Published in final edited form as:

Brain Res Bull. 2014 June ; 0: 36–45. doi:10.1016/j.brainresbull.2013.09.005.

Does PKM ζ maintain memory?

Janine L. Kwapis^a and Fred J. Helmstetter^a

^aDepartment of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2441 E. Hartford Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53211, USA

Abstract

Work on the long-term stability of memory has identified a potentially critical role for protein kinase Mzeta (PKM ζ) in maintaining established memory. PKM ζ , an autonomously active isoform of PKC, is hypothesized to sustain those changes that occurred during memory formation in order to preserve the memory engram over time. Initial studies investigating the role of PKM ζ were largely successful in demonstrating a role for the kinase in memory maintenance; disrupting PKM ζ activity with ζ -inhibitory peptide (ZIP) was successful in disrupting a variety of established associations in a number of key brain regions. More recent work, however, has questioned both the role of PKM ζ in memory maintenance and the effectiveness of ZIP as a specific inhibitor of PKM ζ activity. Here, we outline the research both for and against the idea that PKM ζ is a memory maintenance mechanism and discuss how these two lines of research can be reconciled. We conclude by proposing a number of studies that would help to clarify the role of PKM ζ in memory and define other mechanisms the brain may use to maintain memory.

Keywords

protein kinase Mzeta; PKM; ZIP; memory maintenance; epigenetics; restabilization

1. Introduction

Understanding the neural mechanisms that support long-term memory formation and storage is a fundamental goal of neuroscience. Historically, a large majority of this research has focused on identifying the molecular components of long-term memory formation and, accordingly, a broad understanding of the memory acquisition process has gradually emerged. Until recently, far less work was dedicated to finding the neural mechanisms that support the long-term maintenance of established memories. The discovery of the putative memory maintenance molecule protein kinase Mzeta (PKM ζ) shifted attention from induction of memory to its maintenance. How memories are maintained and updated over time is now a topic of considerable interest.

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Corresponding Author: Fred J. Helmstetter, Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 224 Garland Hall, 2441 E. Hartford Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53211, fjh@uwm.edu, **Phone:** 414-229-4903, **Fax:** 414-229-5219.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

The idea that memory could be actively maintained by enzymatic activity was initially proposed by Francis Crick (1984), who hypothesized that enzymes could actively replace synaptic proteins without changing a synapse's overall activity state. From this perspective, changes that occur during learning could be maintained through persistently active kinases that continuously replace synaptic proteins as they degrade. Early work in the sea snail *Aplysia* identified a number of kinases that show this type of persistent activity following synaptic stimulation, including PKA (cAMP-dependent protein kinase A), CaMKII (Ca²⁺/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II), and PKC (protein kinase C) (Schwartz and Greenberg, 1987; Schwartz, 1993). Blocking these proteins, however, affected the development of intermediate-term facilitation, rather than the maintenance of long-term potentiation (Sutton and Carew, 2000). Nonetheless, research searching for a persistently active "maintenance" enzyme continued to target PKC, which is known to be cleaved *in vitro* to a persistently active PKM form in which the catalytic portion of the molecule exists in the absence of the inhibitory domain (Inoue et al., 1977; Takai et al., 1977). A thorough analysis of the expression of each PKC isoform subsequently revealed that the only PKM found in the mammalian hippocampus matched the PKC ζ isoform (Sacktor et al., 1993; see Sacktor, 2008 for review). PKM ζ was therefore identified as the isoform of PKC that had the potential to be persistently active during memory maintenance.

Initial research on PKM ζ in memory suggested that the molecule acts as a general maintenance mechanism capable of actively sustaining a variety of established associations throughout the brain. More recent work, however, has questioned both the role of PKM ζ in memory maintenance and the specificity of the pharmacological agent used to inhibit PKM ζ in these studies. Here, we present the evidence both for and against the idea that PKM ζ is a general neural mechanism for long-term memory maintenance and outline future studies that will be useful in revealing how established memories are maintained over time.

2. Protein Kinase Mzeta

PKM ζ is an atypical isoform of protein kinase C (PKC) that is believed to actively maintain those cellular changes that occur during memory formation in order to preserve the memory engram over time. *In vitro* work has demonstrated that PKM ζ is both necessary and sufficient to maintain established long-term potentiation (LTP) (Ling et al., 2002), the putative cellular mechanism for memory. A wealth of work from Todd Sacktor's lab at the SUNY Downstate Medical Center has succeeded in characterizing the structure, synthesis, and mechanisms of PKM ζ (see Sacktor, 2012 for review). A standard PKC ζ molecule consists of an amino-terminal regulatory domain connected to a carboxy-terminal catalytic domain by a small hinge region. Under resting conditions, a pseudosubstrate sequence on the regulatory domain of the PKC ζ molecule binds to the catalytic domain, effectively inactivating the molecule until stimulation occurs and temporarily relieves the autoinhibition of the molecule (Newton, 2003; Nishizuka, 1988; Sossin, 2007). PKM ζ is unique in that, in mammals, it is transcribed from an internal promoter on the PKC ζ gene, so PKM ζ mRNA only contains information about the catalytic portion of the molecule (Hernandez et al., 2003; Muslimov et al., 2004). Translation of PKM ζ mRNA produces a protein identical to the catalytic portion of a PKC ζ molecule without any of the regulatory region. Once synthesized, therefore, PKM ζ is constitutively active without requiring second messenger

binding. This constant activity is believed to allow PKM ζ to actively maintain the facilitated synaptic connections that represent the memory engram in the brain (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Sacktor, 2008; Sacktor, 2011).

The most commonly used inhibitor of PKM ζ is myristoylated zeta-pseudosubstrate inhibitory peptide (ZIP), a synthetic peptide that mimics the pseudosubstrate sequence of PKC ζ (Ling et al., 2002; Sajikumar et al., 2005; Serrano et al., 2005). Hypothetically, ZIP should specifically bind and inactivate only those molecules with a compatible binding region for the peptide. As the forebrain expresses high levels of PKM ζ and only minor amounts of PKC ζ (Hernandez et al., 2003), PKM ζ should largely be the target of ZIP infusions. More recent studies have recognized that the other atypical PKC isoform, PKC λ/ι is also a target of the ZIP peptide and may contribute to some of ZIP's effects on LTP and memory (Ren et al., 2013; see discussion section for details).

Using ZIP to inhibit PKM ζ activity, molecular cascades both up- and downstream of the molecule have been identified. Upstream, a number of signaling cascades that are activated during memory formation have also been identified to drive synthesis of PKM ζ . Molecules important for both learning and PKM ζ translation include CaMKII (Ca²⁺-calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II), PKA (protein kinase A), MAPK (mitogen-activated protein kinase, also called ERK), PI3K (phosphoinositide 3-kinase), and mTOR (mammalian target of rapamycin). This overlap suggests that activation of these signaling cascades during a learning event promotes the rapid translation of PKM ζ required for maintenance. Indeed, PKM ζ mRNA contains a long 5' UTR that allows its synthesis to be carefully regulated at the synapse (Hernandez et al., 2003). Translational repression, possibly through miRNA regulation of the PKM ζ transcript, allows stores of PKM ζ mRNA to be deposited in dendrites (Muslimov et al., 2004), so that stimulation of the synapse during a learning event could trigger immediate synthesis of the maintenance molecule (Sacktor, 2008).

Once PKM ζ is locally synthesized, it actively maintains established potentiation at the synapse. One identified mechanism of PKM ζ is to enhance α -amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA) receptor trafficking to the synapse (Yao et al., 2008). A direct infusion of PKM ζ into hippocampal pyramidal neurons doubles the number of postsynaptic AMPA receptors (Ling et al., 2002), contributing to the increased synaptic conductance characteristic of LTP. PKM ζ seems to increase the number of AMPA receptors at the synapse through a trafficking mechanism, as PKM ζ modifies levels of *N*-ethylmaleimide-sensitive fusion protein (NSF), which interacts with the GluR2 subunit of AMPA receptors to augment their trafficking to the postsynaptic membrane (Nishimune et al., 1998; Osten et al., 1998; Song et al., 1998). Blocking the interaction between NSF and AMPA receptors prevents the potentiation normally observed when PKM ζ is perfused into cells (Yao et al., 2008). Additionally, PKM ζ is known to interact with other proteins that are involved in regulating the trafficking of GluR2 to the synapse, including kidney and brain expressed protein (KIBRA) (Buther et al., 2004; Yoshihama et al., 2009) and protein interacting with PKC1 (PICK1) (Yao et al., 2008). Finally, Miguez and colleagues (2010) have demonstrated PKM ζ may play a role in blocking endocytosis of GluR2-containing AMPA receptors. Blocking internalization of GluR2 with the peptide GluR2_{3Y} was sufficient to prevent the impairments in LTP maintenance caused by ZIP (Miguez et al.,

2010). Together, these studies suggest that PKM ζ may maintain memories by enhancing the number of GluR2-containing AMPA receptors at the synapse through both enhanced trafficking and reduced endocytosis. Indeed, recent work has suggested that GluR2-containing AMPA receptors are largely calcium impermeable and expression of these receptors at the synapse may mark a synapse that is currently in a stable form that is resistant to disruption (Clem and Hugarir, 2010; Hong et al., 2013; Rao-Ruiz et al., 2011; Shi et al., 2001). More recent work has indicated that PKM ζ may support enhanced PSD-95 levels at the synapse, as overexpression of PKM ζ in hippocampal neurons produces increased PSD-95 clustering at the synapse and ZIP application disrupted these enhancements (Crary et al., 2006). Currently, all known actions of PKM ζ appear to be postsynaptic; whether PKM ζ also functions presynaptically is unclear.

3. Initial studies: Inhibiting PKM ζ with ZIP disrupts memory maintenance

After it was convincingly demonstrated that PKM ζ is critical for maintaining established LTP, the next step was to test whether memories also require this protein for long-term stability. The first studies investigating PKM ζ 's role in memory maintenance were overwhelmingly positive, showing that inhibiting PKM ζ activity with either chelerythrine (a PKC inhibitor with a high affinity for PKM isoforms at low doses) or ZIP (the peptide designed to specifically inhibit PKM ζ) was sufficient to disrupt a fully consolidated memory (see table 1). The general protocol for testing whether a memory requires PKM ζ for maintenance was similar in all of these studies: at least one day after the learning event (after the consolidation window is closed), PKM ζ would be inhibited in the brain region believed to store the association. The animals' memory would then be assessed either within a few hours of the injection or the following day to determine whether blocking PKM ζ had any effect.

In a number of species (drosophila, aplysia, mice, and rats) and throughout the brain (including hippocampus, amygdala, and the insular cortex), it was demonstrated that blocking ZIP could impair memory storage (see Table 1). Following a positive finding in Jerry Yin's lab showing that chelerythrine application could reverse odor avoidance memory in fruit flies (Drier et al., 2002), a seminal study by Eva Pastalkova and colleagues (2006) demonstrated that ZIP could erase both *in vivo* LTP in the hippocampus and memory for an aversive active avoidance task housed in the same structure. Within a few years, studies had shown ZIP-induced memory impairments in the amygdala for fear conditioning (Kwapis et al., 2009; Kwapis et al., 2012; Miguez et al., 2010; Serrano et al., 2008), inhibitory avoidance, and active avoidance (Gamiz and Gallo, 2011), in the hippocampus for the Morris water maze (Serrano et al., 2008), radial arm maze (Serrano et al., 2008), object location memory (Hardt et al., 2010) and trace eyeblink conditioning (Madronal et al., 2010), in the insular cortex for conditioned taste aversion (CTA) (Shema et al., 2007; Shema et al., 2009), and in the nucleus accumbens for drug memory (Crespo et al., 2012).

For the first time, a logical, simple mechanism had been described to maintain memory: PKM ζ was responsible for actively maintaining memories in the structures that stored these associations throughout the brain. Before long, however, research began to deviate from this

path, suggesting that the mechanisms for long-term memory storage may not be as simple as a single protein actively maintaining established synaptic potentiation.

3. Conflicts arise: PKM ζ may not always maintain memory

3.1. Does PKM ζ maintain all types of memory?

There were a few discrepancies among the early studies on PKM ζ 's role in memory storage that were difficult to reconcile within the framework laid out by the literature (see Table 2). First, a number of studies failed to find effects for ZIP infusions into regions of the brain that are known to participate in the storage of certain associations. For example, two different studies showed that intra-hippocampal ZIP infusions had no effect on an established context fear association (Kwapis et al., 2009; Serrano et al., 2008) despite a wealth of literature suggesting that the hippocampus plays a key role in context fear memory (e.g. Anagnostaras et al., 1999; Kim and Fanselow, 1992; Matus-Amat et al., 2004; Rudy and O'Reilly, 1999). One explanation for this lack of effect was that the hippocampus does not play a role in storing the memory for context, per se, but only participates in its acquisition. Alternatively, it was also suggested that PKM ζ may not play a role in storing general background information, such as contextual or procedural information (Serrano et al., 2008), but only stores foreground or discrete associations. Other studies have shown that ZIP is not effective in disrupting taste familiarity in the insular cortex (Shema et al., 2007) or procedural information for the Morris water maze in the hippocampus (Serrano et al., 2008). Together, these findings suggest that PKM ζ may not indiscriminately store all associations throughout the brain; background information may require a different storage mechanism.

3.2. Is PKM ζ involved in memory maintenance or reconsolidation?

It is more difficult to explain the findings of Parsons & Davis (2011a), who showed that ZIP was only effective in impairing memory when the initial memory test was given within a few days of injection. Using olfactory fear-potentiated startle, the researchers convincingly demonstrated that infusions of ZIP were sufficient to permanently disrupt olfactory fear memory when tested either 2 hours, 1 day, or 2 days after drug infusion. When the initial test was delayed to either 10 or 15 days after infusion, however, memory was not impaired by ZIP infusion (Parsons and Davis, 2011a). This suggests that the memory must be retrieved within a certain time window after ZIP infusion to observe the memory-impairing effects of PKM ζ inhibition. Why this time window exists, however, is unclear. The timecourse of ZIP degradation was more recently identified and the peptide is fully cleared from brain tissue within 24 hours after an intracranial infusion (Kwapis et al., 2012). Thus, the time window for ZIP's effects on memory impairment does not match that of its degradation from brain tissue; memory impairments are still observed at 2 days after infusion, a timepoint well after ZIP has been fully cleared from the brain. One possibility is that ZIP may temporarily disrupt PKM ζ synthesis so that PKM ζ levels are disrupted even after the peptide is eliminated. As a positive feedback loop exists between PKM ζ activity and new PKM ζ synthesis (Kelly et al., 2007; Sacktor, 2011; Westmark et al., 2010), it is possible that disrupting PKM ζ activity has a lingering impact on PKM ζ levels even after the peptide is removed. From this perspective, it is possible that if the memory is retrieved while

PKM ζ levels are disrupted, the memory is unable to restabilize and is lost, leading to a permanent disruption of the memory. PKM ζ levels would likely recover within a few days, however, so that memories tested 10 or 15 days after ZIP infusion would be retrieved in the presence of normal PKM ζ levels that would allow for sufficient restabilization and storage. If this is true, however, it suggests that ZIP's ability to disrupt memory maintenance requires retrieval of that memory while PKM ζ levels are disrupted. PKM ζ may not be a memory "maintenance" mechanism, therefore, but a "restabilization" mechanism.

Not all researchers have observed this time window of ZIP efficacy, however (See Table 1; Gamiz and Gallo, 2011; Shema et al., 2007). Using conditioned taste aversion, Shema and colleagues have shown that ZIP is effective in disrupting memory even when the initial test occurs a full month after ZIP injection into the insular cortex (2007). Similarly, Gamiz and Gallo (2011) found that memory for active avoidance is disrupted when the initial test occurs seven days after ZIP is infused into the amygdala. Although these studies suggest that ZIP is effective regardless of when the memory is first tested, it is possible that the time window of ZIP's efficacy changes based on either the memory or the brain structure being investigated. Future studies should determine whether other associations, particularly those stored outside the amygdala, are affected by ZIP even when the initial test is delayed.

Others have argued that these results are because Parsons & Davis (2011a) used a low dose of ZIP (Nader, 2011; Sacktor, 2012; but see Parsons and Davis, 2011a). This seems unlikely, however, as Parsons & Davis (2011a) used the standard concentration of ZIP, 10nmol/ μ l, the same dose used in a large majority of the initial research on PKM ζ (Kwapis et al., 2009; Kwapis et al., 2012; Pastalkova et al., 2006; Serrano et al., 2008; Shema et al., 2007). The major difference is that Parsons & Davis (2011a) infused a volume of 0.5 μ l per hemisphere into the amygdala, as compared to a volume of 1.0 μ l infused into various structures by other labs (Pastalkova et al., 2006; Serrano et al., 2008; Shema et al., 2007; but see Kwapis). While the *total* amount of drug infused into brain tissue differed between the studies, the concentration was identical, so only the spread of the drug should differ. As research has demonstrated that a volume of 0.5 μ l generally covers the amygdala for a variety of compounds (Allen et al., 2008; Parsons et al., 2006), including ZIP (Kwapis et al., 2012) it can be concluded that this was an appropriate volume of drug to use. Larger volumes sacrifice specificity, as the drug likely infuses into nearby structures in addition to the amygdala. Therefore, the dose used by Parsons & Davis (2011b) was sufficient and comparable to the dose used in most other studies.

3.3. Does ZIP really inhibit PKM ζ ?

To further complicate matters, recent work has suggested that ZIP-induced memory impairments may not due to PKM ζ inhibition per se. A detailed analysis of the spread of ZIP following its intracranial infusion at 10nmol/ μ l estimated that its concentration was approximately 100uM after correcting for spread dilution and loss of drug through the cannulae tract (Lisman, 2012; Wu-Zhang et al., 2012; but see Yao et al., 2013). *In vitro* studies have demonstrated that at this concentration, ZIP is not only effective in inhibiting PKM ζ activity, but also blocks the activity of other kinases, specifically CaMKII, which has

also been implicated in memory storage (e.g. Cao et al., 2008; see Sanhueza and Lisman, 2013 for review).

Additionally, two recent studies using genetic knockout mice to remove different exons of the PKC ζ /PKM ζ gene found that removal of active PKM ζ had no effect on LTP or memory (Lee et al., 2013; Volk et al., 2013). Volk and colleagues (2013) used both a traditional global knockout and a conditional floxed knockout targeting exon 11 of the catalytic domain of PKM ζ to block endogenous PKM ζ before LTP induction or learning. Though knockout animals had no noticeable PKM ζ expression, they showed normal LTP induction and maintenance. Further, these animals showed normal learning and memory in two different hippocampal tasks: associative trace fear conditioning and spatial Morris water maze learning. Surprisingly, bath application of ZIP to hippocampal slices 60 minutes after LTP induction reversed established LTP in both the wild type and knockout animals, suggesting that ZIP reverses established LTP through a PKM ζ -independent mechanism. Using a slightly different knockout, in which exon 9 of the PKC ζ /PKM ζ gene is removed, Lee and colleagues (2013) similarly observed normal learning and memory for cued fear conditioning, novel object recognition memory, object location memory, and cocaine conditioned place preference (CPP) memory in the knockout animal. Consistent with the results of Volk et al. (2013), they also showed that ZIP injection into the nucleus accumbens disrupted memory for cocaine-related CPP in both the wild type and knockout animals. Together, these results indicate that ZIP may reverse memory through a mechanism besides PKM ζ .

The results of Volk (2013) and Lee (2013) suggest that ZIP inhibits an unidentified enzyme (or set of enzymes) that normally supports LTP and memory maintenance in the absence of PKM ζ . What could this mystery enzyme be? One possibility is that ZIP inhibits the atypical PKC λ/ι , which contains the same pseudosubstrate binding region as PKM ζ /PKC ζ and should therefore be a target of ZIP. Volk and colleagues (2013) demonstrated that PKC λ/ι does not form a truncated, constitutively active PKM product following LTP induction and they observed no difference in total PKC λ/ι expression levels following LTP. This does not entirely rule out the possibility that PKC λ/ι is playing a role in maintaining LTP and memory in PKM ζ knockout animals, however, as the researchers did not measure activity of the PKC λ/ι molecule following LTP. Indeed, preliminary research from the Sacktor laboratory has found compensatory increases in PKC λ/ι phosphorylation when PKM ζ is knocked out constitutively (Tsokas et al., 2012). Further, recent work by Ren and colleagues (2013) indicates that PKC λ/ι may indeed play a key role in LTP expression or maintenance, as selective inhibition of the lamda PKC molecule reverses LTP with 20 minutes in hippocampal slices. Future studies will be needed to determine whether PKC λ/ι is involved in maintaining memory, however.

3.4. Problems with the scrambled ZIP control peptide

One additional finding of both the Volk and Lee studies is that the scrambled peptide that is often used as an inactive control for ZIP is both an effective inhibitor of PKM ζ activity (Lee et al., 2013; Volk et al., 2013) and is able to reverse LTP maintenance in hippocampal slices (Volk et al., 2013). This is consistent with the finding of at least one previous study that

showed partial reversal of fear conditioning memory following scrambled ZIP infusion into the amygdala (Kwapis et al., 2009). As the scrambled peptide itself appears to inhibit the maintenance mechanism for both LTP and memory, it is not the most appropriate comparison for ZIP; in order to determine if memory is impaired, ZIP animals should be compared to an animal that shows normal levels of learning and memory, such as a vehicle-infused animal. Studies that compare only ZIP and scrambled ZIP animals therefore need to be interpreted cautiously (see Table 1).

4. Reconciling the conflicting research: Does PKM ζ maintain long-term memory?

Although these recent studies complicate what was once a clear and convincing argument that PKM ζ is the “memory maintenance” molecule, they don’t conclusively rule out the possibility that PKM ζ normally acts to maintain memory. Most obviously, both of the studies using PKM ζ knockout animals disrupt PKM ζ expression well before LTP induction or learning of the behavioral task (Lee et al., 2013; Volk et al., 2013). In these studies, LTP induction or memory acquisition occurred in the absence of PKM ζ . It is possible that disruption of PKM ζ activity triggered a compensatory mechanism that allowed for normal maintenance of LTP and memory despite PKM ζ knockout. In order to conclusively determine that PKM ζ is not necessary for memory maintenance, it is imperative that a conditional knockout is used to test whether disrupting PKM ζ *after* consolidation has an effect on established memory maintenance. Currently, with knockouts that occur well before learning, the researchers are not able to dissociate between the learning and maintenance phases of the association. As ZIP has been shown to disrupt memory up to 3 months following a learning event (Shema et al., 2009), there is sufficient time for a conditional knockout to be induced between the learning and test phases to test whether a genetic knockout of PKM ζ after learning is sufficient to disrupt an established memory.

Additionally, this research is unable to account for the results of Shema and colleagues (2011), who demonstrated that viral overexpression of PKM ζ in the insular cortex either before or 7 days after CTA learning is able to enhance long-term memory for the task. There are a couple of possible explanations to reconcile these two findings. First, as previously mentioned, PKM ζ may maintain memory under normal circumstances, but a compensatory mechanism may support memory maintenance in the absence of functional PKM ζ . Alternatively, it is possible that PKM ζ overexpression activates some downstream mechanism that is also a nonspecific target of ZIP that remains to be identified. In either case, it seems that PKM ζ does promote long-term memory.

Thus, although recent work on PKM ζ demonstrates instances in which the protein may not be required for memory maintenance, it is likely that PKM ζ does play a role in memory maintenance under normal learning conditions. In light of the findings of Parsons and colleagues (2011a), PKM ζ ’s role may be to restabilize an updated memory, instead of actively maintaining an established memory in the absence of retrieval. Additional tests will need to be done to determine the precise length of this post-infusion time window of ZIP’s effectiveness in order to identify why it exists.

5. Future directions

Perhaps it is not surprising that the neural mechanisms underlying memory maintenance appear to be more complicated than originally described. The molecular cascades supporting the induction, reconsolidation and extinction of memories are far more complex than the PKM ζ -centric model that has been described to date for general memory maintenance. Indeed, it appears that in the absence of PKM ζ , other mechanisms can compensate and maintain memory, suggesting the existence of unidentified components of the memory maintenance machinery. Whether these mechanisms also maintain memory in the presence of intact PKM ζ is currently unclear.

More work is needed to conclusively determine the role of PKM ζ in memory maintenance or retrieval and to identify what is being inhibited by ZIP (besides PKM ζ) to block memory in PKM ζ knockout animals. One critical study that needs to be conducted in the near future should test whether a conditional knockout of PKM ζ that is induced *after* learning is effective in reversing a memory acquired in the presence of functional PKM ζ . Until this study is completed, it is impossible to determine whether the effects of Volk et al. (2013) and Lee et al. (2013) are the result of compensatory mechanisms maintaining memory in the absence of functional PKM ζ . The results of this study will affect the direction of future memory maintenance research. If the conditional knockout shows impairments in memory maintenance that are similar to the effects of ZIP, this will validate the wide field of work supporting the idea that PKM ζ maintains memory. If the conditional knockout fails to block the maintenance of memory, however, this will suggest that PKM ζ is not the major mechanism maintaining memory and other mechanisms will need to be explored.

In order to identify the function of PKM ζ in memory, future studies should also develop and use novel inhibitors of the kinase. As every inhibitor has shortcomings (such as ZIP blocking proteins besides PKM ζ and genetic knockouts possibly activating compensatory mechanisms), a conclusive role for PKM ζ will only be identified through converging studies using a range of techniques to inhibit the molecule. Other methods of blocking PKM ζ include antisense oligodeoxynucleotides targeted to PKM ζ mRNA, which could prevent new translation of PKM ζ , and TAT-conjugated peptides designed to inhibit either PKM ζ itself or its downstream targets. Some preliminary work from Todd Sacktor's lab has indicated that an oligodeoxynucleotide targeted to PKM ζ mRNA administered pre-training to the hippocampus was sufficient to disrupt memory consolidation for an active place avoidance task (Tsokas et al., 2012). When published, this finding, which is largely consistent with the memory impairments observed with ZIP, will strengthen the conclusion that PKM ζ primarily functions as a memory maintenance molecule. TAT-conjugated proteins, on the other hand, could be used to block PKM ζ by inhibiting the molecule (or its downstream targets) in a manner similar to ZIP. Fusing TAT to a protein or peptide sequence allows the molecule to pass through the cell membrane and access intracellular signaling cascades (Becker-Hapak et al., 2001). To this end, TAT could be fused to peptide sequences that inhibit PKM ζ or its downstream targets and directly infused into a brain region in order to locally inhibit intracellular PKM ζ . Although ZIP already contains a myristoylated N-terminal, which allows it to cross the cell membrane, comparing the results of ZIP to a similar TAT-conjugated peptide sequence would ensure that the effects of ZIP

are not simply due to myristoylation of the N-terminal. Further, TAT-fused peptides designed to block downstream targets of PKM ζ could be used to test the mechanisms of PKM ζ , as well. PKM ζ is known to interact with a number of proteins involved in regulating GluR2 trafficking to the synapse, including NSF, KIBRA, and PICK1 (Buther et al., 2004; Yao et al., 2008; Yoshihama et al., 2009). Inhibiting these downstream molecules, possibly through TAT-fused peptide infusions, could test the proposed mechanisms of PKM ζ activity, as well.

What other molecules might actively maintain established memory? It is clear that mechanisms besides PKM ζ contribute to memory maintenance, as long-term memory is intact in PKM ζ knockout animals (Lee et al., 2013; Volk et al., 2013). There are a few candidate molecules to target in future studies of memory maintenance. First, it would be fruitful to comprehensively determine what kinases besides PKM ζ are inhibited by ZIP infusion. Although ZIP is generally considered to be a PKM ζ inhibitor, the pseudosubstrate sequence mimicked in the peptide is identical in PKM ζ , PKC ζ and the other atypical isoform of PKC, PKC λ/ι (Bosch et al., 2004; Jiang et al., 2006; Ren et al., 2013; Standaert et al., 2001). As PKC λ/ι is found in the brain (Hernandez et al., 2003; Naik et al., 2000; Oster et al., 2004), infusions of ZIP are likely to inhibit its activity in addition to the activity of PKM ζ . Indeed, a recent study demonstrated that while low doses of ZIP (0.5 μ M) selectively inhibit PKM ζ *in vitro*, a slightly higher concentration (2.0 μ M) also disrupts PKC λ/ι activity (Ren et al., 2013). As the standard concentration of ZIP used in behavioral studies is far higher than this (10 μ M), it is likely that a majority of the studies using ZIP to inhibit PKM ζ also inhibited PKC λ/ι . By comparing low, PKM ζ -specific doses of ZIP to slightly higher doses intended to inhibit both PKM ζ and PKC λ/ι , Ren and colleagues (2013) were also able to determine that PKC λ/ι appears to support early LTP expression in hippocampal slices. PKC λ/ι is therefore a key target of ZIP that may support memory maintenance in the absence of PKM ζ . Although it is tempting to conclude that the memory impairments observed following ZIP infusion in a number of the initial studies on PKM ζ are *actually* due to PKC λ/ι inhibition, this is not necessarily the case. First, it is unclear how PKC λ/ι could continuously sustain an established memory, as it lacks a constitutive isoform that could actively maintain synapses in their potentiated state (Volk et al., 2013). Second, PKM ζ overexpression has been demonstrated to enhance memory (Shema et al., 2011), suggesting that PKM ζ indeed plays a role in memory stability. Future studies should directly test whether PKC λ/ι plays a specific role in memory maintenance or expression by blocking the molecule, possibly with siRNA or antisense oligonucleotide, during the maintenance phase of memory. Further, research should focus on clarifying how PKM ζ and PKC λ/ι work in concert to maintain LTP and memory. Finally, it is possible that other kinases are affected by the relatively high doses of ZIP used in behavioral studies; CaMKII, for example, is known to be inhibited by high concentrations of ZIP *in vitro* and may be nonspecifically inhibited by ZIP infusions in a number of the behavioral studies discussed in this review. As ZIP can have nonspecific effects on other molecules, it is unclear whether its effects on memory and LTP maintenance are indeed due to PKM ζ inhibition.

Other mechanisms may be important in maintaining memory, as well. One compelling idea is that epigenetic mechanisms may participate in long-term memory maintenance.

Epigenetics, changes in the chromatin structure that regulate transcriptional access to DNA, can produce long-lasting changes in gene expression that might serve as a mechanism for memory stability. Accordingly, a number of recent studies have focused on the role of epigenetic changes in memory formation and storage (for review, see Barrett and Wood, 2008; Jarome and Lubin, 2013; Zovkic et al., 2013). Changes in methylation have been identified as a possible memory maintenance mechanism, partially because these changes are stable over time. Histone lysine methylation, for example, which can either activate or repress gene expression depending on the number of methyl groups associated with a specific lysine residue, has been shown to be dynamically regulated following context fear conditioning (Gupta et al., 2010; Gupta-Agarwal et al., 2012). Importantly, long-term changes in histone H3 lysine 4 trimethylation (H3K4me3) have been observed following learning; H3K4me3 is significantly decreased in the entorhinal cortex 24h after context fear conditioning (Gupta-Agarwal et al., 2012). At least some epigenetic changes are therefore long-lasting and could play a role in memory maintenance. Additionally, some forms of DNA methylation are self-perpetuating; DNMT1, for example, appears to actively maintain at least some existing methylation patterns (Law and Jacobsen, 2010; Santos et al., 2005; Zovkic et al., 2013). These persistent changes could explain how synaptic potentiation is maintained over long periods of time; epigenetic control of transcription could ensure continuous gene expression to replenish degrading proteins at the synapse. It is currently unclear whether other epigenetic mechanisms, such as histone acetylation and nucleosome remodeling are involved in memory maintenance. As these chromatin modifications appear to regulate the induction of memory (for review, see Barrett and Wood, 2008; Vogel-Ciernia and Wood, 2012) and blocking histone deacetylation promotes the formation and persistence of memory following a weak training event (e.g. Guan et al., 2009; Levenson et al., 2004; McQuown et al., 2011), it is logical to expect some involvement of these epigenetic mechanisms in the maintenance of existing memory. Whether PKM ζ or PKC λ/ι are targeted by these epigenetic mechanisms to promote memory maintenance remains to be determined.

It is also possible that structural changes at the synapse support long-term memory maintenance (Lamprecht and LeDoux, 2004). Research has shown that dynamic actin filament rearrangement appears to underlie the maintenance of LTP in hippocampal slices. Inhibiting actin rearrangement in hippocampal slices with actin assembly inhibitors (cytochalasin D, cytochalasin B, and latrunculin A) can reverse established LTP without affecting basal synaptic transmission (Krucker et al., 2000). Rearrangement of the actin cytoskeleton in dendritic spines might support memory maintenance, as well; changes in spine size have also been associated with fear conditioning (Ostroff et al., 2010). It is likely that these structural changes at the synapse and the increases in PKM ζ observed following LTP are not mutually exclusive processes. Instead, increases in PKM ζ are probably related to the dynamic changes in the cytoskeleton that seem to support long-term LTP and memory maintenance. Indeed, AMPA receptors play an important role in both PKM ζ -related memory maintenance and cytoskeletal changes observed during L-LTP. PKM ζ is known to increase AMPA receptor trafficking to the synapse to actively maintain potentiation (Yao et al., 2008). Work on synapse morphology has similarly shown that blocking AMPA receptors in cultured neurons triggers the removal of mature dendritic spines *in vitro* (McKinney et al., 1999). Together, these studies suggest that increases in PKM ζ and cytoskeletal

rearrangement work in concert to maintain LTP. Following a learning event, the cytoskeleton is rearranged to produce strengthened connections in activated synapses, including changes in AMPA receptor expression at the postsynaptic density. These changes are then actively maintained through the activity of PKM ζ , which works to maintain a sufficient number of AMPA receptors at the postsynaptic density to maintain the facilitated synaptic connection.

Recent work has suggested that ZIP may disrupt the reconsolidation, rather than the maintenance of memory, as Parsons & Davis (2011a) only observed disruptions when the memory was tested within a certain time window after ZIP infusion. This brings up the possibility that ZIP infusions disrupt the reconsolidation process, rather than the maintenance of memory. Memory retrieval is believed to induce a temporary period of lability that allows an existing association to be updated (Finnie and Nader, 2012). From this perspective, following memory retrieval, the synapses storing the engram are destabilized, characterized by a period of deconstruction and protein degradation that makes the synapses malleable (Jarome et al., 2011; Lee, 2008; Lee, 2010; Lee et al., 2008). This is followed by a period of restabilization that re-solidifies the synaptic connections and ultimately stabilizes and stores the updated association. PKM ζ may act during this restabilization phase, helping to resolidify the synaptic connections that support the memory. Indeed, one identified action of PKM ζ is upregulation GluR2-containing AMPA receptors at functional synapses (Migues et al., 2010; Yao et al., 2008). Recent studies have indicated that GluR2-containing AMPA receptors, which are impermeable to calcium, are expressed when memory is in a stable phase and exchanged for calcium permeable AMPA receptors when the memory is in a labile phase (Clem and Hugarir, 2010; Hong et al., 2013). Accordingly, PKM ζ could restabilize memory after retrieval by increasing GluR2 at synapses.

The results of Parsons & Davis (2011a) may represent a failure of the memory to restailize in the absence of sufficient PKM ζ . From this perspective, when the memory is tested, it destabilizes normally, but it may fail to properly restabilize without adequate PKM ζ levels. In order to test whether PKM ζ is a restabilization mechanism, rather than a storage mechanism, two studies are in order. First, research will need to determine the exact length of the window of ZIP's efficacy following infusion. Parsons & Davis (2011b) demonstrated that ZIP disrupted memory when the initial memory test occurred 2 days post-infusion but not when the test was delayed to 10 days after infusion. Thus, at some point between 2 and 10 days, the ZIP infusion is no longer effective. Information about exactly how long this time window lasts will aid in the identification of a function reason for the window's existence. Second, the hypothesis that ZIP is disrupting memory restabilization needs to be empirically tested. This would be a relatively simple test; as memory restabilization mechanisms are only required when the memory is destabilized through the retrieval process, blocking destabilization of the memory trace should prevent any effects of blocking restabilization. If ZIP prevents restabilization, a pre-retrieval infusion that blocks the destabilization process (such as an inhibitor of either NMDA receptors or protein degradation (Ben Mamou et al., 2006; Choi et al., 2010; Jarome et al., 2011)) should prevent ZIP from impairing memory, even when tested shortly after infusion. On the other hand, if ZIP disrupts memory maintenance, destabilization of the memory trace should not be

required for these effects and ZIP should disrupt memory regardless of the pre-retrieval infusion.

Memory maintenance research is currently in an interesting phase. We have begun to identify major players contributing to the long-term stability of memory, but we are also beginning to see that memory maintenance is more complicated than originally described. Whether PKM ζ turns out to be the mechanism that maintains memory or whether it will be identified as a restabilization mechanism, it is clear that our understanding of memory maintenance is currently incomplete and several compelling lines of research have been triggered by this discussion. It will be interesting to follow how our understanding of memory maintenance progresses as these questions are answered.

References

- Allen TA, Narayanan NS, Kholodar-Smith DB, Zhao Y, Laubach M, Brown TH. Imaging the spread of reversible brain inactivations using fluorescent muscimol. *J. Neurosci. Methods*. 2008; 171:30–8. [PubMed: 18377997]
- Anagnostaras SG, Maren S, Fanselow MS. Temporally graded retrograde amnesia of contextual fear after hippocampal damage in rats: within-subjects examination. *J. Neurosci*. 1999; 19:1106–14. [PubMed: 9920672]
- Barrett RM, Wood MA. Beyond transcription factors: the role of chromatin modifying enzymes in regulating transcription required for memory. *Learn. Mem*. 2008; 15:460–7. [PubMed: 18583646]
- Becker-Hapak M, McAllister SS, Dowdy SF. TAT-mediated protein transduction into mammalian cells. *Methods*. 2001; 24:247–56. [PubMed: 11403574]
- Ben Mamou C, Gamache K, Nader K. NMDA receptors are critical for unleashing consolidated auditory fear memories. *Nat. Neurosci*. 2006; 9:1237–9. [PubMed: 16998481]
- Bosch RR, Bazuine M, Span PN, Willems PH, Olthaar AJ, van Rennes H, Maassen JA, Tack CJ, Hermus AR, Sweep CG. Regulation of GLUT1-mediated glucose uptake by PKC λ -PKC β (II) interactions in 3T3-L1 adipocytes. *Biochem. J*. 2004; 384:349–55. [PubMed: 15307820]
- Buther K, Plaas C, Barnekow A, Kremerskothen J. KIBRA is a novel substrate for protein kinase Czeta. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun*. 2004; 317:703–7. [PubMed: 15081397]
- Cao X, Wang H, Mei B, An S, Yin L, Wang LP, Tsien JZ. Inducible and selective erasure of memories in the mouse brain via chemical-genetic manipulation. *Neuron*. 2008; 60:353–66. [PubMed: 18957226]
- Choi JH, Kim JE, Kaang BK. Protein synthesis and degradation are required for the incorporation of modified information into the pre-existing object-location memory. *Molecular brain*. 2010; 3:1. [PubMed: 20205802]
- Clem RL, Huganir RL. Calcium-permeable AMPA receptor dynamics mediate fear memory erasure. *Science*. 2010; 330:1108–12. [PubMed: 21030604]
- Crary JF, Shao CY, Mirra SS, Hernandez AI, Sacktor TC. Atypical protein kinase C in neurodegenerative disease I: PKMzeta aggregates with limbic neurofibrillary tangles and AMPA receptors in Alzheimer disease. *J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol*. 2006; 65:319–26. [PubMed: 16691113]
- Crespo JA, Stockl P, Ueberall F, Jenny M, Saria A, Zernig G. Activation of PKCzeta and PKMzeta in the nucleus accumbens core is necessary for the retrieval, consolidation and reconsolidation of drug memory. *PloS one*. 2012; 7:e30502. [PubMed: 22348011]
- Crick F. Memory and molecular turnover. *Nature*. 1984; 312:101. [PubMed: 6504122]
- Drier EA, Tello MK, Cowan M, Wu P, Blace N, Sacktor TC, Yin JC. Memory enhancement and formation by atypical PKM activity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nat. Neurosci*. 2002; 5:316–24. [PubMed: 11914720]

- Finnie PS, Nader K. The role of metaplasticity mechanisms in regulating memory destabilization and reconsolidation. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 2012; 36:1667–707. [PubMed: 22484475]
- Gamiz F, Gallo M. Intra-amygdala ZIP injections impair the memory of learned active avoidance responses and attenuate conditioned taste-aversion acquisition in rats. *Learn. Mem.* 2011; 18:529–33. [PubMed: 21784922]
- Guan JS, et al. HDAC2 negatively regulates memory formation and synaptic plasticity. *Nature.* 2009; 459:55–60. [PubMed: 19424149]
- Gupta S, Kim SY, Artis S, Molfese DL, Schumacher A, Sweatt JD, Paylor RE, Lubin FD. Histone methylation regulates memory formation. *J. Neurosci.* 2010; 30:3589–99. [PubMed: 20219993]
- Gupta-Agarwal S, Franklin AV, Deramus T, Wheelock M, Davis RL, McMahon LL, Lubin FD. G9a/GLP histone lysine dimethyltransferase complex activity in the hippocampus and the entorhinal cortex is required for gene activation and silencing during memory consolidation. *J. Neurosci.* 2012; 32:5440–53. [PubMed: 22514307]
- Hardt O, Migues PV, Hastings M, Wong J, Nader K. PKMzeta maintains 1-day- and 6-day-old long-term object location but not object identity memory in dorsal hippocampus. *Hippocampus.* 2010; 20:691–5. [PubMed: 19806657]
- Hernandez AI, Blace N, Crary JF, Serrano PA, Leitges M, Libien JM, Weinstein G, Tcherapanov A, Sacktor TC. Protein kinase M zeta synthesis from a brain mRNA encoding an independent protein kinase C zeta catalytic domain. Implications for the molecular mechanism of memory. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2003; 278:40305–16. [PubMed: 12857744]
- Hong I, Kim J, Kim J, Lee S, Ko HG, Nader K, Kaang BK, Tsien RW, Choi S. AMPA receptor exchange underlies transient memory destabilization on retrieval. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2013; 110:8218–23. [PubMed: 23630279]
- Inoue M, Kishimoto A, Takai Y, Nishizuka Y. Studies on a cyclic nucleotide-independent protein kinase and its proenzyme in mammalian tissues. II. Proenzyme and its activation by calcium-dependent protease from rat brain. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1977; 252:7610–6. [PubMed: 199594]
- Jarome TJ, Werner CT, Kwapis JL, Helmstetter FJ. Activity dependent protein degradation is critical for the formation and stability of fear memory in the amygdala. *PLoS one.* 2011; 6:e24349. [PubMed: 21961035]
- Jarome TJ, Lubin FD. Histone lysine methylation: critical regulator of memory and behavior. *Rev. Neurosci.* 2013; 1–13. [PubMed: 23152400]
- Jiang J, Suppiramaniam V, Wooten MW. Posttranslational modifications and receptor-associated proteins in AMPA receptor trafficking and synaptic plasticity. *Neuro-Signals.* 2006; 15:266–82. [PubMed: 17622793]
- Kelly MT, Crary JF, Sacktor TC. Regulation of protein kinase Mzeta synthesis by multiple kinases in long-term potentiation. *J. Neurosci.* 2007; 27:3439–44. [PubMed: 17392460]
- Kim JJ, Fanselow MS. Modality-specific retrograde amnesia of fear. *Science.* 1992; 256:675–7. [PubMed: 1585183]
- Krucker T, Siggins GR, Halpain S. Dynamic actin filaments are required for stable long-term potentiation (LTP) in area CA1 of the hippocampus. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2000; 97:6856–61. [PubMed: 10823894]
- Kwapis JL, Jarome TJ, Lonergan ME, Helmstetter FJ. Protein kinase Mzeta maintains fear memory in the amygdala but not in the hippocampus. *Behav. Neurosci.* 2009; 123:844–50. [PubMed: 19634944]
- Kwapis JL, Jarome TJ, Gilmartin MR, Helmstetter FJ. Intra-amygdala infusion of the protein kinase Mzeta inhibitor ZIP disrupts foreground context fear memory. *Neurobiol. Learn. Mem.* 2012; 98:148–53. [PubMed: 22659643]
- Lamprecht R, LeDoux J. Structural plasticity and memory. *Nature reviews. Neuroscience.* 2004; 5:45–54. [PubMed: 14708003]
- Law JA, Jacobsen SE. Establishing, maintaining and modifying DNA methylation patterns in plants and animals. *Nature reviews. Genetics.* 2010; 11:204–20. [PubMed: 20142834]
- Lee AM, Kanter BR, Wang D, Lim JP, Zou ME, Qiu C, McMahon T, Dadgar J, Fischbach-Weiss SC, Messing RO. Prkcz null mice show normal learning and memory. *Nature.* 2013; 493:416–9. [PubMed: 23283171]

- Lee JL. Memory reconsolidation mediates the strengthening of memories by additional learning. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2008; 11:1264–6. [PubMed: 18849987]
- Lee JL. Memory reconsolidation mediates the updating of hippocampal memory content. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience.* 2010; 4:168. [PubMed: 21120142]
- Lee SH, Choi JH, Lee N, Lee HR, Kim JI, Yu NK, Choi SL, Lee SH, Kim H, Kaang BK. Synaptic protein degradation underlies destabilization of retrieved fear memory. *Science.* 2008; 319:1253–6. [PubMed: 18258863]
- Levenson JM, O’Riordan KJ, Brown KD, Trinh MA, Molfese DL, Sweatt JD. Regulation of histone acetylation during memory formation in the hippocampus. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2004; 279:40545–59. [PubMed: 15273246]
- Ling DS, Benardo LS, Serrano PA, Blace N, Kelly MT, Crary JF, Sacktor TC. Protein kinase Mzeta is necessary and sufficient for LTP maintenance. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2002; 5:295–6. [PubMed: 11914719]
- Lisman J. Memory erasure by very high concentrations of ZIP may not be due to PKM-zeta. *Hippocampus.* 2012; 22:648–9. [PubMed: 21956821]
- Madronal N, Gruart A, Sacktor TC, Delgado-Garcia JM. PKMzeta inhibition reverses learning-induced increases in hippocampal synaptic strength and memory during trace eyeblink conditioning. *PloS one.* 2010; 5:e10400. [PubMed: 20454458]
- Matus-Amat P, Higgins EA, Barrientos RM, Rudy JW. The role of the dorsal hippocampus in the acquisition and retrieval of context memory representations. *J. Neurosci.* 2004; 24:2431–9. [PubMed: 15014118]
- McKinney RA, Capogna M, Durr R, Gahwiler BH, Thompson SM. Miniature synaptic events maintain dendritic spines via AMPA receptor activation. *Nat. Neurosci.* 1999; 2:44–9. [PubMed: 10195179]
- McQuown SC, et al. HDAC3 is a critical negative regulator of long-term memory formation. *J. Neurosci.* 2011; 31:764–74. [PubMed: 21228185]
- Migues PV, Hardt O, Wu DC, Gamache K, Sacktor TC, Wang YT, Nader K. PKMzeta maintains memories by regulating GluR2-dependent AMPA receptor trafficking. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2010; 13:630–4. [PubMed: 20383136]
- Muslimov IA, Nimmrich V, Hernandez AI, Tcherepanov A, Sacktor TC, Tiedge H. Dendritic transport and localization of protein kinase Mzeta mRNA: implications for molecular memory consolidation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2004; 279:52613–22. [PubMed: 15371429]
- Nader K. On the Temporary Nature of Disruption of Fear-Potentiated Startle Following PKMzeta Inhibition in the Amygdala. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience.* 2011; 5:29. [PubMed: 21734872]
- Naik MU, Benedikz E, Hernandez I, Libien J, Hrabe J, Valsamis M, Dow-Edwards D, Osman M, Sacktor TC. Distribution of protein kinase Mzeta and the complete protein kinase C isoform family in rat brain. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 2000; 426:243–58. [PubMed: 10982466]
- Newton AC. Regulation of the ABC kinases by phosphorylation: protein kinase C as a paradigm. *Biochem. J.* 2003; 370:361–71. [PubMed: 12495431]
- Nishimune A, Isaac JT, Molnar E, Noel J, Nash SR, Tagaya M, Collingridge GL, Nakanishi S, Henley JM. NSF binding to GluR2 regulates synaptic transmission. *Neuron.* 1998; 21:87–97. [PubMed: 9697854]
- Nishizuka Y. The molecular heterogeneity of protein kinase C and its implications for cellular regulation. *Nature.* 1988; 334:661–5. [PubMed: 3045562]
- Osten P, et al. The AMPA receptor GluR2 C terminus can mediate a reversible, ATP-dependent interaction with NSF and alpha- and beta-SNAPs. *Neuron.* 1998; 21:99–110. [PubMed: 9697855]
- Oster H, Eichele G, Leitges M. Differential expression of atypical PKCs in the adult mouse brain. *Brain Res. Mol. Brain Res.* 2004; 127:79–88. [PubMed: 15306123]
- Ostroff LE, Cain CK, Bedont J, Monfils MH, Ledoux JE. Fear and safety learning differentially affect synapse size and dendritic translation in the lateral amygdala. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2010; 107:9418–23. [PubMed: 20439732]
- Parsons RG, Gafford GM, Baruch DE, Riedner BA, Helmstetter FJ. Long-term stability of fear memory depends on the synthesis of protein but not mRNA in the amygdala. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 2006; 23:1853–9. [PubMed: 16623842]

- Parsons RG, Davis M. Temporary disruption of fear-potentiated startle following PKMzeta inhibition in the amygdala. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2011a; 14:295–6. [PubMed: 21258326]
- Parsons RG, Davis M. Gone but not Forgotten. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience.* 2011b; 5:51. [PubMed: 21887139]
- Pastalkova E, Serrano P, Pinkhasova D, Wallace E, Fenton AA, Sacktor TC. Storage of spatial information by the maintenance mechanism of LTP. *Science.* 2006; 313:1141–4. [PubMed: 16931766]
- Rao-Ruiz P, Rotaru DC, van der Loo RJ, Mansvelder HD, Stiedl O, Smit AB, Spijker S. Retrieval-specific endocytosis of GluA2-AMPA receptors underlies adaptive reconsolidation of contextual fear. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2011; 14:1302–8. [PubMed: 21909089]
- Ren SQ, Yan JZ, Zhang XY, Bu YF, Pan WW, Yao W, Tian T, Lu W. PKC λ is critical in AMPA receptor phosphorylation and synaptic incorporation during LTP. *EMBO J.* 2013; 32:1365–80. [PubMed: 23511975]
- Rudy JW, O'Reilly RC. Contextual fear conditioning, conjunctive representations, pattern completion, and the hippocampus. *Behav. Neurosci.* 1999; 113:867–80. [PubMed: 10571471]
- Sacktor TC, Osten P, Valsamis H, Jiang X, Naik MU, Sublette E. Persistent activation of the zeta isoform of protein kinase C in the maintenance of long-term potentiation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1993; 90:8342–6. [PubMed: 8378304]
- Sacktor TC. PKMzeta, LTP maintenance, and the dynamic molecular biology of memory storage. *Prog. Brain Res.* 2008; 169:27–40. [PubMed: 18394466]
- Sacktor TC. How does PKMzeta maintain long-term memory? *Nature reviews. Neuroscience.* 2011; 12:9–15. [PubMed: 21119699]
- Sacktor TC. Memory maintenance by PKMzeta—an evolutionary perspective. *Molecular brain.* 2012; 5:31. [PubMed: 22986281]
- Sajikumar S, Navakkode S, Sacktor TC, Frey JU. Synaptic tagging and cross-tagging: the role of protein kinase Mzeta in maintaining long-term potentiation but not long-term depression. *J. Neurosci.* 2005; 25:5750–6. [PubMed: 15958741]
- Sanhueza M, Lisman J. The CaMKII/NMDAR complex as a molecular memory. *Molecular brain.* 2013; 6:10. [PubMed: 23410178]
- Santos KF, Mazzola TN, Carvalho HF. The prima donna of epigenetics: the regulation of gene expression by DNA methylation. *Braz. J. Med. Biol. Res.* 2005; 38:1531–41. [PubMed: 16172746]
- Schwartz JH, Greenberg SM. Molecular mechanisms for memory: second-messenger induced modifications of protein kinases in nerve cells. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 1987; 10:459–76. [PubMed: 3551762]
- Schwartz JH. Cognitive kinases. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1993; 90:8310–3. [PubMed: 8104334]
- Serrano P, Yao Y, Sacktor TC. Persistent phosphorylation by protein kinase Mzeta maintains late-phase long-term potentiation. *J. Neurosci.* 2005; 25:1979–84. [PubMed: 15728837]
- Serrano P, et al. PKMzeta maintains spatial, instrumental, and classically conditioned long-term memories. *PLoS Biol.* 2008; 6:2698–706. [PubMed: 19108606]
- Shema R, Sacktor TC, Dudai Y. Rapid erasure of long-term memory associations in the cortex by an inhibitor of PKM zeta. *Science.* 2007; 317:951–3. [PubMed: 17702943]
- Shema R, Hazvi S, Sacktor TC, Dudai Y. Boundary conditions for the maintenance of memory by PKMzeta in neocortex. *Learn. Mem.* 2009; 16:122–8. [PubMed: 19181618]
- Shema R, Haramati S, Ron S, Hazvi S, Chen A, Sacktor TC, Dudai Y. Enhancement of consolidated long-term memory by overexpression of protein kinase Mzeta in the neocortex. *Science.* 2011; 331:1207–10. [PubMed: 21385716]
- Shi S, Hayashi Y, Esteban JA, Malinow R. Subunit-specific rules governing AMPA receptor trafficking to synapses in hippocampal pyramidal neurons. *Cell.* 2001; 105:331–43. [PubMed: 11348590]
- Song I, Kamboj S, Xia J, Dong H, Liao D, Huganir RL. Interaction of the N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor with AMPA receptors. *Neuron.* 1998; 21:393–400. [PubMed: 9728920]

- Sossin WS. Isoform specificity of protein kinase Cs in synaptic plasticity. *Learn. Mem.* 2007; 14:236–46. [PubMed: 17404386]
- Standaert ML, Bandyopadhyay G, Kanoh Y, Sajan MP, Farese RV. Insulin and PIP3 activate PKC-zeta by mechanisms that are both dependent and independent of phosphorylation of activation loop (T410) and autophosphorylation (T560) sites. *Biochemistry (Mosc.)*. 2001; 40:249–55.
- Sutton MA, Carew TJ. Parallel molecular pathways mediate expression of distinct forms of intermediate-term facilitation at tail sensory-motor synapses in *Aplysia*. *Neuron*. 2000; 26:219–31. [PubMed: 10798406]
- Takai Y, Kishimoto A, Inoue M, Nishizuka Y. Studies on a cyclic nucleotide-independent protein kinase and its proenzyme in mammalian tissues. I. Purification and characterization of an active enzyme from bovine cerebellum. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1977; 252:7603–9. [PubMed: 199593]
- Tsokas, P.; Hsieh, C.; Wallace, ECJ.; Cottrell, JE.; Fenton, AA.; Messing, RO.; Sacktor, TC. Conditional knockout of the PKC/PKM(zeta) gene in the adult mouse hippocampus prevents L-LTP; Poster presented at the Society for Neuroscience Annual Meeting; New Orleans, LA. 2012;
- Vogel-Ciernia A, Wood MA. Molecular brake pad hypothesis: pulling off the brakes for emotional memory. *Rev. Neurosci.* 2012; 23:607–26. [PubMed: 23096102]
- Volk LJ, Bachman JL, Johnson R, Yu Y, Huganir RL. PKM-zeta is not required for hippocampal synaptic plasticity, learning and memory. *Nature*. 2013; 493:420–3. [PubMed: 23283174]
- Westmark PR, Westmark CJ, Wang S, Levenson J, O’Riordan KJ, Burger C, Malter JS. Pin1 and PKMzeta sequentially control dendritic protein synthesis. *Sci Signal*. 2010; 3:ra18. [PubMed: 20215645]
- Wu-Zhang AX, Schramm CL, Nabavi S, Malinow R, Newton AC. Cellular pharmacology of protein kinase Mzeta (PKMzeta) contrasts with its in vitro profile: implications for PKMzeta as a mediator of memory. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2012; 287:12879–85. [PubMed: 22378786]
- Yao Y, Kelly MT, Sajikumar S, Serrano P, Tian D, Bergold PJ, Frey JU, Sacktor TC. PKM zeta maintains late long-term potentiation by N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor/GluR2-dependent trafficking of postsynaptic AMPA receptors. *J. Neurosci.* 2008; 28:7820–7. [PubMed: 18667614]
- Yao Y, Shao C, Jothianandan D, Tcherepanov A, Shouval H, Sacktor TC. Matching biochemical and functional efficacies confirm ZIP as a potent competitive inhibitor of PKMzeta in neurons. *Neuropharmacology*. 2013; 64:37–44. [PubMed: 22846225]
- Yoshihama Y, Hirai T, Ohtsuka T, Chida K. KIBRA Co-localizes with protein kinase Mzeta (PKMzeta) in the mouse hippocampus. *Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem.* 2009; 73:147–51. [PubMed: 19129633]
- Zovkic IB, Guzman-Karlsson MC, Sweatt JD. Epigenetic regulation of memory formation and maintenance. *Learn. Mem.* 2013; 20:61–74. [PubMed: 23322554]

Table 1
Studies showing positive effects of manipulating PKM ζ during memory maintenance

Structure	Task	Animal	Inhibitor	Controls	Drug Timing	Test Timing	Effect	Reference
Global	OA	Drosophila	Chelerythrine or DN (transgenic)	Veh, wt	Before ACQ	24h post-ACQ	Memory impaired	Drier <i>et al.</i> 2002
	OA	Drosophila	Enhanced PKM ζ (transgenic)	Wt, no hs	30m or 1 h post-ACQ	24h after hs	Memory enhanced	Drier <i>et al.</i> 2002
	Sensitization	Aplysia	ZIP or chelerythrine	Veh, scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	1d post-INJ	Memory impaired	Cai <i>et al.</i> (2011)
AMY	AA	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	7d post-INJ	Memory impaired	Gamiz & Gallo, 2011
	Auditory FC	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	2h or 24h post-INJ	Memory impaired (cued and context fear); Rescued by GluR2 _{3Y} treatment	Serrano <i>et al.</i> 2008; Kwapis <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Migues <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	Context FC	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d or 7d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Kwapis <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	IA	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1 d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Serrano <i>et al.</i> , 2008
	CPP ^M	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1 d post-test 1	1d post-INJ	Memory impaired	He <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	CPA ^M	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1 d post-test 1	1d post-INJ	Memory impaired	He <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	FPS	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1d or 7d post-ACQ	2h, 2d, 10d, or 15d post-INJ	Memory impaired when tested at 2h or 2d post-INJ; no impairment when test delayed (see Table 2)	Parsons & Davis, 2011
	APA	Rat	ZIP, chelerythrine	Veh, scrZIP	1 d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Pastakova <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Serrano <i>et al.</i> , 2008
	WC ^D	Rat	ZIP	Veh	15d after diazepam	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Monti <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	MWM	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1 d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Serrano <i>et al.</i> , 2008
DL	OLM	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1, 6, or 34d post-ACQ	1d post-INJ	Memory impaired; rescued by GluR2 _{3Y} treatment	Hardt <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Migues <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	RAM	Rat	ZIP	Veh, scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Serrano <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	TEC	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	2h post-INJ	Memory impaired	Madronal <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	IB:	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	2d post-INJ	Memory for habit-based responding impaired	Pauli <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	Habit							
Striatum	IB:	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d post-ACQ	2d post-INJ	Memory for contingency impaired	Pauli <i>et al.</i> 2012
Striatum	Contingency							

Structure	Task	Animal	Inhibitor	Controls	Drug Timing	Test Timing	Effect	Reference
NAcc core	Cpp ^{C.M.FF}	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d post-ACQ	1, 3, 7, or 14d post-INJ	Memory impaired	Shabashov <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Li <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	AMPH LS	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d post-ACQ	30m post-INJ	Memory Impaired	Song <i>et al.</i> , 2013
	Nacc shell cyp ^C	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d post-ACQ	3d post-INJ	Memory weakened; normal at test 1, extinguished rapidly	Shabashov <i>et al.</i> , 2012
pPIR	Olfactory FC	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d or 1 month	2d post-INJ	Remote memory impaired	Sacco & Sacchetti (2010)
2° AC	Auditory FC	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d or 1 month	2d post-INJ	Remote memory impaired	Sacco & Sacchetti (2010)
2° OC	Visual FC	Rat	ZIP	scrZIP	1d or 1 month	2d post-inj	Remote memory impaired	Sacco & Sacchetti (2010)
SMC	Sensorimotor reaching	Rat	ZIP	Veh	Immediately post-test	4d post-inj	Memory impaired	Von Kraus <i>et al.</i> (2010)
IC	CTA	Rat	ZIP or DN (viral)	Veh, scrZIP, Control Vector	3d, 1 month, or 3 months post-ACQ	2d, 7d, or 1 month post-INJ	Memory impaired	Shema <i>et al.</i> (2007; 2009; 2011)
	CTA	Rat	Enhanced PKM ζ (viral OE)	Control vector	5d pre-ACQ or 5d post-ACQ	2d post-test or 7d post-INJ of virus	Memory enhanced	Shema <i>et al.</i> (2011)
IL mPFC	Cpp ^M EXT	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d post-test 1	1d post-INJ	EXT memory impaired	He <i>et al.</i> (2011)
	CPA ^N EXT	Rat	ZIP	Veh	1d post-test 1	1d post-INJ	EXT memory impaired	He <i>et al.</i> (2011)

AMY: amygdala; DH: Dorsal Hippocampus; DL: dorsolateral; DM: dorsomedial; NAcc: Nucleus accumbens; pPIR: posterior piriform cortex; 2° AC: secondary auditory cortex; 2° OC: secondary occipital cortex; SMC: sensorimotor cortex; IC: insular cortex; IL mPFC: infralimbic medial prefrontal cortex

OA: odor avoidance; AA: active avoidance; FC: fear conditioning; IA: inhibitory avoidance; CPP: conditioned place preference; CPA: conditioned place aversion; M: morphine; C: cocaine; FF: high-fat food; FPS: fear-potentiated startle; APA: active place avoidance; WC^D: context-mediated diazepam withdrawal; MWM: Morris water maze; OLM: object location memory; RAM: radial arm maze; TEC: trace eyeblink conditioning; IB: instrumental behavior; AMPH LS: amphetamine-induced locomotor sensitization

ZIP: zeta-pseudosubstrate inhibitory peptide; scrZIP: scrambled ZIP; Veh: vehicle; DN: dominant-negative PKM ζ OE: Overexpression

Table 2
Studies indicating PKM ζ may not maintain all memories throughout the brain

Structure	Task	Animal	Inhibitor	Problem	Explanation	Reference
DH	Context FC	Rat	ZIP	Context fear memory not impaired by ZIP	DH not required for context fear memory storage OR PKM ζ only maintains precise information (not background/procedural information)	Serrano <i>et al.</i> (2008); Kwapis <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Object recognition	Rat	ZIP	Object recognition memory not impaired by ZIP	The hippocampus may not store memory for object identity	Hardt <i>et al.</i> (2010)
	Cocaine CPP	Rat	ZIP	Memory for cocaine context intact despite ZIP infusion	Similar to context fear conditioning findings; context memory may not be maintained in DH	Shabashov <i>et al.</i> (2012)
NAcc core	Withdrawal CPA ^M	Rat	ZIP	Memory for withdrawal context intact despite ZIP	Aversive context memory may not be maintained in NAcc.	Li <i>et al.</i> (2011)
NAcc shell	CPP ^M	Rat	ZIP	Memory for morphine-paired context intact despite ZIP	Cocaine-paired context memory may not be maintained in DH. Memory may be weakened by ZIP but not detected on Test 1 (see Shabashov <i>et al.</i> , 2012).	Li <i>et al.</i> (2011)
BLA	FPS	Rat	ZIP	Memory permanently impaired if test came 2h or 2d post-INJ. No impairment observed if initial test given 10 or 15d post-INJ	ZIP-induced impairments may require retrieval of the memory within a certain time window post-INJ. See text for in-depth discussion.	Parsons & Davis, 2011
Global	Trace FC; MWM	Mouse	PKC ζ KO; cKO	Neither memory not impaired by global knockout of PKC ζ /PKM ζ	PKM ζ may not be necessary for memory maintenance; possible compensatory maintenance effects activated by PKM ζ KO before training. See text for in-depth discussion.	Volk <i>et al.</i> (2013)
	Auditory FC, object recognition, object location, and CPP ^c	Mouse	PKC ζ KO	Memory intact for all paradigms tested despite PKM ζ knockout. ZIP impaired CPP ^c memory in PKM ζ knockout animals.	See above. PKM ζ may not be necessary for memory maintenance; possible compensation due to pre-training knockout of PKM ζ . ZIP may be inhibiting other molecules, as it is effective in PKM ζ knockout mouse.	