Distinct evolutionary trajectories of neuronal and hair cell nicotinic acetylcholine receptors

Irina Marcovich[1], Marcelo J. Moglie[1], Agustín E. Carpaneto Freixas[1], Anabella Trigila[1], Lucia F. Franchini[1], Paola V. Plazas[2], Marcela Lipovsek*[1,3] and Ana Belén Elgoyhen*[1,2]

[1] Instituto de Investigaciones en Ingeniería Genética y Biología Molecular "Dr. Héctor N. Torres" (INGEBI), Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[2] Instituto de Farmacología, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[3] Centre for Developmental Neurobiology, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, Guy's Campus, London SE1 1UL.

*These authors contributed equally.

Correspondence should be addressed to Marcela Lipovsek (marcela.lipovsek@kcl.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT

The expansion and pruning of ion channel families has played a crucial role in the evolution of

nervous systems. Remarkably, with a highly conserved vertebrate complement, nicotinic

acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs) are unique among ligand-gated ion channels in that distinct

members of the family have non-overlapping roles in synaptic transmission, either in the nervous

system, the inner ear hair cells or the neuromuscular junction. Here, we performed a comprehensive

analysis of vertebrate nAChRs sequences, single cell expression patterns and comparative functional

properties of receptors from three representative tetrapod species. We show that hair cell nAChRs

underwent a distinct evolutionary trajectory to that of neuronal receptors. These were most likely

shaped by different co-expression patterns and co-assembly rules of component receptor subunits.

Thus, neuronal nAChRs showed high degree of coding sequence conservation, coupled to greater co-

expression variance and conservation of functional properties across tetrapod clades. In contrast,

hair cell α9α10 nAChRs exhibited greater sequence divergence, narrow co-expression pattern and

great variability of functional properties across species. These results point to differential substrates

for random change within the family of gene paralogs that relate to the segregated roles of nAChRs

in synaptic transmission.

INTRODUCTION

The superfamily of pentameric ligand-gated ion channels (LGIC) has an extended evolutionary history and is present in all three life domains (Dent, 2006; Jaiteh et al., 2016; Tasneem et al., 2005). Extant members of the superfamily include eukaryote Cys-loop receptors that respond to acetylcholine (ACh), γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA), glycine or serotonin, invertebrate LGICs that respond to GABA, glutamate, ACh, serotonin and histamine, as well as prokaryote pH and GABA sensitive receptors, among others (Bocquet et al., 2009; Cully et al., 1994; Dent, 2006; Hervé Thany, 2010; Hilf and Dutzler, 2009; Karlin, 2002; Pan et al., 2012; Spurny et al., 2012; Tasneem et al., 2005; Zheng et al., 2002). Nicotinic acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs) are a major branch of the Cys-loop LGIC superfamily (Corringer et al., 2012; Karlin, 2002). To date, 17 different nAChR subunits have been described in the main vertebrate clades: α1-α10, β1-β4, δ, ε and γ (Lester et al., 2004; Millar and Gotti, 2009). These paralogous genes are proposed to derive from 5 paralogons, with the entire complement of extant subunits present in the vertebrate ancestor (Pedersen et al., 2019). Vertebrate nAChRs are non-selective cation channels that participate in numerous processes, most prominently neuromuscular junction (Kalamida et al., 2007; Steinbach, 1989), inner ear efferent (Elgoyhen and Katz, 2012) and neuronal (Albuquerque et al., 2009; Dani and Bertrand, 2007; Zoli et al., 2015) synaptic transmission.

Functional nAChRs are homomeric, comprising five identical subunits, or heteromeric, formed by at least two different subunits (Karlin, 2002; Millar and Gotti, 2009; Zoli et al., 2015). The rules that govern the combinatorial assembly of functional nAChRs are complex and for the most part unknown. Some nAChR subunits can combine with other numerous, albeit specific, subunits. In contrast, some subunits can only form functional receptors with a limited subset (Karlin, 2002; Millar and Gotti, 2009). This segregation has given rise to the three traditional subgroups of vertebrate nAChRs, neuronal, muscle and hair cell, named for their initially described tissue of origin and main functional location. Thus, neuronal nAChRs are formed by multiple combinations of α2-α7 (and α8 in non-mammals) and β2-β4 subunits, comprising a wide combinatorial range with alternative stoichiometries (Millar and Gotti, 2009; Zoli et al., 2015; Zoli et al., 2018). Muscle receptors show tighter co-assembly rules. They have a typical $\alpha1_2\beta1\gamma\delta$ (or $\alpha1_2\beta1\epsilon\delta$) stoichiometry and do not co-assemble with non-muscle subunits (Millar and Gotti, 2009; Mishina et al., 1986). Finally, the hair cell nAChR has a very strict co-assembly constraint, being formed exclusively by α9 and α10 subunits (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Scheffer et al., 2007; Sgard et al., 2002). While α9 subunits can form functional homomeric receptors (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Lipovsek et al., 2014), these are unlikely to play a major role in inner ear hair cells in vivo (Vetter et al., 2007). A consequence of the differences in co-assembly rules between the three subgroups of nAChRs is that,

while muscle cells can toggle between at least two receptor variants and neurons are capable of

expressing a great diversity of nAChRs, hair cells express only one type.

The complement of nAChR subunits is highly conserved across vertebrates and even more so in

tetrapods (Dent, 2006; Pedersen et al., 2019). This suggests a high gene family-wide negative

selection pressure for the loss of paralogs and highlights the functional relevance of each individual

subunit across the vertebrate clade. However, given the major differences in co-expression patterns

and co-assembly rules that distinguish the subgroups of nAChRs, in particular the contrast between

neuronal and hair cell receptors, distinct evolutionary trajectories most likely took place in different

members of the family. On the one hand, if only one (functionally isolated) receptor is expressed by

a given cell type, then selection pressure could have acted on stochastic changes of the coding

sequence of component subunits that altered receptor function. Such changes would not have

resulted in deleterious effects on other nAChRs given the restricted expression pattern of the

subunits. The aforesaid process could have dominated the evolutionary history of the hair cell $\alpha9\alpha10$

receptor. On the other hand, widely expressed subunits that co-assemble into functional receptors

with multiple others have been most probably subjected to strong negative selection pressure.

Changes in the coding sequence that led to changes in functional properties may have had

deleterious effects on alternative receptor combinations expressed in different cell types. In this

case, functional diversification could have arisen from stochastic changes in the expression patterns

of receptor subunits, resulting in a given cell changing the subtype of receptor it expresses, while

preserving individual subunit functionality. Such processes could have dominated the evolutionary

history of neuronal nAChRs. These contrasting theoretical scenarios bring forward three predictions

for the evolutionary history of nAChRs across the vertebrate clade. First, isolated (hair cell) subunits

may show coding sequence divergence while widespread (neuronal) subunits a high degree of

coding sequence conservation. Second, isolated subunits may show low co-expression variation

while widespread subunits a great variability in co-expression patterns. Finally, isolated receptors

may present divergent functional properties across species resulting from changes in coding

sequences, while widespread receptors may show highly conserved functional properties when

formed by the same subunits.

To test these predictions, we studied the molecular phylogeny and the variability in expression

pattern, coupled to co-assembly potential, of vertebrate nAChR subunits. Furthermore, we

performed a comprehensive comparative analysis of the functional properties of the hair cell

($\alpha9\alpha10$) and the two main neuronal ($\alpha7$ and $\alpha4\beta2$) nAChRs from three representative species of

tetrapods. In close agreement with the aforementioned predictions, neuronal subunits showed high

degree of sequence conservation and great variability in co-expression patterns. Additionally, the

functional properties of both α7 and α4β2 receptors did not differ across tetrapods. In contrast, the isolated hair cell α9α10 nAChRs showed the highest degree of sequence divergence and no co-expression variability. Moreover, the functional properties of α9α10 receptors from representative species of tetrapods showed unprecedented divergence, potentially echoing the evolutionary history of vertebrate auditory systems. In summary, here we present strong evidence supporting the notion that, within the family of paralog genes coding for nAChR subunits, receptors belonging to different subgroups (hair cell or neuronal) underwent different evolutionary trajectories along the tetrapod lineage that were potentially shaped by their different co-expression patterns and co-assembly rules. Furthermore, we propose that it is the difference in the most probable substrate for random change and subsequent selection pressure that separate the contrasting evolutionary histories of nAChRs subgroups.

RESULTS

Amino acid sequence divergence and co-expression patterns differentiate neuronal from hair cell nAChR subunits

The comparative analysis of gene paralogs provides the opportunity to test predictions about the evolutionary history of a gene family. In order to study the degree of conservation of coding sequences in subgroups of nAChRs, we performed an exhaustive evaluation of the sequence identity of vertebrate nAChR subunits. The analysis included amino acid sequences from 11 species of birds, reptiles and amphibians , all groups that were notably under-represented in previous work (Dent, 2006; Franchini and Elgoyhen, 2006; Le Novère et al., 2002; Lipovsek et al., 2012; Ortells and Lunt, 1995; Tsunoyama and Gojobori, 1998). The incorporation of these sequences is of particular importance to help resolve differences between clades. Overall, we analysed 392 sequences from 17 nAChR subunits belonging to 29 vertebrate species (Supplementary Table 1). Amino acid sequences were aligned with *Clusta*lW (Supplementary File 1) and a minimum evolution tree was generated (Figure 1 and Supplementary Figures 1-2). Based on sequence identity, the family of nAChR subunits can be split into four groups: α, non-α, α7-like and α9-like (Figure 1). Neuronal subunits (α2-α8 and β2-β4) have the highest degree of vertebrate-wide sequence conservation as observed by the overall, within and between clade comparisons (Figure 1 – bar graphs and Table 1). Percentage sequence identities (%seqIDs) between neuronal orthologues ranged between 72-84% (Figure 1 and Table 1). Moreover, %seqIDs for neuronal subunits within and between mammals and sauropsids clades were generally similar to or greater than vertebrate-wide %seqIDs (Figure 1 – bar graphs and Table 1). In contrast, the hair cell subunits showed lower %seqIDs, with the α10 subunit depicting the lowest value of all nAChR subunits (Figure 1 – bar graphs, red lines and Table 1). As previously reported with smaller datasets (Franchini and Elgoyhen, 2006; Lipovsek et al., 2012), the present extended analysis showed that α10 subunits are unique in presenting a segregated grouping of orthologues. Thus, whereas the orthologue sequences for most nAChR subunits grouped within their own respective branches, the sequences for the α10 subunits were split into two groups: non-mammalian α10 subunits as a sister group to all α9 subunits, and mammalian α10 subunits an outgroup to the α9/non-mammalian α10 branch (Figure 1 and Supplementary Figures 1-2). This segregation reflects the great divergence of mammalian α10 amino acid sequences with respect to their non-mammalian orthologues. In particular, mammalian and sauropsid sequences presented a low degree of between-clade conservation compared to the other nAChR subunits (61.29% - Table 1). Overall, the extended molecular evolution analysis of nAChR subunits showed that while neuronal subunits were highly conserved across all vertebrate clades, α10 hair cell subunits showed the greatest degree of sequence divergence.

The capability to co-assemble into functional receptors and the co-expression of nAChR subunits
within a given cell delineate the complement of receptors that shape its nicotinic ACh response.
Numerous heterologous expression experiments and subunit-specific pharmacological studies have
outlined a comprehensive repertoire of functionally validated pentameric assemblies
(Supplementary Table 2 and references therein). However, no systematic gene expression analysis
that explores the potential spectrum of nAChRs in a given cell type has been performed. In order to
evaluate co-expression patterns, and therefore the potential for co-assembly of nAChR subunits into
functional receptors in different cell-types, we sourced expression data from 10 recent single-cell
transcriptomic studies (Supplementary Table 3). First, from the gene expression matrices we
identified the repertoire of nAChR subunits detected in each single cell (Supplementary Figure 3).
Subsequently, we used a Bayesian approach (Kharchenko et al., 2014) to estimate the likelihood of a
gene being expressed at any given average level in a given cell type (Supplementary Table 4), thus
allowing us to both compare expression levels of individual subunits across cell types (Figure 2A and
Supplementary Figure 4) and survey the relative expression of subunits within each cell type. We
next combined this data with the catalogue of validated nAChR pentamers (Supplementary Table 2)
and outlined the potential complement of pentameric receptors present in each cell type, by
identifying the subunit combinations that are present within a 10-fold, 100-fold or 1000-fold range
of expression level or altogether absent (Figure 2B). As expected, neurons express a range of
neuronal nAChR variants. Major neuronal types are identified by their well characterised nAChRs.
For example, visceral motor neurons from thoracic sympathetic ganglia express receptors containing
α3 and β4 subunits, while cortical neurons express receptors containing α4, β2 and α7 subunits.
Ventral midbrain dopaminergic neurons express high levels of the α6 subunit, together with β2 and
β3 subunits and variable levels of α3, α4 and α5 subunits (Figure 2A). Receptors containing the α2
subunit are almost exclusively observed in retinal neurons. Also, GABAergic, glutamatergic and
dopaminergic neurons from hypothalamus, ventral midbrain and/or sympathetic ganglia present
noticeably different potential complements of nAChRs (Figure 2B). Differences in potential nAChRs
composition can be observed even between closely related cell types. For example, two subtypes of
cortical pyramidal neurons that differ on their projection targets (Chevée et al., 2018) show a
significant difference in the expression level of the α5 subunit (Figure 2C), indicating they could
differ on the ratio of α4β2/α4α5β2 receptors on the plasma membrane. Finally, inner ear hair cells
co-express high levels of α9 and α10 subunits (Figure 2D).

Taken together the analysis of aminoacid sequences and co-expression patterns indicates that,
whereas the α9 and α10 subunits have a restrict expression pattern, they also have the highest

sequence divergence. On the contrary, neuronal nAChRs present higher sequence identity together with a widespread expression pattern.

Divergence of biophysical properties differentiates neuronal from hair cell nAChRs

The restricted expression pattern of hair cell α9 and α10 nAChR subunits (Figure 2) and their exclusive co-assembly with each other (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Scheffer et al., 2007; Sgard et al., 2002), together with the higher level of α10 amino acid sequence divergence (Figure 1 and Table 1), indicate the potential for functional innovations across clades through changes in their coding sequences. In contrast, the high conservation of neuronal subunits coding sequences (Figure 1 and Table 1) may have resulted in highly conserved functional properties of neuronal receptors assembled from the same subunits. We experimentally tested this prediction by performing a comprehensive side-by-side comparison of the functional properties of the two main neuronal, α4β2 and α7 nAChRs, and the hair cell α9α10 nAChR from three representative species of tetrapod clades. To this end, we injected *Xenopus laevis* oocytes with the corresponding cRNAs and characterised the biophysical properties of ACh responses.

ACh evoked responses in tetrapod α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs

We first evaluated the ACh apparent affinity of α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs by performing concentration–response curves. Oocytes injected with rat (*Rattus norvegicus*), chicken (*Gallus gallus*) or frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*) α4 and β2 cRNAs responded to ACh and showed the characteristic two-component ACh dose-response curves that correspond to the well described $(α4)_3(β2)_2$ and $(α4)_2(β2)_3$ prevalent stoichiometries (Figure 3A, Table 2 and (Moroni et al., 2006; Zwart and Vijverberg, 1998)). Oocytes injected with rat, chicken or frog α7 cRNA responded to ACh with similar apparent affinities (Figure 3A, Table 2 and (Couturier et al., 1990; Papke and Porter Papke, 2002)). Finally, rat, chicken and frog α9 and α10 subunits formed functional heteromeric α9α10 nAChRs that responded to ACh in a concentration-dependent manner (Figure 3A and (Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Lipovsek et al., 2012)). The frog α9α10 receptor exhibited a significantly higher apparent affinity than its amniote counterparts (p = 0.0026 (vs rat), p = 0.0060 (vs chick) – Figure 3A and Table 2).

It has been previously reported that rat α9 (Figure 3B and (Elgoyhen et al., 1994)) and chicken α9 (Figure 3B and (Lipovsek et al., 2014)) subunits can form functional homomeric receptors. Likewise, frog α9 subunits assembled into functional homomeric receptors (Figure 3B). In contrast, rat α10 subunits cannot form functional receptors on their own (Figure 3B and (Elgoyhen et al., 2001)). Surprisingly, both chicken α10 (Figure 3B and (Lipovsek et al., 2014)) and frog α10 subunits assembled into functional homomeric receptors (Figure 3B).

In summary, α4β2 and α7 receptors from representative tetrapods showed similar responses to ACh
with no inter-species differences in apparent affinity. In contrast the frog α9α10 receptor exhibited a
10-fold difference in ACh apparent affinity compared to its amniote counterparts. Finally, α10
subunits showed clade-specific differences in the ability to form functional homomeric receptors in
the oocyte heterologous expression system.

Desensitization profiles of tetrapod α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs

A defining feature of nAChRs is their desensitisation upon prolonged exposure to the agonist (Quick
and Lester, 2002). Rat and chicken neuronal α4β2 receptors are characterised by slow
desensitisation kinetics (Mazzaferro et al., 2017). As shown in Figure 4, 70-80% of the maximum
current amplitude remained 20 seconds after the peak response to 100 μM ACh. Similarly, frog α4β2
receptors depicted slow desensitisation profiles, with no significant differences in the percentage of
current remaining 20 seconds after the peak response to 100 μM ACh when compared to that of rat
(p = 0.7326 – Table 2) and chicken α4β2 (p = 0.7204 – Table 2) nAChRs (Figure 4). The frog α7
nAChRs showed fast desensitisation with 2-3% of current remaining 5 seconds after the peak
response to 1 mM ACh, similar to that of rat α7 (p = 0.3743 – Table 2) and chicken α7 (p = 0.2496 –
Table 2) nAChRs (Figure 4 and (Bouzat et al., 2017; Couturier et al., 1990)).

The conserved desensitisation profiles observed for both types of neuronal receptors was in stark
contrast with that of α9α10 receptors (Figure 4 and Table 2). While rat and chicken α9α10 receptors
showed similar and somewhat slow desensitization, with 60-65% of current remaining 20 seconds
after the peak response to ACh (p = 0.9999 – Table 2), frog α9α10 nAChRs exhibited significantly
higher desensitization (14.5% of current remaining 20 seconds after the ACh peak) when compared
to rat α9α10 (p=0.0051 – Table 2) and chicken α9α10 (p=0.0042 – Table 2) receptors.

Modulation by extracellular calcium of tetrapod α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs

Neuronal nAChRs are potentiated by extracellular divalent cations such as Ca^{2+} via an allosteric and
voltage-independent mechanism (Galzi et al., 1996; Mulle et al., 1992; Vernino et al., 1992). The rat
α9α10 nAChR, on the other hand, is both potentiated and blocked by physiological concentrations of
extracellular divalent cations (Weisstaub et al., 2002). Blockage occurs in the micromolar range, is
voltage dependent and proposed to occur as a result of calcium permeation (Weisstaub et al., 2002).
To perform a comparative analysis of calcium modulation on rat, chicken and frog α4β2, α7 and
α9α10 receptors, responses to near-EC_{50} concentrations of ACh were recorded in normal Ringer's
solution at a range of Ca^{2+} concentrations and normalised to the response at 1.8 mM Ca^{2+} (Figure 5).
For the neuronal α4β2 (Figure 5 - top panels) and α7 (Figure 5 - middle panels) receptors from all
three species, a similar potentiation pattern was observed, with increasingly higher responses to

ACh at greater Ca^{2+} concentrations. In contrast, responses of α9α10 nAChRs from rat, chicken and

frog (Figure 5 - bottom panels) exhibited differential modulation by extracellular Ca^{2+}. As previously

reported for the rat α9α10 receptor, responses to ACh were potentiated by extracellular Ca^{2+}, with

maximal responses observed at 0.5 mM. Higher Ca^{2+} concentrations resulted in block of ACh

responses (Figure 5 - bottom left panel and Weisstaub et al., 2002). The chicken α9α10 receptor also

showed peak potentiation of the ACh response at 0.5 mM extracellular Ca^{2+}. However, no evident

block was observed at higher concentrations of the cation (Figure 5 - bottom middle panel). Finally,

the frog α9α10 receptor showed potentiation of ACh responses at all Ca^{2+} concentrations assayed,

with maximal responses detected at 3 mM Ca^{2+} (Figure 5 - bottom right panel). In summary, α4β2

and α7 neuronal receptors showed no significant inter-species differences in modulation by

extracellular calcium. In contrast, α9α10 receptors showed species specific features, with frog α9α10

receptors showing a calcium modulation profile similar to that of neuronal receptors.

Calcium permeability of tetrapod α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs

Calcium permeation through nAChRs holds great functional significance for the activation of calcium

dependent conductances and intracellular signalling pathways (Dani and Bertrand, 2007). Receptors

containing the α7 subunit have high calcium permeability (Séguéla et al., 1993) whereas receptors

containing α4β2 subunits have a lower contribution of calcium to the total current (Haghighi and

Cooper, 2000; Lipovsek et al., 2012). Inner ear hair cell α9α10 nAChRs are unique in their inhibitory

synaptic activity via calcium dependent coupling to SK2 channels in mammals (Glowatzki and Fuchs,

2000; Goutman et al., 2005), birds (Fuchs and Murrow, 1992a; Fuchs and Murrow, 1992b), turtles

(Art et al., 1984) and frogs (Castellano-Muñoz et al., 2010). Differences in calcium permeability

between mammalian and avian α9α10 nAChRs have been reported and proposed to be linked to a

differential role of intracellular calcium stores in efferent modulation of hair cell activity and the

mammalian specific coupling to BK channels (Lipovsek et al., 2014; Lipovsek et al., 2012).

In order to perform a comparative analysis of the extent of the calcium component of ACh responses

of tetrapod neuronal and hair cell nAChRs, we studied the differential activation of the oocyte's

endogenous calcium-activated chloride current (ICl_{Ca}). In oocytes expressing a recombinant receptor

with high calcium permeability, the ICl_{Ca} is strongly activated upon ACh application (Barish, 1983;

Miledi and Parker, 1984). Incubation of oocytes with the membrane-permeant fast Ca^{2+} chelator

BAPTA-AM subsequently abolishes the Cl^{-} component of the total measured current (Gerzanich et

al., 1994). Figure 6 shows representative responses to ACh before and after a 3-hour incubation with

BAPTA-AM for α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs from rat, chicken and frog. Whereas ACh-evoked

currents were only slightly affected in all α4β2 nAChRs denoting no major calcium influx (70-80% of

current remaining after BAPTA incubation, Figure 6, left panels), all α7 receptors showed a strong

reduction of the ACh response after BAPTA incubation (30-40% of current remaining after BAPTA),

indicating significant calcium permeation (Figure 6, middle panels). Thus, no inter-species

differences in the proportion of calcium current for both the low calcium permeant α4β2 and the

highly calcium permeant α7 neuronal receptors were observed (Table 2). Conversely, and as

previously reported (Lipovsek et al., 2014; Lipovsek et al., 2012), we observed a marked difference in

the extent of calcium current between the rat and chicken α9α10 receptors (p = 0.0299 – Figure 6,

right panels and Table 2). Moreover, the percentage of remaining response after BAPTA-AM

incubation for the frog α9α10 receptor (Figure 6, right panels) was similar to that of the rat receptor

(p = 0.9999 – Table 2) and significantly different from that of the chicken α9α10 nAChR (p = 0.0013 –

Table 2). In summary, while α7 and α4β2 neuronal nAChRs showed no inter-species difference in the

extent of calcium current, the frog α9α10 receptor showed a calcium component significantly higher

than that of its chicken counterpart and similar to that of the rat α9α10 receptor.

Current-voltage relationships of tetrapod α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs

Neuronal nAChRs are characterised by a strong inward rectification, with negligible current at

depolarized potentials (Bertrand et al., 2006; Sands and Barish, 1992; Séguéla et al., 1993). This is

proposed to be a relevant feature for their roles as pre-synaptic modulators of neuronal

transmission (Haghighi and Cooper, 2000). On the other hand, amniote α9α10 nAChRs exhibit a

peculiar current-voltage (I-V) relationship due to a considerable outward current at positive

potentials (Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Lipovsek et al., 2012).

In order to perform a comparative analysis of the rectification profiles of neuronal and hair cell

nAChRs we obtained I-V curves by applying a 2 seconds voltage ramp protocol (-120 to +50 mV) at

the plateau of ACh response for α4β2 and α9α10 nAChRs or by recording the current amplitude

elicited by 100 μM ACh at different holding potentials for the highly desensitizing α7 receptor. All

neuronal nAChRs exhibited I-V curves with marked inward rectification with no significant inter-

species differences for either α4β2 or α7 tetrapod receptors (Figure 7, top left and middle panels

and Table 2). Conversely, each of the hair cell α9α10 nAChRs analysed presented its unique I-V

profile. As previously reported, rat α9α10 receptors showed significant outward current at

depolarised potentials and greater inward current at hyperpolarised potentials (Figure 7, top right

panel and Elgoyhen et al., 2001). The chicken α9α10 receptor showed outward current similar to

that of the rat α9α10 receptor, but the inward current was smaller (Figure 7, top right panel).

Surprisingly, the frog α9α10 receptor showed an I-V profile similar to that of neuronal nAChRs, with

strong inward rectification and almost no outward current at depolarised potentials (Figure 7). In

order to quantify the degree of rectification exhibited by each nAChR subtype we obtained the ratio

of current at +40 mV to that at -90 mV (I_{+40}/I_{-90}, Figure 7, bottom panels). Neuronal nAChRs

presented I_{+40}/I_{-90} values smaller than 1, denoting their pronounced inward rectification and showing

no inter-species differences (Table 2). In contrast, the I_{+40}/I_{-90} ratio of α9α10 receptors reflected the

differences in rectification profile (Table 2), with the frog α9α10 receptor showing a I_{+40}/I_{-90} below 1

and significantly different to the higher values obtained for the chick α9α10 (p = 0.0406 – Table 2)

and rat α9α10 (p < 0.0001 – Table 2) receptors that also differed between each other (p = 0.0229 –

Table 2). In summary, while neuronal α4β2 and α7 receptors showed no interspecies differences, the

α9α10 receptors from the three species analysed showed their own individual I-V curves with

different patterns and degrees of rectification.

Comparative functional analysis of neuronal and hair cell nAChRs shows distinct evolutionary

trajectories

Altogether, the characterisation of individual functional properties of tetrapod nAChRs showed a

stark contrast between neuronal and hair cell nAChRs. In order to concomitantly analyse the

diversification, or conservation of receptor function, we performed principal component analysis

(PCA) on all the functional variables measured on α4β2, α7 and α9α10 receptors from the three

species (Table 3). The first two principal components accounted for 82% of the variability (Figure 8).

Moreover, the distribution of receptors in PCA space reflected their overall functional differences

and similarities. Both neuronal α4β2 and α7 receptors occupied distinct regions, more distant in PC1

than in PC2 denoting that these receptors differ more on ACh apparent affinity, desensitisation and

calcium permeability than they do on rectification and calcium modulation (Figure 8). Also, α4β2 and

α7 receptors from the different species were located very close together, reflecting the lack of inter-

species differences in functional properties. In contrast, the hair cell α9α10 receptors from the

different species were distant from each other in PCA space, denoting their extensive functional

divergence (Figure 8). Interestingly, the frog α9α10 nAChR was closer to the α7 receptors than to its

amniote counterparts, highlighting the overall functional similarity between the amphibian α9α10

and α7 nAChRs.

Amino acid sequence phylogenies, co-expression/co-assembly patterns and functional experiments

support the hypothesis of differential evolutionary trajectories for neuronal and hair cell receptors.

Further insight could be attained by the evaluation of these parameters on the receptors present in

the last common ancestor of rat and chicken (amniote ancestor) and of rat, chicken and frog

(tetrapod ancestor). To tackle this, we inferred amniote and tetrapod ancestral sequences for the

receptors and predicted the character state for the functional properties on the α4β2, α7 and α9α10

ancestral receptors (see methods). We then projected this predicted functional states onto the

functional PCA space of the extant receptors (Figure 8). As expected, the predicted ancestral α4β2

and α7 amniote and tetrapod receptors were located close to their extant counterparts. In contrast,

the predicted ancestral states of the α9α10 receptors were localised halfway between the frog

α9α10 and the amniote chicken and rat α9α10 extant receptors, potentially reflecting the functional

evolutionary trajectory of the hair cell receptor. Thus, the ancestral tetrapod α9α10 receptor may

have functionally resembled the extant frog α9α10 receptor and neuronal α7 receptors, mainly on

properties with heavier loading on PC2 (i.e., rectification and calcium permeability). Moreover, the

ancestral amniote α9α10 receptor may have had functional properties that more closely resembled

those of neuronal α4β2 receptors, in particular for properties with heavier loading on PC1 (i.e., ACh

apparent affinity, desensitization and calcium modulation). In summary, the data portrayed in Figure

8, that incorporates information on amino acid sequence and functional properties, describes a

plausible scenario for the functional evolutionary trajectories undertaken by two neuronal and the

hair cell nAChRs within the tetrapod lineage.

Discussion

The expansion of ion channel families on the vertebrate stem branch was mostly driven by the two rounds of whole genome duplications (Roux et al., 2017). This has played a crucial role in the evolution of nervous systems and provided raw material that enabled the diversification of cell types (Liebeskind et al., 2015) resulting in the complexity acquired by vertebrate brains (e.g.(Sugino et al., 2019)). Among the different ion channel families, Cys-loop receptors are within those that underwent the greatest expansion (Liebeskind et al., 2015). While the last common ancestor to bilateria most likely had at least an α7-like subunit, an α9-like, a neuronal/muscle α-like and a neuronal/muscle β-like subunit (Dent, 2006), the entire extant complement of nAChRs, which includes 17 different subunits (α1-α10, β1-β4, δ, ε and γ), was already present in the last common ancestor of all vertebrates (Pedersen et al., 2019). With the exception of some fish species that acquired α11, β1.2 and β5 subunits, for which no expression or functional data has yet been reported (Pedersen et al., 2019), and the loss of the α7-like α8 subunits in mammals, the complement of original vertebrate nAChR subunits has been remarkably conserved. Moreover, within the repertoire of ligand-gated ion channels, nAChRs are unique in that distinct members of the family have non-overlapping and segregated roles in synaptic transmission, either in the nervous system, inner ear hair cells or the neuromuscular junction (Dani and Bertrand, 2007; Elgoyhen and Katz, 2012; Mishina et al., 1986). In this work, we performed in-depth analyses of coding sequence phylogeny, subunit co-expression patterns and comparative functional properties of neuronal and hair cell receptors to explore the potential impact of these segregation of nAChRs subgroups on their respective evolutionary histories. We found a stark contrast between neuronal and hair cell receptors in all variables analysed. Neuronal subunits showed high degree of coding sequence conservation, coupled to greater co-expression variability and conservation of functional properties across tetrapod clades. In contrast, the hair cell α9α10 nAChR showed greater sequence divergence, a highly restricted co-expression pattern and a great degree of variability of functional properties across species. These results indicate that along the tetrapod lineage neuronal and hair cell nAChRs underwent alternative evolutionary trajectories. These were most likely shaped by the differential availability of substrates on which random changes and selection pressure could act upon that resulted from the segregating co-expression patterns and co-assembly rules of component subunits.

The observation that the biophysical functional properties of α4β2 and α7, as examples of neuronal nAChRs, were conserved in the three tetrapod species analysed, relates to their high degree of amino acid sequence conservation (Figure 1 and Table 1). Cholinergic innervation is pervasive, with almost every area of the brain being influenced by nicotinic signalling (Dani and Bertrand, 2007). Moreover, the expression of nAChR subunits is extremely widespread in the central and peripheral

nervous system and neuronal nAChRs assemble in multiple combinations (Supplementary Table 2).

Thus, randomly acquired changes in the coding sequence of a given subunit might be deleterious for

receptor function in a multitude of neuronal types. Such coding sequence changes would therefore

be under strong negative selection pressure. This is in agreement with the absence of signatures of

positive selection in the protein-coding DNA sequences of α4, β2 and α7 subunits (Lipovsek et al.,

2012). Moreover, it parallels previous reports showing that the coding regions of brain expressed

genes show little or no evidence of positive selection (Haygood et al., 2010; Nielsen et al., 2005).

The strong conservation of coding sequence and functional properties we describe here for neuronal

nAChRs, most likely due to negative selection pressure, excludes this substrate as a potential source

of random change that could subsequently result in functional diversification. However, variability in

neurons could alternatively result from a re-shuffling of the complement of nAChR subunits being

expressed. Therefore, and as for most brain expressed genes (Haygood et al., 2010; He et al., 2017;

Hoekstra and Coyne, 2007; Meyer et al., 2017; Nielsen et al., 2005), random changes in non-coding

regions that lead to differential expression patterns across brain areas or species may have played a

substantial role in delineating the evolutionary trajectories of these subtype of nAChRs. Thus, the

differential expression of neuronal nAChRs in different neuronal types, together with the multiple

alternative heteropentameric assemblies (Supplementary Table 2 and (Zoli et al., 2015)), are the

most likely pool of diversity potential. Functional neuronal receptors can be assembled from single α

subunits (e.g. α7), single α and single β subunits (e.g. α4β2), multiple α subunits with single β

subunits (e.g. α4α5β2), single α and multiple β subunits (e.g. α6β3β4) and multiple α and β subunits

(e.g. α4α5β2β3) (Supplementary Table 2 and references therein). Diversity of neuronal nAChRs is

further expanded via the assembly of alternative stoichiometries (e.g. $\alpha4_2\beta2_3$ and $\alpha4_3\beta2_2$). In

agreement with this, our survey of expression patterns across the mouse brain provides numerous

instances of potential functional variability and diversification, even between closely related

neuronal types. For example, dopamine exerts a key role in motivation and reinforcement (Schultz,

2007; Waelti et al., 2001) and this is known to be involved in the addictive properties of nicotine

(Picciotto and Corrigall, 2002; Picciotto et al., 1998). The differential co-expression patterns of

nAChR subunits between the four different subtypes of dopaminergic (DA) midbrain ventral

tegmental area (VTA) neurons defined by transcriptomic analysis ((La Manno et al., 2016) and Figure

2) may contribute to the understanding of the differential control of dopaminergic neuron-firing

patterns by cholinergic input (Mameli-Engvall et al., 2006; Maskos et al., 2005). The α4 and β2

subunits can co-assemble with α5 or β3 subunits (Jain et al., 2016; Kuryatov et al., 2008; Ramirez-

Latorre et al., 1996). Inclusion of α5 can alter α4β2* nicotinic receptor properties substantially,

increasing ACh sensitivity, desensitization kinetics and Ca^{2+} permeability (Kuryatov et al., 2008;

Ramirez-Latorre et al., 1996; Tapia et al., 2007). In addition, incorporation of the β3 subunit to the

α4β2* receptor also increases ACh sensitivity, without significantly affecting Ca^{2+} permeability

(Kuryatov et al., 2008; Tapia et al., 2007). While the β2 and β3 subunits are expressed at comparable

levels in all four VTA DA neuron types, VTA2 and VTA4 showed lower levels of α4, and α5 expression

was present at different (albeit low levels) in VTA1, VTA2 and VTA4 and absent in VTA3 DA neurons.

This indicates that the four subtypes of DA neurons might express differential levels of functionally

distinct α4β2, α4α5β2 and α4β2β3 receptors. Moreover, they all showed equally high levels of the

α6 subunit and low (or undetectable) levels of the α3 subunit, both of which can co-assemble with

α4, α5 and/or β2 subunits, greatly enhancing the complexity of individual nAChRs-mediated

responses of VTA DA neurons to modulatory cholinergic input.

Cortical pyramidal neurons provide a further example of the incremental value of transcriptomic

analysis of the complement of nicotinic subunits. The activity of cortical layer VI neurons is

modulated by a dense cholinergic innervation from the basal forebrain and ACh elicits robust

excitatory responses acting on α4β2* nAChRs. Moreover, layer VI is one of the few cortical areas

that express the accessory α5 nAChR subunit (Proulx et al., 2014; Tian et al., 2014). Cortical neurons

that project to both the ventral posteromedial nucleus (VPM) and the posteromedial complex of the

thalamus express significantly higher levels of the α5 subunit than neurons projecting to the VPM

only (Figure 2C). This suggests VPM-only projecting neurons could have a lower density of α4α5β2

compared to α4β2 nAChRs. In turn, this may contribute to differential cholinergic modulation of

these subtypes of layer VI neurons, that also show differences in excitability (Landisman and

Connors, 2007).

The widespread and overlapping expression of neuronal nAChR subunits is in sharp contrast with the

extremely narrow expression pattern of α9 and α10 subunits. As expected, these are only co-

expressed at very high levels in inner ear hair cells (Figure 2D). With the exception of trace levels of

α10 (not accompanied by α9) at some hypothalamic neurons, hair cell subunits are not expressed in

the brain areas surveyed. These observations support the notion that α9 and α10 are not a subtype

of brain nicotinic subunits (for reviews see (Morley et al., 2018)), but form a group of their own,

characterised by unique expression profile, pharmacological and biophysical properties (Elgoyhen et

al., 1994; Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Katz et al., 2000; Weisstaub et al., 2002). Most notably, nicotine, the

diagnostic agonist of the nAChRs family, does not act as an agonist of α9α10 receptors, but as a

competitive antagonist (Elgoyhen et al., 2001). This is in line with the vast body of literature

indicating that α9α10 nAChRs exclusively mediate fast efferent neurotransmission to cochlear and

vestibular hair cells in the inner ear (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Elgoyhen and Katz, 2012; Elgoyhen et al.,

2001; Holt et al., 2001; Parks et al., 2017).

In addition to high levels of α9 and α10 subunits, hair cells express a number of neuronal (β2 and β4)

and muscle (α1, β1, γ/ε) subunits (Figure 2 and (Roux et al., 2016; Scheffer et al., 2007)). However,

no responses to nicotine application are detected in hair cells (Fuchs and Murrow, 1992b; Gomez-

Casati et al., 2005; Scheffer et al., 2007), indicating that functional muscle or neuronal nAChRs are

not present at the plasma membrane. The detection of neuronal and muscle subunits mRNA may

result from redundant or residual transcription regulation mechanisms. In that context, developing

hair cells appear to recapitulate the γ to ε switch in accessory muscle subunit expression (Figure 2A)

that characterises neuromuscular junction maturation (Mishina et al., 1986). Moreover, similar

"leaky" expression of muscle subunits was detected in a number of neuronal types (Figure 2A).Of

note, muscle subunits showed relatively low levels of coding sequence conservation (Figure 1).

However, muscle cells can toggle between at least two receptor variants (Mishina et al., 1986).

These observations place muscle receptors in between the two extremes of hair cell (isolated) and

neuronal (widespread) receptors. Then, a further test of our hypothesis would be to perform a

comparative study of muscle receptors, with the prediction that a modest level of functional

divergence may be encountered, but outperformed by the differences between muscle receptor

variants.

Spiral ganglion neurons provide afferent innervation to cochlear hair cells and express a range of

neuronal nAChR subunits (Figure 2 and (Hiel et al., 1996; Morley et al., 1998; Reijntjes and Pyott,

2016)). Interestingly, low levels of α9 and α10 subunits are present in SGNs (Figure 2 and (Shrestha

et al., 2018)) and similarly low expression was detected by two other independent single-cell RNA

sequencing studies (Petitpre et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2018). If this low level of α9 and α10 mRNA

proves to be more than "transcriptional noise" then SGNs may be unique among neurons in

expressing the hair cell α9α10 receptor. This might be related to the shared developmental origin of

SGNs and HCs at the otic placode (Arendt et al., 2016; Fritzsch and Beisel, 2004) and could open the

possibility that in addition to neuronal nAChRs, which are thought to partly mediate the nicotinic

effect of lateral olivocochlear terminals on afferent dendrites (Reijntjes and Pyott, 2016), α9α10

nAChRs may also play a role. Finally, α9 expression was not detected in any dorsal root ganglion

neurons, while α10 is present at very low levels in only a few subtypes (Figure 2A and (Usoskin et al.,

2015)). These observations support those reported by qPCR and functional assays (Hone et al., 2011;

Rau et al., 2004) and provide further evidence that the participation of α9* nAChRs in pain processes

is not due to its presence in DRG neurons (Hone et al., 2011; Rau et al., 2004).

The observations that α9 and α10 genes are only co-ordinately transcribed at inner ear hair cells,

together with their ability to only form functional heteromeric receptors when co-assembled with

each other but not with other nAChR subunits (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Elgoyhen et al., 2001; Scheffer

et al., 2007), support our hypothesis that evolutionary changes in the hair cell receptors may have

been focused at the coding sequence. Moreover, it suggests that species specific differences in

olivocochlear cholinergic synaptic transmission could only rely upon modifications in the functional

properties of α9α10 nAChRs. Accordingly, vertebrate α9 and α10 subunits exhibit low overall amino

acid sequence identity (Table 1 and Figure 1), with mammalian α10 subunits showing a higher than

expected accumulation of non-synonymous substitutions that were positively selected (Franchini

and Elgoyhen, 2006; Lipovsek et al., 2012). In addition, α9 subunits also show a high number of

mammalian-specific changes (Lipovsek et al., 2014). As a consequence of this evolutionary

trajectory, the biophysical properties of α9α10 receptors drastically changed across vertebrate

species (Figure 8 and (Lipovsek et al., 2014; Lipovsek et al., 2012)). Crucially, given the restricted

expression pattern and the exclusive co-assembly of the α9 and α10 subunits, these were isolated

evolutionary events within the nAChRs family that did not alter cholinergic synaptic function in other

cell types.

Of note, α9 and α10 expression, together with other nAChR subunits, has been reported in other

peripheral, non-neuronal, tissues (McIntosh et al., 2009; Zoli et al., 2018). For example, several

immune, skin, bladder urothelial and nasal non-neuronal epithelial cells express a number of

nicotinic and muscarinic cholinergic receptor subunits (Hao et al., 2011; Keiger et al., 2003; Kurzen et

al., 2007; McIntosh et al., 2009; Sato et al., 1999; Zarghooni et al., 2007). Therefore a plausible

autocrine/paracrine effect of ACh in these cells can be served by a multiple and redundant battery of

nAChRs that might play a metabotropic function in these peripheral tissues (Criado, 2018;

Zakrzewicz et al., 2017). Due to the redundancy in pathways for ACh signalling, it is unlikely that the

function of α9α10 nAChRs in these peripheral tissues provided the selection forces that shaped the

accumulation of non-synonymous changes on this receptor. Moreover, if these were the case, a

similar process could be predicted for neuronal nAChRs expressed in these cells, an event that did

not occur since neuronal nAChR subunits are under strong purifying selection (Lipovsek et al., 2012).

The comparative analysis of functional properties of α9α10 nAChRs from representative tetrapods

showed unprecedented divergence (summarised in Figure 8). Since the primary function of the

α9α10 receptor is at the postsynaptic side of the efferent modulation of hair cell activity, it can be

hypothesised that the evolutionary changes in receptor function may be coupled to the evolutionary

processes undertaken by the inner ears of the different clades. Upon the transition to land, the

hearing organs of tetrapods underwent parallel evolutionary processes, mainly due to the

independent emergence of the tympanic middle ear, at least five times, in separate groups of

amniotes (Manley, 2017; Tucker, 2017). This was followed by the independent elongation of the

auditory sensory epithelia that extended the hearing range to higher frequencies and the

elaboration of passive and active sound amplification mechanisms that lead to the fine tuning of
sound detection (Dallos, 2008; Hudspeth, 2008; Manley, 2017). More importantly, mammals and
sauropsids underwent a parallel diversification of hair cell types, segregating, partially in birds but
completely in mammals, the phonoreception and sound amplification functions (Koppl, 2011).
Efferent innervation to hair cells, mediated by α9α10 nAChRs, is an ancestral feature common to all
vertebrate species (Sienknecht et al., 2014). In the auditory epithelia it modulates sound
amplification and followed the hair cell diversification pattern: in birds it mainly targets short hair
cells, while in mammals it targets outer hair cells (Koppl, 2011). The latter developed a clade-specific
sound amplification mechanism that is brought about by the motor protein prestin, through a
process known as somatic electromotility (Oliver et al., 2001). Prestin, together with βV giant
spectrin, a major component of the outer hair cells' cortical cytoskeleton which is necessary for
electromotility and the voltage-gated potassium channel gene KCNQ4 all show signatures of positive
selection in the mammalian clade that may relate to the acquisition of somatic electromotility
(Cortese et al., 2017; Franchini and Elgoyhen, 2006; Liu et al., 2012). Thus, the mammalian clade-
specific evolutionary processes observed in both the α9 and α10 subunits (Franchini and Elgoyhen,
2006; Lipovsek et al., 2014; Lipovsek et al., 2012) may be related to overall changes in the efferent
olivovochlear systems of this clade that is tasked with the modulation of prestin-driven somatic
electromotility. A recent high throughput evolutionary analysis identified 167 inner ear expressed
genes with signatures of positive selection in the mammalian lineage (Pisciottano et al., 2019). Thus,
genes expressed in the inner ear can be considered as hotspots for evolutionary innovation in the
auditory system across species, a process that appears to have particularly affected the α9α10
nAChR. In such a scenario, the inter-species differences in the extent of calcium current provide a
context for evaluating the relationship between evolutionary trajectories and the functional role of
α9α10 receptors. In mammals, the high calcium influx through α9α10 receptors activates large
conductance, voltage and low-calcium-sensitive BK potassium channels mediating hyperpolarization
of outer hair cells in higher frequency regions of the cochlea (Wersinger et al., 2010). In contrast, in
short hair cells from the chicken basilar papillae, hyperpolarization is served by the ACh-dependent
activation of high calcium sensitive SK potassium channels (Fuchs and Murrow, 1992a; Fuchs and
Murrow, 1992b; Samaranayake et al., 2004). Moreover, in contrast to adult mammalian hair cells
where efferent fibres directly contact outer hair cells, but not the inner hair cells that release
glutamate to activate afferent auditory fibres, efferent innervation in birds and amphibians co-exists
with afferent innervation in the same hair cells. Calcium influx in these hair cells could therefore
result in efferent-triggered, ACh-mediated release of glutamate to auditory afferents due to calcium
spill over, bypassing sound mechanotransduction. Thus, limiting the extent of calcium influx through

α9α10 nAChRs may be paramount to avoid confounding sensory inputs. In this hypothetical
scenario, the low calcium permeability of the avian α9α10 nAChR or the very high desensitization
kinetics of the amphibian α9α10 nAChR that restrict calcium load could be related to the
aforementioned selection pressure.

In summary, the present work provides evidence supporting different evolutionary trajectories for
neuronal and hair cell nAChRs. These may have resulted from the differential substrates for random
change that dominated evolutionary processes in each receptor subgroup: co-expression/co-
assembly patterns for neuronal subunits, changes in coding sequence for hair cell subunits. It results
salient that among ligand-gated ion channels these alternative evolutionary trajectories are a
particular feature of the nAChRs family of Cys-loop receptors. Thus, this is not observed for
ionotropic glutamate and GABA$_A$ receptors, whose 18 (Traynelis et al., 2010) and 19 (Tsang et al.,
2007) member subunits, respectively, are all expressed in the central nervous system. Finally, this
work highlights the significance of studies that traverse organisational levels. By simultaneously
analysing coding sequences, expression patterns and protein functional properties we were able to
gain new insights into the evolutionary history of gene paralogous, thus providing further context for
the role of nAChRs in neuronal and hair cell synaptic transmission.

Methods

All experimental protocols were carried out in accordance with the guides for the care and use of
laboratory animals of the National Institutes of Health and the Institutional Animal Care and Use
Committee of the Instituto de Investigaciones en Ingeniería Genética y Biología Molecular, "Dr.
Héctor N. Torres".

Phylogenetic analysis of vertebrate nAChRs subunits

All sequences were downloaded from GenBank (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank), UCSC
(http://genome.ucsc.edu/) and Ensembl (www.ensembl.org) databases. The signal peptides of all
sequences were excluded from the analysis since they are not present in the mature functional
protein. Accession numbers are listed in Supplementary Table 1. All sequences were visually
inspected, and missing and/or incorrect exons were obtained from the NCBI Genome Project traces
database (http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi). Sequence alignment was performed using
*Clustal*W on the MEGA7 software (www.megasoftware.net; (Kumar et al., 2016)), with the following
parameters: for pairwise alignments, gap opening penalty: 10, gap extension penalty: 0.1; for
multiple alignments, gap opening penalty: 10, gap extension penalty: 0.2. Protein weight matrix:
Gonnet. Residue specific and hydrophilic penalties: ON. Gap separation distance: 4. End gap
separation: OFF and no negative matrix was used. The delay divergent cutoff was 30%. The full
alignment for the nicotinic subunits from representative vertebrate species is available in
Supplementary File 1 in fasta format.

Average percentage sequence identity was calculated for each subunit using the percentage of
sequence identity between each pair of sequences from the same category for all sequences and for
within or between mammalian and/or sauropsid sequences. For of α10 subunits, the average
percentage of sequence identity was also calculated for the non-mammalian paraphyletic group.
Values obtained are in Table 1.

The phylogenetic tree of all nAChR subunits was built using the MEGA7 software. Positions
containing alignment gaps and missing data were eliminated only in pairwise sequence comparisons.
The final dataset contained a total of 773 positions. The evolutionary distances (i.e., number of
amino acid substitutions per site) were computed using the JTT matrix-based method (Jones et al.,
1992). The neighbour-joining algorithm (Saitou and Nei, 1987) was used to generate the initial tree
and branch support was obtained by bootstrap test (1000 replicates) (Felsenstein, 1985). The
evolutionary history was inferred using the minimum evolution method (Rzhetsky and Nei, 1992). A
first tree was generated with variation rate among sites modelled by a gamma distribution

(Supplementary Figure 1) and a second tree assuming uniform variation rates among sites

(Supplementary Figure 2). Overall, tree topology was similar between both methods.

Analysis of nAChR subunit expression in single-cell RNAseq (scRNAseq) datasets

Processed gene expression data tables were obtained from 10 scRNAseq studies that evaluated gene

expression in retina (Shekhar et al., 2016) inner ear sensory epithelium (Burns et al., 2015; McInturff

et al., 2018) and spiral ganglion (Shrestha et al., 2018), ventral midbrain (La Manno et al., 2016),

hippocampus (Cembrowski et al., 2018), cortex (Chevée et al., 2018), hypothalamus (Romanov et al.,

2017), visceral motor neurons (Furlan et al., 2016) and dorsal root ganglia (Usoskin et al., 2015).

Accession numbers, cell types inferred and number of cells analysed are summarised in

supplementary table 3. For all datasets, we used the published gene expression quantification and

cell type labels. Each dataset was analysed separately. For the retina dataset we used the Smart-

Seq2 sequencing data from Vsx2-GFP positive cells (Shekhar et al., 2016). For the gene expression

quantification we only analysed four cell types that had a minimum number of cells in the dataset

that allowed reliable fitting to the error models: BC1A, BC5A, BC6 and RBC. From the layer VI

somatosensory cortex dataset (Cembrowski et al., 2018) we used a subset of the expression matrix

that corresponds to day 0 (i.e. control, undisturbed neurons) of their experimental manipulation. For

the hypothalamic neurons dataset (Romanov et al., 2017) we used a subset that contained only

neurons from untreated (control) mice and only quantified gene expression on the 10 broad cell

types identified. From the ventral midbrain dopaminergic neurons dataset (La Manno et al., 2016)

we used a subset comprising DAT1-Cre/tdTomato positive neurons from P28 mice. For the SGNs

dataset we used a subset comprising Type I neurons from wild type mice (Shrestha et al., 2018). For

the utricle hair cell datasets we used the normalised expression data of (McInturff et al., 2018). For

the cochlear hair cell data we used the normalised expression data from (Burns et al., 2015) and

continued our analysis with only the 10 cochlear hair cells identified. For the visceral motor neurons

dataset (Furlan et al., 2016) we excluded the neurons that were "unclassified" from further analysis.

For the dorsal root ganglia dataset (Usoskin et al., 2015) we used a subset containing only

successfully classified neurons that were collected at room temperature. Inspection of al datasets for

batch effects and violin plots of the single cell expression of nAChR subunits (Supplementary Figure

3) were performed using the *scater* package (version 1.10.1) (McCarthy et al., 2017). All data analysis

was implemented in R (version 3.5.1) and Bioconductor (version 3.8)

(http://www.bioconductor.org/), running on RStudio (version 1.1.456) (http://www.rstudio.com/).

The publicly available expression matrices for a number of the datasets contained raw counts

(retina, hippocampus, hypothalamus, midbrain, visceral motor neurons). For each of these dataset

individually, we performed a normalisation step using the *scran* package (version 1.10.2) (Lun et al.,

2016) that computes pool-based size factors that are subsequently deconvolved to obtain cell-based
size factors.

The normalised expression matrices and cell type information were used as input to quantify cell-
type specific gene expression. Analysis was performed using the *scde* package (version 1.99.1)
(Kharchenko et al., 2014). We modelled the gene expression measurements from each individual cell
as a weighted mixture of negative binomial and low-magnitude Poisson distributions. The former
accounts for the correlated component in which a transcript is detected and quantified, while the
latter accounts for drop-out events in which a transcript fails to amplify when present. The weighting
of the two distributions is determined by the level of gene expression in the cell population
(Kharchenko et al., 2014). We then used these error models to estimate the likelihood (joint
posterior probability) of a gene being expressed at any given average level in a given cell type
(Kharchenko et al., 2014). Probability distributions for all nAChR subunit genes detected in all the cell
types analysed are shown in sup fig 4. This whole transcriptome analysis provides accurate
estimations of gene expression levels, thus allowing for the comparison of individual genes within a
given cell type (i.e. the complement of nAChR subunits) or the analysis of expression level
differences between cell types (i.e. change in expression level of nAChR subunits between neuronal
subtypes). We combined the information about the complement of nAChR subunits for each cell
type with a comprehensive catalogue of experimentally validated subunit combinations
(Supplementary Table 2 and references therein). We identified the subunit combinations that were
present, in each cell type, within a 10-fold, 10 to 100-fold or 100 to 1000 fold range of expression
level or absent all together. Admittedly, this analysis approach overlooks the complexities of post-
translational modifications, receptor assembly, role of chaperone proteins and transport to the
plasma membrane. However, it provides conservative estimates of the maximum potential of
combinatorial assembly of subunits and thus a maximum for the repertoire of nAChR assemblies
that could be present at the cell membrane.

Expression of recombinant receptors in *Xenopus laevis* oocytes and electrophysiological recordings

Rat and chick α9 and α10 cDNAs subcloned into pSGEM, a modified pGEMHE vector suitable for
Xenopus laevis oocyte expression studies, were described previously (Elgoyhen et al., 1994; Elgoyhen
et al., 2001; Lipovsek et al., 2012). Rat α4, β2 and α7 subunit cDNAs subcloned into pBS SK(−)
(Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) were kindly provided by Dr. Jim Boulter (University of
California, Los Angeles, CA). Chicken α4 and β2 subunit cDNAs subcloned into pCI (Promega,
Madison, WI) were kindly provided by Dr. Isabel Bermudez-Díaz (Oxford Brookes University, Oxford,
UK). Chicken α7 subunit cDNA cloned into pMXT was kindly provided by Dr. Jon Lindstrom
(University of Pennsylvania) and was then subcloned into pSGEM between HindIII and SalI sites. Frog

α4, β2, α7, α9 and α10 subunits were cloned from whole brain *Xenopus tropicalis* cDNA. Total RNA was prepared from whole brains using the RNAqueous – Micro kit AM1931 (Ambion, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Boston, MA). First strand cDNA synthesis was performed using an oligodT and the ProtoScript Taq RT-PCR kit (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA). Second strand synthesis was performed with the NEBNext mRNA Second Strand Synthesis Module kit – E6111S (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA). Full length cDNAs for each subunit were PCR amplified (MultiGene 60 OptiMax^{TM} Thermal Cycler - Labnet International Inc. Edison, NJ) using specific primers (Supplementary Table 5). PCR products were sequenced and subcloned into pSGEM between EcoRI and XhoI sites for α9, α7 and β2 nAChRs subunits, between HindIII and XhoI sites for the α10 subunit and between EcoRI and HindIII sites for the α4 subunit. All expression plasmids are readily available upon request.

Capped cRNAs were *in vitro* transcribed from linearized plasmid DNA templates using the RiboMAX^{TM} Large Scale RNA Production System-T7 (Promega, Madison, WI). The maintenance of *Xenopus laevis*, as well as the preparation and cRNA injection of stage V and VI oocytes, has been described in detail elsewhere (Katz et al., 2000). Briefly, oocytes were injected with 50 nl of RNase-free water containing 0.01–1.0 ng of cRNAs (at a 1 : 1 molar ratio for α9α10 and α4β2 receptors) and maintained in Barth's solution (in mM): NaCl 88, $Ca(NO_3)_2$ 0.33, $CaCl_2$ 0.41, KCl 1, $MgSO_4$ 0.82, $NaHCO_3$ 2.4, HEPES 10, at 18ºC.

Electrophysiological recordings were performed 2 – 6 days after cRNA injection under two-electrode voltage clamp with an Oocyte Clamp OC-725B or C amplifier (Warner Instruments Corp., Hamden, CT). Recordings were filtered at a corner frequency of 10 Hz using a 900BT Tunable Active Filter (Frequency Devices Inc., Ottawa, IL). Data acquisition was performed using a Patch Panel PP-50 LAB/1 interface (Warner Instruments Corp., Hamden, CT) at a rate of 10 points per second. Both voltage and current electrodes were filled with 3M KCl and had resistances of ~1MΩ. Data were analysed using Clampfit from the pClamp 6.1 software (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA). During electrophysiological recordings, oocytes were continuously superfused (10 ml min^{-1}) with normal frog saline composed of (in mM): 115 NaCl, 2.5 KCl, 1.8 $CaCl_2$ and 10 HEPES buffer, pH 7.2. In order to minimize the activation of the oocyte's native Ca^{2+}-sensitive chloride current (ICl_{Ca}) by inward Ca^{2+} current through the nAChRs, all experiments, unless otherwise stated, were carried out in oocytes incubated with the membrane permeant Ca^{2+} chelator 1,2-bis (2-aminophenoxy)ethane-N,N,N',N'-tetraacetic acid-acetoxymethyl ester (BAPTA-AM; 100 µM) for 3 h prior to electrophysiological recordings. This treatment was previously shown to effectively chelate intracellular Ca^{2+} ions and, therefore, to impair the activation of the ICl_{Ca} (Gerzanich et al., 1994). All recordings were performed at -70 mV holding potential, unless otherwise stated.

Biophysical properties of nAChRs

Concentration-response curves were obtained by measuring responses to increasing concentrations of ACh. Current amplitudes were normalized to the maximal agonist response in each oocyte. The mean and S.E.M. values of the responses are represented. Agonist concentration-response curves were iteratively fitted, using Prism 6 software (GraphPad Software Inc., La Jolla, CA), with the equation: $I/Imax = A^{nH} / (A^{nH} + EC_{50}^{nH})$, where I is the peak inward current evoked by the agonist at concentration A^{nH}; Imax is current evoked by the concentration of agonist eliciting a maximal response; EC_{50} is the concentration of agonist inducing half-maximal current response and nH is the Hill coefficient.

Desensitisation of ACh evoked currents was evaluated via prolonged agonist applications. The percentage of current remaining 5 seconds (for α7 nAChRs) or 20 seconds (for α4β2 and α9α10 nAChRs) after the peak of the response was determined for each oocyte.

The effects of extracellular Ca^{2+} on the ionic currents through nAChRs were studied by measuring the amplitudes of the responses to a near-EC_{50} concentration of ACh (10 μM for all α4β2 and amniote α9α10 nAChRs, and 100 μM for all α7 and frog α9α10 nAChRs) on extracellular Ca^{2+} ranging from nominally 0 to 3 mM at a holding potential of -90 mV (Weisstaub et al., 2002). These experiments were carried out in oocytes injected with 7.5 ng of an oligonucleotide (5'-GCTTTAGTAATTCCCATCCTGCCATGTTTC-3') antisense to connexinC38 mRNA (Arellano et al., 1995; Ebihara, 1996) to minimise the activation of the oocyte's nonselective inward current through a hemigap junction channel that results from the reduction of external divalent cation concentration. Current amplitudes at each Ca^{2+} concentration were normalized to that obtained in the same oocyte at a 1.8 mM Ca^{2+}.

I–V relationships were obtained by applying 2 seconds voltage ramps from -120 to +50 mV from a holding potential of -70 mV, at the plateau response to 3 μM ACh. Leakage correction was performed by digital subtraction of the I–V curve obtained by the same voltage ramp protocol prior to the application of ACh. Generation of voltage protocols and data acquisition were performed using a Patch Panel PP-50 LAB/1 interface (Warner Instruments Corp., Hamden, CT) at a rate of 10 points per second and the pClamp 7.0 software (Axon Instruments Corp., Union City, CA). Current values were normalized to the maximum amplitude value obtained for each oocyte. The fast desensitising α7 receptors had negligible plateau currents. For these receptors, responses to 100 μM ACh were obtained at different holding potentials and normalised to the amplitude response at -120 mV in the same oocyte.

Statistical analysis

Shapiro-Wilks normality test was conducted using custom routines written in R v3.4.1 (R
Development Core Team, 2008), through RStudio software v1.0.153. Statistical significance was
determined using either parametric paired *t*-test or One-way ANOVA followed by Holm-Sidak's test,
or nonparametric Wilcoxon or Kruskal-Wallis tests followed by Dunn's tests conducted using Prism 6
software (GraphPad Software Inc., La Jolla, CA). A $p < 0.05$ was considered significant.

Reagents

All drugs were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (Buenos Aires, Argentina). ACh chloride was dissolved in
distilled water as 100 mM stocks and stored aliquoted at -20°C. BAPTA-AM was stored at -20°C as
aliquots of a 100 mM stock solution in dimethylsulfoxide, thawed and diluted into Barth's solution
shortly before incubation of the oocytes. ACh solutions in Ringer's saline were freshly prepared
immediately before application.

Principal component analysis of functional properties

Principal Component Analysis was performed on the experimental values obtained for the functional
properties of extant nAChRs implementing custom routines written in R v3.4.1 and run in RStudio
software v1.0.153. Each of the experimental variables was normalized to the maximum value
recorded to allow for equal weighting of the properties (Supplementary Table 6). The loadings of the
empirical variables on the five principal components (PC) generated are shown in Table 3, alongside
the proportion of the total variability explained by each component. The loadings of each biophysical
property on each principal component are also shown on the vectors biplot (Figure 8 – inset).

Inference of character state of functional properties of ancestral receptors

The pipeline followed to infer the ancestral character state of biophysical properties of is
schematized on Supplementary Figure 5. Briefly, we first reconstructed the ancestral tetrapods and
amniote DNA sequences of the α4, α7, α9, α10 and β2 nAChRs subunits (Supplementary File 2). For
that purpose, we used the same orthologue sequences that were used to construct the phylogenetic
tree of Figure 1, together with a species tree with no branch lengths obtained from Ensembl
(https://www.ensembl.org/info/about/speciestree.html). Inferred ancestral DNA sequences for the
amniote and tetrapod nodes (Supplementary File 2) were obtained, for all three codon positions, by
the maximum likelihood method (Nei and Kumar, 2000) under the Tamura-Nei model (Tamura and
Nei, 1993), on the MEGA7 software (Kumar et al., 2016). The initial tree corresponds to the provided
Species Tree with very strong restriction to branch swap. The rates among sites were treated as a
gamma distribution. All positions with less than 95% site coverage were eliminated.

Subsequently, multiple alignments including extant rat, chick and frog and ancestral amniote and

tetrapod aminoacid sequences were performed using MEGA7 for each studied nAChR

(Supplementary File 3). The sequence identity was used to assign branch length values to α7, α4β2

and α9α10 nAChRs trees, corresponding to 1-SeqID (Supplementary Table 7). Theoretical

concatemeric constructions were built for the heteromeric α9α10 nAChRs considering the

described prevalent $(\alpha9)_2(\alpha10)_3$ stoichiometry (Plazas et al., 2005). For the α4β2 nAChRs, the high

sensitivity $(\alpha4)_2(\beta2)_3$ stoichiometry was used to generate the theoretical concatemeric receptor

(Supplementary File 3). The resulting trees (Supplementary Figure 6) were used, together with the

biophysical properties experimentally determined for the extant receptors (Table 2) as input data for

ancestral character inference. ACh sensitivity (EC_{50} values), desensitization rates (% of remaining I 20

sec after ACh peak), Ca^{2+} modulation (I elicited by ACh at Ca 0.5 mM/Ca 3 mM), Ca^{2+} permeability (%

of remaining I after BAPTA treatment) and rectification profile ($I_{+40\ mV}/I_{-90\ mV}$) for the ancestral

amniote and tetrapod receptors were inferred using the *ace* function from the *APE* package v5.2

(Paradis et al., 2004) implemented in R v3.4.1 and RStudio v1.0.153. We used the Brownian motion

model (Schluter et al., 1997) (Schluter et al., 1997), where characters evolve following a random

walk fitted by maximum likelihood (Felsenstein, 1973) for the ancestral character estimations of

continuous traits. Reconstructed ancestral states are shown in Supplementary Figure 6. Finally, using

the loadings of the biophysical properties on PC1 and 2 (Table 3 and Figure 8 – inset), and the

normalized experimental (extant receptors) and *in silico* reconstructed (ancestral receptors)

biophysical properties results (Supplementary Table 6), we calculated the position of the 15 nAChRs

on a bidimensional PCA space (Figure 8).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina, the

Scientific Grand Prize of the Fondation Pour l'Audition and NIH Grant R01 DC001508 (Paul Fuchs PI

and ABE co-PI) to ABE.

References

Albuquerque, E.X., Pereira, E.F.R., Alkondon, M., and Rogers, S.W. (2009). Mammalian Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors: From Structure to Function. Physiological Reviews 89, 73-120.

Arellano, R.O., Woodward, R.M., and Miledi, R. (1995). A monovalent cationic conductance that is blocked by extracellular divalent cations in Xenopus oocytes. J Physiol 484 (Pt 3), 593-604.

Arendt, D., Musser, J.M., Baker, C.V.H., Bergman, A., Cepko, C., Erwin, D.H., Pavlicev, M., Schlosser, G., Widder, S., Laubichler, M.D., and Wagner, G.P. (2016). The origin and evolution of cell types. Nature reviews Genetics 17, 744-757.

Art, J.J., Fettiplace, R., and Fuchs, P.A. (1984). Synaptic hyperpolarization and inhibition of turtle cochlear hair cells. J Physiol 356, 525-550.

Barish, M.E. (1983). A transient calcium-dependent choloride current in the immature Xenopus oocytes. Journal of Physiology 342, 309-325.

Bertrand, D., Ballivet, M., and Rungger, D. (2006). Activation and blocking of neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptor reconstituted in Xenopus oocytes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 87, 1993-1997.

Bocquet, N., Nury, H., Baaden, M., Le Poupon, C., Changeux, J.P., Delarue, M., and Corringer, P.J. (2009). X-ray structure of a pentameric ligand-gated ion channel in an apparently open conformation. Nature 457, 111-114.

Bouzat, C., Nielsen, B.E., and Esandi, C. (2017). Molecular function of α7 nicotinic receptors as drug targets. Journal of Physiology 00, 1-15.

Burns, J.C., Kelly, M.C., Hoa, M., Morell, R.J., and Kelley, M.W. (2015). Single-cell RNA-Seq resolves cellular complexity in sensory organs from the neonatal inner ear. Nature Communications 6, 1-16.

Castellano-Muñoz, M., Israel, S.H., and Hudspeth, A.J. (2010). Efferent control of the electrical and mechanical properties of hair cells in the bullfrog's sacculus. PLoS ONE 5.

Cembrowski, M.S., Phillips, M.G., DiLisio, S.F., Shields, B.C., Winnubst, J., Chandrashekar, J., Bas, E., and Spruston, N. (2018). Dissociable Structural and Functional Hippocampal Outputs via Distinct Subiculum Cell Classes. Cell 173, 1280--1292.e1218.

Chevée, M., Robertson, J.D.J., Cannon, G.H., Brown, S.P., and Goff, L.A. (2018). Variation in Activity State, Axonal Projection, and Position Define the Transcriptional Identity of Individual Neocortical Projection Neurons. Cell Reports 22, 441-455.

Corringer, P.J., Poitevin, F., Prevost, M.S., Sauguet, L., Delarue, M., and Changeux, J.P. (2012). Structure and pharmacology of pentameric receptor channels: From bacteria to brain. Structure 20, 941-956.

Cortese, M., Papal, S., Pisciottano, F., Elgoyhen, A.B., Hardelin, J.-P., Petit, C., Franchini, L.F., and El-Amraoui, A. (2017). Spectrin βV adaptive mutations and changes in subcellular location correlate with emergence of hair cell electromotility in mammalians. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114, 2054-2059.

Couturier, S., Bertrand, D., Matter, J.-M., Hernandez, M.-C., Bertrand, S., Millar, N., Valera, S., Barkas, T., and Ballivet, M. (1990). A neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptor subunit (α7) is developmentally regulated and forms a homo-oligomeric channel blocked by α-BTX. Neuron 5, 847-856.

Criado, M. (2018). Acetylcholine nicotinic receptor subtypes in chromaffin cells. Pflugers Archiv : European journal of physiology 470, 13-20.

Cully, D.F., Vassilatis, D.K., Liu, K.K., Paress, P.S., Van Der Ploeg, L.H.T., Schaeffer, J.M., and Arena, J.P. (1994). Cloning of an avermectin-sensitive glutamate-gated chloride channel from Caenorhabditis elegans. Nature 371, 707-711.

Dallos, P. (2008). Cochlear amplification, outer hair cells and prestin. Current opinion in neurobiology 18, 370-376.

Dani, J.A., and Bertrand, D. (2007). Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors and Nicotinic Cholinergic Mechanisms of the Central Nervous System. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol 47, 699-729.

Dent, J.A. (2006). Evidence for a diverse Cys-loop ligand-gated ion channel superfamily in early
bilateria. Journal of Molecular Evolution 62, 523-535.
Ebihara, L. (1996). Xenopus connexin38 forms hemi-gap-junctional channels in the nonjunctional
plasma membrane of Xenopus oocytes. Biophysical journal 71, 742-748.
Elgoyhen, A.B., Johnson, D.S., Boulter, J., Vetter, D.E., and Heinemann, S. (1994). α9: an acetylcholine
receptor with novel pharmacological properties expressed in rat cochlear hair cells. Cell 79, 705-715.
Elgoyhen, A.B., and Katz, E. (2012). The efferent medial olivocochlear-hair cell synapse. Journal of
Physiology Paris 106, 47-56.
Elgoyhen, A.B., Vetter, D.E., Katz, E., Rothlin, C.V., Heinemann, S.F., and Boulter, J. (2001). α10: a
Determinant of Nicotinic Cholinergic Receptor Function in Mammalian Vestibular and Cochlear
Mechanosensory Hair Cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of
America 98, 3501-3506.
Felsenstein, J. (1973). Maximum-Likelihood Estimation of Evolutionary Trees from Continuous
Characters. Am J Hum Genet 25, 471-492.
Felsenstein, J. (1985). Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the bootstrap. Evolution
39, 783-791.
Franchini, L.F., and Elgoyhen, A.B. (2006). Adaptive evolution in mammalian proteins involved in
cochlear outer hair cell electromotility. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 41, 622-635.
Fritzsch, B., and Beisel, K.W. (2004). Keeping sensory cells and evolving neurons to connect them to
the brain: molecular conservation and novelties in vertebrate ear development. Brain Behav Evol 64,
182-197.
Fuchs, P.A., and Murrow, B. (1992a). Cholinergic inhibition of short (outer) hair cells of the chick's
cochlea. The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience 12, 800-
809.
Fuchs, P.A., and Murrow, B.W. (1992b). A novel cholinergic receptor mediates inhibition of chick
cochlear hair cells. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences 248, 35-
40.
Furlan, A., La Manno, G., Lubke, M., Haring, M., Abdo, H., Hochgerner, H., Kupari, J., Usoskin, D.,
Airaksinen, M.S., Oliver, G., et al. (2016). Visceral motor neuron diversity delineates a cellular basis
for nipple- and pilo-erection muscle control. Nature Neuroscience 19, 1331-1340.
Galzi, J.L., Bertrand, S., Corringer, P.J., Changeux, J.P., and Bertrand, D. (1996). Identification of
calcium binding sites that regulate potentiation of a neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptor. The
EMBO journal 15, 5824-5832.
Gerzanich, V., Anand, R., and Lindstrom, J.M. (1994). Homomers of α8 and α7 subunits of nicotinic
receptors exhibit similar channel but contrasting binding site properties. Molecular Pharmacology
45, 212 LP-- 220.
Glowatzki, E., and Fuchs, P.A. (2000). Cholinergic synaptic inhibition of inner hair cells in the neonatal
mammalian cochlea. Science 288, 2366-2368.
Gomez-Casati, M.E., Fuchs, P.A., Elgoyhen, A.B., and Katz, E. (2005). Biophysical and pharmacological
characterization of nicotinic cholinergic receptors in rat cochlear inner hair cells. J Physiol 566, 103-
118.
Goutman, J.D., Fuchs, P.A., and Glowatzki, E. (2005). Facilitating efferent inhibition of inner hair cells
in the cochlea of the neonatal rat. Journal of Physiology 566, 49-59.
Haghighi, A.P., and Cooper, E. (2000). A molecular link between inward rectification and calcium
permeability of neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine α3β4 and α4β2 receptors. The Journal of
neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience 20, 529-541.
Hao, J., Simard, A.R., Turner, G.H., Wu, J., Whiteaker, P., Lukas, R.J., and Shi, F.D. (2011). Attenuation
of CNS inflammatory responses by nicotine involves α7 and non-α7 nicotinic receptors. Experimental
Neurology 227, 110-119.
Haygood, R., Babbitt, C.C., Fedrigo, O., and Wray, G.A. (2010). Contrasts between adaptive coding
and noncoding changes during human evolution. ProcNatlAcadSciUSA 107, 7853-7857.

He, Z., Han, D., Efimova, O., Guijarro, P., Yu, Q., Oleksiak, A., Jiang, S., Anokhin, K., Velichkovsky, B.,
Grunewald, S., and Khaitovich, P. (2017). Comprehensive transcriptome analysis of neocortical layers
in humans, chimpanzees and macaques. Nature Neuroscience 20, 886-895.
Hervé Thany, S. (2010). Insect Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors, Vol 683.
Hiel, H., Elgoyhen, A.B., Drescher, D.G., and Morley, B.J. (1996). Expression of nicotinic acetylcholine
receptor mRNA in the adult rat peripheral vestibular system. Brain Research 738, 347-352.
Hilf, R.J.C., and Dutzler, R. (2009). Structure of a potentially open state of a proton-activated
pentameric ligand-gated ion channel. Nature 457, 115-118.
Hoekstra, H.E., and Coyne, J.A. (2007). The locus of evolution: evo devo and the genetics of
adaptation. Evolution 61, 995-1016.
Holt, J.C., Lioudyno, M., Athas, G., Garcia, M.M., Perin, P., and Guth, P.S. (2001). The effect of
proteolytic enzymes on the α9-nicotinic receptor-mediated response in isolated frog vestibular hair
cells. Hearing Research 152, 25-42.
Hone, A.J., Meyer, E.L., McIntyre, M., and McIntosh, J.M. (2011). Nicotinic acetylcholine receptors in
dorsal root ganglion neurons include the α6β4* subtype. The FASEB Journal 26, 917-926.
Hudspeth, A.J. (2008). Making an effort to listen: mechanical amplification in the ear. Neuron 59,
530-545.
Jain, A., Kuryatov, A., Wang, J., Kamenecka, T.M., and Lindstrom, J. (2016). Unorthodox Acetylcholine
Binding Sites Formed by alpha5 and beta3 Accessory Subunits in alpha4beta2* Nicotinic
Acetylcholine Receptors. The Journal of biological chemistry 291, 23452-23463.
Jaiteh, M., Taly, A., and Hénin, J. (2016). Evolution of pentameric ligand-gated ion channels: Pro-loop
receptors. PLoS ONE 11, 1-24.
Jones, D.T., Taylor, W.R., and Thornton, J.M. (1992). The rapid generation of mutation data matrices
from protein sequences. Comput Appl Biosci 8, 275-282.
Kalamida, D., Poulas, K., Avramopoulou, V., Fostieri, E., Lagoumintzis, G., Lazaridis, K., Sideri, A.,
Zouridakis, M., and Tzartos, S.J. (2007). Muscle and neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptors:
Structure, function and pathogenicity. FEBS Journal 274, 3799-3845.
Karlin, A. (2002). Ion channel structure: Emerging structure of the Nicotinic Acetylcholine receptors.
Nature Reviews Neuroscience 3, 102-114.
Katz, E., Verbitsky, M., Rothlin, C.V., Vetter, D.E., Heinemann, S.F., and Elgoyhen, A.B. (2000). High
calcium permeability and calcium block of the α9 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor. Hearing research
141, 117-128.
Keiger, C.J.H., Case, L.D., Kendal-Reed, M., Jones, K.R., Drake, A.F., and Walker, J.C. (2003). Nicotinic
cholinergic receptor expression in the human nasal mucosa. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 112, 77-84.
Kharchenko, P.V., Silberstein, L., and Scadden, D.T. (2014). Bayesian approach to single-cell
differential expression analysis. Nature Methods 11, 740-742.
Koppl, C. (2011). Birds--same thing, but different? Convergent evolution in the avian and mammalian
auditory systems provides informative comparative models. Hearing Research 273, 65-71.
Kumar, S., Stecher, G., and Tamura, K. (2016). MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
Version 7.0 for Bigger Datasets. Molecular biology and evolution 33, 1870-1874.
Kuryatov, A., Onksen, J., and Lindstrom, J. (2008). Roles of accessory subunits in alpha4beta2(*)
nicotinic receptors. Molecular Pharmacology 74, 132-143.
Kurzen, H., Wessler, I., Kirkpatrick, C.J., Kawashima, K., and Grando, S.A. (2007). The non-neuronal
cholinergic system of human skin. Hormone and Metabolic Research 39, 125-135.
La Manno, G., Gyllborg, D., Codeluppi, S., Barker, R.A., Arenas, E., and Linnarsson, S. (2016).
Molecular diversity of midbrain development in resource molecular diversity of midbrain
development in mouse, human and stem cells. Cell 167, 566-580.
Landisman, C.E., and Connors, B.W. (2007). VPM and PoM nuclei of the rat somatosensory thalamus:
Intrinsic neuronal properties and corticothalamic feedback. Cerebral Cortex 17, 2853-2865.

Le Novère, N., Corringer, P.-J., and Changeux, J.-P. (2002). The diversity of subunit composition in
nAChRs: evolutionary origins, physiologic and pharmacologic consequences. Journal of neurobiology
53, 447-456.

Lester, H.A., Dibas, M.I., Dahan, D.S., Leite, J.F., and Dougherty, D.A. (2004). Cys-loop receptors: New
twists and turns. Trends in Neurosciences 27, 329-336.

Liebeskind, B.J., Hillis, D.M., and Zakon, H.H. (2015). Convergence of ion channel genome content in
early animal evolution. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 112, E846--E851.

Lipovsek, M., Fierro, A., Pérez, E.G., Boffi, J.C., Millar, N.S., Fuchs, P.A., Katz, E., and Elgoyhen, A.B.
(2014). Tracking the molecular evolution of calcium permeability in a nicotinic acetylcholine
receptor. Molecular Biology and Evolution 31, 3250-3265.

Lipovsek, M., Im, G.J., Franchini, L.F., Pisciottano, F., Katz, E., Fuchs, P.A., and Elgoyhen, A.B. (2012).
Phylogenetic differences in calcium permeability of the auditory hair cell cholinergic nicotinic
receptor. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 109, 4308-4313.

Liu, Y., Han, N., Franchini, L.F., Xu, H., Pisciottano, F., Elgoyhen, A.B., Rajan, K.E., and Zhang, S. (2012).
The voltage-gated potassium channel subfamily KQT member 4 (KCNQ4) displays parallel evolution
in echolocating bats. Molecular Biology and Evolution 29, 1441-1450.

Lun, A.T., Bach, K., and Marioni, J.C. (2016). Pooling across cells to normalize single-cell RNA
sequencing data with many zero counts. Genome biology 17, 75.

Mameli-Engvall, M., Evrard, A., Pons, S., Maskos, U., Svensson, T.H., Changeux, J.P., and Faure, P.
(2006). Hierarchical Control of Dopamine Neuron-Firing Patterns by Nicotinic Receptors. Neuron 50,
911-921.

Manley, G.A. (2017). Comparative Auditory Neuroscience: Understanding the Evolution and Function
of Ears. Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology : JARO 18, 1-24.

Maskos, U., Molles, B.E., Pons, S., Besson, M., Guiard, B.P., Guilloux, J.P., Evrard, A., Cazala, P.,
Cormier, A., Mameli-Engvall, M., et al. (2005). Nicotine reinforcement and cognition restored by
targeted expression of nicotinic receptors. Nature 436, 103-107.

Mazzaferro, S., Bermudez, I., and Sine, S.M. (2017). α4β2 Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors:
Relationship between subunit stoichiometry and function at the single channel level. Journal of
Biological Chemistry 292, 2729-2740.

McCarthy, D.J., Campbell, K.R., Lun, A.T., and Wills, Q.F. (2017). Scater: pre-processing, quality
control, normalization and visualization of single-cell RNA-seq data in R. Bioinformatics 33, 1179-
1186.

McIntosh, J.M., Absalom, N., Chebib, M., Elgoyhen, A.B., and Vincler, M. (2009). Alpha9 nicotinic
acetylcholine receptors and the treatment of pain. Biochemical Pharmacology 78, 693-702.

McInturff, S., Burns, J.C., and Kelley, M.W. (2018). Characterization of spatial and temporal
development of Type I and Type II hair cells in the mouse utricle using new cell-type-specific
markers. Biology open 7.

Meyer, K.A., Marques-Bonet, T., and Sestan, N. (2017). Differential Gene Expression in the Human
Brain Is Associated with Conserved, but Not Accelerated, Noncoding Sequences. Mol Biol Evol 34,
1217-1229.

Miledi, R., and Parker, I. (1984). Chloride current induced by injection of calcium into Xenopus
oocytes. The Journal of Physiology 357, 173-183.

Millar, N.S., and Gotti, C. (2009). Diversity of vertebrate nicotinic acetylcholine receptors.
Neuropharmacology 56, 237-246.

Mishina, M., Takai, T., Imoto, K., Noda, M., Takahashi, T., Numa, S., Methfessel, C., and Sakmann, B.
(1986). Molecular distinction between fetal and adult forms of muscle acetylcholine receptor.
Nature 321, 406-411.

Morley, B.J., Li, H.S., Hiel, H., Drescher, D.G., and Elgoyhen, A.B. (1998). Identification of the subunits
of the nicotinic cholinergic receptors in the rat cochlea using RT-PCR and in situ hybridization.
Molecular Brain Research 53, 78-87.

Morley, B.J., Whiteaker, P., and Elgoyhen, A.B. (2018). Commentary: Nicotinic Acetylcholine
Receptor α9 and α10 Subunits Are Expressed in the Brain of Mice. Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience
12, 10-13.

Moroni, M., Zwart, R., Sher, E., Cassels, B.K., and Bermudez, I. (2006). α4β2 Nicotinic receptors with
high and low acetylcholine sensitivity: Pharmacology, stoichiometry, and sensitivity to long-term
exposure to nicotine. Mol Pharmacol 70, 755-768.

Mulle, C., Léna, C., and Changeux, J.P. (1992). Potentiation of nicotinic receptor response by external
calcium in rat central neurons. Neuron 8, 937-945.

Nei, M., and Kumar, S. (2000). Molecular Evolution and Phylogenetics (New York: Oxford Press).

Nielsen, R., Bustamante, C., Clark, A.G., Glanowski, S., Sackton, T.B., Hubisz, M.J., Fledel-Alon, A.,
Tanenbaum, D.M., Civello, D., White, T.J., *et al.* (2005). A scan for positively selected genes in the
genomes of humans and chimpanzees. PLoS biology 3, e170.

Oliver, D., He, D.Z.Z., Klöcker, N., Ludwig, J., Schulte, U., Siegfried, W., Ruppersberg, J.P., Dallos, P.,
and Fakle, B. (2001). Intracellular Anions as the Voltage Sensor of Prestin , the Outer Hair Cell Motor
Protein. Science 292, 2340-2344.

Ortells, M., and Lunt, G.G. (1995). History of the Ligand-Gated Superfamily of Receptors. Trends
neuroscience 18, 121-127.

Pan, J., Chen, Q., Willenbring, D., Yoshida, K., Tillman, T., Kashlan, O.B., Cohen, A., Kong, X.P., Xu, Y.,
and Tang, P. (2012). Structure of the pentameric ligand-gated ion channel ELIC cocrystallized with its
competitive antagonist acetylcholine. Nature Communications 3, 714-718.

Papke, R.L., and Porter Papke, J.K. (2002). Comparative pharmacology of rat and human α7 nAChR
conducted with net charge analysis. British Journal of Pharmacology 137, 49-61.

Paradis, E., Claude, J., and Strimmer, K. (2004). APE: Analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R
language. Bioinformatics 20, 289-290.

Parks, X.X., Contini, D., Jordan, P.M., and Holt, J.C. (2017). Confirming a Role for α9 nAChRs and SK
Potassium Channels in Type II Hair Cells of the Turtle Posterior. Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience 11,
1-18.

Pedersen, J.E., Bergqvist, C.A., and Larhammar, D. (2019). Evolution of vertebrate nicotinic
acetylcholine receptors. BMC Evolutionary Biology 19, 1-21.

Petitpre, C., Wu, H., Sharma, A., Tokarska, A., Fontanet, P., Wang, Y., Helmbacher, F., Yackle, K.,
Silberberg, G., Hadjab, S., and Lallemend, F. (2018). Neuronal heterogeneity and stereotyped
connectivity in the auditory afferent system. Nature Communications 9, 3691.

Picciotto, M.R., and Corrigall, W.A. (2002). Neuronal systems underlying behaviors related to
nicotine addiction: neural circuits and molecular genetics. The Journal of neuroscience : the official
journal of the Society for Neuroscience 22, 3338-3341.

Picciotto, M.R., Zoli, M., Rimondini, R., Léna, C., Marubio, L.M., Pich, E.M., Fuxe, K., and Changeux,
J.P. (1998). Acetylcholine receptors containing the β2 subunit are involved in the reinforcing
properties of nicotine. Nature 391, 173-177.

Pisciottano, F., Cinalli, A.R., Stopiello, M., and Castagna, V.C. (2019). Positive Selection and
Adaptation of Novel Inner Ear Genes in the Mammalian Lineage. Molecular Biology and Evolution.

Proulx, E., Piva, M., Tian, M.K., Bailey, C.D.C., and Lambe, E.K. (2014). Nicotinic acetylcholine
receptors in attention circuitry: The role of layer VI neurons of prefrontal cortex. Cellular and
Molecular Life Sciences 71, 1225-1244.

Quick, M.W., and Lester, R.A.J. (2002). Desensitization of neuronal nicotinic receptors. Journal of
Neurobiology 53, 457-478.

Ramirez-Latorre, J., Yu, C.R., Qu, X., Perin, F., Karlin, A., and Role, L. (1996). Functional contributions
of α5 subunit to neuronal acetylcholine receptor channels. Nature 380, 347-351.

Rau, K.K., Johnson, R.D., and Cooper, B.Y. (2004). Nicotinic AChR in Subclassified Capsaicin-Sensitive
and -Insensitive Nociceptors of the Rat DRG. Journal of Neurophysiology 93, 1358-1371.

Reijntjes, D.O.J., and Pyott, S.J. (2016). The afferent signaling complex: Regulation of type I spiral
ganglion neuron responses in the auditory periphery. Hear Res 336, 1-16.

Romanov, R.A., Zeisel, A., Bakker, J., Girach, F., Hellysaz, A., Tomer, R., Alpár, A., Mulder, J., Clotman,
F., Keimpema, E*., et al.* (2017). Molecular interrogation of hypothalamic organization reveals distinct
dopamine neuronal subtypes. Nature Neuroscience 20, 176-188.

Roux, I., Wu, J.S., McIntosh, J.M., and Glowatzki, E. (2016). Assessment of the expression and role of
the α1 -nAChR subunit in efferent cholinergic function during the development of the mammalian
cochlea. Journal of Neurophysiology 116, 479-492.

Roux, J., Liu, J., and Robinson-Rechavi, M. (2017). Selective constraints on coding sequences of
nervous system genes are a major determinant of duplicate gene retention in vertebrates. Molecular
Biology and Evolution 34, 2773-2791.

Rzhetsky, A., and Nei, M. (1992). A simple method for estimating and testing minimum-evolution
trees. Mol Biol Evol 9, 945-967.

Saitou, N., and Nei, M. (1987). The neighbor-joining method: A new method for reconstructing
phylogenetic trees. Mol Biol Evol 4, 406-425.

Samaranayake, H., Saunders, J.C., Greene, M.I., and Navaratnam, D.S. (2004). Ca2+ and K+ (BK)
channels in chick hair cells are clustered and colocalized with apical-basal and tonotopic gradients.
Journal of Physiology 560, 13-20.

Sands, S.B., and Barish, M.E. (1992). Neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptor currents in
phaeochromocytoma (pc12) cells: dual mechanisms of rectification. Journal of Physiology, 467-487.

Sato, K.Z., Fujii, T., Watanabe, Y., Yamada, S., Ando, T., Kazuko, F., and Kawashima, K. (1999).
Diversity of mRNA expression for muscarinic acetylcholine receptor subtypes and neuronal nicotinic
acetylcholine receptor subunits in human mononuclear leukocytes and leukemic cell lines.
Neuroscience Letters 266, 17-20.

Scheffer, D., Sage, C., Plazas, P.V., Huang, M., Wedemeyer, C., Zhang, D.-S., Chen, Z.-Y., Elgoyhen,
A.B., Corey, D.P., and Pingault, V. (2007). The α1 subunit of nicotinic acetylcholine receptors in the
inner ear: transcriptional regulation by ATOH1 and co-expression with the γ subunit in hair cells.
Journal of Neurochemistry 0, 071027034430002--???

Schluter, D., Price, T., Mooers, A., and Ludwig, D. (1997). Likelihood of Ancestors States in Adaptive
Radiation. Evolution 51, 1699-1711.

Schultz, W. (2007). Multiple Dopamine Functions at Different Time Courses. Annual Review of
Neuroscience 30, 259-288.

Séguéla, P., Wadiche, J., Dineley-Miller, K., Dani, J.A., and Patrick, J.W. (1993). Molecular cloning,
functional properties, and distribution of rat brain alpha 7: a nicotinic cation channel highly
permeable to calcium. The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for
Neuroscience 13, 596-604.

Sgard, F., Charpantier, E., Bertrand, S., Walker, N., Caput, D., Graham, D., Bertrand, D., and Besnard,
F. (2002). A novel human nicotinic receptor subunit, alpha10, that confers functionality to the
alpha9-subunit. Molecular Pharmacology 61, 150-159.

Shekhar, K., Lapan, S.W., Whitney, I.E., Tran, N.M., Macosko, E.Z., Kowalczyk, M., Adiconis, X., Levin,
J.Z., Nemesh, J., Goldman, M*., et al.* (2016). Comprehensive Classification of Retinal Bipolar Neurons
by Single-Cell Transcriptomics. Cell 166, 1308--1323.e1330.

Shrestha, B.R., Chia, C., Wu, L., Kujawa, S.G., Liberman, M.C., Goodrich, L.V., Shrestha, B.R., Chia, C.,
Wu, L., Kujawa, S.G*., et al.* (2018). Sensory neuron diversity in the inner ear is shaped by activity
sensory neuron diversity. Cell 174, 1229-1246.

Sienknecht, U.J., Köppl, C., and Fritzsch, B. (2014). Evolution and development of hair cell polarity
and efferent function in the inner ear. Brain, Behavior and Evolution 83, 150-161.

Spurny, R., Ramerstorfer, J., Price, K., Brams, M., Ernst, M., Nury, H., Verheij, M., Legrand, P.,
Bertrand, D., Bertrand, S*., et al.* (2012). Pentameric ligand-gated ion channel ELIC is activated by
GABA and modulated by benzodiazepines. ProcNatlAcadSciUSA 109, 3028-3034.

Steinbach, J.H. (1989). Structural and functional diversity in vertebrate skeletal muscle nicotinic
acetylcholine receptors. Ann Rev Physiol, 353-365.

Sugino, K., Clark, E., Schulmann, A., Shima, Y., Wang, L., Hunt, D.L., Hooks, B.M., Traenkner, D.,
Chandrashekar, J., Picard, S.*, et al.* (2019). Mapping the transcriptional diversity of genetically and
anatomically defined cell populations in the mouse brain. eLife 8.
Sun, S., Babola, T., Pregernig, G., So, K.S., Nguyen, M., Su, S.M., Palermo, A.T., Bergles, D.E., Burns,
J.C., and Muller, U. (2018). Hair Cell Mechanotransduction Regulates Spontaneous Activity and Spiral
Ganglion Subtype Specification in the Auditory System. Cell 174, 1247-1263 e1215.
Tamura, K., and Nei, M. (1993). Estimation of the number of nucleotide substitutions in the control
region of mitochondrial DNA in humans and chimpanzees. Mol Biol Evol 10, 512-526.
Tapia, L., Kuryatov, A., and Lindstrom, J. (2007). Ca2+ Permeability of the (α4)3(β2)2 Stoichiometry
Greatly Exceeds That of (α4)2(β2)3 Human Acetylcholine Receptors. Molecular Pharmacology 71,
769-776.
Tasneem, A., Iyer, L.M., Jakobsson, E., and Aravind, L. (2005). Identification of the prokaryotic ligand-
gated ion channels and their implications for the mechanisms and origins of animal Cys-loop ion
channels. Genome biology 6, R4-R4.
Tian, M.K., Bailey, C.D., and Lambe, E.K. (2014). Cholinergic excitation in mouse primary vs.
associative cortex: region-specific magnitude and receptor balance. The European journal of
neuroscience 40, 2608-2618.
Traynelis, S.F., Wollmuth, L.P., McBain, C.J., Menniti, F.S., Vance, K.M., Ogden, K.K., Hansen, K.B.,
Yuan, H., Myers, S.J., and Dingledine, R. (2010). Glutamate receptor ion channels: Structure,
regulation, and function. Pharmacological Reviews 62, 405-496.
Tsang, S.Y., Ng, S.K., Xu, Z., and Xue, H. (2007). The evolution of GABAA receptor-like genes.
Molecular Biology and Evolution 24, 599-610.
Tsunoyama, K., and Gojobori, T. (1998). Evolution of Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor Subunits. Mol
Biol Evol 15, 518-527.
Tucker, A.S. (2017). Major evolutionary transitions and innovations: the tympanic middle ear.
Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological sciences 372.
Usoskin, D., Furlan, A., Islam, S., Abdo, H., Lönnerberg, P., Lou, D., Hjerling-Leffler, J., Haeggström, J.,
Kharchenko, O., Kharchenko, P.V.*, et al.* (2015). Unbiased classification of sensory neuron types by
large-scale single-cell RNA sequencing. Nature Neuroscience 18, 145-153.
Vernino, S., Amador, M., Luetje, C.W., Patrick, J., and Dani, J.A. (1992). Calcium modulation and high
calcium permeability of neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptors. Neuron 8, 127-134.
Vetter, D.E., Katz, E., Maison, S.F., Taranda, J., Turcan, S., Ballestero, J., Liberman, M.C., Elgoyhen,
A.B., and Boulter, J. (2007). The a10 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor subunit is required for normal
synaptic function and integrity of the olivocochlear system. ProcNatlAcadSciUSA 104, 20594-20599.
Waelti, P., Dickinson, A., and Schultz, W. (2001). Dopamine responses comply with basic
assumptions of formal learning theory. Nature 412, 43-48.
Weisstaub, N., Vetter, D.E., Elgoyhen, A.B., and Katz, E. (2002). The α9α10 nicotinic acetylcholine
receptor is permeable to and is modulated by divalent cations. Hearing research 167, 122-135.
Wersinger, E., McLean, W.J., Fuchs, P.A., and Pyott, S.J. (2010). BK Channels Mediate Cholinergic
Inhibition of High Frequency Cochlear Hair Cells. PLoS ONE 5, e13836-e13836.
Zakrzewicz, A., Richter, K., Agne, A., Wilker, S., Siebers, K., Fink, B., Krasteva-Christ, G., Althaus, M.,
Padberg, W., Hone, A.J.*, et al.* (2017). Canonical and Novel Non-Canonical Cholinergic Agonists
Inhibit ATP-Induced Release of Monocytic Interleukin-1beta via Different Combinations of Nicotinic
Acetylcholine Receptor Subunits alpha7, alpha9 and alpha10. Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience 11,
189.
Zarghooni, S., Wunsch, J., Bodenbenner, M., Brüggmann, D., Grando, S.A., Schwantes, U., Wess, J.,
Kummer, W., and Lips, K.S. (2007). Expression of muscarinic and nicotinic acetylcholine receptors in
the mouse urothelium. Life Sciences 80, 2308-2313.
Zheng, Y., Hirschberg, B., Yuan, J., Wang, A.P., Hunt, D.C., Ludmerer, S.W., Schmatz, D.M., and Cully,
D.F. (2002). Identification of two novel Drosophila melanogaster histamine-gated chloride channel
subunits expressed in the eye. Journal of Biological Chemistry 277, 2000-2005.

Zoli, M., Pistillo, F., and Gotti, C. (2015). Diversity of native nicotinic receptor subtypes in mammalian
brain. Neuropharmacology 96, 302-311.
Zoli, M., Pucci, S., Vilella, A., and Gotti, C. (2018). Neuronal and Extraneuronal Nicotinic Acetylcholine
Receptors. Current neuropharmacology 16, 338-349.
Zwart, R., and Vijverberg, H.P.M. (1998). Four Pharmacologically Distinct Subtypes of a4b2 Nicotinic
Acetylcholine Receptor Expressed in Xenopus laevis Oocytes. Molecular pharmacology 54, 1124-
1131.

1166

1167

Figure 1. Hair cell nAChR subunits show greater sequence divergence than neuronal subunits. Phylogenetic relationships between vertebrate nicotinic subunits as obtained from a minimum evolution tree with variation rate among sites modelled by a gamma distribution. The branches corresponding to the same subunits of different species were collapsed up to the node at which one subunit separates from its closest neighbour. The complete tree is shown in supplementary Figure 1. Triangles height indicates the number of individual sequences within each collapsed branch. Triangles length denotes the divergence on sequence identity from the subunit node. Triangles were coloured according to the average percentage of sequence identity between all pairs of sequences (%seqID, Table 1) within the branch. Numbers in branches indicate the bootstrap value obtained after 1,000 replicates. Scale bar indicates the number of amino acid substitutions per site. Histograms next to each subunit branch indicate the average %seqID for all vertebrates (grey), mammals (pink), mammals vs sauropsids (i.e. amniotes) (green) and sauropsids (yellow). The horizontal red line corresponds to the %seqID of the α10 subunit sequences from all vertebrates. NP = not present.

Figure 2. Hair cell nAChR subunits are co-expressed in inner ear hair cells, while neuronal subunits show widespread and variable co-expression patterns. A. Normalised mean expression level for nAChR subunits across mouse neuronal and sensory cell types. Circle sizes indicate the mean expression level for each cell type, normalised to the highest value observed within each dataset. For detailed explanations of individual cell types refer to main text, methods section or the original publications. **B.** Co-expression of subunits comprising known nAChR assemblies. Dark red squares, all component subunits are co-expressed within a 10-fold range of expression level. Light red squares, all component subunits are co-expressed within a 100-fold range of expression level. Pink squares, all component subunits are expressed within a 1000-fold range of expression level. White squares, at least one subunit of that receptor assembly in not expressed in that cell type. **C.** Estimated joint posterior probability distributions for expression levels of Chrna4, Chrna5 and Chrnb2 in VPM-only and VPM/POm projecting layer VI neurons. **D.** Violin plots of expression level of all nAChR subunits in adult utricle hair cells.

Figure 3. Hair cell nAChRs show differences in ACh apparent affinity, while neuronal nAChRs have similar ACh sensitivity. A. *Top panels.* Representative responses evoked by ACh in oocytes expressing rat, chicken or frog α4+β2, α7 or α9+α10 nAChRs subunits. *Bottom panels.* Concentration-response curves for neuronal α4β2 and α7 nAChRs and hair cell α9α10 nAChRs from the three tetrapod species. Values are mean ± S.E.M. Lines are best fit to the Hill equation (n = 4-9). **B.** Representative responses evoked by ACh in oocytes injected with either rat, chicken or frog homomeric α9 and α10 subunits (n=2–20).

Figure 4. Hair cell nAChRs differ in their desensitization patterns, while neuronal receptors show similar profiles. *Top panels.* Representative responses of α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs to a 60 seconds (for α4β2 and α9α10) or 30 seconds (for α7) application of 100 μM ACh for all α4β2 and amniotes α9α10, and 1 mM ACh for all α7 and frog α9α10 nAChRs. *Bottom panels.* Percentage of current remaining 20 seconds (α9α10 and α4β2) or 5 seconds (α7) after the peak response, relative to the maximum current amplitude elicited by ACh. Bars represent mean ± S.E.M., open circles represent individual oocytes (n = 4-10). **p<0.01, One-Way ANOVA followed by Dunn's test (α4β2 nAChRs) or Kruskal-Wallis followed by Holm Sidak's test (α7 and α9α10 nAChRs).

Figure 5. Extracellular Ca2+ potentiates neuronal nAChRs but differentially modulates α9α10 nAChRs. ACh response amplitude as a function of extracellular Ca2+ concentration. ACh was applied at near-EC50 concentrations (10 µM ACh for all α4β2, rat and chick α9α10 nAChRs and 100 µM ACh for all α7 and frog α9α10 nAChRs). Current amplitudes recorded at different Ca2+ concentrations in each oocyte were normalized to the response obtained at 1.8 mM Ca2+ in the same oocyte. Holding voltage: -90 mV. Bars represent mean ± S.E.M., open circles represent individual oocytes (n = 4-12). *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.005, ****p<0.0001, Paired t-test (rat and frog α4β2 nAChRs and all α7 and α9α10 nAChRs) or Wilcoxon matched pair test (chick α4β2 nAChR) – comparing 0.5 mM Ca2+ vs 3 mM Ca2+.

Figure 6. Unlike neuronal nAChRs, α9α10 nAChRs exhibit differential Ca2+ contribution to the total inward current. *Top panels.* Representative responses to near-EC50 concentration of ACh (10 µM ACh for all α4β2 and amniotes α9α10 nAChRs and 100 µM ACh for all α7 and frog α9α10 nAChRs) in oocytes expressing α4β2, α7 and α9α10 nAChRs, before and after a 3 hour incubation with BAPTA-AM (Vh= −70 mV). *Bottom panels.* Percentage of the initial response remaining after BAPTA incubation. Bars represent mean ± S.E.M., open circles represent individual oocytes (n = 4-10). ****$p<0.0001$, One-Way ANOVA followed by Dunn's test (α4β2 and α7 nAChRs) or Kruskal-Wallis followed by Holm Sidak's test (α9α10 nAChRs).

Figure 7. Hair cell, but not neuronal, nAChRs show differential current-voltage relationships across species. *Top panels.* Representative I–V curves obtained by the application of voltage ramps (-120 to +50mV, 2 seconds) at the plateau response to 3 µM ACh for α4β2 and α9α10 or by the application of 100 µM ACh at different holding potentials for α7 nAChRs. Values were normalized to the maximal agonist response obtained for each receptor. *Bottom panels.* Ratio of current amplitude at +40 mV relative to -90 mV for each oocyte. Bars represent mean ± S.E.M., open circles represent individual oocytes (n = 5-11). *p<0.05 ****p< 0.0001, One-Way ANOVA followed by Dunn's test (α4β2 and α7 nAChRs) or Kruskal-Wallis followed by Holm Sidak's test (α9α10 nAChRs).

Figure 8. Hair cell nAChRs show great functional divergence, while functional properties of neuronal nAChRs are conserved. PCA was conducted using the experimentally determined biophysical properties (Supplementary Table 6). Square symbols represent rat nAChRs, circles represent chick nAChRs and triangles represent frog nAChRs, α4β2 nAChRs are shown in shades of green, α7 nAChRs in shades of purple and α9α10 nAChRs in shades of orange. The projected placement of inferred functional states for amniote (stars) and tetrapod (crosses) ancestral receptors are coloured in grades of yellow (α4β2), blue (α7) or pink (α9α10). Inset. Biplot of the relative contribution of the five biophysical properties to PC1 and PC2.

	All	Mammals	Mammals-Sauropsid	Sauropsid
CHRNA1	83.98 (26)	93.40 (11)	85.44	88.98 (9)
CHRNA2	73.99 (24)	81.02 (11)	71.68	82.21 (7)
CHRNA3	80.91 (23)	89.78 (10)	83.50	91.79 (8)
CHRNA4	73.63 (26)	80.77 (11)	74.14	90.06 (9)
CHRNA5	84.55 (21)	90.65 (9)	86.18	96.27 (7)
CHRNA6	77.61 (24)	88.09 (11)	80.31	84.93 (8)
CHRNA7	79.22 (26)	92.97 (9)	89.69	96.97 (8)
CHRNA8	77.63 (12)	-	-	91.49 (6)
CHRNA9	72.16 (29)	90.90 (11)	74.23	88.28 (9)
CHRNA10	64.93 (24)	88.98 (11)	61.29	75.38 (5)
CHRNB1	70.47 (18)	86.24 (11)	63.82	73.20 (3)
CHRNB2	77.16 (26)	88.70 (11)	75.83	76.87 (9)
CHRNB3	81.47 (28)	88.41 (11)	84.59	91.83 (8)
CHRNB4	72.12 (23)	80.83 (10)	71.75	85.65 (7)
CHRND	71.54 (22)	87.85 (10)	68.02	76.59 (6)
CHRNE	67.34 (16)	83.08 (10)	58.60	-
CHRNG	69.12 (24)	86.81 (11)	63.41	79.55 (8)

Table 1. Mean percentage sequence identity (%seqID). Values were calculated using pairs of sequences of all vertebrates, mammals or sauropsids nAChRs subunits. (n) Indicates the number of orthologues from each subunit included in the calculations. White background: muscle subunits; light background grey: neuronal subunits; dark grey background : hair cells subunits.

Receptor	α4β2					
Species	**Rat**		**Chicken**		**Frog**	
ACh sensitivity — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	3.11 ± 2.11 (3)	159.76 ± 35.67 (4)	1.07 ± 0.15 (6)	66.00 ± 9.76 (4)	0.75 ± 0.02 (7)	143.71 ± 51.89 (5)
ANOVA (p-value)	EC50_1: Rat vs Chick = 0.1346, Rat vs Frog = 0.1018, Chick vs Frog = 0.6927[P]					
	EC50_2: Rat vs Chick = 0.3743, Rat vs Frog = 0.7809, Chick vs Frog = 0.3743[P]					
Desensitization — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	77.13 ± 1.21 (4)		77.68 ± 5.16 (7)		72.70 ± 3.04 (10)	
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.9336, Rat vs Frog = 0.7326, Chick vs Frog = 0.7204[P]					
Ca^{2+} Modulation — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	0.36 ± 0.04 (5)		0.55 ± 0.03 (9)		0.60 ± 0.08 (5)	
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick > 0.999, Rat vs Frog > 0.9999, Chick vs Frog > 0.9999[P]					
Ca^{2+} Permeability — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	72.07 ± 9.62 (4)		78.75 ± 5.04 (6)		81.51 ± 7.91 (6)	
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.7999, Rat vs Frog = 0.7892, Chick vs Frog = 0.7999[P]					
Rectification profile — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	0.07 ± 0.03 (5)		0.03 ± 0.03 (6)		0.02 ± 0.03 (6)	
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.6838, Rat vs Frog = 0.4995, Chick vs Frog = 0.9437[P]					

Receptor	α7		
Species	**Rat**	**Chicken**	**Frog**
ACh sensitivity — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	432.1 ± 123.45 (8)	267.56 ± 87.98 (8)	239.27 ± 33.90 (7)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.365, Rat vs Frog = 0.6723, Chick vs Frog > 0.9999[NP]		
Desensitization — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	3.23 ± 0.79 (6)	3.18 ± 0.54 (9)	2.00 ± 0.41 (6)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick > 0.9999, Rat vs Frog = 0.3743, Chick vs Frog = 0.2496[NP]		
Ca^{2+} Modulation — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	0.63 ± 0.10 (4)	0.46 ± 0.06 (4)	0.63 ± 0.08 (4)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick > 0.999, Rat vs Frog > 0.9999, Chick vs Frog > 0.9999[P]		
Ca^{2+} Permeability — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	29.07 ± 7.68 (4)	37.10 ± 11.82 (4)	38.47 ± 3.98 (7)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.7447, Rat vs Frog = 0.7447, Chick vs Frog = 0.8931[P]		
Rectification profile — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	0.04 ± 0.02 (5)	0.02 ± 0.003 (5)	0.03 ± 0.01 (5)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.5909, Rat vs Frog = 0.9706, Chick vs Frog = 0.7295[P]		

Receptor	α9α10		
Species	**Rat**	**Chicken**	**Frog**
ACh sensitivity — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	19.39 ± 2.08 (9)	17.62 ± 3.33 (6)	110.89 ± 25.00 (7)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick > 0.9999, Rat vs Frog = 0.0026**, Chick vs Frog = 0.006**[NP]		
Desensitization — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	64.46 ± 3.65 (5)	60.84 ± 4.23 (9	14.53 ± 3.01 (7)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick > 0.9999, Rat vs Frog = 0.0051**, Chick vs Frog = 0.0042**[NP]		
Ca^{2+} Modulation — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	3.76 ± 0.73 (5)	1.00 ± 0.07 (4)	0.63 ± 0.05 (12)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick < 0.0001****, Rat vs Frog < 0.0001****, Chick vs Frog > 0.9981[P]		
Ca^{2+} Permeability — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	24.89 ± 2.81 (6)	100.28 ± 14.02 (6)	19.56 ± 3.38 (10)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.0299*, Rat vs Frog > 0.9999, Chick vs Frog = 0.0013**[NP]		
Rectification profile — Mean ± S.E.M (n)	1.21 ± 0.07 (11)	2.31 ± 0.34 (10)	0.21 ± 0.05 (8)
ANOVA (p-value)	Rat vs Chick = 0.0229*, Rat vs Frog = 0.0406*, Chick vs Frog < 0.0001****[NP]		

Table 2. Biophysical properties and statistical comparisons from rat, chicken and frog α4β2, α7 and α9α10 receptors. Values are shown as mean ± S.E.M. (n). [P]: parametric, [NP]: non-parametric analysis. ACh sensitivity: EC_{50} value; Desensitization rate: percentage current remaining 20 seconds (5 sec for α7 receptors) after peak response to a 10-fold concentration of EC_{50} ACh; Ca^{2+} Modulation: current elicited by EC_{50} ACh at Ca^{2+} 0.5 mM relative to Ca^{2+} 3 mM; Ca^{2+} Permeability: percentage of remaining current after BAPTA-AM treatment; Rectification profile: current recorded at +40 mV relative to that recorded at -90 mV.

	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5
ACh sensitivity (EC$_{50}$)	0.55	0.04	0.35	0.72	0.23
Desensitization (%I after ACh peak)	-0.56	-0.11	-0.35	0.41	0.62
Ca^{2+} modulation ($I_{0.5\,mM}/I_{3\,mM}$)	-0.18	0.77	-0.26	0.36	-0.42
Ca^{2+} permeability (%I post-BAPTA)	-0.46	-0.46	0.37	0.38	-0.55
Rectification ($I_{+40\,mV}/I_{-90\,mV}$)	-0.36	0.42	0.74	-0.21	0.31
Proportion of the variability	0.54	0.28	0.14	0.03	0.006
Accumulated proportion	0.54	0.82	0.96	0.99	1.00

Table 3. PCA analysis. *Upper panel*: loading of each experimental parameter on each principal component generated. *Lowe panel*: proportion and accumulated proportion of the variability represented by each PC.

Supplementary Figure 1. Complete minimum evolution phylogenetic tree corresponding to the collapsed tree shown in Figure 1, obtained with variation rates among sites modelled by a gamma distribution. Red branches, mammals; yellow branches, sauropsids; green branches, amphibians; blue branches, fish; light blue branches, coelacanth. The trees were built using minimum evolution method and pairwise deletion for missing sites. The optimal tree with a sum of branch length of 47.32565515 is shown. For clarity, the percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1,000 replicates) are shown only next to the branches that separate different subunits. The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths in the same units as those of the evolutionary distances used to infer the tree.

Supplementary Figure 2. Complete minimum evolution phylogenetic tree obtained assuming uniform variation rates among branches. Red branches, mammals; yellow branches, sauropsids; green branches, amphibians; blue branches, fish; light blue branches, coelacanth. The trees were built using minimum evolution method and pairwise deletion for missing sites. The optimal tree with a sum of branch length of 37.49411418 is shown. For clarity, the percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1,000 replicates) are shown only next to the branches that separate different subunits. The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths in the same units as those of the evolutionary distances used to infer the tree.

Supplementary Figure 3. Violin expression plots showing expression level for all nAChR subunits and acetylcholinesterase (AChE) in the different cell types from the datasets analysed. Expression values are in log2 normalised counts (see methods for details).

Supplementary Figure 4. Joint posterior probabilities of gene expression levels inferred for the nAChR subunits expressed in the cell types and datasets analysed (see methods for details).

Supplementary Figure 5. Experimental workflow detailing the steps followed for the inference of ancestral character states of the functional properties of tetrapod and amniote ancestral α4β2, α7 and α9α10 receptors.

Supplementary Figure 6. nAChRs trees used for the inference of ancestral state states. The tree topology corresponds to the species phylogenetic relationship. The branch lengths correspond to those determined from aminoacid sequence identity analysis between rat-amniote, chick-amniote, amniote-tetrapod and frog-tetrapod pairs of subunits. For the heteromeric α4β2 receptors, branch lengths were calculated assuming a (α4)2(β2)3 assembly. For the heteromeric α9α10 receptors branch lengths were calculated assuming a (α9)2(α10)3 stoichiometry (Plazas et al., 2005). Blue arrows, tetrapod ancestor. Red arrows, amniote ancestor.

	EC$_{50}$ 1	EC$_{50}$ 2	Desensitization	Ca²⁺ modulation	Ca²⁺ permeability	Rectification
α4β2 frog △	0.75	143.71	72.70	0.60	81.51	0.02
α4β2 tetrapod ✕	**1.37**	**130.26**	**74.82**	**0.53**	**78.72**	**0.03**
α4β2 chick ◯	1.07	66.00	77.68	0.55	78.75	0.03
α4β2 amniote ✳	**1.86**	**119.34**	**76.54**	**0.48**	**76.46**	**0.04**
α4β2 rat ▢	3.11	159.76	77.13	0.36	72.07	0.07
α7 frog △	239.27		2.00	0.63	38.47	0.03
α7 tetrapod ✕	**291.59**		**2.89**	**0.53**	**35.92**	**0.03**
α7 chick ◯	267.56		3.18	0.46	37.10	0.02
α7 amniote ✳	**293.28**		**2.92**	**0.53**	**35.83**	**0.03**
α7 rat ▢	432.10		3.23	0.63	29.07	0.04
α9α10 frog △	110.89		14.53	0.63	19.56	0.21
α9α10 tetrapod ✕	**60.27**		**40.55**	**1.38**	**48.80**	**1.14**
α9α10 chick ◯	17.62		60.84	1.00	100.28	2.31
α9α10 amniote ✳	**49.39**		**46.14**	**1.54**	**55.09**	**1.34**
α9α10 rat ▢	19.39		64.46	3.76	24.89	1.21

Supplementary Figure 7. Inferred ancestral character states for amniote and tetrapod α9α10, α4β2 and α7 nAChRs. The biophysical properties of ancestral receptors inferred by maximum likelihood are shown in black. The values in grey correspond to the biophysical properties of extant receptors determined experimentally (Table 2) and used as input for the inference of ancestral character state. The symbols next to each receptor correspond to the symbols in Figure 8.

Species	CHRNA1	CHRNA2	CHRNA3	CHRNA4	CHRNA5	CHRNA6	CHRNA7	CHRNA8	CHRNA9	CHRNA10	CHRNB1	CHRNB2	CHRNB3	CHRNB4	CHRND	CHRNE	CHRNG	SHT3B
Opossum	ENSMODG00000009414	ENSMODG00000015940	ENSMODG00000011883	ENSMODG00000016880	ENSMODG00000011857	ENSMODG00000010120	ENSMODG00000008920	.	ENSMODG00000020560	ENSMODG00000008246	ENSMODG00000006951	ENSMODG00000017165	ENSMODG00000010082*	ENSMODG00000011891	ENSMODG00002646*	ENSMODG00000005395	ENSMODG00002666*	ENSMODG00000008590
Wallaby	ENSMEUG0000003627*	ENSMEUG00000004558*	ENSMEUG00000010388*	ENSMEUG00000006728*	-	ENSMEUG00000012812*	ENSMEUG00000009840*	.	ENSMEUG00000010143*	ENSMEUG00000009564*	ENSMEUG00000008924*	ENSMEUG00000003725*	ENSMEUG00000011355*	ENSMEUG00000001043*	ENSMEUG00000011484*	ENSMEUG00000012183*	ENSMEUG00000011510*	ENSMEUG00000004982
Rat	ENSRNOG0000018286	ENSRNOG00000017424	ENSRNOG00000013829	ENSRNOG00000011202	ENSRNOG00000013610	ENSRNOG00000012283	ENSRNOG00000010853	.	ENSRNOG00000002484	ENSRNOG00000020293	ENSRNOG00000014698	ENSRNOG00000020778	ENSRNOG00000012448	ENSRNOG00000014427	ENSRNOG00000019527	ENSRNOG00000003777	NM_019145.1	
Mouse	ENSMUSG0000027107	ENSMUSG00000022041	ENSMUSG00000032303	ENSMUSG00000027577	ENSMUSG00000035594	ENSMUSG00000031691	ENSMUSG00000030525	.	ENSMUSG00000029205	ENSMUSG00000066279	ENSMUSG00000041189	ENSMUSG00000027950	ENSMUSG00000031492	ENSMUSG00000035200	ENSMUSG00000026251	ENSMUSG00000014669	ENSMUSG00000026253	
Cat	ENSFCAG000000014103*	ENSFCAG00000028158	ENSFCAG00000001932	ENSFCAG00000030656	ENSFCAG00000001930	ENSFCAG00000022358	ENSFCAG00000036300	.	ENSFCAG00000035547	ENSFCAG00000023105	ENSFCAG00000009612	ENSFCAG00000022169*	ENSFCAG00000010080	ENSFCAG00000001933	ENSFCAG00000030943	ENSFCAG00000038719	ENSFCAG00000005681	ENSFCAG00000004982
Dog	ENSCAFG000000013283	ENSCAFG00000008499	ENSCAFG00000007710*	ENSCAFG00000012893	ENSCAFG00000001745*	ENSCAFG00000005444	ENSCAFG00000010220*	.	ENSCAFG00000015915	ENSCAFG00000024527	ENSCAFG00000016315	ENSCAFG00000017172	ENSCAFG00000005460	ENSCAFG00000023904	ENSCAFG00000011283	ENSCAFG00000015838	ENSCAFG00000024807*	ENSCAFG00000013576
Cow	ENSBTAG000000018253	ENSBTAG00000002252	ENSBTAG00000003130	ENSBTAG00000017198	ENSBTAG00000013657*	ENSBTAG00000014056	ENSBTAG00000015775	.	ENSBTAG00000015252	ENSBTAG00000055237	ENSBTAG00000019242	ENSBTAG00000007517	ENSBTAG00000014050	ENSBTAG00000003132	ENSBTAG00000011390*	ENSBTAG00000004908	ENSBTAG00000045943	ENSBTAG00000033130
Human	ENSG0000013843598	ENSG0000012010901512	ENSG0000008080644	ENSG0000010120404	ENSG0000016968484	ENSG0000014743434	ENSG0000017534444	.	ENSG0000017434343	ENSG0000012929749	ENSG0000017017575	ENSG0000016071616	ENSG0000014743232	ENSG0000011797171	ENSG0000013535902	ENSG0000010800108556	ENSG0000019681196811	ENSG0000014930505
Chimp	ENSPTRG000000012658	ENSPTRG00000020105	ENSPTRG00000007347	ENSPTRG00000013735	ENSPTRG00000007346	ENSPTRG00000020210	ENSPTRG00000006865	.	ENSPTRG00000016003	ENSPTRG00000003199	ENSPTRG00000008689	ENSPTRG00000001389	ENSPTRG00000020209	ENSPTRG00000007348	ENSPTRG00000013040	ENSPTRG00000008612	ENSPTRG00000022726	
Megabat	ENSPVAG000000004164	ENSPVAG00000014424	ENSPVAG00000009191	ENSPVAG00000014109	ENSPVAG00000009186	ENSPVAG00000015371*	ENSPVAG00000017796*	.	ENSPVAG00000003814	ENSPVAG00000016436	ENSPVAG00000005067	XM_023534307.1*	ENSPVAG00000015373	ENSPVAG00000009193	ENSPVAG00000007491	ENSPVAG00000000127	ENSPVAG00000007492*	
Microbat	ENSMLUG000000015698	ENSMLUG00000001512	-	Manual search on traces	-	ENSMLUG00000005231	ENSMLUG00000005856	.	ENSMLUG00000000893	ENSMLUG00000013586	ENSMLUG00000009921	ENSMLUG00000007541	ENSMLUG00000027322	ENSMLUG00000011213	ENSMLUG00000011213	ENSMLUG00000015682*	ENSMLUG00000011237	
Chick	ENSGALG000000009301	ENSGALG00000016565	ENSGALG00000003014	ENSGALG00000005801	ENSGALG00000003021	ENSGALG00000015382	ENSGALG00000004096	ENSGALG00000015336	ENSGALG00000014268	NM_001101036.1		ENSGALG00000002707	ENSGALG00000015384	ENSGALG00000003005	ENSGALG00000007899		ENSGALG00000007906	
Turkey	ENSMGAG000000009752	ENSMGAG00000001406	ENSMGAG00000003578	ENSMGAG00000006295	ENSMGAG00000003610*	ENSMGAG00000003610	ENSMGAG00000005132		ENSMGAG00000012228	XM_010706263.2		ENSMGAG00000006616*	ENSMGAG00000007510	ENSMGAG00000003559*	ENSMGAG00000008354		ENSMGAG00000008414	
Duck	ENSAPLG000000007803*	ENSAPLG00000009491*	ENSAPLG00000016121	ENSAPLG00000007776	ENSAPLG00000016223*	ENSAPLG00000012469	ENSAPLG00000010434	ENSAPLG00000007724	ENSAPLG00000013711*	XM_013018564.1	ENSAPLG00000009547*	ENSAPLG00000009547*	ENSAPLG00000012846	ENSAPLG00000016042			ENSAPLG00000015469*	
Flycatcher	ENSFALG000000003034	ENSFALG00000003731	ENSFALG00000010658	ENSFALG00000010418	ENSFALG00000010653	ENSFALG00000005209	ENSFALG00000012362*	ENSFALG00000001025	ENSFALG00000002853*	XM_016305564.1	ENSFALG00000001220	ENSFALG00000001220	ENSFALG00000005194	ENSFALG00000010665	ENSFALG00000007740		ENSFALG00000007743	
Zebra finch	ENSTGUG000000000882 7	-	ENSTGUG00000003469	ENSTGUG00000007453	ENSTGUG00000003451*	ENSTGUG00000000216*	ENSTGUG00000005850	ENSTGUG00000000135	ENSTGUG00000008712	-	ENSTGUG00000004092	ENSTGUG00000004092	ENSTGUG00000000227	XM_002191803.3	-		ENSTGUG00000009924	
Anole lizard	ENSACAG000000005293	ENSACAG00000002388	-	ENSACAG00000005817	-	ENSACAG00000005512	ENSACAG00000008436	ENSACAG00000005448	ENSACAG00000011789	NW_003340045.1	ENSACAG00000015594	ENSACAG00000015594	ENSACAG00000005630		ENSACAG00000010984	ENSACAG00000014790*	ENSACAG00000010910	
American alligator	XM_006267516.3	XM_006274660.2	XM_006261354.1	XM_019484414.1	XM_006261353.1	XM_006276967.2	XM_014559894.1		XM_019478038.1	XM_019480144.1	XM_006275274.2	XM_019497730.1	XM_006276963.2	XM_014605947.1	XM_019484776.1		NW_017709597.1*	
Chinese softshell turtle	ENSPSIG000000003348	ENSPSIG00000012597	ENSPSIG00000016882	ENSPSIG00000012045	-	ENSPSIG00000006517	ENSPSIG00000010525	ENSPSIG00000009608	ENSPSIG00000017539	XM_014580618.1	ENSPSIG00000009407	ENSPSIG00000006807*	ENSPSIG00000017386*	ENSPSIG00000017214		ENSPSIG00000003627*	ENSPSIG00000011304*	
Painted turtle	ENSCPBG000000003798	ENSCPBG00000022315	ENSCPBG00000024258	ENSCPBG00000027193	ENSCPBG00000024257	ENSCPBG00000027581*	ENSCPBG00000016472		ENSCPBG00000017539*	XM_024109380.1	ENSCPBG00000004679	ENSCPBG00000024641*	ENSCPBG00000027579	ENSCPBG00000024259	ENSCPBG00000016193	ENSCPBG00000016561*	ENSCPBG00000016190	
Xenopus tropicalis	ENSXETG000000025420	ENSXETG00000017553	ENSXETG00000031723	ENSXETG00000023746	ENSXETG00000023896*	ENSXETG00000001049*	ENSXETG00000016395	ENSXETG00000018003	ENSXETG00000012603	XM_002942872.4	ENSXETG00000003846	ENSXETG00000016395	ENSXETG00000010250	ENSXETG00000003968*	ENSXETG00000027884	ENSXETG00000014957	ENSXETG00000013994*	
Tibetan frog	XM_018572442.1	XM_018570301.1	-	XM_018566101.1	-	XM_018557911.1	XM_018564234.1	-	XM_018566438.1	-	XM_018573841.1	XM_018570082.1	XM_018557907.1	XM_018572684.1	XM_018563344.1	-	XM_018572139.1	
Coelacanth	ENSLACG000000010009*	ENSLACG00000003345	ENSLACG00000004067*	ENSLACG00000010383*	ENSLACG00000002798	ENSLACG00000015217	ENSLACG00000005760*	ENSTRUG00000002223	ENSLACG00000010253	ENSLACG00000005922	ENSLACG00000008409	ENSLACG00000015217	ENSLACG00000002288	ENSLACG00000004838*	ENSLACG00000015676	ENSLACG00000002691	ENSLACG00000015771	
Fugu	XM_003961904.2	ENSTRUG00000008002*	ENSTRUG00000004067*	ENSTRUG00000010213	ENSTRUG00000005757	ENSTRUTO00000002729.2	NC_018902.1	ENSTRUTO00000005961	ENSTRUG00000013071	NW_004072435.1	XM_011618734.1	ENSTRUG00000005762	ENSTRUG00000006363	ENSTRUG00000025609	ENSTRUG00000007767*	ENSTRUG00000016224	ENSTRUG00000014376*	
Medaka	XM_020713072.2	XM_011491375.3	ENSORLG00000013118	ENSORLG00000000865*	ENSORLG00000020077	ENSORLIT000001150 28636.1	ENSORLG00000018774	ENSORLG00000003203	ENSORLG00000004390	NC_019871.2	ENSORLG00000009700	ENSORLG00000009700	ENSORLG00000003226	ENSORLG00000013114	ENSORLG00000026994	ENSORLG00000008035*	ENSORLG00000014619	
Zebrafish	ENSDARG000000009021	NM_001040327.1	ENSDARG00000100991	NM_001048063.1	ENSDARG00000003420	ENSDARG00000055599	ENSDARG00000101522	ENSDARG00000087224	ENSDARG00000054680	XM_021483417.1	NM_001253810.1	ENSDARG00000017790	ENSDARG00000052764	ENSDARG00000101677	ENSDARG00000019342	ENSDARG00000034307	ENSDARG00000086647*	ENSDARG00000061749

Supplementary Table 1. Accession numbers for sequences used in the phylogenetic analysis. Accession numbers correspond to Ensembl or Genbank databases. *

Sequences mended and/or completed using trace fragments obtained from the NCBI Genome Project traces database.

nAChR subtype	DOI	Reference
α7	10.1016/0896-6273(90)90344-F	Couturier et al., 1990
α8	PMID: 7509438	Gerzanich et al., 1994
α9	10.1016/0092-8674(94)90555-X	Elgoyhen 1994 et al., 1994
α10	10.1093/molbev/msu258	Lipovsek et al., 2014
α2β2	10.1016/0896-6273(88)90208-5	Deneris et al., 1988
α2β4	10.1016/0896-6273(89)90207-9	Duvoisin et al.,1989
α3β2	10.1073/pnas.84.21.7763	Boulter et al., 1987
α3β4	10.1016/0896-6273(89)90207-9	Duvoisin et al.,1989
α4β2	10.1073/pnas.84.21.7763	Boulter et al., 1987
α4β4	10.1016/0896-6273(89)90207-9	Duvoisin et al., 1989
α6β2	10.1046/j.1460-9568.1998.00001.x	Fucile et al., 1998
α6β4	10.1124/mol.106.027326	Tumkosit et al., 2006
α7β2	10.1113/jphysiol.2001.013847	Khiroug et al., 2002
α7β3	10.1074/jbc.274.26.18335	Palma etal., 1999
α7β4	110.1111/j.1471-4159.2012.07931.x	Criado et al., 2012
α9α10	10.1073/pnas.051622798	Elgoyhen et al., 2001
α2α5β2	10.1124/mol.63.6.1329	Vailati et al., 2003
α2α6β2	10.1124/mol.105.015925	Gotti et al., 2005
α2β2β3	10.1111/j.1471-4159.2012.07685.x	Dash et al., 2012
α2β3β4	10.1111/j.1471-4159.2012.07685.x	Dash et al., 2012
α3α4β2	10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2112-05.2005	Turner et al., 2005
α3α4β4	10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2112-05.2005	Turner et al., 2005
α3α5β2	10.1074/jbc.271.30.17656	Wang et al., 1996
α3α5β4	10.1074/jbc.271.30.17656	Wang et al., 1996
α3α6β2	10.1016/S0028-3908(00)00144-1	Kuryatov et al., 2000
α3α6β4	10.1046/j.1460-9568.1998.00001.x	Fucile et al., 1998
α3β2β4	10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2112-05.2005	Turner et al., 2005
α3β2β3	10.1111/j.1471-4159.2012.07685.x	Dash et al., 2012
α3β3β4	10.1074/jbc.273.25.15317	Groot-Kormelink et al., 1998
α4α5β2	10.1038/380347a0	Ramirez-Latorre et al., 1996
α4β2β3	10.1124/mol.108.046789	Kuryatov et al., 2008
α4β3β4	10.1111/j.1471-4159.2012.07685.x	Dash et al., 2012
α5α6β2	10.1016/S0028-3908(00)00144-1	Kuryatov et al., 2000
α5α7β2	10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb11331.x	Girod et al., 1999
α6β2β3	10.1124/mol.106.027326	Tumkosit et al., 2006
α6β3β4	10.1016/S0028-3908(00)00144-1	Kuryatov et al., 2000
α3α4α6β2	10.1111/j.1471-4159.2008.05282.x	Cox etal., 2008
α3α5β2β4	10.1074/jbc.270.9.4424	Conroy and Berg, 1995
α4α6β2β3	10.1124/mol.110.066159	Kuryatov and Lindstrom, 2010
α5α6β3β4	10.1124/jpet104.075069	Grinevich et al., 2005
α1β1γδ	10.1038/321406a0	Mishina et al., 1986
α1β1δε	10.1038/321406a0	Mishina et al., 1986

Supplementary Table 2. Neuronal nAChRs repertoire. Experimentally validated pentameric combinations of nAChR subunits and relevant literature references.

Publication	DOI	Accession	Tissue	mean_genes	Cell_types	#Cells
Shekar, et al. 2016	10.1016/j.cell.2016.07.054	GSE81905	Retina	5372	BC1A	14
					BC5A	24
					BC6	17
					RBC	99
Chevee, et al. 2018	10.1016/j.celrep.2017.12.046	GSE107632	Somatosensory cortex	5614	VPMonly	130
					VPM/Pom	210
Cembrowski, et al. 2018	10.1016/j.cell.2018.03.031	GSE100449	Hippocampus	5218	dSub	72
					pSub1	69
					pSub2	102
Romanov	10.1038/nn.4462	GSE74672	Hypothalamus	3887	Adcyap1	34
					Avp	25
					Dopamine	41
					GABA	311
					circadian	31
					Hmit	24
					Oxytocin	37
					Sst	38
					Trh	55
					Vglut2	137
LaManno, et al. 2016	10.1016/j.cell.2016.09.027	GSE76381	Ventral midbrain	4106	DA_SNC	73
					DA_VTA1	47
					DA_VTA2	28
					DA_VTA3	26
					DA_VTA4	69
Shrestha, et al. 2018	10.1016/j.cell.2018.07.007	GSE114997	Spiral ganglion	8298	SGN_TypeIa	63
					SGN_TypeIb	71
					SGN_TypeIc	45
McInturff	10.1242/bio.038083	GSE115934.	utricle HC	5578	HC_P1	37
					HC_P12	50
					HC_P100	25
Burns	10.1038/ncomms9557	GSE71982	inner ear	7143	Co_HC	10
Furlan, et al. 2016	10.1038/nn.4376	GSE78845	Sympathetic ganglion	6297	Nor1	10
					Nor2	39
					Nor3	103
					Nor4	18
					Nor5	23
					Glu	4
					Ach1	8
					Ach2	8
Usoskin	10.1038/nn.3881	GSE59739	DRG	3821	NF1	21
					NF2	43
					NF3	10
					NF4	16
					NF5	24
					NP1	80
					NP2	19
					NP3	10
					PEP1	50
					PEP2	14
					TH	142

Supplementary Table 3. Single-cell RNA sequencing datasets. Accession information for the datasets used on the analysis of nAChR subunits co-expression patterns. mean_genes, average number of genes per cell detected in each dataset. Cell_types, final cell types, as inferred in each publication, used to estimate the expression levels of nAChR subunit genes. #Cells, number of cells for each cell type present in the final datasets analysed.

Supplementary Table 4 — nAChR subunit gene expression across cell types.

Retina / Somatosensory cortex / Hippocampus / Hypothalamus

	Retina				Somatosensory cortex		Hippocampus			Hypothalamus									
	BC1A	BC5A	BC6	RBC	VPM-only	VPM/Pom	dSub	pSub1	pSub2	Adcyap1	Avp	Dopamine	GABA	circadian	Hmit	Oxytocin	Sst	Trh	Vglut2
Chrna1	3.46	0.72	3.18	1.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna2	2.93	1.41	3.17	1.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna3	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	62.03	5.92	0.00	59.68	0.00	8.54	0.00	9.97
Chrna4	382.03	52.93	25.66	6.74	100.99	92.58	99.88	6.10	30.51	68.76	14.87	80.34	43.55	10.23	37.64	17.36	0.00	17.47	100.82
Chrna5	5.35	2.48	3.18	8.01	13.80	3.05	5.36	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna6	267.64	0.00	601.04	10.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna7	19.29	52.13	0.00	0.00	11.37	20.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.39	0.00	0.00	7.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna10	0.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.59	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnb1	34.77	55.02	28.26	17.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnb2	78.90	23.43	134.51	25.77	43.13	31.83	15.83	13.12	24.99	83.16	21.37	99.08	55.77	35.06	53.54	75.05	92.14	50.69	79.18
Chrnb3	43.53	0.46	138.25	5.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnb4	4.68	1.14	2.02	1.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnd	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrne	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrng	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Ventral midbrain / Spiral ganglion / Inner ear hair cells

	Ventral midbrain					Spiral ganglion			Inner ear hair cells			
	SNC	VTA1	VTA2	VTA3	VTA4	TypeIa	TypeIb	TypeIc	Utricle_HC_P1	Utricle_HC_P12	Utricle_HC_P100	Cochlear_HC
Chrna1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	76.33	5.52	27.55	320.99	376.92	388.80	154.91
Chrna2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna3	75.04	61.02	34.75	0.00	9.22	0.00	0.00	18.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna4	559.44	674.74	277.56	568.53	274.87	131.75	57.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna5	28.65	16.99	19.36	0.00	3.32	0.00	0.00	11.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna6	1286.75	718.59	1140.92	705.52	821.02	0.00	0.00	21.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.61	49.86	21.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.33	13.61	0.00	554.41	626.98	607.56	350.02
Chrna10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.42	7.33	464.02	632.15	599.18	466.89
Chrnb1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.87	59.75	76.27	15.00	39.59	26.26	39.70
Chrnb2	37.12	100.00	91.58	117.53	70.01	298.16	295.47	315.08	96.02	175.77	182.60	62.75
Chrnb3	326.52	370.87	260.30	351.18	344.16	0.00	3.64	11.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnb4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.39	18.07	0.00	24.11	22.30	2.31	4.21
Chrnd	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.35
Chrne	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.97	5.00	7.81	0.00	5.92	22.78	0.00
Chrng	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	509.75	40.42	0.00	32.97

Visceral motor neurons / Dorsal root ganglia

	Visceral motor neurons								Dorsal root ganglia										
	Nor1	Nor2	Nor3	Nor4	Nor5	Glut	Ach1	Ach2	NF1	NF2	NF3	NF4	NF5	NP1	NP2	NP3	PEP1	PEP2	TH
Chrna1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.79
Chrna2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna3	535.34	689.45	825.02	808.62	988.48	107.72	572.22	596.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.86	0.00
Chrna4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.93	0.00	0.00	3.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.71	0.00	0.00	28.78
Chrna5	55.99	50.79	41.92	38.86	38.83	0.00	51.51	37.33	76.83	4.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	95.66	128.57	126.53	89.34	0.00	0.00
Chrna6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	79.15	0.00	8.86	0.00	0.00	9.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.08	6.40
Chrna7	12.13	30.63	39.57	15.58	9.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrna9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.27	0.00
Chrna10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrnb1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.97	0.00	0.00
Chrnb2	90.59	50.45	60.37	46.26	56.20	42.76	62.82	61.41	62.69	45.23	134.24	25.43	61.54	79.49	21.35	59.17	25.69	50.66	47.42
Chrnb3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	109.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.15	0.00	0.00	9.39	0.00	1.70
Chrnb4	154.87	202.31	264.13	290.53	232.07	42.76	222.23	164.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.00	0.00
Chrnd	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrne	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chrng	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Supplementary Table 4. Mean expression of nAChR subunits genes across cell types. Values are means of the estimated joint posterior distributions of gene expression levels inferred for the nAChR subunits expressed in the cell types and datasets analysed.

Primer	Tm (ºC)	Sequence (5'-3')
FXtrop.a9	61.4	TA**GAATTC**ATGCACACATTTTTGGCACGTGTTGG
RXtrop.a9	63.1	AT**CTCGAG**TCACACTGCCTGGGCAATAA
FXtrop.a10	62.4	AT**AAGCTT**TCCTGCCCAACATGAGACTGC
RXtrop.a10	62.1	AT**CTCGAG**GGCACCATCATATGGCTTTG
FXtrop.a7	61.8	TA**GAATTC**TTTGATCTCCTGCGATGGGAGGA
RXtrop.a7	61.9	AT**CTCGAG**TAGAACTGCAGAACCCTAAGCAA
FXtrop.a4	62.7	AT**GAATTC**GCTCTCTGCCAACATGGGTG
RXtrop.a4	60.1	TA**AAGCTT**GGGGTCAGTTCATATCAAACCAG
FXtrop.b2	61.2	TA**GAATTC**GAGGCGATGAGATGATCCGG
RXtrop.b2	61.3	AT**CTCGAG**GCCCTCAATGTTTCTCAGTT

Supplementary Table 5. Primers used for the cloning of *X. tropicalis* nAChRs subunits. The restriction sites for EcoRI, XhoI and HindIII used for subsequent subcloning are highlighted in bold. Tm, annealing temperature.

Receptor	ACh sensitivity (EC$_{50}$)	Desensitization (%I after ACh peak)	Ca^{2+} modulation ($I_{0.5\ mM}/I_{3\ mM}$)	Ca^{2+} permeability (%I post-BAPTA)	Rectification ($I_{+40\ mV}/I_{-90\ mV}$)
Rat α9α10	0.045	0.830	1.000	0.248	0.525
Chick α9α10	0.041	0.783	0.266	1.000	1.000
Frog α9α10	0.257	0.187	0.167	0.195	0.091
Rat α4β2	0.007	0.993	0.097	0.719	0.029
Chick α4β2	0.002	1.000	0.146	0.785	0.014
Frog α4β2	0.002	0.936	0.158	0.813	0.008
Rat α7	1.000	0.042	0.167	0.290	0.016
Chick α7	0.619	0.041	0.121	0.370	0.009
Frog α7	0.554	0.026	0.168	0.384	0.015
Amniote α4β2	0.004	0.985	0.128	0.762	0.019
Tetrapod α4β2	0.003	0.963	0.141	0.785	0.014
Amniote α7	0.679	0.038	0.141	0.357	0.012
Tetrapod α7	0.675	0.037	0.142	0.358	0.012
Amniote α9α10	0.114	0.594	0.409	0.549	0.581
Tetrapod α9α10	0.139	0.522	0.366	0.487	0.494

Supplementary Table 6. Normalized biophysical properties from extant and normalised inferred biophysical properties for ancestral receptors used in PCA analysis. Values are normalised relative to the maximum obtained for each parameter.

α4β2

Comparison	seqID	1-seqID
Rat-amniote	0.824	0.176
Chick-amniote	0.816	0.184
Amniote-tetrapod	0.819	0.181
Frog-tetrapod	0.777	0.223

α7

Comparison	seqID	1-seqID
Rat-amniote	0.888	0.112
Chick-amniote	0.962	0.038
Amniote-tetrapod	0.997	0.003
Frog-tetrapod	0.907	0.093

α9α10

Comparison	seqID	1-seqID
Rat-amniote	0.683	0.317
Chick-amniote	0.821	0.179
Amniote-tetrapod	0.96	0.04
Frog-tetrapod	0.814	0.186

Supplementary Table 7. Estimated distances between extant and inferred ancestral α9α10, α4β2 and α7 nAChRs based on protein sequence identity. Sequence identity (seqID) values between pairs of sequences were calculated using the protein sequence alignments in Supplementary File 3). Distances (1-seqID values) were subsequently used as branch lengths for the receptor trees used for the inference of ancestral character states for each nAChR (Supplementary Figure 6).

Supplementary Files

Supplementary File 1. Multiple alignment of nAChRs subunits. The alignment includes 392 nAChR subunits sequences from 29 different species together with 9 sequences from 5HT3B vertebrate subunits (outgroup).

Supplementary File 2. Sequences used for the reconstruction of ancestral nAChR subunits. DNA sequences from α4, α7, α9, α10 and β2 orthologues used to reconstruct DNA sequences from amniote and tetrapod ancestors. The species trees, in parenthetic format, are shown before the sequence alignment, in fasta format. The branch lengths in the species trees were inferred from each alignment and indicate the amount of accumulated changes.

Supplementary File 3. Extant and inferred ancestral nAChRs protein sequences. Protein sequences from rat, chicken, frog, amniote ancestor and tetrapod ancestor, from α7, $(α4)_2(β2)_3$ and $(α9)_2(α10)_3$ nAChRs were aligned and the sequence identity between pairs of receptors was used to calculate the branch lengths assigned to the receptor trees (Supplementary Figure 6) used to infer ancestral character states of biophysical properties (Supplementary Figure 7).