

1                   **Title: Enhanced maternal behaviors in a mouse model of congenital blindness**

2                   *Short running title: Maternal behaviors in blind mice*

3                   Nouhaila Bouguiyoud<sup>1,2</sup>, Wen Bin Xie<sup>1</sup>, Gilles Bronchti<sup>1</sup>, Johannes Frasnelli<sup>1,2</sup>, &  
4                   Syrina Al Aïn<sup>1,2</sup>

5

6                   <sup>1</sup> Department of Anatomy, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, QC, Canada

7                   <sup>2</sup> CogNAC Research Group, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, QC,  
8                   Canada

9

10                  \*Corresponding author: Syrina Al Aïn, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, 3351, boul. des  
11                  Forges, C.P. 500, Trois-Rivières, QC G9A 5H7, Canada. E-mail: [Syrina.Alain@uqtr.ca](mailto:Syrina.Alain@uqtr.ca)

12

13                  Acknowledgments: This work was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research  
14                  Council of Canada (NSERC) (2017-06942).

15                  **Abstract**

16                  In mammals, mothering is one of the most important pro-social female behavior to promote  
17                  survival, proper sensorimotor and emotional development of the offspring. Different intrinsic  
18                  and extrinsic factors can initiate and maintain these behaviors, such as hormonal, cerebral, and  
19                  sensory changes. Infant cues also stimulate multisensory systems and orchestrate complex  
20                  maternal responsiveness. To understand the maternal behavior driven by complex sensory  
21                  interactions, it is necessary to comprehend the individual sensory systems by taking out other  
22                  senses. An excellent model for investigating sensory regulation of maternal behavior is a murine  
23                  model of congenital blindness, the ZRDBA mice, where both anophthalmic and sighted mice  
24                  are generated from the same litter. Therefore, this study aims to assess whether visual inputs  
25                  are essential to driving maternal behaviors in mice. Maternal behaviors were assessed using  
26                  three behavioral tests, including the pup retrieval test, the home cage maternal behavior test,  
27                  and the maternal aggression test. Our results show that blind mothers: 1) took less time to  
28                  retrieve their offspring inside the nest, 2) spent more time nursing and licking their offspring in  
29                  the second-and third-week post-partum, and 3) exhibited faster aggressive behaviors when  
30                  exposed to an intruder male, compared to the sighted counterparts. This study provides evidence  
31                  that congenitally blind mothers show more motivation to retrieve the pups, care, and protection  
32                  towards their pups than sighted ones, likely due to a phenomenon of sensory compensation.

33                  **Key words:** Congenital blindness, maternal aggression, maternal behaviors, maternal  
34                  motivation, mice.

35      **1. Introduction**

36      Extensive work over the past 50 years has explored mechanisms mediating  
37      caregiving/mothering behavior in a wide variety of model organisms spanning from fishes,  
38      reptiles, birds, to mammals (Bosh, 2013; Dulac et al., 2014; Kristal, 2009; Stolzenberg &  
39      Mayer, 2019). In most mammals, mothering is crucial for the survival, the optimal sensorimotor  
40      and emotional development of the offspring, as the mother is the primary contributor to  
41      ensuring care and protection (Bayerl & Bosch, 2019; Francis & Meaney, 1999; González-  
42      Mariscal & Poindron, 2002; Klampfl & Bosch, 2019; Meaney, 2001; Schaal et al., 2009). It  
43      appears that a core maternal circuit is widely conserved across several species (Numan & Insel,  
44      2003). In rodents, the mother displays a constellation of maternal behaviors, defined by three  
45      major components: (1) maternal motivation to retrieve pups into the nest, (2) maternal care, and  
46      (3) maternal aggression (Bayerl & Bosch, 2019; Klampfl & Bosch, 2019; Numan & Woodside,  
47      2010). More precisely, (1) maternal motivation, referring to an internal process that changes  
48      the way an individual responds to specific external stimuli (Pfaff, 1982), was classically  
49      assessed by using the pup retrieval test, (2) maternal care consists of nest building,  
50      arching/crouching over pups for facilitating access to their nipples/milk, licking/grooming to  
51      help them to urinate/defecate, and (3) maternal aggression is defined as protecting pups against  
52      predators or threatening intruders (Bayerl & Bosch, 2019; Klampfl & Bosch, 2019). All these  
53      maternal behaviors ensure the dietary, energy, thermal, and safety needs of the newly born  
54      (Bosh, 2011; Caughey et al., 2011; González-Mariscal & Poindron, 2002). These coordinated  
55      maternal behaviors are regulated by intrinsic factors, such as a variety of sensory and  
56      neuroendocrine changes during the gestation and postnatal period (Lonstein et al., 2015;  
57      Rosenblatt et al., 1979; Stern, 1989), and extrinsic factors, including pup exposure, female's  
58      reproductive life history, and the degree of sensorimotor maturity of the newly born (Poindron,  
59      2005; Keller et al., 2019; Lévy & Keller, 2009). From the late gestation until the weaning  
60      period, all these changes operate in concert to rewire the brain and remodel the behavior of the  
61      female expressing a high level of maternal responsiveness towards sensory cues emanating  
62      from the offspring (Barrière et al., 2021; Numan & Insel, 2003; Rosenblatt & Lehrman, 1963;  
63      Stern & Lonstein, 2001; Stolzenberg & Champagne, 2016).  
64      Accordingly, the integrity of the sensory channels of the mothers is required to detect their pups,  
65      easily localize them, nurse them, and protect them from predators and intruders (Gandelman et  
66      al., 1970; Noirot, 1969; Rosenblatt, 1967). Since rodents are macrosmatic animals, olfaction is  
67      the main sensory sense driving social behaviors (Brennan & Keverne, 2004; Swaney et al.,

68 2008). The importance of individual sensory systems on maternal behavior regulation has been  
69 investigated by means of experimental alterations (deprivation of sensory inputs or lesion of  
70 sensory organs) or absence of the sensory systems. In rodents, *firstly*, (1: maternal motivation  
71 to retrieve pups into the nest) the ability to retrieve the pups is mainly driven by olfactory cues  
72 emitted by offspring, as anosmia, congenitally or induced by olfactory bulb cauterization or by  
73 gene mutation, results in impaired pup retrieval in female mice (Fraser & Shah, 2014; Weiss et  
74 al., 2011) and rats (Beach & Jaynes, 1956). Ultrasonic vocalizations emitted when pups are  
75 displaced from the nest are also shown to facilitate pup localization and pup retrieval in mice  
76 (Noirot, 1965; Smotherman et al. 1974) and rats (Beach & Jaynes, 1956; Kenyon et al., 1983).  
77 However, one study demonstrated that female mice have identical retrieving behavior when put  
78 in the presence of live, dead or anesthetized pups (i.e. not emitting vocalizations) (Gandelman  
79 et al., 1970), suggesting that body movements and vocalizations of the pups are not necessary  
80 to elicit retrieving behavior. Visual inputs are also important since both peripherally and  
81 centrally blinded female rats retrieved their scattered young but did so more slowly compared  
82 to sighted ones (Beach, 1937; Beach & Jaynes, 1956). *Secondly*, (2: maternal care) it has been  
83 widely established in rodents that the onset and maintenance of maternal behaviors throughout  
84 the lactational period, including nest building, nursing or licking pups, are mainly regulated by  
85 olfactory cues (Gandelman et al., 1971<sub>a,b</sub>; 1972; Fraser & Shah, 2014; Sato et al., 2010;  
86 Vandenbergh, 1973; Weiss et al., 2011) and tactile cues (Morgan et al., 1992; Stern, 1996; Stern  
87 & Johnson, 1990). Ultrasonic vocalizations may also help the mother to avoid accidentally  
88 stepping on the pups (Stern, 1997) and to adjust her nursing position or licking (Gaub & Ehret,  
89 2005). Interestingly, making dams blind - by enucleating or suturing the rat mother's eyes after  
90 parturition - leads to increased maternal care: mothers spent twice as much time licking  
91 (Kolunie et al., 1994) and crouching over their pups compared to sighted ones (Herrenkohl &  
92 Rosenberg, 1972). *Thirdly*, (3: maternal aggression) research in rats showed that olfactory cues  
93 from the male intruder are crucial for eliciting maternal aggression (Ferreira et al., 1987;  
94 Kolunie & Stern, 1995; Mayer & Rosenblatt, 1993), conversely to visual or auditory inputs  
95 (Kolunie et al., 1994). Taken together, these findings highlight that the sensory regulation of  
96 maternal behavior can vary depending on the specific components of maternal behavior, the  
97 experimental procedure, and the tested sensory systems (Herrenkohl & Rosenberg, 1972;  
98 Lonstein et al. 2015; Stolzenberg & Mayer, 2019).

99 Whilst the sensory mechanisms underlying maternal behaviors have been investigated  
100 mostly through sudden and late-deterioration sensory systems in rodents, little work to date has  
101 explored the impact of early sensory deprivation on the expression of maternal responsiveness.

102 To our knowledge, no study has investigated the effect of early blindness on maternal behaviors  
103 in non-human animals despite the existence of various rodent models of early visual  
104 deprivation. Therefore, the aim of the current study is to examine the impact of early blindness  
105 on maternal responsiveness using a mouse model of congenital blindness (ZRDBA strain). We  
106 performed three different tests to study the three components of maternal behavior in  
107 congenitally blind and sighted mothers: (1; maternal motivation to retrieve pups into the nest)  
108 the pup retrieval test consisted in assessing the latency to localize pups and bring them back to  
109 the nest, (2; maternal care) the home cage maternal behaviors test during which the time spent  
110 nursing, interacting, or not interacting with pups was evaluated throughout the lactational  
111 period, and (3; maternal aggression) the maternal aggression test, consisting in quantifying the  
112 latency before the first attack and the frequency and time spent attacking a male intruder.

113

## 114 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 115 **2.1. Animals**

116 A total of 88 female mice of the ZRDBA strain, bred and housed in the animal facility of  
117 the University of Québec in Trois-Rivières, were used for this study. Among them, 20  
118 congenitally blind and 20 sighted dams were assessed for the pup retrieval test, 12 blind and 12  
119 sighted dams were used for the home cage maternal behaviors test, and 12 blind and 12 sighted  
120 dams were assayed for the maternal aggression test. These female mice (aged of 3,5 to 4,5  
121 months) were initially paired with 12 males (2 females and 1 male/cage), and then housed  
122 individually after impregnation in polypropylene cages with wood shavings as bedding material  
123 for nest building. Daily weight gain measurements were performed to determine the pregnancy.  
124 The day of birth was considered postnatal day 0. All mice were housed under standard  
125 environmental conditions of 12h/12h light/dark cycle (light phase: 7:00-19:00 h) at a controlled  
126 room temperature (20-22°C and 40-60% humidity). Food and water were provided *ad libitum*.  
127 Experimental procedures and animal use were permitted by the animal care committee of the  
128 Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (2017-S.A.1), in accordance with the guidelines of the  
129 Canadian Council on Animal Care.

130 The ZRDBA strain has been generated by crossbreeding two strains: the sighted DBA-6  
131 and the anophthalmic ZRDCT strains (Touj et al., 2019; 2021<sub>a,b</sub>). The anophthalmic ZRDCT  
132 strain is characterized by an absence of the eyes, the optic tracts and the afferents retina-  
133 hypothalamus, induced by a mutation on chromosome 18 on the Rx/Rax gene (Chase & Chase,  
134 1941; Tucker et al., 2001). Importantly, anophthalmic (Rx/Rax homozygous) ZRDBA mice are

135 mated with sighted ZRDBA mice (Rx/Rax heterozygous) to produce half of the pups born with  
136 eyes and half of them born anophthalmic within the same litter.

137 **2.2. Behavioral procedures**

138 We tested three major components of maternal behaviors: maternal motivation to retrieve the  
139 pups, maternal care, and maternal aggression (Bayerl & Bosch, 2019; Klampfl & Bosch, 2019;  
140 Numan & Woodside, 2010). Each dam and her litter were tested in only one experimental test  
141 to avoid potential effects of maternal and/or pups' stress. All the recordings and coding were  
142 done using Ethovision XT software (Noldus, Virginia, USA).

143 *2.2.1. Pup retrieval test*

144 Behavioral experiments were carried out under dark conditions (i.e., red light) between 1 pm  
145 and 5 pm. The protocol for the pup retrieval test, adapted from Abel (1972) and Aguggia (2013),  
146 consists in assessing, in anophthalmic and sighted dams, the latency before retrieving their  
147 scattered pups into the nest on day 1, day 2 and day 3 postpartum. First, the mother was left in  
148 its own breeding cage 30 minutes prior to the test to allow it to habituate to the experimental  
149 room. Before the test, the mother was placed in an individual cage and four pups were lined up  
150 on the opposite side of the nest in the breeding cage. The recording was started once the female  
151 was put back in its empty nest and the time spent to retrieve the first pup and all the 4 pups into  
152 the nest was measured. The test lasted 15 minutes maximum. If females were unable to retrieve  
153 the pups, a score of 15 minutes was assigned.

154 *2.2.2. Home cage maternal behavior test*

155 The protocol, adapted from Skripuletz et al. (2010), consisted of video-recording maternal  
156 behaviors for 2 hours over 5 days. Given that mice are crepuscular creatures and are more active  
157 during dawn and dusk (Bains et al., 2018; Peirson & Foster, 2011; Peirson et al., 2018), the  
158 recordings were performed between 5-6 am and 9-10 pm. Maternal behaviors from  
159 anophthalmic and sighted females were analyzed on days 5, 10, 13, 16 and 19 postpartum (PD).  
160 A total of 6 behaviors were coded as follows: maternal behaviors design a) nursing behavior  
161 and b) mother-pup interactions in the nest (grooming and licking), while non-maternal  
162 behaviors refer to c) maternal presence in the nest with no social interaction, d) mother resting  
163 outside of the nest (resting or self-grooming), e) mother walking, and f) mother drinking/eating.  
164 The duration of maternal and non-maternal behaviors was compared between blind and sighted  
165 dams. No maternal-pup separation was performed before the test.

166

167 2.2.3. *Maternal aggression test*

168 The maternal aggression test took place on day 10 post-partum between 1 pm and 4 pm under  
169 dark conditions (i.e., red light). The highest levels of maternal aggression display were observed  
170 between 0 and 13<sup>th</sup> post-partum days, after which it vanishes (Gandelman, 1972; Lonstein &  
171 Gammie, 2002). To avoid any potential infanticide by the male intruder (Vom Saal & Howard,  
172 1982), all pups were removed from the nest prior to the tests (Lonstein & Gammie, 2002). After  
173 a 30 min habituation period, an unrelated adult male intruder (aged 2 months) was introduced  
174 into the female's home cage for a 3-min test. Intruder males were never used more than once,  
175 so any effect of previous aggression on the intruder mice was considered. Maternal attacks,  
176 referring to a female spontaneously biting or kicking the intruder (Martín-Sánchez et al., 2015),  
177 were quantified as follows: latency to the first attack, number of attacks, and total duration of  
178 attacks (Gammie & Nelson, 2001; Gammie et al., 2004).

179 **2.3. Data analyses**

180 Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software ver. 22.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY,  
181 USA). We verified the normal distribution of our data using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Regarding  
182 the pup retrieval test, we performed log-rank (Kaplan-Meier) tests to compare the distribution  
183 of the latencies to retrieve the first and the fourth pups of each of the 3 consecutive days  
184 (Postpartum Day (PD) 1, 2, 3) in both blind and sighted mothers. Then, we used mixed  
185 ANOVAs with *visual status* (2 levels: blind, sighted), as the between-subjects factor, and *day*  
186 *of testing* (3 levels: PD 1, 2, 3), as the within-subjects factor, to examine the improvement across  
187 time in both groups. Here, we compared the latency to retrieve the four pups between blind and  
188 sighted mothers.

189 Regarding the home cage maternal behavior test, we performed a mixed ANOVA with  
190 *visual status* (2 levels: blind, sighted), as the between-subjects factor, and *day of the testing* (3  
191 levels: PD 1, 2, 3), as the within-subjects factor, to compare the durations of each behavioral  
192 parameter in both blind and sighted groups. When the interaction between factors was  
193 significant, Student's *t*-tests with appropriate control (Bonferroni post hoc) for multiple  
194 comparisons were applied to compare both groups on each day of the testing.

195 Regarding the maternal aggression test, we used Student's *t*-tests with appropriate control  
196 for multiple comparisons (Bonferroni) to compare the latency to the first attack, the number of  
197 attacks and total duration of attacks in blind and sighted mothers. For all statistical analyses,  
198 the significance level was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

199 **3. Results**200 **3.1. Pup retrieval test**

201 As illustrated in Figure 1, Kaplan-Meier tests examined differences in the distribution of the  
202 retrieval latencies for the first and the fourth pups on 3 consecutive days postpartum (PD 1, 2  
203 and 3) between blind and sighted mothers. On PD 1, the survival distributions of the latency to  
204 retrieve the first pup were significantly different between blind and sighted mothers ( $\chi^2[1] =$   
205 17.508,  $p < 0.001$ ), whereas the distribution to retrieve the fourth pup were similar in both  
206 groups ( $\chi^2[1] = 3.622$ ,  $p = 0.057$ ). On PD 2, survival distributions of the latencies to retrieve  
207 the first and fourth pup (Fig. 4d) were significantly different between blind and sighted mothers  
208 ( $\chi^2[1] = 11.934$ ,  $p < 0.001$  for pup 1 and  $\chi^2[1] = 5.345$ ,  $p = 0.021$  for pup 4). On PD 3, blind  
209 and sighted dams differed significantly in the latencies to retrieve the first and fourth pups  
210 ( $\chi^2[1] = 17.462$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ;  $\chi^2[1] = 11.431$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , respectively). Thus, blind dams showed  
211 shorter retrieval latencies than sighted dams for pup 1 at PD 1, 2 and 3 and for pup 4 at PD 2  
212 and 3.

213 With regards to fourth-pup retrieval latencies (Figure 2), the ANOVA revealed a significant  
214 effect of *visual status* ( $F(1, 38) = 10.962$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ), and *day of testing* ( $F(2, 76) = 28.494$  ;  $p$   
215  $< 0.001$ ), but no interaction *visual status* \* *day of testing* ( $F(2, 76) = 0.445$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ). Fourth  
216 pup retrieval efficiency improved from PD 1 to PD 2 ( $p < 0.001$ ), PD 1 to PD 3 ( $p < 0.001$ ),  
217 and PD 2 to PD 3 ( $p = 0.043$ ).

218 **3.2. Home cage maternal behaviors test**

219 *A) Mother nursing pups* (Figure 3a): The ANOVA revealed significant effects of *visual status*  
220 ( $F(1, 22) = 41.029$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ), *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 39.285$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and the interaction  
221 *visual status* \* *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 5.117$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Blind dams spent more time nursing  
222 pups compared to sighted dams on PD 13 ( $t = 3.929$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), 16 ( $t = 6.570$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and  
223 19 ( $t = 4.025$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) but not on the PD 5 ( $t = 0.639$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and PD 10 ( $t = -0.171$ ,  $p >$   
224 0.05).

225 *B) Mother-pup interactions in the nest* (Figure 3b): There were significant effects of *visual*  
226 *status* ( $F(1, 22) = 11.481$ ;  $p = 0.003$ ), *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 2.798$  ;  $p = 0.031$ ), and the  
227 interaction *visual status* \* *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 4.648$  ;  $p = 0.002$ ). Blind dams spent more  
228 time interacting with their pups in the nest compared to sighted dams on PD 13 ( $t = 5.138$ ,  $p$   
229  $< 0.001$ ) and 16 ( $t = 3.933$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) but not on PD 5 ( $t = 0.251$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), 10 ( $t = -0.502$ ,  $p >$   
230 0.05) and 19 ( $t = 1.66$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

231 *C) Mother in the nest with no pups' interaction* (Figure 3c): We found a significant effect of  
232 *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 26.597$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ), but not of *visual status* ( $F(1, 22) = 1.267$ ;  $p =$   
233  $0.272$ ) nor the interaction *visual status \* day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 1,391$ ;  $p = 0.258$ ).  
234 Bonferroni's post-hoc tests revealed significant differences between: 1) PD 5 and PD 13 / PD  
235 16 / PD 19 (all  $p < 0.01$ ), 2) PD 10 and PD 16 / PD 19 ( $p = 0.003$  and  $p < 0.001$ , respectively),  
236 3) PD 13 and PD 5/ PD 16 / PD 19 ( $p = 0.01$ ;  $p = 0.031$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , respectively). This indicates  
237 that blind and sighted dams spent progressively more time in the nest with no pups interaction  
238 between PD 5 and PD 19.

239 *D) Mother resting outside the nest* (Figure 3d): the ANOVA yielded significant effects of *visual*  
240 *status* ( $F(1, 22) = 11.706$  ;  $p = 0.002$ ), *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 18.764$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and the  
241 interaction *visual status \* day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 5.626$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Sighted dams spent more  
242 time than blind ones resting outside the nest on PD 10 ( $t = -3.847$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), 13 ( $t = -3.043$ ,  $p$   
243 =  $0.03$ ) and 16 ( $t = -3.628$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ), but no difference was observed on PD 5 ( $t = 0.238$ ,  $p >$   
244  $0.05$ ) and 19 ( $t = 0.193$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

245 *E) Mother walking* (Figure 3e): There was no significant effect of *visual status* ( $F(1, 22) =$   
246  $0.563$ ;  $p = 0.461$ ), *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 1.408$  ;  $p = 0.238$ ), nor the interaction *visual status*  
247 \* *day of testing* ( $F(4, 88) = 0.139$  ;  $p = 0.967$ ).

248 *F) Mother drinking/eating outside the nest* (Figure 3f): There was a significant effect of *day of*  
249 *testing* ( $F(1, 88) = 6.046$  ;  $p < 0.001$ ), but not of *visual status* ( $F(1, 22) = 0.142$  ;  $p = 0.710$ ), nor  
250 the interaction *visual status \* day of testing* ( $F(1, 88) = 2.283$  ;  $p = 0.067$ ). Bonferroni's post-  
251 hoc tests revealed significant differences between PD 10 and: 1) PD 16 ( $p = 0.042$ ), and 2) PD  
252 19 ( $p = 0.013$ ). Bonferroni's post-hoc tests revealed significant differences between PD 13 and:  
253 1) PD 16 ( $p = 0.005$ ), and 2) PD 19 ( $p = 0.014$ ). This indicates that blind and sighted dams spent  
254 progressively less time drinking/eating outside the nest between the second and the third week  
255 postpartum.

256

### 257 **3.3. Maternal aggression test**

258 Results are illustrated in Figure 4. Blind mothers exhibited the first attack faster when exposed  
259 to a male intruder ( $t(1, 22) = 3.664$ ;  $p = 0.003$ ). In contrast, the total duration ( $t(1, 22) = -1.274$ ;  
260  $p > 0.05$ ) and frequency of attacks ( $t(1, 22) = -0.905$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) towards a male intruder were  
261 similar between blind and sighted dams.

262

263

264 **4. Discussion**

265 The findings suggest that congenital visual deprivation results in heightened maternal behaviors  
266 on each of the three major components: (1) maternal motivation to retrieve pups into the nest,  
267 (2) care, and (3) aggression. *Regarding maternal motivation to retrieve pups*, we pointed out  
268 that blind mothers retrieved their pups to the nest faster than sighted ones. In addition, both  
269 blind and sighted dams retrieved faster their pups through the second and third trials, underlying  
270 similar learning abilities in this task. Our result is contrary to previous studies which have  
271 suggested that both peripherally or centrally blinded rat dams retrieved their pups more slowly  
272 than did sighted mothers (Beach, 1937; Beach & Jaynes, 1956). *Regarding maternal care*, we  
273 found that both blind and sighted females display high levels of maternal behaviors during the  
274 early post-partum period (PD 5), with 70% of the time nursing and licking the pups, which is  
275 consistent with previous research conducted on wild-type mice (Grota & Ader, 1974). On day  
276 5 post-partum, when blind and sighted dams were not interacting with their pups in the nest,  
277 they spent the same time resting, walking, and eating/drinking outside the nest (6%-13%,  
278 respectively). On day 10 post-partum, both sighted and blind dams displayed similar nursing  
279 time reduction (with 50% of the time nursing the pups), associated with similar time spent  
280 resting in the nest and walking outside the nest. Additionally, sighted mothers exhibited higher  
281 time resting outside the nest than blind ones, while blind mothers tended to spend longer time  
282 eating/drinking outside the nest than their sighted counterparts. Whereas the time spent nursing  
283 the pups decreases gradually to 25% at the end of the third week postpartum in sighted ZRDBA  
284 dams, just like in wild-type dams (Grota & Ader, 1974), blind ZRDBA dams kept displaying a  
285 stable and high level of maternal behaviors until PD 19 (more than 60% of the time nursing and  
286 licking/grooming pups into the nest), and consequently, less time resting outside the nest during  
287 the second and third week postpartum (Day 13-19 postpartum). These results are in good  
288 agreement with previous findings obtained in enucleated and eyes-sutured female rats  
289 (Herrenkohl & Rosenberg, 1972; Kolunie et al., 1994). We, however, did not find any effect of  
290 the visual status on time spent resting in the nest with no mother-pup interaction, or  
291 eating/drinking and walking, ruling these mechanisms out as potential variables. *Regarding*  
292 *maternal aggression*, while duration and frequency of attacks toward a male intruder were  
293 similar between both groups, blind mothers initiated the first attack faster than their sighted  
294 counterparts. A previous study suggested that visual inputs from the pups or intruder are not  
295 essential to the expression of maternal aggression in rats, since blinded rat dams (by eyelid  
296 suturing on day 2 postpartum) displayed similar levels of maternal aggression one day after the  
297 procedure (Kolunie et al., 1994). Nevertheless, although the bite latency data were not

298 statistically significant between dams temporarily deprived of visual or auditory input and  
299 controls, it is noteworthy to note that blind dams initiated the first bite of the intruder 2,5 times  
300 faster than controls and deaf dams.

301 The inconsistencies between our results and certain studies are likely due to differences in  
302 etiologies, onset, and duration of visual deprivation, resulting in different mechanisms of brain  
303 plasticity and subsequent behavioral adaptations. For most sensory systems, congenital and  
304 early sensory deprivation lead to much sensory compensation and higher brain reorganization  
305 than late and short visual deprivation (Chabot et al, 2007; Kujala et al., 1997; Piché et al., 2004;  
306 Qin et al., 2015; Slimani et al., 2014; Touj et al., 2021b).

307

308 Studies conducted on different murine models of early blindness (congenital, dark-reared  
309 housed, early enucleation) have established that early visual deprivation results in enhanced  
310 nonvisual sensory perception such as olfactory performance and pain sensitivity (Touj et al.,  
311 2019; 2020; 2021<sub>a;b</sub>; Zhou et al., 2017) accompanied by enlargement of the olfactory areas (bulb  
312 and piriform cortex), auditory areas and amygdaloid complex volume (Massé et al., 2014; Touj  
313 et al., 2019; 2021a). Given that multisensory cues emitted by offspring are commonly used to  
314 trigger maternal responsiveness (retrieval, nursing) towards the pups (reviewed in Numan &  
315 Young, 2016; Numan & Isle, 2003; Dulac et al., 2014) and maternal aggression toward a  
316 threatening individual (Kolunie & Stern, 1995; Mayer & Rosenblatt, 1993), such sensory  
317 compensation may help congenitally blind dams to cope with the absence of visual inputs and  
318 to evolve behavioral adjustments toward the offspring. In other words, enhanced intact  
319 remaining modalities due to early visual deprivation, may explain the heightened maternal  
320 responsiveness seen in blind dams.

321 Additionally, as the pup retrieval and the maternal aggression tests were conducted under dark  
322 conditions, the faster responses displayed by blind dams toward the pups/intruder may be  
323 explained by their enhanced ability to navigate driven by non-visual sensory cues. In rodents,  
324 it has been shown that better odor perception and localization (in mice: Weiss et al., 2011;  
325 Fraser & Shah, 2014, in rats: Beach & Jaynes, 1956) and better sound acuity and spatial hearing  
326 (in mice: Noirot, 1965; Smotherman et al., 1974; in rats: Beach & Jaynes, 1956; Kenyon et al.,  
327 1983; Stern, 1990) may help mothers to efficiently retrieve their pups. In line with our results,  
328 several studies using the buried food test showed that blind rodents localized more quickly an  
329 appetent olfactory source than sighted congeners in our blinded ZRDBA mice (Touj et al.,  
330 2020), in dark-reared mice (C57BL6 strain) and in rats (Zhou et al., 2017). Accordingly,  
331 structural MRI and histological analyses conducted on the ZRDBA blind mice suggest that

332 these behavioral/sensory adaptations may be supported by extended neuroplasticity, including  
333 enlargements of olfactory, auditory, orbital regions, amygdaloid complex and some cerebral  
334 regions mediated in navigation and spatial memory, such as fimbria-fornix and nuclei in  
335 mammillary bodies (Touj et al., 2020).

336 Moreover, enhanced attentional processes to respond to auditory and haptic stimuli have been  
337 evidenced in blind rodents. For example, while both blind and sighted rodents preferred  
338 exploring an attractive stimulus (ex: cage with pup, peanut butter, vanilla odor) against a neutral  
339 one (empty cage, water), blind animals spent more time exploring the attractive stimulus than  
340 sighted ones (congenitally blind mice: Touj et al., 2020; enucleated postpartum rat: Beach &  
341 Jaynes, 1956) and less time smelling the negative odor (2MB odor) compared with sighted  
342 mice. These results indicate that early visual deprivation results in hypervigilance toward  
343 meaningful olfactory cues (appetent/rewarding or aversive/fearful).

344 Taken together, these findings suggest that enhanced non-visual sensory processing and/or  
345 attentional processing/awareness in congenitally blind mothers may promote enhanced  
346 maternal behaviors, leading to faster pup retrieval (motivation), higher caregiving in late  
347 lactation -2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> week post-partum- (care), and faster aggressive responses toward an  
348 intruder (aggression). Another explanation can be proposed: increased activity and maternal-  
349 motivated behaviors in our test conditions may be explained by the endogenous circadian  
350 rhythm alteration induced by congenital blindness (Ramamurthy & Krubitzer, 2018; Iura &  
351 Udo, 2014). Although we assumed that blind mice may have synchronized their circadian  
352 rhythm with that of sighted mice as they are housed in the same breeding room under similar  
353 environmental conditions of 12h/12h light/dark cycle, future studies should investigate this  
354 question.

355

356 Interestingly, same results and mechanisms were found in humans. In the same vein, a large  
357 body of evidence showed that early blindness leads to superior perceptual processing in the  
358 remaining sensory modalities in humans, especially in audition, somesthesia and nociception  
359 (Slimani et al., 2013; 2014; 2015; Kupers & Ptito, 2011, 2014). Such enhanced performance on  
360 nonvisual tasks in blind humans is supported by intra-modal and cross-modal brain plasticity  
361 related to dramatical anatomical and functional changes (Voss & Zatorre, 2012; Kupers & Ptito,  
362 2011, 2014; Zhang et al., 2019). With regards to olfaction, a meta-analysis showed no  
363 superiority of blind compared to sighted in humans, for olfactory identification, discrimination  
364 and threshold (Sorokowska et al., 2019), which are tasks that are typically used in clinical tests.  
365 While this seems to argue against the hypothesis of the present article, a recent study shows,

366 inversely, a superiority of congenitally blind in the ecologically relevant olfactory tasks of  
367 odorant localization (Manescu et al., 2021). This is in line with earlier reports on audition in  
368 blind that suggest that ecological relevance is the key factor for crossmodal plasticity (Gougoux  
369 et al., 2004). As rodents' literature, behavioral adaptations were also reported in early blind  
370 women who displayed prolonged duration of breastfeeding beyond the first year postpartum,  
371 accompanied by increased physical contact/proximity and more frequent vocalizations toward  
372 their newborn (Chiesa et al., 2015; Ganea et al., 2018; Santos & Ribeiro, 2020; Thoueille et al.,  
373 2006). In addition, enhanced attentional processes to respond to auditory and haptic stimuli  
374 have been evidenced in blind humans, which may contribute to heightening non-visual sensory  
375 skills (Collignon & De Volder, 2009; Collignon et al., 2006; Hugdahl et al., 2004; Liotti et al.,  
376 1998; Pigeon et al., 2015; Topalidis et al., 2020). Visually impaired adults and children showed  
377 increased odor awareness and reactivity to smells, especially toward social and food odors  
378 (Beaulieu-Lefbvre et al., 2011; Fermenzi et al., 2010). Overall, non-visual channels, such as  
379 olfactory, auditory, and somatosensory systems, are likely used more frequently to guarantee  
380 harmonic interaction despite the mother's impairment.

381  
382 Multiple neural networks in brain areas, activated by both hormonal and environmental inputs,  
383 mediate maternal care/motivation and affective processing (Kim & Strathearn, 2016; Keyser-  
384 Marcus et al., 2001; Lee & Brown, 2002; Lonstein et al., 2015; Numan & Stolzenberg, 2009;  
385 Sato et al., 2010; Terkel et al., 1979; Uriarte et al., 2020), as well as maternal aggression (Bosch  
386 & Neumann et al., 2010; Gammie, 2005; Gammie & Nelson, 2001; Haller, 2018; Hasen &  
387 Gammie, 2005; 2006; Kohl et al., 2017). In rodents, the mPOA/BNST circuits are known to be  
388 involved in the onset and expression of maternal behavior and pup-associated motivation during  
389 the early period of lactation (Lee et al., 1999; 2022; Numan, 2007; Numan & Stolzenberg, 2009;  
390 Miceli et al., 1983; Oxley & Fleming, 2000; Petrusis, 2013; Semaan and Kauffman, 2010;  
391 Terkel et al., 1979; Tobiansky et al., 2013; McHenry et al., 2015 for review). Importantly, this  
392 core circuit has strong connections with the mesolimbic dopamine system, ventral tegmental  
393 area (VTA), nucleus accumbens (NA) and caudate putamen, involved in infant-related reward  
394 processing and in motivation (Barrière et al., 2021; Dong & Swanson, 2004; Dumont &  
395 Williams, 2004; Jalabert et al., 2009; Kudo et al., 2012; Numan, 2007; Numan & Numan, 1997;  
396 Numan & Stolzenberg, 2009; Tobiansky et al., 2013). Additionally, studies have reported that  
397 lactating female rodents expressing higher levels of maternal care and motivation had specific  
398 hypertrophies in regions involved in olfactory (MOB and AOB) and somatosensory  
399 (somatosensory cortex) information processing, in memory (hippocampus, entorhinal cortex,

400 retrosplenial cortex) and in reward and reinforcement (striatum) processing (Barrière et al.,  
401 2021), and possess greater dopaminergic projections from the ventral tegmental area (VTA) to  
402 the nucleus accumbens (NA) (Shahrokh et al., 2010). It is worthy to note that the maternal  
403 behavior of female rodents is plastic and declines gradually until weaning, supported (in part)  
404 by a progressive mPOA and the mesolimbic dopamine system deactivation toward pup-related  
405 stimuli (Grieb et al., 2020; Pereira et al., 2009). Interestingly, high-resolution MRI and  
406 histological studies highlighted large-scale anatomical brain plasticity in the ZRDBA mice  
407 (Touj et al., 2020), in various sensory, limbic and cortical systems that regulate the expression  
408 of maternal behavior. Grey matter volume alterations induced by visual deprivation at birth  
409 were not only observed in the remaining sensory systems (olfactory, auditory, visual areas), but  
410 also in subcortical and cortical structures, such as in BNST and mPOA, anterior hypothalamic  
411 area, insular area, the central nucleus of the amygdala, overall amygdala volume, and nucleus  
412 accumbens. These volumetric differences within specific hormone-sensitive brain regions  
413 which regulate both maternal behaviors and affective processing may reflect the adaptation to  
414 the visual deprivation and the enhanced maternal motivation to retrieve the pups, care, and  
415 protection seen in anophthalmic dams. This neuroanatomical explanation should, however, be  
416 taken with caution as this research has been conducted on both males and non-lactating,  
417 anophthalmic and sighted mice.

418  
419 Future studies should examine whether early visual deprivation may alter structural and  
420 functional plasticity, as well as specific maternal behaviors responsiveness, in late gestating and  
421 lactating females throughout the whole pre- and post-natal period. It is of particular interest to  
422 disentangle cellular and molecular mechanisms underlying anatomical/functional plasticity in  
423 anophthalmic mice, in terms of neural/glial cell number, neural/glial cell size, axon number,  
424 axonal arborization, synaptic density, myelination, blood flow modifications,  
425 hormonal/neurotransmitters levels and receptors' sensitivity/density (Barrière et al., 2019;  
426 Kelly et al., 2015; Zatorre et al., 2012). Furthermore, future immunoassay and  
427 neuroimaging/immunohistochemical investigations should investigate physiological (e.g.,  
428 hormones/neurotransmitters) and neural circuits which support the enhanced maternal  
429 responsiveness in congenitally blind dams.

430

## 431 **5. Conclusion**

432 In the current study, a mouse model of congenital blindness, the ZRDBA strain, was used to  
433 assess potential behavioral adaptations induced by blindness in lactating females. The findings

434 provide evidence that maternal performance is enhanced in congenitally blind dams, in terms  
435 of **maternal motivation to retrieve the pups, care, and protection, underlined by:** 1) a shorter  
436 latency to retrieve pups, 2) increased nursing/licking durations during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> week  
437 postpartum, and 3) a faster aggressive behavior toward a male intruder, compared to sighted  
438 mothers. These behavioral adaptations may be driven by sensory and attentional  
439 compensations, supported by dramatical cerebral plasticity induced by early visual deprivation.  
440 The present study reveals a profound impact of early visual deprivation on motherhood, paving  
441 the way for further physiological, anatomical and behavioral investigations to gain insight into  
442 the hormonal and neural circuits that regulate maternal responsiveness levels across the  
443 postpartum period.

444

445

446

447 **REFERENCES**

448 Abel, E. L. (1972). Suppression of pup retrieving behavior in rats following administration of  
449 L- 9-tetrahydrocannabinol. *Experientia*, 28(10), 1187-1188. doi: 10.1007/bf01946160

450 Aguggia, J. P., Suárez, M. M., & Rivarola, M. A. (2013). Early maternal separation:  
451 neurobehavioral consequences in mother rats. *Behavioural brain research*, 248, 25–31.  
452 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2013.03.040>

453 Bains, R. S., Wells, S., Sillito, R. R., Armstrong, J. D., Cater, H. L., Banks, G., & Nolan, P. M.  
454 (2018). Assessing mouse behaviour throughout the light/dark cycle using automated in-cage  
455 analysis tools. *Journal of neuroscience methods*, 300, 37–47.  
456 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.04.014>

457 Barrière, D. A., Hamieh, A. M., Magalhães, R., Traoré, A., Barbier, J., Bonny, J. M., Ardid, D.,  
458 Busserolles, J., Mériaux, S., & Marchand, F. (2019). Structural and functional alterations in the  
459 retrosplenial cortex following neuropathic pain. *Pain*, 160(10), 2241–2254.  
460 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001610>

461 Barrière, D. A., Ella, A., Szeremeta, F., Adriaensen, H., Même, W., Chaillou, E., Migaud, M.,  
462 Même, S., Lévy, F., & Keller, M. (2021). Brain orchestration of pregnancy and maternal  
463 behavior in mice: A longitudinal morphometric study. *NeuroImage*, 230, 117776.  
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.117776>

465 Bayerl, D. S., & Bosch, O. J. (2019). Brain vasopressin signaling modulates aspects of maternal  
466 behavior in lactating rats. *Genes, brain, and behavior*, 18(1), e12517.  
467 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12517>

468 Beach Jr, F. A. (1937). The neural basis of innate behavior. I. Effects of cortical lesions upon  
469 the maternal behavior pattern in the rat. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 24(3), 393-440.  
470 doi: 10.1037/h0059606

471 Beach, F. A., & Jaynes, J. (1956). Studies of Maternal Retrieving in Rats. III. Sensory Cues  
472 Involved in the Lactating Female's Response to Her Young. *Behaviour*, 10(1/2), 104-125.

473 Beaulieu-Lefebvre, M., Schneider, F. C., Kupers, R., & Ptito, M. (2011). Odor perception and  
474 odor awareness in congenital blindness. *Brain research bulletin*, 84(3), 206–209.  
475 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainresbull.2010.12.014>

476 Bosch O. J. (2013). Maternal aggression in rodents: brain oxytocin and vasopressin mediate  
477 pup defence. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological  
478 sciences*, 368(1631), 20130085. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0085>.

479 Bosch O. J. (2011). Maternal nurturing is dependent on her innate anxiety: the behavioral roles  
480 of brain oxytocin and vasopressin. *Hormones and behavior*, 59(2), 202–212.  
481 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2010.11.012>

482 Bosch, O. J., & Neumann, I. D. (2010). Vasopressin released within the central amygdala  
483 promotes maternal aggression. *The European journal of neuroscience*, 31(5), 883–891. doi:  
484 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2010.07115.x

485 Brennan P.A., & Keverne E. B. (2004). Something in the air? New insights into mammalian  
486 pheromones. *Current Biology*;14:R81–R89. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2003.12.052.

487 Caughey, S. D., Klampfl, S. M., Bishop, V. R., Pfoertsch, J., Neumann, I. D., Bosch, O. J., &  
488 Meddle, S. L. (2011). Changes in the intensity of maternal aggression and central oxytocin and  
489 vasopressin V1a receptors across the peripartum period in the rat. *Journal of*  
490 *neuroendocrinology*, 23(11), 1113–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2826.2011.02224.x>

491 Chabot, N., Robert, S., Tremblay, R., Miceli, D., Boire, D., & Bronchti, G. (2007). Audition  
492 differently activates the visual system in neonatally enucleated mice compared with  
493 anophthalmic mutants. *The European journal of neuroscience*, 26(8), 2334–2348.  
494 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2007.05854.x>

495 Chase, H. B., & Chase, E. B. (1941). Studies on an anophthalmic strain of mice I. Embryology  
496 of the eye region. *Journal of Morphology*, 68(2), 279-301. doi:  
497 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.1050680205>

498 Chiesa, S., Galati, D., & Schmidt, S. (2015). Communicative interactions between visually  
499 impaired mothers and their sighted children: analysis of gaze, facial expressions, voice and  
500 physical contacts. *Child care, health and development*, 41(6), 1040–1046. doi:  
501 [10.1111/cch.12274](https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12274)

502 Collignon, O., & De Volder, A. G. (2009). Further evidence that congenitally blind participants  
503 react faster to auditory and tactile spatial targets. *Canadian journal of experimental psychology*  
504 = *Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale*, 63(4), 287–293.  
505 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015415>

506 Collignon, O., Renier, L., Bruyer, R., Tranduy, D., & Veraart, C. (2006). Improved selective  
507 and divided spatial attention in early blind subjects. *Brain research*, 1075(1), 175–182.  
508 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2005.12.079>

509 Dong, H. W., & Swanson, L. W. (2004). Projections from bed nuclei of the stria terminalis,  
510 posterior division: implications for cerebral hemisphere regulation of defensive and  
511 reproductive behaviors. *The Journal of comparative neurology*, 471(4), 396–433.  
512 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.20002>

513 Dulac, C., O'Connell, L. A., & Wu, Z. (2014). Neural control of maternal and paternal  
514 behaviors. *Science* (New York, N.Y.), 345(6198), 765–770.  
515 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1253291>

516 Dumont, E. C., & Williams, J. T. (2004). Noradrenaline triggers GABA<sub>A</sub> inhibition of bed  
517 nucleus of the stria terminalis neurons projecting to the ventral tegmental area. *The Journal of*  
518 *neuroscience* : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience, 24(38), 8198–8204.  
519 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0425-04.2004>

520 Ferdenzi, C., Coureauaud, G., Camos, V., & Schaal, B. (2010). Attitudes toward Everyday Odors  
521 for Children with Visual Impairments: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Visual Impairment &*  
522 *Blindness*, 104(1), 55–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X1010400109>

523 Fraser, E. J., & Shah, N. M. (2014). Complex chemosensory control of female reproductive  
524 behaviors. *PLoS One*, 9(2), e90368. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0090368

525 Gammie S. C. (2005). Current models and future directions for understanding the neural  
526 circuitries of maternal behaviors in rodents. *Behavioral and cognitive neuroscience reviews*,  
527 4(2), 119–135. doi: 10.1177/1534582305281086

528 Gammie, S. C., & Nelson, R. J. (2001). cFOS and pCREB activation and maternal aggression  
529 in mice. *Brain research*, 898(2), 232–241. doi: 10.1016/s0006-8993(01)02189-8

530 Gammie, S. C., Negron, A., Newman, S. M., & Rhodes, J. S. (2004). Corticotropin-releasing  
531 factor inhibits maternal aggression in mice. *Behavioral neuroscience*, 118(4), 805–814.  
532 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.118.4.805>

533 Ganea, N., Hudry, K., Vernetta, A., Tucker, L., Charman, T., Johnson, M. H., & Senju, A.  
534 (2018). Development of adaptive communication skills in infants of blind parents.  
535 *Developmental psychology*, 54(12), 2265–2273. doi: 10.1037/dev0000564

536 Gandelman R. (1972). Mice: postpartum aggression elicited by the presence of an intruder.  
537 *Hormones and behavior*, 3(1), 23–28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0018-506x\(72\)90003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0018-506x(72)90003-7)

538 Gandelman, R., Zarrow, M. X., & Denenberg, V. H. (1970). Maternal behavior: differences  
539 between mother and virgin mice as a function of the testing procedure. *Developmental  
540 psychobiology*, 3(3), 207–214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.420030308>

541 Gandelman, R., Zarrow, M. X., & Denenberg, V. H. (1971a). Stimulus control of cannibalism  
542 and maternal behavior in anosmic mice. *Physiology & behavior*, 7(4), 583–586.  
543 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(71\)90112-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(71)90112-0)

544 Gandelman, R., Zarrow, M. X., Denenberg, V. H., & Myers, M. (1971b). Olfactory bulb  
545 removal eliminates maternal behavior in the mouse. *Science*, 171(3967), 210-211. doi:  
546 10.1126/science.171.3967.210

547 Gandelman, R., Zarrow, M. X., & Denenberg, V. H. (1972). Reproductive and maternal  
548 performance in the mouse following removal of the olfactory bulbs. *Journal of reproduction  
549 and fertility*, 28(3), 453–456. <https://doi.org/10.1530/jrf.0.0280453>

550 Gaub, S., & Ehret, G. (2005). Grouping in auditory temporal perception and vocal production  
551 is mutually adapted: the case of wriggling calls of mice. *Journal of comparative physiology. A,  
552 Neuroethology, sensory, neural, and behavioral physiology*, 191(12), 1131–1135.  
553 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-005-0036-y>

554 González-Mariscal G., Caba, M., Hoffman K. L., Melo A. I. (2017). “Parental Behavior”. In:  
555 DW Pfaff, M Joël, editors. *Hormones, Brain, and Behavior*, 3rd edition, vol. 1. Oxford:  
556 Academic Press. p. 83–116. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-803592-4.00003-1

557 Gougoux, F., Lepore, F., Lassonde, M., Voss, P., Zatorre, R. J., & Belin, P. (2004).  
558 *Neuropsychology: pitch discrimination in the early blind*. *Nature*, 430(6997), 309.  
559 <https://doi.org/10.1038/430309a>

560 Grieb, Z. A., Vitale, E. M., Morrell, J. I., Lonstein, J. S., & Pereira, M. (2020). Decreased  
561 mesolimbic dopaminergic signaling underlies the waning of maternal caregiving across the  
562 postpartum period in rats. *Psychopharmacology*, 237(4), 1107–1119.  
563 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-019-05441-7>

564 Grota, L. J., & Ader, R. (1974). Behavior of lactating rats in a dual-chambered maternity cage.  
565 *Hormones and behavior*, 5(4), 275–282. doi: 10.1016/0018-506x(74)90014-2

566 Haller J. (2018). The role of central and medial amygdala in normal and abnormal aggression:  
567 A review of classical approaches. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*, 85, 34–43. doi:  
568 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.09.017

569 Hasen, N. S., & Gammie, S. C. (2005). Differential fos activation in virgin and lactating mice  
570 in response to an intruder. *Physiology & behavior*, 84(5), 681–695. doi:  
571 10.1016/j.physbeh.2005.02.010

572 Hasen, N. S., & Gammie, S. C. (2006). Maternal aggression: new insights from Egr-1. *Brain*  
573 *research*, 1108(1), 147–156. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2006.06.007

574 Herrenkohl, L. R. & Rosenberg, P. A., (1972) Exteroceptive stimulation of maternal behavior  
575 in the naïve rat. *Physiology & behavior*, 8(4), 595-598. doi: 10.1016/0031-9384(72)90080-7

576 Hugdahl, K., Ek, M., Takio, F., Rintee, T., Tuomainen, J., Haarala, C., & Hämäläinen, H.  
577 (2004). Blind individuals show enhanced perceptual and attentional sensitivity for identification  
578 of speech sounds. *Brain research. Cognitive brain research*, 19(1), 28–32.  
579 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2003.10.015>

580 Iura, Y., & Udo, H. (2014). Behavioral analyses of visually impaired Crx knockout mice  
581 revealed sensory compensation in exploratory activities on elevated platforms. *Behavioural*  
582 *brain research*, 258, 1–7.

583

584 Jalabert, M., Aston-Jones, G., Herzog, E., Manzoni, O., & Georges, F. (2009). Role of the bed  
585 nucleus of the stria terminalis in the control of ventral tegmental area dopamine neurons.  
586 *Progress in neuro-psychopharmacology & biological psychiatry*, 33(8), 1336–1346.

587 Kelly, E. A., Russo, A. S., Jackson, C. D., Lamantia, C. E., & Majewska, A. K. (2015).  
588 Proteolytic regulation of synaptic plasticity in the mouse primary visual cortex: analysis of  
589 matrix metalloproteinase 9 deficient mice. *Frontiers in cellular neuroscience*, 9, 369.  
590 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2015.00369>

591 Kenyon, P., Cronin, P., & Keeble, S. (1983). Role of the infraorbital nerve in retrieving behavior  
592 in lactating rats. *Behavioral neuroscience*, 97(2), 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.97.2.255>

593

594 Keyser-Marcus, L., Stafisso-Sandoz, G., Gerecke, K., Jasnow, A., Nightingale, L., Lambert, K.  
595 G., Gatewood, J., & Kinsley, C. H. (2001). Alterations of medial preoptic area neurons  
596 following pregnancy and pregnancy-like steroid treatment in the rat. *Brain research bulletin*,  
597 55(6), 737–745. doi: 10.1016/s0361-9230(01)00554-8

598 Kim, S., & Strathearn, L. (2016). Oxytocin and Maternal Brain Plasticity. New directions for  
599 child and adolescent development, 2016(153), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20170>

600 Klampfl, S. M., & Bosch, O. J. (2019). Mom doesn't care: When increased brain CRF system  
601 activity leads to maternal neglect in rodents. *Frontiers in neuroendocrinology*, 53, 100735.  
602 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2019.01.001>

603 Kohl, J., Autry, A. E., & Dulac, C. (2017). The neurobiology of parenting: A neural circuit  
604 perspective. *BioEssays : news and reviews in molecular, cellular and developmental biology*,  
605 39(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.201600159>

606 Klonie, J. M., Stern, J. M., & Barfield, R. J. (1994). Maternal aggression in rats: Effects of  
607 visual or auditory deprivation of the mother and dyadic pattern of ultrasonic vocalizations.  
608 *Behavioral and Neural Biology*, 62(1), 41-49. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-1047\(05\)80057-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-1047(05)80057-3)

610 Klonie, J. M., & Stern, J. M. (1995). Maternal aggression in rats: effects of olfactory  
611 bulbectomy, ZnSO<sub>4</sub>-induced anosmia, and vomeronasal organ removal. *Hormones and*  
612 *behavior*, 29(4), 492–518. doi: 10.1006/hbeh.1995.1285

613 Kristal M. B. (2009). The biopsychology of maternal behavior in nonhuman mammals. *ILAR*  
614 journal, 50(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ilar.50.1.51>

615 Kudo, T., Konno, K., Uchigashima, M., Yanagawa, Y., Sora, I., Minami, M., & Watanabe, M.  
616 (2014). GABAergic neurons in the ventral tegmental area receive dual GABA/enkephalin-  
617 mediated inhibitory inputs from the bed nucleus of the stria terminalis. *The European journal*  
618 *of neuroscience*, 39(11), 1796–1809. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.12503>

619 Kujala, T., Alho, K., Huotilainen, M., Ilmoniemi, R. J., Lehtokoski, A., Leinonen, A., Rinne,  
620 T., Salonen, O., Sinkkonen, J., Standertskjöld-Nordenstam, C. G., & Näätänen, R. (1997).  
621 Electrophysiological evidence for cross-modal plasticity in humans with early- and late-onset  
622 blindness. *Psychophysiology*, 34(2), 213–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1997.tb02134.x>

624 Kupers, R., & Ptito, M. (2011). Insights from darkness: what the study of blindness has taught  
625 us about brain structure and function. *Progress in brain research*, 192, 17–31. doi:  
626 10.1016/B978-0-444-53355-5.00002-6

627 Kupers, R., & Ptito, M. (2014). Compensatory plasticity and cross-modal reorganization  
628 following early visual deprivation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 41, 36-52. doi:  
629 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.08.001>

630 Lee, A., Clancy, S., & Fleming, A. S. (1999). Mother rats bar-press for pups: effects of lesions  
631 of the mpoa and limbic sites on maternal behavior and operant responding for pup-  
632 reinforcement. *Behavioural brain research*, 100(1-2), 15–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4328\(98\)00109-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4328(98)00109-0)

634 Lee, A. W., & Brown, R. E. (2002). Medial preoptic lesions disrupt parental behavior in both  
635 male and female California mice (*Peromyscus californicus*). *Behavioral neuroscience*, 116(6),  
636 968–975. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.116.6.968>

637 Lévy, F., & Keller, M. (2009). Olfactory mediation of maternal behavior in selected mammalian  
638 species. *Behavioural brain research*, 200(2), 336–345.  
639 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2008.12.017>

640 Liotti, M., Ryder, K., & Woldorff, M. G. (1998). Auditory attention in the congenitally blind:  
641 where, when and what gets reorganized?. *Neuroreport*, 9(6), 1007–1012.  
642 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-199804200-00010>

643 Lonstein, J. S., & Gammie, S. C. (2002). Sensory, hormonal, and neural control of maternal  
644 aggression in laboratory rodents. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*, 26(8), 869–888.  
645 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-7634\(02\)00087-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-7634(02)00087-8)

646 Lonstein, J. S., Lévy, F., & Fleming, A. S. (2015). Common and divergent psychobiological  
647 mechanisms underlying maternal behaviors in non-human and human mammals. *Hormones  
648 and behavior*, 73, 156–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ybeh.2015.06.011>

649 Manescu, S., Chouinard-Leclaire, C., Collignon, O., Lepore, F., & Frasnelli, J. (2021).  
650 Enhanced Odorant Localization Abilities in Congenitally Blind but not in Late-Blind  
651 Individuals. *Chemical senses*, 46, bjaa073. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjaa073>

652 Martín-Sánchez, A., McLean, L., Beynon, R. J., Hurst, J. L., Ayala, G., Lanuza, E., & Martínez-  
653 Garcia, F. (2015). From sexual attraction to maternal aggression: when pheromones change  
654 their behavioural significance. *Hormones and behavior*, 68, 65–76.  
655 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ybeh.2014.08.007>

656 Massé, I. O., Guillemette, S., Laramée, M. E., Bronchti, G., & Boire, D. (2014). Strain  
657 differences of the effect of enucleation and anophthalmia on the size and growth of sensory  
658 cortices in mice. *Brain Research*, 1588, 113–126. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2014.09.025

659 Mayer, A. D., & Rosenblatt, J. S. (1993). Peripheral olfactory deafferentation of the primary  
660 olfactory system in rats using ZnSO<sub>4</sub> nasal spray with special reference to maternal behavior.  
661 *Physiology & behavior*, 53(3), 587–592. doi: 10.1016/0031-9384(93)90157-b

662 McHenry, J. A., Rubinow, D. R., & Stuber, G. D. (2015). Maternally responsive neurons in the  
663 bed nucleus of the stria terminalis and medial preoptic area: Putative circuits for regulating  
664 anxiety and reward. *Frontiers in neuroendocrinology*, 38, 65–72.  
665 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2015.04.001>

666 Meaney M. J. (2001). Maternal care, gene expression, and the transmission of individual  
667 differences in stress reactivity across generations. *Annual review of neuroscience*, 24, 1161–  
668 1192. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.1161>

669 Miceli, M. O., Fleming, A. S., & Malsbury, C. W. (1983). Disruption of maternal behaviour in  
670 virgin and postparturient rats following sagittal plane knife cuts in the preoptic area-  
671 hypothalamus. *Behavioural brain research*, 9(3), 337–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328\(83\)90137-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328(83)90137-7)

673 Morgan, H. D., Fleming, A. S., & Stern, J. M. (1992). Somatosensory control of the onset and  
674 retention of maternal responsiveness in primiparous Sprague-Dawley rats. *Physiology &  
675 behavior*, 51(3), 549–555. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(92\)90178-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(92)90178-5)

676 Noirot, E. E. (1965). Changes in responsiveness to young in the adult mouse. 3. The effect of  
677 immediately preceding performances. *Behaviour*, 24(3), 318–325. doi:  
678 10.1163/156853965x00084

679 Noirot, E. E. (1969). Serial order of maternal responses in mice. *Animal behaviour*, Volume:17,  
680 Numéro:3

681 Numan, M. (2007). Motivational systems and the neural circuitry of maternal behavior in the  
682 rat. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 49(1), 12–21. doi: 10.1002/dev.20198

683 Numan, M. & Insel, T.R. (2003) Hormonal and Nonhormonal Basis of Maternal Behavior. In:  
684 The Neurobiology of Parental Behavior, Springer, New York, 8-41.

685 Numan, M., & Numan, M. J. (1997). Projection sites of medial preoptic area and ventral bed  
686 nucleus of the stria terminalis neurons that express Fos during maternal behavior in female rats.  
687 Journal of neuroendocrinology, 9(5), 369–384. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2826.1997.t01-1-00597>.

689 Numan, M., & Stolzenberg, D. S. (2009). Medial preoptic area interactions with dopamine  
690 neural systems in the control of the onset and maintenance of maternal behavior in rats.  
691 Frontiers in neuroendocrinology, 30(1), 46–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2008.10.002>

692 Numan, M., & Young, L. J. (2016). Neural mechanisms of mother-infant bonding and pair  
693 bonding: Similarities, differences, and broader implications. Hormones and behavior, 77, 98–  
694 112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2015.05.015>

695 Oxley, G., & Fleming, A. S. (2000). The effects of medial preoptic area and amygdala lesions  
696 on maternal behavior in the juvenile rat. Developmental psychobiology, 37(4), 253–265.

697 Peirson, S. N., & Foster, R. G. (2011). Bad light stops play. EMBO reports, 12(5), 380.  
698 <https://doi.org/10.1038/embor.2011.70>

699 Peirson, S. N., Brown, L. A., Pothecary, C. A., Benson, L. A., & Fisk, A. S. (2018). Light and  
700 the laboratory mouse. Journal of neuroscience methods, 300, 26–36.  
701 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.04.007>

702 Pereira, M., & Morrell, J. I. (2009). The changing role of the medial preoptic area in the  
703 regulation of maternal behavior across the postpartum period: facilitation followed by  
704 inhibition. Behavioural brain research, 205(1), 238–248.  
705 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2009.06.026>

706 Petrus, A. (2013). Chemosignals and hormones in the neural control of mammalian sexual  
707 behavior. Frontiers in neuroendocrinology, 34(4), 255–267.  
708 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2013.07.007>

709 Pfaff, D. W. (1982). The Physiological Mechanisms of Motivation. The Physiological  
710 Mechanisms of Motivation. Pfaff, Donald W. (Editor). Published by Springer-Verlag, New  
711 York, NY, U.S.A. ISBN 10: 0387906509

712 Piché, M., Robert, S., Miceli, D., & Bronchti, G. (2004). Environmental enrichment enhances  
713 auditory takeover of the occipital cortex in anophthalmic mice. The European journal of  
714 neuroscience, 20(12), 3463–3472. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03823.x>

715 Pigeon, C., & Marin-Lamellet, C. (2015). Evaluation of the attentional capacities and working  
716 memory of early and late blind persons. *Acta psychologica*, 155, 1–7. doi:  
717 [10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.11.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.11.010)

718 Poindron P. (2005). Mechanisms of activation of maternal behaviour in mammals.  
719 Reproduction, nutrition, development, 45(3), 341–351. <https://doi.org/10.1051/rnd:2005025>

720 Qin, W., Xuan, Y., Liu, Y., Jiang, T., & Yu, C. (2015). Functional Connectivity Density in  
721 Congenitally and Late Blind Subjects. *Cerebral cortex* (New York, N.Y. : 1991), 25(9), 2507–  
722 2516. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu051>

723 Ramamurthy, D. L., & Krubitzer, L. A. (2018). Neural Coding of Whisker-Mediated Touch in  
724 Primary Somatosensory Cortex Is Altered Following Early Blindness. *The Journal of*  
725 *neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 38(27), 6172–6189.

726 Rosenblatt J. S. (1967). Nonhormonal basis of maternal behavior in the rat. *Science* (New York,  
727 N.Y.), 156(3781), 1512–1514. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.156.3781.1512>

728 Rosenblatt, J. S., & Lehrman, D. S. (1963). *Maternal behavior in the laboratory rat*. In:  
729 Reingold HL, ed. *Maternal Behavior in Mammals*. New York: Wiley. p 8-57.

730 Rosenblatt, J. S., Siegel, H. I., & Mayer, A. D. (1979). Progress in the Study of Maternal  
731 Behavior in the Rat: Hormonal, Nonhormonal, Sensory, and Developmental Aspects. J. S.  
732 Rosenblatt, R. A. Hinde, C. Beer, & M.-C. Busnel (Éds.), *Advances in the Study of Behavior*  
733 (Vol. 10, pp. 225-311): Academic Press. doi: 10.1016/S0065-3454(08)60096-0.

734 Santos, R., & Ribeiro, V. M. (2020). Transition of blind women to motherhood from the  
735 perspective of Transitions Theory. *Revista brasileira de enfermagem*, 73(suppl 4), e20190234.  
736 <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2019-0234>

737 Sato, A., Nakagawasai, O., Tan-No, K., Onogi, H., Niijima, F., & Tadano, T. (2010). Influence  
738 of olfactory bulbectomy on maternal behavior and dopaminergic function in nucleus accumbens  
739 in mice. *Behavioural brain research*, 215(1), 141–145. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2010.07.012

740 Schaal, B., Coureaud, G., Doucet, S., Delaunay-El Allam, M., Moncomble, A. S., Montigny,  
741 D., Patris, B., & Holley, A. (2009). Mammary olfactory signalisation in females and odor  
742 processing in neonates: ways evolved by rabbits and humans. *Behavioural brain research*,  
743 200(2), 346–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2009.02.008>

744 Semaan, S. J., & Kauffman, A. S. (2010). Sexual differentiation and development of forebrain  
745 reproductive circuits. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 20(4), 424–431.  
746 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2010.04.004>

747 Shahrokh, D. K., Zhang, T. Y., Diorio, J., Gratton, A., & Meaney, M. J. (2010). Oxytocin-  
748 dopamine interactions mediate variations in maternal behavior in the rat. *Endocrinology*,  
749 151(5), 2276–2286. <https://doi.org/10.1210/en.2009-1271>

750 Skripuletz, T., Kruschinski, C., Pabst, R., von Hörsten, S., & Stephan, M. (2010). Postnatal  
751 experiences influence the behavior in adult male and female Fischer and Lewis rats.  
752 *International journal of developmental neuroscience : the official journal of the International*  
753 *Society for Developmental Neuroscience*, 28(7), 561–571.  
754 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdevneu.2010.07.235>

755 Slimani, H., Danti, S., Ricciardi, E., Pietrini, P., Ptito, M., & Kupers, R. (2013).  
756 Hypersensitivity to pain in congenital blindness. *Pain*, 154(10), 1973-1978. doi:  
757 10.1016/j.pain.2013.05.036

758 Slimani, H., Danti, S., Ptito, M., & Kupers, R. (2014). Pain perception is increased in congenital  
759 but not late onset blindness. *PLoS one*, 9(9), e107281.  
760 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107281>

761 Slimani, H., Ptito, M., & Kupers, R. (2015). Enhanced heat discrimination in congenital  
762 blindness. *Behavioural brain research*, 283, 233–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2015.01.037>

763 Smotherman, W. P., Bell, R. W., Starzec, J., Elias, J., & Zachman, T. A. (1974). Maternal  
764 responses to infant vocalizations and olfactory cues in rats and mice. *Behavioral Biology*, 12(1),  
765 55-66. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0091-6773\(74\)91026-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0091-6773(74)91026-8)

766 Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Karwowski, M., Larsson, M., & Hummel, T. (2019).  
767 Olfactory perception and blindness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological  
768 research*, 83(8), 1595–1611. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-018-1035-2>

769 Stern, J. M. (1989). CHAPTER THREE - Maternal Behavior: Sensory, Hormonal, and Neural  
770 Determinants. F. R. Brush, & S. Levine (Eds.), *Psychoendocrinology* (pp. 105-226).  
771 Amsterdam: Academic Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-137952-0.50008-2>.  
772 Repéré à <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780121379520500082>

773 Stern J. M. (1990). Multisensory regulation of maternal behavior and masculine sexual  
774 behavior: a revised view. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*, 14(2), 183–200.  
775 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-7634\(05\)80219-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-7634(05)80219-2)

776 Stern J. M. (1996). Trigeminal lesions and maternal behavior in Norway rats: II. Disruption of  
777 parturition. *Physiology & behavior*, 60(1), 187–190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(96\)00016-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(96)00016-9)

779 Stern J. M. (1997). Offspring-induced nurturance: animal-human parallels. *Developmental  
780 psychobiology*, 31(1), 19–37. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1098-2302(199707)31:1<19::aid-dev3>3.0.co;2-x  
781

782 Stern, J. M., & Lonstein, J. S. (2001). Neural mediation of nursing and related maternal  
783 behaviors. *Progress in brain research*, 133, 263–278. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0079-6123\(01\)33020-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0079-6123(01)33020-0)

785 Stern, J. M., & Johnson, S. K. (1990). Ventral somatosensory determinants of nursing behavior  
786 in Norway rats. I. Effects of variations in the quality and quantity of pup stimuli. *Physiology &  
787 behavior*, 47(5), 993–1011. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(90\)90026-z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(90)90026-z)

788 Stolzenberg, D. S., & Champagne, F. A. (2016). Hormonal and non-hormonal bases of maternal  
789 behavior: The role of experience and epigenetic mechanisms. *Hormones and behavior*, 77, 204–  
790 210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2015.07.005>

791 Stolzenberg, D. S., & Mayer, H. S. (2019). Experience-dependent mechanisms in the regulation  
792 of parental care. *Frontiers in neuroendocrinology*, 54, 100745.  
793 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2019.04.002>

794 Swaney W. T., Curley J. P., Champagne F. A., & Keverne E. B. (2008). The paternally  
795 expressed Gene Peg3 regulates sexual experience-dependent preferences for estrous odors.  
796 *Behavioral Neuroscience*;122: 963–973. doi: 10.1037/a0012706.

797 Terkel, J., Bridges, R. S., & Sawyer, C. H. (1979). Effects of transecting lateral neural  
798 connections of the medial preoptic area on maternal behavior in the rat: nest building, pup  
799 retrieval and prolactin secretion. *Brain research*, 169(2), 369–380.  
800 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993\(79\)91037-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993(79)91037-0)

801 Topalidis, P., Zinchenko, A., Gädeke, J. C., & Föcker, J. (2020). The role of spatial selective  
802 attention in the processing of affective prosodies in congenitally blind adults: An ERP study.  
803 *Brain research*, 1739, 146819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2020.146819>

804 Thoueille, É., Candilis-Huisman, D., Soulé, M. & Vermillard, M. (2006). La maternité des  
805 femmes aveugles: Du désir d'enfant au bébé réel. *La psychiatrie de l'enfant*, 49, 285-348.  
806 <https://doi.org/10.3917/psy.492.0285>

807 Tobiansky, D. J., Roma, P. G., Hattori, T., Will, R. G., Nutsch, V. L., & Dominguez, J. M.  
808 (2013). The medial preoptic area modulates cocaine-induced activity in female rats. *Behavioral*  
809 *neuroscience*, 127(2), 293–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031949>

810 Touj, S., Tokunaga, R., Al Aïn, S., Bronchti, G., & Piché, M. (2019). Pain Hypersensitivity is  
811 Associated with Increased Amygdala Volume and c-Fos Immunoreactivity in Anophthalmic  
812 Mice. *Neuroscience*, 418, 37-49. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.08.035

813 Touj, S., Cloutier, S., Jemâa, A., Piché, M., Bronchti, G., & Al Aïn, S. (2020). Better Olfactory  
814 Performance and Larger Olfactory Bulbs in a Mouse Model of Congenital Blindness. *Chemical*  
815 *Senses*, 45(7), 523-531. doi: 10.1093/chemse/bjaa052

816 Touj, S., Gallino, D., Chakravarty, M. M., Bronchti, G., & Piché, M. (2021a). Structural brain  
817 plasticity induced by early blindness. *The European journal of neuroscience*, 53(3), 778–795.  
818 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.15028>

819 Touj, S., Paquette, T., Bronchti, G., & Piché, M. (2021b). Early and late visual deprivation  
820 induce hypersensitivity to mechanical and thermal noxious stimuli in the ZRDBA mouse.  
821 *European journal of pain* (London, England), 25(10), 2257–2265.  
822 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.1839>

823 Tucker, P., Laemle, L., Munson, A., Kanekar, S., Oliver, E. R., Brown, N., Schlecht, H., Vetter,  
824 M., & Glaser, T. (2001). The eyeless mouse mutation (ey1) removes an alternative start codon  
825 from the Rx/rax homeobox gene. *Genesis* (New York, N.Y. : 2000), 31(1), 43–53.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1002/gene.10003>

827 Uriarte, N., Ferreño, M., Méndez, D., & Nogueira, J. (2020). Reorganization of perineuronal  
828 nets in the medial Preoptic Area during the reproductive cycle in female rats. *Scientific reports*,  
829 10(1), 5479. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-62163-z

830 vom Saal, F. S., & Howard, L. S. (1982). The regulation of infanticide and parental behavior:  
831 implications for reproductive success in male mice. *Science* (New York, N.Y.), 215(4537),  
832 1270–1272. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7058349>

833 Voss, P., & Zatorre, R. J. (2012). Occipital cortical thickness predicts performance on pitch and  
834 musical tasks in blind individuals. *Cerebral cortex* (New York, N.Y. : 1991), 22(11), 2455–  
835 2465. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr311>

836 Weiss, J., Pyrski, M., Jacobi, E., Bufe, B., Willnecker, V., Schick, B., Zizzari, P., Gossage, S.  
837 J., Greer, C. A., Leinders-Zufall, T., Woods, C. G., Wood, J. N., & Zufall, F. (2011). Loss-of-  
838 function mutations in sodium channel Nav1.7 cause anosmia. *Nature*, 472(7342), 186–190. doi:  
839 10.1038/nature09975

840 Zatorre, R. J., Fields, R. D., & Johansen-Berg, H. (2012). Plasticity in gray and white:  
841 neuroimaging changes in brain structure during learning. *Nature neuroscience*, 15(4), 528–536.  
842 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3045>

843 Zhang, C., Lee, T., Fu, Y., Ren, C., Chan, C., & Tao, Q. (2019). Properties of cross-modal  
844 occipital responses in early blindness: An ALE meta-analysis. *NeuroImage. Clinical*, 24,  
845 102041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2019.102041>

846 Zhou, Y., Fang, F. H., Pan, P., Liu, Z. R., & Ji, Y. H. (2017). Visual deprivation induce cross-  
847 modal enhancement of olfactory perception. *Biochemical and biophysical research  
848 communications*, 486(3), 833–838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2017.03.140>

849

850

851

852

853 **CAPTIONS**

854

855 **FIGURE 1. Pup retrieval test on PD 1, 2, 3. Log-rank (Kaplan-Meier) statistics revealed**  
856 **that blind and sighted dams performed differently in most of conditions.** Survival plots  
857 indicate the cumulative proportion of blind dams (black line) and sighted dams (grey line)  
858 retrieving the first and fourth pup on days 1, 2 and 3 postpartum (\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ).

859 **FIGURE 2. Pup retrieval test on PD 1, 2, 3. The mixed ANOVA revealed that blind**  
860 **mothers displayed a shorter latency to retrieve the 4 pups compared with sighted mothers**  
861 **and pup retrieval efficiency improved similarly over time in both groups** (Data are shown  
862 as mean  $\pm$  SEM; \* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ).

863 **FIGURE 3. The total duration of maternal and non-maternal behaviors displayed by**  
864 **blind and sighted mothers throughout the lactational period on days 5, 10, 13, 16 and 19**  
865 **postpartum.** a) Nursing behavior: blind mothers nursed their pups longer than sighted mothers  
866 on PD 13, 16 and 19. b) Mother-pup interactions in the nest: blind mothers spent more time  
867 interacting with pups compared to sighted mothers on PD 13 and 16. c) Mother in the nest with  
868 no pup's interaction: Blind and sighted mothers spent the same time in the nest with no  
869 interaction with their pups throughout the lactational period. d) Mother resting outside the nest:  
870 sighted mothers spent more time resting outside the nest than blind mothers on PD 10, 13, and  
871 16. e) Mother walking: Blind and sighted mothers spent the same time exploring the cage  
872 throughout the lactational period. f) Mother eating/drinking outside the nest: Blind and sighted  
873 mothers spent the same time eating/drinking throughout the lactational period (\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p$   
874 < 0.01, \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ).

875 **FIGURE 4. Aggressive-related behaviors exhibited by blind and sighted mothers toward**  
876 **a male intruder.** Blind mothers were faster to initiate the first attack toward a male intruder  
877 than their sighted counterparts (a), but both groups exhibited a similar total duration of attacks  
878 (b) and a similar number of attacks toward a male intruder (c). Data are shown as mean  $\pm$  SEM.  
879 \*\* $p < 0.01$ .

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888