1

Conduction Velocities of Excitatory Axons Innervating Parvalbumin Interneurons in Primary

Somatosensory Cortex

Kate Scheuer[1]

Xinyu Zhao[2,3]

Meyer Jackson[3]

1. Cellular and Molecular Biology Program, 2. Waisman Center, and 3. Department of

Neuroscience, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53705

Corresponding author email: meyer.jackson@wisc.edu

Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial

interests.

Acknowledgements: National Institutes of Health Grants NS105200 and NS093866 to M.B.J.

and X.Z. Thanks to Dr. Shane McMahon for methodological contributions.

Abstract

Timing plays a critical role in signaling throughout the nervous system. Signaling times

vary widely depending on distance and speed, and timing delays influence circuit computations

such as coincidence detection, synaptic integration, entrainment, temporal summation, and

plasticity. Parvalbumin (PV) interneurons are a major type of inhibitory neuron with critical roles

throughout the brain. Their rapid-spiking characteristics enable them to control the dynamics of

neural circuits across a range of time scales. However, little is known about the factors that

determine the timing of their synaptic inputs. Here, we measured the conduction velocity (CV) of

excitatory axons that target PV interneurons in mouse primary somatosensory cortex. Using a

genetically-encoded hybrid voltage sensor (hVOS) targeted to PV interneurons, we clocked the

arrival of excitatory synaptic inputs with sub-millisecond precision in large numbers of cells

across multiple layers. Arrival times varied with distance, allowing us to determine the CV of the

excitatory axons. Values ranged from 28–241 µm/msec across layers 2-5, and interlaminar CV

was about twice as fast as intralaminar CV. This will enable more rapid computation within

columns, while integration between columns will be slower. hVOS imaging from specific cell

types offers a unique opportunity to investigate conduction in axons defined by their targets.

Introduction

Axonal conduction velocity (CV) influences neural computations by controlling the timing of synaptic inputs. CV impacts processes such as coincidence detection, temporal summation, entrainment, oscillations, synaptic integration, and synaptic plasticity (Bucher & Goaillard, 2011; Chomiak, Peters, & Hu, 2008; Fields, 2015; Pajevic, Basser, & Fields, 2014; Salami, Itami, Tsumoto, & Kimura, 2003). Small variations in CV can have a profound impact on synchrony and oscillation frequency (Ivanov, Polykretis, & Michmizos, 2019; Pajevic et al., 2014), and CV alterations have been linked to a variety of diseases including diabetes (Candy & Szatkowski, 2000), schizophrenia (Corcoba et al., 2015), and Down Syndrome (Olmos-Serrano et al., 2016). Demyelination associated with degenerative diseases such as multiple sclerosis has a major impact on CV (Compston & Coles, 2002; Nave, 2010; Pedroni, Minh do, Mallamaci, & Cherubini, 2014), and slower CV caused by decreased erbB signaling has been linked to bipolar disorder and schizophrenia (Roy et al., 2007).

CV is determined by axonal diameter and other geometric properties, as well as the capacitance and intrinsic excitability of the axonal membrane. CV varies widely between different axons and functional pathways. Axons projecting from ventral temporal cortex to the inferior colliculus conduct approximately three times faster than those projecting to caudate putamen (Chomiak et al., 2008), and hippocampal dentate granule cell (mossy fiber) axons conduct more rapidly than the axons of hilar mossy cells (Ma, Bayguinov, & Jackson, 2017). CV can also differ within the axons of the same cell. For a given ventral temporal cortical neuron, axonal branches with contralateral targets have significantly slower CV compared to axonal branches with ipsilateral targets (Chomiak et al., 2008). CV may also vary based on postsynaptic cell type. As a result of differences in CV, stimulating the same thalamic neuron activates

inhibitory targets before excitatory targets in somatosensory barrel cortex (BC), thus setting a

very narrow time window for excitation (Kimura et al., 2010). Additionally, cell type can

influence CV variability. Martinotti cells in layer 5 (L5) BC have more variable axonal CVs

compared to pyramidal cells in the same layer (Shlosberg, Abu-Ghanem, & Amitai, 2008). These

many variations in CV determine not only computation speed, but by influencing timing and

delays, determine how circuits encode and process information.

Previous measurements of CV have been hindered by technical constraints arising from

the difficulty of recording directly from axons, as well as low throughput, and lack of spatial and

temporal resolution. Voltage imaging has provided a powerful general method for the

measurement of axonal CV (Grinvald, Ross, & Farber, 1981; Hamada, Popovic, & Kole, 2017;

Popovic, Foust, McCormick, & Zecevic, 2011; Sakai et al., 1991), and genetically-encoded

voltage indicators have extended the approach to these problems through the addition of

targeting specificity (Ma, Bayguinov, & Jackson, 2019; Panzera & Hoppa, 2019). The hybrid

voltage sensor (hVOS) has sub-millisecond temporal resolution, single-cell spatial resolution

(Chanda et al., 2005; Ghitani, Bayguinov, Ma, & Jackson, 2015; Ma et al., 2017), and can be

targeted to specific cell populations (Bayguinov, Ma, Gao, Zhao, & Jackson, 2017; Chanda et al.,

2005; Ghitani, Bayguinov, Ma, & Jackson, 2015; Ma et al., 2017). hVOS reveals voltage

changes from large numbers of neurons simultaneously, and when targeted directly to axons, can

resolve differences in CV based on cell type (Ma et al., 2017). In this study, we used hVOS to

measure CV along excitatory axons targeting inhibitory parvalbumin (PV) interneurons in mouse

BC. Because they fire rapidly and have a short membrane time constant, PV interneurons play a

critical role in controlling the temporal integration window of their targets (Cardin, 2018;

Ferguson & Gao, 2018; Galarreta & Hestrin, 2002; Pouille & Scanziani, 2001). They are also

essential for the generation of gamma oscillations, rhythmic brain waves between 30 and 80 Hz

which affect sensory integration, working memory, social cognition, and other functions

(Gandal, Edgar, Klook, & Siegel, 2012; Gloveli et al., 2005; Gonzalez-Burgos, Cho, & Lewis,

2015; Pouille & Scanziani, 2001). Both PV interneurons and gamma oscillations have been

implicated in a variety of psychiatric and neurological disorders including schizophrenia, bipolar

disorder, and autism spectrum disorder (Gonzalez-Burgos et al., 2015; Lauber, Filice, &

Schwaller, 2018; T. Y. Liu et al., 2012). The fast-spiking behavior of PV interneurons suggests

that they are adapted to rapid computations. Thus, the speed of their activation by excitatory

inputs is likely to be important to their function.

While PV interneurons are present throughout L2-6, their density and circuitry vary

widely within the cortex (Staiger & Petersen, 2021). Properties such as excitation/inhibition

balance and gamma oscillation frequency, both linked to PV interneuron function, differ based

on cortical layer (Adesnik, 2018; Xu et al., 2016). We used the response latencies of PV

interneurons to determine CV within and between different cortical layers. CV varied widely

from 44 ± 15 μm/msec (mean $\pm$ SD) for L2/3 intralaminar CV to up to 241 μm/msec for L5 $\rightarrow$

L4 CV. The mean interlaminar CV (111 ± 49 μm/msec) was about twice as fast as the mean

intralaminar CV (57 ± 41 μm/msec). These differences between inter- and intralaminar CV will

influence processing within the BC to make computations within columns faster than

computations between columns.

Results

PV interneuron responses to stimulation in L2/3, L4, and L5

In mice from PV-Cre crosses with hVOS Cre reporter mice (see Methods), hVOS probe has been shown to be expressed in 83% of PV interneurons with 99.2% specificity (Bayguinov et al., 2017). In slices from these mice, BC cortical layers and barrels are visible in gradient contrast optics (Fig. 3A) and fluorescence (Fig. 3B; note that the images were taken with different cameras, so the fields of view do not align precisely). Layers were identified by cell density and cell size (Feldmeyer, 2012; Woolsey & Van der Loos, 1970), and boundaries between layers are marked with dashed lines (Figs. 1, 3, 4, Supp. Fig. 1). Fields of view generally contained L2/3 through L5 (Fig. 1). Barrels were separated into faint "hollows" (Feldmeyer, 2012; Woolsey & Van der Loos, 1970) as well as stronger fluorescence in L4, and boundaries between columns marked by dotted lines (Fig. 3, 4, Supp. Fig. 1). Electrical stimulation in L2/3, L4, and L5 elicited voltage changes in PV interneurons distributed through L2-5, as shown in the maximum amplitude heatmaps in Figs. 1A (L2/3), 1B (L4), and 1C (L5). Warmer colors correspond to greater changes in fluorescence and indicate the presence of responsive PV interneurons. Traces from locations (indicated by number and color) reveal corresponding variations in the magnitude of PV interneuron depolarization (Fig. 1D-F). Dark blue regions of the heatmap indicate the absence of responsive PV interneurons, and traces from those locations show no discernable stimulus-evoked fluorescence change.

Figure 1. PV interneurons throughout a slice respond to stimulation in L2/3 (A), L4 (B), L5 (C) (stimulation sites indicated by white or black stars). In maximum amplitude heatmaps, warmer colors indicate greater changes in fluorescence. These differences in amplitude are visible in selected traces of fluorescence versus time (D-F) from the corresponding heatmaps above. Locations of traces are indicated with small white or black squares and numbers in each map. Arrowheads indicate time of stimulation.

Stronger stimulation elicited responses in more cells over greater distances. Heatmaps of

signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) revealed that stimulation with 10 µA rarely elicited detectable

responses (Fig. 2A). Increasing the stimulus current to 20 µA (Fig. 2B) and 60 µA (Fig. 2C)

elicited responses in more neurons over greater distances, and increasing to 100 µA depolarized

still more neurons over a broader range of distances encompassing nearly the entire field of view

(Figs. 1, 2D). Responses depended on synaptic excitation, as they were blocked by 10 µM

NBQX (Figs. 2E-2F). Patterns of response spread varied but often included intralaminar

responses across multiple barrel columns (Video 1) and/or interlaminar responses within and

between barrel columns (Videos 2, 3). These excitatory responses spread away from the stimulus

electrode as action potentials propagated along excitatory efferents; the speed of this spread

reflects the CV along these axons.

Figure 2. PV interneuron responses to different stimulation currents. Heatmaps of SNR following stimulations of 10 µA (A), 20 µA (B), 60 µA (C), and 100 µA (D). Site of stimulation is marked with a white star in A-D. Heatmap scale in (A) also applies to (B-D). A method of analysis was developed to identify individual, non-overlapping cells with clear responses (see Methods for criteria). E-F. Traces from 6 clearly identified PV interneurons (circled in red in D) show fluorescence versus time before (E) and after (F) the addition of 10 µM NBQX. Blockade by NBQX indicates that responses are glutamatergic.

Identification of single PV interneurons

Determining CV requires the observation of responses in significant numbers of clearly

identified neurons with well-resolved locations and accurately measured latencies. Fluorescence

images of slices (Fig. 3B) display diffusely distributed fluorescence due to the dense arborization

of PV interneurons (Fukuda & Kosaka, 2003). This makes it difficult to locate individual cells

precisely. This, together with the large numbers of responsive cells, made manual analysis

extremely time-consuming. We therefore developed a semi-automated method to identify

responsive PV interneurons (see Methods and Supp. Fig. 1). Briefly, pixels above a baseline

SNR cutoff (Supp. Fig. 1A) were divided into groups using k-means clustering of the SNR maps

(Supp. Fig. 1B). Putative somata were identified as contiguous groups of pixels in the same k-

means cluster based on the reasoning that pixels from the same cell body are expected to have a

similar SNR. A pixel group was considered to be a PV interneuron soma if its amplitude and

SNR were above the cutoffs (0.1% for amplitude, 5 for SNR), did not share a face with another

pixel group, and was < 20 μm across (consistent with the size of a PV interneuron soma

(Kooijmans, Sierhuis, Self, & Roelfsema, 2020; Selby, Zhang, & Sun, 2007; Y. Wang, Gupta,

Toledo-Rodriguez, Wu, & Markram, 2002)).

This process provided a reproducible, robust method of identifying individual PV

interneurons free of subjective choices. The procedure is illustrated with a slice from which a

gradient contrast image is shown in Fig. 3A and a resting fluorescence image is shown in Fig.

3B. The electrode, visible in L2/3 in both images, was used to apply a stimulation of 100 μA. A

SNR heatmap revealed activated cells concentrated in L4, but cells in L2/3 and L5 also

responded (Fig. 3C). This heatmap highlights 56 PV interneurons identified with our clustering

method. Responsive neurons were outlined in black, or in red for locations selected for display of

fluorescence versus time (Fig. 3D). The 8 selected traces show clear depolarizing responses

following stimulation.

Figure 3. Identification of responsive PV interneurons. A. Gradient contrast image (taken with the Kiralux camera), and B. fluorescence image (taken with the CCD-SMQ camera) of a BC somatosensory cortical slice containing L2/3, L4 and L5. The stimulating electrode is visible in L2/3 (star at the tip, black in A and B, white in C). Layer boundaries are indicated by dashed lines, and barrel column borders are indicated with dotted lines in B-C. Following 100 μA stimulation, responsive PV interneurons were identified based on K-means clustering of SNR and other criteria (see Methods and Supp. Fig. 1). C. A SNR heatmap shows that responsive PV interneurons span the field of view and are present in L2-5. We identified 56 responsive PV interneurons outlined in black or red. D. Traces of fluorescence versus time for the 8 PV interneurons outlined in red in C. Arrowhead above indicates stimulation time. All displayed traces show clear decreases in fluorescence following stimulation, indicating depolarization of the highlighted PV interneurons.

Returning to Fig. 2, this method identified 12, 96, 176, and 115 responsive PV

interneurons for 10, 20, 60, and 100 μA stimulation, respectively. The decrease in number of

identifiable cells with 100 µA reflects the higher proportion of overlapping cells that could not be

disambiguated. The best balance between extensive spread with large numbers of readily

resolved individual cells versus too much overlap was seen with 100 µA, so this stimulus

strength was used for experiments on CV. The broad patterns of propagation are clearly evident

in unprocessed data as illustrated in the heatmaps and supplemental videos described above.

However, by employing method we were able to focus on somata and improve the precision of

latency determination. We were thus able to analyze large numbers of cells over a broad area

with a wide range of propagation distances. This analysis thus provided a robust identification of

responsive neurons and, together with our choice of experimental conditions, optimized the

determination of CV.

Intra- and interlaminar conduction velocity

As an action potential propagates along the axon of an excitatory neuron, PV

interneurons closer to the site of initiation respond first and those farther away respond later (Fig.

4A). A sequence of frames taken at one msec intervals from 2 msec to 6 msec after stimulation

illustrate the spatiotemporal pattern of response spread (Fig. 4B). Note that these frames

represent the SNR at successive time points, compared to the maps in Figs. 1-3 showing the

maximum value within the entire post-stimulus measure window. The frames in Fig. 4B show

that PV interneuron responses occur first mostly nearer the stimulating electrode in L4 (2-3

msec), spread vertically both ways to L2/3 and L5 (4-5 msec), and then spread both vertically

and horizontally through L2/3 and L5 (5-6 msec). Thus, a single experiment can capture

propagation along different populations of axons, and because fields of view contained large

numbers of responsive neurons (typically ~50-100), we were generally able to identify 8 or more

neurons along distinct trajectories to track propagation. Fig. 4C-D presents resting fluorescence

and maximum SNR maps, respectively, showing the locations of responsive cells along one

selected trajectory (L4 → L2/3 CV). A plot of latency versus distance fitted to a line gave us the

CV as inverse of the slope (Fig. 4E). By constructing plots along different trajectories, we

determined the CV of different subpopulations of axons that target PV interneurons. Focusing on

PV interneurons in the same layer as the stimulation electrode (between dashed lines in Fig. 4B-

D) provided a determination of intralaminar (horizontal) CV, and focusing on PV interneurons in

the same barrel column as the stimulating electrode (between dotted lines in Fig. 4B-D) provided

a determination of interlaminar (vertical) CV. Interlaminar CV often included an additional

neighboring barrel column. This is consistent with results from rat BC indicating that excitatory

axons tend to project within the same and/or neighboring columns but usually not to columns

beyond the nearest neighbor (Narayanan et al., 2015).

In 22 out of 59 slices, plots of latency versus distance had statistically significant

correlations. Among the remaining slices, negative correlations occurred only rarely (4 out of 59

slices). The highest CV we were able to measure was 241 μm/msec (19 PV interneurons), and

nearly half (15) of the experiments without significant positive correlations yielded CV values

above the highest measurable value. In these cases, the spread within the field of view was too

fast to detect differences in latency. In most cases of such rapid propagation, latencies varied by

less than 0.5 msec (average root-mean-square error = 0.427). These results indicate that in many

slices, the CV was faster than can be measured over the distances accessible within our field of

view. In the remainder of this work, we will focus primarily on CV measurements with

significant distance-latency correlations, unless stated otherwise, and recognize that this biases

our analysis uniformly toward slower conduction.

Figure 4. A. Stimulation excites principal cells, their axons, or both (gray). As an action potential propagates along an excitatory axon, synapses on PV neurons evoke sequential responses (pink, blue, red, purple). (Created with BioRender; https://biorender.com). B. Sequential responses can be observed in a sequence of SNR heatmaps at one msec intervals (times after stimulation indicated in the top right corner of each frame). PV interneuron responses occur first mostly near the stimulating electrode in L4 (2-3 msec), and spread vertically and horizontally through the slice. A white start indicates the site of stimulation in all frames (See videos in supplemental data). Resting fluorescence image (C) and average SNR response heatmap within a 20 msec measure window (D). Black (C) or white (D) stars indicate site of stimulation. Dashed lines mark layer boundaries (B-D). Dotted black (C) or white (B, D) lines perpendicular to layer boundaries outline the stimulated and neighboring barrel. Ten responsive PV interneurons identified by our grouping method along an L4 → L2/3 CV trajectory are outlined in black in C and D, with numbers indicating response order. E. Latency plotted versus distance for these 10 cells. The relationship between latency and distance was significant (t = 4.255, p-value = 0.004), and the slope yielded a CV of 51 μm/msec.

Stimulation in L2/3, L4, and L5 elicited responses that spread within those layers, and

latency versus distance plots yielded intralaminar CV values in L2/3 and L5. In L4 the lack of

correlation prevented us from determining the CV (N=3), and this may indicate that intralaminar

conduction is faster in this layer. L2/3 intralaminar CV measurements were generally slow with

low variance (44 ± 15 μm/msec, N = 52 PV interneurons from 4 slices). The two measured L5

intralaminar CV values were very different (28 μm/msec and 136 μm/msec, N = 18 PV

interneurons from 2 slices), potentially reflecting differences between L5 pyramidal cell

subtypes, which are known to vary in target projection layers and morphology (Larsen &

Callaway, 2006). Fig. 5A shows a plot of latency versus distance with an intralaminar CV in

L2/3 of 37 μm/msec (t = 4.86, p = 0.0009).

Figure 5. Latency versus intralaminar (A) or interlaminar (B) distance for two representative experiments. The steeper slope in A compared to B indicates that the L2/3 intralaminar CV represented in A (37 μm/msec) is slower than the L5 → L4 interlaminar CV shown in B (241 μm/msec).

Correlated latency-distance plots for interlaminar propagation were obtained for all pairs

of layers with the exception of L5 → L2/3. Fig. 5B shows a plot for L5 → L4 conduction

yielding a CV of 241 μm/msec (t = 2.63, p = 0.018). For three other pairs of layers CV values

were similar to one another, with L4 → L2/3 giving CV = 94 ± 37 μm/msec (N = 62 PV

interneurons, 3 slices), L5 → L2/3 giving CV = 107 ± 48 μm/msec (N = 57 PV interneurons, 3

slices), and L2/3 → L4 giving CV = 81 ± 36 μm/msec (N = 93 PV interneurons, 5 slices). Faster

CV values were obtained for L4 → L5 (144 μm/msec, N = 8 PV interneurons, 1 slice) and L5 →

L4 (154 ± 58 μm/msec, N = 63 PV interneurons, 4 slices), including our fastest CV of 241

μm/msec (Fig. 5B). The plot of latency versus distance for L5 → L4 in Fig. 5B is noticeably less

steep than the plot of L2/3 intralaminar CV in Fig. 5A, supporting the view that the L5 → L4 CV

is faster than the intralaminar CV.

Interlaminar CVs (111 ± 49 μm/msec, N = 16 slices) were about twice as fast as

intralaminar CVs (57 ± 41 μm/msec, N = 6 slices), and this difference was statistically

significant (t = -2.587, p = 0.026, Fig. 6A). This difference remained significant even excluding

the single particularly fast interlaminar CV value of 241 μm/msec (t = -2.352, p = 0.046).

ANOVA followed by post-hoc testing revealed that intralaminar CV is about 2.7 times slower

than L5 → L4 interlaminar CV (Fig. 6B, ANOVA: F = 3.085, p = 0.046; Tukey's honestly

significant differences: L5 → L4 CV versus intralaminar CV: p = 0.025). Including values for

slices with CVs too fast to produce significant correlations further supports the assertion that

interlaminar CV is faster than intralaminar CV. This increased the number of intralaminar CV

measurements by 50% (N = 3 additional slices) but increased the number of interlaminar CV

measurements by 75% (N = 12 additional slices). Interestingly, one of these three additional

intralaminar CV values was from L4, possibly suggesting faster intralaminar CV in L4 than L2/3

or L5. Because a higher proportion of interlaminar CV values were too fast to measure, our focus

on experiments with statistically significant correlations underestimates the difference between

interlaminar and intralaminar CV.

Figure 6. Inter- and intralaminar CV. A. Interlaminar CV (111 ± 49 μm/msec) is approximately twice as fast as intralaminar CV (57 ± 41 μm/msec; t = -2.587, p = 0.026). Symbol shapes indicate CV direction (in legend), and group mean ± SD are shown in red. B. Intralaminar (70 PV interneurons, 6 slices), L2/3 → L4 (93 PV interneurons, 5 slices), L4 → L2/3 (62 PV interneurons, 3 slices), L5 → L2/3 (57 PV interneurons , 3 slices), and L5 → L4 (63 PV interneurons, 4 slices) CV. Error bars indicate SD. CV varies significantly based on direction (F = 3.085, p = 0.046), and intralaminar CV is significantly slower than L5 → L4 CV (p= 0.025).

Discussion

Action potential conduction influences virtually all aspects of neural circuit function, and

many approaches have been taken to measure its velocity. Antidromic activation (Chomiak et al.,

2008; Palmer & Stuart, 2006; Salami, Itami, et al., 2003; Shlosberg et al., 2008), whole-cell

recording (Chomiak et al., 2008; Helmstaedter, Staiger, Sakmann, & Feldmeyer, 2008; Kim,

Renden, & von Gersdorff, 2013; Kimura et al., 2010; McDougall et al., 2018; Salami, Itami, et

al., 2003; Salami, Kimura, & Tsumoto, 2003; Shlosberg et al., 2008; Shu, Duque, Yu, Haider, &

McCormick, 2007) and voltage-sensitive dye imaging (Grinvald et al., 1981; Hamada et al.,

2017; Popovic et al., 2011; Sakai et al., 1991) provide accurate measurements of CV but are

limited by their low-throughput and lack of specificity. Other methods lack spatial resolution and

are poorly suited to investigations of single-cell responses (Candy & Szatkowski, 2000;

Drakesmith et al., 2019; Emmenegger, Obien, Franke, & Hierlemann, 2019; Kress & Mennerick,

2009; Radivojevic et al., 2017; Salami, Kimura, et al., 2003). The present study used the

genetically-encoded voltage sensor hVOS to measure CV of excitatory axons targeting PV

interneurons in mouse BC. Because it can be genetically targeted, hVOS provides a unique

opportunity to measure CV along axons innervating specific cell types. hVOS imaging has a

rapid response time that is well-suited for measuring the sub-millisecond differences in latency

required for the determination of CV. Although DPA increases membrane capacitance and thus

slows propagation, this effect is small as increasing DPA from 2 to 4 μM reduced CV by only

15% in mossy fibers (Ma et al., 2017). Furthermore, this uniform effect will reduce CV

proportionally in different populations of axons. In the present study it was difficult to measure

faster CV values, but this could be remedied by reducing magnification to track conduction over

longer distances. Our analysis has incorporated the assumption that axons follow a direct path to

target PV interneurons at different distances. This adds to the biases that reduce our estimates of

CV. This is probably more important for interlaminar than intralaminar conduction, as

interlaminar axons sometimes extend vertically through cortical layers before branching

horizontally (Larsen & Callaway, 2006; Schubert, Kotter, Luhmann, & Staiger, 2006).

CV values reported here are somewhat slower than in previous studies, which can

probably be attributed to our exclusion of experiments without a significant correlation between

latency and distance. Including these experiments yielded a value of 304 ± 501 μm/msec (N =

670 PV interneurons from 37 slices), which trends toward the higher end of the range from

previous reports. Prior studies reported CV values of 140-160 μm/msec in mouse anterior

cingulate cortex (Lee, Miao, Chen, Li, & Zhuo, 2021), 150-550 μm/msec in rat visual cortex

(Murakoshi, Guo, & Ichinose, 1993), 161-240 μm/msec in rat CA3 (Soleng, Raastad, &

Andersen, 2003), about 200-300 μm/msec in mouse BC (Shlosberg et al., 2008), 200 μm/msec in

rat BC (Helmstaedter et al., 2008), and 340 μm/msec in rat primary somatosensory cortex

(Telfeian & Connors, 2003). While some of the variations in these studies can be attributed to

methodological differences such as temperature, this wide range of CV values probably also

reflects the diversity of cortical axons. Axonal diameter, varicosity geometry, and myelination

vary widely and all have a major impact on CV. Ion channel expression also varies widely

between cell types and compartments (Liu, Wang, Pitt, & Liu, 2022; Vacher, Mohapatra, &

Trimmer, 2008), and by controlling the intrinsic excitability of the axonal membrane will have

an impact on CV. Our measurements of CV values for different projections in the same

preparation offer a perspective to the variations between prior reports, and support the view that

this quantity can vary between axons in the same brain region.

PV interneuron microcircuitry, density, and excitation/inhibition input ratios differ

between cortical layers (Adesnik, 2018; Staiger & Petersen, 2021; Xu et al., 2016), and the CV

of axons innervating different PV interneurons will impact their function in cortical

microcircuits. The canonical cortical circuit for information flow begins with thalamic inputs to

L4 followed by transmission to L2/3 and then L5. We could follow this flow to measure a CV of

94 ± 37 μm/msec along L4 excitatory axons targeting L2/3 PV interneurons. We also report CV

along excitatory axons following noncanonical circuits. For example, L2/3 receives input from

L5 (Narayanan et al., 2015; Staiger & Petersen, 2021; Thomson, West, Wang, & Bannister,

2002; Vecchia et al., 2020), and for this projection we measured a CV of 107 ± 48 μm/msec,

which was similar to the L4 → L2/3 CV. We also measured CV along axons from L2/3 and L5

to L4 PV interneurons. Although most L2/3 excitatory cells project to infragranular or

supragranular cortical layers, a small portion target L4 PV interneurons (Thomson et al., 2002),

including a subset of L2/3 pyramidal cells with somata near the L3/4 border (Larsen & Callaway,

2006). Our L2/3 → L4 CV of 81 ± 36 μm/msec was slightly slower than other interlaminar CVs.

There is also evidence for monosynaptic L5 excitatory cell coupling to L4 fast-spiking

interneurons (Vecchia et al., 2020), and our CV in this direction of 154 ± 58 μm/msec was

particularly rapid. These non-canonical pathways targeting L4 PV interneurons may influence

feedback to L4 and therefore impact integration of intracortical and incoming ventral

posteromedial thalamic input. Intralaminar spread was observed in L2/3, L4, and L5. The very

slow L2/3 intralaminar CV value reported here of 44 ± 15 μm/msec is consistent with reported

values of 33-60 μm/msec for intralaminar spread of population excitatory responses in this layer

(Petersen, Grinvald, & Sakmann, 2003).

Interestingly, we found the average intralaminar CV (of L2/3 and L5) to be about twice

as slow as the average interlaminar CV (Fig. 6A) and approximately 2.7 times slower than the

interlaminar L5 → L4 CV (Fig. 6B). These differences have important implications for cortical

function. Long, horizontal L2/3 pyramidal cell axons have been previously observed in multiple

cortical areas across species (Bruno, Hahn, Wallace, de Kock, & Sakmann, 2009; Gilbert, 1992;

Gottlieb & Keller, 1997; Keller & Asanuma, 1993; McGuire, Gilbert, Rivlin, & Wiesel, 1991).

These projections are thought to connect cortical areas with similar functions, such as visual

regions with similar orientation selectivity (Gilbert, 1992). In BC, L2/3 pyramidal cell

intralaminar axons tend to extend across barrels corresponding to whisker rows rather than arcs,

possibly reflecting a directional preference (Feldmeyer, 2012). Both regular-spiking and fast-

spiking units, putative pyramidal cells and PV interneurons, respectively, show selectivity to

whisking direction in BC L2/3 (Andermann & Moore, 2006; Kremer, Leger, Goodman, Brette,

& Bourdieu, 2011). Our measurement of L2/3 intralaminar CV may reflect the targeting of the

PV interneurons of these domains. Murine L5 intralaminar excitatory projections connect

multiple barrel columns (Schubert et al., 2006; Schubert et al., 2001), and intralaminar excitatory

inputs to L5 pyramidal cells usually extend across one and a half barrel columns, so L5

pyramidal cells may integrate information from three whiskers. Thus, the L5 intralaminar CV is

likely to impact multi-whisker integration. While L5 → L4 axonal projections are uncommon

(Staiger & Petersen, 2021), optogenetic stimulation of L5 pyramidal cells elicits firing in L4 fast-

spiking interneurons, and inhibition of L5 pyramidal cells lengthens the reaction time in a texture

discrimination test (Vecchia et al., 2020). L5 → L4 CV may therefore impact temporal sharpness

of responses to sensory stimuli. Together, these results suggest that interlaminar cortical circuits

process more rapidly than intralaminar circuits. Thus, precise timing of inputs to PV interneurons

is likely to play an important role in computations performed within a cortical column and to be

less critical in the collective computations performed by multiple columns. The higher CV for

interlaminar conduction than intralaminar conduction found in the present study will thus meet

distinct demands of different forms of cortical computation.

hVOS imaging offers a new and powerful approach to the study of CV, not only in the

axons of defined cell types (Ma et al., 2017), but also in the axons defined by their targeted cell

types. An important example of such specificity is that thalamocortical projections to inhibitory

neurons have a faster CV than projections to excitatory cells, allowing interlaminar inhibition to

activate L4 targets prior to L2/3 targets (Kimura et al., 2010). Targeting hVOS probes to

different types of neurons has the potential to reveal many additional forms of axon

specialization adapted to different forms of neuronal computation.

Materials and Methods

Animals

Ai35-hVOS1.5 (C57BL/6-*Gt(ROSA)26Sor*$^{tm1(CAG-hVOS1.5)Mbja}$/J, JAX 031102) Cre reporter mice (Bayguinov et al., 2017) were bred with PV Cre driver mice (B6.129P2-Pvalb$^{tm1(cre)Arbr}$/J, JAX 017320) to create animals with PV interneuron-specific hVOS probe expression. All animal procedures were approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of the University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Medicine and Public Health (ACUC protocol: M005952).

Hybrid voltage sensor (hVOS)

The hVOS probe used here harbors a cerulean fluorescent protein (CeFP) tethered to the inner cell membrane by a truncated h-ras motif (Wang, Zhang, Chanda, & Jackson, 2010). Slices are perfused with 4 μM dipicrylamine (DPA), a small anion which partitions into the cell membrane. Membrane depolarization drives DPA towards the CeFP to quench fluorescence through Förster resonance energy transfer. Repolarization drives the DPA away allowing fluorescence to return to baseline (Chanda et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2010). Fluorescence thus reports voltage changes selectively from PV interneurons because these cells express the probe with very high specificity (Bayguinov et al., 2017). DPA has a time resolution < 0.5 msec (Bradley, Luo, Otis, & DiGregorio, 2009; Chanda et al., 2005) and tracks action potentials with excellent temporal fidelity (Ghitani et al., 2015; Ma et al., 2019). Parameters such as latency, amplitude, and half-width were determined from traces of fluorescence versus time (Fig. 7). Amplitude was taken as the peak change in fluorescence from the pre-stimulus baseline, and half-width as the time between rise and fall at half-maximal response. Latency is the time from stimulation to half-maximal response.

Slice preparation

Four- to ten-week-old male and female mice were deeply anesthetized with isoflurane

and sacrificed via cervical dislocation. Brains were dissected and placed into ice-cold cutting

solution (in mM: 10 glucose, 125 NaCl, 4 KCl, 1.25 NaH_2PO_4, 26 $NaHCO_3$, 6 $MgSO_4$, 1 $CaCl_2$)

bubbled with 95% O_2/5% CO_2. Coronal slices (300 μm) were prepared using a Leica VT1200S

vibratome and placed into artificial cerebrospinal fluid (ACSF, same as cutting solution except

1.3 mM $MgSO_4$, 2.5 mM $CaCl_2$, and 4 μM DPA) and bubbled with 95% O_2/5% CO_2 for at least

one hour.

Figure 7. PV interneuron electrical activity was recorded as fluorescence using a genetically-encoded hybrid voltage sensor (hVOS). A. PV interneuron response parameters are extracted from traces of fluorescence versus time. Gray shading indicates the 20 msec measurement window expanded in B. B. Amplitude is the maximum change in fluorescence from baseline. Half-width is the time between half-maximal change in fluorescence during the rising and decay phases. Latency is the time from stimulation to half-maximal change in fluorescence of the rising phase.

Voltage imaging

Slices were continuously perfused with ACSF at room temperature and viewed using a

BX51 Olympus microscope. Layer and barrel boundaries were visually identified based on both

fluorescence and gradient contrast images (Feldmeyer, 2012; Woolsey & Van der Loos, 1970).

Stimulus pulses (100 μA, 180-μsec, except Fig. 2A-C which used 10-60 μA) were generated by a

stimulus isolator (World Precision Instruments, Sarasota, Florida) and applied to various

locations within BC with fire-polished, ACSF-filled KG-33 glass electrodes (King Precision

Glass, Claremont, California) with tip diameter ~6-8 μm. Traces of fluorescence versus time

were averages of 15-30 trials. Slices were illuminated with 435 nm light using an LED light

source (Prizmatix, Holon, Israel). Gradient contrast images were acquired with a Kiralux

(Thorlabs, Newton, New Jersey) CMOS camera; fluorescent images were acquired with this

camera for better visualization, but for voltage imaging we used a CCD-SMQ camera (RedShirt

Imaging, Decatur, Georgia) at a framerate of 2000 Hz and 80x80 spatial resolution. Data were

acquired with a custom data acquisition and analysis program that controlled stimulation and

illumination (Chang, 2006).

Data processing and analysis

Fluorescence divided by resting light intensity ($\Delta F/F$) was passed through a nine-point

binomial temporal filter and a spatial filter with $\sigma = 1$. A polynomial baseline correction was

calculated using fluorescence outside of a 20 msec measurement window from 2 msec before to

18 msec after the stimulus. Parameters including amplitude, half-width, and latency were

calculated from traces of fluorescence versus time. Heatmaps showing SNR are each normalized

to the maximum value within the field of view (with the exception of Fig. 2A-D, as explained in

the figure legend). Heatmaps showing maximum amplitude and associated traces of fluorescence

over time (Fig. 1) are normalized but not divided by resting light intensity.

Responsive neuron identification

We developed a semi-automated method for objective, reproducible identification of

responsive PV interneurons. Supp. Fig. 1 is an extension of Fig. 3 and illustrates this process.

The peak fluorescence change from baseline in the 20 msec post-stimulus time window (Fig. 7B)

was calculated for each pixel and divided by the pre-stimulus root-mean-square fluorescence

during a 20 msec pre-stimulus interval to give the SNR. A SNR cutoff was determined using the

pre-stimulus root-mean-square values, and pixels with a response SNR < cutoff were discarded

(gray pixels, Supp. Fig. 1A). k-means clustering was then performed on the SNR of the

remaining pixels (Supp. Fig. 1B). This served two main purposes. First, k-means clustering

divides pixels into groups likely to contain responsive cells, using the criterion that only pixels

with SNR > 5 represent responsive cell bodies (corresponding to yellow, light blue, and medium

blue clusters, Supp. Fig. 1B). Second, if multiple pixels represent one cell body, they are likely to

have similar SNR values. Because each k-means cluster contains pixels with similar SNRs, two

pixels in the same cluster sharing a face are likely to represent the same cell body. This method

basically compared each pixel to its neighbors and grouped them based on the likelihood they

represent the same cell. One or more contiguous pixels in the same SNR cluster were grouped as

one cell if they were no greater than three pixels across, because each pixel measures 6.68 μm,

and murine PV interneuron somata are approximately 20 μm in diameter (Kooijmans et al.,

2020; Selby et al., 2007; Y. Wang et al., 2002). These criteria excluded some larger clusters of

pixels as potentially representing more than one cell even though they had a high SNR. For

example, some yellow and orange pixels in Fig. 3C and Supp. Fig. 1A, which correspond with

the highest SNR k-means cluster (yellow) in Supp. Fig. 1B, form groups which are larger than 3

pixels across and therefore must contain more than one cell. Likewise, Fig. 2D had fewer

identifiable responsive cells that Fig. 2C because Fig 2D had greater overlap. Pixel groups with

SNR < 5 or amplitude < 0.001 were excluded and not used to select individual responsive

neurons. We also excluded groups of pixels sharing a face to ensure that a single group did not

represent multiple cells. The rationale for this grouping procedure is that pixels draw from an

area that is smaller than a PV interneuron cell body, and we expect SNR to be uniform over the

soma of one neuron. Pixels at a cell edge will not be included due to their lower SNR. Thus, this

criterion is conservative in focusing on pixels containing signals arising from distinct, spatially

separated neurons.

Experimental design and statistical tests

Further analysis of responses from groups of pixels identified as described above was

performed using R and Python. Responses with latency < 1 msec were removed to exclude the

effect of direct stimulation; these were generally very close to the stimulation electrode.

Responses with latency or time to peak > 13 msec were removed to exclude polysynaptic

responses. Disynaptic responses, defined as those occurring more than 2 msec after responses

from neighboring cells (< ~ 20 μm) were also excluded. Potential outliers, defined as responses

with amplitude, half-width, or latency outside the first or third quartile ± 1.5 * interquartile

range, were iteratively identified and visually verified or excluded as appropriate.

Each CV was based on a plot of latency versus distance with at least 8 responsive cells ≥

100 μm from the stimulating electrode, spanning a range of distances ≥ 100 μm. Analyses

included 855 PV interneurons from 59 slices from 13 animals (6 female and 7 male).

Relationships between latency and distance were evaluated with linear regression, and p-values

were corrected for multiple tests using the false-discovery rate. Euclidean distance was

determined between pixels on the 80x80 grid of the CCD-SMQ camera. To determine the

appropriate statistical tests, normality was evaluated with a Shapiro-Wilk test, and differences in

group variances were evaluated with Levene's tests. CV was normally distributed (W = 0.9115,

p = 0.051). Variance did not differ significantly for male and female animals (F = 1.2505, p =

0.277), for inter- and intralaminar CV (F = 0.516, p = 0.481), or for CV directions (intralaminar,

L2/3 → L4, L4 → L2/3, L5 → L2/3, L5 → L4; F = 0.0519, p = 0.994). Therefore, interlaminar

versus intralaminar CV, and CV for male versus female animals were compared with t-tests. CV

did not differ significantly based on sex (t = 0.289, p = 0.778). The effect of direction on CV was

evaluated with ANOVA followed by post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's honestly significant

differences.

Code accessibility

Custom software, R code, and Python code available on request.

References

Adesnik, H. (2018). Layer-specific excitation/inhibition balances during neuronal synchronization in the
visual cortex. *J Physiol, 596*(9), 1639-1657. doi:10.1113/JP274986
Andermann, M. L., & Moore, C. I. (2006). A somatotopic map of vibrissa motion direction within a
barrel column. *Nat Neurosci, 9*(4), 543-551. doi:10.1038/nn1671
Bayguinov, P. O., Ma, Y., Gao, Y., Zhao, X., & Jackson, M. B. (2017). Imaging Voltage in Genetically
Defined Neuronal Subpopulations with a Cre Recombinase-Targeted Hybrid Voltage Sensor. *J
Neurosci, 37*(38), 9305-9319. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1363-17.2017
Bradley, J., Luo, R., Otis, T. S., & DiGregorio, D. A. (2009). Submillisecond optical reporting of
membrane potential in situ using a neuronal tracer dye. *J Neurosci, 29*(29), 9197-9209.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1240-09.2009
Bruno, R. M., Hahn, T. T., Wallace, D. J., de Kock, C. P., & Sakmann, B. (2009). Sensory experience
alters specific branches of individual corticocortical axons during development. *J Neurosci,
29*(10), 3172-3181. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5911-08.2009
Bucher, D., & Goaillard, J. M. (2011). Beyond faithful conduction: short-term dynamics,
neuromodulation, and long-term regulation of spike propagation in the axon. *Prog Neurobiol,
94*(4), 307-346. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2011.06.001
Candy, S. M., & Szatkowski, M. S. (2000). Neuronal excitability and conduction velocity changes in
hippocampal slices from streptozotocin-treated diabetic rats. *Brain Res, 863*, 298-301.
doi:10.1016/s0006-8993(00)02171-5
Cardin, J. A. (2018). Inhibitory Interneurons Regulate Temporal Precision and Correlations in Cortical
Circuits. *Trends Neurosci, 41*(10), 689-700. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2018.07.015
Chanda, B., Blunck, R., Faria, L. C., Schweizer, F. E., Mody, I., & Bezanilla, F. (2005). A hybrid
approach to measuring electrical activity in genetically specified neurons. *Nat Neurosci, 8*(11),
1619-1626. doi:10.1038/nn1558
Chang, P.-P. (2006). *Heterogeneous spatial patterns of long-term potentiation in hippocampal slices.*
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison.
Chomiak, T., Peters, S., & Hu, B. (2008). Functional architecture and spike timing properties of
corticofugal projections from rat ventral temporal cortex. *J Neurophysiol, 100*(1), 327-335.
doi:10.1152/jn.90392.2008
Compston, A., & Coles, A. (2002). Multiple Sclerosis. *Lancet, 359*, 1221-1231. doi:10.1016/S0140-
6736(02)08220-X
Corcoba, A., Steullet, P., Duarte, J. M., Van de Looij, Y., Monin, A., Cuenod, M., Gruetter, R., & Do, K.
Q. (2015). Glutathione Deficit Affects the Integrity and Function of the Fimbria/Fornix and
Anterior Commissure in Mice: Relevance for Schizophrenia. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol, 19*(3),
pyv110. doi:10.1093/ijnp/pyv110
Drakesmith, M., Harms, R., Rudrapatna, S. U., Parker, G. D., Evans, C. J., & Jones, D. K. (2019).
Estimating axon conduction velocity in vivo from microstructural MRI. *Neuroimage, 203*,
116186. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116186

Emmenegger, V., Obien, M. E. J., Franke, F., & Hierlemann, A. (2019). Technologies to Study Action
Potential Propagation With a Focus on HD-MEAs. *Front Cell Neurosci, 13*, 159.
doi:10.3389/fncel.2019.00159
Feldmeyer, D. (2012). Excitatory neuronal connectivity in the barrel cortex. *Front Neuroanat, 6*, 24.
doi:10.3389/fnana.2012.00024
Ferguson, B. R., & Gao, W. J. (2018). PV Interneurons: Critical Regulators of E/I Balance for Prefrontal
Cortex-Dependent Behavior and Psychiatric Disorders. *Front Neural Circuits, 12*, 37.
doi:10.3389/fncir.2018.00037
Fields, R. D. (2015). A new mechanism of nervous system plasticity: activity-dependent myelination. *Nat
Rev Neurosci, 16*(12), 756-767. doi:10.1038/nrn4023
Fukuda, T., & Kosaka, T. (2003). Ultrastructural study of gap junctions between dendrites of
parvalbumin-containing GABAergic neurons in various neocortical areas of the adult rat.
Neuroscience, 120(1), 5-20. doi:10.1016/s0306-4522(03)00328-2
Galarreta, M., & Hestrin, S. (2002). Electrical and chemical synapses among parvalbumin fast-spiking
GABAergic interneurons in adult mouse neocortex. *PNAS, 99*, 12438-12443.
doi:10.1073/pnas.192159599
Gandal, M. J., Edgar, J. C., Klook, K., & Siegel, S. J. (2012). Gamma synchrony: towards a translational
biomarker for the treatment-resistant symptoms of schizophrenia. *Neuropharmacology, 62*(3),
1504-1518. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2011.02.007
Ghitani, N., Bayguinov, P. O., Ma, Y., & Jackson, M. B. (2015). Single-trial imaging of spikes and
synaptic potentials in single neurons in brain slices with genetically encoded hybrid voltage
sensor. *J Neurophysiol, 113*(4), 1249-1259. doi:10.1152/jn.00691.2014
Gilbert, C. D. (1992). Horizontal Integration and Cortical Dynamics. *Neuron, 9*, 1-13. doi:10.1016/0896-
6273(92)90215-y
Gloveli, T., Dugladze, T., Saha, S., Monyer, H., Heinemann, U., Traub, R. D., Whittington, M. A., &
Buhl, E. H. (2005). Differential involvement of oriens/pyramidale interneurones in hippocampal
network oscillations in vitro. *J Physiol, 562*(Pt 1), 131-147. doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2004.073007
Gonzalez-Burgos, G., Cho, R. Y., & Lewis, D. A. (2015). Alterations in cortical network oscillations and
parvalbumin neurons in schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry, 77*(12), 1031-1040.
doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.03.010
Gottlieb, J. P., & Keller, A. (1997). Intrinsic circuitry and physiological properties of pyramidal neurons
in rat barrel cortex. *Exp Brain Res, 115*, 47-60. doi:10.1007/pl00005684
Grinvald, A., Ross, W. N., & Farber, I. (1981). Simultaneous optical measurements of electrical activity
from multiple sites on processes of cultured neurons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 78*.
doi:10.1073/pnas.78.5.3245
Hamada, M. S., Popovic, M. A., & Kole, M. H. (2017). Loss of Saltation and Presynaptic Action
Potential Failure in Demyelinated Axons. *Front Cell Neurosci, 11*, 45.
doi:10.3389/fncel.2017.00045
Helmstaedter, M., Staiger, J. F., Sakmann, B., & Feldmeyer, D. (2008). Efficient recruitment of layer 2/3
interneurons by layer 4 input in single columns of rat somatosensory cortex. *J Neurosci, 28*(33),
8273-8284. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5701-07.2008
Ivanov, V., Polykretis, I. F., & Michmizos, K. P. (2019). *Axonal Conduction Velocity Impacts Neuronal
Network Oscillations*. Paper presented at the 2019 IEEE EMBS International Conference on
Biomedical & Health Informatics (BHI).
Keller, A., & Asanuma, H. (1993). Synaptic Relationships Involving Local Axon Collaterals of Pyramidal
Neurons in Cat Motor Cortex. *J Comp Neurol, 336*, 229-242. doi:10.1002/cne.903360206
Kim, J. H., Renden, R., & von Gersdorff, H. (2013). Dysmyelination of auditory afferent axons increases
the jitter of action potential timing during high-frequency firing. *J Neurosci, 33*(22), 9402-9407.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3389-12.2013
Kimura, F., Itami, C., Ikezoe, K., Tamura, H., Fujita, I., Yanagawa, Y., Obata, K., & Ohshima, M. (2010).
Fast activation of feedforward inhibitory neurons from thalamic input and its relevance to the

regulation of spike sequences in the barrel cortex. *J Physiol, 588*(Pt 15), 2769-2787.
doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2010.188177

Kooijmans, R. N., Sierhuis, W., Self, M. W., & Roelfsema, P. R. (2020). A Quantitative Comparison of
Inhibitory Interneuron Size and Distribution between Mouse and Macaque V1, Using Calcium-
Binding Proteins. *Cereb Cortex Commun, 1*(1), tgaa068. doi:10.1093/texcom/tgaa068

Kremer, Y., Leger, J. F., Goodman, D., Brette, R., & Bourdieu, L. (2011). Late emergence of the vibrissa
direction selectivity map in the rat barrel cortex. *J Neurosci, 31*(29), 10689-10700.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6541-10.2011

Kress, G. J., & Mennerick, S. (2009). Action potential initiation and propagation: upstream influences on
neurotransmission. *Neuroscience, 158*(1), 211-222. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.03.021

Larsen, D. D., & Callaway, E. M. (2006). Development of layer-specific axonal arborizations in mouse
primary somatosensory cortex. *J Comp Neurol, 494*(3), 398-414. doi:10.1002/cne.20754

Lauber, E., Filice, F., & Schwaller, B. (2018). Parvalbumin neurons as a hub in autism spectrum
disorders. *J Neurosci Res, 96*(3), 360-361. doi:10.1002/jnr.24204

Lee, J. A., Miao, Z., Chen, Q. Y., Li, X. H., & Zhuo, M. (2021). Multiple synaptic connections into a
single cortical pyramidal cell or interneuron in the anterior cingulate cortex of adult mice. *Mol
Brain, 14*(1), 88. doi:10.1186/s13041-021-00793-8

Liu, Wang, H. G., Pitt, G. S., & Liu, Z. J. (2022). Direct Observation of Compartment-Specific
Localization and Dynamics of Voltage-Gated Sodium Channels. *J Neurosci, 42*(28), 5482-5498.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0086-22.2022

Liu, T. Y., Hsieh, J. C., Chen, Y. S., Tu, P. C., Su, T. P., & Chen, L. F. (2012). Different patterns of
abnormal gamma oscillatory activity in unipolar and bipolar disorder patients during an implicit
emotion task. *Neuropsychologia, 50*(7), 1514-1520. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.03.004

Ma, Y., Bayguinov, P. O., & Jackson, M. B. (2017). Action Potential Dynamics in Fine Axons Probed
with an Axonally Targeted Optical Voltage Sensor. *eNeuro, 4*(4), 0146-0147.
doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0146-17.2017

Ma, Y., Bayguinov, P. O., & Jackson, M. B. (2019). Optical Studies of Action Potential Dynamics with
hVOS probes. *Curr Opin Biomed Eng, 12*, 51-58. doi:10.1016/j.cobme.2019.09.007

McDougall, S., Vargas Riad, W., Silva-Gotay, A., Tavares, E. R., Harpalani, D., Li, G. L., & Richardson,
H. N. (2018). Myelination of Axons Corresponds with Faster Transmission Speed in the
Prefrontal Cortex of Developing Male Rats. *eNeuro, 5*(4), 0203-0218.
doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0203-18.2018

McGuire, B. A., Gilbert, C. D., Rivlin, P. K., & Wiesel, T. N. (1991). Targets of Horziontal Connections
in Macaque Primary Visual Cortex. *J Comp Neurol, 305*(3), 370-392.
doi:10.1002/cne.903050303

Murakoshi, T., Guo, J., & Ichinose, T. (1993). Electrophysiological identification of horizontal synaptic
connections in rat visual cortex in vitro. *Neurosci Lett, 163*(2), 211-214. doi:10.1016/0304-
3940(93)90385-x

Narayanan, R. T., Egger, R., Johnson, A. S., Mansvelder, H. D., Sakmann, B., de Kock, C. P., &
Oberlaender, M. (2015). Beyond Columnar Organization: Cell Type- and Target Layer-Specific
Principles of Horizontal Axon Projection Patterns in Rat Vibrissal Cortex. *Cereb Cortex, 25*(11),
4450-4468. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhv053

Nave, K. A. (2010). Myelination and support of axonal integrity by glia. *Nature, 468*(7321), 244-252.
doi:10.1038/nature09614

Olmos-Serrano, J. L., Kang, H. J., Tyler, W. A., Silbereis, J. C., Cheng, F., Zhu, Y., Pletikos, M.,
Jankovic-Rapan, L., Cramer, N. P., Galdzicki, Z., Goodliffe, J., Peters, A., Sethares, C., Delalle,
I., Golden, J. A., Haydar, T. F., & Sestan, N. (2016). Down Syndrome Developmental Brain
Transcriptome Reveals Defective Oligodendrocyte Differentiation and Myelination. *Neuron,
89*(6), 1208-1222. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2016.01.042

Pajevic, S., Basser, P. J., & Fields, R. D. (2014). Role of myelin plasticity in oscillations and synchrony
of neuronal activity. *Neuroscience, 276*, 135-147. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2013.11.007

Palmer, L. M., & Stuart, G. J. (2006). Site of action potential initiation in layer 5 pyramidal neurons. *J*
Neurosci, 26(6), 1854-1863. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4812-05.2006
Panzera, L. C., & Hoppa, M. B. (2019). Genetically Encoded Voltage Indicators Are Illuminating
Subcellular Physiology of the Axon. *Front Cell Neurosci, 13*, 52. doi:10.3389/fncel.2019.00052
Pedroni, A., Minh do, D., Mallamaci, A., & Cherubini, E. (2014). Electrophysiological characterization of
granule cells in the dentate gyrus immediately after birth. *Front Cell Neurosci, 8*, 44.
doi:10.3389/fncel.2014.00044
Petersen, C. C. H., Grinvald, A., & Sakmann, B. (2003). Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Sensory Responses
in Layer 2/3 of Rat Barrel Cortex Measured In Vivo by Voltage-Sensitive Dye Imaging
Combined with Whole-Cell Voltage Recordings and Neuron Reconstructions. *J Neurosci, 23*(4),
1298-1309. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-04-01298.2003
Popovic, M. A., Foust, A. J., McCormick, D. A., & Zecevic, D. (2011). The spatio-temporal
characteristics of action potential initiation in layer 5 pyramidal neurons: a voltage imaging study.
J Physiol, 589(17), 4167-4187. doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2011.209015
Pouille, F., & Scanziani, M. (2001). Enforcement of temporal fidelity in pyramidal cells by somatic feed-
forward inhibition. *Science, 293*(5532), 1159-1163. doi:10.1126/science.1060342
Radivojevic, M., Franke, F., Altermatt, M., Muller, J., Hierlemann, A., & Bakkum, D. J. (2017). Tracking
individual action potentials throughout mammalian axonal arbors. *Elife, 6*.
doi:10.7554/eLife.30198
Roy, K., Murtie, J. C., El-Khodor, B. F., Edgar, N., Sardi, S. P., Hooks, B. M., Benoit-Marand, M., Chen,
C., Moore, H., O'Donnell, P., Brunner, D., & Corfas, G. (2007). Loss of erbB signaling in
oligodendrocytes alters myelin and dopaminergic function, a potential mechanism for
neuropsychiatric disorders. *PNAS, 104*(19), 8131-8136. doi:10.1073/pnas.0702157104
Sakai, T., Komuro, H., Katoh, Y., Sasaki, H., Momose-Sato, Y., & Kamino, K. (1991). Optical
Determination of Impulsive Conduction Velocity During Development of Embryonic chick
Cervical Vagus Nerve Bundles. *J Physiol, 439*, 361-381. doi:10.1113/jphysiol.1991.sp018671
Salami, M., Itami, C., Tsumoto, T., & Kimura, F. (2003). Change of conduction velocity by regional
myelination yields constant latency irrespective of distance between thalamus and cortex. *PNAS,*
100(10), 6174-6179. doi:10.1073/pnas.0937380100
Salami, M., Kimura, F., & Tsumoto, T. (2003). Postnatal Changes of Conduction Velocity of the Fibers in
and out of the Mouse Barrel Cortex. *Iran Biomed J, 7*(2), 57-63.
Schubert, D., Kotter, R., Luhmann, H. J., & Staiger, J. F. (2006). Morphology, electrophysiology and
functional input connectivity of pyramidal neurons characterizes a genuine layer va in the
primary somatosensory cortex. *Cereb Cortex, 16*(2), 223-236. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhi100
Schubert, D., Staiger, J. F., Cho, N., Kotter, R., Zilles, K., & Luhmann, H. J. (2001). Layer-Specific
Intracolumnar and Transcolumnar Functional Connectivity of Layer V Pyramidal Cells in Rat
Barrel Cortex. *J Neurosci, 21*(10), 3580-3592. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.21-10-03580.2001
Selby, L., Zhang, C., & Sun, Q. Q. (2007). Major defects in neocortical GABAergic inhibitory circuits in
mice lacking the fragile X mental retardation protein. *Neurosci Lett, 412*(3), 227-232.
doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2006.11.062
Shlosberg, D., Abu-Ghanem, Y., & Amitai, Y. (2008). Comparative properties of excitatory and
inhibitory inter-laminar neocortical axons. *Neuroscience, 155*(2), 366-373.
doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.06.003
Shu, Y., Duque, A., Yu, Y., Haider, B., & McCormick, D. A. (2007). Properties of action-potential
initiation in neocortical pyramidal cells: evidence from whole cell axon recordings. *J*
Neurophysiol, 97(1), 746-760. doi:10.1152/jn.00922.2006
Soleng, A. F., Raastad, M., & Andersen, P. (2003). Conduction latency along CA3 hippocampal axons
from rat. *Hippocampus, 13*(8), 953-961. doi:10.1002/hipo.10141
Staiger, J. F., & Petersen, C. C. H. (2021). Neuronal Circuits in Barrel Cortex for Whisker Sensory
Perception. *Physiol Rev, 101*(1), 353-415. doi:10.1152/physrev.00019.2019

Telfeian, A. E., & Connors, B. W. (2003). Widely integrative properties of layer 5 pyramidal cells support
a role for processing of extralaminar synaptic inputs in rat neocortex. *Neuroscience Letters,*
343(2), 121-124. doi:10.1016/s0304-3940(03)00379-3

Thomson, A. M., West, D. C., Wang, Y., & Bannister, A. P. (2002). Synaptic Connections and Small
Circuits Involving Excitatory and Inhibitory Neurons in Layers 2-5 of Adult Rat and Cat
Neocortex: Triple Intracellular Recordings and Biocytin Labelling In Vitro. *Cereb Cortex, 12*(9),
936-953. doi:10.1093/cercor/12.9.936

Vacher, H., Mohapatra, D. P., & Trimmer, J. S. (2008). Localization and targeting of voltage-dependent
ion channels in mammalian central neurons. *Physiol Rev, 88*(4), 1407-1447.
doi:10.1152/physrev.00002.2008

Vecchia, D., Beltramo, R., Vallone, F., Chereau, R., Forli, A., Molano-Mazon, M., Bawa, T., Binini, N.,
Moretti, C., Holtmaat, A., Panzeri, S., & Fellin, T. (2020). Temporal Sharpening of Sensory
Responses by Layer V in the Mouse Primary Somatosensory Cortex. *Curr Biol, 30*(9), 1589-1599
e1510. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.02.004

Wang, Zhang, Z., Chanda, B., & Jackson, M. B. (2010). Improved probes for hybrid voltage sensor
imaging. *Biophys J, 99*(7), 2355-2365. doi:10.1016/j.bpj.2010.07.037

Wang, Y., Gupta, A., Toledo-Rodriguez, M., Wu, C. Z., & Markram, H. (2002). Anatomical,
Physiological, Molecular and Circuit Properties of Nest Basket Cells in the Developing
Somatosensory Cortex. *Cereb Cortex, 12*(4), 395-410. doi:10.1093/cercor/12.4.395

Woolsey, T. A., & Van der Loos, H. (1970). The Structural Organization of Layer IV in the
Somatosensory Region (S1) of Mouse Cerebral Cortex. *Brain Res, 17*(2), 205-242.
doi:10.1016/0006-8993(70)90079-x

Xu, X., Olivas, N. D., Ikrar, T., Peng, T., Holmes, T. C., Nie, Q., & Shi, Y. (2016). Primary visual cortex
shows laminar-specific and balanced circuit organization of excitatory and inhibitory synaptic
connectivity. *J Physiol, 594*(7), 1891-1910. doi:10.1113/JP271891