
Research Article: New Research | Cognition and Behavior

Effects of Inactivation of the Periaqueductal Gray on Song Production in Testosterone-Treated Male Canaries (*Serinus canaria*)

<https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0048-20.2020>

Cite as: eNeuro 2020; 10.1523/ENEURO.0048-20.2020

Received: 11 February 2020

Revised: 15 July 2020

Accepted: 24 July 2020

This Early Release article has been peer-reviewed and accepted, but has not been through the composition and copyediting processes. The final version may differ slightly in style or formatting and will contain links to any extended data.

Alerts: Sign up at www.eneuro.org/alerts to receive customized email alerts when the fully formatted version of this article is published.

Copyright © 2020 Haakenson et al.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium provided that the original work is properly attributed.

1 **Manuscript Title:** Effects of Inactivation of the Periaqueductal Gray on Song

2 Production in Testosterone-Treated Male Canaries (*Serinus canaria*)

3 **Abbreviated Title:** Effects of PAG Inactivation on Song Production

4 **Authors:** Chelsea M. Haakenson¹, Jacques Balthazart², Gregory F. Ball¹

5 **Affiliations:** ¹Program in Neuroscience and Cognitive Science, Department of

6 Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA ²Laboratory of Behavioral

7 Neuroendocrinology, GIGA Neurosciences, University of Liege, Belgium

8 **Author Contributions:** CMH, JB, and GFB designed research; CMH performed

9 research and analyzed data; CMH, JB, and GFB wrote the paper

10 **Correspondence should be addressed to:**

11 Chelsea M. Haakenson

12 University of Maryland

13 College Park, MD

14 20742 USA

15 Email: chaakens@umd.edu

16 Phone: (301) 314-1955

17 Fax: (301) 314-9566

18 **Number of Figures:** 4

19 **Number of Tables:** 1

20 **Number of Multimedia:** 0

21 **Number of words for Abstract:** 215

22 **Number of words for Significance Statement:** 120

23 **Number of words for Introduction:** 629

24 **Numbers of words for Discussion:** 1383

25 **Acknowledgements:** The authors thank Nikolai Smith and Dr. Edward Smith for
26 designing and printing the custom beak bar used for the surgeries and Zewde Ingram,
27 Devanshi Kanani, Sydney Gittelman, and Afina Karapetyan for assistance quantifying
28 song quality measures and call rate.

29 **Conflict of Interest:** Authors report no conflict of interest.

30 **Funding sources:** This work was supported by NINDS *1 R01 NS104008-01*. Chelsea
31 Haakenson's contribution to this research was supported, in part, by NSF award DGE-
32 1632976.

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 Male canaries (*Serinus canaria*) display seasonal changes in the motivation to
35 sing which have been found to be dependent on the action of testosterone (T). During
36 the breeding season when T is high, males sing at a higher rate compared to males with
37 low T. The effect of T on song rate is known to be mediated by the medial preoptic
38 nucleus (POM); however, it is unclear how T-signaling in POM impacts song production.
39 One potential mechanism is via modulation of dopaminergic input into song control
40 nuclei by the periaqueductal gray (PAG). In order to test the role of PAG in T-mediated
41 song production, we treated male canaries with peripheral T implants and implanted a
42 guide cannula targeting the PAG. Through this guide cannula, we transiently inactivated
43 PAG with injections of the GABA_A agonist, muscimol. Each bird received multiple
44 infusions of both muscimol and saline with a 48-hour washout period between
45 treatments. The order of injection type was randomized and counterbalanced between
46 individuals. Muscimol infusion into the PAG, but not nearby regions, increased the

47 latency to sing post-injection. These results support the hypothesis that PAG is involved
48 in the production of song, potentially mediating the motivation to sing or alternatively
49 interfering with the pre-motor activity of nucleus RA. Other song features were however
50 not affected.

51 **SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT**

52 Communication is essential for social species relying on coordinated behavior for
53 survival and reproduction. However, the neural mechanisms underlying the motivation
54 to engage in vocal communication are currently unknown. Here, we show that inhibition
55 of the periaqueductal gray (PAG) increases the latency for male canaries to sing, but
56 does not influence features of song quality once they resume singing. These results
57 indicate that the PAG is involved in regulating the motor initiation or the underlying
58 motivation of the complex, learned behavior of singing but not of innate vocalizations,
59 such as calls. Our findings suggest that the PAG is likely involved in transmitting
60 preoptic signals to the song control system, probably via dopaminergic projections from
61 this region to song control nuclei.

62 **INTRODUCTION**

63 For social species, communication between individuals is essential for forming
64 bonds and promoting survival. Without the ability to communicate, the benefits of living
65 in a social group – such as coordinated food gathering, collective defense of self and
66 territory, mating, and caring for young – are unattainable. However, having the ability to
67 communicate verbally is useless if one does not actually do so. Therefore, individuals
68 that live in social groups must be motivated to engage in vocal communication.

69 Currently, the neural circuits and molecular mechanisms underlying this motivation are
70 largely unknown.

71 Songbirds are an ideal model for addressing this problem, as they rely on vocal
72 communication to relay biologically significant information, and have a vocal learning
73 process with many parallels to that of humans (Doupe & Kuhl, 1999; Konishi, 2004;
74 Kuhl, 2000, 2003). While song can have a variety of functions, one of its key utilities is
75 in mate attraction (Catchpole & Slater, 2008). Appropriately, in seasonally breeding
76 songbird species such as the canary (*Serinus canaria*), the motivation to sing increases
77 during the breeding season, when attracting a mate is particularly important (Voigt &
78 Leitner, 2008). At this time, males also have increased plasma testosterone (T) (Ball &
79 Balthazart, 2017; Ball, Riters, & Balthazart, 2002; Leitner, Van't Hof, & Gahr, 2003). It is
80 this increase in T that leads to a heightened motivation to sing, in addition to a variety of
81 other effects on song quality (Ball, Castelino, Maney, Appeltants, & Balthazart, 2003).

82 This effect of T on the motivation to sing appears to occur via activity in the
83 medial preoptic nucleus (POM), since implantation of T specifically in this region in
84 castrated male canaries increases the number of songs per minute and the percentage
85 of time spent singing (Alward, Balthazart, & Ball, 2013). In addition, partially lesioning
86 the POM has the inverse effect, causing male European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) to
87 sing less frequently (Alger, Maasch, & Riters, 2009; Riters & Ball, 1999). However, it is
88 not yet known how T in POM can induce such changes in song behavior.

89 One potential pathway for transmission of T-modulated activity in POM to the
90 song control system is via the periaqueductal gray (PAG). There are reciprocal
91 projections between PAG and POM (Riters & Alger, 2004). In addition, PAG sends

92 dopaminergic projections to several nuclei in the song control system – HVC, the robust
93 nucleus of the arcopallium (RA), and Area X (Appeltants, Absil, Balthazart, & Ball, 2000;
94 Appeltants, Ball, & Balthazart, 2002; Castelino, Diekamp, & Ball, 2007; Lewis, Ryan,
95 Arnold, & Butcher, 1981). Neural activity in PAG also appears to be tied to activity in
96 POM, as European starlings with lesions to POM have decreased expression of the
97 immediate early gene ZENK in the PAG (Alger et al., 2009). Furthermore, DOPAC, a
98 metabolite of dopamine, in PAG has been found to correlate with song production
99 (Heimovics, Salvante, Sockman, & Riters, 2011).

100 In the present study, we examine the role of PAG in the control of singing. We
101 castrated male canaries and implanted them with Silastic implants that continuously
102 release testosterone, ensuring high singing rates. We then implanted guide cannulas to
103 target the PAG for neurochemical manipulation in these males. We conducted six trials
104 per individual, alternating infusion of saline (vehicle) or the GABA_A agonist muscimol
105 into this brain region. We hypothesized that PAG transmits to the song system T-
106 modulated activity from POM and accordingly sends motivational cues to song control
107 nuclei. Therefore, we predicted that during trials in which PAG was transiently
108 inactivated, males would either refrain from singing for some time following infusion or
109 sing less frequently than in control trials. Furthermore, we predicted that this effect
110 would be limited to song, since T-modulated changes in vocal behavior are limited to
111 song, which is learned, and do not affect calls, which are innate.

112 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

113 All animal procedures were performed in accordance with the University of
114 Maryland, College Park animal care committee's regulations.

115 **Experimental Animals & Pre-experimental Manipulations**

116 Fourteen adult male canaries (*Serinus canaria*) of the American Singer strain
117 were obtained from a local breeder (Maryland Exotic Birds). Upon arrival, birds were
118 housed in grouped aviaries on a short-day photoperiod (8L:16D) to induce
119 photosensitivity (Nicholls & Storey, 1977). All animals were provided with ad libitum food
120 and water. Male birds were castrated under anesthesia (Forane isoflurane, Baxter;
121 Isotex 4 anesthesia machine, Surgivet) through an incision between the last two ribs on
122 each side. Birds were allowed to recover in their home cage for six weeks to allow
123 adequate time for any residual physiological or behavioral effects of endogenous T to
124 clear.

125 **Stereotaxic Implantation**

126 Birds were anesthetized using isoflurane gas and placed in a stereotaxic
127 apparatus modified for use in small birds. Beaks were placed in a custom, 3D-printed
128 beak holder placed at 45° below the horizontal axis of the apparatus. Each bird received
129 a unilateral guide cannula (26 gauge, C315GMNSPC, Plastics One) implant targeting
130 PAG. In order to target PAG without puncturing the ventricle and inducing bleeding, we
131 oriented the stereotaxic arm at a 40° angle to the right from vertical and then used the
132 following stereotaxic coordinates: dorsoventral: – 7.1 mm from the dorsal surface of the
133 brain; anterior-posterior: 0 mm from the most rostral tip of the cerebellum; medial-
134 lateral: 4.5 mm to the right from midline. The cannula was lowered to the target
135 coordinates and dental cement was applied around the implant. The skin was sutured
136 around the implant. At the time of stereotaxic surgery, males were also implanted
137 subcutaneously with a 12mm-long Silastic implant (Dow Corning; internal diameter,

138 0.76mm; external diameter, 1.65 mm) packed with 10mm of T in order to standardize
139 circulating T levels. Following recovery from surgery, males were transferred to
140 individual sound-attenuating chambers (41 cm x 48 cm x 51 cm) set to 14L:10D to
141 simulate breeding photoperiods.

142 **Microinfusion Procedures**

143 In the week following surgery, birds were handled daily and the dummy injectors
144 were removed and reattached so that the birds would habituate to experimental
145 manipulations. After a male had been observed to sing at least two days in a row, he
146 underwent a mock infusion session to acclimate him to the infusion procedure, in which
147 saline was infused through the internal cannula in the same protocol as later test
148 infusions. Test infusions began two days after the acclimation infusion. Each bird
149 underwent six experimental infusion sessions: three sessions with 0.2 μ l 0.9% saline
150 (vehicle) and three sessions with muscimol in 0.9% saline (0.5 μ g / 0.2 μ l solution, cat #
151 0289, Tocris). Infusions alternated between vehicle and drug, but the starting infusion
152 type was randomized and counterbalanced across individuals. Infusion sessions were
153 separated by at least 48 hours to allow for drug washout. During infusions, the dummy
154 injector was replaced by an internal cannula (33 gauge, C315IMNSPC, Plastics One)
155 connected to a Hamilton microliter syringe via a polyethylene tube. The syringe was
156 loaded into a syringe pump (KDS 220, KD Scientific) programmed to deliver treatment
157 (vehicle or drug) at a rate of 0.1 μ l/min for 2 minutes, for a total volume of 0.2 μ l.
158 Following infusion, the internal cannula was held in place for an additional minute to
159 allow for diffusion and to avoid reflux of the solution. Birds were then returned to their
160 home chamber. Chambers contained a combination microphone/camera (Mini Spy HD

161 1000TVL, TPEKKA) connected to a computer running DVRserver (V6.33b; Mammoth
162 Technologies, Austin, TX) designed for real-time video and audio surveillance. Video
163 and audio was recorded for the remainder of the day following infusions.

164 **Behavior Quantification**

165 Videos for each day were downloaded and converted into two filetypes: AVI files
166 for video viewing and WAV files for audio analysis. In order to quantify the latency to
167 sing, we used two independent measures. First, videos were watched from the time a
168 bird was returned to the chamber after drug infusion until the bird was observed singing.
169 The difference in time between infusion and singing was recorded. Audio files were
170 independently inspected in Adobe Audition, and the time between the sound of the bird
171 being returned to the chamber and the start of singing was recorded. These two
172 measures were then compared to ensure that the recorded latency to sing was
173 accurate. In two instances where there were differences between the latency recorded
174 from videos or from audio files, another investigator analyzed the corresponding files to
175 determine which measure was correct and ultimately a consensus was reached on the
176 true time when the first song occurred. For measures of song quality, we used Audition
177 to clip audio files to be one hour in length, starting at the bird's first song post-infusion.
178 These files were analyzed using Avisoft (SASlab Pro, Berlin, Germany). Songs were
179 defined as bouts of vocalizations longer than or equal to 1 s in duration and separated
180 by 500 ms of silence (Alward et al., 2013). One bird was excluded from any analysis of
181 song quality, due to high background noise from the chamber fan. In order to measure
182 the number of calls, experimenters watched video recordings of the hour following
183 return to the chamber following infusions. For each minute of the hour, experimenters

184 counted the number of calls that occurred during that minute and all counts were
185 summed at the end to get the number of calls that occurred during the entire hour. The
186 same procedure was used in order to quantify perch hops, as a measure of general
187 activity following infusion, for 20 minutes of video following return to the chamber. For all
188 behavior quantification procedures, experimenters were blind to treatment and cannula
189 placement.

190 **Verification of Cannula Targets**

191 After birds completed all six test microinfusion sessions, we performed a final
192 microinfusion of 0.2 μ l fluorescent-conjugated muscimol (Muscimol BODIPY TMR-X
193 Conjugate, cat # M23400, ThermoFisher) according to the procedure described above.
194 We allowed 30 minutes for muscimol diffusion prior to extracting brains and flash
195 freezing them on dry ice. Brains were stored at -80°C. Brain tissue was sectioned with a
196 cryostat (Microm HM 500 OM) at 50 μ m in the coronal plane and directly mounted on
197 slides. We then visualized the spread of fluorescent muscimol and the location of tracts
198 created by the guide cannula to determine if the cannula was accurately targeting PAG
199 for drug infusion.

200 **Data Analysis**

201 We analyzed latency, song measures, and call data using repeated-measures
202 ANOVA, with cannula placement and treatment (muscimol, saline) as factors. In
203 addition, we performed estimation based on confidence intervals using the Data
204 Analysis using Bootstrap-Coupled Estimation (*dabestr*) package, written for use in the R
205 programming language (Ho, Tumkaya, Aryal, Choi, & Claridge-Chang, 2019). For song
206 measures, which encompassed singing behavior in the hour after the bird began

207 singing, we combined data from multiple songs to create a single value for each
208 acoustic feature, averaged across all vocalizations in the hour of audio quantified for
209 each individual and trial. Total number of songs was calculated by adding the number of
210 vocalizations that met our criteria for song. Time spent singing was calculated by adding
211 the duration of each of these songs. For measures that concerned each individual song
212 (song duration, interval between songs, number of song elements, energy, peak to peak
213 amplitude, root mean square (RMS) amplitude, entropy, fundamental frequency,
214 bandwidth, peak amplitude, and peak frequency) we averaged the values of each
215 measure across the songs sung within the one hour song file for a given trial. These
216 measures were chosen in order to quantify a range of song features including
217 stereotypy, volume, and frequency range.

218 **RESULTS**

219 Due to variation in accuracy of stereotaxic implantation of guide cannulas,
220 subjects were categorized in three groups based on the location: PAG, intercollicular
221 nucleus (ICo), and misses (*Figure 1*). Five males were categorized in the ICo group, five
222 in the miss group, and four in the PAG group. The fluorescent muscimol spread an
223 average of 533 μm in the ventral-medial direction away from the end of the guide
224 cannula tract and an average of 225 μm in the perpendicular direction. In individuals
225 where the guide cannulas targeted PAG, this spread was sufficient to cover at least
226 some portion of the contralateral side, in addition to affecting the hemisphere containing
227 the guide cannula. When guide cannulas targeted regions that are located more
228 laterally (ICo and misses), this spread only affected the hemisphere ipsilateral to the
229 guide cannula. To determine if muscimol diffused into the aqueduct and was

230 transported to other brain regions via the ventricular system, we assessed fluorescence
231 around the aqueduct and across brain regions in the telencephalon and diencephalon.
232 We did not observe fluorescence above standard autofluorescence in any brain regions
233 outside the mesencephalon near cannula tracts.

234 **Song Latency**

235 There was a significant difference in latency to begin singing between muscimol
236 and saline trials ($F(1,11) = 5.775$, $p = 0.035$, $\eta^2 = 0.046$) and a significant interaction
237 between cannula placement and treatment ($F(2,11) = 19.222$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.303$)
238 (*Figure 2*). There was no significant main effect of cannula placement alone on latency
239 to sing ($F(2,11) = 1.873$, $p = 0.200$, $\eta^2 = 0.143$). The effect of treatment was driven by
240 differences in the group with guide cannulas targeting PAG. In birds with cannulas
241 targeting PAG, there was a large increase in time to sing post-infusion for muscimol
242 trials compared to saline trials (mean muscimol latency minus saline latency (ΔL) =
243 125.75 min, SE = 13.50), while differences in latency in birds with cannula targeting ICo
244 ($\Delta L = 20.10$ min, SE = 14.34) and in birds with cannula targets classified as misses (ΔL
245 = -41.50 min, SE = 20.43) were smaller. We found a similar pattern of results by
246 performing estimation statistics with the *dabestr* R package. We created 5000
247 bootstrapped sample distributions representing the difference in latency to sing for
248 muscimol trials minus saline trials, such that a positive estimation would indicate a
249 larger latency to sing following muscimol infusions compared to saline infusions. The
250 PAG group had a 95% confidence interval that indicated a larger latency to sing
251 following muscimol trials compared to saline trials (126 min, 95% CI [71.8; 184]). The
252 95% confidence interval for the ICo group (28 min, 95% CI [-3.21;113]) included 0,

253 indicating that there is likely no difference in latency to sing between muscimol and
254 saline trials. The Miss group's 95% confidence interval (-38.8 min, 95% CI [-99.5; -9.51])
255 was close to zero, but did not include zero – indicating a small increase in latency to
256 sing for saline trials.

257 **Song Measures**

258 In the hour after birds began singing, we did not find any significant differences
259 between treatments (saline or muscimol) or between cannula placements for the
260 amount of time spent singing (total number of songs, total amount of time spent singing)
261 or measures of song quality (song duration, interval between songs, energy, number of
262 elements, peak to peak frequency, fundamental frequency, entropy, bandwidth, or
263 amplitude). (*Figure 3, see Table 1 for results of statistical analyses*). We did observe a
264 significant interaction between treatment and placement for RMS amplitude ($F(2,10) =$
265 $4.828, p = 0.0341$). However, the lack of significant main effects of cannula placement
266 ($F(2,10) = 0.485, p = 0.629$) or treatment ($F(1,10) = 0.312, p = 0.589$) and the small
267 effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.012$) suggests that this may be a spurious effect. Furthermore, the
268 95% confidence interval of bootstrapped differences between muscimol and saline trials
269 included zero in all groups, supporting the idea that this is not a real effect (PAG: -2.43
270 RMS power, 95% CI [-5.19; 0.123]; ICo: 0.528 RMS power, 95% CI [-0.002; 1.52]; Miss:
271 0.796 RMS power, 95% CI [-0.942; 2.31]).

272 **Calls**

273 We also quantified the number of calls birds made in the hour immediately
274 following infusion and found no significant differences between treatments ($F(1,11) =$
275 $4.783, p = 0.054$), cannula placements ($F(2,11) = 0.468, p = 0.639$), or an interaction

276 between the two ($F(2,11) = 2.549$, $p = 0.127$) (*Figure 4*). Likewise, 95% confidence
277 intervals of the difference between muscimol and saline trials included zero for all three
278 cannula placements (PAG: -53.9 calls, 95% CI [-140; 0.75], ICo: -24.3 calls, 95% CI [-
279 92.3;53], Miss: 4.31 calls, 95% CI [-18.2; 44.2]).

280 **General Activity**

281 We did not find a difference in the number of perch hops following infusion
282 between cannula placements ($F(2,11) = 0.546$, $p = 0.594$), between saline and
283 muscimol trials ($F(1, 11) = 0.228$, $p = 0.643$), or an interaction between placement and
284 treatment for any cannula placement. ($F(2, 11) = 0.942$, $p = 0.419$). Likewise, the 95%
285 confidence intervals of difference between muscimol and saline trials included zero for
286 all conditions (PAG: -19.3 perch hops, 95 CI [-68.9; 0.1], ICo: -5.6 perch hops, 95 CI [-
287 27.1; 3.4], Miss: 11.3 perch hops, 95 CI [-8.27; 37.2]).

288 **DISCUSSION**

289 This study found that transiently inactivating the PAG increases the latency to
290 sing in castrated male canaries treated with exogenous T. Since muscimol infusion into
291 this region increased the latency to sing, while having no effect on other aspects of song
292 production, PAG seems to be specifically involved in the initiation of singing behavior.
293 This could be due to PAG conveying cues from the POM to the song control system.
294 The interpretation of these results depends critically on the assumed duration of
295 muscimol infused into the PAG. Based on past pharmacological studies, it is likely that
296 the dose of 0.5 μg muscimol we infused in the PAG activated GABA_A receptors for a
297 duration of one or two hours. Indeed a previous study found that an intraperitoneal
298 injection of muscimol produced an analgesia in the hot plate test that was fully effective

299 for 40 min and was already decreasing at 60 min, with an extrapolated return to
300 baseline before 2 hours post injection (Sawynok & Labella, 1982). Using an approach
301 more similar to the present work, muscimol infused into the preoptic area decreased the
302 lordosis quotient of female rats at 10 and, to a lower extent, 30 min post infusion, but
303 the behavior returned to baseline at 60 min. A similar time course was observed for the
304 stimulation of lordosis by muscimol injected into the medial hypothalamus (McCarthy,
305 Malik, & Feder, 1990). These durations of action depend on the doses that are injected
306 but studies combining doses and duration are rare and, to our knowledge, do not exist
307 for brain injections. Based on these data, it seems likely that our injections of a low dose
308 of muscimol modulated GABA_A activity for a duration of about one-two hours which
309 explains why singing activity resumed 125 min later but the quality of the songs
310 produced at that time was not affected. If GABA_A activity was still increased when
311 singing activity recovered, this would mean that PAG does not control song quality,
312 since song was normal at that time. However, we do not believe that this interpretation
313 is very likely, because it would then be difficult to understand why singing activity
314 recovered.

315 In mammalian species, electrical stimulation of the PAG has been shown to elicit
316 innate, species-specific calls (Jürgens, 1994). However, little is known concerning the
317 function of PAG in regulating learned vocalizations, such as song. Projections from the
318 PAG to HVC have been found to be important during zebra finch (*Taeniopygia guttata*)
319 development and song learning – allowing juveniles to detect the presence of a tutor
320 and encode the tutor song (Tanaka, Sun, Li, & Mooney, 2018). Our results indicate that

321 the medial PAG has additional influence on adult song – presumably by transmitting
322 signals from POM to the song system.

323 The nature of the information transferred from POM to PAG would however
324 require additional investigations. In canaries, we have collected extensive evidence
325 indicating that testosterone action in the POM is necessary for singing behavior to occur
326 but does not modify song quality (Alger et al., 2009; Alger & Riters, 2006; Alward et al.,
327 2013; Alward, Bournonville, et al., 2016; Alward, Madison, Parker, Balthazart, & Ball,
328 2016; Riters & Ball, 1999; Vandries et al., 2019). We have therefore hypothesized that
329 the POM modulates the motivation to sing, but it could also be postulated that these
330 effects reflect a modulation of the motor aspects of singing. It is challenging to
331 distinguish between these two hypotheses. The terms motor control are usually used for
332 mechanisms that are relatively close to the effector muscles, including for example the
333 motor magnocellular neurons directly projecting to the spinal chord or possibly neurons
334 in the PAG. The preoptic area is rather considered as an integration area that
335 modulates higher order processes, including motivation. It is often assumed in the
336 literature on male sex behavior in rodents that an increased latency to show sexual
337 behavior after introduction of a female reflects a decrease in motivation (Melis &
338 Argiolas, 1995) and we think that the delay in singing initiation reflects here a similar
339 mechanism. The interpretation of the present experiments is thus probably not that
340 inactivating PAG directly blocks a motor transmission to the muscles of the syrinx (such
341 a direct projection is not known to exist) but rather that this inactivation interrupts
342 transmission of a “motivational” signal from POM to HVC and/or RA. It is however true
343 that RA is myotopically organized based on the muscles of the syrinx (Vicario, 1991) so

344 an indirect modulation of the motor control of the syrinx via the PAG projection to RA
345 could potentially contribute to the effects we have observed in this study.

346 The observation that the general activity of the birds (i.e. perch hopping) and the
347 rate of calling behavior were not affected by muscimol during the period when song was
348 inhibited supports the specificity of the effect on song and argues against an
349 interpretation that would be based on a general inhibition of activity or on a non-specific
350 stress response. However, given the difficulties of ascribing a strictly motivational role to
351 the observed effect of transiently inactivating PAG, additional data would be required to
352 completely dissociate this region's effects on motivation as compared to the motor
353 control of the syrinx.

354 Notably, it appears that the medial PAG, and not ICo, regulates these
355 motivational signals. Birds with cannulas targeting this region took an average of 125
356 minutes longer to begin singing after muscimol infusions, presumably refraining from
357 singing until the muscimol wore off, while birds with cannulas targeting other regions did
358 not display a large difference in song latency between muscimol and saline trials.
359 Immunohistochemical analysis has indicated that this region, referred to as the
360 mesencephalic central gray in some older publications (e.g. Stokes, Leonard, &
361 Nottebohm, 1974), is organized like a folded open ventral mammalian PAG, while the
362 laterally adjacent ICo appears to be homologous to the dorsal mammalian PAG
363 (Kingsbury, Kelly, Schrock, & Goodson, 2011). In addition, the medial PAG contains the
364 A11 group of catecholaminergic neurons, sending projections to the song control
365 system (Appeltants et al., 2000, 2002). We hypothesize that the motivational cues from
366 the POM are transmitted to the song system via these projections. Future studies

367 should investigate these catecholaminergic inputs into song control nuclei and their
368 influence on song behavior.

369 These results indicate that PAG is involved in the initiation of singing behavior
370 and may regulate the motivation to produce song, but cannulas misplaced in the ICo
371 served as a valuable control as ICo has been implicated in production of innate calls
372 (Nieder & Mooney, 2020; Popa & Popa, 1933). Due to this literature, we expected a
373 decrease in calling behavior following muscimol infusion into this region. However, we
374 did not observe such a difference, likely due the placement of cannula. For cannulas
375 targeting PAG, the medial position of the nucleus allowed muscimol to spread and to
376 affect the bilateral extent of the structure. In contrast, when the cannula was located in
377 ICo, a nucleus located more laterally, muscimol was not able to spread to the
378 contralateral side in order to induce bilateral inactivation. Bilateral lesions of ICo
379 decrease ring dove (*Streptopelia risoria*) nest coos, but only unilateral activation of this
380 area with steroid hormones are required to induce an increase in nest-cooing behavior
381 (Cohen & Cheng, 1981, 1982). Therefore, it is possible that using two cannulas to
382 bilaterally inactivate this region would reduce calling behavior, a hypothesis that could
383 be tested in future experiments. In addition, the cannulas classified as being in ICo in
384 this study targeted the medial, rather than lateral, portion of ICo. Since many of the
385 electrical stimulation studies implicating ICo as a regulator of calling behavior targeted
386 the lateral region of the nucleus close to the dorsomedial nucleus of ICo (DM), it is more
387 likely that this lateral portion is responsible for innate vocalizations (Seller, 1980).
388 Therefore, targeting muscimol treatment in this lateral portion of ICo may potentially
389 result in an inhibition of calling behavior.

390 Now that PAG has been identified as a region essential for the initiation of song,
391 and potentially controlling the motivation to produce learned vocalizations, future
392 research is required to identify the underlying cellular and molecular mechanisms.
393 Systematically exploring how this region interacts with the song control system and the
394 POM will advance our understanding of the biological underpinnings of social
395 communication.

396

397 REFERENCES

- 398 Alger, S. J., Maasch, S. N., & Riters, L. V. (2009). Lesions to the medial preoptic
399 nucleus affect immediate early gene immunolabeling in brain regions involved in
400 song control and social behavior in male European starlings. *European Journal of*
401 *Neuroscience*, 29(5), 970–982. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2009.06637.x>
- 402 Alger, S. J., & Riters, L. V. (2006). Lesions to the medial preoptic nucleus differentially
403 affect singing and nest box-directed behaviors within and outside of the breeding
404 season in European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Behavioral Neuroscience*. Riters,
405 Lauren V.: University of Wisconsin, Department of Zoology, 361 Birge Hall, 430
406 Lincoln Drive, Madison, WI, US, 53706, LVRiters@wisc.edu: American
407 Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.120.6.1326>
- 408 Alward, B. A., Balthazart, J., & Ball, G. F. (2013). Differential effects of global versus
409 local testosterone on singing behavior and its underlying neural substrate.
410 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
411 110(48), 19573–19578. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1311371110>
- 412 Alward, B. A., Bournonville, C. De, Chan, T. T., Balthazart, J., Cornil, C. A., & Ball, G. F.

- 413 (2016). Aromatase inhibition rapidly affects in a reversible manner distinct features
414 of birdsong. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 32344. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32344>
- 415 Alward, B. A., Madison, F. N., Parker, S. E., Balthazart, J., & Ball, G. F. (2016).
416 Pleiotropic Control by Testosterone of a Learned Vocal Behavior and Its
417 Underlying. *Eneuro*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0145-15.2016>
- 418 Appeltants, D., Absil, P., Balthazart, J., & Ball, G. F. (2000). Identification of the origin of
419 catecholaminergic inputs to HVC in canaries by retrograde tract tracing combined
420 with tyrosine hydroxylase immunocytochemistry. *Journal of Chemical*
421 *Neuroanatomy*, 18(3), 117–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0891-0618\(99\)00054-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0891-0618(99)00054-X)
- 422 Appeltants, D., Ball, G. F., & Balthazart, J. (2002). The origin of catecholaminergic
423 inputs to the song control nucleus RA in canaries. *NeuroReport*, 13(5), 649–653.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200204160-00023>
- 425 Ball, G. F., & Balthazart, J. (2017). Neuroendocrine Regulation of Reproductive
426 Behavior in Birds. In D. W. Pfaff & M. Joëls (Eds.), *Hormones, Brain, and Behavior*
427 (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 217–254). Oxford: Academic Press.
- 428 Ball, G. F., Castelino, C. B., Maney, D. L., Appeltants, D., & Balthazart, J. (2003). The
429 Activation of Birdsong by Testosterone: Multiple Sites of Action and Role of
430 Ascending Catecholamine Projections. *Annals of the New York Academy of*
431 *Sciences*, 1007, 211–231.
- 432 Ball, G. F., Riters, L. V., & Balthazart, J. (2002). Neuroendocrinology of Song Behavior
433 and Avian Brain Plasticity : Multiple Sites of Action of Sex Steroid Hormones, 178,
434 137–178. <https://doi.org/10.1006/frne.2002.0230>
- 435 Castelino, C. B., Diekamp, B., & Ball, G. F. (2007). Noradrenergic projections to the

- 436 song control nucleus area X of the medial striatum in male zebra finches
437 (taeniopygia guttata). *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 502, 544–562.
438 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne>
- 439 Catchpole, C. K., & Slater, P. J. B. (2008). *Bird song: Biological themes and variations*,
440 2nd ed. *Bird song: Biological themes and variations, 2nd ed.* New York, NY, US:
441 Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511754791>
- 442 Cohen, J., & Cheng, M. F. (1981). The role of the midbrain in courtship behavior of the
443 female ring dove (*Streptopelia risoria*): Evidence from radiofrequency lesion and
444 hormone implant studies. *Brain Research*, 207(2), 279–301.
- 445 Cohen, J., & Cheng, M. F. (1982). Effects of Testosterone Metabolites and Estrogen in
446 the Midbrain Control of Courtship Behavior in the Male Ring Dove (*Streptopelia*
447 *risoria*). *Neuroendocrinology*, 34, 64–74.
- 448 Doupe, A. J., & Kuhl, P. K. (1999). Birdsong and Human Speech: Common Themes and
449 Mechanisms. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 22(1), 567–631.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.22.1.567>
- 451 Heimovics, S. A., Salvante, K. G., Sockman, K. W., & Ritters, L. V. (2011). Individual
452 differences in the motivation to communicate relate to levels of midbrain and striatal
453 catecholamine markers in male European starlings. *Hormones and Behavior*, 60(5),
454 529–539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.08.001>
- 455 Ho, J., Tumkaya, T., Aryal, S., Choi, H., & Claridge-Chang, A. (2019). Moving beyond P
456 values: data analysis with estimation graphics. *Nature Methods*, 16(7), 565–566.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0470-3>
- 458 Jürgens, U. (1994). The role of the periaqueductal grey in vocal behaviour. *Behavioural*

- 459 *Brain Research*, 62(2), 107–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328\(94\)90017-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328(94)90017-5)
- 460 Kingsbury, M. A., Kelly, A. M., Schrock, S. E., & Goodson, J. L. (2011). Mammal-like
461 organization of the avian midbrain central gray and a reappraisal of the
462 intercollicular nucleus. *PLoS ONE*, 6(6), e20720.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020720>
- 464 Konishi, M. (2004). The role of auditory feedback in birdsong. *Annals of the New York
465 Academy of Sciences*, 1016, 463–475.
- 466 Kuhl, P. K. (2000). A new view of language acquisition. *Proceedings of the National
467 Academy of Sciences*, 97(22), 11850–11857.
- 468 Kuhl, P. K. (2003). Human speech and birdsong: communication and the social brain.
469 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
470 100(17), 9645–9646. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1733998100>
- 471 Leitner, S., Van't Hof, T. J., & Gahr, M. (2003). Flexible reproduction in wild canaries is
472 independent of photoperiod. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, 130, 102–
473 108.
- 474 Lewis, J. W., Ryan, S. M., Arnold, A. P., & Butcher, L. L. (1981). Evidence for a
475 catecholaminergic projection to area X in the zebra finch. *The Journal of
476 Comparative Neurology*, 196(2), 347–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.901960212>
- 477 McCarthy, M. M., Malik, K. F., & Feder, H. H. (1990). Increased GABAergic
478 transmission in medial hypothalamus facilitates lordosis but has the opposite effect
479 in preoptic area. *Brain Research*, 507(1), 40–44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-
480 8993\(90\)90519-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993(90)90519-H)
- 481 Melis, M. R., & Argiolas, A. (1995). Dopamine and sexual behavior. *Neuroscience and*

- 482 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 19(1), 19–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7634\(94\)00020-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7634(94)00020-)
483 2
- 484 Nicholls, T. J., & Storey, C. R. (1977). The effect of duration of the daily photoperiod on
485 recovery of photosensitivity in photorefractory canaries (*Serinus canarius*). *General*
486 *and Comparative Endocrinology*, 31(1), 72–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/0016->
487 6480(77)90192-7
- 488 Nieder, A., & Mooney, R. (2020). The neurobiology of innate, volitional and learned
489 vocalizations in mammals and birds. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
490 *Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 375(1789), 20190054.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0054>
- 492 Popa, G. T., & Popa, F. G. (1933). Certain Functions of the Midbrain in Pigeons.
493 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 113(782), 191–195.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1933.0040>
- 495 Ritters, L. V., & Alger, S. J. (2004). Neuroanatomical evidence for indirect connections
496 between the medial preoptic nucleus and the song control system: Possible neural
497 substrates for sexually motivated song. *Cell and Tissue Research*, 316(1), 35–44.
498 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00441-003-0838-6>
- 499 Ritters, L. V., & Ball, G. F. (1999). Lesions to the medial preoptic area affect singing in
500 the male European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Hormones and Behavior*.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1006/hbeh.1999.1549>
- 502 Sawynok, J., & Labella, F. S. (1982). On the involvement of GABA in the analgesia
503 produced by baclofen, muscimol, and morphine. *Neuroph*, 21, 397–403.
- 504 Seller, T. J. (1980). Midbrain regions involved in call production in Java sparrows.

- 505 *Behavioural Brain Research*, 1(3), 257–265.
- 506 Stokes, T. M., Leonard, C. M., & Nottebohm, F. (1974). The telencephalon,
507 diencephalon, and mesencephalon of the canary, *Serinus canaria*, in stereotaxic
508 coordinates. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 156(3), 337–374.
509 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.901560305>
- 510 Tanaka, M., Sun, F., Li, Y., & Mooney, R. (2018). A mesocortical dopamine circuit
511 enables the cultural transmission of vocal behavior. *Nature*, 563, 117–120.
- 512 Vandries, L. M., Ghorbanpoor, S., Cornez, G., Shevchouk, O., Ball, G. F., Cornil, C. A.,
513 ... Balthazart, J. (2019). Testosterone or estradiol when implanted in the medial
514 preoptic nucleus trigger short low-amplitude songs in female canaries Second
515 revision on March 31st Testosterone or estradiol when implanted in the medial
516 preoptic nucleus trigger short low-amplitude. *Eneuro*.
- 517 Vicario, D. S. (1991). Organization of the zebra finch song control system: Functional
518 organization of outputs from nucleus robustus archistriatalis. *The Journal of*
519 *Comparative Neurology*, 309(4), 486–494. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.903090405>
- 520 Voigt, C., & Leitner, S. (2008). Seasonality in song behaviour revisited: Seasonal and
521 annual variants and invariants in the song of the domesticated canary (*Serinus*
522 *canaria*). *Hormones and Behavior*, 54(3), 373–378.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2008.05.001>

524

525 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

526 **Figure 1. Experimental Procedures.** (a) Timeline of experimental procedures (left) and
527 image of cannula trajectory (right) created with BioRender. (b) Coronal sections

528 demonstrating final placement of cannula targets after surgery – 4 in PAG, 5 in ICo, and
529 5 misses. **(c)** Example images of muscimol spread for an individual where cannula
530 placement was on the lateral edge of PAG. Left is a Nissl brightfield photomicrograph
531 showing the location of PAG and right is the corresponding fluorescent
532 photomicrograph.

533 **Figure 2. Change in latency to begin singing post-infusion.** Differences in latency
534 for each individual across trial type. Each line connects the average latency to sing
535 following muscimol infusion to the average latency following saline infusion for an
536 individual bird. Black lines indicate summary statistics (mean and standard error of the
537 mean) while colored lines indicate the average latency for each individual bird.

538 Individual points indicate the latency for each single trial. The three sections of the
539 graph represent cannula placement (ICo, miss, or PAG). In order to determine if an
540 ANOVA was appropriate to determine differences between treatments, we tested the
541 assumption of homoscedasticity (Fig 2-1a). To further assess the differences between
542 groups and treatments, we used bootstrapped estimation statistics of 95% confidence
543 intervals (Fig 2-1b).

544 **Figure 3. Example song quality measurements. (a)** The amount of time in minutes
545 spent singing in the one hour after singing began. There were no significant differences
546 between treatments or cannula placement. The three sections of the graph represent
547 cannula placement (ICo, miss, or PAG). **(b)** The average duration of songs in seconds.
548 There were no significant differences between treatments or cannula placement. **(c)**
549 Average change in RMS Amplitude between treatments (muscimol minus saline). There
550 was a significant interaction between treatment and cannula placement, but no main

551 effect. Each line connects the average data following muscimol infusion to the average
 552 data following saline infusion. Black lines indicate summary statistics (mean and
 553 standard error of the mean) while colored lines indicate the average data for each
 554 individual bird.

555 **Figure 4. There were no significant differences in call rate in the hour following**
 556 **infusion.** Difference between muscimol and saline trials (average number of calls
 557 following muscimol infusion minus average number of calls following saline infusion) for
 558 individual birds. Colors represent cannula placement. Each line connects the average
 559 call rate following muscimol infusion to the average call rate following saline infusion.
 560 Black lines indicate summary statistics (mean and standard error of the mean) while
 561 colored lines indicate the average data for each individual bird.

562

563

Song Measure	Factor	df	F	p	Estimation Statistics		
					difference (muscimol - saline)		
<i>Number of Songs</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.328	0.728	ICo	8.5	95 CI [-6.67; 22.3]
	Treatment	1	0.005	0.944	Miss	-23.4	95 CI [-9.83; 140]
	Interaction	2	1.855	0.206	PAG	25.2	95 CI [-9.83; 140]
<i>Time Spent Singing</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.574	0.581	ICo	24.6	95 CI [-58.9; 89.3]
	Treatment	1	0.130	0.726	Miss	-117	95 CI [-229; -20.2]
	Interaction	2	1.359	0.301	PAG	230	95 CI [-56.5; 1240]
<i>Avg. Song Duration</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.662	0.537	ICo	-0.88	95 CI [-3.34; 1.35]
	Treatment	1	0.164	0.694	Miss	0.089	95 CI [-1.06; 1.55]
	Interaction	2	0.626	0.554	PAG	0.256	95 CI [-1.56; 1.77]
<i>Avg. Inter-song Interval</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.757	0.494	ICo	-13.6	95 CI [-153; 43.4]
	Treatment	1	0.0	0.985	Miss	9.61	95 CI [-147; 166]
	Interaction	2	0.2	0.822	PAG	39	95 CI [-180; 203]
<i>Avg. Song Elements</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.747	0.499	ICo	1	95 CI [-1.78; 6.86]
	Treatment	1	0.407	0.538	Miss	-0.661	95 CI [-14; 14]
	Interaction	2	0.354	0.710	PAG	1.3	95 CI [-1.89; 6.2]
<i>Avg. Energy</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.607	0.564	ICo	0.0002	95 CI [0.00004; 0.0006]
	Treatment	1	0.001	0.989	Miss	-0.000008	95 CI [-0.0009; 0.0001]
	Interaction	2	2.541	0.128	PAG	-0.0003	95 CI [-0.0009; 0.0001]
<i>Avg. Peak to Peak Amplitude</i>	Cannula Placement	2	1.12	0.372	ICo	0.014	95 CI [0.001; 0.038]
	Treatment	1	0.753	0.411	Miss	0.003	95 CI [-0.014; 0.026]
	Interaction	2	2.616	0.134	PAG	-0.037	95 CI [-0.083; 0.008]

<i>Avg. RMS</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.485	0.629	ICo	0.528	95 CI [-0.002; 1.52]
	Treatment	1	0.312	0.589	Miss	0.796	95 CI [-0.942; 2.31]
	Interaction	2	4.828	0.034*	PAG	-2.43	95 CI [-5.19; 0.123]
<i>Avg. Entropy</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.007	0.993	ICo	0.0009	95 CI [-0.010; 0.008]
	Treatment	1	1.683	0.224	Miss	-0.0009	95 CI [-0.007; 0.002]
	Interaction	2	0.171	0.845	PAG	0.0004	95 CI [-0.014; 0.012]
<i>Max. Fundamental Frequency</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.385	0.690	ICo	-52.4	95 CI [-363; 225]
	Treatment	1	1.274	0.285	Miss	-80	95 CI [-221; 85.2]
	Interaction	2	0.014	0.986	PAG	-44.3	95 CI [-613; 614]
<i>Max. Bandwidth</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.343	0.718	ICo	110	95 CI [-129; 495]
	Treatment	1	0.084	0.778	Miss	-43.4	95 CI [-286; 37]
	Interaction	2	0.747	0.498	PAG	-79.4	95 CI [-348; 271]
<i>Max. Peak Amplitude</i>	Cannula Placement	2	0.641	0.547	ICo	0.332	95 CI [-1.94; 2.43]
	Treatment	1	0.512	0.491	Miss	0.15	95 CI [-3.64; 2.84]
	Interaction	2	2.214	0.160	PAG	-2.88	95 CI [-6.2; -0.045]
<i>Max. Peak Frequency</i>	Cannula Placement	2	1.033	0.391	ICo	7.83	95 CI [-217; 149]
	Treatment	1	1.184	0.302	Miss	-182	95 CI [-749; 45.9]
	Interaction	2	0.236	0.794	PAG	-148	95 CI [-730; 492]

564

565 **Table 1.** Results of two-way repeated measures ANOVA of song quality measures.566 **Figure 2-1.** Plots supporting statistical analysis of latency data. **(a)** Plot showing

567 homoscedasticity assumption for ANOVA . Distribution of residuals are plotted against

568 treatment and brain region targeted. **(b)** Plot of confidence intervals of differences

569 between muscimol trials and saline trials bootstrapped 5000 times.







