

**Dataset. Statistical data.**

<b>Dataset. Statistical Data</b>		
<b>Figure</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>N</b>
Fig. 1A	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: $F_{2, 60}=28.46, P<0.0001$ ; Column Factor: $F_{2, 30}= 2.827, P=0.0750$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0516$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=1876$ ; 74 dB: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.7551$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.9922$ ; 78 dB: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.2050$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=3075$ ; 82 dB: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.0006$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0104$ ;	n=11 mice per group;
Fig. 1B1	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: $F_{16, 480}=37.52, P<0.0001$ ; Column Factor: $F_{2, 30}= 4.871, P=0.0147$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0250$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0178$ ;	
Fig. 1B2	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: $F_{16, 480}=16.31, P<0.0001$ ; Column Factor: $F_{2, 30}=0.5823, P=0.5648$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.6688$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.4827$ ;	
Fig. 1B3	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: $F_{1, 60}=13.50, P=0.0005$ ; Column Factor: $F_{2, 60}=3.859, P=0.0265$ ; MK+Saline: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0745$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0065$ ; MK+Risp: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.8899$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=6219$ ;	

Fig. 1C2	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.125</math>, <math>P=0.0053</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.295</math>, <math>P=0.0036</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.6243</math>, <math>P=0.5395</math>; Preference index for S1 and E: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{2,30}=4.222</math>, <math>P=0.0242</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>: <math>P=0.0367</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>: <math>P=0.0286</math>;</p>
Fig. 1C3	<p>Time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.348</math>, <math>P=0.0032</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=3</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=56</math>, <math>P=0.7969</math>; Preference index for S1 and E: Kruskal-Wallis test with <i>post-hoc</i> Dunn's test: <math>F=8.823</math>, <math>P=0.0121</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>: <math>P=0.0389</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>: <math>P=0.0117</math>;</p>
Fig. 1D	<p>For nesting score: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{2,30}=9.640</math>, <math>P=0.0006</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>: <math>P=0.0018</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>: <math>P=0.0010</math>; for unshredded cotton (% weight): Kruskal-Wallis test with <i>post-hoc</i> Dunn's test: <math>F=12.54</math>, <math>P=0.0019</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>: <math>P=0.0021</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>: <math>P=0.0100</math>;</p>
Fig. 1E	<p>For total consumption: water: Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: <math>F_{1,30}=0.1193</math>, <math>P=0.7322</math>; Column Factor: <math>F_{2,30}=0.7092</math>, <math>P=0.5001</math>; for sucrose preference: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{2,30}=22.56</math>; <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;</p>

Fig. 1F	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2,30}=11.84$ , $P=0.0002$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P<0.0001$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0045$ ;	
Fig. 2B2	Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=5.281$ , $P=0.0062$ ;	n=3 mice per group;
Fig. 2C	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: $F_{2, 54}=25.51$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 27}=4.366$ , $P=0.0462$ ; 74 dB: $P=0.9971$ ; 78 dB: $P=0.7700$ ; 82 dB: $P<0.0001$	n=13 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-CON</i> mice; n=14 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-cre+AAV-shHrh2</i> ;
Fig. 2D	For distance moved per 5 mins: two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{16, 816}=27.60$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{3, 51}=22.77$ , $P<0.0001$ ; <i>AAV-CON+Saline</i> vs. <i>AAV-CON+MK-801</i> : $P=0.0087$ ; <i>AAV-CON+MK-801</i> vs. <i>AAV-shHrh2+MK-801</i> : $P=0.0008$ ; For total distance in the first 30 mins: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: row factor: $F_{1, 52}=19.24$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 52}=11.73$ , $P=0.0012$ ; <i>AAV-CON+Saline+Saline</i> vs. <i>AAV-shHrh2+MK-801+Saline</i> : $P<0.0001$ ; <i>AAV-shHrh2+MK-801+Saline</i> vs. <i>AAV-shHrh2+MK-801+Risp</i> : $P<0.0001$ ;	For distance moved per 5 mins, n=14 <i>AAV-CON+Saline</i> , <i>AAV-CON+MK-801</i> and <i>AAV-shHrh2+Saline</i> mice, n=13 <i>AAV-shHrh2+MK-801</i> mice; For total distance of <i>AAV-shHrh2</i> mice treated with risperidone or saline, n=14 mice per group.
Fig. 2E	For nesting score: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=3.018$ , $P=0.0055$ ; for unshredded cotton (% weight): Mann-Whitney test, $U=34$ , $P=0.0012$ ;	
Fig. 2F	Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: <i>AAV-CON</i> , unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=3.985$ , $P=0.0005$ ; <i>AAV-shHrh2</i> , unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.188$ , $P=0.2450$ ; preference index for S1 and E: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=2.201$ , $P=0.0365$ ; Time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: <i>AAV-CON</i> , Mann-Whitney test, $U=28.5$ , $P=0.0008$ ; <i>AAV-shHrh2</i> , Mann-Whitney test, $U=107$ , $P=0.8381$ ; preference index for S2 and S1: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=2.495$ , $P=0.0190$ ;	n=13 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-CON</i> mice; n=14 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-cre+AAV-shHrh2</i> ;

Fig. 2G	Mann-Whitney test, $U=35$ , $P=0.0016$ ;	
Fig. 2H	Mann-Whitney test, $U=46$ , $P=0.0091$ ;	
Fig. 3A2	Unpaired two-tailed $t$ test, $t=4.089$ , $P=0.0150$ ;	n=3 mice per group;
Fig. 3D	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: row factor: $F_{2, 84}=28.05$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{3, 42}=9.412$ , $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: $P=0.1297$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-NEG+MK-801: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: $P=0.0013$ ;	
Fig. 3E	For distance moved per 5 mins: two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: row factor: $F_{16, 672}=10.01$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{3, 42}=7.393$ , $P=0.0004$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: $P=0.9240$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-NEG+MK-801: $P=0.0027$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: $P=0.0187$ ; for total distance: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: $F_{3, 28}=13.96$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: $P=0.7990$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-NEG+MK-801: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: $P=0.0013$ ;	n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-NEG+Saline mice, n=10 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-Hrh2+Saline mice; n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-NEG+MK-801 mice, n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-Hrh2+MK-801 mice;

Fig. 3F	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: AAV-NEG+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.192</math>, <math>P=0.0004</math>; AAV-Hrh2+Saline: Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=21</math>, <math>P=0.0288</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.4489</math>, <math>P=0.6579</math>; AAV-Hrh2+MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=6.349</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; Preference index for S1 and E: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=6.274</math>, <math>P=0.0021</math>; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: <math>P=0.8240</math>; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-NEG+MK-801: <math>P=0.0032</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: <math>P=0.0061</math>; Time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: AAV-NEG+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.750</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; AAV-Hrh2+Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.088</math>, <math>P=0.0007</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.7725</math>, <math>P=0.4480</math>; AAV-Hrh2+MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.490</math>, <math>P=0.0002</math>; Preference index for S2 and S1: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=5.854</math>, <math>P=0.0030</math>; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: <math>P=0.5624</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-NEG+Saline: <math>P=0.0022</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: <math>P=0.0241</math>;</p>
Fig. 3G	<p>For nesting score: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=6.758</math>, <math>P=0.0014</math>; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: <math>P=0.9599</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-NEG+Saline: <math>P=0.0051</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: <math>P=0.0109</math>; for unshredded cotton (% weight): two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=5.347</math>, <math>P=0.0047</math>; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: <math>P=0.9861</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-NEG+Saline: <math>P=0.0313</math>; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: <math>P=0.0076</math>;</p>

Fig. 3H	For total consumption: water: Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: $F_{1, 42}=16.28$ , $P=0.0002$ ; Column Factor: $F_{3, 42}=2.539$ , $P=0.0694$ ; for sucrose preference: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: $F_{3, 29}=13.72$ , $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: $P=0.9695$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-NEG+Saline: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: $P=0.0062$ ;	
Fig. 3I	Two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: $F_{3, 27}=9.864$ , $P=0.0001$ ; AAV-NEG+Saline vs. AAV-Hrh2+Saline: $P=0.2698$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-NEG+Saline: $P=0.0043$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801 vs. AAV-Hrh2+MK-801: $P=0.0043$ ;	
Fig. 4B1	Mann-Whitney test, $U=41$ , $P<0.0001$ ;	n=29 cells from 3 <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> mice, n=23 cells from 3 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> mice;
Fig. 4B2	For burst per minute: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=8.493$ , $P<0.0001$ ; for % of spikes in bursts, Mann-Whitney test, $U=192$ , $P=0.0086$ ;	
Fig. 4D	Mann-Whitney test, $U=366$ , $P=0.1245$ ;	n=29 cells from 5 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-CON</i> mice, n=32 cells from 6 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-shHrh2</i> mice;
Fig. 4E	Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.4035$ , $P=0.6881$ ;	
Fig. 4F	Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.1704$ , $P=0.8653$ ;	
Fig. 4H	Two-way repeated measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: $F_{10, 590}=142.1$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 59}=6.490$ , $P=0.0135$ ;	
Fig. 5B1	Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=2.792$ , $P=0.0070$ ;	
Fig. 5B2	Two-way repeated measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: $F_{7, 413}=135.2$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 59}=5.325$ , $P=0.0246$ ;	
Fig. 5C	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Tukey's test: row factor: $F_{10, 300}=94.66$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{3, 30}=4.759$ , $P=0.0079$ ; AAV-CON vs. AAV-CON+ZD7288: $P=0.8049$ ; AAV-CON vs. AAV-shHrh2: $P=0.0089$ ; AAV-	n=7 cells from four <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-CON</i> mice, n=10 cells from five <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre+AAV-shHrh2</i> mice.

	<i>shHrh2</i> vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288: <i>P</i> =0.0422;	
Fig. 5E	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{1,943, 46.64}=41.84$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 24}=1.419$ , $P=0.2616$ ; 74 dB: AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.6120$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288 vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.8468$ ; 78 dB: AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.5760$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288 vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.6466$ ; 82 dB: AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.0092$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288 vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.0409$ ;	n=9 mice per group;
Fig. 5F	For distance moved per 5 mins: two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{16, 384}=22.03$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 24}=17.03$ , $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288 vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.0160$ ; for total distance: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: $F_{2,24}=17.26$ , $P<0.0001$ ; AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288 vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline: $P=0.0185$ ;	

Fig. 5G	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: AAV-CON+Sa: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.430</math>, <math>P=0.0034</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=27</math>, <math>P=0.2581</math>;</p> <p>AAV+<i>shHrh2</i>+ZD7288: Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=3</math>, <math>P=0.0003</math>; preference index for S1 and E: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{2,24}=5.046</math>, <math>P=0.0148</math>; AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0194</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+ZD7288 vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0222</math>; time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: AAV-CON+Sa: Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=6</math>, <math>P=0.0012</math>; AAV+<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=33</math>, <math>P=0.5457</math>;</p> <p>AAV+<i>shHrh2</i>+ZD7288: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.334</math>, <math>P=0.0042</math>; preference index for S2 and S1: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{2,24}=11.36</math>, <math>P=0.0003</math>; AAV-CON+Saline vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0005</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+ZD7288 vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0013</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6B	<p>Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: <math>F_{2,56}=24.78</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; column factor: <math>F_{3,28}=4.527</math>, <math>P=0.0104</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0099</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0431</math>;</p> <p>WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0110</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6C	<p>For distance moved per 5 mins: two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: <math>F_{22,616}=27.09</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; column factor: <math>F_{3,28}=17.53</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0003</math>;</p> <p>WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0070</math>; for total distance: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3,21}=15.30</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;</p> <p>MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;</p> <p>MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine:</p>	<p>n=8 mice per group;</p>



	<p><math>P=0.0011</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0146</math>;</p>
Fig. 6D	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: Saline-Veh, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=0</math>, <math>P=0.0002</math>; MK-801-Veh, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=21.50</math>, <math>P=0.2909</math>; MK-801-Amthamine, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=1</math>, <math>P=0.0003</math>; MK-801-Betazole, unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=6.290</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; preference index for S1 and E: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3, 28} = 8.565</math>, <math>P=0.0003</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0638</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0011</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0002</math>; time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: Saline-Veh, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=4.500</math>, <math>P=0.0025</math>; MK-801-Veh, unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=1.136</math>, <math>P=0.2749</math>; MK-801-Amthamine, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=0</math>, <math>P=0.0002</math>; MK-801-Betazole, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=9.500</math>, <math>P=0.0160</math>; preference index for S2 and S1: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3, 28} = 10.52</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0004</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0054</math>;</p>
Fig. 6E	<p>For nesting score: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3, 28}=4.268</math>, <math>P=0.0133</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0183</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0183</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0183</math>; for unshredded cotton (% weight): one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3, 28}= 5.314</math>,</p>

	<p><math>P=0.0050</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0069</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0038</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0407</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6F	<p>For total consumption: water: Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: Row Factor: <math>F_{1,28}=0.1659</math>, <math>P=0.6868</math>; Column Factor: <math>F_{3,28}=3.191</math>, <math>P=0.0389</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0295</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.1401</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0493</math>; for sucrose preference: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{3,28}=11.17</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.0007</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.0094</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6G	<p>One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3,28}=11.83</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. Saline-Veh: <math>P=0.0001</math>; MK801-Veh vs. MK-801-Amthamine: <math>P=0.9526</math>; WT+MK801-Veh vs. WT+MK-801-Batazole: <math>P=0.1198</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6H	<p>Kruskal-Wallis test with <i>post-hoc</i> Dunn's test: <math>F=1.597</math>; MK801 vs. Saline: <math>P=0.4198</math>; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: <math>P&gt;0.9999</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6I	<p>One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{2,61}=0.1117</math>, <math>P=0.8945</math>, MK801 vs. Saline: <math>P=0.9860</math>; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: <math>P=0.9255</math>;</p>	<p>n=24 cells from four WT+saline mice, n=22 cells from six WT+MK-801 mice, n=18 cells from five WT+saline+amthamine mice;</p>
Fig. 6J	<p>Kruskal-Wallis test with <i>post-hoc</i> Dunn's test: <math>F=0.5300</math>, MK801 vs. Saline: <math>P&gt;0.9999</math>; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: <math>P=0.9819</math>;</p>	
Fig. 6L	<p>Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: <math>F_{7,427}=317.0</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; column factor: <math>F_{2,61}=3.737</math>, <math>P=0.0294</math>; MK801 vs.</p>	

	Saline: $P=0.0397$ ; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: $P=0.0414$ ;	
Fig. 6N1	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2, 61}= 8.036$ , $P=0.0008$ ; MK801 vs. Saline: $P=0.0031$ ; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: $P=0.0013$ ;	
Fig. 6N2	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{7, 427}=231.9$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 61}=5.032$ , $P=0.0095$ ; MK801 vs. Saline: $P=0.0439$ ; MK801 vs. MK-801+Amthamine: $P=0.0072$ ;	
Fig. S1B	For <i>Hrh2</i> mRNA expression in Glutamate <sup>+</sup> cells: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test: $t=3.519$ , $P=0.0025$ ; for Glutamate intensity, Mann-Whitney test, $U=45$ , $t=0.7394$ ; for soma size: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test: $t=0.3126$ , $P=0.7582$ ;	n=10 for controls and schizophrenia patients;
Fig. S2C	Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=13.00$ , $P=0.0002$ ;	n=3 mice per group;
Fig. S2D	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2, 30}=1.820$ , $P=0.1794$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.3096$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.1334$ ;	
Fig. S2E	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2, 30}=0.09785$ , $P=0.9071$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.9110$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.9985$ ;	
Fig. S2F	Kruskal-Wallis test with <i>post-hoc</i> Dunn's test: $F=0.4501$ , <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P>0.9999$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P>0.9999$ ;	n=11 mice per group;
Fig. S2G	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{4, 120}=195.7$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 30}=0.6229$ , $P=0.5432$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.5460$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.5179$ ;	

Fig. S2H	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{7, 210}=54.87$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 30}=0.1944$ , $P=0.8244$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.7617$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.9539$ ;	
Fig. S3A	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{1.592, 47.76}=28.46$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 30}=2.827$ , $P=0.0750$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : 78dB vs. 74dB: $P=0.0477$ ; 82dB vs. 78dB: $P=0.0073$ ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : 78dB vs. 74dB: $P=0.0040$ ; 82dB vs. 78dB: $P=0.0749$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : 78dB vs. 74dB: $P=0.6564$ ; 82dB vs. 78dB: $P=0.6492$ ;	n=11 mice per group;
Fig. S3B	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: $F_{2, 54}=25.51$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 27}=4.366$ , $P=0.0462$ ; AAV-CON: 78dB vs. 74dB: $P=0.0038$ ; 82dB vs. 78dB: $P<0.0001$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> : 78dB vs. 74dB: $P=0.1316$ ; 82dB vs. 78dB: $P=0.9973$ ;	n=13 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-CON mice; n=14 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-cre</i> +AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> ;
Fig. S3C	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{2, 60}=2.279$ , $P=0.1112$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 30}=0.3757$ , $P=0.6900$ ;	n=11 mice per group;
Fig. S3D	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: $F_{2, 54}=5.536$ , $P=0.0065$ ; column factor: $F_{1, 27}=0.01885$ , $P=0.8918$ ;	n=13 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-CON mice; n=14 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-cre</i> +AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> ;
Fig. S4A	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{2, 80}=31.37$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{3, 40}=1.644$ , $P=0.1945$ ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline: $P=0.1302$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Risp vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline: $P=0.2021$ ; 74dB: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline: $P=0.8132$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Risp vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline: $P=0.9373$ ; 78dB: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline:	n=11 mice per group;

	<p><math>P=0.5589</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Risp</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.5322</math>; 82dB: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0014</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre;Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Risp</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0053</math>;</p>
Fig. S4B	<p>Two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: <math>F_{13, 27}=1.044</math>, <math>P=0.4421</math>; column factor: <math>F_{3, 27}=8.206</math>, <math>P=0.0005</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0003</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Risp</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0058</math>;</p>
Fig. S4C	<p>For nesting score: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=3.779</math>, <math>P=0.0210</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0231</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Risp</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.2241</math>; For unshredded cotton: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=4.693</math>, <math>P=0.0086</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.0090</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Risp</i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup>+Saline</i>: <math>P=0.4473</math>;</p>

Fig. S4D	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=5.975</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp: <math>t=5.464</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;  <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.9005</math>, <math>P=0.3786</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.468</math>, <math>P=0.0002</math>; Preference index for S1 and E: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3, 26}=4.732</math>, <math>P=0.0092</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0032</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0418</math>; Time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.690</math>, <math>P=0.0014</math>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp: <math>t=5.098</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;  <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.9781</math>, <math>P=0.3397</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.198</math>, <math>P=0.0045</math>; Preference index for S2 and S1: two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=8.403</math>, <math>P=0.0004</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0003</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0014</math>;</p>	
Fig. S4E	<p>Two-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{3, 29}=7.327</math>, <math>P=0.0008</math>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0024</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Risp vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>;  <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>+Saline: <math>P=0.0111</math>;</p>	
Fig. S5A	<p>Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.6524</math>, <math>P=0.5216</math>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.6079</math>, <math>P=0.5501</math>; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i>; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i>, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=56</math>, <math>P=0.7969</math>;</p>	n=11 mice per group;

Fig. S5B	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2,30}=8.319$ , $P=0.0013$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> : $P=0.0104$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> vs. <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> : $P=0.0010$ ;	
Fig. S5C	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.1535$ , $P=0.8795$ ; <i>Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Risp: Mann-Whitney test, $U=40$ , $P=0.1932$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.6438$ , $P=0.5270$ ; <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre; Hrh2<sup>fl/fl</sup></i> +Risp, Mann-Whitney test, $U=48$ , $P=0.4385$ ;	
Fig. S5D	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: AAV-CON+Saline, Mann-Whitney test, $U=79$ , $P=0.7909$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline, Mann-Whitney test, $U=88$ , $P=0.6673$ ;	n=13 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-CON mice; n=14 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-cre</i> +AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> ;
Fig. S5E	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: AAV-CON+Saline, Mann-Whitney test, $U=28$ , $P=0.7209$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.959$ , $P=0.0704$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.833$ , $P=0.0881$ ;	n=8 mice per group;
Fig. S5F	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: AAV-CON, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.231$ , $P=0.2387$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> , unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.03677$ , $P=0.9712$ ;	n=8 mice per group;
Fig. S5G	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: AAV-NEG+Saline, Mann-Whitney test, $U=64$ , $P=0.6707$ ; AAV- <i>Hrh2</i> +Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.091$ , $P=0.2897$ ; AAV-NEG+MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.02153$ , $P=0.9830$ ; AAV- <i>Hrh2</i> +MK-801, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.1976$ , $P=0.8459$ ;	n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-NEG+Saline mice, n=10 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV- <i>Hrh2</i> +Saline mice; n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV-NEG+MK-801 mice, n=12 <i>CaMKII<math>\alpha</math>-Cre</i> +AAV- <i>Hrh2</i> +MK-801 mice;
Fig. S5H	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: AAV-CON+Saline, Mann-Whitney test, $U=26$ , $P=0.2224$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.621$ , $P=0.1246$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +ZD7288, Mann-Whitney test, $U=40$ , $P>0.9999$ ;	n=8 mice per group;

Fig. S5I	Time in chambers-Left vs. Right: Saline-Veh, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.8483$ , $P=0.4106$ ; MK-801-Veh, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=1.045$ , $P=0.3139$ ; MK-801-Amthamine, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.2566$ , $P=0.8012$ ; MK-801-Betazole, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, $t=0.3049$ , $P=0.7649$ ;	n=8 mice per group;
Fig. S6A	Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: $F_{2, 42}=31.72$ , $P<0.0001$ ; column factor: $F_{2, 21}=4.443$ , $P=0.0246$ ; 74dB: AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.6185$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.9006$ ; 78dB: AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.4900$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.1546$ ; 82dB: AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.0002$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.0181$ ;	
Fig. S6B	One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2, 21}=11.12$ , $P=0.0005$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.0004$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.0045$ ;	n=8 mice per group;
Fig. S6C	For nesting score: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{2, 21}=3.063$ , $P=0.0681$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.0422$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.6372$ ; For unshredded cotton: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: $F_{3, 21}=3.171$ , $P=0.0626$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: $P=0.0372$ ; AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Saline vs. AAV- <i>shHrh2</i> +Risp: $P=0.2918$ ;	



Fig. S6D	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: AAV-CON+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.050</math>, <math>P=0.0087</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=0.5109</math>, <math>P=0.6174</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Risp, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=4.697</math>, <math>P=0.0003</math>; Preference index for S1 and E: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{2, 21}=4.796</math>, <math>P=0.0192</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: <math>P=0.0248</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Risp: <math>P=0.0270</math>; Time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: AAV-CON+Saline, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.606</math>, <math>P=0.0029</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline: unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=1.036</math>, <math>P=0.3180</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Risp, unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=3.552</math>, <math>P=0.0032</math>; Preference index for S2 and S1: one-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{2, 21}=7.220</math>, <math>P=0.0041</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: <math>P=0.0022</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Risp: <math>P=0.0475</math>;</p>	
Fig. S6E	<p>One-way ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: <math>F_{2, 21}=15.02</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-CON+Saline: <math>P=0.0009</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Saline vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+Risp: <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>;</p>	
Fig. S7B2	<p>Unpaired two-tailed <i>t</i> test, <math>t=8.948</math>, <math>P=0.0009</math>;</p>	<p>n=3 mice per group;</p>
Fig. S7C	<p>Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Sidak's test: row factor: <math>F_{2, 28}=36.67</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; column factor: <math>F_{1, 14}=0.7468</math>, <math>P=0.4021</math>;</p>	
Fig. S7D	<p>For distance moved per 5 mins: two-way repeated measures ANOVA with <i>post hoc</i> Dunnett's test: row factor: <math>F_{16, 336}=6.385</math>, <math>P&lt;0.0001</math>; column factor: <math>F_{2, 21}=5.657</math>, <math>P=0.0108</math>; AAV-CON+MK-801 vs. AAV-CON+Saline: <math>P=0.0167</math>; AAV-CON+MK-801 vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+MK-801: <math>P=0.9972</math>; for total distance: one-way ANOVA with <i>post</i></p>	<p>n=8 mice per group;</p>

	<p><i>hoc</i> Dunnett test: <math>F_{2, 21}=4.709</math>, <math>P=0.0204</math>; AAV-CON+MK-801 vs. AAV-CON+Saline: <math>P=0.0310</math>; AAV-CON+MK-801 vs. AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>+MK-801: <math>P=0.9900</math>;</p>
Fig. S7E	<p>For nesting score: unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.2607</math>, <math>P=0.7981</math>; for unshredded cotton (% weight): unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.4612</math>, <math>P=0.6517</math>;</p>
Fig. S7F	<p>Time in close interaction-E vs. S1: AAV-CON, unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=3.579</math>, <math>P=0.0030</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>, unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=4.078</math>, <math>P=0.0011</math>; preference index for S1 and E: unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.6644</math>, <math>P=0.5172</math>; time in close interaction-S1 vs. S2: AAV-CON, unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=3.821</math>, <math>P=0.0019</math>; AAV-<i>shHrh2</i>, Mann-Whitney test, <math>U=5</math>, <math>P=0.0030</math>; preference index for S2 and S1: unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.3725</math>, <math>P=0.7151</math>;</p>
Fig. S7G	<p>Unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.2615</math>, <math>P=0.7975</math>;</p>
Fig. S7H	<p>Unpaired two-tailed <math>t</math> test, <math>t=0.3425</math>, <math>P=0.7370</math>;</p>