Title

Presynaptic NMDA receptors cooperate with local action potentials to implement activity-

dependent GABA release from the reciprocal olfactory bulb granule cell spine

Authors

Vanessa Lage-Rupprecht[1,2], Li Zhou[1], Gaia Bianchini[1], S. Sara Aghvami[1,3,4], Max Mueller[1],

Balázs Rózsa[5], Marco Sassoé-Pognetto[6] & Veronica Egger[1*]

Affiliations

1. Neurophysiology, Institute of Zoology, Universität Regensburg, 93040 Regensburg,
Germany; 2. Department of Bioinformatics, Fraunhofer SCAI, 53757 Sankt Augustin,
Germany; 3. School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Tehran, 14395-
515 Tehran, Iran; 4. School of Cognitive Sciences, Institute for Research in Fundamental
Sciences (IPM), 19395-5746 Tehran, Iran; 5. Two-Photon Imaging Center, Institute of
Experimental Medicine, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1039 Budapest, Hungary; 6.
Neuroscience Department, University of Turin, I-10126 Torino, Italy.

Abstract

In the rodent olfactory bulb the smooth dendrites of the principal glutamatergic mitral cells (MCs) form reciprocal dendrodendritic synapses with large spines on GABAergic granule cells (GC), where unitary release of glutamate can trigger postsynaptic local activation of voltage-gated Na^+-channels (Na_vs), i.e. a spine spike. Can such single MC input evoke reciprocal release? We find that unitary-like activation via two-photon uncaging of glutamate causes GC spines to release GABA both synchronously and asynchronously onto MC dendrites. This release indeed requires activation of Na_vs and high-voltage-activated Ca^{2+}-channels (HVACCs), but also of NMDA receptors (NMDAR). Simulations show temporally overlapping HVACC- and NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+}-currents during the spine spike, and ultrastructural data prove NMDAR presence within the GABAergic presynapse. This cooperative action of presynaptic NMDARs allows to implement synapse-specific, activity-dependent lateral inhibition and thus could provide an efficient solution to combinatorial percept synthesis in a sensory system with many receptor channels.

Introduction

Reciprocal dendrodendritic microcircuits can be found in several parts of the nervous system and are especially abundant in the vertebrate olfactory bulb (*Crespo et al. 2013*), where the dendrites of the principal mitral and tufted cells (MTCs) engage in such interactions with several major subtypes of local GABAergic neurons. In the glomerular layer, the MTC apical tuft is reciprocally connected to mostly periglomerular cell dendrites. In the external plexiform layer, the long MC lateral dendrites are densely covered with GABAergic synapses that mostly originate from reciprocal arrangements (*Bartel et al. 2015; Sailor et al. 2016; Matsuno et al. 2017*). While proximal circuits are thought to be mostly formed by granule cell (GC) spines (*Miyamichi et al. 2013*), there are also reciprocal dendrodendritic interactions with other GABAergic cell types such as SOM+ neurons, CRH+ neurons and most prominently parvalbumin/PV+ neurons that all feature aspiny, smooth dendrites (partially overlapping populations; *Toida et al. 1994; Lepousez et al. 2010; Huang et al. 2013; Kato et al. 2013; Miyamichi et al. 2013*).

Thus the MC-GC synapse differs from the other bulbar reciprocal arrangements by its location within a large spine on the GC side. These spines feature particularly long necks (*Woolf et al. 1991*) which might serve to electrically isolate the synapse and boost local processing (e.g. *Miller et al. 1985; Spruston 2008*). Indeed, we have gathered evidence that

unitary postsynaptic potentials in GC spines are electrically compartmentalized and thus can

locally activate voltage-gated Na^+-channels (Na_vs) which in turn activate classic presynaptic

high-voltage activated Ca^{2+}-channels (HVACCs) within the spine ('spine spike', *Bywalez et*

al. 2015). Thus, the reciprocal spine might operate as a mini-neuron that can generate

synaptic output upon local activation (*Egger & Urban 2006*).

While there have been many earlier studies of recurrent dendrodendritic inhibition at the

MTC-GC synapse, it is so far unknown whether a unitary, purely local activation of the

spine's microcircuit can indeed trigger release of GABA back onto the exciting MTC. The

issue is still unresolved for two reasons:

(1) most earlier studies used a strong stimulation of voltage-clamped MCs, namely a

depolarization to 0 mV for 20-50 ms (*Isaacson & Strowbridge 1998; Halabisky et al. 2000;*

Isaacson 2001; Chen et al. 2000). This protocol will cause massive release of glutamate from

the lateral MC dendrites, invoking glutamate spillover between them (*Isaacson 1999*) and

resulting in long-lasting recurrent inhibition of MCs with both synchronous and asynchronous

components, the latter with a time constant of ~ 500 ms. Under these circumstances and

zero extracellular $[Mg^{2+}]_e$ GC NMDA receptors (NMDAR) were shown to provide postsynaptic

Ca^{2+} entry sufficient to trigger release of GABA from the GC spine (also in *Schoppa et al.*

1998). However, in normal $[Mg^{2+}]_e$ GABA release was mostly abolished by HVACC blockade

(*Isaacson 2001*; see Discussion).

(2) In spite of these functional demonstrations of recurrent inhibition and of substantial

ultrastructural evidence that GC spines onto MCs are usually reciprocal (e.g. *Price & Powell*

1970, Jackowski et al. 1978, Woolf et al. 1991), functional connectivity between individual

GCs and MCs has remained elusive: no reciprocal connectivity was reported from paired

recordings of MCs coupled to GCs so far (*Isaacson 2001, Kato et al 2013, Pressler &*

Strowbridge 2017) and others including our group have been unable to find connected GC →

MC pairs in the first place (see *Egger et al. 2003, Schoppa 2006*). This puzzling observation

indicates that paired recordings are not a suitable tool to investigate reciprocal release of

GABA.

Here we aim to determine whether – and possibly how - single inputs from MC lateral

dendrites to single GC spines can also trigger recurrent release of GABA from the reciprocal

synapse, using recordings from fluorescently labeled MCs and two-photon uncaging (TPU) of

glutamate along their lateral dendrite near Venus-tagged GC spines. TPU of glutamate

allows to study the operational mechanisms of the reciprocal microcircuit in single GC spines

without causing broader GC activation (*Bywalez et al. 2015*, see also Fig. S1). In this study

we use TPU at GC spines to investigate the reciprocal output by the GABAergic release

machinery via recording of IPSCs in mitral cells. Thus, processing within a single spine can

be disentangled in space and time from extended activation, in order to test the main

predictions from our previous study: The mini-neuron hypothesis along with the GC spine

spike phenomenon suggest that, just like in conventional axons, Na_v and ensuing HVACC

activation are required to cause release, and that unitary activation of the spine is sufficient

for triggering release.

While this concept is validated here, our study also reveals that presynaptic NMDARs gate

reciprocal output at the single-spine level. What is the advantage of such an arrangement

compared to classical neuronal processing? In olfactory coding, a large number of input

channels needs to be combined to synthesize an olfactory percept (e.g. *Mori et al. 1999,*

Murthy 2011). We propose that the mechanisms revealed here can explain the conspicuous

apparent lack of functional reciprocal connectivity mentioned above and, more importantly,

might allow reciprocal GC spines to play a central role in the efficient binding of changing

sets of activated input channels and their glomerular columns.

Results

Experimental configuration

To enable pharmacological interference with components of the reciprocal microcircuit such

as Na_vs and HVACCs, we bypassed release from the MC presynapse via TPU of DNI-caged

glutamate (DNI, see Methods; *Chiovini et al. 2014; Bywalez et al. 2015; Palfi et al. 2018*) in

acute juvenile rat olfactory bulb slices, while recording from MCs in somatic whole-cell

voltage-clamp. To visualize the lateral dendrites, MCs were filled with the dye Alexa594 (50

µM). Fig. 1A shows the recording configuration.

In all MC recordings we observed a high basal frequency of spontaneous events which is a

general hallmark of the olfactory bulb network *(Egger & Urban 2006)*. Wash-in of 1 mM DNI

further increased the basal frequency by on average 1.9 ± 1.2 times (mean value before DNI:

4.5 ± 2.1 Hz, n = 14 MCs, $P < 0.01$), due to the disinhibition resulting from a partial blockade

of $GABA_A Rs$ by DNI, which also reduced the mean spontaneous IPSC amplitude to a fraction

of 0.47 ± 0.16 of control (n = 14 MCs, $P < 0.001$, Fig. S1 A,B,C). In the presence of DNI, the

$GABA_A R$ antagonist bicuculline (BCC, 50 µM) blocked spontaneous activity almost

completely (frequency: 0.13 ± 0.10 of control, n = 6 MCs, $P < 0.01$, Fig. 1C, Fig. S1A).

Figure 1. **TPU-induced glutamatergic activation of GC spines triggers GABA release detected as**
uncaging-evoked reciprocal IPSCs (urIPSCs) in MCs.

(**A**) Experimental setting (scheme and image): Somatic whole cell voltage clamp recording from MC
filled with Alexa 594 (red, 50 μM) and TPU of DNI-caged glutamate (DNI; blue star) at GC spines in
VGAT-Venus rats (GCs green).

(**B**) Example of consecutive uncaging traces showing urIPSC responses (black) and failures (grey);
average of all recordings shown below (red).

(**C**) Effect of GABA$_A$R blockade (bicuculline, BCC, 50 μM, blue) on urIPSCs and spontaneous
activity. Top: Example experiment, showing averaged traces. Bottom: Cumulative data on urIPSC
amplitude (left panel, n =7 MCs) and on frequency of spontaneous IPSCs (right panel, n = 6 MCs).

(**D**) Analysis of asynchronous events. Top: Example trace from (B) with analysis intervals pre- and

post-uncaging (grey areas, black arrows). Counted events marked by blue arrowheads. Bottom:
Normalized IPSC event number and area (integrated activity, relative increase vs control Δ) in pre-
versus post-uncaging intervals (n = 27 MCs, see Methods).
(**E**) Properties of first detected triggered urIPSCs (see Methods). Left: Amplitudes (n = 32 MCs, V_m =
+10 mV). Dark grey: Amplitude distribution of spontaneous IPSCs for comparison (n = 14 MCs,
mean amplitudes). Middle: Release probabilities P_{r_GABA} (n = 44 MCs). Right: Latencies from TPU
onset (n = 36 MCs).
(**F**) Stability of urIPSC recordings. Left: Representative experiment showing individual urIPSC
amplitude values over consecutive stimulations (1 TPU per min). Insets: Averaged urIPSC responses
in the first (black, n = 3 responses) and last ten minutes (grey, n = 3 responses). Right: Comparison of
averaged normalized urIPSC amplitudes separated by 10 min interval (n = 7 MCs).
All Figures: Significance (non-parametric tests): n.s. not significant, * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P <$
0.001; mean data ± S.D.
139

Since in initial experiments we occasionally observed activation of both NMDA and AMPA

autoreceptors on MC dendrites at a holding potential of -70 mV, MCs were clamped to +10

mV in the main body of experiments, near the reversal potential of ionotropic glutamate

receptors (*Isaacson 1999; Friedman & Strowbridge 2000*). All experiments were performed

at physiological levels of $[Mg^{2+}]_e$ (1 mM).

Triggering of reciprocal IPSCs via TPU

To prevent overstimulation with glutamate, we uncaged with similar laser parameter settings

(see Methods) as in the previous study , in which TPU-evoked GC Ca^{2+} signals were

indistinguishable from those of unitary spontaneous or triggered synaptic inputs, including

their strict localization to the spine head (*Bywalez et al. 2015*), and routinely tested these

settings; to ensure similar laser power across experiments, uncaging sites were located at a

shallow depth no more than 20 – 30 µm below the surface of the tissue (see Methods). In

most experiments, uncaging was performed at one spot in the immediate vicinity of GC

spines that were visible in VGAT-Venus rats and in close proximity (0.2 – 0.5 µm) to the MC

lateral dendrite (e.g. Fig. 1A, 2A); in a few initial experiments in WT rats uncaging was

performed 'blindly' at up to four spots along the dendrite to increase the likelihood for

triggering a unitary response (e.g. Fig. 2B; 18% of experiments, see Methods). Responses

were detectable in ~ 30% of tested MCs (total n = 166 MCs, see Methods) and in this fraction

of MCs would occur only in a small subset of stimulations (see below, Fig. 1F), thus

overstimulation of the circuit appears unlikely. In addition, TPU-evoked signals can be

expected to be localized to the stimulated GC spine: there is no Ca^{2+} influx into the adjacent

dendritic shaft upon TPU, as we have shown in GC Ca^{2+} imaging experiments that were

performed previously (dye 100 µM OGB-1 ; average amplitudes ratio ∆F/F spine:dendrite

46:2 % ∆F/F, *Bywalez et al. 2015*) and also interleaved with the MC recordings in this study,

using a low-affinity dye (100 µM OGB-6F, ratio ∆F/F spine:dendrite 24:2, Ona Jodar et al.

2020). Finally we also tested via Ca^{2+} imaging, whether neighboring GC spines of the same

GC could sense uncaged glutamate (n = 11 spine pairs, average distance between

stimulated and non-stimulated spine 4.1 ± 2.2 µm, range 1.5 -6.8 µm, Fig. S1C, D, E). While

the mean amplitude $(∆F/F)_{TPU}$ in the stimulated spine set $(∆F/F)_{TPU}$ = 52 ± 22% was similar to

the data set in Bywalez et al. 2015 (P = 0.38, Mann-Whitney test), there were no detectable

Ca^{2+} transients in the non-stimulated spines (amplitude 2 ± 2 %, P < 0.002 versus stimulated

spine, Fig. S1C, D), and again there was no detectable Ca^{2+} transient in the dendrite in

between (mean 1 ± 2 %, Fig. S1C, D). All three compartments (stimulated and non-

stimulated spine heads, dendritic shaft) showed similar Ca^{2+} transients in response to

somatically evoked action potentials (Fig. S1D). There was no detectable influence of spine

head distance on the relative difference in signal size between stimulated and non-stimulated

spines (Fig. S1E). Thus in our paradigm TPU can be expected to act in a spine-specific

manner.

All uncaging spots were located proximally, at distances < 50 µm from the MC soma (Fig

S1F). The rationale for this choice was to minimize electrotonic attenuation, since IPSC

amplitudes were small (see above). Moreover, proximal stimulation and the use of VGAT-

Venus rats should prevent inadvertent stimulation of reciprocal synapses with other

interneuron types (see Introduction).

TPU of glutamate resulted in consecutive triggered responses and failures in MCs (Fig. 1B).

Responses were classified as triggered if they were observed repeatedly within the same

time window and showed similar kinetics (see Methods). Next we tested whether these

triggered responses were indeed GABAergic by applying the $GABA_A R$ antagonist Bicuculline

(BCC, 50 µM), which invariably blocked responses completely (Fig. 1C, n = 7 MCs, P < 0.01,

Wilcoxon test). Thus in the following the triggered events are denoted as urIPSCs (**u**ncaging-

evoked **r**eciprocal IPSCs).

The amplitude of triggered urIPSCs was on average 12 ± 8 pA (in n = 32 MCs clamped to

+10 mV, Fig. 1E), which is significantly smaller than the mean amplitudes of spontaneous

IPSCs (sIPSCs, n = 14 MCs; 22 ± 12 pA; P < 0.001, Mann-Whitney test, Fig. 1E, S1B). Since sIPSCs are highly likely to mainly originate from the reciprocal MC-GC circuit (see Discussion), this observation further argues against overstimulation with glutamate in our experiment.

The average release probability from the reciprocal spine was estimated as P_{r_GABA} = 0.34 ± 0.11 (Fig. 1E, range 0.13 - 0.60, based on n = 44 MCs, see Methods and Discussion). The latencies of urIPSPCs were not normally distributed (Fig. 1E), with a first peak within the first 10 ms post TPU onset (n = 13 MCs), a second peak around 30 ms (n = 19 MCs within the range 10-50 ms) and a yet more delayed tail (n = 3 MCs, see Fig. S1H and Discussion).

In most experiments we detected putative asynchronous urIPSCs following the first triggered event which were quantified via integral analysis and counting of events (Fig. 1D, see Methods and Discussion). Both area and number of events increased highly significantly in the 500 ms interval following TPU ('post') compared to the same interval right before ('pre'; mean increase of integrated activity ∆_area + 0.50 ± 0.55 relative to 'pre' value; mean increase in event number + 0.25 ± 0.37 relative to 'pre' value; n = 27 MCs, P < 0.001 for both; absolute values in 'pre' area 2.40 ± 1.83 pAs, event numbers 26.1 ± 14.9). ∆_area was also significantly increased if the extra area of the synchronous urIPSC was subtracted (P < 0.005). The total duration of recurrent inhibition was on average 179 ± 137 ms (range 32 – 533 ms, n = 26 MCs, Fig. S1G). Thus, asynchronous recurrent inhibition can be already triggered by single glutamatergic inputs.

Sufficient stability of urIPSC responses was established via long-term recordings (see Methods). The amplitudes of averaged responses during the first and last 5 - 10 photostimulations (with at least 10 min in between to mimic the time course of pharmacological manipulations, mean number of responses per averaged urISPC 2.8 ± 1.1) were not significantly different (Fig. 1F, n = 7 MCs, ratio last to first 0.95 ± 0.15,P = 0.74).

From all these experiments we conclude that local, unitary-like TPU of glutamate can stably trigger both fast and slow reciprocal release of GABA, providing proof that the reciprocal microcircuit can be activated by single synaptic inputs at physiological levels of Mg^{2+}.

Figure 2. The urIPSC is reduced by Na$_v$ blockade (TTX, 500 nM).
(**A, B**) Representative experiments showing a patch-clamped mitral cell (Alexa594 50 µM, red), the uncaging site(s) along a lateral dendrite (blue star) and below the corresponding uncaging traces with individual traces shown in grey, average control traces in red and average TTX traces indicated in blue (A: VGAT-Venus rat, single-site TPU, B: Wistar rat, multi-site TPU). The average traces contain all recordings, both with and without detected responses.
(**C**) Magnified illustration of traces in (A) (for control individual traces with urIPSC responses and their average, for TTX only average, color coding as above).
(**D**) Left: Cumulative normalized data showing the strong reduction of urIPSC amplitude during Na$_v$ blockade with TTX (n = 12 MCs). Diamonds indicate the experiments with no detectable response in the presence of the drug. Right: Comparison of normalized IPSC Δ_area between control and in the presence of TTX (see Methods, n = 10 MCs).

Sodium channel activation is required for most urIPSCs

Next, we investigated a possible contribution of the GC spine spike and thus Na$_v$ activation to

urIPSC generation. Fig. 2 illustrates that wash-in of TTX (500 nM) substantially reduced both

triggered and spontaneous events. On average, urIPSC amplitudes were reduced to a

fraction of 0.17 ± 0.34 of control (Fig. 2D, n = 12 MCs, P < 0.005, Cohen's d = 2.54; absolute

control amplitudes for -70 mV: -7.8 ± 3.6 pA, n = 5 MCs; for +10 mV: 15.4 ± 12.4 pA, n = 7

MCs), and the increase in integrated activity Δ_area was decreased to 0.28 ± 0.21 of its

control value (see Methods; Fig. 2D, n = 10 MCs, P < 0.005). While the frequency of

spontaneous activity was also strongly decreased in TTX, to a fraction of 0.24 ± 0.17 of

control (Fig. S2B, n = 10 MCs, P < 0.005), the mean sIPSC amplitude was unchanged by

TTX (1.36 ± 0.68 of control, n.s., n = 10 MCs, Fig. 2A,B, Fig. S2A, B). There was no

significant correlation between the TTX-induced reductions in sIPSC frequency and in

urIPSC amplitude (Fig. S2C, n = 10, r = 0.23, P = 0.26). Thus the reduction in urIPSC

amplitude is unlikely to be directly related to network effects of TTX.

Thus Na_vs are essential to trigger GABA release from the reciprocal spines.

251
Figure 3. Blockade of high voltage activated Ca^{2+}-channels by ω-conotoxin MVIIC (CTX, 1
μM) causes a prominent reduction of urIPSC amplitudes.
(**A, B**) Two representative experiments in brain slices from VGAT-Venus rat with the corresponding
MC (red), the site of TPU (blue star) and the uncaging traces according to the condition (individual
traces : grey, average control: red, average CTX: green). The average traces contain all recordings,
both with and without detected responses. Left: same cell as in Fig. 1B.
(**C**) Magnified illustration of traces in B (for control individual traces with urIPSC responses and their
average, for CTX only average, color coding as above).
(**D**) Left: Summary of effects of CTX on average normalized urIPSC amplitude (n = 8 MCs).
Diamonds indicate the experiments with no detectable response in the presence of the drug. Right:

Comparison of delta urIPSC areas normalized to control versus in the presence of CTX (n = 9 MCs).

High-voltage activated Ca^{2+} channels in the spine trigger GABA release

HVACCs have been implied to mediate recurrent release from reciprocal spines (*Isaacson*

2001) and are activated by Na$_v$s, contributing a substantial fraction to the total postsynaptic

Ca^{2+} signal in the GC spine (*Bywalez et al. 2015*). To directly test whether HVACC activation

is required for release of GABA, we blocked NPQ-type Ca^{2+} channels with 1 µM ω-conotoxin

MVIIC (CTX; *Bloodgood & Sabatini 2007; Bywalez et al. 2015*).

Fig. 3 shows the resulting substantial decrease of urIPSCs, to a fraction of 0.08 ± 0.14 of

control (from a mean amplitude of 11.3 ± 5.7 pA; n = 8 MCs, P < 0.005, Cohen's d = 6.6, Fig.

3D). This decrease was not different from the effect of TTX on urIPSC amplitude described

above (P = 0.35, ratios in CTX vs TTX). Δ_area decreased to 0.39 ± 0.23 of control (n = 9

MCs, P < 0.005, Fig. 3D), again statistically not different from the effect of TTX on Δ_area

described above (P = 0.15 vs TTX).

CTX decreased sIPSC frequency to a fraction of 0.53 ± 0.15 of control, less markedly than

TTX (Fig. 3E, n = 7 MCs, control vs CTX: P < 0.01; CTX vs TTX: P < 0.005), and had no

effect on the mean sIPSC amplitude (Fig. 3A,B; Fig. S3A, B; 1.00 ± 0.12 of control, n = 7

MCs, n.s.). There was no significant correlation between the CTX-induced reductions in

sIPSC frequency and in urIPSC amplitude (Fig. S3C, n = 7, r = -0.38, P = 0.19).

We conclude that HVACC activation is required for release of GABA from the reciprocal

spine following local input.

NMDA receptors are also relevant for recurrent release

NMDARs are known to substantially contribute to unitary synaptic transmission and to

postsynaptic Ca^{2+} entry at the MC to GC synapse (*Isaacson & Strowbridge 1998; Schoppa et*

al. 1998; Isaacson 2001; Egger et al. 2005). However, because of our previous observation

that NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} entry into GC spines did not depend on Na$_v$ activation (in

contrast to HVACC-mediated Ca^{2+} entry, *Bywalez et al. 2015*), and because of the strong

blocking effects of TTX or CTX on urIPSCs reported above, we expected that NMDAR

blockade would have only mild effects on fast recurrent release upon single inputs.

Intriguingly however, Fig. 4A-D shows that the application of 25 µM D-APV resulted in a

substantial decrease of urIPSC amplitudes, to on average 0.22 ± 0.21 of control (from a

mean amplitude of 13.8 ± 8.6 pA, n = 10 MCs, P < 0.002, Cohen's d = 3.7, Fig. 4D). All

individual experiments showed the amplitude decrease, albeit to a variable degree (range

0.00 - 0.68 of control). Δ_area following TPU decreased to 0.40 ± 0.28 of control (n = 10

MCs, P < 0.003, Fig. 4D). Both effects were statistically not different from the effects of either

TTX or CTX (amplitude: P = 0.12 and P = 0.08; Δ_area: P = 0.19 and P = 0.47).

298
Figure 4. NMDAR blockade with D-APV (25 μM) results in a strong reduction of urIPSC
amplitudes and also reduces AHPs following mitral cell APs
(**A, B**) Two representative uncaging experiments with the corresponding MC (red), the site of TPU
(blue star) and the uncaging traces according to the condition (individual traces: grey, average control:
red, average APV: dark grey); both VGAT-Venus. The average traces contain all recordings, both
with and without detected responses.
(**C**) Magnified illustration of traces in A (for control individual traces with urIPSC responses (grey)
and their average (red), for APV only average (dark grey)).
(**D**) Left: Summary of effects of APV on average normalized urIPSC amplitude (n = 10 MCs).
Diamonds indicate the experiments with no detectable response in the presence of the drug. Right:
Comparison of delta urIPSC integrals between control versus in the presence of APV (n = 10 MCs).
 (**E**) Representative example of MC AP evoked by somatic current injection in control conditions
(black trace) and in the presence of APV (grey trace) and added GBZ (20 μM; blue trace). Inset:
Magnified afterhyperpolarizations (AHPs)s.
(**F**) Left: Cumulative effects of APV on average normalized AHP amplitude (n = 18 MCs). Right:

Effect of occlusion experiments on AHP amplitude (APV before GBZ or GBZ before APV, n = 12
MCs).

While APV also substantially reduced sIPSC frequency, to 0.27 ± 0.23 of control (n = 10

MCs, P < 0.005, Fig. 4A, B; Fig. S4A, B), similar to TTX (P = 0.79) and significantly more

pronounced than CTX (P < 0.01), the mean sIPSC amplitude was unchanged (Fig. 4A, B;

Fig. S4A, B; 0.93 ± 0.29 of control, n = 10 MCs, P = 0.19). There was no positive correlation

between the APV-induced reductions in sIPSC frequency and urIPSC amplitude (Fig. S4C, n

= 10, r = -0.23, P = 0.26). Therefore network effects of APV are unlikely to explain the strong

reduction of urIPSC amplitude.

Since the strength of the effect of NMDAR blockade on urIPSCs was surprising to us, we

sought to provide another line of evidence for these findings in an experimental setting that

does not involve uncaging of glutamate (which might preferentially activate NMDARs, see

Discussion). The afterhyperpolarization (AHP) following single MC APs elicited by somatic

current injection was found to mainly reflect recurrent inhibition in brain slices from adult

mouse (*Nunes & Kuner 2018*), while in juvenile rat inhibitory synaptic contributions to the

AHP were observed to be less substantial but still detectable (on the order of 20-30% relative

to the K^+ channel-mediated component, *Dumenieu et al. 2015*). We used this paradigm to

test whether NMDAR blockade alone could interfere with recurrent inhibition (Fig. 4E, F).

Single MC AP AHPs (V_{hold} = -70 mV) had a mean amplitude $\Delta V_m = -$ 9.2 ± 2.2 mV (n = 18)

and a mean half duration $t_{1/2}$ = 43 ± 25 ms (n = 13). Fig. 4F shows that APV application

significantly reduced the mean AHP amplitude to a fraction of 0.86 ± 0.11 of control (P <

0.0001, Wilcoxon test, Cohen's d = 0.86; reduction in 17 of 18 MCs), while the half duration

was not changed (fraction of control 1.02 ± 0.42, P = 0.65, not shown). Next, to block

GABA$_A$Rs we turned to gabazine (GBZ, 20 μM), since Bicuculline might affect the K^+

channels that contribute to slow AHPs (*Khawaled et al. 1999, Dumenieu et al. 2015*). GBZ

alone caused a slightly stronger reduction than APV, which was not significantly different (to

0.71 ± 0.10 of control, n = 7 MCs, P = 0.08 vs APV, not shown). Occlusion experiments using

APV before GBZ or GBZ before APV did not result in any further reduction (0.97 ± 0.09 of

amplitude in presence of first drug, n = 12 MCs, P = 0.16, Fig. 4E, F). Thus these

experiments also support a substantial role of GC NMDARs for GABA release.

From these and the uncaging experiments we conclude that NMDARs located on GCs are

strongly involved in reciprocal release, even though prevention of HVACC activation (via Na_v

block or pharmacology) also blocks reciprocal release. What is the underlying mechanism?

The simplest explanation for a cooperation would be a summation of NMDAR- and HVACC-

mediated Ca^{2+} currents at the presynaptic Ca^{2+} sensor. For this scenario two requirements

need to be satisfied: (1) temporal overlap of Ca^{2+} currents and (2) spatial proximity of

NMDARs and HVACCs within the same microdomain.

Temporal overlap: Simulations of GC spine Ca^{2+} currents via HVACCs and NMDARs

In conventional glutamatergic synapses the NMDAR-mediated postsynaptic current is rising

rather slowly compared to the AMPAR-mediated component (rise time ~ 10 ms, *Lester et al.*

1990) and therefore the fractional NMDAR Ca^{2+} current seems at first an unlikely candidate

to make direct contributions to fast release. In the reciprocal GC spines however, Na_v

channels are locally activated, which enables fast and substantial NMDAR activation. Fig. 5A

shows a simulation of the postsynaptic NMDAR- and HVACC-mediated Ca^{2+} currents (based

on the detailed NEURON model described in *Aghvami et al. 2019*, see Methods) which

illustrates that the local AP causes a transient boosting of the NMDAR Ca^{2+} current because

of further relief of the Mg^{2+} block during the upstroke and overshoot of the spine spike.

According to the simulation this fast NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} spikelet begins even before the

HVACC-mediated current and tightly overlaps with it within > 1 ms. Thus HVACC- and

NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} currents could act in a cooperative manner at the Ca^{2+} sensor(s) that

mediate fast release of GABA, especially so, if the release probability was proportional to the

fourth power of local $\Delta[Ca^{2+}]$ or more as at other central synapses, and if the channels were

close enough to form a microdomain, allowing for an 'overlap bonus' (*Stanley 2016*; Fig. 5B).

In the temporal domain, this overlap was found to be highly robust against the variation of the

combined Na_v/K_v conductance, and increases in either AMPAR conductance g_{AMPA} or neck

resistance R_{neck} resulted in an earlier activation of both HVACC and NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+}

currents and even stronger overlap (Fig. 5C, see Methods). Decreases resulted at first in

little change and then a loss of the spine spike whereupon there is no more HVACC

activation. To illustrate specifically the contribution of the Na_v-mediated boosting of the

NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} current, we also calculated the overlap bonus for the HVACC-

mediated current as above and the NMDAR current in absence of the spine spike, which

indeed renders the cooperative effect negligible (Fig. 5B).

Figure 5. HVACC- and NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+}-currents overlap temporally in the wake of the spine spike. Simulated spine Ca^{2+}-currents and $(\Delta F/F)_{TPU}$

(**A**) Top panels: spine membrane potential V_m and Ca^{2+}-currents (parameters exactly as in *Aghvami et al. 2019*, their Fig. 2B, except for removed exogenous Ca^{2+} buffer). Bottom: Blow-up of NMDAR- and HVACC-mediated Ca^{2+}-currents, overlaid with the membrane potential V_m. Note the early onset of the NMDAR Ca^{2+}-current and its increase during the underlying local action potential. Red dotted line: NMDAR Ca^{2+}-current in the absence of Na_vs.

(**B**) The temporal coincidence creates an 'overlap bonus' with respect to local Ca^{2+} concentration and triggering of release: Fourth power of single and added Ca^{2+}-currents. Black dotted line: Addition of HVACC with NMDAR Ca^{2+}-current in the absence of Na_vs (purely hypothetical: pretending that HVACC was not affected, only the NMDAR Ca^{2+}-current).

(**C**) Robustness test for extent of overlap between NMDAR- and HVACC-mediated Ca^{2+}-current. Overlap is measured as the stretch of overlapping FWHMs of the current transients (Full Width Half Maxima, see Methods). Parameter variation within 50 - 200% of the nominal value of the neck resistance R_{neck}, the AMPAR conductance $gAMPA$ and the coupled Na_v/K_v conductance $g_{Na/K}$. Results are shown only for parameter runs with spine spike.

(**D**) Simulated fluorescence transients $\Delta F/F$ (in the presence of 100 μM OGB-1) show that the contribution of the Na_v-mediated boost of NMDAR Ca^{2+}-currents to the total NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} signal is almost negligible (see Discussion).

Spatial proximity: Ultrastructural evidence for presynaptic localization of NMDARs

For fast neurotransmitter release to occur, the current view is that Ca^{2+} entry needs to

happen in a proximity of 100 nm or less from the Ca^{2+} sensing part of the SNARE machinery

(reviewed in *Kaeser & Regehr 2014; Stanley 2016*). Therefore, to permit cooperation of Ca²⁺

influxes, NMDARs should be localized very close to or within the GABAergic presynapse.

Earlier electron microscopic (EM) studies had reported the presence of postsynaptic

NMDARs in GC spines and also instances of extrasynaptic labeling (*Sassoè-Pognetto &*

Ottersen 2000, Sassoè et al. 2003). To test for the presence of NMDARs near or within

GABAergic active zones, we analysed GC spine heads in ultrathin sections that were

immunogold-labeled with either GluN1 or GluN2A/B antibodies (Fig. 6A; see Methods); the

sections were selected for the presence of at least one asymmetric (i.e. glutamatergic)

contact and/or one symmetric (i.e. GABAergic) contact.

391
Figure 6. Ultrastructural analysis of the distribution of NMDARs shows their presence at both
post- and presynaptic GC spine membranes in reciprocal dendro-dendritic synapses.
(**A**) Representative micrographs of reciprocal dendrodendritic synapses labeled for GluN1 (A1, A2)
and GluN2A/B (A3, A4). Note that asymmetric MC-to-GC synapses (red arrows) are strongly labeled
and that symmetric GC-to-MC junctions (blue arrows) are also immunopositive. Gold particles are
usually not associated with non-synaptic plasma membrane domains of GC spines. The inset in panel
A2 illustrates the selection of non-synaptic membrane segments (black brackets), symmetric synapses
(blue) and asymmetric synapses (red).

(**B**) Frequency distribution of distances between symmetric and asymmetric synaptic profiles on the
same GC spine membrane (based on n = 60 micrographs with both types of profiles on the same
spine).
(**C**) Frequency distributions of labeling densities across synaptic (symmetric and asymmetric) and
non-synaptic membrane segments for GluN1 (thick lines, n = 120, 111, 138 segments, respectively)
and GluN2A/B (thin dotted lines, n = 46, 25, 24 segments, respectively). The arrows on the x-axis
indicate the mean density (GluN1: solid, GluN2A/B: open). Color code as in (A).
(**D**) Radial distribution of gold particles representing GluN1 (top panel) and GluN2A/B (bottom panel)
at asymmetric (red) and symmetric (blue) synapses. Particle numbers were normalized to the total
length of the respective synaptic segments. Absolute particle numbers see Results.

Interestingly, we observed that when both symmetric and asymmetric synaptic profiles were

visible in individual GC-MC dendrodendritic pairs, the two synaptic profiles were mostly either

contiguous (44% of n = 60 cases, examples Fig. 6A2,A3, cumulative plot Fig. 6B) or closer

than 100 nm (36% of cases). This finding implies that on both sides of the dendrodendritic

synaptic arrangement the postsynaptic specialization very often merges with presynaptic

release sites without interposition of non-synaptic membrane domains, and that therefore on

the GC side postsynaptic NMDARs can be located very closely to the GABAergic

presynapse.

Immunogold labeling for NMDARs was also frequently observed in symmetric contacts, albeit

at a lesser density compared to asymmetric contacts (Fig. 6A). To establish whether there is

an increased likelihood for the presence of NMDARs at symmetric contacts versus

extrasynaptic profiles, we compared the densities of labeling in non-synaptic membrane

segments of GC spines with those in symmetric synapses, and as a control in asymmetric

synapses. GC spines establishing synapses with MC dendrites were selected as described

(see Methods) and all discernible membrane segments within a spine were analysed. For

GluN1, there were 50 particles along 84.5 µm of 138 non-synaptic spine membrane

segments (mean 0.6 particles/µm), 70 particles along 32.7 µm of 120 symmetric profiles

(mean 2.1 particles/µm) and 394 particles along 28.6 µm of 111 asymmetric profiles (mean

13.8 particles/µm). Fig. 6C shows the density distributions across the three types of

membrane segments. The distribution of the density of gold particles at symmetric synapses

was significantly higher than the one in non-synaptic membrane (P = 0.000029, Kolmogorov-

Smirnov test). For GluN2A/B, the sample size was smaller, with 5 particles along 10.0 µm of

24 non-synaptic spine membrane segments (mean 0.5 particles/µm), 89 particles along 14.0

µm of 46 symmetric profiles (mean 6.4 particles/µm) and 96 particles along 6.1 µm of 25

asymmetric profiles (mean 15.7 particles/µm). Still, the density distribution at symmetric

synapses was significantly higher than the distribution at the non-synaptic membrane (P =

0.000048).

Interestingly, while the labeling densities for GluN1 and GluN2A/B were similar across non-

synaptic membranes and asymmetric synapses each (P = 0.99 and P = 0.81, respectively),

labeling of symmetric synapses was considerably stronger for GluN2A/B versus GluN1 (P =

0.00042). This difference might be due to a distinct receptor configuration and/or a better

accessibility of the GluN2 epitopes in the presynaptic symmetric membrane.

Finally, we analysed the radial distribution of particles across synaptic profiles for both

antibodies to establish whether labeling was predominantly associated with either the GC or

the MC membrane (Fig. 6D; see Methods). The distribution of both GluN1 and GluN2A/B

label at asymmetric synapses was similar, with a main peak just inside the postsynaptic GC

membrane and another peak within the synaptic cleft. Only a few gold particles were

localized beyond 20 nm on the MC side, suggesting that NMDARs are not expressed at

significant levels at the glutamate release sites on the MC membrane. Notably, the

distribution of gold particles at symmetric synapses mirrored the one at asymmetric

synapses, implying that labeling for NMDARs is predominantly associated with both the

presynaptic GABAergic and the postsynaptic glutamatergic membrane of GCs.

In summary, we conclude from these findings that NMDARs do play a direct presynaptic role

for GABA release from the reciprocal spine, albeit in cooperation with HVACCs (Fig.7). A

direct consequence of this conclusion is that any inhibitory output from a GC spine will

require the presence of glutamate and thus synaptic input to the respective spine (except

perhaps for GC action potential bursts), with far-ranging implications for the role of GC-

mediated lateral inhibition in early olfactory processing (see Discussion).

459
460
Figure 7 Cooperative release of GABA from the granule cell reciprocal spine
Depolarizing currents are indicated by black solid arrows and Ca^{2+} entry by green solid arrows. Upon
release of glutamate from the mitral cell dendrite, AMPARs get activated, leading to depolarization of
the spine, then activation of both post- and presynaptic NMDARs and Na_vs. The latter in turn drive
further depolarization, i.e. the spine spike, which both activates HVACCs and enhances Ca^{2+} entry via
NMDARs by additional relief of their Mg^{2+} block. HVACC- and presynaptic NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+}-
currents cooperate to promote recurrent release of GABA onto the mitral cell dendrite.
468

Discussion

Here we have demonstrated that mimicking unitary synaptic inputs via two-photon uncaging

of glutamate onto individual olfactory bulb GC spines can activate the entire microcircuit

within the spine, from the local spine spike to the release of GABA onto MC lateral dendrites,

proving the mini-neuron-like functionality of the reciprocal microcircuit. As in classical axonal

release, sequential Na_v channel and HVACC activation triggers output, which occurs on both

fast and slow time scales. Strikingly, however, presynaptic NMDA receptors are also found to

play a role for GABA release. These findings together with other prior knowledge allow to

make an educated guess regarding the specific function of reciprocal spines in bulbar

processing (see further below).

Properties of microcircuit operation and implications for coincident local and global activation

For the proximal reciprocal GC inputs investigated here we estimate that under physiological

conditions close to the MC resting potential the size of the fast IPSCs is on the order of -5

pA, after corrections for the partial $GABA_AR$ block by DNI and the setting of E_{Cl}. Thus,

assuming an *in vivo* MC input resistance of 100 MΩ (*Angelo & Margrie 2011*), an inhibitory

input from a single GC spine will exert a somatic hyperpolarization of at best 0.5 mV, and

therefore even proximal GC inputs will barely influence MC firing (*Fukunaga et al. 2014;*

McIntyre & Cleland 2016) - unless there is coordinated activity across GC spines connected

to the same MC dendrite, for example in the wake of an MC action potential during the

recurrent IPSP (see e.g. Fig. 4F) or during gamma oscillations (e.g. *Kay 2003; Lagier et al.*

2004).

Upon local activation we observed a GABA release probability P_{r_GABA} from the GC spine on

the order of 0.3. This value might represent an upper limit, because the global reduction of

inhibition by DNI could cause a homeostatic upregulation of P_{r_GABA} (e.g. *Rannals & Kapur*

2011), and the detection of connections is generally biased towards larger P_{r_GABA}. Moreover,

it might be developmentally further downregulated, since recurrent inhibition was shown to

decrease in older animals (*Dietz et al. 2011; Dumenieu et al. 2015*).

With $P_{r\_GABA} \approx 0.3$ and the probability for MC glutamate release on the order of $P_{r\_Glu} \approx 0.5 -$

0.75 (*Egger et al. 2005; Pressler & Strowbridge 2017*) the efficiency of the entire reciprocal

microcircuit can be estimated as $P_{reciprocal} = P_{r\_Glu} \cdot P_{r\_GABA} \approx 0.2$, possibly informing future

network models. The rather low P_{r_GABA} observed here also implies that GC spines are likely

to release with higher probabilities upon coincident non-local GC signalling (i.e. regional or

global Ca^{2+} or Na^{+} spikes), due to substantially increased ΔCa^{2+} in the spine as observed

previously (*Egger et al. 2005; Egger 2008; Aghvami et al. 2019; Mueller & Egger 2020)*.

Therefore we predict such coincident non-local activity to boost both recurrent and lateral

inhibition.

As to the minimal latency for recurrent GABA release, the temporal resolution of our

experiments is limited by the uncaging laser pulse duration (1 ms) and by the unknown exact

time course $V_m(t)_{SPINE}$ of the spine spike. Fig. 1E shows that the fastest urIPSCs were

detected within 2 ms from TPU onset, implying that there is a fast mechanism coupling Ca^{2+}

entry to release - in line with earlier findings of tight coupling between Ca^{2+} entry and GABA

release (using EGTA, *Isaacson, 2001*), and of a crucial role for Na_v channels (*Bywalez et al.*

2015; Nunes & Kuner 2018) – as also indicated by our simulations (Fig. 5A).

While ~ 30% of urIPSCs occurred within 10 ms post TPU onset, there was a substantial

fraction with longer latencies in the range of 10 - 30 ms and a few with even larger delays

(which might also correspond to false positives of our detection method). Again, since

$V_m(t)_{SPINE}$ is unknown, we cannot determine to what extent these urIPSCs were actually

asynchronous (if defined as release events that happen later than the fast coupling of HVA

presynaptic Ca^{2+} currents to the release machinery, e.g. *Kaeser & Regehr 2013)*. In any

case, substantial asynchronous release from the GC spine on yet longer time scales

(detected at up to 500 ms post TPU) was frequently observed, in line with earlier studies on

recurrent inhibition that localized the origin of asynchronous signalling within GCs (*Schoppa*

et al. 1998; Chen et al. 2000; Isaacson 2001). This time course of asynchronous release also

matches with the duration of physiological postsynaptic GC spine Ca^{2+} transients *(Ona-Jodar*

et al. 2020). Thus, the microcircuit can operate across a wide range of latencies, which might

contribute to glomerulus-specific GC global AP firing latencies (*Kapoor & Urban 2006*), and

also can generate combined synchronous and asynchronous output.

Na_v-mediated and NMDAR-mediated contributions to release

How is postsynaptic Ca^{2+} entry coupled to release of GABA within the GC spine? Previously

we had shown via occlusion experiments that Ca^{2+} entry via NMDARs occurs independently

from Ca^{2+} entry mediated by the Na$_v$-HVACC pathway, since AMPAR-mediated

depolarization on its own is strong enough to lift the Mg^{2+} block, probably due to boosting by

the high GC spine neck resistance *(Bywalez et al. 2015)*. Therefore, we initially hypothesized

that the Na$_v$-HVACC pathway would provide the sole trigger for fast release of GABA, as in

classical release from axons (see also *Nunes & Kuner 2018*), validating the notion of the GC

spine as an independent mini-neuron that can generate output via its own local AP. Indeed,

blockade of either Na$_v$ or HVACCs strongly reduced or abolished urIPSCs. However, in

subsequent experiments probing NMDAR contribution we observed that urIPSCs were also

massively reduced by blockade of NMDARs.

As a note of caution, activation of single GC spines via TPU might involve spurious activation

of extrasynaptic NMDARs. We had observed that TPU resulted in a slightly larger NMDA-

receptor mediated component of the postsynaptic Ca^{2+} signal than true synaptic activation

via glomerular stimulation (~ 65 % vs ~ 50% of ΔF/F, *Bywalez et al. 2015; Egger et al. 2005*).

Thus, at least part of the strong impact of NMDARs observed here might have been rooted in

their over-activation. Therefore, we investigated recurrent inhibition elicited by single MC

APs, and could demonstrate that NMDAR blockade alone (which does not prevent GC spine

spike generation, *Bywalez et al. 2015*) also reduces recurrent inhibition. This effect was

found to be mutually occlusive with the effect of GABA$_A$R blockade, arguing again in favor of

an essential role of NMDARs for GABA release and against systematic overstimulation in the

TPU experiments (see also Results, Methods).

Another interesting aspect of the strong influence of NMDARs on GC output is that this

property might serve to differentiate the MC↔GC microcircuit from the MC↔PV+ cell

microcircuit, since PV+ cells feature Ca^{2+}-permeable AMPARs and a probably absent

NMDAR component in response to MTC input (*Kato et al. 2013*). Thus, the urIPSC blockade

by APV observed here further argues in favor of a preferential activation of the MC↔GC

circuit by our experimental method.

In our earlier study of TPU-evoked Ca^{2+} signals in GC spines there was no obvious influence

of Na$_v$ activation on NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} entry (*Bywalez et al. 2015*). At first, this finding

might seem at variance with the simulations in Fig. 5 that demonstrate a boosting of early

NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} currents by the spine spike. However, the simulations also indicate

that this extra contribution is not substantial in terms of added $\Delta F/F$ under our experimental

conditions and therefore could not be detected (Fig. 5D). In line with the fast NMDAR-

mediated Ca^{2+} spikelet, *Kampa et al. (2004)* have shown that the earlier the postsynaptic

membrane is depolarized after glutamate release, the more efficiently NMDARs will be

activated. These observations are of general importance in the context of spike-timing

dependent plasticity and electrical compartmentalization of spines (e.g. *Grunditz & Oertner*

2004, Tonnesen & Nägerl 2016).

How exactly do NMDARs now effect release? The Na_V/NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} spikelet

results in substantial and fast coincident activation of NMDARs and HVACCs, and our

ultrastructural evidence for presynaptic NMDARs implies that indeed these currents can feed

into the same presynaptic microdomain (see Results). This overlap bonus at the presynaptic

Ca^{2+} sensor (as predicted by the simulations) could thus explain the observed cooperative

signalling of HVACCs and NMDARs; further investigations are required to consolidate or

replace this hypothesis.

Direct involvement of presynaptic NMDARs in GABA release

Presynaptic actions of NMDARs at specific subsets of both glutamatergic and GABAergic

synapses have recently received attention (reviewed *in Bouvier et al. 2015; Banerjee &*

Paulsen 2016). Presynaptic NMDARs have been shown to play a role in plasticity induction

(e.g. *Duguid & Smart 2004*) or in modulation of basal synaptic transmission, where effects

are mostly observed upon repetitive transmitter release (e.g. *McGuiness et al. 2010*). In the

cerebellum, presynaptic NMDARs are also involved in enhancing spontaneous release of

GABA (*Glitsch & Marty 1999*), with similar observations for extrasynaptic NMDA receptors on

retinal A17 amacrine cells (V*eruki et al. 2019*). However, to our knowledge direct triggering of

release via presynaptic NMDARs during unitary transmission has not been observed so far,

adding another pathway to the already highly diverse signalling downstream of NMDARs.

The observed cooperation between Na_V/HVACCs and NMDARs relates our study back to the

initial studies on dendrodendritic recurrent inhibition (DDI), when it was concluded by several

groups that NMDARs can contribute directly to release from the reciprocal spine upon

extended release of glutamate from the MC dendrite (see Introduction), and *Schoppa et al.*

(1998) already speculated that this presynaptic function might be related to either Ca^{2+} entry

or depolarization. However, the relative contribution of NMDARs has been under debate and it was demonstrated that under physiological conditions HVACC activation would be the dominant release trigger (*Isaacson 2001*). While the standard DDI protocol, using 20-50 ms long depolarizations, would evoke recurrent inhibition also in the presence of TTX (possibly even enhanced, *Halabisky et al. 2000*), it was reported that recurrent inhibition in response to shorter steps (< 5 ms) is substantially smaller than for the long step and reduced in TTX (*Schoppa et al. 1998; Halabisky et al. 2000*). In view of our above results, the standard DDI protocol is likely to recruit NMDAR-dependent pathways for triggering GABA release via prolonged release of glutamate and subsequent summation of EPSPs in GC spines, whereas short steps are more likely to trigger release via the GC spine spike. Thus, the cooperation of NMDARs and HVACCs reconciles these earlier findings.

Reciprocal inhibition and spontaneous inhibitory activity

Spontaneous IPSCs are likely to predominantly originate from the more proximal lateral MC dendrites (*Arnson & Strowbridge 2017*). The slightly larger mean amplitude of sIPSCs compared to the triggered urIPSCs observed here might be explained by perisomatic inhibitory contacts onto MCs, e.g. from type S GCs (*Naritsuka et al. 2009*). All three antagonists of urIPSC generation (TTX, CTX, APV) were found to also substantially reduce sIPSC frequency but not sIPSC amplitude. For Na_v blockade, strong effects on MC sIPSC frequencies but not amplitude were reported also elsewhere (e.g. *Saghatelyan et al. 2005, Arnson & Strowbridge 2017*) and are expected because of the blockade of both spontaneous MC firing and the GC spine spike. The effect of HVACC blockade was less pronounced than that of Na_vs, probably because spontaneous MC firing is less affected.

The substantial effect of NMDAR blockade on spontaneous IPSC frequencies was also observed in other olfactory bulb studies (*Wellis & Kauer 1993; Schmidt & Strowbridge 2014; but see Chen et al. 2000*). Several factors might contribute: (1) the long-lasting depolarizations in MCs that are enhanced by NMDAR activation (*Carlson et al. 2000*), (2) the presence of MC NMDA autoreceptors (*Sassoé-Pognetto et al. 2003*), and (3) the crucial role of NMDARs for reciprocal release from the GC spine reported here, thus any spontaneous release of glutamate from MCs is unlikely to trigger recurrent IPSCs in the presence of APV.

Functional role of presynaptic NMDARs in GC spines: Linking coactive glomerular columns?

While a presynaptic contribution of NMDARs to GABA release from GCs was already demonstrated earlier (see above), our findings imply that not only **can NMDAR activation trigger GABA release, it is actually necessary,** also in the presence of a Na_v-mediated spine spike. This observation is very intriguing for several reasons, that we will briefly discuss here:

(1) Role of granule cell APs for release from the reciprocal spine.

Notwithstanding the precise site of AP generation in GCs, any AP will propagate along the GC dendrite and into the reciprocal spines perfectly well (*Egger et al. 2003, Pressler & Strowbridge 2019*). The ensuing spine depolarization $V_m(t)_{SPINE}$ will resemble that of the spine spike (see also *Aghvami et al. 2019*) which on its own, with NMDARs blocked, according to our findings above cannot trigger GABA release. Therefore, any type of non-local GC AP is rather unlikely to cause release of GABA by itself. This consequence explains the lack of functional evidence for GC → MC transmission in coupled MC → GC pairs, because APs elicited in the GC will not result in GABA release and thus no inhibition will be exerted on the coupled MC (see Introduction).

It should be noted that extracellular stimulation of the GC layer can elicit MC inhibition, even in the presence of APV (*e.g. Chen et al 2000, Egger et al. 2003, Arevian et al. 2008*). Possible explanations might be either that there is some small remaining probability for GABA release from spiking GCs in the absence of glutamate, or that this type of stimulation activates some as of yet unknown inhibitory input to MCs, e.g. via deep short-axon cells or axons of EPL interneurons (*Nagayama et al. 2014, Burton 2017*).

(2) Role of GC-mediated lateral inhibition between MCs.

It is known by now that broad, far-range lateral inhibition between MCs within the EPL is mediated by other interneurons than GCs (see Introduction). Thus, GCs are unlikely to dominate bulbar lateral inhibition in terms of magnitude, i.e. total charge transfer, a view that is also supported by other recent studies (*Fukunaga et al. 2014, Geramita & Urban 2017*). What then is the function of GC-mediated lateral inhibition?

As a consequence of the requirement of presynaptic NMDAR activation, we predict that

there will be no or at best very little GC-mediated lateral inhibition upon activation of a

single glomerular column, even if some columnar GCs fire APs or dendritic Ca^{2+} spikes

(which is fairly likely, *Mueller and Egger 2020*). We propose that GC-mediated **lateral**

inhibition happens predominantly across coactive columns. Thus the discovered

mechanism would allow GCs to perform lateral inhibition 'on demand', selectively on co-

active MCs, providing directed, dynamically switched lateral inhibition in a sensory

system with large numbers of receptor channels. GC-mediated lateral inhibition might

therefore participate in synthesizing the olfactory percept at the level of the bulb from the

individual olfactory receptor channels, most likely via MC synchronization in the gamma

band (e.g. *Laurent et al. 1996, Kashiwadani et al. 1999, Schoppa 2006, Brea et al 2009,*

Li et al. 2015, Peace et al. 2017), while at the same time preventing unnecessary energy

expenditure (i.e. if GABA release would happen from all reciprocal spines of an activated

GC). More importantly, inactive columns will remain sensitive for new stimuli or changing

components because they are not inhibited by active columns.

There is substantial prior evidence in the literature for both the activity-dependence and

NMDAR-dependence of GC-mediated lateral inhibition (*Arevian et al., 2008*). NMDAR

blockade is routinely used to dissect lateral inhibition in the glomerular layer from GC-

mediated lateral inhibition (*Shao et al. 2012, Najac et al. 2015, Geramita & Urban 2017*).

Yet more importantly, in *in vivo* MC recordings there was a subset of MCs that responded

exclusively with inhibition to odor activation, mediated via glomerular layer neurons

(*Fukunaga et al., 2014, their Fig 4 and 7*). Since there was no odor-evoked activity in

these MCs, our results imply that the presynaptic GC NMDARs could not be activated,

preventing GABA release from GCs.

As to behavioural evidence for our hypothesis, both GC NMDARs and Na_vs are known to

play a role specifically in discriminations between binary odorant mixtures in mice, since

in the same behavioral paradigm GC-specific knock-down (in about ~ 50% of GCs) of the

NMDAR-subunit GluN1 resulted in an increase in discrimination time of on average ~ 60

ms, and knock-down of Na_vs of ~ 85 ms versus control, while discriminations between

pure odors were not affected (*Abraham et al., 2010; Nunes & Kuner 2018*). These similar

effects are in line with our findings, since both modifications should prevent both

recurrent and lateral inhibition. However, the relative impact of recurrent inhibition versus

lateral inhibition is not known.

Conclusion: Hypothesis on the purpose of the reciprocal spine

In summary, our findings suggest that reciprocal spines allow the granule cell to selectively

interact with coactive glomerular columns. Thus, the reciprocal spine might be a circuit motif

that specifically enables efficient binding of dispersed olfactory representations, a coding task

that this sensory modality needs to perform due to its large number of receptors. In other

words, reciprocal spines with their unique synaptic arrangement and functionality, including

spine spikes and presynaptic NMDARs, are likely to represent a special adaptation to the

demands of sensory processing in the bulb. Of course, at this point this is a hypothesis that

awaits further exploration via e.g. network simulations and in vivo approaches. Another

intriguing yet more speculative potential function of target-activity-dependent output is that

concurrent preactivation from glutamatergic cortical inputs onto reciprocal spines

(ultrastructure in *Price & Powell 1970*) can also enhance lateral inhibition in addition to

providing feed-forward inhibition, potentially allowing for a top-down projection of olfactory

templates as has been proposed by *Zelano et al. (2011)*.

Methods

Animal handling, slice preparation and electrophysiology

Animals used in our experiments were juvenile Wistar or VGAT-Venus transgenic rats (VGAT-Venus /w-Tg(SLc32a1-YFP*)1Yyan) of either sex (P11 – P19). VGAT-Venus transgenic rats are based on mouse BAC transgenic lines. They were generated by Drs. Y. Yanagawa, M. Hirabayashi and Y. Kawaguchi at the National Institute for Physiological Sciences, Okazaki, Japan, using pCS2-Venus provided by Dr. A. Miyawaki (*Uematsu et al., 2008*), RRID: RGD_2314361. In this rat line, fluorescent Venus protein is preferentially expressed in cells carrying the vesicular GABA transporter (VGAT), i.e. GABAergic neurons: the localization of Venus-labeled cells across OB layers was found to be similar to that of GABA-positive cells; direct colocalization in the cortex yielded an overlap of 97% (*Uematsu et al., 2008*).

Sagittal olfactory bulb brain slices (thickness 300 µm) were prepared in ACSF (composition see below) following procedures in accordance with the rules laid down by the EC Council Directive (86/89/ECC) and German animal welfare legislation. Slices were incubated in a water bath at 33°C for 30 min and then kept at room temperature (22°C) until recordings were performed.

Olfactory bulb mitral cells were visualized by gradient contrast and recorded from in whole cell voltage clamp mode (at -70 mV or +10 mV) or current clamp mode. Recordings were made with an EPC-10 amplifier and Patchmaster v2.60 software (both HEKA Elektronik, Lambrecht/Pfalz, Germany). Experiments were performed at room temperature (22°C). Patch pipette resistance ranged from 5-6-MΩ. Mitral cells clamped at -70 mV were filled with intracellular solution containing the following substances (in mM): (1) tip solution: 130 K-Methylsulfate, 10 HEPES, 4 MgCl2, 2 Ascorbic acid, 10 Phosphocreatine-di-tris-salt, 2.5 Na2ATP, 0.4 NaGTP (2) backfilling solution: 110 Cs-Chloride, 10 HEPES, 10 TEA, 4MgCl2, 2 Ascorbic acid, 10 5-N-(2,6-dimethylphenylcarbamoylmethyl) triethylammonium bromide (QX-314, Sigma), 0.2 EGTA, 10 Phosphocreatine, 2.5 Na2ATP, 0.4 NaGTP, 0.05 Alexa 594 (Ca^{2+} indicator, Thermofisher Scientific, Waltham. Massachusetts, US), at pH 7.3. Mitral cells clamped at + 10 mV contained internal solution composed of: 125 Cs-methanesulfonate, 1

NaCl, 0.5 EGTA, 10 HEPES, 3 MgATP, 0.3 NaGTP, 10 Phosphocreatine-di-Tris-salt, 10 QX-314, 0.05 Alexa 594, at pH 7.3.

For current clamp experiments in either MCs or GCs the internal solution contained: 130 K-Methylsulfate, 10 HEPES, 4 MgCl2, 2 Ascorbic acid, 10 Phosphocreatine-di-Tris-salt, 2.5 Na2ATP, 0.4 NaGTP. Single APs were evoked by somatic current injection (3 ms, 1 nA) and in MCs 5 APs were elicited for every recording condition. MCs with leak currents > 200 pA and GCs with leak currents > 50 pA (at V_{hold} = - 70 mV) were discarded. For MCs, we chose a hyperpolarized holding potential in order to reduce the activation of NMDA autoreceptors on MC lateral dendrites.

The extracellular ACSF was bubbled with carbogen and contained (in mM): 125 NaCl, 26 NaHCO$_3$, 1.25 NaH$_2$PO$_4$, 20 glucose, 2.5 KCl, 1 MgCl$_2$, and 2 CaCl$_2$. The following pharmacological agents were bath-applied in some experiments: bicucculline (BCC, 50 µM, Sigma-Aldrich), ω-conotoxin MVIIC (CTX, 1 µM, Alomone, Jerusalem, Israel), TTX (500 nM, Alomone), D-APV (25 µM, Tocris), gabazine (GBZ, 20 µM, Tocris). In pharmacological experiments we waited for 10 minutes after wash-in of the drugs TTX, APV resp. CTX. In CTX experiments 1mg/ml cyctochrome C was added to the ACSF. TTX voltage clamp experiments were conducted at clamping potentials of -70 mV (n = 5 MCs) or + 10 mV (n = 7 MCs), whereas all CTX and APV voltage clamp experiments were conducted at + 10 mV.

Combined two-photon imaging and uncaging

Imaging and uncaging were performed on a Femto-2D-uncage microscope (Femtonics, Budapest, Hungary). Two tunable, Verdi-pumped Ti:Sa lasers (Chameleon Ultra I and II respectively, Coherent, Santa Clara, CA, USA) were used in parallel. The first laser was set either to 900 nm for simultaneous excitation of YFP and Alexa 594 in one channel for visualization of spines and the MC for urIPSC recordings (or the GC for uEPSP recordings), and the second laser was set to 750 nm for uncaging of caged glutamate. The two laser lines were directly coupled into the pathway of the microscope with a polarization cube (PBS102, Thorlabs Inc, Newton, NJ, USA) and two motorized mirrors. As caged compound we used DNI-caged glutamate (DNI; Femtonics). DNI was used in 1 mM concentration in a closed perfusion circuit with a total volume of 12 ml. Caged compounds were washed in for at least 10 minutes before starting measurements. The uncaging laser was switched using an

electro-optical modulator (Pockels cell model 350-80, Conoptics, Danbury, CT, USA). The

emitted fluorescence was split into a red and a green channel with a dichroic mirror.

<u>Triggering of mitral cell reciprocal IPSCs</u>

The region of interest on a proximal lateral MC dendrite was moved to the center of the

scanning field. In some initial experiments, four uncaging spots were placed in close

apposition along the lateral MC dendrite in case of 'blind' uncaging (n = 8 out of total number

of successful experiments in n = 44 MCs). In most experiments, a single uncaging spot was

positioned near the region of interest, using YFP fluorescence of GABAergic cells in VGAT-

Venus rats as an optical guide to identify potential synaptic contacts between MC lateral

dendrites and GC spines.

The parameter settings for two-photon uncaging were as established previously on the same

experimental rig for precise mimicking of unitary synaptic Ca^{2+} transients in GC spines

(*Egger et al. 2005; Bywalez et al. 2015*). These parameter settings were routinely verified in

parallel test experiments, where we imaged Ca^{2+} transients in GC spines following TPU (as

in *Bywalez et al. 2015)*. The uncaging site was usually chosen within the top 10-30 µm below

the slice surface (since otherwise the visibility of spines in the Venus-VGAT rats was

compromised) and the uncaging power was adjusted to the depth of the uncaging site,

corresponding to a laser power of approximately 15 mW at the uncaging site (*Sobczyk et al.*

2005). The uncaging beam was positioned at ~ 0.2 - 0.5 µm distance from the MC

dendrite/GC spine head. The uncaging pulse duration was 1 ms. The scanning position was

readjusted if necessary before each measurement to account for drift. The microscope was

equipped with a 60x Nikon Fluor water immersion objective (NA 1.0; Nikon Instruments,

Tokyo, Japan). The microscope was controlled by MES v.5.3190 software (Femtonics). To

prevent overstimulation, the uncaging laser power was **not** increased if there was no

detectable response to the preset laser power (based on depth). While we cannot exclude

overstimulation per se, we would like to argue that systematic overstimulation is unlikely to

have occurred based on the following observations (see also Results):

- size of urIPSCs as compared to spontaneous activity (Fig. 1E)

- low reciprocal release probability from the spine (Fig. 1E)

- no extended asynchronous release compared to the classical experiments on

recurrent inhibition (mean total duration of TPU-evoked recurrent inhibition ~ 200 ms,

Fig. S1G, vs a mean half duration ~ 500 ms in e.g. *Schoppa et al. 1998, Isaacson*

2001)

- no evidence for toxicity in our stability experiments (Fig. 1F)

- main finding of dependency of recurrent inhibition on NMDAR activation confirmed by

method that does not involve uncaging

Uncaging stability

To test for the stability of uncaging evoked recurrent IPSCs in MCs, uncaging at a dendritic

region of interest was performed. If repeated uncaging led to the apparent occurrence of

urIPSCs within the same time window (see below for analysis details), the stability

measurement was continued by either uncaging 30 times in total with a frequency of 0.033

Hz (every 30 s) or 5 times in a row with 0.033 Hz followed by a 10 min break (to mimic the

time for wash-in of pharmacological compounds) and another round of uncaging (5x,

0.033Hz). urIPSC amplitudes were taken from averages of the first 5 – 10 and the last 5 – 10

uncaging sweeps and statistically compared with each other.

Uncaging onto nearby GC spines

For the control experiments where we tested whether adjacent GC spines could sense the

glutamate uncaged at an individual spine (Fig S1C, D, E), uncaging was performed as

described above and in (*Bywalez et al. 2015)* near a spine head of a GC filled with 100 µM

OGB-1 and 50 µM Alexa594 in whole-cell current clamp mode. Ca^{2+} imaging was perfomed

using a line scan through the spine head activated by TPU, the adjacent spine head and the

dendritic shaft in between.

Electrophysiology: Data analysis and statistics

Electrophysiological data were analysed with custom written macros in Igor pro

(Wavemetrics, Lake Oswego, OR, USA). Additional sIPSC and urIPSC analysis was

performed using the MiniAnalysis program (Synaptosoft, Decature, GA, USA) and Origin

(Northampton, MA, USA).

<u>Detection of urISPCs</u> Due to the high spontaneous activity, in order to test for the presence

of a signal we performed first an area and event analysis of IPSC traces (see below and Fig.

1D); if a signal was detected based on these analyses, we went on to search for individual

triggered urIPSCs by visual inspection of an overlay of the recorded traces. Individual IPSCs

were considered as uncaging-evoked when they repetitively occurred within the same time

window (width 3 ± 2 ms, n = 35 MCs) after uncaging and had similar kinetics (indicating a

similar location of the respective input on the MC dendrite). Signal types ranged from single

urIPSC events to barrages of urIPSCs lasting tens to hundreds of ms. The release probability

P_{r_GABA} was estimated based on 5 – 30 TPU samplings with a mean of 7.5 ± 1.7 stimulations

(n = 44 MCs).

<u>Area analysis</u> The area was measured in individual traces as the integrated activity above

baseline for a 500 ms pre-uncaging baseline window and for a 500 ms post-uncaging

window, in order to screen for the presence of a signal (Fig. 1D). The 500 ms extent of the

time windows was validated by our measurements of averaged barrage duration (see Fig.

S1G).

Delta (∆) area values were calculated by subtracting the area of the 500 ms pre-uncaging

baseline window ('pre') from the 500 ms post-uncaging window ('post'), in order to isolate the

amount of uncaging-evoked inhibitory activity from spontaneous activity. If this procedure

was applied to averaged traces and the result was negative, the ∆_area value was set to

zero (i.e. no uncaging-evoked activity). While this procedure might still generate false

positives due to spontaneous bursts of activity in the post-uncaging window, it also prevents

a spurious cancelling of activity (false negative) that otherwise might happen upon averaging

∆_area across an entire set of experiments. ∆_area values for pharmacological conditions

were normalized to control ∆_area in order to assess the net effect of drugs on uncaging-

evoked inhibitory activity (Fig. 2D, 3D, 4D).

<u>Event analysis</u> Within the individual recorded traces, the peak time points of individual IPSCs

were analysed. Peak search parameters in MiniAnalysis were adjusted in order to detect

potentially all IPSCs within a trace. For detailed spontaneous IPSC amplitude analysis,

IPSCs were sorted manually after the automated peak search and discarded if the amplitude

exceeded less than 5 pA and/or the IPSC onset was not be detected properly. Event counts

were averaged for the 500 ms pre-uncaging and the 500 ms post-uncaging windows,

respectively.

<u>Evaluation of effects of pharmacological agents</u> For determining drug effects, the averaged

urIPSC amplitudes were scaled down by the ratio of number of responses to total number of

trials, both in control and drug condition, in order to account also for changes in release

probability. If no single responses/urIPSCs could be detected anymore in the presence of

TTX, CTX or APV according to the criteria described above, we measured the mean

amplitude of V_m above baseline in the averaged response at the time point of the maximal

response amplitude in control condition. If this value was below 0, the response size was set

to 0 pA. If the value was larger than 0, we interpreted it as average drug response amplitude

including failures and thus did not scale it. This conservative method prevents false

negatives due to lacking sensitivity in individual trials in the presence of the drug.

<u>Detection of spontaneous activity</u> Spontaneous IPSCs were recorded prior to wash-in of DNI,

in the presence of DNI and in the presence of each pharmacological compound. For each

condition, data were analysed for a total duration of 20 s of recordings.

<u>Analysis of afterhyperpolarizations</u> All stable MC AP recordings within either baseline or drug

condition(s) were averaged (n = 5 recordings each). If between the conditions the holding

membrane potential changed by more than 0.3 mV, or the time course (onset of upstroke

relative to onset of step depolarization, width) and/or the amplitude of the AP changed by

more than 15% from their baseline values, the experiment was discarded. If single individual

recordings showed such variations, they were not included in the average. For each average,

the AHP amplitude was measured as the maximal negative deflection of the membrane

potential from the resting membrane potential.

Simulations

The simulations are based on a published compartmental model in NEURON (Aghvami et

al., 2019, ModelDB entry 244687). This model uses the 5-state gating model for NMDA

receptors (*Destexhe et al. 1998*), while the HVACC model is adopted from *Hemond et al.*

2008, with adjustments based on own Ca^{2+} current recordings (see *Aghvami et al. 2019*). For

the simulations shown in Fig. 5, there was no exogenous Ca^{2+} buffer included except for

panel D where fluorescence transients were simulated in the presence of 100 µM of the

Ca^{2+}-sensitive dye OGB-1 in order to emulate the experimental situation from *Bywalez et al.*

2015.

As a readout measure for the temporal overlap between I_{Ca_NMDAR} and I_{Ca_HVACC} we first

determined the FWHM (full width half maximum) for each current and then the interval within

which the two FWHMs overlapped. At this point, we focussed on temporal relationships and

did not account for current amplitudes or integrals, since Ca^{2+} concentration changes within

nanodomains cannot be properly simulated in NEURON and thus spine Ca^{2+} current

amplitudes are of limited meaning. We tested for the robustness of this measure

against variation of those model parameters that are crucially involved in the generation of

the spine spike, i.e. the resistance of the spine neck (R_{neck}), the conductance of AMPA

receptors (g_{AMPA}) and the voltage-gated sodium channel conductance (varied in proportion to

the potassium channel conductance, $g_{Na/K}$). Their nominal values in the GC model are 1.7

GΩ, 2000 pS and 0.5 S/cm^2 respectively. Each parameter was varied between up to 200% of

the nominal value, and down until no spine spike was generated any more.

Immunogold labeling and electron microscopy

Immunogold labeling was performed on cryosubstituted rat olfactory bulbs (n = 4 animals, 3

months old), that had been used previously; for further details on the fixation, embedding and

immunogold labeling procedure see (*Sassoè-Pognetto & Ottersen, 2000; Sassoè-Pognetto*

et al., 2003).

To maximize detection of the GluN1 subunit, we used a combination of two rabbit antisera as

described in *Sassoè-Pognetto et al. (2003)*. One antiserum (kindly donated by Anne

Stephenson) binds an extracellular domain (amino acid residues 17–35) common to all splice

variants of the GluN1 subunit (*Chazot et al. 1995; Racca et al. 2000*). The other antiserum

was raised against a C-terminal domain and recognizes four splice variants (Chemicon,

Temecula, CA; catalog No. AB1516).

For GluN2, we used a affinity-purified rabbit antibody raised against a synthetic peptide

corresponding to the C-terminus of the GluN2A subunit conjugated to BSA (Chemicon, cat.

no. AB1548). According to the manufacturer, this antibody recognizes the GluN2A and

GluN2B subunits in Western blot analysis of transfected cells.

Ultrastructure data analysis and statistics

Grid squares were analysed systematically for the presence of synaptic profiles (symmetric

and/or asymmetric) between GC spines and MC dendrites (Fig. 6; see also Fig. 1A in

Sassoè-Pognetto & Ottersen 2000). Synaptic profiles were then photographed at high

magnification (75.000 - 120.000x) with a side-mounted CCD camera (Mega View III,

Olympus Soft Imaging System). The plasma membrane of GC spines, when clearly visible,

was classified as either belonging to an asymmetric synaptic profile, a symmetric profile, or a

non-synaptic segment (see Fig. 6A2 for examples). The length of segments was measured

along the spine membrane curvature (using ImageJ 1.52 analysis software) and the number

of immunogold particles within a distance of $\leq$ 30 nm from the GC spine membrane was

counted for the individual segments. The lengths of non-synaptic segments were on average

longer than those of synaptic segments, which argues against an undersampling of gold

particle densities in non-synaptic membranes compared to synaptic membranes and thus a

false positive difference between the density distribution in non-synaptic membranes and

symmetric profiles (GluN1: mean non-synaptic segment length: 610 ± 400 nm, n = 138;

symmetric synaptic profiles: 270 ± 120 nm, n = 120; asymmetric synaptic profiles: 260 ± 110

nm, n = 111; similar results for GluN2, not shown). When both symmetric and asymmetric

synaptic profiles were visible in the same individual spine, the distance of such reciprocal

contacts was also measured along the curvature of the GC spine membrane.

The distribution of labeling along the axis perpendicular to the GC spine membrane (radial

axis) was determined by examining micrographs of transversely cut synaptic profiles, with

well defined presynaptic and postsynaptic membranes. Here all particles at distances up to

40 nm were counted to prevent a possible bias.

Statistical tests

All replicates were biological, i.e. physiological experiments were repeated in different cells

and ultrastructural analyses were conducted in different samples. Since sample sizes were

too small to test for the normal distribution of data and the main type of experiment was novel

(i.e. two-photon uncaging of glutamate on spines and detection of reciprocal IPSCs), all

electrophysiological data were analysed with non-parametric paired (*Wilcoxon matched*

pairs, e.g. for comparing data before and after washin of a drug) or unpaired (*Mann-Whitney-*

U, for comparing effects of different drugs) tests and expressed as mean ± SD. Based on the

properties of these tests and our long-term experience with non-parametric testing (since *Egger et al. 2003*), we used a sample size of at least n = 7 for control type experiments (e.g, stability of urIPSC recordings) and n = 10 for core experiments (effects of Na_v and NMDAR blockade). For the main findings, effect sizes (Cohen's d) were calculated using G*Power (3.1, https://www.psychologie.hhu.de/arbeitsgruppen/allgemeine-psychologie-und-arbeitspsychologie/gpower.html). The density distributions of immunogold particles were compared with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which also does not make prior assumptions on the nature of data distributions (https://www.wessa.net/rwasp_Reddy-Moores%20K-S%20Test.wasp).

Author contributions

VLR performed all uncaging experiments with MC recordings. LZ performed MC current clamp recordings. MM performed supplementary MC recordings and granule cell uncaging experiments. VLR, GB, MM, MSP and VE analyzed data. SSA performed simulations. VE and VLR designed research and wrote the manuscript, with MSP contributing to the parts on ultrastructure. BR provided DNI-caged glutamate and assisted in editing the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We thank Anne Pietryga-Krieger for expert technical assistance, Marius Stephan and Philipp Seidel for assistance with IPSC analysis, Gagik Yeghiazaryan and Anna Bartalis for help with MC current clamp recordings, Imre Vida for facilitating access to VGAT-Venus rats, Sigrun Korsching and Yoshiyuki Kubota for advice on statistics and Ursula Koch for advice on pharmacology and discussions on lateral inhibition. This work was funded mainly by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF, 01GQ1104/01GQ1502), with additional equipment funding by LMU-GSN, DFG-SFB 870 and funding for staff from GIF (1479-418.13; all to VE), and by ERC 682426, GINOP_2.1.1-15-2016-00979, VKSZ_14-1-2015-0155, 712821-NEURAM to BR.

Competing interests

There are competing financial interests since BR is a founder of Femtonics Kft and a member of its scientific advisory board. No other competing interests exist.

References

1. Abraham, N. M., Egger, V., Shimshek, D. R., Renden, R., Fukunaga, I., Sprengel, R., Seeburg, P. H., Klugmann, M., Margrie, T. W., Schaefer, A. T., & Kuner, T. (2010). Synaptic inhibition in the olfactory bulb accelerates odor discrimination in mice. *Neuron, 65*(3), 399-411.

2. Aghvami, S., Müller, M., Araabi, B.N., & Egger V. (2019) Coincidence detection within the excitable rat olfactory bulb granule cell spines. *J. Neurosci.* 39, 584-595. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1798-18.2018

3. Angelo, K., & Margrie, T. W. (2011). Population diversity and function of hyperpolarization-activated current in olfactory bulb mitral cells. *Sci Rep, 1*, 50. doi:10.1038/srep00050

4. Arevian A.,C., Kapoor, V., Urban, N.N. (2008). Activity-dependent gating of lateral inhibition in the mouse olfactory bulb. *Nat Neurosci* 11, 80-87.

5. Arnson, H. A., & Strowbridge, B. (2017). Spatial Structure Of Synchronized Inhibition In The Olfactory Bulb. *J Neurosci,* 37(43):10468 –10480. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1004-17.2017

6. Banerjee, A., Larsen, R.S., Philpot, B.D., & Paulsen,O. (2016). Roles of Presynaptic NMDA Receptors in Neurotransmission and Plasticity. *Trends in Neurosciences* 39 (1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2015.11.001

7. Bartel, D. L., Rela, L., Hsieh, L., & Greer, C. A. (2015). Dendrodendritic synapses in the mouse olfactory bulb external plexiform layer. *J Comp Neurol, 523*(8), 1145-1161. doi:10.1002/cne.23714

8. Bloodgood, B. L., & Sabatini, B. L. (2007). Ca(2+) signaling in dendritic spines. *Curr Opin Neurobiol, 17*(3), 345-351. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2007.04.003

9. Bouvier, G., Bidoret, C., Casado, M., & Paoletti, P. (2015). Presynaptic NMDA receptors: Roles and rules. *Neuroscience, 311*, 322-340. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.10.033

10. Brea JN, Kay LM, Kopell NJ. (2009). Biophysical model for gamma rhythms in the olfactory bulb via subthreshold oscilations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A,* 106, 21954-9. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0910964106.

11. Burton SD. (2017). Inhibitory circuits of the main olfactory bulb. J Neurophysiol. 2017 Oct 1;118(4):2034-2051. doi: 10.1152/jn.00109.2017

12. Bywalez, W. G., Patirniche, D., Rupprecht, V., Stemmler, M., Herz, A. V. M., Pálfi, D., Rozsa, B., & Egger, V. (2015). Local Postsynaptic Voltage-Gated Sodium Channel Activation in Dendritic Spines of Olfactory Bulb Granule Cells. *Neuron, 85*(3), 590-601. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2014.12.051

13. Carlson, G. C., Shipley, M. T., & Keller, A. (2000). Long-lasting depolarizations in mitral cells of the rat olfactory bulb. *J Neurosci, 20*(5), 2011-2021.

14. Chazot, P.L., Cik, M., & Stephenson, F.A. (1995). An investigation into the role of N-glycosylation in the functional expression of a recombinant heteromeric NMDA receptor. Mol Membr Biol, 12,331-337.

15. Chen, W. R., Xiong, W., & Shepherd, G. M. (2000). Analysis of relations between NMDA

receptors and GABA release at olfactory bulb reciprocal synapses. *Neuron, 25*(3), 625-633.

16. Chiovini, B., Turi, G. F., Katona, G., Kaszas, A., Palfi, D., Maak, P., Szalay, G., Szabo, M. F.,
Szabo, G., Szadai, Z., Kali, S., & Rozsa, B. (2014). Dendritic spikes induce ripples in
parvalbumin interneurons during hippocampal sharp waves. *Neuron, 82*(4), 908-924.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2014.04.004

17. Crespo, C., Liberia, T., Blasco-Ibáñez, J.M., Nácher, J., & Varea, E. (2013). The circuits of
the olfactory bulb. The exception as a rule. Anat Rec (Hoboken)., 296(9):1401-1412. doi:
10.1002/ar.22732.

18. Destexhe, A., Mainen, Z.F., & Sejnowski, T.J. (1998). Kinetic models of synaptic
transmission. In: Methods in Neuronal Modeling (2nd edition; edited by Koch, C., & Segev,
I.). MIT press, Cambridge, 1998, 1-25.

19. Dietz SB, Markopoulos F, Murthy VN (2011). Postnatal development of dendrodendritic
inhibition in the mammalian olfactory bulb. *Front Cell Neurosci* 5:10.

20. Duguid, I., & Smart, T.G. (2004) Retograde activation of presynaptic NMDA receptors
enhances GABA release at cerebellar interneuton-Purkinje cell synapses. *Nat Neurosci*, 7(5),
525-533.

21. Duménieu, M., Fourcaud-Trocmé, N., Garcia, S., & Kuczewski, N. (2015).
Afterhyperpolarization (AHP) regulates the frequency and timing of action potentials in the
mitral cells of the olfactory bulb: role of olfactory experience. Physiol Rep, 3(5). pii: e12344.
doi: 10.14814/phy2.12344.

22. Egger, V. (2008). Synaptic sodium spikes trigger long-lasting depolarizations and slow
calcium entry in rat olfactory bulb granule cells. *Eur J Neurosci, 27*(8), 2066-2075.

23. Egger, V., Svoboda, K., & Mainen, Z. F. (2003) Mechanisms of lateral inhibition in the
olfactory bulb: efficiency and modulation of spike-evoked calcium influx into granule cells. J
Neurosci 23:7551–7559.

24. Egger, V., Svoboda, K., & Mainen, Z. F. (2005). Dendrodendritic synaptic signals in olfactory
bulb granule cells: Local spine boost and global low-threshold spike. *J Neurosci, 25*, 3521-
3530.

25. Egger, V., & Urban, N. N. (2006). Dynamic connectivity in the mitral cell-granule cell
microcircuit. *Semin Cell Dev Biol, 17*(4), 424-432.

26. Friedman, D., & Strowbridge, B. W. (2000). Functional role of NMDA autoreceptors in
olfactory mitral cells. *J Neurophysiol, 84*(1), 39-50. doi:10.1152/jn.2000.84.1.39

27. Fukunaga, I., Herb, J. T., Kollo, M., Boyden, E. S., & Schaefer, A. T. (2014). Independent
control of gamma and theta activity by distinct interneuron networks in the olfactory bulb. *Nat*
Neurosci, 17(9), 1208-1216. doi:10.1038/nn.3760

28. Geramita M, Urban NN. (2017) Differences in Glomerular-Layer-Mediated Feedforward
Inhibition onto Mitral and Tufted Cells Lead to Distinct Modes of Intensity Coding. J Neurosci.
2017 Feb 8;37(6):1428-1438.

29. Glitsch, M., & Marty, A. (1999). Presynaptic Effects of NMDA in Cerebellar Purkinje Cells and

Interneurons. J Neurosci, 19(2):511-519.

30. Grunditz, Å., Holbro, N., Tian, L., Zuo, Y., & Oertner, T.G. (2008). Spine Neck Plasticity Controls Postsynaptic Calcium Signals through Electrical Compartmentalization. J Neurosci 28:13457-13466.

31. Halabisky, B., Friedman, D., Radojicic, M., & Strowbridge, B. W. (2000). Calcium influx through NMDA receptors directly evokes GABA release in olfactory bulb granule cells. *J Neurosci, 20*(13), 5124-5134.

32. Hemond, P., Epstein, D., Boley, A., Migliore, M., Ascoli, G.A., & Jaffe, D.B. (2008). Distinct classes of pyramidal cells exhibit mutually exclusive firing patterns in hippocampal area CA3b. *Hippocampus* 18:411-424.

33. Huang, L., Garcia, I., Jen, H.-I., & Arenkiel, B. R. (2013). Reciprocal connectivity between mitral cells and external plexiform layer interneurons in the mouse olfactory bulb. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits, 7*. doi:10.3389/fncir.2013.00032

34. Isaacson, J. S. (1999). Glutamate spillover mediates excitatory transmission in the rat olfactory bulb. *Neuron, 23*(2), 377-384.

35. Isaacson, J. S. (2001). Mechanisms governing dendritic gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) release in the rat olfactory bulb. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 98*(1), 337-342.

36. Isaacson, J. S., & Strowbridge, B. W. (1998). Olfactory reciprocal synapses: dendritic signaling in the CNS. *Neuron, 20*(4), 749-761.

37. Jackowski A, Parnavelas JG, Lieberman AR. (1978) The reciprocal synapse in the external plexiform layer of the mammalian olfactory bulb. Brain Res. 1978 Dec 22;159(1):17-28. doi: 10.1016/0006-8993(78)90106-3.

38. Kaeser, P. S., & Regehr, W. G. (2014). Molecular mechanisms for synchronous, asynchronous, and spontaneous neurotransmitter release. *Annu Rev Physiol, 76*, 333-363. doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-021113-170338

39. Kampa, B., Clements, J., Jonas, P., & Stuart, G.J. (2004) Kinetics of Mg2+ unblock of NMDA receptors: implications for spike-timing dependent synaptic plasticity. J Physiol, 556.2, 337-345.

40. Kapoor, V., & Urban, N. N. (2006). Glomerulus-specific, long-latency activity in the olfactory bulb granule cell network. *J Neurosci, 26*, 11706-11719.

41. Kashiwadani H, Sasaki YF, Uchida N, Mori K. (1999) Synchronized oscillatory discharges of mitral/tufted cells with different molecular receptive ranges in the rabbit olfactory bulb. J Neurophysiol. 82(4):1786-92.

42. Kato, H. K., Gillet, S. N., Peters, A. J., Isaacson, J. S., & Komiyama, T. (2013). Parvalbumin-expressing interneurons linearly control olfactory bulb output. *Neuron, 80*(5), 10.1016/j.neuron.2013.1008.1036. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2013.08.036

43. Kay, L. M. (2003). Two species of gamma oscillations in the olfactory bulb: dependence on behavioral state and synaptic interactions. *J Integr Neurosci, 2*(1), 31-44.

44. Khawaled, R., Bruening-Wright, A., Adelman, J. P., & Maylie, J. (1999). Bicuculline Block of

Small-conductance Calcium-activated Potassium Channels. *Pflügers Archiv : Eur J Physiol.* **438** (3): 314–321. doi:10.1007/s004240050915.

45. Lagier, S., Carleton, A., & Lledo, P.-M. (2004). Interplay between Local GABAergic Interneurons and Relay Neurons Generates Gamma Oscillations in the Rat Olfactory Bulb. *J Neurosci*, 24(18):4382– 4392.

46. Laurent G., Wehr M. & Davidowitz H. (1996) Temporal representations of odors in an olfactory network. *J. Neurosci.* **16**, 3837-3847 (1996)

47. Lepousez, G., Csaba, Z., Bernard, V., Loudes, C., Videau, C., Lacombe, J., Epelbaum, J., & Viollet, C. (2010). Somatostatin interneurons delineate the inner part of the external plexiform layer in the mouse main olfactory bulb. *J Comp Neurol, 518*(11), 1976-1994. doi:10.1002/cne.22317

48. Lester, R.A., Clements, J.D.,Westbrook, G.L., & Jahr, C.E. (1990) NMDAR Channel kinetics determine the time course of NMDA receptor-mediated synaptic currents. Nature, 346(6284):565-567.

49. Li A., Gire H.G., & Restrepo D. (2015) Spike-Field Coherence in a Population of Olfactory Bulb Neurons Differentiates between Odors Irrespective of Associated Outcome. J Neurosci 35(14):5808-5822

50. Matsuno T, Kiyokage E, Toida K. (2017) Synaptic distribution of individually labeled mitral cells in the external plexiform layer of the mouse olfactory bulb. J Comp Neurol. 525(7):1633-1648. doi: 10.1002/cne.24148.

51. McGuinness, L., Taylor, C., Taylor, R.D., Yau, C., Langenhan, T., Hart, M.L., Christian, H., Tynan, P.W., Donnelly, P., & Emptage, N.J. (2010). Presynaptic NMDARs in the hippocampus facilitate transmitter release at theta frequency. *Neuron*, 68(6):1109-1127. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.11.023.

52. McIntyre, A. B. R., & Cleland, T. A. (2016). Biophysical constraints on lateral inhibition in the olfactory bulb. *Journal of Neurophysiology, 115*(6), 2937-2949. doi:10.1152/jn.00671.2015

53. McTavish TS, Migliore M, Shepherd GM, Hines ML. (2012) Mitral cell spike synchroniy modulated by dendrodendritic synapse location. Front Comput Neurosci. 6:3. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2012.00003.

54. Miller, J. P., Rall, W., & Rinzel, J. (1985). Synaptic amplification by active membrane in dendritic spines. *Brain Res, 325*(1-2), 325-330.

55. Miyamichi, K., Shlomai-Fuchs, Y., Shu, M., Weissbourd, B. C., Luo, L., & Mizrahi, A. (2013). Dissecting Local Circuits: Parvalbumin Interneurons Underlie Broad Feedback Control of Olfactory Bulb Output. *Neuron, 80*(5), 1232-1245. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2013.08.027

56. Mori, K., Nagao, H., & Yoshihara, Y. (1999). The olfactory bulb: Coding and Processing of odor molecule information. *Science*, 286, 711-715.

57. Mueller M**.,** Egger V. (2020) Dendritic integration in olfactory bulb granule cells: Threshold for lateral inhibition and role of active conductances upon simultaneous activation. *PLOS Biology*. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000873

58. Nagayama S, Homma R, Imamura F. (2014) Neuronal organization of olfactory bulb circuits. Front Neural Circuits. 8:98. doi: 10.3389/fncir.2014.00098.

59. Najac M, Sanz Diez A, Kumar A, Benito N, Charpak S, De Saint Jan D. (2015) Intraglomerular lateral inhibition promotes spike timing variability in principal neurons of the olfactory bulb. J Neurosci. 35(10):4319-31. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2181-14.2015.

60. Naritsuka, H., Sakai, K., Hashikawa, T., Mori, K., & Yamaguchi, M. (2009). Perisomatic-targeting Granule Cells in the Mouse Olfactory Bulb. *J Comp Neurol*, 525, 409-426.

61. Nunes, D., & Kuner, T. (2018). Axonal sodium channel NaV1.2 drives granule cell dendritic GABA release and rapid odor discrimination. *PLoS Biol, 16*(8), e2003816. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2003816

62. Ona Jodar T., Lage-Rupprecht V., Abraham N.M., Rose C.R. & Egger V. (2020). Local postsynaptic signalling on slow time scales in reciprocal olfactory bulb granule cell spines matches asynchronous release. bioRxiv 2020.09.03.281642 doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.03.281642

63. Pálfi, D., Chiovini, B., Szalay, G., Kaszás, A., Turi, G.F., Katona, G., Ábrányi-Balogh, P., Szőri, M., Potor, A., Frigyesi, O., Lukácsné Haveland, C., Szadai, Z., Madarász, M., Vasanits-Zsigrai, A., Molnár-Perl, I., Viskolcz, B., Csizmadia, I.G., Mucsi, Z., & Rózsa, B. (2018). High efficiency two-photon uncaging coupled by the correction of spontaneous hydrolysis. Org Biomol Chem. 16(11):1958-1970. doi: 10.1039/c8ob00025e.

64. Peace ST, Johnson BC, Li G, Kaiser ME, Fukunaga I, Schaefer AT, Molnar AC, Cleland TA (2017) Coherent olfactory bulb gamma oscillations arise from coupling independent columnar oscillations. bioRxiv 213827; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/213827

65. Pressler, R. T., & Strowbridge, B. W. (2017). Direct Recording of Dendrodendritic Excitation in the Olfactory Bulb: Divergent Properties of Local and External Glutamatergic Inputs Govern Synaptic Integration in Granule Cells. *J Neurosci, 37*(49), 11774-11788. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2033-17.2017

66. Pressler, R. T., & Strowbridge, B. W. (2019). Functional specialization of interneuron dendrites: Identification of action potential initiation zone in axonless olfactory bulb granule cells. J Neurosci. 39(49):9674-9688. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1763-19.2019

67. Price J.L. & Powell T.P. (1970) An experimental study of the origin and the course of the centrifugal fibres to the olfactory bulb in the rat. *J Anat.* **107**:215-237

68. Racca, C., Stephenson, F.A., Streit, P., Roberts, J.D., & Somogyi, P. (2000). NMDA receptor content of synapses in stratum radiatum of the hippocampal CA1 area*. J Neurosci.* 20(7):2512-2522.

69. Rannals, M. D., & Kapur, J. (2011). Homeostatic strengthening of inhibitory synapses is mediated by the accumulation of GABA(A) receptors. *J Neurosci, 31*(48), 17701-17712. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4476-11.2011

70. Saghatelyan, A., Roux, P., Migliore, M., Rochefort, C., Dasmaisons, D., Charneau, P., Shepherd, G.M. & Lledo, P.-M. (2005). Activity-dependent adjustments of the inhibitory

network in the olfactory bulb following early postnatal deprivation. *Neuron 46*, 103-116Sailor, K.A., Valley, M. T., Wiechert, M. T., Riecke, H., Sun, G. J., Adams, W., . . . Lledo, P.-M. (2016). Persistent Structural Plasticity Optimizes Sensory Information Processing in the Olfactory Bulb. *Neuron, 91*(2), 384-396. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.06.004

71. Sassoé-Pognetto, M., & Ottersen, O. P. (2000). Organization of Ionotropic Glutamate Receptors at Dendrodendritic Synapses in the Rat Olfactory Bulb. *J Neurosci*, 20(6):2192–2201.

72. Sassoé-Pognetto, M., Utvik, J. K., Camoletto, P., Watanabe, M., Stephenson, F. A., Bredt, D. S., & Ottersen, O. P. (2003). Organization of postsynaptic density proteins and glutamate receptors in axodendritic and dendrodendritic synapses of the rat olfactory bulb. *J Comp Neurol, 463*(3), 237-248.

73. Schmidt, L. J., & Strowbridge, B. W. (2014). Modulation of olfactory bulb network activity by serotonin: synchronous inhibition of mitral cells mediated by spatially localized GABAergic microcircuits. *Learn Mem, 21*(8), 406-416. doi:10.1101/lm.035659.114

74. Schoppa, N. E., Kinzie, J. M., Sahara, Y., Segerson, T. P., & Westbrook, G. L. (1998). Dendrodendritic inhibition in the olfactory bulb is driven by NMDA receptors. *J Neurosci, 18*(17), 6790-6802.

75. Schoppa NE (2006) AMPA/kainate receptors drive rapid output and precise synchrony in olfactory bulb granule cells. J Neurosci 26:12996-13006.

76. Shao Z, Puche AC, Liu S, Shipley MT. (2012) Intraglomerular inhibition shapes the strength and temporal structure of glomerular output. J Neurophysiol. 108(3):782-93. doi: 10.1152/jn.00119.2012.

77. Sobczyk, A., Scheuss, V., & Svoboda, K. (2005). NMDA receptor subunit-dependent [Ca2+] signaling in individual hippocampal dendritic spines. *J Neurosci, 25*(26), 6037-6046. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1221-05.2005

78. Spruston, N. (2008). Pyramidal neurons: dendritic structure and synaptic integration. *Nat Rev Neurosci, 9*(3), 206-221. doi:10.1038/nrn2286

79. Stanley, E. F. (2016) The Nanophysiology of Fast Transmitter Release. *Trends Neurosci.* 39 (3). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2016.01.005

80. Toida, K., Kosaka, K., Heizmann, C. W., & Kosaka, T. (1994). Synaptic contacts between mitral/tufted cells and GABAergic neurons containing calcium-binding protein parvalbumin in the rat olfactory bulb, with special reference to reciprocal synapses between them. *Brain Res, 650*(2), 347-352.

81. Tonnesen, J., & Nagerl, U. V. (2016) Dendritic Spines as Tunable Regulators of Synaptic Signals. *Front Psychiatry* 7:101. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2016.00101

82. Uematsu, M., Hirai, Y., Karube, F., Ebihara, S., Kato, M., Abe, K., . . . Kawaguchi, Y. (2008). Quantitative Chemical Composition of Cortical GABAergic Neurons Revealed in Transgenic Venus-Expressing Rats. *Cerebral Cortex, 18*(2), 315-330. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhm056

83. Veruki, M. L., Zhou, Y., Castilho, A., Morgans, C. W., & Hartveit, E. (2019) Extrasynaptic

NMDA Receptors on Rod Pathway Amacrine Cells: Molecular Composition, Activation, and Signaling. *J Neurosci* 39: 627-650. Doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2267-18.2018

84. Wellis, D. P., & Kauer, J. S. (1993). GABAA and glutamate receptor involvement in dendrodendritic synaptic interactions from salamander olfactory bulb. *J Physiol, 469*, 315-339.

85. Woolf, T. B., Shepherd, G. M., & Greer, C. A. (1991). Serial reconstructions of granule cell spines in the mammalian olfactory bulb. *Synapse, 7*(3), 181-192.

86. Zelano C, Mohanty A, Gottfried JA. (2011) Olfactory predictive codes and stimulus templates in piriform cortex. Neuron. 72(1):178-87. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2011.08.010.