Distribution of Neurotransmitter Receptors and Zinc in the Pigeon (Columba livia) Hippocampal Formation: A Basis for Further Comparison With the Mammalian Hippocampus
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ABSTRACT

The avian hippocampal formation (HF) and mammalian hippocampus share a similar functional role in spatial cognition, but the underlying neuronal mechanisms allowing the functional similarity are incompletely understood. To understand better the organization of the avian HF and its transmitter receptors, we analyzed binding site densities for glutamatergic AMPA, NMDA, and kainate receptors; GABA A receptors; muscarinic M1, M2 and nicotinic (nACh) acetylcholine receptors; noradrenergic α1 and α2 receptors; serotonergic 5-HT1A receptors; dopaminergic D1/D5 receptors by using quantitative in vitro receptor autoradiography. Additionally, we performed a modified Timm staining procedure to label zinc. The regionally different receptor densities mapped well onto seven HF subdivisions previously described. Several differences in receptor expression highlighted distinctive HF subdivisions. Notable examples include 1) high GABA A and α1 receptor expression, which rendered distinctive ventral subdivisions; 2) high α2 receptor expression, which rendered distinctive a dorsomedial subdivision; 3) distinct kainate, α2, and muscarinic receptor densities that rendered distinctive the two dorsolateral subdivisions; and 4) a dorsomedial region characterized by high kainate receptor density. We further observed similarities in receptor binding densities between subdivisions of the avian and mammalian HF. Despite the similarities, we propose that 300 hundred million years of independent evolution has led to a mosaic of similarities and differences in the organization of the avian HF and mammalian hippocampus and that thinking about the avian HF in terms of the strict organization of the mammalian hippocampus is likely insufficient to understand the HF of birds. J. Comp. Neurol. 522:2553–2575, 2014.
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2004; Jarvis et al., 2013), but what continues to concern researchers is uncertainty with respect to what, if any, areas of the avian HF correspond to the well-defined dentate gyrus (DG) and Ammon’s horn (CA3 and CA1 in particular) of the mammalian hippocampus. The avian HF (Fig. 1) can be coarsely divided into ventromedial (V-complex), dorsomedial (DM), and dorsolateral (DL) subdivisions. Further subdivisions (ventromedial Tr, VI, and Vm; dorsomedial DMd and DMv; and dorsolateral DLd and DLv; Fig. 2) have been described (Erichsen et al., 1991; Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2004). Erichsen et al. (1991) proposed that the medial (Vm) and lateral (VI) dense cell layers of the V-complex correspond to areas of Ammon’s horn, the area between the two cell layers (Tr) to the hilar region, and the dorsomedial HF (DMd and DMv) to the dentate gyrus (DG). However, they acknowledged uncertainty with respect to a dentate gyrus-like structure in the avian HF. The tracing study of Kahn et al. (2003) and Székely and Krebs (1996) in zebra finch (Taeniopygia guttata) essentially led to the same conclusions with respect to the interclass comparisons of Erichsen et al. (1991). By contrast, Atoji and Wild (2004) proposed, based on connectivity data and kainic acid lesions, that the cell layers of the V-complex actually correspond to the DG, whereas an Ammon’s horn-like subdivision is found in DM. Timm staining for zinc is a powerful marker for mossy fibers in mammals and has also been used to search for a DG mossy fiber-like system in bird species other than pigeons (Faber et al., 1989; Aboitiz, 1993; Montagnese et al., 1993, 1996; Tömböl et al., 2000b), but those Timm staining studies failed to reveal distinct, rat-like fiber labeling in the HF of birds. However, zinc labeling has been used to classify different types of glutamatergic synapses that can be found numerously in the CA fields (Sindreu et al., 2003).

To understand better the organization of the avian HF and its transmitter receptors and to shed light on the extent to which there are anatomically defined structures in the avian HF that are comparable to the DG and CA regions in the mammalian hippocampus, we mapped the distribution of 11 different neurotransmitter receptors in the pigeon HF. Our goal was to describe the regional receptor expression in the pigeon hippocampal formation as well as to characterize the receptor organization of HF in distinct subdivisions. We then compared the receptor binding data with published data for the hippocampus in different mammalian species (Kraemer et al., 1995; Palomero-Gallagher et al., 2003; Topic et al., 2007; Cremer et al., 2011). To complement the receptor data, we further carried out a zinc-staining procedure in the pigeon.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Receptor autoradiography

We examined a total of six adult pigeons (Columba livia) of unknown sex. Animals were obtained from local breeders and were housed in individual cages (30 × 30 × 45 cm) in a temperature (21°C ± 1°C)- and humidity-controlled room with a 12-hour light/dark circle. The subjects had access to grit, food, and water ad libitum. All experimental procedures were approved by national authorities (LANUV NRW, Germany) and were carried out in accordance with the National Institutes of Health Guide for care and use of laboratory animals. Animals were decapitated and the brains removed from the skull, frozen immediately in isopentane at −40°C, and stored at −70°C. Serial coronal 10-μm sections were cut with a cryostat microtome (2800 Frigocut E; Reichert-Jung). Sections were thaw mounted on gelatinized slides, freeze dried, and stained with a modified cell body staining for cytoarchitectonic analysis or processed for receptor autoradiography (Merker, 1983; Palomero-Gallagher et al., 2008).

Details of the autoradiographic labeling procedure have been published elsewhere (Zilles et al., 2002a,b; Schleicher et al., 2005). Binding protocols are summarized in Table 1. Three steps were performed in the following sequence: 1) A preincubation step removed endogenous ligand from the tissue. 2) During the main incubation step, binding sites
were labeled with tritiated ligand (total binding). Coincubation of the tritiated ligand and a 1,000–10,000-fold excess of an appropriate nonlabeled ligand (displacer) determined nonspecific and thus nondisplaceable binding. Specific binding is the difference between total and nonspecific binding. 3) A final rinsing step eliminated unbound radioactive ligand from the sections.

The following binding sites were labeled according to the above-cited protocols: 1) α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxalone propionic acid (AMPA) receptor with

Figure 2. Nissl-stained and schematic representation of the pigeon hippocampal formation subdivision boundaries from rostrocaudal atlas levels A 4.00 to A 9.50 (Karten and Hodos, 1967). A–E: Nissl-stained coronal sections of the hippocampal formation. F–J: Nissl-stained coronal section with the boundaries following Atoji and Wild (2004, 2006). K–O: Schematic representation of the subdivision scheme used to map the receptor densities and zinc labeling. The hippocampal formation in the pigeon comprises seven regions: the V-complex, consisting of the ventrolateral (Vl) and ventromedial (Vm) cell bands and the cellular inner triangular region (Tr), the dorsomedial region DM and its ventral (DMv) and dorsal (DMd) subdivisions, and the dorsolateral region DL and its ventral (DLv) and dorsal (DLd) subdivisions. Scale bar = 500 μm.
### TABLE 1.
**Incubation Conditions Used for Receptor Autoradiography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>$^3$H ligand (incubation concentration)</th>
<th>Displacer (incubation concentration)</th>
<th>Incubation buffer</th>
<th>Preincubination step</th>
<th>Main incubation step</th>
<th>Rinsing step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMPA</td>
<td>[3H]AMPA (10 nM)</td>
<td>Glutamate (10 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-acetate (pH 7.2)</td>
<td>3 × 10 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>45 min at 4°C in incubation buffer + 100 mM KSCN</td>
<td>4 × 4 sec at 4°C in incubation buffer + 2 × 2 sec at 4°C in acetone/glutaraldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainate</td>
<td>[3H]kainate (8 nM)</td>
<td>Kainate (100 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-citrate (pH 7.1)</td>
<td>3 × 10 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>45 min at 4°C in incubation buffer + 10 mM Ca-acetate</td>
<td>4 × 4 sec at 4°C in incubation buffer + 2 × 2 sec at 4°C in acetone/glutaraldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMDA</td>
<td>[3H]MK-801 (5 nM)</td>
<td>MK-801 (100 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.2)</td>
<td>15 min at 25°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>60 min at 25°C in incubation buffer + 30 µM glycine + 50 µM spermidine</td>
<td>2 × 5 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscarinic cholinergic M1</td>
<td>[3H]pirenzepine (1 nM)</td>
<td>Pirenzepine (10 µM)</td>
<td>Modified Krebs-Ringer buffer (pH 7.4)</td>
<td>20 min at 25°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>60 min at 25°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>2 × 5 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscarinic cholinergic M2</td>
<td>[3H]oxotremorine-M (0.8 nM)</td>
<td>Carbachol (1 µM)</td>
<td>20 mM HEPES-Tris (pH 7.5) + 10 mM MgCl$_2$</td>
<td>20 min at 25°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>60 min at 25°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>2 × 2 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotinic cholinergic</td>
<td>[3H]cytisine (1 nM)</td>
<td>Nicotine (10 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4)</td>
<td>120 mM NaCl + 5 mM KCl + 1 mM MgCl$_2$ + 2.5 mM CaCl$_2$</td>
<td>15 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>90 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α1 Adrenoceptor</td>
<td>[3H]prazosin (0.2 nM)</td>
<td>Phentolamine (10 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4)</td>
<td>30 min at 37°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>45 min at 30°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>2 × 5 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α2 Adrenoceptor</td>
<td>[3H]UK-14304 (1.4 nM)</td>
<td>Noradrenaline (100 µM) (-)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.7)</td>
<td>100 µM MnCl$_2$ 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4) + 100 mM MnCl$_2$ + 0.1% Ascorbic acid + 0.3 µM 9-OH-DPAT</td>
<td>15 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>90 min at 22°C in incubation buffer 30 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABA</td>
<td>[3H]muscimol (6 nM)</td>
<td>GABA (10 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-citrate (pH 7.0)</td>
<td>3 × 5 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>40 min at 4°C in incubation buffer + 0.01% Ascorbic acid</td>
<td>3 × 3 sec at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serotonergic 5-HT$_{1A}$</td>
<td>[3H] 8-OH-DPAT (1 nM)</td>
<td>Serotonin (10 µM)</td>
<td>170 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.6) + 4 mM CaCl$_2$</td>
<td>30 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>60 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>1 × 5 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dopaminergic D$_{1/5}$</td>
<td>[3H]SCH-23390 (0.5 nM)</td>
<td>SKF 83566 (1 µM)</td>
<td>50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4)</td>
<td>120 mM NaCl + 5 mM KCl + 2 mM CaCl$_2$ + 1 mM MgCl$_2$ + 1 µM Mianserin</td>
<td>20 min at 22°C in incubation buffer</td>
<td>90 min at 4°C in incubation buffer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[3H]AMPA, 2) kainate receptor with [3H]kainate, 3) N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor with [3H]MK-801, 4) γ-aminobutyric acid A (GABA A) receptor with [3H]muscimol, 5) muscarinic cholinergic M 1 receptor with [3H]pirenzepine, 6) muscarinic cholinergic M 2 receptor with [3H]oxotremorine-M, 7) nicotinic cholinergic (nACh) receptor with [3H]cytosine, 8) noradrenergic α 1 adrenoreceptor with [3H]prazosin, 9) noradrenergic α 2 adrenoreceptor with [3H]RX-821002, 10) serotonergic 5-HT 1A receptor with [3H]8-OH-DPAT, and 11) dopaminergic D 1/5 receptors with [3H]SCH 23390. Sections were air dried overnight and subsequently coexposed for 4–5 weeks against a tritium-sensitive film (Hyperfilm; Amersham, Braunschweig, Germany) with plastic 3H standards (Microscales; Amersham) of known concentrations of radioactivity.

Anatomical identification

The borders of the HF subdivisions (Fig. 2) were identified based on previous cytoarchitectural, neurochemical, and tract-tracing studies (Erichsen et al., 1991; Atoji et al., 2002; Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2004, 2005, 2006; Rosinha et al., 2009). Borders of the different subdivisions were traced on prints of the digitized autoradiographs by projecting the cell body stained sections onto the digitized images of the autoradiographs (Fig. 3).

Image analysis

The resulting autoradiographs were subsequently processed via densitometry with a video-based image analyzing technique (Schleicher et al., 2005). Autoradiographs were digitized by means of a KS-400 image analyzing system (Kontron Germany) connected to a CCD camera (Sony) equipped with an S-Orthoplanar 60-mm macro lens (Zeiss). The images were stored as binary files with a resolution of 512 × 512 pixels and eight-bit...
gray value. The gray-value images of the coexposed microscales were used to compute a calibration curve by nonlinear, least-squares fitting, which defined the relationship between gray values in the autoradiographs and concentrations of radioactivity that were then indicated in the color-coded autoradiographs (see Fig. 4). This allowed the pixel-wise conversion of the gray values of an autoradiograph into the corresponding concentration of radioactivity. The concentrations of binding sites occupied by a ligand under incubation conditions are transformed into fmol/mg protein at saturation conditions by means of the equation 

\[ (K_D + L) / A_S \times L \]

where \( K_D \) is the equilibrium dissociation constant of ligand-binding kinetics, \( L \) is the incubation concentration of ligand, and \( A_S \) is the specific activity of the ligand.

For the analysis of each ligand for each subdivision for a given pigeon, we attempted to sample HF, in the left hemisphere, at six evenly distributed anterior–posterior levels between A 9.5 and A 4.0 according to the atlas of Karten and Hodos (1967). However, for some ligands in some individuals, the tissue was not of sufficient quality to carry out an analysis at all six levels, and receptor concentrations were derived from the tissue available and based on fewer than six sections. Also, not all subdivisions extend across the entire anterior–posterior range sampled. For example, the V-complex is not discernible at more anterior levels, and DLd and DMd are not discernible at more posterior levels (Fig. 2); as a result, fewer than six sections were used for these subdivisions. The mean of the gray values contained in a specific HF subdivision over the sampled AP levels from one animal was then transformed into a receptor concentration (fmol/mg protein). The mean of each ligand in each subdivision averaged across the six animals was then reported as the receptor-binding density of a single receptor type for all subdivisions (Fig. 5).

**Statistical analysis**

For comparisons (see below), it was useful to determine whether any difference in receptor densities among the HF subdivisions, either visually or quantitatively revealed, was statistically verifiable. To do this, we first applied a Friedman ANOVA across all subdivisions for each ligand. If significant, pair-wise comparisons were run with the Wilcoxon-rank test. For all statistical analyses, Statistica 10 (StatSoft, Tulsa, OK) was used. The significance level was set at 0.05.

**Zinc labeling**

For the zinc-labeling procedure, an additional five adult pigeons of unknown sex obtained from local breeders were used. Pigeons were housed in individual cages (30 × 30 × 45 cm) in a temperature (21°C ± 1°C)- and humidity-controlled room with a 12-hour light–dark circle. The subjects had access to grit, food, and water ad libitum. All experimental procedures were approved by national authorities (LANUV NRW, Germany) and were carried out in accordance with the National Institutes of Health Guide for care and use of laboratory animals. All subjects were transcardially perfused for 5 min with a 0.1% Na2S in phosphate-buffered solution (105 mM NaH2PO4 · 2H2O in distilled H2O, pH set to 6.35 with NaOH) using an average pressure of 15 ml/min (modified from Danscher and Zimmer, 1978). The brain was removed and incubated for 3 hours in a 5% phosphate-buffered Acrolein solution for immersion fixation, followed by rinsing for twice for 30 min and twice for 5 min in PB. After incubation for 24 hours in 30% sucrose in PB for cryoprotection, brains were cut into 25-μm thin frontal sections using a microtome (Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany). Every tenth section was mounted on slides. Slides were rinsed for 5 min in distilled water and briefly dried at 30°C.

For the zinc staining, four solutions were prepared. 1) Gum arabic, 450 g, was dissolved in 900 ml distilled H2O and stirred for 5 days. After a few hours of precipitation, the supernatant was collected and the precipitate discarded. The Gum arabic solution can be stored at −20°C until further use. 2) Citric acid monohydrate (C6H5O7 · H2O), 5 g, was dissolved in 12.5 ml distilled H2O. After complete dissolving of citric acid monohydrate, 4.85 g trisodium citrate dihydrate (Na3C6H5O7 · 2H2O) was added to the solution. The solution was then filled to 20 ml with distilled H2O. 3) Hydroquinone, 1.7 g, was dissolved in 30 ml distilled H2O. 4) Silver nitrate, 0.21 g, was dissolved in 30 ml distilled H2O. Because the solution is light sensitive, it has to be protected from light all the time.

One hundred twenty-five milliliters of the gum arabic solution was mixed with solutions 2–4 and stirred for 5 min. The emergent developer solution was poured into an opaque plastic box, and sections were incubated in the developer solution for 3–4 hours. When staining had reached a sufficient intensity, as determined visually, the sections were removed from the developer solution and washed under running tap water for 15 minutes. After incubation in H2O overnight, slices were dehydrated and embedded/COVERSLIPPED in DPX (Sigma-Aldrich). It was crucial to use high-grade H2O to
Figure 5. Receptor fingerprints of the pigeon hippocampal formation (HF) subdivisions. The coordinate polar plots (A–K) show the individual receptor densities in fmol/mg protein for all subdivisions. The black lines connecting the mean densities of the receptors in each subdivision define the shape of the fingerprint so the reader can quickly notice substantial differences in the distribution of receptors in all subdivisions of the HF. As demonstrated in the fingerprint, glutamatergic AMPA and NMDA receptors are very similarly distributed in the pigeon HF, with high densities in all areas and a decline in DMd, whereas the high kainate receptors densities in DMd and DLd cause a peak in these subdivisions. GABA_A receptor densities peaked in the VI region and showed a decline in DMd. Muscarinic M_1 and M_2 receptors showed the same fingerprint shape. Densities differed substantially between DLv and the other subdivisions, which resulted in a substantial peak in the west–north direction of their polar plots. By contrast, nicotinic receptors were densely distributed in DMv, Tr, and DLd. Noradrenergic α_1 and α_2 substantially differed in their distributions. Very intense labeling for α_1 was found in the V-complex, so the northeast direction dominates the shape of its fingerprint. By contrast, α_2 receptor levels were high in DMv and the DL regions. 5-HT_1A receptor distributions, although with much lower densities, were similar to the GABA_A receptor distributions but showed no break in DMd. Finally, D_1/D_5 receptor distribution was similar to the M_2 distribution. Note that the scales in A–K are different. DMd, dorsal part of the dorsomedial region of HF; DMv, ventral part of the dorsomedial region of HF; DLD, dorsal part of dorsolateral region of HF; DLV, ventral part of dorsolateral region of HF; Tr, triangular region of the ventromedial region of HF; VM, ventromedial part of the V-complex; VI, ventrolateral part of the V-complex.
prevent any metal or chloride ions from contaminating working solutions or labware until completing incubation in developer solution, because such ions can interfere with autometallographic zinc labeling.

Sections were analyzed with a Zeiss Axio Imager M1 Microscope (Carl Zeiss) with 32.5 objective. HF images at A 9.50, A 8.00, A 6.50, and A 5.00 (according to the atlas of Karten and Hodos, 1967) were taken with an AxioCam MRM (Carl Zeiss) and the software AxioVision 4.8 (Carl Zeiss) with an exposure time of 8.4 msec.

To demonstrate that the observed labeling was specific to zinc, we carried out two control procedures. One control pigeon was perfused without using Na₂S. For a second control pigeon, the developer solution was prepared without silver nitrate. Further steps were performed as described above.

RESULTS

Figure 2 displays representative Nissl-stained sections and schematic images of the HF subdivisions used to map the receptor radiographs and zinc labeling. Beginning ventromedially and moving dorsolaterally, we subdivided HF into a ventromedial region (V-complex) with a medial cell layer (Vm), triangular region (Tr), lateral cell layer (Vl), dorso-dorsomedial region (DMd), ventro-dorsomedial region (DMv), dorso-dorsolateral region (DLd) and ventro-dorsolateral region (DLv).
Receptor-binding site densities in the HF

Binding site densities of all receptors are presented in a two-dimensional polar coordinate plot to construct a multireceptor fingerprint for each analyzed receptor for all HF subdivisions (see Fig. 5). Glutamatergic AMPA and NMDA receptors and GABAergic GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors displayed the highest densities. By contrast, muscarinic cholinergic M<sub>1</sub>, serotonergic 5-HT<sub>1A</sub>, and dopaminergic D<sub>1/5</sub> receptors displayed low densities throughout HF (see Fig. 5). As illustrated in the color-coded autoradiographs, in general, most of the HF subdivisions were labeled by glutamate and GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors, and it is noteworthy that noradrenergic α<sub>1</sub> and α<sub>2</sub> receptors nicely resolved some subdivisions (Figs. 6, 7). All receptor binding site densities are given in fmol/mg protein.

AMPA

Comparisons between all studied subdivisions using a Friedman ANOVA showed significant regional differences.
of the AMPA receptor densities ($\chi^2 \ [N = 6, df = 6] = 25.64, P < 0.001$). AMPA receptor concentrations varied from 1,164 ± 77 fmol/mg in DMd to 1,802 ± 58 fmol/mg in DLv (Figs. 5–7). A high receptor density was also found in Tr (1,777 ± 80 fmol/mg). In general, densities of the dorsolateral subdivisions were higher than those of the dorsomedial subdivisions, with DMd showing the lowest binding site densities among the dorsal regions. Densities in DLd were higher than densities in DMd ($N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05$), and DLv was different from DMv and DMd (both $N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$). AMPA receptor labeling clearly separated DMd and DMv from the V-complex, which showed higher binding site densities. DMv and DMd showed lower densities of AMPA receptors than Tr and Vl (all $N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$), and only DMd was additionally different from Vm ($N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$). DMd was also different from DMv. DMv displayed a binding site density of 1,611 ± 67 fmol/mg, which was about 50% higher compared with DMd ($N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$). Within the V-complex, the higher receptor density in Tr can be distinguished from Vm ($N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$).

**Kainate**

The densities of kainate receptors varied between the HF subdivisions ($\chi^2 \ [N = 6, df = 6] = 29.50, P < 0.001$). Highest densities for kainate receptors were detected in DLd (398 ± 15 fmol/mg) and lowest in DMv (238 ± 23 fmol/mg; Figs. 5–7). In the dorsolateral region, DLd and DLv showed different binding site densities ($N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$). More than any other ligand, labeling of kainate in DMd, with a concentration of 328 ± 23 fmol/mg, clearly separated it from surrounding subdivisions as DMd displayed lower densities than DLd and higher densities than DMv (both $N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$; Fig. 8). In the V-complex, a stepwise decrease in kainate binding site concentration could be observed from VI (303 ± 29 fmol/mg) to Tr (289 ± 27 fmol/mg) to Vm (245 ± 23 fmol/mg; VI and Tr: $N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05$; Tr and Vm: $N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$; VI and Vm: $N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05$; Fig. 5).

**NMDA**

Similarly to AMPA receptors, NMDA receptors were highly expressed in HF. The Friedman ANOVA revealed a significant overall effect ($\chi^2 \ [N = 6, df = 6] = 26.57, P < 0.001$). The highest amounts of NMDA labeling were detected in Tr (1,855 ± 83 fmol/mg) and the

---

**Figure 8.** Color-coded autoradiographs and zinc labeling in the pigeon hippocampal formation (HF). A–J: Color-coded autoradiographs of selected receptors at selected rostrocaudal levels from A 4.00 to A 9.50 highlighting subdivision differences designated by different receptor densities. Red areas indicated high receptor densities; blue areas showed low receptor densities. K–O: Subdivision differences in zinc labeling observed in the pigeon HF from rostrocaudal levels A 4.00 to A 9.50. Black areas were high in zinc, and light gray areas were low in zinc.
lowest in DMd (1,297 ± 76 fmol/mg; Figs. 5–7). Binding site densities for NMDA receptors were homogeneously distributed throughout DLd (1,543 ± 141 fmol/mg) and DLv (1,646 ± 85 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 5, n.s.). Dorsomedially, DMv showed considerably higher concentrations of NMDA receptor labeling (1639 ± 98 fmol/mg) than DMd (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). Furthermore, DMv was clearly distinct with respect to the V-complex (DMv and Tr: N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05; DMv and Vl and Vm: both N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05). In the V-complex, Tr showed a higher density of NMDA receptors compared with Vm (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05) but not VI (N = 6, T = 2, n.s.). However, VI showed a higher density (1,768 ± 82 fmol/mg) than Vm (1,456 ± 93 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). Notably, NMDA displayed a relatively more homogeneous binding site pattern in rostral HF compared with the more regionally distinctive pattern in caudal HF (Figs. 6, 7).

\( GABA_A \)

GABA\(_A\) receptor densities varied from 807 ± 72 fmol/mg protein in VI to 221 ± 33 fmol/mg in DMd (\( \chi^2 \) [N = 6, df = 6] = 28.79, P < 0.001; Figs. 5–8). The dorsolateral regions DLd (588 ± 54 fmol/mg) and DLv (658 ± 40 fmol/mg) showed an approximately threefold higher receptor concentration compared with DMd (221 ± 33 fmol/mg). DMd showed lower GABA\(_A\) receptor density than DLv, DLd, and DMv (all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05), and DMv (415 ± 55 fmol/mg) showed lower densities than DLd (N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05) and DLv (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). Furthermore, DMv and DMd differed from all V-complex subdivisions (all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05, except for DMv and Vm: N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05). Indeed, the low GABA\(_A\) receptor densities in DMd and DMv clearly separate the entire DM from the neighboring ventromedial and dorsolateral regions (Figs. 6–8). In the V-complex, GABA\(_A\) receptor densities decreased from VI (807 ± 72 fmol/mg) to Tr (601 ± 57 fmol/mg) to Vm (546 ± 43 fmol/mg; Figs. 5–8). However, significant differences could be detected only between VI and Tr (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05) and VI and Vm (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05).

\( M_2 \)

M\(_2\) receptor binding resulted in a clear parcellation of HF into its subdivisions (Figs. 5–7). Lowest densities were detected in DMd (64 ± 13 fmol/mg), with highest densities (267 ± 24 fmol/mg) in DLv. The Friedman ANOVA resulted in a significant overall effect (\( \chi^2 \) [N = 6, df = 6] = 29.43, P < 0.001). DLv showed higher amounts of M\(_2\) receptors than DLd (179 ± 13 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05) and DMv (111 ± 22 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). The densities of M\(_2\) receptor in DMd were lower than in all other regions (all N = 6, T = 0; P < 0.05). Receptor density decreased from VI (140 ± 20 fmol/mg) to Tr (125 ± 23 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05) to Vm (97 ± 14 fmol/mg protein; compared with Tr N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05). DMv densities were not different from any subdivision of the V-complex (VI N = 6, T = 3, n.s.; Tr and Vm N = 6, T = 6, n.s.; Figs. 5–7).

\( nACh \)

Binding sites for nACh receptors showed an inverse pattern of densities in DLd and DLv compared with both muscarinergic cholinergic receptor types (Figs. 5–8). A significant overall effect was detected with the Friedman ANOVA (\( \chi^2 \) [N = 6, df = 6] = 27.57, P < 0.001). The concentration of nACh receptors was higher in DLd (228 ± 22 fmol/mg) compared with DLv (167 ± 16 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). Highest binding site density was detected in DMv (273 ± 31 fmol/mg). DMd (190 ± 18 fmol/mg) displayed a lower binding density for nACh receptors than DMv and DLd (both N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). Density for nACh receptors in DMd was also higher compared with DLv, VI (172 ± 15 fmol/mg) and Vm (166 ± 18 fmol/mg; all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05) but not Tr (262 ± 32 fmol/mg; Figs. 5–8).

\( \alpha_1 \)

The Friedman ANOVA revealed a significant regional effect of noradrenergic \( \alpha_1 \) receptors in the pigeon HF (\( \chi^2 \) [N = 6, df = 6] = 31.57, P < 0.001). Noradrenergic \( \alpha_1 \) receptors were detected at only 16 ± 1 fmol/mg in DMd, but substantially higher amounts of 226 ± 11 fmol/mg were found in Tr (Figs. 5–8). DLd (67 ± 5 fmol/mg) and DLv (74 ± 4 fmol/mg) displayed intermediate densities of \( \alpha_1 \) adrenoceptors. VI (172 ± 14 fmol/mg) and Vm (177 ± 27 fmol/mg) showed similar \( \alpha_1 \) receptor densities. The \( \alpha_1 \) receptor binding with \({^3H}\)prazosin generally rendered the entire V-complex
distinctive (Figs. 6–8). DMv displayed at least a fourfold lower density (36 ± 4 fmol/mg) than any ventromedial region and was distinct from all other regions (all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05). The lowest density of noradrenergic α1 receptors in the HF was detected in DMd (all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05).

α2
Whereas α1 adrenoreceptors were highly expressed in the V-complex, α2 adrenoreceptors showed high densities in the dorsolateral and dorsomedial regions. Densities of α2 adrenoreceptors in the HF varied from 441 ± 48 fmol/mg in DMv to 153 ± 19 fmol/mg in DMd (Figs. 5–8). The Friedman ANOVA detected a significant regional overall effect (χ² [N = 6, df = 6] = 30.07, P < 0.001). Densities of α2 adrenoreceptors in DMd were threefold lower than in DMv (N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05; Figs. 5–7). Densities in DMv were also higher in comparison with the regions of the V-complex (VI & Tr N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05; Vm N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05). In the V-complex, VI (271 ± 28 fmol/mg) showed higher densities than Tr (201 ± 21 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05) but not Vm (220 ± 19 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 4, P = 0.17). The noradrenergic α2 adrenoreceptors were also abundant but unequally distributed in DLd (418 ± 31 fmol/mg) and DLv (354 ± 18 fmol/mg; N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05).

5-HT₁A
The expression of serotonergic 5-HT₁A receptors was generally low throughout the pigeon HF (Figs. 5–8), and no significant regional overall differences were detected (χ² [N = 6, df = 6] = 10.00, P = 0.15). However, a notably stronger signal could be found in DMd in some sections, especially at the border between DMd and DMv (see, e.g., Fig. 8). However, this stronger signal seemed to be highly variable across pigeons; no significant difference was detected between DMd (46 ± 3 fmol/mg) and neighboring DMv (40 ± 3 fmol/mg), DLd (44 ± 5 fmol/mg), or DLv (42 ± 3 fmol/mg). Densities in the V-complex varied and showed the highest value in VI (60 ± 10 fmol/mg).

D₁/₅
Dopaminergic D₁/₅ receptors showed the lowest densities of all measured receptor types (Figs. 5–7). However, the Friedman ANOVA detected a significant regional overall effect (χ² [N = 6, df = 6] = 22.86, P < 0.001). The maximal density was 26 ± 3 fmol/mg in DLv (all comparisons N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05; except for the comparison between DLv & DLd N = 6, T = 1, P < 0.05). Although D₁/₅ receptors provided little obvious separation among the HF subdivisions, the boundary between DMd and DMv was rendered distinctive by an almost complete lack of D₁/₅ receptors in DMd (Figs. 5–7). DMd showed the lowest receptor density compared with all other DM and DL structures (13 ± 1 fmol/mg; all N = 6, T = 0, P < 0.05).

Zinc staining
Although we did not see distinct layers of mossy fibers as found in rat hippocampus (but see Discussion), there is heterogeneity in the density of labeling that maps remarkably well onto our subdivision boundaries (Fig. 8). Moving from ventromedially to dorsolaterally, high zinc density indicated by the dense black labeling is clearly seen throughout VI, Vm, and Tr. This dense labeling is diminished in DMv, and labeling is virtually nonexistent in DMd. In dorsolateral DLv, dense labeling is seen again, but moderate labeling, similarly to DMv, is seen in DLv. The zinc data clearly indicate a well-defined boundary between the rich labeling in the V-complex and the absence of labeling in DMd. Also noteworthy is that zinc does not seem to distinguish between DMv and DLv.

DISCUSSION
Summary of main findings
By using receptor autoradiography for 11 different neurotransmitter receptors and zinc staining, we show that the hippocampal formation of the pigeon can be subdivided into seven subdivisions, which match well with other subdivisional schemes based on neurotransmitter distribution (Erichsen et al., 1991) and connectivity (Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2004). Additionally, our data offer a further basis for comparing subdivisions of the mammalian and avian hippocampal formation. Our approach has the advantage that we can compare the receptor architecture of an evolutionarily ancient brain structure, which retains a similar role in spatial cognition in species that have had independent evolutionary histories for about 300 million years. Similarities between birds and mammals may offer insight into how selective pressure may conserve basic receptor traits regardless of structural differences. In addition, it remains uncertain whether clear similarities exist among the subdivisions of avian and mammalian HF. Therefore, an important goal of our study was to compare the receptor architecture of the pigeon and mammalian HF to assess better which, if any, avian subdivisions may correspond best to the mammalian hippocampal DG, CA fields, subiculum, and EC.

Subdivisional organization of the avian hippocampal formation: previous studies
Different criteria have been used to define subdivisions of the HF in diverse bird species (Casini et al.,
1986; Erichsen et al., 1991; Krebs et al., 1991; Montagnese et al., 1996; Székely, 1999; Atoji et al., 2002; Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2006; Nair-Roberts et al., 2006; Suarez et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 2009; Sherry, 2011). During the first part of the twentieth century, judging from comparative studies between reptiles and different types of mammals (e.g., rodents, insectivores, and chiroptera; Rose, 1912) and birds (e.g., chicken and pigeons; Rose, 1914), Rose divided the caudal part of the avian dorsomedial forebrain into a ventrally located Ammon's formation and a dorsally located entorhinal area, which, in his opinion, were comparable to the similarly named regions in mammals (Rose, 1914, 1926). In 1930, Craigie studied the kiwi's hippocampal area the fascia dentate, which was not included in Rose's earlier analysis. A few years later, Craigie (1935) studied the emu’s (Dromiceius novaehollandiae) brain. He introduced the terms hippocampal area and parahippocampal area (APH) based on cell types and their arrangement. However, a clear border between the ventral and dorsal parts of HF as well as between the APH and the hyperpallium apicale (HA) were not defined. Furthermore, the HF in most other bird species is considerably smaller than that in the emu, so the emu classification is difficult to apply to other bird species.

Using Nissl staining and the previous data, Karten and Hodos (1967) divided the pigeon hippocampal formation into two regions, a hippocampus proper and the APH. Analysis of neurotransmitters and related enzymes with immunohistochemical methods offered the first higher resolution HF subdivision scheme and revealed seven candidate subdivisions (Erichsen et al., 1991; Krebs et al., 1991). A later electrophysiological study was able to resolve five of these subdivisions (Siegel et al., 2000). Probably the most influential subdivisional scheme of the avian HF comes from the work of Atoji and Wild (2004, 2006). Using tract tracing and Nissl staining, they divided the pigeon hippocampal formation into a dorsomedial region (DM), a dorsolateral region (DL), a medial V-complex region (V), which included a triangular region (Tr) with adjacent ventromedial (Vml) and ventrolateral (Vll) cell layers. Also located dorsomedially were three smaller areas, a magnocellular (Ma), a parvocellular (Pa), and a cell-poor (Po) region (Atoji and Wild, 2004, 2006). Additionally, Atoji and Wild (2004, 2006) showed that DM could be further subdivided into a lateral portion (DMl) and a medial portion (DMM). DL could also be further subdivided into a dorsal portion (DLd) and a ventral portion (DLv). It is the subdivisional scheme of Atoji and Wild (2004) that we used to create our provisional subdivisional map, and indeed it is remarkable how well many of the receptors studied here, as well as the zinc labeling, respected the borders of these subdivisions.

**Boundaries and subdivisions of the pigeon HF based on receptor autoradiography**

Consistent with earlier studies using immunohistochemical (Krebs et al., 1991; Erichsen et al., 1991) and tract tracing (Atoji and Wild, 2004, 2006; Kahn et al., 2003) analyses, the receptor data indicated relatively sharp boundaries between the most lateral portions of HF, namely, DLd and DLv, and laterally adjacent areas (for some examples see Figs. 6–8). The border between HA and dorsolateral HF was especially visible with AMPA, GABA_{A}, M_{2}, \alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, and 5-HT_{1A} receptor labeling. Densities of AMPA, GABA_{A}, M_{2}, and 5-HT_{1A} receptors were higher in HA than in neighboring DLd and DLv, whereas densities of \alpha_{1} and \alpha_{2} receptors were lower (quantitative HA data not presented).

More posteriorly, dorsolateral HF has been typically distinguished from the neighboring dorsolateral corticoid area (CDL) based on its shape; CDL is characterized as a uniformly thin wall, whereas DL decreases in thickness as it approaches CDL laterally (Montagnese et al., 1993; Atoji and Wild, 2004, 2006). Our ligand maps, by contrast, reveal a much clearer boundary. The border between HF and CDL is particularly distinct with GABA_{A}, M_{2}, \alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, and 5-HT_{1A} receptor labeling (Figs. 6, 7). Densities of GABA_{A}, \alpha_{1}, and 5-HT_{1A} receptors are higher in the CDL than in dorsolateral HF, whereas M_{2} and \alpha_{2} receptor densities are lower (quantitative data for CDL not presented; Herold et al., 2011, 2012). Also notable is that in more caudal HF CDL borders DMd and DMv as DLd and DLv disappear (for examples see Fig. 8).

Receptor imaging also allowed identification of a boundary between the HF dorsolateral subdivisions, DLd and DLv, and the adjacent dorsomedial structures, DMd and DMv. Densities of AMPA, kainate, GABA_{A}, M_{2}, M_{2}, and \alpha_{1} receptors were higher in DLd and DLv, whereas nACh receptors were lower in DLd and DLv compared with, in particular, DMv (Figs. 5–7). In general, the multireceptor mapping supports the identification of seven subdivisions as proposed by Erichsen et al. (1991) and Atoji and Wild (2004, 2006).

**Glutamate receptors**

Glutamate AMPA and NMDA receptor densities were high in all regions of the pigeon HF. AMPA binding did not vary between DLd and DLv, but clearly separated DL from DMv. Furthermore, DMd displayed a relatively low concentration compared with the other regions and could be clearly separated from DMv. In general, DM
showed lower densities than the surrounding DL and V-complex ventromedial regions. In the V-complex, AMPA binding was lower in Vm compared with Tr. Our results showed higher AMPA densities in the pigeon HF compared with those reported for \[^{3}H\] AMPA binding in marsh tits (Parus palustris) and blue tits (Parus caeruleus; Stewart et al., 1999). Furthermore, there seemed to be no differences in AMPA receptor densities between DL (their APH) and DM/V-complex (their Hp) in tits.

An immunohistochemical analysis of glutamatergic AMPA receptor subunits revealed that GluR1, GluR2/3, and GluR4 are expressed in the pigeon HF (Rosinha et al., 2009). Especially GluR1 and GluR2/3 were expressed pre dominantly in so-called IR and T neurons, whereas GluR4 was expressed predominantly in so-called R neurons. IR neurons are multipolar projection neurons, T neurons are triangular pyramidal neurons, and R neurons are ovoid or stellate cells that may be glial cells or local interneurons (Tömböl et al., 2000a; Atoji et al., 2002). Rosinha et al. (2009) observed intense labeling for GluR1 and GluR2/3 in the V-complex, in which we detected high AMPA receptor densities as well.

Generally fewer kainate receptors were expressed compared with NMDA or AMPA, but kainate receptors showed a differential regional distribution pattern. Kainate receptor density reached a maximum in DLd and DMd, and the lowest densities were measured in DMv. Again, DMv was distinct from the surrounding DL, ventromedial regions, and DMd. In the V-complex, a stepwise decrease in receptor density could be detected from VI to Tr to Vm. We are aware of no other studies that have looked at kainate receptor binding in birds.

NMDA receptor binding discriminated mainly among DMd, DMv, and the V-complex. Highest NMDA receptor densities were found in VI and Tr, and the lowest densities were detected in DMd. Similarly to AMPA receptors, NMDA receptor binding in the V-complex separated Tr from Vm but not VI. Furthermore, the pattern of NMDA receptors seemed to become increasingly distinctive in the subdivisions of the more caudal part of HF. Compared with our present results, densitometric measurements of NMDA receptor binding with \[^{3}H\]MK801 in blue and marsh tits showed the same overall densities in the HF of blue tits and slightly lower densities for marsh tits (Stewart et al., 1999). However, in both marsh and blue tits, there seemed to be only small overall differences in NMDA receptor densities between DL (their APH) and DM/V-complex (their Hp).

**GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor**

Examination of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor densities showed again a clear boundary between HF dorsolateral and dorso-medial regions. Densities decreased overall from DL to DMv to DMd. In addition, DMv was different from the V-complex, which showed higher GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor densities. Within the V-complex, a decrease from VI to Tr to Vm was observed. Earlier binding studies in pigeons did not show differences in GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor labeling in the Hp/APH region (Veenman et al., 1994). However, our pattern of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor density is in general agreement with results from other bird species looking at GABAergic neurochemistry. In members of the Corvidae and Paridae, calbindin distribution divides HF into five main regions, and the medial and the lateral branches of what would be the V-complex are different (Montagnese et al., 1993). Glutamate decarboxylase (GAD; an enzyme in GABAergic interneurons) was found homogeneously distributed in the neuropil of the pigeon DM and DL, and in small to medium-sized immunoreactive cells throughout the entire HF (Krebs et al., 1991). The pattern of GAD was approximately coextensive with the calbindin staining of Montagnese et al. (1993). As with the intensely GAD- and calbindin-labeled areas, we found high densities of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors throughout the entire pigeon DL and VI. By contrast, GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors were relatively weakly expressed in DM, particularly in DMd.

**Cholinergic receptors**

The different cholinergic receptors were each distinctly distributed throughout the HF. M<sub>1</sub> densities were highest, followed by M<sub>2</sub> and nACh. M<sub>1</sub> receptors showed the highest concentration in DLv and lower densities in DLd, DMv, and Tr. A low M<sub>1</sub> receptor density rendered DMd distinct from the other regions. In the V-complex, densities decreased from VI to Tr to Vm, again showing a difference in receptor profile between the medial and the lateral dense cell layers. A similar receptor distribution pattern was also found for M<sub>2</sub> receptors. By contrast, nACh receptor binding showed higher densities in DLd compared with DLv. Both DLv and DLd were different from DMv, whereas DMv again was not distinguishable from Tr. However, higher densities in Tr separated this region from VI and Vm.

Analysis of muscarinic (M-type) receptors with \[^{3}H\]N-methyl scopolamine showed no differences in densities between DM/V-complex (their Hp) and DL (their APH) in quail (Coturnix coturnix japonica) but higher amounts of M-type receptors in DL compared with DM/V-complex in starlings (Sturnus vulgaris; Ball et al., 1990). The densities of M-type receptors in the quail and starling HF were higher across all major subdivisions compared with our findings in pigeon. Although the difference could be explained by species variation, probably more important is the use of subtype-specific ligands for the
group of M-type receptors in our study. Our binding protocols label M₁ and M₂ subtypes separately, which can explain the higher densities for all M-type receptors found by Ball et al. (1990). Our findings are also in line with an earlier autoradiographic study, which showed only low to moderate densities of M-type receptors, 25–250 fmol/mg protein, in DL and DM/V-complex of the pigeon (Dietl et al., 1988). As with starlings (Ball et al., 1990), pigeons showed higher densities of M-type receptors in DL than in all other HF subregions. Weak labeling of muscarinic cholinergic receptors was found in DMd, but nACh receptors occurred at a relatively high density in DMd (see Fig. 5).

**Monoaminergic receptors**

Monoaminergic receptors showed highly variable densities in the pigeon HF. Highest densities were observed for noradrenergic α receptors and lowest for D₁/5 receptors α₁. Receptors were expressed in the V-complex region, with highest densities both in Tr and in Vm. This finding is in contrast to the lower density in VI. The α₁ receptor density of the V-complex was clearly different from that of DMv. DMv can be separated from DMd, DLd, and DLv by differences in α₁ receptor density. However, DLd and DLv could not be discriminated by their α₁ receptor binding. α₂ Receptor binding was higher in DMv and the DL regions. By contrast, α₂ receptors were more dense in DLd compared with DLv but did not differ from DMv. Again, DMd was rendered distinct by its lower α₂ receptor density compared with DMv, DLd, and DLv. In the V-complex, a relatively homogeneous distribution of α₂ receptors was detected. VI showed higher densities compared with Tr but not Vm. Our results seem to be in line with the distribution of α₂ receptors in the European starling (Heimovics et al., 2011). Although not quantified in their publication, the autoradiographs of the starling HF look similar to the autoradiographs that we obtained for pigeons.

Serotonergic 5-HT₁₄ receptors did not differ among any of the subdivisions. This has already been reported for DL and the DM/V-complex (APH and Hp, respectively, in Herold et al., 2012). The quantitative result is somewhat surprising, because a higher density in DMd was detected by visual inspection in a number of brain sections (see Figs. 6, 7). Similarly to the neurotransmitter 5-HT labeling in DMd and DMv (DMs and parts of DMI in Krebs et al., 1991), 5-HT₁₄ receptor labeling in our study seemed to slowly decrease from rostral to caudal HF, perhaps obscuring subdivision differences in 5-HT₁₄ receptor density.

Dopaminergic D₁/5 receptors were differentially distributed between DLv and all other subregions. They reach their highest densities in DLv compared with the other subregions. Additionally, lower D₁/5 densities were observed in DMd compared with the surrounding regions. As in our results, tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) was detected mainly in the dorsal parts of the pigeon HF (Krebs et al., 1991). In general, the low densities of D₁/5 receptors observed in the pigeon HF are in line with former studies in pigeons, quails, and chicken (Gallus gallus; Dietl and Palacios, 1988; Ball et al., 1995; Schnabel and Braun, 1996; Kleitz et al., 2009).

**Comparison with the mammalian hippocampal formation**

The avian HF and mammalian hippocampus develop from the same portion of the telencephalon (Kallen, 1962; Rodriguez et al., 2002), share the same cell types (Molla et al., 1986; Tömöl et al., 2000a), and have similar neurochemical profiles (Erichsen et al., 1991; Krebs et al., 1991). A special characteristic of both the avian HF and the mammalian hippocampus is adult neurogenesis (Altman, 1962; Barnea and Nottebohm, 1994; Eriksson et al., 1998; Hoshooley et al., 2005; Ming and Song, 2005; Pytte et al., 2007). The similarities may explain the presumably conserved role of both the avian HF and the mammalian hippocampus in cognition (Sherry et al., 1992; Colombo and Bred- bent, 2000). However, the connections to other brain areas, e.g., septum, hypothalamus, brainstem nuclei, and telencephalic sensory processing areas, are not fully identical (Casini et al., 1986; Atoji and Wild, 2006). Furthermore, the cytoarchitectural differences between the avian and the mammalian HF have made it difficult to identify similarities in subdivisional organization (but see Erichsen et al., 1991; Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2006; Papp et al., 2007).

The mammalian hippocampus is divided into distinct subregions based on anatomical criteria, DG with the hilus region, Ammon’s horn (comprising the fields CA1–CA4), and the subiculum (Amaral and Witter, 1989; Insuausti, 1993; Amunts et al., 2005; Witter, 2007). Because of the distinct cytoarchitecture of DG and Ammon’s horn regions, they can be distinguished from the laterally positioned subiculum and EC. Typically, the CA regions are densely packed with pyramidal neurons, whereas the DG is densely packed with granular cells. In contrast, the avian HF is a more nuclear-like structure, densely packed with heterogeneous populations of neurons with a slow transition into the parahippocampal area (DL). In the mammalian hippocampus, the EC is part of the parahippocampal area ( gyrus parahippocampalis) and differs considerably from the hippocampal
regions (Amaral and Witter, 1989; Insauti, 1993; Amunts et al., 2005; Witter, 2007).

Different regions of the avian HF, based on tracing studies, have been proposed to be homologues of the mammalian DG. Székely and Krebs (1996) and Kahn et al. (2003) proposed that DM is a homologue of DG and that the V-complex is a homologue of unspecified CA fields. Atoji and Wild (2004, 2006), by contrast, claimed that DM shows properties of both CA and subiculum, whereas the V-shaped structure (our V-complex), because of its intrinsic connections, seems to be more similar to DG. However, seemingly all researchers agree that DL is comparable to EC (Székely, 1999; Siegel et al., 2002; Atoji and Wild, 2004; Puelles et al., 2007; Rattenborg and Martinez-Gonzalez, 2011).

In general, the receptor autoradiographic analysis of 10 different receptor types in the hippocampus of 11 different mammalian species showed that α1, M1, 5-HT2, GABA<sub>A</sub>, AMPA, kainate, and NMDA receptor densities were minimally variable across species, whereas α2, 5-HT<sub>1A</sub>, and M2 were highly variably expressed (Palomero-Gallagher, 1999). In many of the species studied and compared with all other hippocampal structures, CA3 showed the lowest receptor densities (Kraemer et al., 1995; Palomero-Gallagher, 1999; Zilles et al., 2000; Cremer et al., 2009). To compare and identify better the subdivision similarities (and differences) between pigeon HF and mammalian hippocampus, we created a summary of the already published receptor data in the mammalian HF (Table 2). This table provides the relative receptor densities for each mammalian hippocampal substructure normalized to the mean value of the investigated receptor type in the total hippocampus. For better comparisons, we also added the relative densities for each substructure of the pigeon HF. As in the pigeon, glutamate receptors showed high densities in the mammalian hippocampus, with higher densities for AMPA and NMDA compared with kainate receptors (Palomero-Gallagher, 1999; Zilles et al., 2000; Topic et al., 2007). In rats (Rattus norvegicus) and mice (Mus musculus), CA1 showed the highest densities for AMPA and NMDA receptors, followed by DG. In contrast, CA3 and DG were high in kainate receptors (Table 2). Overall, the following conclusions can be drawn: in comparing the relative densities of glutamatergic receptors in the different subdivisions of the rodent hippocampus and pigeon HF, the most striking similarities exist between high kainate receptor densities in VI, Tr, DMD, and DG/CA3, as well as DLd vs. EC, and low kainate receptor concentrations in Vm/DMv and CA1/CA2. NMDA and AMPA receptor densities were mostly comparable between VI/Tr/DMv and DG/CA1 (Table 2). Binding of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors with [3H]muscimol showed high receptor densities in the pigeon HF and mammalian hippocampus (Kraemer et al., 1995; Topic et al., 2007; Cremer et al., 2009, 2010). GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor densities decreased from Ent to DG to CA1 to CA2 to CA3 in mouse, rat, and marmoset (Callithrix jacchus) brains. Again, VI/Tr/Vm and the DL regions resembled DG/CA1 and EC, respectively. DMv was similar to CA2, and DMD, with its very low GABA<sub>A</sub> densities, was comparable to CA3. M receptors were more highly expressed in the marmoset and the rodent hippocampus compared with the pigeon HF, but nACh showed higher densities in pigeons compared with rodents (Pauly et al., 1989; Kraemer et al., 1995; Topic et al., 2007; Wolff et al., 2008; Cremer et al., 2009). In pigeons, cholinergic binding sites nicely discriminated among the different subdivisions; however, no pattern was observed to indicate any correspondence among mammalian and avian hippocampal substructures based on density variation in cholinergic receptors (Table 2). This lack of correspondence may reflect interspecies variability with respect to cholinergic receptor types that may obscure detection of general differences in the hippocampal-cholinergic systems in mammals and birds. The analysis of the monoaminergic receptors revealed that α<sub>2</sub> receptor binding suggests a similarity for CA1/DG and VI/DMv, whereas lower densities in CA2/CA3 appear to resemble more Tr/Vm/DMd (Table 2; Zilles et al., 2003). 5-HT<sub>1A</sub> receptors showed comparable relative densities only between DG and VI and between CA1 and Vm for the rat, but not for mice or other mammals (Table 2; Palomero-Gallagher, 1999). D<sub>1/5</sub> receptors also suggest a DG more similar to VI and DMv. The high densities of D<sub>1/5</sub> receptors in the DL regions are also detected in EC.

Overall, we propose close similarity between DG/CA1 and the VI/Tr/DMv regions, whereas DMD/Vm might be more comparable to the CA2/CA3 regions. DMD shared several receptor characteristics with CA3, and generally DMv was more similar to CA1 and Vm resembled CA2. The DL regions seemed to be comparable to EC (Fig. 9). This latter finding is in line with the generally accepted similarity between DL and EC (for review see Atoji and Wild, 2006).

Zinc staining

High levels of zinc in the mossy fiber system of rats have led avian researchers to seek a DG equivalent in birds, relying on Timm staining. In previous studies (Faber et al., 1989; Montagnese et al., 1993; Tömöl et al., 2000b) of chick and zebra finch brains, an obvious parallel to DG could not be revealed. An examination of our zinc staining (Fig. 8) also failed to reveal the distinctive labeling suggestive of the layered...
### TABLE 2.
Comparison of Neurotransmitter Receptor Densities in the Pigeon and Mammalian Hippocampal Formation (HF)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Vm</th>
<th>DMv</th>
<th>DMd</th>
<th>Dld</th>
<th>DLv</th>
<th>CA1</th>
<th>CA2</th>
<th>CA3</th>
<th>DG</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMPA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>109 (1), 114 (2), 117 (5), 102 (6), 110 (4), 115 (7)</td>
<td>90 (1), 87 (2), 94 (5)</td>
<td>86 (1), 78 (2), 94 (5), 95 (4), 90 (7)</td>
<td>97 (1), 104 (2), 95 (5), 98 (6), 96 (4), 94 (7)</td>
<td>68 (6)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52 (1), 67 (2,6), 59 (5), 71 (4), 63 (7)</td>
<td>74 (1), 58 (2), 69 (5)</td>
<td>140 (1), 127 (2), 174 (5), 116 (4), 113 (7)</td>
<td>124 (1), 113 (2), 132 (6), 97 (5), 113 (4), 125 (7)</td>
<td>134 (6)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMDA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>120 (1), 124 (2), 130 (5), 105 (6), 126 (4), 135 (7), 110 (3)</td>
<td>84 (1), 83 (2), 99 (5), 88 (3)</td>
<td>74 (1), 71 (2), 83 (5), 81 (4), 69 (7), 82 (3)</td>
<td>90 (1), 101 (2), 89 (5), 95 (6), 93 (4), 97 (7), 94 (3)</td>
<td>77 (6)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse, Marmoset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABA(\alpha)_A</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80 (2), 87 (6), 122 (4), 106 (7), 111 (3)</td>
<td>70 (2), 72 (3)</td>
<td>47 (2), 62 (4), 58 (7), 60 (3)</td>
<td>119 (2), 111 (6), 114 (4), 137 (7), 112 (3)</td>
<td>118 (6)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse, Marmoset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(_1)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>118 (2), 128 (12), 119 (7), 113 (8), 101 (3)</td>
<td>74 (2), 67 (12), 104 (3)</td>
<td>65 (2), 94 (12), 71 (7), 70 (8), 97 (3)</td>
<td>109 (2), 139 (12), 110 (7), 117 (8), 99 (3)</td>
<td>111 (12)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse, Marmoset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(_2)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>115 (2), 141 (12), 91 (7), 124 (8), 103 (3)</td>
<td>101 (2), 86 (12), 110 (3)</td>
<td>105 (2), 104 (12), 142 (7), 79 (8), 111 (3)</td>
<td>86 (2), 89 (12), 74 (7), 97 (8), 88 (3)</td>
<td>146 (12)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse, Marmoset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nACh</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56 (12), 103 (7), 95 (2), 108 (7), 88 (3)</td>
<td>56 (12), 103 (7), 95 (2), 108 (7), 88 (3)</td>
<td>56 (12), 45 (7), 101 (2), 104 (7), 95 (3)</td>
<td>260 (12), 152 (7), 103 (2), 88 (7), 110 (3)</td>
<td>185 (12)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)_1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>106 (2), 108 (7), 88</td>
<td>102 (2), 101 (3)</td>
<td>101 (2), 104 (7), 95 (3)</td>
<td>260 (12), 152 (7), 103 (2), 88 (7), 110 (3)</td>
<td>185 (12)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse, Marmoset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)_2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>103 (2)</td>
<td>90 (2)</td>
<td>86 (2)</td>
<td>105 (2)</td>
<td>132 (13)</td>
<td>Rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-HT(_1)A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93 (2), 79 (9), 205</td>
<td>44 (2)</td>
<td>73 (2), 29 (7)</td>
<td>130 (2), 119 (9), 66</td>
<td>27 (13)</td>
<td>Rat, Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(_1/5)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>39 (2), 76 (10)</td>
<td>58 (2)</td>
<td>54 (2)</td>
<td>177 (2), 147 (10), 170 (11)</td>
<td>170 (11)</td>
<td>Rat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Values for each structure correspond to the receptor density in percentage relative to the mean density of the receptor type in the hippocampus (mammals) or the HF (pigeons). The conclusion of this summary is illustrated in Figure 9. (1) Palomero-Gallagher et al., 2003; (2) Topic et al., 2007; (3) Kraemer et al., 1995; (4) Zilles et al., 2000; (5) Martens et al., 1998; (6) Cremer et al., 2009; (7) Cremer et al., 2011; (8) Wolff et al., 2008; (9) Zavitsanou et al., 2010; (10) Savosta et al., 1986; (11) Cremer et al., 2010; (12) Silvery et al., 1997; (13) our unpublished data.
organization of mossy fibers in rats (Danscher et al., 1973; Danscher and Zimmer, 1978; Zimmer and Haug, 1978). At first glance, our findings also call into question whether mossy fibers, and by inference a strict equivalent to the DG, is present in birds, despite the indicators of our autoradiographic analysis. However, a further examination of Figure 8 shows that the V-complex of the avian HF is densely labeled with zinc, whereas in the DMv area staining is low, and the DMd is almost devoid of zinc staining. In the DL region, high levels of zinc could be observed in the DLv region but not in the DLd. No distinctive laminar-like labeling similar to the rat hippocampus could be observed. In fact, the diffuse but dense labeling in our V-complex resembles the diffuse and dense labeling in the CA regions of the primate hippocampus (Amaral et al., 2007). Therefore, if one considers the density of zinc labeling rather than looking for distinct mossy fibers, our V-complex resembles more the CA regions of mammals and particularly primates. On the other hand, not only the mossy fibers in the mammalian hippocampus are labeled with zinc. Zinc labeling occurred also in the granular cell layer and the molecular layer of DG (Zimmer and Haug, 1978; De Biasi and Bendotti, 1998). Given this fact, our zinc results do not exclude a correspondence between VI/Tr and DG or Vm/DMv/DMd and the CA regions as suggested by the receptor data. Dense zinc labeling in the DLv and low labeling in DLd is in line with the non-homogeneous labeling of EC and subiculum in the rat HF (Zimmer and Haug, 1978; Riba-Bosch and Perez-Clausell, 2004).

The colocalization of NMDA receptors and zinc characterizes much of Ammon’s horn of the mammalian hippocampus, where glutamate and zinc (Zn$^{2+}$) are coreleased (Sindreu et al., 2003; Qian and Noebels, 2005). Thus, the extent to which NMDA receptors and zinc colocalize in the avian HF is of additional comparative interest. However, one limitation of our staining technique is that it labeled only vesicular zinc, leaving extracellular zinc undetected. Despite this limitation, examination of the NMDA fingerprint in Figure 5 and the zinc labeling in Figure 8 reveals some notable similarities. Based on the fingerprints, the highest density of NMDA receptors were found in VI and Tr of the V-complex, where there was also dense labeling for zinc. Vm, by contrast, had lower NMDA receptor densities and less dense zinc labeling. Similarities continue in the two DM subdivisions, where higher NMDA and zinc labeling densities were found in DMv compared with DMd. Overall, there is an apparent correlation between the density of NMDA receptors and the zinc labeling density in the avian HF, a pattern also found in the mammalian hippocampus. From the perspective of possible subdivision parallels, the dense coupling of NMDA

Figure 9. Similarities between receptor distribution in the subdivisions of the pigeon HF (A) and receptor distribution in the subdivisions of a typical (idealistic) mammalian hippocampus (B). The same colors indicate substantial overlap in relative receptor densities based on semiquantitative comparisons between the pigeon HF and the rat hippocampus (Table 2). Here DMv, VI, and Tr share similarities with DG and CA1 (indicated in orange), and DMd and Vm share similarities with CA2 and CA3 (indicated in blue), whereas DLd/DLv share similarities with entorhinal cortex (EC; indicated in green). CA1, cornu ammonis field 1; CA2, cornu ammonis field 2; CA3, cornu ammonis field 3; DG, dentate gyrus; DMd, dorsal part of the dorsomedial region of HF; DMv, ventral part of the dorsomedial region of HF; DLd, dorsal part of dorsolateral region of HF; DLv, ventral part of dorsolateral region of HF; EC, entorhinal cortex; Tr, triangular region of the ventromedial region of HF; Vm, ventromedial part of the V-complex; VI, ventrolateral part of the V-complex.
CONCLUSIONS

Although the mammalian hippocampus and avian HF derive from the same portion of the developing pallium (Reiner et al., 2004; Jarvis et al., 2013), their relationship to the rest of the forebrain is somewhat different. Whereas the mammalian hippocampus interacts, indirectly, with virtually the entire neocortex (Bird and Burgess, 2008), the avian HF has more limited connectivity (Csillag et al., 1994; Leutgeb et al., 1996; Kröner and Güntürkün, 1999; Atoji et al., 2002; Atoji and Wild, 2005). For example, unlike the case for the mammalian hippocampus, only a small projection from the medial septum to HF has been detected (Casini et al., 1986; Atoji and Wild, 2004; Montagnese et al., 2004). Given the incomplete correspondence in the subdivisional organization of the mammalian and avian HF, it is tempting to speculate that the differences in connectivity can in part explain how the two systems evolved differently. Internal characteristics (Aboitz, 1993; Manns and Eichenbaum, 2005; Papp et al., 2007; Rattenborg and Martinez-Gonzalez, 2011). However, in both mammals and birds, the hippocampal formation shares a number of morphological, physiological, and neurochemical similarities (Krebs et al., 1989; Bingman and Mench, 1990; Erichsen et al., 1991; Montagnese et al., 1993; Colombo et al., 1997; Margrie et al., 1998; Gagliardo et al., 1999; Tömöl et al., 2000a; Atoji et al., 2002; Budzynski et al., 2002; Bingman et al., 2003, 2005; Kahn et al., 2003; Atoji and Wild, 2004, 2005, 2006; Hough and Bingman, 2004; Bischof et al., 2006; Nair-Roberts et al., 2006; Hoshooley and Sherry, 2007; Sherry, 2011; Gupta et al., 2012) and plays a similar role in cognition, especially in spatial cognition (Bingman et al., 1998; Colombo and Broadbent, 2000; Suzuki and Clayton, 2000; Tommasi et al., 2003; Watanabe and Bischof, 2004; Ruploh et al., 2011; Mayer et al., 2012). By comparing the receptor architectonic profile of the pigeon HF with the mammalian hippocampus, we detected a number of shared traits (Fig. 9). However, as indicated by a study in the zebra finch that investigated the expression of immediate early genes during spatial learning, a study that detected individual patch locations that were not in line with previously described hippocampal subdivisions (Mayer et al., 2012), it may be possible that information processing in the HF of birds is, at least in part, different from that in the mammalian hippocampus (but see Kahn et al., 2003). Székely (1999) also came to the same conclusion, that the avian HF probably has a somewhat different wiring organization compared with the mammalian hippocampus. Therefore, in assuming a kind of nonlaminar, network organization for the avian HF (for review see Atoji and Wild, 2006), it may be that there was less selective pressure to organize the avian HF into anatomically discrete subdivisions such as those found in the mammalian hippocampus. Another point is that, although the avian HF and mammalian hippocampus develop from the same type of cells during development, so far expression profiles of selective markers have not clarified whether these cells are more amygdalect or more cortex-like, or both (Reiner et al., 2004; Dugas-Ford et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2013; Jarvis et al., 2013). To understand the development of hippocampal subfields, it is also very important to understand how cells originate, how cells migrate, and during which time window cells express specific genes that organize their future targets during development (Chris-tie et al., 2013; Montiel and Molnar, 2013). As one last consideration, from analysis of gene expression profiles between different species, some researchers have proposed that the DG is one of the most recently evolved structures of the mammalian brain (see Kempermann, 2012). Thus, it may be that birds did not evolve a DG, but this would not exclude the independent evolution of a functional equivalent, as has been shown for the nidopallium caudolaterale of birds and the prefrontal cortex of mammals (Güntürkün, 2012).

Overall, our study reveals an avian HF characterized by distinct subdivisions based on differences in receptor-type distribution and zinc density. Similarities to the mammalian HF could be observed between VI/Tr/DMv and DG/CA1, between Vm/DMd and CA2/CA3, and between DL and Ent (Table 2, Fig. 9). However, we suggest that 300 million years of independent evolution has led to a mosaic of similarities and differences in the subdivisional organization of the avian HF and mammalian hippocampus and that thinking about the avian HF in terms of the strict subdivisional organization of the mammalian hippocampus is likely insufficient to understand the avian HF.
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