A retinal circuit that vetoes optokinetic responses to fast

visual motion

Adam Mani, Xinzhu Yang, Tiffany Zhao, Megan L. Leyrer, Daniel Schreck,

David M. Berson

Department of Neuroscience, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA.

Abstract

Optokinetic nystagmus (OKN) complements the vestibulo-ocular reflex (VOR) to

stabilize the retinal image during head rotation. OKN is driven by the ON

direction-selective ganglion cells (ON DSGCs), a rare class of retinal output neuron

that encodes both the direction and speed of global retinal slip. The cells and synaptic

circuits that give ON DSGCs their directional tuning are well known, but those

dictating their slow-speed preference (and thus OKN's) remain enigmatic. Here, we

probe this circuit through patch recordings, functional imaging, genetic manipulation,

and serial electron microscopic reconstruction in mouse retina. We confirm earlier

evidence that feedforward glycinergic inhibition is the main suppressor of ON DSGC

responses to fast motion and reveal a surprising source for this inhibition ― the

VGluT3 amacrine cell, a retinal interneuron that releases both glycine and glutamate,

exciting some neurons and inhibiting others. We find that VGluT3 cells respond

robustly to fast global motion and that their output reaches most RGC types, as well as

a diverse group of amacrine and bipolar cells. They *enhance* the response of ON-OFF

DSGCs to fast motion, while *suppressing* it in ON DSGCs. Together, our results identify

a novel role for VGluT3 cells, limiting the range of retinal slip speeds that drive image-

stabilizing eye movements. More broadly, they suggest VGluT3 cells shape the

response of many RGCs and amacrine cells to fast motion.

27   **Introduction**

Animals see better when their visual systems are supported by sensorimotor

networks for image stabilization. Stabilizing the image on the photoreceptor array

simplifies crucial visual computations, such as extracting weak, noisy signals or

distinguishing the motion of objects from retinal image motion resulting from the

observer's own eye, head, or body movements.

Image-stabilizing reflexes are extremely widespread among animals with image-

forming eyes. In vertebrates, rotation of the head triggers vestibular and visual

feedback signals to brainstem and cerebellum oculomotor networks which generate

eye counter-rotation to cancel the global drift of the retinal image (retinal slip). These

innate responses comprise the vestibulo-ocular reflex (VOR) and the optokinetic

reflex (OKR) [1–3]. Both produce nystagmus, in which slow image-stabilizing eye

movements are periodically interrupted by fast resets of gaze in the opposite

direction.

Vestibular and visual image-stabilizing reflexes complement one another in the

velocity domain. The VOR plays the primary image-stabilizing role during rapid

rotatory motion of the head. Canal signals are strong, driving a powerful VOR that

nulls most of the retinal image motion. The modest residual slip triggers the OKR. At

slow speeds, for which VOR gain is weak, OKR is the dominant stabilization

mechanism and the two reflexes sum to achieve nearly perfect stabilization over a

broad range of rotational speeds. The OKR is speed-tuned. It must be responsive to

slow slip velocities to compensate for the limitations of the VOR. but it must be

insensitive to fast speeds or it would thwart fast eye movements, such as saccades or

the fast resetting phase of nystagmus.

Among the more than three dozen types of mammalian retinal ganglion cells (RGCs)

[4–6], only a very specific subset appear to participate in visually driven image

stabilization. These are direction-selective ganglion cells (DSGCs), and mainly those of

a specific subclass – the ON DSGCs. They send their axons almost exclusively to the

nuclei of the accessory optic system (AOS) [1,2,7], which relays their retinal slip

signals to the vestibulocerebellum and through it to the oculomotor system. This

circuit, including apparently homologous ON DSGCs, is highly conserved across

vertebrates. The far more common ON-OFF class of DSGCs makes only a small

contribution to this circuit, projecting instead mainly to the lateral geniculate nucleus

and superior colliculus.

ON DSGCs, like the OKR they drive, respond best to slow speeds of retinal slip,

typically ~1°/s, depending on species and stimulus [2,8,9]. They are effectively silent

during fast visual motion, as during saccades or the fast phase of nystagmus. By

contrast, ON-OFF DSGCs respond well to such fast motion [9] (but see [10]). Other

types of RGCs exhibit diverse speed tuning profiles, with some highly responsive to

very fast motion.

ON DSGCs thus encode both components of the vector of retinal slip used by the

image-stabilization system – its speed and direction. The mechanisms conferring

direction selectivity on these and other DSGCs, anchored by starburst amacrine cells

(SACs), have been studied in great detail [11–14]. By contrast, much less is

understood about the cell types, neurotransmitters, and synaptic circuits that confer

slow speed tuning upon ON DSGCs or distinct speed-tuning profiles upon other RGC

types.

Diverse mechanisms may underlie slow-speed tuning in ON DSGCs. Excitatory drive

might be attenuated at higher speeds due to suboptimal spatiotemporal summation of

excitatory inputs across the dendritic arbor [15] or intrinsic membrane properties

that filter out the high-frequency excitatory currents induced by fast motion.

Alternatively, fast motion might trigger presynaptic inhibition of the bipolar cells (and

VGluT3 amacrine cells [16]) which provide excitatory input to ON DSGCs.

In an alternative candidate mechanism, amacrine cells activated by fast global retinal

slip would provide direct feedforward inhibition onto the ON DSGC. A study in rabbit

retina showed that just such a circuit confers slow speed tuning on ON DSGCs, and

demonstrated that the inhibitory transmitter is glycine [9]. The closely related

ON-OFF DSGCs lack this glycinergic input and respond well to fast speeds [9].

Here in mouse retina we have used serial block face electron microscopy (SEM), patch

recordings, and cell-type-specific optogenetics and chemogenetics to delineate the

synaptic networks responsible for vetoing ON DSGC responses at high speeds. Our

observations in mice echo the rabbit findings: direct feedforward glycinergic

inhibition of ON DSGCs is primarily responsible [9] for their slow speed preference.

We next exploit connectomics to identify an unexpected source of this glycinergic

inhibition — the VGluT3 amacrine cell — an unusual amacrine cell that makes

excitatory (glutamatergic) synapses onto some postsynaptic targets and inhibitory

(glycinergic) synapses onto others [17–19]. A prior optogenetic study found an

excitatory glutamatergic VGluT3 input to ON DSGCs [16]. Though we replicate that

result in a few ON DSGCs, the dominant synaptic influence is glycinergic inhibition.

We demonstrate that this provides the main basis for vetoing the ON DSGCs response

to fast global retinal slip.

Previous studies have shown that VGluT3 cells have strong receptive-field surrounds

[16,20], which would seem incompatible with robust responses to fast global motion.

However, our calcium imaging data demonstrate robust activation of VGluT3

dendrites by global motion, weakened surrounds when the stimulus is moving, and a

marked preference for fast motion.

We confirm that the other major class of DSGCs, the ON-OFF DSGCs — receive only

excitatory glutamatergic input from VGluT3 cells. This *augments* their responses to

fast motion, in contrast to the suppressive influence in ON DSGCs. The connectomic

data document widespread VGluT3 output to most types of RGCs. This suggests that

these amacrine cells may play a major role in sculpting the retinal output during fast

motion, by enhancing the responses of some RGCs and inhibiting others. In ON DSGCs,

it vetoes the response of the image-stabilization system to fast velocities such as those

generated by gaze shifts, neatly separating these two visuo-oculomotor realms.

Results

Inhibition at fast speeds underlies slow speed tuning in mouse ON DSGCs*.*

To explore the speed-tuning mechanism, we made patch recordings of synaptic

currents and spiking responses in ON DSGC during presentation of full-field gratings

drifting in the preferred direction at various speeds. We located these rare RGCs using

2-photon imaging of fluorescent reporters (Hoxd10-GFP or Pcdh9-Cre) or by

surveying extracellular spike responses of RGCs of intermediate size for characteristic

responses to flashed stimuli (see Supplemental Information and Methods). In all

cases, we confirmed the identity of ON DSGCs from their selectivity for the direction of

grating drift and through dye-filling and imaging of their characteristic dendritic

morphology (see Supplemental Information and Supp. Fig. S1).

As expected, ON DSGCs were remarkable among RGCs in preferring slower speeds of

grating drift (Fig. 1A-C, blue curves). Optimal spiking responses were obtained at

retinal speeds of 150 ± 11 μm/s (angular velocity of 5 ± 2°/s; mean ± SEM; n = 63),

close to previously reported values for mouse ON-DSGCs and OKN gain [2]. This is

probably a slight overestimate of preferred speed; about one in four cells responded

best to the slowest speed tested (76 μm/s) and thus may have preferred even slower

speeds. Spike responses were strongly attenuated at speeds above the optimum,

dropping to half their maximum spike rate at roughly twice the optimum speed (360

± 23 μm/s, 12 ± 0.8°/s). Many other RGC types responded to much higher speeds of

grating drift (Fig. 1C). For example, ON-OFF DSGCs exhibited optimum speeds about

four times faster than those of ON DSGCs (600 ± 70 μm/s; half max. speeds 2000 ±

160 μm/s, 67 ± 5 °/s, (n = 17), Fig. 1C). Some RGC types responded to even higher

speeds. For example, ON alpha cells maintained better than half-maximal responses

even above 3000 μm/s (100 °/s) . Other RGC types, such as ON-delayed RGCs [21],

shared the slow speed tuning of ON DSGCs.

We hypothesized that the preference of mouse ON-DSGCs for slow speeds would

result from direct glycinergic inhibition, as demonstrated in rabbit retina [9]. To test

this idea, we first used whole-cell voltage clamp to record excitatory and inhibitory

currents evoked in ON DSGCs by various speeds of grating drift in the preferred

direction (Fig. 1A,B, red, orange curves). Both excitatory and inhibitory input were

broadly tuned for speed, but with different profiles. Excitation was present at the

slowest speeds we tested, but rose with speed, peaking at speeds five times faster

than those evoking the most robust spiking (710 ± 90 μm/s (n = 11), or 24 °/s).

Excitation declined to half its maximum at 2290 ± 170 μm/s. Thus, although

excitatory drive is affected by speed, this is insufficient to explain the slow speed

tuning in ON DSGCs.

Though inhibition was strongest at speeds close to those evoking the strongest

excitation (1220 ± 170 μm/s, declining half max. > 2900 μm/s, n = 12), it was

relatively weaker than excitation at slow speeds and relatively stronger at fast ones.

The crossover of the two curves occurred at ~700 μm/s, above which nearly all

spiking was suppressed (Fig. 1A). Taken together, the above results imply that slow

speed tuning of ON DSGCs reflects a shift in excitatory-inhibitory balance in favor of

inhibition at higher speeds, as in the rabbit [9].

For most speeds, the excitatory current traces exhibited a single prominent peak for

each cycle of the grating (Fig. 1B), presumably reflecting glutamatergic input from ON

bipolar cells, their dominant source of excitation. In contrast, inhibitory current traces

often exhibited minor peaks roughly anti-phase to the excitation, when the dark bars

of the grating overlie the receptive field. The OFF pathway may therefore make a

larger contribution to inhibition than to excitation. At higher speeds, the inhibitory

current exhibited not only the stimulus-locked modulatory component but also an

underlying continuous inhibitory conductance. This was much less apparent for

excitation. This confirms earlier observations in rabbit ON DSGCs.

Fast retinal slip triggers feedforward glycinergic inhibition of ON DSGCs

We repeated these experiments adding receptor antagonists to the bath to test the

hypothesis that the feed-forward inhibition evoked at fast speeds was glycine-

mediated, as in rabbit (Fig. 1D,E). The glycine receptor antagonist strychnine sharply

attenuated the inhibition, dramatically reducing the steady plateau of inhibition

evoked by fast grating motion. At speeds evoking maximum inhibitory current, total

inhibition was reduced by more than half its control value (57±4% decrease in charge

transfer; n=3. See note in Supplemental Information). In contrast, blockade of $GABA_A$

receptors alone (SR95531) had only a modest effect (Fig. 1D,E; 17±7% decrease in

charge transfer; n=3). Simultaneous application of both antagonists abolished all

inhibitory current in the ON DSGCs. Thus, effectively all inhibition driven by fast

motion is mediated by $GABA_A$ and glycine receptors under our experimental

conditions.

Taken together, these results demonstrate that fast motion triggers direct glycinergic

inhibition of ON DSGCs, as first shown in rabbit [9]

Figure 1. Inhibitory mechanism underlying slow speed tuning in ON DSGCs. , (A) Top: Speed
tuning in the response of ON DSGCs to moving gratings, as revealed by spiking (blue) and synaptic
currents (excitation: red; inhibition: orange). Curves are population averages; all are normalized to
their maxima. Shading denotes standard error of the mean (S.E.M.). Currents, expressed as charge
transfer, were measured at a holding voltage of -65 mV (excitation) and +20 mV (inhibition). Bottom:
the grating stimulus shown to scale with a schematic ON DSGC receptive field (center and surround;
red circles). (B) Time course of mean spiking and current responses (±S.E.M.) to different grating
speeds; color scheme as in A. (C) Distribution of speed preferences among RGCs of different functional
types as indexed by the highest speed capable of evoking a response half that evoked by the optimal
speed. (D) Pharmacological analysis of the inhibitory conductance. Selective glycinergic blockade
(purple; strychnine) strongly reduces the inhibition seen under control conditions (orange), while
blocking ionotropic GABA receptors (black; SR95531) had a weaker effect. Combined application (blue)
blocked all inhibition. (E) Effects of GABA blockade (black; top row) or glycinergic blockade (purple;
bottom row) on the time course of inhibitory currents. In both cases, the other antagonist was
subsequently added to the first, blocking all inhibition (blue).

Electron microscopic reconstructions identify VGluT3 amacrine cells as the

primary source of glycinergic synapses onto ON DSGCs.

Most glycinergic retinal inhibition derives from small-field amacrine cells with highly

branched dendritic arbors [22,23]. We searched for synaptic contacts from such cells

onto ON DSGCs in an existing serial blockface electron microscopic (SEM) dataset of

the adult mouse inner plexiform layer spanning >200 μm (volume 'k0725' [24]). We

focused our analysis mainly on a single previously reconstructed presumed ON DSGC

(Fig. 2) [15]. Numerous anatomical features identify this as an ON DSGC. Its dendrites

narrowly costratify with the processes of starburst amacrine cells (SACs), with nearly

the entire arbor within the ON SAC plexus (Fig. 2B-E). There, they cofasciculate with

SAC processes (Fig. 2A) and receive numerous wrap-around synaptic contacts [12]

from SAC varicosities (Fig. 2F, G). Analysis of the orientation of the presynaptic SAC

processes confirmed the asymmetric connectivity that confers direction selectivity

upon DSGCs [12–15]. The minor OFF branches, a common feature of ON DSGC arbors

in mice [2], receive some OFF SAC contacts. Presumptive ON-OFF DSGCs in the volume

shared many of these attributes but had smaller dendritic arbors, higher branching

density, and a larger fraction of their arbor in the OFF SAC plexus.

To identify possible sources of glycinergic amacrine cell inhibition to this ON DSGC,

we first marked all the non-ribbon synaptic contacts we could find (n=431; Fig. 2F-I).

For each contact, we reconstructed enough of the presynaptic process to sort it into

one of three groups (Fig. 2A-E): SACs; wide-field amacrine cells; or candidate

glycinergic neurons. SACs were recognizable from their narrow stratification within

the ON or OFF SAC plexus, thin straight connecting dendrites, and large wrap-around

varicosities targeting mainly other SACs and DSGCs. Wide-field cells had sparser

branching and fewer varicosities and were not strictly confined to the SAC plexuses.

Candidate glycinergic neurons were much more highly branched, with arbors that

extended well outside the SAC plexuses.

SAC inputs accounted for fully 83% of the non-ribbon contacts (n=340; 317 ON and

23 OFF). At least by this measure, GABAergic SAC input dominates the inhibition of

ON DSGCs. Candidate glycinergic inputs (n=41) were the next most common,

comprising 10% of non-ribbon inputs, with wide-field inputs nearly as common at 7%

of all input (n=27). A small minority of inputs (n=23; 5%) could not be identified

because too small a fraction of the arbor could be reconstructed, and were excluded

from the sample.

We extensively reconstructed all of the presumptive glycinergic neurons identified by

our initial screen. To our surprise, nearly all of them appeared to be VGluT3 amacrine

cells, as documented below (n=38 synapses from 16 cells). Two were synapses from

Type H18 amacrine cells [25,26] and one was from an unidentified medium-field type.

We detected no synaptic inputs from any of the many other types of small-field

amacrine cell types, even after examining a large sample of such cells reconstructed in

another study [26]. We conclude that VGluT3 amacrine cells are by far the best

candidate glycinergic cell type shaping the slow-speed tuning of ON DSGCs.

Multiple structural observations confirm these as VGluT3 amacrine cells (Fig. 3). First,

their stratification is appropriate (Fig. 3E, F, J). They arborize most heavily in the

middle of the inner plexiform layer (IPL), between the ON and OFF SAC plexuses, but

extend sparse processes into and even a bit beyond those plexuses . Their cell bodies

lie in the inner nuclear layer, are of appropriate size, and are distributed with spacing

that suggests a regular mosaic (Fig. 3A). Their dendritic-field diameters (106 ± 7 μm,

n = 10 cells) are in line with earlier data [18,20] and overlap extensively with a

coverage factor of at least 5 (Fig. 3A, inset).

Input and output patterns matched previous reports on VGluT3 cells, and were very

consistent across the population of reconstructed cells (Fig 3I, Supplemental Table

S5), confirming other evidence that they belong to a single type. In keeping with

functional evidence for input from both the ON and OFF pathways to VGluT3 cells, our

reconstructed cells receive ribbon synapses from diverse ON and OFF bipolar cells.

The complement of bipolar inputs largely reflects their dendritic stratification (Fig.

3G, I) with most input from OFF types 3a, 3b, and 4 and ON types 5o, 5i, 5t, and little

from bipolar types stratifying at the IPL margins (OFF types 1,2 and GluMI [27]), and

ON types 6, 7, 8 and 9. Their outputs include all the ganglion-cell targets so far

identified in physiological studies (Supplemental Table S5). These included W3 cells

[16,28], OFF transient alpha cells [29], Suppressed-by-Contrast cells of several types

[29,30] including the ON Delayed RGC [21] (see Discussion), both ON and ON-OFF

DSGCs [16,28], and M1 ipRGCs [31] (For RGC type nomenclature see [4] and

accompanying online database). However, our SEM analysis suggests that their

outputs are much more diverse than previously appreciated, with contacts to the

great majority of known RGC types [4], including OFF sustained alpha , Jam-B [32], ON

alpha, F-mini-ON [33], F-mini-OFF [33], OFF transient medium RF, and diverse

varieties of smaller field RGCs stratifying between the ChAT bands [34]. Two ipRGC

types notably not targeted by VGluT3 are the M2 [35] and M5 (PixON) [36,37] types,

which stratify largely outside the VGluT3 plexus. VGluT3 cells also synapsed upon

diverse types of amacrine cells, though only rarely onto other VGluT3 cells or SACs.

We have not reconstructed most amacrine-cell targets, though WF cells stratifying

between the SAC plexuses were among the most common recipients [38]. VGluT3

outputs, like their ribbon inputs, were distributed most heavily within and between

the SAC plexuses (Fig. 3H), though they were also sparsely present in the distal IPL.

Some of these are somato-dendritic synapses onto M1 ipRGCs. One unexpected

feature of the VGluT3 cells in this volume was a consistent upward (roughly dorsal)

displacement of the dendritic arbor relative to the soma (Fig. 3B-D).

Figure 2. Amacrine cell inputs onto an ON DSGC. (A) SEM reconstruction of the distribution and sources of all detected amacrine-cell synaptic contacts onto an ON DSGC. Dendrites of the ganglion cell are shown in black except for the sparse branches in the OFF sublayer (red). Synaptic contacts are plotted as dots, color coded by amacrine-cell source (see key), as determined by reconstruction of presynaptic cells. The plexus of ON SAC dendrites is shown in gray. Boundaries of the SEM volume appear as a fine rectangle. (B-E) side (vertical) views of depth of these inputs within the IPL. Gray bands mark the ON and OFF SAC plexuses. (G-I) Example SEM images of amacrine-cell synapses onto the ON DSGC. The ON-DSGC is shown in yellow. The presynaptic cells are color coded as in A-E: VGluT3 cells (F,G), an ON SAC (H) and a WF amacrine cell (I).

Figure 3 Morphology, input and output of VGluT3 amacrine cells. (A-D). Dendritic arbors and
mosaic of VGluT3 amacrine cells reconstructed in the k0725 SEM volume as seen in top view (*en fac*e).
Enlarged view (inset) shows that local regions contain dendrites of at least 5 VGluT3 cells. B-D: Same
dendritic profiles as in A but divided arbitrarily into three groups to provide a clearer view of single
arbors. (E,F) Side (vertical) views of the stratification of reconstructed VGluT3 cells within the IPL,
shown together (E) and, for 3 cells, individually (F). (G, H) Side view of the location in depth of ribbon
inputs (F) and synaptic outputs (G) of VGluT3 cells. Gray bands in E-H mark the ON and OFF SAC
plexuses; VGluT3 cells appear gold in G and H. (I) Heatmap plot of the fraction of all ribbon synaptic
inputs derived from each bipolar type, identified at the top (G – GluMI, X – XBC, R – rod bipolar cell).
Bar at top shows pooled data for all identified ribbon contacts (n=710). Lower panel illustrates the
consistency of this pattern across individual cells, shown one per row in descending order of the
number of identified ribbons. (J) Stratification profile of reconstructed VGluT3 processes (red; n=17) in
relation to those of ON and OFF SACs (black). Data are normalized to the ON SAC plexus.

VGluT3 cells make functional glycinergic synapses onto ON DSGCs

Of the three types of amacrine cells shown by the SEM analysis to provide input to ON

DSGCs, only one – the VGluT3 cell – is known to be glycinergic. Thus, VGluT3 cells are

apparently the source of most, if not all, the glycinergic suppression of ON DSGCs

during rapid motion. The other two presynaptic types – SAC and widefield amacrine

cells – use GABA as their sole inhibitory transmitter [23,39–41]. This is a surprising

conclusion because VGluT3 ACs have been reported to provide glutamatergic

excitation to ON DSGCs, not glycinergic inhibition [16]. To test for the inferred

glycinergic influence, we recorded postsynaptic currents evoked in ON DSGCs by

optogenetic depolarization of VGluT3 cells. For these studies, we crossed a novel

strain of VGluT3-Cre mice with a strain that expresses channelrhodopsin2 (ChR2) in a

Cre-dependent manner (Ai32) (See Methods and Supplemental Information, Supp.

Fig. S2). Conventional photoreceptor-mediated light responses and cholinergic

transmission were suppressed with a cocktail of synaptic blockers ('photoreceptor

block'; L-AP4, ACET, hexamethonium [16]). Optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells

evoked robust inhibitory currents in 81% of the ON DSGCs tested (13/16 cells) (Fig.

4A-C). Peak inhibitory postsynaptic currents averaged 33 ± 4 pA for single light

pulses. We also delivered optogenetic pulse trains to mimic the temporal modulation

of VGluT3 cells during grating motion (Fig. 4D). Evoked inhibitory currents persisted

in postsynaptic ON DSGCs throughout a 5 s train over the full range of frequencies

tested (1-8 Hz, corresponding to grating speeds of roughly 400 - 3000 μm/s for

experiments shown in Fig. 1). At higher stimulus frequencies, IPSCs summed

temporally to produce a continuous inhibitory conductance (Fig. 4D bottom traces),

much as they did during rapid grating motion (Fig. 1B, yellow traces). Thus, inhibition

of ON DGSCs by VGluT3 cells exhibits kinetics compatible with their proposed role in

vetoing responses to fast motion.

The inhibition evoked by activation of VGluT3 cells was glycinergic, as expected.

Blocking ionotropic glutamate receptors (CNQX, D-AP5) had little effect on the

optogenetically induced inhibitory conductance (Fig 4A, B; mean reduction in

maximal current of 28 ± 7%, 5 cells), whereas further blockade of glycine receptors

(strychnine) virtually eliminated the current (decrease of 81 ± 5%, 4 cells). The

broad-spectrum glutamate blockade used ensures that these photostimulation-

induced currents are mediated optogenetically, not because rods and cones are

driving glutamatergic signals through synaptic networks. It also excludes indirect

effects mediated by evoked release of glutamate from VGluT3 cells. We conclude that

these amacrine cells inhibit ON DSGCs through direct glycinergic synaptic input.

We reversed the order of drug application in three cells. When strychnine was the

first inhibitory blocker applied, the optogenetically evoked inhibition was completely

suppressed in one cell (Fig 4C, left). However, in two other cells, strychnine left at

least half the inhibition intact. This residual inhibition was abolished upon further

addition of the glutamate receptor antagonists (Fig 4C, right). Presumably this

strychnine-resistant inhibitory current occurs when VGluT3 activation

glutamatergically excites one or more GABAergic amacrine cell types that synapse

onto ON DSGCs (see Discussion).

Control experiments confirmed that off-target ChR2 expression in Müller cells was not

responsible for the evoked currents in ON DSGCs; that other known targets of VGluT3

input responded as expected to the optogenetic stimulus (Fig. 4E); and that the

pharmacological effects shown in Fig. 4B,C were not simply the result of rundown of

optogenetic responses over trials (Supplemental Information, Supp. Fig. S3).

To evaluate a previous report that VGluT3 cells provide glutamatergic excitation to

ON DSGCs [16], rather than glycinergic inhibition as found here, we repeated these

experiments with ON DSGCs clamped at the chloride reversal potential.

Optogenetically evoked EPSCs were detected in only two of the 16 cells tested (12%),

with peak currents of 10 ± 1 pA (Fig. 4F, G). The excitation was mediated by

glutamate: it persisted following application of strychnine, but was eliminated by

application of the ionotropic glutamate receptor blockade (Fig. 4G). Both of those cells

also exhibited evoked IPSCs when clamped at 0 mV.

Figure 4. Postsynaptic currents evoked in ON DSGCs by optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells.
(A) Raw inhibitory current trace (V_{hold}: +20 mV) in a single ON DSGC in response to optogenetic
stimulation during the period marked by interrupted vertical lines. "Photoreceptor block" consists of L-
AP4, ACET and Hexamethonium. (B) Pharmacological effects on the evoked inhibitory current in two
ON DSGCs (left and right panels; left panel from same cell as in A). The sequence of drug application is
listed above; current traces are smoothed. (C) As for B, but with glycinergic blockade preceding
glutamatergic blockade. (D) Inhibitory currents in an ON DSGCs in response to optogenetic pulse trains
of frequencies 1, 2, 4, 8 Hz. Pulse width: 100 ms. (E) Optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells evokes
inhibitory currents in a Suppressed by Contrast RGC (V_{hold}: +20 mV), and excitatory currents in an ON-
OFF DSGC (V_{hold}: -65 mV; both under photoreceptor block). (F) Excitatory currents (raw) evoked in an

402 ON DSGC by optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells. V_{hold}: -65 mV. (G) Pharmacological effects on this
403 current in the same cell.
404

Chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 cells reduces fast-motion inhibition of ON

DSGCs

We tested the effects of chemogenetically suppressing VGluT3 cells on the inhibition

of ON DSGCs by fast motion. We used a DREADD system (Designer Receptor

Exclusively Activated By Designer Drugs) in VGluT3-Cre mice, expressing the hM4Di

receptor in VGluT3 cells either by intraocular injection of a Cre-dependent viral vector

or by crossing VGluT3-Cre mice with Cre-dependent DREADD mice (Methods). In

either case, bath-application of the DREADD ligand (CNO) markedly reduced the

inhibitory currents induced by drifting gratings at all speeds (Fig. 5A, B). At speeds

evoking maximal inhibition, CNO reduced inhibitory charge transfer by 43 ± 7% (n =

3) for viral experiments and 38 ± 6% (n = 3) for those based on the genetic cross. The

same ligand had no effect on inhibition in an ON DSGC in a DREADD-free mouse (Fig.

5C).

The chemogenetic approach (Fig. 5A, B) was less effective than strychnine (Fig. 1D) in

reducing the motion-induced inhibition in ON DSGCs. Indeed, addition of strychnine

during the chemogenetic manipulation further reduced the inhibition (Fig. 5D, E).

This could reflect incomplete chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 output or

alternative sources of glycinergic inhibition beyond VGluT3 cells. Application of CNO

scaled down the currents by about the same factor across speeds (Fig 5A, B, E) while

preserving the kinetics (Fig. 5E), which is consistent with incomplete suppression of

VGluT3 (see Supplemental Information and Discussion).

Taken together, the above results suggest that the native inhibition in ON DSGCs at

high speeds is provided at least to a large extent by glycine release from VGluT3 cells,

although our effort to suppress VGluT3 signaling was only partially effective.

VGluT3 cells augment fast-motion responses in ON-OFF DSGCs

We found that the other direction-selective class, the ON-OFF DSGCs, were excited by

optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells excites (Fig.4E), in agreement with earlier work

[16,28]. Thus, VGluT3 cells appear to exert essentially opposite signs of effect on the

two DSGC classes. ON-OFF DSGCs responded well to fast gratings that induced strong

glycinergic suppression in ON DSGCs (Fig. 5F, 1C). This suggested that glutamate

release from VGluT3 cells may augment ON-OFF DSGC responses in this range of

speeds. Indeed, chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 cells reduced the excitation

evoked in ON-OFF DSGCs by fast gratings moving in the preferred direction ($17 \pm 3\%$

reduction in excitatory charge transfer from its control value; Fig. 5G). The reduction

was more pronounced at faster speeds: the speed response curves (Fig. 5G) were

shifted towards lower speeds at the falling branch ($\Delta = 400 \pm 160$ μm/s at half max. of

the control curves). Though incomplete blockade of VGluT3 cells may underrepresent

these influences, most of the residual excitatory current presumably represents

bipolar ribbon synaptic input. Thus, during rapid visual motion, VGluT3 cells affect

the two DSGC classes in opposing ways, enhancing responses in ON-OFF DSGCs while

suppressing ON DSGCs.

Figure 5. Chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 cells alters speed tuning of ON and ON-OFF
DSGCs. Effect of DREADD-mediated suppression of VGluT3 cells on speed tuning in ON DSGCs (A-E)
and in ON-OFF DSGCs (F,G). (A, B) Application of the DREADD ligand CNO (red trace) partially
suppressed inhibitory currents evoked by moving gratings in ON DSGCs under control conditions
(blue), regardless of whether the method for Cre-dependent DREADD expression was intraocular
injection of a Cre-dependent virus (A) or through a genetic cross (B). V_{hold} : +20 mV. (C) Control
experiment showing that CNO has no effect when applied in a DREADD-free retina from a HoxD10-GFP
mouse. (D) Most inhibition that remains after CNO application is blocked by further addition of the
glycine-receptor antagonist strychnine.-(E) Individual current traces of the ON DSGC in D under the
same pharmacological conditions and using the same color scheme as in D. Grating speed: 1060 µm/s.
(F) Spiking and synaptic excitation in ON-OFF DSGCs as a function of grating speed. V_{hold} : -65 mV (G)
Speed tuning profiles of excitatory charge in ON-OFF DSGCs , before and after application of CNO. For
experiments in F and G, DREADD was expressed through a genetic cross.
465
466

VGluT3 dendrites are strongly activated by fast global motion

The foregoing results imply that fast motion triggers VGluT3 output. To provide more

direct evidence on this point, we recorded their calcium responses using GCaMP6

expressed selectively in these cells using a genetic cross (VGluT3-Cre x Ai148) [42].

VGluT3 dendrites exhibited robust calcium signals in response to the motion of full-

field grating stimuli, especially at the fast speeds that trigger feedforward glycinergic

inhibition of ON DSGCs. Speed tuning was highly consistent for different ROIs within

each field of view, and across most fields of view (FOV; Fig. 6C), and at different

depths within the VGluT3 plexus. Some FOVs exhibited an unusually robust response

to the fastest speeds (Fig. 6C, right panel).

The robust response to extended stimuli was unexpected because VGluT3 receptive

fields have strong suppressive surrounds [16,20,42]. Indeed, calcium responses were

greatly enhanced when we restricted the same gratings to a circular patch centered

on the FOV (345 µm diam.; Fig. 6D). This enhancement was apparent at all speeds, and

quadrupled the response to the optimal speed. Slow gratings that failed to drive

responses when presented full-field now evoked clear Ca^{2+} signals. Nonetheless, the

high-speed preference remained.

To probe the spatial organization of these surround effects, we presented spots or

masked gratings of various sizes centered on the FOV (Fig. 6E,F). Area-response

profiles based on spot stimuli closely resembled those reported earlier based on patch

recordings from VGluT3 somas [20](Fig. 6E; green curve), with strong surround

suppression and maximal responses for spots ~200 µm in diameter (ON response:

204 ±10 µm; 20 ROIs. OFF response: 217±12 µm; 19 ROIs). Grating patches (blue

curve) produced a markedly different area-response profile, with much less response

attenuation as grating patches extended into the surround. For the largest stimuli

tested (930 µm diam.) grating responses persisted about a quarter of their maximum

response (26 ± 3%, 28 ROIs), whereas spot responses were suppressed to less than a

tenth of their maximum (ON: 8 ± 1%, 20 ROIs; OFF 4 ± 1%, 19 ROIs). Further, when

gratings were used, the optimum size of the stimulus was roughly doubled (408 ± 10

µm; 28 ROIs). We conclude that though VGluT3 cells have strong receptive-field

surrounds, the surround suppression is stimulus-dependent and permits robust

responses to global retinal motion.

The difference in surround suppression between the two stimuli (Fig. 6E) could arise

from the presence or absence of continuous motion. Alternatively it could be the

result of a contrast increase during the stimulus time. The spot stimulus by its nature

is a step in overall contrast (positive or negative) with respect to the preceding and

surrounding background. The gratings however, were presented on a gray

background, with the mean change in overall contrast being zero. We thus tested new

sets of spots and gratings, with overall contrast in the two stimuli equal and positive

(Fig. 6F; see Methods). The area-response functions for spots resembled those seen

previously (Fig. 6E), though the lower contrast weakened the responses. The

surround suppression for masked gratings, however, was stronger than for zero mean

gratings. Despite this, receptive fields sizes assessed with gratings were once again

larger than those measured with spots of equal contrast (Fig. 6F). Therefore, the

weaker surround suppression in the case of gratings vs. spots, is both due to a smaller

change in contrast, and due to the continuous motion.

Taken together our results suggest that VGluT3 ACs are fit to report global image slip

and do not exhibit a prohibitive surround suppression.

To our surprise, the VGluT3 dendritic Ca^{2+} signals were tuned to the direction of

grating motion. (Fig. 6G, H). Typically, individual ROIs exhibited a preference for

grating motion in either direction along a single axis; 84% of ROIs met the standard

criterion for this form of orientation selectivity (OS; 69 of 82 ROIs, 5 FOVs, 3 mice).

Many ROIs preferred motion in one direction; 57% met the standard criterion for

direction selectivity (DS, 47 ROIs). Only 5% (4 ROIs) showed neither orientation or

direction preference (43% met both criteria). In some FOVs, ROIs were either mostly

orientation selective (Fig. 6G, top) or mostly direction selective (Fig 6G, middle), while

other FOVs contained a mix of OS and DS behavior (Fig 6G, bottom). Overall OS ROIs

(69) were strongly clustered around a preference for dorsoventral axis of motion

($\sim$70° or 250°); a minor second cluster appeared near the nasotemporal axis ($\sim$20° or

200°) (Fig. 6I, left). Preferred directions of DS ROIs (47) clustered mainly near the

nasotemporal axis ($\sim$200°). Note that we defined the preferred orientation as the

preferred axis of motion (not e.g. as the orientation of the bars in the grating).

536
537
Figure 6. Calcium responses in VGluT3 AC dendrites. (A) Part of a field of view of a live flat-
mounted retina at the level of the VGluT3 dendritic plexus, marked by GCaMP6 fluorescence. Yellow
outlines show typical ROIs used to assess local Ca²⁺ signals. (B) Temporal variation in fluorescence
intensity ($\Delta F/F_0$) in two ROIs (top and bottom rows), in response to full-field gratings drifting in one

direction at different speeds, noted above the traces. Individual trials, gray; mean over trials, blue or
magenta. (C) Net calcium response ($\Delta F/F_0$, averaged over the stimulus time) to full-field gratings as
function of speed for four different FOVs; data for all ROIs in the field were pooled. The two left panels
(blue and magenta) include data from the ROIs of the corresponding color in B. (D) As for C, but varying
the extent of the grating to assess surround suppression of the grating response. Responses are greatly
enhanced when the grating moves within a circular mask (345 μm diameter). (E) Area-response
functions for flashed bright spots presented from darkness (green traces) and for drifting gratings
(blue trace). Spot responses are shown separately for the ON (light green) and OFF responses (dark
green). For gratings, size tuning was assessed by presentation within a circular mask of variable size
(speed: 1520 μm/s; direction fixed but chosen arbitrarily, presented from gray background). (F) Same
as in E., but the spots and gratings are matched in net positive contrast relative to the background. (G-I)
Evidence for orientation and direction selectivity of the VGluT3 dendritic plexus. (G) Polar plots of
average responses vs. the direction of motion of a full-field grating (speeds 1500 or 1900 μm/s) in 3
FOVs. Colored curves in bottom panel show data for several individual ROIs. (H) Distributions of
orientation and direction selectivity indices (OSI and DSI) of 63 ROIs, 3 FOVs shown in G. An ROI was
considered DS or OS if its DSI or OSI was ≥ 0.2, respectively. (I) Angular distributions of the preferred
orientations (top), or preferred directions of (bottom) of single ROIS (n= 69 OS ROIs and 47 DS from 5
FOVs).
560

Discussion

Optokinetic image stabilization is triggered by slow image drifts but not by fast retinal

motion such as occurs during saccades. Here, we identify the inhibitory synaptic

circuit primarily responsible for this speed selectivity in mice. It features a familiar

amacrine cell type - the VGluT3 cell - in a surprising new role. We show that VGluT3

cells respond well to fast global motion, and that they veto ON DSGC responses to fast

motion through feedforward glycinergic inhibition.

Our conclusions are supported by a wealth of convergent evidence. Our

pharmacological findings recapitulate earlier evidence in rabbit implicating

glycinergic inhibition as the key suppressor of fast motion responses in ON DSGCs.

Connectomic analysis shows that just three types of amacrine cells account for nearly

all conventional (non-ribbon) synaptic contacts onto ON DSGCs, only one of which -

the VGluT3 cell - is glycinergic. We show that the VGluT3 plexus is strongly activated

by rapid motion, and that this is true even during global retinal slip, despite the strong

suppressive surrounds of VGluT3 receptive fields. We confirm that optogenetic

activation of VGluT3 cells evokes glycinergic inhibitory currents in ON DSGCs whereas

chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 output reduces the inhibition of ON DSGCs

triggered by rapid motion. Though our data points to feedforward glycinergic

inhibition from VGluT3 cells as the main determinant of slow speed preference in ON

DSGCs, their speed-tuning profile is undoubtedly shaped to some extent also by their

excitatory inputs [15] and by their GABAergic inputs from SACs and widefield

amacrine cells.

The output of ON DSGCs to the accessory optic system encodes the local vector of

global retinal slip, a precondition for proper image stabilization during head rotation.

The vector has two components: direction and speed. The directional coding is well

known to derive mainly from a specific amacrine-cell type, the SAC, through spatially

asymmetric feedforward GABAergic inhibition of the ON DSGC. We argue that the

other vector component is supplied by synaptic input from VGluT3 amacrine cells.

These dual-transmitter interneurons excite some RGCs through glutamate release,

while inhibiting others through glycine. An earlier pair of studies reported only

excitatory glutamatergic transmission from VGluT3 cells to ON DSGCs [16], not

glycinergic inhibition [29]. Though we confirmed some VGluT3-mediated

glutamatergic excitation of ON DSGCs, it was present only in a minority of cells and

was weaker and more sustained than in the earlier findings. The difference may be

partly attributable to our 20-fold dimmer photostimulation stimulus. As far as we are

aware, this is the first time any neuronal type has been shown to receive both

excitatory and inhibitory input from VGluT3 cells. SACs are also dual-transmitter

amacrine cells, exciting DSGCs through nicotinic receptors as well as inhibiting them

through GABA. Together, SACs and VGluT3 cells account for more than 92% of the

total inhibitory synapses onto ON DSGCs, as shown by our reconstructions. The

remaining inhibitory inputs come almost entirely from widefield amacrine cells.

Image stabilization is ubiquitous among animals and crucial for effective vision during

self-motion. Optokinetic and optomotor responses are present in all major vertebrate

classes and always exhibit preferential activation by slow retinal slip. Many of the

genes, cell types, and brain pathways that support such image-stabilizing reflexes are

likewise highly conserved in mammals and other vertebrates. Both SACs and VGluT3

cells have been described in higher primate retinas [43–45], so the same two cell

types may encode the two components of the global retinal slip vector in the human

retina as they do in mice. Genetic defects perturbing this circuit disrupt normal image

stabilization in human patients [3].

VGluT3 cells differentiate the functional signals of ON and ON-OFF DSGCs

It has been known for half a century that ON DSGCs prefer slow speeds while ON-OFF

DSGCs prefer faster speeds [8]. The mechanistic basis of this difference has remained

obscure. In this report, we show that VGluT3 cells respond vigorously to rapid global

motion and use glycinergic feedforward inhibition to suppress ON DSGCs' response to

fast motion. ON-OFF DSGCs, on the other hand, lack VGluT3 inhibition which

presumably enables their fast-motion responses. However, VGluT3 cells further

differentiate the speed preferences of the two DSGC classes by augmenting fast-

motion responses in ON-OFF DSGCs though excitatory glutamatergic synapses.

The two classes of DSGCs have distinct functional roles. ON DSGCs are by far the

dominant visual input to the accessory optic system and vestibulocerebellum, which

convert slow retinal slip signals into slow optokinetic image-stabilizing eye

movements. ON-OFF DSGCs direct their output instead to the superior colliculus and

lateral geniculate nucleus, and thus on to the visual cortex. The collicular output

allows object motion to trigger gaze or attentional shifts, while the cortical pathway

exploits motion information for numerous perceptual computations including figure-

ground segmentation, depth perception, and encoding of self-motion. A broad range

of speeds are relevant to these midbrain and cortical functions, but for image

stabilization, the key motion signal is slow global retinal slip. This specific

spatiotemporal pattern of visual reafference informs the brain of a shortfall in the

vestibular image-stabilizing reflex, the VOR. If this system were responsive to fast

motion, it would conflict with the gaze-shifting network, because it would trigger

image stabilization during the fast retinal slip produced by saccades. Silencing the

image stabilization system at the retinal level, rather than in downstream brain

networks, is energetically favorable since it achieves the same outcome with fewer

spikes.

The differing requirements of these two systems in the speed domain is

accommodated by the differing speed-tuning profiles of the two classes of DSGCs (ON

vs ON-OFF). Our findings now allow us to trace this functional difference back one

step further to VGluT3 cells, a interneuron with robust fast-motion-responses and

opposing transmitter actions on the two classes: glycinergic inhibition of ON DSGCs,

and glutamatergic excitation of ON-OFF DSGCs.

Are VGluT3 cells the sole source of glycinergic inhibition of ON DSGCs?

Strychnine effectively blocks all glycine receptors on ON DSGCs as shown by the

observation that all residual motion-induced inhibition is eliminated by blocking

GABA receptors (Fig. 1D). Chemogenetic suppression of VGluT3 cells selectively was

less effective in eliminating this feedforward glycinergic inhibition since adding

strychnine further reduced it. This may indicate that there are other sources of

glycinergic input. The connectomic analysis did identify two synapses from H18

amacrine cells [25,46] to ON DSGCs. If H18 cells are glycinergic, as suggested by their

relatively small, highly branched dendritic arbors, their contributions to ON DSGC

inhibition would have been blocked by strychnine but not by our chemogenetic

manipulation. However, the transmitter composition of H18 cells is unknown, and

they synapse onto ON DSGCs only very rarely. We therefore favor an alternate

explanation - that VGluT3 cells are virtually the sole glycinergic input, but that our

chemogenetic manipulation of them was only partly effective. This could have

occurred for several reasons. When the exogenous receptor was expressed virally,

some fraction of VGluT3 cells may not have been transduced. Even when the receptor

was presumably expressed ubiquitously through a Cre-dependent genetic cross,

application of CNO failed to block the inhibition as completely as strychnine did. This

might indicate that the inhibitory K^+ current evoked by activation of the designer

receptor was too weak to suppress all light-evoked synaptic release from VGluT3

terminals. A scaling down of VGluT3 output of this sort could account for the finding

that the CNO-sensitive inhibition was a fixed fraction of the total strychnine-sensitive

inhibition across the full range of speeds, and that the shapes of the inhibitory current

traces were preserved following CNO application (Fig. 5A, B, Supplemental

Information and Fig. S4). The alternative model, in which the chemogenetic silencing

of VGluT3 cells is incomplete, cannot easily account for such a simple scaling-down of

the glycinergic inhibition because the postulated alternative source of inhibition

would have to closely match VGluT3 cells in speed tuning. These two models are not

exhaustive; others mechanisms might account for the discrepancy between the

chemogenetic and strychnine effects. For example, because strychnine blocks glycine

receptors globally, it might alter the inhibition measured in ON DSGCs indirectly by its

impact on other synaptic circuits.

New insights into VGluT3 connectivity and function

The synaptic machinery supporting dual glycine/glutamate transmission from

VGluT3 cells to their postsynaptic partners remains opaque. The two transmitters

could be co-released at the same active zone, with the sign of effect determined

mainly by postsynaptic receptor composition. Alternatively, there could be spatially

segregated sites of glycine and glutamate release. Our SEM reconstructions provide

the first opportunity to compare the ultrastructure of VGluT3 output synapses known

to be functionally glycinergic or glutamatergic. Contacts onto known targets of the

glutamatergic output (ON-OFF DS; OFF transient alpha; W3/UHD cells) were

conventional contacts, not ribbon synapses. Nor were they obviously different in size

or form from synapses onto targets known or shown here to be predominantly

inhibitory (Suppressed-by-Contrast cells of various forms [29,30,47], ipRGCs [31] and

ON DSGCs (present study). Of course, a closer examination or better ultrastructural

data might reveal such differences.

The connectomic evidence suggests that the direct influences of VGluT3 cells extend

far more widely to other retinal neurons than appreciated in earlier functional

surveys. They encompass diverse RGCs and amacrine cells as well as some cone

bipolar cells. Other VGluT3 cells are rarely the target of synaptic output from this

amacrine cell type, which stands in marked contrast to the extensive mutual

inhibition between SACs.

In the absence of obvious ultrastructural correlates of the two sorts of VGluT3 output

synapses, we cannot infer whether the previously unknown output targets receive

glutamatergic or glycinergic influence from VGluT3 cells. However, our study does

offer one small clue. In the presence of glycinergic blockade, optogenetic activation of

VGlut3 cells evoked a presumptive GABA-mediated inhibitory current in some ON

DSGCs. This suggests that that VGluT3 cells supply glutamatergic excitation to one or

both of the GABAergic amacrine cell types that synapse onto ON DSGCs. One of these

types, the SACs exhibits no synaptic currents in response to optogenetic activation of

VGluT3 cells [16], nor did our SEM analysis turn up more than a very few synaptic

contacts from VGluT3 cells to SACs. This leaves the widefield amacrine cells as the

likely conduit for this influence. Whatever the circuit responsible, this indirect

influence of VGluT3 cells is net inhibitory onto the ON DSGC, just as the direct

glycinergic influence is.

Since SEM analysis implied that virtually all types of RGCs receive some VGluT3 input,

the role identified here for VGluT3 cells in sculpting the speed-tuning profiles of

DSGCs (both ON and ON-OFF) is likely to extend broadly to the retinal output. For RGC

types getting excitatory glutamatergic drive from VGluT3 cells, we would expect

boosted sensitivity to relatively fast motion. OFF transient alpha cells are one such

type and our data confirm their high-speed sensitivity. When the VGluT3 contribution

is inhibitory, we expect it to favor responses to slow speeds in the postsynaptic

ganglion cells, as for ON DSGCs. Just such a functional influence seems to be detectable

in a bistratified medium-field RGC type variously termed ON-delayed [21],

Suppressed by Contrast [30,47,48], R-cell [49], or Type 73 [6]. They are ON-type

RGCs, but their spiking response to light steps exhibits a characteristic delay which

was traced in part to fast feedforward glycinergic inhibition [21]. Ostensibly the same

type was inhibited by optogenetic activation of VGluT3 cells [30], and we confirm the

synaptic contacts from VGluT3 cells onto this type by SEM. Taken together, these

findings imply that this cell type might, like the ON DSGCs, prefer slow speeds. Our

survey of speed tuning of various RGC types appears to confirm this (Fig. 1C), since

ON-delayed cells were the only RGC type to prefer speeds as slow as those preferred

by ON DSGCs.

The surprising responsiveness of VGluT3 cells to global motion

Ca^{2+} imaging revealed robust responses to global motion in VGluT3 dendrites. This is

unexpected because VGluT3 cells are known to be strongly suppressed by visual

stimulation of their receptive-fields surrounds [16,20,42]. Responsiveness to global

motion also seems at odds with the reported selectivity of these cells for local object

motion [20,42]. We have shown that the strength of surround suppression is context

dependent, as is often the case [50,51]. When the receptive field is probed with a

moving grating of various sizes, rather than with flashed spots, the surround appears

weaker and the center appears larger ([16], Fig. 6E, F). For gratings instead of spots,

both motion and the lack of a sudden and sustained contrast step led to a weaker

surround suppression. During retinal slip of a natural visual image, no sudden

appearance or large changes in contrast occur, and thus VGluT3 surround

suppression should be minimal.

Though we have highlighted here the responsiveness of VGluT3 cells to global motion,

they may nonetheless participate in object-motion sensing, as proposed in relation to

their glutamatergic excitation of W3 RGCs [20,42]. Indeed gratings localized to a patch

resulted in much stronger responses in VGluT3 dendrites than full-field ones (Fig 6D).

The complete suppression measured previously for global motion could well be due

to the use of a different stimulus than ours, and specifically the stimulus duration:

these studies tested the responses to a short uniform motion of the grating (a 100 μm

translation during 0.25-0.5 s). An initial delay in the response relative to the stimulus

onset can be seen in our fluorescence traces as well (Fig. 6B) although it could be

attributable to voltage-calcium dynamics. Other stimulus parameters (e.g. grating

cycle length, orientation, relatively slow speed) could also have an effect.

Sensitivity of VGluT3 cells to the axis or direction of movement

Virtually every patch of the VGluT3 plexus we tested (95%) showed selectivity for

either the axis (orientation) or the direction of grating motion. This was unexpected,

and reveals yet another striking parallel with the SACs, whose dendrites are also

direction selective. There are also striking differences between the two types in this

regard. Though single SAC dendrites prefer somatofugal motion, SAC dendrites of

diverse orientations and directional preferences are intermixed at any location in the

dendritic plexus, and pooled local Ca^{2+} responses reveal no obvious directional bias at

the population level [24]. The VGluT3 plexus, however, shows strong biases in the

pooled local signal. An unresolved question is how the directional or orientation

preference differs, if at all, between neighboring VGluT3 cells, or within the arbor of a

single cell.

If VGluT3 dendrites are orientation/direction selective, can they still suppress fast-

motion responses in all four cardinal directions, and thus in all four ON DSGC

subtypes? We suggest they do: VGluT3 directional preference exhibited considerable

local variability, even when the net preference was strongly skewed. Preferences

differed even more across FOVs. Since ON DSGCs have very large dendritic arbors

(~10-12 times larger than the FOV area), they presumably sum inhibition from

VGluT3 cells spanning a large region and diverse preferences. Still, the observed bias

in VGluT3 motion preferences suggest possible interactions in the optokinetic system

between the direction and speed of retinal slip; ON DSGC subtypes preferring some

directions may be more strongly suppressed by fast speeds than others.

The connectivity of VGluT3 cells to nearly all RGC types means that their

contributions to shaping RGC response properties may extend beyond speed tuning to

include selectivity for the direction or axis (orientation) of motion. It will be of

interest to assess whether VGluT3 tuning for orientation and direction are linked to

their own dendritic asymmetry (as revealed at least in this volume; Fig. 3A-D),

similarly to the asymmetric arbors in two RGC types: the ON-OFF DSGCs preferring

ventral motion [52] and of JamB-OFF orientation-selective cells [53].

Methods

Animals. All procedures were in accordance with the National Institutes of Health

guidelines and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at

Brown University. Detailed below are the strains of mice used, of adult mice of either

sex, 2–8 months old. Wildtype C57BL/6J (Jackson Laboratory); To target ON DSGCs

for recording, HoxD10-GFP (GENSAT collection, Tg(Hoxd10-

EGFP)LT174Gsat/Mmucd, MMRRC #032065) and Pcdh9-Cre (GENSAT collection,

Tg(Pcdh9-Cre)NP276Gsat/Mmucd, MMRRC #036084) were used. The VGluT3-Cre

line (The Jackson Laboratory, B6;129S-$Slc17a8^{tm1.1(cre)Hze}$/J, #028534) was crossed

with Ai32 (Jackson, B6.Cg-$Gt(ROSA)26Sor^{tm32(CAG-COP4*H134R/EYFP)Hze}$/J, #024109) for

optogenetics, DREADD (Jackson, B6.129-$Gt(ROSA)26Sor^{tm1(CAG-CHRM4*,-mCitrine)Ute}$/J,

#026219) for chemogenetics, Ai14 (Jackson, B6;129S6-$Gt(ROSA)26Sor^{tm14(CAG-}$

$^{tdTomato)Hze}$/J, #007908) for characterization of the VGluT3-Cre mouse, and Ai148

(Jackson, B6.Cg-$Igs7^{tm148.1(tetO-GCaMP6f,CAG-tTA2)Hze}$/J, #030328) for Ca^{2+} imaging. For the

Müller cell control experiment, GLAST-Cre (Jackson, Tg(Slc1a3-cre/ERT)1Nat/J,

#012586) was crossed with Ai32.

Retinal dissection. Isolation of the retina was performed similarly to [54]. The eyes

were removed and immersed in oxygenated Ames medium (95% O2, 5% CO2; Sigma-

Aldrich; supplemented with 23 mM NaHCO3 and 10 mM d-glucose). Under dim red

light, the globe was cut, and cornea, lens and vitreous humour removed. A relieving

ventral cut was made in the eyecup, and the retina was isolated. three more cuts were

made in the retina, roughly along the temporal, nasal and dorso-nasal directions, the

asymmetry of which was used to disambiguate retinal orientation. The retina was flat-

mounted on a polylysine coverslip (Corning, #354086), which was secured in a

recording chamber.

Tamoxifen injections. Tamoxifen (Sigma-Aldrich) was dissolved in corn oil (Sigma-

Aldrich) to make 20 mg/ml, sonicated (30 minutes, RT) and placed in hot water (2

hrs, 45 °C) and once homogenous, filtered in a 0.2 μm filter. Tamoxifen was injected

IP, 2-2.5 mg per mouse, 3 days in a row. This resulted in dense YFP labeling of Müller

glia in GLAST-Cre x Ai32 mice [55]. The animals were used in experiments three

weeks after the last tamoxifen injection.

Electrophysiology. Patch-clamp recordings of isolated flat-mount retina were

performed under current-clamp using a Multiclamp 700B amplifier, Digidata 1550

digitizer, and pClamp 10.5 data acquisition software (Molecular Devices; 10 kHz

sampling). Pipettes were pulled from thick-walled borosilicate tubing (P-97, Sutter

Instruments). Retinas were continuously superfused during experiments with

oxygenated Ames' medium at 32 °C, flow rate ~5 ml/minute. For cell attached

recordings, Ames filled pipettes were used (tip resistance of 4-5 MΩ). For whole cell

voltage clamp recordings, pipettes filled with cesium internal solution (In mM: Cs

methane sulfonate, 104.7, TEA-Cl, 10, HEPES, 20, EGTA, 10, QX-314, 2, ATP-Mg, 5,

GTP-Tris, 0.5, pH 7.3, osmolarity 276 mOsm; All purchased from Sigma-Aldrich) were

used (tip resistance of 5.5-6.5MΩ). To isolate excitatory and inhibitory synaptic

currents, the recorded cell was held near the reversal potential for inhibition (~ -65

mV) and excitation (~ +20 mV), respectively. Application of synaptic blockers to the

bath as well as Clozapine-N-Oxide (CNO) was done by switching the perfused medium

into medium containing the blocker and waiting for ~7 minutes. The blockers used

were: strychnine (1 µM, Sigma), SR95531 (10 µM, Sigma), L-AP4 (20 µM, Tocris),

ACET (10 µM, Tocris), Hexamethonium (100 µM, Sigma) CNQX (20 µM, Tocris), D-AP5

(50 µM, Tocris). In the DREADD experiments, CNO was used to activate the DREADD

(1 nM, Sigma).

Light stimulation. Light stimuli were generated as in [54]. Patterned visual stimuli,

synthesized by custom software using Psychophysics Toolbox under Matlab (The

MathWorks), were projected (AX325AA, HP) and focused onto the photoreceptor

outer segments through the microscope's condenser. The projected display covered

~1.5 × 1.5 mm (5.8 μm/pixel). The video projector was modified to use a single UV

LED lamp (NC4U134A, Nichia). The LED's peak wavelength (385 nm) shifted to 395

nm after transmission through a 440 nm short-pass dichroic filter (FF01-440/SP,

Semrock), a dichroic mirror (T425lpxr, Chroma), and various reflective neutral

density filters (Edmund Optics). The photoisomerization rates used were 10^2-10^3

R*/rod/s, and for the used spectrum were similar among rods, M-cones and S-cones.

In the beginning of a stimulus sequence, a uniform screen with the stimulus' mean

intensity (gray) was projected for 20-30s for light adaptation.

To identify RGC types, the spike responses of the cell to a 460 μm spot of +0.95

contrast were recorded. To assess the directional tuning of ON DSGCs we used a full-

field sinusoidal gratings (cycle = 377 μm, contrast = 0.95, stimulus duration = 5 s,

inter-stimulus duration = 3 s at uniform mean grating intensity) drifting in 8

directions in a randomized sequence (drift speed = 226μm/s, 4 repetitions). For

speed response curves, the same grating was drifted in the preferred direction

(DSGCs), at 7-8 different speeds at a randomized sequence, with 3 repetitions for each

speed. For VGluT3 dendrites Ca^{2+} imaging, the same stimulus was used, with the

direction of motion chosen arbitrarily. The same was also presented in a circular

patch on a gray background in Fig. 6D. In Fig 6E, white spots of different sizes were

presented from dark, and the grating stimulus was presented from gray in circular

masks of different sizes. In Fig. 6F, gratings and gray spots of different sizes (gray =

the mean intensity of the gratings) were both presented from dark, to equalize the

global contrast of the two stimuli. To assess the directional tuning of ROIs we used

full-field gratings drifting in 8 directions as above, with speeds 1500 or 1900 μm/s.

Electrophysiology data analysis. Numbers with errors quoted in the text are mean ±

standard error of the mean, unless otherwise specified. All data analysis was done

using custom written Matlab procedures. Individual peri-stimulus time histograms

(PSTH) presented for spikes, or current traces for voltage clamp recordings, were

averaged over three trials. Gray traces in Fig. 1B are individual trials. In population

response vs. speed data, curves from different cells were normalized by their

maximum and averaged. In population data where synaptic blockers or CNO were

used (DREADDs), the response curves for each cell were normalized by the maximum

of the control curve for that cell, and then curves were averaged over cells. The

currents presented for optogenetics (Fig. 4) were recorded at 20kHz, and in Fig. 4B-E

and 4J, current traces were averaged in 10ms windows. Current traces in Fig. 4 were

averaged over 3-5 trials. Direction and orientation selectivity indices (DSI, OSI) and

preferred directions and orientations were calculated from vector sums of responses

in different directions of motion [54,56].

Immunohistochemistry. Retinas were fixed and counterstained with the following

antibodies: Goat anti-ChAT (Choline acetyltransferase; 1:200, Millipore Sigma

#AB144); Rabbit anti VGluT3 (1:250, Invitrogen #PA5-85784). Chicken anti GFP

(1:1000, Abcam #ab13970) was used to enhance the fluorescence of the Cre-

dependent GFP virus. Rabbit anti-HA tag (1: 200, Cell Signaling Technology #3724)

was used to stain the HA-tagged hM4Di receptor in the VGluT3 x DREADD mouse.

Imaging for cell targeting and dendritic morphology. To target fluorescent cells for

patch recording, two photon imaging was used (Olympus FV1200MPE BASIC (BX-

61WI) microscope, 25×, 1.05 NA water-immersion objective (XLPL25XWMP,

Olympus), and an ultrafast pulsed laser (Mai Tai DeepSee HP, Spectra-Physics) tuned

to 910 nm. To acquire an image stack, RGCs were filled during electrophysiological

recordings with Alexa hydrazide 488 or 594 (100 µM, Invitrogen), and were imaged

following the recording, either using the two-photon or the single-photon (confocal)

configurations of the two-photon microscope. Tissue in which fluorescent proteins

were expressed was often fixed and immunostained (see above), and subsequently

imaged on a confocal microscope (Olympus FV3000, UPlan Super Apochromat

objectives, 30xS, 1.05 NA, or 60x2S, 1.3 NA) in the Leduc Imaging Facility, Brown

University. Confocal and two-photon stacks were processed in Fiji

(https://imagej.net/software/fiji), and collapsed using either maximum intensity or

maximum standard deviation projections.

Functional imaging. Imaging of calcium indicator signals were acquired using the

aforementioned two-photon microscope and conditions, as has been done previously

[54]. The frame rate was 15 Hz. For imaging responses in dendrites, 128 x 256 pixel

fields of view were used with a zoom of 4.5-5x (60 μm x120 μm FOVs). Light stimulus

presentation was synchronized to the fly-back times in the scanning of the

microscope so that they did not interfere with the measured signal.

Functional imaging data analysis. Functional imaging analysis was done using Fiji and

custom written Matlab routines. A standard deviation projection of movies were

made, over which ROIs were manually marked over brighter dendrites (Fig 6A), and

traces of their area-averaged brightness over time were acquired. For the baseline

fluorescence F_0, we averaged the brightness over 0.5 s before every stimulus

presentation. ROIs were chosen for analysis if their time averaged responses

surpassed a threshold $\Delta F/F_0$ (0.3 – 0.6) during at least 6 stimulus presentations out of

24. Fig. 6B-F show curves averaged over responsive ROIs.

Intraocular injections. Mice were anaesthetized with isoflurane (3% in oxygen; Matrx

VIP 3000, Midmark). A viral vector inducing Cre dependent expression of a payload

(see below) was injected into the vitreous humour of the right eye through a glass

pipette using a microinjector (Picospritzer III, Science Products GmbH). Analgesia

(Proparacaine, eye drops) was applied to the eye ~2 min before the injection, and

immediately following the injection (Buprenorphine SR, 0.02 ml, intraperitoneal) to

minimize postoperative pain. Mice were then taken off anesthesia, recovered within

several minutes, and monitored for 48 hrs following the procedure. Animals were

killed and retinas removed 14–21 d later.

Viruses. pAAV2/2-hSyn-DIO-hM4D(Gi)-mCherry (Addgene #44362, Roth Lab) was

injected intraocularly in VGluT3-Cre mice, causing Cre-dependent expression of

hM4D(Gi), a modified human muscarinic M4 receptor, that is an inhibitory Designer

Receptor Exclusively Activated by Designer Drugs (DREADD). AAV2/2-EF1a-DIO-

hChR2(H134R)-EYFP (from UNC vector core, Deisseroth Lab) was injected VGluT3-

Cre mice to express ChR2 in a Cre dependent manner, but mostly caused expression in

too few of the VGluT3 ACs to drive optogenetic responses in postsynaptic RGCs (Fig.

2E, Supp. Fig. 2D). rAAV2/2-CAG-flex-GFP (UNC vector core) was injected in Pcdh9-

Cre mice to target ON DSGCs for recording.

Optogenetics. Light stimulation to activate ChR2 was generated using a LED light

source (Mightex MLS-5500-MK1; LED driver: open-ephys.org, Cyclops) and

introduced through the microscope objective and GFP excitation filter cube, resulting

in a spectrum peak at 480±10 nm, and illumination over an area of 1 mm in diameter.

The light intensity at the sample was 0.9-1.4 nW/μm^2, the lowest intensity that

yielded robust postsynaptic responses in ON DSGCs. The stimulation time was 0.1 s or

1 s for 5 repeats, 4 s between repeats. The intensity and time were optimized for a

robust response, while minimizing the rundown of the response over time, and the

driving of large bursts of current that were sometimes observed, that were

inconsistent over trials or not stimulus-locked.

Electron microscopy neuronal reconstructions. An existing dataset of retinal sections

from a Serial Blockface Electron Microscope (SEM), 'k0725' [24] was used. The

imaged volume dimensions were 50 x 210 x 260 μm³ with the short dimension

spanning the IPL and parts of the GCL and INL layers of the retina. The pixel size was

13.2 nm² and the section thickness 26 nm. The images contained intracellular details,

e.g. synaptic vesicles. The webKnossos platform (https://webknossos.org) was used

for tracing neuronal skeletons and annotating synapses . For the plot of stratification

depth (Fig. 3J), the depth of nodes in the skeletons were normalized to the depth of

the ON SAC plexus to correct for the tilt and curvature of the tissue in the block [57].

Acknowledgements

974   The authors are grateful to Roman Drabchuk for help in intraocular injections and

975   SEM cell tracing, to Rachel Gunderson for careful annotation of the Ca^{2+} imaging

976   movies, and to Dianne Boghossian for technical support. Supported by NIH R01

977   EY12973.

References

1.   Simpson, J.I. (1984). The Accessory Optic System. Annu. Rev. Neurosci. *7*, 13–41.

2.   Dhande, O.S., Estevez, M.E., Quattrochi, L.E., El-Danaf, R.N., Nguyen, P.L., Berson,

D.M., and Huberman, A.D. (2013). Genetic dissection of retinal inputs to

brainstem nuclei controlling image stabilization. J. Neurosci. *33*, 17797–17813.

3.   Yonehara, K., Fiscella, M., Drinnenberg, A., Esposti, F., Trenholm, S., Krol, J.,

Franke, F., Scherf, B.G., Kusnyerik, A., Müller, J., *et al.* (2016). Congenital

Nystagmus Gene FRMD7 Is Necessary for Establishing a Neuronal Circuit

Asymmetry for Direction Selectivity. Neuron *89*, 177–193.

4.   Goetz, J., Jessen, Z.F., Jacobi, A., Mani, A., Cooler, S., Greer, D., Kadri, S., Segal, J.,

Shekhar, K., Sanes, J., *et al.* (2021). Unified Classification of Mouse Retinal

Ganglion Cells Using Function, Morphology, and Gene Expression. SSRN

Electron. J., 1–27.

5.   Sanes, J.R., and Masland, R.H. (2015). The Types of Retinal Ganglion Cells:

Current Status and Implications for Neuronal Classification. Annu. Rev.

Neurosci. *38*, 221–246.

6.   Bae, J.A., Mu, S., Kim, J.S., Turner, N.L., Tartavull, I., Kemnitz, N., Jordan, C.S.,

Norton, A.D., Silversmith, W.M., Prentki, R., *et al.* (2018). Digital Museum of

Retinal Ganglion Cells with Dense Anatomy and Physiology. Cell *173*, 1293-

1306.e19.

7.   Borst, A., and Euler, T. (2011). Seeing Things in Motion: Models, Circuits, and

Mechanisms. Neuron *71*, 974–994. Available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.08.031.

8.   Oyster, C.W., Takahashi, E., and Collewijn, H. (1972). Direction-selective retinal

ganglion cells and control of optokinetic nystagmus in the rabbit. Vision Res. *12*,

183–193.

9.   Sivyer, B., Tomlinson, A., and Rowland Taylor, W. (2019). Simulated saccadic

stimuli suppress ON-type direction-selective retinal ganglion cells via

glycinergic inhibition. J. Neurosci. *39*, 4312–4322.

10.   Kay, J.N., de la Huerta, I., Kim, I.J., Zhang, Y., Yamagata, M., Chu, M.W., Meister, M.,

and Sanes, J.R. (2011). Retinal ganglion cells with distinct directional

preferences differ in molecular identity, structure, and central projections. J.

1011  Neurosci. *31*, 7753–7762.

1012 11. Barlow, H.B., and Levick, W.R. (1965). The mechanism of directionally selective

1013  units in rabbit's retina. J. Physiol. *178*, 477–504.

1014 12. Briggman, K.L., Helmstaedter, M., and Denk, W. (2011). Wiring specificity in the

1015  direction-selectivity circuit of the retina. Nature *471*, 183–190. Available at:

1016  http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature09818.

1017 13. Vaney, D.I., Sivyer, B., and Taylor, W.R. (2012). Direction selectivity in the

1018  retina: symmetry and asymmetry in structure and function. Nat. Rev. Neurosci.

1019  *13*, 194–208. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3165.

1020 14. Yonehara, K., Balint, K., Noda, M., Nagel, G., Bamberg, E., and Roska, B. (2011).

1021  Spatially asymmetric reorganization of inhibition establishes a motion-sensitive

1022  circuit. Nature *469*, 407–410. Available at:

1023  http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature09711.

1024 15. Matsumoto, A., Briggman, K.L., and Yonehara, K. (2019). Spatiotemporally

1025  Asymmetric Excitation Supports Mammalian Retinal Motion Sensitivity. Curr.

1026  Biol. *29*, 3277-3288.e5. Available at:

1027  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.048.

1028 16. Lee, S., Chen, L., Chen, M., Ye, M., Seal, R.P., and Zhou, J. (2014). An

1029  unconventional glutamatergic circuit in the retina formed by vGluT3 amacrine

1030  cells. Neuron *84*, 708–715. Available at:

1031  http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.10.021.

1032 17. Grimes, W.N., Seal, R.P., Oesch, N., Edwards, R.H., and Diamond, J.S. (2011).

1033  Genetic targeting and physiological features of VGLUT3+ amacrine cells. Vis.

Neurosci. *28*, 381–392.

18.   Haverkamp, S., and Wässle, H. (2004). Characterization of an Amacrine Cell

Type of the Mammalian Retina Immunoreactive for Vesicular Glutamate

Transporter 3. J. Comp. Neurol. *468*, 251–263.

19.   Johnson, J., Sherry, D.M., Liu, X., Fremeau, R.T., Seal, R.P., Edwards, R.H., and

Copenhagen, D.R. (2004). Vesicular glutamate transporter 3 expression

identifies glutamatergic amacrine cells in the rodent retina. J. Comp. Neurol.

477, 386–398.

20.   Kim, T., Soto, F., and Kerschensteiner, D. (2015). An excitatory amacrine cell

detects object motion and provides feature-selective input to ganglion cells in

the mouse retina. Elife *4*, 1–13.

21.   Mani, A., and Schwartz, G.W. (2017). Circuit Mechanisms of a Retinal Ganglion

Cell with Stimulus-Dependent Response Latency and Activation Beyond Its

Dendrites. Curr. Biol. *27*, 471–482. Available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.12.033.

22.   Heinze, L., Harvey, R.J., Haverkamp, S., and Wässle, H. (2007). Diversity of

glycine receptors in the mouse retina: localization of the alpha4 subunit. J.

Comp. Neurol. *500*, 693–707.

23.   Zhang, C., and McCall, M.A. (2012). Receptor targets of amacrine cells. Vis.

Neurosci. *29*, 11–29.

24.   Ding, H., Smith, R.G., Poleg-Polsky, A., Diamond, J.S., and Briggman, K.L. (2016).

Species-specific wiring for direction selectivity in the mammalian retina. Nature

535, 105–110. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature18609.

25.   Helmstaedter, M., Briggman, K.L., Turaga, S.C., Jain, V., Seung, H.S., and Denk, W.

1058   (2013). Connectomic reconstruction of the inner plexiform layer in the mouse

1059   retina. Nature *500*, 168–174. Available at:

1060   https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12346.

1061   26.   Jain, V., Hanson, L., Sethuramanujam, S., Michaels, T., Gawley, J., Gregg, R.G., Pyle,

1062   I., Zhang, C., Smith, R.G., Berson, D., *et al.* (2022). Gain control by sparse, ultra-

1063   slow glycinergic synapses. Cell Rep. *38*, 110410. Available at:

1064   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110410.

1065   27.   Della Santina, L., Kuo, S.P., Yoshimatsu, T., Okawa, H., Suzuki, S.C., Hoon, M.,

1066   Tsuboyama, K., Rieke, F., and Wong, R.O.L. (2016). Glutamatergic Monopolar

1067   Interneurons Provide a Novel Pathway of Excitation in the Mouse Retina. Curr.

1068   Biol. *26*, 2070–2077.

1069   28.   Krishnaswamy, A., Yamagata, M., Duan, X., Hong, Y.K., and Sanes, J.R. (2015).

1070   Sidekick 2 directs formation of a retinal circuit that detects differential motion.

1071   Nature *524*, 466–470.

1072   29.   Lee, S., Zhang, Y., Chen, M., and Zhou, Z.J. (2016). Segregated Glycine-Glutamate

1073   Co-transmission from vGluT3 Amacrine Cells to Contrast-Suppressed and

1074   Contrast-Enhanced Retinal Circuits. Neuron *90*, 27–34. Available at:

1075   http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.02.023.

1076   30.   Tien, N.W., Kim, T., and Kerschensteiner, D. (2016). Target-Specific Glycinergic

1077   Transmission from VGluT3-Expressing Amacrine Cells Shapes Suppressive

1078   Contrast Responses in the Retina. Cell Rep. *15*, 1369–1375. Available at:

1079   http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2016.04.025.

31. Lee, S., Chen, M., Shi, Y., and Zhou, Z.J. (2021). Selective glycinergic input from
vGluT3 amacrine cells confers a suppressed-by-contrast trigger feature in a
subtype of M1 ipRGCs in the mouse retina. J. Physiol. *0*, 1–14.

32. Liu, J., and Sanes, J.R. (2017). Cellular and molecular analysis of dendritic
morphogenesis in a retinal cell type that senses color contrast and ventral
motion. J. Neurosci. *37*, 12247–12262.

33. Rousso, D.L., Qiao, M., Kagan, R.D., Yamagata, M., Palmiter, R.D., and Sanes, J.R.
(2016). Two Pairs of ON and OFF Retinal Ganglion Cells Are Defined by
Intersectional Patterns of Transcription Factor Expression. Cell Rep. *15*, 1930–
1944. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2016.04.069.

34. Jacoby, J., and Schwartz, G.W. (2017). Three small-receptive-field ganglion cells
in the mouse retina are distinctly tuned to size, speed, and object motion. J.
Neurosci. *37*, 610–625.

35. Schmidt, T.M., and Kofuji, P. (2009). Functional and Morphological Differences
among Intrinsically Photosensitive Retinal Ganglion Cells. J. Neurosci. *29*, 476
LP – 482. Available at: http://www.jneurosci.org/content/29/2/476.abstract.

36. Stabio, M.E., Sabbah, S., Quattrochi, L.E., Ilardi, M.C., Fogerson, P.M., Leyrer, M.L.,
Kim, M.T., Kim, I., Schiel, M., Renna, J.M., *et al.* (2018). The M5 Cell: A Color-
Opponent Intrinsically Photosensitive Retinal Ganglion Cell. Neuron *97*, 150-
163.e4. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.11.030.

37. Johnson, K.P., Zhao, L., and Kerschensteiner, D. (2018). A Pixel-Encoder Retinal
Ganglion Cell with Spatially Offset Excitatory and Inhibitory Receptive Fields.
Cell Rep. *22*, 1462–1472. Available at:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2018.01.037.

38.   Jia, Y., Lee, S., Zhuo, Y., and Jimmy Zhou, Z. (2020). A retinal circuit for the

1105   suppressed-by-contrast receptive field of a polyaxonal amacrine cell. Proc. Natl.

1106   Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *117*, 9577–9583.

1107   39.   Eggers, E.D., and Lukasiewicz, P.D. (2006). GABAA, GABAC and glycine receptor-

1108   mediated inhibition differentially affects light-evoked signalling from mouse

1109   retinal rod bipolar cells. J. Physiol. *572*, 215–225.

1110   40.   Brüggen, B., Meyer, A., Boven, F., Weiler, R., and Dedek, K. (2015). Type 2 wide-

1111   field amacrine cells in TH:: GFP mice show a homogenous synapse distribution

1112   and contact small ganglion cells. Eur. J. Neurosci. *41*, 734–747.

1113   41.   Park, S.J.H., Borghuis, B.G., Rahmani, P., Zeng, Q., Kim, I.J., and Demb, J.B. (2015).

1114   Function and circuitry of VIP+ interneurons in the mouse retina. J. Neurosci. *35*,

1115   10685–10700.

1116   42.   Hsiang, J.C., Johnson, K.P., Madisen, L., Zeng, H., and Kerschensteiner, D. (2017).

1117   Local processing in neurites of VGluT3-expressing amacrine cells differentially

1118   organizes visual information. Elife *6*, 1–16.

1119   43.   Rodieck, R.W. (1989). Starburst amacrine cells of the primate retina. J. Comp.

1120   Neurol. *285*, 18–37.

1121   44.   Yamada, E.S., Dmitrieva, N., Keyser, K.T., Lindstrom, J.M., Hersh, L.B., and

1122   Marshak, D.W. (2003). Synaptic connections of starburst amacrine cells and

1123   localization of acetylcholine receptors in primate retinas. J. Comp. Neurol. *461*,

1124   76–90.

45.   Marshak, D.W., Chuang, A.Z., Dolino, D.M., Jacoby, R.A., Liu, W.S., Long, Y.,

Sherman, M.B., Suh, J.M., Vila, A., and Mills, S.L. (2015). Synaptic connections of

amacrine cells containing vesicular glutamate transporter 3 in baboon retinas.

Vis. Neurosci. *32*.

46. Jain, V., Hanson, L., Sethuramanujam, S., Gregg, R.G., Zhang, C., Smith, R.G.,

Berson, D.M., McCall, M.A., and Awatramani, G.B. (2021). Gain control by sparse,

ultra-slow glycinergic synapses. bioarxiv *1*, 1–42.

47. Jacoby, J., and Schwartz, G.W. (2018). Typology and circuitry of suppressed-by-

contrast retinal Ganglion cells. Front. Cell. Neurosci. *12*, 1–7.

48. Tien, N.W., Pearson, J.T., Heller, C.R., Demas, J., and Kerschensteiner, D. (2015).

Genetically identified suppressed-by-contrast retinal ganglion cells reliably

signal self-generated visual stimuli. J. Neurosci. *35*, 10815–10820.

49. Sabbah, S., Berg, D., Papendorp, C., Briggman, K.L., and Berson, D.M. (2017). A

cre mouse line for probing irradiance- and direction-encoding retinal networks.

eNeuro *4*, 1–21.

50. Wienbar, S., and Schwartz, G.W. (2018). The dynamic receptive fields of retinal

ganglion cells. Prog. Retin. Eye Res. *67*, 102–117. Available at:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2018.06.003.

51. Grimes, W.N., Schwartz, G.W., and Rieke, F. (2014). The synaptic and circuit

mechanisms underlying a change in spatial encoding in the retina. Neuron *82*,

460–473. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.02.037.

52. Trenholm, S., Johnson, K., Li, X., Smith, R.G., and Awatramani, G.B. (2011).

Parallel mechanisms encode direction in the retina. Neuron *71*, 683–694.

Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.06.020.

53.   Nath, A., and Schwartz, G.W. (2017). Electrical synapses convey orientation

selectivity in the mouse retina. Nat. Commun. *8*. Available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01980-9.

54.   Sabbah, S., Gemmer, J.A., Bhatia-Lin, A., Manoff, G., Castro, G., Siegel, J.K., Jeffery,

N., and Berson, D.M. (2017). A retinal code for motion along the gravitational

and body axes. Nature *546*, 492–497. Available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature22818.

55.   Wang, J., O'Sullivan, M.L., Mukherjee, D., Puñal, V.M., Farsiu, S., and Kay, J.N.

(2017). Anatomy and spatial organization of Müller glia in mouse retina. J.

Comp. Neurol. *525*, 1759–1777. Available at:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27997986.

56.   Nath, A., and Schwartz, G.W. (2016). Cardinal orientation selectivity is

represented by two distinct ganglion cell types in mouse retina. J. Neurosci. *36*,

3208–3221.

57.   Sümbül, U., Song, S., McCulloch, K., Becker, M., Lin, B., Sanes, J.R., Masland, R.H.,

and Seung, H.S. (2014). A genetic and computational approach to structurally

classify neuronal types. Nat. Commun. *5*, 3512.

1166