

PVN-mPFC OT projections modulates pup-directed pup care or attacking in virgin mandarin voles

Reviewed Preprint

Published from the original preprint after peer review and assessment by eLife.

[About eLife's process](#)**Reviewed preprint version 1**

April 17, 2024 (this version)

Posted to preprint server

March 11, 2024

Sent for peer review

March 6, 2024

Lu Li, Zhixiong He, Yin Li, Caihong Huang, Wenjuan Hou, Zijian Lv, Lizi Zhang, Yishan Qu, Yahan Sun, Kaizhe Huang, Xiao Han, Fadao Tai ✉

Shaanxi Normal University, China

 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access

 Copyright information

Abstract

In many species, adult animals may exhibit caregiving or aggression towards conspecific offspring. The neural mechanisms underlying the infanticide and pup care remain poorly understood. Here, using monogamous virgin mandarin voles (*Microtus mandarinus*) that may exhibit pup care or infanticide, we found that more oxytocin (OT) neurons in the paraventricular nucleus (PVN) were activated during pup caring than infanticide. Optogenetic activation of OT neurons in the PVN facilitated pup-caring in male and female mandarin voles. In infanticide voles, optogenetic activation of PVN OT cells prolonged latency to approach and attack pups, whereas inhibition of these OT neurons facilitated approach and infanticide. In addition, OT release in the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) in pup-care voles increased upon approaching and retrieving pups, and decreased in infanticide voles upon attacking pups. Optogenetic activation of PVN OT neuron projections to the mPFC shortened the latency to approach and retrieve pups and facilitated the initiation of pup care, whereas inhibition of these projections had little effect. For pup-care females, neither activation nor inhibition of the terminals affected their behavior towards pups. In infanticide male and female voles, optogenetic activation of PVN-mPFC OT projection terminals prolonged the latency to approach and attack pups and suppressed the initiation of infanticide, whereas inhibition of these projections promoted approach and infanticide. Finally, we found that intraperitoneal injection of OT promoted pup care and inhibited infanticide behavior. It is suggested that the OT system, especially PVN OT neurons projecting to mPFC, modulates pup-directed behaviors and OT can be used to treat abnormal behavioral responses associated with some psychological diseases.

eLife assessment

This **important** work provides insights into the neural mechanisms regulating specific parental behaviors. By identifying a key role for oxytocin synthesizing cells in the paraventricular nucleus of the hypothalamus and their projections to the medial prefrontal cortex in promoting pup care and inhibiting infanticide, the study advances our understanding of the neurobiological basis of these contrasting behaviors in male and female mandarin voles. The evidence supporting the authors' conclusions is **solid** but lacks some critical methodological detail. The work should be of interest to researchers studying neuropeptide control of social behaviors in the brain.

Introduction

Both paternal and maternal care are critical to the survival as well as the physical and mental well-being of the offspring (He et al., 2019 [DOI](#)). Although we know a great deal about the neural mechanisms underlying maternal care, the neural substrates of paternal behavior remain elusive because of lacking ideal animal model of paternal care. Only in some monogamous rodents (e.g. prairie voles), canids and primates, do males assist and spend a great deal of energy caring for pups (Malcolm, 2015 [DOI](#); Mendoza & Mason, 1986 [DOI](#); Rosenfeld, Johnson, Ellersieck, & Roberts, 2013 [DOI](#)). However, some male rodents without reproductive experience also show paternal care toward alien pups, while some others ignore or even attack alien pups (Dai et al., 2022 [DOI](#)). These different pup-directed behavioral responses are based on their physiological and environmental states, and the killing of young of the conspecifics by sexually inexperienced mammals is a widespread phenomenon among different animal taxa (Lukas & Huchard, 2014 [DOI](#)). Infanticide is thought to benefit the infanticide by promoting their own reproduction (Hrdy, 1974 [DOI](#)). In laboratory mice, male mice without pairing experience typically display infanticide (Svare & Mann, 1981 [DOI](#)), but males are able to shift from infanticide to pup care when they have the opportunity to encounter their own offspring (Elwood, 1977 [DOI](#)). Contrary to our extensive understanding of the maternal circuit, little is known about the neural substrates underlying female infanticide. The virgin mandarin voles (*Microtus mandarinus*) naturally exhibit biparental care and infanticide in both female and male that provide ideal animal model to reveal mechanism underlying paternal care in male and infanticide in females.

OT is well-known as a key hormone for initiating and maintaining maternal care (Yoshihara, Numan, & Kuroda, 2018 [DOI](#)), which is primarily synthesized in the PVN and supraoptic nucleus (SON), among which the PVN plays an important role in initiating maternal care in rats (Munetomo, Ishii, Miyamoto, Sakuma, & Kondo, 2016 [DOI](#)). There is evidence to suggest that OT not only regulates maternal motivation, but also mediates paternal behavior (Bales, Kim, Lewis-Reese, & Sue Carter, 2004 [DOI](#)). When mouse fathers were exposed to their pups, OT neurons in the PVN were specifically activated and they also showed more aggression towards intruders to protect the own pups (Shabalova et al., 2020 [DOI](#)). Compared with rodents, similar neuropeptides and hormones are involved in paternal behavior in non-human primates (Woller et al., 2012 [DOI](#)). Similar to other mammals, paternal care only exists in a few primate species (Dulac, O'Connell, & Wu, 2014 [DOI](#); Woller et al., 2012 [DOI](#)). A study on marmoset monkeys showed that fathers have higher levels of OT secretion in the hypothalamus than non-fathers (Woller et al., 2012 [DOI](#)), and intraventricular infusion of OT reduces the tendency of marmoset fathers to refuse to transfer food to their young offspring (Saito & Nakamura, 2011 [DOI](#)). However, where and how pathways of OT neurons regulates pup care and infanticide behavior remain largely unknown.

The mPFC is involved in attention switching, decision-making, behavioral flexibility and planning, making it potentially crucial for rapidly expressing pup care or infanticide behavior (Alsina-Llanes & Olazábal, 2021 [DOI](#)). It has been reported that the mPFC is highly activated in human mothers when they hear cry from their babies (Lorberbaum et al., 2002 [DOI](#)). The mPFC is also activated when rat mother contacts their pups first time (Fleming & Korsmit, 1996 [DOI](#)), while the damage of the mPFC disrupts pup retrieve and grooming behavior in rats (Afonso, Sison, Lovic, & Fleming, 2007 [DOI](#)). In rodents and humans, the mPFC was activated during the process of caring offspring (Hernández-González, Navarro-Meza, Prieto-Beracoechea, & Guevara, 2005 [DOI](#); Seifritz et al., 2003 [DOI](#)). In addition, a large number of neurons in the mPFC express oxytocin receptors (OTRs) (Smeltzer, Curtis, Aragona, & Wang, 2006 [DOI](#)). OT in the circulation of mice can act on the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) to increase social interaction and maternal behavior (Munesue et al., 2021 [DOI](#)). Although there are some studies on the role of the mPFC in pup care, its involvement in infanticide has not yet been reported. Thus, we hypothesized that PVN OT neurons projections to mPFC may causally control paternal or infanticide behaviors.

Based on the potential antagonistic effects between pup care and infanticide behavior in neural mechanisms (Dulac et al., 2014 [DOI](#); Kohl, Autry, & Dulac, 2017 [DOI](#); Mei, Yan, Yin, Sullivan, & Lin, 2023 [DOI](#)), as well as the potential role of PVN-to-mPFC OT projections in pup care and infanticide. Here, a combination of methods, including immunohistochemistry, optogenetics, fiber photometry and intraperitoneal injection of OT were used to reveal neural mechanisms underlying paternal care and infanticide. We found that PVN OT neurons regulated the expression of pup care and infanticide, and further identified the involvement of PVN-to-mPFC OT projections in paternal care and infanticide. Collectively, these findings establish a regulatory role for PVN-to-mPFC OT neurons in the expression of pup-directed behaviors and suggest potential targets for the future development of intervention strategies against psychiatric disorders associated with infanticide.

Results

Pup care behavior activate more OT⁺ cells than infanticide in PVN

In order to observe the activated OT neurons in virgin voles during pup care and infanticide behaviors, we co-stained OT and c-Fos on brain slices from voles exhibiting different behaviors using immunofluorescence method (Fig. 1a [DOI](#)). Histological analysis showed no difference in the number of OT or c-Fos positive cells between the pup care and infanticide groups of female (Fig. 1b [DOI](#), c [DOI](#), Fig. 1-source data 1) and male (Fig. 1e [DOI](#), f [DOI](#), Fig. 1-source data 1) voles. Approximately 11% (male) and 14% (female) of OT cells expressed c-Fos during pup caring, whereas only about 3% (males) and 7% (females) of OT neurons were labeled by c-Fos during infanticide (female: $t(6) = 5.173$, $P < 0.01$, Fig. 1d [DOI](#), Fig. 1-source data 1; male: $t(6) = 2.607$, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 1g [DOI](#), Fig. 1-source data 1). In male and female voles, more OT neurons were activated during pup-caring than infanticide (Fig. 1d [DOI](#), g [DOI](#)).

Effects of optogenetic activation of PVN

OT neurons on pup-directed behaviors

To reveal causal role of PVN OT neuron in regulation of pup-care and infanticide behaviors, effects of optogenetic activation of PVN OT neurons on pup-directed behaviors were investigated (Fig. 2a [DOI](#), b [DOI](#), c [DOI](#)). Over 89% of CHR2 expression overlapped with OT neurons indicating high specificity of CHR2 virus (Fig. 2d [DOI](#), Figure 2-source data 1). 473 nm light simulation increase c-Fos expression in CHR2 virus infected brain region that validated the effect of optogenetic activation (Supplementary Data Fig. 1a [DOI](#) - c [DOI](#)). We found that optogenetic activation of PVN OT cells significantly reduced latency to approach (CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 7) = 11.374$, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 2o [DOI](#), Figure 2-source data 1) and retrieve pups (CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 4) = 14.755$, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 2p [DOI](#),




Figure 1

Activated OT neurons in the PVN of mandarin voles during pup care ($n = 4$) and infanticide ($n = 4$).

a. Representative histological images of OT (green) and c-Fos (red) positive cells in PVN: Blue, DAPI; Yellow, merged cells. Enlarged views of the boxed area were shown to the right of each image, white arrows indicated the overlap of OT and c-fos positive cells. Scale bars, 50 μ m. b. Number of OT positive cells in pup care and infanticide female voles. c. Number of c-Fos positive cells in pup care and infanticide female voles. d. Percentage of c-Fos-expressing cells in OT cells of PVN from pup care and infanticide female voles. $**P < 0.01$. Independent sample t-tests. e. Number of OT cells in pup care and infanticide male voles. f. Number of c-Fos cells in pup care and infanticide male voles. g. Percentage of c-Fos-expressing cells in OT cells of PVN from pup care and infanticide male voles. $*P < 0.05$. Independent sample t-tests. Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 1-source data 1.

Statistical results of data on the number of OT-positive cells, the number of c-fos-positive cells, and the rate of overlap between OT and c-fos in the PVN of female and male pup-care and infanticide voles.

Figure 2-source data 1) and prolonged crouching time (CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 7) = 60.585, P < 0.001$, **Fig. 2s**, Figure 2-source data 1) in pup-care males, but had no effect on females (**Fig. 2j-n**, Figure 2-source data 1), nor in control virus group. Optogenetic activation of these neurons significantly reduced the latency to approach and attack pups in male (approach: CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 5) = 185.509, P < 0.0001$, **Fig. 2h**, Figure 2-source data 1; infanticide: CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 5) = 59.877, P < 0.01$, **Fig. 2i**, Figure 2-source data 1) and female voles (approach: CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 6) = 64.810, P < 0.001$, **Fig. 2f**, Figure 2-source data 1; infanticide: CHR2: off vs on $F(1, 6) = 75.729, P < 0.001$, **Fig. 2g**, Figure 2-source data 1) displaying infanticide behaviors whereas had no effect on control virus group (**Fig. 2f-i**, Figure 2-source data 1). These results suggest that activation of PVN OT neurons facilitate pup care behavior and significantly inhibit infanticide behavior.

Effects of optogenetic inhibition of PVN

OT neurons on pup-directed behaviors

To further verify the roles of PVN OT neurons on pup-induced behavior, we optogenetically inhibited OT cells by eNpHR virus and tested pup-directed behaviors (**Fig. 3a,b,c**). More than 90% of neurons expressing eNpHR overlapped with OT positive neurons indicating high specificity of eNpHR virus infection (**Fig. 3d**, Figure 3-source data 1). 589 nm light stimulation to eNpHR virus infected brain regions reduced c-fos expression verifying the effectiveness of optogenetic inhibition via eNpHR virus (**Supplementary Data Fig. 1d-f**). Inhibition of PVN OT neurons showed no significant effect on pup care behavior in male and female voles that spontaneously exhibited pup caregiving behaviors (**Fig. 3j-s**, Figure 3-source data 1). For both male and female voles in the infanticide group, eNpHR inhibition significantly shortened the latency to approach (female: $F(1, 5) = 1331.434, P < 0.0001$, **Fig. 3f**, Figure 3-source data 1; male: $F(1, 5) = 10.472, P < 0.05$, **Fig. 3h**, Figure 3-source data 1) and attack pups (female: $F(1, 5) = 291.606, P < 0.0001$, **Fig. 3g**, Figure 3-source data 1; male: $F(1, 5) = 46.901, P < 0.01$, **Fig. 3i**, Figure 3-source data 1). These results suggest that inhibition of OT neurons in the PVN significantly facilitates infanticide behavior.

Changes in OT release upon pup-directed behaviors

The results of the optogenetic manipulation demonstrated that PVN OT neurons regulated pup-induced behavior. We next detected the OT release in the mPFC during pup-induced behavior by OT1.0 sensor (**Fig. 4a-c**). Pup-caring female and male voles showed a significant increase (female: $F(1.958, 13.708) = 45.042, P < 0.001$; male: $F(5, 35) = 24.057, P < 0.01$) in the signal for OT1.0 sensors upon approaching (female: $P < 0.01$; male: $P < 0.05$) and retrieving (female: $P < 0.01$; male: $P < 0.05$), whereas there was no significant difference in the signal at the onset of other behaviors compared with the signal before the introduction of the pups (**Fig. 4f-m**, Figure 4-source data 1). In addition, we compared the signals of OT1.0 sensors in the pup-caring voles upon the first, second and third approaches to the pups (female: $F(2, 14) = 10.917, P < 0.01$; male: $F(2, 14) = 13.351, P < 0.01$), OT release peaked at the first approach and tended to decrease thereafter (**Fig. 4d,e**, Figure 4-source data 1). In infanticide female and male voles, OT release decreased upon attacking in infanticide males ($F(1.117, 7.822) = 85.803, P < 0.001$) and females ($F(1.068, 7.479) = 36.336, P < 0.001$) (**Fig. 4n-r**, Figure 4-source data 1). In addition, no significant changes in signals were detected from the individuals with control AAV2/9-hSyn-OTmut during pup-directed behaviors (**Supplementary Data Fig. 2**). In addition, no changes in OT release were detected while subjects were exposed to object with similar size and shape as the pup (**Supplementary Data Fig. 3**). These results indicate that mPFC OT release significantly increased upon approaching and retrieving in pup-care voles, but decreased upon attacking pups in infanticide voles.




Fig. 2

Effects of optogenetic activation of PVN OT neurons on pup-directed behaviors

a. Schematic of virus injection and optical fiber implantation. b. Schematic diagram of the behavioral test. c. Representative histologic images of CHR2 (red) expression and OT staining (green), enlarged view of the boxed area is on the right side. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. d. Statistics on the specificity of CHR2 expression in 3 voles, more than 89% of CHR2 positive neurons overlapped with OT positive neurons. e. Time line of the experiment. f–i, Approach (f, h) and infanticide (g, i) latency of infanticide 7 female and 6 male voles in mCherry (control virus group) and CHR2 groups. ** $P < 0.01$ vs. CHR2 OFF; *** $P < 0.001$ vs. CHR2 OFF; **** $P < 0.0001$ vs. CHR2 OFF. Two-way rmANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). j–n, Latency to approach (j), latency to retrieve (k), grooming time (l), sniffing time (m) and crouching time (n) of 7 pup-care female voles in female control virus and CHR2 groups. o–s, Latency to approach (o), latency to retrieve (p), grooming time (q), sniffing time (r) and crouching time (s) of 8 pup-care male voles in male control virus and CHR2 groups. * $P < 0.05$ vs. CHR2 OFF, *** $P < 0.001$ vs. CHR2 OFF. Two-way rmANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 2-source data 1.

Statistical results of the number of cells expressing only CHR2 and co-expressing CHR2 and OT in the PVN of 3 optogenetic virus-injected voles, the approach latency and infanticide latency of infanticide voles, and the approach latency, retrieval latency, grooming time, sniffing time, and crouching time of pup-care voles.




Fig. 3

Effects of optogenetic inhibition of PVN OT neurons on pup-directed behaviors. a. Schematic of virus injection and optical fiber implantation. b. Schematic diagram of the behavior test. c. Representative histological images of OT staining (green) and eNpHR (red) expression, enlarged view of the boxed area is shown on the right side. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. d. Statistics on the specificity of CHR2 expression in 3 voles, more than 90% of eNpHR expression overlapped with OT. e. Time line of the experiment. f-i, Approach (f, h) and infanticide (g, i) latency in 6 female (f, g) and 6 male (h, i) infanticide voles. * $P < 0.05$ vs. eNpHR OFF; ** $P < 0.01$ vs. eNpHR OFF; **** $P < 0.0001$ vs. eNpHR OFF. Two-way rmANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). j-n, Approach latency (j), retrieval latency (k), grooming time (l), sniffing time (m) and crouching time (n) in 6 control mCherry and eNpHR group of pup-care female voles. o-s, Approach latency (o), retrieval latency (p), grooming time (q), sniffing time (r) and crouching time (s) in 6 control mCherry and eNpHR group of pup-care male voles. Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 3-source data 1.

Statistical results of the number of cells expressing only eNpHR and co-expressing eNpHR and OT in the PVN of 3 optogenetic virus-injected voles, the approach latency and infanticide latency of infanticide voles, and the approach latency, retrieval latency, grooming time, sniffing time, and crouching time of pup-care voles.




Fig. 4

OT release in the mPFC upon pup-directed behaviors a. Recording instrument settings. b. Illustrations of viral expression and optical fibre location. c. Representative histological image of OT1.0 sensor (green) and optical fibre locations. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 500 μm . d, e. Area under the curve (AUC) per second for pup-care female (d) and male (e) voles approaching pups for the first, second and third time (n = 8). * $P < 0.05$ vs. first. ** $P < 0.01$ vs. first. One-way rmANOVA. f. Representative $\Delta F/F$ traces in pup-care female (f, top) and male (f, bottom) voles during interaction with pups. g-k. Post-event histograms (PETHs) of z-score of OT1.0 sensor for the following pup-directed behaviors: approach (g), investigate (h), retrieve (i), grooming (j) and crouch (k). l, m. The mean AUC of z-scores for pup-care female (l) and male (m) voles across various pup-directed behaviors (n = 8). Female: ** $P < 0.01$ vs approach. $P < 0.01$ vs retrieve. Male: * $P < 0.05$ vs approach. $P < 0.05$ vs retrieve. One-way rmANOVA. n. Representative $\Delta F/F$ traces in infanticide female (n, top) and male (n, bottom) voles during interaction with pups. o, p. PETHs of z-score of OT1.0 sensor for approach and infanticide in infanticide voles. q, r. The mean AUC of z-score of OT1.0 sensor for pre pup, approach and infanticide in infanticide female (q) and male (r) voles (n = 8). ** $P < 0.01$ vs infanticide. One-way rmANOVA. Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 4-source data 1.

Area under the curve per second for pre-pup, approach, and infanticide behaviors in infanticide voles and area under the curve per second for first, second, and third approaches to pups, as well as pre-pup, approach, investigation, retrieval, grooming, and crouching behaviors in pup-care voles.

Effects of optogenetic activation of PVN OT neurons terminals in the mPFC on pup-directed behaviors

Previous experiment found that OT release in the mPFC changed upon pup-directed behavior. To manipulate the neural circuit, we first verified oxytocin projections from PVN to the mPFC. We injected retrogradely labeled virus in the mPFC and observed the overlap of virus with OT in the PVN (**Fig. 5**). Then, we tested whether optogenetic activation of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals in the mPFC affects pup-induced behaviors (**Fig. 6a-d**). Similar to previous results, in the pup caring group, activation of the terminals facilitated approaching ($F(1,5) = 23.915, P < 0.01$) and retrieving ($F(1,5) = 39.664, P < 0.01$) in male voles (**Fig. 6o-s**, Figure 6-source data 1), but had no effect on females (**Fig. 6j-n**, Figure 6-source data 1). In male and female infanticide group voles, optogenetic activation of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals prolonged latency to approach (female: $F(1,5) = 37.094, P < 0.01$; male: $F(1,5) = 74.718, P < 0.001$) and attack pups (female: $F(1,5) = 38.347, P < 0.01$; male: $F(1,5) = 61.589, P < 0.01$) (**Fig. 6f-i**, Figure 6-source data 1). These results suggest that activation of the PVN OT neurons to mPFC projection promoted the onset of pup care behavior in pup-care male voles and inhibited the onset of infanticide behavior in infanticide voles.

Optogenetic inhibition of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals promoted infanticide

We then optogenetically suppressed the projection terminals from PVN OT neurons to mPFC and observed changes in pup-directed behaviors (**Fig. 7a-d**). Similar to the results of the PVN OT neurons inhibition, we found that optogenetic inhibition of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals promoted approach ($F(1,5) = 119.093, P < 0.001$) and infanticide ($F(1,5) = 112.501, P < 0.001$) in infanticide male (**Fig. 7h,i**, Figure 7-source data 1) and female voles (approach: $F(1,5) = 280.031, P < 0.0001$; retrieve: $F(1,5) = 268.694, P < 0.0001$) (**Fig. 7f,g**, Figure 7-source data 1). For pup-care male and female voles, inhibition of these terminals did not significantly affect their pup care behaviors (**Fig. 7j-s**, Figure 7-source data 1). These results suggest that optogenetic inhibition of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals promotes the onset of infanticide behavior in infanticide voles.

Intraperitoneal injection of OT

For pre-clinic purpose, we tested the effect of peripheral administration of OT on pup-directed behavior (**Fig. 8a**). Delivery of OT promoted approach ($t(4) = 3.737, P < 0.05$) and retrieval ($t(4) = 4.190, P < 0.05$) in pup-care male voles (**Fig. 8k,m**), while it had no significant effect on the pup-directed behaviors in females (**Fig. 8f-j**). For infanticide voles, there was not significant prolongation of approach latency (**Fig. 8d**), but a significant extension of infanticide latency in males after delivery of OT ($t(6) = -2.988, P < 0.05$, **Fig. 8e**). In infanticide female voles, both the latency to approach ($Z = -2.380, P < 0.05$, **Fig. 8b**) and attack pups ($t(7) = -3.626, P < 0.01$, **Fig. 8c**) were significantly prolonged by the delivery of OT. In addition, we found that intraperitoneal injection of OT significantly reduced the number of infanticide female ($\chi^2 = 4.740, P < 0.05$, **Fig. 8p**) and male voles ($\chi^2 = 3.039, P = 0.081$, **Fig. 8q**). These results indicate that peripheral delivery of OT can promote the onset of pup care behavior in pup-care male voles and can significantly suppress the infanticide in both sexes. This provides a basis for the application of OT in clinic and wild life management.




Fig. 5

Determination of PVN to mPFC oxytocin projection. **a.** Schematic diagram of mPFC virus injection and OT staining. **b.** Histological pictures of OT (red) and AAV11 (green) co-staining in male and female. Yellow, merged. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m.




Fig. 6

Effects of optogenetic activation of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals on pup-directed behaviors. **a**, Schematic of virus injection and optical fiber implantation. **b**, Schematic diagram of the behavior test. **c**, Illustration of optical fiber implantation in the target brain region. **d**, Representative histological pictures of the fiber position and projection terminals. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. **e**, Time line of the experiment. **f–i**, Changes in approach latency (**f**, **h**) and infanticide latency (**g**, **i**) of female (**f**, **g**) and male (**h**, **i**) infanticide voles in CHR2 and control mCherry group before and after delivery of light ($n = 6$). $**P < 0.01$ vs. CHR2 OFF; $***P < 0.001$ vs. CHR2 OFF. Two-way ANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). **j–n**, Approach latency (**j**), retrieval latency (**k**), grooming time (**l**), sniffing time (**m**) and crouching time (**n**) in control mCherry and CHR2 group of pup-care female voles ($n = 6$). **o–s**, Approach latency (**o**), retrieval latency (**p**), grooming time (**q**), sniffing time (**r**) and crouching time (**s**) in control mCherry and CHR2 group of pup-care male voles ($n = 6$). $**P < 0.01$ vs. CHR2 OFF. Two-way rmANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 6-source data 1.

Statistical results of the approach latency and infanticide latency in infanticide voles, and the approach latency, retrieval latency, grooming time, sniffing time, and crouching time of pup-care voles.




Fig. 7

Optogenetic inhibition of the PVN OT neuron projection terminals promoted the onset of infanticide a. Illustration of virus injection and optical fiber implantation. b. Schematic of the behavior test. c. Diagram of optical fiber implantation in the target brain region. d. Representative histological pictures of the fiber location and projection terminals. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 75 μ m. e. Time line of the experiment. f-i, Changes in approach (f, h) and infanticide (g, i) latency of female and male infanticide voles in eNpHR (n = 6) and control mCherry groups (n = 6) before and after light delivery. **** P < 0.001 vs. eNpHR OFF. **** P < 0.0001 vs. eNpHR OFF. Two-way rmANOVA (factors: treatment $\times$ stimulus). j-n, Approach latency (j), retrieval latency (k), grooming time (l), sniffing time (m) and crouching time (n) in control mCherry (n = 6) and eNpHR (n = 6) group of pup-care female voles. o-s, Approach latency (o), retrieval latency (p), grooming time (q), sniffing time (r) and crouching time (s) in control mCherry (n = 6) and eNpHR group (n = 6) of pup-care male voles. Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 7-source data 1.

Statistical results of the approach latency and infanticide latency in infanticide voles, and the approach latency, retrieval latency, grooming time, sniffing time, and crouching time of pup-care voles.




Fig. 8

Pup-directed behaviors before and after intraperitoneal delivery of OT a. Diagram of intraperitoneal OT delivery. b,c, Approach (b) and infanticide latency (c) of infanticide female voles ($n = 8$). * $P < 0.05$. Paired-samples t-test. ** $P < 0.01$. Wilcoxon signed ranks test. d,e, Approach (d) and infanticide latency (e) of infanticide male voles ($n = 7$). * $P < 0.05$. Paired-samples t-test. f-j, Approach latency (f, $n = 7$), sniffing time (g, $n = 7$), latency to retrieve (h, $n = 4$), grooming time (i, $n = 7$) and crouching time (j, $n = 7$) before and after delivery of OT in pup-care female voles. k-o, Approach latency (k), sniffing time (l), latency to retrieve (m), grooming time (n) and crouching time (o) before and after delivery of OT in pup-care male voles ($n = 5$). * $P < 0.05$. Paired-samples t-test. p,q Changes in infanticide rates in female (p) and male (q) voles after administration of saline and OT. * $P < 0.05$. Independent samples t-tests. Error bars indicate SEM.

Figure 8-source data 1.

Statistical results of the approach latency and infanticide latency in infanticide voles, and the approach latency, retrieval latency, grooming time, sniffing time, and crouching time of pup-care voles. Statistical results on the number of infanticide or not infanticide in voles injected with saline and OT.

Discussion

In this study, we used monogamous, highly social mandarin voles to explore the role of PVN OT neurons and PVN^{OT}-mPFC projections in the modulation of pup care and infanticide behaviors. More OT neurons in the PVN were activated during pup care than infanticide behaviors. Optogenetic activation of the OT neurons in the PVN or OT neuron fibers in the mPFC promoted pup care and inhibited infanticide behavior, whereas inhibition of these neurons and their fibers in the mPFC promoted infanticide. In addition, intraperitoneal administration of OT promoted approach and retrieve in pup care male voles, and inhibited infanticide in both male and female voles. The present study revealed that the PVN to mPFC OT neural circuits regulate pup care and infanticide behavior in virgin mandarin voles.

Firstly, we found that more OT neurons in the PVN were activated during pup care than infanticide behaviors, which is consistent with the well-established prosocial role of OT and its ability to promote pup care behavior (Bosch & Young, 2018). Meanwhile, we found that activation of OT neurons in the PVN facilitated pup care behaviors such as approach, retrieval and crouching in pup-care male voles; whereas inhibition of OT had no effect on paternal behavior; activation and inhibition of OT neurons in the PVN had no significant effect on pup care behaviors in pup-care females; and activation of OT neurons in the PVN inhibited pup killing in infanticide voles, whereas the corresponding inhibition of OT neurons in the PVN facilitated infanticide. This finding is consistent with previous report that silencing OT neurons delayed the retrieval behavior in virgin mice (Carcea et al., 2021). Further study found that simply observing dams retrieve pups through a transparent barrier could increase retrieval behavior and PVN OT neuron activity of virgin females (Carcea et al., 2021). If OTR knockout mice are used, no pup retrieval occurs after observation, and these results suggest that input from visual signals activated OT neurons in the PVN of virgin mice allowing it to adapt to the needs of its pups and produce pup care behaviors (Carcea et al., 2021). In addition, this study further demonstrated that OT in the PVN facilitated the retrieval behavior by modulating the plasticity of the left auditory cortex and amplifying the response of mice to the pup's call (Carcea et al., 2021). These studies also support finding from optogenetic activation of OT neurons in the PVN in the present study. The results of the present study are also supported by a recent study that chemogenetic activation OT neurons in the PVN increase pup care and reduce infanticide (Inada et al., 2022).

However, manipulation of OT neurons in the PVN produced no significant effect on pup caring in pup-care females. This may be due to the fact that female voles have inherently higher OT neural activity (Häussler, Jirikowski, & Caldwell, 1990), and female mice have more OT neurons and OT axon projections than males (Häussler et al., 1990), and that there are also significant differences in OTR expression between two sexes (Insel, Gelhard, & Shapiro, 1991; Uhl-Bronner, Waltisperger, Martínez-Lorenzana, Condes Lara, & Freund-Mercier, 2005) that possibly shows ceiling effects of the OT system. This sex difference has been reported in other study that activation of OT neurons in the PVN activated noradrenergic neurons in the locus coeruleus by co-releasing OT and glutamate, increased attention to novel objects in male rats, and that this neurotransmission was greater in males than in females (Wang, Escobar, & Mendelowitz, 2021). In the present study, we also observed that optogenetic activation of OT neurons in PVN increased crouching behavior in the pup-care male voles, but did not affect grooming time possibly via increase of OT release. This result is in line with a previous study that injection of an OTR antagonist into the MPOA of male voles significantly reduced the total duration of pup care behavior and increased the latency to approach pups and initiate paternal behavior in male voles (Yuan et al., 2019). This finding suggests that the results of peripherally administered OT and optogenetically activated OT of PVN in the present study may also have the involvement of OT-OTR interactions in MPOA. Parturition in experimental animals is accompanied by a decrease in infanticide and the emergence of pup-care behavior, and along with this process OTR expression

increased not only on mammary contractile cells, but also in various regions of the brain, such as MPOA, VTA, and OB, which are all considered to be important brain regions related to the onset and maintenance of pup care behaviors (Bosch & Neumann, 2012 [↗](#); Shahrokh, Zhang, Diorio, Gratton, & Meaney, 2010 [↗](#); Yu, Kaba, Okutani, Takahashi, & Higuchi, 1996 [↗](#)). For example, in a OB study, intra-OB injection of OT antagonist significantly delayed the onset of pup care behaviors such as retrieve, crouching, and nesting in female rats, whereas intra-OB injection of OT in virgin females induced 50% of females to show intact pup care behaviors (Yu et al., 1996 [↗](#)). Therefore, the effects of activation of PVN OT neurons may be a result of actions on multiple brain regions involved in the expression of pup care behavior. Which brain regions that PVN OT neurons project to are involved in pups caring or infanticide needs further studies.

Optogenetic activation of the OT neural projection terminal from the PVN to the mPFC facilitated the onset of pup care behaviors, such as approach and retrieval, in pup-care male voles, whereas inhibition of this circuit had no effect; neither activation nor inhibition had a significant effect in pup-care females; and activation of this neural circuit inhibited infanticide in infanticide voles, whereas the corresponding inhibition of this circuit facilitated infanticide. In addition, we have demonstrated an increase in OT release in pup-care voles upon approaching and retrieving pups, and a decrease in OT release in infanticide voles when infanticide occurs, as recorded by OT sensors in the mPFC. There is some evidence indicating that the mPFC may be an important brain region for OT to exert its effects. In addition to expressing OTRs in the mPFC (Liu, Pappas, & Carter, 2005 [↗](#); Smeltzer et al., 2006 [↗](#)), the mPFC contains OT-sensitive neurons (Ninan, 2011 [↗](#)) and receives projections of OT neurons from the hypothalamus (Knobloch et al., 2012 [↗](#); Sofroniew, 1983 [↗](#)). It has been further shown that blocking OTR in the mPFC of postnatal rats by an OTR antagonist delayed the retrieval of pups and reduced the number of pups retrieved by rats, impaired the care of pups, and decreased the latency to aggression towards intruders, increased the number of attacks, and increased anxiety in postnatal rats but had no effect on the level of anxiety in virgin rats (Sabihi, Dong, Durosko, & Leuner, 2014 [↗](#)). These results further suggest that OT in mPFC is involved in the regulation of pup care behavior and support the results of this study in pup care voles and infanticide voles from an OTR perspective. Previous studies have shown that optical activation of the mPFC maintains aggression within an appropriate range, with activation of this brain region suppressing aggression between male mice and inhibition of the mPFC resulted in quantitative and qualitative escalation of aggression (Takahashi, Nagayasu, Nishitani, Kaneko, & Koide, 2014 [↗](#)), which is similar to our findings with infanticide voles. For pup care behavior it has been reported that the mPFC brain region may be involved in the rapid initiation of pup care behavior in mice without pairing experience (Alsina-Llanes & Olazábal, 2020 [↗](#)), which supported the experimental results of pup-care male voles in the present study, but the present study further suggested that OT neurons projecting to mPFC regulated pup-caring and infanticide behavior possibly via increase of OT release in the mPFC.

Another interesting finding is that peripheral OT administration promoted pup care behavior in male voles, such as approaching and retrieving pups, but had no significant effect on pup care behaviors in female voles. This result was supported by previous study that OT administered peripherally inhibited infanticide in pregnant and reproductively inexperienced females and promoted pup caring in pregnant females (McCarthy, Bare, & vom Saal, 1986 [↗](#)). Further research has demonstrated that OT in the central nervous system also inhibited infanticide in female house mice (McCarthy, 1990 [↗](#)). In addition, peripheral administration of OT inhibits infanticide in male mice without pairing experience (Nakahara et al., 2020 [↗](#)). Moreover, the experience of pairing facilitated the retrieval of pups by increasing peripheral OT levels in both male and female mice (Lopatina et al., 2011 [↗](#)). This is similar to the findings of pup-care males in the present study, whereas the absence of similar results in females may be due to differences in OT levels between the sexes (Tamborski, Mintz, & Caldwell, 2016 [↗](#)). Pup-care female voles in this study already showed short latency to approach and retrieve pups before peripheral administration of OT. We also found that peripheral OT administration suppressed infanticide behavior in both male and female voles. It is consistent with previous study that infanticide in female house mice with no

pairing experience and pregnant females with pre-existing infanticide was effectively suppressed by subcutaneous injection of OT, while injection of OT also helped pregnant females to show care for strange pups (McCarthy et al., 1986 [DOI](#)). Unpaired male mice's aggression towards pups was accompanied by changes in the activity of the vomeronasal neurons, and as males were paired with females and lived together, the activity of these neurons decreased, accompanied by a shift from infanticide to pup care behavior (Nakahara et al., 2020 [DOI](#)). The OTR expresses throughout the vomeronasal epithelium that allows OT to potentially inhibit infanticide by reducing vomeronasal activity. The previous study found that intraperitoneal injection of OT reduced the activity of the vomeronasal, and further validated that OT modulates the activity of vomeronasal neurons by acting on the sensory epithelium to produce behavioral changes by intraperitoneal injection of an OTR antagonist that cannot cross the blood-brain barrier (Nakahara et al., 2020 [DOI](#)). It has recently been shown that peripheral OT was able to cross the blood-brain barrier into the central nervous system to act (Yamamoto et al., 2019 [DOI](#)), meaning that delivery of OT via the periphery may have increased central OT levels and thus exerted an effect. A recent study demonstrated that the secretion of OT in the brain of male mice with no pairing experience facilitated the performance of pup care behaviors and inhibited infanticide (Inada et al., 2022 [DOI](#)), which also supported the results of the present study. Similar to rodents and non-human primates, there is evidence to suggest that OT contributes to paternal care (Feldman & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2017 [DOI](#)). Fathers with partners have higher plasma OT levels than non-fathers without partners (Mascaro, Hackett, & Rilling, 2014 [DOI](#)). Intranasal OT treatment increases fathers' play, touch, and social interaction with their children (Weisman, Zagoory-Sharon, & Feldman, 2012 [DOI](#)). Our result provide possible application of OT in reduction of abnormality in pup-direct behavior associated with psychological diseases in human and increases of well being in wild life management.

In summary, these results indicate that the PVN to mPFC OT neural projection is involved in the regulation of pup care and infanticide behavior in virgin mandarin voles. These data provide new insights into the neural circuits underlying OT-mediated pup-directed behaviors.


Methods

Animals

All animal care and use were in compliance with the guidelines of the China's Animal Welfare council and approved by Animal Welfare Committee of Shaanxi Normal University. The virgin Mandarin voles (*Microtus mandarinus*) used in this study were bred at Animal Center of Shaanxi Normal University and were kept at 24°C under a 12h light-dark cycle (lights on at 8 a.m.) with food and water provided ad libitum. The stereotactic surgery was performed at the age of 8 weeks of voles. After surgery, voles were housed with their cage mates. Behavioral tests were carried out 3weeks after surgery for animal recovery and the viral infection, and 1-5 days old pups were from other breeders.

Viruses

AAV2/9-mOXT: Promoter-hCHR2(H134R)-mCherry-ER2-WPRE-pA (8.41×10^{12} µg/ml) and AAV2/9-mOXT: Promoter-mCherry-pA (1.21×10^{13} µg/ml) were purchased from Shanghai Taitool Bioscience LTD. AAV2/9-mOXT-eNpHR3.0-mCherry-WPRE-hGH-pA (2.27×10^{12} µg/ml) were purchased from BrainVTA (Wuhan, China) LTD. AAV2/9-hSyn-OT 1.0 (2.06×10^{12} µg/ml), AAV2/9-hSyn-OTmut (2.10×10^{12} µg/ml) and AAV11-EF1α-EGFP (5.00×10^{12} µg/ml) were purchased from Brain Case Biotechnology LTD. All viruses were dispensed and stored at -80°C.




Supplementary Data Fig. 1

Light-induced c-Fos expression overlapping with mCherry, CHR2 or eNpHR

a, 473 nm light-induced c-Fos (green) expression overlapping with mCherry (red). Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. b, 473 nm light-induced c-Fos (green) expression overlapping with CHR2 (red). Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. c, 473 nm light induced more c-fos expression in CHR2, which indicated the effectiveness of CHR2 (n = 3). **** P < 0.0001. Independent-samples t-test. d, 589 nm light-induced c-Fos (green) expression overlapping with mCherry (red). Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. e, 589 nm light-induced c-Fos (green) expression overlapping with eNpHR (red). Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 50 μ m. f, 589 nm light induced less c-fos expression in eNpHR, which indicated the effectiveness of eNpHR (n = 3). ** P < 0.01. Independent-samples t-test. Error bars indicate SEM. For c,f, n = 3 per group, data are mean $\pm$ s.e.m. Statistical analysis was performed using independent-samples T test (c,f). ** P < 0.01, **** P < 0.0001. Details of the statistical analyses are as follows: c, t (4) = -23.139, P = 0.000021, f, t (4) = 10.136, P = 0.001.

Supplementary Data Fig. 1-source data 1

Statistical results of light-induced c-Fos expression overlapping with mCherry, CHR2 or eNpHR.




Supplementary Data Fig. 2

Recordings of OTmut sensor in the mPFC on OT release

a. Recording instrument settings. b. Illustrations of viral expression and optical fibre location. c. Representative histological image of OTmut sensor (green) and optical fibre locations. Blue, DAPI. Scale bars, 500 μ m. d-h,j-n, PETHs of z-score of OTmut sensor for the following pup-directed behaviors: approach (d,j), investigate (e,k), retrieve (f,l), grooming (g,m) and crouch (h,n). i,o, AUC per second of z-scores for pup-care female ($n = 6$, i) and male ($n = 6$, o) voles across various pup-directed behaviors. p,q,s,t, PETHs of z-score of OTmut sensor for approach and infanticide in infanticide voles. r,u, AUC per second of z-score of OTmut sensor for pre pup, approach and infanticide in infanticide female ($n = 6$, r) and male ($n = 6$, u) voles. Error bars indicate SEM. For i,o,r,u, $n = 6$ per group, data are mean $\pm$ s.e.m. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way rmANOVA (i,o,r and u). Details of the statistical analyses are as follows: i, $F(5, 25) = 0.680$, $P = 0.643$; o, $F(2, 25) = 0.074$, $P = 0.996$; r, $F(2, 10) = 0.002$, $P = 0.998$; u, $F(2, 10) = 0.665$, $P = 0.536$.

Supplementary Data Fig. 2-source data 1

Area under the curve per second for pre-pup, approach, and infanticide behaviors in infanticide voles and area under the curve per second for pre-pup, approach, investigation, retrieval, grooming, and crouching behaviors in pup-care voles.



Supplementary Data Fig. 3

Recordings of OT1.0 sensor for investigating object

a,b,d,e, Post-event histograms (PETHs) of z-score of OT1.0 sensor for approaching and investigating object in female (a,b) and male (d,e) voles. c,f, AUC per second of z-scores for pre object, approaching and investigating behaviors in female (n = 4, c) and male (n = 4, f) voles. Error bars indicate SEM. For c,f, n = 4 per group, data are mean $\pm$ s.e.m. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way rmANOVA. Details of the statistical analyses are as follows: c, $F(1.016, 3.047) = 0.346$, $P = 0.601$; f, $F(2,6) = 0.183$, $P = 0.838$.

Supplementary Data Fig. 3-source data 1

Area under the curve per second for pre-object, approach, and investigating in female and male voles.

Immunohistochemistry

After behavioral tests, serial brain sections were harvested for histological analysis. Anesthetized voles were perfused with 40ml of PBS and 20ml of 4% paraformaldehyde. After perfusion, brains were excised and post-fixed by immersion in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight at 4°C. Brains were dehydrated in 20% and then 30% sucrose for 24h respectively before they were embedded in OCT and cryosectioned into 40 µm slices. Brain slices were rinsed with PBS (10 min) and PBST (PBS and 0.1% Triton X-100, 20 min), blocked in ready-to-use goat serum (Boster, AR0009) for 30 minutes at room temperature (RT), and then incubated overnight at 4°C with primary antibody in PBST. The primary antibodies used were: mouse anti-OT (1:7000, Millipore, MAB5296), rabbit anti-c-Fos (1:1000, Abcam, ab190289). Following PBST washing (3×5 min), sections were incubated with secondary antibodies in PBST for 2h (RT) and stained with DAPI, and then washed once more with PBS (3×5 min). The secondary antibodies used were: goat anti-mouse Alexa Fluor 488 (1:200, Jackson ImmunoResearch, 115-545-062), goat anti-rabbit Alexa Fluor 488 (1:200, Jackson ImmunoResearch, 111-545-003), goat anti-rabbit TRITC (1:200, Jackson ImmunoResearch, 111-025-003) and ready-to-use DAPI staining solution (Boster, AR1177). Finally, the brain slices were sealed with an anti-fluorescent attenuation sealer.

Images were captured with a fluorescent microscope (Nikon) to confirm the viral expression, placements of optic fiber and viruses, and also the number of c-Fos, OT and virus positive cells. To analyze the activity of OT neurons (co-expression of c-Fos and OT) among different behaviors and the specificity of viral expression (co-expression of viruses and OT) in the PVN brain region, positive cells in the PVN were manually counted based on the Allen Mouse Brain Atlas.

Stereotactic Surgery

For optogenetic manipulation experiments, CHR2, eNpHR and mCherry-expressing control virus were stereotactically injected into the PVN (AP: -0.4 mm, ML: 0.2 mm, DV: 5.3mm) bilaterally through a Hamilton needle using nanoinjector (Reward Life Technology, KDS LEGATO 130) at 100 nl/min. For optogenetic manipulation, optic fibers (2.5 mm O.D., Reward Life Technology, China) with an appropriate exposed fiber length (PVN: 6 mm, mPFC: 3 mm) were implanted ~100 µm above the PVN and mPFC (AP: 2.2 mm ML: 0.9, DV: 1.89 with a 20° angle lateral to middle) and secured with dental cement (Changshu ShangChi Dental Materials Co., Ltd., 202005). For fiber optometry experiment, optic fibers were inserted ~100 µm above the mPFC (AP: 2.2 mm ML: 0.3, DV: 1.8) after injecting the OT1.0 sensor viruses. The stereotactic coordinates were determined from three-dimensional brain atlas (Chan, Kovacevic, Ho, Henkelman, & Henderson, 2007 [\[1\]](#)) and the adjusted coordinates in our lab. (The stereotactic coordinates were determined by the Allen Mouse Brain Atlas and laboratory-corrected data used for voles.)

Optogenetic

Test animals were injected with 300 nL AAV2/9-mOXT: Promoter-hCHR2(H134R)-mCherry-ER2-WPRE-pA or rAAV-mOXT-eNpHR3.0-mCherry-WPRE-hGH-pA bilaterally into the PVN at 100 nl/min. Control animals were injected with AAV2/9-mOXT: Promoter-mCherry-pA in the same condition. Two weeks later, an optic fiber was implanted ~100 µm above the PVN and mPFC bilaterally and was secured using dental cement. After surgery, animals were housed with their cage mates as before. Before the behavioral test, each implanted fiber was connected to a light laser (NewdoonInc., Aurora 300, 473 nm for activation, 589 nm for inhibition) with a 400 µm patch cord and then we introduced the test animal into center of test arena. After the test animal acclimated to the arena for at least 20 min and settled down, we placed a pup in the farthest corner away from the test animal and immediately began recording and applying light stimulation.

In pup-directed pup care behavioral test, light stimulation lasted for 11 min (3 mW, 20 Hz, 20 ms, 8 s ON and 2 s OFF) to cover the entire interaction. In the infanticide behavioral test, the stimulation lasted until the pup was removed. Each vole was tested twice successively, more than 30 min apart, once with the stimulation OFF, once ON.

To confirm that ChR2 or eNpHR3.0 stimulation indeed induced neural activation or inhibition, we used light to stimulate the brain through an optical fiber when voles were alone in their home cage, and subsequently determined neural activation or inhibition by c-Fos staining one and a half hours after light stimulation .

Fiber photometry

To record the fluorescence signals of the OT1.0 sensor during various pup-directed behaviors. Virgin voles were anesthetized with 1-2% isoflurane and immobilized on a stereotaxic device (RWD, China). Then, 300 nl AAV9-hSyn-OT1.0 or AAV9-hSyn-OTmut virus was injected into the left side of mPFC (AP: 2.2 mm ML: 0.3, DV: 1.8). After the injection, a 200 μ m optical fiber was implanted ~100 μ m above the injection site and fixed with dental cement. After 2 weeks of recovery, the optic fiber was connected to the fiber photometry system (QAXK-FPS-LED, ThinkerTech, Nanjing, China) through a patch cable. To avoid bleaching the sensor, the 470 nm laser power at the tip of the fiber was adjusted to 50 μ W. Voles were placed in test cages and allowed to move freely for at least 20 minutes to acclimate to the environment. Then, a pup was placed in the cage at a distance from the testing vole. If the vole retrieved the pup or ignored the pup completely or attacked the pup, gently removed the pup and introduced another pup ~60 seconds later to stimulate more interaction. This process was repeated 3-6 times, and then the vole exhibiting pup care behavior was allowed to freely interact with the last introduced pup until the vole crouched over the pup for more than 10 s, after which the pups were removed for about 60 s and reintroduced. This latter process was repeated 3-4 times. After the pup test, we subsequently placed an object (a vole-sized plastic toy) into the cage and recorded 4 voles that investigated the object 3-6 times.

Videos were recorded with screen-recording software to synchronize the OT1.0 fluorescence signals and pup-directed behaviors. Fluorescence signals were recorded into MATLAB mat files and analyzed with customized MATLAB code. Data were matched to a variety of behaviors towards pups based on individual trials. The change in signal was displayed as z-scored $\Delta F/F$, which was measured by $(V_{\text{signal}} - \text{mean}(V_{\text{basal}}))/\text{std}(V_{\text{basal}})$. The V_{signal} and V_{basal} refer to the recorded values at each time point and the recorded values during the baseline period before the stimuli. The AUC (area under the curve) was calculated based on z-scored $\Delta F/F$ matching the duration of the behavior, and the AUC per second was used to compare the different fluorescence signals of behaviors and the baseline.

Behavioral paradigm and analysis

Animal behaviors in optogenetic experiments were recorded by a camera from the side of a transparent cage. ‘Approach pup’ was defined as the testing vole faced and walked right up to pup, and the latency of approach was the period from the time the pup was placed in the cage until the vole began to approach the pup. ‘Investigate pup’ was defined as the vole’s nose came into close contact with any part of the pup’s body. ‘Attack pup’ was defined as the vole attacked and bit a pup which can be recognized by the wound, and the latency to attack was the period from the time the pup was placed in the cage until the vole launched an attack. ‘Retrieve pup’ was defined as from the time a vole picked up a pup using its jaws to the time it dropped the pup at or around the nest, and the latency of retrieval was the time between the pup was put in the cage and the time the vole picked up the pup in its jaws. ‘Groom pup’ was defined as a vole combed the pup’s body surface with its muzzle, accompanied by a rhythmic up-and-down bobbing of the vole’s head and

displacement of the pup. ‘Crouch’ was defined as the vole squatted quietly over the pup with no apparent movement. Pup-directed behaviors in optogenetic experiments were scored and analyzed by JWatcher.

OT treatments

Test virgin voles were acclimatized in their cages for 20 min before being injected intraperitoneally with 0.9% NaCl (1 ml/kg) and pups were introduced 30 min later to record from the side using a video camera. Thirty mins after the first record, voles were re-injected intraperitoneally OT 1 mg/kg (Leuner, Caponiti, & Gould, 2012 [DOI](#)) (Bachem, 50-56-6), and pups were introduced 30 min later to record behaviors. All behaviors were scored and analyzed using JWatcher.

Statistics

Parametric tests were used to analyze normally distributed data, and nonparametric tests were used for data that is not normally distributed according to Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests. Independent samples t-tests (two-tailed) were performed to assess number of OT, c-fos and merge rate of OT & c-fos during different pup-directed behaviors (Pup-care vs. Infanticide) and the number of c-fos-IR positive neurons (mCherry vs. CHR2; mCherry vs. eNpHR 3.0). The behavioral changes following optogenetic activation and inhibition (factors: treatment × stimulus) of PVN and mPFC were analyzed by two-way repeated-measures ANOVA. One way ANOVA were used to analyze the AUC changes recorded by the OT sensors in different behaviors. Paired-samples t-test (two-tailed) and Wilcoxin signed ranks test were used to analyze changes in pup-directed behaviors before and after intraperitoneal injection of OT. The Pearson chi-square test was used to compare the difference in the number of infanticide voles between the saline and OT groups. All data were presented as mean ± SEM, statistical analyses of data were performed using MATLAB and SPSS 22.0 software.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Fundings

This research was funded by the STI2030-Major Projects grant number 2022ZD0205101, the National Natural Science Foundation of China grants numbers 32270510 and 31901082, Natural Science Foundation of Shaanxi Province, China grant number 2020JQ-412, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation grant number 2019M653534 and Fundamental Research Funds for Central University grants numbers GK202301012.

References

1. Afonso V. M., Sison M., Lovic V., Fleming A. S (2007) **Medial prefrontal cortex lesions in the female rat affect sexual and maternal behavior and their sequential organization** *Behav Neurosci* **121**:515–526 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.121.3.515>
2. Alsina-Llanes M., Olazábal D. E (2020) **Prefrontal cortex is associated with the rapid onset of parental behavior in inexperienced adult mice (C57BL/6)** *Behav Brain Res* **385** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2020.112556>

3. Alsina-Llanes M., Olazábal D. E (2021) **NMDA lesions in the prefrontal cortex delay the onset of maternal, but not infanticide behavior in pup-naïve adult mice (C57BL/6)** *Behav Neurosci* **135**:402–414 <https://doi.org/10.1037/bne0000427>
4. Bales K. L., Kim A. J., Lewis-Reese A. D., Sue Carter C (2004) **Both oxytocin and vasopressin may influence alloparental behavior in male prairie voles** *Horm Behav* **45**:354–361 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2004.01.004>
5. Bosch O. J., Neumann I. D (2012) **Both oxytocin and vasopressin are mediators of maternal care and aggression in rodents: from central release to sites of action** *Horm Behav* **61**:293–303 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.11.002>
6. Bosch O. J., Young L. J (2018) **Oxytocin and Social Relationships: From Attachment to Bond Disruption** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* **35**:97–117 https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2017_10
7. Carcea I., Caraballo N. L., Marlin B. J., Ooyama R., Riceberg J. S., Mendoza Navarro J. M., Froemke R. C. (2021) **Oxytocin neurons enable social transmission of maternal behaviour** *Nature* **596**:553–557 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03814-7>
8. Chan E., Kovacevic N., Ho S. K., Henkelman R. M., Henderson J. T (2007) **Development of a high resolution three-dimensional surgical atlas of the murine head for strains 129S1/SvImJ and C57Bl/6J using magnetic resonance imaging and micro-computed tomography** *Neuroscience* **144**:604–615 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2006.08.080>
9. Dai B., Sun F., Tong X., Ding Y., Kuang A., Osakada T., Lin (2022) **Responses and functions of dopamine in nucleus accumbens core during social behaviors** *Cell Rep* **40** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2022.111246>
10. Dulac C., O'Connell L. A., Wu Z (2014) **Neural control of maternal and paternal behaviors** *Science* **345**:765–770 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1253291>
11. Elwood R. W (1977) **Changes in the responses of male and female gerbils (*Meriones unguiculatus*) towards test pups during the pregnancy of the female** *Animal Behaviour* **25**:46–51 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472\(77\)90066-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(77)90066-5)
12. Feldman R., Bakermans-Kranenburg M. J (2017) **Oxytocin: a parenting hormone** *Current Opinion in Psychology* **15**:13–18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.02.011>
13. Fleming A. S., Korsmit M (1996) **Plasticity in the maternal circuit: effects of maternal experience on Fos-Lir in hypothalamic, limbic, and cortical structures in the postpartum rat** *Behav Neurosci* **110**:567–582 <https://doi.org/10.1037//0735-7044.110.3.567>
14. Häussler H. U., Jirikowski G. F., Caldwell J. D (1990) **Sex differences among oxytocin-immunoreactive neuronal systems in the mouse hypothalamus** *J Chem Neuroanat* **3**:271–276
15. He Z., Young L., Ma X. M., Guo Q., Wang L., Yang Y., Tai (2019) **Increased anxiety and decreased sociability induced by paternal deprivation involve the PVN-PrL OTergic pathway** *Elife* **8** <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.44026>
16. Hernández-González M., Navarro-Meza M., Prieto-Beracoechea C. A., Guevara M. A (2005) **Electrical activity of prefrontal cortex and ventral tegmental area during rat maternal behavior** *Behav Processes* **70**:132–143 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2005.06.002>

17. Hrdy S. B (1974) **Male-male competition and infanticide among the langurs (*Presbytis entellus*) of Abu Rajasthan.** *Folia Primatol (Basel)* **22**:19–58 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000155616>
18. Inada K., Hagihara M., Tsujimoto K., Abe T., Konno A., Hirai H., Miyamichi (2022) **Plasticity of neural connections underlying oxytocin-mediated parental behaviors of male mice** *Neuron* **110**:2009–2023 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2022.03.033>
19. Insel T. R., Gelhard R., Shapiro L. E (1991) **The comparative distribution of forebrain receptors for neurohypophyseal peptides in monogamous and polygamous mice** *Neuroscience* **43**:623–630 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4522\(91\)90321-e](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4522(91)90321-e)
20. Knobloch H. S., Charlet A., Hoffmann L. C., Eliava M., Khrulev S., Cetin A. H., Grinevich (2012) **Evoked axonal oxytocin release in the central amygdala attenuates fear response** *Neuron* **73**:553–566 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.11.030>
21. Kohl J., Autry A. E., Dulac C (2017) **The neurobiology of parenting: A neural circuit perspective** *Bioessays* **39**:1–11 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.201600159>
22. Leuner B., Caponiti J. M., Gould E (2012) **Oxytocin stimulates adult neurogenesis even under conditions of stress and elevated glucocorticoids** *Hippocampus* **22**:861–868 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20947>
23. Liu W., Pappas G. D., Carter C. S (2005) **Oxytocin receptors in brain cortical regions are reduced in haploinsufficient (+/-) reeler mice** *Neurol Res* **27**:339–345 <https://doi.org/10.1179/016164105x35602>
24. Lopatina O., Inzhutova A., Pichugina Y. A., Okamoto H., Salmina A. B., Higashida H (2011) **Reproductive experience affects parental retrieval behaviour associated with increased plasma oxytocin levels in wild-type and CD38-knockout mice** *J Neuroendocrinol* **23**:1125–1133 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2826.2011.02136.x>
25. Lorberbaum J. P., Newman J. D., Horwitz A. R., Dubno J. R., Lydiard R. B., Hamner M. B., George M. S. (2002) **A potential role for thalamocingulate circuitry in human maternal behavior** *Biol Psychiatry* **51**:431–445 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223\(01\)01284-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223(01)01284-7)
26. Lukas D., Huchard E (2014) **Sexual conflict. The evolution of infanticide by males in mammalian societies** *Science* **346**:841–844 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1257226>
27. Malcolm J. R (2015) **Paternal Care in Canids** *American Zoologist* **25**:853–856 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/25.3.853>
28. Mascaro J. S., Hackett P. D., Rilling J. K (2014) **Differential neural responses to child and sexual stimuli in human fathers and non-fathers and their hormonal correlates** *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **46**:153–163 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2014.04.014>
29. McCarthy M. M (1990) **Oxytocin inhibits infanticide in female house mice (*Mus domesticus*)** *Horm Behav* **24**:365–375 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0018-506x\(90\)90015-p](https://doi.org/10.1016/0018-506x(90)90015-p)
30. McCarthy M. M., Bare J. E., vom Saal F. S. (1986) **Infanticide and parental behavior in wild female house mice: effects of ovariectomy, adrenalectomy and administration of oxytocin and prostaglandin F2 alpha** *Physiol Behav* **36**:17–23 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(86\)90066-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(86)90066-1)

31. Mei L., Yan R., Yin L., Sullivan R. M., Lin D (2023) **Antagonistic circuits mediating infanticide and maternal care in female mice** *Nature* **618**:1006–1016 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06147-9>
32. Mendoza S. P., Mason W. A (1986) **Parental division of labour and differentiation of attachments in a monogamous primate (*Callicebus moloch*)** *Animal Behaviour* **34**:1336–1347 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(86\)80205-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(86)80205-6)
33. Munesue S. I., Liang M., Harashima A., Zhong J., Furuhashi K., Boitsova E. B., Higashida H (2021) **Transport of oxytocin to the brain after peripheral administration by membrane-bound or soluble forms of receptors for advanced glycation end-products** *J Neuroendocrinol* **33** <https://doi.org/10.1111/jne.12963>
34. Munetomo A., Ishii H., Miyamoto T., Sakuma Y., Kondo Y (2016) **Puerperal and parental experiences alter rat preferences for pup odors via changes in the oxytocin system** *J Reprod Dev* **62**:17–27 <https://doi.org/10.1262/jrd.2015-046>
35. Nakahara T. S., Camargo A. P., Magalhães P. H. M., Souza M. A. A., Ribeiro P. G., Martins-Netto P. H., Papes F (2020) **Peripheral oxytocin injection modulates vomeronasal sensory activity and reduces pup-directed aggression in male mice** *Sci Rep* **10** <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-77061-7>
36. Ninan I (2011) **Oxytocin suppresses basal glutamatergic transmission but facilitates activity-dependent synaptic potentiation in the medial prefrontal cortex** *J Neurochem* **119**:324–331 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-4159.2011.07430.x>
37. Rosenfeld C. S., Johnson S. A., Ellersieck M. R., Roberts R. M (2013) **Interactions between parents and parents and pups in the monogamous California mouse (*Peromyscus californicus*)** *PLoS One* **8** <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075725>
38. Sabihi S., Dong S. M., Durosko N. E., Leuner B (2014) **Oxytocin in the medial prefrontal cortex regulates maternal care, maternal aggression and anxiety during the postpartum period** *Front Behav Neurosci* **8** <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00258>
39. Saito A., Nakamura K (2011) **Oxytocin changes primate paternal tolerance to offspring in food transfer** *J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol* **197**:329–337 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-010-0617-2>
40. Seifritz E., Esposito F., Neuhoﬀ J. G., Lüthi A., Mustovic H., Dammann G., Di Salle (2003) **Differential sex-independent amygdala response to infant crying and laughing in parents versus nonparents** *Biol Psychiatry* **54**:1367–1375 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223\(03\)00697-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223(03)00697-8)
41. Shabalova A. A., Liang M., Zhong J., Huang Z., Tsuji C., Shnayder N. A., Higashida (2020) **Oxytocin and CD38 in the paraventricular nucleus play a critical role in paternal aggression in mice** *Horm Behav* **120** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2020.104695>
42. Shahrokh D. K., Zhang T. Y., Diorio J., Gratton A., Meaney M. J (2010) **Oxytocin-dopamine interactions mediate variations in maternal behavior in the rat** *Endocrinology* **151**:2276–2286 <https://doi.org/10.1210/en.2009-1271>
43. Smeltzer M. D., Curtis J. T., Aragona B. J., Wang Z (2006) **Dopamine, oxytocin, and vasopressin receptor binding in the medial prefrontal cortex of monogamous and promiscuous voles** *Neurosci Lett* **394**:146–151 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2005.10.019>

44. Sofroniew M. V (1983) **Morphology of vasopressin and oxytocin neurones and their central and vascular projections** *Prog Brain Res* **60**:101–114 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0079-6123\(08\)64378-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0079-6123(08)64378-2)
45. Svare B., Mann M (1981) **Infanticide: genetic, developmental and hormonal influences in mice** *Physiol Behav* **27**:921–927 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(81\)90062-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(81)90062-7)
46. Takahashi A., Nagayasu K., Nishitani N., Kaneko S., Koide T (2014) **Control of intermale aggression by medial prefrontal cortex activation in the mouse** *PLoS One* **9** <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094657>
47. Tamborski S., Mintz E. M., Caldwell H. K (2016) **Sex Differences in the Embryonic Development of the Central Oxytocin System in Mice** *J Neuroendocrinol* **28** <https://doi.org/10.1111/jne.12364>
48. Uhl-Bronner S., Waltisperger E., Martínez-Lorenzana G., Condes Lara M., Freund-Mercier M. J (2005) **Sexually dimorphic expression of oxytocin binding sites in forebrain and spinal cord of the rat** *Neuroscience* **135**:147–154 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2005.05.025>
49. Wang X., Escobar J. B., Mendelowitz D (2021) **Sex Differences in the Hypothalamic Oxytocin Pathway to Locus Coeruleus and Augmented Attention with Chemogenetic Activation of Hypothalamic Oxytocin Neurons** *Int J Mol Sci* **22** <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22168510>
50. Weisman O., Zagoory-Sharon O., Feldman R (2012) **Oxytocin administration to parent enhances infant physiological and behavioral readiness for social engagement** *Biol Psychiatry* **72**:982–989 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.06.011>
51. Woller M. J., Sosa M. E., Chiang Y., Prudom S. L., Keelty P., Moore J. E., Ziegler T. E (2012) **Differential hypothalamic secretion of neurocrines in male common marmosets: parental experience effects?** *J Neuroendocrinol* **24**:413–421 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2826.2011.02252.x>
52. Yamamoto Y., Liang M., Munesue S., Deguchi K., Harashima A., Furuhashi K., Higashida H (2019) **Vascular RAGE transports oxytocin into the brain to elicit its maternal bonding behaviour in mice** *Commun Biol* **2** <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-019-0325-6>
53. Yoshihara C., Numan M., Kuroda K. O (2018) **Oxytocin and Parental Behaviors** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* **35**:119–153 https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2017_11
54. Yu G. Z., Kaba H., Okutani F., Takahashi S., Higuchi T (1996) **The olfactory bulb: a critical site of action for oxytocin in the induction of maternal behaviour in the rat** *Neuroscience* **72**:1083–1088 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4522\(95\)00600-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4522(95)00600-1)
55. Yuan W., He Z., Hou W., Wang L., Li L., Zhang J., Tai (2019) **Role of oxytocin in the medial preoptic area (MPOA) in the modulation of paternal behavior in mandarin voles** *Horm Behav* **110**:46–55 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2019.02.014>

Article and author information

Lu Li

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Zhixiong He

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Yin Li

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Caihong Huang

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Wenjuan Hou

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Zijian Lv

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Lizi Zhang

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Yishan Qu

Shaanxi Normal University, China

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-1849-6361](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1849-6361)

Yahan Sun

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Kaizhe Huang

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Xiao Han

Shaanxi Normal University, China

Fadao Tai

Shaanxi Normal University, China

For correspondence: taifadao@snnu.edu.cn

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-6804-4179](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6804-4179)

Copyright

© 2024, Li et al.

This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Editors

Reviewing Editor

Annaliese Beery

University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, United States of America

Senior Editor

Kate Wassum

University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, United States of America

Reviewer #1 (Public Review):

Summary:

This important study investigated the role of oxytocin (OT) neurons in the paraventricular nucleus (PVN) and their projections to the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) in regulating pup care and infanticide behaviors in mandarin voles. The researchers used techniques like immunofluorescence, optogenetics, OT sensors, and peripheral OT administration. Activating OT neurons in the PVN reduced the time it took pup-caring male voles to approach and retrieve pups, facilitating pup-care behavior. However, this activation had no effect on females. Interestingly, this same PVN OT neuron activation also reduced the time for both male and female infanticidal voles to approach and attack pups, suggesting PVN OT neuron activity can promote pup care while inhibiting infanticide behavior. Inhibition of these neurons promoted infanticide. Stimulating PVN->mPFC OT projections facilitated pup care in males and in infanticide-prone voles, activation of these terminals prolonged latency to approach and attack. Inhibition of PVN->mPFC OT projections promoted infanticide. Peripheral OT administration increased pup care in males and reduced infanticide in both sexes. However, some results differed in females, suggesting other mechanisms may regulate female pup care.

Strengths:

This multi-faceted approach provides converging evidence, strengthens the conclusions drawn from the study, and makes them very convincing. Additionally, the study examines both pup care and infanticide behaviors, offering insights into the mechanisms underlying these contrasting behaviors. The inclusion of both male and female voles allows for the exploration of potential sex differences in the regulation of pup-directed behaviors. The peripheral OT administration experiments also provide valuable information for potential clinical applications and wildlife management strategies.

Weaknesses:

While the study presents exciting findings, there are several weaknesses that should be addressed. The sample sizes used in some experiments, such as the Fos study and optogenetic manipulations, appear to be small, which may limit the statistical power and generalizability of the results. Effect sizes are not reported, making it difficult to evaluate the practical significance of the findings. The imaging parameters and analysis details for the Fos study are not clearly described, hindering the interpretation of these results (i.e., was the entire PVN counted?). Also, does the Fos colocalization align with previous studies that look at PVN Fos and maternal/ paternal care? Additionally, the study lacks electrophysiological data to support the optogenetic findings, which could provide insights into the neural mechanisms underlying the observed behaviors.

The study has several limitations that warrant further discussion. Firstly, the potential effects of manipulating OT neurons on the release of other neurotransmitters (or the influence of other neurochemicals or brain regions) on pup-directed behaviors, especially in females, are not fully explored. Additionally, it is unclear whether back-propagation of action potentials during optogenetic manipulations causes the same behavioral effect as direct stimulation of PVN OT cells. Moreover, the authors do not address whether the observed changes in behavior could be explained by overall increases or decreases in locomotor activity.

The authors do not specify the percentage of PVN->mPFC neurons labeled that were OT-positive, nor do they directly compare the sexes in their behavioral analysis (or if they did, it

is not clear statistically). While the authors propose that the sex difference in pup-directed behaviors is due to females having greater OT expression, they do not provide evidence to support this claim from their labeling data. It is also uncertain whether more OT neurons were manipulated in females compared to males. The study could benefit from a more comprehensive discussion of other factors that could influence the neural circuit under investigation, especially in females.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.96543.1.sa2>

Reviewer #2 (Public Review):

Summary:

This series of experiments studied the involvement of PVN OT neurons and their projection to the mPFC in pup-care and attack behavior in virgin male and female Mandarin voles. Using Fos visualization, optogenetics, fiber photometry, and IP injection of OT the results converge on OT regulating caregiving and attacks on pups. Some sex differences were found in the effects of the manipulations.

Strengths:

Major strengths are the modern multi-method approaches and involving both sexes of Mandarin vole in every experiment.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses include the lack of some specific details in the methods that would help readers interpret the results. These include:

- (1) No description of diffusion of centrally injected agents.
- (2) Whether all central targets were consistent across animals included in the data analyses. This includes that is not stated if the medial prelimbic mPFC target was in all optogenetic study animals as shown in Figure 4 and if that is the case, there is no discussion of that subregion's function compared to other mPFC subregions.
- (3) How groups of pup-care and infanticidal animals were created since there was no obvious pre-test mentioned so perhaps there was the testing of a large number of animals until getting enough subjects in each group.
- (4) The apparent use of a 20-minute baseline data collection period for photometry that started right after the animals were stressed from handling and placement in the novel testing chamber.
- (5) A weakness in the results reporting is that it's unclear what statistics are reported (2 x 2 ANOVA main effect of interaction results, t-test results) and that the degrees of freedom expected for the 2 X 2 ANOVAs in some cases don't appear to match the numbers of subjects shown in the graphs; including sample sizes in each group would be helpful because the graph panels are very small and data points overlap.

The additional context that could help readers of this study is that the authors overlook some important mPFC and pup caregiving and infanticide studies in the introduction which would help put this work in better context in terms of what is known about the mPFC and these behaviors. These previous studies include Febo et al., 2010; Febo 2012; Peirera and Morrell, 2011 and 2020; and a very relevant study by Alsina-Llanes and Olazábal, 2021 on mPFC lesions and infanticide in virgin male and female mice. The introduction states that nothing is known about the mPFC and infanticide. In the introduction and discussion, stating the species

and sex of the animals tested in all the previous studies mentioned would be useful. The authors also discuss PVN OT cell stimulation findings seen in other rodents, so the work seems less conceptually novel. Overall, the findings add to the knowledge about OT regulation of pup-directed behavior in male and female rodents, especially the PVN-mPFC OT projection.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.96543.1.sa1>

Reviewer #3 (Public Review):

Summary:

Here Li et al. examine pup-directed behavior in virgin Mandarin voles. Some males and females tend towards infanticide, others tend towards pup care. c-Fos staining showed more oxytocin cells activated in the paraventricular nucleus (PVN) of the hypothalamus in animals expressing pup care behaviors than in infanticidal animals. Optogenetic stimulation of PVN oxytocin neurons (with an oxytocin-specific virus to express the opsin transgene) increased pup-care, or in infanticidal voles increased latency towards approach and attack.

Suppressing the activity of PVN oxytocin neurons promoted infanticide. The use of a recent oxytocin GRAB sensor (OT1.0) showed changes in medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) signals as measured with photometry in both sexes. Activating mPFC oxytocin projections increased latency to approach and attack in infanticidal females and males (similar to the effects of peripheral oxytocin injections), whereas in pup-caring animals only males showed a decrease in approach. Inhibiting these projections increased infanticidal behaviors in both females and males and had no effect on pup caretaking.

Strengths:

Adopting these methods for Mandarin voles is an impressive accomplishment, especially the valuable data provided by the oxytocin GRAB sensor. This is a major achievement and helps promote systems neuroscience in voles.

Weaknesses:

The study would be strengthened by an initial figure summarizing the behavioral phenotypes of voles expressing pup care vs infanticide: the percentages and behavioral scores of individual male and female nulliparous animals for the behaviors examined here. Do the authors have data about the housing or life history/experiences of these animals? How bimodal and robust are these behavioral tendencies in the population?

Optogenetics with the oxytocin promoter virus is a nice advance here. More details about their preparation and methods should be in the main text, and not simply relegated to the methods section. For optogenetic stimulation in Figure 2, how were the stimulation parameters chosen? There is a worry that oxytocin neurons can co-release other factors- are the authors sure that oxytocin is being released by optogenetic stimulation as opposed to other transmitters or peptides, and acting through the oxytocin receptor (as opposed to a vasopressin receptor)?

Given that they are studying changes in latency to approach/attack, having some controls for motion when oxytocin neurons are activated or suppressed might be nice. Oxytocin is reported to be an anxiolytic and a sedative at high levels.

The OT1.0 sensor is also amazing, these data are quite remarkable. However, photometry is known to be susceptible to motion artifacts and I didn't see much in the methods about controls or correction for this. It's also surprising to see such dramatic, sudden, and large-scale suppression of oxytocin signaling in the mPFC in the infanticidal animals - does this

mean there is a substantial tonic level of oxytocin release in the cortex under baseline conditions?

Figure 5 is difficult to parse as-is, and relates to an important consideration for this study: how extensive is the oxytocin neuron projection from PVN to mPFC?

In Figures 6 and 7, the authors use the phrase 'projection terminals'; however, to my knowledge, there have not been terminals (i.e., presynaptic formations opposed to a target postsynaptic site) observed in oxytocin neuron projections into target central regions.

Projection-based inhibition as in Figure 7 remains a controversial issue, as it is unclear if the opsin activation can be fast enough to reduce the fast axonal/terminal action potential. Do the authors have confirmation that this works, perhaps with the oxytocin GRAB OT sensor?

As females and males had similar GRAB OT1.0 responses in mPFC, why would the behavioral effects of increasing activity be different between the sexes?

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.96543.1.sa0>