Active membrane conductances and morphology of a collision detection neuron broaden its impedance profile and improve membrane synchrony

Running title: Impedance profile of a collision detection neuron

Richard B. Dewell[1] and Fabrizio Gabbiani[1,2]
[1]Department of Neuroscience, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, USA; [2]Department of
Electrical and Computer Engineering, Rice University, Houston, TX, USA

Corresponding authors:
Fabrizio Gabbiani - gabbiani@bcm.edu
Richard B. Dewell - dewell@bcm.edu

Abstract

Our brain processes information through the coordinated efforts of billions of individual neurons, each

of which transforms a small part of the overall information stream. Central to this is how neurons

integrate and transform complex patterns of synaptic inputs. The neuronal membrane impedance

determines the change in membrane potential in response to input currents, and therefore sets the gain

and timing for synaptic integration. Using single and dual dendritic recordings *in vivo*, pharmacology,

and computational modeling, we characterized the role of two active conductances g_H and g_M,

meditated respectively by hyperpolarization-activated cyclic nucleotide gated (HCN) channels and by

muscarine sensitive M-channels, in shaping the membrane impedance of a collision detection neuron

in female *Schistocerca americana* grasshoppers. The neuron is known by its acronym LGMD, which

stands for lobula giant movement detector. In contrast to other neurons where these conductances have

been studied, we found that g_H and g_M promote broadband, synchronous integration over the LGMD's

functional range of membrane potentials and input frequencies. Additionally, we found that the

branching morphology of the LGMD helped increase both the gain and synchrony associated with the

neuron's membrane impedance. The same result held for a wide range of dendritic morphologies,

including those of mammalian neocortical pyramidal neurons and cerebellar Purkinje cells. Thus, these

findings further our understanding of the integration properties of individual neurons by showing the unexpected role played by two widespread active conductances and by dendritic morphology in shaping synaptic integration.

Significance Statement

Information in the brain is processed by neurons that receive thousands of synaptic inputs. Understanding how neurons integrate these inputs is critical to neuroscience. Neuronal integration depends on complex interactions of synaptic input patterns and the electrochemical properties of dendrites. Although examining the input patterns and dendritic processing *in vivo* is not yet possible in the mammalian brain, it is within simpler nervous systems. Here, we used an identified collision detection neuron in grasshoppers to examine how its morphology and membrane properties determine the gain and synchrony of synaptic integration in relation to the computations it performs. The neuronal properties examined are ubiquitous and therefore will further a general understanding of neuronal computations, including those in our own brain.

Introduction

By the nineteen forties, neuroscience had recognized that neuronal membranes exhibited bandpass impedance properties and had begun investigating which cellular mechanisms contributed to their resistance, capacitance, and inductance (Cole, 1941). The capacitance is determined by the lipid bilayer of the membrane, and its resistance by the membrane permeability, but the inductance came from an unknown source. After the discovery of active conductances, it became clear that their kinetics produced a phenomenological inductance, and that its properties could be investigated using Hodgkin and Huxley's equations (Mauro, 1961; Mauro et al., 1970). In the decades since, researchers have learned a great deal about the roles of active conductances in shaping the electrical properties of

neurons, and how neuronal bandpass properties can generate rhythmic activity across neural networks

(Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000; Wang, 2010; Das et al., 2017). Rhythmic activity within the brain

contributes to multiple cognitive processes and to timing control across brain regions (Wang, 2010;

Buzsáki and Moser, 2013).

Several membrane channels, including HCN and M channels, influence neural oscillations and

synchrony both at the cellular and network level. M channels contribute to theta resonance (4-10 Hz)

in pyramidal neurons (Hu et al., 2002, 2009; Hönigsperger et al., 2015), and influence network

oscillations *in vivo* (Peters et al., 2005). HCN channels produce theta resonance in many neuron types

(Ströhmann et al., 1995; Hutcheon et al., 1996; Hu et al., 2002; Gastrein et al., 2011), but can also

generate delta resonance (1-3 Hz; Ulrich, 2014), or no resonance at all (Anderson et al., 2011). In

addition to rectifying conductances like g_H and g_M, amplifying conductances such as those mediated by

persistent sodium and voltage-gated calcium channels also shape the impedance profile (Hutcheon et

al., 1996; Lampl and Yarom, 1997).

Another factor shaping the impedance profile of a neuron is its dendritic morphology. An

extended morphology causes dendrites to be more compartmentalized which increases attenuation and

phase lag of descending inputs, but simultaneously improves local coincidence detection and nonlinear

processing (Häusser and Mel, 2003; London and Hausser, 2005). It has been proposed that dendritic

branching and tapering optimizes integration by increasing synaptic homogeneity (Cuntz et al., 2007).

Additionally, the complex dendritic morphology of pyramidal and Purkinje neurons can increase

neuronal resonance (Dhupia et al., 2015; Ostojic et al., 2015). Much remains unexplored, though, on

the influence that complex dendritic morphologies have on the integration properties of neurons *in

vivo*.

Similarly, because the work on neuronal membrane properties has mainly been done with

cultured neurons or brain slices and that the natural synaptic input patterns are still unknown for most

neurons, much remains unanswered about how the impedance properties of neurons influence neural

computations. Here we used *in vivo* dendritic electrophysiology, pharmacology, and computational

modeling to investigate the impedance properties of the LGMD, an identified collision detection

neuron with known synaptic input patterns and dendritic computations. Experiments investigated the

roles of morphology, g_H, and g_M in shaping these properties. As both g_H and g_M are sensitive to

numerous modulators (Delmas and Brown, 2005; Wahl-Schott and Biel, 2009), our ability to conduct

experiments *in vivo* ensures that the channels are in the relevant modulatory state. Surprisingly, the

presence of these channels was found to decrease membrane resonance and oscillatory or bursting

activity, instead broadening the bandpass of the neuronal membrane and increasing its consistency over

different membrane potentials. Like these active conductances, the neuron's morphology also helped

broaden the bandpass of the neuronal membrane and increased its synchrony.

Materials and Methods

Animals

Experiments were performed on adult female grasshoppers 7-12 weeks of age (*Schistocerca*

americana). Animals were reared in a crowded laboratory colony under 12 h light/dark conditions.

Animals were selected for health and size without randomization, and investigators were not blinded to

experimental conditions. Sample sizes were not predetermined before experiments. The surgical

procedures used have been described previously (Gabbiani and Krapp, 2006; Jones and Gabbiani,

2012; Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a).

Visual stimuli

Visual stimuli were generated using Matlab (RRID:SCR_001622) and the Psychophysics

Toolbox (PTB-3, RRID:SCR_002881) on a personal computer running Windows XP. A conventional

cathode ray tube monitor refreshed at 200 frames per second was used for stimulus display (LG

Electronics, Seoul, Korea). Looming stimuli are the two-dimensional projections of an object

approaching on a collision course with the animal. They consisted of an expanding dark square

simulating a solid object with half size *l* approaching at constant speed *v* (illustrated in Figure 1B). The

expansion profile is characterized by the ratio $l/|v|$, as previously described (Gabbiani et al., 2001).

Electrophysiology

Sharp-electrode LGMD intracellular recordings were carried out in current-clamp or voltage-

clamp mode using thin walled borosilicate glass pipettes (outer/inner diameter: 1.2/0.9 mm; WPI,

Sarasota, FL; see Jones and Gabbiani, 2012, as well as Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a for details). The

membrane potential (V_m) and current (I_m) were low-pass filtered with cutoff frequencies of 10 kHz and

5 kHz, respectively. Most recordings were digitized at a sampling rate of 20,073 Hz (for some

experiments V_m was digitized at 40,146 Hz). We used a single electrode clamp amplifier capable of

operating in discontinuous mode at high switching frequencies (20-35 kHz; SEC-10, NPI, Tamm,

Germany). Responses to current injections were recorded in discontinuous current clamp mode (DCC).

For dual recordings we inserted under visual guidance a second sharp electrode into the excitatory

dendritic field of the LGMD (see Figure 2A) with a motorized micromanipulator (Sutter Instruments,

Novato, CA). Membrane potential was recorded with a second SEC-10 amplifier in bridge mode with

electrode resistance and capacitance compensation when not injecting current and in DCC mode while

injecting current. Switching frequencies, signal filtering and digitization were identical for both

recordings.

Both the physical distance along the dendrites and an estimate of the electrotonic distance

between recording electrode pairs were measured as follows. First, all cells were stained with Alexa

Fluor 594 and imaged with a CCD camera to record electrode position (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a).

Next, to estimate the dendritic distance between recording pairs, an image of the neuron and electrodes

(cf. Figure 2A) was imported into ImageJ (RRID:SCR_003070), the dendritic path between the

electrode tips was manually traced, and the corresponding path length recorded. To estimate the

electrotonic distance between the recording pairs we measured the amplitude of the back-propagating

action potentials (bAP) at each location and used the difference in these amplitudes. As in a previous

study, the differences in bAP amplitude provided a more reliable explanatory variable for distance

dependent effects (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a).

A neuron's frequency-dependent membrane properties are characterized by its impedance

profile. The subthreshold impedance can be decomposed into input impedance which describes local

change in membrane potential at the site of an input current and transfer impedance that describes

change in membrane potential at remote locations after propagation through the neuron. Both input and

transfer impedance shape synaptic integration within dendrites. Additionally, impedance properties at

the site of spike initiation influence the transformation of membrane potential into spiking activity,

including the bandpass filtering and timing of a neuron's output. If a neuron's conductance distribution

is uniform, then the transfer and input impedances will have similar properties, but when it is not the

impedance profile varies by location and transfer depends on the recording locations and the direction

of signal propagation (Hu et al., 2009; Vaidya and Johnston, 2013).

To measure the impedance profile, we injected sine waves of increasing frequency called chirp

(or zap) currents. We recorded the injected membrane current simultaneously with the membrane

potential to avoid any discrepancies between the computer-generated waveform and the current

injected by the amplifier. The chirp currents used were identical to those described in Dewell and

Gabbiani (2018b). The chirp current is defined as $I(t) = I_p sin\phi(t)$, where I_p is the peak current, $\phi(t)$

is the phase of the sine wave, and its instantaneous frequency is defined as $f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{d\phi}{dt}$ (in units of

Hz). We generally used chirps with a duration of 20 s (sometimes 30 s, as is illustrated in Figure 2B)

that increased in frequency either linearly or exponentially with time. In most experiments, as well as

for all simulations, we used exponentially increasing chirp currents. The linear chirp started at 0 Hz

and was calculated as $I(t) = I_p sin(\pi\beta t^2)$, with t being the time from the start of the chirp (in units of

s) and β the rate of increase in instantaneous chirp frequency (in Hz/s). The exponential chirp was

given by $I(t) = I_p \sin(2\pi f_0 t e^{\beta t})$, where f_0 is the initial chirp frequency and β determines the

(accelerating) rate of frequency increase (Barrow and Wu, 2009). For all exponential chirps, we used f_0

= 0.05 Hz and β = 0.24 Hz which produced a chirp current increasing to 35 Hz over 20 s. We saw no

differences in the calculated impedance profiles with chirps having different frequency profiles, in

accordance with previous comparisons of impedance profiles between chirps of increasing and

decreasing frequencies (Ulrich 2002; Erchova et al. 2004; Hu et al. 2002; van Brederode and Berger

2008; van Brederode and Berger 2011) or comparison of linearly increasing chirps and sum of sine

wave stimuli (Hutcheon et al., 1996).

Pharmacology

We applied the HCN- channel blocker ZD7288 and the M-channel blocker XE991 either

directly in the bath saline or by local puffing as previously described (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a,

2018b). For local puffing, drugs were mixed with physiological saline containing fast green (0.5%) to

visually monitor the affected region and were puffed using a micropipette connected to a pneumatic

picopump (PV830, WPI, Saratoga, FL). For both delivery methods, drug concentrations within the

lobula were ~200 μM for ZD7288 and ~100-200 μM for XE991. In dual recording experiments,

mecamylamine was applied to block excitatory postsynaptic potentials (EPSPs) and was present in

both control and drug conditions. Blockade of EPSPs reduced membrane noise as well as noise in the

calculated impedance profiles. In paired comparisons, mecamylamine caused small increases in

impedance amplitude (~5%) but this difference was smaller than the variability between animals or

between dendritic locations. For control data we thus pooled recordings with and without

mecamylamine.

Experimental design and statistical analyses

Data analysis was carried out with custom MATLAB code (The MathWorks, Natick, MA).

Linear fits were done by minimization of the sum of squared errors. Before each chirp current a -2 nA

hyperpolarizing step current was used for monitoring the input resistance and the membrane time

constant. Unless otherwise specified, all statistical tests were made using the Wilcoxon rank sum test

(WRS) which does not assume normality or equality of variance. Normality of the data was assessed

by using a Lilliefors test for any tests assuming it.

The complex impedance Z was calculated as $Z(f) = $ fft(V_m)/fft(I_m) where fft is the (frequency

dependent) fast Fourier transform, I_m the membrane current, and V_m the membrane potential. Both I_m

and V_m were down sampled to 2 kHz before the fft. Z was calculated for each trial and then averaged

across trials. The complex impedance is composed of the real valued resistance R and the imaginary

valued reactance X: $Z = R + i\,X$. A positive reactance, or inductance, indicates that changes in V_m

precede changes in I_m. Conversely, a negative reactance, or capacitance, indicates that changes in I_m

precede changes in V_m. The impedance amplitude is calculated as the absolute value of Z: $|Z(f)| =$

$\sqrt{R(f)^2 + X(f)^2}$. The impedance phase is calculated by the inverse tangent of the reactance divided

by the resistance: $\Phi(f) = \tan^{-1} X(f)/R(f)$. This impedance phase is equal to the angle between the

x-axis and a line from the origin to a point of the impedance locus plot (cf. Figure 4C).

Input impedance (Z_{IN}) was calculated from the V_m and I_m recorded at the site of current

injection. Transfer impedance (Z_{TR}) was calculated with the I_m from the site of current injection and the

V_m from the non-injected site. Voltage attenuation was calculated as the percent reduction in

impedance amplitude from the current injection site to the non-injected site: $V_{att}(f) =$

$(|Z_{IN}(f)| - |Z_{TR}(f)|)/|Z_{IN}(f)|$. Similarly, the phase lag was calculated as the input minus the transfer

impedance phase. The phase lag was converted to a time lag by $t_{lag}(f) = \Phi(f)/(2\pi f)$ where f is the

instantaneous chirp frequency (in Hz) calculated as $f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{d}{dt}\sin^{-1}(\frac{I(t)}{I_p})$, for details see Dewell and

Gabbiani (2018b). The asynchrony was then calculated as the mean absolute time lag across

frequencies.

Resonant frequency and resonance strength were calculated from the input impedance

amplitude and were the frequency at which the impedance amplitude was at its maximum and the ratio

of the maximum impedance to the steady state impedance. Minimum and maximum phase were

respectively calculated as the lowest (most capacitive) and highest (most inductive) input impedance

phase. The impedance frequency variation was calculated as the standard deviation (across frequencies

ranging from 0 up to 35 Hz) of the impedance amplitude profile divided by the mean impedance

amplitude. Unlike resonance strength, the frequency variation statistic (f_{var}) incorporates both the

strength and breadth of the bandpass, giving an indication of how ohmic (or broadband) the membrane

is. Indeed, an ideal resistor would have a frequency variation of zero while a membrane exhibiting

sharp bandpass attributes would produce high frequency variation. For the membrane constant values

we used for our electrical circuit models (see below) f_{var} values were 18.4 for the lowpass circuit, and

378 for the strongest bandpass circuit. There is a potential drawback to the statistic, though, in that it

depends on the frequency range examined, limiting the ability to directly compare values between

studies examining different frequency ranges.

For calculating the power density of the membrane potential, we used the Matlab multitaper

power spectral density estimate (function 'pmtm'), with a time-half bandwidth product of 4 measured

over 15 octaves at frequencies of 2^{-4} to 2^{11} Hz with 8 voices (scales) per octave. All data was "zero-

meaned" before calculating the power density estimate and the resulting estimates were then averaged

across trials. For estimating the time-varying power density we used Matlab's continuous wavelet

transform (function 'cwt'). The frequency range was set from 0.1 to 2,000 Hz and the signal was not

extended. As for the spectral density estimate, wavelet transforms were calculated for individual trials

and the resulting wavelet transform coefficients were then averaged across trials. In the calculation of

both measures, the raw data was used with no down sampling or filtering.

Electrical circuit model

To compare LGMD membrane impedance to the impedance of an equivalent cable based on a

series of either RC or RLC circuits, we calculated the complex circuit impedance as follows. The RLC

circuit was modeled as illustrated in Figure 3F. The membrane impedance density was calculated as:

225
$$Z_m \;=\; \frac{R_m}{1 - l_{rat} \;+\; l_{rat}/(1 + i\tau_L\omega) \;+\; i\tau_m\omega}$$

226   where Z_m is input impedance density (Ωcm^2), R_m is membrane resistivity (Ωcm^2), C_m is membrane

227   capacitance (F/cm^2), τ_m (s) is membrane time constant ($\tau_m = R_m C_m$), τ_L is the inductance time constant

228   (s), ω is frequency in rad/s, l_{rat} is the ratio of the membrane conductance that is in series with the

229   inductor (range [0–1]), and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. If l_{rat} is zero, then no current will pass through the inductor and the

230   circuit is equivalent to an RC circuit with membrane impedance:

231
$$Z_m \;=\; R_m/(1 \;+\; i\tau_m\omega)$$

In both cases, the input impedance (Z_{IN}) was calculated by dividing Z_m by the unit surface area of the

cable (cm^2). We used the average dendritic circumference of our full LGMD model (20.85 μm) for the

cable circumference.

Transfer impedance measures were based upon a cable of fixed diameter and infinite length.

The voltage transfer along the cable was calculated as $V_{TR} = e^{-l/\lambda}$, where l (cm) is the distance

between the two locations and λ is the cable length constant (cm), $\lambda = \sqrt{Z_m/(R_a d b_f)}$. R_a is the axial

resistivity (Ωcm), d is the diameter (cm), and $b_f = 3$ is the branch factor – a scalar added to account for

additional attenuation due to the dendritic branching. The transfer impedance Z_{TR} at distance l from the

site of current injection is the product of Z_{IN} and V_{TR}.

Morphological neuron models

Comparisons between different cell morphologies used published neuron models downloaded

from ModelDB (RRID:SCR_007271). Among the available morphologies, we selected neurons

spanning a wide range of branching patterns and sizes. The morphologies used included a cerebellar

Purkinje neuron (Miyasho et al., 2001; Ostojic et al., 2015), a CA1 pyramidal neuron (Migliore et al.,

2004), an oriens-lacunosum/moleculare (OLM) hippocampal interneuron (Sekulić et al., 2015), and a

human layer 2/3 temporal cortex pyramidal neuron (Eyal et al., 2016). As we sought to compare the

influence of the cell morphology, all models were passive with identical membrane properties close to

those used in the LGMD model ($C_m = 0.8$ µF/cm^2, $G_m = 0.1$ mS/cm^2, Ra = 350 Ωcm). All simulations

were carried out using the NEURON software simulation package. For a passive model measuring

impedance with chirp currents, as was done experimentally, or with NEURON's built-in impedance

tools yielded the same result, so we used the built-in impedance measurement to speed up the

simulations carried out for Fig. 7A and B.

In Fig. 7G, the percentage of cell surface area with improved transfer impedance amplitude was

calculated from the data depicted in Fig. 7F (left). Specifically, we calculated the transfer impedance

amplitude between all neuron segments and compared it to the impedance amplitude of an isopotential

model (using the same cell morphology but with axial resistivity set to zero). The impedance amplitude

of an isopotential cell is $R/(1 + \omega^2\tau_m^2)^{0.5}$, where R is the membrane resistance (MΩ), ω is the frequency

(s^{-1}), and τ_m is the membrane time constant (s). As C_m and G_m were the same for all morphologies, their

membrane time constants were the same ($\tau_m = C_mG_m$) while the membrane resistance changed with

their total membrane area A ($R = (AG_m)^{-1}$). For each segment, we summed the surface area of all

segments to which a broadband signal transferred with greater gain than the isopotential value (dashed

line in Fig. 7F, left) and divided by the neuron's total surface area. Frequencies of 0 to 1000 Hz were

used and averaged with equal weight.

Similarly, to obtain Fig. 7H we compared the transfer impedance phase between all segment

pairs and compared it to the impedance phase of an isopotential equivalent. The impedance phase of an

isopotential cell is $\tan^{-1}(-\tau_m\omega)$, as illustrated in Fig. 7E, right. For the phase measurements, a weighted

average was used with the transfer amplitude between the segment pair determining the weight for

each frequency. As signals of some frequencies transfer better than others, the transfer phase of these

signals influences the membrane synchrony more. The percentage area with increased impedance

phase was then calculated by summing the surface area of segments with more synchronous transfer

phase and dividing by the total membrane surface area of the neuron. These calculations effectively

measure the average signal transfer of a passive cell with realistic morphology under the simplifying

assumptions that broadband inputs impinge upon the neuron with a uniform density. Although these

assumptions would not necessarily hold *in vivo* where the locations and frequency of inputs is

constantly changing, they provide a reasonable method of estimating transfer impedance without

relying on the less realistic assumptions that all inputs impinge on a single location or that all signals

only integrate at a single location, like the neuron's spike initiation zone.

Results

The LGMD (O'Shea and Williams 1974) is an identified neuron in locusts that selectively responds to

visual stimuli mimicking impending collision (Schlotterer, 1977; Rind and Simmons, 1992). The

LGMD possesses three dendritic fields with the largest one, field A, integrating excitatory inputs

originating from every facet of the compound eye (Fig. 1A). The LGMD discriminates (simulated)

approaching objects that activate thousands of facets based on the object's trajectory and spatial

coherence (Fig. 1B, C; Gray et al., 2001; Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a). The LGMD's dendritic

computations and stimulus selectivity depend on the precise spatiotemporal patterning of synaptic

inputs (Peron et al., 2007; Jones and Gabbiani, 2010; Zhu and Gabbiani, 2016), and their filtering by

active conductances that include sodium, low voltage calcium, calcium-dependent potassium, HCN,

and M channels (Gabbiani et al., 2002; Peron and Gabbiani, 2009; Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018b,

2018a). Different aspects of the LGMD's firing patterns – including burst firing – have been tied to the

generation of escape behaviors (Fotowat et al., 2011; McMillan and Gray, 2015; Dewell and Gabbiani,

2018a).

The spontaneous and stimulus-evoked membrane potential spectral power density of the LGMD

is highest at low frequencies. Due to the large number of synaptic inputs impinging upon the LGMD,

its membrane potential exhibits a high level of spontaneous synaptic background noise that has been

estimated at 2,000 synaptic inputs per second (Jones and Gabbiani, 2012). This and the short

membrane time constant of the LGMD *in vivo* (~ 7 ms) raises the possibility that high frequency

components might dominate the LGMD's membrane potential power spectrum. Examination of the

membrane potential time course under constant, uniform illumination of the eye reveals both high and

low frequency components (Fig. 1D). After calculating the power spectral density of spontaneous

membrane fluctuations (see Methods), we found that 87% of the signal power was contained below 35

Hz with 50% at less than 7.5 Hz (Fig. 1E, black lines). This breakdown of spectral power frequencies

was measured under constant illumination, though, and the LGMD's principal role is detecting

looming stimuli.

During the course of looming stimuli, the number of activated ommatidia increases from ~10 to

over 2,500. According to the most recent estimates of LGMD excitatory contacts per ommatidium

(Rind et al., 2016), such stimuli would produce an increase in activated synapses from ~100 to over

20,000. This increased synaptic input occurs in ever tighter time windows (Fig. 1C) and might lead to a

corresponding shift in power towards higher frequencies. However, during looming stimuli the low

frequency power increased, with over 50% of it below 1.5 Hz (Fig. 1E, blue lines). As most of the

membrane depolarization and spiking activity generated by looming occurs shortly before the time of

collision, we used wavelet analysis to resolve the frequency content of the membrane potential in the

time domain (see Methods). During the last second before the projected time to collision there was a

clear increase in the spectral density, but the highest signal power remained concentrated at 1-2 Hz

(Fig. 1F). During this period, spiking activity is highest (Fig. 1C) leading to a modest increase in

power at higher frequencies (Fig. 1F, gray box). That the signal power of the LGMD membrane

potential is highest at low frequencies despite the high frequency of synaptic inputs could be due to the

activation characteristics of these inputs or to the LGMD's membrane implementing a low-pass filter

favoring low frequency signals. We tested the latter possibility by measuring the frequency-resolved

input and transfer impedance of the LGMD's membrane. The input impedance reveals the mapping of

synaptic current frequencies to local dendritic membrane potential ones, while the transfer impedance

documents the change in membrane potential frequency content as the signal propagates from the

dendrites toward the SIZ.

Single and dual dendritic LGMD recordings in vivo in response to chirp currents. The LGMD's

input and transfer impedance were measured by recording *in vivo* the membrane potential with sharp

electrodes (Fig. 2A). These experiments consisted of injecting chirp currents during single or paired

recordings in the excitatory dendritic field. A chirp current is a sine waveform with time-varying

frequency; in the present recordings all chirps consisted of monotonically increasing frequency

sweeps. With each recording electrode we simultaneously measured the current and potential, allowing

us to calculate the gain and phase of the current-voltage transfer. The gain and the phase of this

transform are encapsulated in the complex-valued, frequency dependent membrane impedance $Z(f)$.

Further, by superposing chirp currents on different DC holding currents allowed us to measure

impedance at multiple steady-state membrane potentials (V_{ss}; Fig. 2B), and thus at different steady-

state activation levels of subthreshold conductances present in the LGMD membrane. In general, chirp

responses looked consistent across V_{ss} values and tapered slightly with increasing frequency.

Examination of different periods of the chirp show that at low frequencies the oscillations in

membrane current and potential were synchronous, while at higher frequencies the membrane potential

lagged behind the current and the change in potential was smaller (Fig. 2C). We conducted similar

experiments in voltage clamp and found similar changes to occur (Fig. 2D).

Quantification of transfer impedance characteristics was made as a function of the distance

between different pairs of dendritic recordings. The inter-electrode distance was measured both as the

dendritic path length between the electrodes in experimental micrographs (path distance, Fig. 2A), and

as the difference in back propagating action potential (bAP) amplitudes (electrotonic distance). At the

base of the excitatory dendritic field, the bAP amplitude was ~40 mV and decayed to <10 mV in distal

dendritic branches. The recording locations in the present study were primarily in larger branches with

bAP amplitudes between 20 and 40 mV. The path distances between these electrode pairs ranged from

63 to 150 μm. The difference in bAP amplitudes was well correlated with changes in membrane

potential transfer properties (Fig. 2E). In contrast, there was no correlation between path distance and

voltage attenuation ($r(9) = 0.17$, $p = 0.63$, Pearson linear correlation), likely due to differences in

dendrite diameter or number of branch points between the recording pairs. With increased electrotonic

distance between recording pairs, there was reduced voltage transfer and an increased delay. The

electrotonically closest recordings had ≤10% voltage attenuation, while for more distant pairs this

value increased to almost 50% (Fig. 2E). The average phase and time lags between locations was ~3°

and 0.5 ms between the most synchronous pairs and ~10° and 2 ms between the most asynchronous

pairs. For subsequent analyses of transfer impedance, data from all recording pairs were pooled.

Impedance amplitude was consistent across holding potentials and chirp frequencies. The

impedance amplitude is the absolute value of the complex impedance and represents the gain function

mapping at each frequency a given synaptic or electrode current into a change in membrane potential.

We measured the impedance amplitude at different V_{ss} values and examined how its profile changed

with holding potential. The LGMD dendrites have a resting membrane potential near -65 mV, can be

hyperpolarized by inhibitory inputs to below -70 mV, and are depolarized by excitatory inputs to >-50

mV during looming stimuli (Fig. 1C). We thus used V_{ss} values spanning that range, and confined

below the spike threshold potential.

Input impedance amplitude was highest at low membrane potentials (<-75 mV), particularly at

low frequencies (Fig. 3A, dashed box). Near the resting membrane potential, changes in V_{ss} produced

little change in impedance amplitude, despite the presence of HCN and M channels that have been

associated with membrane resonance in several cell types (Fig. 3A, red and yellow traces). Unlike

other HCN and M channel-expressing neurons that exhibit a pronounced resonant frequency, the

LGMD exhibited a more consistent input impedance amplitude profile (Gutfreund et al., 1995a;

Hutcheon et al., 1996; Hu et al., 2002; Gastrein et al., 2011). The transfer impedance amplitude

similarly changed little with membrane potential and tapered only slightly with increased frequency

(Fig. 3B). Accordingly, the voltage attenuation between paired recordings also showed a high overlap

across holding potentials (Fig. 3C). The variability of the voltage attenuation between recording pairs

was higher though, due to the differences in electrotonic distance (Fig. 2E). Consistency in impedance

at different holding potentials requires consistency in membrane conductance. The LGMD has large

HCN and M conductances which increase with hyperpolarization and depolarization, respectively

(Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a, 2018b). That the impedance amplitude remains nearly constant at

different V_{ss} values suggests a reciprocal relation between these conductances such that their total

conductance remains roughly constant across holding potentials, particularly near V_{rest}. This in turn

would increase the consistency of EPSP amplitudes. This idea was confirmed by injecting simulated

EPSP waveforms at the same V_{ss} values used to measure impedance, resulting in EPSP amplitudes that

were independent of V_{ss} (r(89) = -0.05, p = 0.63, 91 V_{ss} values from 16 recordings in 9 animals).

The resonance properties of an electrical circuit are characterized by its bandwidth and

resonance strength (the Q factor, Horowitz and Hill, 2015). However, neuronal membranes have more

complex impedance profiles that are not as easily characterized. The most commonly used measure of

neuronal resonance strength is the ratio of peak to steady-state impedance (Koch, 1984).

Unfortunately, this measure ignores other frequencies and particularly those above the peak frequency.

So, in addition to this standard measure (see below, Fig. 6B), we wanted an additional measure that

incorporated impedance at frequencies below and above the resonant frequency and thus we

characterized the variability of the impedance amplitude by its standard deviation across frequencies

normalized to the mean impedance amplitude, which we call the frequency variation (see Methods).

The frequency variation of LGMD's input impedance was 10-15% and decreased slightly with

membrane depolarization (Fig. 3D, black). Transfer impedance had a frequency variation of ~20% and

also decreased with depolarization (Fig. 3D, red). At V_{rest} and the depolarized potentials seen during a

looming stimulus, there was little frequency variation and no prominent lowpass filtering of input or

transfer potentials, ruling out the membrane impedance as the cause of the power spectrum

concentration at low frequencies (Fig. 1E,F). Instead, this suggests that the low frequency power is due

to the activation characteristics of the synaptic inputs during a looming stimulus.

To test what electrical components could produce the impedance amplitude properties of the

LGMD, we created an array of RC and RLC circuit models (Fig. 3 E, F). For both model types we

used a specific membrane capacitance (C_m) and conductance (G_m) yielding a time constant (τ_m) of 6.9

ms, close to that measured experimentally in the LGMD (Gabbiani and Krapp, 2006; Peron et al.,

2007; Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a, 2018b). The RLC circuit contained, in addition to the parallel

conductance and capacitance, a series conductance and inductance (Fig. 3F). We varied the percentage

of G_m that was in series with the inductance and the inductance time constant (τ_L) to determine which,

if any, parameters reproduced the LGMD's impedance amplitude. For most of the tested parameter

space, the circuit model's input impedance amplitude varied more with frequency than that of the

LGMD (Fig. 3G). Circuits with a fast inductance (≤ 10 ms) had impedance amplitudes as consistent as

that of the LGMD, while slow inductances increased the frequency variation beyond that of an RC

circuit, which was already higher than that of the LGMD. This is surprising considering that the

LGMD's resting membrane conductance is heavily dependent on rectifying HCN channels with a time

constant of ~1 s (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a). To assess the importance of the LGMD's membrane

time constant to the frequency variation, we examined the same range of inductance values in an RLC

circuit with doubled τ_m (increasing τ_m by increasing C_m or by decreasing G_m had the same effect). With

the higher τ_m, no inductance parameters produced a frequency variation as low as that of the LGMD.

Therefore, the low frequency variation of the LGMD's impedance profile depends on a fast τ_L in

addition to the fast τ_m. Of the LGMD's known conductances, g_M is a likely candidate to provide such a

fast inductance.

Impedance phase reveals high membrane synchrony consistent across holding potentials. Here

we refer to a neuron's membrane synchrony as the extent to which changes in membrane potential are

in phase with input currents of different frequencies. Membrane capacitance produces a phase lag

between input currents and their resulting change in membrane potential that increases both with

frequency and distance of propagation. Conductances like g_H and g_M counteract this delay and increase

the synchrony between synaptic input currents and the membrane potential (Ulrich, 2002; Narayanan

and Johnston, 2008; Hu et al., 2009; Vaidya and Johnston, 2013). To characterize the relative

synchrony of the LGMD's membrane potential with respect to current inputs, we thus measured the

frequency-dependent dendritic impedance phase. In a passive, isopotential neuron, membrane

capacitance forces input impedance phase to saturate at -90° as input current frequency increases

(Mauro, 1961; Narayanan and Johnston, 2008). Conversely, a positive impedance phase indicates that

the change in voltage precedes the change in current, a feature requiring a physiological process that

resembles an electrical inductance. Like impedance amplitude, the LGMD's impedance phase varied

little with V_{ss} values, distinguishing it again from other neurons where impedance phase has been

studied (Gutfreund et al., 1995a; Narayanan and Johnston, 2008). For all holding potentials, the phase

was positive at low frequencies (≤ 1 Hz). Although phase decreased with frequency, it saturated well

above -90° and in some recordings even increased at frequencies > 20 Hz. This was the case for both

the input and the transfer impedance phase (Fig. 4A and B, respectively). At depolarized potentials,

there was an additional small increase in phase for theta frequencies (Fig. 4A, B purple lines). The

LGMD subthreshold membrane potential exhibited zero phase and hence was most synchronous at ~1

Hz, in contrast to spiking which is most synchronous at 6 Hz (Dewell & Gabbiani 2018b).

Plotting as in Fig. 4C the real and imaginary components of the input impedance, called

respectively resistance and reactance, illustrates both the low frequency inductive and the high

frequency capacitive properties of the input impedance phase (corresponding to positive and negative

reactance, respectively). Such impedance locus plots combine the information on the impedance

amplitude (Fig. 3A) and phase (Fig. 4A): for each point in a locus plot if one were to draw a line

segment from the origin to the point, the length of the segment would be equal to the impedance

amplitude and the angle relative to the x-axis is the impedance phase. Fig. 4C confirms that the input

reactance was consistent across V_{ss} values while the input resistance increased at hyperpolarized

potentials resulting in rightward shift of the curves as V_{ss} decreases. The impedance locus plot of the

transfer impedance reveals even less change across membrane potentials, with only a small increase in

transfer resistance at hyperpolarized potentials (Fig. 4D). The relative phase of the input and transfer

impedances is the membrane potential phase lag with larger values indicating increased transfer delay

(Fig. 4E). The phase lag between input and transfer phase was also consistent across V_{ss} values and

was negative at frequencies ≤ 1 Hz, indicating an inductive phase shift on the propagating membrane

potential. The low frequency inductive characteristics of both the input and transfer impedance reveal

the influence of a slow inductor, likely the slowly rectifying HCN conductance.

456   Signal frequencies with zero reactance (and therefore an impedance phase of zero) are

synchronous; the membrane potential changes in unison with the membrane current. To test how

synchronous the LGMD's membrane was across the full range of frequencies examined, we converted

from phase to time and calculated the mean absolute asynchrony. This yielded a mean asynchrony of

~2 ms between the input current and membrane potential at the input location independent of V_{ss} (Fig.

4F, grey). The asynchrony of the transfer impedance was ~3 ms at V_{ss} near -80 mV and decreased with

depolarization (Fig. 4F, red). We similarly measured the asynchrony of the membrane potential

recorded at the two positions, which was ≤ 1 ms (Fig. 4F, brown). To test how this measured

asynchrony compared to that of an RLC circuit, we surveyed the same parameter range as depicted in

Figure 3. No inductance parameters generated a circuit as synchronous as the LGMD. Circuits with a

large and fast inductance generated the lowest input impedance asynchrony, but this was still > 3.5 ms

(Fig. 4G). Reproducing the LGMD's low frequency inductive phase (Fig. 4A,B) required an RLC

circuit model with a slow inductance ($\tau_L \approx 1$ s). Dashed black lines of the low frequency insets (Fig.

4A,B & D) were produced by inductance parameters marked by the black star in Fig. 4G. Although the

addition of a slow inductance to an RLC circuit reproduced the low frequency inductance of the

LGMD membrane, it increased the input and transfer asynchrony of the circuit model further from that

of an RC circuit (Fig. 4H). The asynchrony between the membrane potential recorded at the two

locations could be reproduced by either cable model (Fig. 4H, right). This shows that the LGMD must

have an additional synchronizing influence unaccounted for by the circuit model. Whether this

increased synchrony is explainable by the LGMD's active membrane conductances is not immediately

evident.

HCN and M channels reduce impedance amplitude and frequency variation. To assess the

influence of HCN and M channels on the LGMD's input impedance profile, we measured the input

impedance before and after addition of two channel specific blockers: ZD7288 and XE991,

respectively. Blocking g_H reduces the resting membrane potential and input resistance of the LGMD

(Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a), so after HCN blockade with ZD7288 we applied chirps with lower

peak current and higher DC holding current to generate equivalent V_{ss} values and changes in

membrane potential (Fig. 5A). After g_H blockade a decrease in the membrane potential was seen with

increasing chirp frequencies. Examination of the impedance amplitude shows that low frequency

impedance doubled after g_H blockade and that the impedance decreased more steeply with input

frequency (Fig. 5B). A reduction in inductance was also clear from the decreased impedance phase

after g_H block (Fig. 5C).

Blockade of g_M with XE991 increases the LGMD's resting membrane potential and input

resistance (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018b), so we used decreased holding currents and chirp amplitudes

after blockade to account for these changes. After g_M blockade, a resonance emerged (Fig. 5D,

arrowhead). This was reflected in the peak near 4 Hz in the impedance amplitude profile (Fig. 5E).

This increased 4 Hz impedance likely helps generate the increased spiking observed in response to ~4

Hz inputs following g_M blockade (Dewell & Gabbiani 2018b). After g_M blockade the impedance phase

increased at frequencies ≤ 2 Hz and decreased at higher frequencies (Fig. 5F). These effects suggest

that in addition to implementing an inductance evident above 2 Hz, g_M also counteracts an additional

inductance that increases impedance amplitude at frequencies around 4 Hz and phase at frequencies ≤

2 Hz. Both g_M and g_H reduced the frequency variation of the LGMD, with g_M causing a larger

reduction at depolarized potentials and g_H reducing it more at hyperpolarized potentials, consistent

with their activation kinetics (Fig. 5G). Finally, the impedance locus plots show that the increased

frequency variation after block of either channel is due to a large increase in the range of resistances

and a reduced high frequency reactance (Fig. 5H).

The resonant frequency of the LGMD increased with membrane potential in the control

condition but was more consistent across V_{ss} values after blockade of either g_H or g_M (Fig. 6A). The

strength of resonance was small at all V_{ss} values in control conditions and after g_H block (Fig. 6B).

After g_M block, though, at resting V_m and above a strong membrane resonance was observed with

impedance amplitudes around 3 Hz (Fig. 6A) double that of steady state (0 Hz) impedance (Fig. 6B).

Both conductances contribute to the low overall membrane impedance of the LGMD, with g_H causing

the largest reduction in maximum impedance amplitude at and below resting Vm and g_M reducing the

maximum impedance amplitude at depolarized potentials (Fig. 6C). After g_H block, this maximum

impedance occurred at ≤ 1 Hz for all membrane potentials (Fig. 6A). Although we did not measure the

effects of g_H and g_M blockade on transfer impedance, there was a high similarity between input and

transfer resonance in control conditions (transfer and input resonant frequencies were within 1 Hz of

each other and resonance strengths differed by < 0.05 for $>75\%$ of trials). So, the changes in transfer

resonance after channel block would most likely parallel the changes shown for input resonance.

In addition to reducing the impedance amplitude and making it more consistent across

frequencies, both g_H and g_M increased the membrane synchrony. After blockade of either channel the

input asynchrony increased, with g_M blockade having the largest effect (Fig. 6D). The large change in

synchrony after g_M blockade was due to a more capacitive minimum phase at high frequencies (Fig.

6E) and a more inductive maximum phase at low frequencies (Fig. 6F). This g_M dependent increase in

membrane synchrony could underlie the g_M dependent increase in spike timing precision observed

previously (Dewell & Gabbiani 2018b). Although, the range of impedance phases did not increase

significantly after g_H blockade, the input impedance phase decayed to a minimum at a lower frequency

(Fig. 5C). Both g_H and g_M improve the input synchrony of the LGMD, but even after blocking the

channels, the LGMD membrane was more synchronous than any RLC circuit model (compare Fig. 6D

and Fig. 4H). This suggests that there must be an additional mechanism beyond these membrane

conductances that increases the LGMD's membrane synchrony.

Neuronal morphology increases membrane gain and high frequency synchrony. To test the

influence of the LGMD's morphology on membrane impedance we conducted simulations with a

passive LGMD model. Plotting the input impedance phase of every section of the LGMD (Fig. 7A)

revealed that it was larger than that of an isopotential model (dashed line) indicating higher synchrony

between a local input current and membrane potential. For the same frequency range used in

experiments, the passive LGMD model segments had input asynchronies of 2.1 ± 1.1 ms, matching

experimental data (c.f. Fig. 4H). This suggests that the LGMD morphology plays a bigger role in the

membrane's input synchrony than its active conductances. The model showed a monotone decrease in

phase at frequencies below 35 Hz, but at higher frequencies the phase oscillated with a different

amplitude and period for each section (Fig. 7A). For all frequencies, all sections had higher input

synchrony than an isopotential equivalent model, with an average phase increase of ~60° for

frequencies ≥ 100 Hz (Fig. 7A, inset). The input impedance amplitude was also altered by cell

morphology, decreasing less with frequency than in an isopotential equivalent model (Fig. 7B; dashed

line). The input frequency variation of the model sections was 8.6 ± 4.7% for the physiologically

dominant frequency range (< 35 Hz; see Fig. 1), demonstrating that the LGMD's morphology alters the

input impedance amplitude profile as much as its active conductances. At higher frequencies, the input

impedance amplitude remained monotonically decreasing, but was always higher than that of the

isopotential model (Fig. 7B, dashed line). The largest average increase over that of the isopotential

model of 46% came at 210 Hz (Fig. 7D inset).

To determine whether the effects of morphology on impedance was unique to the LGMD, we

conducted similar simulations using four other neuronal morphologies covering a range of sizes and

branching patterns (Fig. 7C). For all morphologies, input impedance increased relative to their

isopotential equivalents (otherwise identical model but with zero axial resistance), with largest average

increase in the LGMD and a cerebellar Purkinje model for both the phase and amplitude (Fig. 7D and

E). Models of layer 2/3 pyramidal, CA1 pyramidal, and oriens-lacunosum moleculare (OLM) neurons

had a progressively smaller increase in input impedance relative to their isopotential equivalents (Fig.

7D,E).

Hence, the branched structures of the LGMD and other neurons enhance local inputs with

increased gain and higher synchrony, although this was offset in part by lower signal transfer because

the branching and axial resistance also increase voltage attenuation between cell regions. The net effect

of the morphology on the membrane impedance is therefore not immediately apparent. In experiments,

transfer impedance was measured by injecting current at a single location and recording the membrane

potential at another. Synaptic currents, however, impinge at thousands of locations spread out across

the dendrites. Furthermore, these inputs don't propagate independently to the site of spike initiation.

To assess the net effect of morphology on impedance we thus calculated the transfer impedance

in an all-to-all manner, with current frequencies between 0 and 5 kHz injected into each model

segment and the impedance measured in all other segments of the model. An example of transfer

impedance profiles from one dendritic segment of the LGMD is illustrated for a 35 Hz current in Fig.

7F (amplitude on left, phase on right). These plots show that segments near the current injection site

(arrowheads) had higher transfer impedance while more distant segments had lower transfer

impedance than an isopotential equivalent (dashed lines). For all segments of all models, at all

frequencies, nearby segments exhibited increased and distant segments decreased transfer impedance

relative to the isopotential model. To determine how far signals propagated before the increased

attenuation overcame the increased input impedance, we quantified, for each segment, its area of

increased transfer impedance relative to an isopotential equivalent. This was recorded as a percentage

of membrane for which transfer amplitude and phase were increased compared to the equivalent

isopotential model. In Fig. 7F, this percentage would correspond to the surface area of the segments

marked in red divided by the total membrane area (red and black).

For currents injected into some LGMD segments, the surface area with increased transfer

amplitude was as high as 90% and amounted to ~70% for the average segment (Fig. 7G, black). The

Purkinje model had a similar area of increased transfer as the LGMD (Fig. 7G, purple). Models of the

pyramidal and OLM neurons, however, had an increased transfer amplitude from most segments to

~90% of the neuron's surface area (Fig. 7G). These observations do not match those on input

impedance amplitude (Fig. 7D), suggesting that the LGMD and Purkinje morphologies are more

compartmentalized, with a higher (local) input impedance amplitude increase but a lower increase of

transfer impedance amplitude.

Across models, the increased input phase transferred to less of the cells' surface, though (Fig.

7H). For the LGMD, the improved synchrony of the input impedance spread throughout most of the

neuron. At best, transfer from some segments retained a more synchronous phase to 90% of the LGMD

surface, and on average inputs had higher transfer phase than in a corresponding isopotential model to

67% of the neuron (Fig. 7H, black). The Purkinje neuron had improved transfer phase to a slightly

smaller portion of the neuron, with transfer from the average segment retaining improved synchrony to

57% of the neuron (Fig. 7H, purple). The average model segment of pyramidal neurons and the OLM

interneuron had improved transfer phase to slightly less than 50% of the rest of the neuron (Fig. 7H).

That the morphologies with a larger area of increased transfer amplitude had smaller areas of increased

transfer phase indicates a tradeoff between timing and gain in the neuronal morphology with the

LGMD and Purkinje morphologies providing more sensitive temporal discrimination of inputs and the

pyramidal and interneuron morphologies providing increased signal gain.

In addition to quantifying the area of improved transfer, we also calculated membrane area

weighted averages of the transfer to examine the net effect of the morphology on signal transfer. As

neuronal branched morphologies cause membrane potentials to attenuate and increase delays, it would

not be surprising if the net effect of the branching morphology were a reduced transfer amplitude (and

synchrony, see next paragraph) relative to an isopotential model. This was not the case. The average

transfer impedance amplitude for the morphologies tested were all slightly increased above their

isopotential equivalent (Fig. 7I, dashed line). Each morphology generated a small bandpass increase in

transfer amplitude (Fig. 7J). The CA1 pyramidal model had the highest increase, with 40 Hz inputs

having a net increase of 9%. The LGMD and Purkinje morphologies generated smaller, higher

frequency peaks of 4-5% increase near 65 Hz. This shows that the branching morphology of neurons

provide a bandpass increase to the overall membrane gain.

To calculate the average transfer phase, values were weighted by the strength of the transfer

amplitude: if there is minimal signal transfer between 2 segments then the phase of that transfer is less

relevant. All morphologies had increased net transfer phase for signals above 100 Hz (Fig. 7K, L). For

lower frequencies, the increased input synchrony was almost exactly counteracted by transfer delay

yielding almost no net effect of morphology on low frequency phase (Fig. 7L, inset). The overall effect

of the morphologies on transfer phase was minimal on low frequency signals, but improved the

synchrony of high frequency signals, like those generated from fast synaptic currents.

Discussion

Here we have described the impedance properties of the LGMD *in vivo*, measured over the

range of frequencies encompassing most of the signal power mediated by the LGMD's synaptic inputs.

We found that the membrane impedance amplitude of the LGMD is consistent over the range of

subthreshold membrane potentials and input frequencies involved in the detection of approaching

objects. Further, the membrane impedance revealed a high degree of synchrony between input current

and resulting changes in membrane potential. This membrane synchrony and gain consistency were

both increased by the conductances g_H and g_M, as well as the neuron's branching morphology.

Despite a high rate of spontaneous and stimulus-evoked synaptic inputs due to the large number

of excitatory synapses the LGMD receives (Rind et al., 2016), most of its membrane power was

concentrated at low frequencies (Fig. 1E). During looming stimuli, as the rate of excitation increased,

the dominant signal frequency actually decreased with over 50% of the membrane potential spectral

power below 1.5 Hz (Fig. 1E, F). As neither the input nor the transfer impedance amplitude of the

LGMD were lowpass (Fig. 3A, B), this must reflect the characteristics of pre-synaptic inputs to the

LGMD. Neither the membrane gain, nor its synchrony changed dramatically over the frequencies

tested, favoring integration over a broad frequency range during looming. Yet, close to rest the

membrane gain was highest at 1.8±2.8 Hz (Fig. 3A) and synchrony (zero phase) was highest at 1.3±1.0

Hz (Fig. 4A), well within the range of dominant frequencies during looming stimuli (Fig. 1F). These

properties likely help shape the LGMD's selectivity for looming stimuli. If the LGMD's membrane

were lowpass it would decrease its ability to discriminate transient signals. In escape behavior,

selectivity is as important as detection, and the LGMD reliably discriminates between stimuli that

generate different, transient, synaptic input patterns (Gray et al., 2001; Peron and Gabbiani, 2009;

Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a). A more broadband membrane could thus help discriminate among

patterns of the synaptic inputs.

This raises the question of what shapes the frequency dependence of the membrane gain. We

found that the neuron's morphology (Fig. 7C) and the active conductances g_H and g_M (Fig. 5G)

dramatically reduced frequency variation of the membrane gain. This is surprising, as both g_H and g_M

increase as the membrane potential moves away from their reversal potential, thus providing negative

(restorative) feedback in response to membrane potential changes. Hence, g_H and g_M have been

categorized as 'inductive' making neurons more bandpass (Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000; Narayanan and

Johnston, 2008; Hu et al., 2009; Hönigsperger et al., 2015). Examination of the effect of g_H on the

membrane gain (Fig. 5B), reveals that its primary effect on the LGMD is in fact the same as in other

neurons, reduction of lowpass filtering. This will produce bandpass resonance, if the resulting highpass

inductance is strong enough, when paired with the lowpass effect of membrane capacitance. Therefore

whether the g_H narrows the membrane bandpass properties or broadens them, as it does here and in

CA3 interneurons (Anderson et al., 2011), depends on the relative balance of its effects and those of

other membrane properties.

That the overall influence of a conductance on membrane impedance is due to its interaction

with other membrane properties is even clearer in the effects seen when blocking g_M. In thalamic relay

neurons, low voltage activated Ca^{2+} (Ca_{LVA}) channels produce bursting and a 2-4 Hz resonance

(Hutcheon et al., 1994; Puil et al., 1994). The LGMD also has a Ca_{LVA} conductance that can generate

bursting (Peron and Gabbiani, 2009; Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018b). As recently shown, g_M antagonizes

this bursting, thus regulating the LGMD firing pattern (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018b). Blockade of g_M

also generated a change in impedance amplitude resulting in a 2-5 Hz resonance (Fig. 5D) matching

the frequency range of LGMD calcium bursts following g_M block (Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018b). In

hippocampal pyramidal neurons g_M blockade does not result in resonance (Hu et al., 2002, 2009),

suggesting that g_M antagonism of a Ca_{LVA} conductance likely does not occur in these neurons. It would

be interesting to test whether the resonance mediated by Ca_{LVA} channels in relay thalamic neurons is

similarly regulated by g_M.

In addition to showing low frequency variation, the impedance of the LGMD also showed

consistency across membrane potentials. As an object approaches increasing excitation causes

dendritic depolarization of >20 mV, so changes in dendritic integration properties with membrane

potential would influence the detection of impending collisions. Neither the amplitude nor the phase of

the membrane impedance changed much from -70 to -55 mV (Fig. 3 and 4). This consistency can also

be largely explained by g_H and g_M. At hyperpolarized potentials g_H increases, dominating the

membrane conductance, while conversely g_M increases with depolarization. At the LGMD's resting

membrane potential (-65 mV), both channels have large conductances and shallow activation kinetics

(Dewell and Gabbiani, 2018a, 2018b). This improves the consistency of the total membrane

conductance with changing membrane potential. If the activation ranges of g_H and g_M had less overlap

in the LGMD, they would be more likely to dominate within their activation range creating the

separate hyperpolarized and depolarized resonances seen in pyramidal cells (Hu et al., 2002, 2009).

This too demonstrates the importance of interactions between conductances in determining their effect

on the membrane's integration properties. As both g_H and g_M have kinetics that are sensitive to

numerous modulators, the channel interactions are likely dependent on modulatory state (Delmas and

Brown, 2005; Wahl-Schott and Biel, 2009). An advantage of *in vivo* characterization, as done here, is

that the channels are in their intrinsic modulatory state.

Synaptic integration is influenced by the membrane synchrony as well as its gain. Like for the

gain we found LGMD synchrony to be consistent across membrane potentials (Fig. 4A, B). We also

found that the LGMD membrane was more synchronous than could be explained by a circuit model

(Fig. 4H). The synchrony was enhanced by both g_H and g_M (Fig. 6D-F). Blockade of g_M produced a

capacitive phase shift at high frequencies and an inductive phase shift at low frequencies leading to

reduced synchrony. The low frequency inductive shift is most likely through interactions with Ca_{LVA}

channels (see above). In contrast, g_H had less influence on high frequencies but reduced low frequency

synchrony. At 1.3 Hz which is near the peak membrane power during looming stimuli (Fig. 1F) g_H

blockade increased the asynchrony from 0 to 10 ms.

Although g_H and g_M increased synchrony, the LGMD remained more synchronous after their

blockade than an equivalent circuit model. Testing a morphologically realistic LGMD model revealed

that the neuron's shape increased the membrane's input synchrony as much as the active conductances

(Fig. 7A, B). The branching morphology introduces new electrical paths whose axial resistivity does

not decrease with frequency. This led to increased input gain and input synchrony. Previous modeling

of dendritic atrophy in pyramidal neurons and Purkinje branching morphology have also found

increased gain and phase due to dendritic branching (Dhupia et al., 2015; Ostojic et al., 2015). This led

us to wonder how the influence of LGMD's morphology on impedance compared to other cell

morphologies, and whether the increase in input impedance caused by an extended neuronal

morphology was counteracted by decreased signal propagation. We tested this with transfer impedance

simulations of five neuronal morphologies.

Transfer impedance is defined between two locations. While its technically infeasible to

simultaneously record intracellularly from many places within a neuron, in a model it is no more

difficult to measure transfer between one hundred locations than between two. The reason we chose to

measure the all-to-all transfer rather than just transfer from individual dendrites to the site of spike

initiation as usual is simple. In neurons, *in vivo* synaptic currents impinge throughout the dendrites and

do not propagate in isolation, but continuously integrate with new inputs as they propagate. As far as

we know, this is the first examination of the sum transfer of a dendritic arbor in this fashion, and it

revealed that in the LGMD, as well as other cell morphologies, the net effect of the cell morphology is

an increase in all-to-all impedance gain and high frequency synchrony. Additionally, we found that the

net increase in gain is bandpass and provides a hitherto undescribed potential source of gamma

resonance (30-100 Hz; Fig. 7I). This furthers previous findings on the effects of dendritic morphology

on a neuron's integration capabilities (Moore et al., 1988; Mainen and Sejnowski, 1996; Dhupia et al.,

2015).

Ultimately the desired integration properties of a neuron are dictated by the pattern of its inputs

and its computational role. For hippocampal pyramidal neurons that receive theta rhythmic inputs, a

strong theta (4-10 Hz) resonance and synchrony could be advantageous (Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000;

Hu et al., 2009; Vaidya and Johnston, 2013). Similarly, it might be a computational benefit for cortical

neurons to exhibit large impedance changes with membrane potential to enhance differences between

up and down network states (Gutfreund et al., 1995b; Hasselmo, 2005; Heys et al., 2010; Wang, 2010).

For auditory neurons, specialized in detecting high frequency sound waves, a low capacitance and fast

membrane lead to membrane resonance at frequencies up to 400 Hz (Remme et al., 2014; Mikiel-

Hunter et al., 2016). The LGMD detects approaching objects and discriminates their specific input

statistics from a wide range of other input patterns through their integration over a wide range of

membrane potentials. Thus, achieving a high consistency in membrane impedance across frequencies

and membrane potentials by a balance of active membrane conductances and an extended morphology

is exactly what is needed to fine tune escape behaviors.

References:

Anderson WD, Galván EJ, Mauna JC, Thiels E, Barrionuevo G (2011) Properties and functional

implications of I_h in hippocampal area CA3 interneurons. Pflügers Archiv - European Journal

of Physiology 462:895–912.

Barrow AJ, Wu SM (2009) Low-Conductance HCN1 Ion Channels Augment the Frequency Response

of Rod and Cone Photoreceptors. Journal of Neuroscience 29:5841–5853.

Buzsáki G, Moser EI (2013) Memory, navigation and theta rhythm in the hippocampal-entorhinal

system. Nature Neuroscience 16:130–138.

Cole KS (1941) Rectification and inductance in the squid giant axon. The Journal of General

Physiology 25:29–51.

Cuntz H, Borst A, Segev I (2007) Optimization principles of dendritic structure. Theoretical Biology

and Medical Modelling 4:21.

Das A, Rathour RK, Narayanan R (2017) Strings on a Violin: Location Dependence of Frequency

Tuning in Active Dendrites. Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience 11 Available at:

http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncel.2017.00072/full [Accessed June 4, 2018].

Delmas P, Brown DA (2005) Pathways modulating neural KCNQ/M (Kv7) potassium channels.

Nature Reviews Neuroscience 6:850–862.

Dewell RB, Gabbiani F (2018a) Biophysics of object segmentation in a collision-detecting neuron

Rieke F, ed. eLife 7:e34238.

Dewell RB, Gabbiani F (2018b) M current regulates firing mode and spike reliability in a collision

detecting neuron. J Neurophysiol in press.

Dhupia N, Rathour RK, Narayanan R (2015) Dendritic atrophy constricts functional maps in resonance

and impedance properties of hippocampal model neurons. Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience 8

Available at: http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncel.2014.00456/abstract [Accessed

June 4, 2018].

Eyal G, Verhoog MB, Testa-Silva G, Deitcher Y, Lodder JC, Benavides-Piccione R, Morales J,

DeFelipe J, de Kock CP, Mansvelder HD, Segev I (2016) Unique membrane properties and

enhanced signal processing in human neocortical neurons. eLife 5 Available at:

https://elifesciences.org/articles/16553 [Accessed September 5, 2018].

Fotowat H, Harrison RR, Gabbiani F (2011) Multiplexing of Motor Information in the Discharge of a

Collision Detecting Neuron during Escape Behaviors. Neuron 69:147–158.

Gabbiani F, Krapp HG (2006) Spike-Frequency Adaptation and Intrinsic Properties of an Identified,

Looming-Sensitive Neuron. Journal of Neurophysiology 96:2951–2962.

Gabbiani F, Krapp HG, Koch C, Laurent G (2002) Multiplicative computation in a visual neuron

sensitive to looming. Nature 420:320–324.

Gabbiani F, Mo C, Laurent G (2001) Invariance of Angular Threshold Computation in a Wide-Field

Looming-Sensitive Neuron. J Neurosci 21:314.

Gastrein P, Campanac émilie, Gasselin C, Cudmore RH, Bialowas A, Carlier E, Fronzaroli-Molinieres

L, Ankri N, Debanne D (2011) The role of hyperpolarization-activated cationic current in

spike-time precision and intrinsic resonance in cortical neurons *in vitro*: I_h and neuronal timing.

The Journal of Physiology 589:3753–3773.

Gray JR, Robertson RM, Lee JK (2001) Activity of descending contralateral movement detector

neurons and collision avoidance behaviour in response to head-on visual stimuli in locusts.

Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology 187:115–

129.

Gutfreund Y, yarom Y, Segev I (1995a) Subthreshold oscillations and resonant frequency in guinea-

pig cortical neurons: physiology and modelling. The Journal of Physiology 483:621–640.

Gutfreund Y, Yarom Y, Segev I (1995b) Subthreshold oscillations and resonant frequency in guinea-

pig cortical neurons: physiology and modelling. The Journal of Physiology 483:621–640.

Hasselmo ME (2005) What is the function of hippocampal theta rhythm?—Linking behavioral data to

phasic properties of field potential and unit recording data. Hippocampus 15:936–949.

Häusser M, Mel B (2003) Dendrites: bug or feature? Current Opinion in Neurobiology 13:372–383.

Heys JG, Giocomo LM, Hasselmo ME (2010) Cholinergic Modulation of the Resonance Properties of

Stellate Cells in Layer II of Medial Entorhinal Cortex. Journal of Neurophysiology 104:258–

270.

Hönigsperger C, Marosi M, Murphy R, Storm JF (2015) Dorsoventral differences in Kv7/M-current

and its impact on resonance, temporal summation and excitability in rat hippocampal pyramidal

cells: Kv7/M-channel differences in dorsal and ventral CA1 pyramidal cells. The Journal of

Physiology 593:1551–1580.

Horowitz P, Hill W (2015) The Art of Electronics. The Art of Electronics, by Paul Horowitz, Winfield

Hill, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Hu H, Vervaeke K, Graham LJ, Storm JF (2009) Complementary Theta Resonance Filtering by Two

Spatially Segregated Mechanisms in CA1 Hippocampal Pyramidal Neurons. Journal of

Neuroscience 29:14472–14483.

Hu H, Vervaeke K, Storm JF (2002) Two forms of electrical resonance at theta frequencies, generated

by M-current, h-current and persistent Na^+ current in rat hippocampal pyramidal cells. The

Journal of Physiology 545:783–805.

Hutcheon B, Miura RM, Puil E (1996) Subthreshold membrane resonance in neocortical neurons.

Journal of Neurophysiology 76:683–697.

Hutcheon B, Miura RM, Yarom Y, Puil E (1994) Low-threshold calcium current and resonance in

thalamic neurons: a model of frequency preference. Journal of Neurophysiology 71:583–594.

Hutcheon B, Yarom Y (2000) Resonance, oscillation and the intrinsic frequency preferences of

neurons. Trends in Neurosciences 23:216–222.

Jones PW, Gabbiani F (2010) Synchronized Neural Input Shapes Stimulus Selectivity in a Collision-

Detecting Neuron. Current Biology 20:2052–2057.

Jones PW, Gabbiani F (2012) Impact of neural noise on a sensory-motor pathway signaling impending
collision. Journal of Neurophysiology 107:1067–1079.

Koch C (1984) Cable theory in neurons with active, linearized membranes. Biological Cybernetics
50:15–33.

Lampl I, Yarom Y (1997) Subthreshold oscillations and resonant behavior: two manifestations of the
same mechanism. Neuroscience 78:325–341.

London M, Hausser M (2005) Dendritic Computation. Annual Reviews of Neuroscience 28:503–532.

Mainen ZF, Sejnowski TJ (1996) Influence of dendritic structure on firing pattern in model neocortical
neurons. Nature 382:363–366.

Mauro A (1961) Anomalous Impedance, A Phenomenological Property of Time-Variant Resistance.
Biophysical Journal 1:353–372.

Mauro A, Conti F, Dodge F, Schor R (1970) Subthreshold Behavior and Phenomenological Impedance
of the Squid Giant Axon. The Journal of General Physiology 55:497–523.

McMillan GA, Gray JR (2015) Burst Firing in a Motion-Sensitive Neural Pathway Correlates with
Expansion Properties of Looming Objects that Evoke Avoidance Behaviors. Frontiers in
Integrative Neuroscience 9 Available at:
http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fnint.2015.00060/abstract [Accessed May 12,
2018].

Migliore M, Messineo L, Ferrante M (2004) Dendritic I_h Selectively Blocks Temporal Summation of
Unsynchronized Distal Inputs in CA1 Pyramidal Neurons. Journal of Computational
Neuroscience 16:5–13.

Mikiel-Hunter J, Kotak V, Rinzel J (2016) High-Frequency Resonance in the Gerbil Medial Superior

Olive Battaglia FP, ed. PLOS Computational Biology 12:e1005166.

Miyasho T, Takagi H, Suzuki H, Watanabe S, Inoue M, Kudo Y, Miyakawa H (2001) Low-threshold

potassium channels and a low-threshold calcium channel regulate Ca^{2+} spike firing in the

dendrites of cerebellar Purkinje neurons: a modeling study. Brain Research 891:106–115.

Moore LE, Yoshii K, Christensen BN (1988) Transfer impedances between different regions of

branched excitable cells. Journal of Neurophysiology 59:689–705.

Narayanan R, Johnston D (2008) The h Channel Mediates Location Dependence and Plasticity of

Intrinsic Phase Response in Rat Hippocampal Neurons. Journal of Neuroscience 28:5846–

5860.

O'Shea M, Williams JLD (1974) The anatomy and output connection of a locust visual interneurone;

the lobular giant movement detector (LGMD) neurone. Journal of Comparative Physiology

91:257–266.

Ostojic S, Szapiro G, Schwartz E, Barbour B, Brunel N, Hakim V (2015) Neuronal Morphology

Generates High-Frequency Firing Resonance. Journal of Neuroscience 35:7056–7068.

Peron S, Gabbiani F (2009) Spike frequency adaptation mediates looming stimulus selectivity in a

collision-detecting neuron. Nature Neuroscience 12:318–326.

Peron SP, Krapp HG, Gabbiani F (2007) Influence of Electrotonic Structure and Synaptic Mapping on

the Receptive Field Properties of a Collision-Detecting Neuron. Journal of Neurophysiology

97:159–177.

Peters HC, Hu H, Pongs O, Storm JF, Isbrandt D (2005) Conditional transgenic suppression of M

channels in mouse brain reveals functions in neuronal excitability, resonance and behavior.

Nature Neuroscience 8:51–60.

Puil E, Meiri H, Yarom Y (1994) Resonant behavior and frequency preferences of thalamic neurons.

Journal of Neurophysiology 71:575–582.

Remme MWH, Donato R, Mikiel-Hunter J, Ballestero JA, Foster S, Rinzel J, McAlpine D (2014)

Subthreshold resonance properties contribute to the efficient coding of auditory spatial cues.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 111:E2339–E2348.

Rind FC, Simmons PJ (1992) Orthopteran DCMD neuron: a reevaluation of responses to moving

objects. I. Selective responses to approaching objects. Journal of Neurophysiology 68:1654–

1666.

Rind FC, Wernitznig S, Pölt P, Zankel A, Gütl D, Sztarker J, Leitinger G (2016) Two identified

looming detectors in the locust: ubiquitous lateral connections among their inputs contribute to

selective responses to looming objects. Scientific Reports 6 Available at:

http://www.nature.com/articles/srep35525 [Accessed September 5, 2018].

Schlotterer GR (1977) Response of the locust descending movement detector neuron to rapidly

approaching and withdrawing visual stimuli. Canadian Journal of Zoology 55:1372–1376.

Sekulić V, Chen T-C, Lawrence JJ, Skinner FK (2015) Dendritic distributions of Ih channels in

experimentally-derived multi-compartment models of oriens-lacunosum/moleculare (O-LM)

hippocampal interneurons. Frontiers in Synaptic Neuroscience 7 Available at:

http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fnsyn.2015.00002/abstract [Accessed September

5, 2018].

Ströhmann B, Schwarz DWF, Puil E (1995) Electrical Resonances in Central Auditory Neurons. Acta
Oto-Laryngologica 115:168–172.

Ulrich D (2002) Dendritic Resonance in Rat Neocortical Pyramidal Cells. Journal of Neurophysiology
87:2753–2759.

Ulrich D (2014) Subthreshold delta-frequency resonance in thalamic reticular neurons. European
Journal of Neuroscience 40:2600–2607.

Vaidya SP, Johnston D (2013) Temporal synchrony and gamma-to-theta power conversion in the
dendrites of CA1 pyramidal neurons. Nature Neuroscience 16:1812–1820.

Wahl-Schott C, Biel M (2009) HCN channels: Structure, cellular regulation and physiological
function. Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences 66:470–494.

Wang X-J (2010) Neurophysiological and Computational Principles of Cortical Rhythms in Cognition.
Physiological Reviews 90:1195–1268.

Zhu Y, Gabbiani F (2016) Fine and distributed subcellular retinotopy of excitatory inputs to the
dendritic tree of a collision-detecting neuron. Journal of Neurophysiology 115:3101–3112.

Figure 1. Spontaneous and looming stimulus-evoked spectral power density of the LGMD's

membrane potential. A) Micrograph of the LGMD, illustrating its dendritic fields (labeled A, B and C),

the spike initiation zone (SIZ, marked with *) at the start of the axon, and the soma which lies outside

of the neuron's electrical signal path (adapted from Gabbiani et al., 2002). Scale bar: 25 μm. B) A

looming stimulus consists of a black square expanding symmetrically on the animal's retina (bottom).

It simulates an object of half size l approaching on a collision course at constant velocity v (< 0),

subtending an angular size $\theta(t)$ at the retina (top). C) Looming stimuli produce an angular size that

increases nonlinearly over time (top, blue line). Most of the response to looming stimuli occurs shortly

before the projected time of collision as can be seen in the average membrane potential (V_m, middle)

and firing rate (bottom, displayed as mean ± standard error of the mean, sem, for 59 looming stimuli; N

= 16 animals). D) Example recording of dendritic membrane potential within the LGMD while the eye

was exposed to uniform illumination (V_m low-pass filtered at 10 kHz and digitized at 40 kHz). E)

Despite the high frequency of spontaneous inputs, the V_m power is concentrated at frequencies below 5

Hz (black, abscissa is on logarithmic scale). During looming stimuli, the signal power increased 125-

fold but remained concentrated at low frequencies (blue). Inset shows the data on a double logarithmic

scale. Solid lines and shaded regions are mean ± sem (N=16 animals). F) Using wavelet analysis to

measure the membrane potential power density in both the frequency and time domains reveals that

during spiking there is increased high frequency power (dashed square), but the peak power remains at

frequencies <10 Hz. Plot displays the average power density map of the same 59 looming responses

shown in C and E.

Dewell and Gabbiani, Fig. 2

Figure 2. Characterization of LGMD's membrane impedance profile with *in vivo* dendritic recordings.

A) Either single or dual recordings were made from dendritic field A and the primary neurite

connecting field A to the SIZ. Image taken with a CCD camera during a dual recording after staining

the LGMD with Alexa 594. The internal solution of both electrodes contained Alexa 594 for

visualization. Red and green ellipses encompass the region sampled by the proximal and distal

electrode, respectively, across 12 recording pairs (8 animals). B) To measure membrane impedance,

chirp currents (sine waveforms of increasing frequency) were injected at different steady-state

membrane potentials (V_{ss}). At top is an example of a linearly increasing chirp current followed by four

recordings of the membrane potential in response to this chirp current superposed on different holding

currents (I_{hold}). The values of I_{hold} and V_{ss} (dashed lines) were 2, 0, -2, -4 nA and -56, -64, -74, -86 mV,

respectively (from top to bottom). C) Examples traces of low and high frequency sections of the

measured membrane current and potential. At low frequencies the current and potential are

synchronous (~0° impedance phase) but at high frequencies the potential trails the current (negative

impedance phase). Note that at high frequencies the membrane potential is reduced relative to the

current indicating a reduction in impedance amplitude. D) Impedance measurements were similar

when measured in voltage clamp. E) Signals attenuated more and had longer lags as the electrotonic

distance increased between recording electrodes (estimated by the difference in amplitudes of the

backpropagating action potential, bAP). Each point and error bar report the mean value and sd (across

different V_{ss} values) for a recording pair (N = 11 recording pairs from 8 animals). Mean bAP

amplitudes were 32 and 26 mV for the proximal and distal electrode; the dendritic path distance

between recordings ranged from 63 to 149 μm with a mean of 105 μm.

Dewell and Gabbiani, Fig. 3

Figure 3. The LGMD membrane impedance amplitude and voltage attenuation behave similarly across

frequencies and membrane potentials. A) Input impedance (Z_{IN}) amplitude profiles measured at

different steady-state membrane potentials (V_{ss}, see Fig. 2B) and displayed as mean ± sem (lines and

shaded regions) reveal a high degree of overlap across membrane potentials. The lines only show clear

separation for low frequencies (<10 Hz, dashed square) at membrane potentials >10 mV below V_{rest} (-

65 mV). N = 76 recordings from 56 animals. B) The transfer impedance (Z_{TR}) amplitude between

different dendritic sites also varied little across membrane potentials. The inset shows the average input

and transfer impedance amplitudes (solid lines) overlaid with those of an RLC circuit model as

depicted in panel F (dashed lines). N = 13 recording pairs from 10 animals. C) Voltage attenuation

(V_{att}) is more variable between recordings than impedance amplitude (note the larger sem regions in C

when compared to A or B) with ~20–35% reduction in voltage between dendritic locations. The inset

compares attenuation with that of the best-fit RLC model of panel F. Same data set as in B. D) The

frequency variation (f_{var}) of the input and transfer impedance amplitude as well as that of voltage

attenuation decreased slightly with membrane depolarization. The frequency variation shows the

consistency across frequencies, with a value of 0 indicating an ideal resistor. E,F) RC and RLC

circuits, respectively, were chained to obtain equivalent cylinder models for comparison with the data.

For both circuit models $G_m = 116$ µS/cm^2 and $C_m = 0.8$ µF/cm^2. See methods for details on impedance

calculations. G) Heatmap illustrating the effect of the RLC circuit inductor parameters on the

frequency variation of its input impedance. The left edge ($G_L = 0$) corresponds to the RC circuit

depicted in E. Slower inductor time constants (τ_L) increased frequency variation. Increasing the ratio

G_L/G_m increased frequency variability for slow inductors and decreased it for fast inductors. The red

line delimits the parameter region that had a frequency variation as low as the LGMD data. The star

indicates the parameter values used for the insets in panels B and C which best matched the shape of

the LGMD impedance amplitude profiles. H) Heatmap of an RLC circuit with τ_m twice that of the

LGMD (increasing either C_m or decreasing G_m had the same effect). For this slower circuit model, no

inductor parameter yielded an impedance as consistent across frequencies as the LGMD data. In G and

H plotted values are for input impedance; transfer impedance maps look similar but with frequency

variations of ~1.06 times those in the input impedance maps for all parameters.

956
957

958   Dewell and Gabbiani, Fig. 4

Figure 4. LGMD membrane synchrony and consistency across membrane potentials. A) Z_{IN} phase profiles (mean ± sem) are inductive (exhibit positive phase) only at frequencies < 1Hz (inset), show high overlap across membrane potentials, and level off around -30°. N = 76 recordings from 56 animals. B) Z_{TR} phases similarly exhibit induction at frequencies < 1Hz (inset) and overlap across membrane potentials. N = 13 recording pairs from 10 animals. C, D) Impedance locus plots show the real (resistance) and imaginary (reactance) components of the impedance, pooled across frequencies (dotted arrow). The membrane inductance at low frequencies is evidenced by the points with positive reactance. At hyperpolarized potentials, resistance increased but otherwise the LGMD maintained a consistent profile across membrane potentials. E) Phase lag of membrane potential at 'recording-only' location relative to that at the 'recording and current injection' location. At frequencies <1 Hz there was a phase advance with the more distant location preceding the input location (inset). The phase lag increased steadily with frequency. F) Asynchrony was measured as the mean absolute time lag between pairs of simultaneously recorded variables (0 ms equals perfect synchrony). Z_{IN} asynchrony corresponds to the lag between the input current and local membrane potential. Z_{TR} asynchrony was calculated from the lag between the input current and membrane potential at the secondary recording location and V_m transfer asynchrony from the lag between the membrane potentials at the two recording locations. Z_{TR} asynchrony decreased with membrane depolarization. G) RLC circuit input asynchrony as a function of its inductor parameters. Z_{TR} asynchrony was ~1.1 times higher than Z_{IN} values shown. The LGMD low frequency inductive phase could only be reproduced by a slow inductor. Dashed black lines in insets of A, B and E produced by parameters marked by black star in G. H) The LGMD exhibited higher synchrony between membrane current and voltage (phase nearer 0°) than an RC circuit model ($G_L = 0$) or the RLC circuit model marked by black star in G. No RLC parameters produce as small a mean Z_{IN} or Z_{TR} asynchrony as the LGMD.

Figure 5. Blockade of either HCN or M channels decreased membrane current-voltage synchrony and increased impedance variation with stimulus frequency. A) Example chirp currents (top) and membrane potential responses (bottom) before (left, black) and after (right, red) ZD7288 application. After drug application the chirp amplitude was decreased and I_{hold} was increased to produce a similar V_{ss} and similar changes in membrane potential. B) After blocking HCN channels with ZD7288, input impedance increased 2-fold at low frequencies. Population average impedance (across animals and V_{ss}) is shown as mean ± sem (solid line and shaded region). The grey line is the difference between the averages. C) Impedance phase decreased at all frequencies after HCN blockade, reducing membrane current-voltage synchrony. D) Example chirp currents (top) and response (bottom) before (left) and after (right) XE991 application. After drug application the chirp amplitude and I_{hold} were decreased to produce a similar V_{ss} and similar changes in membrane potential. E) After blocking M channels with XE991 a large increase in low frequency input impedance was also seen with peak at ~4 Hz. F) After M channel block impedance phase increased at low frequencies (<2 Hz) but decreased at higher frequencies. G) The increased low frequency impedance after blockade of HCN or M channels produced higher Z_{IN} frequency variations across steady-state membrane potentials. Z_{IN} frequency variation is displayed as linear fit (solid lines) and 95% confidence intervals (dotted lines). M channel blockade increased variation mainly at depolarized potentials while HCN blockade had a greater effect at hyperpolarized potentials. H) Input impedance locus plots before and after channel block show clear increases in both the resistance and capacitive reactance. Control data from 53 recordings at 181 V_{ss} from 44 animals; ZD7288 data includes 9 recordings at 36 V_{ss} from 6 animals; XE991 data includes 6 recordings at 14 V_{ss} from 6 animals.

Dewell and Gabbiani, Fig. 6

Figure 6. Membrane resonance decreased after HCN block but increased after M channel block. A)

The resonant frequency (f_R) of the LGMD increased with membrane potential under control conditions

(black), but after HCN block f_R decreased to < 1Hz for all potentials (red). Following I_M block, f_R

remained roughly constant at ~3Hz for all potentials (green). Data is plotted as best linear fit (solid

line) and 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines). B) The resonance strength, calculated as the

maximum impedance amplitude divided by steady-state impedance amplitude ($|Z_{IN}(0)|$), was <1.2 for

all membrane potentials under control conditions and after HCN block. After I_M block, however, a

larger resonance was observed at depolarized membrane potentials. C) Despite larger variations of the

f_R with membrane potential under control conditions (see A), the maximum impedance amplitude (max

$|Z_{IN}|$) changed more with V_m after either HCN or I_M blockade and was higher at all Vm values after

HCN block and at depolarized Vm after I_M block. D) Input asynchrony measured as the mean absolute

time lag between the input current and local membrane potential. I_m-V_m synchrony decreased by ~1

ms after HCN block (red) and ~2 ms after M channel block (green). Control data (black) is the same as

shown in Fig. 4F. E) The minimum impedance phase reached at high frequency decreased after I_M

blockade, especially at depolarized membrane potentials, approaching the -90° minimum phase of an

isopotential circuit. F) Conversely, the peak impedance phase at low frequency increased after I_M

block. Same recordings as in Fig. 5: control data from 53 recordings at 181 V_{ss} from 44 animals;

ZD7288 data includes 9 recordings at 36 V_{ss} from 6 animals; XE991 data includes 6 recordings at 14

V_{ss} from 6 animals.

Figure 7. Simulations of passive neurons reveal the influence of morphology on impedance

characteristics. A) Every segment of the LGMD model (thin black lines) had higher input impedance

phase than an isopotential model (dashed line). At frequencies >30 Hz input impedance phase

oscillated, with a period and amplitude depending on the considered dendritic section. B) All sections

of the LGMD model (thin black lines) exhibited a decrease in input impedance amplitude smaller than

that of an isopotential model (dashed line). For each section the impedance amplitude is normalized to

impedance at 0 Hz ($|Z_{IN}(0)|$). The difference between the input impedance amplitude and that of an

isopotential model was maximal at ~200 Hz. Insets in A and B show the average difference between

the extended and isopotential models. C) The effect of neuronal morphology on impedance was tested

in the LGMD (black) and 4 other cell morphologies of different size and shape: a cerebellar Purkinje

cell (purple), a hippocampal CA1 pyramidal cell (red), a cortical layer 2/3 pyramidal cell (blue), and a

CA1 oriens lacunosum-moleculare interneuron (OLM; green). D) All neuron models tested had large

increase in input phase compared to an isopotential equivalent model, with the LGMD and Purkinje

models exhibiting the highest phase. Data is color coded to depictions in C and presented as mean ± sd

(solid lines and shaded regions). E) All morphologies had increased input impedance amplitude

relative to their isopotential equivalents. Data presented as in D. F) Data from example dendritic

segments of the LGMD model shows that at 35 Hz the transfer impedance amplitude (left) and phase

(right) decreased with distance from the site of current injection (arrowhead). Segments for which

transfer impedance was higher than that of an isopotential equivalent neuron (dashed line) are red.

Data in G and H measured by summing the surface area of red segments and dividing by the total

surface area. G) For each neuron model segment, we summed the surface area of other model segments

for which signal transfer was increased compared to an isopotential equivalent and divided by the

neuron's total surface area. Bar widths indicate how many model segments had improved transfer for

each percentage range, and grey squares mark the average segment. All morphologies had increased

transfer amplitudes compared to an isopotential equivalent model, with the LGMD and Purkinje

morphologies having improved transfer for a smaller percentage of the neuron segments. H) For the

LGMD and Purkinje morphologies most segments had improved transfer phase to the majority of the

neuron (measured as sum area of segments with increased phase transfer over total area). For the other

morphologies most segments had reduced transfer phase to other segments comprising the majority of

the neuronal membrane. I) For all models, an average all-to-all transfer impedance was measured as a

function of frequency (colored lines) and compared to the impedance of an isopotential equivalent

(dashed line). All segments of all morphologies had very similar average transfer impedance profiles

with only a small deviation from isopotential (dashed line; each model displayed as mean ±1 sd). J)

The increase of each cell's mean transfer amplitude as a function of frequency from isopotential reveals

a bandpass increase in average transfer gain. K) The average all-to-all transfer phase for each model

was similar with improvements at frequencies above ~50 Hz relative to the isopotential model (dashed

line); solid lines and shaded regions are mean ± 1 sd for each model. L) The average change in phase

was slightly negative at frequencies near the cell's peak gain, and increased to ~20° in the kHz range.

Inset shows the average effect on transfer phase over the physiologically dominant frequency range.

1066