Time course of alterations in adult spinal motoneuron properties in the SOD1(G93A) mouse model of ALS

Seoan Huh[1], Charles J. Heckman[1,2,3], and Marin Manuel[1,4,§]

[1]Department of Physiology, [2]Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, and [3]Department of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Science, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA. [4]Université de Paris, SPPIN - Saints-Pères Paris Institute for the Neurosciences, CNRS, Paris, France.

§ Corresponding author:

Marin MANUEL
SPPIN - Saints-Pères Paris Institute for the Neurosciences
Université de Paris, 45, rue des Saints-Pères, 75006 Paris, France
email: marin.manuel@neurobio.org

Author contribution

Conceptualization: S.H., C.J.H., and M.M.; Methodology: S.H., C.J.H., and M.M.; Investigation: S.H.; Formal analysis: S.H. and M.M.; Software: M.M.; Visualization: S.H. and M.M.; Writing - Original Draft: S.H.; Writing - Review & Editing: S.H., C.J.H., and M.M.; Funding Acquisition: C.J.H and M.M.; S.H., C.J.H., and M.M. approved the final version of this manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NIH NINDS R01NS077863 and NINDS R01NS110953. S.H. was supported by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (NSF GRFP).

Abstract

Although ALS is an adult-onset neurodegenerative disease, motoneuron electrical

properties are already altered during embryonic development. Motoneurons must

therefore exhibit a remarkable capacity for homeostatic regulation to maintain a

normal motor output for most of the life of the patient. In the present paper, we

demonstrate how maintaining homeostasis could come at a very high cost. We

studied the excitability of spinal motoneurons from young adult SOD1(G93A) mice

to end-stage. Initially homeostasis is highly successful in maintaining their overall

excitability. This initial success, however, is achieved by pushing some cells far

above the normal range of passive and active conductances. As the disease

progresses, both passive and active conductances shrink below normal values in the

surviving cells. This shrinkage may thus promote survival, implying the previously

large values contribute to degeneration. These results support the hypothesis that

motoneuronal homeostasis may be "hyper-vigilant" in ALS and a source of

accumulating stress.

Significance Statement

44   During ALS, motoneurons exhibit a remarkable ability to maintain a normal

45   motor output despite continuous alterations of their electrophysiological properties,

46   up to the point when overt symptoms become apparent. We show that this

47   homeostatic process can sometimes push motoneurons beyond the normal range,

48   which may be causing long-lasting harm.

Introduction

ALS is a fatal neurodegenerative disorder characterized by progressive loss of cortical and spinal motoneurons. Five to ten percent of the ALS cases are familial (FALS), and ~20% of the FALS cases are due to mutations in the Superoxide Dismutase1 (SOD1) gene (Rosen et al., 1993). Studies in the mutant SOD1 (mSOD1) mouse and other animal models have revealed that multiple cellular functions become impaired as the disease progresses (Ilieva et al., 2009; Kanning et al., 2009; Johnson and Heckman, 2010; Brownstone and Lancelin, 2018), implying that homeostatic mechanisms are failing. Yet, despite an early surge in motoneuron excitability in the embryonic state (Kuo et al., 2004; van Zundert et al., 2008; Pieri et al., 2009; Martin et al., 2013), mutant mice maintain a normal motor output for several months, suggesting the involvement of very potent and effective homeostatic process to maintain the intrinsic excitability of the motoneurons.

The standard measure of the net excitability of motoneurons is the relation between the frequency of firing and the amplitude of the injected current. Multiple ionic currents contribute to this frequency-current (F-I) function relationship. Chief among them are persistent inward currents (PICs), which are mediated by voltage-gated $Na+$ and $Ca2+$ channels. In neonatal mSOD1 mice, PICs in spinal motoneurons become aberrantly large (Quinlan et al., 2011). On its own, this change would increase F-I gain, but it is compensated by commensurate increases in the leak currents that set the input conductance of the cell, so that the net excitability remains constant (Quinlan et al., 2011). These abnormal changes show that F-I homeostasis during the neonatal period is achieved via a compensatory mechanism.

If, however, these compensatory increases persist into the young adult state, then

the continued distortions in input conductances and PIC amplitudes could induce a

substantial stress within the motoneurons. Increasing the number of leak

conductances and voltage-gated channels implies a higher energy expenditure to

maintain the resting membrane potential and ionic gradients across the membrane,

which already occupies a large share of the metabolic budget of neurons (Attwell

and Laughlin, 2001; Herculano-Houzel, 2011; Howarth et al., 2012). One must also

consider the additional burden associated with the increased housekeeping tasks

such as lipid synthesis, trafficking of organelles and protein synthesis, which

account for 25–50% of the energy budget of neurons (Rolfe and Brown, 1997;

Attwell and Laughlin, 2001). In this scenario, the initial success in the homeostatic

regulation of net excitability would come at a severe cost, likely accelerating the

onset of degeneration. Indeed, neurons function on a very restricted energy budget

that is independent of their size (Herculano-Houzel, 2011). On the other hand, if

homeostatic processes instead successfully return input conductance and PIC values

to normal ranges before the onset of denervation, then homeostasis for the F-I

function would reduce stress on the cell and effects on subsequent degeneration

would likely be small.

Here, we investigated how the homeostatic processes required to maintain

normal excitability (current onset and F-I gain) develop as the disease progresses.

We undertook the first *in vivo* voltage-clamp studies of motoneurons in the

SOD1(G93A) mouse model of ALS and pursued these measurements across a wide

range of ages, from P30 to P120. This age range spans the young adult period, the

onset of denervation period (~P50, Pun et al., 2006), and the development of overt

symptoms (~P90). Because adult mSOD1 motoneurons tend to have a larger input

conductance than controls (Delestrée et al., 2014), we hypothesized that input

conductance and PIC values would continue to grow in the young adult state. Our

results supported this hypothesis, revealing, in fact, a continual increase in the

amplitude of these parameters, followed by a collapse, so that motoneurons

surviving beyond the onset of overt symptoms (~P90) had aberrantly small values

of each. These results are consistent with the possibility that homeostasis for

excitability is not weak but excessively strong and that this overreaction contributes

to subsequent degeneration (Mitchell and Lee, 2012).

Methods

Animals

This study was performed in strict accordance with the recommendations in the

Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals of the National Institutes of

Health. All of the animals were handled according to protocols approved by

Northwestern University's institutional animal care and use committee (IACUC). All

surgery was performed under sodium pentobarbital anesthesia, and every effort

was made to minimize suffering. Because of the reproducible and stereotyped

progression of symptoms, we chose to use mice overexpressing the human

SOD1(G93A) gene, in which glycine has been substituted by alanine at residue 93 as

a mouse model of ALS. Hemizygous B6SJL.SOD1(G93A) transgenic mutant males

were bread with B6SJL F1 females (obtained from the Jackson Laboratory, Bar

Harbor, ME)(Leitner et al., 2009). Offspring were genotyped and the transgene copy

number was compared to a housekeeping gene at Transnetyx (Cordova, TN). Only

mice with relative copy number >45 were used in this study. The control group

consisted of non-transgenic littermates, with the same B6SJL background (WT). 33

animals of either sex were used in this study. Because these experiments tend to

have a higher success rate with larger animals, our sample was biased towards

males (27 males and 6 females). Animals were divided into different age groups for

analysis: animals whose age was <60 days-old were categorized as P30–60 (N=9

mice), animals whose age was ≥60 and <90 as P60–90 (N=12 mice), and animals

older than ≥90 days-old were classified as P90–120 (N=12 mice).

In vivo preparation

Procedures were similar to those in our previous studies (Manuel and Heckman,

2011). Initially, atropine (0.2 mg/kg) was administered subcutaneously to prevent

salivation. Ten minutes later, anesthesia was initiated with an intraperitoneal

injection of pentobarbital sodium (70 mg/kg) and maintained by intravenous

infusion of supplemental doses of pentobarbital (6 mg/kg) mixed in perfusion

solution containing 4% glucose, 1% $NaHCO_3$, and 14% Plasmion. The trachea was

cannulated, allowing the mouse to be artificially ventilated with 100% O_2. The end-

tidal PCO_2 was continuously monitored and maintained around 4% by adjusting

ventilator parameters including respiratory rate around 120–150 bpm and tidal

volume around 0.09–0.23 mL. The hind limb muscles were then dissected; biceps

femoris was removed to expose the sciatic nerve, which was thereafter placed over

a stimulating electrode. A laminectomy was performed at the T13–L1 level and the

L3–L4 spinal segments were exposed. To prevent the spinal cord from dehydration,

a custom made bath was affixed using silicone elastomer and covered with mineral

oil. To locate the motoneurons of interest, the sciatic nerve was stimulated at 1.8–2×

the minimum intensity required to observe an afferent volley.

Electrophysiology

Intracellular recordings of spinal motoneurons were performed by impaling them

with glass micropipette electrodes filled with 3M KCl with a resistance of 8–15 MΩ.

Motoneurons were identified by the presence of antidromic action potential from

stimulation of the sciatic nerve. Cells with unstable resting membrane potential

(RMP) or with RMP more depolarized than −50 mV were excluded from the analysis.

We record a median of 3 cells per animal (average ± SD 3.1±1.7 cells per animal,

mode 2 cells/animal, N=33).

PICs were recorded in discontinuous voltage-clamp mode, with switching rates of

6–8 kHz. Clamp feedback gain was between 0.3 and 1.5. In addition to the feedback

gain from the Axoclamp amplifier, an additional low-frequency feedback loop with a

gain of 11 and a cutoff of −3 dB at 0.3 kHz was used to improve voltage control in

such large cells as motoneurons (Lee and Heckman, 1998). Monitoring outputs were

observed at all times to assure reasonable settling of the electrode. To record PICs, a

slow triangular voltage ramp (−80 to −40 mV) was applied (Lee and Heckman,

1998). Leak current was determined by fitting a regression line through the

subthreshold region (−80 to −65 mV) of the I-V function. Then, this leak was

subtracted from the total function to determine the PIC amplitude (measured both

on the ascending and descending part of the ramp). In addition, the voltage at which

the PIC was maximal on each part of the ramp was recorded (PIC peak voltage). The

PIC onset voltage was estimated on the leak-subtracted trace as the point where the

curve started to visibly deviate downward from the horizontal. Input conductance

was estimated as the slope of the leak current.

To assess the intrinsic properties of the motoneuron in current-clamp mode, we

measured the frequency-current (F-I) relationship of action potential firing. The F-I

relationship was determined based on the firing produced by a triangular current

injection. The interspike frequency was then plotted against the intensity of the

injected current. All these measurements were carried out in the discontinuous

current-clamp mode of the Axoclamp 2A amplifier, with switching rates of 6–8 kHz.

Mouse motoneurons possess two regimes of firing: a sub-primary range of firing,

followed by a linear primary range (Manuel et al., 2009; Manuel and Heckman,

2011). The primary range was identified visually starting from the top of the ramp

and going backward towards the beginning (for the ascending ramp) of forward

towards the end (for the descending ramp). A linear portion of the instantaneous

frequency, with low variability, can generally be easily identified before a sudden

change of slope or an increase in firing variability. The "gain" of the F-I relationship

was determined by fitting a regression line over the linear range so identified

(separately on the ascending and descending phase of the ramp). The other

parameters measured in the F-I relationship were: the current at which the first

action potential (AP) fires on the ascending ramp (recruitment current). the current

at which the last AP fires on the descending ramp (current at de-recruitment); the

voltage threshold for spiking, which was determined as the voltage where the slope

of the membrane voltage reaches 10 mV/ms before the first AP (Sekerli et al., 2004);

the current and firing frequency at the transition between the sub-primary and

primary ranges (Manuel and Heckman, 2011).

Data analysis

Recordings were acquired and analyzed using Spike2 v.7 (CED, Cambridge, UK).

Data were analyzed using the scientific python (v.3.7.4) ecosystem: Pandas v.1.0.5

(McKinney, 2011), SciPy v.1.5.2 (Virtanen et al., 2020), DABEST v.0.3.0 (Ho et al.,

2019), statsmodels v.0.12.0 (Seabold and Perktold, 2010) and scikit-learn v.0.23.0

(Pedregosa et al., 2011). Figures were generated using matplotlib v.3.1.3 (Hunter,

2007) and seaborn v.0.10.0 (Waskom et al., 2020).

Statistical analysis

All data are reported as mean ± standard deviation with their respective sample

size. Each cell is treated as an independent observation, and the reported N refers to

the number of cells, unless otherwise specified. No test was performed to detect

outliers, and no data points were excluded from the analysis. When comparing

between WT and mSOD1 samples, we focus on estimation statistics that rely on

effect sizes and confidence intervals (95%CI), rather than null hypothesis

significance testing, as recommended by several scientific societies and editorial

boards (Bernard, 2019; Makin and Orban de Xivry, 2019; Wasserstein et al., 2019;

Michel et al., 2020). Unless otherwise specified, effect sizes are reported as

differences of means and Hedges' *g* (Hedges, 2016). Where appropriate, data are

presented as Cumming plots (Cumming, 2012) generated using DABEST. In these

plots, the raw data are plotted as swarms of points. In addition, the mean ± standard

deviation of each group is plotted as a notched line immediately to the right of each

group. The effect size and bootstrapped 95% CIs are plotted on separate axes

beneath the raw data. Confidence intervals were bias-corrected and accelerated, and

are displayed with the bootstrap distribution of the mean; resampling was

performed 5000 times (Ho et al., 2019). Welch's *t*-test (Welch, 1947) results are

provided for information only. ANCOVA was performed using statsmodels' OLS

routines, fitting the model "PIC amplitude ~ input conductance * Genotype". No

significant interaction term was detected for any of the age groups considered, and

the model was run again without interaction. Dimensionality reduction was

performed using scikit-learn's PCA. The 21 electrophysiological features (which did

not include genotype or age) of our dataset were centered and scaled then projected

on a 5D space. For analysis, only the first three principal components were

considered.

Results

We set out to compare neuronal excitability, in 103 motoneurons from

SOD1(G93A) mice (mSOD1; 53 motoneurons), and their non-transgenic (WT; 50

motoneurons) littermate, aged between 31 and 123 days old. Neuronal excitability

was estimated on the response of the motoneurons to a triangular ramp of current

in current-clamp mode. In addition, PICs were measured in each motoneuron using

a triangular voltage ramp in voltage-clamp mode. Most of the values measured on

the ascending and descending phases of the ramps, both in voltage-clamp and

current-clamp were very strongly correlated (PIC amplitude on ascending and

descending ramps: r^2=0.75; PIC onset voltage: r^2=0.89; PIC peak voltage: r^2=0.90;

recruitment and de-recruitment currents: r^2=0.90). For this reason, we will mostly

focus on the parameters measured on the ascending ramp.

Given the large period considered here, one also needs to consider whether

alterations in motoneuron properties were direct effects of the mutation or merely

shifts in the distribution of the properties caused by the progressive loss of a

fraction of the motoneurons, starting with the least excitable FF motoneurons (Pun

et al., 2006; Hegedus et al., 2007, 2008; Martínez-Silva et al., 2018). For this reason,

we have split our dataset into three age groups. First, the young adult group (P30–

60) corresponds to pre-symptomatic animals, with little to no neuromuscular-

junction denervation (denervation starts at >P50 in FF motor units (Pun et al.,

2006)). The presymptomatic group (P60–90) corresponds to a group where there

are no overt motor symptoms despite a substantial loss of distal axons (Pun et al.,

2006) and the beginning of cell death in the spinal cord (Kanning et al., 2009;

Lalancette-Hebert et al., 2016). The symptomatic group (P90–120) contains animals

showing overt motor symptoms, and which have lost a significant proportion of

their motoneurons, particularly in the FF and FR population. Because motoneurons

are still intact in the young adult group, changes in electrical properties can be

directly interpreted as the direct result of the mutation, rather than the result of a

shift in the population average caused by the loss of a fraction of the motoneurons.

This age group will therefore be the main focus of the rest of our analysis.

Motoneurons from young adult mutant mice have overly large PICs

In motoneurons, one of the major determinants of excitability are PICs, which were measured in response to a slow (5 mV/s) ramp in voltage-clamp mode. The amplitude of the PIC was measured on the leak-subtracted trace at the point where the downward deflection of the trace was maximal (see Figure 1A–B). We also measured the PIC activation voltage, and the voltage at which the PICs reached their peak.

In WT animals, PIC amplitude remained roughly steady during the age period studied (Figure 1C). However, in mSOD1 motoneurons, PIC amplitudes started higher than in WT animals at the youngest stages, then decreased strikingly over time (Figure 1C). When broken down by age groups (Figure 1D), our results show that, in the young adult stage (P30–60), the SOD1 mutation lead to an almost 3× increase in PIC amplitudes compared to WT motoneurons. This increase appears to be a continuation of the trend observed in neonates, where PICs were already increased ~2 fold compared to controls (Quinlan et al., 2011). In the presymptomatic group (P60–90), however, mSOD1 PICs shrunk to the same amplitude as WT motoneurons. At symptomatic stages (P90–120), the trend seen in young animals is reversed: PICs are much smaller in mSOD1 motoneurons compared to WT motoneurons (Table 1).

In addition to its effect on PIC amplitude, SOD1 mutation also affected the voltage at which PICs are recruited. The "PIC onset voltage", measured as the voltage at the point where the leak-subtracted motoneuron I-V curve initially begins to curve downward, was hyperpolarized by 10 mV in young mSOD1 mice compared to WT

controls (WT: −58.03±6.35 mV, N=19 vs. mSOD1: −69.41±5.71 mV, N=15; g=−1.83

95%CI[−2.64−−0.78]; t(32)=5.49, p=5.1e−06), and then slowly increased over time

to match the value in WT motoneurons by endstage (Figure 1E). The SOD1 mutation

had a similarly large effect on the voltage at which the PIC reached its maximum in

young animals (WT: −43.83±4.79 mV, N=19 vs. SOD1: −52.32±4.20 mV, N=15;

g=−1.83 95%CI[−2.63−−1.04]; t(32)=5.50, p=4.8e−06). The peak voltage then

increased progressively over time, paralleling the onset voltage (Figure 1F).

These profound changes in PIC amplitude and activation voltage would be

expected to have an impact on the firing properties of motoneurons. We, therefore,

performed current-clamp recordings in the same motoneurons as above. Starting

from its natural resting membrane potential, we injected a triangular ramp of

current to elicit the repetitive firing of the motoneuron (Figure 2A−B), and

measured the voltage threshold for spiking on the first spike triggered by the ramp.

In concordance with the hyperpolarization of the PICs, spiking threshold was also

hyperpolarized in young animals (WT: −45.35±5.48 mV, N=19 vs. mSOD1:

−54.86±5.15 mV, N=14; g=−1.74 95%CI[−2.53−−0.81]; t(31)=5.10, p=1.9e−05), and

increased over time (Figure 1G).

Young adult motoneurons are nonetheless not hyperexcitable

Despite the large alterations in PIC amplitude and activation voltage and the

change in the voltage threshold for spiking, the excitability of the motoneurons was

remarkably unaffected by the SOD1 mutation, regardless of age. Excitability was

quantified using the intensity of the current required to elicit the first spike on the

ascending ramp ("recruitment current"). Although the recruitment current

decreased over time in mSOD1 animals (Figure 2C), this effect was mostly driven by

older animals (Figure 2D). Young adult (P30–60) mutant motoneurons, whose

neuromuscular junctions are just starting to be denervated, and pre-symptomatic

motoneurons (P60–90), which experience substantial denervation, did not require,

on average, less current to reach firing threshold than WT controls (Figure 2D). At

symptomatic stages (P90–120), the SOD1 mutation does lead to a decrease in the

recruitment current compared to WT animals (Figure 2D), which is probably caused

by the degeneration of the high threshold motoneurons at this stage.

Neuronal excitability depends not only on how much current is needed to start

firing, but also at what frequency the neuron is firing once it is recruited. We

quantified the firing frequency of the motoneurons by measuring the slope of the

frequency-current relationship. As shown previously (Manuel et al., 2009), most F-I

curves, regardless of age and genotype, showed a distinct sub-primary range (SPR)

with a steep slope and high variability followed by a linear phase called primary

range (PR). We used the "gain" of the motoneuron, i.e. the slope of the F-I curve in

the PR, as another measure of excitability of motoneurons. Despite the alterations in

PICs in mutant motoneurons, the gain of the motoneuron F-I curves was unaffected

by both age and mutation (Figure 2E–F).

Compensatory changes responsible to maintain excitability

The fact that young adult motoneurons are not hyperexcitable despite substantial

alterations in the PICs suggests that other compensatory mechanisms are acting to

preserve the functional output of the cells. Motoneuron input conductance is an

important factor controlling neuron excitability. We estimated the input

conductance of mSOD1 and WT motoneurons from the slopes of their I-V

relationships around the level of the resting membrane potential (see Figure 1 and

Methods). Input conductances of mSOD1 and WT motoneurons are plotted against

the age of the animal in Figure 3A. Consistent with the continuous increase in the

size of the animals over the age span studied, WT motoneurons exhibit a moderate

increase in input conductance in WT motoneurons over time (Figure 3A). On the

other hand, mSOD1 motoneurons showed the opposite trend (Figure 3A). Young

adult mutant motoneurons had an input conductance almost twice as high as WT

controls at P30–P60 (Figure 3B). This increase is relatively greater (~1.7 fold) than

that observed in neonatal motoneurons (~1.25 fold) (Quinlan et al., 2011),

suggesting that the trend for increased conductance has become stronger as the

animal matures into the young adult state. However, by the late pre-symptomatic

stage (P60–90), the mutation had no longer any effect on input conductance. Finally,

symptomatic (P90–120) mSOD1 motoneurons had a smaller input conductance than

WT controls (Figure 3B), but this difference could be due to the degeneration of the

largest, high-threshold units at this stage.

The increase in input conductance is not the only compensatory change

happening in young adult mutant motoneurons. In particular, one would have

expected the leftward shift in the activation voltage of PICs seen in these

motoneurons to have a profound impact on their firing behavior. This discrepancy

can be explained by a parallel hyperpolarization (by almost 10 mV) of the resting

membrane potential in young adult mSOD1 motoneurons (Figure 4, P30–60). This

effect is still observable at pre-symptomatic stages, but to a lesser degree (Figure 4,

P60–90). At symptomatic ages, however, mutant motoneurons had similar resting

membrane potentials as WT controls (Figure 4, P90–120).

When taking into account this hyperpolarization of the resting membrane

potential, the relative values of the voltage threshold for spiking (ΔV_{th}, difference

between the voltage threshold and the resting membrane potential), as well as the

relative activation voltage of the PICs (ΔV_{PIC}) and the relative voltage at the peak of

the PIC (ΔV_{peak}) were all similar between WT and mSOD1 motoneuron regardless of

age (Table 1), which suggest that these are the quantities that are homeostatically

regulated.

Arms race between PICs and input conductance
Our results show that, during the disease progression, motoneurons are actively

engaged in a homeostatic process to maintain their firing output. The ratio of PIC to

conductance is a major determinant of net excitability. If these two parameters grow

in proportion, then net excitability is likely to stay about the same (Huh et al., 2017).

We thus analyzed the relationship between PIC amplitude and input conductance

(Figure 5). In the young adult animals (Figure 5A), the majority of the mutant

motoneurons are clustered in the upper right-hand corner, with values of both

conductances and PIC amplitudes that are outside of the range of WT controls. Yet,

the slopes were similar for both groups (ANCOVA, no significant interaction

between input conductance and genotype on PIC amplitude, $t(30)=-0.590$, $p=0.560$),

and the mutation had only a negligible effect on the relationship between PIC

amplitude and conductance (ANCOVA, effect of mutation -0.40 95%CI$[-6.73-5.92]$,

$t(30)=-0.130$, $p=0.898$). Therefore the relationship between PIC amplitude and

input conductance was the same in WT and mSOD1 mice. This implies that, in these

animals, the cells that are abnormally large (large input conductance) also have PICs

that have increased in proportion. It is plausible that this process would, by itself,

cause undue stress to the cell (Attwell and Laughlin, 2001; Herculano-Houzel, 2011;

Howarth et al., 2012), due to the high metabolic demand imposed by their large size,

as well as the potential massive influx of calcium caused by their abnormally large

PICs. At the pre-symptomatic stages, the WT and mSOD1 populations roughly

overlap (Figure 5B). At the symptomatic ages, the situation is reversed, with the

appearance of a cluster (N=6) of very small cells with very small PICs (Figure 5C).

These results show that the overall initial increase in PIC and conductance

amplitudes were driven by the SOD1 mutation generates a sub-population of

motoneurons with conductance and PIC amplitudes that are well above the normal,

WT range (P30–60). Then, as the disease progresses, the steady reduction in these

amplitudes is so strong that by P90–120, some of the surviving cells fall well below

the normal range.

Some cells are hypoexcitable and cannot fire repetitively

Despite the remarkable ability of spinal motoneurons to maintain their

excitability and firing output demonstrated above, some mSOD1 motoneuron

tended to lose their ability to fire repetitively as the disease progressed (Delestrée

et al., 2014; Martínez-Silva et al., 2018). Out of the 53 mutant motoneurons

recorded, 6 motoneurons could not fire repetitively to current ramps despite still

being able to fire a single or a few action potentials to current steps. Figure 6 shows

an example of such a motoneuron. Although those cells were not, on average, larger

than those that fired repetitively (Figure 6D), non-firing cells were characterized by

a very small PIC amplitude (Figure 6E, see also (Huh et al., 2017)). Finally, although

non-firing motoneurons could be recorded in WT mice (7 out of 50 motoneurons),

non-firing motoneurons appeared, on average, 25 days earlier in mSOD1 mice

(Figure 6F).

Other motoneuron properties
Given the large number of electrophysiological parameters measured in each cell

(21 per cell), we used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to analyze the overall

behavior of the cells across time and genotype. The first three principal components

(PCs) accounted for 67% of the variance in the data (PC1: 33.8%, PC2: 21.4%, PC3:

11.9%). Figure 7A$_{1-3}$ shows how the first three principal components varied with

the age of the animal in mSOD1 and WT mice. For WT mice, all principal

components were constant over time (slopes: PC1 0.102 AU/week 95%CI[−0.178–

0.381], r^2=0.024, p=0.459; PC2 −0.112 AU/week 95%CI[−0.368–0.144], r^2=0.034,

p=0.376; PC3 0.043 AU/week 95%CI[−0.182–0.269], r^2=0.007, p=0.694). On the

other hand, in mSOD1 mice, the first two principal components evolved over time.

PC1 started at a higher value than WT mice, decreased over time (slope

−0.460 AU/week 95%CI[−0.625−−0.295], r^2=0.450, p=1.6e−06), and became smaller

than in WT mice at endstage. PC2 followed the opposite trend. In young mSOD1

animals, PC2 was lower than in WT animals, and then it increased over time (albeit

by a very small amount; 0.151 AU/week 95%CI[0.006–0.296], r^2=0.102, p=0.042).

Finally, PC3 stayed constant (−0.089 AU/week 95%CI[−0.192–0.013], r^2=0.074,

p=0.086) and indistinguishable from WT. Higher principal components did not show

any dependency on age or genotype (not shown).

The opposite behavior of PC1 and PC2 in mSOD1 mice indicates that several

features are anti-correlated. PC1 was strongly positively correlated to input

conductance, as well as most current measurements (PIC amplitude, recruitment

current, etc.) (Figure 7B), which were also the features that were increased the most

in young adult mSOD1 vs. WT animals (Figure 7C, top rows). On the other hand, PC2

was more strongly correlated to voltage measurements (voltage threshold, PIC peak

voltage, PIC onset voltage, resting membrane potential; Figure 7B), which were

features that were strongly decreased in young adult mSOD1 vs. WT (Figure 7C,

bottom rows). Overall, PCA clearly highlights two sets of features that evolve in

opposite direction over time, presumably to compensate for one another in order to

maintain neuronal excitability as close to normal as possible.

Discussion

In this paper, we studied how motoneuron electrical properties evolve over the

time course of ALS, focusing particularly on the persistent inward currents (PICs).

We show that, in young adult mutant mice, before and up to the time when motor

unit denervation is just starting, PICs are abnormally large compared to controls.

This increase in PIC amplitude is accompanied by a parallel increase in motoneuron

input conductance with the net effect that the excitability of the cells remains

normal. Later, while the animals remain pre-symptomatic but denervation has

begun, motoneuron properties return to normal levels. Finally, in symptomatic

animals, mutant motoneurons tend to have smaller input conductance and smaller

recruitment current, which is most likely due to the death of the largest, low

threshold cells at this stage.

Homeostatic regulation of motoneuron output

Although ALS is classically considered an adult-onset disease, we know from

earlier studies of motoneurons in animal models of ALS that the change in

motoneurons' intrinsic excitability is the first sign to be seen in the pathogenesis,

long before any overt motor deficits manifest. Hyperexcitability is observed in

cultured E13 spinal motoneurons (Kuo et al., 2004), E15 cortical motoneurons (Pieri

et al., 2009), E17.5 spinal motoneurons (Martin et al., 2013 p.20), as well as early

postnatal hypoglossal motoneurons (van Zundert et al., 2008). Consequently, the

motor system in general, and motoneurons in particular, must exhibit remarkable

capability for homeostatic regulation to maintain a quasi-normal motor output until

overt symptoms appear, but there are many combinations of intrinsic properties

that can produce the same firing pattern (Marder and Goaillard, 2006). In neonatal

mSOD1 mice, the majority of motoneurons exhibited normal excitability (based on

recruitment current and F-I gain), although the most resistant population of

motoneuron seem to retain some hyperexcitability (Quinlan et al., 2011; Leroy et al.,

2014). Yet, PICs were almost twice as large in mutant compared to WT neonatal

motoneurons (Quinlan et al., 2011). This increased PIC amplitude was seemingly

compensated by a parallel increase in input conductance (Quinlan et al., 2011). In

adults, this trend seems to continue, particularly in the young adult age group.

Global analysis of our dataset using PCA shows that, generally speaking, currents

tend to be much bigger in young adult mSOD1 mice compared to WT (we observe an

almost 3× increase in PIC amplitude, accompanied by an almost 2× increase in input

conductance), which then tend to decrease over time. This increase is accompanied

by a hyperpolarization of the PIC onset and peak voltages, but which are

compensated by a commensurate hyperpolarization of the resting membrane

potential. These trends with disease progression from the embryonic state through

the development of severe symptoms are summarized in Figure 8. An overall

pattern of oscillations is evident, with the PIC oscillations tending to increase

excitability but the conductance and rest potential oscillations tending to reduce it.

The properties of the motoneurons seem to normalize at the late pre-

symptomatic stage (P60–90), but it is unclear whether this is due to changes in the

homeostatic pathways involved, or whether it is caused by the start of the

degeneration process in the most vulnerable motoneurons. At symptomatic stages,

motoneurons appear to be hyper-excitable. They have, on average, a smaller input

conductance (Figure 3), and smaller recruitment current (Figure 2), but that most

likely reflect the fact that the largest cells have degenerated by this age, and that the

remaining cells may have shrunk (see below, and Dukkipati et al., 2018). In addition,

it should be noted that a small but growing number of cells become incapable of

firing repetitively at this stage (Delestrée et al., 2014; Martínez-Silva et al., 2018).

The hidden cost of excitability homeostasis

Although the degeneration of motoneurons in ALS constitutes a failure in cell

homeostasis, our results show that, throughout the "silent", presymptomatic phase

of ALS, motoneurons are actively engaged in a highly successful homeostatic process

to maintain their firing output, and thereby producing a normal motor behavior.

The driving force behind this homeostatic process remains mysterious. Although

it is commonly agreed that intracellular calcium plays a major role in this process

(Turrigiano et al., 1994; O'Leary et al., 2010; O'Leary and Wyllie, 2011), this calcium

can enter the cell through various channels (e.g. synaptic receptors, voltage-

dependent calcium channels) and the location and pattern of that calcium signal

could potentially have distinct downstream targets. We demonstrated here that

motoneurons can maintain a normal firing output through most of the pre-

symptomatic phase of the disease in response to current injected through the

microelectrode. Yet, during behavior, motoneurons are activated through synaptic

inputs, most of which are impinging on the dendritic tree. Bączyk, Ouali Alami et al.

(2020) have recently demonstrated that excitatory synaptic inputs are depressed in

pre-symptomatic mSOD1 mice. Excitability homeostasis, therefore, cannot be

restricted to the intrinsic properties of motoneurons, but potentially involve the

whole sensorimotor network. Indeed, in the motor cortex, although several cell

types (including corticospinal pyramidal cells) were found to be intrinsically

hyperexcitable in symptomatic mSOD1 mice, the activity of corticospinal pyramidal

neurons during behavior (measured by two-photon calcium imaging during head-

fixed locomotion) was indistinguishable from controls (Kim et al., 2017). Whether

network-level homeostasis and intrinsic excitability homeostasis are parallel,

independent, processes, or whether one precedes and drives the other remains to be

investigated.

Whatever the case may be, the process by which the cells maintain the firing

output could, by itself, be a major source of stress for the cells. We do not know

whether the cells increase their conductance to compensate for the fast increase in

PICs or *vice versa*, but the result is the appearance of cells with both input

conductance and PIC amplitudes outside of the normal range (Figure 5A). The

increase in input conductance could be due to the insertion of more channels in the

membrane. However, direct measurements of soma sizes have revealed that pre-

symptomatic mutant cells are physically larger than controls (Shoenfeld et al., 2014;

Dukkipati et al., 2018). This increase in size, coupled with the larger calcium entry in

the cells due to the larger PICs (which are in part calcium-medicated (Li and

Bennett, 2003)), is bound to cause undue metabolic stress on those cells that are

outside of the normal range (Attwell and Laughlin, 2001), even though cells manage

to maintain a normal output. If we assume that all motoneurons experience the

same shift in their properties, then Fast Fatigable (FF) motoneurons, which are the

cells with the largest input conductance, and the largest PICs in normal conditions

(Lee and Heckman, 1998; Huh et al., 2017), are likely to be the cells that are the

further out of the normal range. This might explain why they are the most

vulnerable to ALS (Pun et al., 2006; Hegedus et al., 2007, 2008).

As the disease progresses, those large, vulnerable cells become the first

motoneurons that will embark on a degeneration pathway (Saxena et al., 2009,

2013; Martínez-Silva et al., 2018), and will lose their ability to fire repetitively

(Martínez-Silva et al., 2018). This early loss of the large cells is consistent with stress

induced by aberrantly large conductances and PICs. This loss is also likely the

primary reason why motoneurons appear to recover normal properties at late pre-

symptomatic stages. Nevertheless, it is probable that all motoneurons, regardless of

type, experience this form of stress. Interestingly, we observed that some of the

smallest motoneurons, which are the most resistant to the disease, appear to shrink

in the oldest animals (Figure 5C), consistent with anatomical observations (Kiernan

and Hudson, 1991; Dukkipati et al., 2018). At this point, it is unclear whether this

shrinkage is a pathological feature or a strong homeostatic effort by the surviving

motoneurons to counteract the stress generated by their initial hypertrophy.

Hyper-vigilant homeostasis

Mitchell and colleagues have recently performed meta-analyses of data obtained

from many studies on multiple cellular properties, which revealed patterns of

oscillations as the disease progressed, suggesting the existence of high feedback

gains for homeostatic processes (Mitchell and Lee, 2012; Irvin et al., 2015). Several

aspects of our results are consistent with this "hyper-vigilant" homeostasis

hypothesis. Similar oscillatory patterns are present in our results, as illustrated in

Figure 8. Although the cells are successful at maintaining their net excitability

constant, this is achieved at the cost of excessively high amplitudes for conductances

and PICs. These large amplitude changes lead to the appearance of groups of cells

that are first well above the normal range of properties, followed by an over-

reaction where some cells end up well below the normal range. This behavior fits

well with the "hyper-vigilant" model (Irvin et al., 2015), but a direct test of the

hyper-vigilant homeostasis hypothesis will require quantitative comparisons of the

responses of ALS and WT motoneurons to controlled homeostatic challenges.

Comparison with previous studies

Previous studies in adult SOD1 mice have suggested that spinal motoneurons

became hyperexcitable (Meehan et al., 2010; Jensen et al., 2020). The most recent

study uses the same SOD1(G93A) (albeit on a C57BL/6 genetic background) and

same anesthetics as the present study, but has focused on two fairly advanced time

points (~P75 and ~P115). They have observed an increase in input resistance

(decrease in input conductance) between WT and mSOD1 mice at both P75 and

P115. The increase at P115 is consistent with our results, and is probably due to the

loss of the largest motoneurons at this stage. However, we did not observe a

difference in resistance in our P60–90 group. The cause for this discrepancy

remains unknown, but it could suggest an earlier onset of cell death in their colony.

In their dataset, this decrease in conductance was associated with an apparent

hyperexcitability: the recruitment current was lower and the F-I curve was steeper.

However, their use of a low DCC switching rate (3 kHz, compared to 6–8 kHz used

here) may have distorted the firing properties of their cells and led to an

overestimation of their excitability (Manuel, 2020 in press).

We have previously studied the properties of motoneurons in the same

SOD1(G93A) mouse model of ALS (Delestrée et al., 2014; Martínez-Silva et al., 2018)

but have mainly focused on a short period just at the onset of denervations (P45–

55). Although that time point partly overlaps with the present young adult stage, we

had not detected differences in input conductances (Martínez-Silva et al., 2018).

This might be because the difference in input conductance is largest at earlier time

points (Figure 3). Indeed, the difference is gone at P60–90, and we did report an

increase in input conductance in an earlier series of experiments, which was more

pronounced in younger animals (Delestrée et al., 2014). Similarly, we did not detect

a difference in resting membrane potential in the Martínez-Silva et al. (2018) study.

Again, the discrepancy could be due to the difference in the distributions of the ages

of the animals studied. The precise reason for this difference remains, however,

unknown and warrants further study.

Since input conductance is dependent on motoneuron size (Burke, 1981;

Heckman and Enoka, 2012), our present results are consistent with anatomical

studies that have measured soma sizes in mSOD1 mice. In young adult animals,

motoneurons are markedly larger in mSOD1 mice compared to WT animals

(particularly in males)(Shoenfeld et al., 2014; Dukkipati et al., 2018). At

symptomatic stages, however, the situation is reversed and the remaining

motoneurons appear to have shrunk below the size of the smallest motoneurons in

WT mice (Dukkipati et al., 2018).

In the present study, we recorded only 13 motoneurons out of 103 (7/50 WT and

6/53 mSOD1) that were unable to fire repetitively, contrary to our previous study

where we showed that a large proportion of vulnerable motoneurons became

hypoexcitable before the onset of denervation (P45–55, Martínez-Silva et al., 2018).

This discrepancy could be explained by the experimental constraints of the present

study. Indeed, obtaining stable voltage-clamp recordings mice in vivo is quite a

challenge, requiring electrodes able to pass substantial amounts of current and

motoneuron able to withstand the protocol. Since we have only included for analysis

cells in which both the voltage-clamp and current-clamp protocols were completed

successfully, we hypothesize that we may have biased our sample towards the

healthiest cells that have yet to take the path of degeneration.

Limitations

The results presented here have been collected on the SOD1(G93A) mouse model

of ALS, a model that has attracted criticisms due to it being an overexpression

model, and its failure to bring seemingly promising therapies to the clinic (Philips

and Rothstein, 2015). Nevertheless, some parallel with other studies suggests that

our results could be extended to other models. First, Meehan et al. (2010) have

studied an unrelated mSOD1(G127X) model and have shown that although the net

excitability of the motoneurons was not affected by the mutation, there were

nonetheless signs of increased PICs in these motoneurons. Second, we observed

that, in late symptomatic animals, some cells exhibited a very small input

conductance, well below the normal range at this age, suggesting that these cells

actually shrank. This observation matches morphological measurements in mSOD1

mice (Dukkipati et al., 2018), but also observations from sporadic human patients

(Kiernan and Hudson, 1991).

We demonstrated a remarkably successful homeostatic control of motoneuron

firing, that we can attribute to commensurate changes in PICs and input

conductance. However, it is likely that other currents are also implicated in this

process (Marder and Goaillard, 2006). Limitations inherent to in vivo

electrophysiology prevent us from isolating many different currents and further in

vitro investigations in adults (Jiang and Heckman, 2006; Mitra and Brownstone,

2011; Jiang et al., 2017; Bhumbra and Beato, 2018) are warranted to shed more light

on the panoply of channels involved in this process.

Conclusion

Overall, our results show homeostasis for net excitability in mutant SOD1

motoneurons is remarkably strong in the presymptomatic state. This success

however comes at a cost of large compensatory changes in basic electrical

properties. These results support the hypothesis that ALS is not due to a single

specific root cause but instead caused by an inherent instability at the system-level

(Mitchell and Lee, 2012), possibly caused by a "hyper-vigilant" homeostatic system

in motoneurons. Initial perturbations in the electrical properties of motoneurons

would be overcompensated for, leading to new sources of stress, which, in turn,

would be overcorrected, and so forth until the metabolic burden becomes too high

to sustain for the motoneuron. FF motoneurons have higher metabolic needs (Le

Masson et al., 2014) and lower calcium-buffering capabilities (Grosskreutz et al.,

2010) in the first place, which make them particularly vulnerable to this vicious

cycle.

Data availability

Data files and a computational notebook allowing reproducing the analysis and

figures of this article are provided at the URL:

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3831946

References

Attwell D, Laughlin SB (2001) An Energy Budget for Signaling in the Grey Matter of the Brain. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 21:1133–1145 DOI: 10.1097/00004647-200110000-00001.

Bączyk M, Ouali Alami N, Delestrée N, Martinot C, Tang L, Commisso B, Bayer D, Doisne N, Frankel W, Manuel M, Roselli F, Zytnicki D (2020) Synaptic restoration by cAMP/PKA drives activity-dependent neuroprotection to motoneurons in ALS. J Exp Med 217 DOI: 10.1084/jem.20191734.

Bernard C (2019) Changing the Way We Report, Interpret, and Discuss Our Results to Rebuild Trust in Our Research. eNeuro 6 DOI: 10.1523/ENEURO.0259-19.2019.

Bhumbra GS, Beato M (2018) Recurrent excitation between motoneurones propagates across segments and is purely glutamatergic. PLOS Biol 16:e2003586 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2003586.

Brownstone RM, Lancelin C (2018) Escape from homeostasis: spinal microcircuits and progression of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Neurophysiol 119:1782–1794 DOI: 10.1152/JN.00331.2017.

Burke RE (1981) Motor units: anatomy, physiology, and functional organization. In: Handbook of physiology. The nervous system. Motor control., pp 345–422. American Physiological Society.

Cumming G (2012) Understanding the new statistics: effect sizes, confidence intervals, and meta-analysis. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Delestrée N, Manuel M, Iglesias C, Elbasiouny SM, Heckman CJ, Zytnicki D (2014) Adult spinal motoneurones are not hyperexcitable in a mouse model of inherited amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Physiol 592:1687–1703 DOI: 10.1113/JPHYSIOL.2013.265843.

Dukkipati SS, Garrett TL, Elbasiouny SM (2018) The vulnerability of spinal motoneurons and soma size plasticity in a mouse model of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Physiol 596:1723–1745 DOI: 10.1113/JP275498.

Grosskreutz J, van den Bosch L, Keller BU (2010) Calcium dysregulation in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Cell Calcium 47:165–174 DOI: 10.1016/j.ceca.2009.12.002.

Heckman CJ, Enoka RM (2012) Motor Unit. Compr Physiol 2:2629–2682 DOI: 10.1002/cphy.c100087.

Hedges LV (2016) Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect size and Related Estimators: J Educ Stat DOI: 10.3102/10769986006002107.

Hegedus J, Putman CT, Gordon T (2007) Time course of preferential motor unit loss in the SOD1 G93A mouse model of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neurobiol Dis 28:154–164 DOI: 10.1016/j.nbd.2007.07.003.

Hegedus J, Putman CT, Tyreman N, Gordon T (2008) Preferential motor unit loss in the SOD1 G93A transgenic mouse model of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Physiol 586:3337–3351 DOI: 10.1113/jphysiol.2007.149286.

Herculano-Houzel S (2011) Scaling of Brain Metabolism with a Fixed Energy Budget
per Neuron: Implications for Neuronal Activity, Plasticity and Evolution. PLoS
ONE 6 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0017514.
Ho J, Tumkaya T, Aryal S, Choi H, Claridge-Chang A (2019) Moving beyond P values:
data analysis with estimation graphics. Nat Methods 16:565–566 DOI:
10.1038/s41592-019-0470-3.
Howarth C, Gleeson P, Attwell D (2012) Updated Energy Budgets for Neural
Computation in the Neocortex and Cerebellum. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab
32:1222–1232 DOI: 10.1038/jcbfm.2012.35.
Huh S, Siripuram R, Lee RH, Turkin VV, O'Neill D, Hamm TM, Heckman CJ, Manuel M
(2017) PICs in motoneurons do not scale with the size of the animal: a possible
mechanism for faster speed of muscle contraction in smaller species. J
Neurophysiol 118:93–102 DOI: 10.1152/JN.00045.2017.
Hunter JD (2007) Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. Comput Sci Eng 9:90–95
DOI: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55.
Ilieva H, Polymenidou M, Cleveland DW (2009) Non-cell autonomous toxicity in
neurodegenerative disorders: ALS and beyond. J Cell Biol 187:761–772 DOI:
10.1083/jcb.200908164.
Irvin CW, Kim RB, Mitchell CS (2015) Seeking homeostasis: temporal trends in
respiration, oxidation, and calcium in SOD1 G93A Amyotrophic Lateral
Sclerosis mice. Front Cell Neurosci 9:248 DOI: 10.3389/FNCEL.2015.00248.
Jensen DB, Kadlecova M, Allodi I, Meehan CF (2020) Spinal motoneurones are
intrinsically more responsive in the adult G93A SOD1 mouse model of
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Physiol 598:4385–4403 DOI:
10.1113/JP280097.
Jiang MC, Adimula A, Birch D, Heckman CJ (2017) Hyperexcitability in synaptic and
firing activities of spinal motoneurons in an adult mouse model of
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neuroscience 362:33–46 DOI:
10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.08.041.
Jiang MC, Heckman CJ (2006) In vitro sacral cord preparation and motoneuron
recording from adult mice. J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci 156:31–36.
Johnson MD, Heckman CJ (2010) Interactions between focused synaptic inputs and
diffuse neuromodulation in the spinal cord. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1198:35–41 DOI:
10.1111/J.1749-6632.2010.05430.X.
Kanning KC, Kaplan A, Henderson CE (2009) Motor neuron diversity in development
and disease. Annu Rev Neurosci 33:409–440.
Kiernan JA, Hudson AJ (1991) Changes in Sizes of Cortical and Lower Motor Neurons
in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. Brain 114:843–853 DOI:
10.1093/brain/114.2.843.
Kim J, Hughes EG, Shetty AS, Arlotta P, Goff LA, Bergles DE, Brown SP (2017)
Changes in the Excitability of Neocortical Neurons in a Mouse Model of
Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Are Not Specific to Corticospinal Neurons and
Are Modulated by Advancing Disease. J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci 37:9037–
9053 DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0811-17.2017.
Kuo JJ, Schonewille M, Siddique T, Schults ANA, Fu R, Bär PR, Anelli R, Heckman CJ,
Kroese ABA (2004) Hyperexcitablity of cultured spinal motoneurons from

presymptomatic ALS mice. J Neurophysiol 91:571–575 DOI:
10.1152/jn.00665.2003.
Lalancette-Hebert M, Sharma A, Lyashchenko AK, Shneider NA (2016) Gamma
motor neurons survive and exacerbate alpha motor neuron degeneration in
ALS. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 113:E8316–E8325 DOI:
10.1073/pnas.1605210113.
Le Masson G, Przedborski S, Abbott LF (2014) A Computational Model of Motor
Neuron Degeneration. Neuron 83:758–760 DOI:
10.1016/j.neuron.2014.07.001.
Lee RH, Heckman CJ (1998) Bistability in spinal motoneurons in vivo: systematic
variations in persistent inward currents. J Neurophysiol 80:583–593.
Leitner M, Menzies S, Lutz C (2009) Working with ALS Mice. The Jackson
Laboratory.
Leroy F, Lamotte d'Incamps B, Imhoff-Manuel RD, Zytnicki D (2014) Early intrinsic
hyperexcitability does not contribute to motoneuron degeneration in
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. eLife 3 DOI: 10.7554/eLife.04046.
Li Y, Bennett DJ (2003) Persistent sodium and calcium currents cause plateau
potentials in motoneurons of chronic spinal rats. J Neurophysiol 90:857–869.
Makin TR, Orban de Xivry J-J (2019) Ten common statistical mistakes to watch out
for when writing or reviewing a manuscript Rodgers P, Parsons N, Holmes N,
eds. eLife 8:e48175 DOI: 10.7554/eLife.48175.
Manuel M (2020) Sub-optimal Discontinuous Current-Clamp switching rates lead to
deceptive mouse neuronal firing. bioRxiv:2020.08.13.250134 DOI:
10.1101/2020.08.13.250134.
Manuel M, Heckman CJ (2011) Adult mouse motor units develop almost all of their
force in the subprimary range: a new all-or-none strategy for force
recruitment? J Neurosci 31:15188–15194 DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2893-
11.2011.
Manuel M, Iglesias C, Donnet M, Leroy F, Heckman CJ, Zytnicki D (2009) Fast
kinetics, high-frequency oscillations, and subprimary firing range in adult
mouse spinal motoneurons. J Neurosci 29:11246–11256 DOI:
10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3260-09.2009.
Marder E, Goaillard J-M (2006) Variability, compensation and homeostasis in
neuron and network function. Nat Rev Neurosci 7:563–574 DOI:
10.1038/nrn1949.
Martin E, Cazenave W, Cattaert D, Branchereau P (2013) Embryonic alteration of
motoneuronal morphology induces hyperexcitability in the mouse model of
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neurobiol Dis 54:116–126 DOI:
10.1016/j.nbd.2013.02.011.
Martínez-Silva M de L, Imhoff-Manuel RD, Sharma A, Heckman C, Shneider NA,
Roselli F, Zytnicki D, Manuel M (2018) Hypoexcitability precedes denervation
in the large fast-contracting motor units in two unrelated mouse models of ALS
Rubin LL, ed. eLife 7:e30955 DOI: 10.7554/ELIFE.30955.
McKinney W (2011) pandas: a foundational Python library for data analysis and
statistics. Python High Perform Sci Comput 14.

Meehan CF, Moldovan M, Marklund SL, Graffmo KS, Nielsen JB, Hultborn H (2010)
Intrinsic properties of lumbar motor neurones in the adult G127insTGGG
superoxide dismutase-1 mutant mouse in vivo: evidence for increased
persistent inward currents. Acta Physiol Oxf Engl 200:361–376 DOI:
10.1111/j.1748-1716.2010.02188.x.
Michel MC, Murphy TJ, Motulsky HJ (2020) New Author Guidelines for Displaying
Data and Reporting Data Analysis and Statistical Methods in Experimental
Biology. Mol Pharmacol 97:49–60 DOI: 10.1124/mol.119.118927.
Mitchell CS, Lee RH (2012) Dynamic Meta-Analysis as a Therapeutic Prediction Tool
for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. In: Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (Maurer
M, ed). InTech. DOI: 10.5772/32384.
Mitra P, Brownstone RM (2011) An in vitro spinal cord slice preparation for
recording from lumbar motoneurons of the adult mouse. J Neurophysiol
107:728–741 DOI: 10.1152/JN.00558.2011.
O'Leary T, Rossum MCW van, Wyllie DJA (2010) Homeostasis of intrinsic excitability
in hippocampal neurones: dynamics and mechanism of the response to chronic
depolarization. J Physiol 588:157–170 DOI: 10.1113/jphysiol.2009.181024.
O'Leary T, Wyllie DJA (2011) Neuronal homeostasis: time for a change? J Physiol
589:4811–4826 DOI: 10.1113/jphysiol.2011.210179.
Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M,
Prettenhofer P, Weiss R, Dubourg V, Vanderplas J, Passos A, Cournapeau D,
Brucher M, Perrot M, Duchesnay E (2011) Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in
Python. J Mach Learn Res 12:2825–2830.
Philips T, Rothstein JD (2015) Rodent Models of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. Curr
Protoc Pharmacol Editor Board SJ Enna Ed--Chief Al 69:5.67.1-5.67.21 DOI:
10.1002/0471141755.ph0567s69.
Pieri M, Carunchio I, Curcio L, Mercuri NB, Zona C (2009) Increased persistent
sodium current determines cortical hyperexcitability in a genetic model of
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Exp Neurol 215:368–379 DOI:
10.1016/j.expneurol.2008.11.002.
Pun S, Santos AF, Saxena S, Xu L, Caroni P (2006) Selective vulnerability and pruning
of phasic motoneuron axons in motoneuron disease alleviated by CNTF. Nat
Neurosci 9:408–419 DOI: 10.1038/nn1653.
Quinlan KA, Schuster JE, Fu R, Siddique T, Heckman CJ (2011) Altered postnatal
maturation of electrical properties in spinal motoneurons in a mouse model of
amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Physiol 589:2245–2260.
Rolfe DF, Brown GC (1997) Cellular energy utilization and molecular origin of
standard metabolic rate in mammals. Physiol Rev 77:731–758 DOI:
10.1152/physrev.1997.77.3.731.
Rosen DR, Siddique T, Patterson D, Figlewicz DA, Sapp P, Hentati A, Donaldson D,
Goto J, O'Regan JP, Deng H-X (1993) Mutations in Cu/Zn superoxide dismutase
gene are associated with familial amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Nature 362:59–
62 DOI: 10.1038/362059a0.
Saxena S, Cabuy E, Caroni P (2009) A role for motoneuron subtype-selective ER
stress in disease manifestations of FALS mice. Nat Neurosci 12:627–636 DOI:
10.1038/nn.2297.

Saxena S, Roselli F, Singh K, Leptien K, Julien J, Gros-louis F, Caroni P (2013)
Neuroprotection through Excitability and mTOR Required in ALS Motoneurons
to Delay Disease and Extend Survival. Neuron 80:80–96 DOI:
10.1016/j.neuron.2013.07.027.
Seabold S, Perktold J (2010) statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with
python. In: 9th Python in Science Conference DOI: 10.25080/Majora-
92bf1922-011.
Sekerli M, Del Negro CA, Lee RH, Butera RJ (2004) Estimating action potential
thresholds from neuronal time-series: new metrics and evaluation of
methodologies. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 51:1665–1672 DOI:
10.1109/TBME.2004.827531.
Shoenfeld L, Westenbroek RE, Fisher E, Quinlan K a, Tysseling VM, Powers RK,
Heckman CJ, Binder MD (2014) Soma size and Cav1.3 channel expression in
vulnerable and resistant motoneuron populations of the SOD1G93A mouse
model of ALS. Physiol Rep 2:e12113 DOI: 10.14814/phy2.12113.
Turrigiano G, Abbott LF, Marder E (1994) Activity-dependent changes in the
intrinsic properties of cultured neurons. Science 264:974–977 DOI:
10.1126/science.8178157.
van Zundert B, Peuscher MH, Hynynen M, Chen A, Neve RL, Brown RH, Constantine-
Paton M, Bellingham MC (2008) Neonatal neuronal circuitry shows
hyperexcitable disturbance in a mouse model of the adult-onset
neurodegenerative disease amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Neurosci Off J Soc
Neurosci 28:10864–10874 DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1340-08.2008.
Virtanen P et al. (2020) SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing
in Python. Nat Methods:1–12 DOI: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2.
Waskom M et al. (2020) mwaskom/seaborn: v0.10.0 (January 2020). Zenodo. DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.3629446.
Wasserstein RL, Schirm AL, Lazar NA (2019) Moving to a World Beyond "p < 0.05."
Am Stat 73:1–19 DOI: 10.1080/00031305.2019.1583913.
Welch BL (1947) The generalisation of student's problems when several different
population variances are involved. Biometrika 34:28–35 DOI:
10.1093/biomet/34.1-2.28.
847

Figure legends

Figure 1: PIC amplitude is larger is young adult mSOD1 mice

A. Example of a PIC recording from a P43 WT mouse. The green bottom trace is

the ascending part of the voltage ramp. The top blue trace is the raw current. The

dashed line shows the leak current estimated by fitting a straight line in the

subthreshold potential region, and which is used to measure the input conductance

of the cell. The leak-subtracted current trace is obtained by subtracting the leak

current from the raw current trace. The dash-dotted lines show some of the

measurements: *PIC amp.*: PIC amplitude, measured at the point of largest deflection

on the leak-subtracted trace; V_{onset}: voltage at which the PICs start to activate; V_{peak}:

voltage at which PICs reach their maximum. **B.** Example of a PIC recording from a

P35 mSOD1 mouse. Same organization as in A. **C.** Plot of the amplitude of the PICs

(in nA) vs. age in WT (blue square) and mSOD1 mice (red diamonds). The solid lines

correspond to the linear regression lines with 95% confidence intervals (shaded

areas). WT: slope=0.12 nA/week 95%CI[−0.068–0.32], r^2=0.034 (p=0.2); SOD1:

slope=−0.45 nA/week 95%CI[−0.64−−0.25], r^2=0.29 (p=3.4e−05). **D**. Breakdown of

the difference in PIC amplitude between WT and mSOD1 animals by age groups.

P30–60 WT: 2.30±2.17 nA, N=19 vs. mSOD1: 6.73±3.28 nA, N=15; g=1.59

95%CI[0.63–2.45]; t(32)=−4.50, p=0.00016. P60–90 WT: 2.47±1.69 nA, N=16 vs.

mSOD1: 2.75±2.40 nA, N=24; g=0.12 95%CI[−0.53–0.65]; t(38)=−0.42, p=0.67. P90–

120 WT: 4.12±3.69 nA, N=15 vs. mSOD1: 1.90±1.78 nA, N=14; g=−0.74

95%CI[−1.26–0.01]; t(27)=2.08, p=0.05. **E.** Evolution of the membrane potential at

which the PICs start to activate (PIC onset voltage) vs. age. WT:

slope=−0.33 mV/week 95%CI[−0.77–0.11], r^2=0.045 (p=0.14). SOD1:

slope=0.91 mV/week 95%CI[0.41–1.4], r^2=0.21 (p=0.00063). **F.** Evolution of the

membrane potential at which the PICs reach their peak (PIC peak voltage) vs. age.

WT: slope=−0.29 mV/week 95%CI[−0.73–0.16], r^2=0.034 (p=0.2). SOD1:

slope=0.68 mV/week 95%CI[0.28–1.1], r^2=0.18 (p=0.0014). **G.** Evolution of the

voltage threshold for spiking (measure in current-clamp mode) vs. age. WT:

slope=−0.14 mV/week 95%CI[−0.57–0.28], r^2=0.0096 (p=0.5). SOD1:

slope=0.77 mV/week 95%CI[0.34–1.2], r^2=0.23 (p=0.0007).

Figure 2. Mutant motoneurons are not hyperexcitable

A. Example of the response of a P43 WT mouse (same motoneuron as in Figure

1A) to a triangular ramp of current. From bottom to top, traces are: injected current,

membrane potential, and instantaneous firing frequency. The dash-dotted lines

show some of the measurements: $I_{recruit.}$: current intensity at which the motoneuron

starts to fire; $I_{derecruit.}$: de-recruitment current; ΔI: difference between the de-

recruitment and recruitment currents; $I_{trans.\ SPR/PR}$: the current at the transition

between sub-primary range and primary range; *F-I gain*: slope of the linear fit of the

firing frequency in the primary range; ΔF: difference between the instantaneous

firing frequency at de-recruitment and recruitment; V_{th}: voltage threshold for

spiking measured on the first spike of the ramp. **B.** Example of the response of a P35

mSOD1 mouse (same motoneuron as in Figure 1B). Same organization as in A. **C.**

Plot of the current intensity required for eliciting the first spike on a triangular ramp

of current in WT (blue squares) and mSOD1 motoneurons (red diamonds). WT:

slope=0.1 nA/week 95%CI[−0.11–0.31], r^2=0.019 (p=0.34). SOD1:

slope=−0.35 nA/week 95%CI[−0.56−−0.14], r^2=0.2 (p=0.0019). **D.** Breakdown of the

difference in recruitment current between WT and mSOD1 motoneurons in each of

the age groups. In young adult and presymptomatic mice, mutant motoneurons

require the same amount of current than WT motoneuron to fire, P30–60 WT:

4.73±3.14 nA, N=19 vs. mSOD1: 6.21±2.51 nA, N=14; g=0.50 95%CI[−0.24–1.24];

t(31)=−1.51, p=0.14. P60–90 WT: 5.28±2.64 nA, N=16 vs. mSOD1: 4.53±3.38 nA,

N=20; g=−0.24 95%CI[−0.93–0.41]; t(34)=0.75, p=0.46. At the symptomatic stages

(P90–120), mutant motoneurons exhibit a lower current threshold for firing (WT:

5.43±3.07 nA, N=15 vs. mSOD1: 2.19±1.56 nA, N=13; g=−1.26 95%CI[−1.95–−0.47];

t(26)=3.59, p=0.0017), compatible with the loss of the least excitable cells. **E.** The

slope of the F-I relationship, measured over the primary range, is not affected by the

mutation, regardless of the age of the animals. WT: slope=−0.13 Hz/nA/week

95%CI[−0.65–0.38], r^2=0.011 (p=0.6). SOD1: slope=0.27 Hz/nA/week 95%CI[−0.23–

0.77], r^2=0.028 (p=0.28). **F.** Breakdown of the difference between WT and mSOD1

motoneurons by age group: P30–60 WT: 9.3±3.6 Hz/nA, N=10 vs. mSOD1:

8.3±3.4 Hz/nA, N=14; g=−0.28 95%CI[−1.10–0.64]; t(22)=0.69, p=0.5. P60–90 WT:

12.2±7.3 Hz/nA, N=8 vs. mSOD1: 10.3±6.4 Hz/nA, N=16; g=−0.27 95%CI[−1.22–

0.54]; t(22)=0.62, p=0.54. P90–120 WT: 8.0±3.2 Hz/nA, N=10 vs. mSOD1:

10.8±9.1 Hz/nA, N=13; g=0.38 95%CI[−0.43–0.93]; t(21)=−1.04, p=0.31.

Figure 3: Young mutant motoneurons have an aberrantly large input conductance

A. Plot of the motoneuron input conductance vs. age in WT (blue squares) and

mSOD1 (red diamonds) animals. The solid lines correspond to the linear regression

lines with 95% confidence intervals (shaded areas). WT slope=0.018 μS/week

95%CI[0.0061–0.029], r^2=0.16 (p=0.0035) ; SOD1 slope=−0.041 μS/week

95%CI[−0.052–−0.03], r^2=0.53 (p=6.1e−10).) **B.** Breakdown of the difference in

input conductance between WT and mSOD1 animals by age groups. P30–60 WT:

0.42±0.16 μS, N=19 vs. mSOD1: 0.72±0.18 μS, N=15; g=1.73 95%CI[0.92–2.41];

t(32)=−5.06, p=2.2e−05. P60–90 WT: 0.46±0.16 μS, N=16 vs. mSOD1: 0.42±0.15 μS,

N=24; g=−0.28 95%CI[−0.96–0.37]; t(38)=0.88, p=0.39. P90–120 WT: 0.60±0.15 μS,

N=15 vs. mSOD1: 0.33±0.13 μS, N=14; g=−1.85 95%CI[−2.57−−1.16]; t(27)=5.16,

p=2.1e−05.

Figure 4. The resting membrane potential of young adult mutant mice is
hyperpolarized

A. Plot of the motoneuron resting membrane potential vs. age in WT (blue

squares) and mSOD1 (red diamonds) animals. The solid lines correspond to the

linear regression lines with 95% confidence intervals (shaded areas). WT:

slope=−0.068 mV/week 95%CI[−0.52–0.38], r^2=0.0019 (p=0.76). SOD1:

slope=0.81 mV/week 95%CI[0.31–1.3], r^2=0.18 (p=0.0022). **B.** Breakdown of the

difference in resting membrane potential between WT and mSOD1 animals by age

groups. P30–60 WT: −62.38±5.52 mV, N=19 vs. mSOD1: −71.45±8.78 mV, N=15;

g=−1.24 95%CI[−2.13−−0.23]; t(32)=3.49, p=0.002. P60–90 WT: −60.98±5.35 mV,

N=16 vs. mSOD1: −66.18±5.63 mV, N=22; g=−0.92 95%CI[−1.54−−0.18]; t(36)=2.89,

p=0.0067. P90–120 WT: −64.71±7.42 mV, N=15 vs. mSOD1: −61.99±5.43 mV, N=13;

g=0.40 95%CI[−0.35–1.10]; t(26)=−1.12, p=0.27.

Figure 5. Some motoneurons exhibit properties outside of the normal range
A. Plot of the PIC amplitude vs. the input conductance of young adult

motoneurons (P30–60) in WT (blue squares) and mSOD1 (red diamonds) animals.

The grey line is the best linear fit ± 95% confidence interval (shaded area) for both

samples. Slope=7.7 mV 95%CI[2.6–12.7], r^2=0.55 (p=0.004). The marginal plots

indicate the kernel density estimation of the distributions of the values in the two

populations. The ‡ symbol points to the fraction of the mSOD1 population that is

outside the range of the WT population. **B.** Same as A for the presymptomatic age

range P60–90. Slope=5.4 mV 95%CI[1.1–9.8], r^2=0.15 (p=0.016). **C.** Same as A for

the symptomatic age range P90–120. Slope=7.0 mV 95%CI[−0.8–14.9], r^2=0.23

(p=0.078).

Figure 6: Some cells are hypoexcitable and cannot fire repetitively

A. Example of an mSOD1 motoneuron (from a P88 mouse) that is unable to fire

repetitively in response to a triangular ramp of current. Top trace: membrane

potential, bottom trace: injected current. **B.** This same motoneuron was

nevertheless able to generate a single full-height action potential in response to a

square pulse of current. Same organization as in A. **C.** Voltage-clamp measurement

of the PICs in this same motoneuron. Traces are (from top to bottom), leak current

(dashed line), raw current (blue), leak-subtracted current (red) and voltage

command (green). **D.** Non-firing motoneurons had a similar input conductance

compared to motoneurons capable of firing repetitively. Firing: 0.49±0.22 µS, N=47

vs. non-firing: 0.38±0.20 µS, N=6; g=−0.54 95%CI[−1.11–0.50]; t(51)=1.36, p=0.22 **E.**

Non-firing motoneurons had much smaller PICs than motoneurons able to fire

repetitively. Firing: Firing: 4.04±3.18 nA, N=47 vs. non-firing: 0.60±0.49 nA, N=6;

g=−1.12 95%CI[−1.42−−0.86]; t(51)=6.81, p=1.3e−08 **F.** Non-firing motoneurons

appear earlier in mSOD1 animals compared to WT animals. WT: 100±16 days old,

N=7 vs. SOD1: 75±23 days old, N=6; g=−1.20 95%CI[−2.06–0.01]; t(11)=2.24,

p=0.053.

Figure 7. Overview of the change in principal components over time.

A$_{1-3}$. Plot of the three first principal components vs. age in WT (blue squares) and

mSOD1 motoneurons (red diamonds). The solid lines correspond to the linear

regression lines with 95% confidence intervals (shaded areas). **B.** Heatmap showing

the correlation coefficient between each principal component (columns) and the

features (rows) shown on the right. Correlation coefficients are color-coded from

dark blue ($r=-1$) to dark red ($r=+1$). **C.** Summary of the evolution of the difference

between WT and mSOD1 motoneurons (quantified by the effect size Hedges' g) for

each of the features and each of the time points considered. The features are

ordered by the size of the effect of the mutation in the P30–60 age group. On each

row, the dashed line represents an effect size of zero. Scale bar: 2 units.

Figure 8: summary of the changes in motoneuron properties over time

Schematic representation of the changes in four key electrophysiological

properties over time. The dots represent the effect size (Hedges' g) and the vertical

bars show the 95%CI around g. The thin lines are cubic splines interpolation of the

data over time. The points have been slightly staggered so that the vertical bars do

not occlude each other. †Data from embryonic motoneurons are from Martin et al.

(2013). These authors did not measure PICs in embryonic motoneurons. Kuo et al.

(2004) did measure PICs, but their embryonic motoneurons were cultured for 10–

30 days in vitro, and their development stage is therefore uncertain. ‡Data from

neonates (P0–5 and P6–12) are from Quinlan et al. (2011).

Table 1: summary of the properties of the motoneurons, broken down by age
range

The table shows the various properties that were measured in each motoneuron.

The rows are sorted in descending order of effect size at P30–60. WT and mSOD1

columns show mean values ± standard deviation, with the 95%CI around the mean

below. The "Mean diff." column shows the mean difference between mSOD1 and WT

population, with 95% CI and the result of Welch's test (for information). The

"Hedges' g" column shows the effect size and its 95%CI below.

A WT

Leak current
Raw current
10 nA

Leak-subtracted
current
10 mV
PIC ampl.

−70

Voltage
command

V_{onset} V_{peak}

2 s

B SOD1

10 nA

10 mV

−70

2 s

C

PIC amplitude (nA)

Genotype
■ WT
◆ SOD1

Mouse age (days)

D

P30–60   **P60–90**   **P90–120**

PIC Amplitude (nA)

****

WT   SOD1   WT   SOD1   WT   SOD1
N = 19   N = 15   N = 16   N = 24   N = 15   N = 14

Mean difference

SOD1
minus
WT

SOD1
minus
WT

SOD1
minus
WT

E

PIC onset voltage (mV)

Mouse age (days)

F

PIC peak voltage (mV)

Mouse age (days)

G

Voltage threshold
for spiking (mV)

Mouse age (days)

A P30–60 **B** P60–90 **C** P90–120

	P30–60				P60–90				P90–120			
	WT (N=19)	SOD1 (N=15)	Mean diff.	Hedges' g	WT (N=16)	SOD1 (N=24)	Mean diff.	Hedges' g	WT (N=15)	SOD1 (N=14)	Mean diff.	Hedges' g
Input conductance	0.42±0.16 µS [0.35–0.49]	0.72±0.18 µS [0.64–0.82]	0.30 µS [0.19–0.42] (p=2.2e−05 ****)	1.73 [0.93–2.40]	0.46±0.16 µS [0.39–0.54]	0.42±0.15 µS [0.36–0.48]	−0.04 µS [−0.14–0.05] (p=0.39)	−0.28 [−0.96–0.39]	0.60±0.15 µS [0.53–0.67]	0.33±0.13 µS [0.26–0.39]	−0.27 µS [−0.37−−0.17] (p=2.1e−05 ****)	−1.85 [−2.57−−1.17]
PIC amplitude	2.30±2.17 nA [1.52–3.45]	6.73±3.28 nA [5.18–8.51]	4.43 nA [2.56–6.29] (p=0.00016 ***)	1.59 [0.62–2.48]	2.47±1.69 nA [1.81–3.51]	2.75±2.40 nA [1.97–3.89]	0.27 nA [−0.93–1.53] (p=0.67)	0.12 [−0.53–0.67]	4.12±3.69 nA [2.67–6.40]	1.90±1.78 nA [1.24–3.19]	−2.22 nA [−4.63−−0.41] (p=0.05)	−0.74 [−1.27–0.00]
PIC amplitude (down ramp)	2.65±2.60 nA [1.76–4.16]	5.55±3.48 nA [4.01–7.45]	2.90 nA [0.86–4.89] (p=0.013 *)	0.94 [0.15–1.70]	2.29±2.30 nA [1.52–4.01]	2.87±2.22 nA [2.12–3.87]	0.58 nA [−1.03–1.76] (p=0.44)	0.25 [−0.50–0.82]	4.43±3.10 nA [3.03–6.09]	2.25±1.98 nA [1.48–3.56]	−2.18 nA [−3.99−−0.34] (p=0.032 *)	−0.81 [−1.49−−0.03]
Current at transition SPR/PR	5.93±3.24 nA [4.37–8.51]	8.01±2.67 nA [6.54–9.24]	2.08 nA [−0.95–4.08] (p=0.13)	0.69 [−0.48–1.68]	6.28±3.92 nA [4.32–9.67]	5.23±3.30 nA [3.99–7.23]	−1.04 nA [−4.72–1.39] (p=0.53)	−0.29 [−1.34–0.48]	5.90±2.70 nA [4.24–7.38]	2.70±2.34 nA [1.18–3.76]	−3.20 nA [−5.24−−1.28] (p=0.0081 **)	−1.23 [−2.07−−0.35]
Recruitment current	4.73±3.14 nA [3.50–6.23]	6.21±2.51 nA [4.77–7.27]	1.49 nA [−0.65–3.22] (p=0.14)	0.50 [−0.25–1.26]	5.28±2.64 nA [4.19–6.79]	4.53±3.38 nA [3.35–6.35]	−0.76 nA [−2.57–1.27] (p=0.46)	−0.24 [−0.94–0.43]	5.43±3.07 nA [4.07–7.16]	2.19±1.56 nA [1.59–3.32]	−3.24 nA [−4.98−−1.63] (p=0.0017 **)	−1.26 [−1.96−−0.52]
Current at derecruitment	5.92±3.76 nA [4.38–7.65]	7.64±3.31 nA [5.91–9.24]	1.72 nA [−0.73–3.94] (p=0.17)	0.47 [−0.24–1.19]	6.54±4.07 nA [4.69–9.12]	5.01±4.05 nA [3.54–7.04]	−1.53 nA [−4.41–1.18] (p=0.31)	−0.37 [−1.16–0.33]	5.64±2.95 nA [4.03–7.22]	2.59±1.58 nA [1.93–3.64]	−3.05 nA [−4.75−−1.24] (p=0.0056 **)	−1.26 [−2.23−−0.37]
Frequency at transition SPR/PR	54.30±17.35 Hz [45.49–66.17]	57.90±17.06 Hz [49.74–66.74]	3.60 Hz [−10.88–15.87] (p=0.62)	0.20 [−0.65–1.04]	53.55±13.32 Hz [44.57–62.21]	43.75±13.55 Hz [36.99–49.60]	−9.79 Hz [−20.63–0.31] (p=0.11)	−0.70 [−1.52–0.09]	51.58±15.41 Hz [41.70–59.94]	42.44±11.34 Hz [36.74–48.89]	−9.14 Hz [−19.10–1.70] (p=0.13)	−0.67 [−1.58–0.23]
Normalized PIC amplitude (down ramp)	6.72±5.77 nA/µS [4.50–9.57]	7.85±4.85 nA/µS [5.49–10.58]	1.13 nA/µS [−2.42–4.63] (p=0.56)	0.20 [−0.48–0.96]	5.05±4.43 nA/µS [3.38–7.73]	6.81±5.14 nA/µS [5.24–9.34]	1.75 nA/µS [−1.16–4.57] (p=0.26)	0.35 [−0.35–0.89]	7.77±5.24 nA/µS [5.46–10.56]	6.72±4.91 nA/µS [4.77–9.82]	−1.05 nA/µS [−4.38–2.82] (p=0.58)	−0.20 [−0.92–0.60]
ΔI (current at derecruitment−recruitment)	1.20±1.20 nA [0.69–1.74]	1.45±1.25 nA [0.89–2.17]	0.25 nA [−0.54–1.10] (p=0.57)	0.20 [−0.49–0.87]	1.47±1.83 nA [0.57–2.52]	0.42±1.10 nA [−0.01–0.94]	−1.04 nA [−2.22−−0.05] (p=0.093)	−0.72 [−1.57–0.05]	0.98±1.32 nA [0.38–1.78]	0.39±0.63 nA [0.05–0.71]	−0.58 nA [−1.50–0.13] (p=0.18)	−0.55 [−1.28–0.27]
Voltage threshold (relative to RMP)	17.03±6.37 mV [14.16–19.76]	18.09±5.21 mV [15.10–20.44]	1.05 mV [−3.07–4.74] (p=0.61)	0.17 [−0.53–0.86]	15.59±5.54 mV [13.26–18.55]	19.26±6.29 mV [16.80–22.24]	3.67 mV [−0.33–7.32] (p=0.072)	0.60 [−0.13–1.26]	17.10±5.54 mV [14.32–19.66]	13.79±3.62 mV [12.09–15.77]	−3.31 mV [−6.66–0.11] (p=0.071)	−0.67 [−1.44–0.15]
ΔF (frequency at derecruitment−recruitment)	1.79±13.96 Hz [−5.29–7.01]	3.77±11.06 Hz [−1.51–9.55]	1.98 Hz [−5.93–10.90] (p=0.65)	0.15 [−0.56–0.80]	6.53±17.29 Hz [0.25–21.46]	1.93±8.73 Hz [−1.51–6.16]	−4.60 Hz [−19.62–2.62] (p=0.4)	−0.36 [−1.12–0.37]	−0.85±7.97 Hz [−4.64–4.12]	0.75±7.97 Hz [−3.66–4.64]	1.60 Hz [−5.07–7.19] (p=0.62)	0.19 [−0.66–1.04]
PIC peak voltage (relative to RMP)	18.32±7.08 mV [15.26–21.42]	19.13±8.15 mV [14.28–22.51]	0.81 mV [−4.99–5.20] (p=0.76)	0.10 [−0.61–0.82]	18.09±7.71 mV [15.11–22.59]	21.18±5.82 mV [19.14–23.99]	3.09 mV [−1.76–6.94] (p=0.19)	0.45 [−0.34–1.10]	16.37±8.32 mV [12.41–20.31]	15.60±5.86 mV [12.55–18.63]	−0.77 mV [−6.08–4.36] (p=0.78)	−0.10 [−0.87–0.66]
F-I gain (PR, descending ramp)	19.21±10.07 Hz/nA [15.19–29.17]	17.23±5.15 Hz/nA [14.91–20.03]	−1.98 Hz/nA [−12.04–2.61] (p=0.58)	−0.25 [−1.15–0.58]	33.93±35.75 Hz/nA [18.24–75.19]	15.25±8.95 Hz/nA [11.99–21.30]	−18.68 Hz/nA [−59.63−−2.66] (p=0.22)	−0.88 [−1.69–0.11]	15.15±7.14 Hz/nA [11.73–20.87]	20.05±11.30 Hz/nA [15.50–28.05]	4.90 Hz/nA [−2.37–12.22] (p=0.23)	0.48 [−0.48–1.07]
F-I gain (PR, ascending ramp)	9.30±3.58 Hz/nA [7.08–11.31]	8.30±3.37 Hz/nA [6.42–9.86]	−1.00 Hz/nA [−3.68–1.83] (p=0.5)	−0.28 [−1.09–0.63]	12.18±7.30 Hz/nA [8.81–19.47]	10.28±6.43 Hz/nA [8.15–15.26]	−1.90 Hz/nA [−8.81–2.94] (p=0.54)	−0.27 [−1.23–0.53]	8.01±3.16 Hz/nA [6.33–10.08]	10.84±9.13 Hz/nA [7.69–19.20]	2.84 Hz/nA [−0.81–10.27] (p=0.31)	0.38 [−0.41–0.94]
PIC onset voltage (relative to RMP)	4.36±5.66 mV [1.69–6.68]	2.05±5.38 mV [−1.02–4.23]	−2.31 mV [−6.23–1.00] (p=0.23)	−0.41 [−1.05–0.28]	1.76±5.75 mV [−0.85–4.65]	6.12±5.54 mV [3.80–8.38]	4.36 mV [0.56–7.69] (p=0.025 *)	0.76 [0.01–1.40]	1.57±5.10 mV [−0.86–4.11]	0.92±5.94 mV [−1.76–4.48]	−0.64 mV [−4.57–3.45] (p=0.76)	−0.11 [−0.93–0.64]
Resting membrane potential	−62.38±5.52 mV [−64.71−−59.91]	−71.45±8.78 mV [−75.13−−66.37]	−9.07 mV [−13.37−−3.66] (p=0.002 **)	−1.24 [−2.19−−0.28]	−60.98±5.35 mV [−63.81−−58.71]	−66.18±5.63 mV [−68.56−−63.88]	−5.20 mV [−8.47−−1.59] (p=0.0067 **)	−0.92 [−1.54−−0.19]	−64.71±7.42 mV [−68.61−−61.39]	−61.99±5.43 mV [−64.41−−58.61]	2.72 mV [−1.57–7.73] (p=0.27)	0.40 [−0.32–1.10]

Voltage threshold for spiking	−45.35±5.48 mV−54.86±5.15 mV [−47.79−−43.03][−57.21−−52.17]	−9.51 mV [−12.79−−5.75] (p=1.9e−05 ****)	−1.74 [−2.53−−0.84]	−45.39±7.04 mV−47.53±5.85 mV [−49.10−−42.26][−49.76−−44.73]	−2.14 mV [−6.20−2.13] (p=0.34)	−0.33 [−1.04−0.38]	−47.61±5.00 mV−48.20±5.41 mV [−49.94−−45.17][−50.94−−45.31]	−0.59 mV [−4.24−2.98] (p=0.77)	−0.11 [−0.85−0.63]
PIC peak voltage	−43.83±4.79 mV−52.32±4.20 mV [−45.74−−41.49][−54.10−−50.00]	−8.49 mV [−11.41−−5.52] (p=4.8e−06 ****)	−1.83 [−2.60−−1.03]	−42.89±6.94 mV−44.88±5.24 mV [−45.81−−39.26][−46.93−−42.88]	−1.98 mV [−6.20−1.50] (p=0.34)	−0.33 [−0.97−0.33]	−48.34±5.89 mV−46.24±6.27 mV [−50.89−−45.11][−49.56−−43.26]	2.10 mV [−2.40−6.21] (p=0.36)	0.34 [−0.43−1.15]
PIC onset voltage	−58.03±6.35 mV−69.41±5.71 mV [−60.91−−55.34][−71.66−−66.01]	−11.38 mV [−14.95−−7.18] (p=5.1e−06 ****)	−1.83 [−2.69−−0.81]	−59.22±4.88 mV−59.66±6.39 mV [−61.96−−57.18][−61.98−−56.91]	−0.43 mV [−3.71−3.21] (p=0.81)	−0.07 [−0.70−0.54]	−63.15±6.31 mV−60.12±7.25 mV [−65.99−−59.85][−63.92−−56.48]	3.03 mV [−1.95−7.63] (p=0.24)	0.43 [−0.35−1.17]
PIC end voltage	−58.67±6.87 mV−71.37±6.36 mV [−61.68−−55.65][−73.99−−67.60]	−12.69 mV [−16.68−−8.02] (p=4.1e−06 ****)	−1.86 [−2.69−−0.80]	−60.48±4.90 mV−61.80±7.27 mV [−63.57−−58.66][−64.75−−58.95]	−1.32 mV [−4.61−2.66] (p=0.5)	−0.20 [−0.77−0.42]	−65.00±5.70 mV−61.30±8.12 mV [−67.79−−62.19][−65.34−−57.16]	3.70 mV [−1.44−8.54] (p=0.17)	0.52 [−0.28−1.27]
PIC peak voltage (down ramp)	−43.73±4.89 mV−53.63±4.90 mV [−45.62−−41.28][−55.76−−50.95]	−9.90 mV [−13.10−−6.60] (p=2.1e−06 ****)	−1.97 [−2.78−−1.17]	−42.49±8.15 mV−45.85±6.11 mV [−45.71−−37.94][−48.41−−43.56]	−3.36 mV [−8.41−0.62] (p=0.17)	−0.47 [−1.08−0.16]	−48.14±5.25 mV−45.98±6.26 mV [−50.45−−45.05][−49.54−−43.13]	2.17 mV [−2.22−5.96] (p=0.32)	0.37 [−0.41−1.20]