Full title: Eye-specific synaptic clustering through activity-dependent stabilization and

punishment mechanisms in the developing visual system

Short title: Activity-dependent synaptic clustering underlies eye-specific competition

Author list: Chenghang Zhang[1] and Colenso M. Speer[1,*]

Author Affiliations: [1] Department of Biology, University of Maryland, College Park,

Maryland, USA. 20742.

*Corresponding author

E-mail: cspeer@umd.edu (CS)

Abstract

Co-active synaptic connections are often spatially clustered to enable local dendritic computations underlying learning, memory, and basic sensory processing. In the mammalian visual system, retinal ganglion cell (RGC) axons converge to form clustered synaptic inputs for local signal integration in the dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus (dLGN) of the thalamus. Retinogeniculate synapse clustering is promoted by visual experience after eye-opening, but the earliest events in cluster formation and potential regulation by spontaneous retinal wave activity prior to visual experience are unknown. Here, using volumetric super-resolution single-molecule localization microscopy together with eye-specific labeling of developing retinogeniculate synapses in the mouse, we show that synaptic clustering is eye-specific and activity-dependent during the first postnatal week. We identified a subset of complex retinogeniculate synapses with larger presynaptic vesicle pools and multiple active zones that simultaneously promote the clustering of like-eye synapses (synaptic stabilization) and prohibit synapse clustering from the opposite eye (synaptic punishment). In mutant mice with disrupted spontaneous retinal wave activity, complex synapses form, but fail to drive eye-specific synaptic clustering and punishment seen in controls. These results highlight a role for spontaneous retinal activity in regulating eye-specific stabilization and punishment signals contributing to synaptic clustering in circuits essential for visual perception and behavior.

Introduction

A hallmark of neuronal computation is the formation of spatially clustered synaptic inputs to facilitate local computations within individual dendrites (1-3). Through linear and non-linear signal integration mechanisms, synaptic clusters play critical computational roles in learning, memory, and sensory processing underlying cognition and behavior (4-7). During circuit development, the formation of synaptic clusters is regulated by both spontaneous and sensory-driven neural activity that helps to stabilize or eliminate individual synapses to establish mature connectivity patterns (5, 6, 8).

A model example of activity-dependent synaptic cluster formation is the refinement of retinal inputs to the dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus (dLGN) of the thalamus (9). Electron microscopy (EM) reconstructions of the mouse dLGN reveal the convergence of retinal ganglion cell (RGC) inputs to form "complex" synaptic clusters known as glomeruli (10-13). Each individual glomerulus contains multiple RGC axon terminal boutons formed onto a dendritic branch of a dLGN relay neuron. Individual bouton structures vary from small terminals with a single active zone (AZ) to large and/or perforated synapses containing multiple AZs (10-13). These ultrastructural observations are supported by additional experimental results from transsynaptic (14) and Brainbow-based RGC labeling (11, 13), optogenetic stimulation of RGC axons (15, 16), and calcium imaging of retinogeniculate boutons (17) confirming the clustering of RGC inputs to relay neuron dendrites in the dLGN. Because individual glomeruli often receive inputs from multiple RGCs encoding either similar or distinct visual features (17), the

proper developmental wiring of RGC bouton clusters is critical for local dendritic

integration functions that drive visual spike responses in the adult brain.

Previous studies have shown that synaptic cluster development in neural circuits

depends upon spatiotemporally correlated synaptic activity that induces local

biochemical and mechanical signaling mechanisms to regulate synaptogenesis,

pruning, and plasticity (6, 18). In the developing retinogeniculate system, there are two

sources of correlated activity that could contribute to synaptic clustering: 1) visual

experience that drives topographic activation of neighboring RGCs and 2) spontaneous

retinal wave activity that correlates burst firing of neighboring RGCs prior to eye-

opening. Consistent with experience-dependent plasticity, retinogeniculate bouton

clustering increases after eye-opening (10, 13, 19) and visual deprivation reduces

clustering (19). However, these experience-dependent changes occur long after the

spontaneous activity-dependent segregation of eye-specific retinogeniculate axons prior

to eye-opening (20-22). Before photoreceptor-mediated visual onset, retinal waves

generate spatiotemporal correlations in RGC burst activity that are predicted to facilitate

Hebbian strengthening of co-active synapses (Butts et al., 2007) and promote eye-

specific synaptic clustering. Whether retinogeniculate synapse clustering begins prior to

eye-opening and is regulated by spontaneous retinal activity is unknown.

To address this question, we used volumetric super-resolution microscopy together with

anterograde tract tracing and immunohistochemical synaptic protein labeling to

investigate the development of clustered eye-specific synapses in the dLGN prior to the

onset of photoreceptor-mediated visual experience. During the first postnatal week, we

identified a subpopulation of retinogeniculate synapses from both eyes-of-origin that

contained larger presynaptic vesicle pools and multiple active zones (AZs). These

"complex" synapses acted as loci for the clustering of synapses from the same eye

(synaptic stabilization). At the same time, complex synapses of opposite eyes-of-origin

showed a distance-dependent interaction that reduced synaptic clustering in an eye-

specific manner during retinogeniculate competition (synaptic punishment). These

patterns of synaptic stabilization and punishment were absent in a genetic mutant

mouse line with disrupted stage II cholinergic retinal waves and abnormal eye-specific

segregation. These results demonstrate that spontaneous retinal activity regulates

retinogeniculate clustering prior to eye-opening and offer further support for the

existence of non-cell-autonomous synaptic stabilization and punishment signals

underlying eye-specific competition in the developing visual system.

Results

A unique set of complex synapses shows eye-specific differences during retinogeniculate segregation

To look for evidence of synaptic clustering during eye-specific segregation, we collected super-resolution imaging data in the dLGN of wild-type (WT) mice at three postnatal time points (P2, P4, and P8) (Fig 1A). We labeled eye-specific synapses by monocular injection of Alexa Fluor-conjugated cholera toxin subunit B tracer (CTB) together with immunostaining for presynaptic Bassoon, postsynaptic Homer1, and presynaptic vesicular glutamate transporter 2 (VGluT2) proteins (23). Using volumetric STochastic Optical Reconstruction Microscopy (STORM) (24), we collected separate image volumes (~45K μm^3 each) from three biological replicates at each developmental time point. To determine whether spontaneous retinal activity impacts synaptic clustering across the same time period, we performed identical experiments in a knockout mouse line lacking the beta 2 subunit of the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor (β2KO), which disrupts spontaneous cholinergic retinal wave activity, eye-specific axonal segregation, and retinogeniculate synapse development (20, 23, 25-33). Because eye-specific segregation is incomplete until P8 in the mouse, we limited our analysis to the future contralateral eye-specific region of the dLGN, which is reliably identified across all stages of postnatal development (Fig 1A, see also Materials and methods).

Fig 1. A unique set of complex synapses shows eye-specific differences during retinogeniculate segregation. (A) Experimental design: CTB-Alexa 488 was injected into the right eye of wild-type (WT) and β2KO mice. Tissue was collected from the left dLGN at P2, P4, and P8. The red squares indicate the STORM imaging regions. (B) Representative complex (left panels) and simple synapses (right panels) in WT (top panels) and β2KO mice (bottom panels) at each age. (C) Representative CTB(+) dominant-eye (top panels) and CTB(-) non-dominant-eye (bottom panels) complex synapses in a WT P8 sample, showing synaptic (left panels), CTB (middle panels), and merged immunolabels (right panels). (D) Eye-specific complex synapse density across development in WT (top panel) and β2KO mice (bottom panel). (E) Eye-specific complex synapse fraction across development in WT (top panel) and β2KO mice (bottom panel). In (D) and (E), error bars represent means ± SEMs. Statistical significance between CTB(+) and CTB(-) synapse measurements was assessed using one-way ANOVA. *: $p<0.05$, **: $p<0.01$. N=3 biological replicates for each age/genotype.

Across our dataset collected from different ages and genotypes, the enhanced

resolution of STORM images revealed distinct subtypes of retinogeniculate synapses

(S1A Fig). These included "complex" synapses characterized by the presence of

multiple (2-4) Bassoon(+) active zones (AZs) and greater VGluT2 signal, as well as

"simple" retinogeniculate synapses that were smaller and contained a single AZ (Fig 1B

and S1A Fig). To determine the eye-of-origin for each retinogeniculate synapse, we

measured the colocalization of CTB signal with VGluT2 (Fig 1C). By imaging in the

contralateral eye-specific region relative to the CTB-injected eye, we defined CTB(+)

VGluT2 clusters as "dominant-eye" synapses originating from the contralateral eye.

Conversely, CTB(-) VGluT2 clusters were classified as "non-dominant eye" synapses

originating from the ipsilateral eye (Fig 1C). Our previous work using binocular CTB

control injections confirmed the high efficiency of retinogeniculate synapse labeling by

anterograde tracing, thereby enabling accurate assignment of eye-specific synapses in

the mouse brain (23).

After assigning eye-of-origin to all retinogeniculate synapses, we measured the density

of complex and simple synapses from both eyes over development. In WT mice, the

density of CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses increased progressively from P2 to

P8 (Fig 1D, upper panel). In contrast, the density of CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex

synapses increased from P2 to P4 and then decreased at P8 (Fig 1D, upper panel). The

density of simple synapses followed the same pattern (S1B Fig, upper panel) consistent

with the overall refinement of eye-specific synapses (23). In β2KO mice, the density of

both complex (Fig 1D, lower panel) and simple eye-specific synapses (S1B Fig, lower

panel) was reduced relative to controls at P4 and P8.

To further investigate complex synapse maturation, we measured the fraction of

complex synapses relative to the total synapse number over development. In WT mice,

the total fraction of dominant-eye complex synapses increased from ~20% at P2 to

~29% at P8 while non-dominant-eye complex synapses remained constant between

~14-17% across the same period (Fig 1E, upper panel). A similar pattern of eye-specific

complex synapse maturation was found in β2KO mice (Fig 1E, lower panel), showing

that relative proportions of complex versus simple synapses appeared normal despite

an overall reduction in total synapse density when spontaneous retinal activity was

disrupted (23).

Complex synapses undergo eye-specific vesicle pool

maturation

Each complex synapse could represent an individual, larger RGC bouton with multiple

active zones, or, alternatively, several clustered simple RGC boutons originating from

one or more presynaptic RGC axons (10, 12, 13). To distinguish these possibilities, we

compared the developmental changes in VGluT2 volume and active zone number for

complex versus simple synapses. In WT mice, both complex (Fig 2A, left panel) and

simple (Fig 2B, left panel) synapses showed developmental increases and eye-specific

differences in presynaptic VGluT2 volume. In WT complex synapses at P4, the median

dominant-eye VGluT2 cluster volumes were 372% larger than non-dominant-eye

VGluT2 clusters (Fig 2A, left panel). In contrast, β2KO mice showed a smaller

magnitude difference (110%) between eye-specific complex synapse VGluT2 volume at

the same time point (Fig 2A, right panel). In simple synapses at P4, the magnitudes of

eye-specific differences in VGluT2 volume were reduced to 135% (WT, Fig 2B, left

panel) and 41% (β2KO, Fig 2B, right panel). These results indicate that eye-specific

differences in vesicle pool size are more significant for complex synapses versus simple

synapses and that the maturation of both synapse types is regulated by spontaneous

retinal activity.

Fig 2. Complex synapses undergo eye-specific vesicle pool maturation. (A) Violin plots showing the distribution of VGluT2 cluster volume for complex synapses in WT and β2KO mice at each age. The black dots represent the median value of each biological replicate (N=3) and the black horizontal lines represent the median value of all synapses. Black lines connect measurements of CTB(+) and CTB(-) populations from the same biological replicate. Statistical significance was determined using a mixed model ANOVA with a post hoc Bonferroni test. Black asterisks indicate eye-specific differences and colored asterisks indicate differences across time points. (B) Violin plots similar to (A) show the distribution of VGluT2 cluster volume for simple synapses in WT and β2KO mice at each age. (C) Average number of active zones (AZs = individual bassoon clusters) per complex synapse in WT (top panel) and β2KO mice (bottom panel). (D) VGluT2 cluster volume as a function of AZ number for all synapses in WT P4 samples (top panel) and β2KO P4 samples (bottom panel). (E) Average VGluT2 cluster volume per AZ for all synapses in WT P4 samples (top panel) and β2KO P4 samples (bottom panel). In (C-E), error bars represent means ± SEMs from N=3 biological replicates. Statistical significance was assessed using one-way ANOVA with a post hoc Tukey's test. Black asterisks indicate eye-specific differences and colored asterisks indicate differences between simple (1 AZ) and complex (>1 AZ) synapses. "n.s." indicates no significance between simple and complex synapses. In all panels, *: p<0.05, **: p<0.01, ***: p<0.001.

We next measured the number of Bassoon clusters in each complex synapse and

asked whether the corresponding VGluT2 cluster volume was consistent with a

summation of VGluT2 volume from multiple simple synapses. In both WT (Fig 2C, top

panel) and β2KO mice (Fig 2C, bottom panel), complex synapses were associated with

an average of 2-3 Bassoon clusters in the first postnatal week. The average number of

AZs in CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses increased from P2-P8, while CTB(-)

non-dominant-eye synapses did not add AZs during this period (Fig 2C). For CTB(+)

dominant-eye synapses in both WT and β2KO mice, the size of the vesicle pool was

positively correlated with the number of AZs (Fig 2D, S2A/B Figs). This correlation was

also present in CTB(-) non-dominant-eye synapses, but with a smaller magnitude.

Dividing the total presynaptic VGluT2 volume by the AZ number showed that simple and

complex synapses had an equivalent presynaptic vesicle volume associated with each

AZ (Fig 2E, S2C/D Figs). This suggests that complex synapses in the first postnatal

week are comprised of several simple RGC synapses each with similar VGluT2 volume

(putative nascent glomeruli). This conclusion is further supported by EM data showing

that individual synaptic terminals in the P7 mouse dLGN are commonly associated with

a single AZ (10).

191   Complex synapses are loci for synaptic clustering

Previous studies support the hypothesis that eye-specific competition is achieved

through stabilization and strengthening of co-active dominant-eye RGC inputs together

with punishment and elimination of non-dominant-eye inputs (34-36). Within this

context, complex synapses with multiple presynaptic release sites may drive strong

postsynaptic responses and the induction of non-cell-autonomous stabilization and/or

elimination signals that regulate synaptic cluster development (37-39). To investigate

whether complex synapses contribute to synaptic clustering, we measured the fraction

of eye-specific simple synapses located near like-eye complex synapses and compared

this to a randomized simple synapse distribution (Fig 3A-C). Simple synapses were

considered nearby if their weighted centroids were within 1.5 µm of a complex synapse

edge (Fig 3A, S3 Fig). For CTB(+) dominant-eye projections in WT mice, simple

synapses showed non-random clustering near complex synapses, which increased

progressively over development (Fig 3B, middle panel). In contrast, when searching for

CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapses nearby CTB(+) dominant-eye complex

synapses, we found no evidence for synaptic clustering (S3A Fig, middle panel). These

results indicate that CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses stabilize the local

formation of like-eye-type simple synapses.

Fig 3. Complex synapses are loci for synaptic clustering. (A) A representative complex synapse in a WT P8 dLGN (arrow) with nearby simple synapses (arrowheads) clustered within 1.5 μm (dashed yellow ring). (B) The fraction of CTB(+) dominant-eye simple synapses near like-eye complex synapses (cartoon) across development in WT (middle panel) and β2KO mice (right panel). Colored lines show the measured distributions and black lines show results of a randomized simple synapse distribution within the sample imaging volume. (C) Same as in (B) showing results for CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapses near like-eye complex synapses. In B/C, a one-way ANOVA was used to test the statistical significance between original and randomized data. Error bars represent means ± SEMs. *: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $P < 0.001$. (D) Cumulative distribution of simple synapse VGluT2 volume for CTB(+) dominant-eye simple synapses near (<1.5 μm, black lines) or far from (>1.5 μm, red lines) like-eye complex synapses. (E) Same as in (D) showing the cumulative distribution of simple synapse VGluT2 volume for CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapse relative to like-eye complex synapses. The distributions in (D/E) show merged data across all developmental ages. A nonparametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used for statistical analysis. "n.s." indicates no significant difference between near and far simple synapse distributions.

Similarly, for CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses in WT mice, we observed a significant increase in the clustering of like-eye CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapses nearby from P2 to P4 (Fig 3C, middle panel). Subsequently, the fraction of clustered simple synapses decreased from P4 to P8, reaching a level similar to randomized data (Fig 3C, middle panel). This increase in clustering coincides with ipsilateral RGC axon synaptogenesis (23) and demonstrates that ipsilateral CTB(-) complex synapses promote local synaptogenesis despite being in the future contralateral eye-specific territory. However, after the close of eye-specific competition at P8, clustered CTB(-) simple synapses were eliminated, indicating that CTB(-)

complex synapses failed to stabilize nearby simple synapses during eye-specific

competition. This effect was not due to an overall loss of complex synapses as the

CTB(-) complex synapse fraction was consistent across the first postnatal week (Fig

1E). Just as we found for CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses, CTB(-) non-

dominant-eye complex synapses showed no selective stabilization of simple synapses

from the opposite eye (S3B Fig, middle panel).

In β2KO mice, CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses also stabilized nearby like-eye

simple synapses, although the effect size was reduced relative to controls (Fig 3B, right

panel). Similarly, CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses in β2KO mice failed to

stabilize like-eye simple synapses to the level seen in controls (Fig 3C, right panel). As

we observed in control mice, complex synapses of either eye did not selectively

stabilize opposite eye-synapses in β2KO mice (S3A/B Fig, lower panels). Together,

these results suggest that while local synapse stabilization mechanisms are at least

partially maintained in β2KO mice, defects in spontaneous retinal activity reduce eye-

specific synaptic clustering.

Based on our independent findings of eye-specific differences in vesicle pool volume

(Fig 2 A/B) and non-random synapse clustering around complex synapses (Fig 3 A-C),

we hypothesized that complex synapses might also regulate the vesicle pool size of

nearby simple synapses as a mechanism contributing to presynaptic maturation. To test

this, we divided the population of simple synapses into two groups: those that were

within a 1.5 μm radius of a like-eye complex synapse ('near') and those that were at any

distance >1.5 μm ('far'). When comparing the vesicle pool volumes between near and

far simple synapse groups across all ages and genotypes, we found no significant

differences for either dominant-eye or non-dominant-eye simple synapses (Fig 3D/E,

displays the data merged for all time points). This result shows that activity-dependent

synapse stabilization mechanisms do not impact simple synapse vesicle pool size.

Complex synapses mediate distance-dependent synaptic stabilization and punishment underlying eye-specific competition

RGC axon refinement is a dynamic process involving branch stabilization and

elimination based upon the relative activity patterns among neighboring inputs (37, 40).

Axonal remodeling is partially regulated by synaptic transmission (41) and the induction

of non-cell-autonomous stabilization and punishment signals (38, 39, 42). Although the

precise mechanisms of axonal stabilization and punishment are not fully understood, it

is likely that non-cell-autonomous signals operate at a local scale through direct cell-cell

interactions or diffusible paracrine factors. Based on our observation that CTB(-) non-

dominant-eye simple synapses initially cluster around like-eye complex synapses and

were eliminated during eye-specific competition (Fig 3C), we hypothesized that CTB(-)

synapses may be punished by nearby CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses in a

distance-dependent manner.

To test this hypothesis, we first examined whether the size of CTB(-) non-dominant-eye

complex synapses is affected by their spatial proximity to CTB(+) dominant-eye

complex synapses (Fig 4A/B). For each CTB(-) complex synapse, we measured the

vesicle pool volume (Fig 4A, P4 data as an example) and AZ number (Fig 4B) as a

function of each synapse's distance to the nearest CTB(+) complex synapse. We found

no correlation between presynaptic properties and inter-eye complex synapse distances

across all ages in both WT mice (Fig 4 A/B, left panels) and β2KO mice (Fig 4A/B, right

panels) (P2/P8 data not shown). These findings align with our earlier discovery that

simple synapse vesicle pool volume is unaffected by proximity to complex synapses

(Fig 3C), suggesting that presynaptic protein organization is not influenced by

mechanisms governing synaptic clustering.

Fig 4. Complex synapses mediate distance-dependent synaptic stabilization and punishment underlying eye-specific competition. (A) VGluT2 volume of CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses relative to their distance to the nearest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse in a WT P4 sample (left panel) and a β2KO P4 sample (right panel). Each black dot represents one synapse. (B) Distributions of distances between CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses and their nearest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse separated by the number of AZs within each CTB(-) complex synapse in WT P4 samples (left panel) and β2KO P4 samples (right panel). The median value is indicated by the horizontal line within the box, while the box boundaries represent quartile values. The whiskers represent the maximum and minimum values. A mixed model ANOVA was used to perform statistical tests. "n.s." indicates no significance differences. (C) Cumulative distributions of distances between CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses and their nearest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse (cartoon) in WT P4 samples (left panel) and β2KO P4 samples (right panel). Red lines indicate clustered complex synapses with nearby (<1.5 μm) simple synapses and black lines indicate isolated complex synapses with no nearby simple synapses. (D) Same presentation as in (C), showing distances between CTB(-) complex synapses. (E) Same presentation as in (C), showing distances between CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses and their nearest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse (cartoon). (F) Same presentation as in (C), showing distances between CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses and the nearest CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapse. For C-F, nonparametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were used for statistical comparisons. "***" indicates p<0.001, while "n.s." indicates no significant differences.

Next, we investigated whether complex synapses influence synaptic clustering around

other nearby complex synapses in a distance-dependent manner. For this analysis, we

categorized eye-specific complex synapses into two groups: complex synapses with

nearby (< 1.5 μm) simple synapses from the same eye (referred to as "clustered"), and

complex synapses with no nearby simple synapses (referred to as "isolated"). We then

measured the distance between each complex synapse and its closest complex

synapses from each eye-of-origin (Fig 4 C-F).

In WT mice at P4, we found that clustered CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapses

were closer to other CTB(+) complex synapses compared to isolated CTB(+) synapses,

indicating a synaptic stabilization effect (Fig 4C, left panel). Similarly, clustered CTB(-)

non-dominant-eye complex synapses were closer to the nearest CTB(-) complex

synapse compared to isolated CTB(-) complex synapses (Fig 4D, left panel). These

distance-dependent relationships were not observed when complex synapse positions

of the target eye were randomized (S4A/B Fig). These findings indicate that complex

synapses from both eyes are more likely to stabilize like-eye-type simple synapses

when they are in closer proximity to other complex synapses from the same eye. The

stabilization effect of CTB(+) complex synapse clustering persisted until P8 (S4C Fig,

left panel). However, by P8, CTB(-) complex synapse stabilization was not observed

(S4D Fig, right panel), consistent with synapse elimination and a loss of CTB(-)

clustering by this time point (Fig 3C). Furthermore, distance-dependent effects on

synaptic clustering at P4 were only observed in WT mice and not in β2KO mice (Fig 4

C/D, right panels; S4E/F Fig, shows P8 β2KO data).

To look for evidence of competitive interactions between synapses from the two eyes,

we next measured the distances between clustered and isolated CTB(-) non-dominant

eye complex synapses and the closest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse (Fig

4E). In WT mice at P4, we observed that isolated CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex

synapses were closer to the nearest CTB(+) dominant-eye complex synapse compared

to clustered CTB(-) synapses (Fig 4E, left panel), consistent with an opposite-eye

punishment signal. Similar to our findings on synaptic stabilization, this punishment

effect was not observed in β2KO mice (Fig 4E, right panel) or when complex synapse

positions of the target eye were randomized (S4A/B Fig).

Lastly, we compared the distances between clustered versus isolated CTB(+) dominant-

eye synapses with respect to CTB(-) non-dominant-eye complex synapses and we

found no differences in WT mice (Fig 4F, left panel) or β2KO mice (Fig 4F, right panel).

This suggests that complex synapses from the non-dominant-eye do not exert a

punishment effect on synapses from the dominant-eye (Fig 4F). Together, these results

demonstrate that complex synapses contribute to eye-specific competition through

activity-dependent stabilization and punishment mechanisms that act locally (within ~6

μm) to regulate synaptic clustering.

322   Discussion

Relay neurons of the dLGN function as crucial hubs for the integration of RGC inputs

within eye-specific synaptic clusters to drive spike output to the primary visual cortex. In

this study, we used volumetric super-resolution microscopy together with eye-specific

synaptic immunolabeling to show that 1) eye-specific synaptic clustering begins during

retinogeniculate refinement prior to eye-opening, 2) synaptic clustering is regulated by a

subpopulation of complex synapses with large vesicle pools and multiple AZs, 3)

complex synapses regulate clustering through distance-dependent stabilization of like-

eye synapses and punishment of opposite-eye synapses, and 4) eye-specific synaptic

clustering relies on normal spontaneous retinal wave activity during the first postnatal

week. These results advance our understanding of the developmental timeline of

retinogeniculate glomerulus development and suggest that spontaneous neural activity

regulates synaptic stabilization and punishment signals underlying competitive synaptic

refinement in the developing visual system.

Previous anatomical studies have demonstrated the maturation of retinogeniculate

glomeruli through the progressive clustering of RGC boutons following eye-opening in

mice (10, 13, 19). This process is visual experience-dependent and is partly disrupted

by sensory deprivation (late dark-rearing) (19). At maturity, retinogeniculate clusters are

primarily eye-specific and contain very few, weak synapses from the non-dominant eye

within each eye-specific region (14, 16). Our STORM images reveal that eye-specific

synaptic clustering emerges prior to eye-opening, during the period of eye-specific

competition regulated by stage II cholinergic retinal waves. This clustering is marked by

the development of a subset of complex synapses that contain a greater number of

synaptic vesicles and AZs (putative clustered RGC terminal boutons). These synapses

differ from simple synapses (isolated RGC terminals) that have fewer vesicles and a

single active zone.

Since our STORM images did not include a membrane stain, we were unable to identify

the boundaries of individual RGC terminals. Therefore, it remains unclear whether

complex synapses represent multiple RGC boutons or single terminals with multiple

AZs. However, several lines of evidence suggest that complex synapses likely consist

of two or more small RGC terminals, each with a single AZ. First, we found that the

vesicle pool volume in complex synapses is proportional to the number of associated

AZs, with each AZ having a comparable vesicle pool size to that of simple synapses.

Second, the developmental increase in complex synapse vesicle pool volume matches

that of simple synapses. Third, previous electron microscopy (EM) imaging data in the

P7 mouse dLGN shows that synaptic profiles are small and mainly associated with a

single AZ (10). Larger retinogeniculate terminals containing several AZs are observed

later in development after eye-opening (10, 13).

Compared to mature synaptic glomeruli (~ 6 μm diameter), complex synapses formed

during the first postnatal week are significantly smaller (~1 μm diameter). This suggests

that further aggregation and convergence of RGC inputs are required for the maturation

of complex synapses into bona fide glomeruli. Consistent with this, we found that

complex synapses acted as local hubs for the clustering of additional like-eye-type

simple synapses. The radius of simple synapse clustering around complex synapses

was in the range of ~ 3-4 µm, indicating that these clustered simple synapses may

serve as the substrate for glomerulus maturation.

In the adult dLGN, bouton clustering facilitates the convergence of RGC inputs

representing similar visual features (e.g. direction of motion) and the integration of

parallel visual channels carried by unique RGC mosaics (12, 14, 17). Retinal waves

drive co-activation of synaptic transmission in boutons from neighboring RGCs, which

may support the development of clustered synaptic inputs to relay neurons. Consistent

with this, pharmacological and genetic disruptions of cholinergic retinal wave

propagation decrease direction selective responses in postsynaptic neurons in the

superior colliculus (43). Our STORM images revealed that in β2KO mice with disrupted

retinal waves, complex synapses were formed and showed a development increase in

vesicle pool volume and AZ number similar to WT mice (Fig 2). However, the clustering

of simple synapses around complex synapses was reduced, though not eliminated (Fig

3 B/C), in β2KO mice. Since retinal waves persist in β2KO mice (31-33), a residual level

of correlated activity between adjacent RGC synapses may be sufficient to promote

synaptic clustering. In the future, it will be of interest to investigate how correlated

synaptic activity impacts local clustering using pharmacological or optogenetic

manipulations to reduce or enhance RGC correlations in the developing retina (44-47).

While studying the spatial relationships between complex synapses, we observed

increased clustering of dominant-eye inputs (stabilization) and decreased clustering of

non-dominant-eye inputs (punishment) depending on the distance between eye-specific

complex synapses. Synaptic clustering was more likely to occur around complex

synapses that were nearby other complex synapses from the same eye (within ~ 6 μm).

This finding is consistent with the presence of non-cell-autonomous signals that regulate

eye-specific axonal stabilization (37, 38, 42). In addition to mechanisms that stabilize

axon branches, eye-specific projections also undergo competitive refinement and

axonal retraction mediated by punishment signals. Neurotransmission plays a crucial

role in these mechanisms as shown by genetic deletions of VGluT2 or RIM1 proteins

from ipsilaterally-projecting RGCs (41, 48). These deletions decrease presynaptic

vesicle release and prevent contralateral RGC axon retraction from the ipsilateral eye-

specific territory in the dLGN (41, 48). One downstream mediator of synaptic

punishment is JAK2 kinase, which is phosphorylated in less active synapses (39).

Similar to VGluT2 and RIM1 deletion phenotypes, over-expression of a dominant-

negative mutant JAK2 lacking kinase activity prevents axon retraction in transfected

RGCs during eye-specific competition (39).

Our super-resolution images show that synapse clustering is less likely to occur around

non-dominant-eye complex synapses when they were located nearby dominant-eye

complex synapses (a competitive punishment effect). This finding is consistent with

previous studies of bulk axonal remodeling and highlights the role of synaptic

punishment in axonal refinement phenotypes. In β2KO mice at P4, we did not find

evidence of distance-dependent effects on synaptic clustering (either stabilization or

punishment), indicating that spontaneous retinal activity regulates eye-specific synaptic

clustering mechanisms at a local microcircuit scale (within ~ 6 μm). A possible

mechanism underlying this effect is the activity-dependent development of functional

presynaptic terminals. We previously found that β2KO mice fail to develop eye-specific

differences in vesicle recruitment to the active zone, which are normally present in WT

mice as early as P2 (23). This effect is accompanied by an overall reduction in the

number of retinogeniculate synapses in the β2KO mouse (23). In the current study, we

found that complex synapses show greater eye-specific differences in presynaptic

vesicle pool volume compared to simple synapses and that these eye-specific

differences are significantly reduced in β2KO mice. Altogether, these results are

consistent with a model in which spontaneous retinal activity regulates presynaptic

development and vesicle release probability, which is required for the induction of local

stabilization and punishment signals that govern eye-specific synapse clustering.

Our results in the developing retinogeniculate system bear similarities to the

development of synaptic clusters in other circuits. During the refinement of the

neuromuscular junction (NMJ), individual myocytes are initially innervated by multiple

motor neuron axons that form intermingled synapses (49, 50). Subsequently, NMJ

terminals undergo competitive refinement, where connections from a single motor axon

are elaborated and strengthened, while competing axons are eliminated (51, 52).

Similar to our findings on eye-specific complex synapse development, competition at

the developing NMJ is also dependent on inter-synaptic distance, with motor axons

losing connections that are in closer proximity to their competing synapses (49, 50).

This process is activity-dependent, and blocking synaptic activity with pharmacological

or genetic methods biases competition and leads to elimination of the silenced inputs

(53, 54). Interestingly, competing motor axon outputs show differences in presynaptic

release probability at early stages of development, suggesting that biases in presynaptic

release may underlie competition (55), possibly through the induction of local

stabilization and punishment signals (52).

While the molecular mechanisms regulating synaptic competition at the NMJ are not

well understood, additional insights have been gained from studies of the developing

hippocampus. Synaptic clustering onto hippocampal pyramidal neurons is activity-

dependent and is blocked by chronic application of TTX or NMDA-receptor antagonists

(56). Activation of NMDA receptors by co-active inputs triggers postsynaptic calcium-

induced calcium-release and spreading calcium signals that regulate the maturation of

clustered synapses (57). While co-active synapses are strengthened by spontaneous

activity, synapses with asynchronous activity undergo synaptic depression, which is

blocked by disruptions of proBDNF/P75^{NTR} signaling (58). Similarly, the clustering of co-

active inputs is prevented by manipulations of BDNF-TrkB signaling and matrix

metalloproteinase 9 (MMP9), a proteinase that converts proBDNF to mature BDNF (59).

Together, these findings suggest a model in which postsynaptic activation by co-active

inputs drives local spreading intracellular calcium signaling, leading to proBDNF

release. Extracellular proBDNF is then cleaved by MMP9 to induce BDNF-TrkB

signaling, which stabilizes locally synchronized synapses and promotes cluster

maturation (59). At the same time, proBDNF may weaken asynchronous synapses

through P75^{NTR} activation (58). Relating these neurotrophic mechanisms to visual

system development, a computational model that incorporates BDNF-mediated synaptic

refinement suggests that correlations in retinal waves are sufficient to induce local

synaptic clustering contributing to orientation selectivity in cortical neurons (60).

Supporting a role for correlated spontaneous activity in synaptic refinement for the

computation of directional motion, disruptions of retinal wave activity through

pharmacological and genetic approaches reduce direction-selective responses in the

mouse superior colliculus (43).

Although the molecular mechanisms underlying the clustering of eye-specific

retinogeniculate inputs are still unknown, our STORM imaging results provide

anatomical support for the existence of local signaling factors that mediate non-cell-

autonomous interactions, which underlie both synaptic stabilization and punishment.

These factors may induce direct signaling between presynaptic RGC axon terminals or,

alternatively, initiate postsynaptic responses that lead to reverse cell-cell signaling or

the release of diffusible retrograde factors that stabilize and eliminate synapses based

on input timing. JAK2/STAT signaling has been identified as one downstream regulator

of synaptic punishment (39), which helps narrow the search for specific upstream

induction signals in future experiments. It will also be of special interest to further

investigate the eye-specific induction of glial-associated phagocytic signaling pathways

that prune weak synapses during eye-specific segregation (61-63).

Materials and methods:
481

482   The raw imaging data in this paper were previously reported (23). Materials and

483   methods below are adapted from this work.

Animals
485

Wild-type C57BL/6J mice used in this study were purchased from the Jackson

Laboratory (Stock Number 000664). β2KO mice were a generous gift of Dr. Michael C.

Crair (Yale School of Medicine). All experimental procedures were performed in

accordance with an animal study protocol approved by the Institutional Animal Care and

Use Committee (IACUC) at the University of Maryland. Neonatal male and female mice

were used interchangeably for all experiments. Tissue from biological replicates (N=3

animals) was collected for each age (P2/P4/P8) from each genotype (WT and β2KO)

(18 animals total). Primers used for genotyping β2KO mice include: forward primer

CAGGCGTTATCCACAAAGACAGA; reverse primer

TTGAGGGGAGCAGAACAGAATC; mutant reverse primer

ACTTGGGTTTGGGCGTGTTGAG (64, 65).

Eye injections

Intraocular eye injections were performed one day before tissue collection. Briefly, mice

were anesthetized by inhalant isoflurane and sterile surgical spring scissors were used

to gently part the eyelid to expose the corneoscleral junction. A small hole was made in

the eye using a sterile 34-gauge needle and ~0.5 µl of cholera toxin subunit B

conjugated with Alexa Fluor 488 (CTB-488, ThermoFisher Scientific, Catalogue

Number: C34775) diluted in 0.9% sterile saline was intravitreally pressure-injected into

the right eye using a pulled-glass micropipette coupled to a Picospritzer (Parker

Hannifin).

dLGN tissue preparation

Animals were deeply anesthetized with ketamine/xylazine and transcardially perfused

with 5-10 mls of 37°C 0.9% sterile saline followed by 10 mls of room temperature 4%

EM Grade paraformaldehyde (PFA, Electron Microscopy Sciences) in 0.9% saline.

Brains were embedded in 2.5% agarose and sectioned in the coronal plane at 100 µm

using a vibratome. From the full anterior-posterior series of dLGN sections (~6-8

sections) we selected the central two sections for staining in all biological replicates.

These sections were morphologically consistent with Figures 134-136 (5.07-5.31 mm)

of the postnatal day 6 mouse brain from Paxinos, et al., "Atlas of the developing mouse

brain" Academic Press, 2020 (66). Selected sections were postfixed in 4% PFA for 30

minutes at room temperature and then washed for 30-40 minutes in 1X PBS. The dLGN

was identified by the presence of CTB-488 signals using a fluorescence dissecting

microscope. A circular tissue punch (~500 μm diameter) containing the dLGN was

microdissected from each section using a blunt-end needle. A small microknife cut was

made at the dorsal edge of the dLGN which, together with the CTB-488 signal, enabled

us to identify the dLGN orientation during image acquisition.

Immunohistochemistry

We used a serial-section single-molecule localization imaging approach to prepare

samples and collect super-resolution fluorescence imaging volumes as previously

described (24). dLGN tissue punches were blocked in 10% normal donkey serum

(Jackson ImmunoResearch, Catalogue Number: 017-000-121) with 0.3% Triton X-100

(Sigma-Aldrich Inc.) and 0.02% sodium azide (Sigma-Aldrich Inc.) diluted in 1X PBS for

2-3 hours at room temperature and then incubated in primary antibodies for ~72 hours

at 4°C. Primary antibodies used were Rabbit anti-Homer1 (Synaptic Systems,

Catalogue Number: 160003, 1:100) to label postsynaptic densities (PSDs), mouse anti-

Bassoon (Abcam, Catalogue Number AB82958, 1:100) to label presynaptic active

zones (AZs), and guinea pig anti-VGluT2 (Millipore, Catalogue Number AB251-I, 1:100)

to label presynaptic vesicles. Following primary antibody incubation, tissues were

washed in 1X PBS for 6 x 20 minutes at room temperature and incubated in secondary

antibody solution overnight for ~36 hours at 4°C. The secondary antibodies used were

donkey anti-rabbit IgG (Jackson ImmunoResearch, Catalogue Number 711-005-152,

1:100) conjugated with Dy749P1 (Dyomics, Catalogue Number 749P1-01) and Alexa

Fluor 405 (ThermoFisher, Catalogue Number: A30000), donkey anti-mouse IgG

(Jackson ImmunoResearch, Catalogue Number 715-005-150, 1:100) conjugated with

Alexa Fluor 647 (ThermoFisher, Catalogue Number: A20006) and Alexa Fluor 405, and

donkey anti-guinea pig IgG (Jackson ImmunoResearch, Catalogue Number 706-005-

148, 1:100) conjugated with Cy3b (Cytiva, Catalogue Number: PA63101). Tissues were

washed 6 x 20 minutes in 1X PBS at room temperature after secondary antibody

incubation.

Postfixation, dehydration, and embedding in epoxy resin

Tissue embedding was performed as previously described (24). Tissues were postfixed

with 3% PFA + 0.1% GA (Electron Microscopy Sciences) in PBS for 2 hours at room

temperature and then washed in 1X PBS for 20 minutes. To plasticize the tissues for

ultrasectioning, the tissues were first dehydrated in a graded dilution series of 100%

ethanol (50%/70%/90%/100%/100% EtOH) for 15 minutes each at room temperature

and then immersed in a series of epoxy resin/100% EtOH exchanges (Electron

Microscopy Sciences) with increasing resin concentration (25% resin/75% ethanol; 50%

resin/50% ethanol; 75% resin/25% ethanol; 100% resin; 100% resin) for 2 hours each.

Tissues were transferred to BEEM capsules (Electron Microscopy Sciences) that were

filled with 100% resin and polymerized for 16 hours at 70°C.

Ultrasectioning

Plasticized tissue sections were cut using a Leica UC7 ultramicrotome at 70 nm using a

Histo Jumbo diamond knife (DiATOME). Chloroform vapor was used to reduce

compression after cutting. For each sample, ~100 sections were collected on a

coverslip coated with 0.5% gelatin and 0.05% chromium potassium (Sigma-Aldrich Inc.),

dried at 60 degrees for 25 minutes, and protected from light prior to imaging.

Imaging chamber preparation

Coverslips were chemically etched in 10% sodium ethoxide for 5 minutes at room

temperature to remove the epoxy resin and expose the dyes to the imaging buffer for

optimal photoswitching. Coverslips were then rinsed with ethanol and dH_2O. To create

fiducial beads for flat-field and chromatic corrections, we mixed 715/755nm and

540/560nm, carboxylate-modified microspheres (Invitrogen, Catalogue Numbers F8799

and F8809, 1:8 ratio respectively) to create a high-density fiducial marker and then

further diluted the mixture at 1:750 with Dulbecco's PBS to create a low-density bead

solution. Both high- and low-density bead solutions were spotted on the coverslip (~0.7

ul each) for flat-field and chromatic aberration correction respectively. Excess beads

were rinsed away with dH2O for 1-2 minutes. The coverslip was attached to a glass

slide with double-sided tape to form an imaging chamber. The chamber was filled with

STORM imaging buffer (10% glucose, 17.5µM glucose oxidase, 708nM catalase, 10mM

MEA, 10mM NaCl, and 200mM Tris) and sealed with epoxy.

Imaging setup

Imaging was performed using a custom single-molecule super-resolution imaging system. The microscope contained low (4x/10x air) and high (60x 1.4NA oil immersion) magnitude objectives mounted on a commercial frame (Nikon Ti-U) with back optics arranged for oblique incident angle illumination. We used continuous-wave lasers at 488nm (Coherent), 561nm (MPB), 647nm (MPB), and 750nm (MPB) to excite Alexa 488, Cy3B, Alexa 647, and Dy749P1 dyes respectively. A 405 nm cube laser (Coherent) was used to reactivate Dy749P1 and Alexa647 dye photoswitching. The microscope was fitted with a custom pentaband/pentanotch dichroic filter set and a motorized emission filter wheel. The microscope also contained an IR laser-based focus lock system to maintain optimal focus during automatic image acquisition. Images were collected on 640*640-pixel region of an sCMOS camera (ORCA-Flash4.0 V3, Hamamatsu Photonics) with a pixel size of ~155 nm.

Automated image acquisition

Fiducials and tissue sections on the coverslip were imaged using the low magnification objective (4X) to create a mosaic overview of the specimen. Beads/sections were then imaged at high-magnification (60X) to select regions of interest (ROIs) in the Cy3B and Alexa 488 channels. Before final image acquisition, laser intensities and the incident angle were adjusted to optimize photoswitching for STORM imaging and utilize the full dynamic range of the camera for conventional imaging.

Low-density bead images were taken in 16 partially overlapping ROIs. 715/755nm

beads were excited using 750 nm light and images were collected through Dy749P1

and Alexa 647 emission filters. 540/560nm beads were excited using a 488 nm laser

and images were collected through Alexa 647, Cy3B, and Alexa 488 emission filters.

These fiducial images were later used to generate a non-linear warping transform to

correct chromatic aberration. Next, ROIs within each tissue section were imaged at

conventional (diffraction-limited) resolution in all four-color channels sequentially.

Following conventional image acquisition, a partially overlapping series of 9 images

were collected in the high-density bead field for all 4 channels (Dy749P1, Alexa 647,

Cy3B, and Alexa 488). These images were later used to perform a flat-field image

correction of non-uniform laser illumination across the ROIs. Another round of bead

images was taken as described above in a different ROI of the low-density bead field.

These images were later used to confirm the stability of chromatic offsets during

imaging. All ROIs within physical sections were then imaged by STORM for Dy749P1

and Alexa 647 channels. Images were acquired using a custom progression of

increasing 405nm laser intensity to control single-molecule switching. 8000 frames of

Dy749P1 channel images were collected (60 Hz imaging) followed by 12000 frames of

Alexa 647 channel images (100 Hz). In a second imaging pass, the same ROIs were

imaged for Cy3B and Alexa 488 channels, each for 8000 frames (60 Hz).

We imaged the ipsilateral and contralateral ROIs separately in each physical section of

the dLGN. For consistency of ROI selection across biological replicates at each age, we

identified the dorsal-ventral (DV) axis of the dLGN and selected ROIs within the center

(core region) at 2/5 (ipsilateral ROI) and 4/5 (contralateral ROI) of the full DV length.

Image processing

Single-molecule localization was performed using a previously described DAOSTORM

algorithm (67) modified for use with sCMOS cameras (68). Molecule lists were rendered

as 8-bit images with 15.5 nm pixel size where each molecule is plotted as an intensity

distribution with an area reflecting its localization precision. Low-density fiducial images

were used for chromatic aberration correction. We localized 715/755 beads in Dy749P1

and Alexa 647 channels, and 540/560 beads in Alexa 647, Cy3B, and Alexa 488

channels. A third-order polynomial transform map was generated by matching the

positions of each bead in all channels to the Alexa 647 channel. The average residual

error of bead matching was <15 nm for all channels. The transform maps were applied

to both 4-color conventional and STORM images. Conventional images were upscaled

(by 10X) to match the STORM image size. The method to align serial sections was

previously described (24). STORM images were first aligned to their corresponding

conventional images by image correlation. To generate an aligned 3D image stack from

serial sections, we normalized the intensity of all Alexa 488 images and used these

normalized images to generate both rigid and elastic transformation matrices for all four-

color channels of both STORM and conventional data. The final image stack was then

rotated and cropped to exclude incompletely imaged edge areas. Images of the

ipsilateral regions were further cropped according to CTB-488 signals to exclude

contralateral areas.

Cell body filter

The aligned STORM images had non-specific labeling of cell bodies in Dy749P1 and

Alexa 647 channels corresponding to Homer1 and Bassoon immunolabels. To limit

synaptic cluster identification to the neuropil region we identified cell bodies based on

their Dy749P1 signal and excluded these regions from further image processing.

STORM images were convolved with a Gaussian function (σ=140 nm) and then

binarized using the lower threshold of a two-level Otsu threshold method. We located

connected components in the thresholded images and generated a mask based on

components larger than e^{11} voxels. Because cell body clusters were orders of

magnitude larger than synaptic clusters, the cell body filter algorithm was robust to a

range of size thresholds. The mask was applied to images of all channels to exclude

cell body areas.

Eye-specific synapse identification and quantification

To correct for minor variance in image intensity across physical sections, we normalized

the pixel intensity histogram of each section to the average histogram of all sections.

Image histograms were rescaled to make full use of the 8-bit range. Using a two-level

Otsu threshold method, the conventional images were thresholded into three classes: a

low-intensity background, low-intensity signals above the background representing non-

synaptic labeling, and high-intensity signals representing synaptic structures. The

conventional images were binarized by the lower two-level Otsu threshold, generating a

mask for STORM images to filter out background signals. STORM images were

convolved with a Gaussian function ($\sigma = 77.5$ nm) and thresholded using the higher two-

level Otsu threshold. Following thresholding, connected components were identified in

three dimensions using MATLAB 'conncomp' function. A watershedding approach was

applied to split large clusters that were improperly connected. Clusters were kept for

further analysis only if they contained aligned image information across two or more

physical sections. We also removed all edge synapses from our analysis by excluding

synapses that did not have blank image data on all adjacent sides.

To distinguish non-specific immunolabeling from true synaptic signals, we quantified two

parameters for each cluster: cluster volume and cluster signal density calculated by the

ratio of within-cluster pixels with positive signal intensity in the raw STORM images.

Two separate populations were identified in 2D histograms plotted from these two

parameters. We manually selected the population with higher volumes and signal

densities representing synaptic structures. To test the robustness of the manual

selection, we performed multiple repeated measurements of the same data and

discovered a between-measurement variance of <1% (data not shown).

To identify paired pre- and postsynaptic clusters, we first measured the centroid-

centroid distance of each cluster in the Dy749P1 (Homer1) and Alexa 647 (Bassoon)

channels to the closest cluster in the other channel. We next quantified the signal

intensity of each opposing synaptic channel within a 140 nm shell surrounding each

cluster. A 2D histogram was plotted based on the measured centroid-centroid distances

and opposing channel signal densities of each cluster. Paired clusters with closely

positioned centroids and high intensities of apposed channel signal were identified

using the OPTICS algorithm. In total we identified 49,414 synapses from WT samples (3

samples each at P2/P4/P8, 9 total samples) and 33,478 synapses in $\beta 2^{-/-}$ mutants (3

samples each at P2/P4/P8, 9 total samples). Retinogeniculate synapses were identified

by pairing Bassoon (Alexa 647) clusters with VGluT2 (Cy3B) clusters using the same

method as pre/post-synaptic pairing. Synapses from the right eye were identified by

pairing VGluT2 clusters with CTB (Alexa 488) clusters. The volume of each cluster

reflected the total voxel volume of all connected voxels, and the total signal intensity

was a sum of voxel intensity within the volume of the connected voxels.

Complex synapse identification and quantification

To determine whether an eye-specific VGluT2 cluster is a complex synapse or a simple

synapse, we measured the number of active zones (defined by individual Bassoon

clusters) associated with each VGluT2 cluster in the dataset. A 3D shell was extended

140 nm from the surface voxels of each VGluT2 cluster and any Bassoon clusters that

fell within the shell were considered to be associated with the target VGluT2 cluster.

The number of active zones (AZs) associated with each VGluT2 cluster was then

measured. VGluT2 clusters associated with more than 1 AZ were defined as complex

synapses, while those associated with only 1 AZ were defined as simple synapses.

Quantification of complex and simple synapse VGluT2 cluster volume was performed

using the "regionprops" function in MATLAB, which provided the voxel size and

weighted centroid of each VGluT2 cluster. The search for simple synapses adjacent to

complex synapses (synaptic clustering analysis) was conducted using a similar search

approach as for associated Bassoon clusters, with expansion shell sizes ranging from 1

μm to 4 μm from the surface voxels of each complex synapse. The main figures in the

study utilized an expansion size of 1.5 μm. An eye-specific simple synapse was

considered to be near a complex synapse if its weighted centroid fell within the

expanded region.

729   Quantification and Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS. Plots were generated by SPSS or R

(ggplot2). Statistical details are presented in the figure legends. For all measurements in

this paper, we analyzed N = 3 biological replicates (individual mice) for each genotype

(WT and β2KO) at each age (P2, P4, and P8). Cluster densities, synapse AZ number,

average VGluT2 cluster volume, and all fraction measurements were presented as

mean ± SEM values in line plots and were compared by one-way ANOVA tests with a

post-hoc Tukey's test when there were more than 2 factors. Nonparametric

Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were used in all cumulative histogram comparisons. We

used a linear mixed model to compare VGluT2 cluster volumes (Fig 2) and the distance

measurements in Fig 4B. For VGluT2 cluster volume comparisons, the age or eye-of-

origin was the fixed main factor and biological replicate IDs were nested random factors.

In distance measurement comparisons, the complex synapse AZ number was the fixed

main factor and biological replicate IDs were nested random factors. Pairwise

comparisons among main factor groups were performed by a post-hoc Bonferroni's test.

In violin plots, each violin showed the distribution of grouped data from all biological

replicates from the same condition. Each black dot represents the median value of each

biological replicate and the horizontal black line represents the group median. Black

lines connect measurements of CTB(+) and CTB(-) populations from the same

biological replicate. Asterisks in all figures indicate statistical significance: *$P<0.05$,

**$P<0.01$, ***$P<0.001$.

Acknowledgements:

752   We thank Dr. Michael C. Crair for generously sharing the β2KO mouse line

753   used in this work.

Author contributions:

Conceptualization, C.Z. and C.M.S.; data curation, C.Z. and C.M.S.;

formal analysis, C.Z. and C.M.S.; funding acquisition, C.M.S.; investigation,

C.Z. and C.M.S.; methodology, C.Z. and C.M.S.; project administration,

C.Z. and C.M.S.; resources, C.Z. and C.M.S.; software, C.Z.

and C.M.S.; supervision, C.M.S.; validation, C.Z. and C.M.S.; visualization,

C.Z. and C.M.S.; writing – original draft preparation, C.Z. and C.M.S.; writing –

review & editing, C.Z. and C.M.S.

References:

1. Rall W. Electrophysiology of a dendritic neuron model. Biophys J. 1962;2(2 Pt 2):145-67.

2. Mel B, editor The Clusteron: Toward a Simple Abstraction for a Complex Neuron1991

1991: Morgan-Kaufmann.

3. Poirazi P, Mel BW. Impact of active dendrites and structural plasticity on the memory

capacity of neural tissue. Neuron. 2001;29(3):779-96.

4. Mel BW, Schiller J, Poirazi P. Synaptic plasticity in dendrites: complications and coping

strategies. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2017;43:177-86.

5. Leighton AH, Lohmann C. The Wiring of Developing Sensory Circuits-From Patterned

Spontaneous Activity to Synaptic Plasticity Mechanisms. Front Neural Circuits. 2016;10:71.

6. Winnubst J, Lohmann C. Synaptic clustering during development and learning: the why,

when, and how. Front Mol Neurosci. 2012;5:70.

7. Kastellakis G, Poirazi P. Synaptic Clustering and Memory Formation. Front Mol Neurosci.

2019;12:300.

8. Kirchner JH, Gjorgjieva J. Emergence of synaptic organization and computation in

dendrites. 2022;28(1):21-30.

9. Bickford ME. Synaptic organization of the dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus. Eur J

Neurosci. 2019;49(7):938-47.

10. Bickford ME, Slusarczyk A, Dilger EK, Krahe TE, Kucuk C, Guido W. Synaptic development

of the mouse dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus. J Comp Neurol. 2010;518(5):622-35.

11. Hammer S, Monavarfeshani A, Lemon T, Su J, Fox MA. Multiple Retinal Axons Converge

onto Relay Cells in the Adult Mouse Thalamus. Cell Rep. 2015;12(10):1575-83.

12.   Morgan JL, Berger DR, Wetzel AW, Lichtman JW. The Fuzzy Logic of Network

Connectivity in Mouse Visual Thalamus. Cell. 2016;165(1):192-206.

13.   Monavarfeshani A, Stanton G, Van Name J, Su K, Mills WA, Swilling K, et al. LRRTM1

underlies synaptic convergence in visual thalamus. Elife. 2018;7:e33498.

14.   Rompani SB, Mullner FE, Wanner A, Zhang C, Roth CN, Yonehara K, et al. Different

Modes of Visual Integration in the Lateral Geniculate Nucleus Revealed by Single-Cell-Initiated

Transsynaptic Tracing. Neuron. 2017;93(4):767-76 e6.

15.   Litvina EY, Chen C. Functional Convergence at the Retinogeniculate Synapse. Neuron.

2017;96(2):330-8 e5.

16.   Bauer J, Weiler S, Fernholz MHP, Laubender D, Scheuss V, Hubener M, et al. Limited

functional convergence of eye-specific inputs in the retinogeniculate pathway of the mouse.

Neuron. 2021;109(15):2457-68 e12.

17.   Liang L, Fratzl A, Goldey G, Ramesh RN, Sugden AU, Morgan JL, et al. A Fine-Scale

Functional Logic to Convergence from Retina to Thalamus. Cell. 2018;173(6):1343-55 e24.

18.   Pulikkottil VV, Somashekar BP, Bhalla US. Computation, wiring, and plasticity in synaptic

clusters. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2021;70:101-12.

19.   Hong YK, Park S, Litvina EY, Morales J, Sanes JR, Chen C. Refinement of the

retinogeniculate synapse by bouton clustering. Neuron. 2014;84(2):332-9.

20.   Muir-Robinson G, Hwang BJ, Feller MB. Retinogeniculate axons undergo eye-specific

segregation in the absence of eye-specific layers. J Neurosci. 2002;22(13):5259-64.

21.   Godement P, Salaün J, Imbert M. Prenatal and postnatal development of

retinogeniculate and retinocollicular projections in the mouse. J Comp Neurol.

1984;230(4):552-75.

22.   Jaubert-Miazza L, Green E, Lo FS, Bui K, Mills J, Guido W. Structural and functional

composition of the developing retinogeniculate pathway in the mouse. Vis Neurosci.

2005;22(5):661-76.

23.   Zhang C, Yadav S, Speer CM. The synaptic basis of activity-dependent eye-specific

competition. Cell Rep. 2023;42(2):112085.

24.   Vatan T, Minehart JA, Zhang C, Agarwal V, Yang J, Speer CM. Volumetric super-

resolution imaging by serial ultrasectioning and stochastic optical reconstruction microscopy in

mouse neural tissue. STAR Protocols. 2021;2(4):100971.

25.   Xu HP, Burbridge TJ, Chen MG, Ge X, Zhang Y, Zhou ZJ, et al. Spatial pattern of

spontaneous retinal waves instructs retinotopic map refinement more than activity frequency.

Dev Neurobiol. 2015;75(6):621-40.

26.   Xu HP, Burbridge TJ, Ye M, Chen M, Ge X, Zhou ZJ, et al. Retinal Wave Patterns Are

Governed by Mutual Excitation among Starburst Amacrine Cells and Drive the Refinement and

Maintenance of Visual Circuits. J Neurosci. 2016;36(13):3871-86.

27.   Xu HP, Furman M, Mineur YS, Chen H, King SL, Zenisek D, et al. An instructive role for

patterned spontaneous retinal activity in mouse visual map development. Neuron.

2011;70(6):1115-27.

28.   Rossi FM, Pizzorusso T, Porciatti V, Marubio LM, Maffei L, Changeux JP. Requirement of

the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor beta 2 subunit for the anatomical and functional

development of the visual system. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2001;98(11):6453-8.

29.   Grubb MS, Rossi FM, Changeux JP, Thompson ID. Abnormal functional organization in

the dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus of mice lacking the beta 2 subunit of the nicotinic

acetylcholine receptor. Neuron. 2003;40(6):1161-72.

30.   Dhande OS, Hua EW, Guh E, Yeh J, Bhatt S, Zhang Y, et al. Development of single

retinofugal axon arbors in normal and beta2 knock-out mice. J Neurosci. 2011;31(9):3384-99.

31.   Sun C, Warland DK, Ballesteros JM, van der List D, Chalupa LM. Retinal waves in mice

lacking the beta2 subunit of the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

2008;105(36):13638-43.

32.   Stafford BK, Sher A, Litke AM, Feldheim DA. Spatial-temporal patterns of retinal waves

underlying activity-dependent refinement of retinofugal projections. Neuron. 2009;64(2):200-

12.

33.   Bansal A, Singer JH, Hwang BJ, Xu W, Beaudet A, Feller MB. Mice lacking specific

nicotinic acetylcholine receptor subunits exhibit dramatically altered spontaneous activity

patterns and reveal a limited role for retinal waves in forming ON and OFF circuits in the inner

retina. J Neurosci. 2000;20(20):7672-81.

34.   Assali A, Gaspar P, Rebsam A. Activity dependent mechanisms of visual map formation--

from retinal waves to molecular regulators. Semin Cell Dev Biol. 2014;35:136-46.

35.   Fassier C, Nicol X. Retinal Axon Interplay for Binocular Mapping. Front Neural Circuits.

2021;15:679440.

36.   Faust TE, Gunner G, Schafer DP. Mechanisms governing activity-dependent synaptic

pruning in the developing mammalian CNS. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2021;22(11):657-73.

37.   Rahman TN, Munz M, Kutsarova E, Bilash OM, Ruthazer ES. Stentian structural plasticity

in the developing visual system. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020;117(20):10636-8.

38.   Louail A, Sierksma MC, Chaffiol A, Baudet S, Assali A, Couvet S, et al. cAMP-Dependent

Co-stabilization of Axonal Arbors from Adjacent Developing Neurons. Cell Rep.

2020;33(1):108220.

39.   Yasuda M, Nagappan-Chettiar S, Johnson-Venkatesh EM, Umemori H. An activity-

dependent determinant of synapse elimination in the mammalian brain. Neuron.

2021;109(8):1333-49 e6.

40.   Munz M, Gobert D, Schohl A, Poquérusse J, Podgorski K, Spratt P, et al. Rapid Hebbian

axonal remodeling mediated by visual stimulation. Science. 2014;344(6186):904-9.

41.   Koch SM, Dela Cruz CG, Hnasko TS, Edwards RH, Huberman AD, Ullian EM. Pathway-

specific genetic attenuation of glutamate release alters select features of competition-based

visual circuit refinement. Neuron. 2011;71(2):235-42.

42.   Kutsarova E, Schohl A, Munz M, Wang A, Zhang YY, Bilash OM, et al. BDNF signaling in

correlation-dependent structural plasticity in the developing visual system. PLoS Biol.

2023;21(4):e3002070.

43.   Ge X, Zhang K, Gribizis A, Hamodi AS, Sabino AM, Crair MC. Retinal waves prime visual

motion detection by simulating future optic flow. Science. 2021;373(6553).

44.   Stellwagen D, Shatz CJ. An instructive role for retinal waves in the development of

retinogeniculate connectivity. Neuron. 2002;33(3):357-67.

45.   Stellwagen D, Shatz CJ, Feller MB. Dynamics of retinal waves are controlled by cyclic

AMP. Neuron. 1999;24(3):673-85.

46.   Sun C, Speer CM, Wang GY, Chapman B, Chalupa LM. Epibatidine application in vitro

blocks retinal waves without silencing all retinal ganglion cell action potentials in developing

retina of the mouse and ferret. J Neurophysiol. 2008;100(6):3253-63.

47.   Zhang J, Ackman JB, Xu HP, Crair MC. Visual map development depends on the temporal

pattern of binocular activity in mice. Nat Neurosci. 2011;15(2):298-307.

48.   Assali A, Le Magueresse C, Bennis M, Nicol X, Gaspar P, Rebsam A. RIM1/2 in retinal

ganglion cells are required for the refinement of ipsilateral axons and eye-specific segregation.

Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):3236.

49.   Balice-Gordon RJ, Chua CK, Nelson CC, Lichtman JW. Gradual loss of synaptic cartels

precedes axon withdrawal at developing neuromuscular junctions. Neuron. 1993;11(5):801-15.

50.   Gan WB, Lichtman JW. Synaptic segregation at the developing neuromuscular junction.

Science. 1998;282(5393):1508-11.

51.   Wyatt RM, Balice-Gordon RJ. Activity-dependent elimination of neuromuscular

synapses. J Neurocytol. 2003;32(5-8):777-94.

52.   Sanes JR, Lichtman JW. Development of the vertebrate neuromuscular junction. Annu

Rev Neurosci. 1999;22:389-442.

53.   Buffelli M, Burgess RW, Feng G, Lobe CG, Lichtman JW, Sanes JR. Genetic evidence that

relative synaptic efficacy biases the outcome of synaptic competition. Nature.

2003;424(6947):430-4.

54.   Balice-Gordon RJ, Lichtman JW. Long-term synapse loss induced by focal blockade of

postsynaptic receptors. Nature. 1994;372(6506):519-24.

55.   Kopp DM, Perkel DJ, Balice-Gordon RJ. Disparity in neurotransmitter release probability

among competing inputs during neuromuscular synapse elimination. J Neurosci.

2000;20(23):8771-9.

56.   Kleindienst T, Winnubst J, Roth-Alpermann C, Bonhoeffer T, Lohmann C. Activity-

dependent clustering of functional synaptic inputs on developing hippocampal dendrites.

Neuron. 2011;72(6):1012-24.

57.   Lee KF, Soares C, Thivierge JP, Beique JC. Correlated Synaptic Inputs Drive Dendritic

Calcium Amplification and Cooperative Plasticity during Clustered Synapse Development.

Neuron. 2016;89(4):784-99.

58.   Winnubst J, Cheyne JE, Niculescu D, Lohmann C. Spontaneous Activity Drives Local

Synaptic Plasticity In Vivo. Neuron. 2015;87(2):399-410.

59.   Niculescu D, Michaelsen-Preusse K, Guner U, van Dorland R, Wierenga CJ, Lohmann C. A

BDNF-Mediated Push-Pull Plasticity Mechanism for Synaptic Clustering. Cell Rep.

2018;24(8):2063-74.

60.   Kirchner JH, Gjorgjieva J. Emergence of local and global synaptic organization on cortical

dendrites. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):4005.

61.   Chung WS, Clarke LE, Wang GX, Stafford BK, Sher A, Chakraborty C, et al. Astrocytes

mediate synapse elimination through MEGF10 and MERTK pathways. Nature.

2013;504(7480):394-400.

62.   Schafer DP, Lehrman EK, Kautzman AG, Koyama R, Mardinly AR, Yamasaki R, et al.

Microglia sculpt postnatal neural circuits in an activity and complement-dependent manner.

Neuron. 2012;74(4):691-705.

63.   Stevens B, Allen NJ, Vazquez LE, Howell GR, Christopherson KS, Nouri N, et al. The

classical complement cascade mediates CNS synapse elimination. Cell. 2007;131(6):1164-78.

64.   Burbridge TJ, Xu HP, Ackman JB, Ge X, Zhang Y, Ye MJ, et al. Visual circuit development

requires patterned activity mediated by retinal acetylcholine receptors. Neuron.

2014;84(5):1049-64.

65.   Picciotto MR, Zoli M, Lena C, Bessis A, Lallemand Y, Le Novere N, et al. Abnormal

avoidance learning in mice lacking functional high-affinity nicotine receptor in the brain.

Nature. 1995;374(6517):65-7.

66.   Paxinos G. Atlas of the developing mouse brain at E17.5, P0 and P6. 1st ed. Amsterdam ;

Boston: Elsevier; 2007. xi, 353 p. p.

67.   Babcock H, Sigal YM, Zhuang X. A high-density 3D localization algorithm for stochastic

optical reconstruction microscopy. Optical Nanoscopy. 2012;1(6).

68.   Babcock HP, Huang F, Speer CM. Correcting Artifacts in Single Molecule Localization

Microscopy Analysis Arising from Pixel Quantum Efficiency Differences in sCMOS Cameras. Sci

Rep. 2019;9(1):18058.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Eye-specific differences in simple synapse density in the first postnatal week, related to Fig 1. (A) Volumetric STORM imaging enables the differentiation of complex (arrows) versus simple (arrowheads) synapses (top panels), which cannot be distinguished in diffraction-limited conventional images (bottom panels). (B) The density of eye-specific simple synapses across ages in WT (top panel) and β2 KO mice (bottom panel). Error bars represent means ± SEMs (N=3 biological replicates for each age/genotype). Statistical tests were performed using a one-way ANOVA. *: P<0.05. **: p<0.01.

S2 Fig. Complex synapses undergo eye-specific vesicle pool maturation, related to Fig 2. (A-B) VGluT2 cluster volume relative to AZ number for each synapse in WT (left panels) and β2KO mice (right panels) at P2 (A) and P8 (B). Error bars indicate means ± SEMs (N=3 biological replicates for each age and genotype). A one-way ANOVA was used to assess statistical significance between eye-of-origin (black asterisks) and eye-specific synapses with different AZ numbers (colored asterisks). A post hoc Tukey's test was conducted for pairwise comparisons between simple (1 AZ) and complex (>1 AZ) synapses. (C-D) VGluT2 volume per AZ (bassoon cluster) for all synapses in WT (left panels) and β2KO mice (right panels) at P2 (C) and P8 (D). Figure presentation and statistical tests were the same as shown in (A) and (B). In all panels: *: $p<0.05$; **:$p<0.01$; ***:$p<0.001$.

S3 Fig. Complex synapses are loci for synaptic clustering, related to Fig 3. (A)

Percentage of CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapses near an opposite-eye

complex synapse in WT (top panel) and β2KO mice (bottom panel). (B) Same

presentation as in (A), showing percentage of CTB(+) dominant-eye simple synapses

near an opposite-eye complex synapse. (C) To further validate our selection of a 1.5 um

search radius, we performed additional control measurements with varying local search

radii. For complex synapses of both eyes-of-origin, the detection of non-random

clustering increased when the search radius was expanded from 1 µm to 2 µm and then

decreased as the radius was further expanded to sample the average simple synapse

density (3-4 µm) (example with CTB(-) non-dominant-eye synapses). The figure shows

the percentage of CTB(-) non-dominant-eye simple synapses near like-type CTB(-)

complex synapses across development as a function of increasing distance cutoffs from

the surface of complex synapses. Distributions are shown for cutoff distances of 1.0 µm

(top left panel), 2.0 µm (top right panel), 3.0 µm (bottom left panel), and 4.0 µm (bottom

right panel). For all panels, grey and purple lines represent the original data, and black

lines represent the results from a randomized simple synapse distribution. Error bars

represent means ± SEMs (N=3 biological replicates for each age and genotype).

Statistical tests between original and randomized data were performed using one-way

ANOVA. *: P<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001. "n.s." indicates no significant differences.

S4 Fig. Complex synapses mediate distance-dependent synaptic stabilization and

punishment underlying eye-specific competition, related to Fig. 4. (A) Cumulative

histogram of the distances from CTB(+) complex synapses to their nearest CTB(+) (left

panel) and CTB(-) (right panel) complex synapse in P4 WT data where simple synapse

distributions were randomized. Black lines show distributions for isolated complex

synapses with no nearby (<1.5 μm) simple synapses and red lines show distributions for

clustered complex synapses with one or more simple synapses nearby. (B) Same

presentation as in (A), showing distances from CTB(-) complex synapses to their

nearest CTB(+) (left panel) and CTB(-) (right panel) complex synapse in P4 WT

randomized data. (C and D) Same presentation as in A/B, showing WT P8 original data.

(E and F) Same presentation as in C/D, showing β2KO P8 original data. Nonparametric

Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were used for statistical comparisons (N=3 biological

replicates for each condition). ***: p<0.001. "n.s." indicates no significant differences.