

# How activity dependent feedback inhibition may maintain head direction signals in mouse presubiculum

Jean Simonnet<sup>1,\*</sup>, Mérie Nassar<sup>1</sup>, Federico Stella<sup>2</sup>, Ivan Cohen<sup>3</sup>, Bertrand Mathon<sup>1</sup>, Charlotte N. Boccara<sup>2</sup>, Richard Miles<sup>1</sup> and Desdemona Fricker<sup>1,4,\*</sup>

(1) Inserm U1127, CNRS UMR7225, Sorbonne Universités, UPMC S1127, Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle épinière, Paris, France; (2) IST, Klosterneuburg, Austria; (3) INSERM U1130, CNRS UMR8246, UPMC, Neuroscience Paris Seine, Paris, France; (4) CNRS UMR8119, Université Paris Descartes, 75006 Paris, France.

## ABSTRACT

Orientation in space is represented in specialized brain circuits. Persistent head direction signals are transmitted from anterior thalamus to the presubiculum, but the identity of the presubicular target neurons, their connectivity and function in local microcircuits are unknown. Here we examine how thalamic afferents recruit presubicular principal neurons and Martinotti interneurons and the ensuing synaptic interactions between these cells. Pyramidal neuron activation of Martinotti cells in superficial layers is strongly facilitating such that high frequency head directional stimulation efficiently unmutes synaptic excitation. Martinotti cell feedback plays a dual role: precisely timed spikes may not inhibit the firing of in-tune head direction cells, while exerting lateral inhibition. Autonomous attractor dynamics emerge from a modeled network implementing wiring motifs and timing sensitive synaptic interactions in the pyramidal - Martinotti cell feedback loop. This inhibitory microcircuit is therefore tuned to refine and maintain head direction information in the presubiculum.

## INTRODUCTION

The neural head direction signal is processed over several interconnected brain areas, and similarly to other sensory systems, it is relayed through the thalamus<sup>1</sup>. From there it reaches the presubicular cortex, located between the hippocampus and the entorhinal cortex<sup>2</sup>. About half of presubicular principal neurons signal head direction<sup>3,4</sup>. They fire persistently when the head of the animal faces a specific direction. The dorsal presubiculum, also termed postsubiculum (Brodmann area 48), controls the accuracy of the head direction signal and links them to specific features of the environment thus enabling a role for the hippocampal formation in landmark-based navigation<sup>5,6</sup>.

Vestibular inputs make a decisive contribution to head directional firing of neurons in the anterodorsal nucleus of the thalamus<sup>1,7,8</sup> and lesions of this thalamic region abolish head direction firing in presubiculum<sup>6</sup>. Head direction signals transmitted via the thalamus are integrated in the presubiculum with visual information<sup>5</sup> from visual<sup>9</sup> and retrosplenial cortices<sup>7</sup>, and information from the hippocampal formation<sup>2</sup>. Presubicular head direction cells in layer 3 project to the entorhinal cortex<sup>10,11</sup> and may contribute to spatial firing of grid cells<sup>12-14</sup>.

The properties of presubicular microcircuits that signal head direction are less clear than the long-range outputs from the region. The electrophysiological and morphological properties of excitatory and inhibitory presubicular neurons have been described<sup>15,16</sup>. Pyramidal cells can generate persistent firing with little adaptation over tens of seconds<sup>17</sup> as needed to signal a maintained head direction. However, less is known of the connectivity and dynamics of inter- and intralaminar presubicular synapses<sup>18</sup>. Such data are crucial to understand how signals are transformed within the presubiculum and how this structure gates the flow of head direction information to the entorhinal cortex.

The roles of presubicular interneurons are presumably multiple: they provide global inhibition to restrain over-excitation<sup>19</sup> and, as suggested by continuous attractor theories, could induce selective inhibition of pyramidal cells, ensuring head direction signal specificity over time<sup>14,20-23</sup>. Yet, details of the recruitment of inhibitory cells are unknown. In somatosensory cortex, high frequency pyramidal cell firing is needed to recruit Martinotti interneurons. These cells then initiate a feedback inhibition of distal pyramidal cell dendrites<sup>24-26</sup>, to exert a local control on excitatory synapses made at these sites<sup>27</sup>. Facilitating excitation of interneurons may be critical for the treatment of the persistent head direction signal, however, there is no data on the functional effects of Martinotti cells in the presubiculum.

We report here that strong recurrent connectivity between the presubicular Martinotti cells and layer III pyramidal cells form a feedback inhibitory circuit. Importantly, the excitation of Martinotti cells by pyramidal cells exhibits a dramatic activity-dependent facilitation. The feedback effects of Martinotti cell inhibition on pyramidal cell activity depend on IPSP timing, suggesting they could provide a source of lateral inhibition that enforces directionally selective firing. Testing these hypotheses by modelling connectivity and synaptic dynamics of recurrent Martinotti-cell mediated inhibition revealed features of an attractor network generating activity patterns comparable to presubicular recordings *in vivo*. Our results demonstrate autonomous dynamic activity in the presubicular cortex emerging from the local circuits that process head direction signals *in vivo*.

## RESULTS

### *Electrophysiology of presubicular Martinotti and pyramidal cells*

In order to elucidate the functional role of Martinotti cells in the presubicular microcircuit, we first characterized the basic properties of Martinotti cells (MC) and pyramidal cells (PC) in superficial

layer 3 of mouse presubiculum. In total, data from 166 PCs and 161 MC recorded in horizontal slices (Fig. 1) from 60 animals are included in this study. MCs were identified as GFP positive neurons in tissue from X98-SST and Sst-Cre::tdTomato transgenic mice<sup>16</sup>. Martinotti cells often discharged spontaneously from a relatively depolarized membrane potential above -60 mV ( $n = 80$  cells; Fig. 1a-c, Supplementary Table 1; ref.<sup>16</sup>). They exhibited low threshold spiking in response to current pulses and their axons ramified extensively in layer 1 like Martinotti cells in somatosensory cortex<sup>28</sup> (Fig. 1a,d,e). Pyramidal cells, in contrast, typically did not discharge spontaneously and membrane potentials were significantly more hyperpolarized, below -70 mV ( $n = 87$  cells), than those of MCs (Mann Whitney test, two-tailed  $p < 0.0001$ ; Fig. 1a-c and Supplementary Table 1). PCs fired regularly in response to injected current<sup>15</sup> with a higher threshold current ( $92.3 \pm 50.4$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sd;  $n = 65$ ) than in MCs ( $51.5 \pm 38.9$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sd;  $n = 64$ ; Mann Whitney test, two-tailed,  $p < 0.0001$ ). The input-output gain was lower in PCs ( $0.373 \pm 0.127$  Hz.pA<sup>-1</sup>, mean  $\pm$  sd;  $n = 65$ ) than in MCs ( $0.845 \pm 0.040$  Hz.pA<sup>-1</sup>, mean  $\pm$  sd;  $n = 64$ ; Mann Whitney test, two-tailed,  $p < 0.0001$ , Fig. 1e and Supplementary Table 1).

#### *Anterior thalamic fibers directly excite principal neurons in superficial layers of presubiculum*

Head directional inputs to the presubiculum originate in part from the Anterior Thalamic Nuclei<sup>6,29</sup> (ATN). We sought to define presubicular targets of these afferents by *in vivo* stereotaxic, intra-thalamic injection of viral vectors to transduce channelrhodopsin-2 fused to eYFP (Fig. 2;  $n = 5$  SstCre::tdTomato mice). Fluorescent (eYFP) labeled thalamic axons innervated superficial layers of presubiculum, more densely in layers 1 and 3 than layer 2. A few axons were present in deep layers and in parasubiculum. The zone of thalamic innervation ended abruptly at the border to the adjacent subiculum. Very few axons if any were present in entorhinal cortex (Fig. 2a,b and Supplementary Fig. 1). Optical stimulation of ATN axons *in vitro* let us compare synaptic responses of PCs and MCs to thalamic input (Fig. 2c,d). At -65 mV, 11 out of 14 layer 3 pyramidal cells were made to fire by optical stimulation, while 4 out of 9 Martinotti-like cells of layer 3 discharged action potentials in response to identical stimuli. The latencies of optically evoked EPSCs in pyramidal cells were short and mono-synaptic (median = 1.435) with a median charge transfer of 2.818 nC over 25 ms. In Martinotti-like neurons optically evoked EPSCs occurred with longer, more variable latencies ( $3.5 \pm 0.7$  ms) with lower charge transfer (median = 0.200 nC over 25 ms) indicating a weaker excitatory drive (Fig. 2c,e,f). TTX (1  $\mu$ M) and 4AP (100  $\mu$ M) let us examine synaptic excitation mediated by thalamic afferents in isolation. Optical stimulation continued to excite PCs (median = 1.306 nC over 25 ms, Fig. 2d,g) showing they are directly innervated by ATN fibers, but light-evoked responses in MCs were suppressed (median = 0.013 nC over 25 ms, Fig. 2d,g). These data suggest that optical excitation of Martinotti cells is mediated indirectly via synapses made by presubicular pyramidal cells. In return, Martinotti cells may provide a recurrent inhibitory control of pyramidal cells. We next

examined the presubicular PC-MC connectivity pattern and its dynamics using dual patch clamp recordings in X98-SST mice for Martinotti cell identification.

*A feedback loop: pyramidal cells activate Martinotti cells and are inhibited in return*

Pyramidal cells and Martinotti cells were highly interconnected (Fig. 3) as expected from the spatial overlap of their axons and dendrites (Fig. 1a). The proportion of connected pairs was 57% (83 of 146 tested) for Martinotti cell to pyramidal cell (MC-to-PC) and 38% (59 of 156 tested) for pyramidal cell to Martinotti cell (PC-to-MC). 28% of cell pairs (39 of 141) were reciprocally connected, a little more than the 22% expected given the probability for unilateral connections. For PCs that excited a MC, the probability of reciprocal inhibitory connection was very high, 81% (39 out of 48 tested), while only 48% (39 out of 80 tested) of MCs inhibiting a PC received reciprocal excitation. Connectivity between pyramidal neurons (PC-to-PC) was very low (1 of 48 tested). At -50 mV, the mean amplitude of inhibitory postsynaptic currents or potentials (IPSCs or IPSPs) triggered by Martinotti cells was  $9.01 \pm 1.19$  pA ( $n = 45$ ) or  $-0.56 \pm 0.07$  mV ( $n = 21$ ). The probability that a single spike triggered a postsynaptic event was high (transfer rate  $0.86 \pm 0.05$ , mean  $\pm$  sem; median = 0.925;  $n = 11$ ; Fig. 3c,d), and for multiple trials, at least one postsynaptic event was observed for each connected pair. PC-to-MC transmission was much less reliable. For single spikes, the transfer rate from pyramidal cells to Martinotti cells was very low,  $0.12 \pm 0.02$  (median = 0.08;  $n = 44$ , Fig. 3e). In 6 pairs, successful synaptic transmission occurred only during high frequency trains, which allowed us to identify them as functionally connected pairs, but single presynaptic spikes never initiated a postsynaptic response (at least 30 trials for each pair). In 38 PC-to-MC pairs, single pyramidal cell spikes, or first spikes in a train, occasionally initiated excitatory postsynaptic responses. Their potency, that is, the mean absolute amplitude of single successful responses for PC-to-MC synapses, was  $20.1 \pm 1.94$  pA (median = 20.4 pA;  $n = 31$ ) or  $1.44 \pm 0.21$  mV (median = 1.37 mV;  $n = 8$ ). The efficacy, the potency multiplied by the transfer rate, was  $2.36 \pm 0.58$  pA (median = 1.24;  $n = 38$ ) or  $0.24 \pm 0.05$  mV (median = 0.27;  $n = 9$ ) for the first spike; Fig. 3e; Supplementary Fig. 2).

We have shown a significant asymmetry in synaptic reliability in the recurrent inhibitory loop between pyramidal cells and Martinotti interneurons in superficial layers of the presubiculum: inhibitory synapses are much more reliable than excitatory connections. Since the dynamic behavior of both synapses in this feedback circuit will govern its operation<sup>30,31</sup>, we examined postsynaptic responses at different rates of pre-synaptic firing. Transfer rate, potency and efficacy were analysed for synaptic responses to trains of 30 action potentials at either 10 Hz or 30 Hz, repeated with an inter-stimulus interval of at least 20 seconds (Fig. 4a and 5a). We detected all postsynaptic events and classed those following pre-synaptic spikes at mono-synaptic latencies (see methods) as spike-induced events.

### *Stable Martinotti cell inhibition during repetitive stimulation.*

Information transfer at MC-to-PC connections was reliable and stable during synaptic activation at 10 or 30 Hz (Supplementary Table 2 and Fig. 4a-d). The synaptic efficacy for the first five action potentials (early efficacy) and that of the last five action potentials (late efficacy) in trains of 30 pre-synaptic spikes were similar, for 10 Hz and 30 Hz stimulations (early 10 Hz,  $16.97 \pm 3.58$  pA; late 10 Hz,  $17.33 \pm 3.32$  pA; early 30 Hz,  $16.13 \pm 3.73$  pA; late 30 Hz,  $15.47 \pm 2.76$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sem,  $n = 8$  pairs; Friedman test,  $P = 0.5222$ ). Changes in efficacy during repetitive firing were mostly due to changes of potency and less to alterations in transfer rate (Fig. 4e). Cumulative efficacy evolved linearly during repetitive stimulations (Fig. 4f). Changes in synaptic frequency (see methods) were proportional to changes in presynaptic firing frequency (Fig. 4g). Thus, the dynamic behavior of MC-to-PC inhibitory synapses is relatively stable with little dependence on the history of pre-synaptic firing.

### *Repetitive stimulation unmutes the PC-to-MC connection in a frequency dependent manner*

In contrast, PC-to-MC excitatory synapses displayed remarkable facilitating dynamic behavior ( $n = 58/59$  pairs). Figure 5 shows an example of excitatory postsynaptic currents (EPSCs) elicited by 10 Hz and 30 Hz stimulations (Fig. 5a). Synaptic efficacy was low at first, but increased greatly with both the number and frequency of pre-synaptic action potentials, even though spike-to-spike responses varied between trials (Fig. 5a-d, Friedman test,  $P = 0.0002$ ). At 10 Hz, late efficacy ( $6.51 \pm 2.99$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sem,  $n = 9$ ) was more than double early efficacy ( $2.99 \pm 0.99$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sem,  $n = 9$ ). At 30 Hz, late efficacy ( $17.34 \pm 5.14$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sem,  $n = 9$ ) was four times higher than early efficacy ( $4.41 \pm 0.88$  pA, mean  $\pm$  sem,  $n = 9$ ). Efficacy increased for 6/9 pairs tested at 10 Hz (Fig. 5d left, Dunn's multiple comparison, n.s.) and for 9/9 pairs at 30 Hz (Fig. 5d right, Dunn's multiple comparison,  $p < 0.05$ ). The extent of the increase varied between connections especially at 30 Hz (Fig. 5d). In contrast to the MC-to-PC synapse, changes in efficacy at the PC-to-MC synapse during activation at 30 Hz were due to variations in response probability and not in potency (Fig. 5e,  $n = 15$  pairs). Increased efficacy implies a greater reliability of PC-to-MC synaptic transmission for increasing numbers and frequencies of pre-synaptic spikes. Furthermore the synaptic frequency increased supra-linearly with presynaptic spike frequency. After one second, the cumulative efficacy was 11 times higher at 30 Hz than at 10 Hz (Fig. 5f). The synaptic frequency was 5.9 times faster for early spikes and 7.9 times faster for late spikes, when presynaptic firing rate increased from 10 to 30 Hz (Fig. 5f,g), thus largely exceeding expected changes due to a three-fold increase in the rate of synaptic activation. We refer to this remarkable form of facilitation as synaptic unmuting.

### *Increase of transfer rate at the PC-to-MC synapse as a medium term memory process*

Presubicular Martinotti cells are reliably excited only when pyramidal cells fire at high frequency, as when they signal a preferred head direction. These frequency dependent changes do not reflect long-term synaptic plasticity since synaptic efficacy returned to previous values within ~20 s (Fig. 5a).

Several paired records nevertheless revealed medium term effects on the PC-to-MC excitatory synaptic transmission ( $n = 10$ , Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 3). When synaptic unmuting was induced after initial 30-40 Hz high frequency firing of the pyramidal neuron, synaptic transfer at the PC-to-MC synapse remained enhanced even as PC firing adapted to lower frequencies of firing (Supplementary Fig. 3a-c, blue lines). Similarly, after a high frequency spike train had unmuted the PC-to-MC synapse, a subsequent 10 Hz test stimulation maintained transfer rates well above those during a 10 Hz control spike train (Supplementary Fig. 3d-e). These results show that the unmuting effect of high frequency synaptic activation outlasts the high frequency stimulation itself. We then determined the time course of decay of synaptic enhancement. Following synaptic unmuting by a 30 Hz spike train of duration 2 seconds, synaptic responses to subsequent 2 Hz test stimuli revealed a double exponential time course of decay of synaptic efficacy and transfer back to baseline level, with a fast time constant of 0.74 s and 0.97 s followed by a slower time constant of 12.96 s and 18.94 s ( $n = 7$  pairs, Fig. 6a-c). We conclude that the PC-to-MC synapse remained in a mode of enhanced information transfer efficiency for tens of seconds after sustained activation at high frequency.

### *How in vivo head direction signaling activates the PC-MC loop*

How do these findings relate to head direction signaling *in vivo*? We recorded firing of presubicular head direction (HD) cells from rats running in an open field in order to test their effects at the PC-MC synapse. Firing of presubicular head direction cells *in vivo* was very irregular and instantaneous frequencies fluctuated widely<sup>3</sup>. Neurons with typical mean direction specific firing rates of ~15 Hz, could have peak instantaneous firing frequencies up to 250 Hz ( $n = 5$ ; Fig. 7a,b). While the head remained within range of preferred directions (here 200° - 240°), the neuron shown in Fig. 7a fired in a sustained manner.

We used spike trains from isolated single head direction units within their preferred range *in vivo* as depolarizing current commands to presynaptic PCs in paired PC-MC recordings (Fig. 7c,d). As expected, excitatory transmission induced at the start of high frequency *in vivo* spike patterns was poor. The PC-to-MC synaptic efficacy increased considerably during sustained high frequency firing (from  $0.9 \pm 0.6$  to  $21.7 \pm 11.9$  pA;  $n = 5$ ), and synaptic unmuting persisted during later sparse firing, even after a silent period of several hundred milliseconds (Fig. 7e,f). We noted not only an increase in synaptic events “locked” to presynaptic spikes with latencies < 3 ms, but also an increase in the frequency of delayed excitatory postsynaptic events after sustained high frequency firing (Fig. 7e).



Firing of Martinotti cells induced by pyramidal cell firing was consistent with facilitating synaptic dynamics. Synchronous and asynchronous EPSPs summed to reach Martinotti cell firing threshold during repetitive high frequency firing (Fig. 7g,h).

For comparison, we also examined the synaptic transmission of the same spike train onto fast-spiking parvalbumin (PV) expressing interneurons in paired PC-PV recordings (Supplementary Fig. 4). Quite opposite to Martinotti cells, PV+ neurons responded with highest efficacy at the onset of a high frequency spike train, then displayed depression. The facilitating pattern of synaptic recruitment was therefore specific to Martinotti cells but not PV+ interneurons.

### *Spike timing dependent inhibitory effect favoring lateral inhibition over self-induced inhibition*

We next asked how Martinotti cell mediated feedback IPSPs affected post-synaptic pyramidal cells. Pyramidal cell spikes typically initiated Martinotti cell firing at a less than 8 ms delay (84% of spikes,  $n = 4$  pairs; Fig. 8a, right panel). Therefore, in reciprocally connected cell pairs the great majority of self-induced Martinotti-cell mediated IPSPs occurred with short latency ( $<10$  ms) after a PC spike. These feedback IPSPs coincided with the spike afterhyperpolarization (AHP) of the triggering pyramidal cell. As illustrated in Fig. 8a, feedback IPSPs summed with the AHP, resulting in a larger pyramidal cell hyperpolarization and enhancing the peak amplitude of the next pyramidal cell action potential, while exerted little inhibitory effect on pyramidal cell firing.

However, Martinotti cells also mediate lateral inhibition. IPSPs in neighboring, but not reciprocally connected, pyramidal cells tend to occur with timing unrelated to preceding pyramidal cell spikes. The functional difference between feedback inhibition versus lateral inhibition on PC firing can therefore be addressed by studying the effect of short ( $<10$ ms) versus long latency IPSPs. We tested the hypothesis that lateral inhibition has distinct effects to reciprocal inhibition in recordings from unidirectionally connected MC-to-PC pairs with mean IPSP amplitude greater than  $-0.3$  mV at  $-50$  mV ( $n = 7$ ; Fig. 8b-e). MC action potentials were timed to initiate IPSPs at different times during the PC firing cycle ( $n = 7$ , 30-50 Hz). We then compared the effects of IPSPs of latencies  $<10$  ms (feedback-like) or  $>10$  ms between PC and MC firing. We measured values for the pyramidal cell AHP ( $AHP_{TEST}$ ) together with the peak of the next spike ( $PK_{TEST}$ ) and the inter-spike interval ( $ISI_{TEST}$ ). Since these parameters can adapt during spike trains, observed values were compared to extrapolated values. Pyramidal cell AHPs were more hyperpolarized for short latencies ( $-0.49 \pm 0.13$  mV, Fig. 8c, Wilcoxon signed rank test,  $P = 0.0313$ ) than for long latencies ( $0.02 \pm 0.02$  mV; Fig. 8c, Wilcoxon signed rank test,  $P = 0.6875$ ). PC action potential amplitude was increased for short latencies ( $0.31 \pm 0.11$  mV) compared to delayed MC spike timing ( $-0.06 \pm 0.05$  mV; Fig. 8d). Interspike intervals were significantly longer when MC-spikes were delayed  $>10$  ms rather than at short-latency ( $111.6 \pm 2.6$  % vs.  $103.3 \pm 0.95$  %; Fig. 8e, unilateral Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test,  $P < 0.01$ ). Thus, the

inhibitory effect of Martinotti cell IPSPs depends on when they are initiated during a PC firing cycle. Short latency feedback IPSPs are induced when persistent PC firing recruits a MC - these IPSPs have little inhibitory effect and may even encourage PC firing. In contrast, delayed IPSPs impinging on non-reciprocally connected PCs tend to delay subsequent PC discharges.

### *Inhibitory attractor network model reproduces presubicular head direction signaling*

Head direction signals are organized internally, such that neurons with similar preferred head directions fire together in a correlated way<sup>29</sup>. Computational models of the head direction signal suggest that this activity profile may emerge from an attractor network<sup>20,23,32,33</sup>. These models mostly rely on strong excitatory connections between cells with similar preferred directions. We asked whether a model based on experimentally measured connectivity, strength and dynamic behavior of synapses in recurrent Martinotti-cell circuits could generate attractor network dynamics, in the absence of recurrent excitation between pyramidal cells.

Presubicular pyramidal cell and Martinotti cell interactions were simulated in a firing rate model, with the interneurons and principal cells represented as a two-layer network (Fig. 9a). Pyramidal cells influenced each other only via feedback inhibition, through the Martinotti cell layer. Each pyramidal cell was assigned a preferred firing direction, so that the entire population evenly spanned 360°. The network was modeled after six key experimental findings of this study. 1. Each pyramidal unit contacted multiple Martinotti units, and vice-versa, with a high number of reciprocal connections (local dependency on phase similarity of head direction cells; cf. Methods). 2. Facilitating excitation of Martinotti neurons with slow decay was implemented. 3. Martinotti mediated inhibition was stable. 4. Martinotti units were spontaneously active. 5. The inhibitory strength of IPSPs was a function of the excitation received by pre-synaptic pyramidal units. Highly active pre-synaptic pyramidal cells were largely unaffected by reciprocal feedback inhibition. Stronger, lateral inhibition was exerted on less active pyramidal units (Fig. 9a, right panel). 6. The transmission of directional information from the thalamus was simulated as a selective external input activating pyramidal units directly, but not Martinotti units.

We show that, in the absence of correlated inputs, the model network spontaneously generated a directionally selective increase in activity, thus satisfying attractor network dynamics (Fig. 9b). The model neurons coding for a certain direction forcedly mirrored the thalamic directional input, and when the external drive was reduced and the system relaxed, the neuronal activity profiles were mostly maintained (Fig. 9c). Polar plots of the activity of representative pyramidal cells were similar to those of finely tuned head direction cells *in vivo*, while Martinotti cells were very little directionally modulated (Supplementary Fig. 5). The precision of the pyramidal cell tuning could be controlled by varying the range  $\alpha$  of the inhibition suppression around an existing connection between a pyramidal



cell and a Martinotti cell. Finally the model allowed us to test the importance of the facilitating synaptic dynamics of Martinotti cell recruitment for the formation of a coherent activity bump. When facilitating synapses were replaced with depressing or stable synapses, bump formation could be obtained if synapses rapidly returned to their initial state (large b1, Supplementary Fig. 5). However, the activity correlation with initial external input fell apart, underscoring the key importance of the facilitating PC-to-MC synaptic properties for a maintained head directional signal (Fig. 9d,e). Thus recurrent excitatory synapses made with PV interneurons, which exhibit a dynamic depression, are not part of the attractor that maintains the head directional information in the presubiculum. In conclusion, an inhibitory feedback triggered exclusively at high firing frequencies with spike-timing dependent inhibitory effects on pyramidal cells will suffice to refine and sustain head direction signals in the presubiculum.

## DISCUSSION

We have described activity-dependent dynamic properties of the Martinotti cell inhibitory feedback loop in the presubiculum. These properties underlie a self-sustained processing of head direction information in presubicular microcircuits. Superficial pyramidal cells are directly excited by thalamic inputs. Martinotti type interneurons are excited by these pyramidal cells and reliably inhibit pyramidal cell dendrites in layers 1 and 3. Feedback excitatory transmission from pyramidal cells to Martinotti cells is greatly facilitated during sustained high frequency presynaptic firing. Synaptic transfer may be enhanced for several seconds after a PC-to-MC connection is “unmuted”. The behavior of this feedback inhibitory circuit is directly relevant to patterns of head direction activity. Natural firing patterns of these cells, recorded *in vivo*, recruited Martinotti cells very effectively *in vitro* whereas lower firing frequencies had little effect. Firing of these interneurons had distinct timing-dependent effects. In reciprocal connections, MCs fired at short latencies after PC action potentials. Inhibition by such precisely timed, spike-locked IPSPs was less effective than for randomly timed IPSPs, such that Martinotti cells provide a strong lateral inhibition. This feedback circuit is well-adapted to refine head direction signals in the presubiculum and to robustly preserve sustained firing of in-tune head direction cells.

Head direction signals are thought to be generated in subcortical nuclei and relayed via the thalamus to the parahippocampal region<sup>1,6</sup>. Neurons of anterior thalamus (ATN) project quite specifically to the presubiculum<sup>7</sup> (Fig. 2). A monosynaptic connection from ATN to presubicular head direction cells has been recently inferred *in vivo* based on short latency, reliable spike transmission<sup>29</sup>. Here we examined the effects of optogenetic activation of anterior thalamic axon terminals on single presubicular neurons *in vitro*. Our data provide functional evidence for a direct innervation of layer 3 pyramidal neurons of

the presubiculum by thalamic fibers. Martinotti type interneurons received no direct excitation. Pyramidal cells of superficial layers project directly to the MEC (data not shown; cf. also<sup>11,34</sup>). While grid cell activity of MEC neurons depends on head direction information<sup>35</sup>, the ATN does not project directly to the MEC. Thus integration of head direction code in presubicular superficial layers seems to be an essential element in the construction of inputs to MEC grid cells.

Recurrent feedback circuits of Martinotti cells and pyramidal cells are highly interconnected. The probability of PC-to-MC connections was 37%. The MC-to-PC connection probability was even higher: 58%. Such estimates from paired recordings are probably underestimates since all connections may not be preserved in slices. Our pipette solution was designed to enhance the driving force for chloride, increasing our ability to detect inhibitory synaptic events and to distinguish them from failures. Nevertheless, we may have missed low amplitude inhibitory synaptic events generated at very distal dendritic sites. Martinotti cells of other cortical areas also have high connection probabilities with local pyramidal cells to provide a dense, reliable and non-specific inhibition<sup>36</sup>, with both convergent and divergent connectivity<sup>25,37</sup>. We detected no direct activation of Martinotti cells by thalamic afferents reinforcing the feedback role of MCs in a presubiculum circuit. With a very low rate of recurrent connection between pyramidal cells (~ 2%), the PC-MC pathway becomes especially important to mediate interactions between presubicular pyramidal cells, similar to layer 5 pyramidal cells in neocortex<sup>25</sup> or to layer 2 stellate cells in medial entorhinal cortex<sup>38,39</sup>.

We found MCs were only excited to fire by summed EPSPs induced after synaptic unmuting when PCs fired at high frequencies for prolonged periods. Single PC spikes never led to MC discharge (Fig. 7g, 8a). The short-term dynamics of pyramidal cell synapses vary between fast-spiking, parvalbumin expressing or low threshold spiking, somatostatin expressing interneurons in neocortex and hippocampus<sup>25,40-42</sup> (cf. also Supplementary Fig. 4). The facilitation during repeated activation shown here at synapses that excite Martinotti cells is similar to that of synapses made with SST immunopositive interneurons in hippocampus<sup>41</sup> and neocortex<sup>24,25,42,43</sup>, even though the presubiculum is not a typical neocortical area, but rather part of the transitional periarchicortex. Synaptic facilitation in the presubiculum has slow kinetics, corresponding well to the persistent discharges of head direction cells. In somatosensory cortex, a 3-fold increase in average EPSP amplitude could be obtained after 8 stimulations at 20 Hz<sup>43</sup>, while in presubiculum a similar degree of facilitation was obtained after 30 stimuli at 30 Hz. Presubicular PC-to-MC synapses were often silent during paired pulse stimuli. We therefore analyzed synaptic dynamics from responses to trains of action potentials at 10 or 30 Hz. Enhanced synaptic efficacy during these trains resulted from increased transfer rate rather than potency (Fig. 5e). This phenomenon persisted for a time after high frequency stimuli (Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 3) as at some other synapses<sup>31,44</sup>. Nevertheless even after unmuting, the transfer

rate remained quite low at this synapse, compared to responses elicited by similar stimuli at neocortical PC-to-MC synapses in layer 3<sup>43</sup> or layer 5<sup>25</sup>.

Possibly presubicular PC-to-MC transmission is regulated by an activity dependent mechanism, distinct from short term facilitation<sup>31,45</sup>, situated at either axonal or presynaptic sites<sup>46</sup>, and affecting spike waveform or the release machinery<sup>26,47,48</sup>. Transfer rate depends on both the probability of neurotransmitter release  $p_r$ , and the number of release sites. Data on numbers of terminals and active zones as well as the location of synapses on post-synaptic membrane will necessitate ultrastructural work. Further, since basal and dynamic values for  $p_r$  may differ at individual PC-MC synaptic boutons<sup>49</sup>, a full description would also require information on vesicle pool size and replenishment. This work has rather presented an average picture of PC-MC synapses. Functionally, activity dependent synaptic unmuting and asynchronous release provide a medium term synaptic memory<sup>50</sup>. Such a trace of recent head directions at this synapse would permit comparison with incoming visual and hippocampal information converging in the presubiculum.

About half of presubicular principal neurons are directionally modulated<sup>3</sup>. Head direction cells sustain firing at high frequencies with weak adaptation while an animal maintains its head in a preferred direction<sup>4</sup>. PC-to-MC synapses are perfectly tuned to activate recurrent inhibition for sustained HD signals. With very low initial transfer rates they act as a high pass filter<sup>30</sup>, insensitive to sharp increases, but enhanced over time. Unlike fast-spiking parvalbumin expressing interneurons<sup>10</sup>, MCs may therefore not be recruited during fast head turns when head direction cells do not fire persistently. MC inhibition of pyramidal cell dendrites seems likely to control the genesis of regenerative dendritic events<sup>27</sup>. It will act to suppress dendritic electrogenesis and counter the effects of EPSPs impinging at local dendritic sites. MC feedback inhibition would prevent over-excitation and control network activity<sup>19,51</sup> during persistent head direction firing. But it would also provide a common time window for dendritic excitation and so synchronize firing in neurons with similar head direction tuning. In the context of head direction sensitivity, spiking output is a critical variable, and head direction signaling is identified *in vivo* according to neuronal firing. The influence of MC inhibition on somatic and axonal processes of spike generation may be relatively minor. Nevertheless, MCs may affect somatic firing by propagation of a dendritic hyperpolarization or by preventing the somatic propagation of dendritic EPSPs. The effects of inhibition vary with timing during the pyramidal cell firing cycle (Fig. 8; ref<sup>52,53</sup>). In reciprocally connected cell pairs, when PCs drive MC firing, an IPSP is generated at short latency during the PC AHP. These IPSPs enhance repolarization which may facilitate initiation of the next PC action potential. Short latency feedback inhibition is therefore functionally less inhibitory than randomly timed lateral inhibition. Because well-tuned head direction cells fire maximally, and poorly-tuned cells fire less<sup>14</sup>, PC-to-MC synapse dynamics clearly favor MC recruitment by well-tuned direction cells. Lateral feedback then preferentially inhibits poorly-tuned cells.

Experimental data let us propose a modified continuous attractor model based on recurrent inhibition to mimic head direction activity. The build-up of strong principal neuron activation as a necessary condition for interneuron recruitment is essential to the model. We suggest that activity-dependent unmuting of Martinotti cells and their facilitating synapse dynamics are key for autonomous circuit dynamics in the presubiculum. In contrast to primary visual cortex<sup>54</sup>, the presubiculum could, in this way, sustain activity. Fast-spiking PV neurons with depressing synapses (Supplementary Fig. 4) are not part of the attractor. We suggest that during fast head turns, when Martinotti cells are not recruited, the system may switch to a relay type function. Presubicular fast-spiking interneurons fire at higher rates during rotation<sup>10</sup>, that is, when the population of active head direction cells shifts quickly. The excitatory inputs received by PV neurons continuously changes to different sets of synapses, and for each transient head direction, PV neurons will rapidly provide inhibition with depressing dynamics. However, Martinotti cells become active and stay active during maintained directional signaling, and could support a form of working memory<sup>55-57</sup>, especially in the absence of a stabilizing stimulus<sup>55</sup>. Our data on a one-dimensional head direction system might suggest that equivalent dynamics exist in the medial entorhinal grid-cell system<sup>38,58</sup>. We note the model network requires no directional tuning of presubicular interneurons. The efficacy of inhibitory synapses depends exclusively on the timing of interneuron firing with respect to firing in the presynaptic principal neuron, leading to little inhibition for a driving head direction cell, but stronger lateral inhibition. In conclusion, the recruitment of Martinotti cells by differentially active, randomly connected pyramidal cells provides an economic way to refine and sustain presubicular head direction signal representations.

## METHODS

### *Animals*

Most work was done on slices from transgenic mice (X98-SST line, JAX 006340) that express GFP in a subpopulation of somatostatin-positive (SST) neocortical Martinotti cells<sup>28</sup>. X98-SST mice were maintained by breeding heterozygous males with C57BL/6J females (CERJ Janvier). Sst-Cre::tdTomato mice were used in experiments involving the light activation of Channelrhodopsin-2 (ChR2). They were obtained by crossing male Sst-IRES-Cre mice<sup>59</sup> (Jax 013044) with females from the Ai14 Cre reporter line<sup>60</sup> (Jax 007914). SST positive neurons of these mice express the red fluorescent protein tdTomato, which can be visualized without activating ChR2. Pvalb-Cre::tdTomato mice were used for comparing synapse dynamics. They were obtained by crossing Pvalb-Cre mice<sup>61</sup> (Jax 008069) with the Ai14 Cre reporter line. Animal care and use conformed to the European Communities Council Directive of 2010 (2010/63/EU) and French law (87/848). Our study was approved by the local ethics committee Charles Darwin N°5.

### *Stereotactic Virus Injections*

Adeno-associated viral vectors carrying genes for Chr2-EYFP fusion proteins (AAV2/9.hSyn.hChr2 (H134R)-EYFP.WPRE.hGH; University of Pennsylvania Vector Core) were injected into the anterior thalamic nucleus (ATN) at postnatal age P28. For surgery, mice were deeply anesthetized with intraperitoneal injection of ketamine hydrochloride and xylazine (100 and 15 mg.kg<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) following stereotaxic procedures described previously<sup>62</sup>. The virus was delivered via a 33-gauge needle with a Hamilton syringe in a syringe Pump Controller (Harvard Apparatus, Pump 11 elite) at 20 nl.min<sup>-1</sup>. ATN was targeted at coordinates from Bregma: lateral, 0.75 mm; posterior, -0.82 mm; depth, -3.2 mm. Slices were prepared at 12-16 days after vector injection. The injected volume was 150 nl, to be as specific as possible (cf. Supplementary Fig. 1), but with enough spread to cover ATN.

### *Slice preparation, in vitro electrophysiology and photostimulation*

Under ketamine and xylazine anesthesia, animals were perfused via the heart with 30 ml or more of a solution containing (in mM): 125 NaCl, 25 sucrose, 2.5 KCl, 25 NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 1.25 NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 2.5 D-glucose, 0.1 CaCl<sub>2</sub> and 7 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, cooled to 2–6 °C and equilibrated with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in O<sub>2</sub>. The forebrain was dissected, and horizontal slices of thickness 260–320 μm were cut with a vibratome (Leica VT1200S). They were transferred to a storage chamber containing warmed (37°C) artificial cerebrospinal fluid (ACSF) of : 124 NaCl, 2.5 KCl, 26 NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 1 NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 2 CaCl<sub>2</sub>, 2 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, and 11 D-glucose (mM), gently bubbled with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in O<sub>2</sub> (pH 7.3, 305–310 mOsm/L). ACSF in the storage chamber cooled towards room temperature (22–25°C) as slices were kept for at least 1 hr before transfer to a recording chamber.

The recording chamber, of volume ~ 2 ml, was heated to 33 – 35 °C. Neurons were visualized with an EMCCD Luca-S camera (Andor) on an Axioskop 2 FS plus microscope (Zeiss, France) with infrared differential interference contrast. Glass recording pipettes were pulled from borosilicate glass of external diameter 1.5 mm (Clark Capillary Glass, Harvard Apparatus) using a Brown-Flaming electrode puller (Sutter Instruments). A low-chloride potassium gluconate-based (Low-Cl K-gluc) internal solution contained (in mM): 145 K-gluconate, 2 KCl, 10 HEPES, 0–0.2 ethylene glycol tetra-acetic acid (EGTA), 2 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 4 MgATP, 0.4 Tris-GTP, 10 Na<sub>2</sub>-phosphocreatine. The cesium gluconate-based internal solution (Cs-gluc) contained (in mM): 135 Cs-gluconate, 5 KCl, 10 HEPES, 0–0.2 ethylene glycol tetra-acetic acid (EGTA), 2 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 4 MgATP, 0.4 Tris-GTP, 10 Na<sub>2</sub>-phosphocreatine. Recordings were made with low-Cl K-gluc solution unless specified. Tip resistance of filled pipettes was 3–7 MΩ. Whole-cell records were made with a Multiclamp 700B amplifier and acquired with pClamp software (Molecular Devices). Recordings were filtered at 6–12 KHz in current clamp mode and at 2–6 KHz in voltage clamp mode. No correction was made for junction potential (~15 mV). Access resistance was continuously monitored and records were excluded if variations exceeded 15 %.

Pyramidal cells were identified as non-fluorescent regular spiking neurons with typical properties<sup>15</sup>; Martinotti-like cells (MC) of tissue from X98-SST mice were defined as green fluorescent neurons, and those from Sst-Cre::tdTomato mice as red fluorescent neurons. In both mouse lines, MC possessed resting membrane potential above -65 mV. Discharges were either adapting or low threshold firing and biocytin filling revealed typical Martinotti cell axonal and dendritic morphologies (Fig. 2).

Channelrhodopsin expressing terminals from the AT thalamic nucleus were excited with blue light from a source (Cairn OptoLED, white) coupled to the epifluorescence microscope port, filtered (BP 450-490, FT 510) and fed into a 60X 1.0 NA plan-Apochromat objective. Light pulses of 0.5 ms duration and intensity 2 mW were delivered at 20 s intervals. 1  $\mu$ M TTX and 40  $\mu$ M 4AP were added to the bath to check for direct vs. indirect optical activation. Salts and anesthetics were all obtained from Sigma, except TTX from Tocris.

### *In vivo electrophysiology*

Head direction firing was sampled from presubicular neurons *in vivo* in rats, with higher channel counts and unit yield compared to mice (cf. ref.<sup>3</sup>). Briefly, tetrodes were implanted in 4 months old Long-Evans rats at AP 2.2 mm in front of the transverse sinus, ML 3.7 mm from the midline, and DV 1.5 mm below the dura. Tetrodes were lowered progressively until reaching presubicular layers. Recording sites in presubiculum were confirmed from post-hoc Nissl, parvalbumin and calbindin stained sections. Head direction was tracked with two light-emitting diodes while the animal collected randomly distributed food crumbs from a 100 cm wide square box. Spikes were sorted offline with cluster cutting Axona software. Head direction was calculated from projections of the relative position of the two LEDs on the horizontal plane. Directional tuning for each cell was obtained by plotting firing rate against the rat head direction, divided into bins of 3 degrees and smoothed with a 14.5 degrees mean window filter (14 bins on each side). Command protocols for slice records were generated from these spike trains imported into pClamp.

### *Data analysis*

Signals were analyzed with AxoGraphX, and locally-written software (Labview, National Instruments; MATLAB, The Mathwork). Algorithms to detect action potentials and measure active and passive neuronal properties were described previously<sup>15,16</sup>. All relevant data are available from the authors.

### *Detection of postsynaptic events*

Excitatory and inhibitory postsynaptic currents and potentials were detected and measured automatically from low-pass filtered records adapted to the recording mode (0.4 KHz for EPSPs, 1 KHz for EPSCs and 500-750 KHz for IPSCs). Spontaneous or spike-associated events were detected as continuous rising signals exceeding a threshold set for records from each cell to minimize both false



positive and negative detection. Thresholds were 0.3-0.6 mV for EPSPs, 4-7 pA for EPSCs and IPSCs recorded in K-gluconate and 4-12 pA for IPSCs recorded with Cs-gluconate solution.

Spike-locked postsynaptic events were defined as first events occurring within a monosynaptic latency (generally 0.5-3 ms for an EPSC and 0.5-4 ms for an IPSC). Delayed postsynaptic events were those that occurred later than the spike-locked events or outside the monosynaptic window but still within 10 ms after the spike. PSC latencies were calculated from the action potential peak to the mid-rise of the postsynaptic event.

Spontaneous activity can bias values for synaptic transfer. We estimated “false positives” which might exaggerate monosynaptic transfer rates. Presynaptic firing patterns were aligned to a “control window”, before stimulation, and transfer rate, corresponding to a noise value, was calculated. This procedure was applied multiple (250 - 300) times using different starting points in the same control window. The number of “false positive” rarely exceeded 0.05. It depended on the level of background synaptic activity, but not on presynaptic firing frequency.

#### *Synapse dynamics in repetitive stimuli*

Synaptic transfer rate was calculated from paired records as the number of detected post-synaptic events divided by the number of presynaptic spikes. Failure rate was  $1 - \text{transfer rate}$ . Synaptic potency (pA or mV) was defined as the amplitude of detected events. Efficacy (pA or mV) was the mean amplitude of responses including failures (failure amplitude = 0). Efficacy may be deduced as potency  $\times$  transfer rate. Synaptic transmission during repeated presynaptic activation was analyzed in these terms to derive transfer rate, potency and efficacy for either (1) a given spike across different trials of a standard stimulus, or (2) groups of successive spikes elicited during a defined time. For spike trains, the first five spikes and the last five spikes were grouped to increase measurement precision (Figs. 4 and 5) when trial-to-trial variability was high. Changes of transfer rate, potency and efficacy over time are measured as the ratio of late/early values. Cumulative efficacy was calculated as the sum of efficacy over time and provides a temporal dynamic. The derivative of this cumulative efficacy, that we called “synaptic frequency”, corresponds to the information transferred per second.

#### *Inhibitory effect*

Functional MC-mediated inhibition was quantified as the ability of an IPSP to delay PC-discharge (ISI modulation). We also measured effects of IPSPs induced after pyramidal cell firing. In an effective recurrent circuit, pyramidal cells may induce MC-spike firing evoking in turn an IPSP in the initiating pyramidal cell. This effect was quantified as an enhanced pyramidal cell AHP (AHP modulation) or change in peak amplitude of a PC-spike (Peak modulation). Both parameters could be affected by intrinsic properties such as adaptation, peak accommodation and an AHP depolarization during

repetitive firing. We therefore determined the effect of inhibition as changes from predicted pyramidal cell repetitive firing behavior (Fig. 8).

### *Cellular anatomy*

Biocytin (1mg/ml) was added to the pipette solution to reveal the morphology of some recorded cells as described<sup>15,16</sup>. Axi-dendritic morphology was reconstructed from z-stacks of acquired images with Neurolucida software (Microbrightfield, Williston, VT, USA).

### *Computational model*

Our model builds on previous network models of the head direction system that generate attractor dynamics with directionality<sup>21,63,64</sup>. In the present model, network function is dominated by indirect, inhibitory interactions between pyramidal cells, and we explicitly include interneurons mediating such interactions in the dynamics of the system.

*Network Wiring.* We simulated the activity of a layer of  $N_{pyr}$  pyramidal units interacting through a population of  $N_{inh} = \rho N_{pyr}$  Martinotti units. Each pyramidal unit was assigned a preferred direction  $\Theta$ , evenly spaced to cover the  $0 - 2\pi$  interval, while Martinotti units were identified with an index  $j$ . Pyramidal units did not interact directly through recurrent excitatory connectivity, but they were highly connected to the Martinotti cell layer and so influenced each other via disynaptic feedback inhibition. The strength of this feedback inhibition exerted from each pyramidal unit on the rest of the population defined the effective interaction among pyramidal cells. The wiring of the system was conceived to produce a regularly patterned effective connectivity. As in previous continuous attractor models in head direction systems<sup>20-23</sup> connectivity depended on the angular distance of the preferred direction of pyramidal units. Pyramidal units with similar preferred phase did not inhibit each other, while they tended to suppress the activity of units with different directional selectivity.

Excitatory connections from pyramidal to Martinotti units ( $W_{\Theta,j}^{OUT}$ ) and inhibitory connections from Martinotti units back to the pyramidal layer ( $W_{j,\Theta}^{IN}$ ) were established as follows (cf. Fig. 9a).

Initially, each Martinotti unit randomly connected to pyramidal units with a 0.7 probability. A sub-set  $N_{Conn}$  of these inhibitory connections was randomly selected as “main connections” with strength  $\sim W^{OUT}$ . Inhibitory connections contacting neighboring pyramidal cells were pruned. Consequently, for each main connection between a Martinotti unit  $\tilde{j}$  and a pyramidal unit  $\tilde{\Theta}$ , connections from the Martinotti unit to pyramidal units with directional preference close to  $\tilde{\Theta}$  were pruned. The number of main connections  $N_{Conn}$  for each Martinotti unit depended on the range of pruning,  $\alpha$ . The number of pruned connections for each main connection was a constant fraction  $\Lambda$  of all the possible connections for any range of the pruning, that is  $\alpha N_{Conn} = \Lambda N_{pyr}$ . Therefore :

$$N_{Conn} = \frac{\Lambda^* N_{Pyr}}{\alpha} \quad (1)$$

After establishing the inhibitory connectivity, the excitatory wiring was established as follows. Each main connection was associated with a reciprocal excitatory connection of uniform strength. Additional excitatory connections were created with a 0.4 probability and a reduced strength, compared to those associated with the main connections, randomly drawn from the  $[0, w^{OUT}]$  interval (where  $w^{OUT} < \tilde{w}^{OUT}$ ).

As a last step, the strength of the inhibitory connections converging on each pyramidal cell was normalized according to:

$$\sum_j W_{j,\Theta}^{IN} = w^{IN} \quad (2)$$

Ultimately, three different groups of connections could be found (cf. Fig. 9a): 1) strong main excitatory connections from pyramidal to Martinotti (purple arrow) 2) weaker excitatory connections (blue arrows) and 3) inhibitory connections (Network parameters are given in Supplementary Table 4).

*Unit Dynamics.* A pyramidal unit assigned with preferred direction  $\Theta$  was described by its firing rate at time  $t$ ,  $r_E(\Theta, t)$ , regulated through the following dynamics:

$$\tau_E \dot{r}_E(\Theta, t) = -r_E(\Theta, t) + f(h(\Theta, t) + I(\Theta, t)) \quad (3)$$

where  $f[I] = g[I]_+$  is a threshold linear f-I curve and  $\tau_E$  is the neuronal time constant. The input to the unit consisted of an external input term,  $h$  (see below), and the contribution coming from feedback inhibition,  $I$ . In turn, the inhibition term consisted of the combined effect of the presynaptic Martinotti units:

$$I(\Theta, t) = \sum_j w_{j,\Theta}^{IN} r_I(j, t) \quad (4)$$

where  $w_{j,\Theta}^{IN}$  is the strength of the inhibitory connection between Martinotti unit  $j$  and pyramidal unit  $\Theta$ . Similarly, for Martinotti units firing rate was regulated by the equation

$$\tau_I \dot{r}_I(j, t) = -r_I(j, t) + f(E(j, t)) \quad (5)$$

that includes a time constant  $\tau_I > \tau_E$  generating slower input integration times. For the pyramidal units, the excitatory current  $E$  was the sum of pre-synaptic inputs. For Martinotti units, the summation was modulated by synaptic temporal dynamics described in the next paragraph. Synaptic facilitation may be crucial to stabilize the network<sup>55-57</sup>.

*Dynamic properties of synapses.* The formation of a coherent bump of activity crucially depended on the stable excitation of Martinotti interneurons. For Fig. 9d-e, in order to examine the influence of

synapse dynamics on the stability of Martinotti interneurons activity, we modified the previous equation,

$$\tau_I \dot{r}_I(j, t) = -r_I(j, t) + f(\tilde{E}(j, t)) \quad (6)$$

so that the term  $\tilde{E}(j, t)$  reflected either depressing or facilitating synaptic dynamics. We introduced a variable regulating the responsiveness of synaptic contacts between each pyramidal and Martinotti cell:

$$\tilde{E}(j, t) = \sum_j \gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Eff}(t) w_{\Theta, j}^{OUT} r_E(\Theta, t). \quad (7)$$

The evolution of the synaptic efficacy  $\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Eff}$  was mediated by the equations:

$$\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Eff}(t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-k_1(\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Act}(t) - k_2)}} \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Act}(t) = \gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Act}(t-1) + b2 * r_E(\Theta, t-1) + b1 * ((1 - \text{sgn}(b2)) / 2 - \gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Act}(t-1)) \quad (9)$$

$\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Act}$  is a variable in the range [0,1] that integrates over time the synaptic activity between pyramidal cell  $\Theta$  and Martinotti cell  $j$ . The activation state of the synapses is then turned into the efficacy value  $\gamma_{\Theta, j}^{Eff}$  through a sigmoid transfer function. The two activation parameters control the direction (b2) and the persistence (b1) of the modulation. If  $b2 > 0$  then synapses are facilitating, otherwise, when  $b2 < 0$ , the equations represent synaptic depression. For increasing b1, synapses come back faster to their initial state.

The experimentally observed spike-timing dependence of recurrent inhibition is implemented as the dynamic regulation of the effectiveness of feedback inhibition from a Martinotti unit to a pyramidal unit: Feedback inhibitory strength decreases as the contribution of a given pyramidal cell to Martinotti cell firing increases. The reciprocal feedback inhibition for each pair was re-computed at every time-step according to:

$$W_{j, \Theta}^{IN} \rightarrow (1 - R_{\Theta, j}) W_{j, \Theta}^{IN} \quad (10)$$

$$R_{\Theta, j} = \frac{w_{\Theta, j}^{OUT} r_E(\Theta, t)}{\sum_j w_{\Theta, j}^{OUT} r_E(\Theta, t)} \quad (11)$$

Therefore, each pyramidal cell would see a modification of the inhibitory connection strength depending on its contribution to the activity of the corresponding Martinotti cell. In the case of a single pyramidal cell driving a Martinotti cell, its feedback inhibition would be zero.

*External Input.* Each pyramidal unit in the network received an independent, time-dependent, activation current  $h(\Theta, t)$  from an external source. Since all the internal effective interactions between pyramidal units were inhibitory, this external source of excitation was necessary for activity in the network. In our simulations, each unit was fed with a random input, uncorrelated across units, but correlated in time:

$$\tau_N \dot{h}(\Theta, t) = -h(\Theta, t) + \eta(\mu, \sigma) \quad (12)$$

where  $\eta$  was a normal distributed random variable with mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$ . This random background input could be combined with an additional direction selective component, restricted to a sub-set of the units, centered around a given direction  $\varphi$ ,

$$h(\Theta, t) = \beta \exp(-(\Theta - \varphi)^2 / 2\kappa^2) \quad (13)$$

where  $\beta$  controlled the strength of this component (with respect to the background one) and  $\kappa$  regulated the degree of selectivity around the central selected direction  $\varphi$  (cf. Supplementary Table 4 for network parameters values).

*Activity Bump Coherence.* The degree of concentration of the pyramidal cell activity was measured as

$$\Omega = \frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{N_{pyr}} e^{i\Theta_k} r_E(\Theta_k) \right|}{\sum_{k=1}^{N_{pyr}} r_E(\Theta_k)} \quad (14)$$

*Simulations.* Simulations consisted in integrating the network dynamics during 200 time steps of 1-ms. When only white noise was fed into the system, the simulation consisted in reproducing network dynamics starting from a random activity configuration. When studying the effect of directionally selective external inputs, the network received random and selective external inputs to the pyramidal cell layer for the first 60 time steps with the latter then gradually fading away between time steps 60 and 80. This procedure was repeated with the directional input sequentially centered over each of the cells preferred directions.

All simulations were performed using MATLAB custom code, available from the authors.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental information includes three Tables and five Supplementary Figures and can be found below.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Région Ile-de-France and Fondation pour la recherche Médicale (J.S.) and by ANR Grant JCJC R10206DD (D.F.). The research leading to these results also benefitted from the program “Investissements d’avenir” ANR-10-IAIHU-06 and we gratefully acknowledge financial support from the ERC (322721, RM). We thank Karl Deisseroth for making available AAV-hSyn-hChR2(H134R)-EYFP. We thank Dominique Debanne for discussions, and Matthew Nolan and Bruno Delord for comments on the manuscript. *In vivo* spike train data were collected in the lab of Edvard and May-Britt Moser (Trondheim, Norway).

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

J.S. and D.F. conceived and designed research, interpreted the data and supervised the experiments. All *in vitro* recordings were carried out and analyzed by J.S., with the help of M.N. for recordings with optical stimulations and experiments on parvalbumin interneurons. B.M., M.N. and J.S. performed stereotaxic viral injections. I.C. provided tools for analysis. F.S. implemented the model and run the simulations. C.B. performed *in vivo* recordings and co-coordinated the study. J.S., F.S., C.B., R.M. and D.F. wrote the paper.

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Correspondence to: Jean Simonnet ([jean.simonnet@bccn-berlin.de](mailto:jean.simonnet@bccn-berlin.de)) or Desdemona Fricker ([desdemona.fricker@parisdescartes.fr](mailto:desdemona.fricker@parisdescartes.fr))

## REFERENCES

1. Taube, J. S. The head direction signal: origins and sensory-motor integration. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **30**, 181–207 (2007).
2. Van Strien, N. M., Cappaert, N. L. M. & Witter, M. P. The anatomy of memory: an interactive overview of the parahippocampal-hippocampal network. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **10**, 272–282 (2009).
3. Boccara, C. N. *et al.* Grid cells in pre- and parasubiculum. *Nat. Neurosci.* **13**, 987–994 (2010).
4. Taube, J. S., Muller, R. U. & Ranck, J. B. Head-direction cells recorded from the postsubiculum in freely moving rats. II. Effects of environmental manipulations. *J. Neurosci.* **10**, 436–447 (1990).
5. Yoder, R. M., Peck, J. R. & Taube, J. S. Visual Landmark Information Gains Control of the Head Direction Signal at the Lateral Mammillary Nuclei. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 1354–1367 (2015).
6. Goodridge, J. P. & Taube, J. S. Interaction between the postsubiculum and anterior thalamus in the generation of head direction cell activity. *J. Neurosci.* **17**, 9315–9330 (1997).
7. van Groen, T. & Wyss, J. M. The postsubicular cortex in the rat: characterization of the fourth region of the subicular cortex and its connections. *Brain Res* **529**, 165–177 (1990).
8. Valerio, S. & Taube, J. S. Head Direction Cell Activity Is Absent in Mice without the Horizontal Semicircular Canals. *J. Neurosci.* **36**, 741–754 (2016).




9. Vogt, B. A. & Miller, M. W. Cortical connections between rat cingulate cortex and visual, motor, and postsubicular cortices. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **216**, 192–210 (1983).
10. Preston-Ferrer, P., Coletta, S., Frey, M. & Burgalossi, A. Anatomical organization of presubicular head-direction circuits. *eLife* **5**, (2016).
11. Tukker, J. J., Tang, Q., Burgalossi, A. & Brecht, M. Head-Directional Tuning and Theta Modulation of Anatomically Identified Neurons in the Presubiculum. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 15391–15395 (2015).
12. Wills, T. J., Cacucci, F., Burgess, N. & O'Keefe, J. Development of the hippocampal cognitive map in preweanling rats. *Science* **328**, 1573–1576 (2010).
13. Langston, R. F. *et al.* Development of the spatial representation system in the rat. *Science* **328**, 1576–1580 (2010).
14. McNaughton, B. L., Battaglia, F. P., Jensen, O., Moser, E. I. & Moser, M.-B. Path integration and the neural basis of the 'cognitive map'. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **7**, 663–678 (2006).
15. Simonnet, J., Eugène, E., Cohen, I., Miles, R. & Fricker, D. Cellular neuroanatomy of rat presubiculum. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **37**, 583–597 (2013).
16. Nassar, M. *et al.* Diversity and overlap of parvalbumin and somatostatin expressing interneurons in mouse presubiculum. *Front. Neural Circuits* **9**, 1–19 (2015).
17. Yoshida, M. & Hasselmo, M. E. Persistent firing supported by an intrinsic cellular mechanism in a component of the head direction system. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 4945–4952 (2009).
18. Funahashi, M. & Stewart, M. Presubicular and parasubicular cortical neurons of the rat: functional separation of deep and superficial neurons in vitro. *J. Physiol.* **501** ( Pt 2), 387–403 (1997).
19. Isaacson, J. S. & Scanziani, M. How Inhibition Shapes Cortical Activity. *Neuron* **72**, 231–243 (2011).
20. Skaggs, W. E., Knierim, J. J., Kudrimoti, H. S. & McNaughton, B. L. A model of the neural basis of the rat's sense of direction. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process Syst.* **7**, 173–180 (1995).
21. Zhang, K. Representation of spatial orientation by the intrinsic dynamics of the head-direction cell ensemble: a theory. *J. Neurosci.* **16**, 2112–2126 (1996).
22. Song, P. & Wang, X.-J. Angular Path Integration by Moving 'Hill of Activity': A Spiking Neuron Model without Recurrent Excitation of the Head-Direction System. *J. Neurosci.* **25**, 1002–1014 (2005).
23. Goodridge, J. P. & Touretzky, D. S. Modeling attractor deformation in the rodent head-direction system. *J. Neurophysiol.* **83**, 3402–3410 (2000).
24. Berger, T. K., Perin, R., Silberberg, G. & Markram, H. Frequency-dependent disynaptic inhibition in the pyramidal network: a ubiquitous pathway in the developing rat neocortex. *J. Physiol.* **587**, 5411–5425 (2009).
25. Silberberg, G. & Markram, H. Disynaptic inhibition between neocortical pyramidal cells mediated by Martinotti cells. *Neuron* **53**, 735–746 (2007).
26. Zhu, J., Jiang, M., Yang, M., Hou, H. & Shu, Y. Membrane Potential-Dependent Modulation of Recurrent Inhibition in Rat Neocortex. *PLoS Biol* **9**, e1001032 (2011).
27. Murayama, M. *et al.* Dendritic encoding of sensory stimuli controlled by deep cortical interneurons. *Nature* **457**, 1137–1141 (2009).
28. Ma, Y., Hu, H., Berrebi, A. S., Mathers, P. H. & Agmon, A. Distinct subtypes of somatostatin-containing neocortical interneurons revealed in transgenic mice. *J. Neurosci.* **26**, 5069–5082 (2006).
29. Peyrache, A., Lacroix, M. M., Petersen, P. C. & Buzsáki, G. Internally organized mechanisms of the head direction sense. *Nat. Neurosci.* **18**, 569–575 (2015).
30. Abbott, L. F. & Regehr, W. G. Synaptic computation. *Nature* **431**, 796–803 (2004).
31. Regehr, W. G. Short-Term Presynaptic Plasticity. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology* **4**, a005702–a005702 (2012).
32. Knierim, J. J. & Zhang, K. Attractor Dynamics of Spatially Correlated Neural Activity in the Limbic System. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **35**, 267–285 (2012).
33. Redish, A. D., Elga, A. N. & Touretzky, D. S. A coupled attractor model of the rodent head direction system. *Netw. Comp. Neural Syst.* (1996).
34. Rowland, D. C. *et al.* Transgenically Targeted Rabies Virus Demonstrates a Major

- Monosynaptic Projection from Hippocampal Area CA2 to Medial Entorhinal Layer II Neurons. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 14889–14898 (2013).
35. Winter, S. S., Clark, B. J. & Taube, J. S. Spatial navigation. Disruption of the head direction cell network impairs the parahippocampal grid cell signal. *Science* **347**, 870–874 (2015).
36. Fino, E. & Yuste, R. Dense inhibitory connectivity in neocortex. *Neuron* **69**, 1188–1203 (2011).
37. Kapfer, C., Glickfeld, L. L., Atallah, B. V. & Scanziani, M. Supralinear increase of recurrent inhibition during sparse activity in the somatosensory cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **10**, 743–753 (2007).
38. Couey, J. J. *et al.* Recurrent inhibitory circuitry as a mechanism for grid formation. *Nat. Neurosci.* **16**, 318–324 (2013).
39. Pastoll, H., Solanka, L., van Rossum, M. C. W. & Nolan, M. F. Feedback inhibition enables  $\theta$ -nested  $\gamma$  oscillations and grid firing fields. *Neuron* **77**, 141–154 (2013).
40. Ali, A. B., Deuchars, J., Pawelzik, H. & Thomson, A. M. CA1 pyramidal to basket and bistratified cell EPSPs: dual intracellular recordings in rat hippocampal slices. *J. Physiol.* **507** ( Pt 1), 201–217 (1998).
41. Ali, A. B. & Thomson, A. M. Facilitating pyramid to horizontal oriens-alveus interneurone inputs: dual intracellular recordings in slices of rat hippocampus. *J. Physiol.* **507** ( Pt 1), 185–199 (1998).
42. Beierlein, M., Gibson, J. R. & Connors, B. W. Two dynamically distinct inhibitory networks in layer 4 of the neocortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* **90**, 2987–3000 (2003).
43. Fanselow, E. E., Richardson, K. A. & Connors, B. W. Selective, State-Dependent Activation of Somatostatin-Expressing Inhibitory Interneurons in Mouse Neocortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* **100**, 2640–2652 (2008).
44. Gupta, A., Wang, Y. & Markram, H. Organizing principles for a diversity of GABAergic interneurons and synapses in the neocortex. *Science* **287**, 273–278 (2000).
45. Jackman, S. L., Turecek, J., Belinsky, J. E. & Regehr, W. G. The calcium sensor synaptotagmin 7 is required for synaptic facilitation. *Nature* **529**, 88–91 (2016).
46. Buchanan, K. A. *et al.* Target-specific expression of presynaptic NMDA receptors in neocortical microcircuits. *Neuron* **75**, 451–466 (2012).
47. Debanne, D., Bialowas, A. & Rama, S. What are the mechanisms for analogue and digital signalling in the brain? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 63–69 (2013).
48. Rama, S. *et al.* Presynaptic hyperpolarization induces a fast analogue modulation of spike-evoked transmission mediated by axonal sodium channels. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 10163 (2015).
49. Branco, T. & Staras, K. The probability of neurotransmitter release: variability and feedback control at single synapses. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **10**, 373–383 (2009).
50. Mongillo, G., Barak, O. & Tsodyks, M. Synaptic theory of working memory. *Science* (2008). doi:10.1126/science.1151153
51. Beed, P. *et al.* Inhibitory gradient along the dorsoventral axis in the medial entorhinal cortex. *Neuron* **79**, 1197–1207 (2013).
52. Cobb, S. R., Buhl, E. H., Halasy, K., Paulsen, O. & Somogyi, P. Synchronization of neuronal activity in hippocampus by individual GABAergic interneurons. *Nature* **378**, 75–78 (1995).
53. Mann, E. O. & Paulsen, O. Role of GABAergic inhibition in hippocampal network oscillations. *Trends Neurosci.* **30**, 343–349 (2007).
54. Reinhold, K., Lien, A. D. & Scanziani, M. Distinct recurrent versus afferent dynamics in cortical visual processing. *Nat. Neurosci.* **18**, 1789–1797 (2015).
55. Itskov, V., Hansel, D. & Tsodyks, M. Short-Term Facilitation may Stabilize Parametric Working Memory Trace. *Front. Comput. Neurosci.* **5**, 40 (2011).
56. Krishnamurthy, P., Silberberg, G. & Lansner, A. A cortical attractor network with Martinotti cells driven by facilitating synapses. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e30752 (2012).
57. Fung, C. C. A., Wong, K. Y. M., Wang, H. & Wu, S. Dynamical synapses enhance neural information processing: gracefulness, accuracy, and mobility. *Neural Comput.* **24**, 1147–1185 (2012).
58. Roudi, Y. & Moser, E. I. Grid cells in an inhibitory network. *Nat. Neurosci.* **17**, 639–641 (2014).

59. Taniguchi, H. *et al.* A Resource of Cre Driver Lines for Genetic Targeting of GABAergic Neurons in Cerebral Cortex. *Neuron* **71**, 995–1013 (2011).
60. Madisen, L. *et al.* A robust and high-throughput Cre reporting and characterization system for the whole mouse brain. *Nat. Neurosci.* **13**, 133–140 (2010).
61. Hippenmeyer, S. *et al.* A developmental switch in the response of DRG neurons to ETS transcription factor signaling. *PLoS Biol.* **3**, e159 (2005).
62. Mathon, B. *et al.* Increasing the effectiveness of intracerebral injections in adult and neonatal mice: a neurosurgical point of view. *Neurosci. Bull.* **31**, 685–696 (2015).
63. Stringer, S. M., Trappenberg, T. P., Rolls, E. T. & de Araujo, I. E. T. Self-organizing continuous attractor networks and path integration: one-dimensional models of head direction cells. *Network* **13**, 217–242 (2002).
64. Boucheny, C., Brunel, N. & Arleo, A. A continuous attractor network model without recurrent excitation: maintenance and integration in the head direction cell system. *J. Comput. Neurosci.* **18**, 205–227 (2005).

## FIGURES



**Figure 1. Morphology and electrophysiological intrinsic properties of Martinotti interneurons and pyramidal cells in superficial layers of presubiculum**


(a) Anatomical reconstruction of reciprocally connected PC and MC in layer 3. PC dendrites (blue) and MC axon (red) covered layer 1 and 3, PC axon (yellow) and MC dendrites (green) mainly occupied layer 3 (inset). Subiculum is to the left and the parasubiculum to the right.

(b) Current clamp recordings of a MC (green) and a PC (blue). The MC fired spontaneously, the PC, with a more hyperpolarized membrane potential, was silent.

(c) Membrane potential values for 80 MCs (circles, X98-SST, green; SstCre, orange) and 87 PCs (triangles, X98-SST, blue; SstCre, purple). The horizontal bar indicates the mean value.

(d) Typical responses of a MC and a PC to negative and positive current step injections of duration 800 ms from -65 mV.

(e) Plotting input-output (I-O) gain against threshold current separates PCs (triangles) from MCs (circles; same color code as in (c)).



**Figure 2. Pyramidal cells, but not Martinotti cells, are directly innervated by the anterior thalamus.**

**(a)** Channelrhodopsin2-eYFP expression in Anterior Thalamus (AT) of SstCre::tdTomato mice fifteen days after stereotaxic injections of an AAV vector. Injection site in AT and projecting thalamic axons in the ipsilateral presubiculum (horizontal brain section, 20° angle; dorso-ventral depth 2.5 - 3).


**(b)** Enlarged view of the parahippocampal cortex. Thalamic axons specifically target the superficial layers of presubiculum. DG: dentate gyrus; S: subiculum; PrS: presubiculum; PaS: parasubiculum; EC: entorhinal cortex;

**(c)** Presubicular responses to illumination (470 nm LED, 0.5 ms, 2 mW) of ChR2-expressing thalamic fibers, in simultaneous records from a PC and MC. Top, action potentials were evoked in three trials following a blue light flash in the PC but not in the MC. Below, light evoked EPSCs from three trials, and average responses (40 trials) in red.

**(d)** In TTX-4AP containing ACSF, EPSCs were still elicited in PCs, indicating that thalamic axons made direct synaptic contacts onto PCs. Responses were mostly abolished in MCs, suggesting indirect, di-synaptic excitation of MCs.

**(e)** Onset latencies of PC EPSCs are significantly shorter than for MC EPSCs. \*\* Mann-Whitney test,  $P < 0.01$ .

**(f-g)** Absolute charge transfer over 25 ms after the light stimulus in **(f)** standard and **(g)** TTX-4AP containing ACSF is significantly higher in PCs than MCs. \*\*\* and \*\* Dunn's multiple comparison test  $P < 0.001$  and  $P < 0.01$ , performed after a significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) Kruskal-Wallis test comparing responses in PC and MC from standard and TTX-4AP conditions. Horizontal bars indicate median values. Data from  $n = 14$  PC (blue triangles) and 9 MCs (green circle) from 5 mice.



### Figure 3. Pyramidal and Martinotti cells form an inhibitory feedback loop.

**(a)** Connectivity between PC and MCs, determined from dual patch clamp recordings in 55 X98-SST mice, showing the percentage of connected pairs (%) and the number of tested paired records (n). Very few PC-PC connections were detected.


**(b)** Single spikes of MCs (green) reliably evoked small IPSPs in a PC (blue). Action potentials were initiated by brief current injections (1-2.5 nA for 1-2.5 ms; (b) and (d)). Average current traces in red, stimulation artifacts on the MC voltage trace blanked.

**(c)** Transfer rate (n = 11), IPSC amplitude (n = 45 pairs) and IPSP absolute amplitude (n = 21 pairs) from responses to single spikes at MC-to-PC synapses. Red horizontal bars are median values. Transfer rates from automatically detected synaptic events, recorded with a Cs-Glu based internal solution. Amplitudes from averages of responses recorded using a low-Cl K-Glu internal solution (cf. methods).

**(d)** Single spikes of PCs (blue) did not reliably evoke EPSPs in a MC (green). The mean EPSP amplitude (red) was very low.


**(e)** Transfer rate (n = 44), EPSC absolute amplitude (n = 38) and EPSP amplitude (n = 8) from responses to single spikes at a PC-to-MC synapse. Red horizontal bars give median values. Transfer rate and potency from automatically detected synaptic events, recorded with a low-Cl K-Glu internal solution (methods). Efficacy was calculated as transfer rate x potency and





## Figure 4. Stable inhibitory control by Martinotti cells

- (a)** 30 action potentials elicited at 10 or 30 Hz in a MC (green traces). Voltage clamp traces from a connected PC (blue traces) recorded at +40 mV, with a Cs-Glu internal solution. Three successive trials in blue, average of 8 trials in red. The inter-trial-interval here was 40 sec. Below, raster plots of synaptic transfer for 8 successive trials, showing presynaptic action potentials (green bar) and IPSCs (red dots) triggered at monosynaptic latencies (0 - 3 ms). Transmission failed only infrequently (cf. Supplementary Table 2).
- (b)** Detail of early and late MC-spikes and IPSCs in 30 Hz trains. Stimulus artifacts blanked.
- (c)** Poststimulus-histograms of IPSCs at monosynaptic latencies in the range 0 – 3 ms show peaks at 1.63 for trains at 10 Hz and 1.67 ms for trains at 30 Hz.
- (d)** MC-to-PC synaptic efficacy (transfer rate x absolute potency) was unrelated to the spike position in a train or to firing frequency ( $n = 8$ , Friedman test,  $P = 0.5222$ ).
- (e)** Late/early transfer rate and potency plotted against late/early efficacy ( $n = 8$  pairs, 30 Hz stimulation). These synapses are highly reliable with a low dynamic range (0.8 – 1.4). Slope of linear regressions show a small variation in synaptic efficacy is related to change in potency, rather than transfer rate.
- (f)** The cumulative efficacy (mean  $\pm$  sem, summed efficacy over time) of MC-to-PC synapses reveals stable dynamics during long stimulus trains.
- (g)** The synaptic frequency for early and late spikes of 10 and 30 Hz trains, normalized to 10 Hz. The increase in synaptic frequency corresponds to the 3-fold increase in presynaptic spike frequency (red dashed line)



**Figure 5. Repetitive stimulation progressively unmutes PC – MC excitatory synapses.**

(a) 30 action potentials elicited at 10 Hz and at 30 Hz in a PC (blue traces). Voltage clamp traces from a connected MC at -65 mV. Three successive trials in green, average of 8 trials in red. The inter-trial-interval here was 40 sec. Below, raster plots of synaptic transfer for 8 trains show presynaptic action potentials (blue bars), and EPSCs (red dots) triggered at monosynaptic latencies (0-3 ms). More EPSCs were elicited during the 30 Hz than the 10 Hz train and by late (last five) compared to early spikes (first five).

(b) Detail of early and late PC-spikes and MC-responses in 30 Hz trains. The transmission transfer rate was higher for late stimuli.


(c) Poststimulus-histogram of EPSCs at monosynaptic latencies, of 0–3 ms, show peaks at 1.16 and 1.14 ms (median) for trains at 10 and 30 Hz. Total counts were higher for 30 than 10 Hz, due to the frequency dependence of release.

(d) PC-MC synaptic efficacy (transfer rate x absolute potency) showed a strong dependence on spike number during a train and spike frequency ( $n = 9$ , Friedman test,  $P=0.0002$ ). Facilitation occurred at 30 Hz but not at 10 Hz (\* Dunn's Multiple comparison test,  $P < 0.05$ ).

(e) Late/early transfer rate and potency plotted against late/early efficacy ( $n = 15$  pairs, 30 Hz stimulation). Increased efficacy resulted from a higher transfer rate rather than changes in potency.

(f) Non-linear cumulative efficacy (mean  $\pm$  sem, summed efficacy over time) plotted against time shows facilitation dynamics and frequency dependence.

(g) The synaptic frequency increased more than the 3-fold change in presynaptic spike frequency, for both early and late spikes, during 10 and 30 Hz trains (red dashed line). Stimulus artifacts blanked in (a-b).




**Figure 6. Enhancement of PC-to-MC synaptic transmission outlasts train of high frequency stimulation.**

(a) Synaptic efficacy and transfer rate were monitored (at 2 Hz) before and after unmuting induced by a 30 Hz presynaptic spike train of 2 seconds.

(b) Synaptic efficacy and (c) transfer rate for  $n = 7$  pairs normalized to the maximal level reached during unmuting and averaged. Decay of these parameters was fitted with a dual exponential function (blue line):


$$\text{Decay} = \text{UM} - \text{Span}_{\text{FAST}} \cdot \exp(-t/\text{Tau}_{\text{FAST}}) + \text{Span}_{\text{SLOW}} \cdot \exp(-t/\text{Tau}_{\text{SLOW}})$$

$\text{Span}_{\text{FAST}}$  and  $\text{Span}_{\text{SLOW}}$  indicate the relative contributions of  $\text{Tau}_{\text{FAST}}$  and  $\text{Tau}_{\text{SLOW}}$ . Baseline was constrained to the mean value for the spikes preceding unmuting (broken line).




**Figure 7. PC-to-MC synaptic unmuting and Martinotti cell recruitment by head direction spike trains.**

- (a) Polar plot showing firing frequency (spike/sec) as a function of head direction (°) for a head direction cell recorded in vivo.
- (b) Detected spikes for this unit plotted against instantaneous head direction and frequency.
- (c) The spike train was injected as a current command into a presubicular pyramidal cell in vitro.
- (d) The shaded part of the trace in (c) extended (total trace time 1.4 sec).
- (e) Three successive responses recorded from a connected MC in voltage clamp at -65 mV (green traces) show unmuting and facilitation.
- (f) Synaptic strength for EPSCs from 5 pairs. Transfer was null at first and increased progressively after sustained high frequency firing. Transfer rate remained high during subsequent lower frequency firing (at right).
- (g) Current clamp recording of MC cell in (e) at resting potential. Four successive traces show reliable firing towards the end of high-frequency head direction derived spiking.
- (h) MC firing probability (200 ms bins) was maximal after persistent high frequency PC firing (from 5 pairs). Error bars are S.E.M.



**Figure 8**

(a) MC recruitment by a PC in a reciprocally connected pair (top left). Magnification of a MC-spike evoked by PC firing at short latency (bottom). The MC-spike alters the PC-spike AHP ( $AHP_{TEST}$ ), the PC-spike peak ( $PK_{TEST}$ ) and the PC ISI ( $ISI_{TEST}$ ) according to the delay after the PC-spike  $PK_{INT}$ . Dotted lines indicate the extrapolated level for  $PK_{TEST}$  and for  $AHP_{TEST}$ . Right, MC firing triggered by PC spikes in  $n = 4$  PC-MC pairs. 84% of MC spikes have a delay of less than 8 ms after a PC spike (65 out of 77 spikes;  $n = 4$  pairs).




(b) Spike timing dependent MC-inhibition was tested in unidirectionally connected MC-to-PC pairs. Drifting single MC-spikes were triggered during sustained PC firing (30-50 Hz). Two sweeps of PC firing are shown (one in blue, one in red), with the corresponding MC spikes at the bottom. For the blue voltage trace, the PC-spike to MC-spike delay was short ("time locked"; delay < 10 ms, similar to reciprocal connections as in (a)). For the red voltage trace ("delayed"), the MC spike delay exceeded 10 ms.

(c-e) Differential effect of short latency vs long latency inhibitory modulation of AHP, peak and ISI of PC spikes (30-50 Hz;  $n = 7$ ).


(c) The PC AHP was more hyperpolarized for short latency, time-locked MC-spikes but not for delayed MC-spikes ( $n = 7$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ ). The modulation of the PC-spike AHP was calculated as  $(AHP_{TEST} - AHP_{INT}) - (AHP_{INT} - AHP_{REF})$ .

(d) The PC-spike peak after a MC-spike was higher for timed locked but not for delayed inhibition ( $n = 7$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ). Peak modulation was calculated as  $(PK_{TEST} - PK_{INT}) - (PK_{INT} - PK_{REF})$ .

(e) The PC ISI increased more for delayed than for time-locked inhibition ( $n = 7$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ). ISI change was calculated as  $100 \times (ISI_{TEST} / ISI_{INT}) - (ISI_{INT} / ISI_{REF})$ . Each dot indicates the mean for one pair. Horizontal bars are medians. The median-null difference was assessed with a Wilcoxon signed rank test ( $\dagger p < 0.05$ ) and the relative difference between short- and long-latency inhibition with a Wilcoxon match-pairs signed rank test (\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ). ISI, inter-spike interval; AHP, after-hyperpolarization; PK, peak.



Timed locked vs Delayed inhibition,  $n = 7$  pairs.



**Figure 9. Structure and activity patterns of the neural network model.**

**(a)** (a) Schematic representation of the network wiring process. Left: Initial random connectivity between each Martinotti cell (green circle) and the pyramidal cell population (blue triangles). Middle panels: Establishment of final connectivity by selecting and strengthening the main connections (for simplicity only 1 Main Connection is shown; inhibitory strength  $\lambda = 0$ ). Connections with neighboring units are removed (pink area), reciprocal excitatory connections are added (blue). Right: resulting inhibitory effect of each pyramidal cell on the rest of the population. Phase selective suppression of activity is mediated by collective Martinotti cell activity.

**(b-e)** The dynamic properties at the excitatory PC-to-MC synapses are governed by two parameters,  $b_1$ , controlling the persistence of synaptic modulation, and  $b_2$ , controlling the strength and direction of the modulation (cf. Methods and Figure S5). To examine the importance of facilitating synapse dynamics,  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  are chosen to model either facilitating ((b-c),  $b_1 = 0.00025$ ;  $b_2 = 0.5$ ) or depressing excitatory synapse dynamics ((d-e),  $b_1 = 0.04$ ;  $b_2 = -0.5$ ).

**(b)** Spontaneous activity profile formation in pyramidal cells. In blue, example of raw activity over time of the pyramidal cell population (arranged according to directional selectivity) in the absence of selective external input. Fed with white noise input, the system evolves over time from an initial random configuration (left) towards a stable configuration of concentrated activity ("bump" formation, right). In green, same as above, but for simultaneous activity of Martinotti cells (positions on the circle are randomly assigned).

**(c)** Persistence of directional tuning after external input removal. Starting from random activity (left), pyramidal cells around a given direction are transiently provided with an additional external input (red arrows). The final state of the network is then observed after removing this additional input (grey background). No directional selectivity appears in Martinotti cells.

**(d)** Replacing facilitating by depressing dynamics at excitatory synapses impairs the spontaneous development of a coherent activity bump in the network.

**(e)** Depressing excitatory synapse dynamics do not support the persistence of directional activity correlated to an initial external input.