Visual pathway origins: an electron microscopic volume for connectomic analysis of the human foveal retina

Yeon Jin Kim[1], Orin Packer[1], Thomas Macrina[2], Andreas Pollreisz[3], Christine A. Curcio[4], Kisuk Lee[2], Nico Kemnitz[2], Dodam Ih[2], Tri Nguyen[2], Ran Lu[2], Sergiy Popovych[2], Akhilesh Halageri[2], J. Alexander Bae[2], Joe Strout[2], Stephan Gerhard[5], Robert G. Smith[6], Paul R. Martin[7], Ulrike Grünert[7], Dennis M. Dacey[1,8,9,*]

[1]Department of Neurobiology & Biophysics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195

[2]Zetta AI LLC, Sherrill, NY, USA

[3]Department of Ophthalmology, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[4]Department of Ophthalmology and Vision Sciences, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Alabama 35294

[5]Aware LLC, Rappenstrasse 19, 8307 Effretikon, Switzerland

[6]Department of Neuroscience, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104

[7]The University of Sydney, Save Sight Institute and Discipline of Ophthalmology, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, NSW, 2000, Australia

[8]Washington National Primate Research Center, Seattle, WA 98195

[9]Lead contact

*Corresponding author: Dennis M. Dacey (dmd@uw.edu)

This file includes:

Main Text (Main text pages: 21, Total pages: 67)

Figures 1 to 7

In Brief (currently 36 words)

Deep-learning based reconstruction of cells and synapses in a human fovea reveals visual

pathway origins and human-specific wiring for color vision, opening the door to a complete

synaptic-level connectome of this critical locus in the human central nervous system.

Highlights

• Complete EM level reconstruction of cells and synaptic circuitry in a human fovea

• New circuit motifs for short-wavelength (S-cone) pathways feeding color vision

• Pathways to the brain are greatly reduced relative to non-primate mammals

Summary

With over 10^{14} synapses, the human brain presents a seemingly insurmountable challenge to a

nano-scale circuit-level understanding of its diverse neural systems. The foveal retina however

presents a feasible site for a complete connectome of a key human CNS structure. Foveal cells

and circuits are miniaturized and compressed to densely sample the visual image at highest

resolution to initiate form, color and motion perception. Here we use computational methods first

applied to the fly brain to provide a draft connectome of all neurons in a foveal volume. We

found synaptic connections distinct to humans linking short-wavelength sensitive cones to color

vision pathways. Moreover, by reconstructing excitatory synaptic pathways arising from cone

photoreceptors we found that 96% of foveal ganglion cells contribute to only three major

pathways to the brain. This new resource reveals unique features of a human neural system

and opens a door to its complete connectome.

Keywords: Human CNS, Human fovea, Human retina connectome, Human Müller cells,

Human bipolar cells, Human ganglion cells, Human amacrine cells, Human microglia, Human

astrocytes, Human color vision.

Introduction

The vertebrate retina was one of the first neural structures where the great complexity of neurons and their circuits was recognized[1], and where critical links were later made between cell structure and visual function [2,3]. The retina was also a focus of early application of connectomics methods to reconstruct neural systems at the synaptic level [4-9] and most recently has emerged as a system where anatomically and functionally distinct cell populations can be linked to their molecular profiles [10-13] and the genetics of human disease [12,14]. Yet even for this intensively studied, most accessible part of the central nervous system (CNS), the number of cell types – on the order of 100 – that may synaptically interact has precluded a full wiring diagram of how one of our most fundamental senses, vision, is initiated.

The recent achievement of a complete connectome of the brain of the fruit fly, Drosophila melanogaster [15,16], has made the connectome of a larger mammalian brain a now-conceivable goal [17-20] and connectomic methods have now been applied to mm scale volumes of mouse and human neocortex [18,19,21,22]. Nanoscale analysis of the neocortex is overwhelmingly hampered by the many input and output pathways that cannot yet be identified while a human brain connectome remains an immense challenge for each of its many neural systems. In the present study we take advantage of the specialized properties of the foveal retina to provide a first draft connectome of this critical locus in the human CNS.

The fovea is a specialized central region in the retina of humans and other day-active primates ideally suited to the connectomics approach where, like a miniature brain, neural circuits are spatially compressed to facilitate highest resolution form, color and motion perception. At barely 1 mm wide the fovea encodes the central few degrees of visual space, but its representation is magnified 100-fold across the surface of primary visual cortex [23-27] making it essential for perception. Failure of foveal function is a hallmark of the most devastating blinding retinal diseases.

From a signal-processing viewpoint, the retina is a self-contained input-to-output sensory

structure where light transduction by photoreceptors is processed by diverse neural cell types

occupying two cell and synaptic layers across a physical span of just ~200 μm. The foveal

volume presented here thus houses complete arrays of parallel visual pathways from sensory

receptor to output neuron. We provide an inventory of all foveal cell types and their relative

numbers, as well as the assignment of synaptic connections to characterize functional circuits.

We directly address the long-standing question of the number and identity of visual pathways

that link the fovea to the brain. We find only three major visual pathways accounting for about

96% of the projection to the human brain: a striking reduction compared to both non-primate

mammals [28-30] and non-human primates [31,32]. Lastly, initial exploration of cell type specific circuits

indicates that the neural coding for trichromatic color vision may be specific to our own species.

This human foveal dataset is now available to an open community of users to finalize the

connectome and model its functional properties.

Results

Acquisition of the foveal volume. Our goal was to obtain complete retinal circuitry near the peak of cone density (peak of visual acuity) [33,34]. The task is complicated because foveal cones feed inner retinal circuits via very long axons (Henle fibers, Figures 1A-1C) [35]. Our ROI therefore was taken at 500 μm from the foveal center, where cone axon length averages 400 μm [36]; this ROI location is linked to cones located ~100-300 μm from the pit center (~0.7-1.4 deg). We cut 3028 vertical sections at 50 nm through a total depth of ~150 μm and imaged an area that was 180 μm tall x 180 μm wide (5 nm pixels) extending from the Henle fiber layer at its outer border to the nerve fiber layer at its inner border (Figure 1D). We used recent computational methods [37,38] to align the images, detect membrane boundaries, segment neurons and glia, and finally to detect synapses (Figures 1D-1K; see Star Methods for details). For ease of reference, we named this volume HFseg1 (Human Fovea, segmented 1). The initial segmentation was used to proofread, annotate and type all cells in HFseg1 (Figures 1F-1G; see Table S1A, 3008 total cells). All cell types and draft synaptic connections are available in an accessible form at NeuroMaps (https://neuromaps.app/datasets, see Table S3).

Cell populations

Non-neuronal cells*.* Müller cells are radial glia with cell bodies in the INL and processes that extend from the external (photoreceptor inner segment-ONL border) to the internal limiting membrane (Figure S1A). We could readily annotate all Müller cells (555 cells, Figure 1G, Table S1B) because their nuclei were distinctly large and strictly euchromatic (Figures S3C, S3F). A second, smaller population of glial cells was present in the GCL (Figures S1B, S3B) and provisionally identified as astrocytes [39] (32 cells, Table S1B). These cells showed cell bodies that

apposed blood vessels and sparsely branched dendrites that radiated from the soma without

penetrating the INL (Figure S1B).

Lastly, we identified 15 microglial cells (Table S1B) with cell bodies in the IPL or GCL (Figure

S1A); a few cells were also associated with the deep retinal vasculature at the OPL-INL border.

They show nuclear morphology (Figures S3A) distinct from both Müller cells and astrocytes

(Figures S3C, S3B). The density of microglial cells was low, consistent with previous

measurements in the macaque monkey foveal retina [40,41].

Photoreceptors. HFseg1 contained 313 cone (pedicles) and 24 rod (spherules) synaptic

terminals (rod : cone = 0.07, Tables S1C, 1D). Rods first appear ~100 µm from the foveal center

[33,34,42]. Fifteen cone pedicles were identified as short wavelength sensitive (S) cones (Table S1C,

Figure 2A) based on distinctive connectivity [43]. The remaining 298 cones comprised long (L) and

medium (M) wavelength sensitive cones, referred to collectively as LM cones.

Cone pedicles contact each other by short extensions (telodendria) or by distinct pedicle-to-

pedicle apposition (Figure 2B). These contacts harbor gap junctions representing the earliest

neuronal interactions in the visual pathway. In non-human primates, LM–LM cone contacts are

abundant, but S–LM contacts are greatly reduced or absent [43,44], apparently reflecting a need to

support color vision by isolating short from long wavelength signals [45,46]. In human retina

however S-LM cone contacts are reported [47,48]. We therefore mapped the full cone-cone

connectivity to determine whether S-LM contacts are a consistent feature of human fovea. We

used automated methods to detect all cone-cone contacts (n = 1141 contacts). Contacts were

large with a thick, darkly stained region defining the contact area (see Figure 2B insets) [49]. We

found abundant S–LM cone contacts (n = 15 S cones; 4.93 ± 1.91 contacts/*pedicle*), with LM–LM

cone contacts (n = 298 LM cones, 6.90 ± 3.07 contacts/*pedicle*) occurring at somewhat higher

frequency.

Horizontal cells. The horizontal cell network in the outer retina generates lateral negative

feedback that contributes to the antagonistic receptive field surround of cones, bipolar cells, and

ganglion cells. In macaque retina the horizontal cell mediated surround is required for color-

coding light responses [50-52] and is therefore a key element in the circuitry that initiates color

vision. Two horizontal cell types, H1 and H2 cells, with distinctive morphology and cone

connectivity, are widely recognized in peripheral primate retina [53-57]. Knowledge of the horizontal

cell populations in the foveal human retina remains rudimentary though H1 and H2 cells have

been distinguished by immunostaining[58], morphology [43] and in transcriptomic datasets [12].

We annotated 265 horizontal cells in HFseg1 and found almost all (255 cells) to be H1 cells

(Table S1E) with a very small population of the H2 cells (10 cells). The H1 cells showed small

(~30–50 µm diameter) and profusely branched dendritic trees. Neighboring H1 cells overlapped

extensively such that each cone pedicle was contacted by several H1 cells (Figures 2C and 2C

insets). For most cells a long axon-like process arose from the soma or dendrite and extended to

the edge of the volume within the OPL without branching (indicated by arrows, Figure 2C; these

long processes are known to terminate in a finely branched arbor that innervates rod spherules

[59,60]). In contrast to H1 cells, the H2 cells showed very large, and loosely branched dendritic trees

(>100 µm in diameter) that only sparsely innervated most cone pedicles and showed little

dendritic overlap with neighboring H2 cells (Figure 2D). Consistent with previous descriptions,

the axon of the H2 cells was meandering and made additional sparse contacts with cone

pedicles [54-56].

In macaque and marmoset retina H1 cells largely avoid contact with S cones whereas H2 cells

show some selectivity for S cones [55,57,61]. The substantially higher density of H1 cells relative to

H2 cells in HFseg1 altered this expected synaptic relationship. We found the H2 cells do

maintain some preference for synapsing with S cones (Figure 2D). However, we also found that

the numerically dominant H1 horizontal cells formed most synapses with S cones (H1, 86.3%

±1.8%; H2, 13.8% ± 1.8%, n = 2 S cones). In addition, H2 cells formed less than 2% of the

horizontal cell contacts with two identified LM cones (H1, 98.1% ± 0.1%; H2, 1.9% ± 0.1%, n = 2

LM cones) (also Figure S4). The H1 cells therefore receive input from and are expected to

provide negative feedback to all three (S, L and M) cone types (Figures 2C, 2D and S4). Taken

together, the S-LM cone coupling and the combined S and LM cone connectivity of H1 horizontal

cells provides new connectomic evidence for a difference between human and non-human

primates in color related circuitry[43] that can now be explored in greater depth in HFseg1.

Bipolar cells. In foveate primates, flat (FMB, OFF type) and invaginating (IMB, ON Type) midget

bipolar cells show dominant connections to single cones and ganglion cells, whereas diffuse

types contact several cones and have been divided into 8 types (DB1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6 and

Giant) [62]. Finally, a single blue cone bipolar (BB) cell type shows selective targeting of S cones.

We annotated 912 bipolar cells (Table S1F); the major types recognized in non-human primates

were identified but with some notable differences outlined below (Figure 3).

Of the cells with distinctive cone connectivity, FMB (302 cells, Table S1F) and IMB cells (264

cells, Table S1F, Figures 3A, 3B) accounted for 62% of all bipolar cells. Blue-cone bipolar cells

(BB cells; Figures 3B, 3C, S5) by contrast formed only 1.9% of all bipolar cells (17 cells, Table

S1F). All ON bipolar cells showed darkly staining, heterochromatic nuclear profiles that

distinguished them from most other cells in the INL (Figure S3F). Of the presumed OFF diffuse

bipolar types we identified DB1 [63] (54 cells), DB2 (92 cells) and DB3 (41 cells, Table S1F,

Figures 3A, 3C) types, each formed distinctive axonal mosaics. We were not able to divide the

outer DB3 cells into the previously identified DB3a, DB3b types [64-67]. The DB3 cells showed large

axonal fields and likely correspond to the calbindin-positive DB3a type in macaque, marmoset

and human retina [68-71]. If this association holds then DB3b cells are either absent or present at a

very low density in the foveal DB population.

In the inner half of the IPL, DB4 (34 cells), DB5 (45 cells) and DB6 cells (12 cells, Table S1F)

were distinguished by axonal morphology and stratification depth (Figures 3B, 3C). We failed to

observe a clear correlate of the more recently described Giant bipolar type [72,73] but a small

number of unidentified cells that remain to be studied in detail could include the Giant type (n = 7,

Table S1F). Lastly, rod bipolar cells (RB, 6 cells, 0.7% of total BCs, Table S1F) made

invaginating contacts, as expected [74,75], with the small number of rod spherules and showed

small unbranched axonal arbors that contained far fewer ribbon synapses (15.8 ± 2.2 ribbons, n

= 5) than diffuse or midget bipolar cells (see Figure S10) [76,77].

Bipolar cells not previously described in primates were also present in HFSeg1. One group

showed small field amacrine-like morphology (called here outer-x and inner-x in Figures 3A, 3B)

but nevertheless contained abundant ribbon synapses (Figure S6). Similar cells were found

recently in mouse retina [10,78] and likely correspond to the OFF-x bipolar cells identified by

transcriptomics of human fovea [12] (20 cells, Table S1F). While most of these cells stratified in the

outer half of the IPL (Outer-x cells, n = 15, Figures S6A-S6B), 5 examples stratified in the inner

half of the IPL (Inner-x cells, Figures S6C-S6G). Another previously undescribed bipolar type

showed the typical DB cell connection to cones but extended axonal branches in both outer and

inner IPL to varying extents. We referred to this cell group as DBbroad (18 cells, Figures 3A, S7,

Table S1F). The exact connections of these cells remain to be determined but we observed

synaptic output to OFF-outer and ON-inner ganglion cell types (see also Figures S7C, S7E). In

the OPL, DBbroad cells made only basal contacts with cone pedicles and thus we have placed

the DBbroad cells provisionally in the OFF bipolar category, though the lack of invaginating cone

contacts does not preclude an ON-type response from these cells [79].

In sum, the bipolar cells in HFseg1 could be related to previous classification of midget and

diffuse bipolar types for non-human primate retina. However, some bipolar types appeared

absent or very low in density (DB3b and Giant types) or not previously observed (DBbroad, x-

type). Our classification can now be substantiated or modified by a more complete analysis of

synaptic connectivity.

Amacrine cells. We identified 293 amacrine cells, including 40 cells displaced to the ganglion

cell layer (Table S1G). Most amacrine cells showed cell type-specific nuclear staining (from

strongly heterochromatic to strongly euchromatic) and nuclear shape (from smooth and round to

deeply infolded) (Figure S3).

We sorted the amacrine cells into small (diameter < 100 µm; n = 189), and large field (diameter

>100 µm) groups (n = 104). We divided these groups into 19 types (6 small field and 13 large

field; Table S1G) based on morphology, stratification, mosaic interactions and nuclear

morphology (Figures S3, S8, S9). Figure 4 provides a partial view of this dataset by highlighting

four cell types (see also Table S3); two additional amacrine populations are illustrated in Figure

S8.

The AII type (AC2) was present at the highest density of any amacrine cell population (75 cells,

Table S1G). This cell type was recognized by its well-established morphology across species [80]

including human [62,81,82] (Figures 4A, 4B). A major function of AII cells is to transfer signals from

rod bipolar to cone bipolar cells, serving as conduits for rod signals to ganglion cells at scotopic

light levels [83]. However, the presence of AII amacrine cells at such a high density in the fovea,

where rods are all but absent, suggests a circuit function switch to a primary role in photopic

spatial vision. Indeed, we observed that AII cells in HFseg1 are postsynaptic to varied cone

bipolar types, including IMB cells (Figure S9).

The second amacrine type highlighted here (Figures 4C, 4D) is the starburst amacrine (17 cells,

AC7 (SAC) in Table S1G). Starburst cells have been intensively studied in mouse and rabbit

retina for their pivotal role in direction selectivity in ganglion cells [84] and are present in primate

retina, including human [12,85-87] , though their connectivity and contribution to direction selectivity

in foveal retina is unknown. Almost all starbursts were found in the ganglion cell layer (GCL),

where they were the most numerous AC type (14/40 cells, 35%, see lower panel in Figure 4D),

consistent with previous estimates [85,87].

An additional small field type, AC11 (22 cells, Figures 4E, 4F, Table S1G) showing fine, densely

branched, broadly stratified dendrites falls into a group of cells conventionally referred to as

"knotty" amacrines [88-90] and may correspond to the strongly parvalbumin positive cells described

in macaque monkey [91]. By contrast the large field type, AC8 (10 cells, Figures 4G, 4H, Table

S1G) shows thick, narrowly stratified, radiate dendrites that are both pre- and postsynaptic to

FMB axon terminals.

In sum, the HFseg1 volume will now make it possible to directly determine the complete

connectivity of each of the amacrine types as a framework for understanding their roles in foveal

function.

Evaluation of synapse detection.

To assess the accuracy of ribbon segmentation and synapse prediction (Figures 1H-1K), we

compared predicted synaptic assignments to manual (ground truth) assignments. We focused on

the incoming cone-to-midget bipolar cell synapse in the OPL and the outgoing midget bipolar cell

synapses to amacrine and ganglion cells in the IPL. For ground truth, we manually annotated

these connections for the ON and OFF midget pathways linked to three LM cones (cones 21, 22,

and 58; Figure S10, Tables S2A-S2C).

Figures 5A-5B show the predicted outgoing synapses for a pair of midget bipolar cell axon

terminals. Measures of precision (true synapses/[true synapses + false positives]) and sensitivity

(true synapses/[true synapses + false negatives]) were taken for ribbon identification and

synaptic partner assignments. The predicted segmentation of ribbons showed precision and

sensitivity near 100%; there were few false positives and nearly zero false negatives (precision:

93.5% ± 2.7%; sensitivity: 99.7% ± 0.8%, n = 6 midget bipolar cells, 370 total ribbons, Figure 5B

inset). Synaptic assignment for these ribbons was also excellent (precision: 89.0% ± 5.4%;

sensitivity: 93.7% ± 4.6%, n = 6 midget bipolar cells, 637 total synapses, Figure 5B inset). These

values demonstrate for the first time the high accuracy of convolutional nets for predicting and

segmenting ribbon synapses.

By contrast with the ribbon synapses made in the IPL, ribbon synapses made by the cone

pedicle are extremely complex [92,93] (Figures 1H, 1I). Crucially, synaptic processes can either

invaginate into the synaptic face of the pedicle to reach the active zone or occupy a basal (or flat)

position at base of the cone pedicle up to ~800 nm from the sites of transmitter release [93,94].

Bipolar cells form type-specific connection motifs with the cone pedicle [66,72,93] so we determined

not only whether a synapse was predicted, but also how well the number of incoming synapses

from a cone to a specific bipolar cell type was captured. We mapped all incoming cone synapses

to the dendritic tips for each of six midget bipolar cells sampled. We found high precision and

sensitivity for ribbon detection (n = 51) in the 3 cone pedicle (precision: 92.3% ± 6.7%; sensitivity:

100% ± 0%, n = 3 LM cones, Figures S2A-S2C) and for the multiple postsynaptic processes (n =

153) deriving from the invaginating (IMB) and flat (FMB) midget bipolar cells (precision: 98.7% ±

1.2%; sensitivity: 99.7% ± 0.6%, total synaptic connections, see Figure S2C right). Diffuse

bipolar cells, which make more sparse connections with multiple cones, were also sampled (n =

2, DB4 and DB2; Figures S2D-S2F), yielding similar precision and sensitivity results.

For inhibitory synapses we focused on the dominant AII amacrine cell (Table S1G) where a

glycinergic synapse to OFF bipolar cells is well established [80,81,95,96]. We manually mapped all the

outgoing synapses made by two neighboring AII amacrine cells and compared our ground truth

data to the predicted synaptic assignments (Figures 5C-5G). The prediction captured well the

origin of synaptic output from the outer stratifying lobular appendages of the AII cell to outer-OFF

bipolar cells (Figures 5D-5G). Vesicle clouds were also detected with high sensitivity (87.5% ±

0.7%, n = 2 AIIs; false negatives were rare, Figure 5C bottom) but relative to ribbon detection,

there were more false positives, thereby reducing the accuracy of the overall synapse detection

(76.0% ± 8.5%, n = 2 AIIs). With this limitation, the results show that our dataset accurately

reflects synaptic connectivity and can serve as a starting point to build a complete synaptic level

connectome of foveal human retina.

Ganglion cells. We annotated 599 ganglion cells (Table S1H). Thirteen GCs were displaced to

the INL or IPL. Midget GCs comprised the great majority (536 cells, ~90%, Table S1H) [12,97] and

were readily divided into outer-OFF stratifying (280 cells) and inner-ON stratifying (256 cells)

types (Figures 6A, 6E). A second well defined cell type, the parasol cell (26 cells, 13 inner-ON

cells and 13 outer-OFF cells, ~4% of total GCs) was also easily distinguished (Figures 6B, 6F,

Table S1H). Small bistratified GCs (12 cells, ~2% of total GCs, Table S1H), were distinguished

by their broad dendritic ramification (Figures 6C, 6G) and extensive synaptic input from blue

cone bipolar cells (BB cells) [98]. Together, the midget, parasol and small bistratified cells account

for 95.8% of the ganglion cell in HFseg1. The remaining 25 ganglion cells show relatively large

dendritic fields, various morphological forms and, taken together, should constitute all remaining

central visual pathways present at this retinal location.

We divided these remaining cells into 6 provisional types of large field GCs. Large field GC1

(LFGC1, 6 cells, Table S1H) was postsynaptic to blue-cone bipolar cells and a dendritic tree that

co-stratified with the small bistratified cells (Figures 6D, 6H). These cells likely correspond to the

large bistratified GC observed in the human fovea [47] and marmoset and macaque retinal

periphery [31,99]. Large field GC2 (LFGC2, 6 cells Table S1H) showed broadly stratified and

densely branched dendritic trees (Figures 6I, 6L); a counterpart in monkey retina remains

unclear but similar morphology has been observed in human peripheral retina [100]. A third cell

group (LFGC3, 4 cells, Table S1H) stratifies across the center of IPL (Figures 6J, 6M) and

appears to correspond to previously described recursive bistratified cells, identified as ON-OFF

direction selective cells in the macaque monkey retina [32]. A fourth cell group (LFGC4, 5 cells,

Table S1H) shows large cell bodies and radiate dendritic branching near the center of the IPL

costratified with the inner-ON and outer-OFF parasol cells (Figures 6K, 6N) (3 inner and 2 outer

stratified) and could correspond to the smooth mono-stratified type identified in macaque and

marmoset retina [31,32,101]. A fifth group of cells (not shown) shows very sparsely branching

dendrites stratified in the inner IPL (LFGC5, 4 cells, Table S1H) that could correspond to inner

melanopsin cells (or an inner sparse type recognized in macaque and marmoset). Lastly, a few

very sparsely branching GC processes (not linked to cell bodies within the volume) were very

sparsely branching and stratified along the outer border of the IPL were also present, likely

corresponding to outer melanopsin ganglion cells [102]. If included in our current total this would

give 7 large field types and 12 ganglion cell types in total.

Our provisional classification shows multiple ganglion cell types observed in the monkey and

human retinal periphery absent from HFseg1 and, by implication from the normal human fovea.

This result also stands in sharp contrast to the retina of the mouse where ~40 GC types have

been distinguished throughout the retina [28-30]. To this point however we had not ruled out the

possibility that cell bodies of some ganglion cell types are not present in the volume but have

large dendritic trees which penetrate the volume and contribute significantly to the circuitry of the

inner retina. We therefore took a second approach to identifying the visual pathways in HFseg1

by mapping what we called the "vertical excitatory connectome".

The vertical excitatory connectome

We reasoned, as others have [103], that to generate parallel pathways to the brain each cone must

be locally presynaptic to each cone bipolar type (for the S cone, there is uncertainty on this point,

due to its more specialized role in color vision). At the next synaptic step, the total output of all

bipolar cell types should project to all ganglion cell types. In other words, in principle, *all visual*

pathways should be synaptically linked to the output of any given cone.

To test this hypothesis, we annotated the ribbon synapses and all postsynaptic bipolar cells for

three LM and two S cones. For each bipolar cell the synaptic ribbons and their postsynaptic

targets were next identified (Figures 7A-7B). For each ribbon synapse we then identified the

postsynaptic GC partner(s). Finally, we determined the relative synaptic density from a given

cone via its postsynaptic bipolar cells to each identified GC (see details in Figures S10-S11 and

Table S2).

We found that bipolar cells connected to the three LM cones synapsed overwhelmingly with

midget and/or parasol ganglion cells (Figure S10), accounting for 92.1% of the total bipolar

synaptic output *to ganglion cells* (Figures 7C, 7D, S10, Tables S2A-S2C). Thus, synaptic density

mirrors well the cell density (midget and parasol cells together account for 93.8% of all ganglion

cells in HFseg1, Table S1H). By contrast, the large field ganglion cell types (LFGC1-LFGC5,

Figures 6D, 6H, 6I-6N) identified in our GC survey (Figure S10, Tables S2A-S2C) received 7.9%

of the bipolar synaptic output, while accounting for 4.2% of the total ganglion cells (Table S1H).

Output to dendritic fragments of unidentified ganglion cells was rare, accounting for ~0.5% of the

total bipolar output to ganglion cells (0.53 ± 0.76, n = 3 LM cones, Tables S2A-S2C). These data

align with our population analysis described above and show that, for the LM cones, diverse

synaptic signals are overwhelmingly targeted to the midget and parasol pathways, with the

remaining 5-10% of synapses distributed across a limited number of large field, very low density

pathways.

One final unanticipated feature of the HFseg1 dataset stands out, that is, a striking asymmetry in

the bipolar output (Figure 7C), with about twice the number of ribbon synapses arising from OFF

pathway connections. For example, 595 excitatory synaptic contacts are directed at OFF parasol

cells, compared to 233 synapses directed at ON parasol cells (n = 5 cones): a greater than

twofold difference. This result provides a plausible synaptic basis for the well documented

dominance of OFF pathway processing in human vision [104-106] and at higher levels in the visual

pathway [107,108] and can now be explored further in the HFseg1 connectome.

Discussion

A human foveal connectome. Our aim was to apply computational tools developed to

reconstruct and proofread the Drosophila nervous system [15,16,109] to generate an accessible

dataset enabling the first connectome in the human CNS. The current dataset includes

segmentation of all cells and other membrane bounded structures as well as identification of

synapses and synaptic partner relationships. Given ~2400 neuronal cell bodies in the volume

already typed, ~25k edits already made, and a mean additional proofread time of 30

minutes/neuron we estimate ~1200-person hours for proofreading to completion. Thus, with a

relatively small number of users engaged by specific circuit hypotheses, the HFseg1 connectome

could be completed in less than six months.

Cell type profiling. HFseg1 permitted a provisional identification all cell types and their relative

densities (Table S1). Similar datasets currently exist for large cell samples from human and non-

human primate central retina where cell types were clustered by gene expression profile and

linked to anatomical types by marker genes [11,12,14,110,111]. HFseg1 permits a comparison of the

two approaches and suggests generally good correspondence though with some unexpected

differences. For example, the ratio of H1 to H2 horizontal cell types identified by transcriptomics

were shown in macaque and human central retina to be ~3:1 and 7:1 respectively. By contrast

our connectomic profile shows that the H1 to H2 ratio is much higher (26:1) with H1 cells forming

96.2% of the horizontal cells at this foveal location. Thus, the transciptomically-identified trend

towards the H1 cell type in the fovea is evident but much more extreme in HFseg1. A similar

trend holds for other clearly identified types: midget ganglion cells make up ~90% of the ganglion

cell population in our sample and 86% in the transcriptome; AII and starburst amacrine cells

make up 26% and 5.5% of the amacrine cell population respectively but only 18% and 1.3% of

the amacrines identified by molecular profiling. Conversely parasol ganglion cells account for

only 4.4% of HFseg1 ganglion cells but 10% in a transcriptomics sample [12]. One explanation for

these differences may be that our smaller sample represents the cone-enriched foveal center

whereas the larger samples used for single cell RNAseq encompassed a much larger area (~1.5

mm, central 5 degrees) of central retina; cell type-specific density changes are extremely steep

across this region and the larger spatial sample would average out such changes.

Certain cell populations previously recognized have not, at least thus far, been evident in

HFseg1. For example, the recent functional, anatomical and molecular distinction made between

diffuse bipolar types DB3a and DB3b in macaque monkey [65,66] and human retina [12,69] was not

apparent in HFseg1. Though provisional, we found evidence for only 19 amacrine cell

populations whereas molecular profiling proposes 73 amacrine cell types in human retina [14]. This

difference suggests that the relationship between cells defined by gene expression and

anatomical types may not always be straightforward (with the caveat noted above that tissue

location may impact the relative densities (and corresponding circuitry) of cell populations).

The vertical excitatory connectome. In the retina of the mouse ~40 distinct ganglion cell

populations have been recognized [28-30]. In non-human primate fewer than 20 pathways have

been defined, with transcriptomic and anatomical identification in reasonable agreement [11,31,32].

In human fovea, only 12 pathways have been suggested by transcriptomic analysis [12,14] in close

agreement with the current results. It was nevertheless striking that in the HFseg1 dataset ~96%

of the ganglion cells comprised just 3 anatomically distinct groups: the midget, parasol and small

bistratified cells. When we manually traced the vertical connectome from a single cone to its

postsynaptic bipolar cells and in turn to all postsynaptic ganglion cells we obtained the same

result, with these three major pathways accounting for over 90% of the synapses from bipolar

cells to ganglion cells. Thus, the reduction in the number of visual pathways appears to be a

fundamental, defining feature of foveal synaptic organization. A simple explanation might be the

need to transmit a high-fidelity signal with single cone resolution, with the required midget

ganglion cells in essence squeezing out all the other ganglion cell types. But there are other

major changes in the connectome related to foveal function that remain to be understood. For

example, rod photoreceptors are absent or greatly reduced at the foveal center, but how this

might impact overall visual pathway cell type diversity and function is unknown. Similarly, the

number of directionally selective visual pathways found in non-primate mammals appears greatly

reduced in non-human primates [32,112] but the significance of this difference remains to be

clarified.

The foveal connectome and human color vision.

Most psychophysically based models of human color vision assume the presence of two parallel

color opponent channels: red vs green and blue vs yellow [109]. The red-green pathway shows

opposing L vs M cone interaction and has been associated with the circuitry that feeds the

midget ganglion cell [113]. However, the human psychophysically defined red-green pathway

requires that a small S cone input also be incorporated[114]. The locus of this critical synapse

remains unclear with recent data from macaque monkey implicating both retina [110] and primary

visual cortex [111]. The HFseg1 connectome shows that H1 horizontal cells, a major source of the

surround in the midget circuit [51], likely contribute antagonistic signals from L, M and S cone

types, thereby providing a simple and unanticipated explanation for the added S cone

contribution to the human red-green channel. An interaction site early in S, L and M cone

pathways of the human fovea might also begin to explain unexpected S-LM cone coupling, i.e.,

to inject a relatively small high-fidelity S-cone signal into downstream pathways utilized for

trichromatic color vision [115,116].

Limitations to the study

The HFseg1 dataset reflects the nascent field of comparative connectomics both within and

across species. One criticism of connectomics is small sample size [20] which can impact

interpretation of the connectome, even for the relatively stereotyped fly brain [117], and more so for

the highly variable human nervous system. However, because the fovea is small it can be

replicated in multiple individuals and provide a source for understanding connectomes that vary

in visual capacity, age, and health. These considerations aside, the HFseg1 dataset suggests

extreme differences in human foveal retina compared to non-primate mammals, likely reflected in

genetic differences in cell types and synaptic connections [13]. A deeper understanding of human

connectomes should permit animal models to be better placed into the context of the human

nervous system.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by NIH grants EY-028282 and RF1-MH129260 to D.M.D. and NIH

grant P51 OD010425 to the Washington National Primate Research Center and EY01730 to the

Vision Research Core at the University of Washington. We thank Sharm Knecht for tissue

preparation and managing EM data acquisition.

Author contributions

Y.J.K. and D.M.D. conceived the project. Y.J.K. and D.M.D. generated the ground truth for

segmentation and synapses, performed proofreading and created annotations. Y.J.K. and

D.M.D. analyzed the data and generated figures. Y.J.K., D.M.D., P.R.M., and U.G., wrote the

paper and consulted on figure development. C.A.C. and R.G.S., edited the paper. A.P. acquired

human tissue. D.M.D., Y.J.K., C.A.C. and A.P. acquired funding. Zetta AI performed EM data

alignment, segmentation, synapse detection and cone-cone contactome detection and ingested

all data into the CAVE infrastructure for proofreading. S.G. developed 3D visualizations and

analysis tools at NeuroMaps.app.

Declaration of interests

K.L., N.K., D.I., T.N., R.L., S.P., A.H., J.A.B., J.S. and T.M. declare financial interests in Zetta AI.

S.G. is owner of Aware LLC and developed the NeuroMaps.app. The remaining authors declare

no competing interests.

 Figure legends

Figure 1. The HFseg1 volume. **A.** The fovea forms a pit in the retina ~3 mm temporal to the

optic disc (within the inset rectangle). **B**. Schematic foveal pit showing cone (red) to bipolar cell

(blue) to ganglion cell (green) circuit. ONL, outer nuclear layer, HFL, Henle fiber layer; INL, inner

nuclear layer; GCL, ganglion cell layer. **C**. Trimmed retinal block face and ROI (yellow box) in

temporal retina ~400 μm from the foveal center. **D**. Single section from the imaged volume

(cropped laterally) to illustrate the retinal layers, HFL, OPL, outer plexiform layer; INL; IPL, inner

plexiform layer, GCL and NFL, nerve fiber layer. **E**. Volume segmented into membrane bound

objects. **F**. Examples of segmented cells photoreceptor axon terminal (PC, white), horizontal cell

(HC, orange), ON and OFF bipolar cells (BC, light and dark blue), Müller glia cell (MC, yellow),

amacrine cells (AC, green), ON and OFF ganglion cells (GC, dark and light violet); astrocytes

and microglia not shown here. **G**. Numbers and cell soma locations of the cell types shown in **F**.

H. Three segmented ribbons (varied colors) at synaptic triads (red arrowheads) in a single cone

pedicle. **I.** Synaptic assignments associated with each ribbon (yellow dots and lines). An IMB

(inner-ON midget bipolar; violet, white open arrowhead) cell makes an invaginating contact and

two FMB cells (outer-OFF midget bipolar; light and dark blue, white open arrowheads) make a

basal contact with the cone pedicle. **J.** Examples of ribbon and synapse prediction in the inner

plexiform layer (IPL) for an FMB cell axon terminal at two locations (left and right panels).

Segmented ribbons (varied colors, red arrowheads) and synaptic predictions (blue dots, lines).

K. Inhibitory vesicle cloud segmentation (varied colors) and synaptic prediction (red dots and

lines) in the IPL between an amacrine cell and an FMB axon terminal. Insets in **J** and **K** show

zoomed view of synapses indicated by white boxes.

Figure 2. Photoreceptor and horizontal cell populations. **A**. Array of photoreceptor axon

terminals (cone pedicles, rod spherules) viewing the synaptic face of the terminals (298 LM

cones, gold; 15 S cones, blue, 24 rods, brown) (see Tables S1A, S1C, S1D). **B**. Six cone

pedicles within the white dotted box in **A**. Left, the pedicles contact each other via telodendria

(e.g., arrows) within the circled areas. A pedicle identified as an S cone (white asterisk) contacts

neighboring LM cone 230. Right, EM micrographs showing telodendritic contacts (open white

arrowheads) between LM cones (top) and S cone with LM cone (bottom). **C**. Six overlapping H1

cells are shown (varied colors); each H1 cell forms lateral elements in S cone 15 (blue). Upper

inset shows the cell bodies of the six H1 cells. Circular inset at lower left shows EM view of H1

cell lateral elements at a synaptic invagination of S cone 15 (red arrowhead). Circular inset at

lower right shows a 3D view of S cone 15 (partial transparency) contacting multiple H1 cells. **D**.

Two H2 cells (tan and red) contacting multiple S cones, including S cone 15. Lower insets show

H2 cell lateral elements at S cone 15 in single layer EM view (left) and 3D (right) view

(conventions as in **C**).

Figure 3. Bipolar cell types. A. Outer stratifying types (FMB, flat midget bipolar; DB, diffuse

bipolar). Outer-x bipolar cells lacked a dendrite but made ribbon synapses in the IPL (Figure S6).

DBbroad cells extend processes across the IPL depth (Figure S7). **B.** Inner stratifying bipolar

types; IMB, invaginating midget bipolar; DB, diffuse bipolar types; BB, blue-cone bipolar type,

Inner-x bipolar (Figure S6); RB, rod bipolar. **C**. Horizontal view of spatial mosaics of axon

terminals for small groups of neighboring cells of each bipolar type, as indicated.

Figure 4. Amacrine cells. Amacrine cells in the INL (253 cells) and GCL (40 cells) were divided

into 19 types (AC1-19; Table S1G). **A.** Small field, AII amacrine cells (AC2), in vertical view

show outer, lobular dendrites (white arrowhead) and extensive, inner dendrites (green

arrowhead). **B.** Horizontal view of the entire AII population in HFseg1; lower panel, vertical view.

C. Starburst amacrine cells (AC7) were located primarily in the GCL (GCL, 14 cells; INL, 3

cells). White arrowheads indicate typical fasciculation of dendrites. **D.** Mosaic of starburst cells,

GCL cells (red-violet) and INL cells (yellow); lower panel, vertical view. **E**. Small field amacrine

type (AC11) in horizontal view with densely branched dendritic arbor. **F**. Horizontal view of the

AC11 cell mosaic; lower panel, vertical view shows dendrites extend broadly across the IPL. **G.**

Large field amacrine cells (AC8) with thick lobular dendrites, narrowly stratified in the outer IPL.

H. Horizontal view of the complete mosaic; lower panel shows vertical view of outer IPL

stratification. Scale bar in **C** applies to **E** and **G**. Scale bar in lower panel of **H** applies to **B, D, F**.

Figure 5. Synapse detection. A. OFF midget bipolar (yellow) and ON midget bipolar (red)

presynaptic to an outer-OFF (blue) and inner-ON (green) midget ganglion cell. **B.** Outgoing

synapses detected for the midget bipolar cell axon terminals shown in **A** (ganglion cells removed,

semi-transparent view). Synaptic ribbons (red/violet dots) and postsynaptic profiles were first

identified manually (see Figure S10; cone 22; BC 308 (IMB) and BC 303 (FMB)). Predicted

outgoing synapses (green dots and lines, IMB; blue dots and lines, FMB). White arrowheads

numbered 1-4 indicate the panels shown on the right in single layer EM view. Predicted and

segmented synaptic ribbons (in varied colors, red arrowheads); predicted postsynaptic segments

are marked by the dots and lines linking the synaptic ribbon to its postsynaptic structure

(unlabeled postsynaptic profiles belong to amacrine cells). Inset histogram shows precision and

sensitivity of ribbon detection and synaptic assignment. **C.** Inhibitory output synapses made by

two neighboring AII amacrine cells (purple and orange in partial transparency). Yellow dots show

synaptic output predictions; most synaptic outputs arise in the outer half of the IPL and are

presynaptic to OFF bipolar cells. Inset shows precision and sensitivity for the synapses made by

each AII cell. **D-E**. Single layer images showing segmented vesicle clouds (varied colors) in the

purple AII cell (shown in **C**) and synaptic connections predicted with an FMB cell (yellow dots

and lines; ribbons in the FMB are also segmented). **F-G**. Same conventions as in **D-E** but

showing three segmented vesicle clouds and synaptic predictions for the orange AII cell (shown

in **C**), with another FMB cell.

Figure 6. Ganglion cells. A. Cluster of inner-ON (red-violet) and outer-OFF (yellow-green)

midget ganglion cells; dendrites stratify broadly across inner (ON) and outer (OFF) half of the

IPL. **B**. Inner-ON (red-violet) and outer-OFF (yellow-green) parasol ganglion cells; dendrites

stratify broadly near the center of the IPL. **C**. Small bistratified ganglion cells extend dendrites

across the ON-OFF subdivision of the IPL. **D**. Large bistratified ganglion cells (LBGC1) show

large dendritic field and broad stratification coextensive with the small bistratified cells. White

arrowhead shows branching processes arising from the cell body of unknown significance. **E-H**,

Mosaic of dendritic arbors in horizontal view of the same cells shown in **A-D**. **E**. Outer-OFF

(yellow-green, top) and inner-ON (red-violet) midget GC. **F**. Outer-OFF parasol cell dendrites

show minimal overlap (inner-ON parasol mosaic not shown). **G**. Small bistratified cells show

minimal dendritic tree overlap. **H**. LFGC1 (Large bistratified cells) show a much larger and more

sparsely branching irregular tree, with greater overlap of neighboring cells. **I-K**. Morphology of

three additional large field types. **I**. LFGC2 (Large diffuse cells) show a densely branched tree

broadly stratified across the IPL. **J**. LFGC3 (Recursive bistratified cells) are narrowly bistratified

near center of the IPL and tend to fasciculate with starburst amacrine cells. **K**. LFGC4 (Inner

smooth monostratified cells) show large, monostratified dendritic trees costratified with parasol

cells. **L-N**. Horizontal views of the cells shown in **I-K.**

Figure 7. Vertical excitatory connectome. A. Vertical connectome for a single LM cone (cone

22, see details in Figure S10B). Cone pedicle and postsynaptic bipolar cells shown in silhouette.

Synaptic ribbons in the cone pedicle (top, OPL) and bipolar cell axon terminals (lower, IPL) are

shown as red balls. Inset shows all bipolar cells postsynaptic to this cone pedicle (outer, yellow-

gold; inner, blue-violet-red). **B**. The same views for an identified S-cone (cone 103, see details in

Figure S11B; synaptic ribbons, blue dots). **C**. Histogram shows output synapse numbers (left

axis) and percent (right axis) made via bipolar cells connected to 3 LM and 2 S cones with

postsynaptic GC types. Note that OFF pathway derived synapses greatly outnumber ON

pathway synapses. **D**. The great majority of synapses from LM and S cones are distributed to

midget, parasol and small bistratified ganglion cells (Major GCs) with all other large field types

receiving 7.9% (LM) and 6.4% (S) of the synaptic output (see also Table S2). Unidentified

processes account for 0.5% of total synaptic output (LM) (see Tables S2A-S2C).

STAR METHODS

Detailed methods are provided in the online version of this paper and include the following:

- KEY RESOURCES TABLE
- CONTACT FOR REAGENT AND RESOURCE SHARING
- EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS
- Human tissue preparation and acquisition
- METHOD DETAILS
- Identification of foveal ROI, serial block-face SEM sample preparation and image
acquisition
- Volume creation
- Montaging
- Alignment
- Segmentation
- Synapse detection
- Ribbon synapse detection in OPL and IPL
- Vesicle cloud detection and inhibitory synapse assignment in the IPL
- IPL inhibitory synapse assignment
- Generating the cone-cone contactome
- Proofreading and synaptic connectivity and updating with the Connectome Annotation
Version Engine (CAVE)
601
602 - DATA AND SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY
603

604 **STAR METHODS**

606 **KEY RESOURCES TABLE**

REAGENT or RESOURCE	SOURCE	IDENTIFIER
Biological samples		
EM human retinal samples	Medical University of Vienna	https://www.meduniwien.ac.at
Deposited data		
Electron microscopy image volume	This paper	
Segmented image data with annotated cells	This paper	
Excitatory/conventional inhibitory synaptic segmentation	This paper	
Synaptic connectivity sample tables	This paper	
CAVE	This paper	
NeuroMapsCAVE	This paper	https://neuromaps.app
Software and algorithms		
Python 3	Python.org	https://www.python.org
Jupyter Notebook 7.0.8	Jupyter.org	https://jupyter.org
Meshparty		https://github.com/CAVEconnectome/MeshParty
NeuroMaps	NeuroMaps.app	https://neuromaps.app
TrakEM2	NIH FIJI	https://fiji.sc/, RRID: SCR_002285

CONTACT FOR REGENT AND RESOURCE SHARING

Further information and request for resources should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the

Lead contact, Dennis M. Dacey (dmd@uw.edu).

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

Human tissue acquisition and preparation

Human eyes (52-year-old, white male; brain dead organ donor) were acquired from the Medical

University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria at the time of death by surgical enucleation. A small

incision was made to give fixative access to the posterior chamber and the retina was in this

way immersion fixed in 4% glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M sodium cacodylate buffer, pH7.3-7.4 at room

temperature. Medical history confirmed no abnormalities of the visual system recorded and no

driving limitations; the ocular status was defined medically as unremarkable at time of

enucleation. Eyes were shipped in fixative to the University of Washington where the retinas

were dissected and prepared for electron microscopy.

METHOD DETAILS

Identification of foveal ROI, serial block-face SEM sample preparation and image

acquisition

Retinal tissue was dissected using a light microscope to facilitate identification of the optic disc

and the center of the foveal pit as well as the major retinal meridians. We selected an ROI that

extends across absolute eccentricity of ~450-650 microns (temporal retina). This location is

linked to cones located ~100-300 microns from the foveal pit center due to the lateral migration

of retinal circuits from the cones at the foveal center. This location encompasses much of the

central 1 degree (~300 µm/deg) of visual angle (Figures 1A-1C).

The dissected retina was then plastic embedded and prepared for electron microscopy as

previously described[1]. In brief, the tissue was incubated in a 1.5% potassium ferrocyanide and

2% osmium tetroxide (OsO4) solution for 1 h. After washing, the tissue was placed in a freshly

made thiocarbohydrazide solution for 20 min and then rinsed and incubated in 2% OsO4 for 30

min. Lastly, the tissue was stained en bloc in 1% uranyl acetate overnight and subsequently

stained with Walton's lead aspartate, dehydrated and plastic embedded (Durcupan, 44610,

Sigma Aldrich). After evaluation of the ROI by semithin sectioning the tissue block was trimmed,

gold-coated by standard methods, and mounted in an Apreo SEM Volumescope (Thermo

Fisher). We cut 3028 sections at 50 nm thick for a total depth of ~150 microns, imaging an ROI

(180 μm tall x 180 μm wide; 5 nm pixels) that encompassed the full vertical depth of the retina,

from the Henle fiber layer (HFL) to the nerve fiber layer (Figure 1D). The overall ROI was

imaged on the blockface after each section as 25 sequential tiles (8000 x 8000 pixels or 40 x 40

μm; 75,700 total image tiles) with 10% overlap. Images were stitched within layer and aligned

across layers using standard methods available in TrakEM2 [2] (NIH image plugin; Scale Invariant

Feature Transform (SIFT) with affine translation) to create a good quality volume. We first

evaluated this TrakEM2-aligned volume by manual reconstruction of a small number of selected

cells and circuits [47]. To further develop this volume as a connectomic resource we applied deep-

learning based computational approaches to realign, segment and reconstruct all cells and

synaptic connections as follows [22,37].

Volume creation

Montaging. Tile offsets were determined manually, then refined by template matching at 40 nm

with a search window of 96 pixels. Tiles were cropped by 128 pixels to avoid edge distortions

and placed to minimize the sum of least squares from the new offsets. Outliers were inspected

and given manual placement. These cropped tiles were processed to create a pyramid of

encodings for resolutions between 20 nm and 640 nm [118], and then stitched to make the

montaged section in two steps. In the first step, only the two neighboring tiles in Y were

considered, with both neighbors being fixed. Using an online finetuner pyramid [118] with the

calculated placement as the starting point, a displacement field was generated that would warp

the encoded tiles to minimize the pixel difference with the fixed tiles. The encoded tiles were

then warped using this displacement field, eroded by a pixel to avoid partial pixels at the edge,

blended to the fixed tiles using the mean of the pixel values in the overlap, and then passed

through CLAHE enhancement to mitigate the contrast loss from the warping and blending,

resulting in strips of encoded tiles where every other tile had been warped. In the second step,

the strips of tiles from the first step were stitched to each other, holding every other strip fixed in

a similar process. An error map was generated at both steps by computing the difference

between the encodings in the overlap at 40 nm and inspected. The non-encoded tiles were

cropped by 394 pixels, warped according to the composed displacement fields from the

encodings, and combined to yield montaged sections.

Alignment. The unaligned sections were first processed to create a pyramid of encodings [118]. A

rigid transformation for the entire dataset was estimated using SIFT features [119] extracted from

the encodings at 640 nm and correspondences established between nearest and next-nearest

section pairs. From the rigidly aligned encodings, displacement fields at 40 nm resolution were

generated between nearest and next-nearest section pairs using an online finetuner pyramid [118].

A convolutional net trained to detect local misalignments and/or simple mismatches caused by

defects in the EM images was used to mask unreliable regions in each displacement field. In

addition, 25 sections with defects that presented with non-smooth deformations were masked

by hand. Pairwise displacement fields and transformation masks were then passed to a global

relaxation [118,120]. This relaxation was performed first at 2560 nm across all 3028 sections of the

dataset, and subsequently in blocks of approximately 100 sections at a resolution of 640 nm,

using the previously generated drift-free fields as constraints for the start and end sections of

each of the 31 blocks. The resulting displacement fields were composed with the earlier rigid

transformation and the final aligned image stack warped and rendered at 10 nm.

Segmentation. We pretrained a convolutional net to predict affinities between neighboring voxels

at 16×16×40 nm³ using 1,368 µm³ of manually annotated data derived from three mouse visual

cortex datasets [121]. We used the residual symmetric U-Net architecture [122] with modifications [123]

and trained with data augmentation previously described [124]. We trained the network for

2,000,000 iterations using four NVIDIA L4 GPUs with PyTorch data parallelism, where each GPU

processed individual patches with its own model replica.

To further fine-tune this network, we manually created training data consisting of 39 μm³ at a

resolution of 20×20×50 nm³. In contrast to the pretraining datasets, mitochondria were

intentionally over segmented to bias boundary detection toward a more conservative approach,

aiming primarily to reduce merge errors at the expense of increasing split errors. Although we

initially hypothesized that this mitochondrial over segmentation would minimally impact neuron

reconstruction accuracy, we observed that it occasionally resulted in split errors in scenarios

where mitochondria were tightly enclosed within very thin neuronal branches. Nevertheless, due

to the substantial reduction in merge errors achieved by this strategy, we considered the

corresponding increase in split errors acceptable. The training setup for fine-tuning was identical

to the pretraining configuration. We fine-tuned the network for 300,000 iterations.

We predicted an affinity map for the whole dataset. Dark voxels could sometimes span multiple

cells and cause segmentation errors. We therefore applied a binarized mask for dark voxels

with a threshold of 0.2, invalidating each dark voxel and its three incident affinities. The resulting

masked affinity map was then segmented with a mean affinity agglomeration threshold of 0.25

[124]. The segmentation was ingested into the Connectome Annotation Versioning Engine

proofreading platform, CAVE [125] for further analysis (Zetta.ai, hosting).

CAVE permitted proofreading to be performed by a user community accessing the web-based

neuroglancer interface [124,126] with dynamic updating of segment ID and related synaptic

connectivity. We named this segmented volume HFseg1 (Human Fovea, segmentation 1). The

HFseg 1 segmentation was of high initial quality such that it was possible to identify and

annotate all major cell classes within the volume and to sort these cells into populations of

distinct types using the annotation tools available in neuroglancer. Current annotations have

been ingested into CAVE and provide a cell type ID hypothesis that can later be tested for each

proposed cell population by further analysis of synaptic connectivity. All cells are accessible at

NeuroMaps (https://neuromaps.app).

Cell types were identified provisionally based on segment 3D morphology (dendritic

morphology, stratification depth, and spatial regularity and interaction (mosaics) and in some

cases nuclear morphology) with proofreading ongoing (> 25,000 edits) and applied thus far to

correct larger obvious mergers (primarily with glial cell processes) that interfered with cell type

identification and additional more detailed proofreading on circuits of interest in the current

survey of cone-bipolar-ganglion cell connections. The majority of cell populations were

unambiguously recognized based on previous studies of primate retina [62,127,128] (e.g., the S

cones, the H1 and H2 horizontal cells, the starburst and AII amacrine cell types, the midget,

diffuse and blue-cone bipolar types, or the midget, parasol and small bistratified ganglion cell

types); some cell types (mainly low density amacrine types) were provisionally designated

subject to further proofreading and connectivity analysis. The properties and relative densities of

these cell types provide the starting point from which the full synaptic connectome can be

determined after proofreading by the community, and the assignment of synaptic connections to

each cell in the volume. Following FlyWire[38], we have initiated an open community of retinal

neurobiologists (currently 7 labs participating) to use these tools to complete proofreading of the

HFseg1 volume.

Synapse detection

Ribbon synapse detection in OPL and IPL. A symmetric residual U-Net architecture was trained

on data with a resolution of $10\times10\times50$ nm^3 using input patches of size $128\times128\times20$ to generate

a probability map that indicates the likelihood of each voxel belonging to a synaptic ribbon [129].

To remove less robust predictions at the boundaries, only the central $96\times96\times16$ voxels of the

input patch was used as the output. The model was trained on a total volume of 2,254 µm^3 of

manually labeled cutouts sampled from various regions across the entire dataset.

The ribbon segmentation was produced by (1) down sampling the probability map by 2×, (2)

thresholding for voxels above 0.15, and (3) using 26-connectivity to extract connected

components. Segments smaller than 5 voxels in a 20×20×50 nm^3 resolution were neglected to

eliminate spurious detections.

To achieve ribbon detection in the OPL segments smaller than 5 voxels in a 20×20×50 nm^3

resolution within the bounds of the OPL were neglected to eliminate spurious detections. For

each detected ribbon within a cone pedicle, postsynaptic partners were automatically identified

via the following steps: (1) All neighboring segments touching the pedicle within 800 nm of the

ribbon centroid were identified. (2) For each neighbor, a representative point close to the ribbon

was chosen as the postsynaptic site. These constitute the set of putative synapses for each

ribbon. (3) After cell identification, only putative synapses onto bipolar or horizontal cells were

kept; all others were filtered out (e.g. Müller glia, neighboring cones, mitochondria). (4) Finally,

for each distinct ribbon-postsynaptic cell pair, all but the shortest putative synapse were filtered

out. The result was that for each ribbon in a cone, a single synaptic connection was found onto

any bipolar or horizontal cell making contact with that cone pedicle within 800 nm.

For synaptic ribbons in the IPL segments smaller than 50 voxels in a 20×20×50 nm^3 resolution

within the bounds of the IPL were neglected to eliminate spurious detections. For each detected

ribbon, postsynaptic partners were automatically identified via the following steps: (1) Identify

the two largest cells within a small (500 nm) window of the centroid of the ribbon which contact

the presynaptic cell, and also contact each other. (2) If such a pair is found, the ribbon is

assumed to synapse on both (i.e., a dyadic synapse). (3) If no such pair is found, then within the

window, the single largest cell contacting the presynaptic cell is identified as the postsynaptic

partner. (4) Putative synapses were filtered by cell type, requiring the presynaptic cell to be

previously annotated as a bipolar cell, and the postsynaptic partner to be previously annotated

as amacrine, or ganglion cell. Note we did not at this time try to use a convolutional net to

detect a low density of possibly ribbonless synapses.

Vesicle cloud detection and Inhibitory synapse assignment in the IPL. A symmetric residual U-

Net architecture was trained on data with a resolution of $10×10×50$ nm^3 using input patches of

size $128×128×20$ to generate a probability map that indicates the likelihood of each voxel

belonging to a vesicle cloud [129]. To remove less robust predictions at the boundaries, only the

central $96×96×16$ voxels of the input patch was used as the output. The model was trained on a

total volume of 2,254 µm^3 of manually labeled cutouts sampled from various regions across the

entire dataset (the same cutouts as ribbon synapse detection). Manual labels were roughly

annotated to mark approximate locations of vesicle clouds rather than precise boundaries.

The vesicle cloud segmentation was produced by (1) downsampling the probability map by 2×,

(2) thresholding for voxels above 0.15, and (3) using 26-connectivity to extract connected

components. Segments with fewer than 200 voxels were excluded, based on the range of

vesicle cloud sizes encountered.

IPL inhibitory synapse assignment. A symmetric residual U-Net architecture was trained on data

with a resolution of $20×20×50$ nm^3 using input patches of size $24×24×8$ to generate a probability

map that indicates the likelihood of each voxel belonging to the postsynaptic cell [129]. The model

was trained on 682 µm^3 of manually annotated labeled cutouts.

The model was applied once for each vesicle cloud detected, in a window centered on the

centroid of the vesicle cloud. Using the initial automatic cell segmentation, the cell with the

highest mean probability within the window was selected as the putative postsynaptic partner

[129]. Further filtering by cell type was applied, requiring the presynaptic cell to be previously

annotated as an amacrine cell, and the postsynaptic partner to be previously annotated as

amacrine, bipolar, or ganglion cell.

Generating the cone-cone contactome. The first synaptic contacts in the retina are gap junctions

formed among cones and between cones and rods. These junctions are harbored in large

dense contacts (adherens junctions) made between the photoreceptor synaptic terminals. We

identified this connectional relationship as follows. Cones and rods were manually identified and

proofread to completion. Contacts between all cones and rods in the OPL were computed using

abiss [130] where a contact is considered to be a set of connected voxel faces that are shared by

the same pair of segments. For each contact, we count the number of voxel faces along each

orientation (xy, xz, and yz), as well as the minimum bounding box containing all of the faces.

The surface area of a contact was estimated by computing the sum of the area of all faces

involved. Contacts were excluded from analysis if (1) the surface area of the contact was ≤ 0.04

μm^2 (mean surface area of contact, 0.55 ± 0.3 μm^2, n = 1141 cone-cone contacts) or (2) the

center of the bounding box was more than 15 μm from the approximate center of the cone

pedicle (manually identified). All remaining contacts were manually inspected with 1× coverage

to determine if they corresponded to what would be manually identified as a true cone-cone

contacts harboring gap junctions.

Proofreading, synaptic connectivity and updating with the Connectome Annotation

Versioning Engine (CAVE)

As noted above we ingested synapse predictions and cell type annotations into CAVE. A critical

functionality given by CAVE is that is allows collaborative users to programmatically query the

up-to-date proofread connectivity graph (synaptic connectivity is updated during proofreading of

each segment-cell type) as well as any changes made to the metadata (cell type IDs,

descriptions, or other annotations). We used the Jupyter notebook application to execute

Python code that queried the HFseg1 dataset by leveraging Python libraries that interact with

the human foveal dataset, enabling access to segment IDs and synaptic assignments.

DATA AND SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY

The HFseg1 dataset (volume, segmentation, synaptic detection and full annotation) are

currently hosted by Zetta.ai (https://zetta.ai/) and all data is accessible by permission. The latest

version of the HFseg1 dataset is also available at NeuroMaps (https://neuromaps.app).

References

1.   Ramon y Cajal, S. (1892). La rètine des vertèbrès. La Cellule *9*, 119-257.

2.   Masland, R.H., and Raviola, E. (2000). Confronting complexity: strategies for
understanding the microcircuitry of the retina. Annual review of neuroscience *23*, 249-
284.

3.   Rodieck, R.W. (1973). The vertebrate retina: Principles of structure and function (W.H.
Freeman).

4.   Helmstaedter, M., Briggman, K.L., Turaga, S.C., Jain, V., Seung, H.S., and Denk, W.
(2013). Connectomic reconstruction of the inner plexiform layer in the mouse retina.
Nature *500*, 168-174. 10.1038/nature12346.

5.   Kim, J.S., Greene, M.J., Zlateski, A., Lee, K., Richardson, M., Turaga, S.C., Purcaro, M.,
Balkam, M., Robinson, A., Behabadi, B.F., et al. (2014). Space-time wiring specificity
supports direction selectivity in the retina. Nature *509*, 331-336. 10.1038/nature13240.

6.   Briggman, K.L., Helmstaedter, M., and Denk, W. (2011). Wiring specificity in the
direction-selectivity circuit of the retina. Nature *471*, 183-188. 10.1038/nature09818.

7.   Anderson, J.R., Jones, B.W., Watt, C.B., Shaw, M.V., Yang, J.H., Demill, D., Lauritzen,
J.S., Lin, Y., Rapp, K.D., Mastronarde, D., et al. (2011). Exploring the retinal
connectome. Molecular vision *17*, 355-379.

8.   Calkins, D.J., Schein, S.J., Tsukamoto, Y., and Sterling, P. (1994). M and L cones in

837   macaque fovea connect to midget ganglion cells by different numbers of excitatory

838   synapses. Nature *371*, 70-72.

839   9.   Calkins, D.J., and Sterling, P. (1996). Absence of spectrally specific lateral inputs to

840   midget ganglion cells in primate retina. Nature *381*, 613-615.

841   10.   Shekhar, K., Lapan, S.W., Whitney, I.E., Tran, N.M., Macosko, E.Z., Kowalczyk, M.,

842   Adiconis, X., Levin, J.Z., Nemesh, J., Goldman, M., et al. (2016). Comprehensive

843   Classification of Retinal Bipolar Neurons by Single-Cell Transcriptomics. Cell *166*, 1308-

844   1323 e1330. 10.1016/j.cell.2016.07.054.

845   11.   Peng, Y.R., Shekhar, K., Yan, W., Herrmann, D., Sappington, A., Bryman, G.S., van Zyl,

846   T., Do, M.T.H., Regev, A., and Sanes, J.R. (2019). Molecular Classification and

847   Comparative Taxonomics of Foveal and Peripheral Cells in Primate Retina. Cell *176*,

848   1222-1237. 10.1016/j.cell.2019.01.004.

849   12.   Yan, W., Peng, Y.R., van Zyl, T., Regev, A., Shekhar, K., Juric, D., and Sanes, J.R.

850   (2020). Cell Atlas of The Human Fovea and Peripheral Retina. Sci Rep *10*, 9802.

851   10.1038/s41598-020-66092-9.

852   13.   Hahn, J., Monavarfeshani, A., Qiao, M., Kao, A.H., Kolsch, Y., Kumar, A., Kunze, V.P.,

853   Rasys, A.M., Richardson, R., Wekselblatt, J.B., et al. (2023). Evolution of neuronal cell

854   classes and types in the vertebrate retina. Nature *624*, 415-424. 10.1038/s41586-023-

855   06638-9.

856   14.   Li, J., Wang, J., Ibarra, I.L., Cheng, X., Luecken, M.D., Lu, J., Monavarfeshani, A., Yan,

857   W., Zheng, Y., Zuo, Z., et al. (2023). Integrated multi-omics single cell atlas of the human

858   retina. Res Sq. 10.21203/rs.3.rs-3471275/v1.

859   15.   Dorkenwald, S., Matsliah, A., Sterling, A.R., Schlegel, P., Yu, S.C., McKellar, C.E., Lin,

860   A., Costa, M., Eichler, K., Yin, Y., et al. (2024). Neuronal wiring diagram of an adult brain.

861   Nature *634*, 124-138. 10.1038/s41586-024-07558-y.

862   16.   Azevedo, A., Lesser, E., Phelps, J.S., Mark, B., Elabbady, L., Kuroda, S., Sustar, A.,

863   Moussa, A., Khandelwal, A., Dallmann, C.J., et al. (2024). Connectomic reconstruction of

864   a female Drosophila ventral nerve cord. Nature *631*, 360-368. 10.1038/s41586-024-

865   07389-x.

866   17.   Abbott, L.F., Bock, D.D., Callaway, E.M., Denk, W., Dulac, C., Fairhall, A.L., Fiete, I.,

867   Harris, K.M., Helmstaedter, M., Jain, V., et al. (2020). The Mind of a Mouse. Cell *182*,

868   1372-1376. 10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.010.

869   18.   Shapson-Coe, A., Januszewski, M., Berger, D.R., Pope, A., Wu, Y., Blakely, T., Schalek,

870   R.L., Li, P.H., Wang, S., Maitin-Shepard, J., et al. (2024). A petavoxel fragment of human

871   cerebral cortex reconstructed at nanoscale resolution. Science *384*, eadk4858.

872   10.1126/science.adk4858.

873   19.   Loomba, S., Straehle, J., Gangadharan, V., Heike, N., Khalifa, A., Motta, A., Ju, N.,

874   Sievers, M., Gempt, J., Meyer, H.S., and Helmstaedter, M. (2022). Connectomic

875   comparison of mouse and human cortex. Science *377*, eabo0924.

876   10.1126/science.abo0924.

877   20.   Lichtman, J.W., and Sanes, J.R. (2008). Ome sweet ome: what can the genome tell us

878   about the connectome? Current opinion in neurobiology *18*, 346-353.

879   10.1016/j.conb.2008.08.010.

880   21.   Ding, Z., Fahey, P.G., Papadopoulos, S., Wang, E.Y., Celii, B., Papadopoulos, C., Kunin,

881   A.B., Chang, A., Fu, J., Ding, Z., et al. (2023). Functional connectomics reveals general

882   wiring rule in mouse visual cortex. bioRxiv. 10.1101/2023.03.13.531369.

883   22.   Turner, N.L., Macrina, T., Bae, J.A., Yang, R., Wilson, A.M., Schneider-Mizell, C., Lee, K.,

884   Lu, R., Wu, J., Bodor, A.L., et al. (2022). Reconstruction of neocortex: Organelles,

885   compartments, cells, circuits, and activity. Cell *185*, 1082-1100 e1024.

886   10.1016/j.cell.2022.01.023.

887   23.   Wandell, B.A., Dumoulin, S.O., and Brewer, A.A. (2007). Visual field maps in human

888   cortex. Neuron *56*, 366-383. 10.1016/j.neuron.2007.10.012.

889   24.   Sereno, M.I., Sood, M.R., and Huang, R.S. (2022). Topological Maps and Brain

890   Computations From Low to High. Frontiers in systems neuroscience *16*, 787737.

891   10.3389/fnsys.2022.787737.

892   25.   Harvey, B.M., and Dumoulin, S.O. (2011). The relationship between cortical

893   magnification factor and population receptive field size in human visual cortex:

894   constancies in cortical architecture. J Neurosci *31*, 13604-13612.

895   10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2572-11.2011.

26.   Sereno, M.I., Dale, A.M., Reppas, J.B., Kwong, K.K., Belliveau, J.W., Brady, T.J., Rosen,

B.R., and Tootell, R.B. (1995). Borders of multiple visual areas in humans revealed by

functional magnetic resonance imaging. Science *268*, 889-893.

10.1126/science.7754376.

27.   Schira, M.M., Tyler, C.W., Breakspear, M., and Spehar, B. (2009). The foveal confluence

in human visual cortex. J Neurosci *29*, 9050-9058. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1760-09.2009.

28.   Baden, T., Berens, P., Franke, K., Roman Roson, M., Bethge, M., and Euler, T. (2016).

The functional diversity of retinal ganglion cells in the mouse. Nature *529*, 345-350.

10.1038/nature16468.

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

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

Cells with Dense Anatomy and Physiology. Cell *173*, 1293-1306 e1219.

10.1016/j.cell.2018.04.040.

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

Shekhar, K., Sanes, J.R., and Schwartz, G.W. (2022). Unified classification of mouse

retinal ganglion cells using function, morphology, and gene expression. Cell reports *40*,

111040. 10.1016/j.celrep.2022.111040.

31.   Masri, R.A., Percival, K.A., Koizumi, A., Martin, P.R., and Grunert, U. (2019). Survey of

retinal ganglion cell morphology in marmoset. J Comp Neurol *527*, 236-258.

10.1002/cne.24157.

32. Kim, Y.J., Peterson, B.B., Crook, J.D., Joo, H.R., Wu, J., Puller, C., Robinson, F.R.,

Gamlin, P.D., Yau, K.W., Viana, F., et al. (2022). Origins of direction selectivity in the

primate retina. Nature communications *13*, 2862. 10.1038/s41467-022-30405-5.

33. Curcio, C.A., Sloan, K.R., Kalina, R.E., and Hendrickson, A.E. (1990). Human

photoreceptor topography. J.Comp.Neurol. *292*, 497-523.

34. Curcio, C.A., Kar, D., Owsley, C., Sloan, K.R., and Ach, T. (2024). Age-Related Macular

Degeneration, a Mathematically Tractable Disease. Investigative ophthalmology & visual

science *65*, 4. 10.1167/iovs.65.3.4.

35. Schein, S.J. (1988). Anatomy of macaque fovea and spatial densities of neurons in

foveal representation. J Comp Neurol *269*, 479-505. 10.1002/cne.902690403 [doi].

36. Drasdo, N., Millican, C.L., Katholi, C.R., and Curcio, C.A. (2007). The length of Henle

fibers in the human retina and a model of ganglion receptive field density in the visual

field. Vision Res *47*, 2901-2911. 10.1016/j.visres.2007.01.007.

37. Lee, K., Turner, N., Macrina, T., Wu, J., Lu, R., and Seung, H.S. (2019). Convolutional

nets for reconstructing neural circuits from brain images acquired by serial section

electron microscopy. Current opinion in neurobiology *55*, 188-198.

10.1016/j.conb.2019.04.001.

38. Dorkenwald, S., McKellar, C.E., Macrina, T., Kemnitz, N., Lee, K., Lu, R., Wu, J.,

Popovych, S., Mitchell, E., Nehoran, B., et al. (2022). FlyWire: online community for

whole-brain connectomics. Nature methods *19*, 119-128. 10.1038/s41592-021-01330-0.

39. Masri, R.A., Greferath, U., Fletcher, E.L., Martin, P.R., and Grünert, U. (2025).

Immunohistochemistry and spatial density of Müller cells in the human fovea.

Investigative ophthalmology & visual science *in press*.

40. Singaravelu, J., Zhao, L., Fariss, R.N., Nork, T.M., and Wong, W.T. (2017). Microglia in

the primate macula: specializations in microglial distribution and morphology with retinal

position and with aging. Brain Struct Funct *222*, 2759-2771. 10.1007/s00429-017-1370-

x.

41. Goyal, M., Bordt, A.S., Neitz, J., and Marshak, D.W. (2023). Trogocytosis of neurons and

glial cells by microglia in a healthy adult macaque retina. Sci Rep *13*, 633.

10.1038/s41598-023-27453-2.

42. Lee, S.C.S., Martin, P.R., and Grunert, U. (2019). Topography of Neurons in the Rod

Pathway of Human Retina. Investigative ophthalmology & visual science *60*, 2848-2859.

10.1167/iovs.19-27217.

43. Kim, Y.J., Packer, O., Pollreisz, A., Martin, P.R., Grunert, U., and Dacey, D.M. (2023).

Comparative connectomics reveals noncanonical wiring for color vision in human foveal

retina. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

120, e2300545120. 10.1073/pnas.2300545120.

44. O'Brien, J.J., Chen, X., Macleish, P.R., O'Brien, J., and Massey, S.C. (2012).

Photoreceptor coupling mediated by connexin36 in the primate retina. J Neurosci *32*,

4675-4687. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4749-11.2012.

45. Hornstein, E.P., Verweij, J., and Schnapf, J.L. (2004). Electrical coupling between red

and green cones in primate retina. Nature neuroscience *7*, 745-750.

46. Li, W., and DeVries, S.H. (2004). Separate blue and green cone networks in the

mammalian retina. Nature neuroscience *7*, 751-756.

47. Kim, Y.J., Packer, O., and Dacey, D.M. (2024). A circuit motif for color in the human

foveal retina. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America *121*, e2405138121. 10.1073/pnas.2405138121.

48. Kolb, H., Goede, P., Roberts, S., McDermott, R., and Gouras, P. (1997). Uniqueness of

the S-cone pedicle in the human retina and consequences for color processing.

J.Comp.Neurol. *386*, 443-460.

49. Tsukamoto, Y., Masarachia, P., Schein, S.J., and Sterling, P. (1992). Gap junctions

between the pedicles of macaque foveal cones. Vision Res. *32*, 1809-1815.

50. Martin, P.R., Blessing, E.M., Buzas, P., Szmajda, B.A., and Forte, J.D. (2011).

Transmission of colour and acuity signals by parvocellular cells in marmoset monkeys. J

Physiol *589*, 2795-2812. 10.1113/jphysiol.2010.194076.

51. Wool, L.E., Crook, J.D., Troy, J.B., Packer, O.S., Zaidi, Q., and Dacey, D.M. (2018).

Nonselective Wiring Accounts for Red-Green Opponency in Midget Ganglion Cells of the

Primate Retina. J Neurosci *38*, 1520-1540. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1688-17.2017.

52.   Crook, J.D., Manookin, M.B., Packer, O.S., and Dacey, D.M. (2011). Horizontal cell

feedback without cone type-selective inhibition mediates "red-green" color opponency in

midget ganglion cells of the primate retina. J Neurosci *31*, 1762-1772.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4385-10.2011.

53.   Dacey, D.M., Lee, B.B., Stafford, D.K., Pokorny, J., and Smith, V.C. (1996). Horizontal

cells of the primate retina: cone specificity without spectral opponency. Science *271*,

656-659.

54.   Kolb, H., Mariani, A., and Gallego, A. (1980). A second type of horizontal cell in the

monkey retina. J.Comp.Neurol. *189*, 31-44.

55.   Goodchild, A.K., Chan, T.L., and Grünert, U. (1996). Horizontal cell connections with

short-wavelength-sensitive cones in macaque monkey retina. Vis. Neurosci. *13*, 833-

845.

56.   Ahnelt, P., and Kolb, H. (1994). Horizontal cells and cone photoreceptors in human

retina: A golgi-electron microscopic study of spectral connectivity. J.Comp.Neurol. *343*,

406-427.

57.   Dacey, D.M., Lee, B.B., Stafford, D.K., Pokorny, J., and Smith, V.C. (1996). Horizontal

cells of the primate retina: cone specificity without spectral opponency. Science *271*,

656-659. 10.1126/science.271.5249.656.

58. Masri, R.A., Weltzien, F., Purushothuman, S., Lee, S.C.S., Martin, P.R., and Grunert, U.

(2021). Composition of the Inner Nuclear Layer in Human Retina. Investigative

ophthalmology & visual science *62*, 22. 10.1167/iovs.62.9.22.

59. Peichl, L., Sandmann, D., and Boycott, B.B. (1998). Comparative anatomy and function

of mammalian horizontal cells. In Development and Organization of the Retina, Chalupa,

and Finlay, eds. (Plenum Press), pp. 147-172.

60. Dacheux, R.F., and Raviola, E. (1990). Physiology of HI horizontal cells in the primate

retina. Proc.R.Soc.Lond.B Biol.Sci. *239*, 213-230.

61. Chan, T.L., and Grünert, U. (1998). Horizontal cell connections with short wavelength-

sensitive cones in the retina: A comparison between New World and Old World

primates. J.Comp.Neurol. *393*, 196-209.

62. Grunert, U., and Martin, P.R. (2020). Cell types and cell circuits in human and non-

human primate retina. Progress in retinal and eye research, 100844.

10.1016/j.preteyeres.2020.100844.

63. Puthussery, T., Gayet-Primo, J., Taylor, W.R., and Haverkamp, S. (2011).

Immunohistochemical identification and synaptic inputs to the diffuse bipolar cell type

DB1 in macaque retina. J Comp Neurol *519*, 3640-3656. 10.1002/cne.22756.

64. Puthussery, T., Percival, K.A., Venkataramani, S., Gayet-Primo, J., Grunert, U., and

Taylor, W.R. (2014). Kainate receptors mediate synaptic input to transient and sustained

OFF visual pathways in primate retina. J Neurosci *34*, 7611-7621.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4855-13.2014.

65.   Puthussery, T., Venkataramani, S., Gayet-Primo, J., Smith, R.G., and Taylor, W.R.

(2013). NaV1.1 channels in axon initial segments of bipolar cells augment input to

magnocellular visual pathways in the primate retina. J Neurosci *33*, 16045-16059.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1249-13.2013.

66.   Tsukamoto, Y., and Omi, N. (2015). OFF bipolar cells in macaque retina: type-specific

connectivity in the outer and inner synaptic layers. Frontiers in neuroanatomy *9*, 122.

10.3389/fnana.2015.00122.

67.   Tsukamoto, Y., and Omi, N. (2014). Some OFF bipolar cell types make contact with both

rods and cones in macaque and mouse retinas. Frontiers in neuroanatomy *8*, 105.

10.3389/fnana.2014.00105.

68.   Haverkamp, S., Haeseleer, F., and Hendrickson, A. (2003). A comparison of

immunocytochemical markers to identify bipolar cell types in human and monkey retina.

Visual neuroscience *20*, 589-600.

69.   Masri, R.A., Grunert, U., and Martin, P.R. (2020). Analysis of Parvocellular and

Magnocellular Visual Pathways in Human Retina. J Neurosci *40*, 8132-8148.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1671-20.2020.

70.   Grünert, U., Martin, P.R., and Wässle, H. (1994). Immunocytochemical analysis of

bipolar cells in the macaque monkey retina. J.Comp.Neurol. *348*, 607-627.

71. Weltzien, F., Percival, K.A., Martin, P.R., and Grunert, U. (2015). Analysis of bipolar and

amacrine populations in marmoset retina. J Comp Neurol *523*, 313-334.

10.1002/cne.23683.

72. Tsukamoto, Y., and Omi, N. (2016). ON Bipolar Cells in Macaque Retina: Type-Specific

Synaptic Connectivity with Special Reference to OFF Counterparts. Frontiers in

neuroanatomy *10*, 104. 10.3389/fnana.2016.00104.

73. Joo, H.R., Peterson, B.B., Haun, T.J., and Dacey, D.M. (2011). Characterization of a

novel large-field cone bipolar cell type in the primate retina: evidence for selective cone

connections. Visual neuroscience *28*, 29-37. 10.1017/S0952523810000374.

74. Tsukamoto, Y., and Omi, N. (2022). Multiple Invagination Patterns and Synaptic Efficacy

in Primate and Mouse Rod Synaptic Terminals. Investigative ophthalmology & visual

science *63*, 11. 10.1167/iovs.63.8.11.

75. Saha, A., Zuniga, J., Mian, K., Zhai, H., Derr, P.J., Hoon, M., and Sinha, R. (2023).

Regional variation in the organization and connectivity of the first synapse in the primate

night vision pathway. iScience *26*, 108113. 10.1016/j.isci.2023.108113.

76. Grünert, U., and Martin, P.R. (1991). Rod bipolar cells in the macaque monkey retina:

Immunoreactivity and connectivity. J.Neurosci. *11*, 2742-2758.

77. Kolb, H., Zhang, L., and Dekorver, L. (1993). Differential staining of neurons in the

human retina with antibodies to protein kinase C isozymes. Vis.Neurosci. *10*, 341-351.

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

1051   Tsuboyama, K., Rieke, F., and Wong, R.O.L. (2016). Glutamatergic Monopolar

1052   Interneurons Provide a Novel Pathway of Excitation in the Mouse Retina. Current

1053   biology : CB *26*, 2070-2077. 10.1016/j.cub.2016.06.016.

1054   79.   Calkins, D.J., Tsukamoto, Y., and Sterling, P. (1996). Foveal cones form basal as well as

1055   invaginating junctions with diffuse ON bipolar cells. Vision Res. *36*, 3373-3381.

1056   80.   Strettoi, E., Raviola, E., and Dacheux, R.F. (1992). Synaptic connections of the narrow-

1057   field, bistratified rod amacrine cell (AII) in the rabbit retina. J.Comp.Neurol. *325*, 152-168.

1058   81.   Strettoi, E., Masri, R.A., and Grunert, U. (2018). AII amacrine cells in the primate fovea

1059   contribute to photopic vision. Sci Rep *8*, 16429. 10.1038/s41598-018-34621-2.

1060   82.   Lee, S.C., Weltzien, F., Madigan, M.C., Martin, P.R., and Grunert, U. (2016).

1061   Identification of AII amacrine, displaced amacrine, and bistratified ganglion cell types in

1062   human retina with antibodies against calretinin. J Comp Neurol *524*, 39-53.

1063   10.1002/cne.23821.

1064   83.   Demb, J.B., and Singer, J.H. (2012). Intrinsic properties and functional circuitry of the AII

1065   amacrine cell. Visual neuroscience *29*, 51-60. 10.1017/S0952523811000368.

1066   84.   Vaney, D.I., Sivyer, B., and Taylor, W.R. (2012). Direction selectivity in the retina:

1067   symmetry and asymmetry in structure and function. Nature reviews. Neuroscience *13*,

1068   194-208. 10.1038/nrn3165.

1069   85.   Rodieck, R.W., and Marshak, D.W. (1992). Spatial density and distribution of choline

1070   acetyltransferase immunoreactive cells in human, macaque, and baboon retinas.

1071   J.Comp.Neurol. *321*, 46-64.

1072   86.   Rodieck, R.W. (1989). Starburst amacrine cells of the primate retina. J.Comp.Neurol.

1073   *285*, 18-37.

1074   87.   Zhang, C., Yu, W.Q., Hoshino, A., Huang, J., Rieke, F., Reh, T.A., and Wong, R.O.L.

1075   (2019). Development of ON and OFF cholinergic amacrine cells in the human fetal

1076   retina. J Comp Neurol *527*, 174-186. 10.1002/cne.24405.

1077   88.   Polyak, S.L. (1941). The Retina (University of Chicago Press).

1078   89.   Mariani, A.P. (1990). Amacrine cells of the rhesus monkey retina. J.Comp.Neurol. *301*,

1079   382-400.

1080   90.   Boycott, B.B., and Dowling, J.E. (1969). Organization of the primate retina: light

1081   microscopy. Philos.Trans.R.Soc.Lond.B Biol.Sci. *255*, 109-184.

1082   91.   Klump, K.E., Zhang, A.J., Wu, S.M., and Marshak, D.W. (2009). Parvalbumin-

1083   immunoreactive amacrine cells of macaque retina. Visual neuroscience *26*, 287-296.

1084   10.1017/S0952523809090075.

1085   92.   Haverkamp, S., Grunert, U., and Wassle, H. (2000). The cone pedicle, a complex

1086   synapse in the retina. Neuron *27*, 85-95. 10.1016/s0896-6273(00)00011-8.

1087   93.   Grabner, C.P., Futagi, D., Shi, J., Bindokas, V., Kitano, K., Schwartz, E.A., and DeVries,

1088   S.H. (2023). Mechanisms of simultaneous linear and nonlinear computations at the

1089   mammalian cone photoreceptor synapse. Nature communications *14*, 3486.

1090   10.1038/s41467-023-38943-2.

1091   94.   Herr, S., Ngo, I.T., Huang, T.M., Klug, K., Sterling, P., and Schein, S. (2011). Cone

1092   synapses in macaque fovea: II. Dendrites of OFF midget bipolar cells exhibit Inner

1093   Densities similar to their Outer synaptic Densities in basal contacts with cone terminals.

1094   Visual neuroscience *28*, 17-28. 10.1017/S0952523810000465.

1095   95.   Wässle, H., Grünert, U., Chun, M.H., and Boycott, B.B. (1995). The rod pathway of the

1096   macaque monkey retina: Identification of AII-amacrine cells with antibodies against

1097   calretinin. J.Comp.Neurol. *361*, 537-551.

1098   96.   Grünert, U. (1997). Anatomical evidence for rod input to the parvocellular pathway in the

1099   visual system of the primate. Eur.J.Neurosci. *9*, 617-621.

1100   97.   Dacey, D.M. (1993). The mosaic of midget ganglion cells in the human retina.

1101   J.Neurosci. *13*, 5334-5355.

1102   98.   Calkins, D.J., Tsukamoto, Y., and Sterling, P. (1998). Microcircuitry and mosaic of a blue-

1103   yellow ganglion cell in the primate retina. J.Neurosci. *18*, 3373-3385.

1104   99.   Dacey, D.M., Peterson, B.B., Robinson, F.R., and Gamlin, P.D. (2003). Fireworks in the

1105   primate retina: in vitro photodynamics reveals diverse LGN-projecting ganglion cell

1106   types. Neuron *37*, 15-27.

1107   100.   Peterson, B.B., and Dacey, D.M. (2000). Morphology of wide-field bistratified and diffuse

1108   human retinal ganglion cells. Visual neuroscience *17*, 567-578.

1109   101.   Crook, J.D., Peterson, B.B., Packer, O.S., Robinson, F.R., Gamlin, P.D., Troy, J.B., and

1110   Dacey, D.M. (2008). The smooth monostratified ganglion cell: evidence for spatial

1111   diversity in the Y-cell pathway to the lateral geniculate nucleus and superior colliculus in

1112   the macaque monkey. J Neurosci *28*, 12654-12671. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2986-

1113   08.2008.

1114   102.   Liao, H.W., Ren, X., Peterson, B.B., Marshak, D.W., Yau, K.W., Gamlin, P.D., and Dacey,

1115   D.M. (2016). Melanopsin-expressing ganglion cells on macaque and human retinas form

1116   two morphologically distinct populations. J Comp Neurol *524*, 2845-2872.

1117   10.1002/cne.23995.

1118   103.   Wassle, H., Puller, C., Muller, F., and Haverkamp, S. (2009). Cone contacts, mosaics,

1119   and territories of bipolar cells in the mouse retina. J Neurosci *29*, 106-117.

1120   29/1/106[pii]10.1523JNEUROSCI.4442-08.2009 [doi].

1121   104.   Ratliff, C.P., Borghuis, B.G., Kao, Y.H., Sterling, P., and Balasubramanian, V. (2010).

1122   Retina is structured to process an excess of darkness in natural scenes. Proceedings of

1123   the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *107*, 17368-17373.

1124   10.1073/pnas.1005846107.

1125   105.   Komban, S.J., Alonso, J.M., and Zaidi, Q. (2011). Darks are processed faster than lights.

1126   J Neurosci *31*, 8654-8658. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0504-11.2011.

106. Rahimi-Nasrabadi, H., Moore-Stoll, V., Tan, J., Dellostritto, S., Jin, J., Dul, M.W., and

Alonso, J.M. (2023). Luminance Contrast Shifts Dominance Balance between ON and

OFF Pathways in Human Vision. J Neurosci *43*, 993-1007. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1672-

22.2022.

107. Jin, J., Wang, Y., Lashgari, R., Swadlow, H.A., and Alonso, J.M. (2011). Faster

thalamocortical processing for dark than light visual targets. J Neurosci *31*, 17471-

17479. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2456-11.2011.

108. Jin, J., Wang, Y., Swadlow, H.A., and Alonso, J.M. (2011). Population receptive fields of

ON and OFF thalamic inputs to an orientation column in visual cortex. Nature

neuroscience *14*, 232-238. 10.1038/nn.2729.

109. Nern, A., Loesche, F., Takemura, S.Y., Burnett, L.E., Dreher, M., Gruntman, E., Hoeller,

J., Huang, G.B., Januszewski, M., Klapoetke, N.C., et al. (2025). Connectome-driven

neural inventory of a complete visual system. Nature. 10.1038/s41586-025-08746-0.

110. Zhang, L., Cavallini, M., Wang, J., Xin, R., Zhang, Q., Feng, G., Sanes, J.R., and Peng,

Y.R. (2024). Evolutionary and developmental specialization of foveal cell types in the

marmoset. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America *121*, e2313820121. 10.1073/pnas.2313820121.

111. Cowan, C.S., Renner, M., De Gennaro, M., Gross-Scherf, B., Goldblum, D., Hou, Y.,

Munz, M., Rodrigues, T.M., Krol, J., Szikra, T., et al. (2020). Cell Types of the Human

Retina and Its Organoids at Single-Cell Resolution. Cell *182*, 1623-1640 e1634.

10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.013.

112.   Wang, A.Y.M., Kulkarni, M.M., McLaughlin, A.J., Gayet, J., Smith, B.E., Hauptschein, M.,

1149   McHugh, C.F., Yao, Y.Y., and Puthussery, T. (2023). An ON-type direction-selective

1150   ganglion cell in primate retina. Nature *623*, 381-386. 10.1038/s41586-023-06659-4.

1151   113.   Shevell, S.K., and Martin, P.R. (2017). Color opponency: tutorial. Journal of the Optical

1152   Society of America. A, Optics, image science, and vision *34*, 1099-1108.

1153   10.1364/JOSAA.34.001099.

1154   114.   Stockman, A., and Brainard, D.H. (2010). Color Vision Mechanisms. In OSA Handbook

1155   of Optics, M. Bass, ed. (McGraw-Hill), pp. 11.11-11.104.

1156   115.   Hsu, A., Smith, R.G., Buchsbaum, G., and Sterling, P. (2000). Cost of cone coupling to

1157   trichromacy in primate fovea. Journal of the Optical Society of America. A, Optics, image

1158   science, and vision *17*, 635-640.

1159   116.   DeVries, S.H., Qi, X., Smith, R., Makous, W., and Sterling, P. (2002). Electrical coupling

1160   between mammalian cones. Current biology : CB *12*, 1900-1907.

1161   117.   Schlegel, P., Yin, Y., Bates, A.S., Dorkenwald, S., Eichler, K., Brooks, P., Han, D.S.,

1162   Gkantia, M., Dos Santos, M., Munnelly, E.J., et al. (2024). Whole-brain annotation and

1163   multi-connectome cell typing of Drosophila. Nature *634*, 139-152. 10.1038/s41586-024-

1164   07686-5.

1165   118.   Popovych, S., Macrina, T., Kemnitz, N., Castro, M., Nehoran, B., Jia, Z., Bae, J.A.,

1166   Mitchell, E., Mu, S., Trautman, E.T., et al. (2024). Petascale pipeline for precise

alignment of images from serial section electron microscopy. Nature communications *15*,

289. 10.1038/s41467-023-44354-0.

119.   Lowe, D.G. (1999). Object recognition from local scale-invariant features. Proceedings of

the Seventh IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision. IEEE.

120.   Saalfeld, S., Fetter, R., Cardona, A., and Tomancak, P. (2012). Elastic volume

reconstruction from series of ultra-thin microscopy sections. Nature methods *9*, 717-720.

10.1038/nmeth.2072.

121.   Consortium, T.M., Bae, J.A., Baptiste, M., Bishop, C.A., Bodor, A.L., Brittain, D.,

Buchanan, J., Bumbarger, D.J., Castro, M.A., Celii, B., et al. (2023). Functional

connectomics spanning multiple areas of mouse visual cortex. bioRxiv,

2021.2007.2028.454025. 10.1101/2021.07.28.454025.

122.   Lee, K., Zung, J., Li, P.H., Jain, V., and Seung, H.S. (2017). Superhuman accuracy on

the SNEMI3D connectomics challenge. arXiv *preprint arXiv:1706.00120*.

123.   Lee, K., Lu, R., Luther, K., and Seung, H.S. (2021). Learning and Segmenting Dense

Voxel Embeddings for 3D Neuron Reconstruction. IEEE Trans Med Imaging *40*, 3801-

3811. 10.1109/TMI.2021.3097826.

124.   Macrina, T., Lee, K., Lu, R., Turner, N.L., Wu, J., Popovych, S., Silversmith, W., Kemnitz,

N., Bae, J.A., Castro, M.A., et al. (2021). Petascale neural circuit reconstruction:

automated methods. bioRxiv, 2021.2008.2004.455162. 10.1101/2021.08.04.455162.

125.   Dorkenwald, S., Schneider-Mizell, C.M., Brittain, D., Halageri, A., Jordan, C., Kemnitz,

1187   N., Castro, M.A., Silversmith, W., Maitin-Shephard, J., Troidl, J., et al. (2023). CAVE:

1188   Connectome Annotation Versioning Engine. bioRxiv. 10.1101/2023.07.26.550598.

1189   126.   Maitin-Shepard, J., Baden, A., Silversmith, W., Perlman, E., Collman, F., Blakely, T.,

1190   Funke, J., Jordan, C., Falk, B., Kemnitz, N., et al. (2021). google/neuroglancer.

1191   127.   Boycott, B.B., and Wässle, H. (1991). Morphological classification of bipolar cells of the

1192   primate retina. Eur.J.Neurosci. *3*, 1069-1088.

1193   128.   Wässle, H., and Boycott, B.B. (1991). Functional architecture of the mammalian retina.

1194   Physiol.Rev. *71*, 447-480.

1195   129.   Turner, N.L., Lee, K., Lu, R., Wu, J., Ih, D., and Seung, H.S. (2020). Synaptic Partner

1196   Assignment Using Attentional Voxel Association Networks. pp. 1-5.

1197   130.   Lu, R., Zlateski, A., and Seung, H.S. (2021). Large-scale image segmentation based on

1198   distributed clustering algorithms. arXiv *arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10795 [cs.CV]*, 1-

1199   8. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.10795.

1200

1201   **Figures (Figure 1 to Figure 7)**

1202

1203

1204 **Figure 1**

1205

1206

1207 **Figure 2**

1208

1209 **Figure 3**

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221 **Figure 4**

Table in panel C:

Amacrines	synapse		total (#)
	precision	sensitivity	
ACII 35	70 %	88 %	34
ACII 36	82 %	87 %	47
Average	76.0 %	87.5 %	40.5
SD	8.5 %	0.7 %	9.2

1222

Figure 5

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

Figure 6

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

A

LM cone

synaptic ribbons
(red balls)

OPL

bipolar cells

INL

IPL

LM cone

bipolar cells

synaptic ribbons
(red balls)

5 µm

5 µm

B

S cone

synaptic ribbons
(blue balls)

OPL

bipolar cells

INL

S cone

bipolar cells

IPL

synaptic ribbons
(blue balls)

5 µm

5 µm

C

Divergent pathway of total excitatory synaptic output from a single cone

Total synapses (#)

Total percent (%)

□ LM cone mediated circuit (n = 3)
■ S cone mediated circuit (n = 2)

ON MG OFF MG ON Parasol OFF Parasol SBGC LFGC1 LFGC 2 LFGC3 LFGC4 LFGC5 Melanopsin (?) Unidentified

Major GCs

Large Field GCs

D

LM	Major GCs	Large Field GCs
LM cone 21	94.5 %	5.5 %
LM cone 22	88.4 %	11.6 %
LM cone 58	93.3 %	6.7 %
Average (n = 3)	92.1 %	7.9 %
SD	3.2 %	3.2 %

S	Major GCs	Large Field GCs
S cone 54	94.7 %	5.3 %
S cone 103	92.8 %	7.2 %
Average (n = 2)	93.6 %	6.4 %
SD	1.2 %	1.2 %

1239

1240   **Figure 7**