1 Title: Disrupted basal ganglia output during movement preparation in hemi-parkinsonian
2 mice accounts for behavioral deficits
3
4 Abbreviated title: BG output accounts for hemi-parkinsonian deficits
5

6 Anand Tekriwal [1,2,5,6], Mario J. Lintz [1,3,5,6], John A. Thompson [2,4,5,6], and Gidon Felsen [1,5,6] *
7
1. Department of Physiology and Biophysics, University of Colorado School of
Medicine, Aurora, CO 80045
2. Department of Neurosurgery, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO
80045
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO
80045
4. Department of Neurology, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO
80045
5. Neuroscience Program, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO 80045
6. Medical Scientist Training Program, University of Colorado School of Medicine,
Aurora, CO 80045
19
20
* To whom correspondence should be addressed
Phone: (303) 724-4532
Fax: (303) 724-4501
E-mail: gidon.felsen@cuanschutz.edu
Department of Physiology and Biophysics
University of Colorado School of Medicine
12800 E. 19th Ave., Mail Stop 8307, Aurora, CO 80045, USA

28
29
30

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health
(R01NS079518) and the Boettcher Foundation's Webb-Waring Biomedical Research Award.
Technical support was provided by the Optogenetics and Neural Engineering Core at the
University of Colorado School of Medicine, funded in part by the National Institutes of
Health (P30NS048154). We thank Quang Dang and Ben Peterson for data collection, and
members of the Felsen lab for comments on the manuscript.
37
38 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Abstract

Parkinsonian motor deficits are associated with elevated inhibitory output from the basal ganglia (BG). However, several features of Parkinson's disease (PD) have not been accounted for by this supra-inhibition framework, including the potentially therapeutically-relevant observation that movements guided by external stimuli are less impaired than otherwise-identical movements generated based on internal goals. Is this difference due to divergent processing within the BG itself, or to the recruitment of extra-BG pathways by sensory processing? In addition, surprisingly little is known about precisely when, in the sequence from selecting to executing movements, BG output is altered by PD. Here, we address these questions by recording activity in the SNr, a key BG output nucleus, in hemiparkinsonian (hemi-PD) mice performing a well-controlled behavioral task requiring stimulus-guided and internally-specified directional movements. We found that hemi-PD mice (n = 5, male) exhibited a bias ipsilateral to the side of dopaminergic cell loss, consistent with supra-inhibition of contralateral movements by BG output, and that this bias was stronger when movements were internally specified rather than stimulus guided, consistent with clinical observations in parkinsonian patients. We further found that changes in SNr activity during movement preparation could account for the ipsilateral behavioral bias, as well as its greater magnitude for internally-specified movements. These results suggest that parkinsonian changes in BG output underlying movement preparation contribute to the greater deficit in internally-specified in comparison to stimulus-guided movements.

Significance Statement

Parkinsonian patients exhibit the intriguing phenomenon that movements guided by external stimuli are often less impaired than otherwise-identical movements generated based on internal goals. For example, patients can exhibit a more normal gait when their steps are guided by patterned floor tiling than when traversing a featureless floor. Whether this difference in movement execution is due to distinct processing intrinsic to the basal ganglia (BG) or to compensation from other motor pathways is an open question with therapeutic implications. We addressed this question by recording BG output during behavior in a parkinsonian mouse model. We found that mice exhibited greater impairment in internally-specified than stimulus-guided movements, and that differences in BG output during movement preparation could account for this effect.

Introduction

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disease of the basal ganglia (BG) in which motor impairments arise from disordered – typically, elevated – inhibitory BG output resulting from the loss of dopaminergic tone (DeLong, 1990; Wichmann et al., 1999; Ibanez-Sandoval et al., 2007; Utter and Basso, 2008; Wang et al., 2010a; Seeger-Armbruster and von Ameln-Mayerhofer, 2013; Brazhnik et al., 2014; Filyushkina et al., 2019; McGregor and Nelson, 2019). One predominant theoretical framework for BG pathology in PD is the "rate model", which posits that motor centers downstream of the BG are over-inhibited, leading to disordered movements (Albin et al., 1989; DeLong, 1990; Obeso et al., 2008; Utter and Basso, 2008; McGregor and Nelson, 2019; Vitek and Johnson, 2019). However, recent studies have revealed parkinsonian phenomena that the rate model would not predict, including the intriguing clinical observation that not all forms of movement are equally affected by PD: when movements are guided by external stimuli (e.g., gait matching with a rhythmic auditory stimulus or visually patterned flooring, kinematics are less impaired than for otherwise identical movements made in the absence of guiding stimuli (Glickstein and Stein, 1991; McIntosh et al., 1997; Ballanger et al., 2006; Daroff, 2008; McDonald et al., 2015; Distler et al., 2016). The primary question raised by this observation is whether parkinsonian BG output is similarly disrupted for these "stimulus-guided" and "internally-specified" movements. If so, we might infer that stimulus-guided movements are protected from PD via the recruitment of extra-BG pathways (Lewis et al., 2007; Hackney et al., 2015; Drucker et

al., 2019; Filyushkina et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020). However, differences in parkinsonian

BG output between these forms of movements would implicate BG processing itself in this

behavioral phenomenon. Given that understanding the neural basis for this clinical

observation could be leveraged to improve treatment for PD, we sought to develop a suitable

experimental paradigm for examining parkinsonian BG output during stimulus-guided and

internally-specified movements.

We specifically sought to focus on parkinsonian BG output during movement

preparation, a key motor phase in which sensory and cognitive variables are integrated

(Cisek and Kalaska, 2010), and disruption of which is thought to underlie bradykinetic

parkinsonian movement (Dick et al., 1984; Jahanshahi et al., 1992; Suri et al., 1998; Berardelli

et al., 2001; Cutsuridis and Perantonis, 2006; Moroney et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2015; Hess and

Hallett, 2017). Under normal conditions, the SNr, a BG output nucleus, is strongly engaged

by the preparation of directional movements (Handel and Glimcher, 1999; Sato and

Hikosaka, 2002; Lintz and Felsen, 2016). However, while numerous studies have examined

parkinsonian changes in SNr activity under passive conditions or rhythmic locomotion

(Hutchison et al., 1994; Wichmann et al., 1999; Galati et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010a;

Seeger-Armbruster and von Ameln-Mayerhofer, 2013; Brazhnik et al., 2014; Lobb and

Jaeger, 2015; Aristieta et al., 2016; Willard et al., 2019), this approach is insufficient for

differentiating how SNr activity during distinct phases of movement, including preparation,

is affected by PD. To address this question, we therefore recorded SNr activity during a

behavioral task in which mice with unilateral dopaminergic cell loss prepare, and

subsequently initiate, SNr-engaging directional (left or right) movements that are either

stimulus-guided or internally-specified (Uchida and Mainen, 2003; Thompson and Felsen,

2013; Lintz and Felsen, 2016). Crucially, by requiring that mice wait for a go signal before

initiating their movement, movement preparation is temporally isolated from initiation,

allowing us to dissociate the effects of PD on BG output underlying these processes.

We found that mice exhibited a directional bias ipsilateral to the hemisphere with

dopaminergic cell loss, consistent with rate model predictions, and that this bias was more

prominent on internally-specified than stimulus-guided trials, accordant with clinical

observations. Furthermore, we found that SNr activity during movement preparation was

altered in a manner consistent with the behavior, suggesting that reorganization of BG

processing by dopaminergic cell loss contributes to the greater deficit in performance of

internally-specified than stimulus-guided movements.

Materials and Methods

Animal subjects

All experiments were performed according to protocols approved by the University of

Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. Subjects

were male adult C57BL/6J mice (aged 7–14 months at the start of experiments; Jackson Labs)

housed in a vivarium with a 12-hr light/dark cycle with lights on at 5:00 am. Food (Teklad

Global Rodent Diet No. 2918; Harlan) was available *ad libitum*. Access to water was

restricted prior to the behavioral session to motivate performance; however, if mice did not

obtain ~1 ml of water during the behavioral session, additional water was provided for ~2–5

min following the behavioral session. All mice were weighed daily and received sufficient

water during behavioral sessions to maintain >85% of pre-water restriction weight.

For behavioral analyses, only mice that completed at least 15 pre- and 15 post-surgery

sessions were included (hemiparkinsonian (hemi-PD), n = 4; control, n = 4). For

electrophysiological analyses, mice were included if well-isolated neurons were recorded

during the task (hemi-PD, n = 5; control, n = 4). Some data from control mice were

previously published using different analyses than the current study (Lintz and Felsen, 2016).

For rotation assay analyses, only mice that completed at least three pre- and three-post

surgery rotation assay sessions were included (hemi-PD, n = 5; control, n = 3).

Behavioral task

Mice were trained on a task requiring stimulus-guided (SG) and internally-specified (IS)

movements (Fig. 1) as previously described (Lintz and Felsen, 2016). Briefly, each mouse was

water-restricted and trained to interact with three ports (center: odor port; sides: reward

ports (Fig. 2A) along one wall of a behavioral chamber (Island Motion). On each trial, the

mouse entered the odor port, triggering the delivery of an odor; waited 488 ± 104 ms (mean ±

SD) for an auditory go signal; exited the odor port; and entered one of the reward ports (Fig.

2A). Premature exit from the odor port resulted in the unavailability of reward on that trial.

Odors were comprised of binary mixtures of (-)-carvone ("Odor A") and (+)-carvone ("Odor

B"). On each SG trial, one of seven odor mixtures was presented via an olfactometer (Island

Motion): Odor A/Odor B = 95/5, 80/20, 60/40, 50/50, 40/60, 20/80, or 5/95. Mixtures in which

Odor A > Odor B indicated reward availability only at the left port and mixtures in which

Odor B > Odor A indicated reward availability only at the right port (Fig. 2B). Since we

surgically targeted the left hemisphere in all mice, we refer to Odor A as the "ipsilateral

odor" and Odor B as the "contralateral odor" (e.g., Fig. 2C). Similarly, we refer to the

directions "left" and "right" as "ipsilateral" and "contralateral", respectively. On trials in

which Odor A = Odor B (Odor A/Odor B = 50/50), the probability of reward at the ipsilateral

and contralateral ports, independently, was 0.5. Reward, consisting of 4 μl of water, was

delivered by transiently opening a calibrated water valve 10–100 ms after reward port entry.

Odor and water delivery were controlled, and port entries and exits were recorded, using

custom software (available at https://github.com/felsenlab; adapted from C. D. Brody) written

in MATLAB (MathWorks).

Mice learned to perform SG trials (Fig. 2C) within ~48 sessions (1 session/day);

detailed training stages are described in Stubblefield et al. (Stubblefield et al., 2013). Mice

required an additional ~5 sessions to learn to perform interleaved blocks of SG and IS trials.

On each IS trial the 50/50 mixture was presented, and reward was available only at one side

throughout the block (Fig. 2D). Detailed training stages for IS trials are described in Lintz &

Felsen (Stubblefield et al., 2013; Stubblefield et al., 2015; Lintz and Felsen, 2016). Mice

performed 5 blocks (SG, IS, SG, IS, SG) per session (Fig. 2B); the side associated with reward

switched between each IS block. Upon completing training, mice performed at least 15

sessions to establish pre-surgery baseline behavior, underwent surgery (see below), and

subsequently resumed task performance (post-surgery behavior; Fig. 1).

Rotation assay

The direction of spontaneous movement was assessed before and after surgery using a

standard rotation assay (Ungerstedt, 1976; Smith et al., 2012). Following intraperitoneal (i.p.)

administration of d-amphetamine (2.5 mg/kg, Sigma), mice were placed in a transparent

beaker with a diameter of 11.5 cm. Mice were monitored for the next 90 mins and behavior

recorded using an overhead camera. Rotations were analyzed from 10 to 30 mins post i.p.

injection. A rotation score was calculated by counting the total number of complete

ipsilateral (left) rotations and subtracting the total number of complete contralateral (right)

rotations (Fig. 3B). Repeated testing was carried out with at least 1 week between d-

amphetamine injections to allow for recovery.

SNc surgery – Unilateral 6 OHDA and saline injections

The mouse was anesthetized with isoflurane and secured in a stereotaxic device, the

skull was exposed with a midline incision, and a craniotomy targeting the left SNc was

performed, centered at 3.07 mm posterior from bregma, 1.250 mm lateral from the midline,

and 4.35 mm deep from cortical surface (Paxinos and Franklin, 2004). Injection volume

totaled 2 μL injected at target (2.43 mg 6-OHDA/mL 0.02% ascorbic acid). After suturing the

incision, a topical triple antibiotic ointment (Major) mixed with 2% lidocaine hydrochloride

jelly (Akorn) was applied to the scalp, the mouse was removed from the stereotaxic device,

the isoflurane was turned off, and oxygen alone was delivered to the mouse to gradually

alleviate anesthetic state. Mice were administered sterile isotonic saline (0.9%) for

rehydration and an analgesic (Ketofen; 5 mg/kg) for pain management. Analgesic and topical

antibiotic administration was repeated daily for up to 5 days, and mice were closely

monitored for any signs of distress.

This procedure was identical for control mice assessed on the rotation assay but with

saline injected instead of 6-OHDA. These mice did not undergo further surgery and were

used solely for rotation assay testing (Fig. 3B).

SNr surgery – tetrode implantation

Details of the surgical procedure are provided in Thompson and Felsen (Thompson

and Felsen, 2013). Briefly, following establishment of pre-surgery baseline behavior and (in

hemi-PD mice) following unilateral 6-OHDA injections (Fig. 1), the mouse was anesthetized

with isoflurane and secured in a stereotaxic device, the scalp was incised and retracted, 2

small screws were attached to the skull, and a craniotomy targeting the left SNr was

performed, centered at 3.07 mm posterior from bregma and 1.25 mm lateral from the midline

(Franklin and Paxinos, 2004). A VersaDrive 4 microdrive (Neuralynx), containing 4

independently adjustable tetrodes, was affixed to the skull via the screws, luting (3M), and

dental acrylic (A-M Systems). A second small craniotomy was performed in order to place

the ground wire in direct contact with the brain. After the acrylic hardened, a topical triple

antibiotic ointment (Major) mixed with 2% lidocaine hydrochloride jelly (Akorn) was

applied to the scalp, the mouse was removed from the stereotaxic device, the isoflurane was

turned off, and oxygen alone was delivered to the mouse to gradually alleviate anesthetic

state. Mice were administered sterile isotonic saline (0.9%) for rehydration and an analgesic

(Ketofen; 5 mg/kg) for pain management. Analgesic and topical antibiotic administration was

repeated daily for up to 5 days, and mice were closely monitored for any signs of distress.

Electrophysiology

Neural recordings were collected using four tetrodes, wherein each tetrode consisted

of four polyimide-coated nichrome wires (Sandvik; single-wire diameter 12.5 μm) gold

plated to 0.2–0.4 MΩ impedance. Electrical signals were amplified and recorded using the

Digital Lynx S multichannel acquisition system (Neuralynx) in conjunction with Cheetah

data acquisition software (Neuralynx). Tetrode depths were adjusted approximately 23 hrs

before each recording session in order to sample an independent population of neurons

across sessions. To estimate tetrode depths during each session we calculated distance

traveled with respect to the rotation fraction of the screw that was affixed to the shuttle

holding the tetrode. One full rotation moved the tetrode ~250 μm and tetrodes were moved

~62.5 μm between sessions. The final tetrode location was confirmed through histological

assessment (see below).

Offline spike sorting and cluster quality analysis was performed using MClust

software (MClust-4.3, A.D. Redish, et al.) in MATLAB. Briefly, for each tetrode, single units

were isolated by manual cluster identification based on spike features derived from sampled

waveforms. Identification of single units through examination of spikes in high-dimensional

feature space allowed us to refine the delimitation of identified clusters by examining all

possible two-dimensional combinations of selected spike features. We used standard spike

features for single unit extraction: peak amplitude, energy (square root of the sum of squares

of each point in the waveform, divided by the number of samples in the waveform), and the

first principal component normalized by energy. Spike features were derived separately for

individual leads. To assess the quality of identified clusters we calculated two standard

quantitative metrics: L-ratio and isolation distance (Schmitzer-Torbert et al., 2005). Clusters

with an L-ratio of less than 0.75 and isolation distance greater than 6.5 were deemed single

units, which resulted in the exclusion of 7% of the identified clusters. Only clusters with few

interspike intervals less than 1.5 ms were considered for further examination. Furthermore,

we excluded the possibility of including data from the same neuron twice by ensuring that

both the waveforms and response properties sufficiently changed across sessions. If they did

not, we conservatively assumed that we were recording from the same neuron, and only

included data from one session.

Immunohistochemistry

Mice were overdosed with an i.p. injection of sodium pentobarbital (100 mg/kg) and

transcardially perfused with saline followed by ice-cold 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in

0.1 M phosphate buffer (PB). After perfusion, brains were submerged in 4% PFA in 0.1 M PB

for 24 hrs for post-fixation and then cryoprotected for 24 hrs by immersion in 30% sucrose in

0.1 M PB. The brain was encased in the same sucrose solution, and frozen rapidly on dry ice.

Serial coronal sections (60 μm) were cut on a sliding microtome. Fluorescent Nissl

(NeuroTrace, Invitrogen) was used to identify cytoarchitectural features of the SNr and

verify tetrode tracks and lesion damage within or below the SNr, as previously described

(Lintz and Felsen, 2016). In addition, coronal sections were stained for tyrosine hydroxylase

(TH). Following repeated soaks in PBS and blocking solution, sections were exposed to

primary antibody overnight (Anti-Tyrosine Hydoxylase (Rabbit) Antibody, 1:1000,

Rockland). Next, sections were washed in carrier solution (2x10-min) and exposed to

secondary antibody for 2 hrs (Goat anti-Rabbit IgG (H+L) Secondary Antibody, 1:500).

Images were captured with a 10x objective lens, using an LSM 5 Pascal series Axioskop 2 FS

MOT confocal microscope (Zeiss). For each mouse, a representative coronal section including

the SNc (Paxinos & Franklin) was used to quantify dopaminergic cell loss by comparing the

number of TH+ neurons ipsilateral and contralateral to the injection. Hemi-PD mice without

verified >70% dopaminergic cell loss (5/10), were excluded from the group. Secondary

confirmation of dopaminergic cell loss was quantified in the same manner using coronal

sections containing the striatum (Fig. 3A).

Behavioral directional bias

On SG trials, directional bias was quantified using psychometric functions fitted

to $p = 1/1 + e_{(-a-bx)}$, where x is the proportion of Odor A in the binary odor mixture, p is the

fraction of ipsilateral choices, and a and b are the best-fit free parameters. The slope of the

function is captured by b, while its directional bias was calculated as Bias = $a/b + 50$ (Felsen

and Mainen, 2008). Positive bias values reflect an ipsilateral (leftward) shift (Fig. 4A) relative

to a perfectly symmetric psychometric function, and negative values reflect a contralateral

(rightward) shift (Fig. 4B). To directly compare directional bias between SG and IS trials

within the same session (Fig. 6B), for SG and IS trials separately we calculated the difference

between the fraction of trials for which ipsilateral was the correct choice and the fraction of

actual ipsilateral choices. Sessions were included in this analysis if the mouse completed at

least 25 trials of each direction (ipsilateral and contralateral) and type (SG and IS) trials.

Neuronal direction preference

We used an ROC-based analysis to quantify the selectivity of single neurons for

movement direction (Green DM, 1966; Lintz and Felsen, 2016). This analysis calculates the

ability of an ideal observer to classify whether a given firing rate was recorded in one of two

conditions (i.e., preceding ipsilateral (left) or contralateral (right) movement). We defined

"preference" as $2(ROC_{area} - 0.5)$, a measure ranging from –1 to 1, where –1 signifies the

strongest possible preference for ipsilateral, 1 signifies the strongest possible preference for

contralateral, and 0 signifies no preference (Feierstein et al., 2006; Lintz and Felsen, 2016).

For example, if the firing rate of a given neuron is generally higher preceding ipsilateral than

contralateral movements, that neuron is assigned a preference < 0. Statistical significance was

determined with a permutation test: we recalculated the preference after randomly

reassigning all firing rates to either of the two groups, repeating this procedure 500 times to

obtain a distribution of values, and calculated the fraction of random values exceeding the

actual value. We tested for significance at $\alpha = 0.05$. Trials in which the movement time

(between odor port exit and reward port entry) was > 1.5 s were excluded from all analyses.

Neurons with < 25 trials of each trial type under comparison (ipsilateral SG, contralateral SG,

ipsilateral IS, or contralateral IS) or with a firing rate < 2.5 spikes/s for either trial type under

comparison, were excluded from all analyses.

Shift function

We used a shift function to quantify if and how two distributions differ (Rousselet et

al., 2017). Briefly, using a Harrell-Davis quantile estimator (Harrell and Davis, 1982),

distributions were divided into 10 equal parts by 9 "deciles." For example, the 1_{st} decile is the

value below which 10% of the values lie while the 9_{th} decile is the value below which 90% of

values lie. The shift function compares a given decile in distribution A with its corresponding

decile in distribution B. Corresponding deciles were determined to be significantly different

if the confidence interval of their differences, calculated by sampling the difference between

bootstrapped distributions 200 times, did not cross 0.

Activity change during epoch of interest compared to baseline

We calculated the normalized response (NR) for each neuron as NR = Ft/Fb where Ft

is the median firing rate in the "test" window (either movement preparation epoch or

movement initiation epoch) and Fb is the median firing rate in the "baseline" window. Since

the structure of our task does not include a natural "baseline" epoch – i.e., in which the

mouse is in a motionless state unaffected by task demands – our baseline window was

defined as the time of odor port entry to reward port exit (i.e., the duration of the whole

trial; (Lintz and Felsen, 2016). Neurons with Fb < 2.5 spikes/s were excluded from analyses.

Statistical significance was determined using a pairwise t-test to compare Ft and Fb from the

same trial. Neurons with NR < 1 (p < 0.05) were defined as "Decreasing" and neurons with

NR > 1 (p < 0.05) were defined as "Increasing"; all other neurons were categorized as "No Δ"

(Fig. 8; Table 1). Note that, by convention, a decreasing neuron that decreases more for

contralateral than ipsilateral movement would be considered to have an ipsilateral direction

preference (as calculated above), because firing rate is higher for ipsilateral movement (Sato

and Hikosaka, 2002; Lintz and Felsen, 2016).

Statistical Analysis

In general, MATLAB was used for all statistical analyses except for χ_2 analyses, which

were performed in R. Distributions were tested for normality and unless all data sets under

comparison were normally distributed, non-parametric statistical tests were used. For

consistency, all graphical representations of central tendency are medians, independent of

whether parametric or non-parametric statistical tests were used.

Results

Effect of unilateral dopaminergic cell loss on stimulus-guided and internally-specified

movements

To examine how parkinsonian conditions affect stimulus-guided (SG) and internally-

specified (IS) movements and their underlying BG output, we first trained mice on a

behavioral task designed to elicit these forms of movements (Figs. 1, 2A,B) (Lintz and Felsen,

2016). Briefly, on each trial of the task, the mouse was presented with a binary odor mixture

at a central port, waited for an auditory go signal, and moved to the ipsilateral (left) or

contralateral (right) reward port for a water reward (Fig. 2A). Each daily experimental

session consisted of interleaved blocks of SG and IS trials (Fig. 2B; Materials and

Methods)(Lintz and Felsen, 2016). On SG trials, the dominant component of the odor

mixture – which varied by trial – determined the side at which reward was delivered, while

on IS trials, a balanced mixture of the two odors preceded delivery of reward at the same side

throughout the block (Fig. 2B; Materials and Methods). Consistent with previous results

(Lintz and Felsen, 2016; Lintz et al., 2019), the direction of movement on SG trials was

selected based on the stimulus (Fig. 2C) while the direction of movement on IS trials was

selected based on recent trial history (Fig. 2D).

Upon achieving proficient performance on the task (Fig. 2C,D; Materials and

Methods), mice received 6-OHDA injections to one SNc to unilaterally ablate dopaminergic

neurons (Ungerstedt, 1976; Chang et al., 2006; Israel and Bergman, 2008; Avila et al., 2010;

Smith and Heuer, 2011; Brazhnik et al., 2012; Seeger-Armbruster and von Ameln-

Mayerhofer, 2013; Brazhnik et al., 2014) and were implanted with a chronic tetrode drive

targeting the ipsilateral SNr to record BG output (Fig. 1). Only mice with > 70%

histologically-confirmed dopaminergic cell loss (examined following all behavioral and

recording experiments; Fig. 1, Fig. 3A) were included in the "hemi-PD" group for all

subsequent analyses (5/10 mice; Materials and Methods). Confirming the validity of our

hemi-PD model, hemi-PD mice exhibited a greater ipsilateral bias than control mice (saline

delivered to SNc) on a standard rotation assay (p = 0.0357, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test;

Fig. 3B; Materials and Methods), and the mean firing rate of SNr neurons was higher (p =

0.0157, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test; Fig. 3C), consistent with rate-model predictions and

previous reports (Sanderson et al., 1986; Hutchison et al., 1994; Wichmann et al., 1999;

Chang et al., 2006; Brazhnik et al., 2014; Lobb and Jaeger, 2015).

We next examined whether unilateral dopaminergic cell loss affected the SG and IS

movements required by our task (Fig. 1). Given the rate-model prediction that SNr-recipient

nuclei for contralateral movement are over-inhibited (Albin et al., 1989; DeLong, 1990;

Obeso et al., 2008; Utter and Basso, 2008; McGregor and Nelson, 2019; Vitek and Johnson,

2019), and supported by our findings of greater ipsilateral bias on the rotation assay (Fig. 3B)

and an increase in mean SNr activity (Fig. 3C), we expected hemi-PD mice to exhibit an

ipsilateral bias for both SG and IS movements. To quantify the extent of directional bias on

SG trials, for each mouse we estimated the pre-surgery and post-surgery bias based on a

logistic function fit separately to the choices from all sessions before and all sessions after

surgery, respectively (Fig. 4A,B; Materials and Methods). In hemi-PD mice, we found that

choices after surgery were biased ipsilaterally compared to before surgery (p = 0.0478, 1-

tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 4A,C), while no post-surgery change in bias was observed in

control mice (p = 0.186, 1-tailed unpaired t-test; post-surgery change in ipsilateral bias was

greater for hemi-PD than control mice, p= 0.0468, 1-tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 4B,C).

Consistent with their ipsilateral directional bias, hemi-PD mice exhibited a larger increase in

reaction time (defined as the time from go signal to reward port entry) post-surgery for

contralateral than ipsilateral movements (p = 0.0143, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test; Fig.

4D,F). While control mice also exhibited longer reaction times post-surgery, as expected

given the additional weight of the chronic recording drive, the increase was not greater for

contralateral than ipsilateral movements (p = 0.385, 1-tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 4E,G).

We observed similar effects of unilateral dopaminergic cell loss on IS movements (Fig.

5). For these trials, we quantified bias by separately examining the fraction of ipsilateral

choices during blocks in which reward was delivered at the ipsilateral port ("ipsilateral

blocks") and at the contralateral port ("contralateral blocks"). On ipsilateral blocks, both

groups of mice nearly always chose the ipsilateral port (median fraction ipsilateral choices:

hemi-PD pre-surgery = 0.88, post-surgery = 0.85; control pre-surgery = 0.89, post-surgery =

0.87; Fig. 5A,B). On contralateral blocks, however, hemi-PD mice were more likely to

choose the ipsilateral port after than before surgery (median pre-surgery = 0.12, post-surgery

= 0.31; p = 0.0115, 1-tailed paired t-test; Fig. 5A,C), while control mice did not exhibit this

change (median pre-surgery = 0.12, post-surgery = 0.18; p = 0.100, 1-tailed paired t-test; post-

surgery change in ipsilateral bias was greater for hemi-PD than control mice, p = 0.0298, 1-

tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 5B,C). We also found the same effect on reaction times on IS trials

as we did on SG trials: hemi-PD (but not control) mice exhibited a greater post-surgery

increase in reaction time on contralateral than ipsilateral trials (hemi-PD: p = 0.0143, 1-tailed

Wilcoxon rank sum test; control: p = 0.434, 1-tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 5D-G). Thus, on

both SG and IS trials, unilateral dopaminergic cell loss resulted in fewer and slower

contralateral movements, consistent with rate-model predictions.

We next asked whether this effect was greater in magnitude, indicative of greater

impairment, on SG or IS trials. Given that PD patients are less impaired when performing

movements guided by external stimuli (Glickstein and Stein, 1991; Ballanger et al., 2006;

Daroff, 2008; McDonald et al., 2015; Distler et al., 2016; Tekriwal et al., 2018), we expected

unilateral dopaminergic cell loss to have a greater impact on IS trials. To examine this

possibility, we directly compared, within each session, behavior on SG and IS trials. We first

compared the percent correct, as a measure of overall performance on these two trial types.

We found that, before surgery, hemi-PD mice performed better (higher percent correct) on

IS trials, consistent with the observation that the correct choice remained the same

throughout the block (Fig. 6A). However, post-surgery, mice exhibited a significant shift

toward better relative performance on SG trials (p = $6.52 \times 10_{-15}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum

test; Fig. 6A). We next compared directional bias on SG and IS trials by calculating the

difference between the fraction of trials for which ipsilateral was the correct choice and the

fraction of actual ipsilateral choices, separately for SG and IS blocks within each session. We

found that, pre-surgery, hemi-PD mice were slightly more ipsilaterally biased on IS than SG

trials, but post-surgery they exhibited a greater ipsilateral bias on IS than SG trials (p =

0.0300, 1-tailed unpaired t-test; Fig. 6B). Finally, we compared median reaction times

between SG and IS trials within each session, separately for ipsilateral and contralateral

movements. To control for the potential effects of discrimination difficulty on reaction time,

we only included "easy discrimination" SG trials (95:5, 80:20, 20:80, 5:95)(Lintz and Felsen,

2016) in this analysis. We found that, pre-surgery, reaction times in both directions tended

to be somewhat shorter on IS than SG trials, consistent with previous findings (Lintz and

Felsen, 2016) ($p_{pre\_ipsi} = 1.25 \times 10_{-12}$; $p_{pre\_contra} = 4.65 \times 10_{-12}$; 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test;

Fig. 6C). Post-surgery, reaction times for ipsilateral movements exhibited this same pattern,

but there was no difference in reaction times between contralateral SG and IS movements

($p_{post\_ipsi} = 6.10 \times 10_{-5}$; $p_{post\_contra} = 0.0901$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test). Together, these

analyses demonstrate that IS trials are relatively more affected than SG trials by unilateral

dopaminergic cell loss.

Effect of unilateral dopaminergic cell loss on basal ganglia output

We sought to determine whether behavioral differences between SG and IS trials

could be accounted for by activity in the SNr, which is known to play a role in the

movements elicited by this task (Lintz and Felsen, 2016). In the same mice described in the

above behavioral results, we used chronically implanted tetrodes to record from 183 SNr

neurons in hemi-PD mice (n = 5) and 285 neurons in control mice (n = 4) that met our

analysis criteria (Materials and Methods). We focused on activity underlying movement

preparation, which has been implicated in parkinsonian motor deficits (Dick et al., 1984;

Jahanshahi et al., 1992; Suri et al., 1998; Berardelli et al., 2001; Cutsuridis and Perantonis,

2006; Moroney et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2015; Hess and Hallett, 2017). Consistent with

previous results (Lintz and Felsen, 2016), we observed that SNr activity recorded from hemi-

PD mice was often modulated during the "movement preparation epoch" (from 100 ms after

the odor valve was opened until the go signal) and depended on movement direction (Fig.

7A). We first asked whether firing rate during this epoch differed between hemi-PD and

control mice, similar to the difference we and others have observed in baseline activity (Fig.

3C)(Hutchison et al., 1994; Wichmann et al., 1999; Galati et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010a;

Seeger-Armbruster and von Ameln-Mayerhofer, 2013; Brazhnik et al., 2014; Lobb and

Jaeger, 2015; Aristieta et al., 2016; Willard et al., 2019). The rate model would predict

elevated SNr activity in hemi-PD mice, consistent with the ipsilateral bias that we observed

given that SNr activity inhibits downstream motor centers that primarily mediate

contralateral movement. However, we found no overall difference between groups for

movement in either direction (p_{ipsi}= 0.0520; p_{contra}= 0.0954, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum tests;

Fig. 7B,C). The ipsilateral bias exhibited by hemi-PD mice on SG and IS trials therefore

cannot be explained simply by an *absolute* increase in SNr activity during movement

preparation.

We next examined whether unilateral dopaminergic cell loss affected the *relative*

activity of individual neurons between ipsilateral and contralateral movements (Fig. 7A),

which could also potentially account for the ipsilateral behavioral bias. We therefore

calculated the "direction preference" of each neuron, which quantifies the difference in

firing rate during a specified epoch between ipsilateral and contralateral movements, and

ranges from -1 (higher firing rates for ipsilateral movements) to 1 (higher firing rates for

contralateral movements), where 0 represents no preference (Materials and Methods)(Green

DM, 1966; Feierstein et al., 2006; Lintz and Felsen, 2016). We found that the populations of

neurons recorded in hemi-PD and control mice each exhibited a range of preferences, with

some neurons preferring ipsilateral movement (Fig. 7D, cyan; $p < 0.05$, permutation test;

Materials and Methods) and some preferring contralateral movement (Fig. 7D, magenta; $p <$

0.05, permutation test). However, the distributions of preferences exhibited by neurons

recorded in hemi-PD and control mice differ ($p = 7.31 \times 10^{-4}$, 2-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov

test) in two key respects.

First, the population of SNr neurons in hemi-PD mice exhibited weaker direction

preference than the population in control mice. We quantified this difference with several

complementary analyses. A smaller proportion of neurons in hemi-PD mice (52/183, 28%;

Table 1) than control mice (199/285, 70%; Table 1) exhibited a significant direction

preference ($p = 2.20 \times 10^{-16}$, χ^2-test = 147, df = 1). When the entire population in hemi-PD

and control mice is considered (i.e., including neurons with and without a significant

direction preference), the strength of the preference, independent of sign, was smaller in

hemi-PD mice (median = 0.0815) than control mice (median = 0.179; $p = 1.87 \times 10^{-12}$, 1-tailed

Wilcoxon rank sum tests). Finally, we used a shift function analysis to identify the deciles in

which the distributions differed (Rousselet et al., 2017) (Materials and Methods). This

analysis revealed that preferences were closer to 0 in hemi-PD than control mice in the 3

deciles representing the most ipsilateral preferences and in the 3 deciles representing the

most contralateral preferences, consistent with weaker direction preference in hemi-PD

mice. Together, these analyses indicate that unilateral dopaminergic cell loss results in a

fundamental disruption of the representation of movement direction that is normally

observed in the SNr (Handel and Glimcher, 1999; Berardelli et al., 2001; Lintz and Felsen,

2016).

Second, the population of SNr neurons in hemi-PD mice, but not control mice,

exhibited a slight bias towards contralateral preferences. While the entire distribution of

preferences in hemi-PD mice was not contralaterally skewed (median = 0.136; $p = 0.368$, 1-

tailed Wilcoxon sign-rank test), of the neurons that exhibited a significant preference (Fig.

7D, magenta and cyan, Table 1), more were contralateral-preferring (32/52, magenta; Table

1) than ipsilateral-preferring (20/52, cyan; $p = 0.0155$, χ^2-test = 4.65 df = 1; Table 1). In

contrast, in control mice we found roughly equal proportions of contralateral-preferring

(105/199, magenta; Table 1) and ipsilateral-preferring (94/199, cyan; Table 1) neurons ($p =$

0.158, χ^2-test = 1.01, df = 1; Fig. 7D, Table 1). This analysis indicates that, in the population

of SNr neurons in which direction preference is spared, unilateral dopaminergic cell loss

results in more neurons exhibiting higher activity for contralateral than ipsilateral

movements, consistent with the ipsilateral behavioral bias that we observed (Figs. 4,5, Table

1).

To gain insight into the reorganization of BG output induced by unilateral

dopaminergic cell loss, we next examined these systematic differences in preferences

between hemi-PD and control mice within functional classes of SNr neurons (Fig. 8, Table

1). Separate subpopulations of SNr neurons are known to exhibit increases or decreases in

activity as movements are prepared and initiated (Handel and Glimcher, 1999; Sato and

Hikosaka, 2002; Lintz and Felsen, 2016); these subpopulations presumably play different

functional roles. We therefore categorized neurons into one of three classes based on

whether their activity during movement preparation increased, decreased, or did not change,

relative to baseline (Table 1; Materials and Methods). We first noticed a clear difference in

the proportion of neurons in each class between hemi-PD and control groups ($p = 1.32 \times 10^{-11}$,

$\chi 2$-test = 50.108, df = 2; n = 183 neurons, 5 hemi-PD mice; n = 285 neurons, 4 control

mice; Fig. 8A, Table 1). Specifically, we found that a higher proportion of neurons recorded

in hemi-PD mice (54.1%) than in control mice (40.0%) exhibited decreased activity, and a

corresponding lower proportion of neurons recorded in hemi-PD mice (19.7%) than in

control mice (44.9%) exhibited increased activity (Fig. 8A, Table 1; Materials and Methods).

In addition, our finding that fewer neurons in hemi-PD than control mice exhibited a

significant direction preference held true across all 3 subpopulations of neurons (Fig. 8A,

Table 1). Finally, we found that the contralateral bias in the hemi-PD group among neurons

exhibiting a direction preference was largely due to those that exhibited decreased activity

during movement preparation (contralateral:ipsilateral ratio = 25:7, p = $1.07 \times 10_{-5}$, $\chi2$-test =

18.1, df = 1; Fig. 8A, Table 1); this subpopulation in the control group did not show this effect

(contralateral:ipsilateral ratio = 36:42; p = 0.788, $\chi2$-test = 0.641, df = 1; Fig. 8A, Table 1).

Thus, unilateral dopaminergic cell loss resulted in a larger proportion of SNr neurons that

release downstream motor centers from inhibition, with a greater effect on ipsilateral than

contralateral movements, accounting for the relationship between SNr activity and the

ipsilateral behavioral bias.

Thus far we have focused on SNr activity during the movement preparation epoch. As

our task is designed to separate movement preparation from initiation, we were able to

extend our analyses to movement initiation. We expected to observe similar changes during

movement initiation, consistent with previous studies (Kravitz et al., 2010; Wang et al.,

2010b; Abedi et al., 2013; Freeze et al., 2013). We therefore repeated our firing rate, direction

preference and functional class analyses for the period from the go signal until 100 ms after

odor port exit, when the movement is initiated. As with the movement preparation epoch,

we found no overall difference in firing rate during movement initiation between the hemi-

PD and control groups for movement in either direction (p_{ipsi}= 0.193; p_{contra}= 0.103, 1-tailed

Wilcoxon rank sum tests). Next, as with movement preparation, we found that a smaller

proportion of neurons in hemi-PD than control mice exhibited a direction preference during

movement initiation (p = $4.41 \times 10_{-5}$, $\chi2$-test = 20.0, df = 2; Fig. 8B), but our shift function

analysis comparing the distributions of direction preferences in hemi-PD and control mice

revealed only one differing decile (8_{th} decile). Consistent with this result, we found no

difference between hemi-PD and control mice in the proportion of neurons that increased or

decreased activity during movement initiation compared to baseline (p = 0.459, χ2-test =

1.56, df = 2; n = 183 neurons, 5 hemi-PD mice; n = 285 neurons, 4 control mice; Fig. 8B,

Table 1). Thus, dopaminergic cell loss appears to affect BG output more during movement

preparation than during movement initiation in the context of our behavioral task.

Finally, we examined whether the changes in SNr activity during movement

preparation associated with unilateral dopaminergic cell loss were consistent with the

stronger ipsilateral behavioral bias on IS compared to SG trials (Fig. 6). For example, the

representative neuron shown in Fig. 9A appears to exhibit a contralateral preference,

consistent with an ipsilateral behavioral bias, on IS but not SG trials. To examine this

phenomenon across the population, we compared direction preference during the movement

preparation epoch between IS and SG trials within the same session (Fig. 9B). In the hemi-

PD group, we found that preference was significantly greater (i.e. more contralateral) on IS

than SG trials (p = 0.00390, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test, n = 158 neurons; Fig. 9B). We

also observed a significant difference in control mice (p = 0.0180, 2-tailed Wilcoxon sign

rank test; n = 285 neurons), but in the opposite direction (i.e. more ipsilateral). Together,

these analyses of SNr activity show that changes in BG output in hemi-PD mice are

consistent with their overall ipsilateral behavioral bias (Figs. 4,5), as well as their stronger

bias on IS than SG trials (Fig. 6).

Discussion

In this study, we primarily sought to determine whether BG output could explain the greater impairment in IS than SG movements under parkinsonian conditions. By recording SNr activity in hemi-PD mice performing SG and IS movements, we found that unilateral dopaminergic cell loss alters the relationship between SNr activity and movement direction as movements are prepared (Figs. 7D, 8, Table 1), consistent with the ipsilateral bias in behavior (Figs 4, 5). While we did not observe an absolute increase in preparation-related SNr activity in hemi-PD mice (Fig. 7B,C), as predicted by classical models of parkinsonian BG activity (DeLong, 1990; McGregor and Nelson, 2019), our findings are consistent with a rate-model framework in which greater SNr output inhibits downstream motor nuclei mediating contralateral movements (DeLong, 1990; McGregor and Nelson, 2019; Vitek and Johnson, 2019). In contrast, neural activity during movement initiation was little changed between hemi-PD and control groups (Fig. 8B), suggesting that parkinsonian conditions affect BG output subserving movement preparation more than initiation, consistent with studies in PD patients (Jahanshahi et al., 1992; Beiser and Houk, 1998; Suri et al., 1998; Cutsuridis and Perantonis, 2006; Moroney et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2015).

While unilateral dopaminergic cell loss resulted in an ipsilateral bias on both SG and IS trials (Figs. 4 and 5), we found that the effect was larger on IS trials (Fig. 6). This difference was reflected in the activity of SNr neurons, which exhibited a stronger contralateral preference (i.e., higher activity on contralateral than ipsilateral trials) on IS than SG trials (Fig. 9). This finding is consistent with our previous work showing that SNr

activity is more sensitive to movement direction under IS than SG conditions (Lintz and

Felsen, 2016), which suggests that the cognitive processes associated with IS movements are

more BG-dependent than those associated with SG movements. One key factor that may

explain the difference in BG-dependence between IS and SG trials is the influence of prior

choices and outcomes, which are crucial for determining the correct direction of movement

on IS, but not SG, trials. The SNr receives direct excitatory input from the pedunculopontine

tegmental nucleus (Scarnati et al., 1984; Beninato and Spencer, 1987), which encodes prior

choices and outcomes (Thompson and Felsen, 2013); SNr activity itself reflects prior choices

(Lintz and Felsen, 2016), and in general the BG are thought to bias activity in downstream

motor centers towards movements associated with larger rewards (Hikosaka et al., 2000; Sato

and Hikosaka, 2002; Watanabe et al., 2003; Kawagoe et al., 2004; Hikosaka et al., 2006). The

disruption of BG signaling by unilateral dopaminergic cell loss may therefore affect the

(adaptive) influence of priors on movement selection (Perugini et al., 2016), resulting in a

greater deficit on IS than SG trials. The importance of the BG in representing priors is also

consistent with our finding that SNr activity related to movement preparation, which is

influenced by priors, was more affected than activity related to movement initiation, which

is not.

In addition to the shift in the population of neurons in hemi-PD mice towards

contralateral preference consistent with the ipsilateral behavioral bias, a large proportion of

neurons exhibited no relationship between activity and movement direction (gray bars in

Figs. 7D, 8A, Table 1). Further, we found that more neurons in hemi-PD mice exhibited a

decrease than an increase in activity during movement preparation compared to baseline

activity, which was not the case in control mice (Fig. 8A, Table 1), perhaps due to the

increased baseline activity in hemi-PD mice (Fig. 3C). While these finding do not directly

relate to our primary behavioral readout of directional bias, they suggest a profound

reorganization of BG output under parkinsonian conditions. How this reorganization could

contribute to other features of parkinsonian behavior can be examined in future studies.

While we have demonstrated a clear link between the electrophysiological and

behavioral effects of unilateral dopaminergic cell loss, it is worth considering potential

caveats in interpreting our results. First, the hemi-PD mice included in our study all

exhibited an ipsilateral behavioral bias. Although our electrophysiological results are

consistent with this bias, we would be able to draw stronger conclusions about the

relationship between BG output and behavior with a set of mice exhibiting a wider range of

behavioral biases. Indeed, one mouse that was excluded from our hemi-PD group due to

insufficient dopaminergic cell loss (< 70%; Fig. 3A) exhibited a significant *contralateral* bias

on both SG and IS trials ($SG_{\Delta \text{ Directional bias}}$ = -12.9, see Fig. 2C for comparisons; $IS_{\Delta \text{ Fraction ipsi. choices}}$ =

-0.0792 , see Fig. 3C for comparisons). When we analyzed the SNr recordings from this

mouse, we found that the neurons with a significant direction preference (74/83 neurons)

largely exhibited an *ipsilateral* preference during the movement preparation epoch

(ipsilateral:contralateral ratio = 59:15, p = $7.74 \times 10_{-13}$, χ2-test = 50.0, df = 1, see Fig. 8A, Table

1 for comparisons). While we can only speculate about the potential compensatory

adaptations that emerge in the BG with relatively moderate dopaminergic cell loss, the fact

that the direction of behavioral bias remains consistent with neural direction preference

further supports our finding that BG output mediates the effect of parkinsonian conditions

on behavior.

Second, olfactory deficits are a known hallmark of PD (Hawkes and Shephard, 1993;

Hawkes, 1995; Tarakad and Jankovic, 2017; Tekriwal et al., 2017). Given our use of an

olfactory task, is it possible that the behavioral effects under parkinsonian conditions are due

to sensory and not motor deficits. We suggest that this is unlikely for two reasons: 1) on IS

trials the olfactory cue was not informative about reward location, 2) and on SG trials a

deficit in olfactory discrimination would be reflected in a flattening, rather than a shift, in

the psychometric function, which we did not observe.

Finally, while the hemi-PD model provides a powerful approach for examining the

neural basis of parkinsonian movement (Ungerstedt, 1976; Avila et al., 2010; Galati et al.,

2010; Brazhnik et al., 2012; Brazhnik et al., 2014; Dorval and Grill, 2014), PD typically

presents with bilateral dopaminergic cell loss. It is possible that dopaminergic input from the

spared SNc may compensate for the unilateral insult, and other differences between the

model and the clinical condition must be considered. However, our comparison between

ipsilateral and contralateral movements, at the behavioral and neurophysiological levels, was

well suited to the hemi-PD model, and we suggest that our results can cautiously inform the

reorganization of BG output that occurs in PD.

In conclusion, we found that the behavioral effects of unilateral dopaminergic cell

loss, including differences between stimulus-guided and internally-specified movements, can

be accounted for by changes in SNr activity during movement preparation. While our results

could not be explained by the simplest prediction of the classical rate model that BG output

is tonically elevated by dopaminergic cell loss, they were consistent with a model in which

output during movement preparation determines movement direction. Future studies can

examine how the BG interacts with other motor systems to differentially mediate stimulus-

guided and internally-specified movements under parkinsonian conditions.

References

Abedi PM, Delaville C, De Deurwaerdere P, Benjelloun W, Benazzouz A (2013) Intrapallidal
administration of 6-hydroxydopamine mimics in large part the electrophysiological
and behavioral consequences of major dopamine depletion in the rat. Neuroscience
236:289-297.

Albin RL, Young AB, Penney JB (1989) The functional anatomy of basal ganglia disorders.
Trends Neurosci 12:366-375.

Aristieta A, Ruiz-Ortega JA, Miguelez C, Morera-Herreras T, Ugedo L (2016) Chronic L-
DOPA administration increases the firing rate but does not reverse enhanced slow
frequency oscillatory activity and synchronization in substantia nigra pars reticulata
neurons from 6-hydroxydopamine-lesioned rats. Neurobiol Dis 89:88-100.

Avila I, Parr-Brownlie LC, Brazhnik E, Castaneda E, Bergstrom DA, Walters JR (2010) Beta
frequency synchronization in basal ganglia output during rest and walk in a
hemiparkinsonian rat. Exp Neurol 221:307-319.

Ballanger B, Thobois S, Baraduc P, Turner RS, Broussolle E, Desmurget M (2006)
"Paradoxical kinesis" is not a hallmark of Parkinson's disease but a general property of
the motor system. Mov Disord 21:1490-1495.

Beiser DG, Houk JC (1998) Model of cortical-basal ganglionic processing: encoding the serial
order of sensory events. J Neurophysiol 79:3168-3188.

Beninato M, Spencer RF (1987) A cholinergic projection to the rat substantia nigra from the
pedunculopontine tegmental nucleus. Brain Res 412:169-174.

Berardelli A, Rothwell JC, Thompson PD, Hallett M (2001) Pathophysiology of bradykinesia
in Parkinson's disease. Brain 124:2131-2146.

Brazhnik E, Novikov N, McCoy AJ, Cruz AV, Walters JR (2014) Functional correlates of
exaggerated oscillatory activity in basal ganglia output in hemiparkinsonian rats. Exp
Neurol 261:563-577.

Brazhnik E, Cruz AV, Avila I, Wahba MI, Novikov N, Ilieva NM, McCoy AJ, Gerber C,
709   Walters JR (2012) State-dependent spike and local field synchronization between
710   motor cortex and substantia nigra in hemiparkinsonian rats. J Neurosci 32:7869-7880.
711   Chang JY, Shi LH, Luo F, Woodward DJ (2006) Neural responses in multiple basal ganglia
712   regions following unilateral dopamine depletion in behaving rats performing a
713   treadmill locomotion task. Exp Brain Res 172:193-207.
714   Chen W, de Hemptinne C, Miller AM, Leibbrand M, Little SJ, Lim DA, Larson PS, Starr PA
715   (2020) Prefrontal-Subthalamic Hyperdirect Pathway Modulates Movement Inhibition
716   in Humans. Neuron.
717   Cisek P, Kalaska JF (2010) Neural mechanisms for interacting with a world full of action
718   choices. Annu Rev Neurosci 33:269-298.
719   Cutsuridis V, Perantonis S (2006) A neural network model of Parkinson's disease
720   bradykinesia. Neural Netw 19:354-374.
721   Daroff RB (2008) Paradoxical kinesia. Mov Disord 23:1193.
722   DeLong MR (1990) Primate models of movement disorders of basal ganglia origin. Trends
723   Neurosci 13:281-285.
724   Dick JP, Cowan JM, Day BL, Berardelli A, Kachi T, Rothwell JC, Marsden CD (1984) The
725   corticomotoneurone connection is normal in Parkinson's disease. Nature 310:407-409.
726   Distler M, Schlachetzki JC, Kohl Z, Winkler J, Schenk T (2016) Paradoxical kinesia in
727   Parkinson's disease revisited: Anticipation of temporal constraints is critical.
728   Neuropsychologia 86:38-44.
729   Dorval AD, Grill WM (2014) Deep brain stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus reestablishes
730   neuronal information transmission in the 6-OHDA rat model of parkinsonism. J
731   Neurophysiol 111:1949-1959.
732   Drucker JH, Sathian K, Crosson B, Krishnamurthy V, McGregor KM, Bozzorg A, Gopinath K,
733   Krishnamurthy LC, Wolf SL, Hart AR, Evatt M, Corcos DM, Hackney ME (2019)
734   Internally Guided Lower Limb Movement Recruits Compensatory Cerebellar Activity
735   in People With Parkinson's Disease. Front Neurol 10:537.
736   Feierstein CE, Quirk MC, Uchida N, Sosulski DL, Mainen ZF (2006) Representation of spatial
737   goals in rat orbitofrontal cortex. Neuron 51:495-507.
738   Felsen G, Mainen ZF (2008) Neural substrates of sensory-guided locomotor decisions in the
739   rat superior colliculus. Neuron 60:137-148.
740   Filyushkina V, Popov V, Medvednik R, Ushakov V, Batalov A, Tomskiy A, Pronin I, Sedov A
741   (2019) Hyperactivity of Basal Ganglia in Patients With Parkinson's Disease During
742   Internally Guided Voluntary Movements. Front Neurol 10:847.
743   Franklin K, Paxinos G (2004) Paxinos and Franklin's the Mouse Brain in Stereotaxic
744   Coordinates 5th Edition.
745   Freeze BS, Kravitz AV, Hammack N, Berke JD, Kreitzer AC (2013) Control of basal ganglia
746   output by direct and indirect pathway projection neurons. J Neurosci 33:18531-18539.

Galati S, D'Angelo V, Olivola E, Marzetti F, Di Giovanni G, Stanzione P, Stefani A (2010)
Acute inactivation of the medial forebrain bundle imposes oscillations in the SNr: a
challenge for the 6-OHDA model? Exp Neurol 225:294-301.
Glickstein M, Stein J (1991) Paradoxical movement in Parkinson's disease. Trends Neurosci
14:480-482.
Green DM SJ (1966) Signal detection theory and psychophysics. New York, NY: John Wiley
& Sons.
Hackney ME, Lee HL, Battisto J, Crosson B, McGregor KM (2015) Context-Dependent
Neural Activation: Internally and Externally Guided Rhythmic Lower Limb
Movement in Individuals With and Without Neurodegenerative Disease. Front
Neurol 6:251.
Handel A, Glimcher PW (1999) Quantitative analysis of substantia nigra pars reticulata
activity during a visually guided saccade task. J Neurophysiol 82:3458-3475.
Harrell FE, Davis CE (1982) A new distribution-free quantile estimator. Biometrika 69:635-
640.
Hawkes CH, Shephard BC (1993) Selective anosmia in Parkinson's disease? Lancet 341:435-
436.
Hawkes CM (1995) Diagnosis and treatment of Parkinson's disease. Anosmia is a common
finding. BMJ 310:1668.
Hess CW, Hallett M (2017) The Phenomenology of Parkinson's Disease. Semin Neurol
37:109-117.
Hikosaka O, Takikawa Y, Kawagoe R (2000) Role of the basal ganglia in the control of
purposive saccadic eye movements. Physiol Rev 80:953-978.
Hikosaka O, Nakamura K, Nakahara H (2006) Basal ganglia orient eyes to reward. J
Neurophysiol 95:567-584.
Hutchison WD, Lozano AM, Davis KD, Saint-Cyr JA, Lang AE, Dostrovsky JO (1994)
Differential neuronal activity in segments of globus pallidus in Parkinson's disease
patients. Neuroreport 5:1533-1537.
Ibanez-Sandoval O, Carrillo-Reid L, Galarraga E, Tapia D, Mendoza E, Gomora JC, Aceves J,
Bargas J (2007) Bursting in substantia nigra pars reticulata neurons in vitro: possible
relevance for Parkinson disease. J Neurophysiol 98:2311-2323.
Israel Z, Bergman H (2008) Pathophysiology of the basal ganglia and movement disorders:
from animal models to human clinical applications. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 32:367-
377.
Jahanshahi M, Brown RG, Marsden CD (1992) Simple and choice reaction time and the use
of advance information for motor preparation in Parkinson's disease. Brain 115 (Pt
2):539-564.
Kawagoe R, Takikawa Y, Hikosaka O (2004) Reward-predicting activity of dopamine and
caudate neurons--a possible mechanism of motivational control of saccadic eye
movement. J Neurophysiol 91:1013-1024.

Kravitz AV, Freeze BS, Parker PR, Kay K, Thwin MT, Deisseroth K, Kreitzer AC (2010) Regulation of parkinsonian motor behaviours by optogenetic control of basal ganglia circuitry. Nature 466:622-626.

Lewis MM, Slagle CG, Smith AB, Truong Y, Bai P, McKeown MJ, Mailman RB, Belger A, Huang X (2007) Task specific influences of Parkinson's disease on the striato-thalamo-cortical and cerebello-thalamo-cortical motor circuitries. Neuroscience 147:224-235.

Lintz MJ, Felsen G (2016) Basal ganglia output reflects internally-specified movements. Elife 5.

Lintz MJ, Essig J, Zylberberg J, Felsen G (2019) Spatial representations in the superior colliculus are modulated by competition among targets. Neuroscience 408:191-203.

Lobb CJ, Jaeger D (2015) Bursting activity of substantia nigra pars reticulata neurons in mouse parkinsonism in awake and anesthetized states. Neurobiol Dis 75:177-185.

McDonald LM, Griffin HJ, Angeli A, Torkamani M, Georgiev D, Jahanshahi M (2015) Motivational Modulation of Self-Initiated and Externally Triggered Movement Speed Induced by Threat of Shock: Experimental Evidence for Paradoxical Kinesis in Parkinson's Disease. PLoS One 10:e0135149.

McGregor MM, Nelson AB (2019) Circuit Mechanisms of Parkinson's Disease. Neuron 101:1042-1056.

McIntosh GC, Brown SH, Rice RR, Thaut MH (1997) Rhythmic auditory-motor facilitation of gait patterns in patients with Parkinson's disease. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 62:22-26.

Moroney R, Heida C, Geelen J (2008) Increased bradykinesia in Parkinson's disease with increased movement complexity: elbow flexion-extension movements. J Comput Neurosci 25:501-519.

Obeso JA, Rodriguez-Oroz MC, Benitez-Temino B, Blesa FJ, Guridi J, Marin C, Rodriguez M (2008) Functional organization of the basal ganglia: therapeutic implications for Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 23 Suppl 3:S548-559.

Perugini A, Ditterich J, Basso MA (2016) Patients with Parkinson's Disease Show Impaired Use of Priors in Conditions of Sensory Uncertainty. Curr Biol 26:1902-1910.

Rousselet GA, Pernet CR, Wilcox RR (2017) Beyond differences in means: robust graphical methods to compare two groups in neuroscience. Eur J Neurosci 46:1738-1748.

Sanderson P, Mavoungou R, Albe-Fessard D (1986) Changes in substantia nigra pars reticulata activity following lesions of the substantia nigra pars compacta. Neurosci Lett 67:25-30.

Sato M, Hikosaka O (2002) Role of primate substantia nigra pars reticulata in reward-oriented saccadic eye movement. J Neurosci 22:2363-2373.

Scarnati E, Campana E, Pacitti C (1984) Pedunculopontine-evoked excitation of substantia nigra neurons in the rat. Brain Res 304:351-361.

Schmitzer-Torbert N, Jackson J, Henze D, Harris K, Redish AD (2005) Quantitative measures of cluster quality for use in extracellular recordings. Neuroscience 131:1-11.

Seeger-Armbruster S, von Ameln-Mayerhofer A (2013) Short- and long-term unilateral 6-hydroxydopamine lesions in rats show different changes in characteristics of spontaneous firing of substantia nigra pars reticulata neurons. Exp Brain Res 224:15-24.

Smith GA, Heuer A (2011) 6-OHDA Lesions Models of Parkinson's Disease in the Rat In: Animal Models of Movement Disorders (Lane EL and Dunnett SB, ed), pp281-297. .

Smith GA, Heuer A, Dunnett SB, Lane EL (2012) Unilateral nigrostriatal 6-hydroxydopamine lesions in mice II: predicting l-DOPA-induced dyskinesia. Behav Brain Res 226:281-292.

Stubblefield EA, Costabile JD, Felsen G (2013) Optogenetic investigation of the role of the superior colliculus in orienting movements. Behav Brain Res 255:55-63.

Stubblefield EA, Thompson JA, Felsen G (2015) Optogenetic cholinergic modulation of the mouse superior colliculus in vivo. J Neurophysiol 114:978-988.

Suri RE, Albani C, Glattfelder AH (1998) Analysis of double-joint movements in controls and in parkinsonian patients. Exp Brain Res 118:243-250.

Tarakad A, Jankovic J (2017) Anosmia and Ageusia in Parkinson's Disease. Int Rev Neurobiol 133:541-556.

Tekriwal A, Felsen G, Thompson JA (2018) Modular auditory decision-making behavioral task designed for intraoperative use in humans. J Neurosci Methods 304:162-167.

Tekriwal A, Kern DS, Tsai J, Ince NF, Wu J, Thompson JA, Abosch A (2017) REM sleep behaviour disorder: prodromal and mechanistic insights for Parkinson's disease. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 88:445-451.

Thompson JA, Felsen G (2013) Activity in mouse pedunculopontine tegmental nucleus reflects action and outcome in a decision-making task. J Neurophysiol 110:2817-2829.

Uchida N, Mainen ZF (2003) Speed and accuracy of olfactory discrimination in the rat. Nat Neurosci 6:1224-1229.

Ungerstedt U (1976) 6-hydroxydopamine-induced degeneration of the nigrostriatal dopamine pathway: the turning syndrome. Pharmacol Ther B 2:37-40.

Utter AA, Basso MA (2008) The basal ganglia: an overview of circuits and function. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 32:333-342.

Vitek JL, Johnson LA (2019) Understanding Parkinson's disease and deep brain stimulation: Role of monkey models. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

Wang Y, Zhang QJ, Liu J, Ali U, Gui ZH, Hui YP, Chen L, Wang T (2010a) Changes in firing rate and pattern of GABAergic neurons in subregions of the substantia nigra pars reticulata in rat models of Parkinson's disease. Brain Res 1324:54-63.

Wang Y, Zhang QJ, Liu J, Ali U, Gui ZH, Hui YP, Chen L, Wu ZH, Li Q (2010b) Noradrenergic lesion of the locus coeruleus increases apomorphine-induced circling behavior and the firing activity of substantia nigra pars reticulata neurons in a rat model of Parkinson's disease. Brain Res 1310:189-199.

Watanabe K, Lauwereyns J, Hikosaka O (2003) Neural correlates of rewarded and
unrewarded eye movements in the primate caudate nucleus. J Neurosci 23:10052-
10057.
Wichmann T, Bergman H, Starr PA, Subramanian T, Watts RL, DeLong MR (1999)
Comparison of MPTP-induced changes in spontaneous neuronal discharge in the
internal pallidal segment and in the substantia nigra pars reticulata in primates. Exp
Brain Res 125:397-409.
Willard AM, Isett BR, Whalen TC, Mastro KJ, Ki CS, Mao X, Gittis AH (2019) State
transitions in the substantia nigra reticulata predict the onset of motor deficits in
models of progressive dopamine depletion in mice. Elife 8.
Wu T, Hallett M, Chan P (2015) Motor automaticity in Parkinson's disease. Neurobiol Dis
82:226-234.
878
879

880   **Figures**

BEHAVIOR

Training

Baseline

EXPERIMENTAL MANIPULATION

Surgery & Pharmacology

OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

Behavior & neurophysiology

Histology

Time ➡

1 week

882   **Figure 1.**   Experimental timeline.

Figure 2.　　Behavioral task and baseline performance. *A*, Port locations (top) and timing

of task events (bottom). Ipsilateral (I) and contralateral (C) are defined relative to the side of

brain targeted for surgery (always left). Cyan represents ipsilateral choices, magenta

represents contralateral choices. *B*, Odor mixtures on SG (stimulus-guided) and IS

(internally-specified) trials (top) and interleaving of SG and IS blocks within a session

(bottom). Horizontal cyan and magenta lines indicate which port(s) were rewarded in each

block: On SG trials, ipsilateral side was rewarded when Odor A > Odor B (cyan),

contralateral side was rewarded when Odor B > Odor A (magenta), and either side was

equally likely to be rewarded when Odor A = Odor B; on all IS trials, Odor A = Odor B and

only one side was rewarded throughout the block. *C,* Baseline (pre-surgery) performance on

SG trials for representative mouse subsequently assigned to the hemi-PD group. Gray lines

show best-fit logistic functions (Materials and Methods) for each session (n = 17). Circles

show average across sessions; solid line shows best-fit logistic function to all choices across

sessions. *D*, Baseline (pre-surgery) performance on IS trials for representative mouse

subsequently assigned to hemi-PD group. Gray lines link ipsilateral- and contralateral-

rewarded IS blocks within the same session (n = 15). Black circles indicate medians. Mouse

chose the ipsilateral port more often on ipsilateral-rewarded blocks (p = $3.05 \times 10_{-5}$, 1-tailed

Wilcoxon signed rank test).

Figure 3. Validation of hemi-PD mouse model. *A*, Representative coronal section (0.97

mm anterior to Bregma) in hemi-PD mouse. 6-OHDA was delivered to the ipsilateral SNc.

Green, Nissl; red, tyrosine hydroxylase. *B*, Behavior in rotation assay. Beginning 10 min.

following delivery of d-amphetamine (IP, 2.5 mg/kg), net ipsilateral rotations (# ipsilateral -

contralateral) were counted for 20 min. Within mouse (n = 5 hemi-PD; n = 3 control

(saline delivered to SNc instead of 6-OHDA)) change in net ipsilateral rotations between pre-

and post-surgery sessions was calculated. Gray, each mouse; black, median. Hemi-PD mice

exhibited more net ipsilateral rotations following surgery (p = 0.0357 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank

sum test). *C*, Baseline activity (odor port entry to reward port exit in each trial) of SNr

neurons during task performance in hemi-PD (dark gray) and control (light gray) mice. Black

lines, medians. Median baseline SNr activity was higher in hemi-PD mice (p = 0.0157, 1-

tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test).

Figure 4. Effect of hemi-parkinsonian state on stimulus-guided (SG) movements. *A*,

Choices and best-fit logistic functions for SG trials in all pre- (gray, n = 30) and post- (black,

n = 42) surgery sessions for a representative hemi-PD mouse. Error bars, ±SEM. Leftward

arrow indicates ipsilateral directional bias post-surgery relative to pre-surgery, quantified

with logistic fits (Materials and Methods). *B*, As in *A*, for a representative control mouse

(tetrode drive implanted to SNr; n = 17 pre-surgery and 33 post-surgery sessions). *C*, Change

in directional bias (post-surgery – pre-surgery) was more ipsilateral for hemi-PD than

control mice (p = 0.0468, 1-tailed unpaired t-test); ipsilateral change in directional bias was

significant for hemi-PD (p = 0.0478, 1-tailed t-test) but not control mice (p = 0.186, 1-tailed

t-test). Horizontal bars, medians; boxes, 25th and 75th percentiles. *D,* Median reaction time

(from go signal to reward port entry) shown separately for pre-surgery (n = 16 sessions) and

post-surgery (n = 12 sessions) ipsilateral and contralateral SG trials for the same mouse as in

A. Only correct trials are included; all choices on 50/50 trials are considered correct. (Error

bars, ±2 SEM). *E,* As in *D*, for a representative control mouse (n = 17 pre-surgery and 33 post-

951   surgery sessions; same representative mouse as in *B*). *F,* Change in median reaction time

952   (post-surgery – pre-surgery) was larger for contralateral than ipsilateral correct SG trials in

953   hemi-PD mice (p = 0.0143, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test). *G,* As in *F,* for control mice (p =

954   0.385, 1-tailed unpaired t-test).

Figure 5. Effect of hemi-parkinsonian state on internally-specified (IS) movements. **A.**

Separately for IS trials in which the ipsilateral and contralateral side was rewarded, median

fraction ipsilateral choices for pre-surgery (n = 65 sessions) and post-surgery (n = 22 sessions)

sessions are shown for a representative hemi-PD mouse. Fraction of ipsilateral choices

increased post-surgery relative to pre-surgery on trials in which the contralateral side was

rewarded, but not on trials in which the ipsilateral side was rewarded (Error bars, ±2 SEM).

B, As in *A*, for a representative control mouse (tetrode drive implanted; n = 14 pre-surgery

and 13 post-surgery sessions) *C.* Change in fraction ipsilateral choices on trials in which

contralateral side was rewarded (post-surgery – pre-surgery) was more ipsilateral for hemi-

PD than control mice (p = 0.0298, 1-tailed unpaired t-test); ipsilateral change was significant

for hemi-PD (p = 0.0115, 1-tailed t-test) but not control mice (p = 0.1004, 1-tailed t-test).

Horizontal bars, medians; boxes, 25th and 75th percentiles. *D,* Median reaction time (from go

signal to reward port entry) shown separately for pre-surgery (n = 65 sessions) and post-

surgery (n = 22 sessions) ipsilateral and contralateral IS trials for the same mouse as in *A*).

Only correct trials are included. (Error bars, ±2 SEM). *E,* As in *D*, for a representative control

mouse (n = 14 pre-surgery and 13 post-surgery sessions, same representative mouse as in *B*).

F, Change in median reaction time (post-surgery – pre-surgery) was larger for contralateral

than ipsilateral IS trials in hemi-PD mice (p = 0.0143, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test). *G,*

As in *F*, for control mice (p = 0.434, 1-tailed unpaired t-test).

1000

Figure 6. Direct comparison between stimulus-guided (SG) and internally-specified (IS)

behavior in hemi-PD mice. *A,* Within-session comparison of % correct between SG and IS

trials for pre- and post-surgery sessions for hemi-PD mice (n = 4). All 50/50 SG trials were

considered correct. Pre-surgery performance was better on IS trials; post-surgery (hemi-

parkinsonian) performance was better on SG trials (p = 6.52×10^{-15}, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank

sum test). Horizontal bars, medians; boxes, 25_{th} and 75_{th} percentiles. (Controls, not pictured,

p = 0.405, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum test, n = 153 pre-surgery sessions, n = 48 post-surgery

sessions). *B,* Within-session comparison of fraction of ipsilateral choices between SG and IS

trials for all hemi-parkinsonian sessions, see Materials and Methods for calculation details.

Hemi-parkinsonian behavior was more ipsilaterally biased on IS than SG trials as compared

to pre-surgery (p = 0.0300, 1-tailed unpaired t-test) (Controls, not pictured, p = 0.707, 1-

tailed unpaired t-test, n = 153 pre-surgery sessions, n = 48 post-surgery sessions). *C,* Within-

session comparison of reaction time between SG and IS trials for all hemi-parkinsonian

sessions. In pre-surgery sessions, reaction times were faster on IS than SG trials for both

directions. In hemi-parkinsonian sessions, reaction times were faster on IS than SG ipsilateral

trials, but did not differ between IS and SG contralateral trials. To control for multiple

comparisons, we first ran a Kruskal-Wallis as an ANOVA measure. If this test rejected the

null that all groups are from the same distribution, we then investigated specific comparisons

based on our planned analyses ($p = 9.83 \times 10^{-7}$, Kruskal-Wallis test; $p_{pre\_ipsi} = 1.25 \times 10^{-12}$, 1-

tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; $p_{post\_ipsi} = 6.10 \times 10^{-5}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; p_{pre_contra}

$= 4.65 \times 10^{-12}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; $p_{post\_contra} = 0.0901$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign

rank test). (Controls, not pictured, $p = 5.11 \times 10^{-6}$, Kruskal-Wallis test; $p_{pre\_ipsi} = 9.95 \times 10^{-10}$, 1-

tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; $p_{post\_ipsi} = 7.27 \times 10^{-7}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; p_{pre_contra}

$= 7.12 \times 10^{-23}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign rank test; $p_{post\_contra} = 2.41 \times 10^{-4}$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon sign

rank test).

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

Figure 7.   SNr activity during movement preparation in behaving hemi-PD and control

mice. **A,** Rasters (top) and peri-event time histograms (bottom) for an example neuron from a

hemi-PD mouse aligned to odor valve open and segregated by choice. Histograms are

smoothed with a Gaussian filter; shading, ±SEM. **B,C,** Mean firing rate during movement

preparation epoch (between odor valve open and go signal) did not differ between

populations of neurons in hemi-PD and control mice on ipsilateral (*B*) or contralateral (*C*)

trials ($p_{ipsi}= 0.0520$; $p_{contra}= 0.0954$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon rank sum tests; n = 183 neurons in 5

hemi-PD mice; 285 neurons in 4 control mice). Horizontal bars, medians. **D,** Distribution of

direction preferences for population of neurons in hemi-PD mice (top) had a smaller range

than in control mice (bottom) ($p = 7.31 \times 10^{-4}$, 2-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test), and more

neurons exhibited a significant preference in control than in hemi-PD mice ($p = 2.20 \times 10^{-16}$,

χ^2-test). Arrowhead, example neuron shown in *A*.

1045

1046

1047

Figure 8. Functional classes of SNr neurons during movement preparation and initiation

in behaving hemi-PD and control mice. *A,* Fraction of neurons with a given direction

preference segregated by whether their average activity during the movement preparation

epoch (beginning 100 ms after the odor valve opens and ending with the go signal)

significantly increased (Inc.), decreased (Dec.) or did not change (No Δ) relative to average

baseline firing rate, for hemi-PD (top) and control (bottom) mice. Proportion of neurons

exhibiting an increase, a decrease, and no change differs between hemi-PD and control mice

($p = 1.32 \times 10^{-11}$, χ2-test = 50.108, df = 2). Similarly, proportion of ipsilateral, contralateral,

and no direction preference neurons differed between hemi-PD and control mice ($p = 2.2 \times$

10^{-16}, χ2-test = 149.58, df = 2). *B,* Fraction of neurons with a given direction preference

segregated by whether their activity during the movement initiation epoch (beginning with

the go signal and ending 100 ms after odor poke out) increased, decreased or did not change

relative to pre-surgery, for hemi-PD (top) and control (bottom) mice. Proportion of neurons

exhibiting an increase, a decrease, and no change did not differ between hemi-PD and

control mice (p = 0.459, χ2-test = 1.5586, df = 2; n = 183 neurons in 5 hemi-PD mice; 285

neurons in 4 control mice); proportion of ipsilateral, contralateral, and no direction

preference neurons differed between hemi-PD and control mice (p = 4.413×10^{-5}, χ2-test =

20.049, df = 2).

1079

1080

1081

1082

Hemi-PD	Decreased FR	No Δ FR	Increased FR	Total
Contralateral	25	5	2	32 (17.5%)
Ipsilateral	7	9	4	20 (10.9%)
Non-selective	67	34	30	131 (71.6%)
Total	99 (54.1%)	48 (26.2%)	36 (19.7%)	183 neurons

Control	Decreased FR	No Δ FR	Increased FR	Total
Contralateral	36	15	54	105 (36.8%)
Ipsilateral	42	18	34	94 (33.0%)
Non-selective	36	10	40	86 (30.2%)
Total	114 (40%)	43 (15.1%)	128 (44.9%)	285 neurons

1083

1084 **Table 1:** Direction preference and activity change from baseline for all SNr neurons recorded

1085 from hemi-PD (upper) and control (lower) mice.

1086

1087

1088

1089

Figure 9. SNr activity on stimulus-guided (SG) and internally-specified (IS) trials in

hemi-PD mice. *A,* Rasters (top) and peri-event histograms (bottom), on stimulus-guided (SG,

left) and internally-specified (IS, right) trials, for an example neuron from a hemi-PD mouse

aligned to odor valve open and segregated by choice. Histograms are smoothed with a

Gaussian filter; shading, ±SEM. *B,* Direction preference on SG and IS trials for population of

SNr neurons in hemi-PD mice. Each neuron is represented by a pair of connected gray

symbols; only neurons with significant preference ($p < 0.05$) on SG and/or IS trials are

shown. Preference was more contralateral on IS than SG trials ($p = 0.0132$, 1-tailed Wilcoxon

sign rank test, n = 79). Black symbols, medians.

1099