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CNTNAP2 is a direct FoxP2 target in vitro and in vivo in zebra finches: complex regulation by age and activity
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Mutations of FoxP2 are associated with altered brain structure, including the striatal part of the basal ganglia, and cause a severe speech and language disorder. Songbirds serve as a tractable neurobiological model for speech and language research. Experimental downregulation of FoxP2 in zebra finch Area X, a nucleus of the striatal song control circuitry, affects synaptic transmission and spine densities. It also renders song learning and production inaccurate and imprecise, similar to the speech impairment of patients carrying FoxP2 mutations. Here we show that experimental downregulation of FoxP2 in Area X using lentiviral vectors leads to reduced expression of CNTNAP2, a FoxP2 target gene in humans. In addition, natural downregulation of FoxP2 by age or by singing also downregulated CNTNAP2 expression. Furthermore, we report that FoxP2 binds to and activates the avian CNTNAP2 promoter in vitro. Taken together these data establish CNTNAP2 as a direct FoxP2 target gene in songbirds, likely affecting synaptic function relevant for song learning and song maintenance.
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Toward this end, over 800 candidate direct Foxp2 target genes have been identified in large scale screens in mice and humans (Mukamel et al. 2011; Roll et al. 2010; Spiteri et al. 2007; Vernes et al. 2007, 2008, 2011). Among them is contactin-associated protein-like 2 (CNTNAP2), a member of the neurexin protein family (Suedhof 2008; Vernes et al. 2008). CNTNAP2 is implicated in diverse human disorders such as autism, schizophrenia, cortical dysplasia, focal epilepsy (CDFE), specific language impairment (SLI), epilepsy, Gilles de la Tourette syndrome and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD; Rodenas-Cuadrado et al. 2014), some of which affect language (e.g. autism, Tourette and CDFE). How CNTNAP2 function relates to these pathologies is not yet well understood. CNTNAP2 is relevant for the clustering of voltage gated potassium channels at the juxtaparanodes of myelinated axons (Girault et al. 2003; Horresh et al. 2008; Poliak et al. 1999), but also plays important roles in neuronal migration, network formation, and the growth and maintenance of dendritic spines (Anderson et al. 2012; Gdalyahu et al. 2015; Penagarikano et al. 2011; Rodenas-Cuadrado et al. 2014). Knockdown of Cntnap2 in primary neuron cultures leads to a decrease in dendritic branching, spine head width and synaptic strength (Anderson et al. 2012). Loss of function in mice (Cntnap2−/−) results in fewer striatal interneurons and a lower spine density in cortical layer 5b neurons compared to litter-mate controls (Gdalyahu et al. 2015; Penagarikano et al. 2011). The decrease in spine density occurs because existing spines are eliminated, not because newly generated spines fail to be stabilized (Gdalyahu et al. 2015). Studying CNTNAP2 as a potential target of FoxP2 in postembryonic and adult songbirds holds the promise to illuminate which of the above functions are relevant for song learning and song maintenance.

Songbirds have shed light on the importance of striatal FoxP2 expression for learned vocalizations (Adam et al. 2016; Haesler et al. 2007; Heston & White 2015; Teramitsu & White 2006; Thompson et al. 2013; Wohlgemuth et al. 2014). Experimental alteration of FoxP2 levels in the striatal song nucleus Area X of zebra finches leads to decreased spine density and impairs the learning and production of song (Haesler et al. 2007; Heston & White 2015; Murugan et al. 2013; Schulz et al. 2010). We hypothesized that CNTNAP2 is a direct FoxP2 target gene in songbirds for the following reasons: (1) CNTNAP2 is a target of FOXP2 in humans (Vernes et al. 2008). (2) CNTNAP2 affects spine density in mice (Gdalyahu et al. 2015) as does FoxP2 in zebra finches (Schulz et al. 2010), raising the possibility that the observed effect of FoxP2 on spines is mediated via CNTNAP2. (3) Expression levels of CNTNAP2 and FoxP2 in adult zebra finches are both higher in the striatum than in AreaX (Haesler et al. 2004; Panaitof et al. 2010; Thompson et al. 2013). Here we demonstrate...
that FoxP2 can bind to and regulate the CNTPNAP2 promoter in vitro and that CNTPNAP2 expression is correlated to FoxP2 expression in Area X of juvenile and adult males. A FoxP2 knockdown can lead to a correlated CNTPNAP2 down-regulation, suggesting that the striatal regulation of CNTPNAP2 by FoxP2 is the result of a direct interaction.

Methods

Nomenclature

The FoxP2 nomenclature follows the convention proposed in Kaestner et al. (2000): FOXP2 in Homo sapiens, Foxp2 in Mus musculus and FoxP2 in all other species, including zebra finches (Taeniopygia guttata). For all genes we use the italicized letters to refer to the gene or cDNA and roman type to refer to the protein.

Subjects

All experiments were performed in accordance with the guidelines of the governmental law (TierSchG). 39 male zebra finches were used in this study. Prior to the experiments, animals were housed in large free flight avaries under a 12h:12h light:dark-cycle with food and water provided ad libitum. Birds were sexed on the day of hatching via polymerase chain reaction (PCR) as previously described (Adam et al. 2014). At the beginning of the experiments, all birds (except those that underwent surgery) were isolated in sound attenuating recording boxes overnight to monitor morning vocal activity. Birds that did not sing were either overdosed with isoflurane immediately after the lights went on in the morning or 2 h later. Birds in the singing group were allowed to sing undirected song and were overdosed after they sang more than 500 motifs within 2 h after their first motif of the day. The first motif had to be sung within 2 h after the lights went on. Vocalizations were continuously monitored and recorded using the Sound Analysis Pro software SAP2001 (Tchernichovski et al. 2000).

Injection of lentiviral vectors

Injections of lentiviral vectors mediating a FoxP2-knockdown were performed as described previously (Adam et al. 2016; Haesler et al. 2007). In brief, at post hatch day 23 (day 23) male zebra finches were injected into Area X with two different lentiviral vectors, in one hemisphere with the vector carrying one of two FoxP2-knockdown constructs (shFoxP2-f or shFoxP2-h), in the other hemisphere with a non-silencing control construct (Haesler et al. 2007). Injections (approximately 200 nl per site) were placed into eight sites in each hemisphere. Injection side and order as well as the choice of the FoxP2-knockdown construct were randomized. After surgery the animals were transferred to their home cages and allowed to grow up normally in the presence of their biological parents and siblings. At day 35 birds were overdosed, the brain was quickly extracted and cut up normally in the presence of their biological parents and siblings. The side was chosen randomly. Total RNA from properly targeted microbiopsies of one hemisphere were pooled. In all cases total RNA was extracted using the RNX kit (Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany). Complementary DNA (cDNA) synthesis was carried out using random hexamer primers and 180 ng or 40 ng total RNA for the pooled or individual microbiopsy samples, respectively. Reverse-transcriptase free reactions were included to control for genomic DNA contamination. All cDNAs were diluted with nucleosse free water (10-fold for pooled, fivefold for individual microbiopsies).

Quantitative Reverse Transcription PCR

qRT-PCR reactions were run in duplicates in a total reaction volume of 20 μl. Five microliter of diluted cDNA were added to 15 μl reaction mix containing 10 μl 2x KAPA SYBR FAST Universal QPCR Mix (Peqlab, Erlangen, Germany), 10 pmol of each primer (18 pmol in the case of FoxP2 and ROX (50 μM, Peqlab) as a reference dye. Reverse-transcriptase free samples as well as no template controls were included to test for DNA-contamination and contamination of reagents, respectively. An inter-run calibrator (IRC) was always included, if samples were run on different plates. The efficiency of all primer pairs was derived using 10-fold dilution series over six orders of magnitude. The efficiency of all primer pairs ranged within 2 ± 10%. We used the following primer pairs: FoxP2 (5'-CCTGGCTGTGAAAGCGTTGTTG3'/5'-ATTGGACCCCACTGAGGAAC3') (Haesler et al. 2007), HMBS (5'-GCAGATGGTTGACATCAACG3' /5'-GTTCTGGTCTCCCTGCTTACG3') (Haesler et al. 2007), GFP (5'-AGAACAGCCATAGGTGTAAC3'/5'-AGAACAGCCATAGGTGTAAC3') (Adam et al. 2016) and CNTPNAP2 (5'-GAGGGGAGGTCGAGCTTAATA3'/5'-GGATTGGAGACCCGAGAC3') (TCTATGGACCTC3'). Reactions were run on a MX3005P system (Agilent, Santa Clara, California, USA) using the following temperature program: 10 min at 95°C for, 40 cycles of 30 seconds at 95°C, 30 seconds at 65°C for FoxP2 and 60°C for HMBS) and a melting curve to check for amplification specificity. The mean C_ for each sample was derived from the run data and used to calculate relative gene expression for the gene of interest (GOI; FoxP2 or CNTPNAP2). We used HMBS as a reference gene, as it is the most stable of all tested potential reference genes for our experiments (Adam et al. 2016; Haesler et al. 2007). We used the
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Search for transcription factor binding sites in the CNTNAP2 promoter

We utilized the CNTNAP2 promoter sequence that we used in the Luciferase experiment (genomic location: chr2:31 216 312–31 217 544, WashU taeGut3.2.4/taeGut2) to predict transcription factor binding sites by means of three databases – Jaspar (Mather et al. 2016), Patch (Matys et al. 2006) and MatInspector (Cartharius et al. 2005) – using the default settings. We merged all results into one table and then retained only matches of transcription factors with a zebra finch homolog according to the current Ensembl annotation (ENS79, Yates et al. 2016). Homologs were identified using Biomart (Smedley et al. 2004) and MatInspector (Cartharius et al. 2005). We further filtered the list of transcription factors potentially binding to the CNTNAP2 promoter by keeping only transcription factors that are expressed in adult, but not juvenile Area X and vice versa, using a published microarray dataset (Hilliard et al. 2012), and our own unpublished transcriptome data. In a last step we removed transcription factor interactions with mRNA expression values that are strongly correlated with those of FoxP2 (orange Module in Hilliard et al. 2012), because we were interested in finding potential regulators of CNTNAP2 that act either independently of FoxP2 or counteract FoxP2’s downregulation of CNTNAP2.

Statistical analysis

All statistical tests were performed using the data analysis software R (R Core Team 2013): Paired t-tests (Luciferase assays) were conducted using t.test(), Mann Whitney U-tests (age difference FoxP2 and CNTNAP2) using wilcox.test(), regressions (dependency of CNTNAP2 expression on FoxP2 expression) using lm() and Wilcoxon signed rank tests (reduction of FoxP2 and CNTNAP2 after knock-down) using wilcox.test(). Plots were generated using the ggplot2 package (2.0.0) (Wickham 2009).

Results

FoxP2 is directly enhancing CNTNAP2 expression in vitro

A prerequisite for CNTNAP2 to be a FoxP2 target gene is that it has FoxP2 binding sites in its regulatory regions and that FoxP2 can regulate CNTNAP2 expression by binding to these motifs. To investigate this in zebra finches, we screened for FoxP2 binding sites (Nelson et al. 2013) in the regulatory regions of the zebra finch CNTNAP2 gene (ENSTGUG0000001794). We identified several FoxP2 binding sites, in particular in the 5′-UTR-region of the gene. To test whether the FoxP2 protein binds to these sites, we conducted electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSA). We designed a 46bp probe containing three binding sites approximately 350bp upstream of the start-codon (genomic location: chr2:31 216 574–31 216 619, WashU taeGut3.2.4/taeGut2). Adding FoxP2 protein to the labeled probe resulted in an upwards shift of the band (Fig. 1a, ‘ps’), which was abolished by the addition of an unlabeled probe (‘competitor’). Pre-incubation with an antibody against FoxP2-V5 led to a supershift of the band (‘ss’), confirming that FoxP2-protein caused the initial shift.

We further used luciferase reporter assays to test if binding of FoxP2 to the CNTNAP2 promoter changed its transcriptional activity. We performed these experiments on a zebra finch cell line (G266) derived from tumor tissue of a male bird (Toh & Arnold 2011). Choosing the G266 cell line instead of the typically used human cell lines, ensured that not only the promoter and FoxP2-protein were from zebra finches, but also the entire transcriptional machinery. Overexpression of FoxP2 protein in G266 cells reduced the expression of the luciferase reporter gene under the control of the SV40 promoter (paired t-test, n=6, t=3.1417, df=5, P=0.0256; Fig. 1b, SV40) as it does in HEK293T cells (Adam et al. 2016). When we tested the FoxP2-dependent transcription from a 1591bp region of the CNTNAP2 promoter including the 5′-UTR we found a significant enhancement of transcription in the presence of FoxP2, but not in the presence of the empty vector control (paired t-test, n=6, t=−4.2861, df=5, P=0.0078; Fig. 1b, CNTNAP2). We thus conclude that FoxP2 has the capacity to directly regulate CNTNAP2 expression in zebra finches.

CNTNAP2 and FoxP2 expression are positively correlated in Area X of juvenile males

FoxP2 expression is lower in Area X of adult males than in juvenile males (Haesler et al. 2004; Thompson et al. 2013)
Figure 2: **CNTNAP2** expression is strongly and positively correlated to FoxP2 expression in Area X of non-singing juveniles. (a) FoxP2 mRNA expression levels in Area X are significantly higher in juvenile males (50–52 days, mean 50 days, no fill, n = 15) than in adult males (>120 days, 123–968 days, mean 297 days, black fill, n = 9). Expression levels were measured by qRT-PCR from microbiopsy samples of Area X of juvenile and adult males that did not sing prior to sacrifice. (b) **CNTNAP2** mRNA expression levels are significantly higher in adults than in juveniles. (c) Expression of **CNTNAP2** was significantly and positively correlated with FoxP2 expression in non-singing juveniles, (d) but not in non-singing adults. Each dot represents one individual; the dashed lines around the fitted line denote the 0.95 confidence interval. Gene expression was normalized to the reference gene HMBS and the mean of the adult group was set to 1. Upper case letters denote adult males, lower case letters juvenile males.

and is downregulated by undirected singing in both age groups (Teramitsu & White 2006; Teramitsu et al. 2010). If FoxP2 directly regulated **CNTNAP2** in Area X of zebra finches we would expect to see positively correlated changes in **CNTNAP2** mRNA levels. To test our hypothesis, we measured the expression levels of both genes in Area X of juvenile and adult males. To exclude the influence of undirected song on this dataset, we made sure that males did not sing on the day of sacrifice. After taking microbiopsies from Area X we performed qRT-PCR. The results confirmed our previous finding that FoxP2 levels in Area X are lower in adult birds (>120 days, 123–968 days, mean 297 days, n = 9) than in juveniles (50–52 days, mean 50 days, n = 15; Mann Whitney U-test, U = 120, P = 0.0009774; Fig. 2a; Haesler et al. 2004). The opposite was the case for **CNTNAP2** expression, which was significantly higher in adults compared to juveniles (Mann Whitney U-test, P = 0.002737; Fig. 2b). This direction of regulation suggested that FoxP2 may be repressing **CNTNAP2** expression in Area X of male zebra finches. If this were the case, we expected to find a negative correlation between the expression levels of FoxP2 and **CNTNAP2** in individual birds. However, FoxP2 and **CNTNAP2** levels were strongly positively correlated in juvenile individuals (Linear Model, $R^2 = 0.467$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.4261$, $F_{1,13} = 11.39$, $P = 0.004973$; Fig. 2c). Interestingly, this was not the case in adult birds (Linear Model, $R^2 = 0.009593$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.1319$, $F_{1,7} = 0.0678$, $P = 0.8021$; Fig. 2d). How can we reconcile the finding that **CNTNAP2** expression is enhanced by FoxP2 in juvenile non-singing males with the fact that levels of **CNTNAP2** expression are not linked to levels of FoxP2 expression in non-singing adults? Another, unidentified, age-dependent factor might enhance...
CNTNAP2 expression in adult Area X and this could cause the significantly higher CNTNAP2 mRNA levels in adult males in comparison to juvenile males. To address this possibility, we searched in silico for transcription factor binding sites on the CNTNAP2 promoter to narrow down the list of potential transcription factors affecting CNTNAP2 expression in adult non-singers. We therefore only took transcription factors into account that are expressed in adults but not in juveniles (Hilliard et al. 2012, unpublished own data), (see Methods for details). We identified 76 transcription factors, which are only expressed in adult Area X and have predicted binding sites in the CNTNAP2 promoter (Table S1, Supporting information).

**CNTNAP2 and FoxP2 expression levels are positively correlated after undirected song**

Undirected song, which leads to a downregulation of FoxP2 expression in adult male zebra finches (Teramitsu & White 2006; Thompson et al. 2013) is thought to be associated with enhanced neural plasticity (Brainard & Doupe 2013; Ritters et al. 2014), which bears resemblance to the juvenile state of song learning. We thus asked whether the singing induced change in FoxP2 mRNA levels would lead to a correlated downregulation of CNTNAP2 expression in adult male birds. We hypothesized that the interaction of FoxP2 with CNTNAP2 might only occur during periods of enhanced plasticity, like song learning or undirected song (Andalman & Fee 2009; Brainard & Doupe 2013; Charlesworth et al. 2011; Tumer & Brainard 2007; Woolley et al. 2014). To test this, we added an additional group of adult birds that sang more than 500 motifs of undirected song within two hours after the first motif of the day (see Methods for more details). Indeed, in contrast to the results in non-singing adults (Fig. 2d) CNTNAP2 expression was significantly and positively correlated with FoxP2 expression in singing individuals (Linear Model, $R^2 = 0.3098$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.565$, $F_{1,6} = 10.09$, $P = 0.01916$; Fig. 3).

**CNTNAP2 expression is reduced after FoxP2 knockdown**

To causally link our finding that CNTNAP2 expression is positively correlated with FoxP2 expression, we experimentally reduced FoxP2 levels in Area X of juvenile males using lentiviral vectors as described previously (Adam et al. 2016; Haesler et al. 2007; Murugan et al. 2013; Schulz et al. 2010). We expected to see a downregulation of CNTNAP2 mRNA levels positively correlated to the decrease of FoxP2. Lentiviral vectors mediating a FoxP2 knockdown were injected into Area X of one hemisphere of juvenile males at day 23, while a control construct was injected into the contralateral hemisphere. After confirming that FoxP2 was downregulated on the knockdown hemisphere compared to the control hemisphere (Wilcoxon signed rank test, $W = 28$, $P = 0.01563$, $n = 7$; Fig. 4a), we measured the expression of CNTNAP2 in all hemispheres. CNTNAP2 levels were reduced in four of seven knockdown hemispheres when compared to the control hemisphere of the same animal (Wilcoxon signed rank test, $W = 18$, $P = 0.1422$; Fig. 4b). Moreover the expression of CNTNAP2 was positively correlated to the FoxP2 expression levels in both, the control (Linear Model, $R^2 = 0.6817$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.618$, $F_{1,5} = 10.71$, $P = 0.02215$; Fig. 4c) and the knockdown group (Linear Model, $R^2 = 0.5686$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.4823$, $F_{1,5} = 6.591$, $P = 0.0502$; Fig. 4d) as indicated by the significant positive correlation between the expression of the two genes. We concluded that FoxP2 can indeed regulate CNTNAP2 expression in vivo.

**Discussion**

In this study, we investigated whether CNTNAP2 is a direct FoxP2 target gene in songbirds as reported for humans (Vernes et al. 2008). We found that FoxP2 protein directly bound to and regulated the CNTNAP2 promoter. In non-singing juvenile zebra finches CNTNAP2 and FoxP2 expression were positively correlated, which was also the case in adult males when they were singing vigorously. In the same vein, an experimental knockdown of FoxP2 led to lower CNTNAP2 levels in four of our seven birds, even though this difference did not reach statistical significance. The regulatory relationship between FoxP2 and CNTNAP2 may contribute to the behavioral and neuroanatomical changes observed after knockdown of FoxP2 in male songbirds, like the previously observed effect on striatal spine density (Schulz et al. 2010).

**CNTNAP2 expression in zebra finches can be regulated by FoxP2**

We found CNTNAP2 expression levels in Area X to be lower in non-singing juveniles than in non-singing adult male zebra finches. While age-related upregulation of CNTNAP2 was also reported in LMAN of zebra finches (Condro & White 2014; Panaitof et al. 2010) and in cultured murine pyramidal
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neurons (Varea et al. 2015), Panaitof et al. (2010) did not find expression differences between juvenile and adult Area X. The discrepancy between our findings and those by Panaitof et al. (2010) might be due to the fact that we used qRT-PCR whereas Panaitof et al. (2010) performed in situ hybridizations, methods with different dynamic ranges. Additionally, Panaitof et al. (2010) normalized the CNTNAP2 expression in Area X to the expression in the surrounding striatum, so that a concomitant upregulation of CNTNAP2 in the striatum could obscure the upregulation of CNTNAP2 in Area X.

In our study, FoxP2 expression was positively correlated with CNTNAP2 expression in zebra finches. The direction of regulation differs in human neuron-like cell line, where over-expression of FOXP2 leads to downregulation of CNTNAP2 expression (Vernes et al. 2008). Likewise, in the developing human cortex CNTNAP2 is expressed highest in layers with low FOXP2 expression and vice versa (Vernes et al. 2008). One explanation for these tissue differences could be that transcription factors binding to the same site can repress or enhance a gene depending on the presence of other transcription factors (Diamond et al. 1990). Different cofactors exist in different cell lines and tissues, influencing the direction of regulation. Examples for such cofactors could be other FoxP-family members (FoxP1 and FoxP4), Nkx2.1, CtBP1, Pias1, members of the NuRD chromatin-remodeling complex and members of the FoxO-subfamily, all known to interact with FoxP2 and to modulate its ability to regulate target gene expression (Chokas et al. 2010; Estruch et al. 2016; Li et al. 2004; van Boxtel et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2008). Furthermore, all of these cofactors are expressed in Area X of juvenile as well as adult male zebra finches (unpublished own data, Hilliard et al. 2012). Especially the FoxO-family members are promising candidates because FoxO3 and FoxP1 are known to bind to the same enhancers. Through this interaction FoxP1 is able to regulate specific FoxO3 target genes (van Boxtel et al. 2013). The same kind of interaction might occur between FoxP2 and FoxO4 binding sites, which are very similar to the FoxP1 and FoxO3 binding sites, respectively (Mathelier et al. 2016).

Tissue specific differences determining the direction of regulation are also likely since the negative correlation of FOXP2 and CNTNAP2 levels in human cortex (Vernes et al. 2008) is not mirrored in developing dorsal thalamus and striatum of humans where both genes can be co-expressed strongly (Alarcon et al. 2008; Teramitsu et al. 2004). Furthermore, in the zebra finch brain CNTNAP2 and FoxP2 expression overlap in the striatum, Purkinje cell layer and the optic tectum, whereas in LMAN and nidopallium CNTNAP2 is expressed but FoxP2 is not. In general, CNTNAP2 has a much wider expression pattern in the songbird brain (Condro & White 2014; Panaitof et al. 2010) than FoxP2 (Haeusler et al. 2004; Teramitsu et al. 2004). In areas where both FoxP2 and CNTNAP2 are co-expressed, as is the case in Area X, our data show that FoxP2 can positively influence CNTNAP2 expression (e.g. in juveniles and singing adults); however, FoxP2 expression does not always have this effect, shown by the

Figure 4: Knockdown of FoxP2 reduces CNTNAP2 expression levels. Lentiviral vectors mediating the expression of either a shRNA directed against FoxP2 or a non-silencing control shRNA were injected into left and right Area X of juvenile (day 23) male zebra finches. Injection order and side were randomized. (a) FoxP2 expression was significantly decreased on the knockdown hemisphere (black fill) compared to the control hemisphere (no fill) of the same animal. (b) Expression of CNTNAP2 was decreased in some animals. (c) CNTNAP2 expression was significantly and positively correlated with FoxP2 expression in both, the control and (d) knockdown hemisphere. Each dot represents one individual; the dashed lines around the fitted line denote the 0.95 confidence interval. Numbers denote individual males.
absence of a relationship in non-singing adults. In the latter case, FoxP2 might not bind to the CNTNAP2 promoter or if it does, additional factors prevent its transcriptional regulation of CNTNAP2.

In summary, FoxP2 is clearly not the only transcription factor regulating CNTNAP2 expression. To search for additional ones expressed in Area X we used an in silico approach and identified 76 transcription factors with predicted binding sites in the CNTNAP2 promoter. These transcription factors are good candidates to mediate the age-dependent upregulation of CNTNAP2 expression. Further experiments are needed to address whether the candidates from this list actually bind to the CNTNAP2 promoter in vivo. The candidate gene with most binding sites in the CNTNAP2 promoter was SP3, a transcription factor known to repress the SP1 mediated activation of the human D1A receptor gene (Yang et al. 2000). Interestingly, D1A is regulated by FoxP2 in zebra finches (Murugan et al. 2013). Being regulated by FoxP2 and SP3 might thus be common to a subset of FoxP2 target genes.

Taking our findings and published data together, FoxP2 does regulate CNTNAP2 in Area X of male zebra finches, yet the relationship is more complicated than a simple ‘more is more’ dependency. We propose that during periods of enhanced plasticity, such as in juvenile males and during undirected singing in adult males, FoxP2 influences CNTNAP2 expression in a linear manner. However, in the ‘default state of the adult motor system’ (Brainard & Doupe 2013), when the anterior forebrain pathway is not injecting variability into the motor pathway, the influence of FoxP2 on CNTNAP2 might be overridden by other factors, e.g. miRNAs or other transcription factors.
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