

ConFER: A Neurally Constrained Computational Model of Context-Dependent Fear Extinction Recall and Relapse

Shreya K. Rajagopal¹, Thad A. Polk¹
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Abstract:

Exposure therapy, a standard treatment for anxiety disorders, relies on fear extinction. However, extinction recall is often limited to the spatial and temporal context in which it is learned leading to fear relapse in novel contexts or after delays. While animal studies provide valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying extinction recall, their invasive nature limits direct applicability to human research. Computational models that incorporate findings from animal research and generate testable hypotheses for human studies can bridge this gap. Current models, however, often focus either on detailed neuron-level activity, limiting their scope, or simulate behavior by abstracting away from neural mechanisms. Moreover, they tend not to disentangle the distinct roles of cue and context information in fear extinction and recall.

To address these limitations, we present the Context-Dependent Fear Extinction Recall Model (ConFER), a systems-level, neurally constrained model of fear extinction and recall, and fear relapse. ConFER integrates findings from the neural fear circuit, including distinct pathways for processing cue and context information and valence-based stimulus-responsive regions in the basolateral amygdala (BLA) that encode extinction and fear memories. These pathways independently activate positive and/or negative BLA representations based on learned associations, which compete to produce the final fear response. ConFER simulates fear renewal across various contexts and spontaneous recovery after delays, while also generating novel, testable predictions. Notably, it predicts that counterconditioning may confer greater resilience than extinction in preventing relapse in new contexts or after delays. By providing a mechanistic view of the relapse of fear, ConFER offers potential insights to enhance clinical interventions by improving exposure therapy outcomes.

Introduction:

When a neutral stimulus, such as a blinking light, is repeatedly paired with a fear-evoking unconditioned stimulus (US), such as a footshock, animals develop a conditioned fear response to the previously neutral stimulus—a process known as fear acquisition. When the conditioned stimulus (CS) is then repeatedly presented without the US, the fear response fades in a process called extinction. Exposure therapy, a widely used treatment for anxiety disorders, relies on fear extinction, but often yields mixed results^{1,2}, likely because extinction recall is highly context-dependent. In particular, extinction recall is often restricted to the specific spatial and temporal context where extinction occurred, causing fear to return in different contexts or after a long delay in the same context. Extensive neuroscientific research on fear extinction in animals offers valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying the relapse of fear post-therapy, but translating these findings to humans remains challenging due to the invasive nature of these experiments. Neuroscientifically constrained computational models of fear conditioning phenomena that integrate key findings from the animal literature could help bridge this gap. Such models could not only replicate well-understood fear-conditioning phenomena but also provide novel hypotheses about the mechanisms underlying contextual extinction recall, which could inform clinical interventions.

Existing models of fear conditioning tend to adopt either a bottom-up or a top-down approach. A bottom-up approach models fear at the neuronal level, resulting in highly focused models that simulate the neuronal mechanisms underlying a specific set of experiments at the individual neuron level³⁻⁵. A top-down approach, on the other hand, reproduces a larger range of behavioral phenomena but at the cost of abstracting away from the details of the underlying neuroscientific mechanisms⁶⁻⁹. While each of these classes of models serves distinct and meaningful objectives, a middle-ground approach that leverages the advantages of both approaches holds promise for a unique set of insights.

Crucially, many models also overlook the role of context in fear extinction and its subsequent relapse. For bottom-up models, incorporating context processing might involve adding a simulation of hippocampal processing since the hippocampus is crucially involved in encoding and processing contexts¹⁰. However, owing to the complexity of simulating individual neuron activity in these models, they are typically limited to a single brain region such as the lateral amygdala, which encodes fear associations^{3,4}. Even when multiple regions are included, the hippocampus is often excluded to avoid increasing complexity⁵. Top-down models, on the other hand, have more abstract learning rules that tend to treat extinction as the weakening of the CS-US association without separating cue and context information. For example, deterministic models like the Rescorla-Wagner and temporal difference models fail to account for the context-specific nature of extinction and treat it as context-independent unlearning^{8,9}. In contrast, some probabilistic models of associative learning, like the latent cause theory model, approach extinction learning as a context-dependent phenomenon by attributing distinct latent causes to fear acquisition and extinction^{6,7}.




Figure 1: (a) A simplified schematic of the circuit of fear in the brain. Cue information travels directly to the basolateral amygdala (BLA), activating either the fear or extinction engram based on cue associations. Context information travels to the hippocampus and then to the BLA via the Infralimbic Cortex to suppress fear or the Prelimbic cortex to activate fear. There is competition between the fear and extinction engrams in the BLA, following which the central amygdala (CeA) has downstream projections to initiate the appropriate behavioral response (b) Computational model architecture. Context and cue inputs are connected to stored engrams in the positive (green) and negative (red) stimulus-responsive BLA populations. Purple circles indicate engrams stored in each BLA population, with the filled yellow engram indicating activation. The yellow square indicates a selection of a random subset of BLA-positive neurons to form an extinction engram. The scaled sum of activations of each BLA population is used to determine the final fear level, which is computed as a tanh function.

To address these gaps, we introduce the Context-Dependent Fear Extinction Recall Model (ConFER) – a novel computational model that is constrained by the known neural circuitry, but that also captures many of the major behavioral phenomena associated with fear processing, including the context-based return of fear. The model architecture is described in Figure 1. ConFER consists of a cue input analogous to sensory cortices, a context input analogous to the hippocampus CA1 region, and a basolateral amygdala (BLA) module representing emotional associations^{11,12}. Importantly, the BLA module incorporates distinct populations of neurons responding to positive and negative rewards¹³. ConFER computes the final fear response as a competition between activations in these positive and negative BLA populations. Crucially, fear extinction has been shown to form a distinct extinction memory engram in the positive reward-responsive BLA, which points to such a competitive process¹⁴. ConFER also has distinct pathways for cue and context processing as seen in the brain¹⁵, allowing it to simulate context-dependent return of fear phenomena. These distinct pathways also allow for differential learning and forgetting rates in cue-emotion and context-emotion pairings, enabling a deeper understanding of how emotional associations change across context combinations.

In this paper, we introduce the architecture and mechanisms of this neurally constrained systems-level model. We demonstrate that it can simulate fear acquisition and extinction learning across multiple experiment trials. We then simulate two key return-of-fear effects: fear renewal, where fear returns in contexts other than the extinction context, and spontaneous recovery, where fear re-emerges after a delay in the extinction context. We compare the predictions derived from the simulations to empirical findings from animal experiments. Additionally, we compare the effectiveness of fear extinction (CS presented without the US) to counterconditioning (CS presented paired with a positive reward) across various context combinations in order to derive a novel empirically testable prediction. Finally, we discuss ConFER's contributions, limitations, and future research directions.

Results:

The following experimental simulations sampled cues (CSs) and contexts from predefined sets of five 3-dimensional cue vectors and five 3-dimensional context vectors, respectively. Fear-inducing stimuli – representing painful shocks, puffs of air to the face, foul odor, etc. – and positive-reward stimuli (USs) – juice, sugar, etc. – were selected from predefined sets of four 4-dimensional negative and positive US vectors. The memory engrams corresponding to these USs are represented by the purple circles encompassing 4 neurons each in the negative and positive BLA respectively in Figure 1. Each negative US activated a predefined set of 4 neurons within a pool of 16 negative BLA neurons, while each positive US activated a predefined set of 4 neurons within a pool of 16 positive BLA neurons. The filled yellow circle in the negative BLA depicts an active fear-inducing stimulus in Figure 1. The indexing in the results corresponds to the index of the selected CS, US, and context. In the results, CSs and USs are numbered from 1 to 5 respectively, and the contexts are labeled from A to E. These cue and context inputs were chosen randomly to represent different phenomena, ensuring that the results were not influenced by specific input selection.

We assigned different learning and decay rates to the cue-BLA and context-BLA pathways to reflect the differing speeds at which emotional associations form and fade in cues and contexts during a cued fear conditioning paradigm. In ConFER, cue-BLA associations strengthen more quickly than context-BLA associations and do not decay over time. In contrast, context-BLA associations weaken exponentially as time passes. Further details are provided in the Methods.

R1. Simulating Fear Acquisition and Extinction across Experimental Trials




Figure 2: **Fear Acquisition and Extinction Learning Curves** (a and b) Model predictions for fear acquisition learning across trials (*in blue*) and extinction learning across trials (*in orange*). (a) Acquisition and Extinction take place in the same context (b) Extinction takes place in a different context (c) Acquisition (Cond.) and Extinction curves from the Quirk (2002) fear conditioning study in rats.

Fear Acquisition

We paired a neutral cue (CS-1) with a shock (negative US-1) across 16 experimental trials in the acquisition context (Context A). ConFER's predicted fear level for each trial is shown in the blue curves in Figures 2a and 2b. We observed that fear acquisition followed an increasing, concave-down trajectory, indicating that the animal rapidly acquired a fear response during the initial trials, with the rate of acquisition slowing as it approached the maximum level of fear. This pattern mirrors findings from studies on fear acquisition in rats, such as the Quirk (2002) study on fear learning, extinction, and spontaneous recovery¹⁶ (Figure 2c).

For this experiment, both CS-1 and Context A were assumed to have no prior emotional associations with the positive or negative BLA populations, as the animal encountered both for the first time. Consequently, the initial connection strengths between CS-1 and negative US-1, as well as between Context A and negative US-1, were set to zero. With each shock trial, the connection weights between CS-1 and negative US-1 and between Context A and negative US-1 were incremented, with cue weights increasing more substantially than context weights.

Since neither CS-1 nor Context A had preexisting positive BLA connections, the positive BLA was not activated during fear acquisition. Negative BLA activation led to a consistent fear response across trials.

Computing the final fear response using a tanh function of the net BLA activation resulted in the observed concave-down learning curve. This approach reflects the animal's initial surprise at the sudden pairing of a neutral cue and context with a negative US, followed by slower learning as the animal begins to anticipate the association.

Fear Extinction

We simulated fear extinction in two contexts: the acquisition context (Context A) and a novel context (Context B). While the extinction learning curves were similar in both contexts, the initial level of fear was higher in the acquisition context, requiring more extinction trials to fully extinguish the fear response compared to the novel context. Notably, across both contexts, extinguishing the fear response required more trials than acquiring it.

Fear Extinction in the Acquisition Context

Following fear acquisition, we presented ConFER with the fear-conditioned stimulus (CS-1) in the original acquisition context (Context A), but without pairing it with a shock. We provided 41 extinction trials and found that ConFER required 36 trials to fully extinguish the fear response (Figure 2a). The resulting extinction curve followed a decreasing, concave-down trajectory, indicating slower extinction learning in the initial trials, with more rapid learning as the fear response approached its minimum. This pattern is consistent with the extinction curves observed in Quirk (2002)¹⁶ (Figure 2c).

When a cue is presented in the absence of a US, existing learned associations between the cue-context pair and the basolateral amygdala (BLA) automatically activate the corresponding positive and/or negative engrams in the BLA. The final fear level is then computed as the tanh output of the net BLA activation, reflecting the competition between active positive and negative engram populations. In this experiment, CS-1 and Context A had pre-existing negative associations from prior pairing with negative US-1. Because the experiment was conducted immediately after acquisition, the context-emotion associations had not yet decayed.

Since CS-1 and Context A had negative associations but no US was present, the extinction engram associated with CS1 would need to be activated. Since this was the first extinction trial for CS-1, ConFER created a new extinction engram by recruiting 4 random neurons from a pool of 16 positive BLA neurons. With each extinction trial, the connection strength between the context and this extinction engram increased, while the connection weight between the cue and the extinction engram remained unchanged. ConFER posits that extinction operates through the context pathway, neutralizing the existing cue association rather than reversing it.

Extinction continued until the net positive BLA activation from the extinction engram matched the net negative BLA activation from the learned fear association via both the cue and context pathways. After trial 36, when this balance was achieved, the fear response remained at zero for the remaining trials. Additionally, the extinction engram formed for CS-1 would be reactivated if CS-1 required re-extinction in future experiments.

The reason fear extinction requires significantly more trials than fear acquisition lies in ConFER's reliance on the context pathway during extinction. Fear acquisition utilizes both the rapid CS–negative US pathway and the slower Context–negative US pathway to gradually build a fear response. In contrast, extinction relies solely on the slower Context–positive US pathway, meaning more trials are needed to generate sufficient positive BLA activation to neutralize the existing negative BLA activation.

Fear Extinction in a Novel Context

The extinction process in the novel context (Context-B) followed the same mechanisms as in the acquisition context. However, Context-B was assumed to be neutral, with no pre-existing emotional associations. This resulted in a lower initial fear level at the start of extinction compared to Context A. In Context A, the fear response was driven by the combined negative BLA activations from both the CS1–negative US-1 and Context A–negative US-1 connections. In contrast, in Context-B, only the CS1-negative US-1 connection contributed to the fear response. Consequently, fewer trials were needed to fully extinguish the fear response. Although ConFER was provided with 26 extinction trials, it required only 21 trials to achieve complete fear extinction. The extinction learning curve associated with a novel context is shown in Figure 2b.

R2. Simulating Fear Renewal Across Different Context Combinations

We examined ConFER's predictions on the renewal of fear across different context combinations. In the following sections, context combinations are described as a 3 letter combination of Acquisition-Context, Extinction-Context, and Testing-Context, where ABC renewal would refer to an experiment where fear is first acquired in Context A, extinguished in Context B, and finally, the renewal of the fear post-extinction is tested in Context C. We test renewal in 5 different context combinations across two sets of conditions: When fear acquisition and extinction take place in two different contexts, Context A and Context B, respectively, we evaluate renewal across the 3 possible context combinations: ABA, ABB, and ABC. When fear acquisition and extinction take place in the same context, Context A, we evaluate renewal across the two possible context combinations: AAA and AAB. We compare ConFER's predictions to empirical findings on fear renewal across these context combinations from animal experiments^{17–19}. In all the results that follow, we evaluate the level of fear renewed in the first experiment trial in the testing context. There is negligible delay between acquisition, extinction and testing stages in the experiments described in this section.

Fear Renewal when Fear Acquisition and Extinction Occur in Different Contexts

In this experiment, we build on ConFER's behavior described in Section R1, where a fear response to CS-1 was acquired in Context A and subsequently extinguished in a different context, Context B. For ABA renewal, ConFER is reintroduced to the acquisition context, Context A, and presented with a single trial of CS-1, unpaired with any US. We observe a complete return of fear, with the renewed fear level matching the maximum fear acquired during the original acquisition phase. ConFER's prediction is shown as a red bar in Figure 3a, alongside the corresponding empirical result for ABA renewal depicted as a red bar in Figure 3b. ConFER successfully replicates the empirical finding that returning the animal to the acquisition context after extinction in a different context results in a full return of fear.

Several factors contribute to this complete return of fear when ConFER encounters CS-1 in Context A after extinction in Context B. These are depicted in Figure 3g. First, extinction operates via the context pathway, allowing the extinction context (Context B) to form connections with and activate an extinction engram in the positive BLA (Figure 3f). Upon returning to the acquisition context (Context A), ConFER can no longer activate the extinction engram, as Context A lacks any associations with it. In contrast, Context A has retained its associations with the negative US-1 engram formed during the acquisition phase. Since there were no delays between acquisition, extinction, and renewal testing, there is negligible decay in these context-association connections.

Furthermore, CS-1 maintains a strong connection with the negative US-1 engram in the negative BLA, as this connection does not decay over time. With both ContextA and CS-1 activating the negative BLA and no activation of the positive BLA, the net BLA activation output, processed through the tanh function, results in a strong fear response.










Figure 3: Fear Renewal Across Different Context Combinations. The charts on the left contain ConFER's predictions, and the charts on the right reflect corresponding empirical findings from Bouton (2004), Bouton and Bolles (1979a), and Bouton and Ricker (1993). (a and b) Level of fear renewed when acquisition and extinction take place in different contexts A and B, respectively. Bars show the level of fear renewed in the acquisition context (ABA Renewal in red), a novel context (ABC Renewal in green), and in the extinction context (ABB Renewal in yellow). (c and d) Level of fear renewed when acquisition and extinction take place in the same context A. Bars show the level of fear renewed in a novel context (AAB Renewal in yellow) and in the acquisition/extinction context (AAA Renewal in red). (e through f) Model mechanisms involved in fear acquisition in Context A (e), fear extinction in Context B (f), and fear renewal in Context A (ABA Renewal) (g), Context C (ABC Renewal) (h) and Context B (ABB Renewal) (i). Dotted associations are susceptible to temporal decay while solid associations are not. Thickness of arrows depicts strengths of connection weights. Red arrows show negative BLA associations, while green arrows show positive BLA associations. Greyed out arrows depict existing associations that are inactive for the presented cue-context pair. Fear acquisition involves strengthening cue (CS-1) and acquisition context (Context A, Living Room) associations with the negative US present (US-1) (e), whereas fear extinction only involves strengthening of the extinction context (Context B, Bedroom) association with the associated extinction engram (yellow rectangle) (f). ABA Renewal reactivates CS-1 and Acquisition Context associations with US-1 leading to a full return of fear (g). ABC Renewal works only through the CS-1 association, with neither the positive extinction context association nor the negative acquisition context association present, leading to a slightly decreased return of fear (h). ABB Renewal reactivates the extinction engram through the extinction context pathway which neutralizes the negative CS-1 association with US-1 (i).

ABC Renewal

In the ABC renewal experiment, CS-1 was presented following fear acquisition in Context A and extinction in Context B, this time in a novel context, Context C. This led to a substantial, though incomplete, renewal of the original fear response compared to the complete renewal observed in the ABA experiment. ConFER's prediction for renewed fear in Context C is represented by the green bar in Figure 3a, with the corresponding empirical result shown as the green bar in Figure 3b. ConFER successfully replicates this empirical finding, capturing the relative differences between ABA and ABC renewal. Our results demonstrate that while fear returns fully in the acquisition context (ABA), a significant degree of fear also returns in a novel context (ABC), though not as completely.

The difference in the level of fear renewed in the ABA and ABC conditions stems from a key distinction: in ABC renewal, only CS-1 retains connections with the shock engram in the negative BLA (Figure 3h). The connections that the acquisition context (Context A) formed with the shock engram no longer contribute to negative BLA activation. This results in a slightly lower overall negative BLA activation in the ABC case. However, this reduction is modest, as the context's contribution to the overall negative association is inherently lower due to its slower learning rate compared to cues.

ABB Renewal

In the ABB renewal experiment, CS-1 was presented following acquisition in Context A and extinction in Context B, with testing conducted in the extinction context (Context B). We observed almost no renewal of fear in this context, as represented by the yellow bar in Figure 3a, with the corresponding empirical results shown in Figure 3b. ConFER's predictions align with empirical findings, showing no significant fear renewal in the extinction context immediately after extinction, which is expected, as ConFER has established the extinction context as safe.

This outcome occurs because the extinction context (Context B) maintains strong connections with the extinction engram in the positive BLA, effectively neutralizing the association between CS-1 and the shock engram in the negative BLA (Figure 3i). Over time, however, as the delay between extinction and renewal testing increases, the positive context association begins to decay, allowing the more stable negative CS-1–shock association to dominate. This gradual shift leads to a return of fear, which is explored further in the spontaneous recovery section.

Fear Renewal when Fear Acquisition and Extinction Occur in the Same Context

AAB Renewal

In this experiment, we build on ConFER's behavior described in Section R1, where fear was acquired and subsequently extinguished in the same context, Context A. For AAB renewal, we tested fear renewal in a novel context, Context B. ConFER predicted a significant renewal of the original fear in Context B, as represented by the yellow bar in Figure 3c, with the corresponding empirical result shown as the yellow bar in Figure 3d. ConFER successfully replicates this empirical finding, highlighting the relative similarities between AAB and ABC renewal. In both conditions, fear renewal occurs to a large degree but not completely, as observed in the ABA condition.

The mechanisms driving AAB and ABC renewal are the same, as both involve renewal testing in a novel context that ConFER has not previously encountered. In AAB renewal, Context A (the extinction context) forms associations with the extinction engram in the positive BLA. However, during testing in Context B, these associations are absent, allowing the negative BLA response linked to CS-1 to dominate. As in the ABC condition, this results in lower fear renewal than in ABA renewal, where the acquisition context also contributes to the fear response by reactivating the Acquisition-Context—shock association.

AAA Renewal

In the AAA renewal experiment, we again build on ConFER's behavior described in Section R1, where fear acquisition and extinction both occurred in Context A. For AAA renewal, the fear renewal test was conducted in the same context, Context A, immediately after extinction. ConFER predicted no fear renewal in this condition, as reflected by the red bar in Figure 3c, with the corresponding empirical finding shown as the red bar in Figure 3d.

The mechanisms involved are identical to those observed in ABB renewal: the extinction context's strong association with the positive extinction engram effectively neutralizes the CS-1–shock association in the negative BLA, preventing fear renewal. The only difference in AAA renewal is that the extinction engram is also strong enough to neutralize the additional Context A–shock association since the extinction phase in the acquisition context involved neutralizing both cue and context-shock associations.

R3. Spontaneous Recovery

Spontaneous recovery refers to the return of fear after extinction, occurring in the extinction context following a prolonged delay. In this experiment, fear acquisition took place for CS-1 in Context A, followed by extinction in the same context. Testing was conducted in Context A after varying periods of delay post-extinction, spanning several days. This paradigm is similar to AAA renewal in terms of context combinations, but in AAA renewal, testing occurs immediately after extinction, whereas here, a delay is introduced.

We observed that fear gradually returns over time, with a sharp increase in the first few days, stabilizing as the fear response reaches the level observed after the initial acquisition phase. This concave-down, increasing trajectory of fear recovery is shown in Figure 4a. ConFER's predicted trajectory closely matches the empirical findings from the Quirk (2002) study¹⁶ of spontaneous recovery, depicted in Figure 4b. In ConFER, the complete return of fear is simulated over a period of 21 days by adjusting the decay rate of context-emotion associations, allowing them to diminish entirely over approximately 500 time units, corresponding to 500 hours or 21 days.




Figure 4: **Spontaneous Recovery.** (a) ConFER's predictions for the amount of fear that returns after prolonged delays after extinction, with the delay measured across 21 simulated days. (b) Empirical findings on the return of fear following fear extinction in rats across 14 days from Quirk (2002) show a similar learning curve over time. (c through f) Model mechanisms involved in fear acquisition in Context A (c), fear extinction in Context A itself (d), and exponentially increasing spontaneous recovery in Context A (e, f).

following a time delay t (e) and complete spontaneous recovery in Context A after a 21 day simulated delay within ConFER (f). Dotted associations are susceptible to temporal decay while solid associations are permanent. Thickness of arrows depicts strengths of connection weights. Red arrows show negative BLA associations, while green arrows show positive BLA associations. Fear extinction in the acquisition context involves the acquisition context forming new positive associations with the extinction engram to neutralize existing cue and context associations with US-1 (d). With a time delay t , context associations decay as indicated by the thinning dotted lines, while the negative cue association begins to dominate (e). With a 21 day simulated delay, the context associations decay completely leading to a near complete return of fear via the CS1–US1 negative association (f).

During extinction, Context A formed associations with the positive extinction engram, and this association strengthened until the positive BLA activation neutralized the net negative BLA activation associated with the fear-conditioned CS-1 and Context A from the acquisition phase (Figure 4d). Day 0 of testing spontaneous recovery, immediately after extinction, corresponds to the AAA renewal condition, where the Context A–extinction engram association remains intact and neutralizes the negative CS-1–shock and Context A–shock associations. However, with each passing day, the context–emotion associations begin to decay, as the context pathway is prone to weakening over time (Figure 4e). This decay follows a concave-down, increasing exponential pattern, with rapid initial decay followed by slower rates as the context associations diminish.

As time progresses, the connection strength between Context A and the extinction engram decays further, resulting in diminished positive BLA activation. Meanwhile, the CS-1—shock engram association remains stable, continuously activating the negative BLA. This imbalance eventually leads to the negative BLA activation dominating, producing increasingly strong fear responses in the extinction context over time till a complete return of fear occurs with a long delay (Figure 4f). The tanh function used in the fear output ensures that the fear response is bounded and cannot exceed the maximum level reached during the original acquisition phase.

It is worth noting that a second context association also decays during this process—the Context A—shock engram connection formed during acquisition. This decay slightly reduces the BLA's net negative activation. However, since the stable CS-1—shock association contributes the majority of the net negative activation, the effect on spontaneous recovery is minimal.

R4. Comparison of Fear Renewal and Spontaneous Recovery Following Counterconditioning vs. Extinction

We conducted a series of counterconditioning experiments to assess the long-term efficacy of counterconditioning compared to extinction in preventing the return of fear. These experiments examined fear renewal across the ABA, ABB, and ABC conditions. We did not include conditions where acquisition and extinction occurred in the same context, as ConFER predicts equivalent outcomes for ABB and AAA (test context = extinction context), and for ABC and AAB (test context \neq extinction context). Additionally, we evaluated spontaneous recovery in the extinction context after a 21-day delay.

The counterconditioning experiments began with a fear acquisition phase, consisting of 16 presentations of CS-1 paired with a shock (negative US-1) in Context A. Counterconditioning was then performed in a different context (Context B), where CS-1 was paired with a positive reward (positive US-2). We found that 9 trials of CS-1 paired with positive US-2 were sufficient to neutralize the fear response without reversing the reward contingency (Figure 5a).




Figure 5: **Counterconditioning.** (a) Model predictions of levels of fear during Fear acquisition (in blue) and counterconditioning (in purple) across experimental trials. (b) Model predictions of levels of fear during Fear acquisition (in blue) and extinction (in orange) across experimental trials. (c) A comparison of the amount of fear that returns following counterconditioning (purple bars) and extinction (orange bars). The first 3 sets of bars represent the immediate return of fear via fear renewal in the acquisition, extinction, and novel contexts, respectively. The final pair of bars represents the return of fear in the extinction context after a 21-day delay via spontaneous recovery.

Counterconditioning operates through a separate mechanism compared to extinction in ConFER. While extinction relies solely on the context pathway to neutralize fear, counterconditioning allows the fear-conditioned CS-1 to form new associations with positive US-2. Moreover, Context B also develops associations with positive US-2. Together, CS-1 and Context B engage the same learning mechanisms used during fear acquisition during counterconditioning but with opposite valence. As a result, the faster learning cue pathway contributes to the reduction of fear, requiring fewer trials to achieve fear neutralization than in fear extinction (Figure 5b).

Following counterconditioning, we assessed the return of fear in Context A (ABA), Context B (ABB), and a novel context, Context C (ABC). ConFER's predictions for fear renewal in each condition are shown as blue bars in Figure 5c, with the corresponding renewal following extinction shown in red.

We observed that counterconditioning led to a slightly reduced fear renewal in the acquisition context (Context A) compared to extinction (ABA). When ConFER re-encountered CS-1 in Context A following counterconditioning, the associations formed between Context-B and the positive extinction engram were lost. However, the CS-1–positive US-2 association formed during counterconditioning remained intact. Since ConFER was trained only to neutralize the fear response without reversing the reward association, the positive BLA activation associated with CS-1 was modest, allowing a large return of fear, albeit less than post-extinction.

In the counterconditioning context (Context B), we found no significant difference in fear renewal between counterconditioning and extinction. Extinction neutralized fear through context associations with the positive extinction engram, while counterconditioning involved associations between both the cue and the context with positive US-2. Although the underlying mechanisms differ, both strategies prevented fear renewal when tested in the extinction context immediately after training, as the extinction associations remained intact.

We also found that fear renewal in the novel context (Context C) was significantly lower following counterconditioning compared to extinction (ABC). After counterconditioning, although the associations with Context B and positive US-2 were inactive in the novel context, the CS-1–positive US-2 association provided sufficient activation of the positive BLA to compete with the existing CS-1–negative US-1 association from the acquisition phase. Nonetheless, as neutralization involved both CS-1 and Context B associations with positive US-2, a partial return of fear still occurred.

Lastly, we assessed spontaneous recovery in the counterconditioning context (Context B) after a 21-day delay. The fear that returned following counterconditioning was less than half of the near-complete return observed after extinction (Figure 5c). This difference arises because, although the Context B–positive US associations formed during counterconditioning decayed over time, the Cue-2–positive US association remained intact, as cue-based associations are more resilient to decay. In contrast, extinction, which relied exclusively on the context pathway, led to the complete decay of all positive BLA associations over the 21-day period. As a result, the fear response after extinction fully re-emerged, whereas counterconditioning preserved a degree of fear suppression due to the enduring cue-positive US association.

Discussion

In this study, we developed a neurally constrained computational model called ConFER that captures the dynamics of fear acquisition, extinction, and the context-dependent return of fear. ConFER bridges the gap between detailed neuronal mechanisms and abstract behavioral theories by integrating distinct pathways for cue and context processing projecting to distinct positive and negative stimulus-responsive regions in the basolateral amygdala (BLA). ConFER successfully replicates key experimental phenomena observed in animal studies, including fear renewal across various context combinations and spontaneous recovery over time. Here, we discuss how our findings align with existing theories of associative learning, its implications for understanding fear relapse, and potential applications in clinical interventions for anxiety disorders.

One of the distinctive features of ConFER is that it has distinct pathways for cue and context processing pathways in a cued fear conditioning paradigm. We propose that the cue pathway forms fear associations more rapidly than the context pathway. During fear conditioning, the cue serves as the more salient predictor of the unconditioned stimulus, with sensory input from the cue directly projecting to the BLA, enabling rapid encoding of fear responses. In contrast, contextual information is processed through a slower route: sensory inputs from the environment project first to the CA1 region of the hippocampus, where the context is encoded, before projecting to the BLA via the Ventral Medial Prefrontal Cortex (VmPFC) to form a contextual fear association^{20–22}. Specifically, the pathway from the downstream projections of the ventral hippocampus to the infralimbic cortex (IL), followed by projections of the IL into the BLA are implicated in fear extinction, while downstream projections from the ventral hippocampus to the prelimbic cortex (PL), followed by projections of the PL into the BLA are implicated in fear activation. ConFER accounts for these distinct context-dependent fear and extinction pathways as depicted by the green and red context–BLA pathways respectively in Figure 1^{22,23}. In addition to a difference in learning rates, ConFER also suggests that cue-BLA associations are more resilient to temporal decay, whereas

context-BLA associations weaken over time. This reflects the idea that retaining fear responses to salient cues is critical for survival, while contextual information becomes less relevant with time. The persistence of cue-fear associations is evident in fear renewal phenomena, where fear responses return across different contexts, except the extinction context^{17,18}. By contrast, spontaneous recovery offers insights into the temporal decay of context-extinction engram associations, as it involves no active experimental manipulation except for a time delay¹⁶. The full return of fear in the extinction context underscores that while the CS–fear engram association remains stable, the context–extinction engram association decays over time. By incorporating distinct pathways for cue and context associative learning with differential rates of learning and decay, ConFER is able to simulate context-dependent return of fear phenomena following extinction, expanding on the effects explained by existing models of associative learning by offering new insights into the nuanced roles of cue and context in fear renewal and spontaneous recovery.

ConFER also incorporates a memory engram-based approach to fear learning, extinction, and recovery. It posits that fear engrams are persistently stored in the negative BLA, consistent with findings that fear memory engrams persist throughout the lifespan and are essential for fear memory retrieval, as deactivation of the BLA results in the loss of these memories^{24,25}. However, while the fear engram is persistent, it remains dynamic, as its activity can be modulated or silenced by surrounding neural circuitry^{26,27}. In ConFER, fear extinction is represented by the formation and activation of an extinction engram in the positive BLA, which neutralizes the negative BLA activity during extinction. This is inspired by recent evidence showing that a random set of positive BLA neurons is recruited to form an extinction engram during extinction learning¹⁴. ConFER simulates fear extinction as the extinction engram in the positive BLA neutralizing the fear response in the negative BLA instead of an unlearning of the acquired fear that models of associative learning often suggest^{8,9}.

Animals acquire a fear association to a cue independently of the context during fear conditioning. However, once the cue is extinguished in a specific context, the context becomes crucial in determining whether the animal exhibits a fear response or an extinction response to the now ambiguous cue. This suggests that during fear acquisition, fear is formed as simple associations between the individual elements of the cue and the features of the context with the US. In contrast, fear extinction relies on learning that integrates the cue-context configuration, suggesting that the configuration itself forms the associative link with the US. This distinction indicates that different associative learning frameworks—the simple associative theory, where individual elements form associations with the US, and the configural associative theory, where configurations of elements form associations—are engaged at different stages of fear learning and extinction recall²⁸.

Deterministic models of associative learning, such as the Rescorla-Wagner model and the Temporal Difference model of classical conditioning, align with the simple associative framework. In these models, the cue and context elements are treated collectively as a compound cue, with the most predictive elements increasing in associative strength relative to their association with the US^{8,9}. In contrast, probabilistic models like the Latent Cause Theory add an additional layer of inference by using both cue and context features, along with the presence or absence of a US, to attribute experimental trials to different latent causes in the environment. In this framework, the combination of individual features infers underlying categories or causes^{6,7}. ConFER integrates both simple and configural associative frameworks. When the US is present, ConFER operates within the simple associative framework, where both cue and context dimensions increase their associative strength through distinct pathways with different learning and decay rates. During extinction, however, ConFER shifts towards the configural associative framework. In this stage, it computes the net activation of the cue-context configuration and seeks to neutralize this activation during extinction learning. Extinction involves forming associations between the extinction context and a cue-specific extinction engram, which is more specific to the

cue-context configuration than to either element independently. As a result, ConFER aligns more with the configural associative theory during extinction learning and recall.

A key feature of ConFER is its departure from a strict prediction error (PE) framework, distinguishing it from classic associative learning models such as Rescorla-Wagner and Temporal Difference (TD) models, where PE directly drives changes in associative strength. In these models, learning is traditionally governed by the degree of expectation violation: large associative updates occur with surprising outcomes, while expected outcomes yield smaller updates. In contrast, ConFER's learning rates are independent of prediction error and depend solely on the nature of the connection pathway—specifically, whether it is cue- or context-based. Extinction studies, including those by Quirk (2002)¹⁶, suggest that a PE-based learning framework may be insufficient to fully capture extinction dynamics in behavior without an additional performance layer. For instance, during early extinction trials, the unexpected absence of the US generates high PE, yet animals show minimal reductions in fear responses, reflecting a slow behavioral shift. ConFER interprets this effect not as a slow learning process, but as a cautious performance strategy, wherein performance is represented by the tanh output of the net activation in the BLA for each trial. The use of a tanh function allows ConFER to simulate a performance-based response that prioritizes safety, yielding the gradual behavioral adaptation observed during extinction. This adaptation arises from a concave-down decrease in fear responses as negative BLA activation decreases, effectively modeling the cautious modulation of fear during extinction.

ConFER, grounded in a parsimonious framework, has the potential to generate new behavioral hypotheses based on its predictions in experimental manipulations. These hypotheses could inform the design of experimental paradigms aimed at improving our understanding of extinction recall in humans. One such hypothesis we explored in detail is that counterconditioning should be more effective than fear extinction at preventing fear relapse. ConFER predicts that while counterconditioning will not significantly reduce fear relapse in the original fear acquisition context, it will be far more effective at preventing relapse in a novel context. This is a key prediction, as overgeneralization of fear to stimuli and contexts not directly linked to the initial fear acquisition is a hallmark symptom of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other anxiety disorders^{29,30}. Testing whether counterconditioning can indeed restrict the fear response largely to the acquisition context post-extinction is an important direction for future research. ConFER further suggests that counterconditioning requires fewer trials to neutralize the fear response compared to extinction, which is an essential distinction if this can minimize patient distress during exposure therapy. This difference arises from the distinct pathways engaged during the two processes. Extinction relies on the slower, more decay-prone context pathway from the hippocampus to the BLA, while counterconditioning activates the more robust thalamus-BLA pathway, which processes sensory input directly. This distinction may also suggest that counterconditioning could be more effective than extinction in patients with hippocampal damage or impairments in context processing. Notably, PTSD has been linked to impaired contextual processing, suggesting dysfunction in this pathway^{31,32}, and individuals with PTSD have consistently shown smaller hippocampal volumes compared to controls³³. Given that counterconditioning likely engages the faster, more resilient cue-based neural circuitry, it may offer a promising direction for improving clinical interventions. There remains a scarcity of studies directly comparing the long-term effects of counterconditioning and extinction in preventing fear relapse, and existing research has shown mixed results^{34–36}. However, some initial efforts to incorporate counterconditioning in human exposure therapy have shown promising results³⁷, indicating that this approach warrants further exploration.

D1. Limitations and Future Directions:

ConFER, in line with animal findings, predicts that fear renewal occurs in any context other than the extinction context. Notably, the degree of fear renewal is influenced by the similarity between the test and extinction contexts—greater dissimilarity results in stronger renewal effects³⁸. This context-adaptive response likely engages pattern separation and pattern completion mechanisms to distinguish between extinction and test contexts. The dentate gyrus–hippocampal CA3 pathway is crucial for pattern separation, while the CA1 region and other medial temporal lobe structures are implicated in pattern completion^{39–41}. However, ConFER currently treats all novel contexts as equally dissimilar from the extinction context, without calculating any context similarity. In future work, we aim to incorporate a similarity module to capture these more nuanced contextual fear responses.

A related limitation is that while ConFER employs multidimensional cues and contexts, it does not yet account for distributed representations. Each cue and context is treated as an independent entity, meaning that the fear learning associated with specific elements of one cue or context does not influence the associative strengths of similar elements in other cues or contexts. Presently, the multidimensionality serves primarily to demonstrate how distinct neurons from various US engrams are recruited at random to encode an extinction engram. In future iterations, we intend to adopt a distributed representation framework to enable generalization across shared features of cues and contexts, enhancing ConFER's flexibility and ecological validity.

Finally, although ConFER accounts for the time elapsed between trials, it does not yet incorporate within-trial temporal dynamics. The temporal difference (TD) model of classical conditioning has demonstrated that both the duration for which the CS is presented and the interval between CS and US presentations play key roles in shaping conditioning phenomena⁸. Incorporating such temporal variables within trials would allow ConFER to better simulate real-world conditioning processes.

D2. Conclusion:

We present a neurally constrained computational model that offers a novel framework for understanding the mechanisms underlying fear acquisition, extinction, and the context-dependent return of fear. By incorporating distinct cue and context pathways and simulating the formation of separate fear and extinction engrams in the basolateral amygdala (BLA), ConFER captures key experimental findings and generates testable hypotheses—particularly regarding the efficacy of counterconditioning over traditional extinction methods. These insights enhance our understanding of the neural underpinnings of fear learning and relapse, with significant potential for informing and improving clinical interventions for anxiety disorders.

Methods:

M1. Model Architecture:

The architecture of ConFER, illustrated in Figure 1b, is grounded in a simplified schematic of the fear circuit in the brain, shown in Figure 1a. ConFER takes as input a 3-dimensional cue vector and a 3-dimensional context vector, where each dimension represents distinct features of the cue and context, respectively. For example, a blinking yellow light as a cue might have dimensions representing its intensity, warmth, and blinking frequency, while the corresponding context dimensions might encode the room temperature, size, and furniture density. In this study, we utilized 5 distinct 3D cues and 5 distinct 3D contexts, but ConFER is designed to scale to accommodate larger sets as needed.

Within ConFER, the BLA (basolateral amygdala) module comprises two main populations of neurons: a positive-stimulus-responsive population (green, Figure 1b) and a negative-stimulus-responsive population

(red, Figure 1b), each containing 16 neurons. These populations are subdivided into 4 memory engrams, each of which represents preprogrammed responses to USs that naturally elicit either reward or aversive reactions. For example, within the positive population, the 16 neurons encode positive US engrams for stimuli such as food, water, or social interaction. Similarly, the negative population encodes negative US engrams corresponding to stimuli like shocks, foul odors, or puffs of air. The yellow-filled purple circle in Figure 1b represents an active shock engram, highlighting the activation of a fear response when the cue is paired with a shock.

During extinction learning, ConFER forms extinction engrams by recruiting 4 neurons at random from the positive BLA population. In Figure 1b, the yellow rectangle highlights an example of one such extinction engram. These engrams are formed specifically for the cue undergoing extinction and are not preprogrammed but rather dynamically generated based on the cue's prior association with a negative US when a US is no longer present. Once formed, the extinction engram is permanently linked to the corresponding cue and will be reactivated when that cue is presented in subsequent extinction trials. This mechanism draws on experimental findings from rodent studies^{14,42}. The cue inputs are connected to both the negative and positive BLA populations through distinct pathways, represented by red and green pathways in Figure 1b. These connections are stored in 15x16 cue–BLA connection matrices, which represent the connection strengths between the 5 unique 3D cues (15 total dimensions) and the 16 neurons encoding the US engrams in the BLA. Separate matrices exist for cue–positive BLA and cue–negative BLA connections. Likewise, context inputs are connected to the BLA via two distinct context–BLA matrices, each of size 15x16, which store the connection weights between the context inputs and BLA engrams. The context–negative BLA pathway models the hippocampus CA1–prelimbic cortex (PL)–BLA circuit, responsible for fear memory activation⁴³, while the context–positive BLA pathway models the hippocampus CA1–infralimbic cortex (IL)–BLA circuit, which activates extinction engrams²³.

When a cue is presented in a specific context, ConFER updates two sets of connection weights: the cue–engram connection (3 input cue dimensions × 4 engram neurons) and the context–engram connection (3 input context dimensions × 4 engram neurons), updating the corresponding matrices. The BLA engram activation is computed by summing the linear activations from both cue and context pathways, with the final BLA activation reflecting the cumulative connection strength.

ConFER introduces a scaling mechanism to adjust the contribution of each BLA engram based on the salience of the associated US. The scaling factors K1 (positive US) and K2 (negative US), each of size 4x1 corresponding to 4 USs in each BLA population, modulate the strength of the BLA activation based on the emotional significance of the US. For instance, a footshock would be assigned a higher scaling factor, contributing more heavily to the fear response, whereas a puff of air might receive a lower factor, resulting in a weaker activation. All 4 dimensions of the US engram are scaled equally. The extinction engram, however, recruits neurons from pre-existing engrams, and each neuron's activation is scaled based on the corresponding US it is recruited from.

M2. The *Execute_training_trial* Function: Stepwise Computational Process in Each Experimental Trial:

The computational steps described in this section constitute the algorithm of the *execute_training_trial* function.

1. **Model Receives Inputs:** Each trial begins with ConFER receiving the following inputs:
 - a. *cue_index*: The index of the input cue from the stored set of five cues.

- b. *context_index*: The index of the input context from the set of five contexts.
- c. *negative_US_present*: A Boolean indicating the presence of a negative US.
- d. *positive_US_present*: A Boolean indicating the presence of a positive US.
- e. *engram_index*: The index of the BLA US engram to activate from the four stored engrams. When there is no US present, this is set as *None*.
- f. *time_from_last_trial*: The time elapsed (in hours) since the last trial.
- g. *Set Modify_cue_engram_wts* flag = *FALSE*: In ConFER, the context–BLA pathway is prone to modification both in the presence and absence of a US, but the cue–BLA pathway is only updated when a US is present. Thus, ConFER begins each trial with a default assumption that the cue pathway will not be modified, and this flag is flipped to true when it detects that a US is present.

2. **Temporal Decay of the Context Pathway**: ConFER applies exponential decay to all existing context–BLA positive and negative associations based on the time elapsed since the previous trial. The decay is calculated using the factor λ , as defined by Equation 1. We set the constant $m = 0.001$, allowing the context weights to decay over approximately 21 days (~500 hours).

$$\text{Decay Factor: } \lambda = 1 - e^{-mt} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Context-Positive BLA}_{(15 \times 16)} = \text{Context-Positive BLA} - \lambda * \text{Context-Positive BLA} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Context-Negative BLA}_{(15 \times 16)} = \text{Context-Negative BLA} - \lambda * \text{Context-Negative BLA} \quad (3)$$

3. **Compute Fear Response to the Cue-Context Input Pair**: ConFER first evaluates the net emotional response associated with the input cue and context combination by calculating the net activation of the positive and negative BLA populations. This is done by summing the scaled activations within each population and then subtracting the net negative activation from the net positive activation to obtain the net BLA activation (Equation 4). In this equation, i denotes the engram index, ranging from 1 to 4 for each BLA population, while j refers to individual neurons within each engram. The resulting value is passed through a tanh function (Equation 5) to compute the final fear response, constrained within the range of $[-1, 1]$. For simplicity, in all reported simulations, the scaling factors $K1$ and $K2$ were both set to 1, indicating that all USs were equally salient and the tanh constant n was set to 0.01.

$$\text{Net BLA Activation} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{j=1}^4 K1(i, 1) * \text{Positive Engram}_{i,j} - \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{j=1}^4 K2(i, 1) * \text{Negative Engram}_{i,j} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Fear Response} = \tanh(n * \text{Net BLA Activation}) \quad (5)$$

4. **Check for the Presence of a US, or an Emotional Response in its Absence**: ConFER first checks for the presence of a US:
- a. If a US (positive or negative) is present, ConFER initiates the acquisition process by calling the *weight_update* function (detailed in Section M3). Before this function is invoked, ConFER sets the *modify_cue_engram_wts* flag to true, allowing modifications in the cue–BLA connection weights since the presence of a US permits changes to the cue associations.

- b. If no US is present but the Fear Response $\neq 0$, ConFER prepares for the extinction process by setting specific parameters and calling the `weight_update` function:
 - i. For fear extinction, `positive_US_present = true` is set to form the extinction engram, which is functionally equivalent to a positive US engram during extinction. The `upper_threshold` is set to the current net negative BLA activation, ensuring that the extinction engram only neutralizes the fear response without flipping the association.
 - ii. For extinction of a positive association, `negative_US_present = true` is set, and the `upper_threshold` is adjusted to the net positive BLA activation.
- c. If neither a US nor an emotional response is present, no connection weights are updated, and the trial ends without calling the `weight_update` function.

In all cases, the trial concludes by computing the final fear response at the end of the trial in the same way as described in Step 3.

M3. The Weight_Update Function: Updating Cue–BLA and Context–BLA connection Weights

The `weight_update` function is called only once per experimental trial to update the connection strengths between the cue–BLA and context–BLA pathways.

1. Function Inputs: The `weight_update` function is called within the `execute_training_trial` function and accepts the following inputs:
 - a. `cue_index`, `context_index`, `negative_US_present`, `positive_US_present`, `engram_index`: Shared inputs with the `execute_training_trial` function.
 - b. `cue_to_pos_engram_weights`, `cue_to_neg_engram_weights`: Connection strength matrices for cue–positive BLA and cue–negative BLA connections.
 - c. `context_to_pos_engram_weights`, `context_to_neg_engram_weights`: Connection strength matrices for context–positive BLA and context–negative BLA connections.
 - d. `net_pos_sum`, `net_neg_sum`: Net positive and negative BLA activation values.
 - e. `modify_cue_engram_weights`: A flag indicating whether cue–pathway weights can be modified.
 - f. `upper_bound`: The upper limit of BLA activation, beyond which weights are not incremented. This is set to a large value by default but adjusted prior to extinction.
2. Identifying BLA Engram Neurons for Weight Updates: ConFER first checks the `engram_index` to determine whether a BLA engram is active during the trial. If an engram is active, the function identifies the corresponding 4 BLA neurons to modify. If `engram_index = None`, the function either forms a new extinction engram for the cue or reactivates an existing extinction engram if the cue has previously undergone extinction.

When forming a new extinction engram, 4 random neuron indices are selected from the set of 16 neurons in the BLA population. In both cases, the neuron indices with which cue and context associations will be modified are referred to as *selected indices*.

3. Updating Cue and Context Weights: Once the neuron indices are identified, ConFER updates the cue and context connection weights based on the following conditions:
 - a. Cue weights are only updated if `modify_cue_engram_wts = true`, while context weights can always be modified.
 - b. If `negative_US_present = true` and `net_neg_sum < upper_bound`:
The selected indices will correspond to a negative BLA engram. The connection weights between the 3D input context and the 4D selected indices are incremented by a fixed value of 0.5. If `modify_cue_engram_wts = true`, the connection weights between the 3D input cue and the 4D selected indices are incremented by 0.7.
 - c. If `positive_US_present = true` and `net_pos_sum < upper_bound`:
The same procedure is followed, but the selected indices will correspond to a positive BLA engram.

The fixed increment values (0.5 for context, 0.7 for cue) reflect ConFER's assumption that the cue pathway learns faster than the context pathway. If necessary, these values can be adjusted to accommodate different learning rates.

Code Availability: The code for simulating all findings described in the results is available in the git repository: <https://github.com/shreyakr96/CompModelFear>

References

1. Foa, E. B., Hembree, E. A. & Rothbaum, B. O. *Prolonged Exposure Therapy for PTSD: Emotional Processing of Traumatic Experiences: Therapist Guide*. viii, 146 (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, US, 2007). doi:10.1093/med:psych/9780195308501.001.0001.
2. Markowitz, S. & Fanselow, M. Exposure Therapy for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: Factors of Limited Success and Possible Alternative Treatment. *Brain Sci.* **10**, 167 (2020).
3. Kim, D., Paré, D. & Nair, S. S. Mechanisms contributing to the induction and storage of Pavlovian fear memories in the lateral amygdala. *Learn. Mem.* **20**, 421–430 (2013).
4. Li, G., Nair, S. S. & Quirk, G. J. A Biologically Realistic Network Model of Acquisition and Extinction of Conditioned Fear Associations in Lateral Amygdala Neurons. *J. Neurophysiol.* **101**, 1629–1646 (2009).
5. Mattera, A., Pagani, M. & Baldassarre, G. A Computational Model Integrating Multiple Phenomena on Cued Fear Conditioning, Extinction, and Reinstatement. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* **14**, (2020).
6. Gershman, S. J. A Unifying Probabilistic View of Associative Learning. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **11**, e1004567 (2015).
7. Gershman, S. J. & Niv, Y. Exploring a latent cause theory of classical conditioning. *Learn. Behav.* **40**, 255–268 (2012).
8. Ludvig, E. A., Sutton, R. S. & Kehoe, E. J. Evaluating the TD model of classical conditioning. *Learn. Behav.* **40**, 305–319 (2012).
9. Rescorla, R. & Wagner, A. A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: Variations in the effectiveness of reinforcement and nonreinforcement. in *Classical Conditioning II: Current Research and Theory* vol. Vol. 2 (1972).
10. Smith, D. M. & Bulkin, D. A. The Form and Function of Hippocampal Context Representations. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **0**, 52–61 (2014).
11. Barrientos, S. A. & Tiznado, V. Hippocampal CA1 Subregion as a Context Decoder. *J. Neurosci.* **36**, 6602–6604 (2016).
12. Sun, Y., Gooch, H. & Sah, P. Fear conditioning and the basolateral amygdala. *F1000Research* **9**, F1000 Faculty Rev-53 (2020).

13. O'Neill, P.-K., Gore, F. & Salzman, C. D. Basolateral amygdala circuitry in positive and negative valence. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **49**, 175–183 (2018).
14. Zhang, X., Kim, J. & Tonegawa, S. Amygdala Reward Neurons Form and Store Fear Extinction Memory. *Neuron* **105**, 1077-1093.e7 (2020).
15. Maren, S., Phan, K. L. & Liberzon, I. The contextual brain: implications for fear conditioning, extinction and psychopathology. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 417–428 (2013).
16. Quirk, G. J. Memory for Extinction of Conditioned Fear Is Long-lasting and Persists Following Spontaneous Recovery. *Learn. Mem.* **9**, 402–407 (2002).
17. Bouton, M. E. Context and behavioral processes in extinction. *Learn. Mem. Cold Spring Harb. N* **11**, 485–494 (2004).
18. Bouton, M. E. & Bolles, R. C. Contextual control of the extinction of conditioned fear. *Learn. Motiv.* **10**, 445–466 (1979).
19. Bouton, M. E. & Ricker, S. T. Renewal of extinguished responding in a second context. *Anim. Learn. Behav.* **22**, 317–324 (1994).
20. Kim, J. J. & Jung, M. W. Neural circuits and mechanisms involved in Pavlovian fear conditioning: A critical review. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **30**, 188–202 (2006).
21. Kim, W. B. & Cho, J.-H. Synaptic Targeting of Double-Projecting Ventral CA1 Hippocampal Neurons to the Medial Prefrontal Cortex and Basal Amygdala. *J. Neurosci.* **37**, 4868–4882 (2017).
22. Laurent, V. & Westbrook, R. F. Inactivation of the infralimbic but not the prelimbic cortex impairs consolidation and retrieval of fear extinction. *Learn. Mem. Cold Spring Harb. N* **16**, 520–529 (2009).
23. Bloodgood, D. W., Sugam, J. A., Holmes, A. & Kash, T. L. Fear extinction requires infralimbic cortex projections to the basolateral amygdala. *Transl. Psychiatry* **8**, 1–11 (2018).
24. Gale, G. D. *et al.* Role of the Basolateral Amygdala in the Storage of Fear Memories across the Adult Lifetime of Rats. *J. Neurosci.* **24**, 3810–3815 (2004).
25. Poulos, A. M. *et al.* Persistence of fear memory across time requires the basolateral amygdala complex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 11737–11741 (2009).
26. Bergstrom, H. C. The neurocircuitry of remote cued fear memory. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **71**, 409–417 (2016).

27. Davis, P. & Reijmers, L. G. The dynamic nature of fear engrams in the basolateral amygdala. *Brain Res. Bull.* **141**, 44–49 (2018).
28. Sutherland, R. J. & Rudy, J. W. Configural association theory: The role of the hippocampal formation in learning, memory, and amnesia. *Psychobiology* **17**, 129–144 (1989).
29. Lis, S. *et al.* Generalization of fear in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Psychophysiology* **57**, e13422 (2020).
30. Lissek, S. *et al.* Elevated Fear Conditioning to Socially Relevant Unconditioned Stimuli in Social Anxiety Disorder. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **165**, 124–132 (2008).
31. Levy-Gigi, E., Sudai, E. & Bar, M. Context as a barrier: Impaired contextual processing increases the tendency to develop PTSD symptoms across repeated exposure to trauma. *J. Anxiety Disord.* **100**, 102765 (2023).
32. Liberzon, I. & Abelson, J. L. Context Processing and the Neurobiology of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. *Neuron* **92**, 14–30 (2016).
33. Logue, M. W. *et al.* Smaller Hippocampal Volume in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A Multisite ENIGMA-PGC Study: Subcortical Volumetry Results From Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Consortia. *Biol. Psychiatry* **83**, 244–253 (2018).
34. Holmes, N. M., Leung, H. T. & Westbrook, R. F. Counterconditioned fear responses exhibit greater renewal than extinguished fear responses. *Learn. Mem.* **23**, 141–150 (2016).
35. Keller, N., Hennings, A. & Dunsmoor, J. Behavioral and neural processes in counterconditioning: past and future directions. *Behav. Res. Ther.* **125**, 103532 (2020).
36. Meulders, A., Karsdorp, P. A., Claes, N. & Vlaeyen, J. W. S. Comparing Counterconditioning and Extinction as Methods to Reduce Fear of Movement-Related Pain. *J. Pain* **16**, 1353–1365 (2015).
37. Dunsmoor, J. E., Ahs, F., Zielinski, D. J. & LaBar, K. S. Extinction in multiple virtual reality contexts diminishes fear reinstatement in humans. *Neurobiol. Learn. Mem.* **113**, 157–164 (2014).
38. Bandarian Balooch, S. & Neumann, D. L. Effects of multiple contexts and context similarity on the renewal of extinguished conditioned behaviour in an ABA design with humans. *Learn. Motiv.* **42**, 53–63 (2011).
39. Bakker, A., Kirwan, C. B., Miller, M. & Stark, C. E. L. Pattern Separation in the Human Hippocampal

CA3 and Dentate Gyrus. *Science* **319**, 1640–1642 (2008).

40. Guzman, S. J. *et al.* How connectivity rules and synaptic properties shape the efficacy of pattern separation in the entorhinal cortex–dentate gyrus–CA3 network. *Nat. Comput. Sci.* **1**, 830–842 (2021).
41. Rolls, E. The mechanisms for pattern completion and pattern separation in the hippocampus. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* **7**, (2013).
42. Herry, C. *et al.* Switching on and off fear by distinct neuronal circuits. *Nature* **454**, 600–606 (2008).
43. Sierra-Mercado, D., Padilla-Coreano, N. & Quirk, G. J. Dissociable Roles of Prelimbic and Infralimbic Cortices, Ventral Hippocampus, and Basolateral Amygdala in the Expression and Extinction of Conditioned Fear. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **36**, 529–538 (2011).