### **Methods**

Behavioral tests and animal care were conducted in accordance with the standard ethical guidelines (European Communities Directive 86/609 EEC; National Institutes of Health 1995) and approved by the local ethical committee (CEEA-IMAS-UPF). All experiments were carried out under blind conditions.

## *Water maze*

Animals were habituated to environmental conditions for 15 days and handled by the experimenter daily 4 days before the initiation of the experimental procedures. During the experimental phase, mice were group housed (3- 4 mice per cage) under a 12:12-h light-dark schedule (lights on at 0800) in controlled environmental conditions of humidity (60%) and temperature (22  $\pm$  2 °C) with free access to food and water. Only males (6-8 months of age) were tested in this study. All behavioral testing was conducted by the same experimenters in an isolated room and at the same time of the day (08:30 to 15:30). The pool was situated in a 10  $\text{m}^2$  room with extra maze cues (doors, posters, cabinets, and electrical fixtures) visible from inside the pool (170 cm diameter, depth 60 cm; Panlab S.L., Barcelona). The swimming pool was filled with water (23  $\pm$  1 °C) made opaque with nontoxic white painting (Abacus S.L., Barcelona) and a platform (15 cm diameter) was placed 1.5 cm below the water surface. Diffuse illumination was provided by indirect lighting from 40 W lamps aimed towards the ceiling. Behavioral experimenters were blind to the genotype of the animal.

Two different experimental paradigms were applied. One used general procedures described in detail elsewhere [1], except as noted below. The other was a repeated acquisition paradigm to separately assess working and reference memory. The experiments were performed in two subsequent phases using two separate groups of animals. Two pre-training sessions, in which animals learned the opportunity to escape (the platform) was used in both experiments. Once mice were familiarized with the set-up and acquired procedural learning in the pretraining sessions, the water maze task was performed. The visuo-spatial water maze protocol (Experiment I) consisted of five tasks (2 pre-training, 10 acquisition, 1 probe, 1 cue and 3 reversal sessions) [1,2]. Mice were tested for place learning acquisition in the water maze pool over 10 acquisition sessions (four trials per session; one session per day). The platform was placed in a fixed position in the center of the north-west quadrant and in each trial, mice were placed at one of the starting locations in random order [north, south, east, west (N, S, E, W), including permutations of the four starting points persession] of the swimming pool. Mice were allowed to swim until they located the submerged platform in a fixed position (NW quadrant, 22 cm away from the wall) or until 60 s had elapsed and were then placed on it for 20 s. In the probe session [four trials entering the pool from the four different starting points (N, S, E and W)] the platform was removed and mice were allowed to swim for 60 s without platform. The time spent in the trained and non-trained quadrants during 60 s were recorded. In the cued learning session [four trials entering the pool from the four different starting points (N, S, E and W)] the platform was elevated 1 cm above the water and its position was clearly indicated by a visible cue (black flag) and white curtains prevented the use of extra-maze cues. On the next day, mice performed the reversal learning session [four trials entering the pool from the four different starting points (N, S, E and W), three consecutive acquisition days]. In this test, the platform position was changed to the quadrant opposite to the previous location of the platform (SE). Mice unable to find the platform within 60 s were placed on it for 20 s.

Animals were tested in a repeated reversal learning paradigm (Experiment II) specifically designed to assess short and long-term memories [3,4]. It consisted of eight pairs of acquisition sessions, with the platform hidden, and from one daily session to the next, the platform was placed in a different location (E, SW, center and NW), each position being used once every four consecutive sessions. Each of the four starting positions (N, S, E, W) was used randomly in every daily session. Thus, mice randomly started from each of the four starting positions on the first (odd) trial of a pair and from the same starting position on the second (even) trial of the pair. The first trial of a pair was terminated when the mouse located the platform or when 60 s had elapsed; following a period of 20 s, in which the animal was allowed to stay on the platform. The second trial of a pair was run immediately. Several fixed extra maze cues were constantly visible from the pool. Acquisition and cued sessions consisted of four pairs of trials 30-45 min apart.

In both Experiment I and II, escape latencies, length of the swimming paths and swimming speed for each animal and trial were monitored and computed by a tracking system (SMART, Panlab S.A.) connected to a video camera placed above the pool. To better evaluate the spatial distribution of the behavior of the mice, the paths traveled in peripheral (15 cm wide) and central rings were measured in each trial and the Wishaw's index was calculated, corresponding to the percentage of path traveled within a straight corridor connecting the start and the goal.

Statistical analysis of water maze data was performed by using One-way ANOVA when significant (*P* < 0.05) interaction between factors was found. Acquisition sessions were analysed also with Repeated Measures test (General Linear Model). The dependent variables analyzed in the water maze were escape latencies, length of swimming paths (in the center, periphery and total) and swimming speeds. Data are reported as mean ± SEM. The statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS 12.0 software.

### *Active avoidance procedure and object recognition task*

Mice were initially housed five per cage in a temperature  $(21\pm1\degree C)$  and humidity (65 $\pm10\%$ ) controlled room with a 12-/12- h light/dark cycle (lights on from 08:00 to 20:00 hours) with ad libitum food and water. Experiments took place during the light phase. Mice were trained to avoid an aversive unconditioned stimulus (US), an electric shock (0.2 mA) continuously applied to the grid of the floor, associated with the presentation of a light (10 W) serving as a conditioned stimulus (CS) in a two-way shuttle box apparatus (Panlab, Barcelona). The apparatus consists of a box with two compartments  $(20 \times 10 \text{ cm})$  connected by a  $3 \times 3 \text{ cm}$  door. The CS was switched on in the compartment in which the mouse was placed preceding 5 s the onset of the US and overlapping it for 25 s. Using this procedure, the light was presented in the compartment for 30 s (5 s alone and 25 s together with the US). At the end of the 30 s period, both CS and US were automatically turned off. A conditioned response was recorded when the animal avoided the US by changing from the compartment where the animal received the CS into the opposite compartment within the 5 s after the onset of the CS. If animals failed to avoid the shock, they could escape it by crossing during the US (25 s). Between each trial session, there was an intertrial interval of 30 s. The ratio of conditioned with respect to the total number of changes of compartment was also determined. Mice were placed in the shuttle box for 10 min before the start of each session to allow them to explore the box. After this habituation period, mice were subjected daily to 100-trial active avoidance sessions during 10 days.

The object recognition task was performed as reported previously [5] in a plexiglas open-field box (51 cm wide  $\times$  51 cm long  $\times$  58 cm high) with white vertical walls and a white floor divided into 25 equal squares. The light intensity in the middle of the field was 30 lux. The objects to be discriminated were a marble (5.5 cm high, object A) and a plastic (4.5 cm high, object B) figure. First, mice were individually habituated to the open-field for 50 min. The next day, they were submitted to a 10-min acquisition trial (first trial) during which they were placed in the open-field in the presence of object A. Locomotor activity (number of squares crossed), rearings and time that animal took to explore object A (animal's snout directed toward the object at a distance  $\leq 1$  cm) were recorded. A 10-min retention trial (second trial) occurred 1 h later. During this second trial, objects A and B were placed in the open-field, and locomotor activity, rearings and time that animal took to explore object A  $(t_A)$  and object B  $(t_B)$  were recorded. A recognition index was defined as  $[t_B/(t_A + t_B)] \times 100$ .

For the active avoidance paradigm, differences in the number of conditioned changes and in the ratio of conditioned versus total changes were analysed using Two-way ANOVA (day as within subjects factor, genotype as between subjects factor). For the object recognition task, number of squares crossed and rears were analysed using Two-way ANOVA (trial as within subjects factor, genotype as between subjects factor). Comparisons between genotypes were by One-way ANOVA and the Bonferroni post-test. In the object recognition task, recognition index of the different groups were compared using One-way ANOVA. Analyses were conducted using the statistical package SPSS 13.0. Differences were considered significant when the probability of error was less than  $5\%$ . Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SEM.

## *Electrophysiology in vitro*

Transgenic and wild type littermates were anaesthetised by intraperitoneal injection of a mixture of medetomidine (1 mg/kg) and ketamine (76 mg/kg), before being killed by cervical dislocation. The brains were rapidly removed and chilled ( $\leq 3 \degree$ C), in oxygenated, ice-cold cutting solution composed of (in mM): 110 choline chloride, 2.5 KCl, 1.25 NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 25 NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 0.5 CaCl<sub>2</sub>, 7 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 1.3 ascorbate, 3 pyruvate, and 7 dextrose. Parasagital slices were cut from the dorsal hippocampus using a Vibroslice (Campden Instruments, Loughborough, UK). Slices were maintained in standard artificial cerebrospinal fluid (ACSF) consisting of (in mM): 125 NaCl, 26 NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 3 KCl, 2 CaCl<sub>2</sub>, 1.0 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 1.25 NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, and 10 glucose and gased with 95%  $O<sub>2</sub>$ -5% CO<sub>2</sub> during the whole process. Extracellular experiments used 400 µm thick slices prepared from 5-6 month old mice, and maintained in an interface chamber kept at 33 °C, and micropipettes filled with ACSF (4-5 MΩ). Granule cell responses were evoked with a bipolar Nichrome wire stimulating electrode placed in molecular layer 50-200 um from the recording site in granular layer. Single pulse stimuli were used to construct a stimulus response curve to identify the stimulus strength needed to evoke population spikes of half maximum amplitude, which were then used to perform a paired-pulse facilitation/inhibition experiment.Whole cell recordings used 300  $\mu$ m thick slices prepared from 1-2 month old mice and maintained submerged at 31-33 °C, under an Olympus BX-51 DIC microscope with water-immersion objectives, for patch-clamp recordings in whole-cell configuration under voltage clamp. Patch pipettes contained (in mM): cesium gluconate, 145; CsCl, 10; HEPES, 10; NaCl, 2; and EGTA, 0.1; pH = 7.25 (adjusted with CsOH). Granule cell bodies were selected for recording according to their size, location and appearance. A bipolar stimulating electrode was placed at perforant path 70-280 µm from the granular cell layer. Constant current pulses were delivered to perform an input-output curve. Evoked IPSCs were measured as the integral of the membrane current response, which estimates charge transfer. Spontaneous IPSCs were identified and measured using MiniAnalysis software (Synaptosoft Inc).

## **References**

- 1. Morris R (1984) Developments of a water-maze procedure for studying spatial learning in the rat. J Neurosci Methods 11 (1):47-60. doi:0165-0270(84)90007-4 [pii]
- 2. Chen G, Chen KS, Knox J, Inglis J, Bernard A, Martin SJ, Justice A, McConlogue L, Games D, Freedman SB, Morris RG (2000) A learning deficit related to age and beta-amyloid plaques in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. Nature 408 (6815):975-979. doi:10.1038/35050103
- 3. van der Staay FJ, de Jonge M (1993) Effects of age on water escape behavior and on repeated acquisition in rats. Behav Neural Biol 60 (1):33-41
- 4. Escorihuela RM, Vallina IF, Martinez-Cue C, Baamonde C, Dierssen M, Tobena A, Florez J, Fernandez-Teruel A (1998) Impaired short- and long-term memory in Ts65Dn mice, a model for Down syndrome. Neurosci Lett 247 (2-3):171-174
- 5. Meziane H, Dodart JC, Mathis C, Little S, Clemens J, Paul SM, Ungerer A (1998) Memory-enhancing effects of secreted forms of the beta-amyloid precursor protein in normal and amnestic mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 95 (21):12683-12688



**Statistical values and scatter plot of all probes contained in the genome-wide analysis.** Spots with  $|Fold Change| > 1.6$  and  $FDR < 0.1$  are highlighted in green (repressed genes) and red (induced genes).





**Real-time qPCR analysis of Npas4.** Expression levels of Npas4 mRNA in cerebral cortex  $(Cx)$ , striatum  $(Str)$  and cerebellum  $(Cb)$  from wild type (wt) and transgenic (tg) mice. Values are normalized with respect to HPRT mRNA content. Results are the mean  $\pm$  SEM of 8-12 mice in two separate experiments  $*P < 0.05$  (two-tailed, unpaired *t*-test).

## **Figure S3**

#### A Npas4

CTCCCTCTCCCGTTCGACGTCACGGGATGACGTC GGAAGTCTGGGAGGGAGGAGGAGCACCCCCCCT CCCCAGCCAGTGGCTCCCTCTGCAGCTTGCTTTA GCCCAGCCTCCCGCCTCCCGCTGCCCCCCCCCGT CTCTAAAAACGAGCCCCCCCACGCCTCTCAGGAGC **TATATAAGGCGGATCGAGGCAGGCGAGGGGGGC** AGCGCTGCCGAGCGGAGCCCAGGAGTGGAGCG AGAGCGAGCAAGAGCCTGAGCGAAAAGACCGGG AAGCAAGGAAGAGGAAGCCTCCGGTGCATCGGG AAAGGATCGCAGGTGCTCGGGAGCCGGAGCTGG AGCTCCACAGCCGGCAGTCATGTACCGATCCACC

# B c-fos

GTTGAAAGCCTGGGGCGTAGAGTTGACGACAGAGC GCCCGCAGAGGGCCTTGGGGCGCGCTTCCCCCCCC TTCCAGTTCCGCCCAGTGACGTAGGAAGTCCATCCAT TCACAGCGCTTCEATAAAGGCGCCAGCTGAGGCGCC TACTACTCCAACCGCGACTGCAGCGAGCAACTGAGA AGACTGGATAGAGCCGGCGGTTCCGCGAACGAGCA GTGACCGCGCTCCCACCCAGCTCTGCTCTGCAGCTC CCACCAGTGTCTACCCCTGGACCCCTTGCCGGGCTT TCCCCAAACTTCGACCATGATGTTCTCGGGTTTCAAC GCCGACTACGAGGCCCTCATCCTCCCGCTGCAGTAGC

#### $\mathbf c$ **BDNF exon IV**

CGTGCACTAGAGTGTCTATTTCGAGGCAGAGGAGGT ATCATATGACAGCTCAQGTCAAGGCAGCGTGGAGCC CTCTCGTGGACTCCCACCCACTTTCCCATTCACCGAG GAGAGGACTGCTCTCGCTGCCGCTCCCCCCACCCAC CCCCGGCGAGCTAGCATGAAATCTCCCAGCCTCTGC CTAGATCAAATGGAGCTTCTCGCTGAAGGCGTGCGA GTATTACCTCCGCCATGCAATTTCCACTATCAATAATTT AACTTCTTTGCTGCAGAACAGGAGTACATATCGGCCA CCAAAGACTCGCCCCCTCCCCCTTTTAACTGAAGAGA AGGGGAAATATATAGTAAGAGTCTAGAACCTTGGGGA CCGGTCTTCCCCAGAGCAGCTGCCTTGATGTTTACTT **TGACAAGTAGTGACTGAAAAAG** 

## **D** DREAM

ACTGGAGGTTCAGGATGGAGGCGAAGGAGGGG GGAGATAAGAGGGGGAGGGAAGAGGCAGAGGAAG AGAGGTGGAGCTAAGACTCGGAAGGAAGGGAGGGT GGAAGGAGTGGGCAGGGGGCGGGAGAGAAACCTC CAGTGACAATTGCGTCTGGGTCCAAGCAAACATGAG GCAGCTGCCAGCCGGACCAAGCAGTCTGGCTTGCT CGGGCTGCAAAGCGGGAAGATTAGTGACGGTCCCT TTCAGCAGCAGAGATGCAGAGGACCAAGGTAGGCG **CTG** 

**Nucleotide sequence of mouse promoters.** (**A**) Npas4, (**B**) c-fos, (**C**) BDNF exon IV and (**D**) DREAM gene regulatory regions. The TATA box (blue), the translation start site (green) and the location of putative DRE sites (red) are indicated.





**Total GABAergic cellularity is not modified in transgenic hippocampus.** (**A**) Coronal sections from wild type (wt) and transgenic (tg) hippocampus showing immunostained parvalbumin (PV) positive cells and total GAT1 immunoreactivity in CA1 and dentate gyrus (DG). Bar represents 100 µm. (**B**) Quantification of parvalbumin positive cells in wild type and transgenic hippocampus.

**Figure S5**



**In vitro depressed inhibition in dentate gyrus of transgenic mice.** (**A**) Effect of the interval between paired stimuli on the difference in population spike amplitude as percentage of the first response. The stimulus intensity required for half-maximal population spike with single stimuli was not different between genotypes (wt 8.2±1.4 V, tg 10.9±1.6 V). Paired evoked responses at 5 ms inter-stimulus interval shows

inhibition in wt ( $n=13$ ) and facilitation in tg ( $n=17$ ) mice (Two-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post-test,  $* P < 0.05$ ). At right are original traces of population spikes in pyramidal cells at 5 ms inter-pulse interval showing the inhibition and facilitation in wt and tg mice, respectively. (**B**) Inhibitory postsynaptic currents (IPSCs) evoked by single pulse stimulation at 0 mV holding potential in whole-cell recordings. Charge transferred during IPSC as a function of stimulus strength shows decreased inhibitory current in tg mice  $(n=13)$  compared to wt  $(n=26)$ . Mean IPSC area difference is significant at the 0.05 level (Univariate ANOVA with Bonferroni post-test). At right are superimposed IPSCs evoked by stimuli in the range 0.5 to 10 mA. (**C**) Frequency and average amplitude of spontaneous IPSCs in wt  $(n = 12)$  and tg  $(n = 10)$  mice recorded at 0 mV (Mann-Whitney Rank Test, \* *P* < 0.05). At right are representative traces of spontaneous IPSCs. (**D**) Excitatory postsynaptic currents (EPSCs) evoked by single pulse stimulation at -80 mV holding potential in whole-cell recordings. Charge transferred during EPSC as a function of stimulus strength shows no difference (Univariate ANOVA) in excitatory currents between genotypes (wt n=26, tg n=14). (**E**) Frequency and average amplitude of spontaneous EPSCs recorded at -80 mV shows no difference (Mann-Whitney Rank Test) between genotypes (wt  $n = 10$ , tg  $n =$ 11). Vertical error bars represent SEM.





**A-type current is not altered in daDREAM mice.** (**A**) A-current recorded in hippocampal neurons in wild type mice. (**B**) Pooled data showing that peak amplitude of A-type current at different voltage steps is similar in wild-type (wt) and transgenic (tg) mice. (**C**) Typical traces showing the steady-state inactivation of A-type current in wild type mice. Currents were recorded during membrane potential held to 30 mV following a 400 ms conditioning pulse from  $-115$  mV to  $+25$  mV with 20 mV steps. (**D**) Steady-state activation and inactivation curves in transgenic and wild type mice. The data were fitted with Boltzmann function. Steady-state activation is plotted as voltage steps versus  $g/g<sub>max</sub>$ , while the steady-state inactivation is plotted as voltage steps versus  $I/I_{\text{max}}$ .





**Impaired Wishaw index in the water maze in daDREAM mice.** (**A**) Wishaw index, defined as % path inside the optimal corridor to reach the platform, indicates the use of less efficient learning strategies in transgenic (tg) than in wild type (wt) littermates across acquisition sessions (Repeated measures ANOVA  $F_{(1,19)} = 10.314$ ,  $P = 0.003$ ). \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ . (**B**) No differences in permanence time in trained quadrant (NE) or the first platform cross latency (inset) were observed between transgenic and wild type mice in the removal session, which assesses reference memory through mice preference for the previously trained quadrant. Data are expressed as mean ± SEM.



**Impaired performance in the reversal session of the water maze in daDREAM mice.** In the reversal-learning test, the platform was hidden in the opposite quadrant to the trained one. Transgenic (tg) mice showed a non-significant trend to search more the platform in the old-goal quadrant and spent less time in the new-goal quadrant than wild type (wt) mice (One-way ANOVA  $F_{(1,19)} = 5.610$ ,  $P = 0.029$ ). Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SEM.  $*P < 0.05$ .





**Reduced learning in the active avoidance procedure.** (**A**) Repeated measures ANOVA for conditioned changes revealed no significant main effect in transgenic (tg) mice. (**B**) Repeated measures ANOVA for the ratio of conditioned changes, with respect to the total number of changes of compartment, revealed a significant main effect of day of training ( $F_{(9,288)} = 45.851$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), genotype ( $F_{(2,32)} = 4.633$ ,  $P <$ 0.05) and interaction between these two factors  $(F_{(18,288)} = 2.545, P \le 0.01)$ . Post-hoc comparisons following significant one-way ANOVA for each day of training showed that tg mice significantly decreased the ratio of conditioned changes with respect to wild type (wt) mice on day 2 and on the last two sessions. Data are shown as mean  $\pm$ SEM in 100 trial sessions during 12 days (wt,  $n = 15$ ; tg,  $n = 11$ ). \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P <$ 0.01 (Bonferroni post-test).



**Table S1** Sequences of primers and probes used for real-time quantitative PCR

a SYBR Green based qPCR

Transcript	Assay ID	
Npas4	Mm00463644 m1	
Nr4a1	Mm011300401 m1	
$c$ -Fos	Mm00487425 m1	
Mef2c	Mm01340839 m1	
Per <sub>3</sub>	Mm00478120 m1	
JunB	Mm00492781 m1	
Sox11	Mm01281943 s1	
Egr2	Mm00456650 m1	
Mbd4	Mm01184338 m1	
$GABAR\alpha1$	Mm01299033 m1	
GAT <sub>1</sub>	Mm00618601 m1	
<b>VIAAT</b>	Mm00494138 m1	
GAD <sub>2</sub>	Mm00484623 ml	
KChIP1	Mm01189526 m1	
KChIP2	Mm00518914 m1	
KChIP4	Mm00518835 ml	
<b>CREB</b>	Mm01342452-m1	

**Table S2** Assays from Applied Biosystems used for real-time quantitative PCR



**Table S3** Sequences of primers used for semiquantitative PCR



**Table S4** Genes whose expression levels are modified in transgenic compared to wild type hippocampus. Clustering according to Gene Ontology (Biological process)









**Table S5** Genes whose expression levels are modified in transgenic compared to wild type hippocampus. Clustering according to Gene Ontology (Cellular Component)











**Table S6** Genes whose expression levels are modified in transgenic compared to wild type hippocampus. Clustering according to Gene Ontology (Molecular function)











Session	ANOVA $F_{(1,19)}$	P value
1 odd	22.299	$P = 0.000$
1 even	6.853	$P = 0.017$
2 odd	1.681	$P = 0.211$
2 even	2.999	$P = 0.100$
3 odd	5.398	$P = 0.032$
3 even	20.266	$P = 0.000$
4 odd	7.630	$P = 0.013$
4 even	6.137	$P = 0.023$
5 odd	33.608	$P = 0.000$
5 even	14.924	$P = 0.001$
6 odd	13.470	$P = 0.002$
6 even	12.811	$P = 0.002$
7 odd	15.939	$P = 0.001$
7 even	12.914	$P = 0.002$
8 odd	2.242	$P = 0.152$
8 even	2.060	$P = 0.037$

**Table S7** Escape latency on odd trials across the acquisition sessions of the reversal learning paradigm

P values correspond to ANOVA  $F_{(1,19)}$ 

**Table S8** Categorization of activity-dependent genes according to their induction by DREAM derepression and/or the nuclear calcium/calmodulin complex as defined in [1]



(**A**) DREAM target genes whose activity-dependent induction is independent of the nuclear calcium/calmodulin complex

Column headings are as follows: ID, GenBank identification number; Symb, gene symbol; tg, fold repression in DREAM transgenic hippocampus; Bicc/Inh as defined in [1] Bicc/, change in the expression after biccuculine-induced action potential bursting: nc, no change, \*\* between 5 and 10 fold and \*\*\* more than 10-fold; /Inh, percentage of inhibition of the change following blockade of nuclear calcium signaling with CaMBP4: -, inhibition lower than 40%



(**B**) Genes that are induced by both DREAM derepression and the nuclear calcium/calmodulin complex

Column headings are as follows: ID, GenBank identification number; Symb, gene symbol; tg, Fold repression in DREAM transgenic hippocampus; Bicc/Inh as defined in [1] Bicc/, change in the expression after biccuculine-induced action potential bursting: \*, change between 2 and 5 fold, \*\* between 5 and 10 fold and \*\*\* more than 10-fold; /Inh, percentage of inhibition of the change following blockade of nuclear calcium signaling with CaMBP4: \*, inhibition between 40 and 60%, \*\* inhibition between 60 and 80%, \*\*\* inhibition greater than 80%

(**C**) Activity-dependent genes whose induction is not related to DREAM derepression



Column headings are as follows: ID, GenBank identification number; Symb, gene symbol; tg, nc, no change in DREAM transgenic hippocampus as compared to wild type; Bicc/Inh as defined in [1] Bicc/, change in the expression after biccuculine-induced action potential bursting: \*\* change between 5 and 10 fold and \*\*\* more than 10-fold; /Inh, percentage of inhibition of the change following blockade of nuclear calcium signaling with CaMBP4: \*, inhibition between 40 and 60%, \*\* inhibition between 60 and 80%, \*\*\* inhibition greater than 80%

## **Reference**

1. Zhang SJ, Zou M, Lu L, Lau D, Ditzel DA, Delucinge-Vivier C, Aso Y, Descombes P, Bading H (2009) Nuclear calcium signaling controls expression of a large gene pool: identification of a gene program for acquired neuroprotection induced by synaptic activity. PLoS Genet 5 (8):e1000604