1 **Non-uniform distribution of dendritic nonlinearities differentially engages**
2 **thalamostriatal and corticostriatal inputs onto cholinergic interneurons**
3

6 Osnat Oz[1], Lior Matityahu[1], Aviv Mizrahi-Kliger[1,2], Alexander Kaplan[1,2], Noa Berkowitz[1],
7 Lior Tiroshi[1†], Hagai Bergman[1,2,3], Joshua A. Goldberg[1*]
8
[1]Department of Medical Neurobiology, Institute of Medical Research Israel – Canada, The Faculty of
Medicine,
[2]Edmond and Lily Safra Center for Brain Sciences,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 9112102 Jerusalem, Israel
[3]Department of Neurosurgery, Hadassah Medical Center, 9112102 Jerusalem, Israel

[†]<u>Current address</u>: Department of Neurobiology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, 60208, USA
15
16 [*]**Corresponding author, <u>joshua.goldberg2@mail.huji.ac.il</u>**

17
Abstract

The tonic activity of striatal cholinergic interneurons (CINs) is modified differentially

by their afferent inputs. Although their unitary synaptic currents are identical, cortical inputs

onto distal dendrites only weakly entrain CINs, whereas proximal thalamic inputs trigger

abrupt pauses in discharge in response to salient external stimuli. To test whether the

dendritic expression of the active conductances that drive autonomous discharge contribute to

the CINs' capacity to dissociate cortical from thalamic inputs, we used an optogenetics-based

method to quantify dendritic excitability. We found that the persistent sodium (NaP) current

gave rise to dendritic boosting and that the hyperpolarization-activated cyclic nucleotide-

gated (HCN) current gave rise to a subhertz membrane resonance. This resonance may

underlie our novel finding of an association between CIN pauses and internally-generated

slow wave events in sleeping non-human primates. Moreover, our method indicated that

dendritic NaP and HCN currents were preferentially expressed in proximal dendrites. We

validated this non-uniform distribution with two-photon imaging of dendritic back-

propagating action potentials, and by demonstrating boosting of thalamic, but not cortical,

inputs by NaP currents. Thus, the localization of active dendritic conductances in CIN

dendrites mirrors the spatial distribution of afferent terminals and may promote their

differential responses to thalamic vs. cortical inputs.

Introduction

The striatal cholinergic interneuron (CIN) is a key modulator of the striatal microcircuitry, impacting the neuronal excitability, synaptic transmission and synaptic plasticity of spiny projection neurons (SPNs), as well as other striatal interneurons (Abudukeyoumu et al., 2019; Assous, 2021; Goldberg et al., 2012). There are two processes that drive the ongoing release of acetylcholine (ACh) by CINs. First, the two glutamatergic inputs arising from cerebral cortex and intralaminar nuclei of the thalamus can drive CINs to discharge (Bradfield et al., 2013; Ding et al., 2010; Kosillo et al., 2016; Lapper and Bolam, 1992; Matsumoto et al., 2001; Sharott et al., 2012; Thomas et al., 2000). While the unitary synaptic currents generated by these two inputs in CINs are identical (Aceves Buendia et al., 2019), that thalamic inputs to CINs dominate in the sense that they that give rise to larger excitatory post-synaptic potentials (EPSPs) (Johansson and Silberberg, 2020) and can trigger abrupt pause responses, often flanked by excitatory peaks, to external saliency-related cues (Apicella et al., 1991; Goldberg and Reynolds, 2011; Graybiel et al., 1994; Kimura et al., 1984; Morris et al., 2004; Raz et al., 1996). In contrast, cortical inputs to CINs are weaker in that they give rise to smaller EPSPs and cannot trigger the pause response (Ding et al., 2010).

Second, even in the absence of afferent input, CINs exhibit multiple autonomously generated discharge patterns – including regular and irregular pacemaking, as well as burst firing (Bennett et al., 2000; Bennett and Wilson, 1999; Goldberg and Reynolds, 2011; Goldberg and Wilson, 2010). These firing patterns are generated by an interplay between various nonlinear ionic currents including voltage- and calcium-activated K^+ currents, as well as two voltage-dependent pacemaker currents: the hyperpolarization-activated cyclic nucleotide-gated (HCN) current; and the persistent Na^+ (NaP) current (Bennett et al., 2000; Deng et al., 2007; Goldberg et al., 2009; Goldberg and Wilson, 2010, 2005; McGuirt et al., 2021; Oswald et al., 2009; Song and Surmeier, 1996; Wilson, 2005; Wilson and Goldberg, 2006). The main purpose of these pacemaker currents presumably is to guarantee the ongoing release of ACh onto the striatal microcircuitry by sustaining the autonomous discharge of CINs. Nevertheless, these pacemaker (and other subthreshold) currents will also impact how cortical and thalamic inputs are integrated by the CINs.

Attaining a mechanistic (e.g., dynamical systems) understanding of how the repertoire of CIN firing patterns is generated, requires a full characterization of the nonlinear properties of the pacemaker (and other) currents (e.g., by determining their voltage dependence and

kinetics) – which is a daunting endeavor. In contrast, understanding how these currents
impact synaptic inputs is a simpler task. Because individual synaptic inputs are small, the
membrane nonlinearities can be *linearized* making the analysis of their impact simpler and
more general - a treatment called the quasi-linear membrane approximation. This analysis
dates back to Mauro (Koch, 1984; Mauro et al., 1970) and has shown that quasi-linear
membranes can give rise to two qualitatively different transformations of inputs:
amplification and *resonance* (Goldberg et al., 2007; Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000). Being a
linear approximation, the quasi-linear approximation is amenable to Fourier analysis, which
helps to better define these transformations as linear (time-invariant) filters on the input in
frequency space.

Amplification arises from regenerative ionic currents – that provide positive feedback
– including inward (depolarizing) currents activated by depolarization, such as the NaP
current. Here the main effect in frequency space is amplification of the amplitude response
(as compared to the response of a passive linear membrane). Resonance arises from
restorative currents – that provide negative feedback – including inward currents activated by
hyperpolarization, such the HCN current. In frequency space, the defining properties of
resonance is a peak (at a non-zero frequency) in the amplitude response, and a zero-crossing
of the phase delay (at a nearby frequency). On a practical level, the quasi-linear response
properties of a membrane can be measured by providing a small-amplitude, sinusoidally-
modulated voltage command to an intracellularly-recorded neuron and recording the resultant
sinusoidal output current. Calculating the ratio of the voltage amplitude to the current
response yields an estimate of the membrane's impedance (which is, loosely speaking, an
indication of the neuron's "input resistance" to a sinusoidal input as a function of its
frequency). Membrane impedances have been reported for various neuronal types in the brain
(Hutcheon et al., 1996; Ulrich, 2002), including in the striatum (Beatty et al., 2015). Beatty
and collaborators (2015) found that CINs exhibit a resonance in the vicinity of 1 Hz.
Moreover, they found that the shape of the impedance function depended on the holding
voltage, which is understandable given that the amplitude of the various subthreshold
currents is voltage-dependent. Finally, with use of tetrodotoxin (TTX), a selective antagonist
of voltage-activated Na^+ (Nav) channels, Beatty and collaborators (2015) demonstrated that
NaP currents contributed to these filtering properties of the CIN membrane.

Use of somatic voltage perturbations, however, fails to discriminate the role played by

the CINs' dendritic arbor *per se* in transforming synaptic inputs. The CINs' dendritic arbor

can span well over half a millimeter from the soma (Wilson, 2004), with cortical inputs

terminating on distal dendrites and thalamic inputs terminating perisomatically and on

proximal dendrites (Lapper and Bolam, 1992; Thomas et al., 2000). Both dendritic

morphology (as taught by cable theory) and dendritic nonlinearities will lead to distal cortical

inputs being integrated differently from proximal thalamic input. Thus, the impact of

membrane nonlinearities on the quasi-linear approximation will depend on *where* they are

expressed throughout the dendritic arbor. To address this question, we recently developed an

optogenetics-based experimental method (that relies on the use of quasi-linear cable theory

and Fourier analysis) to determine the duration of the delays introduced by dendrites, and

how these delays impact the rapidity and fidelity of a neuron's response to its input. We used

our method to study GABAergic neurons of the substantia nigra pars reticulata (SNr) that

expressed channelrhodopsin-2 (ChR2). We illuminated (with a 470 nm LED) either a small

perisomatic region or the entire dendritic arbor. Comparison of the two illumination regimes

enabled us to demonstrate that dendrites (that in the SNr can be >700 µm long) introduce a

significant integration delay. The analysis also yielded that SNr dendrites behaved like

passive linear filters, without evidence for amplification or resonances, or any dependence on

holding voltage (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019).

In the present study, we apply our method to study nonlinearities of CIN dendrites.

We demonstrate that HCN and NaP currents shape the quasi-linear response properties of

CINs, and that their presence in the dendrites contributes additional phase delays.

Furthermore, we show that our analysis can reveal information about dendritic location of

membrane nonlinearities, and use the analysis to deduce that both HCN and NaP currents are

expressed primarily proximally. The proximal distribution of NaP currents is supported by

measuring: a) how far autonomously generated backpropagating action potentials (bAPs)

actively invade the dendritic arbor; and b) the differential boosting by NaP currents of

proximal thalamostriatal vs. distal corticostriatal EPSPs.

Figure 1: CIN membranes exhibit voltage-dependent quasi-linear properties. **A.** CINs exhibit a voltage sag due to HCN currents, and autonomous pacemaking due to NaP currents. **B.** Application of 2 mV sinusoidal voltage commands to the soma, of increasing frequencies, elicits a current response that is voltage dependent (black trace, –55 mV; red trace, –70 mV). **C.** Estimation of the impedance (left) and phase shift (right) show that at –55 mV, CINs exhibit an amplified impedance and that at –70 mV, CINs exhibit a resonance (non-monotonic impedance and negative phase delays). Solid lines are parameter fits for $(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^{-1/2}$ up to a scale factor (left), and phase shift, ϕ_s (right, see Eq. 4).

Results

Ionic currents underlying amplification and resonance in cholinergic interneurons

The HCN and NaP currents depolarize CINs over largely non-overlapping voltage

ranges. The HCN current is mostly active below –60 mV and is responsible for the voltage

sag in response to a hyperpolarizing current pulse (Fig. 1A, "HCN"), whereas the NaP

current takes over at –60 mV and is necessary and sufficient (Bennett et al., 2000) to drive

CINs to action potential threshold (Fig. 1A, "NaP"). Therefore, because NaP is a regenerative

current, while HCN is a restorative current, we would expect the current responses to an

oscillating voltage command to depend strongly on whether the membrane voltage is

clamped above or below –60 mV (Beatty et al., 2015). We therefore held mouse CINs in

whole-cell voltage clamp (*n = 10* neurons, *N = 4* mice), first at –55 mV, and subjected them

to a voltage command that was composed of a continuous sequence of sinusoidal cycles with

an amplitude of 2 mV and a frequency that increases discretely from 0.2 to 20 Hz. The

current amplitude was very small at low frequencies and increased monotonically to the high

frequency (Fig. 1B, black), which is suggestive of an impedance curve with amplified lower

frequencies. Loosely speaking, this means that the CINs' "input resistance" to a low

frequency oscillatory input currents is boosted. As expected (Fig. 1C, black), the impedance

curve, $|Z(f)|$, exhibited an amplifying structure, with the phase delay being strictly positive. In

order to quantify the degree of amplification, we fit the model of the phase delay, ϕ_s, for an

iso-potential cell with quasi-linear properties (see Materials and Methods). In this fit, there is

a (negative) amplifying parameter, μ_n – that is derived from biophysical properties of

amplifying current (e.g., the slope of the activation curve, reversal potential, etc.) (Goldberg

et al., 2007) – which was estimated to be $\mu_n = -3.9$.

When neurons were held at –70 mV ($n = 10$ neurons, $N = 7$ mice), the current

response was very different, it was much larger at subhertz frequencies as compared to the

experiment at –55 mV, and then exhibited what looks like a slightly decreasing amplitude for

frequencies near 1 Hz, followed by an amplitude increase at higher frequencies (Fig. 1B,

red). Estimation of the amplitude response and phase delay (Fig. 1C, red), revealed

significantly different curves (amplitude: $P = 6 \cdot 10^{-25}$, phase: $P = 1 \cdot 10^{-17}$, ANCOVA) with a

clear resonance peak at approximately 1 Hz, and a zero crossing at a slightly lower frequency

(Fig. 1C, red). Fitting the somatic phase delay yielded a reasonable fit only when both an

amplifying and resonant component were included in the fit with the amplifying parameter

($\mu_n = -3.4$) being only slightly reduced relative to the –55 mV fit. In contrast, the additional

(positive) resonance parameter, μ_h – which is derived from the biophysical properties of the

restorative current – was estimated to be $\mu_h = 1.6$ (see Materials and Methods) based on the

fit to the negative lobe in the phase delay.

The previous experiments suggest that the amplifying effect at –55 mV occurs due to

prominence of the amplifying NaP current in that voltage range, whereas the resonance

visible at –70 mV is due to the HCN current that dominates that voltage range. This

conclusion was supported by the fact that application of 1 μM TTX ($n = 9$ neurons, $N = 4$

mice), that abolished autonomous spiking and slightly hyperpolarized the CIN (Fig. 2A),

reduced the impedance ($P = 9 \cdot 10^{-9}$) and exhibited a trend toward a shortened phase delay (P

$= 0.137$, ANCOVA, Fig. 2B). These changes are captured by the amplification parameter

being estimated as less negative ($\mu_n = -2.0$), which reduces ϕ_s (Eq. 4, in Materials and

Methods). Similarly, application of 10 µM ZD7288, the selective HCN antagonist ($n = 9$

neurons, $N = 7$ mice), which abolished the sag response (Fig. 2C), abolished the resonance

peak in the impedance curve ($P = 4 \cdot 10^{-16}$) and significantly reduced the negative lobe in the

phase delay ($P = 0.018$, ANCOVA, Fig. 2D), which was captured by the resonance

parameter being reduced to $\mu_h = 0.5$.

Figure 2: Amplification is caused by NaP currents, whereas the resonance is caused by HCN currents. A. TTX (blue) prevents autonomous spiking (black). **B.** TTX prevents amplification of the impedance (left), and reduces the phase shift (right). **C.** ZD7288 (red) abolishes the voltage sag (black). **D.** ZD7288 abolishes the resonance peak in the impedance, and the negative phase shifts in the subhertz range. Solid lines are parameter fits as in Fig. 1.

<u>Optogenetic interrogation of the spatial distribution of NaP and HCN currents in the CIN</u>

<u>dendritic arbor</u>

While the above experiments demonstrate the NaP and HCN currents are capable of

transforming subthreshold voltage fluctuations, the question remains as to where within the

CIN's somatodendritic compartments these currents perform their amplifying and restorative

actions, respectively. One extreme scenario is that they are restricted to the axosomatic region

(where they are needed for sustaining the autonomous firing patterns of the CINs). In that

scenario, the dendrites could be entirely linear, passively transmitting the distal

depolarizations to the soma. Only at the soma are the inputs then transformed by these

currents. However, a more realistic scenario is that these currents are also expressed

dendritically and exert their nonlinear influence on synaptic inputs more distally. But in this

scenario, we would still want to know where along the dendrites the currents are expressed.

To determine the precise location of these channels would require advanced *in situ* molecular

and anatomical techniques and/or direct electrophysiological recordings from CIN dendrites

in conjunction with advanced imaging techniques. While these experiments may, in principle,

be done, we wondered whether the optogenetics-based technique that we recently developed

to interrogate the role of dendrites in synaptic integration (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019) could

help us address this question.

We previously showed that the impact of dendrites on synaptic integration can be

quantified by studying the response of neurons that express ChR2 post-synaptically to (470

nm) illumination of their dendritic arbor. In particular, we compared between two spatial

patterns of illumination of the somatodendritc arbor of SNr neurons: either a small

perisomatic region (approximately 100 μm in diameter) or the entire dendritic arbor. By

using sinusoidally-modulated blue LED illumination at various temporal frequencies, we

were able to calculate the phase delays produced by both spatial patterns, and found that

illumination of the entire dendritic arbor introduced larger phase delays. In order to quantify

the effect, we fit the data to a tractable theoretical model of a semi-infinite cable (Goldberg et

al., 2007; Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019). As mentioned above, in the case of the SNr neuron,

we found that the dendrites were well-fit by a passive linear cable model, whose parameters

(i.e., time and space constants) we could estimate. The conclusion that SNr dendrites were

largely linear was further supported by the finding that these phase delays were voltage-

independent (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019).

Because CINs exhibit prominent amplifying and resonating currents that are strongly

voltage dependent (Figs. 1 & 2), we posited that by using the same optogenetic technique and

semi-infinite cable model we would be able to quantify the contribution of CIN dendrites to

post-synaptic integration. In particular, we hypothesized that by fitting a *quasi-linear* cable

model we would be able to quantify to what degree CIN dendrites *per se* possess amplifying

or resonating properties (See Materials and Methods). Finally, by comparing illumination of

the proximal *vs.* the entire dendritic arbor, we could learn something about the localization of

the nonlinearities along the dendritic arbor. To this end, we crossed mice that express Cre-

recombinase under a ChAT promoter with the Ai32 mouse that expresses ChR2 and EYFP in

a Cre-dependent manner (see Materials and Methods). The cholinergic neuropil and

individual CINs could be clearly visualized in the dorsal striatum of these ChAT-ChR2 mice

(Fig. 3A). Individual CINs were patched and recorded in voltage clamp, while illuminating

either the proximal region with a 60X water-immersion objective (Fig. 3A) or the entire slice

with a 5X air objective, with a continuous sequence of sinusoidally modulated illumination

waveforms at various frequencies (Fig. 3B, blue).

Figure 3: Optogenetic interrogation of the quasilinear properties of CIN dendrites indicates that dendritic nonlinearities are more prominent proximally. A. A CIN in a sagittal slice from ChAT-ChR2 mouse is patch-clamped in the whole-cell mode while either a small proximal region around the soma or the full-field are illuminated with a sinusoidally modulated 470 nm LED. **B.** The current response to the proximal (black) and full-field (red) illumination differ, with the phase of the full-field illumination right-shifted at the higher frequencies (20 Hz is highlighted in yellow). **C.** Phase shifts at –55 mV holding potential, calculated for proximal (black) and full-field illumination (red). A tendency towards negative phase shifts is present at 0.4 Hz (green arrow). **D.** Phase shifts at –70 mV holding potential, exhibit a negative phase shift. Fitting the quasi-linear model at –55 mV demonstrate the magnitude of the amplification parameter (μ_n) is smaller for the full field fit (Eqs. 1-3). Similarly, at –70 mV the resonance parameter (μ_h) is smaller for the full field fit. The elevation in these parameters' magnitudes when illuminating proximally relative to full-field suggest that the surface densities of NaP and HCN currents is higher proximally.

Comparison of the somatic current traces in response to proximal (Fig. 3B, black) vs.

full-field (red) illumination demonstrated that the phase of the full-field-generated current is

delayed relative to the proximally-generated current. This could be observed in the raw data

both for the low and high (yellow inset) frequencies. The effect at the high frequency was

very evident when plotting the phase delay curves both when the CINs were held at –55 mV

(Fig. 3C) and at –70 mV (Fig. 3D). Estimation of the phase delays revealed delays that were

considerably larger than those observed with the electrical somatic stimulation (Fig. 1). Thus,

to account for these large delays (Figs. 3C&D), we fit a model of the sum of a somatic delay,

ϕ_s (Eq. 4, in Materials and Methods), and a dendritic delay, ϕ_d (Eq. 1, in Materials and

Methods). For the curve calculated at the –55 mV holding potential ($n = 5$ neurons, $N = 4$

mice), we fit a model with only an amplifying current. As expected, the fits were

significantly different ($P = 4 \cdot 10^{-3}$, ANCOVA) and extracted a larger effective radius (in units

of space constants) of $r = 1.47$ for the full field stimulation as compared to $r = 0.79$ (See

Materials and Methods). Additionally, the amplifying parameter was more negative

($\mu_n = -0.32$) for the proximal fit than for the full field fit ($\mu_n = -0.15$). At face value, this

latter finding means that the amplifying nonlinearity appears denser when activating only the

proximal arbor, than when activating the entire arbor. In other words, this finding suggests

that the NaP currents are denser more proximally and probably drop off farther out in the

CIN dendrites.

A closer look at the fits (at the –55 mV holding potential) reveals that the phase delay

at 0.4 Hz (for both the proximal and full field illumination), is not captured by this model.

This dip in phase delay (Fig. 3C, green arrow) at this low frequency is reminiscent of what a

restorative current is expected to do. In order to accentuate the effect of the restorative HCN

currents, we repeated the experiment at the –70 mV holding potential (Fig. 3D). In this case

($n = 14$ neurons, $N = 11$ mice), the phase delays at the lower frequencies (especially at 0.4

Hz) were negative, which was reminiscent of the results from the electrical voltage

stimulation experiments (Fig. 1) at the –70 mV holding potential.

When fitting a full soma-plus-dendrite model (incorporating both amplifying and

restorative parameters) the fits were significantly different ($P = 8 \cdot 10^{-4}$, ANCOVA) and the

differences between the estimates of the effective radii were larger: $r = 1.4$ for the full-field

vs. $r = 0.41$ for the proximal illumination. Here too the restorative parameter was estimated

to be larger for the proximal fit ($\mu_h = 1.11$) relative to the full field fit ($\mu_h = 0.61$), suggesting

that the HCN currents are denser more proximally. This conclusion is buttressed by the fact

that the negative phase delays in the subhertz frequency range tended to be less negative for

the full-field illumination ($P = 0.037$, Wilcoxon rank sum test on phase delays at 0.4 Hz). In

the framework of our quasi-linear model, the only mathematically possible way to recreate

this finding while increasing the effective radius r is by reducing the restorative parameter μ_h.

Otherwise, if μ_h were constant then illuminating a larger region of the cable – by increasing r

– would necessarily recruit more restorative current, thereby making the negative delays

more negative. Thus, the conclusion of our analysis is that CIN dendrites indeed express the

amplifying and resonating nonlinearities, which can contribute to post-synaptic integration.

Moreover, the analysis strongly suggests that these nonlinearities are concentrated proximally

and likely taper off distally. In the following section, we provide independent evidence in

support of this conclusion vis-à-vis NaP currents.

Figure 4: Autonomous action potentials actively back-propagate in CIN dendrites up to 70 μm from the soma. A. Autonomous discharge of a CIN that was patched and filled with fluo-4 and Alexa Fluor 568 for 2PLSM imaging (image). **B.** Line scans at various distances from the soma exhibit Ca^{2+} oscillations caused by bAPs. **C.** Calculating the spike-triggered average of these oscillations and fitting an alpha-function gives an estimate of the amplitude of these oscillations (in % $\Delta F/F_o$). **D.** The scatter plot of these amplitudes as a function of distance from the soma (11 CINs from 7 mice are pooled) exhibits a large degree of variability. However, a 35 μm moving average (black line) exhibits that the Ca^{2+} transients begin to decay approximately 70 μm from the soma, indicating that bAPs are supported by Nav channels up to that point (the initial increase up to 20 μm is due to the increase in the surface-to-volume ratio in the large proximal dendrites).

<u>Distance of dendritic bAP invasion indicates location of amplifying Nav channels</u>

The persistent and fast-inactivating Nav currents flow through the same Nav channels

(Alzheimer et al., 1993). Therefore, determining to what distance from the soma dendritic

bAPs invade provides a measure of the Nav channels density – and therefore where the NaP

current is present – in the dendritic arbor. To this end, we used 2PLSM Ca^{2+} imaging to

measure the size of the Ca^{2+} transients elicited by bAPs in autonomously firing CINs at

various distances from the soma (Fig. 4A). We conducted line scans ($n = 11$ neurons, $N = 7$

mice) to measure the Ca^{2+} signals at various distances from the soma (Fig. 4B). Next, we

estimated the size of the spike triggered average (STA) of the $\Delta F/F_0$ Ca^{2+} signal, by

averaging around spontaneous APs measured at the soma (Fig. 4C). The amplitude of the

STA was estimated by fitting it with an alpha-function (see Materials and Methods). A scatter

plot of STA amplitude *vs.* distance from soma demonstrates a large degree of variability (Fig.

4D). Nevertheless, applying a 35 µm moving average to the scatter plot reveals a trapezoidal

dependence of Ca^{2+} transient sizes (Fig. 4D, black). The initial dip in the size of the transients

at short distances from the soma result from the large size of the proximal dendrites (Fig.

4D), which reduces the size of the Ca^{2+} transient due to the low surface-to-volume ratio of the

thick proximal dendrites. Neglecting that effect, we found that the size of the bAP driven

Ca^{2+} transients remains constant up to approximately 70 µm from the soma, and then drops

off. This spatial dependence of the Ca^{2+} transient amplitude, suggests that the bAP maintains

a constant amplitude due to the presence of Nav channels that sustain their regenerative

nature out to some 70 µm from the soma. Farther out the Ca^{2+} transients decrease presumably

due to a drop off in Nav channel expression, which leads to a lower amplitude bAPs, and

hence less Ca^{2+} via voltage-activated Ca^{2+} channels. Thus, this measurement strengthens the

conclusion that NaP currents are present in CIN dendrites – primarily in proximal dendrites

(up to approximately 70 µm from the soma).

<u>NaP currents boost proximal thalamic inputs but not distal cortical inputs to CINs</u>

The above data indicate that Nav channels are preferentially expressed in proximal

dendrites. Therefore, their ability to boost small voltage perturbation, including synaptic

inputs, should be restricted to proximal dendrites. Because thalamic inputs terminate

proximally, whereas cortical inputs terminate distally (Lapper and Bolam, 1992; Thomas et

al., 2000), we would expect only the former to be boosted by Nav current. To test this, we

transcranially inoculated the PfN of Vglut2-ires-Cre mice with adeno-associated viruses

(AAVs) harboring Cre-dependent ChR2 and EYFP genes (Fig. 5A) (Aceves Buendia et al.,

2019; Rehani et al., 2019). Two weeks later, we tested the sensitivity of optogenetically-

evoked EPSPs to ranolazine (30 µM), a selective antagonist of the NaP current, in CINs

patched in acute striatal slices. The mean amplitude of the EPSP was reduced by a median of

16% (*n = 11* neurons, *N = 4* mice, *P = 0.04*, Wilcoxon signed-rank test, Fig. 5B). In order to

test whether the more distal cortical inputs are modulated by NaP, we used the Thy1-ChR2

mice (Aceves Buendia et al., 2019; Arenkiel et al., 2007) that expressed ChR2 in

corticostriatal fibers (Fig. 5C). The EPSPs elicited by cortical inputs to CINs in these mice

were unaffected by ranolazine (*n = 11* neurons, *N = 6* mice, *P = 0.74*, Wilcoxon signed-rank

test, Fig. 5D). Thus, the post-synaptic modulation of glutamatergic inputs to CINs by NaP

currents corresponds to the spatial distribution of these currents as derived from our analysis

of the quasi-linear properties of CINs and 2PLSM imaging of bAPs.

Figure 5: Thalamic – but not cortical EPSPs – onto CINs are boosted by NaP currents in healthy mice. A. The parafascicular nucleus (PfN) of Vglut2-Cre mice was inoculated with AAVs harboring Cre-dependent ChR2, so that 470 nm LED illumination of striatal slices activated PfN terminals while CINs were patched in current clamp mode. **B.** Optogenetically evoked thalamic EPSPs in CINs (held between –50 mV and –60 mV) were reduced by 30 μM ranolazine. **C.** CINs were patched in current clamp in Thy1-ChR2 mice, so that 470 nm LED illumination of striatal slices activated nominally cortical terminals. **D.** Optogenetically evoked cortical EPSPs were unaffected by ranolazine.

Figure 6: TANs, but not SPNs, exhibit a pause-like response to slow-wave events occurring during natural non-REM sleep in non-human primates (NHPs). A. Top: simultaneous recording of LFP and a TAN in an NHP during N2 and N3 stages of sleep. Bottom: simultaneous recording of LFP and an SPN in an NHP during N2 and N3 stages of sleep. **B.** Top: TAN firing rate conditioned on the occurrence of an LFP slow wave event (28,603 triggers). Middle: Average striatal LFP signal triggered on the occurrence of slow wave events (see Materials and Methods). Bottom: SPNs firing rate conditioned on the occurrence of slow wave event (6,065 triggers). Gray box indicates the 99% confidence intervals.

Tonically active neurons in non-human primates exhibit a pause-like response to slow wave

oscillations during sleep

Our data, alongside previous studies (Beatty et al., 2015), demonstrate that

somatodendritic HCN currents give rise to resonances in the subhertz range in CIN surface

membranes. In contrast, SPNs exhibit no resonance (Beatty et al., 2015). This suggests CINs

in intact animals may exhibit increased sensitivity to oscillatory inputs in that frequency

range, whereas SPNs should not. Delta waves in the electroencephalogram (EEG) and in

cortical and sub-cortical local field potentials (LFP) are prominent during non-REM sleep

across species (Brown et al., 2012; Liu and Dan, 2019), including in non-human primates

(NHPs) (Mizrahi-Kliger et al., 2018). Because the LFP is widely thought to represent

subthreshold cellular activity, affected by afferent and recurrent synaptic inputs (Buzsáki et al., 2012), we hypothesized that the tonically active neurons (TANs) in the NHP striatum – that are comprised primarily of CINs (Aosaki et al., 1995; Kawaguchi, 1993; Wilson et al., 1990) – will exhibit stronger entrainment to slow-wave LFP events during sleep, while SPNs under the same conditions will not. Indeed, triggering the spike trains of TANs and SPNs (from $N = 2$ NHPs) on slow wave events that occur during sleep stages N2 and N3 (Mizrahi-Kliger et al., 2018; Riedner et al., 2007), which represent relatively deep non-REM sleep, demonstrates that the firing rates of TANs ($n = 122$) is modulated by these slow-wave events, whereas the firing rate of SPNs ($n = 83$) is not. Importantly, the biphasic response exhibited by TANs to slow-wave events bears a striking resemblance to the "classical" TAN response to external cues (Aosaki et al., 1995; Apicella et al., 1991; Joshua et al., 2008; Kimura et al., 1984). Because these responses in awake primates require an intact thalamic projection (Bradfield et al., 2013; Goldberg and Reynolds, 2011; Matsumoto et al., 2001; Schulz and Reynolds, 2013; Smith et al., 2004; Yamanaka et al., 2018) (and there is no reason to assume that this is altered in sleep), they provide support to the hypothesis that the CIN membrane resonance contributes to a thalamically-driven biphasic CIN response during slow-wave sleep. Importantly, because the primates are asleep in a sound-proof room, this is, to the best of our knowledge, the first report of striatal TANs responding to an internally-generated brain event, and not an external saliency-related cue.

Discussion

Quasi-linear dendritic properties of CINs and the non-uniform distribution of their active conductances

In the current study, we applied a cable-theoretic and optogenetics-based formalism – that we developed previously to study dendritic properties of SNr neurons (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019) – to study the dendritic properties of CINs. Unlike SNr neurons that were found to act like passive linear cables exhibiting no voltage dependent properties, we find that CIN dendrites exhibit both amplification and resonances in a voltage dependent manner: amplification is more prominent at depolarized subthreshold potentials (approximately –55 mV), whereas resonances are more prominent at more hyperpolarized potentials (approximately –70 mV). Moreover, we found that our method is able to provide information about where in the dendritic arbor these quasi-linear properties are localized. We extracted boosting (μ_n) and resonance (μ_h) parameters for proximal vs. full-field illumination, and

found that the magnitude of both parameters is smaller when the entire dendritic arbor is illuminated. In other words, activating more of the distal dendritic membrane dilutes the amplifying and resonating effects, meaning that the additional membrane illuminated in the full-field condition contributed less to amplification and resonances. The simplest interpretation of this finding is that the active conductances that give rise to amplification and resonance are more highly expressed proximally and apparently taper off farther out in the dendritic arbor. We identified the relevant currents by studying the quasi-linear properties of CIN somata with voltage perturbations. We found that amplification is TTX sensitive and therefore arises from Nav channels, that give rise to the NaP current. Similarly, we found that resonances require HCN channels.

We used two indirect methods to validate the preferentially proximal localization of NaP currents. First, we implemented a widely-used approach of estimating the distance of dendritic invasion of bAPs by imaging the Ca^{2+} influx that accompanies them (Carter and Sabatini, 2004; Day et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 2009; Kerr, 2004; Rehani et al., 2019; Tanimura et al., 2016). We found – not unlike in SPN neurons – that bAPs maintain their amplitude out to 70 μm from the soma and then begin to decay, suggesting that Nav currents that support bAP propagation taper off from that point onwards. Future work can verify this by directly testing where locally puffed TTX attenuates the bAP (perhaps even with the use of voltage sensitive probes). Second, we demonstrated that only thalamic – but not cortical – EPSPs exhibit sensitivity to the selective NaP blocker. Because the thalamic terminals are located more proximally (Lapper and Bolam, 1992; Thomas et al., 2000), this provides further evidence that NaP currents are more prominent locally. The preferential localization of HCN currents proximally in CIN dendrites requires additional validation, particularly because other neurons exhibit an opposite pattern (Berger et al., 2001). However, we were less interested in validating the proximal localization of HCN currents, because unlike NaP currents, activation of HCNs is conditioned on CINs being actively (after-)hyperpolarized, during which bAPs are unlikely to occur. We did however test a context in which HCN currents, and the resonance they underlie, are likely to affect CIN collective dynamics. We found that TANs respond biphasically to internally-generated slow wave activity during sleep. This preferential entrainment is consistent with the fact that CIN membranes exhibit a resonance in the subhertz range as found by us and others (Beatty et al., 2015). The elevated impedance (or frequency dependent access resistance) in this range means that inputs fluctuating in this range will more efficiently depolarize the CINs and therefore more likely to trigger additional action potentials than inputs fluctuating at a frequency that is far from

the resonance frequency. Accordingly, SPNs that do not exhibit resonances (Beatty et al.,
2015) are not entrained by the slow wave oscillation. Our findings in sleeping NHPs are at
odds with a rodent study by Sharott and collaborators (Sharott et al., 2012) that found only a
weak association between cortical slow-wave activity and the discharge of TANs in
anesthetized mice. Moreover, they reported a stronger association of SPNs with the slow
wave activity. These differences may be attributable to species differences and/or differences
between natural sleep and anesthesia.

<u>Advantages and limitations of the quasi-linear formalism and the optogenetics-based</u>
<u>approach</u>

As mentioned in the introduction, the quasi-linear approach provides a tool to
characterize membrane excitability in general functional terms, without requiring the
complete biophysical characterization of membrane currents. Unfortunately, the method is
not invertible: even after estimating all the quasilinear parameters one cannot deduce the full
biophysical characterization of the underlying channels even if one has a precise
mathematical model of these channels. Moreover, even though we extracted the values of μ_n
and μ_h, we do not know how to translate them into a quantitative measure of channel density,
or have a proper explanation as to why the somatic values of these parameters (estimated
with voltage perturbations) are larger than the dendritic ones. Still, the ability to compare
parameters for various spatial illumination patterns enables us to reach qualitative
conclusions regarding relative channel density. Additionally, our attribution of μ_n to NaP and
μ_h to HCN is only provisional. CINs possess other channels that have a major influence on
their firing patterns such as A-type, inward rectifying, and various Ca^{2+}-activated K^+
channels, to mention a few (Bennett et al., 2000; Deng et al., 2007; Goldberg et al., 2009;
Goldberg and Wilson, 2010, 2005; McGuirt et al., 2021; Oswald et al., 2009; Song and
Surmeier, 1996; Wilson, 2005; Wilson and Goldberg, 2006), that were not included in our
analysis. Future work, should elaborate how these and other channels contribute to the quasi-
linear properties of CINs and their dendrites.
Using optogenetics provides another level of practicality. The seminal studies that
characterized the filtering properties of dendrites or pyramidal neurons (Berger et al., 2001;
Goldberg et al., 2007; Hutcheon et al., 1996; Ulrich, 2002) required dual soma-dendrite
patching which is not practical for all neuronal types whose dendrites taper off rapidly.
Expressing opsins in the membrane being activated, as we did, means that a single somatic

patch electrode can suffice to conduct the quasi-linear characterization. We currently use this

approach to illuminate large regions of the dendritic arbor simultaneously, which means we

can only derive large-scale dendritic properties. In the future, localized laser stimulation of

dendritic regions (visualized with the help of a fluorescent marked in the patch pipette), or

even two-photon laser activation of opsin (provided one can find stimulation parameters that

do not harm the dendrites) could be used as an alternative approach. Another point to

consider is that the temporal kinetics of the opsin also introduces additional linear filtering of

the input (Higgs and Wilson, 2017; Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019). However, by demonstrating

differential responses to various spatial patterns we circumvent this concern. On the backdrop

of optogenetics being utilized almost exclusively to study circuit mapping (Häusser, 2021;

Kim et al., 2017) by expressing opsins presynaptically, we believe our study joins other

studies (Higgs and Wilson, 2017; Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019) to underscore the value of

using opsins expressed postsynaptically to study neuronal – even dendritic – excitability.

<u>Somatic amplification and resonance in CINs</u>

We preceded our optogenetic characterization of dendritic nonlinearities with the

electrical characterization of quasilinear somatic properties using a sinusoidal voltage

command applied through the patch pipette. As previously reported by Beatty and

collaborators (Beatty et al., 2015), CIN somata exhibit a membrane resonance in the subhertz

range, that depends on the holding potential. However, while Beatty and collaborators found

that an amplified resonance is present in the more depolarized (approximately – 55 mV)

range, we found that the resonance is only pronounced in the more hyperpolarized

(approximately –70 mV) range, where it depends on the HCN current. It is possible that the

resonances observed by Beatty and collaborators (2015) at –55 mV arose from ineffective

clamping of dendrites with the slightly higher resistance electrodes used in that study. In

support of this proposition, we also found evidence for the resonance arising from unclamped

(dendritic) membranes. When the CINs were clamped at –55 mV, while somatic voltage

perturbations did not produce a resonance, optogenetic stimulation (both proximal and full

field) at 0.4 Hz produced a more negative phase than at the neighboring 0.2 Hz and 0.6 Hz

stimulation (Fig. 3C, green arrow). This downward deflection in phase is reminiscent of the

full flown negative subhertz region that occurred with optogenetic stimulation when the CINs

were clamped at –70 mV. Thus, it is likely that resonance originated in both studies from

dendritic HCN currents. Because in the study of Beatty and collaborators (Beatty et al., 2015)

TTX lowered the impedance, without removing the subhertz resonance peak, we conclude

that the effect of TTX in both studies is to remove the NaP-dependent boosting, without

directly affecting resonance.

<u>Dendritic contribution to capacity of CINs to differentiate between their excitatory inputs</u>

In NHPs, TANs that are comprised primarily of CINs (Aosaki et al., 1995; Goldberg

and Wilson, 2010; Kawaguchi, 1993; Wilson et al., 1990), encode – through a brief pause in

their tonic firing – external stimuli that are salient (and often unexpected, even conveying a

stop or behavioral shift signal (Aoki et al., 2018; Thorn and Graybiel, 2010)) or stimuli that

are associated with reward (Apicella et al., 1991; Goldberg and Reynolds, 2011; Kimura et

al., 1984). The pause response requires an intact projection from the parafascicular nucleus

(PfN) of the thalamus (Bradfield et al., 2013; Goldberg and Reynolds, 2011; Matsumoto et

al., 2001; Schulz et al., 2011; Schulz and Reynolds, 2013; Smith et al., 2004; Yamanaka et

al., 2018), indicating that TANs are attuned to thalamic input. While TANs do not respond to

ongoing movement (Aosaki et al., 1994; Apicella et al., 1991; Kimura et al., 1984; Raz et al.,

1996), and hence seem less attuned to sensorimotor cortical input (Sharott et al., 2012), CIN

activity in awake behaving mice is strongly modulated by self-initiated movements (Gritton

et al., 2019; Howe et al., 2019; Yarom and Cohen, 2011). Nevertheless, slice physiology

studies in rodents (Aceves Buendia et al., 2019; Assous, 2021; Assous et al., 2017; Ding et

al., 2010; Johansson and Silberberg, 2020; Kosillo et al., 2016; Threlfell et al., 2012) clearly

show that thalamic inputs to CINs are stronger in the sense that they give rise to larger EPSPs

(Johansson and Silberberg, 2020) and can trigger a pause-like responses (Ding et al., 2010),

whereas cortical inputs to CINs are weaker in that they give rise to smaller EPSPs and cannot

trigger the pause-like response. Thus, it is clear that CINs differentiate between these two

excitatory inputs and respond differently to them. A major contributor to the CINs' capacity

to dissociate thalamic and cortical input is the differential distribution of their respective

terminals on the dendritic arbor: thalamic input terminate perisomatically and on proximal

dendrites, whereas cortical input terminates on distal dendrites (Lapper and Bolam, 1992;

Thomas et al., 2000). Our finding that the higher expression of NaP currents in proximal

dendrites preferentially boosts thalamic over cortical inputs, suggests that active

conductances are expressed in CIN dendrites in a manner that corresponds and reinforces the

effect of the spatial separation between the terminals of the two inputs.

 Adaptive changes in dendritic excitability in movement disorders

The capacity of the CIN dendritic excitability to mirror the distribution of afferent

terminals is also an adaptive process. We previously reported that CIN dendritic excitability

is elevated in the Q175 mouse model of Huntington's disease (HD) (Tanimura et al., 2016).

In contrast to control (Thy1-ChR2) mice in which cortical EPSPs in CINs are insensitive to

ranolazine (Fig. 5), cortical excitatory postsynaptic currents (EPSCs) in CINs from Q175

mice (crossed with Thy1-ChR2 mice) are strongly reduced by ranolazine. The acquired

dependence of distal cortical inputs on NaP currents in Q175 mice results from an

upregulation of the NaP current, which was also evidenced by bAPs invading farther out into

the CINs' dendritic arbor (Tanimura et al., 2016). This elevated excitability in the Q175

mouse is probably a homeostatic response aimed at elevating the postsynaptic sensitivity to

the remaining synaptic contents after the loss of afferent cortical and thalamic inputs

observed in HD mouse models (Deng et al., 2013). Because thalamostriatal inputs are also

altered in models of Parkinson's disease (PD) (Aceves Buendia et al., 2019; Parker et al.,

2016; Tanimura et al., 2019), future work should determine whether the excitability of CIN

dendrites is altered in these models, as well. Importantly, dendrites are positioned at the

interface between synaptic inputs and the intrinsic properties of CIN. While changes in

synaptic transmission and intrinsic excitability of CINs have received attention in models of

PD, HD and other movement disorders (Abudukeyoumu et al., 2019; Aceves Buendia et al.,

2019; Choi et al., 2020; Ding et al., 2006, 2011; Eskow Jaunarajs et al., 2015; Paz et al.,

2021; Pisani et al., 2007; Plotkin and Goldberg, 2019; Tanimura et al., 2019; Tubert and

Murer, 2021), studying alterations in dendritic excitability in these models is a

complementary approach that remains a largely unchartered territory.

The membrane channels that are expressed in CINs (e.g., Nav, HCN, Kv4, etc.) are

targets for neuromodulation under normal, healthy circumstances (Deng et al., 2007;

Maurice, 2004; Song and Surmeier, 1996). Therefore, it is likely that the dendritic excitability

of CINs can be modulated under physiological conditions, as well, as a way to adjust the

tuning of CINs to their afferent inputs. Conversely, if boosting and resonances are present

primarily proximally, the selective tuning of CINs to subhertz slow-wave oscillations is

probably stronger for thalamic inputs (that terminate proximally) than for cortical inputs.

Future experiments can address this issue by testing how silencing the PfN affects the

observed entrainment of TANs to slow-waves (Fig. 6).

In summary, we have used a new optogenetics-based approach, complemented by
other electrophysiological and imaging approaches, to demonstrate that the spatial
localization of active dendritic conductances that endow CIN dendrites with quasi-linear
filtering properties corresponds to the spatial distribution of their two main afferent excitatory
inputs. This matching up of presynaptic terminals with post-synaptic excitability, probably
contributes to the capacity of CINs to respond differentially to cortical and thalamic inputs.
Sensorimotor information of cortical origin seems to be integrated continuously in a moment-
by-moment fashion. In contrast, thalamic inputs lead to abrupt pauses in TAN firing, even in
response to internally-generated brain-states (e.g., during slow-wave activity). The fact that
dendritic arbors adapt to the spatiotemporal patterns of afferent inputs is likely an important
principle of neural computation that deserves further attention, particularly in the framework
of autonomously active neurons such at CINs, SNr neurons and other basal ganglia
pacemakers.
529

Materials and Methods

Ethics statement: All experimental protocols were conducted in accordance with the National
Institutes of Health Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, and with the Hebrew
University guidelines for the use and care of laboratory animals in research. The experiments
adhered to, received prior written approval and were supervised by the Institutional Animal
Care and Use Committee of the Faculty of Medicine.

Mice: Homozygous Ai32 (RCL-ChR2(H134R)/EYFP) mice (The Jackson laboratory [Jax]
stock: 012569) that express floxed ChR2 and an EYFP fusion protein under the CAG
promoter were crossed with homozygous ChAT-IRES-Cre (Δneo) mice the express Cre
recombinase under the choline acetyltransferase promoter (Jax stock: 031661). The ChAT-
ChR2 offspring (4-8 weeks old/both sexes) were used for the majority of experiments. To
investigate corticostriatal transmission, we used homozygous transgenic Thy1-ChR2 mice
(B6.Cg-Tg (Thy1-COP4/EYFP) 18Gfng/1, Jax stock: 007612), that express ChR2 under the
Thy1 promoter in cortical neurons (Arenkiel et al., 2007). To investigate thalamostriatal
transmission, we used Vglut2-ires-Cre mice (Jax stock: 016963).

Non-Human Primates (NHPs): Data were obtained from two healthy, young adult, female
vervet monkeys. The monkeys were habituated to sleeping in a primate chair, positioned in a
dark, double-walled sound-attenuating room. The primate chair restrained the monkeys' hand

and body movements but otherwise allowed them to be in a position similar to their natural

(sitting) sleeping posture. Detailed sleep habituation, surgery and sleep staging were reported

previously (Mizrahi-Kliger et al., 2018). For extracellular recordings, the monkeys' heads

were immobilized with a head holder and eight glass-coated tungsten microelectrodes were

advanced the dorsal striatum. Electrical signals were amplified with a gain of 20, filtered

using a 0.075 Hz (2 pole) to 10 kHz (3 pole) Butterworth filter and sampled at 44 kHz by a

16-bit analog/digital converter. Spiking activity was sorted online using a template matching

algorithm. The striatum was identified based on its stereotaxic coordinates according to MRI

imaging and primate atlas data (Martin and Bowden, 2000). Tonically active neurons (TANs)

and spiny projection neurons (SPNs) were identified using real-time assessment of their

electrophysiological features. Spiking and local field potentials (LFP) were recorded only for

identified recording sites with stable recording quality (i.e., where single-neuron spiking

yielded an average isolation score ≥ 0.85).

We followed established procedures for slow wave detection in the LFP (Riedner et al.,

2007). Briefly, the LFP signal was filtered at the 0.5-4 Hz range and putative slow wave events

whose duration was 0.25-2 seconds were kept for further analysis. Next, the slow wave peaks

were sorted according to their amplitude. Artifacts were removed by discarding all events

whose amplitude exceeded 5 standard deviations above the mean. Finally, conditional firing

rate analysis was only performed on 30% of the slow wave events with the highest amplitude.

<u>Stereotaxic viral inoculation in Vglut2-ires-Cre mice</u>: Mice were deeply anesthetized with

isoflurane in a non-rebreathing system (2.5% induction, 1-1.5% maintenance) and placed in a

stereotaxic frame (Kopf Instruments, Tujunga, CA). Temperature was maintained at 35˚C

with a heating pad, artificial tears were applied to prevent corneal drying, and animals were

hydrated with a bolus of injectable saline (10 ml/kg) mixed with analgesic (2.5 mg/kg

Meloxicam). Stereotaxic injections into caudal intralaminar nuclei of thalamus were

performed under aseptic conditions. Adeno-associated viruses (AAV) serotype 9 carrying

double-floxed fusion genes for hChR2 (E123A) and EYFP under an EF1a promoter

(University of Pennsylvania Vector Core, Addgene #35507) were used to transfect PfN

neurons. Injection coordinates were from Bregma: lateral, 0.65 mm; posterior, 2.3 mm; and

3.35 mm depth from surface of brain (Rehani et al., 2019). A small hole was bored into the

skull with a micro drill bit and a glass pipette was slowly inserted at the PfN coordinates. To

minimize backflow, solution was slowly injected; a total volume of 280 nl (>2.5x1012

GC/ml) of the AAV constructs was injected over a period of approximately 1.5 min and the

pipette was left in place for 5 min before slowly retracting it. Slice physiology experiments

were conducted 2-3 weeks after surgery.

<u>Slice preparation</u>: Mice were deeply anesthetized with ketamine (200 mg/kg)–xylazine (23.32

mg/kg) and perfused transcardially with ice-cold-modified artificial cerebrospinal fluid

(ACSF) bubbled with 95% O_2–5% CO_2, and containing (in mM) 2.5 KCl, 26 $NaHCO_3$, 1.25

Na2HPO4, 0.5 $CaCl_2$, 10 $MgSO_4$, 0.4 ascorbic acid, 10 glucose and 210 sucrose. The brain

was removed, and 275 μm thick sagittal slices containing the striatum were cut in ice-cold-

modified ACSF. Slices were then submerged in ACSF, bubbled with 95% O_2–5% CO_2,

containing (in mM) 2.5 KCl, 126 NaCl, 26 $NaHCO_3$, 1.25 Na_2HPO_4, 2 $CaCl_2$, 2 $MgSO_4$ and

10 glucose, and stored at room temperature for at least 1 h prior to recording.

<u>Electrophysiological recording</u>: The slices were transferred to the recording chamber

mounted on a Zeiss Axioskop fixed-stage microscope and perfused with oxygenated ACSF at

31ºC. During the optogenetic stimulation experiments, in order to guarantee that the effects

we measured were generated post-synaptically, the ACSF solution contained (in μM) 10

DNQX to block AMPA receptors, 50 D-APV to block NMDA receptors, 10 gabazine

(SR95531) to block $GABA_A$ receptors, and 2 CGP55845 to block $GABA_B$ receptors. An

Olympus 60X, 0.9 NA water-immersion objective with a 26.5 mm field number (FN) was

used to examine the slice using standard infrared differential interference contrast video

microscopy. Patch pipette resistance was typically 4-5 MΩ when filled with recording

solutions. The junction potential estimated at 7-8 mV was not corrected. The intracellular

solution contained (in mM) 135.5 KCH_3SO_3, 5 KCl, 2.5 NaCl, 5 Na-phosphocreatine, 10

HEPES, 0.2 EGTA, 0.21 Na_2GTP, and 2 $Mg_{1.5}ATP$, pH 7.3 with KOH (280–290 mOsm/kg).

In the Ca^{2+} imaging experiments (see below) the internal solution contained (in mM) 135 K-

gluconate, 5 KCl, 2.5 NaCl, 5 Na-phosphocreatine, 10 HEPES, 0.1 fluo-4 (Molecular

Probes), 0.1 Alexa Fluor 568 (for morphological visualization, Molecular Probes), 0.21

Na_2GTP, and 2 $Mg_{1.5}ATP$, pH 7.3 with KOH (280–290 mOsm/kg). Electrophysiological

recordings were obtained with a MultiClamp 700B amplifier (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale,

CA). Signals were filtered at 10 kHz online, digitized at 10 or 20 kHz and logged onto a

personal computer with the Signal 6 software (Cambridge Electronic Design, Cambridge,

UK). All reagents, drugs and toxins were purchased from either Merck/Sigma-Aldrich

(Darmstadt, Germany), Tocris Biosciences (Bristol, UK) or HelloBio (Bristol, UK).

<u>Voltage-perturbation experiments</u>: CINs were held at either –55 mV or –70 mV and were

given an 83 second-long voltage command structured as a concatenated sequence of

sinusoids from a discrete set of frequencies ranging from 0.2 to 20 Hz with an amplitude of 2

mV (3 or 5 seconds per frequency, such that each frequency was represented by an integer

multiple of its fundamental period). Phase shifts between the voltage sinusoidal and the

somatic current response were determined by the location of the peak in the cross-correlation

function (CCF) of the two traces (whose units are mV·pA), for each stimulation frequency

and for each illumination condition. The impedance at each frequency, $|Z(f)|$, was calculated

from the maximal amplitude of the CCF as $|Z(f)| = (2\text{ mV})^2/\max(\text{CCF})$ (so that its units are

GΩ).

<u>Optogenetic stimulation</u>: Optogenetic stimulation was performed with blue-light (470 nm)

LED illumination via the objective (Mightex, Toronto, ON, Canada). We used two spatial

illumination regimes: a) *proximal illumination* wherein an opaque disk with a central pinhole

was placed in the back focal plane of the 60X water-immersion objective such that a ~130

μm diameter region around the soma was illuminated (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019), thereby

targeting the soma and proximal dendrites; and b) *full-field illumination* of the entire slice

with a 5X air objective which excites the soma and the entire dendritic field. In all

experiments, LED light intensity was chosen such that stimulation generated comparable

current responses for both regimes. We used the same sequence of sinusoids described above,

only this time the voltage driving the LED was modulated (the minimal voltage was the

LED's voltage threshold, 40 mV). The phase delays were again calculated according to the

latency of the peak of the CCF between the LED voltage command and somatic current.

Note, that the phases were corrected by 0.5 (or by π in radians) due to the fact that the ChR2

inward current is in antiphase with the LED's voltage command.

<u>Two-photon laser scanning microscopy (2PLSM)</u>: The two-photon excitation source was a

Chameleon Vision II tunable Ti:Sapphire pulsed laser (Coherent, Santa Clara, CA, USA)

tuned to 820 nm. The images were collected with the Femto2D system (Femtonics, Budapest,

Hungary) which includes two 3 mm galvo-scanners, one gated GaAsP and one multi-alkaline

non-descanned photomultiplier tube for imaging fluo-4 and Alexa Fluor, respectively. Z-

stacks of optical sections (spaced 2 μm apart) were collected using 0.2 μm pixels and 15 μs

dwell times. Optical and electrophysiological data were obtained using the software package

MES (Femtonics), which also integrates the control of all hardware units in the microscope.

The software automates and synchronizes the imaging signals and electrophysiological

protocols. Data was extracted from the MES package to personal computers using custom-

made code in MATLAB. We recorded spontaneously occurring bAPs with line scans at

various distances measured radially from the tip of the soma. Spike triggered averages of the

calcium measurements ($\Delta F/F_0$) were estimated and an alpha-function was fit to them. The

value of the peak of the fitted alpha-function was used as a measure of the size of the

spontaneous bAP at that location.

<u>Drugs and Reagents:</u> TTX was used to block voltage-activated Na^+ currents. Ranolazine was

used to block NaP. ZD7288 was used to block the HCN current. Gabazine (SR-95531) and

CGP 55845 were used to block $GABA_A$ and $GABA_B$ receptors, respectively. All reagents,

drugs and toxins were purchased from either Merck/Sigma-Aldrich (Darmstadt, Germany),

Tocris Biosciences (Bristol, UK) or HelloBio (Bristol, UK).

<u>Data analysis and statistics</u>: Data were analyzed and curve fitting was performed using custom

code in Matlab (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA).

<u>Parameter fitting to the phase delay:</u> In our previous study (Tiroshi and Goldberg, 2019), we

modeled the dendritic arbor as a semi-infinite cable with a homogeneous quasi-linear

membrane (i.e., the current density of each nonlinearity is constant along the dendrite). When

a segment of length r (measured in units of the dendrite's space constant) from the soma is

activated with a sinusoidal current injection (to model the 470 nm illumination of the ChR2-

laden dendrites, which activates the inward current carried by the ChR2), the dendritic phase

delay is given by

$$\phi_d = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\tan^{-1}\frac{q}{p} - \tan^{-1}\frac{\sin qr}{e^{pr} - \cos qr}\right) \qquad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

666   where

$$p = \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} + \alpha}{2}} \qquad q = \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} - \alpha}{2}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

668   α and β are functions of frequency and are determined by the linearization of the dendritic

669   nonlinearities as explained in Goldberg et al. (2007) and Remme and Rinzel (2011), with a

670   negative amplifying parameter, μ_n, and a positive resonance parameter, μ_h.

$$\alpha(f) = \gamma_R + \frac{\mu_n}{1 + (2\pi f \tau_n)^2} + \frac{\mu_h}{1 + (2\pi f \tau_h)^2} \tag{Eq. 3a}$$

$$\beta(f) = 2\pi f \left[\tau - \frac{\mu_n \tau_n}{1 + (2\pi f \tau_n)^2} - \frac{\mu_h \tau_h}{1 + (2\pi f \tau_h)^2} \right] \tag{Eq. 3b}$$

Additional parameters include total dendritic conductance (relative to leak), γ_R, the

membrane time constant τ, and the time constants representing the kinetics of the nonlinear

dendritic conductances, as explained in Goldberg et al. (2007) and Remme and Rinzel

(2011). In some cases we only used the amplifying parameter in the fit (e.g., Fig. 1C).

Using the same formalism it is easy to show that for the (isopotential) soma with a

quasi-linear membrane the phase delay is given by

$$\phi_s = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tan^{-1} \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \tag{Eq. 4}$$

corresponding to an amplitude that is equal to $(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^{-1/2}$ up to a scaling factor. In the

main text, we point out that when μ_n becomes less negative ϕ_s is reduced. This is because

when μ_n becomes less negative α is increased (Eq. 3a) and β is decreased (Eq. 3b). Thus,

when we fit only somatic delays we use ϕ_s, but when we fit the dendritic delays we use the

sum of $\phi_s + \phi_d$, because the dendritic perturbation as recorded by the intracellular electrode

is filtered both by the dendritic and the somatic (quasi-linear) membranes.

Statistics: Null hypotheses were rejected if the P-value was below 0.05. The nonparametric

two-tailed Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used for matched samples and the Wilcoxon rank-

sum test was used for independent samples. The parametric ANCOVA test was used to test

significant changes in the amplitude and phase curves as a function of the natural logarithm

of the frequencies (an operation which spreads out this independent parameter more

uniformly). Null hypotheses were rejected if the P-value was below 0.05.

For the TAN and SPN locking to slow wave peak analysis, confidence intervals (at P-

value of 0.01) were calculated based on the distribution of conditional firing rates 1 s before

and after the slow wave peak.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by a European Research Council (ERC) Consolidator Grant (no. 646886) to J.A.G. and grants from the Israel Science Foundation (no. 2051/20), German Research Foundation (CRC TRR295), Israel-China Binational Science Foundation and the Silverstein Foundation to H.B. We would like to thank Ronit Cherki and Anatoly Shapochnikov for excellent technical assistance.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Abudukeyoumu N, Hernandez-Flores T, Garcia-Munoz M, Arbuthnott GW. 2019. Cholinergic modulation of striatal microcircuits. *Eur J Neurosci* **49**:604–622. doi:10.1111/ejn.13949

Aceves Buendia J de J, Tiroshi L, Chiu W, Goldberg JA. 2019. Selective remodeling of glutamatergic transmission to striatal cholinergic interneurons after dopamine depletion. *Eur J Neurosci* **49**:824–833. doi:10.1111/ejn.13715

Alzheimer C, Schwindt P, Crill W. 1993. Modal gating of Na+ channels as a mechanism of persistent Na+ current in pyramidal neurons from rat and cat sensorimotor cortex. *J Neurosci* **13**:660–673. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.13-02-00660.1993

Aoki S, Liu AW, Akamine Y, Zucca A, Zucca S, Wickens JR. 2018. Cholinergic interneurons in the rat striatum modulate substitution of habits. *Eur J Neurosci* **47**:1194–1205. doi:10.1111/ejn.13820

Aosaki T, Kimura M, Graybiel AM. 1995. Temporal and spatial characteristics of tonically active neurons of the primate's striatum. *J Neurophysiol* **73**:1234–1252.

Aosaki T, Tsubokawa H, Ishida A, Watanabe K, Graybiel AM, Kimura M. 1994. Responses of tonically active neurons in the primate's striatum undergo systematic changes during behavioral sensorimotor conditioning. *J Neurosci* **14**:3969–3984.

Apicella P, Scarnati E, Schultz W. 1991. Tonically discharging neurons of monkey striatum respond to preparatory and rewarding stimuli. *Exp Brain Res* **84**:672–675.

Arenkiel BR, Peca J, Davison IG, Feliciano C, Deisseroth K, Augustine GJ, Ehlers MD, Feng G. 2007. In vivo light-induced activation of neural circuitry in transgenic mice expressing channelrhodopsin-2. *Neuron* **54**:205–218. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2007.03.005

Assous M. 2021. Striatal cholinergic transmission. Focus on nicotinic receptors' influence in striatal circuits. *Eur J Neurosci* **53**:2421–2442. doi:10.1111/ejn.15135

Assous M, Kaminer J, Shah F, Garg A, Koós T, Tepper JM. 2017. Differential processing of thalamic information via distinct striatal interneuron circuits. *Nature Communications* **8**:15860. doi:10.1038/ncomms15860

Beatty Joseph A., Song SC, Wilson CJ. 2015. Cell-type-specific resonances shape the responses of striatal neurons to synaptic input. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **113**:688–700. doi:10.1152/jn.00827.2014

Bennett BD, Callaway JC, Wilson CJ. 2000. Intrinsic membrane properties underlying
spontaneous tonic firing in neostriatal cholinergic interneurons. *J Neurosci* **20**:8493–
8503. doi:20/22/8493 [pii]
Bennett BD, Wilson CJ. 1999. Spontaneous activity of neostriatal cholinergic interneurons in
vitro. *J Neurosci* **19**:5586–5596.
Berger T, Larkum ME, Lüscher H-R. 2001. High I_h Channel Density in the Distal Apical
Dendrite of Layer V Pyramidal Cells Increases Bidirectional Attenuation of EPSPs.
Journal of Neurophysiology **85**:855–868. doi:10.1152/jn.2001.85.2.855
Bradfield LA, Bertran-Gonzalez J, Chieng B, Balleine BW. 2013. The Thalamostriatal
Pathway and Cholinergic Control of Goal-Directed Action: Interlacing New with
Existing Learning in the Striatum. *Neuron* **79**:153–166.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2013.04.039
Brown RE, Basheer R, McKenna JT, Strecker RE, McCarley RW. 2012. Control of Sleep
and Wakefulness. *Physiological Reviews* **92**:1087–1187.
doi:10.1152/physrev.00032.2011
Buzsáki G, Anastassiou CA, Koch C. 2012. The origin of extracellular fields and currents —
EEG, ECoG, LFP and spikes. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **13**:407–420. doi:10.1038/nrn3241
Carter AG, Sabatini BL. 2004. State-Dependent Calcium Signaling in Dendritic Spines of
Striatal Medium Spiny Neurons. *Neuron* **44**:483–493.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2004.10.013
Choi SJ, Ma TC, Ding Y, Cheung T, Joshi N, Sulzer D, Mosharov EV, Kang UJ. 2020.
Alterations in the intrinsic properties of striatal cholinergic interneurons after
dopamine lesion and chronic L-DOPA. *eLife* **9**:e56920. doi:10.7554/eLife.56920
Day M, Wokosin D, Plotkin JL, Tian X, Surmeier DJ. 2008. Differential Excitability and
Modulation of Striatal Medium Spiny Neuron Dendrites. *Journal of Neuroscience*
28:11603–11614. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1840-08.2008
Deng P, Zhang Y, Xu ZC. 2007. Involvement of I(h) in dopamine modulation of tonic firing
in striatal cholinergic interneurons. *J Neurosci* **27**:3148–3156. doi:27/12/3148 [pii]
10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5535-06.2007
Deng YP, Wong T, Bricker-Anthony C, Deng B, Reiner A. 2013. Loss of corticostriatal and
thalamostriatal synaptic terminals precedes striatal projection neuron pathology in
heterozygous Q140 Huntington's disease mice. *Neurobiol Dis* **60**:89–107.
doi:10.1016/j.nbd.2013.08.009
Ding J, Guzman JN, Tkatch T, Chen S, Goldberg JA, Ebert PJ, Levitt P, Wilson CJ, Hamm
HE, Surmeier DJ. 2006. RGS4-dependent attenuation of M4 autoreceptor function in
striatal cholinergic interneurons following dopamine depletion. *Nat Neurosci* **9**:832–
842. doi:10.1038/nn1700
Ding JB, Guzman JN, Peterson JD, Goldberg JA, Surmeier DJ. 2010. Thalamic Gating of
Corticostriatal Signaling by Cholinergic Interneurons. *Neuron* **67**:294–307.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.06.017
Ding Y, Won L, Britt JP, Lim SAO, McGehee DS, Kang UJ. 2011. Enhanced striatal
cholinergic neuronal activity mediates L-DOPA-induced dyskinesia in parkinsonian
mice. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**:840–845.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1006511108
Eskow Jaunarajs KL, Bonsi P, Chesselet MF, Standaert DG, Pisani A. 2015. Striatal
cholinergic dysfunction as a unifying theme in the pathophysiology of dystonia.
Progress in Neurobiology **127–128**:91–107. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2015.02.002
Goldberg JA, Deister CA, Wilson CJ. 2007. Response Properties and Synchronization of
Rhythmically Firing Dendritic Neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **97**:208–219.
doi:10.1152/jn.00810.2006

Goldberg JA, Ding JB, Surmeier DJ. 2012. Muscarinic Modulation of Striatal Function and
Circuitry In: Fryer AD, Christopoulos A, Nathanson NM, editors. Muscarinic
Receptors, Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer
Berlin Heidelberg. pp. 223–241. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-23274-9_10
Goldberg JA, Reynolds JN. 2011. Spontaneous firing and evoked pauses in the tonically
active cholinergic interneurons of the striatum. *Neuroscience* **198**:27–43.
doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2011.08.067
Goldberg JA, Teagarden MA, Foehring RC, Wilson CJ. 2009. Nonequilibrium Calcium
Dynamics Regulate the Autonomous Firing Pattern of Rat Striatal Cholinergic
Interneurons. *Journal of Neuroscience* **29**:8396–8407.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5582-08.2009
Goldberg JA, Wilson CJ. 2010. The Cholinergic Interneurons of the Striatum: Intrinsic
Properties Underlie Multiple Discharge Patterns. In: Steiner H, Tseng KY, editors.
Handbook of Basal Ganglia Structure and Function. London: Academic Press. pp.
133–149.
Goldberg JA, Wilson CJ. 2005. Control of Spontaneous Firing Patterns by the Selective
Coupling of Calcium Currents to Calcium-Activated Potassium Currents in Striatal
Cholinergic Interneurons. *Journal of Neuroscience* **25**:10230–10238.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2734-05.2005
Graybiel A, Aosaki T, Flaherty A, Kimura M. 1994. The basal ganglia and adaptive motor
control. *Science* **265**:1826–1831. doi:10.1126/science.8091209
Gritton HJ, Howe WM, Romano MF, DiFeliceantonio AG, Kramer MA, Saligrama V,
Bucklin ME, Zemel D, Han X. 2019. Unique contributions of parvalbumin and
cholinergic interneurons in organizing striatal networks during movement. *Nat
Neurosci* **22**:586–597. doi:10.1038/s41593-019-0341-3
Häusser M. 2021. Optogenetics — The Might of Light. *N Engl J Med* **385**:1623–1626.
doi:10.1056/NEJMcibr2111915
Higgs MH, Wilson CJ. 2017. Measurement of phase resetting curves using optogenetic
barrage stimuli. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **289**:23–30.
doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.06.018
Howe M, Ridouh I, Allegra Mascaro AL, Larios A, Azcorra M, Dombeck DA. 2019.
Coordination of rapid cholinergic and dopaminergic signaling in striatum during
spontaneous movement. *eLife* **8**:e44903. doi:10.7554/eLife.44903
Hutcheon B, Miura RM, Puil E. 1996. Subthreshold membrane resonance in neocortical
neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **76**:683–697. doi:10.1152/jn.1996.76.2.683
Hutcheon B, Yarom Y. 2000. Resonance, oscillation and the intrinsic frequency preferences
of neurons. *Trends in Neurosciences* **23**:216–222. doi:10.1016/S0166-
2236(00)01547-2
Johansson Y, Silberberg G. 2020. The Functional Organization of Cortical and Thalamic
Inputs onto Five Types of Striatal Neurons Is Determined by Source and Target Cell
Identities. *Cell Reports* **30**:1178-1194.e3. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2019.12.095
Joshua M, Adler A, Mitelman R, Vaadia E, Bergman H. 2008. Midbrain Dopaminergic
Neurons and Striatal Cholinergic Interneurons Encode the Difference between
Reward and Aversive Events at Different Epochs of Probabilistic Classical
Conditioning Trials. *Journal of Neuroscience* **28**:11673–11684.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3839-08.2008
Kawaguchi Y. 1993. Physiological, morphological, and histochemical characterization of
three classes of interneurons in rat neostriatum. *J Neurosci* **13**:4908–4923.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.13-11-04908.1993

Kerr JND. 2004. Action Potential Timing Determines Dendritic Calcium during Striatal Up-
States. *Journal of Neuroscience* **24**:877–885. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4475-03.2004
Kim CK, Adhikari A, Deisseroth K. 2017. Integration of optogenetics with complementary
methodologies in systems neuroscience. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **18**:222–235.
doi:10.1038/nrn.2017.15
Kimura M, Rajkowski J, Evarts E. 1984. Tonically discharging putamen neurons exhibit set-
dependent responses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **81**:4998–
5001. doi:10.1073/pnas.81.15.4998
Koch C. 1984. Cable theory in neurons with active, linearized membranes. *Biol Cybern*
50:15–33. doi:10.1007/BF00317936
Kosillo P, Zhang Y-F, Threlfell S, Cragg SJ. 2016. Cortical Control of Striatal Dopamine
Transmission via Striatal Cholinergic Interneurons. *Cereb Cortex* **26**:4160–4169.
doi:10.1093/cercor/bhw252
Lapper SR, Bolam JP. 1992. Input From the Frontal Cortex and the Nucleus To Cholinergic
Interneurons in the Dorsal of the Rat **51**:533–545.
Liu D, Dan Y. 2019. A Motor Theory of Sleep-Wake Control: Arousal-Action Circuit. *Annu
Rev Neurosci* **42**:27–46. doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-080317-061813
Martin RF, Bowden DM. 2000. Primate brain maps: structure of the macaque brain. Elsevier.
Matsumoto N, Minamimoto T, Graybiel AM, Kimura M. 2001. Neurons in the Thalamic
CM-Pf Complex Supply Striatal Neurons With Information About Behaviorally
Significant Sensory Events. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **85**:960–976.
doi:10.1152/jn.2001.85.2.960
Maurice N. 2004. D2 Dopamine Receptor-Mediated Modulation of Voltage-Dependent Na+
Channels Reduces Autonomous Activity in Striatal Cholinergic Interneurons. *Journal
of Neuroscience* **24**:10289–10301. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2155-04.2004
Mauro A, Conti F, Dodge F, Schor R. 1970. Subthreshold Behavior and Phenomenological
Impedance of the Squid Giant Axon. *Journal of General Physiology* **55**:497–523.
doi:10.1085/jgp.55.4.497
McGuirt AF, Post MR, Pigulevskiy I, Sulzer D, Lieberman OJ. 2021. Coordinated Postnatal
Maturation of Striatal Cholinergic Interneurons and Dopamine Release Dynamics in
Mice. *J Neurosci* **41**:3597–3609. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0755-20.2021
Mizrahi-Kliger AD, Kaplan A, Israel Z, Bergman H. 2018. Desynchronization of slow
oscillations in the basal ganglia during natural sleep. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
115:E4274–E4283. doi:10.1073/pnas.1720795115
Morris G, Arkadir D, Nevet A, Vaadia E, Bergman H. 2004. Coincident but distinct
messages of midbrain dopamine and striatal tonically active neurons. *Neuron* **43**:133–
143. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2004.06.012 S0896627304003551 [pii]
Oswald MJ, Oorschot DE, Schulz JM, Lipski J, Reynolds JN. 2009. IH current generates the
afterhyperpolarisation following activation of subthreshold cortical synaptic inputs to
striatal cholinergic interneurons. *J Physiol* **587**:5879–5897. doi:jphysiol.2009.177600
[pii] 10.1113/jphysiol.2009.177600
Parker PRL, Lalive AL, Kreitzer AC. 2016. Pathway-Specific Remodeling of Thalamostriatal
Synapses in Parkinsonian Mice. *Neuron* **89**:734–740.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.12.038
Paz RM, Tubert C, Stahl AM, Amarillo Y, Rela L, Murer MG. 2021. Levodopa Causes
Striatal Cholinergic Interneuron Burst-Pause Activity in Parkinsonian Mice. *Mov
Disord* **36**:1578–1591. doi:10.1002/mds.28516
Pisani A, Bernardi G, Ding J, Surmeier DJ. 2007. Re-emergence of striatal cholinergic
interneurons in movement disorders. *Trends in Neurosciences* **30**:545–553.
doi:10.1016/j.tins.2007.07.008

Plotkin JL, Goldberg JA. 2019. Thinking Outside the Box (and Arrow): Current Themes in
Striatal Dysfunction in Movement Disorders. *Neuroscientist* **25**:359–379.
doi:10.1177/1073858418807887

Raz A, Feingold A, Zelanskaya V, Vaadia E, Bergman H. 1996. Neuronal synchronization of
tonically active neurons in the striatum of normal and parkinsonian primates. *J*
Neurophysiol **76**:2083–2088.

Rehani R, Atamna Y, Tiroshi L, Chiu W-H, de Jesús Aceves Buendía J, Martins GJ,
Jacobson GA, Goldberg JA. 2019. Activity Patterns in the Neuropil of Striatal
Cholinergic Interneurons in Freely Moving Mice Represent Their Collective Spiking
Dynamics. *eNeuro* **6**:ENEURO.0351-18.2018. doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0351-18.2018

Remme MWH, Rinzel J. 2011. Role of active dendritic conductances in subthreshold input
integration. *J Comput Neurosci* **31**:13–30. doi:10.1007/s10827-010-0295-7

Riedner BA, Vyazovskiy VV, Huber R, Massimini M, Esser S, Murphy M, Tononi G. 2007.
Sleep Homeostasis and Cortical Synchronization: III. A High-Density EEG Study of
Sleep Slow Waves in Humans. *Sleep* **30**:1643–1657. doi:10.1093/sleep/30.12.1643

Schulz JM, Oswald MJ, Reynolds JNJ. 2011. Visual-Induced Excitation Leads to Firing
Pauses in Striatal Cholinergic Interneurons. *Journal of Neuroscience* **31**:11133–
11143. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0661-11.2011

Schulz JM, Reynolds JNJ. 2013. Pause and rebound: sensory control of cholinergic signaling
in the striatum. *Trends in Neurosciences* **36**:41–50. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2012.09.006

Sharott A, Doig NM, Mallet N, Magill PJ. 2012. Relationships between the Firing of
Identified Striatal Interneurons and Spontaneous and Driven Cortical Activities In
Vivo. *Journal of Neuroscience* **32**:13221–13236. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2440-
12.2012

Smith Y, Raju DV, Pare JF, Sidibe M. 2004. The thalamostriatal system: a highly specific
network of the basal ganglia circuitry. *Trends Neurosci* **27**:520–527.
doi:10.1016/j.tins.2004.07.004 S0166-2236(04)00232-2 [pii]

Song WJ, Surmeier DJ. 1996. Voltage-dependent facilitation of calcium channels in rat
neostriatal neurons. *J Neurophysiol* **76**:2290–2306.

Tanimura A, Du Y, Kondapalli J, Wokosin DL, Surmeier DJ. 2019. Cholinergic Interneurons
Amplify Thalamostriatal Excitation of Striatal Indirect Pathway Neurons in
Parkinson's Disease Models. *Neuron* **101**:444-458.e6.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2018.12.004

Tanimura A, Lim SAO, Aceves Buendia J de J, Goldberg JA, Surmeier DJ. 2016.
Cholinergic Interneurons Amplify Corticostriatal Synaptic Responses in the Q175
Model of Huntington's Disease. *Front Syst Neurosci* **10**.
doi:10.3389/fnsys.2016.00102

Thomas TM, Smith Y, Levey AI, Hersch SM. 2000. Cortical Inputs to m2-Immunoreactive
Striatal Interneurons in Rat and Monkey. *Synapse* **37**:252–261.

Thorn CA, Graybiel AM. 2010. Pausing to Regroup: Thalamic Gating of Cortico-Basal
Ganglia Networks. *Neuron* **67**:175–178. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.07.010

Threlfell S, Lalic T, Platt NJ, Jennings KA, Deisseroth K, Cragg SJ. 2012. Striatal Dopamine
Release Is Triggered by Synchronized Activity in Cholinergic Interneurons. *Neuron*
75:58–64. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2012.04.038

Tiroshi L, Goldberg JA. 2019. Population dynamics and entrainment of basal ganglia
pacemakers are shaped by their dendritic arbors. *PLoS Comput Biol* **15**:e1006782.
doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006782

Tubert C, Murer MG. 2021. What's wrong with the striatal cholinergic interneurons in
Parkinson's disease? Focus on intrinsic excitability. *Eur J Neurosci* **53**:2100–2116.
doi:10.1111/ejn.14742

Ulrich D. 2002. Dendritic Resonance in Rat Neocortical Pyramidal Cells. *Journal of*
Neurophysiology **87**:2753–2759. doi:10.1152/jn.2002.87.6.2753
Wilson C, Chang H, Kitai S. 1990. Firing patterns and synaptic potentials of identified giant
aspiny interneurons in the rat neostriatum. *J Neurosci* **10**:508–519.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.10-02-00508.1990
Wilson CJ. 2005. The mechanism of intrinsic amplification of hyperpolarizations and
spontaneous bursting in striatal cholinergic interneurons. *Neuron* **45**:575–585.
Wilson CJ. 2004. Basal Ganglia In: Shepherd GM, editor. The Synaptic Organization of the
Brain. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 361–413.
Wilson CJ, Goldberg JA. 2006. Origin of the slow afterhyperpolarization and slow rhythmic
bursting in striatal cholinergic interneurons. *J Neurophysiol* **95**:196–204.
doi:00630.2005 [pii] 10.1152/jn.00630.2005
Yamanaka K, Hori Y, Minamimoto T, Yamada H, Matsumoto N, Enomoto K, Aosaki T,
Graybiel AM, Kimura M. 2018. Roles of centromedian parafascicular nuclei of
thalamus and cholinergic interneurons in the dorsal striatum in associative learning of
environmental events. *J Neural Transm* **125**:501–513. doi:10.1007/s00702-017-1713-
z
Yarom O, Cohen D. 2011. Putative Cholinergic Interneurons in the Ventral and Dorsal
Regions of the Striatum Have Distinct Roles in a Two Choice Alternative Association
Task. *Front Syst Neurosci* **5**. doi:10.3389/fnsys.2011.00036
953