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SUMMARY

Dopamine is thought to play a major role in learning. However, while dopamine D1 receptors (D1Rs) in the prefrontal cortex (PFC) have been shown to modulate working memory-related neural activity, their role in the cellular basis of learning is unknown. We recorded activity from multiple electrodes while injecting the D1R antagonist SCH23390 in the lateral PFC as monkeys learned visuomotor associations. Blocking D1Rs impaired learning of novel associations and decreased cognitive flexibility but spared performance of already familiar associations. This suggests a greater role for prefrontal D1Rs in learning new, rather than performing familiar, associations. There was a corresponding greater decrease in neural selectivity and increase in alpha and beta oscillations in local field potentials for novel than for familiar associations. Our results suggest that weak stimulation of D1Rs observed in aging and psychiatric disorders may impair learning and PFC function by reducing neural selectivity and exacerbating neural oscillations associated with inattention and cognitive deficits.

INTRODUCTION

Learning and memory are foundations of advanced cognition. Their impairment is found, for example, in Parkinson’s disease and schizophrenia (Owen et al., 1992; Park and Holzman, 1992; Elvevåg and Goldberg, 2000; Lewis et al., 2003; Jankovic, 2008; Wang et al., 2011). These disorders also impact the PFC as monkeys learned visuomotor associations. Blocking D1Rs impaired learning of novel associations and decreased cognitive flexibility but spared performance of already familiar associations. This suggests a greater role for prefrontal D1Rs in learning new, rather than performing familiar, associations. There was a corresponding greater decrease in neural selectivity and increase in alpha and beta oscillations in local field potentials for novel than for familiar associations. Our results suggest that weak stimulation of D1Rs observed in aging and psychiatric disorders may impair learning and PFC function by reducing neural selectivity and exacerbating neural oscillations associated with inattention and cognitive deficits.

Learning and memory are foundations of advanced cognition. Their impairment is found, for example, in Parkinson’s disease and schizophrenia (Owen et al., 1992; Park and Holzman, 1992; Elvevåg and Goldberg, 2000; Lewis et al., 2003; Jankovic, 2008; Wang et al., 2011). These disorders also impact the PFC as monkeys learned visuomotor associations. Blocking D1Rs impaired learning of novel associations and decreased cognitive flexibility but spared performance of already familiar associations. This suggests a greater role for prefrontal D1Rs in learning new, rather than performing familiar, associations. There was a corresponding greater decrease in neural selectivity and increase in alpha and beta oscillations in local field potentials for novel than for familiar associations. Our results suggest that weak stimulation of D1Rs observed in aging and psychiatric disorders may impair learning and PFC function by reducing neural selectivity and exacerbating neural oscillations associated with inattention and cognitive deficits.

In addition to understanding D1R function at the single neuron level, additional insight can be gained from the next level up: interactions between networks of neurons. This is often studied by examining oscillations in the local field potentials (LFPs) and coherence in neural activity, which are thought to reflect communication and interactions between neuron populations. In the cortex, oscillations at alpha, beta, and gamma frequencies have been associated with attention and memory (Engel et al., 2001; Fries et al., 2001, 2008; Jensen et al., 2002; Buschman and Miller, 2007; Schroeder and Lakatos, 2009; Siegel et al., 2009; Benchenane et al., 2011; Bollimunta et al., 2011). Importantly, altered oscillations have been observed in normal and pathological aging (Lizlo et al., 2011) and in a number of neurological and psychiatric disorders, notably Parkinson’s disease and schizophrenia (Spencer et al., 2003; Cho et al., 2006; Uhlhaas and Singer, 2006; Başar and Güntekin, 2008; Wang,
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Two monkeys learned associations between visual cues presented at the center of gaze and saccades to the right or left by trial and error (Figure 1A). Cue and saccade were separated by a short (1,000 ms) memory delay. To compare new learning with well-learned associations, we blocked trials with pairs of novel cues on 80% of the trials (learning trials) and pairs of highly familiar cues on 20% of the trials (familiar trials). Once a pair of new associations was learned (at least 80% correct for each novel cue; see Experimental Procedures), two new cues replaced the previously novel cues and a new block started. Familiar cues remained unchanged for the entire session. Monkeys completed 8–12 blocks per session during training. In each session, monkeys first completed several preinjection (baseline) blocks (Figure 1B). Then, 3 μl of either saline or the D1R antagonist SCH23390 (30 μg) were pressure injected into the dorsolateral or ventrolateral PFC (dlPFC and vlPFC, respectively) through a metal cannula at 0.3 μl/min (see Experimental Procedures). Injections started at the beginning of a block (injection block), and different numbers of baseline blocks were used in different sessions (Figure 1B) to avoid any confounds related to systematic changes in monkeys’ behavior with block. The animals never stopped working during the session.

We first determined whether the monkeys’ performance showed any postinjection learning deficit. A distribution of monkeys’ error rates during learning trials was generated by fitting a sigmoid curve to the trial-by-trial performance (Williams and Eskandar, 2006; see Experimental Procedures). The average distribution across the baseline blocks was compared to the distribution from each block after the injection using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test. In saline sessions (n = 20), we did not observe any postinjection deficit (p > 0.05; first 60 trials/block, the minimum block length). In 21 of the 30 sessions in which SCH23390 was injected, there were significantly worse learning performances on the injection block and/or the next block relative to baseline blocks (KS, p < 0.05).

RESULTS

Prefrontal Dopamine D1 Receptors Are More Important for Learning New Associations than Performance of Familiar Associations

(A) Monkeys performed a delayed associative learning task, similar to that described previously (Asaad et al., 1998; Pasupathy and Miller, 2005). Animals fixated to start trial. A cue object was followed by a brief memory delay and presentation of two target dots. Saccade to the target associated with the cue was rewarded with juice drops. Trials were blocked in pairs of novel cues (80% of trials) and pairs of highly familiar cues (20%). When performance of learning trials reached 80%, novel cues were replaced and a new block started.

(B) Monkeys first completed several baseline blocks (green lines before injections). Then, 3 μl of saline or SCH23390 (30 μg diluted in saline) were pressure injected in the left PFC (injection block, first red line). Blocks affected by the treatments (postinjection blocks, second red line) were followed by blocks in which behavior recovered (washout blocks, green lines after injections). Drugs were injected after different numbers of baseline blocks (2–4; B1–B4; B1–B4) in different sessions (S1–S3).

In fact, for all affected sessions, learning was impaired only on the first two postinjection blocks, even though an affected session was defined as an effect on any postinjection block. Representative examples are shown in Figure 2A.

Learning rate was defined as the slope of the sigmoid curve fitted to the trial-by-trial performance, high rates indicating rapid learning. Figure 2B shows the average learning curves and learning rates across saline and affected SCH23390 sessions. The learning rates of the first two blocks after SCH23390 in significantly affected sessions were smaller than the baseline learning rates (logistic regression of the first 60 trials/block in 50 baseline blocks, mean slope = 0.05 ± 0.008 versus 38 postinjection blocks, mean slope = 0.017 ± 0.007; mean ± SEM; Wilcoxon test, p = 0.005). These postinjection learning rates
Figure 2. Dopamine D1 Receptors in the Lateral PFC Are More Involved in Learning New Associations than Performance of Familiar Associations

(A) Representative examples of the performance (average of three trials) of two different sessions in which saline (top) and SCH23390 (SCH; bottom) were injected. Each plot corresponds to an individual block. Saline did not affect learning, whereas SCH23390 altered the learning curve immediately. The performance of familiar associations remained intact (Fam, percent correct is shown on top left of each block).

(B) Average percent correct performance across sessions during learning for the preinjection baseline block (block +1), the block during which saline or SCH23390 was injected, and the first (block +1), second (block +2), and third (block +3) postinjection blocks. The learning rates are also shown. Note that during the injection block and first postinjection block, learning curves are slower (shallower) and learning rates are smaller. Saline (Sal), n = 20 sessions; SCH23390 impairs (SCH imp), n = 21 sessions; SCH23390 no effect (SCH ne), n = 9 sessions.

(C) Number of blocks learned and average number of correct trials to criterion for baseline (Bas), drug, and washout (WO) blocks.

(D) Map of the injections. Injection sites where the learning performance was affected (red dots) and unaffected (green dots) by saline or SCH23390 are shown. The exact location of the injections was determined by magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). PS, Principal sulcus; AS, Arcuate sulcus.

(E) Perseverative errors increased significantly after the injection of SCH23390 (t test).

(F) The performance of familiar associations was not affected by the treatments in any session.

(G) Reaction times (RT) during familiar associations (blue bars) were smaller than during novel associations (red bars). This difference was enhanced after the injection of SCH23390 in D1R-modulated sites. The mean and SEM are shown. **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; t test. See also Figure S1.
were also smaller than that of the first two blocks after saline injections (40 postsaline injection blocks, mean = 0.06 ± 0.007; p = 1 × 10^{-5}) and smaller than the learning rates of the first two blocks after SCH23390 in unaffected sessions (18 postinjection blocks, mean = 0.12 ± 0.04; p = 3 × 10^{-5}). On average, the impairment lasted 1 hr (59 ± 5 min), during which monkeys completed fewer numbers of blocks because they needed more correct trials to learn the associations (Figure 2C). There was an anatomical dissociation between affected and unaffected sites: most (18 of 21) sessions with a learning deficit followed vPFC injections, whereas the sites unaffected by SCH23390 were mainly in the dIPFC (Figure 2D, proportion of vPFC versus dIPFC affected sites; chi-square, p = 9 × 10^{-5}). We did not observe any anterior versus posterior trend for the location of affected sites. Performance for each of the two novel cues was similarly impaired in both animals (see Figure S1 available online).

The learning impairment was not due to altered eye movements. We did not observe any major changes in the trajectories or accuracy of the saccades after the injection of SCH23390. The vast majority of saccades during error trials ended within the target window around the incorrect target (<4.0°). In fact, if anything, saccade accuracy somewhat improved after SCH23390: there was an increase in error trial saccades ending within the incorrect target window (88% ± 4% to 95% ± 5% of error trials; t test, p = 0.02). The average eye movement velocities (deg/s) also increased after injection of SCH23390 (from 401 ± 3 deg/s to 422 ± 5 deg/s; p = 4 × 10^{-5}), perhaps due to frustration from the learning impairment and reduction in reward. Errors were not caused by increased impulsivity, a premature saccade toward the correct target before the “go” cue (baseline, 7.4% ± 0.5% of trials; SCH23390, 7.7% ± 0.6%; Wilcoxon test, p = 0.62 versus baseline, p = 0.75 versus saline). But there was a modest increase in perseveration (the average number of consecutive repeats of an error), from 1.6% ± 0.2% of trials during baseline to 4.3% ± 0.6% during the first hour postinjection in affected sites (Wilcoxon test, p = 4 × 10^{-5}), perhaps due to frustration from the learning impairment and reduction in reward.

In contrast to new learning, performance of familiar associations was unimpaired in all sessions (Figures 2F and S1), and the proportion of perseverative errors was not different from baseline (Wilcoxon test, p = 0.59). Reaction times were shorter for familiar associations than for novel associations during the baseline blocks (122 ± 5 ms versus 133 ± 1 ms, Wilcoxon test, p = 0.003), an effect also observed after the injection of SCH23390 in behaviorally sensitive sites (121 ± 4 ms versus 137 ± 1 ms, p = 6 × 10^{-4}; Figure 2G).

**Prefrontal Dopamine D1 Receptors and Neural Selectivity during Novel and Familiar Associations**

We recorded the activity of individual prefrontal neurons from 7–15 electrodes located 1 or 2 mm away from the injection site. Typically, 15–30 isolated neurons could be recorded in each session. Only neurons that were well isolated before and after the injections were included in the analyses (see Experimental Procedures). The injections of saline and SCH23390 induced a small, slow, and steady increase in neuronal activity. The firing rate across all recorded neurons in saline sessions increased from 2.36 ± 0.2 to 2.57 ± 0.21 spikes/s from baseline to postinjection epochs (omitting the first 20 min after the injections; n = 286 neurons; t test, p = 0.07). During SCH23390 sessions, there was an increase from 2.06 ± 0.13 to 2.56 ± 0.2 spikes/s from baseline to postinjection epochs (n = 279 neurons; p = 0.002), which was not different from that during postsaline injection epochs (saline: 2.57 ± 0.21 versus SCH23390: 2.56 ± 0.2 spikes/s, p = 0.96). The small increases in firing rate are often seen and probably due to a mechanical stimulation of the neural tissue. All effects reported below are above and beyond these modest increases in firing rate.

With learning, the monkeys were increasingly able to predict which saccade would be required at the end of the trial as soon as the cue appeared early in the trial. As in previous studies, there was a corresponding increase in early trial saccade-predicting activity, especially during cue presentation. By the end of the baseline blocks (last 20 correct trials), almost 30% of randomly selected neurons showed a significant difference in firing rate between the preferred and nonpreferred associated directions during the cue presentation and/or the memory delay (Figures 3A and 3B, top panels; saline, 81 of 286 neurons [28.3%]; SCH23390, 78 of 279 neurons [28%]; analysis of variance [ANOVA] during cue and/or memory delay, p < 0.05; Pasupathy and Miller, 2005). The analyses below will focus on this early trial activity. During baseline blocks, a higher proportion of neurons showing such selectivity was observed near sites behaviorally sensitive to SCH23390 than insensitive sites (28.6% versus 9.4%, chi-square, p = 8 × 10^{-7}), suggesting that SCH23390 was most impairing at sites more involved in the task. As the analyses below will show, after SCH23390, but not saline, this neural selectivity was reduced (Figure 3B; see an example neuron in Figure S2).

We quantified the neural information about saccade direction on correctly performed trials for each neuron using the percent explained variance (PEV) statistic (Siegel et al., 2009; Buschman et al., 2011). PEV reflects the amount of variance in each neuron’s trial-by-trial firing rate that is explained by saccade direction. Higher PEV indicates more selectivity for the predicted saccade (the one associated with the current cue). It was calculated over an eight-correct-trial window stepped by one trial (see Experimental Procedures; Pasupathy and Miller, 2005). We compared PEV early in learning of the novel associations (first ten correct trials per block) versus late in learning (last ten correct trials per block) for the population of selective neurons (as above). During baseline and after saline injection blocks, the average PEV increased with learning (Figures 3A and 3B; cue period, first versus last ten correct trials on saline baseline blocks: 0.02 ± 0.002 versus 0.04 ± 0.002, t test, p = 1 × 10^{-6}; on saline postinjection blocks: 0.029 ± 0.001 versus 0.047 ± 0.001, p = 4 × 10^{-6}; on SCH23390 baseline blocks: 0.02 ± 0.002 versus 0.033 ± 0.001, p = 4 × 10^{-5}). However, after the injection of SCH23390, there was no corresponding increase in average PEV in the first two postinjection blocks, when there was a learning impairment (first versus last ten correct trials per block, 0.009 ± 0.003 versus 0.007 ± 0.001, p = 0.78; Figure 3B, bottom panels). Also, average PEV during the last ten
more during learning of novel associations than during perfor-
rating during the cue period, with drug treatment (baseline, drug,
and washout) and preferred direction as factors, showed a signif-
ificant effect of SCH23390 on both factors (with no interaction). A
post hoc test indicated a reduction of selectivity after SCH23390
(but not saline) via increased activity to the nonpreferred direc-
tion (Bonferroni post hoc test). During washout, neural selectivity
began to recover (Figures 3B and 3C). Neural activity was more
noisy than during baseline, but there was once again a significant
difference between preferred versus nonpreferred directions
(Figure 3C, t test, p = 0.03). Receiver operating characteristic
(ROC) analysis yielded similar results (Figure S2 and Supple-
mental Experimental Procedures).

As mentioned above, there was no difference in average
activity across the whole neuron population after SCH23390
relative to saline. However, for SCH23390, there was a small,
but significant, greater increase in overall activity of neurons
that were selective during learning (see above) during the first
30 min postinjection (Figure 3D and example neuron in Figure S2;
saline normalized activity raised to 1.18 ± 0.02 [5–30 min postin-
jection], n = 81; SCH23390 normalized activity raised to 1.41 ±
0.03, n = 78; Wilcoxon test, p = 4 × 10⁻⁴). Thus, task-selective
neurons were more susceptible than nontask-selective neurons
to D1R modulation. This increase persisted during the washout
period, when behavior returned to normal.

By contrast, neural selectivity to familiar associations was less
affected by SCH23390. We examined the overlap of selectivity
during novel and familiar associations in single neurons. We
determined that ~35%–40% of neurons with selectivity during
learning also showed selectivity to familiar associations (Fig-
ure 4A; saline: 31 of 81 neurons [38.3%], SCH23390: 26 of
78 neurons [33.3%]; ANOVA during cue and/or memory delay,
p < 0.05). Note that this percentage is a conservative estimate.
Familiar cues were only shown to the animals on 20% of the
trials, thus limiting statistical power. Thus, it is likely that many
of the neurons with selectivity during learning were also selective
during familiar associations. A two-way ANOVA of the PEV
during the cue period, with drug treatment and novel versus
familiar association as factors, showed an effect of SCH23390
on both factors (with no interaction), indicating that blockade
of D1Rs had a different effect on activity to novel versus familiar
associations. In fact, PEV was significantly larger during familiar
than novel associations (Figure 4B, same neurons as in Fig-
ure 3B; PEV novel mean = 0.007 ± 0.001 versus familiar
mean = 0.017 ± 0.004; p = 0.027, Bonferroni post hoc test).
This was observed both when neurons were chosen for signifi-
cant selectivity to novel associations (above) as well as when
neurons were chosen for selectivity to familiar associations (Fig-
ure S3). In sum, SCH23390 reduced neural selectivity and PEV
more during learning of novel associations than during perform-
ance of familiar associations.

**Dopamine D1 Receptor Blockade Increases Spike
Synchronization and the Power of Alpha and Beta
Oscillations**

In 95 of 163 recording sites (58% of electrodes in all SCH23390
sessions), SCH23390 generated large-amplitude sharp deflec-
tions in LFPs. Monkeys never stopped working during these
episodes. Deflections were downward in 72% of sites, the

---

**Figure 3. Selectivity of Prefrontal Neurons Is D1R-Dependent during
Learning of Novel Associations**

(A and B) Normalized firing rates after learning (last 20 trials/block; correct trials
only) for preferred (blue traces) and nonpreferred (magenta traces) saccade
directions, in saline sessions (A) and SCH23390 sessions (B). Cell activity was
normalized by the mean firing rate during the 200 ms before cue presentation
in baseline blocks. Color scale shows strength of direction selectivity (PEV,
proportion of explainable variance by direction factor, shuffle corrected).

(C) Relative changes in normalized firing rate between preferred and non-
preferred directions (cue epoch). Note the remarkable increase in spiking for
nonpreferred directions after SCH23390. Two-way ANOVA with Bonferroni
post hoc test.

(D) Average normalized firing rates of neurons selective to novel associations
in saline and SCH23390 sessions. Shaded area indicates significantly higher
firing rate after SCH23390 relative to saline (Wilcoxon test, p < 0.05). Saline,
n = 81 neurons; SCH23390, n = 78 neurons. The mean and SEM are shown.
See also Figure S2.

Correct trials of these blocks and sessions was reduced com-
pared to baseline blocks (SCH23390 during the first two postin-
jection blocks: mean = 0.007 ± 0.001 versus baseline blocks
from the same sessions: 0.033 ± 0.001, p = 1 × 10⁻⁹). PEV
was also reduced compared to the corresponding postsaline
injection blocks (mean = 0.047 ± 0.001, p = 1 × 10⁻⁹). Moreover,
after SCH23390, but not saline, the difference in firing rate
between preferred and nonpreferred directions during the cue
period was reduced (Figure 3C). A two-way ANOVA of the firing
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We detected deflections with an amplitude threshold. The total number of deflections during post-SCH23390 injection periods varied across sites (examples 1–3 in Figure 5A) but was rare after saline injections (example 4 in Figure 5A). Typically, the largest number of deflections appeared shortly after the end of the injections and lasted on average 18 ± 5 min (range 10–30 min), while the learning impairment lasted about 1 hr (see above). The duration of the learning deficit did not correlate with the total number of deflections observed after the injections (Pearson’s correlation, $R^2 = 0.02$, $p = 0.34$) nor the proportion of sites with deflections ($R^2 = 0.14$, $p = 0.09$). In fact, in eight sessions without deflections on any recording site, monkeys still had severe learning deficits. Thus, the deflections per se were not sufficient for the learning impairment. As Figure 5B shows, deflections were common in the first 20 min after SCH23390 injection (mean total deflections per site = 394, range 0–3,608) but were rare after saline (mean total deflections per site = 7, range 1–14).

Deflections were associated with spike bursts of neurons. The bottom panels of Figure 5A show 4 s segments of LFP traces and multiunit activity from four electrodes from each of the examples shown in the top panels. Note that there is increased spiking activity in close temporal proximity with the deflections, suggesting that deflections might be “population spikes” generated by the hypersynchronization of neurons. In fact, there was an increase in spike-to-spike coherence during epochs of deflections relative to baseline epochs from the same sessions (Figure 5C; $n = 139$ pairs of multiunit activity sites across electrodes pairs at 1 mm distance, SCH23390 sessions with deflections only; Wilcoxon test, $p < 0.05$).

Figure 5D shows the average deflection ($n = 11,330$, deflections, 28 electrodes from five sessions) and the power spectrum of the LFP trace over 400 ms windows centered on each deflection (100 ms before to 300 ms after the initial sharp voltage change). It revealed a large peak at alpha frequencies (12.2 Hz) and, indeed, the power spectra of the LFPs during strong deflection episodes showed a marked increase in alpha oscillations (~12 Hz) (see Figure S4 for an example).

We compared LFP oscillatory power on correct trials during baseline blocks with the postinjection blocks separately for sessions or recording sites with and without deflections. In baseline blocks, there was a prominent alpha/beta band (10–30 Hz) during the fixation, delay, and saccade execution epochs (Figures 6A and 6B). During postinjection blocks after injection of SCH23390 ($n = 163$ electrodes), but not saline ($n = 84$ electrodes), there was an increase in the power of oscillations below 30 Hz compared to baseline blocks. The deflections have an alpha component (see above) so, naturally, sites with deflections ($n = 95$) showed an increase in alpha band (10–14 Hz) after SCH23390 and also in beta band (14–30 Hz) for novel and familiar associations over baseline blocks (Figures 6A and 6B; Wilcoxon test, $p < 0.05$, shaded areas; Figure 6C, last 20 trials/block). Importantly, this increase in low-frequency power in the LFPs was still observed in sites without deflections ($n = 68$, Figure 6B), indicating that the SCH23390-induced increase in low-frequency oscillations was not due to the deflections alone. This increase was more pronounced for novel than familiar associations in sites without deflections (Figures 6B and 6C; Wilcoxon test, $p < 0.05$). The increase in alpha/beta oscillations was also observed in sessions without deflections on any recording site (Figure S5) and was greater at sites where blockade of D1Rs impaired learning compared to areas where learning was intact (Figure S5).

**DISCUSSION**

Our findings indicate that dopamine D1 receptors in the monkey lateral PFC are likely to be involved in learning new cue-response associations but less involved in performance of familiar associations. After the injection of a D1R antagonist, especially in the ventrolateral PFC, monkeys learned new cue-response associations much more slowly, whereas performance of highly familiar associations was intact. Two not mutually exclusive possibilities may account for this dissociation: (1) familiar associations are not dependent on prefrontal D1Rs, and (2) they are dependent on another brain area, such as the striatum, where they could be encoded as habits (Graybiel, 2008).

Although we cannot conclusively say that the effects were due to a local action of SCH23390 in the lateral PFC, some evidence suggests that this is so. First, the lateral PFC is a large expanse of...
Cortex and the drugs were injected virtually in the middle of it. Second, the effects began immediately during the long, slow, injection. If the site of action were elsewhere, it would take time for the drug to diffuse to those sites. Instead, we observed that the effects began a few minutes after the start of the injection. Third, not all sites in the lateral PFC produced an effect, as might be expected if the drug had widespread actions (see Experimental Procedures); most vlPFC, but not dlPFC, sites resulted in impairment. There are similar levels of D1R expression in these areas (de Almeida et al., 2008), so this may reflect the greater number of vlPFC than dlPFC neurons with selectivity during conditional visuomotor tasks (Wilson et al., 1993), and thus suggests the vlPFC as the site of action. Finally, while SCH23390 has a preference for binding to D1Rs, it also binds to serotonin 5-HT2 and 5-HT1C receptors (Bischoff et al., 1988; Alburges et al., 1992). Thus, we cannot disregard the possibility that some of the SCH23390 effects are mediated in part by these receptors. The specificity of D1 receptors could be established by injecting several 5-HT antagonists, but conducting these experiments would be difficult in monkeys. Importantly, our neurophysiological results are in line with previous studies in which D1R specificity could be established. For example, a previous study in monkeys (Sawaguchi and Goldman-Rakic, 1994) showed that local injections of ketanserin, a selective antagonist of 5-HT2 receptors, near PFC sites affected by SCH23390 failed to induce any clear changes in the monkeys’ performance, suggesting that SCH23390 was acting on D1Rs. Studies in humans indicate that prefrontal D1Rs are involved in working memory (Robbins, 2000). Müller et al. (1998) demonstrated performance-enhancing effects of a mixed D1-D2 agonist on spatial working memory, but no effect of a selective D2 agonist, suggesting a role for D1Rs. Studies in monkeys and rodents have shown that modulation by D1Rs in the dIPFC and prelimbic cortex during spatial working memory follows an inverted-U-shaped curve: too little or too much D1R stimulation causes cognitive impairment, while moderate levels of D1R

Figure 5. Blockade of Prefrontal Dopamine D1 Receptors Generates Deflections in LFPs and Increases Neuron Synchronization

(A) Top: the injection of SCH23390 in the PFC generated large-amplitude deflections in 58% of the recording sites. Examples of LFP traces recorded from three SCH23390 sessions and one saline session are shown. The time course of the learning impairment (green lines indicate no impairment, red lines indicate impairment) and the time of the SCH23390 and saline injections (blue lines) are also shown. Asterisks mark the location of the 4 s segments magnified in the bottom panels. Bottom: the deflections correlated with spike bursts of neurons recorded from multiple electrodes. Four second segments of LFP traces are shown, and multunit activity from four electrodes (el1–el4) from each of the examples is shown in the top panels. Spike bursts were followed by a strong rebound inhibition. Each line corresponds to a single action potential.

(B) Number of postinjection deflections in all recording sites during the first 20 min after saline (black) or SCH23390 (red). Deflections were detected in many electrodes after SCH23390 but were rarely observed after saline.

(C) Spike-to-spike coherence increased during epochs with deflections compared to baseline (n = 139 pairs of multunit activity sites, all pairs at 1 mm distance have been included, SCH23390 sessions with deflections only), indicating an augmented neuron synchronization. Shaded area indicates significance with the Wilcoxon test (p < 0.05). Confidence intervals depict a jackknife test.

(D) Average deflection and power spectrum of 400 ms windows centered on each deflection (100 ms before to 300 ms after the initial sharp voltage change; n = 11,330 deflections, 28 electrodes from 5 sessions). Dashed line marks the peak at 12.2 Hz. The power spectrum was computed by using the multitaper method (time-bandwidth product TW = 2 and k = 3 tapers; see Experimental Procedures). See also Figure S4.
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D1Rs in the lateral PFC may play a role in cognitive flexibility as well. The PFC seems to be key for different types of behavioral flexibility and response inhibition, although the exact subregions involved have been debated (Dias et al., 1996, 1997; Seamans et al., 1998; Granon et al., 2000; Chudasama and Robbins, 2004; Vijayraghavan et al., 2007). Our results suggest that prefrontal D1Rs in the monkey vIPFC play a relevant role in associative learning, perhaps by sculpting neural selectivity of prefrontal neurons.

The reduction in neural selectivity induced by SCH23390 was more pronounced for novel than familiar associations in single neurons. This suggests that the synapses that modify with new learning are modulated by D1Rs and are separate from those involved in encoding of familiar associations. This supports recent in vitro work suggesting that long-term potentiation (LTP), a cellular mechanism of synaptic plasticity thought to be critical for learning and memory consolidation, is D1R dependent (Xu and Yao, 2010). D1Rs may modulate reward-dependent plasticity of corticostriatal synapses. Increases of dopamine release may strengthen the efficacy of corticostriatal synapses after reward, while dopamine decreases may weaken synapses for nonreward (Hikosaka et al., 2006; Hong and Hikosaka, 2011). Our results suggest this may also occur in the PFC, because during D1R blockade, neurons failed to achieve the learning-induced level of selectivity seen for familiar associations (as they do without blockade). Without the influence of D1Rs, there might be no potentiation of the synaptic strength necessary for learning, and behavior might then be captured by non-D1R plasticity mechanisms that strengthen the most recently activated pathways, resulting in increased perseveration. During familiar associations, synaptic strength might be already potentiated and thus less dependent on D1Rs. It is plausible that familiar associations are encoded in structures other than the PFC. However, the fact that neural selectivity (and PEV) during familiar associations is still partly reduced by the D1R antagonist supports the coexistence of D1R-sensitive and D1R-less-sensitive sets of synapses on single prefrontal neurons.

Neural selectivity and PEV during washout periods did not return to the exact same state as the baseline before the drug was injected. Neural information returned but was more variable, and neurons continued to show elevated firing rates. It is likely that SCH23390 had lingering effects on neural activity that could have lasted hours. However, as our analyses demonstrate,
in contrast to the drug period in which neural information about the associations was virtually gone from the PFC, there was a return of neural information during the washout period that could have supported behavioral performance.

The decrease in neural selectivity seemed mostly due to an increase in activity to nonpreferred saccade directions. This agrees with recent data showing that low levels of D1R stimulation enhance spatial tuning by decreasing responses to nonpreferred directions during a spatial working memory task (Vijayraghavan et al., 2007). Thus, during both learning and working memory, prefrontal D1Rs sculpt neural selectivity by reducing the activity to nonpreferred directions, supporting a role for D1Rs in increasing signal-to-noise ratio by reducing neural noise (Amsten, 2011). Modeling studies have proposed that these sculpting actions of D1Rs facilitate the acquisition and stabilization of memory representations by preventing responses to interfering stimuli (Durstewitz et al., 2000; Seamans and Yang, 2004; Floresco and Magyar, 2006). Indeed, we found that during D1R blockade, monkeys needed more correct trials to learn the associations—that is, they had to repeat the cue-reward contingencies more times to acquire and stabilize the new rule.

Hypostimulation of D1Rs increased spike synchronization and neural oscillations in the lateral PFC. During associative learning, alpha/beta oscillations predominated. Blockade of D1Rs increased the power of this band. In addition, shortly after SCH23390 injections, large-amplitude deflections were observed in the LFP signals in almost 60% of the recording sites, together with a strong increase in the power of alpha oscillations. The shape and irregularity of the sequences of deflections, and the long duration of deflection epochs, suggest that they were not full seizures (Steriade, 2006; Suntsova et al., 2009). In fact, a recent study has found that during seizures in epilepsy patients, neural spiking activity decreases dramatically (Truccolo et al., 2011). This was not observed in our study. However, the deflections could have been a reflection of ongoing microseizures, recently found in epileptic patients to be associated with hyperexcitability (Schevon et al., 2008, 2010). Alpha/beta oscillations were also increased in electrodes without deflections, especially during learning of novel associations. This indicates that the SCH23390-induced increase in these oscillations was not due to the deflections alone. Increase in alpha rhythms has been associated with inattention (Fries et al., 2001; Bolhimunta et al., 2011) and is thought to reflect decreased excitability to protect task-relevant information from interference (Jensen et al., 2002). Thus, it is possible that D1R blockade impairs learning by forcing the PFC into an “inattentive mode” that disrupts the development of learning-related neural selectivity. The increase in beta rhythms is consistent with the aberrant hypersynchronization proposed to underlie some neurological and psychiatric disorders such as Parkinson’s disease and schizophrenia, in which exacerbated beta oscillations have been observed (Uhlhaas and Singer, 2006; Wang, 2010). Further, altered dopamine neurotransmission in the PFC has been reported for these disorders (Knable and Weinberger, 1997; Okubo et al., 1997; Kulisevsky, 2000; Abi-Dargham et al., 2002; Mattay et al., 2002). Our findings demonstrate that a selective blockade of prefrontal D1Rs can generate these aberrant alpha/beta oscillations, suggesting that the cognitive deficits observed in these disorders may be partly caused by hypostimulation of prefrontal D1Rs.

In summary, blockade of D1Rs in the monkey lateral PFC impairs associative learning but not performance of familiar associations. This selective learning impairment appears to be caused by a reduction of learning-related neuron selectivity and increased alpha/beta oscillations associated with inattention and cognitive deficits. These results may have important implications for our understanding of how low stimulation of prefrontal D1Rs contributes to cognitive deficits in aging and in neurological and psychiatric disorders.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Behavioral Task**

We trained two rhesus monkeys (Macaca mulatta; LA and LK) in a delayed associative learning task (Figure 1). Animal protocols were approved by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Animal Care and Use Committee. Under general anesthesia, each monkey was implanted with a head bolt to immobilize the head and a recording chamber on top of the left lateral PFC. All surgeries were performed under aseptic conditions with postoperative antibiotic and analgesia. Eye position was tracked optically with an infrared camera (EyeLink 1000 system). Stimuli were projected onto a screen 45 cm from the monkeys. Trials (Figure 1A) began when monkeys fixated at a central white dot (±2.0˚). After 800 ms of fixation, one of four possible cues was presented centrally for 500 ms. Monkeys were required to fixate for 1,000 ms until the fixation dot disappeared (‘‘go’’ signal) and to make a saccade to one of the two white dots positioned horizontally at ±8.5˚ eccentricity. Correct saccades were rewarded with drops of juice. Trials were aborted if the monkeys broke fixation before the presentation of the target dots (early trials). Impulsive trials were early trials in which a saccade was implemented to the correct target. Trials were combined in blocks; each block comprised of two novel cues on 80% of the trials (learning trials) and two highly familiar cues (>1.5 years of training) on 20% of the trials (familiar trials). New cues replaced the novel ones after monkeys reached the following learning criterion: 30 correct trials for each novel cue and ≥80% performance over the last ten consecutive trials per cue. Performance of familiar associations was not taken into consideration for this criterion. After reaching the criterion, a new block started and monkeys learned a new pair of associations. Stimulus presentation and behavioral monitoring were controlled using two computers running the CORTEX real-time control system. The fixed memory delay (1,000 ms) allowed monkeys to anticipate the time of target onset and probably resulted in overall shorter reaction times than unpredictable delay.

The mean behavioral performance for each block was estimated from the monkey’s binary responses (correct or incorrect) using a binomial (logistic) regression model (Williams and Eskandar, 2006). The fitted sigmoid curves were used to compare distributions with a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The learning rates were estimated from the slopes of the sigmoid curves. The duration of the learning impairment after SCH23390 was measured as the sum of the duration of postinjection blocks showing slower learning curves and smaller learning rates than baseline blocks.

**Neural Recordings**

Electrode penetration sites were determined using MRI scans obtained before surgery. The recording chamber was positioned stereotaxically over the left lateral PFC of each animal overlaying the principal sulcus (i.e., the dorsolateral and ventrolateral portions of the PFC were equally accessible). The location of the principal sulcus could also be mapped out neurophysiologically (absence of cells and low-amplitude LFP signals). Electrophysiological signals were recorded simultaneously from 7–15 dura-puncturing tungsten microelectrodes (FHC Instruments), located 1 or 2 mm away from the infusion cannula. Electrodes were lowered each day either independently or in pairs and were advanced using custom-made screw-driven minimicrodrives mounted on...
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2D/3D space. We only used waveforms from electrodes in which p values were smaller than 0.05 in all the segments, i.e., the clusters were well separated before and after the injections. In general, even though some of the clusters moved slightly after the injection, p values were very small (<10⁻³).

Spike–Rate Analysis

All spike-rate analyses were performed with custom software written in MATLAB (Mathworks). We note that our analyses focus on effects across neuron populations, not examples of individual neurons. As in previous studies (Asaad et al., 1998; Pasupathy and Miller, 2005), balanced ANOVAs were conducted on the spiking activity during two episodes of the trial: “cue” (100–600 ms after cue onset) and “delay” (100–800 ms after cue offset). Neurons displaying direction selectivity showed statistically different firing rates for preferred versus nonpreferred directions during “cue” and/or “delay” epochs in baseline blocks after learning (last 20 correct trials per novel association before block switch). Firing rates for preferred and nonpreferred directions of all selective neurons were normalized by the mean firing rate during fixation (200 ms before the cue onset). Saccade direction selectivity was quantified as the fraction of each neuron’s variance explained by saccade direction (one-way ANOVA; direction variance / direction variance + error variance); percent explained variance or PEV). To quantify changes during learning, we calculated PEV for each neuron across an eight-trial window (eight correct trials for right versus eight correct trials for left associations), slid in one-trial steps, and 100 ms time window within a trial, over the first 30 correct trials per association (the minimum block length). To correct for biases in PEV values, we performed a randomization test on each neuron and time point by randomly shuffling trials between the two directions and permuting this randomization 1,000 times. PEV shuffle was then subtracted from PEV (Siegel et al., 2009; Buschman et al., 2011). We also computed the ROC area under the curve (Figure S2 and Supplemental Experimental Procedures) (Buschman and Miller, 2007; Histed et al., 2009). This test reflects how well one can predict the saccade direction based on the firing rate of a given neuron. ROC was shuffle corrected in the same way as PEV.

Spectral Analysis

To investigate which LFP activity reflects signal components independent to trial events, we subtracted from each trial the LFP signal averaged across all trials. This removed stimulus-locked responses such as evoked potentials. Sixty hertz noise was digitally filtered with a Butterworth filter. Spectrograms were built using a continuous wavelet transform with a Morlet function as mother wavelet, center frequencies between 1 and 128 Hz in 0.25 octave steps (Torrence and Compo, 1998; http://paos.colorado.edu/research/wavelets). Power spectra and spike-to-spike coherence were computed using the multitaper method described elsewhere (http://www.chronux.org). Fourier transform was applied to the tapered time series signal. We used an optimal family of orthogonal tapers (slepian functions). These are parameterized by their time length T and frequency bandwidth W. For chosen T and W, maximally k = 2TW – 1 tapers centered in frequency are appropriate for spectral estimation. Power spectra were estimated over 0.4 s windows centered on deflections (Figure 5D) and correct trials of 2.5 s (Figure 6B) with time-bandwidth product TW = 2 and k = 3 tapers. The same parameters were used for measuring spike-to-spike coherence during baseline and epochs with the largest number of deflections. To enhance readability of the LFP power at high frequencies, which are masked by the 1/f* power-law decay, we normalized the power by the frequency.

Supplemental Information

Supplemental Information includes five figures and Supplemental Experimental Procedures and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2012.04.018.
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