; Qian et al., 1997; Rhim et al., 1997; Sun et al., 2003; Brown and Travagli, 2003; Lin et al., 2004). NPY therefore must repress the action of inhibitory pathways in order to promote feeding behavior. *Drosophila* neuropeptide F (dNPF) is an ortholog of NPY, which has a C-terminal amidated phenylalanine instead of the amidated tyrosine in vertebrates (Brown et al., 1999). Evidence suggests that dNPF plays a similar role in appetitive behavior in flies. dNPF overexpression prolongs feeding in larvae and delays the developmental transition from foraging to pupariation (Wu et al., 2003). Furthermore, overexpression of a dNPF receptor gene, *npfr1* (Garczynski et al., 2002), causes well-fed larvae to eat bitter-tasting food that wild-type larvae will only consume if they are hungry (Wu et al., 2005).

In this study, we exploited dNPF to identify a neural circuit that participates in motivational control of appetitive memory behavior in adult fruit flies. We show that stimulation of dNPF neurons promotes appetitive memory performance in fed flies, mimicking the hungry state. *npfr1* is required in dopaminergic (DA) neurons that innervate the MB for satiety to suppress appetitive memory performance. Directly blocking the DA neurons during memory testing reveals performance in fed flies, whereas stimulating them suppresses performance in hungry flies. These data suggest that six DA neurons are a key module of dNPF-regulated circuitry, through which the internal motivational states of hunger and satiety are represented in the MB.

RESULTS

Stimulation of dNPF Neurons Promotes Memory Retrieval in Fed Flies

Feeding of flies after appetitive conditioning suppresses memory performance (Figure 1A) and the suppression is reversed by restarvation (Krashes and Waddell, 2008). Food deprivation is also required for efficient appetitive learning, but a learning defect could simply result from satiated flies failing to ingest the reinforcing sucrose. In this study, we specifically manipulated memory retrieval, and in all experiments we ensured that flies were efficiently trained by food depriving them for 18 hr before training. Immediately after training, we transferred flies to vials with, or without, food for 3 hr before testing appetitive memory. Flies starved before and after training display robust appetitive memory, but memory performance steadily declines after 10–30 min of feeding (Figure 1A), indicating a continuum of performance relative to the satiety state of the flies.

Immunostaining for dNPF in adult fly brains reveals neurons in the subesophageal ganglion (SOG), the dorsal and lateral protocerebrum, and the central complex (CC) (Wen et al., 2005) (Figure 1B). One can control some of these neurons by using a *dNPF* promoter-driven GAL4 to express GAL4-*uas* promoter-driven transgenes (Wen et al., 2005). *dNPF*-GAL4 driven *uas-CD8::GFP* labels most of the dNPF-immunoreactive neurons whose cell bodies reside in the dorsal protocerebrum but not those whose somata are clustered in the SOG (Figure 1B, and Figure S1 available online).

We reasoned that dNPF release might represent the food-deprived state in the brain, and so we tested whether stimulation of dNPF-expressing neurons could override the suppression of memory performance by feeding. We expressed the heat-sensitive *uas-dTrpA1* transgene (Hamada et al., 2008) with *dNPF*-GAL4. *dTrpA1* encodes a transient receptor potential (TRP) channel that is required in a small number of neurons in the brain for temperature preference in *Drosophila* (Hamada et al., 2008). Ectopically expressed dTRPA1 conducts Ca^{2+} and depolarizes neurons when flies are exposed to $>25^{\circ}C$, allowing one to stimulate specific neurons. We first food deprived and trained wild-type, *dNPF*-GAL4, *uas-dTrpA1*, and *dNPF*-GAL4;*uas-dTrpA1* flies, fed them ad libitum for 3 hr, and tested appetitive memory at the permissive $23^{\circ}C$. No group showed robust appetitive memory under these conditions (Figure 1C), and no statistical differences were apparent between groups ($p > 0.57$). However, stimulation of dNPF neurons for 30 min before and during testing by shifting the flies to $31^{\circ}C$ revealed memory performance in *dNPF*-GAL4;*uas-dTrpA1* flies that was statistically different from all other groups ($p < 0.006$) (Figure 1D). Therefore, stimulation of dNPF neurons mimics food deprivation, consistent with dNPF being a key factor in the internal state of hunger in the brain.

Localizing the Relevant dNPF-Modulated Circuit

We used a *uas*-RNA interference (RNAi) transgene against the dNPF receptor, *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* (Wu et al., 2003, 2005) to localize the relevant dNPF-modulated neurons, reasoning that *npfr1* disruption would impair appetitive memory in hungry flies. We verified the efficacy of the *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* transgene for our purpose by expressing it in all neurons using *n-synaptobrevin*-GAL4 and testing appetitive memory performance. As expected, the memory performance of *uas-npfr1^{RNAi};n-syb*-GAL4 flies was impaired and was statistically different from all other control groups ($p < 0.04$). However, *uas-npfr1^{RNAi};n-syb*-GAL4 flies were normal for aversive olfactory conditioning (Tully and Quinn, 1985) (Figure S2).

We next drove *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* with GAL4 drivers that express in the dorsal protocerebrum and CC—*c005*, *210Y*, *104Y*, and *c061* and in all MB neurons or the MB $\alpha\beta$ and γ neurons—*OK107*, and *MB247*. We food deprived wild-type flies, flies with a piggyBac element in the *npfr1* locus, *npfr1*[*c01896*] (Bellen et al., 2004), flies expressing *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* in specific neurons, and flies harboring GAL4 or *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* alone and tested appetitive memory 3 hr after training. The performance of *npfr1*[*c01896*] and *c061;uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* flies was statistically different (both $p < 0.01$) from all other flies (Figure 2). These data suggest




Figure 1. Stimulation of dNPF Neurons Promotes Appetitive Memory Expression in Satiated Flies

(A) Feeding after training suppresses appetitive memory performance. A double asterisk denotes a significant difference ($p < 0.007$), a single asterisk ($p < 0.03$) from all other groups. Temperature shift protocols are shown. The white bar represents fly storage in empty vials, while the yellow bar indicates flies stored with food. Figure format is used throughout this study.

(B) dNPF is expressed in neurons that innervate the dorsal and lateral protocerebrum, the SOG, and the CC. Immunostaining with anti-dNPF antibody (red) partially overlaps (yellow, merge) with dNPF-GAL4-driven CD8::GFP (green). dNPF-stained cells in the SOG are not labeled by dNPF-GAL4. The dNPF antibody only labels the upper layer of the fan-shaped body, consistent with processes in the ellipsoid body and lower fan-shaped body being postsynaptic regions. The scale bar represents 20 μm .

(C) Feeding flies after training suppresses memory performance. All flies were food deprived, trained, fed, and tested at 23°C.

(D) Stimulation of dNPF neurons before testing produces memory performance in fed flies. All flies were food deprived, trained, and fed for 150 min at 23°C. All flies were then transferred to 31°C for 30 min and tested for appetitive memory. An asterisk denotes significant difference ($p < 0.05$, ANOVA) from unmarked groups. Data are shown as the mean \pm standard error of the mean (SEM).

c061 neurons mediate the effects of dNPF on appetitive memory expression.

Some c061 Neurons Innervate the MB

We visualized c061 neurons with uas-CD8::GFP. Confocal analysis revealed expression, including intrinsic neurons of the MBs (Figure 3A). Since MB expression of uas-npr1^{RNAi} did not disrupt memory (Figure 2), we crossed in a GAL80 transgene that blocks GAL4 activity in all MB neurons (MBGAL80) (Krashes et al.,

2007). MBGAL80 abolished MB expression, but prominent expression remained in three neurons per hemisphere, whose projections densely innervate the MB heel and peduncle. Another cluster of five neurons per hemisphere innervate a specific layer in the fan-shaped body of the CC (Figure 3B and Movies S1 and S2). Higher-resolution imaging revealed innervation of the MB peduncle occupied by $\alpha\beta$ but not $\alpha'\beta'$ neurons (Figure 3E). Output from $\alpha'\beta'$ neurons is required to consolidate appetitive memory, whereas output from $\alpha\beta$ neurons




Figure 2. Disruption of *npfr1* Expression Impairs Appetitive Memory in Food-Deprived Flies

Food-deprived *npfr1*[c01896] flies and those expressing *uas-npr1*^{RNAi} with c061 have impaired 3 hr appetitive memory, whereas those expressing *uas-npr1*^{RNAi} with c005, 210Y, 104Y, OK107, or MB247 are normal. An asterisk denotes significant difference ($p < 0.01$, ANOVA) from other unmarked groups. Data are shown as the mean \pm SEM.

is required for appetitive memory retrieval (Krashes et al., 2007; Krashes and Waddell, 2008). Finding neurons that innervate the MB heel and $\alpha\beta$ neurons is consistent with a model where satiety affects memory retrieval by modulating MB $\alpha\beta$ and γ neurons.

The MB-Innervating Neurons Are Dopaminergic

Some DA neurons innervate the MB heel and base of the peduncle (Friggi-Grelin et al., 2003; Riemensperger et al., 2005; Tanaka et al., 2008) (Figure S4). We therefore immunostained c061;MBGAL80;*uas-CD8::GFP* brains with anti-tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) antibody. TH specifically labels DA neurons in flies because they do not produce epinephrine or norepinephrine. This analysis revealed that the three c061 MB-innervating neurons double label with GFP and anti-TH (Figure 3F), consistent with them releasing dopamine. Their position by the MB calyx defines them as belonging to the protocerebral posterior lateral 1 (PPL1) DA neuron cluster (Friggi-Grelin et al., 2003; Riemensperger et al., 2005).

Finding the MB-innervating neurons label for TH allowed us to use a *TH* promoter-driven GAL80 (*THGAL80*) to remove DA neuron expression (Sitaraman et al., 2008). We combined c061 and c061;MBGAL80 with *THGAL80* and *uas-CD8::GFP* and visualized brains colabeled with anti-TH. *THGAL80* suppressed expression in DA neuron somata (Figures 3C, 3D, and 3G) and eliminated expression in processes innervating the heel and peduncle region of the MB (Figures 3C and 3D). Expression remained in c061;*THGAL80* brains in MB, the fan-shaped

body, and SOG (Figure 3C). In c061;MBGAL80/*THGAL80* brains, expression remained in the fan-shaped body and SOG (Figure 3D). Therefore, c061 DA neurons innervate the dorsal protocerebrum and MB heel and peduncle. Transgenic markers of neural polarity suggest DA processes in the dorsal protocerebrum are postsynaptic, whereas those in the MB heel and peduncle are presynaptic (Zhang et al., 2007) (data not shown).

npfr1 Expression in DA Neurons Is Required for Appetitive Memory

We tested the importance of *npfr1* in DA neurons by expressing *uas-npr1*^{RNAi} with *TH*-GAL4. We food-deprived flies before and after training and tested 3 hr appetitive memory. Performance of *TH*-GAL4;*uas-npr1*^{RNAi} flies was statistically different from that of wild-type, *TH*-GAL4, and *uas-npr1*^{RNAi} control flies ($p < 0.01$; Figure 4A). We also used *THGAL80* to test whether DA neuron expression was required for the appetitive memory defect of c061;*uas-npr1*^{RNAi} flies. Memory of c061;*THGAL80*; *uas-npr1*^{RNAi} flies was statistically indistinguishable from that of controls ($p > 0.9$) and was statistically different from that of c061;*uas-npr1*^{RNAi} and *TH*-GAL4;*uas-npr1*^{RNAi} flies (Figure 4A). Therefore, *npfr1* expression is required in DA neurons that innervate the MB for appetitive memory performance in hungry flies.

Blocking DA Neurons Promotes Memory Retrieval in Fed Flies

We used c061;MBGAL80 and *THGAL80* to test whether DA neurons were responsible for inhibiting memory performance in fed flies. We directly blocked their output during memory testing with the dominant temperature-sensitive *uas-shibire*^{ts1} (*shi*^{ts1}) transgene (Kitamoto, 2001). *shi*^{ts1} blocks membrane recycling and thus synaptic vesicle release at the restrictive temperature of 31°C and this blockade is reversible by returning flies to <25°C.

Flies were food deprived, trained, and immediately transferred to vials containing food before testing of 3 hr memory. We performed this experiment at 23°C throughout (Figure 4B), or we blocked the neurons prior to and during memory retrieval by shifting flies to 31°C for 1 hr before testing (Figure 4C). We tested wild-type and single-transgene GAL4 and *uas-shi*^{ts1} flies in parallel. At 23°C, performance was suppressed by feeding, and there were no significant differences between groups ($p > 0.77$; Figure 4B). However, when c061;MBGAL80;*uas-shi*^{ts1} neurons were blocked prior to and during retrieval, appetitive memory performance was statistically different from all other groups (all $p < 0.04$; Figure 4C). Expression of *uas-shi*^{ts1} in c061;MBGAL80 neurons except the DA neurons did not enhance performance (Figure 4C). Memory of c061;MBGAL80/*THGAL80*;*uas-shi*^{ts1} flies was statistically indistinguishable from that of the control groups ($p > 0.99$). Importantly, blocking DA neurons did not further enhance hungry fly performance (all $p > 0.17$; Figure 4D). Therefore, these data are consistent with the DA neurons limiting memory performance in fed flies. It is likely that dopamine provides the inhibition because the DA neurons do not label for the inhibitory transmitter gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA; Figure S3).




Figure 3. *c061* Labels Six DA Neurons that Innervate the MB

(A) Projection view of a *c061;uas-CD8::GFP* brain. Filled yellow arrows mark the heel region of the MB resembling that in *TH-GAL4* labeled brains (Figure S4A).

(B) Combination of MBGAL80 with *c061;uas-CD8::GFP* eliminates MB expression and reveals neurons that innervate the heel of the MB (filled yellow arrows). Also see Movies S1 and S2.

(C) Combination of *THGAL80* with *c061;uas-CD8::GFP* eliminates expression in the neurons innervating the region between the MB lobes and MB heel (hollow arrows) but leaves expression elsewhere intact.

(D) Projection view of a *c061;MBGAL80/THGAL80;uas-CD8::GFP* brain. *THGAL80* removes expression from the neurons innervating the dorsal protocerebrum and MB heel (hollow arrows) and leaves expression in the fan-shaped body and elsewhere intact. The scale bar represents 20 μm .

(E) Higher-magnification single confocal section views of the MB heel and peduncle region in a *c061;uas-CD8::GFP* brain. Top, innervation of the MB heel. Bottom, innervation in the base of the peduncle. Inset, section through the peduncle showing zones occupied by the $\alpha\beta$, $\alpha'\beta'$, and γ MB neurons. The MB is colabeled with MB-DsRED.

(F) Confocal section through a *c061;MBGAL80;uas-CD8::GFP* brain at the level of the MB calyx (outlined). GFP (green) labels three cell bodies at the side of the calyx and five more lateral cell bodies. Counter staining with anti-TH antibody (red) labels 12 cell bodies in the PPL1 cluster, and three of them overlap (merge, yellow) with *c061;MBGAL80* driven GFP. The scale bar represents 10 μm .

(G) Confocal section through a PPL1 cluster in a *c061;MBGAL80/THGAL80;uas-CD8::GFP* brain. GFP (green) labels five cell bodies, and none overlap with anti-TH staining. The scale bar represents 10 μm .

The DA Neurons Are MB-MP Neurons

Similar neurons that innervate the MB have been described (Tanaka et al., 2008). NP2758 labels a single pair of MB-MP neurons, named according to the regions of the MB that they innervate: medial lobe and pedunculus (MP) (Figure 5B and Movies S3 and S4). From here, we refer to MB-innervating DA neurons as MB-MP neurons. We also found that *krasavietz-GAL4* (Dubnau et al., 2003; Shang et al., 2007) combined with MBGAL80 (Krashes et al., 2007) expresses in MB-MP neurons (Figure 5C and Movies S5 and S6).

We counted the TH-positive neurons in the PPL1 cluster in each GAL4 line (Figures 5E and S4B). Three TH-positive cells are labeled by GFP in each PPL1 cluster in *c061;MBGAL80;uas-CD8::GFP* flies. *MBGAL80;krasavietz/uas-CD8::GFP* also labels three TH neurons, but two are MB-MP neurons and the other innervates the vertical MB α lobe (Figures 5C and S4C). Lastly, we confirmed that *NP2758;uas-CD8::GFP* labels one MB-MP

neuron per hemisphere. We combined the lines in pairs and counted cells colabeled with GFP and anti-TH to determine whether *c061*, *krasavietz*, and NP2758 label overlapping MB-MP neurons. Four cell bodies are labeled in PPL1 in *c061;MBGAL80;krasavietz* flies. One of these is the α lobe projecting *krasavietz* neuron (Figures 5C, 5D, and S4), so *MBGAL80;krasavietz* labels two of the three *c061* MB-MP neurons. Three cell bodies are labeled in PPL1 in *NP2758;MBGAL80;krasavietz* flies, showing that NP2758 labels one of the two *MBGAL80;krasavietz* MB-MP neurons. Therefore, *c061;MBGAL80* labels three MB-MP neurons, *MBGAL80;krasavietz* labels two of these, and NP2758 labels one of the MB-MP neurons that is common to *c061;MBGAL80* and *MBGAL80;krasavietz* (Figure 5D). We did not observe more than three MB-MP neurons on each side of the brain.

Blocking NP2758 or *krasavietz;MBGAL80* neurons prior to and during memory retrieval did not reveal performance in fed flies




Figure 4. c061 DA Neurons Regulate Appetitive Memory Performance

Temperature-shift protocols are shown above each graph.

(A) Expression of *uas-npr1^{RNAi}* in all DA neurons with *TH-GAL4* or in a subset of DA neurons with *c061* impairs 3 hr appetitive memory in hungry flies. Expression of *uas-npr1^{RNAi}* in *c061* neurons except the DA neurons (*c061;THGAL80;uas-npr1^{RNAi}*) does not affect appetitive memory.

(B) Feeding of flies after training suppresses 3 hr memory. All genotypes were food deprived, trained, fed, and tested at the permissive temperature of 23°C.

(C) Blocking synaptic output from *c061;MBGAL80* neurons before testing reveals memory performance in fed flies. Removal of *uas-shi^{ts1}* expression from the DA neurons reverses the memory-promoting effect (*c061;MBGAL80/THGAL80;uas-shi^{ts1}* flies). All genotypes were food deprived, trained, and stored in food vials for 120 min at 23°C. Flies were then shifted to 31°C for 60 min and tested for memory.

(D) Blocking output from *c061;MBGAL80* neurons does not enhance performance in food-deprived flies. All genotypes were food deprived, trained, and stored in empty vials for 120 min at 23°C. Flies were then shifted to 31°C for 60 min before being tested for appetitive memory at 31°C. Asterisks denote significant difference ($p < 0.05$, ANOVA) from other unmarked groups. Data are shown as the mean \pm SEM.

(Figure S5). Therefore, it is either necessary to block all six MB-MP neurons to release appetitive memory in fed flies or the two MB-MP neurons uniquely labeled by *c061* could be responsible.

MB-MP Stimulation Inhibits Appetitive Memory Expression in Hungry Flies

To further assess whether MB-MP neurons limit appetitive memory expression, we tested whether MB-MP neuron stimulation suppressed memory in hungry flies. We tested wild-type flies, flies expressing *uas-dTrpA1* in MB-MP neurons, and *GAL4* and *uas-dTrpA1* flies in parallel using two different temperature regimens: permissive 23°C throughout (Figure 6A), or we stimulated neurons prior to and during memory retrieval by shifting flies to 31°C (Figure 6B). We starved flies, trained them, and transferred them to empty vials before testing 3 hr memory. All groups displayed robust appetitive memory at 23°C, and there was no statistical difference between groups ($p > 0.96$) (Figure 6A). However, acute MB-MP neuron stimulation prior to and during memory retrieval severely impaired memory (Figure 6B). The performance of *c061;MBGAL80/uas-dTrpA1*, *MBGAL80/uas-dTrpA1;krasavietz*, and *NP2758;uas-dTrpA1* flies was statistically different from all other groups ($p < 0.04$). These

data suggest that stimulation of two MB-MP neurons is sufficient to block appetitive memory performance.

The suppression of performance with MB-MP activation is not due to irreversible MB damage. Food-deprived *c061;MBGAL80/uas-dTrpA1* flies stimulated during acquisition (Figure S6A) or for 1 hr after training (Figure S6B) showed normal 3 hr memory ($p > 0.58$ and $p > 0.70$, respectively). Furthermore, brief stimulation during testing is sufficient to suppress performance ($p < 0.005$; Figure S6C).

We also stimulated MB-MP neurons with the cold-sensitive *uas-TRPM8* transgene (Peabody et al., 2009). The mammalian TRPM8 channel is activated below 18°C (McKemy et al., 2002; Peier et al., 2002). We starved and trained flies and put them in empty food vials for 3 hr before testing appetitive memory. No statistical difference was apparent between the performance of flies at the permissive 23°C ($p > 0.50$) (Figure 6C). However, stimulation of *c061-MB-MP* neurons by shifting of flies to 16°C for 1 hr before testing impaired memory (Figure 6D). Performance of *c061;MBGAL80/uas-TRPM8* flies was statistically different from all other groups ($p < 0.03$). Therefore, stimulation of MB-MP neurons with *dTRPA1* or *TRPM8* suppresses performance in hungry flies (Figures 6B and 6D) and mimics feeding (Figure 1A).




Figure 5. The c061 DA Neurons Are MB-MP Neurons

(A) Projection view of a c061;MBGAL80/uas-CD8::GFP brain showing MB-MP neurons (white arrows) and neurons in the subesophageal ganglion (also see *Movies S1 and S2*).

(B) Projection view of a NP2758;uas-CD8::GFP brain showing MB-MP neurons (white arrows) and neurons in the subesophageal ganglion (also see *Movies S3 and S4*).

(C) Projection view of a MBGAL80; krasavietz/uas-CD8::GFP brain showing MB-MP neurons (white arrows). DA neurons innervating the MB α -stalk (blue arrows, also see *Figure S4C*) and neurons in the fan-shaped body and local neurons in the antennal lobe are also labeled (also see *Movies S5 and S6*). The MB is labeled with MB-DsRED.

(D) Cartoon illustrating the gross structure of MB-MP neurons and the expression pattern of each GAL4. The MB is shown as an outline. DA neuron cell bodies (red, anti-TH) of a single PPL1 cluster are shown with the labeling of each GAL4 overlaid. The cell body organization is not stereotyped, and it is difficult to distinguish the projections of each MB-MP neuron. No order or detail is inferred here. At least one MB-MP neuron sends a contralateral projection to the other MB (green arrow head).

(E) *krasavietz* and NP2758 label a subset of c061 MB-MP neurons. Each column shows the separate and merged channels from confocal images of a PPL1 cluster in brains colabeled with GAL4-driven GFP (green) and anti-TH (red). Double-labeled neurons are marked with an arrow in the merged images. The quantification of neurons is shown in *Figure S4B*.

Scale bars represent 20 μ m (A, B, and C) and 10 μ m (E).

To exclude the possibility that manipulations with *uas-shi^{ts1}* and *uas-dTrpA1* interfere with olfaction or gustation, we tested the acuity of all flies used in this study. No significant differences were found between the relevant groups for either odor or sucrose acuity (Table S1). Therefore, blocking output from MB-MP neurons reveals appetitive memory performance in satiated flies, whereas stimulation suppresses appetitive memory expression in hungry flies. These data are consistent with MB-MP neurons being a neural mechanism through which satiety suppresses appetitive memory performance.

DISCUSSION

Drosophila as a Model for Motivational Systems

It is critical to an animal's survival that behaviors are expressed at the appropriate time. Motivational systems provide some of this behavioral control. Apart from the observation that motivational states are often regulated by hormones or neuromodulatory factors (Toates, 1986; Watts, 2003), we know little about how motivational states modulate specific neural circuitry.

Hungry fruit flies form appetitive long-term memory, after a 2 min pairing of odorant and sucrose, and memory performance is only robust if the flies remain hungry (Krashes and Waddell, 2008). Therefore, this paradigm includes key features of models for motivational systems (Toates, 1986): the conditioned odor provides the incentive cue predictive of food, there is a learned representation of the goal object (odorant/sucrose), and the expression of learned behavior depends on the internal physiological state (hunger and not satiety). In this study, we identified a neural circuit mechanism that integrates hunger/satiety and appetitive memory.

What Normally Regulates dNPF-Expressing Neurons?

We do not know the signals that ordinarily control dNPF-releasing neurons. In mammals, NPY-expressing neurons are a critical part of a complex hypothalamic network that regulates food intake and metabolism (Saper et al., 2002). In times of adequate nutrition, NPY-expressing neurons are inhibited by high levels of leptin and insulin that are transported into the brain after release from adipose tissue and the pancreas (Figueroa




Figure 6. MB-MP Stimulation Suppresses Appetitive Memory Expression in Hungry Flies

Temperature shift protocols are shown above each graph.

(A) The permissive 23°C does not disrupt 3 hr appetitive memory. All genotypes were starved, trained, stored for 3 hr in empty vials, and tested for memory at 23°C.

(B) Stimulation of six, four, or two MB-MP neurons with *uas-dTrpA1* before and during testing attenuates memory performance in starved flies. All genotypes were food deprived, trained, and stored in empty vials for 120 min at 23°C and were then shifted to 31°C for 60 min before and during testing.

(C) The permissive temperature of 23°C does not disrupt 3 hr appetitive memory. All genotypes were starved, trained, stored in empty vials for 3 hr, and tested for appetitive memory at 23°C.

(D) Stimulation of six MB-MP neurons with *uas-TRPM8* before and during testing attenuates memory performance in starved flies. All genotypes were food deprived, trained, and stored in empty food vials for 120 min at 23°C and were then shifted to 16°C for 60 min before and during testing. An asterisk denotes significant difference ($p < 0.05$, ANOVA) from other unmarked groups. Data are shown as the mean \pm SEM.

A Model for the Role of MB-MP Neurons

NPY inhibits synaptic function in mammals (Colmers et al., 1988, 1991; Klapstein and Colmers, 1993; Qian et al., 1997; Rhim et al., 1997; Sun et al., 2003; Browning and Travagli, 2003; Lin et al., 2004), and our data suggest that dNPF promotes appetitive memory performance by suppressing inhibitory MB-MP neurons. We propose a model in which MB-MP neurons gate MB output (Figure 7). Appetitive memory performance is low in fed flies because the MB $\alpha\beta$ and γ neurons are inhibited by tonic dopamine release from MB-MP neurons. Hence, when the fly encounters

and Benoit, 2009). In hungry mice, leptin and insulin levels fall, leading to loss of inhibition of NPY neurons. Flies do not have leptin, but they have several insulin-like peptides (Arquier et al., 2008), that may regulate dNPF neurons. Some NPY-expressing neurons are directly inhibited by glucose (Levin et al., 2006). Fly neurons could sense glucose with the Bride of Sevenless receptor (Kohyama-Koganeya et al., 2008). In blowflies, satiety involves mechanical tension of the gut and abdomen (Gelperin, 1967, 1971). Lastly, it will be interesting to test the role of other extracellular signals implicated in fruit fly feeding behavior, including the hugin (Melcher and Pankratz, 2005) and take-out neuropeptides (Sarov-Blat et al., 2000; Meunier et al., 2007).

the conditioned odorant during memory testing, the MB neurons encoding that olfactory memory respond, but the signal is not propagated beyond the MB because of the inhibitory influence of MB-MP neurons. However, when the flies are food deprived, dNPF levels rise, and dNPF disinhibits MB-MP neurons, and other circuits, through the action of NPFR1. dNPF disinhibition of the MB-MP neurons opens the gate on the MB. Therefore, when hungry flies encounter the conditioned odorant during memory testing, the relevant MB neurons are activated and the signal propagates to downstream neurons, leading to expression of the conditioned behavior.

Satiety and hunger are not absolute states. We sometimes observe above-chance performance scores in fed flies, and




Figure 7. Model for the Role of MB-MP Neurons

Left panels illustrate the state of the inhibitory control exerted upon the MB in the fed state (top) and starved state (bottom). When fed flies are exposed to the conditioned odor during memory testing (right panels), the appropriate projection neurons and MB neurons are activated (yellow). However, the signal only propagates beyond the MB neurons in hungry flies when the MB-MP neuron “gate” is open. Red lines denote inhibition, and green lines denote relief from inhibition. See the Discussion for more detail.

shorter periods of feeding after training suggest that inhibition of performance is graded. This could be accounted for by a competitive push-pull inhibitory mechanism between dNPF and MB-MP neurons.

By gating the MB through the MB-MP neurons, hunger and satiety are likely affecting the relative salience of learned odor cues in the fly brain. However, MB-MP neurons are unlikely to change the sensory representation of odor in the MB because flies trained with stimulated MB-MP neurons perform normally when tested for memory without stimulation (Figure S6A). Therefore, odors are likely perceived the same irrespective of MB-MP neuron activity. Furthermore, the MB-MP neurons did not affect naive responses to the specific odorants used. It will be interesting to test whether MB-MP neurons change responses to other odorants and/or modulate arousal (Andreatic et al., 2005; Kume et al., 2005; Seugnet et al., 2008), visual stimulus salience (Zhang et al., 2007), and attention-like phenomena (van Swinderen, 2007).

Structural and Functional Subdivision of DA Neurons

There are eight different morphological classes of DA neurons that innervate the MB (Mao and Davis, 2009), and our data imply functional subdivision. Previous studies concluded that DA neurons convey aversive reinforcement (Schwaerzel et al., 2003; Schroll et al., 2006; Riemensperger et al., 2005) (Figure S7).

We specifically manipulated the MB-MP DA neurons. MB-MP neurons are not required for acquisition of aversive olfactory memory ($p > 0.94$) (Figure S7), consistent with a distinct function in controlling the expression of appetitive memory. Since several studies have implicated the MB α lobe in memory (Pascual and

Preat, 2001; Yu et al., 2005, 2006), other DA neurons in PPL1 that innervate the α lobe (like those labeled in MBGAL80;krasavietz, Figures 5C and S4) may provide reinforcement. The MB-MP neurons may also be functionally divisible and independently regulated to gate MB function. The idea that a specific DA circuit restricts stimulus-evoked behavior is reminiscent of literature tying dopamine to impulse control in mammals (Weintraub, 2008; Blum et al., 1996). Previous studies of DA neurons in *Drosophila* (Schwaerzel et al., 2003; Schroll et al., 2006; Seugnet et al., 2008; Andreatic et al., 2005; Kume et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2007) have simultaneously manipulated all, or large numbers of DA neurons. Our data suggest that the DA neurons should be considered as individuals or small groups.

Motivation and Learning in Flies

Flies have to be hungry to efficiently acquire appetitive memory, but whether this reflects a state-dependent neural mechanism or results from the failure to ingest enough sugar is unclear. Stimulation of MB-MP neurons in hungry flies did not impair appetitive memory formation (Figure S6A), and therefore MB-MP neurons are unlikely to constrain learning in fed flies. Other dNPF-regulated neurons may provide this control since NPY has been implicated in learning (Redrobe et al., 2004).

Hunger Simultaneously Regulates Discrete Neural Circuit Modules

The dNPF-expressing neurons innervate broad regions of the brain and may simultaneously modulate distinct neural circuits to promote food seeking. MB-MP neurons represent a circuit through which the salience of learned food-relevant odor cues is regulated by relative nutritional state. Given the apparent role of the MB as a locomotor regulator (Huber, 1967; Martin et al., 1998; Pitman et al., 2006; Joiner et al., 2006), MB-MP neurons may also generally promote exploratory behavior. There are likely to be independent circuits for other elements of food-seeking behavior including those that potentiate gustatory pathway sensitivity and promote ingestion.

NPY stimulates feeding but inhibits sexual behavior in rats (Clark et al., 1985). Modulators exerting differential effects could provide a neural mechanism to establish a hierarchy of motivated states and coordinate behavioral control. dNPF may potentiate activity in food seeking-related circuits while suppressing circuits required for other potentially competing behaviors, e.g., sexual pursuit.

Regulating Behavior with Inhibitory Control

In this study, we provide the first multilevel neural circuit perspective for a learned motivated behavior in fruit flies. Our work demonstrates a clear state-dependence for the expression of appetitive memory. Odorants that evoke conditioned appetitive behavior in hungry flies are ineffective at evoking appetitive behavior in satiated flies. Therefore, the fly brain is not simply a collection of input-output reflex units and includes neural circuits through which the internal physiological state of the animal establishes the appropriate context for behavioral expression.

Dethier (1976) proposed that “a satiated fly receives maximum inhibitory feedback so that sensory input is behaviorally

ineffective. As deprivation increases inhibition wanes and sensory input becomes increasingly effective in initiating feeding.” Our data provide experimental evidence that this prediction is also likely to be accurate for expression of appetitive memory in the fruit fly where the mechanism involves neuromodulation in the central brain. The DA MB-MP neurons inhibit the expression of appetitive memory performance in satiated flies, whereas dNPF disinhibits the MB-MP neurons in food-deprived flies. The likelihood that appetitive behavior is triggered by the conditioned odorant is therefore determined by the competition between inhibitory systems in the brain. The concept that continuously active inhibitory forces in the insect brain control behavioral expression was also proposed many years ago (Roeder, 1955). Here, we provide evidence that these neurons exist and that their hierarchical arrangement is a key determinant of behavioral control.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Fly Strains

See the Supplemental Data for fly stock source. To express dTRPA1 in dNPF neurons, we crossed *uas-dTrpA1* females to *dNPF-GAL4* male flies. To screen for neurons that required *npfr1*, we crossed female *uas-npfr1^{RNAi}* flies to *c061*, *c061;THGAL80*, *210Y*, *c005*, *104Y*, *OK107*, *MB247*, *TH-GAL4*, *n-syb*, or *n-syb;uas-dcr2* males. *c061* is located on the X chromosome, so female *c061;MBGAL80* flies were crossed to *uas-shi^{ts1}* males. Similarly, we crossed *c061;MBGAL80* females with *THGAL80;uas-shi^{ts1}* males. To express *uas-shi^{ts1}* in MB-MP neurons, we crossed female *uas-shi^{ts1}* flies to *NP2758* or *MBGAL80;krasavietz* males. Since *NP2758* is on the X chromosome, only female flies were assayed from the *NP2758* cross. We expressed dTRPA1 in the MB-MP neurons by crossing female *uas-dTrpA1* flies to *NP2758* or *MBGAL80;krasavietz* males or *c061;MBGAL80* females with *uas-dTrpA1* males. All GAL4 and *uas-transgene* flies were crossed with wild-type females to create heterozygous controls. We visualized GAL4 expression by crossing to *uas-mCD8::GFP* or *uas-mCD8::GFP;MB-DsRED* flies (Lee and Luo, 1999; Riemensperger et al., 2005).

Behavioral Analysis

All flies were food deprived for 16–20 hr before being trained in milk bottles containing 10 × 6 cm filter paper soaked with water. The olfactory appetitive paradigm was performed as described (Krashes and Waddell, 2008). After training, flies were stored for 3 hr in vials with food or containing only water-damp filter paper. All experiments performed after feeding included a control group of food-deprived flies. The performance index (PI) was calculated as the number of flies running toward the conditioned odor minus the number of flies running toward the unconditioned odor divided by the total number of flies in the experiment. A single PI value is the average score from flies of the identical genotype tested with each odor (3-Octanol or 4-Methylcyclohexanol). Olfactory and gustatory acuity was performed according to Keene et al. (2006).

Statistical analyses were performed using KaleidaGraph (Synergy Software). Overall analyses of variance (ANOVA) were followed by planned pairwise comparisons between the relevant groups with a Tukey honestly significant difference post hoc test. Unless stated otherwise, all experiments are $n \geq 8$.

Immunohistochemistry

Adult female flies were collected 3–5 days after eclosion, and brains or entire central nervous systems were dissected in ice-cold PBS (1.86 mM NaH_2PO_4 , 8.41 mM Na_2HPO_4 , 175 mM NaCl) and fixed in 2% paraformaldehyde solution in PBS for 10 min at room temperature (RT). Samples were then washed five times for 15 min with PBS containing 0.25% Triton X-100 (PBT), blocked for 1 hr with PBT containing 5% normal goat serum (all at RT), and incubated with primary antibody in blocking solution for 2 days at 4°C. Samples were washed five times for 15 min in PBT, incubated with secondary antibody in

PBT for 12 hr at 4°C, and washed ten times for 15 min with PBT and two times in PBS for 15 min, and mounted in Vectashield (Vector Labs) for confocal microscopy. Imaging was performed on a Zeiss LSM 5 Pascal confocal microscope, and images were processed in ImageJ and Adobe Photoshop. In some cases, debris on the brain surface was manually deleted from the relevant confocal sections to permit construction of a clear projection view of the Z stack. Antibodies were diluted: mouse IgG_{2a} anti-GFP (Invitrogen, 1:200), rabbit anti-Tyrosine hydroxylase (Chemicon, 1:100), rabbit anti-dNPF (gift from P. Shen, 1:2000), rabbit anti-GABA (Sigma, 1:100), mouse monoclonal 4B1 anti-*Drosophila* ChAT (Hybridoma Bank, University of Iowa, 1:100), FITC-conjugated anti-Mouse IgG_{2a} (Jackson Laboratory, 1:200), Cy3-conjugated anti-rabbit (Jackson Laboratory, 1:200), and Cy5-conjugated anti-Mouse IgG₁₇ (Jackson Laboratory 1:200).

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Supplemental Data include Supplemental Results, Supplemental Experimental Procedures, one table, seven figures, and six movies and can be found with this article online at [http://www.cell.com/supplemental/S0092-8674\(09\)01105-2](http://www.cell.com/supplemental/S0092-8674(09)01105-2).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Andre Fiala, Paul Garrity, Julie Simpson, Ping Shen, Tim Tully, and Troy Zars for flies. We also thank Geraldine Wright, Hans Hoffman, Tzumin Lee, and Stanley Heinze for their input. This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grants MH09883 and MH081982 to S.W. and National Research Service Award DA024499 to M.J.K.

Received: April 1, 2009

Revised: June 10, 2009

Accepted: August 17, 2009

Published: October 15, 2009

REFERENCES

- Abizaid, A., and Horvath, T.L. (2008). Brain circuits regulating energy homeostasis. *Regul. Pept.* 149, 3–10.
- Andretic, R., van Swinderen, B., and Greenspan, R.J. (2005). Dopaminergic modulation of arousal in *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.* 15, 1165–1175.
- Arquier, N., Geminard, C., Bourouis, M., Jarretou, G., Honegger, B., Paix, A., and Leopold, P. (2008). *Drosophila* ALS regulates growth and metabolism through functional interaction with insulin-like peptides. *Cell Metab.* 7, 333–338.
- Bellen, H.J., Levis, R.W., Liao, G., He, Y., Carlson, J.W., Tsang, G., Evans-Holm, M., Hiesinger, P.R., Schulze, K.L., Rubin, G.M., et al. (2004). The BDGP gene disruption project: single transposon insertions associated with 40% of *Drosophila* genes. *Genetics* 167, 761–781.
- Bewick, G.A., Gardiner, J.V., Dhillon, W.S., Kent, A.S., White, N.E., Webster, Z., Ghatei, M.A., and Bloom, S.R. (2005). Post-embryonic ablation of AgRP neurons in mice leads to a lean, hypophagic phenotype. *FASEB J.* 19, 1680–1682.
- Bindra, D. (1959). *Motivation: A Systematic Reinterpretation* (New York: Ronald Press Company).
- Blum, K., Sheridan, P.J., Wood, R.C., Braverman, E.R., Chen, T.J., Cull, J.G., and Comings, D.E. (1996). The D2 dopamine receptor gene as a determinant of reward deficiency syndrome. *J. R. Soc. Med.* 89, 396–400.
- Brown, M.R., Crim, J.W., Arata, R.C., Cai, H.N., Chun, C., and Shen, P. (1999). Identification of a *Drosophila* brain-gut peptide related to the neuropeptide Y family. *Peptides* 20, 1035–1042.
- Browning, K.N., and Travagli, R.A. (2003). Neuropeptide Y and peptide YY inhibit excitatory synaptic transmission in the rat dorsal motor nucleus of the vagus. *J. Physiol.* 549, 775–785.

- Clark, J.T., Kalra, P.S., Crowley, W.R., and Kalra, S.P. (1984). Neuropeptide Y and human pancreatic polypeptide stimulate feeding behavior in rats. *Endocrinology* 115, 427–429.
- Clark, J.T., Kalra, P.S., and Kalra, S.P. (1985). Neuropeptide Y stimulates feeding but inhibits sexual behavior in rats. *Endocrinology* 117, 2435–2442.
- Colmers, W.F., Lukowiak, K., and Pittman, Q.J. (1988). Neuropeptide Y action in the rat hippocampal slice: site and mechanism of presynaptic inhibition. *J. Neurosci.* 8, 3827–3837.
- Colmers, W.F., Klapstein, G.J., Fournier, A., St-Pierre, S., and Treherne, K.A. (1991). Presynaptic inhibition by neuropeptide Y in rat hippocampal slice in vitro is mediated by a Y2 receptor. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 102, 41–44.
- Dethier, V.G. (1976). *The Hungry Fly - A Physiological Study of the Behaviour* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Dubnau, J., Chiang, A.S., Grady, L., Barditch, J., Gossweiler, S., McNeil, J., Smith, P., Buldoc, F., Scott, R., Certa, U., et al. (2003). The stufen/pumilio pathway is involved in Drosophila long-term memory. *Curr. Biol.* 13, 286–296.
- Figlewicz, D.P., and Benoit, S.C. (2009). Insulin, leptin, and food reward: update 2008. *Am. J. Physiol. Regul. Integr. Comp. Physiol.* 296, R9–R19.
- Friggi-Grelin, F., Coulom, H., Meller, M., Gomez, D., Hirsh, J., and Birman, S. (2003). Targeted gene expression in Drosophila dopaminergic cells using regulatory sequences from tyrosine hydroxylase. *J. Neurobiol.* 54, 618–627.
- Garczynski, S.F., Brown, M.R., Shen, P., Murray, T.F., and Crim, J.W. (2002). Characterization of a functional neuropeptide F receptor from Drosophila melanogaster. *Peptides* 23, 773–780.
- Gelperin, A. (1967). Stretch receptors in the foregut of the blowfly. *Science* 157, 208–210.
- Gelperin, A. (1971). Abdominal sensory neurons providing negative feedback to the feeding behavior of the blowfly. *J. Comp. Physiol. [A]* 72, 17–31.
- Gropp, E., Shanabrough, M., Borok, E., Xu, A.W., Janoschek, R., Buch, T., Plum, L., Balthasar, N., Hampel, B., Waisman, A., et al. (2005). Agouti-related peptide-expressing neurons are mandatory for feeding. *Nat. Neurosci.* 8, 1289–1291.
- Hamada, F.N., Rosenzweig, M., Kang, K., Pulver, S.R., Ghezzi, A., Jegla, T.J., and Garrity, P.A. (2008). An internal thermal sensor controlling temperature preference in Drosophila. *Nature* 454, 217–220.
- Hinde, R.A. (1966). *Animal Behaviour: A Synthesis of Ethology and Comparative Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company).
- Huber, F. (1967). Central control of movements and behavior of invertebrates. In *Invertebrate Nervous Systems*, C.A.G. Wiersma, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), pp. 333–351.
- Hull, C.L. (1951). *Essentials of Behavior* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Joiner, W.J., Crocker, A., White, B.H., and Sehgal, A. (2006). Sleep in Drosophila is regulated by adult mushroom bodies. *Nature* 441, 757–760.
- Kalra, S.P. (1997). Appetite and body weight regulation: is it all in the brain? *Neuron* 19, 227–230.
- Keene, A.C., and Waddell, S. (2007). Drosophila olfactory memory: single genes to complex neural circuits. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 8, 341–354.
- Keene, A.C., Krashes, M.J., Leung, B., Bernard, J.A., and Waddell, S. (2006). Drosophila dorsal paired medial neurons provide a general mechanism for memory consolidation. *Curr. Biol.* 16, 1524–1530.
- Kennedy, J.S. (1987). Animal motivation: the beginning of the end? In *Perspectives in Chemoreception and Behavior*, T. Jermy, R.F. Chapman, E.A. Bernays, and J.G. Stoffolano, eds. (New York: Springer).
- Kitamoto, T. (2001). Conditional modification of behavior in Drosophila by targeted expression of a temperature-sensitive shibire allele in defined neurons. *J. Neurobiol.* 47, 81–92.
- Klapstein, G.J., and Colmers, W.F. (1993). On the sites of presynaptic inhibition by neuropeptide Y in rat hippocampus in vitro. *Hippocampus* 3, 103–111.
- Kohyama-Koganeya, A., Kim, Y.J., Miura, M., and Hirabayashi, Y. (2008). A Drosophila orphan G protein-coupled receptor BOSS functions as a glucose-responding receptor: loss of boss causes abnormal energy metabolism. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105, 15328–15333.
- Krashes, M.J., and Waddell, S. (2008). Rapid consolidation to a radish and protein synthesis-dependent long-term memory after single-session appetitive olfactory conditioning in Drosophila. *J. Neurosci.* 28, 3103–3113.
- Krashes, M.J., Keene, A.C., Leung, B., Armstrong, J.D., and Waddell, S. (2007). Sequential use of mushroom body neuron subsets during drosophila odor memory processing. *Neuron* 53, 103–115.
- Kume, K., Kume, S., Park, S.K., Hirsh, J., and Jackson, F.R. (2005). Dopamine is a regulator of arousal in the fruit fly. *J. Neurosci.* 25, 7377–7384.
- Lee, T., and Luo, L. (1999). Mosaic analysis with a repressible cell marker for studies of gene function in neuronal morphogenesis. *Neuron* 22, 451–461.
- Levin, B.E., Kang, L., Sanders, N.M., and Dunn-Meynell, A.A. (2006). Role of neuronal glucosensing in the regulation of energy homeostasis. *Diabetes* 55, 122–130.
- Lin, S., Boey, D., and Herzog, H. (2004). NPY and Y receptors: lessons from transgenic and knockout models. *Neuropeptides* 38, 189–200.
- Lorenz, K.Z. (1950). The comparative method in studying innate behaviour patterns. In *Symposia of the Society for Experimental Biology*, No. 4, Physiological Mechanisms in Animal Behaviour (New York: Academic Press), pp. 221–268.
- Luquet, S., Perez, F.A., Hnasko, T.S., and Palmiter, R.D. (2005). NPY/AgRP neurons are essential for feeding in adult mice but can be ablated in neonates. *Science* 310, 683–685.
- Mao, Z., and Davis, R.L. (2009). Eight different types of dopaminergic neurons innervate the Drosophila mushroom body neuropil: anatomical and physiological heterogeneity. *Front Neural Circuits* 3, 5.
- Martin, J.R., Ernst, R., and Heisenberg, M. (1998). Mushroom bodies suppress locomotor activity in Drosophila melanogaster. *Learn. Mem.* 5, 179–191.
- McKemy, D.D., Neuhausser, W.M., and Julius, D. (2002). Identification of a cold receptor reveals a general role for TRP channels in thermosensation. *Nature* 416, 52–58.
- Melcher, C., and Pankratz, M.J. (2005). Candidate gustatory interneurons modulating feeding behavior in the Drosophila brain. *PLoS Biol.* 3, e305.
- Meunier, N., Belgacem, Y.H., and Martin, J.R. (2007). Regulation of feeding behaviour and locomotor activity by takeout in Drosophila. *J. Exp. Biol.* 210, 1424–1434.
- Pascual, A., and Preat, T. (2001). Localization of long-term memory within the Drosophila mushroom body. *Science* 294, 1115–1117.
- Peabody, N.C., Pohl, J.B., Diao, F., Vreede, A.P., Sandstrom, D.J., Wang, H., Zelensky, P.K., and White, B.H. (2009). Characterization of the decision network for wing expansion in Drosophila using targeted expression of the TRPM8 channel. *J. Neurosci.* 29, 3343–3353.
- Peier, A.M., Moqrich, A., Hergarden, A.C., Reeve, A.J., Andersson, D.A., Story, G.M., Earley, T.J., Dragoni, I., McIntyre, P., Bevan, S., and Patapoutian, A. (2002). A TRP channel that senses cold stimuli and menthol. *Cell* 108, 705–715.
- Pitman, J.L., McGill, J.J., Keegan, K.P., and Allada, R. (2006). A dynamic role for the mushroom bodies in promoting sleep in Drosophila. *Nature* 441, 753–756.
- Qian, J., Colmers, W.F., and Saggau, P. (1997). Inhibition of synaptic transmission by neuropeptide Y in rat hippocampal area CA1: modulation of presynaptic Ca²⁺ entry. *J. Neurosci.* 17, 8169–8177.
- Redrobe, J.P., Dumont, Y., Herzog, H., and Quirion, R. (2004). Characterization of neuropeptide Y, Y(2) receptor knockout mice in two animal models of learning and memory processing. *J. Mol. Neurosci.* 22, 159–166.
- Rhim, H., Kinney, G.A., Emmerson, P.J., and Miller, R.J. (1997). Regulation of neurotransmission in the arcuate nucleus of the rat by different neuropeptide Y receptors. *J. Neurosci.* 17, 2980–2989.
- Riemensperger, T., Voller, T., Stock, P., Buchner, E., and Fiala, A. (2005). Punishment prediction by dopaminergic neurons in Drosophila. *Curr. Biol.* 15, 1953–1960.

- Roeder, K.D. (1955). Spontaneous activity and behavior. *Scientific Monthly* *80*, 362–370.
- Sahu, A., Kalra, P.S., and Kalra, S.P. (1988). Food deprivation and ingestion induce reciprocal changes in neuropeptide Y concentrations in the paraventricular nucleus. *Peptides* *9*, 83–86.
- Sanacora, G., Kershaw, M., Finkelstein, J.A., and White, J.D. (1990). Increased hypothalamic content of preproneuropeptide Y messenger ribonucleic acid in genetically obese Zucker rats and its regulation by food deprivation. *Endocrinology* *127*, 730–737.
- Saper, C.B., Chou, T.C., and Elmquist, J.K. (2002). The need to feed: homeostatic and hedonic control of eating. *Neuron* *36*, 199–211.
- Sarov-Blat, L., So, W.V., Liu, L., and Rosbash, M. (2000). The *Drosophila* takeout gene is a novel molecular link between circadian rhythms and feeding behavior. *Cell* *101*, 647–656.
- Schroll, C., Riemensperger, T., Bucher, D., Ehmer, J., Voller, T., Erbguth, K., Gerber, B., Hendel, T., Nagel, G., Buchner, E., and Fiala, A. (2006). Light-induced activation of distinct modulatory neurons triggers appetitive or aversive learning in *Drosophila* larvae. *Curr. Biol.* *16*, 1741–1747.
- Schwaerzel, M., Monastirioti, M., Scholz, H., Friggi-Grelin, F., Birman, S., and Heisenberg, M. (2003). Dopamine and octopamine differentiate between aversive and appetitive olfactory memories in *Drosophila*. *J. Neurosci.* *23*, 10495–10502.
- Seugnet, L., Suzuki, Y., Vine, L., Gottschalk, L., and Shaw, P.J. (2008). D1 receptor activation in the mushroom bodies rescues sleep-loss-induced learning impairments in *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.* *18*, 1110–1117.
- Shang, Y., Claridge-Chang, A., Sjulson, L., Pypaert, M., and Miesenböck, G. (2007). Excitatory local circuits and their implications for olfactory processing in the fly antennal lobe. *Cell* *128*, 601–612.
- Sitaraman, D., Zars, M., Laferriere, H., Chen, Y.C., Sable-Smith, A., Kitamoto, T., Rottinghaus, G.E., and Zars, T. (2008). Serotonin is necessary for place memory in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *105*, 5579–5584.
- Stanley, B.G., and Leibowitz, S.F. (1985). Neuropeptide Y injected in the paraventricular hypothalamus: a powerful stimulant of feeding behavior. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *82*, 3940–3943.
- Sun, Q.Q., Baraban, S.C., Prince, D.A., and Huguenard, J.R. (2003). Target-specific neuropeptide Y-ergic synaptic inhibition and its network consequences within the mammalian thalamus. *J. Neurosci.* *23*, 9639–9649.
- Tanaka, N.K., Tanimoto, H., and Ito, K. (2008). Neuronal assemblies of the *Drosophila* mushroom body. *J. Comp. Neurol.* *508*, 711–755.
- Tatemoto, K., Carlquist, M., and Mutt, V. (1982). Neuropeptide Y—a novel brain peptide with structural similarities to peptide YY and pancreatic polypeptide. *Nature* *296*, 659–660.
- Tempel, B.L., Bonini, N., Dawson, D.R., and Quinn, W.G. (1983). Reward learning in normal and mutant *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *80*, 1482–1486.
- Thorpe, W.H. (1956). *Learning and Instinct in Animals* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Toates, F.M. (1986). *Motivational Systems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tolman, E.C. (1932). *Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men* (New York: The Century Co.).
- Tully, T., and Quinn, W.G. (1985). Classical conditioning and retention in normal and mutant *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Comp. Physiol. [A]* *157*, 263–277.
- van Swinderen, B. (2007). Attention-like processes in *Drosophila* require short-term memory genes. *Science* *315*, 1590–1593.
- Watts, A.G. (2003). Motivation. In *The Handbook of Brain Theory and Neural Networks*, M.A. Arbib, ed. (Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books, MIT Press), pp. 680–683.
- Weintraub, D. (2008). Dopamine and impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease. *Ann. Neurol.* *64* (Suppl 2), S93–S100.
- Wen, T., Parrish, C.A., Xu, D., Wu, Q., and Shen, P. (2005). *Drosophila* neuropeptide F and its receptor, NPFR1, define a signaling pathway that acutely modulates alcohol sensitivity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *102*, 2141–2146.
- Wu, Q., Wen, T., Lee, G., Park, J.H., Cai, H.N., and Shen, P. (2003). Developmental control of foraging and social behavior by the *Drosophila* neuropeptide Y-like system. *Neuron* *39*, 147–161.
- Wu, Q., Zhao, Z., and Shen, P. (2005). Regulation of aversion to noxious food by *Drosophila* neuropeptide Y- and insulin-like systems. *Nat. Neurosci.* *8*, 1350–1355.
- Yu, D., Keene, A.C., Srivatsan, A., Waddell, S., and Davis, R.L. (2005). *Drosophila* DPM neurons form a delayed and branch-specific memory trace after olfactory classical conditioning. *Cell* *123*, 945–957.
- Yu, D., Akalal, D.B., and Davis, R.L. (2006). *Drosophila* alpha/beta mushroom body neurons form a branch-specific, long-term cellular memory trace after spaced olfactory conditioning. *Neuron* *52*, 845–855.
- Zhang, K., Guo, J.Z., Peng, Y., Xi, W., and Guo, A. (2007). Dopamine-mushroom body circuit regulates saliency-based decision-making in *Drosophila*. *Science* *316*, 1901–1904.