Acetylcholine modulates cerebellar granule cell spiking by regulating the balance of synaptic excitation and inhibition

Abbreviated title: Cholinergic modulation of cerebellar circuits

Taylor R. Fore, Nathan Taylor, Nicolas Brunel, and Court Hull

Department of Neurobiology, Duke University Medical School, Durham, 27710 United States

Correspondence:

Dr. Court Hull

Email: Hull@neuro.duke.edu

Phone: 919-613-0927

Number of Pages: 34

Number of Figures: 9

Number of Words:

      Abstract: 243

      Introduction: 560

      Discussion: 1249

Conflict of Interest Statement:

The authors declare no competing financial interests

Acknowledgements:

This work was supported by grants from the NIH NINDS (5R01NS096289-02), the NSF (DGF1106401) the Sloan Foundation, and the Whitehall Foundation. We thank Dr. Lindsey Glickfeld and members of the Hull and Glickfeld labs for input and technical assistance throughout the project.

Abstract

Sensorimotor integration in the cerebellum is essential for refining motor output, and the first stage

of this processing occurs in the granule cell layer. Recent evidence suggests that granule cell

layer synaptic integration can be contextually modified, though the circuit mechanisms that could

mediate such modulation remain largely unknown. Here we investigate the role of Acetylcholine

(ACh) in regulating granule cell layer synaptic integration. We find that Golgi cells, interneurons

that provide the sole source of inhibition to the granule cell layer, express both nicotinic and

muscarinic cholinergic receptors. While acute ACh application can modestly depolarize some

Golgi cells, the net effect of longer, optogenetically induced ACh release is to strongly

hyperpolarize Golgi cells. Golgi cell hyperpolarization by ACh leads to a significant reduction in

both tonic and evoked granule cell synaptic inhibition. ACh also reduces glutamate release from

mossy fibers by acting on presynaptic muscarinic receptors. Surprisingly, despite these

consistent effects on Golgi cells and mossy fibers, ACh can either increase or decrease the spike

probability of granule cells as measured by non-invasive cell attached recordings. By constructing

an integrate and fire model of granule cell layer population activity, we find that the direction of

spike rate modulation can be accounted for predominately by the initial balance of excitation and

inhibition onto individual granule cells. Together, these experiments demonstrate that ACh can

modulate population-level granule cell responses by altering the ratios of excitation and inhibition

at the first stage of cerebellar processing.

Significance Statement

The cerebellum plays a key role in motor control and motor learning. While it is known that

behavioral context can modify motor learning, the circuit basis of such modulation has remained

unclear. Here we find that a key neuromodulator, Acetylcholine (ACh), can alter the balance of

excitation and inhibition at the first stage of cerebellar processing. These results suggest that

ACh could play a key role in altering cerebellar learning by modifying how sensorimotor input is

represented at the input layer of the cerebellum.

Introduction

To coordinate movements and learn sensorimotor associations, the cerebellum must

integrate signals across a variety of modalities and timescales (Giovannucci et al., 2017; Ito, 2006,

2012; Mauk and Buonomano, 2004; Wagner et al., 2017). These signals are conveyed to the

cerebellum via mossy fiber projections that form excitatory connections onto a much larger

network of granule cells. The divergence from mossy fibers to granule cells has long been

hypothesized to enable expansion recoding that enhances pattern separation and increases the

encoding capacity of the network (Albus, 1971; Cayco-Gajic et al., 2017; Gilmer and Person,

2017; Marr, 1969).

While classical models of granule cell layer function posit rigid integration rules dictated

by the anatomical pattern of mossy fiber to granule cell connectivity, recent studies have

demonstrated that the granule cell layer can be contextually modified during behavior.

Specifically, granule cell responses to certain sensory modalities can be suppressed during

locomotion (Ozden et al., 2012). Moreover, associative learning can be enhanced during

locomotion via circuit modulation thought to occur in the granule cell layer (Albergaria et al., 2018).

Such contextual modification of granule cell responses may allow for both the enhancement of

behaviorally relevant stimuli that should be learned, as well as suppression of information that

should not be learned. However, the cellular mechanisms that allow such context-dependent

regulation are largely unknown.

Throughout the brain, neuromodulators play a key role in contextual circuit regulation

(Froemke et al., 2013; Kuchibhotla et al., 2017; Letzkus et al., 2011). In the cerebellum, there are

prominent ACh projections that terminate in the granule cell layer (Jaarsma et al., 1997).

Moreover, immunohistochemical studies have shown both nicotinic and muscarinic receptors in

the cerebellar cortex (Dominguez de Toro et al., 1997; Dominguez del Toro et al., 1994;

Nakayama et al., 1997; Neustadt et al., 1988; Turner and Kellar, 2005). These anatomical

observations suggest that ACh could be a key regulator of cerebellar processing and cerebellar-

dependent behaviors. Indeed, behavioral studies have demonstrated cholinergic enhancement

of the OKR and VOR reflexes (Prestori et al., 2013; Tan and Collewijn, 1991, 1992).

To test how acetylcholine acts to modulate granule cell layer processing and synaptic

integration, we have investigated both cell autonomous and circuit level effects of ACh by

recording from granule cell layer neurons in an acute, in-vitro brain slice preparation.   We find

that ACh predominantly leads to a prolonged suppression of Golgi cell activity via muscarinic

receptor activation, in turn reducing both tonic and evoked synaptic inhibition onto granule cells.

In addition, activation of presynaptic muscarinic receptors on mossy fibers leads to a reduction in

granule cell excitation. Together, the coincident reduction in excitation and inhibition increases

spike probability in some granule cells, while reducing spike probability in others. A population

level integrate and fire model of granule cell layer synaptic processing reveals that the direction

of modulation depends on the relative balance of excitation and inhibition of individual granule

cells. Specifically, we find that the activity of granule cells with the most inhibition is preferentially

enhanced by ACh, whereas the activity of granule cells with little inhibition is largely suppressed.

Thus, these data suggest that ACh can act to enhance the reliability of granule cells that are

significantly inhibited in response to specific mossy fiber input. Such modulation would be well-

suited to enhance the responses of granule cells that receive stimulus specific inhibition without

expanding the overall population response.

Materials and Methods

Acute Slices and Recordings:

Acute sagittal slices (250 μm) were prepared from the cerebellar vermis of Sprague Dawley rats

(20–25 days old, males, Charles River) and ChAT-IRES-Cre mice (B6;129S6-*Chat^{tm2(cre)Lowl}*/J,

Jackson Labs, P40-60, males and females). Slices were cut in an ice-cold potassium cutting

solution (Dugue et al., 2005) consisting of (in mM): 130 K-gluconate, 15 KCl, 0.05 EGTA, 20

HEPES, 25 glucose (pH 7.4, 320 mmol/kg), and were transferred to an incubation chamber

containing artificial CSF comprised of (in mM): 125 NaCl, 26 NaHCO$_3$, 1.25 NaH$_2$PO$_4$, 2.5 KCl, 2

CaCl$_2$, 1 MgCl$_2$, and 25 glucose (pH 7.3, 320 mmol/kg). A NMDA antagonist, *R*-CPP (2.5 µM,

Tocris), was added to the potassium cutting solution to enhance cell survival. Slices were

incubated at 32° C for 20 minutes, and then kept at room temperature for up to 7 hours. All

solutions were saturated with 95% O$_2$ and 5% CO$_2$. All procedures were performed according to

guidelines approved by the Duke University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

Visually guided (SliceScope Pro 2000 with Dodt-gradient contrast and water-immersion 60x

objective, Scientifica) whole-cell recordings were obtained using a Multiclamp 700B (Axon

Instruments) with thick-walled borosilicate glass patch pipettes (Granule cells, whole cell: 5-7 MΩ,

Granule cells, cell attached: 10-14 MΩ, Golgi cells: 2-4 MΩ; 1.5 mm OD, 0.84 mm ID, World

Precision Instruments). Electrophysiological recordings were digitized at 20 kHz (Digidata 1440A,

Axon Instruments), filtered at 10 kHz, and performed at 32-33 °C. Glass monopolar electrodes (1

MΩ) filled with aCSF, in conjunction with a stimulus isolation unit (ISO-Flex, A.M.P.I.), were used

for extracellular stimulation of the mossy fiber tract. For cell-attached recordings, only cells with

an initial spike probability in control conditions between approximately 20% and 60% were

recorded to allow for increases or decreases in spike rate during pharmacological manipulations.

Spontaneous and evoked IPSCs were recorded at the EPSC reversal potential (+10 mV). Evoked

excitatory postsynaptic currents (eEPSC) were recorded at a holding potential of -70 mV and -60

mV for granule cells and Golgi cells, respectively. Voltage-clamp recordings of IPSCs and EPSCs

were collected using a cesium-based internal solution containing (in mM): 140 Cs-gluconate, 15

HEPES, 0.5 EGTA, 2 TEA-Cl, 2 MgATP, 0.3 NaGTP, 10 Phosphocreatine-Tris$_2$, 2 QX-314 Cl, pH

was adjusted to 7.2 with CsOH, resulting in a final osmolality of 316 mmol/kg. Current-clamp and

voltage-clamp recordings of Golgi cells were performed using a potassium-based internal solution

containing (in mM): 150 K-gluconate, 3 KCl, 10 HEPES, 0.5 EGTA, 3 MgATP, 0.5 NaGTP, 5

Phosphocreatine-Tris$_2$, 5 Phosphocreatine-Na$_2$, pH was adjusted 7.2 with KOH, osmolality: 315

mmol/kg. Membrane potentials were not corrected for the liquid junction potential. Series

resistance was monitored during voltage-clamp recordings with a 5 mV hyperpolarizing pulse,

and only recordings that remained stable over the period of data collection were used. All drugs

were purchased from Abcam or Tocris.

Virus Injections and Optogenetic Experiments:

Expression of the optogenetic actuator Chronos in ChAT+ cerebellar projection neurons was

achieved using retro-orbital injection (2-10 μL)(Yardeni et al., 2011) of AAV-PHP.eb-Syn-FLEX-

rc[Chronos-tdTomato] into ChAT-IRES-Cre mice (B6;129S6-*Chat$^{tm2(cre)Lowl}$*/J, Jackson Labs)

at P0-P2. Recordings with optogenetic stimulation were subsequently performed between P40-

P60. Labeled axons in these experiments were observed throughout the cerebellar vermis,

including both thin fibers and mossy fiber-like axons. Mossy fiber-like axons were most dense in

lobules VIII-X. Experiments were performed in any vermis lobule where labeling was evident as

visualized by Td-Tomato expression during experiments. Optogenetic stimulation was performed

using full-field illumination (50 Hz, 2-3 sec, 10-20 mW) with a 450 nm laser (Optoengine, MGL-III-

450).

Data Analysis:

IPSCs and EPSCs were analyzed using Clampfit, Igor Pro, and Mini Analysis software (v6.0.3,

Synaptosoft Inc.) using a 3 kHz low pass Butterworth filter. Detection thresholds for single trial

responses were set to 5x (IPSCs) or 2.5x (EPSCs) greater than the baseline RMS noise level.

Synaptic potency was measured as the amplitude on all trials where EPSCs or IPSCs were

successfully evoked, excluding failures. Mossy fiber paired-pulse ratios were determined using

an inter-stimulus interval (IS) of 40 ms and measured from an average waveform across 30

consecutive trials. For voltage-clamp recordings of nicotinic and muscarinic currents, peak current

amplitudes were measured from the subtracted average current for each cell. For cell attached

recordings, spike probabilities were calculated in 1 ms bins, and normalized to the maximum spike

probability on a per cell basis. Spike rates were calculated across all three stimuli in a 45 ms

window and normalized to control. Data are reported as mean ± SEM (unless otherwise noted),

and statistical analysis was carried out using custom R package (available at

github.com/trfore/MAtools) and Clampfit (Molecular Devices). Data was tested for

homoscedasticity using Brown-Forsythe test and for normality via quantile-quantile plots. For

heteroscedastic data, we applied a repeated measures ANOVA with Dunnett's post hoc test;

additionally, sphericity was not assumed and a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied.

Alternatively, a one-way ANOVA with Tukey post hoc was used. Significant differences are

denoted as follows: *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, and * = $p < 0.05$.

Modelling:

The granular layer model was simulated with the Brian simulator (http://briansimulator.org). The

structure of the network was adapted from Solinas et al. (Solinas et al., 2010), which aims to

recreate a functionally relevant cube of the cerebellar granular layer with 100 μm edge length.

The model comprised 315 mossy fibers, 4096 granule cells, and 27 Golgi cells. Probabilistic

synapses were formed using the convergence ratios in Table 1, with the probability of a particular

presynaptic neuron making a connection with a particular postsynaptic neuron defined as p =

(Conv. ratio) / (Total no. presynaptic neurons). There were no spatial constraints on synapse

formation.

Table 1.

	Number	Conv. ratio	Synapse prob.
mf	315		
GrC	4096		
GoC	27		
mf → GrC		4:1	0.0127
mf → GoC		10:1	0.0317
GoC → GrC		4:1	0.1481

Granule and Golgi cells were modeled as conductance-based leaky integrate-and-fire neurons with sub-threshold membrane dynamics governed by:

$$C_m \frac{dv}{dt} = g_l(E_l - v) + (g_e + g_n)(E_e - v) + (g_i + g_t)(E_i - v)$$

for granule cells, and

$$C_m \frac{dv}{dt} = g_l(E_l - v) + (g_e + g_n)(E_e - v)$$

for Golgi cells, where C_m is the membrane capacitance; v is the membrane potential; E_l, E_e, and E_i are leak, excitatory, and inhibitory reversal potentials; g_l, g_e, and g_i are leak, excitatory, and (phasic) inhibitory conductances; g_t is the (fixed) tonic inhibitory conductance in granule cells; and g_n is a stochastically fluctuating excitatory conductance described by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process,

$$\tau_n \frac{dg_n}{dt} = -g_n + \sigma_n\sqrt{\tau_n}\xi(t),$$

where $\xi(t)$ is a white noise with unit variance density. Table 2 lists the fixed parameters for each cell type in control conditions. In control, Golgi cells fired spontaneously on average between 1 and 6 Hz. This spontaneous activity was achieved by setting the Golgi cell leak reversal E_l near spike threshold and allowing the stochastic excitatory current to occasionally drive the cell above

threshold. Application of GABAzine was simulated by eliminating both tonic and phasic inhibition

onto granule cells, without changing Golgi cell excitability. Tonic release of acetylcholine was

simulated by suppressing Golgi cell activity (viz., by setting the leak reversal back to the resting

membrane potential) and reducing the magnitude of mossy fiber excitation onto both granule and

Golgi cells by 54.79% and 54.22% of their control values, respectively, as per experimental

results. Tonic inhibition was reduced differentially across granule cells by a fraction drawn from a

Gamma distribution with mean 0.6 and standard deviation 0.07.

Table 2.

	v_r	v_{th}	C_m	g_l	g_t	E_l	E_e	E_i	σ_n	τ_n	τ_e	τ_i
	(mV)		(pF)	(nS)		(mV)			(nS)		(ms)	
GrC	-75	-55	3.1	0.2	1	-75	0	-75	0.05	20	12	20
GoC	-55	-50	60	3	0	-51	0	-75	0.1	20	12	-

Three conditions (control, GABAzine, muscarine) were each simulated for 100 trials, each trial

running for two seconds. Trials were simulated for one second without mossy fiber input to allow

for decorrelation of GrC and GoC populations. Mossy fiber stimulation was modeled as three

spikes delivered to a random selection of 32 mossy fibers at 1.01, 1.02, and 1.03 s. The same

32 mossy fibers were stimulated across all trials of an individual simulation. Each mossy fiber was

assigned a mean synaptic weight from a gamma distribution with a mean and standard deviation

of 0.1 nS. Following a presynaptic mossy fiber spike, excitatory postsynaptic conductance g_e in

both granule and Golgi cells was instantaneously increased by a synaptic weight drawn from a

gamma distribution with mean and standard deviation equal to that mossy fiber's assigned mean.

A presynaptic Golgi cell spike elicited a fixed instantaneous jump in the inhibitory conductance g_i

on the postsynaptic granule cell with a 2 ms delay. Synaptic conductances decayed following the

equations:

$$\tau_e \frac{dg_e}{dt} = -g_e$$

235   and

$$\tau_i \frac{dg_i}{dt} = -g_i,$$

where τ_e and τ_i are decay time constants specific to excitation and inhibition in each cell type.

Upon reaching threshold v_{th}, the membrane potential was immediately reset to its resting rate v_r,

and held there for an absolute refractory period of 2 and 10 ms for granule and Golgi cells,

respectively.

Excitatory and inhibitory conductance traces were recorded for each granule cell during the

simulation, as well as spike times. Spike probabilities were calculated in 1 ms bins over the 100

trials, and normalized to the peak spike probability on a per cell basis. Only granule cells with

active mossy fiber input and a nonzero spike probability ratio in control were considered for

subsequent analysis. To match with experimental criteria, we further selected for those cells

whose peak spike probability to the second stimulus did not exceed 0.6, and whose peak spike

probability to the third stimulus did not exceed that to the second. Cells categorized as 'increasing'

spike probability in muscarine had a mean normalized spike probability greater than 1, while

'decreasing' cells had a mean normalized spike probability less than 1. Average conductance was

calculated by integrating each conductance trace over a 60 ms period starting 10 ms before the

first stimulus and ending 30 ms after the final stimulus, then dividing by that interval.

Results

Cholinergic modulation of Golgi Cells

Anatomical studies have reported nicotinic and muscarinic receptors in the cerebellar

cortex (Jaarsma et al., 1997). Additionally, functional studies have found α7-nAChRs (Prestori et

al., 2013), α4β2-nAChRs, and M3-mAChRs on granule cells; however, α4β2-nAChRs are

reportedly developmentally down-regulated (Didier et al., 1995) and the M3-mAChRs are

expressed in ~15% of granule cells in lobules IX-X (Takayasu et al., 2003). To test for functional

cholinergic receptors in the adult cerebellar granule cell layer, we performed whole-cell recordings

from Golgi and granule cells in the presence of synaptic receptor antagonists (NBQX 5 µM, R-

CPP 2.5 µM, and SR95531 5 µM), and focally applied acetylcholine (ACh 500 µM, 200 ms) via a

second pipette positioned in close proximity (~5-20 µm) to the recorded somata.

Golgi cells are the primary inhibitory interneuron in the granule cell layer, providing the

main source of synaptic inhibition to granule cells. Because Golgi cells fire spontaneously

between 1 to 20 Hz (Forti et al., 2006) , we first tested for acetylcholine-mediated regulation of

their spontaneous firing (**Figure 1A**). Brief application of ACh caused a transient increase in the

firing rates of 7 of 10 recorded Golgi cells (5.3 ± 1.2 fold, n = 7 of 10, **Figure 1B, C, D**). However,

in all recorded Golgi cells, there was a longer lasting suppression of firing (0.13 ± 0.06 fold, n =

10). To test what synaptic currents were responsible for these changes in spontaneous firing rate,

we recorded in voltage-clamp configuration from a subset of the same cells. Focal application of

ACh revealed a prolonged outward current that was blocked by the selective type II muscarinic

receptor antagonist AF-DX 116 (1 µM)(16.1 ± 2.6 pA, n = 7, **Figure 1E,F**), as well as a transient

inward current that was blocked by the non-selective nicotinic receptor antagonist MMA (10 µM)

(40.3 ± 11.4 pA, n = 7, **Figure 1E,F**). In contrast, granule cell recordings revealed no change in

membrane potential in response to ACh application in current-clamp, and no nicotinic nor

muscarinic receptor-activated currents in voltage-clamp (n = 24, **Figure 1 G-J**).

Focal application of ACh onto Golgi cells suggests the possibility of long-term suppression

during periods of ongoing acetylcholine release when nicotinic receptors are desensitized. To test

this, we simulated tonic release of acetylcholine by bath application of muscarine (10 µM) in the

presence of TTX (0.5 µM) to block spontaneous pacemaking (**Figure 2A**). In these experiments,

muscarine produced a prolonged hyperpolarization that lasted the duration of the agonist

application, and was abolished in the presence of the non-selective muscarinic receptor

antagonist atropine (5 μM). To test whether such long-term modulation could be achieved by

endogenous release of ACh, we expressed the optogenetic actuator chronos in cerebellar

projecting cholinergic neurons (methods), and stimulated labeled axons in cerebellar vermis using

2-3 second pulse trains (50 Hz) of blue light (**Figure 2 B-E**). This stimulation protocol produced

a modest depolarizing current during the stimulation, but predominantly resulted in a long-lasting,

atropine sensitive outward current that emerged after the stimulus and persisted for 10s of

seconds (**Figure 2D,E**). Overall, these finding suggest that ongoing bouts of granule cell layer

ACh release can activate M2 muscarinic receptors on Golgi cells that produces a long-lasting, net

suppression of these interneurons.

Cholinergic regulation of granule cell tonic inhibition

Golgi cells are the main source of granule cell synaptic inhibition (Eccles et al., 1966;

Farrant and Brickley, 2003; Kanichay and Silver, 2008). Specifically, GABA released from Golgi

cells activates two types of granule cell $GABA_A$ receptors to regulate granule cell excitability

(Brickley et al., 1996; Crowley et al., 2009; Duguid et al., 2015; Duguid et al., 2012). Based on

our measurements of muscarinic receptor-mediated Golgi cell suppression, we next tested for

changes in tonic granule cell synaptic inhibition during simulated bulk release of acetylcholine

using bath application of muscarine (**Figure 3**). Bath application of muscarine resulted in a

significant decrease in both spontaneous IPSC (sIPSC) frequency (83.7 ± 2.9% decrease, control:

4.5 ± 0.8 Hz, muscarine: 0.8 ± 0.3 Hz, n=11, P<0.0001, **Figure 3B**) and a tonic inhibitory current

mediated by non-desensitizing $GABA_A$ receptors (54.3 ± 3.3% decrease, control: 8.85 ± 1.08 pA,

muscarine: 4.1 ± 0.7 pA, P<0.0001, **Figure 3C**). These effects were reversed by atropine (sIPSC

frequency: 4.9 ± 0.9 Hz, holding current: 7.5 ± 1.0 pA, **Figure 3B-D**), suggesting that M2 receptor-

mediated suppression of Golgi cell firing can significantly reduce tonic granule cell synaptic

inhibition.

Activation of Golgi Cell M2 receptors induces spike rate plasticity

In a subgroup of granule cells, sIPSC frequency increased following bath application of

muscarine (1.7 ± 0.2 of control, n=5 of 11, P = 0.015, **Figure 3D**). These data suggest an increase

in spontaneous Golgi cell firing rates following muscarine application. Previous work has

demonstrated that Golgi cell pacemaking can undergo a form of long-term firing rate potentiation

following extended membrane hyperpolarization (Hull et al., 2013). To test whether activation of

M2 receptors could provide an endogenous mechanism for inducing this plasticity, we performed

whole-cell current clamp recordings from Golgi cells in the presence of synaptic receptor

antagonists (NBQX 5 μM, CPP 2.5 μM, SR95531 5 μM) while simulating bulk acetylcholine

release via bath application of muscarine (10 μM). Muscarine reliably suppressed GoC spiking

throughout the application period (baseline: 4.2 ± 0.6 Hz; musc: 0.5 ± 0.3 Hz; **Figure 4A**).

Following subsequent atropine application, Golgi cell firing resumed at rates that were, on

average, higher than in control (5.5 ± 0.7 Hz, **Figure 4A**). In agreement with previous work (Hull

et al., 2013), this firing rate potentiation was preferential to Golgi cells with low baseline firing rates

(FRP; <5Hz: 1.6 ± 0.2 norm, n=13; >5Hz: 1.0 ± 0.1 norm, n=4; **Figure 4B-D**). These results

suggest that acetylcholine can act as an endogenous mechanism for inducing Golgi cell firing rate

potentiation by activating M2 muscarinic receptors. Moreover, the diversity of plasticity across

Golgi cells with different initial firing rates was in agreement with the diversity of changes in sIPSC

rates in granule cells following muscarine application (**Figure 3D**).

Cholinergic regulation of evoked granule cell inhibition

Golgi cells also provide evoked feed-forward inhibition in response to mossy fiber

activation that serves to regulate excitability during cerebellar input (Duguid et al., 2015; Kanichay

and Silver, 2008). To test how evoked granule cell inhibition is regulated by ongoing cholinergic

modulation, we electrically stimulated the mossy fibers during bath application of muscarine.

Mossy fiber stimulation reliably evoked IPSCs (control: 51.8 ± 8.4 pA, 12.8 ± 5.8% failure rate, n

= 5, **Figure 5**). In the presence of muscarine, evoked IPSC amplitudes decreased significantly

(98.2 ± 0.8% decrease, 0.6 ± 0.4 pA, P<0.0001, **Figure 5 B-D**), and the failure rate increased

significantly (98.4 ± 0.8% failure rate, P=0.0004, **Figure 5E**). Atropine reversed these effects on

the evoked IPSC amplitude (11.0 ± 15.7%, 53.0 ± 9.9 pA, **Figure 5D**) and failure rate (19.3 ±

7.1% failure rate, **Figure 5E**). Importantly, evoked IPSCs were di-synaptically evoked, as

glutamatergic antagonists (NQBX 5 μM, CPP 2.5 μM) abolished all evoked IPSCs (100 ± 0%

failure rate, **Figure 5E**).   The muscarine-induced reduction in evoked IPSC amplitude and

increase in failure rates are consistent with our finding of muscarinic receptor-mediated Golgi cell

hyperpolarization. However, because these experiments rely on stimulated mossy fiber input, it

is also possible that a muscarinic receptor-mediated reduction in presynaptic mossy fiber input to

Golgi cells could also contribute to the observed reduction in evoked IPSCs.

Presynaptic Muscarinic Receptors reduce Mossy Fiber input to the granule cell layer

To test whether long-term cholinergic release could also regulate the efficacy of

glutamatergic mossy fiber inputs, we next tested how bath application of muscarine regulates

EPSCs onto both Golgi cells and granule cells. We first tested for the presence of muscarinic

receptors at mossy fiber to Golgi cell synapses (**Figure 6**). In response to mossy fiber stimulation,

muscarine significantly decreased the amplitude of evoked EPSCs onto Golgi cells (50.7 ± 11.7%

, control: 127.0 ± 16.6 pA, muscarine: 61.4 ± 22.1 pA, atropine: 120.2 ± 18.7 pA, n=10, P=0.0028,

Figure 6B-D) and increased the failure rate (control: 2.2 ± 1.0%, muscarine: 29.6 ± 8.5%,

atropine: 2.2 ± 0.6%, P<0.0001, **Figure 6E**). Notably, we did not observe a significant increase

in paired-pulse ratio in muscarine, as would be expected if muscarine acts presynaptically to

reduce release probability (**Figure 6G**). However, mossy fibers also express GABA$_B$ receptors,

and muscarine silences Golgi cell spiking to reduce ongoing GABA release. Thus, muscarine

should also reduce presynaptic $GABA_B$ receptor activation, and this effect could serve to produce

a competing increase release probability. In the presence of the $GABA_B$ receptor antagonist CPG

54626 (1 μM), however, muscarine produced only a modest trend toward larger paired-pulse

ratios (control PPR = 0.9 ± 0.0, muscarine PPR = 1.0 ± 0.1, p = 0.7, **Figure 6H**). We note,

however, that the strong reduction in EPSC amplitude and multiple EPSC failures in muscarine

add considerable variability to PPR measurements in this condition.

To test whether presynaptic regulation of mossy fiber input is selective to Golgi cell

synapses, we next measured evoked EPSCs onto granule cells during bath application of

muscarine (**Figure 7**). Again, we found a significant decrease in mossy fiber-evoked EPSCs in

muscarine, along with a significant increase in failure rate (52.8 ± 9.60% EPSC decrease, control:

68.6 ± 10.7 pA, muscarine: 32.4 ± 8.8 pA, n = 10, control failure rate: 0.3 ± 0.3%, muscarine: 26.3

± 7.5%, **Figure 7B-F**). These effects were reversed in atropine (11.8 ± 4.4%, amplitude: 64.0 ±

11.4 pA, failure rate: 1.3 ± 0.7%, **Figure 7B-F**). As with Golgi cell synapses, muscarine did not

significantly increase the paired-pulse ratio (control: 0.8 ± 0.0 muscarine: 0.9 ± 0.1, atropine: 0.8

± 0.0, P = 0.4889, **Figure 7G**). These data reveal that ongoing ACh release can reduce the

efficacy of excitatory glutamatergic mossy fiber input to granule cell layer neurons by activating

presynaptic muscarinic receptors.

Muscarinic receptor activation produces bi-directional changes in granule cell spike

probability

Our results show that ACh can act through muscarinic receptors to reduce both incoming

excitation and synaptic inhibition in the granule cell layer. To test how these effects combine at

the circuit level to regulate granule cell activity, we performed non-invasive cell-attached

recordings from granule cells while stimulating mossy fiber input (**Figure 8**). Across 8 recorded

granule cells that spiked in response to mossy fiber stimulation (methods), bath application of

muscarine significantly altered spike probability (**Figure 8 C-F**). Importantly, however, modulation

of granule cell spiking fell into two distinct categories: In 5 of 8 granule cells, we observed an

increase in granule cell spike probability and rate in response to muscarine application

(muscarine: 1.9 ± 0.3 normalized rate, n = 5, p = 0.0814, **Figure 8C, D**). The remaining 3 granule

cells exhibited a large decrease in spike probability and rate following muscarine application

(muscarine: 0.2 ± 0.2 S.D. normalized rate, n = 3, p = 0.0612, **Figure 8E, F**). In contrast, blocking

all ionotropic GABAergic inhibition (SR95531 5 µM) dramatically increased spike probabilities and

rates uniformly across all recorded granule cells (muscarine: 1.2 ± 0.4 normalized, GABAzine: 6.8

± 1.6; ANOVA $F_{1.076, 7.53}$ = 14.95, P=0.0049, n = 8, **Figure 8C-G**). Consistent with the fast

membrane time constant of granule cells (Fleming and Hull, 2019), however, neither muscarine

nor SR95531 altered the timing of the first spikes in response to stimulation (mean ± S.D. stim 1:

control = 3.5 ± 1.3 ms, musc = 4.3 ± 2.0 ms; stim 2: control = 2.3 ± 0.8 ms, musc = 2.5 ± 1.4 ms;

stim 3: control = 2.5 ± 1.2 ms, musc = 2.8 ± 1.4 ms; n=5; **Figure 8H**). Thus, these data reveal

that muscarine can alter granule cell responses by enhancing the reliability and rate of spiking in

some granule cells receiving mossy fiber input, and reducing spike probability and rate in others.

Network model of granule cell spiking in response to muscarinic neuromodulation

How does muscarine produce this population level, bi-directional change in granule cell

spiking? Because it is not possible to record sub-threshold excitation and inhibition across

pharmacological conditions in the same granule cells where cell-attached recordings of spiking

were performed, we generated a network model of granule cell activity to test what parameters

determine whether granule cells will increase or decrease their spike probabilities in response to

muscarinic neuromodulation. As muscarine reduces both excitatory and inhibitory inputs to

granule cells, we expect intuitively that the net effect on granule cell firing will depend on which

reduction is strongest – granule cells in which excitatory inputs are more strongly reduced than

inhibitory inputs should decrease their spiking activity, while the opposite should occur in the

opposite situation where inhibitory inputs are more reduced.

To test this hypothesis, we simulated a granular layer network of 4,096 granule cells and

27 Golgi cells, receiving inputs from 315 mossy fibers, with realistic connectivity parameters

(methods). In this network simulation, we implemented all the effects of muscarine characterized

above, in such a way as to match experimental results (methods). Upon stimulation of a random

subset of 32 mossy fibers, granule cell spiking activity was qualitatively similar to the slice

preparation. Of the 319 granule cells that spiked in response to mossy fiber stimulation, 85

exhibited an increase in spiking activity in the simulated presence of muscarine (peak spike

probability in muscarine: 2.53 ± 0.13, normalized to control, **Figure 9 A,C**), while 65 showed

decreased spiking activity (peak spike probability in muscarine: 0.33 ± 0.04, normalized to control,

Figure 9 B,C). The remaining granule cells did not change spike probability, and were excluded

from further analysis.

We found no significant correlation between the number of active mossy fiber inputs and

the change in spike probability in muscarine (Spearman's correlation; r = 0.03 p = 0.66, **Figure 9**

D). However, cells exhibiting an increase in spike probability were dominated by inhibition in

control conditions (net conductance: -0.51 ± 0.08 nS, **Figure 9 E,G**), whereas cells with

decreasing spike probability received relatively less Golgi cell input (net conductance: 0.20 ± 0.07

nS, **Figure 9 E,G**). Moreover, there was a preferentially greater reduction in tonic inhibition of

cells with increased spiking activity (increasing: 65.5 ± 1% reduction, decreasing: 55.7 ± 1%

reduction, Kolmogorov-Smirnov D = 0.62, p < 0.0001, **Figure 9 F, G**).

We tested that our results did not depend on a specific realization of the network

connectivity by simulating 30 independent realizations of the connectivity matrix, and patterns of

input mossy fiber stimulation.   While the relative numbers of cells exhibiting increases and

decreases in spike probability were variable across different instantiations of the model, the

underlying input profiles distinguishing the two cell categories were comparable (increasing cells

had a net inhibitory conductance in control: -0.40 ± 0.03 nS, decreasing cells had a net excitatory

conductance in control: 0.26 ± 0.03 nS, not shown). Similarly, we saw consistently larger

decreases in the inhibitory tonic current between for cells that increased their spike probability in

muscarine (increasing: 64.7 ± 0.2% reduction, decreasing: 57.6 ± 0.2% reduction, not shown).

Together, these results indicate that muscarinic neuromodulation preferentially enhances the

spike rates of granule cells with larger synaptic inhibition in control conditions.

Discussion

Here we have shown that acetylcholine activates muscarinic receptors to modulate two of

the three main nodes within the granule cell layer of the cerebellar cortex. Specifically, both Golgi

cells and mossy fibers express muscarinic receptors that serve to hyperpolarize Golgi cells and

decrease mossy fiber release probability respectively. By simulating ongoing release of

acetylcholine using bath application of muscarine, we revealed a suppression of Golgi cell spiking

that is mediated by M2-type muscarinic receptors.　Consistent with this finding, optogenetic

stimulation of ChAT+ cerebellar projections produced a long-lasting, net hyperpolarizing current

in Golgi cells that greatly outlasted the duration of stimulation.　At the circuit level, suppression of

Golgi spiking led to a large decrease in synaptic inhibition onto granule cells. In parallel, muscarine

also reduced excitatory transmission from mossy fibers by acting on presynaptic muscarinic

receptors.

Together, by acting on both Golgi cells and mossy fibers, we find that ACh can alter the

coordination of excitation and inhibition onto granule cells.　Surprisingly, however, these changes

in excitation and inhibition produce diverse changes in granule cell spiking at the population level.

Specifically, spike probability in some granule cells can be enhanced, while others are largely

suppressed.　By generating a network model of the granule cell layer, we provide evidence that

the direction of spike rate modulation is established by the initial balance of excitation and

inhibition onto each cell, as well as the degree to which neuromodulation reduces tonic inhibition.

Overall, cells with higher levels of inhibition increased their spike rates in response to

neuromodulation, while cells with less inhibition decrease their spike rates. These changes are

in stark contrast to the responses observed after removing all inhibition, which dramatically

increases spiking of the entire population. Thus, these data suggest that by simultaneously

reducing excitation and inhibition, cholinergic neuromodulation can provide a mechanism for

enhancing the responses of subsets of granule cells without expanding the overall population

response.

Under what conditions might ACh act to modulate the granule cell layer in vivo? Previous

work suggests that ChAT+ cerebellar projecting neurons originate from diverse sources (Jaarsma

et al., 1997). Consistent with our findings, these projections can take the form of mossy fiber-like

inputs, or thinner beaded fibers (Jaarsma et al., 1997). Previous studies have shown that ChAT+

mossy fiber terminals and beaded fibers are expressed throughout the cerebellar cortex, with

lobules IX/X having the densest mossy fiber innervation and lobule IX having the densest beaded

fiber innervation (Barmack et al., 1992a; Jaarsma et al., 1996; Ojima et al., 1989). We also

observed the densest innervation of ChAT+ mossy fiber-like terminals in these lobules, though

ChAT+ terminals were present in all lobules, and we observed optogenetically driven currents in

Golgi cells throughout the vermis. Anatomical studies have suggested that the ChAT+ MFs

located in lobules IX/X and the flocculus originate from medial vestibular nucleus (MVN) and

nucleus prepositus hypoglossi (NPH) (Barmack et al., 1992b), whereas ChAT+ beaded fibers

may originate from the pedunculopontine tegmental nuclei (PPTg) (Newman and Ginsberg, 1992;

Ruggiero et al., 1997; Woolf and Butcher, 1989). Notably, for any of these sources it remains

possible that other neurotransmitters are co-released with ACh as has been shown in other brain

regions (Granger et al., 2017). However, based on our goal of measuring the longer timescale

effects of ACh, we did not investigate the possibility of other fast transmitters that may also play

a role during the initial phases of transient ACh release.

Such diversity of sources of ACh suggests multiple roles for cholinergic signaling. Inputs

from the medial vestibular nucleus may be important for modulation of vestibular guided reflexes.

In support of a role for ACh in modulating vestibular guided behaviors, previous work has shown

that cerebellar injection of cholinergic agonists can enhance both OKR and VOR reflexes (Prestori

et al., 2013; Tan and Collewijn, 1991, 1992). Such findings are in line with an enhancement of

responses in granule cells, and particularly those receiving vestibular input. Thus, the increased

spike probabilities observed here in a subpopulation of granule cells may explain these previously

observed behavioral effects of ACh.

The presence of cholinergic inputs from the PPTg also suggest a role for ACh in contextual

modulation of the granule cell layer, for instance by arousal or locomotion. Indeed, recent work

has demonstrated a locomotion-dependent enhancement of learning in a cerebellar dependent

form of delay eyeblink conditioning (EBC) (Albergaria et al., 2018). Specifically, the acquisition

rate of delay EBC was correlated with the animals running speed. In this study, the circuit

mechanism underlying this enhancement was linked to an increase in granule cell layer

excitability (Albergaria et al., 2018). In this model, behaviorally relevant sensory information would

more easily drive granule cells past spike threshold during locomotion, and thus transmit more

effectively to downstream Purkinje cells to promote synaptic plasticity and learning. While

speculative, our results suggest the possibility that ACh could provide an endogenous mechanism

to disinhibit populations of granule cells and enable such locomotion-dependent effects on

learning. In particular, because the PPTg is active during locomotion (Lee et al., 2014), it could

provide the type of tonic acetylcholine release that would enhance granule cell responses and

promote associative learning.   At present, however, it is unknown whether ACh is released into

the cerebellar cortex during locomotion.

Finally, our results suggest that the key determinant of how ACh modulates granule cell

spike probability is the initial balance of excitation and inhibition onto each cell. Indeed, previous

work has demonstrated that inhibition is not homogenous across granule cells (Crowley et al.,

2009). Such diversity may arise from a combination of factors, including differences in the number

of Golgi cell inputs per glomerulus (Jakab and Hamori, 1988), the number of granule cell dendrites

per cell (Palay and Chan-Palay, 1974), a diversity of Golgi cell types (Geurts et al., 2001; Neki et

al., 1996; Simat et al., 2007), or differences in GABA receptor expression at granule cell synapses

(Wall, 2002). Likewise, the amplitude of unitary excitatory mossy fiber conductances onto granule

cells has been shown to vary over a wide range, and depend on the source of the mossy fiber

input (Chabrol et al., 2015). Moreover, because granule cells can integrate multiple mossy fiber

inputs from diverse sources (Huang et al., 2013), it is possible for individual cells to exhibit

considerable variability in both the amount of excitation and inhibition they receive across the

population.

Notably, we find ACh selectively increases the excitability of the granule cells that are

most strongly inhibited. Previous work has suggested that that granule cell inhibition can be

stimulus-specific (Precht and Llinas, 1969), and recent work has indicated that such stimulus

specific inhibition may play a key role in cerebellar learning (Kalmbach et al., 2011). If different

Golgi cells can indeed be recruited by some stimuli and not others, cholinergic neuromodulation

would provide an ideal mechanism to enhance the responses of granule cells that would

otherwise be suppressed by stimulus-specific inhibition. Hence, such a mechanism could serve

to enhance learning for specific mossy fiber inputs, perhaps based on behavioral context or

stimulus salience. Thus, ACh neuromodulation would provide an appealing means to regulate

learning or modify the gain of cerebellar transformations. While future *in vivo* experiments will be

necessary to evaluate this possibility, our results reveal both the cell autonomous and circuit level

actions by which ongoing ACh release can act through muscarinic receptors to modulate granule

cell excitability. Such data thus provide the foundation for interpreting the *in vivo* effects of

cholinergic neuromodulation at the input stage of cerebellar processing.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Acetylcholine activates nicotinic and muscarinic (M2) receptors in Golgi cells but

does not act on granule cells. A) Schematic showing intracellular recording of Golgi cells during

focal application of acetylcholine chloride (ACh). A glass pipette containing 500 μM ACh was

placed in close proximity to the soma. **B)** Representative current-clamp recording of spontaneous

activity in the presence of glutamatergic (NBQX 5 μM, CPP 2.5 μM) and GABAergic (SR-95531

5 μM) antagonist. A 200 ms pulse of ACh evokes a transient increase in spontaneous activity

followed by a pause. **C-D)** Normalized spike rate across stimulus presentations (normalized to

the 5 sec period prior to ACh stimulus, 1 sec bins, n = 10). **C)** Time course of ACh mediated

change in spike rate (group average). **D)** Average spike rate by cell (grey), group average (black,

mean ± SEM; ANOVA, $F_{1.052, 9.471}$ = 9.679, P = 0.0111, n = 10) at 4 sec (0.99 ± 0.09 norm), 6 sec

(4.0 ± 1.1 norm, P = 0.0517), 10 sec (0.1 ± 0.06 norm, P = 0.0004), and 20 sec (1.1 ± 0.2 norm,

P = 0.9658). **E)** Voltage-clamp recordings from the same cell in B. A 200 ms pulse of ACh evokes

an outward current that is blocked by a selective muscarinic M2 antagonist (AF-DX116 1 μM),

and an inward current that is blocked by a non-selective nicotinic antagonist (MMA 10 μM). **F)**

Peak amplitudes from voltage-clamp recordings at -60 mV. Amplitudes were determined using

the subtracted average current for each cell (nicotinic: 40.3 ± 11.4 pA, muscarinic: 16.1 ± 2.6 pA,

n = 7). **G)** Schematic showing intracellular recording of granule cells during focal application of

acetylcholine chloride (ACh). A glass pipette containing 500 μM ACh was placed in close proximity

to the soma. **H)** Representative current clamp trace from a granule cell in the presence of

glutamatergic (NBQX 5 μM, CPP 2.5 μM) and GABAergic (SR-95531 5 μM) antagonist. A 500 ms

pulse of ACh fails to evoke change in the membrane potential. **I)** Average spike rate across all

cells (n = 24). **J)** Grouped voltage-clamp trace from all cells (n = 24).

Figure 2. Activation of Muscarinic Receptors on Golgi Cells Hyperpolarizes the Membrane

A) Whole cell current-clamp recordings from Golgi cell in the in the presence of a Na$^+$ channel

antagonist, tetrodotoxin (TTX, 0.5 µM), to block spontaneous firing. Bath application of muscarine

hyperpolarizes the membrane potential (musc: -65.2 ± 3.57 mV, n=6). **B-C)** Expression of

chronos-TdTomato in ChAT+ cerebellar projections. **C)** Expanded view of the cerebellar cortex

from B). Open arrows indicate thin, beaded fibers, closed arrow indicates mossy fiber-like

projection. **D)** Average voltage-clamp recording from an example Golgi cell (Vm = -55 mV) in

response to optogenetic stimulation (450 nm, 50 Hz, 15 mW, 2 sec) in control (black) and following

atropine application (5 µM, gray) (control average = 31.4 ± 4.8 pA, atropine average = 10.2 ± 2.3

pA, n = 8, p = 0.002, paired t-test). **E)** Summary of Golgi cell optogenetic stimulation experiments.

Figure 3. Activation of muscarinic M2 receptors on Golgi cell decreases phasic and tonic

inhibition in granule cells. A) Example whole-cell voltage clamp recording from a granule cell

held at the reversal potential of excitation (~10 mV) to record GABA$_A$ receptor-mediated phasic

and tonic inhibition (measured using sIPSC frequency and holding current, respectively). Dashed

horizontal line indicates no holding current. **B)** Grouped average spontaneous IPSC frequency

across time in the presence of muscarine (musc, 10 µM), atropine (5 µM), and GABA$_A$ antagonist

(SR-95531 5 µM; mean ± SEM, n = 11). **C)** Grouped average holding current across time. **D)** *Left*,

Summary of the change in sIPSC frequency for individual cells. Quantified using a 2-minute

window (control: 2-4', muscarine: 7-9', atropine: 12-14', values normalized to control; ANOVA,

$F_{1.041,\ 10.41}$=29.49, P = 0.0002, n = 11). Group average for each condition: muscarine (0.2 ± 0.0

norm, P<0.0001); atropine (1.2 ± 0.2 norm, P = 0.3773). *Right*, Summary of the change in holding

current (ANOVA, $F_{1.565,\ 15.65}$= 65.96, P<0.0001) for individual cells in muscarine (group average:

0.5 ± 0.0 norm, P<0.0001) and atropine (group average: 0.9 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.0681). sIPSC and

tonic inhibition was confirmed using the GABA$_A$ antagonist (SR95531 5 µM).

Figure 4. Activation of M2 receptors on Golgi cells invokes firing rate potentiation. Whole-

cell, current-clamp recordings from Golgi cells before and during bath application of muscarine

(musc, 10 µM). **A)** *Top*, representative current-clamp recording during muscarine application.

Bath application of muscarine silences the spontaneous firing activity and this effect is reversed

by the non-selective mAChR antagonist, atropine. *Bottom*, normalized spike rate across all

experiments (rate at 5': 4.2 ± 0.6 Hz; 20': 5.5 ± 0.7 Hz; mean ± SEM; n = 17). **B)** Normalized spike

rate across experiments that had a baseline firing rate below 5 Hz (rate at 5': 3.2 ± 0.3 Hz; 20':

4.7 ± 0.6 Hz; n = 13). **C)** Normalized spike rate across experiments that had a baseline firing rate

above 5 Hz (rate at 5': 7.7 ± 1.5 Hz; 20': 7.9 ± 1.8 Hz; n = 4). **D)** Plot showing the initial spike rate

and FRP rate for individual cells. The degree of FRP was dependent on initial spike rate.

Figure 5. Reduction of feed-forward inhibition by muscarinic receptors.

A) Schematic showing the intracellular recording configuration and stimulus location, ~500–1000

µm from the cell. **B)** Representative voltage-clamp recordings of IPSCs (averaged from 30

consecutive events recorded at ~10 mV) evoked by electrical stimulation (2 pulses at 25 Hz, 100

µs pulse width) of mossy fibers in control, muscarine (10 µM), and atropine (5 µM). **C)** Response

patterns of evoked IPSCs (peak amplitude) for 30 consecutive trials in each drug condition.

Failures are shown in white. **D-E)** Summary of all recorded cells. **D)** Average amplitude of the first

evoked IPSC (30 consecutive trials, measurement includes successes and failures, values

normalized to control) in muscarine (10 µM, 0.0 ± 0.0 norm, P<0.0001), and atropine (5 µM, 1.1

± 0.2 norm, P = 0.7283). Individual cells are depicted in grey, black lines and error bars show

mean ± SEM (ANOVA, $F_{1.003, 4.014}$ = 44.17, P = 0.0026, n = 5). **E)** Summary of IPSC failure rate to

the first stimulus in control (12.0 ± 5.83 %), muscarine (10 µM, 98.0 ± 0.8 %, P = 0.0004), and

atropine (5 µM, 19.3 ± 7.1 %, P = 0.4479), and glutamate antagonist (NQBX 5 µM & CPP 2.5 µM,

100.0 ± 0.0 %, P = 0.0003; ANOVA, $F_{1.561, 6.244}$ = 132.8, P<0.0001).

Figure 6. **Activation of presynaptic muscarinic receptors alters glutamatergic transmission**

at the mossy fiber-Golgi cell synapse. **A)** Schematic showing the intracellular recording

configuration and stimulus location. **B)** Representative voltage-clamp recordings of EPSCs

(averaged from 30 consecutive events recorded at -60 mV) evoked by electrical stimulation (2

pulses at 25 Hz, 100 µs pulse width) of mossy fibers in control, muscarine (10 µM), and atropine

(5 µM). **C)** Response patterns of evoked EPSCs (peak amplitude) for 30 consecutive trials in each

drug condition. Failures are shown in white. **D-G)** Summary of all recorded cells. **D)** Average

amplitude of the first evoked EPSC (30 consecutive trials, measurement includes successes and

failures, values normalized to control) in muscarine (10 µM, 0.4 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.0035), and

atropine (5 µM, 0.9 ± 0.0 norm, P = 0.0439). Individual cells are depicted in grey, black lines and

error bars show mean ± SEM (ANOVA, $F_{1.192, 10.73}$=13.58, P = 0.0028, n = 10). **E)** Summary of

EPSC failure rate to the first stimulus in control (2.2 ± 0.96 %), muscarine (29.6 ± 8.52 %, P =

0.0358), atropine (2.2 ± 0.6 %, P = 0.8209), and glutamate antagonist (NQBX 5 µM & CPP 2.5

µM, 100.0 ± 0.0 %, P<0.0001; ANOVA, $F_{1.063, 9.565}$ = 120.9, P<0.0001, n = 10). **F)** Summary of

EPSC potency to the first stimulus (measurement excludes event failures) in control (1.0 ± 0.0

norm), muscarine (0.6 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.0027), and atropine (0.9 ± 0.0 norm, P = 0.0792; ANOVA,

$F_{1.345, 12.11}$=13.72, P = 0.0017). **G)** Summary of paired-pulse ratio (PPR) in control (1.0 ± 0.1),

muscarine (1.0 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.9895), and atropine (0.8 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.5238; ANOVA, $F_{1.914,}$

$_{17.23}$=0.7338, P = 0.4889). **H)** Summary of paired-pulse ratio (PPR) in the presence of CGP (1

µM) in control (0.9 ± 0.0), muscarine (1.0 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.7094), and atropine (0.8 ± 0.1 norm,

P = 0.3975; ANOVA, $F_{1.492, 13.43}$=1.225, P = 0.3040).

Figure 7. Activation of presynaptic muscarinic receptors reduces glutamatergic

transmission at the mossy fiber-granule cell synapse. **A)** Schematic showing the intracellular

recording configuration and stimulus location. **B)** Representative voltage-clamp recordings of

EPSCs (averaged from 30 consecutive events recorded at -70 mV) evoked by electrical

stimulation (2 pulses at 25 Hz, 100 µs pulse width) of mossy fibers in control, muscarine (10 µM),

and atropine (5 µM). **C)** Response patterns of evoked EPSCs (peak amplitude) for 30 consecutive

trials in each drug condition. Failures are shown in white. **D-G)** Summary of all recorded cells. **D)**

Average amplitude of the first evoked EPSC (30 consecutive trials, measurement includes

successes and failures, values normalized to control) in muscarine (10 µM, 0.5 ± 0.1 norm, P =

0.0007), and atropine (5 µM, 1.0 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.8771). Individual cells are depicted in grey,

black lines and error bars show mean ± SEM (ANOVA, $F_{1.65, 14.85}=14.98$, P = 0.0005, n = 10). **E)**

Summary of EPSC failure rate to the first stimulus in control (0.3 ± 0.3 %), muscarine (10 µM,

26.3 ± 7.5 %, P = 0.017), and atropine (5 µM, 1.3 ± 0.7 %, P = 0.4037), and glutamate antagonist

(NQBX 5 µM & CPP 2.5 µM, 100.0 ± 0.00 %, P<0.0001; ANOVA, $F_{1.017, 9.156} = 160.0$, P<0.0001).

F) Summary of EPSC potency to the first stimulus (measurement excludes event failures) in

control, muscarine (0.6 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.0007), and atropine (1.0 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.9183;

ANOVA, $F_{1.388, 12.49}=10.02$, P = 0.0047). **G)** Summary of paired-pulse ratio (PPR) in control (0.8 ±

0.0), muscarine (0.9 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.8560), and atropine (0.8 ± 0.0 norm, P = 0.9951; ANOVA,

$F_{1.276, 11.49}=0.2322$, P = 0.6969).

Figure 8. Muscarinic receptors modulate GrC spike probability. A) Schematic showing the

cell-attached recording configuration and stimulus location. **B)** Representative cell-attached

recording. Stimulus intensity was set to generate GrC spiking with approximately 20-60 %

probability in response to either the 2nd or 3rd stimulus (3 pulses at 40Hz, repeated at 0.1 Hz). **C)**

Spike raster from an example granule cell that increased spike probability in muscarine. **D)**

Summary of spike probability across all granule cells that increased spiking in muscarine (n=5).

Spike probability was measured by normalizing each cell to its maximum response in control. **E)**

Spike raster from an example granule cell that decreased spike probability in muscarine. **F)**

Summary of spike probability across all granule cells that decreased spiking in muscarine (n=3).

G) Summary of spike rates in control, muscarine (10 µM, 1.2 ± 0.4 norm, P = 0.9087), atropine (5

µM, 0.9 ± 0.2 norm, P = 0.8923), $GABA_A$ antagonist (GABAzine, 5 µM, 6.8 ± 1.6 norm, P = 0.0259),

and glutamatergic antagonists (NQBX 5 µM & CPP 2.5 µM, 0.3 ± 0.1 norm, P = 0.0021; ANOVA,

$F_{1.076,\ 7.53}$ = 14.95, P = 0.0049, n = 8). **H)** Summary of the first spike latency in each drug condition

(mean & SD). Grouped average to 1st stimulus (3.8 ± 0.2 ms), 2nd (2.4 ± 0.1 ms), and 3rd (2.6 ±

0.1 ms; two-way ANOVA, $F_{3,\ 84}$ = 1.01, P = 0.3925).

Figure 9. A computational model shows that the heterogeneity in granule cell responses can be

explained by the variability in input connectivity and synaptic conductances. **A)** Summary of spike

probability across all simulated granule cells that increased spiking in muscarine. **B)** Summary of

spike probability across all simulated granule cells that decreased spiking in muscarine. **C)**

Summary of peak spike probabilities for simulated granule cells from (A) and (B) in muscarine vs.

control. Black denotes granule cells that increased spike probability, and gray denotes cells that

decreased spike probability. **D)** Summary of granule cell peak spike probability in muscarine vs.

number of active mossy fiber inputs. **E)** Summary of granule cell peak spike probability in

muscarine vs. average net (excitatory – inhibitory) conductance in control conditions. **F)** Granule

cell peak spike probability in muscarine vs. fractional reduction of inhibitory tonic current. **G)**

Summary of the average net control conductance (left) and inhibitory tonic current (right) for

simulated granule cells that increased (black) or decreased (gray) spiking in muscarine. **H)**

Distributions of average net input in control for simulated granule cells that increased (black) or

decreased (gray) spiking in muscarine. **I)** Distributions of fractional reduction of inhibitory tonic

current in simulated granule cells that increased (black) or decreased (gray) spiking in muscarine.

References

Albergaria, C., Silva, N.T., Pritchett, D.L., and Carey, M.R. (2018). Locomotor activity modulates

associative learning in mouse cerebellum. Nature Neuroscience 21, 725-735.

Albus, J.S. (1971). A theory of cerebellar function. Mathematical Biosciences 10, 25-61.

Barmack, N.H., Baughman, R.W., and Eckenstein, F.P. (1992a). Cholinergic innervation of the

cerebellum of rat, rabbit, cat, and monkey as revealed by choline acetyltransferase activity and

immunohistochemistry. The Journal of comparative neurology 317, 233-249.

Barmack, N.H., Baughman, R.W., Eckenstein, F.P., and Shojaku, H. (1992b). Secondary

vestibular cholinergic projection to the cerebellum of rabbit and rat as revealed by choline

acetyltransferase immunohistochemistry, retrograde and orthograde tracers. The Journal of

comparative neurology 317, 250-270.

Brickley, S.G., Cull-Candy, S.G., and Farrant, M. (1996). Development of a tonic form of

synaptic inhibition in rat cerebellar granule cells resulting from persistent activation of GABAA

receptors. The Journal of Physiology 497 (Pt 3), 753-759.

Cayco-Gajic, A., Clopath, C., and Silver, R.A. (2017). Sparse synaptic connectivity is required

for decorrelation and pattern separation in feedforward networks. Nature Communications 8.

Chabrol, F.P., Arenz, A., Wiechert, M.T., Margrie, T.W., and DiGregorio, D.A. (2015). Synaptic

diversity enables temporal coding of coincident multisensory inputs in single neurons. Nature

Neuroscience.

Crowley, J.J., Fioravante, D., and Regehr, W.G. (2009). Dynamics of Fast and Slow Inhibition

from Cerebellar Golgi Cells Allow Flexible Control of Synaptic Integration. Neuron 63, 843-853.

Didier, M., Berman, S.A., Lindstrom, J., and Bursztajn, S. (1995). Characterization of nicotinic

acetylcholine receptors expressed in primary cultures of cerebellar granule cells. Molecular

Brain Research 30, 17-28.

Dominguez de Toro, E., Juíz, J.M., Smillie, F.I., Lindstrom, J., and Criado, M. (1997).

Expression of α 7 neuronal nicotinic receptors during postnatal development of the rat

cerebellum. Developmental Brain Research 98, 125-133.

Dominguez del Toro, E., Juiz, J.M., Peng, X., Lindstrom, J., and Criado, M. (1994).

Immunocytochemical localization of the alpha 7 subunit of the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor in

the rat central nervous system. The Journal of comparative neurology 349, 325-342.

Duguid, I., Branco, T., Chadderton, P., Arlt, C., Powell, K., and Häusser, M. (2015). Control of

cerebellar granule cell output by sensory-evoked Golgi cell inhibition. Proceedings of the

National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 112, 13099-13104.

Duguid, I., Branco, T., London, M., Chadderton, P., and Hausser, M. (2012). Tonic Inhibition

Enhances Fidelity of Sensory Information Transmission in the Cerebellar Cortex. Journal of

Neuroscience 32, 11132-11143.

Eccles, J., Llinás, R., and Sasaki, K. (1966). The mossy fibre-granule cell relay of the

cerebellum and its inhibitory control by Golgi cells. Experimental Brain Research.

Farrant, M., and Brickley, S.G. (2003). Properties of GABAA receptor-mediated transmission at

newly formed Golgi-granule cell synapses in the cerebellum. Neuropharmacology 44, 181-189.

Fleming, E., and Hull, C. (2019). Serotonin regulates dynamics of cerebellar granule cell activity

by modulating tonic inhibition. J Neurophysiol 121, 105-114.

Forti, L., Cesana, E., Mapelli, J., and D'Angelo, E. (2006). Ionic mechanisms of

autorhythmic firing in rat cerebellar Golgi cells. The Journal of Physiology 574, 711-729.

Froemke, R.C., Carcea, I., Barker, A.J., Yuan, K., Seybold, B.A., Martins, A.R.O., Zaika, N.,

Bernstein, H., Wachs, M., Levis, P.A.*, et al.* (2013). Long-term modification of cortical synapses

improves sensory perception. Nature Neuroscience 16, 79-88.

Geurts, F.J., Timmermans, J., Shigemoto, R., and De Schutter, E. (2001). Morphological and

neurochemical differentiation of large granular layer interneurons in the adult rat cerebellum.

Neuroscience 104, 499-512.

Gilmer, J.I., and Person, A.L. (2017). Morphological Constraints on Cerebellar Granule Cell

Combinatorial Diversity. The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for

Neuroscience 37, 12153-12166.

Giovannucci, A., Badura, A., Deverett, B., Najafi, F., Pereira, T.D., Gao, Z., Ozden, I., Kloth,

A.D., Pnevmatikakis, E., Paninski, L.*, et al.* (2017). Cerebellar granule cells acquire a

widespread predictive feedback signal during motor learning. Nature Neuroscience 20, 727-734.

Granger, A.J., Wallace, M.L., and Sabatini, B.L. (2017). Multi-transmitter neurons in the

mammalian central nervous system. Curr Opin Neurobiol 45, 85-91.

Huang, C.C., Sugino, K., Shima, Y., Guo, C., Bai, S., Mensh, B.D., Nelson, S.B., and Hantman,

A.W. (2013). Convergence of pontine and proprioceptive streams onto multimodal cerebellar

granule cells. Elife 2, e00400.

Hull, C.A., Chu, Y., Thanawala, M., and Regehr, W.G. (2013). Hyperpolarization Induces a

Long-Term Increase in the Spontaneous Firing Rate of Cerebellar Golgi Cells. Journal of

Neuroscience 33, 5895-5902.

Ito, M. (2006). Cerebellar circuitry as a neuronal machine. Progress in Neurobiology 78, 272-
303.

Ito, M. (2012). The Cerebellum (FT Press).

Jaarsma, D., Diño, M.R., Cozzari, C., and Mugnaini, E. (1996). Cerebellar choline
acetyltransferase positive mossy fibres and their granule and unipolar brush cell targets: a
model for central cholinergic nicotinic neurotransmission. Journal of Neurocytology 25, 829-842.

Jaarsma, D., Ruigrok, T., Caffé, R., and Cozzari, C. (1997). Cholinergic innervation and
receptors in the cerebellum. Progress in brain.

Jakab, R.L., and Hamori, J. (1988). Quantitative morphology and synaptology of cerebellar
glomeruli in the rat. Anat Embryol (Berl) 179, 81-88.

Kalmbach, B.E., Voicu, H., Ohyama, T., and Mauk, M.D. (2011). A subtraction mechanism of
temporal coding in cerebellar cortex. J Neurosci 31, 2025-2034.

Kanichay, R.T., and Silver, R.A. (2008). Synaptic and Cellular Properties of the Feedforward
Inhibitory Circuit within the Input Layer of the Cerebellar Cortex. Journal of Neuroscience 28,
8955-8967.

Kuchibhotla, K.V., Gill, J.V., Lindsay, G.W., Papadoyannis, E.S., Field, R.E., Sten, T.A.H.,
Miller, K.D., and Froemke, R.C. (2017). Parallel processing by cortical inhibition enables
context-dependent behavior. Nature Neuroscience 20, 62-71.

Lee, A.M., Hoy, J.L., Bonci, A., Wilbrecht, L., Stryker, M.P., and Niell, C.M. (2014). Identification
of a brainstem circuit regulating visual cortical state in parallel with locomotion. Neuron 83, 455-
466.

Letzkus, J.J., Wolff, S.B.E., Meyer, E.M.M., Tovote, P., Courtin, J., Herry, C., and Lüthi, A.

(2011). A disinhibitory microcircuit for associative fear learning in the auditory cortex. Nature

480, 331-335.

Marr, D. (1969). A theory of cerebellar cortex. The Journal of Physiology.

Mauk, M.D., and Buonomano, D.V. (2004). The neural basis of temporal processing. Annual

Review of Neuroscience 27, 307-340.

Nakayama, H., Shioda, S., Nakajo, S., Ueno, S., Nakashima, T., and Nakai, Y. (1997).

Immunocytochemical localization of nicotinic acetylcholine receptor in the rat cerebellar cortex.

Neuroscience Research 29, 233-239.

Neki, a., Ohishi, H., Kaneko, T., Shigemoto, R., Nakanishi, S., and Mizuno, N. (1996).

Metabotropic glutamate receptors mGluR2 and mGluR5 are expressed in two non-overlapping

populations of Golgi cells in the rat cerebellum. Neuroscience 75, 815-826.

Neustadt, A., Frostholm, A., and Rotter, A. (1988). Topographical distribution of muscarinic

cholinergic receptors in the cerebellar cortex of the mouse, rat, guinea pig, and rabbit: A species

comparison. Journal of Comparative Neurology 272, 317-330.

Newman, D.B., and Ginsberg, C.Y. (1992). Brainstem Reticular Nuclei that Project to the

Cerebellum in Rats A Retrograde Tracer Study; pp. 24–38. Brain, Behavior and Evolution 39,

24-38.

Ojima, H., Kawajiri, S.I., and Yamasaki, T. (1989). Cholinergic innervation of the rat cerebellum:

Qualitative and quantitative analyses of elements immunoreactive to a monoclonal antibody

against choline acetyltransferase. Journal of Comparative Neurology 290, 41-52.

Ozden, I., Dombeck, D.A., Hoogland, T.M., Tank, D.W., and Wang, S.S.H. (2012). Widespread

State-Dependent Shifts in Cerebellar Activity in Locomoting Mice. PloS one 7, e42650.

Palay, S.L., and Chan-Palay, V. (1974). Cerebellar cortex (New York: Springer).

Precht, W., and Llinas, R. (1969). Functional organization of the vestibular afferents to the

cerebellar cortex of frog and cat. Exp Brain Res 9, 30-52.

Prestori, F., Bonardi, C., Mapelli, L., Lombardo, P., Goselink, R., De Stefano, M.E., Gandolfi, D.,

Mapelli, J., Bertrand, D., Schonewille, M., *et al.* (2013). Gating of Long-Term Potentiation by

Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors at the Cerebellum Input Stage. PloS one 8, e64828.

Ruggiero, D.A., Anwar, M., Golanov, E.V., and Reis, D.J. (1997). The pedunculopontine

tegmental nucleus issues collaterals to the fastigial nucleus and rostral ventrolateral reticular

nucleus in the rat. Brain Research 760, 272-276.

Simat, M., Parpan, F., and Fritschy, J.-m. (2007). Heterogeneity of Glycinergic and Gabaergic

Interneurons in the Granule Cell Layer of Mouse Cerebellum. Comparative and General

Pharmacology 83, 71-83.

Solinas, S., Nieus, T., and D'Angelo, E. (2010). A realistic large-scale model of the cerebellum

granular layer predicts circuit spatio-temporal filtering properties. Front Cell Neurosci 4, 12.

Takayasu, Y., Iino, M., Furuya, N., and Ozawa, S. (2003). Muscarine-induced increase in

frequency of spontaneous EPSCs in Purkinje cells in the vestibulo-cerebellum of the rat. Journal

of Neuroscience 23, 6200-6208.

Tan, H.S., and Collewijn, H. (1991). Cholinergic modulation of optokinetic and vestibulo-ocular

responses: a study with microinjections in the flocculus of the rabbit. Experimental Brain

Research 85, 475-481.

Tan, H.S., and Collewijn, H. (1992). Cholinergic and noradrenergic stimulation in the rabbit

flocculus have synergistic facilitatory effects on optokinetic responses. Brain Research 586,

130-134.

Turner, J.R., and Kellar, K.J. (2005). Nicotinic cholinergic receptors in the rat cerebellum:

multiple heteromeric subtypes. Journal of Neuroscience 25, 9258-9265.

Wagner, M.J., Kim, T.H., Savall, J., Schnitzer, M.J., and Luo, L. (2017). Cerebellar granule cells

encode the expectation of reward. Nature Publishing Group 544, 1-18.

Wall, M.J. (2002). Furosemide reveals heterogeneous GABA(A) receptor expression at adult rat

Golgi cell to granule cell synapses. Neuropharmacology 43, 737-749.

Woolf, N.J., and Butcher, L.L. (1989). Cholinergic systems in the rat brain: IV. descending

projections of the pontomesencephalic tegmentum. Brain Research Bulletin 23, 519-540.

Yardeni, T., Eckhaus, M., Morris, H.D., Huizing, M., and Hoogstraten-Miller, S. (2011). Retro-

orbital injections in mice. Lab Anim (NY) 40, 155-160.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Figure 9