Electrical Coupling between Olfactory Glomeruli

Emre Yaksi[1] and Rachel I. Wilson[1,*]
[1]Department of Neurobiology, Harvard Medical School, 220 Longwood Avenue, Boston MA, 02115, USA
*Correspondence: rachel_wilson@hms.harvard.edu
DOI 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.08.041

SUMMARY

In the *Drosophila* antennal lobe, excitation can spread between glomerular processing channels. In this study, we investigated the mechanism of lateral excitation. Dual recordings from excitatory local neurons (eLNs) and projection neurons (PNs) showed that eLN-to-PN synapses transmit both hyperpolarization and depolarization, are not diminished by blocking chemical neurotransmission, and are abolished by a gap-junction mutation. This mutation eliminates odor-evoked lateral excitation in PNs and diminishes some PN odor responses. This implies that lateral excitation is mediated by electrical synapses from eLNs onto PNs. In addition, eLNs form synapses onto inhibitory LNs. Eliminating these synapses boosts some PN odor responses and reduces the disinhibitory effect of GABA receptor antagonists on PNs. Thus, eLNs have two opposing effects on PNs, driving both direct excitation and indirect inhibition. We propose that when stimuli are weak, lateral excitation promotes sensitivity, whereas when stimuli are strong, lateral excitation helps recruit inhibitory gain control.

INTRODUCTION

Sensory neurons are generally selective for particular stimulus features. Neurons at the same level of sensory processing that are tuned to different features can be thought of as representing different "processing channels." One of the aims of sensory neuroscience is to understand the mechanisms and functions of crosstalk between such channels.

The notion of a sensory channel is particularly well-defined in early olfactory processing. This is because each glomerulus in the olfactory bulb or antennal lobe defines both an anatomical module and a discrete feedforward circuit. Each olfactory receptor neuron (ORN) is presynaptic to a single glomerulus, and each second-order neuron is postsynaptic to a single glomerulus (Bargmann, 2006). Functional connections between processing channels were until recently thought to be mainly inhibitory, with little or no spread of excitation between principal neurons in different glomeruli (Lledo et al., 2005; Schoppa and Urban, 2003; but see Laurent et al., 2001). Recently, however, several studies in the *Drosophila* antennal lobe demonstrated the existence of excitatory connections between second-order neurons

in different glomeruli (Olsen et al., 2007; Root et al., 2007; Shang et al., 2007). These studies found that when the ORN inputs to a second-order neuron were silenced, that neuron still received indirect odor-evoked excitation from other glomeruli (which we define here as "lateral excitation"). These studies proposed that lateral excitation was mediated by local neurons (LNs) that extend dendrites into many glomeruli and form dendrodendritic synapses with second-order neurons (termed projection neurons, or PNs).

Both the mechanism and the function of lateral excitation are uncertain. It has been suggested that its function might be to boost responses to weak stimuli (Olsen et al., 2007; Shang et al., 2007), but this could not be directly tested because there was no known way to abolish lateral excitation. It was also proposed that lateral excitation is mediated by the release of acetylcholine from LNs (Shang et al., 2007). However, this could not be directly tested because cholinergic antagonists block the transmission of all olfactory signals to the brain; this is due to the fact that ORNs are themselves cholinergic (Kazama and Wilson, 2008). Moreover, lateral excitation is recruited very rapidly after ORN signals reach the brain, with a delay almost too short for a disynaptic connection (1.5 ms; Kazama and Wilson, 2008). This rapid recruitment of lateral excitation suggests that the underlying mechanism might be unusual.

In this study, we had two broad aims. Our first aim was to determine the synaptic mechanisms responsible for the spread of excitation between glomeruli. Our second aim was to discover how eliminating these mechanisms alters the output of the antennal lobe in response to olfactory stimuli.

RESULTS

Optogenetic Stimulation of LNs Produces Mixed Excitation-Inhibition in PNs

When direct ORN input to a PN is silenced, olfactory stimuli can still elicit an excitatory response (Olsen et al., 2007; Root et al., 2007; Shang et al., 2007). This is thought to reflect the action of excitatory LNs (eLNs). However, it has not been directly demonstrated that any LNs actually have excitatory effects on other neurons. Several studies have noted the existence of GABA-immunonegative LNs (Chou et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2007; Wilson and Laurent, 2005), which are potential candidates for excitatory LNs. Among the Gal4 lines that reportedly drive expression in LNs, none is specific to GABA-negative LNs, but about half of the LNs labeled by *krasavietz-Gal4* are GABA negative (58%–61%; Chou et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2007), making it a useful starting point. Shang et al. (2007) reported that GABA-negative *krasavietz* LNs are immunopositive for choline

acetyltransferase (Cha), although a later study reported that not all are Cha-positive (Chou et al., 2010), casting some doubt on their function.

We therefore began by asking whether *krasavietz* LNs can excite PNs. We used *krasavietz-Gal4* to drive expression of both a GFP reporter and a light-activated cation channel (channelrhodopsin-2 or ChR2; Boyden et al., 2005). Targeted whole-cell in vivo recordings from GFP-labeled LNs confirmed that blue light depolarized these neurons and elicited a train of spikes (Figures 1A and 1B).

We then made whole-cell in vivo recordings from PNs in these flies. Optogenetic stimulation of *krasavietz* LNs evoked both excitation and inhibition in PNs (Figures 1C and 1D). If the PN response were due to the combined action of cholinergic and GABAergic LNs, it should be completely blocked by Cd^{2+}, a broad-spectrum antagonist of voltage-dependent calcium channels and thus a blocker of chemical synaptic transmission. However, in the presence of Cd^{2+}, the excitatory component was actually increased, and only the inhibitory component was abolished (Figure 1D). Subtraction of the traces recorded before and after adding the drug revealed that the Cd^{2+}-sensitive component is hyperpolarizing and slow, whereas the Cd^{2+}-insensitive component is depolarizing and fast (Figure 1E). As a negative control, we also recorded from PNs in flies that lacked the *krasavietz-Gal4* driver. Light evoked almost no response, confirming that most of the PN response in flies harboring the *krasavietz-Gal4* driver was due to ChR2-mediated currents in Gal4-expressing cells (data not shown). Taken together, these results imply that the *krasavietz* population includes eLNs, but eLNs do not excite PNs through chemical synapses.

Identifying eLNs

As a next step, we aimed to locate the GABA-negative LNs within the *krasavietz* population. We labeled *krasavietz* LNs with CD8:GFP and performed dual immunofluorescence confocal microscopy with anti-GABA and anti-CD8 antibodies. We observed that GABA-negative *krasavietz* LN somata were located just ventrolateral to the antennal lobe neuropil (Figure 2A). By comparison, most of the GABA-positive somata were dorsolateral to the antennal lobe, with fewer located ventrally. This suggested that we could preferentially study eLNs by targeting the ventral region.

To test this idea, we performed dual whole-cell recordings from PNs and *krasavietz* LNs. We injected depolarizing current into each recorded LN to produce a depolarization and a train of spikes (Figures 2B and 2C). This could evoke either depolarization (Figure 2B) or hyperpolarization (Figure 2C) in the simultaneously recorded PN. In some cases, there was no PN response. Consistent with the immunostaining results, we only observed depolarization in the PN when we were recording from an LN located in the ventral region. When we observed hyperpolarization in the PN, it was generally when we were recording from an LN located dorsally. In total, we performed 74 dual recordings from PNs and *krasavietz* LNs, of which 37 showed an excitatory LN-PN connection, 17 showed an inhibitory LN-PN connection, and the remainder showed no connection.

In these experiments, we also noticed that the LNs that depolarized PNs had distinctive electrophysiological properties.


Figure 1. Optogenetic Stimulation of LNs Produces Mixed Excitation-Inhibition in PNs

(A) Activity in an LN that expresses channelrhodopsin is recorded with a whole-cell electrode at the soma in current-clamp mode. The genotype is *UAS-ChR2:YFP/+; krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP/UAS-ChR2:YFP*.

(B) Blue light depolarizes the LN and evokes a train of spikes.

(C) Recording from a PN while exciting LNs.

(D) Exciting LNs evokes mixed excitation-inhibition in PNs. Blocking chemical synaptic transmission with Cd^{2+} (100 μM) converts this to a purely excitatory response. Traces are averages across cells, ± SEM (n = 5).

(E) Subtracted traces show that Cd^{2+}-insensitive transmission consists of fast excitation, whereas Cd^{2+}-sensitive transmission consists of slow inhibition.

Specifically, these cells were always barraged by spontaneous inhibitory postsynaptic potentials (IPSPs; Figure 2D). In these cells we also typically saw small events resembling attenuated action potentials (~10mV amplitude; Figure 2D) in addition to full-sized spikes (~40mV amplitude). In our paired recordings, every LN that made an excitatory connection with the simultaneously recorded PN also had these distinctive electrophysiological properties. The converse was also true: every LN with these properties also made an excitatory connection with the PN, implying that each eLN is connected to most or all PNs. By contrast, we never saw these properties in LNs that hyperpolarized PNs (Figure 2E). In the experiments that follow, we use the presence of spontaneous IPSPs, together with soma location and GFP expression, as our diagnostic method of identifying eLNs.

Odor Responses of eLNs Can Account for the Properties of Lateral Excitation

If eLNs mediate lateral excitation, then they should be excited by odors. In addition, their odor selectivity should correlate with the selectivity of lateral excitation. In order to test these predictions, we made recordings from eLNs while presenting a chemically diverse panel of odors. We selected odors that would elicit

Figure 2. Identifying Excitatory LNs

(A) Projection of a confocal z stack through a portion of the antennal lobes. Dorsal is up. CD8:GFP (green) labels *krasavietz* LNs, and anti-GABA immunofluorescence (magenta) labels GABAergic neurons. LN dendrites fill each antennal lobe (dotted circle). Inset (square) shows that some ventrolateral LN somata are GABA negative. Other LN somata are located outside these sections. The genotype is *krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(B) Injecting depolarizing current into an LN with a ventrolateral soma evokes a train of spikes in that LN and a much smaller depolarization in a simultaneously recorded PN. PN response is an average of 50 traces.

(C) Injecting depolarizing current into a different LN (here with a dorsal soma) evokes hyperpolarization in a simultaneously recorded PN.

(D) Spontaneous activity in a *krasavietz* LN with a ventrolateral soma. IPSPs (arrowhead) and short spikes (arrow) are characteristic features of these LNs. This is the same LN as in (B).

(E) Spontaneous activity in a *krasavietz* LN with a dorsal soma. This is the same LN as in (C).

a broad range of total activity levels in the ORN population (Hallem and Carlson, 2006). We verified this by using local field potential recordings from the antenna, which provide a rough estimate of the total amount of ORN activity (Olsen et al., 2010). These recordings confirmed that this odor panel elicits a wide range of total ORN activity levels (Figures 3A and 3B).

Next, we recorded from eLNs to determine how they respond to odors. Interestingly, all the odors in our test panel elicited similar eLN responses, regardless of their chemical structure or the total amount of ORN activity they elicited (Figures 3C and 3D). Every eLN we recorded from was broadly tuned to odors and was sensitive to even weak ORN input. Finally, we asked how the responses of eLNs compare with the properties of lateral excitation. We removed the feedforward inputs to a subset of PNs by bilaterally removing the olfactory organ housing their cognate ORNs (either the antennae for PNs in an antennal glomerulus or the palps for PNs in a palp glomerulus). We labeled deafferented PNs with GFP and recorded specifically from these cells while stimulating ORN input to other glomeruli by using our panel of test odors. Again, we observed that all the odors in the panel elicited similar lateral excitation in these PNs (Figures 3E and 3F). Qualitatively similar results were observed for PNs in three different glomeruli (VC1, VC2, and DM1).

These results are consistent with the hypothesis that eLNs are the neural substrate of lateral excitation. The sensitivity and broad tuning of lateral excitation have been noted previously (Olsen et al., 2007; Shang et al., 2007). Our results imply that these properties reflect the odor response characteristics of eLNs themselves.

eLNs Make Electrical Synapses onto PNs

In contrast to a previous study that proposed that eLNs excite PNs by releasing acetylcholine (Shang et al., 2007), our optogenetic stimulation experiments suggest that eLNs do not excite PNs through chemical synapses. However, because this technique activates a mixed population of LNs, the interpretation of this result is complicated by coactivating excitatory and inhibitory inputs. We therefore turned to dual intracellular recordings to examine the properties of eLN-PN connections in a more selective manner. We found that depolarizing the eLN elicited a depolarization in the PN, whereas hyperpolarizing the eLN elicited a hyperpolarization in the PN (Figures 4A and 4B). Blocking chemical synaptic transmission with Cd^{2+} did not weaken the PN responses (Figures 4B and 4C). Similarly, two nicotinic acetylcholine receptor antagonists had no effect, although a third antagonist had weak effects in some experiments (Figure S1, available online). It is difficult to determine whether there is a small chemical component to these synapses and, if so, whether this represents spillover or conventional synaptic transmission (see Discussion). What is clear is that eLNs are electrically coupled to PNs, and this represents the main mechanism by which eLNs depolarize PNs.

Two points are worth noting about the values of the coupling coefficients that we measured in these experiments (Figure 4C). First, although these coefficients are small, they almost certainly underestimate the strength of the connection at the synapse. This is because both electrodes are located at the soma, and the soma can be electronically distant from synaptic sites

Figure 3. Comparing ORN Activity, eLN Activity, and Lateral Excitation in PNs

(A) An electrode in the antenna records the extracellular local field potential, a measure of total ORN activity.

(B) Antennal local field potential responses to a panel of odors that activate the ORN population to various degrees. A downward field potential deflection indicates increased ORN activity. Traces are averages of eight recordings ± SEM across recordings. Genotypes are the same as those used for (D) and (F) (four *krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP* and four *NP5221-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*).

(C) Activity in eLNs is recorded in whole-cell current-clamp mode.

(D) All test odors elicit depolarization in eLNs. Traces are low-pass filtered to remove spikes, averaged across eight cells, ± SEM across cells. All eLNs we recorded were disproportionately sensitive to the weaker odors and were broadly tuned. All these stimuli elicited similar spike rates as well as similar levels of depolarization. The genotype is *krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(E) Lateral excitation in PNs is recorded in whole-cell current-clamp mode. Direct ORN input to these PNs is abolished by bilaterally removing the olfactory organ (antenna or palps) containing the ORNs presynaptic to these PNs; the other organ is left intact and is stimulated with odors.

(F) Lateral excitation evoked by the same odor panel. Traces are low-pass filtered to remove spikes, averaged across 12 cells, ± SEM across cells. Data from three glomeruli are pooled (VC1, VC2, and DM1). Note the sensitivity and broad tuning of lateral excitation. The genotype is *NP5221-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(Gouwens and Wilson, 2009). Thus, voltages will decay substantially while traveling from the presynaptic electrode to the synaptic site and from the synaptic site to the postsynaptic electrode. Second, depolarizing signals were transmitted more effectively across this electrical connection than were hyperpolarizing signals (Figures 4B and 4C). This could reflect better propagation of depolarizing voltages to the site of the gap junction and/or electrical rectification at the junction (Phelan et al., 2008).

Genetic Elimination of Synapses from eLNs onto PNs

We next asked whether we could genetically disrupt the connections from eLNs onto PNs. The *Drosophila* genome contains multiple genes coding for gap-junction subunits (Phelan et al., 1998). Among these, *shaking-B* (*shakB*) is a good candidate. The *shakB* locus produces alternative transcripts, a set of which (*shakB.neural*) are expressed in the adult central nervous system (Sun and Wyman, 1996; Zhang et al., 1999). The *shakB*[2] allele produces a complete elimination of *shakB.neural* proteins. This mutation disrupts electrical connections in the optic lobe and in the giant fiber escape pathway (Curtin et al., 2002; Phelan et al., 1996; Sun and Wyman, 1996; Thomas and Wyman, 1984), and it produces defects in visual escape behaviors and increased seizure susceptibility (Kuebler and Tanouye, 2000; Thomas and Wyman, 1984).

We began by asking whether *shakB* is expressed by antennal lobe neurons. We used patch electrodes to collect the somata of individual GFP-labeled PNs, pooled these samples, and performed RT-PCR with nested primers designed to detect *shakB* transcripts. We detected a clear band at the predicted size (Figure S2), meaning that this gap-junction subunit is probably expressed in antennal lobe PNs.

We then tested whether the *shakB*[2] mutation eliminates electrical synapses from eLNs onto PNs. Dual recordings showed that connections from eLNs onto PNs were completely abolished in mutant flies (Figures 4B and 4C). These results are consistent with the idea that eLN-to-PN synapses are electrical connections.

eLNs Receive Cholinergic Excitation from PNs

Dual recordings also gave us the opportunity to examine synaptic transmission in the reverse direction, from PNs onto eLNs (Figure 4D). In every pair we recorded, stimulating the PN depolarized the eLN (Figure 4E). This implies that each eLN receives excitation from most or all PNs. PN-to-eLN synapses transmitted both depolarizing and hyperpolarizing signals (Figures 4E and 4F). Cd^{2+} had no effect on transmission of hyperpolarizing steps but did significantly reduce transmission of depolarizing steps (Figures 4E and 4F). Nicotinic antagonists had similar

Figure 4. Connections between eLNs and PNs

(A) Stimulating an eLN while recording a response in a PN. (Antenna are removed.) The genotype is *krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(B) In a typical control pair, hyperpolarizing and depolarizing the eLN (top) produces hyperpolarization and depolarization in the PN (bottom). Adding Cd^{2+} does not weaken the response, and indeed the response is slightly increased, probably because Cd^{2+} blocks spontaneous IPSPs and so increases eLN excitability. (Blue and black traces are from the same pair.) In a typical pair from a *shakB[2]* mutant (magenta), PN responses are abolished. Top traces are single trials; bottom traces are averages of 40–70 trials.

(C) Group data showing mean coupling coefficients (±SEM). The coupling coefficient is the change in the membrane potential of the postsynaptic cell, divided by the change in the presynaptic cell. Coupling is not significantly affected by Cd^{2+} (n = 6 pairs tested with Cd^{2+}, paired t tests) but is significantly decreased in the mutant (n = 37 control pairs and 19 *shakB[2]* pairs, p < 0.0001, Mann-Whitney U tests).

(D) Stimulating a PN while recording the response in an eLN.

(E) Hyperpolarizing and depolarizing a PN (top) produces hyperpolarization and depolarization in an eLN (bottom). Cd^{2+} weakens the response to depolarization but not hyperpolarization. (Blue and black traces are from the same pair.) In a typical pair from a *shakB[2]* mutant, the response to hyperpolarization is absent, but the response to depolarization remains.

(F) Group data showing that Cd^{2+} significantly reduces the response to depolarization (n = 6 pairs tested with Cd^{2+}, p < 0.05, paired t test) but not hyperpolarization. The mutation eliminates the response to hyperpolarization (n = 39 control pairs and 19 *shakB[2]* pairs, p < 0.0001, Mann-Whitney U tests) but not depolarization.

effects (Figure S1). These results imply that PN-to-eLN synapses are mixed chemical-electrical synapses. Consistent with this conclusion, we found that the *shakB[2]* mutation abolishes the transmission of hyperpolarizing steps but not depolarizing steps (Figures 4E and 4F). Together, these results show that PNs release acetylcholine onto eLNs, in addition to coupling electrically to eLNs.

eLNs Make Mixed Synapses onto iLNs

Our results suggest that eLNs do not release acetylcholine onto PNs. However, some GABA-negative *krasavietz* LNs are Cha positive (Chou et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2007), implying that these cells do synthesize acetylcholine. This raises the question of whether eLNs release acetylcholine onto cells other than PNs. In particular, we wondered whether eLNs might make cholinergic synapses onto inhibitory LNs (iLNs).

To investigate this, we performed dual recordings between eLNs and iLNs (Figure 5A). In many of these pairs, depolarizing the eLN produced a depolarizing response in the iLN (Figure 5B). This was substantially reduced by Cd^{2+} (Figures 5B and 5C) and by a nicotinic antagonist (Figure S1). This implies that eLN-to-iLN synapses are largely cholinergic, whereas eLN-to-PN synapses

Figure 5. Connections between eLNs and iLNs

(A) Stimulating an eLN while recording a response in an iLN. (Antenna are removed.) The genotype is *krasavietz-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(B) Hyperpolarizing and depolarizing an eLN (top) produces hyperpolarization and depolarization in the iLN (bottom). Adding Cd^{2+} blocks most of the response to depolarization but not the response to hyperpolarization. (Blue and black traces are from the same pair.). In the *shakB²* mutant pair, iLN responses are gone.

(C) Group data (mean ± SEM) showing that Cd^{2+} significantly reduces the response to depolarization (n = 6 pairs tested with Cd^{2+}, p < 0.005, paired t test) but not hyperpolarization. The *shakB²* mutation eliminates responses to both hyperpolarizing and depolarizing steps (n = 39 control and 25 *shakB²* pairs, p < 0.0001, Mann-Whitney U-tests).

(D) Stimulating an iLN while recording a response in an eLN.

(E) In one sample pair, hyperpolarizing and depolarizing an iLN produces little effect in the eLN. Because Cd^{2+} blocks spontaneous IPSPs in the postsynaptic cell, it makes it easier to see a small degree of electrical coupling (blue, same pair). In a different pair (middle black traces), depolarizing the iLN produces relatively strong hyperpolarization in the eLN, implying a GABAergic connection. In a *shakB²* mutant pair (magenta), a strong inhibitory connection can still be observed from the iLN to the eLN.

(F) There is no significant effect of either Cd^{2+} (n = 6 pairs, paired t tests) or the *shakB²* mutation (n = 39 control and 25 *shakB²* pairs, Mann-Whitney U tests) on iLN-to-eLN synapses. The failure to see significant results in the group data may reflect the heterogeneity of these connections.

are mainly or purely electrical. (It is possible that some eLN-to-iLN connections are polysynaptic, but the fact that some of these connections were relatively strong makes it unlikely that they are all polysynaptic.)

These synapses also probably have an electrical component, because hyperpolarizing the eLN generally hyperpolarized the iLN (Figures 5B and 5C). We therefore tested whether the *shakB²* mutation alters these connections. Surprisingly, connections from eLNs onto iLNs were completely gone in mutant flies (Figures 5B and 5C). This is unexpected because the chemical component of these connections should not necessarily depend on the electrical component. This result implies that the electrical

component of this synapse is required for the proper development of the chemical component.

We also examined synaptic transmission in the reverse direction, from iLNs onto eLNs (Figure 5D). In some cases, we saw the signature of an electrical connection—namely, weak transmission of both depolarizing and hyperpolarizing pulses from the iLN to the eLN (Figure 5E). In other cases, depolarizing the iLN strongly hyperpolarized the eLN (Figure 5E), suggesting that iLNs can release GABA onto eLNs.

Together, these results demonstrate that excitatory and inhibitory LNs are interconnected. This in turn suggests that eLNs play a role in the recruitment of GABAergic inhibition.

Figure 6. Connections between PNs

(A) Recording simultaneously from two PNs in glomerulus DA1. Genotype is *Mz19-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*. In control flies, sister PNs are coupled by mixed chemical-electrical synapses (Kazama and Wilson, 2009).

(B) Hyperpolarizing and depolarizing a PN (top) produces hyperpolarization and depolarization in the sister PN. In the *shakB²* mutant, both hyperpolarizing and depolarizing responses are abolished.

(C) Group data (mean ± SEM) showing that coupling coefficients for both depolarizing and hyperpolarizing pulses are significantly reduced in the mutant (n = 4 control and 4 mutant pairs yielding 8 coupling coefficients for each condition, p < 0.0005, Mann-Whitney U tests).

PN-PN Interactions Require Electrical Synapses

These recordings revealed that *shakB* is required for the proper development of the chemical component of eLN-to-iLN synapses. Given this, we wondered whether *shakB* is also required for the chemical component of yet another chemical-electrical synapse—namely, the reciprocal synapse between PNs in the same glomerulus. This synapse transmits both depolarizing and hyperpolarizing steps, and the transmission of depolarizing steps is partially blocked by Cd^{2+} (Kazama and Wilson, 2009).

In order to record from pairs of such "sister" PNs simultaneously, we took advantage of a Gal4 line that labels seven PNs in glomerulus DA1 (Berdnik et al., 2006; Jefferis et al., 2004). We recorded from pairs of GFP-positive DA1 PNs and probed their reciprocal connections (Figure 6A). In control flies, we found that DA1 PNs were always reciprocally connected, and both depolarizing and hyperpolarizing steps were transmitted across these connections. In the *shakB²* mutant, we found that these connections were completely abolished (Figures 6B and 6C).

We interpret this as evidence that sister PNs are normally coupled by mixed chemical-electrical connections but that the electrical component is required for the proper development of the chemical component. Interestingly, this result has a direct precedent in the mouse olfactory bulb, where electrical synapses between sister mitral cells are required for the development of chemical synapses between these cells (Maher et al., 2009). We cannot exclude the idea that sister PNs couple indirectly by synapsing onto the same eLN, but this seems unlikely given that PN-PN interactions are relatively strong.

Genetic Elimination of Odor-Evoked Lateral Excitation

We have shown that the *shakB²* mutation eliminates eLN-to-PN synapses. Therefore, if eLNs mediate odor-evoked lateral excitation, then the *shakB²* mutation should eliminate this phenomenon. To test this idea, we focused on PNs in three different

glomeruli: VC1, VC2, and DM1. We labeled these PNs with GFP to target them specifically with our electrodes, and we removed their feedforward inputs by removing the olfactory organ housing their cognate ORNs. For example, VC1 ORNs are housed in the maxillary palp, and so we removed the palp when we recorded from these PNs so that we could observe purely lateral signals from antennal glomeruli. In this type of recording configuration, we found that all test odors elicited reliable lateral excitation in wild-type PNs, but no odors elicited any lateral excitation in *shakB²* mutant PNs (Figure 7). This result supports the conclusion that eLNs mediate odor-evoked lateral excitation. (Note that in the mutant, weak odor-evoked lateral inhibition was observed; this is consistent with a previous report that there is a small amount of postsynaptic lateral inhibition in this circuit [Olsen and Wilson, 2008], although most lateral inhibition is presynaptic.)

For all three PN types we recorded from, the *shakB²* mutation had the same effect, arguing that the mechanism of lateral excitation is not glomerulus specific. This is an important result because different PNs can receive either strong or weak lateral excitation depending on the glomerulus they innervate (Olsen et al., 2007). In these experiments, we noticed that wild-type VC1 and VC2 PNs showed lateral excitation of a size that was typical of most other glomeruli (Olsen et al., 2007), whereas wild-type DM1 PNs consistently showed smaller lateral excitation (Figure 6). Because the *shakB²* mutation abolishes lateral excitation in all three cases, we would interpret this heterogeneity as reflecting stronger electrical coupling with the eLN network in some glomeruli and weaker coupling in other glomeruli.

As a control, we verified that expressing a *shakB.neural* transgene under Gal4/UAS control rescues odor-evoked lateral excitation (Figure S3). This result shows that the phenotype is due to loss of *shakB* and is not an artifact of the genetic background. We also performed a series of control experiments to verify the

Figure 7. The *shakB²* Mutation Abolishes Odor-Evoked Lateral Excitation in PNs

(A) Recording lateral input to PNs in identified glomeruli (VC1 and VC2). Both of these glomeruli normally receive ORN input exclusively from the maxillary palp, and in these experiments the palp is removed. Thus, any odor-evoked input must reflect lateral input via LNs. The genotype is *NP5221-Gal4, UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(B) In control flies, odors elicit lateral excitation in these PNs, but in *shakB²* flies this is abolished (mean ± SEM, n = 7 control cells and 7 mutant cells, p < 0.001 for all odors, Mann-Whitney U tests). A small amount of lateral inhibition remains in the mutant. Here, results for VC1 and VC2 PNs were pooled because the two PN types exhibit similar amounts of odor-evoked lateral excitation (n = 4 VC1 and 3 VC2 for both control and mutant).

(C) Same as (A), but for glomerulus DM1. This glomerulus receives ORN input exclusively from the antenna, and in these experiments the antenna is removed. The genotype is *NP5221-Gal4,UAS-CD8:GFP*.

(D) Same as (B), but for DM1 (mean ± SEM, n = 5 control and 5 mutant, p < 0.05 for all odors except the last, Mann-Whitney U tests). Note that in control flies, the magnitude of lateral excitatory input to this PN is unusually small. This is not a general feature of antennal PNs, because in the same recording configuration many antennal PNs show large lateral excitation (Olsen et al., 2007).

specificity of the mutant phenotype. First, we confirmed that PN morphology and glomerular compartmentalization is normal in the mutant (Figure S4). Then, we verified that ORN odor responses are also normal (Figure S4). Finally, we checked that iLN-PN connections are normal (Figure S4). Taken together, these results show that the antennal lobe is essentially normal in the *shakB²* mutant, except for three types of synapses that have an

electrical component and are abolished: eLN-to-PN synapses, eLN-to-iLN synapses, and PN-PN reciprocal synapses.

Eliminating Lateral Excitation Can Reduce PN Odor Responses

Given that the *shakB²* mutation eliminates three specific types of synapses in the antennal lobe, we then asked whether this mutation alters PN spiking responses to odors in an otherwise intact circuit. Because *shakB²* eliminates synapses from eLNs onto PNs, we might predict that it reduces some PN odor responses. Furthermore, *shakB²* also eliminates PN-PN reciprocal synapses, and this is another reason why we would predict that it reduces some PN odor responses. However, because this mutation also eliminates eLN-to-iLN synapses, it might reduce the recruitment of inhibition, and so we might predict that it actually increases some PN odor responses.

To investigate this, we compared PN odor responses in control flies and *shakB²* mutants. We used GFP labeling to target our electrodes to PNs in four glomeruli: VC1, DA1, VC2, and DM1. We exploited differences in the way these four types of PNs couple to other glomeruli and to sister PNs in order to disambiguate changes in lateral excitation, lateral inhibition, and PN-PN synapses.

We began with glomerulus VC1 (Figure 8A) because only one PN is known to be present in this glomerulus (Tanaka et al., 2004; see also Experimental Procedures). If only one PN is present, this would simplify the situation because it would mean that there are no PN-PN synapses. In VC1 PNs, we found that responses to all the test odors were weaker in *shakB²* flies than in controls, and for many odors, this difference was statistically significant (Figures 8B and 8C).

If this phenotype reflects a loss of lateral excitation, it should disappear for a stimulus that is specific to VC1 ORNs. Fortunately, these ORNs are the only neurons in the palp that respond to the odor fenchone (Goldman et al., 2005). Some antennal ORNs also respond to this odor (data not shown), but we made fenchone a "private" odor for VC1 by removing the antennae. When we recorded from VC1 PNs in flies with intact antennae, fenchone elicited an excitatory response that was significantly smaller in *shakB²* mutant flies (Figures 8A and 8B), implying that this odor elicits lateral excitation onto VC1 from antennal glomeruli. By contrast, when we recorded from VC1 PNs in flies with antennae removed, there was no difference between control and *shakB²* responses (Figures 8D and 8E). This supports the idea that the phenotype is due to the loss of lateral excitation, at least for this PN and these odors.

Eliminating PN-PN Interactions Can Reduce PN Odor Responses

Next, we examined a second glomerulus, DA1. This glomerulus is notable for containing an unusually large number of sister PNs (seven in total; Berdnik et al., 2006). The only known ligand for DA1 ORNs is *cis*-vaccenyl acetate, which is also relatively selective for these ORNs (Clyne et al., 1997; Schlief and Wilson, 2007; van der Goes van Naters and Carlson, 2007). Thus, *cis*-vaccenyl acetate should elicit reciprocal excitation among sister DA1 PNs but little or no lateral input to these PNs, providing us with an opportunity to look specifically at the role of sister PN interactions in shaping PN odor responses.

Figure 8. The *shakB²* Mutation Reduces Some PN Odor Responses

(A) Recording odor-evoked spiking activity from VC1 PNs in an intact circuit.

(B) Peristimulus time histograms show spiking responses of VC1 PNs to one test odor (fenchone) at three concentrations, ± SEM. Responses from control and *shakB²* flies are overlaid (n = 9 control and 8 mutant). Asterisks indicate significant differences (p < 0.05, Mann-Whitney U tests).

(C) Comparison between mean odor-evoked firing rate (averaged across VC1 PNs) for every test odor (n = 8–9 control and 6–8 mutant). Responses in dark shades are significantly different (fenchone 10^{-2}, fenchone 10^{-4}, cyclohexanone 10^{-2}, cyclohexanone 10^{-4}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-2}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-3}); responses in pastel shades are not (fenchone 10^{-6}, heptanone 10^{-2}, heptanone 10^{-4}, heptanone 10^{-6}, cyclohexanone 10^{-6}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-4}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-6}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-1}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-2}).

(D) Recording odor-evoked spiking activity from VC1 PNs with antennae removed. This makes fenchone a "private" odor for VC1 ORNs because these are the only palp ORNs that respond to fenchone.

(E) Responses to fenchone in VC1 PNs recorded in flies with antennae removed (n = 6 control and 5 mutant). There are no significant differences between control and mutant (Mann-Whitney U tests).

(F) Recording odor-evoked spiking activity from DA1 PNs. The odor that stimulates DA1 ORNs (*cis*-vaccenyl acetate) is relatively selective. Note that there are many PNs in this glomerulus.

(G) Responses to *cis*-vaccenyl acetate in control and mutant DA1 PNs (n = 5 control and 7 mutant). Asterisk indicates a significant difference (p < 0.05, Mann-Whitney U test).

significantly diminished in the *shakB²* mutant (Figures 9A–9C). However, other responses were significantly larger in the mutant (Figures 9B and 9C). Given that this mutation eliminates eLN-to-iLN synapses, this phenotype might reflect a defect in the recruitment of GABAergic inhibition. To test this, we compared the effect of adding GABA receptor antagonists (5 μM picrotoxin and 20 μM CGP54626) in control versus mutant PNs. If *shakB²* reduces the amount of GABAergic inhibition recruited by these stimuli in VC2 PNs, then the antagonists should have a smaller effect on mutant VC2 PN odor responses. Indeed, we found that the disinhibitory effect of adding the antagonists was significantly smaller in the mutant than in controls (Figures 9D and 9E). This is consistent with the conclusion that eLNs are involved in recruiting GABAergic inhibition, presumably via their excitatory synapses onto iLNs.

Finally, we also examined glomerulus DM1. As in VC1 and VC2, only one PN is known to reside in this glomerulus. Unlike VC1 and VC2 PNs, DM1 PNs receive only weak lateral excitation, suggesting weak coupling to the eLN network (Figure 7).

We confirmed that *cis*-vaccenyl acetate elicits an excitatory response in DA1 PNs (Figures 8F and 8G), as previously reported (Schlief and Wilson, 2007). In *shakB²* mutant flies, we found that this response was significantly smaller than in control flies (Figure 8G). Because *shakB²* eliminates reciprocal synapses between DA1 PNs (Figure 6), and because *cis*-vaccenyl acetate is a relatively "private" odor for DA1 ORNs, this result implies that PN-PN synapses can amplify odor responses.

Perturbing Electrical Networks Can Increase PN Odor Responses by Reducing Inhibition

We next turned to glomerulus VC2. In this glomerulus, as in VC1, only one PN may be present (Tanaka et al., 2004). As in VC1, we found that some VC2 PN spiking responses to odors were

Figure 9. The *shakB²* Mutation Impairs the Recruitment of Inhibition

(A) Recording odor-evoked spiking activity from VC2 PNs.

(B) Responses to several test odors in control and *shakB²* VC2 PNs (n = 6 control and 6 mutant cells), ± SEM. Asterisks indicate significant differences ($p < 0.05$, Mann-Whitney U tests).

(C) Mean odor-evoked firing rate (averaged across VC2 PNs) for every test odor. Responses in dark shades are significantly different (fenchone 10^{-2}, fenchone 10^{-6}, heptanone 10^{-6}, cyclohexanone 10^{-2}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-2}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-3}); responses in pastel shades are not (fenchone 10^{-4}, heptanone 10^{-2}, heptanone 10^{-4}, cyclohexanone 10^{-4}, cyclohexanone 10^{-6}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-2}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-4}, isoamyl acetate 10^{-6}, 4-methylphenol 10^{-1}).

(D) Most responses in control VC2 PNs are disinhibited after adding GABA receptor antagonists (5 μM picrotoxin and 20 μM CGP54626). Asterisks indicate significant differences (n = 4 cells tested with antagonists, $p < 0.05$, paired t tests).

(E) In *shakB²* VC2 PNs, GABA receptor antagonists had little effect (n = 4 cells tested with antagonists; asterisks indicate significant differences). Across all odors, the amount of disinhibition was significantly smaller in mutant versus control PNs (n = 5 odors, $p < 0.005$, paired t test comparing drug-induced change in firing rate averaged across cells).

bulb (Aungst et al., 2003), but they have not been shown to have excitatory effects on principal neurons. In this study, we show directly that local neurons can excite principal neurons and thereby spread activity between glomeruli.

A previous study proposed that excitatory LNs depolarize PNs by releasing acetylcholine (Shang et al., 2007), based on the finding that some *krasavietz* LNs are immunopositive for Cha. However, using an optogenetic approach, we find that selectively stimulating *krasavietz* eLNs produces an excitatory response that is insensitive to blocking synaptic vesicle exocytosis, suggesting primarily electrical rather than chemical coupling from eLNs onto PNs. Moreover, dozens of dual recordings from *krasavietz* eLNs and PNs revealed clear evidence of electrical connections. Together, these results are strong evidence that *krasavietz* LNs couple to PNs electrically. We found it was difficult to determine conclusively whether eLN-to-PN synapses have a small cholinergic component. On the one hand, we found that, on average, neither Cd^{2+} nor mecamylamine nor D-tubocurarine had any effect, and this argues against a cholinergic component. On the other hand, α-bungarotoxin slightly inhibited coupling (Figure S1). In any event, it is clear that this synapse is largely (if not purely) electrical.

Given these results, it is interesting that eLNs synapses onto iLNs clearly have a strong chemical component. Unlike eLN-to-PN synapses, eLN-to-iLN synapses were almost completely blocked by either Cd^{2+} or mecamylamine (Figure S1). This implies

Perhaps not surprisingly, the *shakB²* mutation had no significant effect on DM1 PN odor responses (Figure S5). This negative result is consistent with our conclusion that the gross anatomy of the antennal lobe is normal in *shakB²* mutants, as are ORN odor responses (Figure S4).

DISCUSSION

Target-Cell-Specific Properties of eLN Synapses

Our findings directly demonstrate that LNs can excite PNs. Putative excitatory local neurons have been identified in the olfactory

that the properties of eLN output synapses are target-cell specific: synapses onto PNs are largely or purely electrical, whereas synapses onto iLNs are largely chemical with a smaller electrical component. There are several examples in the literature of a neuron forming synapses with different properties onto different types of target cells (Pelkey and McBain, 2007), but this example of target-cell specialization seems particularly striking.

Functional Implications of Electrical Synapses

What is the functional relevance of our finding that eLNs form electrical synapses onto PNs? One distinctive property of electrical connections is their speed. This helps explain why lateral excitation is recruited so rapidly. Indeed, electrical stimulation of the antennal nerve elicits depolarization in maxillary palp glomeruli only about 1.5 ms after onset of depolarization in an antennal glomerulus (Kazama and Wilson, 2008). This suggests that the eLN network contributes to the earliest time points in the PN odor response. Consistent with this idea, we often saw differences between control and $shakB^2$ mutant PNs during the earliest epoch of PN responses (e.g., Figure 8B). Thus, lateral excitation may be preferentially involved in the rising phase of PN odor responses, whereas inhibition seems to be recruited more slowly (Figure 1E). Preferential transmission of the rising phase of an odor pulse may speed odor detection and promote resolution of rapid odor fluctuations (Bhandawat et al., 2007).

Another characteristic feature of electrical synapses is that they are less noisy than chemical synapses (Connors and Long, 2004). A previous study showed that whereas noise in sister PNs is highly correlated, noise is almost entirely uncorrelated in PNs innervating different glomeruli (Kazama and Wilson, 2009). That result implied that LNs contribute relatively little correlated noise to PNs. Our finding that eLN-PN connections are electrical rather than chemical may help explain why that is so. It also suggests that the eLN network is unlikely to add substantial noise to PN odor responses, contrary to a previous suggestion that this is the major function of eLNs (Shang et al., 2007).

A further characteristic property of electrical connections is that they can alter the way signals propagate through a cell. This is because an electrical connection acts as a shunt that diminishes the effect of a synaptic current on a cell's membrane potential. Thus, eliminating electrical connections can make neurons more electrotonically compact (Bennett and Zukin, 2004). Indeed, we observed that the $shakB^2$ mutation significantly increased PN input resistance in PNs that normally receive relatively strong lateral excitation (p < 0.05 for VC1 and VC2, Mann-Whitney U tests; not significant in DA1 and DM1). This might be expected to increase PN responses to their direct ORN inputs, but this is not what we observed: when VC1 PNs were disconnected from lateral input (by removing the antennae), the $shakB^2$ mutation did not increase the spiking responses of these PNs to their direct ORN inputs, despite the fact that PN input resistance was increased. The change in PN input resistance may be too small to have an effect on PN spike rate; alternatively, changes in PN input resistance may trigger compensatory changes in the strength of ORN-to-PN synapses, as has been shown previously (Kazama and Wilson, 2008).

Properties and Functions of Odor-Evoked Lateral Excitation

Previous studies have noted two curious features of odor-evoked lateral excitation in the antennal lobe. First, even weak levels of ORN activity are sufficient to recruit lateral excitation onto PNs. Second, odor stimuli that differ in chemical structure and/or concentration elicit somewhat similar levels of lateral excitation (Olsen et al., 2007; Shang et al., 2007).

Our results imply that these features reflect properties of eLNs themselves. Namely, eLNs respond robustly to even weak levels of ORN activity, and they are relatively indiscriminate in their responses. Each eLN extends its neurites into most or all glomeruli (data not shown), and so it may pool excitatory input from most or all glomeruli. Moreover, we found that the probability of finding a connection from a randomly chosen PN onto an eLN was 100%. This suggests that all PNs converge onto each eLN. If so, this would help explain why eLNs are sensitive to even weak odors and are excited by all chemical classes of odors.

What is the function of spreading excitation between glomeruli? We suggest that eLNs may function to slightly and transiently increase the excitability of all PNs when any ORN channel is activated. In addition, eLNs might have a role in promoting synchrony among PN spikes. As a result, the eLN network could improve odor detection when stimuli are weak. An obvious potential problem with this network is that spreading excitation between glomeruli could destroy PN odor selectivity. However, this is evidently not a problem in practice because PNs are in fact odor selective (Bhandawat et al., 2007). In this study, we found that increasing the level of ORN activity does not substantially increase the strength of eLN odor responses. This ceiling on eLN activity might be useful in preventing lateral excitation from becoming too powerful when odors are strong. In other words, the tendency for eLN odor responses to saturate should help preserve PN odor selectivity.

Interactions among LNs

Thus far, thinking about the functional relevance of eLNs has considered only their role in connecting PNs in different glomeruli. In this study, we discovered that eLNs provide excitatory input not only to PNs, but also to iLNs. Indeed, eLN synapses onto iLNs are stronger than their synapses onto PNs. This implies that a major function of eLNs is to recruit GABAergic inhibition.

Consistent with this, we found that some PN odor responses are actually potentiated by the $shakB^2$ mutation, which suggests a loss of inhibition that is large enough to outweigh the loss of lateral excitation. Moreover, whereas in control flies some odor responses were substantially disinhibited by GABA receptor antagonists, in $shakB^2$ flies these responses were much less disinhibited when GABA receptors were blocked. This result supports the idea that eLNs provide an important source of excitatory drive to iLNs, although iLNs also receive excitatory input from PNs (Figure S4; see also Wilson et al., 2004).

The idea that interneurons can excite other interneurons—thereby modulating inhibition of principal cells—has a precedent in other neural circuits. For example, the vertebrate retina contains two layers of electrically coupled inhibitory interneurons: horizontal cells in the outer retina, and amacrine cells in the inner

retina. Because these retinal networks are purely electrical, they are not thought to boost the overall level excitation in the interneuron network; rather, they are thought to simply average signals across neighboring cells, thus creating a more uniform inhibitory surround (Bloomfield and Völgyi, 2009). In the antennal lobe, electrical coupling between eLNs and iLNs may serve an analogous "smoothing" function. But because eLNs also excite iLNs through chemical synapses, eLNs are likely to also boost the overall level of excitation in iLNs, thereby boosting inhibition of PNs.

Why might it be useful for eLNs to drive both direct excitation of PNs and indirect inhibition of PNs? We propose that the relative importance of these two effects depends on odor intensity. The excitatory drive relayed by eLNs onto PNs is probably most important when odor stimuli are weak. When stimuli are strong, the excitation that eLNs provide to iLNs may be relatively more important. Although we found that increasing stimulus intensity does not substantially increase eLN activity, PN input to iLNs is probably growing as ORN activity rises. It may be the combined excitatory drive from eLNs and PNs onto iLNs that causes GABAergic inhibition to grow with rising ORN activity (Olsen et al., 2010; Olsen and Wilson, 2008). Increasing inhibition helps prevent PN activity from saturating and may promote odor discrimination (Asahina et al., 2009; Olsen et al., 2010; Root et al., 2008; Sachse and Galizia, 2003).

A Challenge for Understanding Neural Circuits

Electrical networks are pervasive in both vertebrates and invertebrates (Bennett and Zukin, 2004; Connors and Long, 2004; Phelan, 2005). Thus, understanding signal propagation in electrical networks has fundamental importance for understanding how neural circuits function. Several new genetic approaches to control neural circuits in vivo involve disrupting synaptic vesicle release (Luo et al., 2008; Simpson, 2009). However, electrical synapses will be unaffected by these perturbations. Other approaches involve introducing channels that are controlled by light or unnatural ligands (Luo et al., 2008; Simpson, 2009). However, the effects of opening a channel in specific cell populations can differ for electrical versus chemical networks, because electrical connections are bidirectional whereas chemical connections are not. These considerations should inspire caution in interpreting experiments using these approaches and should also emphasize the need for new tools to specifically perturb electrical networks.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Fly Stocks

Flies were raised at 25°C on conventional cornmeal agar medium under a 12/12 hr light/dark cycle. All experiments were performed on adult female flies, 1–3 days after eclosion (except where otherwise noted). Gal4 lines were previously described as follows: *krasavietz-Gal4* on chromosome 3 (drives Gal4 expression in both GABA+ LNs and GABA− LNs [Chou et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2007]); *GH146-Gal4* on chromosome 2 (drives Gal4 expression in a large fraction of PNs [Stocker et al., 1997]); *NP5221-Gal4* on chromosome 2 (drives Gal4 expression in one VC1 PN, one VC2 PN, and one DM1 PN [Tanaka et al., 2004]); and *Mz19-Gal4* on chromosome 2 (drives Gal4 expression in seven DA1 PNs [Berdnik et al., 2006; Jefferis et al., 2004]). The *krasavietz-Gal4* line drives Gal4 expression in at least three eLNs per antennal lobe, based on the fact that we have recorded sequentially from three GFP-positive eLNs in the same antennal lobe when GFP was expressed under the control of this driver. While we assume that the *NP5221-Gal4* line drives Gal4 expression in all the PNs in glomeruli VC1, VC2, and DM1 (i.e., one PN in each of these three glomeruli), we cannot exclude the idea that there are other PNs in these three glomeruli that do not express Gal4. However, in experiments where we labeled PNs in specific glomeruli with photoactivatible GFP (expressed under the Cha promoter), we have found that the total number of PNs in most individual glomeruli is generally the same as the number labeled by enhancer-trap Gal4 lines in our laboratory (W.W. Liu and R.I.W., unpublished data), so we think this assumption is reasonable. Lines with UAS-linked transgenes were previously described as follows: *UAS-CD8:GFP* on chromosomes 2 and 3 (Lee and Luo, 1999); *UAS-ChR2:YFP* on chromosomes 2 and 3 (Hwang et al., 2007; lines "C" and "B"); and *UAS-shakB.neural* on chromosome 2 (Curtin et al., 2002). The $shakB^2$ mutation has been previously characterized (Baird et al., 1990; Homyk et al., 1980).

Electrophysiology

In vivo whole-cell patch-clamp recordings from the somata of PNs and LNs were performed as described previously (Wilson and Laurent, 2005). The external saline solution bathing the brain contained (in mM): 103 NaCl, 3 KCl, 5 N-Tris(hydroxymethyl)methyl-2- aminoethane-sulfonic acid, 8 trehalose, 10 glucose, 26 NaHCO₃, 1 NaH₂PO₄, 1.5 CaCl₂, and 4 MgCl₂ (osmolarity adjusted to 270–275 mOsm). The saline was bubbled with 95% O₂/5% CO₂ and the pH equilibrated at 7.2. Patch-clamp electrodes were filled with an internal solution consisting of the following (in mM): 140 potassium aspartate, 10 HEPES, 1 EGTA, 4 MgATP, 0.5 Na₃GTP, 1 KCl, and 13 biocytin hydrazide. The pH of the internal solution was adjusted to 7.2 and the osmolarity was adjusted to ~265 mOsm. Local field potential recordings in the antenna (Figure 3) and single-sensillum recordings of ORN spikes (Figure S4) were performed essentially as described previously (Bhandawat et al., 2007; Olsen et al., 2007). Recordings were performed in current-clamp mode with an Axopatch 200B amplifier (Axon Instruments). Recorded voltages were low-pass filtered at 2 kHz and digitized at 10 kHz. Data acquisition and all the analyses were performed in MATLAB (MathWorks) with custom software. All antagonists were prepared as concentrated stock solutions in water (or DMSO for CGP54626) and then added to the saline perfusate to achieve the stated final concentration.

Immunohistochemistry

Identified PNs were filled with biocytin during the recording, and the morphology of the recorded neurons was visualized post hoc after fixation and after incubation with 1:1000 streptavidin:Alexa Fluor 568 (Invitrogen), as described previously (Bhandawat et al., 2007). The antennal lobe neuropil was visualized with a primary incubation of 1:10 mouse anti-nc82 antibody (Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA) and a secondary incubation of 1:250 anti-mouse:Alexa Fluor 633 (Invitrogen), as described previously (Bhandawat et al., 2007). Images were acquired on a Zeiss LSM 510 confocal microscope with a 40× oil-immersion objective.

Olfactory Stimulation

Odors were diluted in paraffin oil at the concentrations specified, except 4-methylphenol, which was diluted in water. Dilutions were freshly prepared every 5 days. Odors were delivered with a custom-built olfactometer, as described previously (Bhandawat et al., 2007), that dilutes the headspace of the odor vial a further ~10-fold in clean air before it reaches the fly. The flow rate of the odor delivery stream was 2.2 liters/min. Odor stimuli were applied for 500 ms every 45 s for 6 trials per odor per cell.

Optogenetic Stimulation

Newly eclosed flies were cultured for 2 days in the dark on conventional medium supplemented with potato flakes rehydrated in an aqueous solution of all-*trans*-retinal. All-*trans*-retinal was prepared as a stock solution in ethanol (35 mM) and diluted 20-fold in water just before mixing with the potato flakes. Blue light was delivered via a 100-W Hg arc lamp (Olympus) attenuated with a 25% neutral-density filter. Pulses of light (500 ms) were delivered every 5 s via a shutter (Uniblitz) controlled by a TTL pulse. As a negative control, we recorded from PNs in flies lacking the Gal4 driver (genotype *UAS-Chr2:YFP;*

UAS-ChR2:YFP) and confirmed that light elicited only a very small depolarization in these PNs (mean ± standard error of the mean [SEM] = 0.2mV ± 0.2mV, n = 5).

Dual Whole-Cell Recordings

In the dual recordings involving eLNs, we expressed GFP under the control of the *krasavietz* Gal4 line to label eLNs, and we recorded from randomly selected PNs or iLNs. Although PNs were not GFP labeled in these recordings, they are identifiable based on their small-amplitude action potentials (Wilson et al., 2004; <12mV). Cells identified as PNs in this way always formed excitatory connections onto eLNs. Similarly, although iLNs were not GFP labeled in these experiments, they are identifiable based on their large-amplitude action potentials (Wilson et al., 2004; >25mV) and lack of IPSPs (which distinguishes them from eLNs; see Figure 2). Cells identified as iLNs in this way never formed excitatory chemical synaptic connections onto other cells but sometimes formed inhibitory chemical synaptic connections onto other cells that were blocked by GABA receptor antagonists (data not shown). In all dual-recording experiments, the antennae were removed just before the experiment in order to minimize spontaneous activity. The intensity of current injection was adjusted in each experiment to achieve voltage deflections of approximately ± 40mV in the cell into which current was injected. Current injections (500 ms duration) were repeated every 5 s for 40–50 trials. The response of the unstimulated cell was low-pass filtered (50 Hz cutoff) to remove any spikes and was averaged over all trials. The coupling coefficient was computed as the average change in membrane potential of the postsynaptic neuron divided by that of the presynaptic neuron.

Data Analysis

Spikes were detected with custom software. The coupling coefficient was calculated by dividing the trial-averaged membrane potential change in the postsynaptic cell by the change in the presynaptic cell. Peristimulus time histograms were generated by calculating the firing rate in 50 ms bins that overlapped by 25 ms. Mean PN spiking responses were quantified as the average spike rate during a 500 ms window beginning 100 ms after nominal stimulus onset, averaged across all six trials with a given stimulus (Figures 8 and 9). Lateral excitation in PNs was calculated as the average odor-evoked change in membrane potential (versus the preodor baseline membrane potential in each trial) during a 200 ms time window beginning 100 ms after nominal stimulus onset, averaged across all six trials (Figure 7 and Figure S3). All error bars and bands represent ± SEM values.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes five figures and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.08.041.

REFERENCES

Asahina, K., Louis, M., Piccinotti, S., and Vosshall, L.B. (2009). A circuit supporting concentration-invariant odor perception in Drosophila. J. Biol. 8, 9.

Aungst, J.L., Heyward, P.M., Puche, A.C., Karnup, S.V., Hayar, A., Szabo, G., and Shipley, M.T. (2003). Centre-surround inhibition among olfactory bulb glomeruli. Nature 426, 623–629.

Baird, D.H., Schalet, A.P., and Wyman, R.J. (1990). The Passover locus in Drosophila melanogaster: complex complementation and different effects on the giant fiber neural pathway. Genetics 126, 1045–1059.

Bargmann, C.I. (2006). Comparative chemosensation from receptors to ecology. Nature 444, 295–301.

Bennett, M.V., and Zukin, R.S. (2004). Electrical coupling and neuronal synchronization in the Mammalian brain. Neuron 41, 495–511.

Berdnik, D., Chihara, T., Couto, A., and Luo, L. (2006). Wiring stability of the adult Drosophila olfactory circuit after lesion. J. Neurosci. 26, 3367–3376.

Bhandawat, V., Olsen, S.R., Gouwens, N.W., Schlief, M.L., and Wilson, R.I. (2007). Sensory processing in the Drosophila antennal lobe increases reliability and separability of ensemble odor representations. Nat. Neurosci. 10, 1474–1482.

Bloomfield, S.A., and Völgyi, B. (2009). The diverse functional roles and regulation of neuronal gap junctions in the retina. Nat. Rev. Neurosci. 10, 495–506.

Boyden, E.S., Zhang, F., Bamberg, E., Nagel, G., and Deisseroth, K. (2005). Millisecond-timescale, genetically targeted optical control of neural activity. Nat. Neurosci. 8, 1263–1268.

Chou, Y.H., Spletter, M.L., Yaksi, E., Leong, J.C., Wilson, R.I., and Luo, L. (2010). Diversity and wiring variability of olfactory local interneurons in the Drosophila antennal lobe. Nat. Neurosci. 13, 439–449.

Clyne, P., Grant, A., O'Connell, R., and Carlson, J.R. (1997). Odorant response of individual sensilla on the Drosophila antenna. Invert. Neurosci. 3, 127–135.

Connors, B.W., and Long, M.A. (2004). Electrical synapses in the mammalian brain. Annu. Rev. Neurosci. 27, 393–418.

Curtin, K.D., Zhang, Z., and Wyman, R.J. (2002). Gap junction proteins expressed during development are required for adult neural function in the Drosophila optic lamina. J. Neurosci. 22, 7088–7096.

Goldman, A.L., Van der Goes van Naters, W., Lessing, D., Warr, C.G., and Carlson, J.R. (2005). Coexpression of two functional odor receptors in one neuron. Neuron 45, 661–666.

Gouwens, N.W., and Wilson, R.I. (2009). Signal propagation in Drosophila central neurons. J. Neurosci. 29, 6239–6249.

Hallem, E.A., and Carlson, J.R. (2006). Coding of odors by a receptor repertoire. Cell 125, 143–160.

Homyk, T., Jr., Szidonya, J., and Suzuki, D.T. (1980). Behavioral mutants of Drosophila melanogaster. III. Isolation and mapping of mutations by direct visual observations of behavioral phenotypes. Mol. Gen. Genet. 177, 553–565.

Hwang, R.Y., Zhong, L., Xu, Y., Johnson, T., Zhang, F., Deisseroth, K., and Tracey, W.D. (2007). Nociceptive neurons protect Drosophila larvae from parasitoid wasps. Curr. Biol. 17, 2105–2116.

Jefferis, G.S., Vyas, R.M., Berdnik, D., Ramaekers, A., Stocker, R.F., Tanaka, N.K., Ito, K., and Luo, L. (2004). Developmental origin of wiring specificity in the olfactory system of Drosophila. Development 131, 117–130.

Kazama, H., and Wilson, R.I. (2008). Homeostatic matching and nonlinear amplification at identified central synapses. Neuron 58, 401–413.

Kazama, H., and Wilson, R.I. (2009). Origins of correlated activity in an olfactory circuit. Nat. Neurosci. 12, 1136–1144.

Kuebler, D., and Tanouye, M.A. (2000). Modifications of seizure susceptibility in Drosophila. J. Neurophysiol. 83, 998–1009.

Laurent, G., Stopfer, M., Friedrich, R.W., Rabinovich, M.I., Volkovskii, A., and Abarbanel, H.D. (2001). Odor encoding as an active, dynamical process: experiments, computation, and theory. Annu. Rev. Neurosci. 24, 263–297.

Lee, T., and Luo, L. (1999). Mosaic analysis with a repressible cell marker for studies of gene function in neuronal morphogenesis. Neuron 22, 451–461.

Lledo, P.M., Gheusi, G., and Vincent, J.D. (2005). Information processing in the mammalian olfactory system. Physiol. Rev. 85, 281–317.

Luo, L., Callaway, E.M., and Svoboda, K. (2008). Genetic dissection of neural circuits. Neuron 57, 634–660.

Maher, B.J., McGinley, M.J., and Westbrook, G.L. (2009). Experience-dependent maturation of the glomerular microcircuit. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *106*, 16865–16870.

Olsen, S.R., and Wilson, R.I. (2008). Lateral presynaptic inhibition mediates gain control in an olfactory circuit. Nature *452*, 956–960.

Olsen, S.R., Bhandawat, V., and Wilson, R.I. (2007). Excitatory interactions between olfactory processing channels in the Drosophila antennal lobe. Neuron *54*, 89–103.

Olsen, S.R., Bhandawat, V., and Wilson, R.I. (2010). Divisive normalization in olfactory population codes. Neuron *66*, 287–299.

Pelkey, K.A., and McBain, C.J. (2007). Differential regulation at functionally divergent release sites along a common axon. Curr. Opin. Neurobiol. *17*, 366–373.

Phelan, P. (2005). Innexins: members of an evolutionarily conserved family of gap-junction proteins. Biochim. Biophys. Acta *1711*, 225–245.

Phelan, P., Nakagawa, M., Wilkin, M.B., Moffat, K.G., O'Kane, C.J., Davies, J.A., and Bacon, J.P. (1996). Mutations in shaking-B prevent electrical synapse formation in the Drosophila giant fiber system. J. Neurosci. *16*, 1101–1113.

Phelan, P., Bacon, J.P., Davies, J.A., Stebbings, L.A., Todman, M.G., Avery, L., Baines, R.A., Barnes, T.M., Ford, C., Hekimi, S., et al. (1998). Innexins: a family of invertebrate gap-junction proteins. Trends Genet. *14*, 348–349.

Phelan, P., Goulding, L.A., Tam, J.L., Allen, M.J., Dawber, R.J., Davies, J.A., and Bacon, J.P. (2008). Molecular mechanism of rectification at identified electrical synapses in the Drosophila giant fiber system. Curr. Biol. *18*, 1955–1960.

Root, C.M., Semmelhack, J.L., Wong, A.M., Flores, J., and Wang, J.W. (2007). Propagation of olfactory information in Drosophila. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *104*, 11826–11831.

Root, C.M., Masuyama, K., Green, D.S., Enell, L.E., Nässel, D.R., Lee, C.H., and Wang, J.W. (2008). A presynaptic gain control mechanism fine-tunes olfactory behavior. Neuron *59*, 311–321.

Sachse, S., and Galizia, C.G. (2003). The coding of odour-intensity in the honeybee antennal lobe: local computation optimizes odour representation. Eur. J. Neurosci. *18*, 2119–2132.

Schlief, M.L., and Wilson, R.I. (2007). Olfactory processing and behavior downstream from highly selective receptor neurons. Nat. Neurosci. *10*, 623–630.

Schoppa, N.E., and Urban, N.N. (2003). Dendritic processing within olfactory bulb circuits. Trends Neurosci. *26*, 501–506.

Shang, Y., Claridge-Chang, A., Sjulson, L., Pypaert, M., and Miesenböck, G. (2007). Excitatory local circuits and their implications for olfactory processing in the fly antennal lobe. Cell *128*, 601–612.

Simpson, J.H. (2009). Mapping and manipulating neural circuits in the fly brain. Adv. Genet. *65*, 79–143.

Stocker, R.F., Heimbeck, G., Gendre, N., and de Belle, J.S. (1997). Neuroblast ablation in Drosophila P[GAL4] lines reveals origins of olfactory interneurons. J. Neurobiol. *32*, 443–456.

Sun, Y.A., and Wyman, R.J. (1996). Passover eliminates gap junctional communication between neurons of the giant fiber system in Drosophila. off. J. Neurobiol. *30*, 340–348.

Tanaka, N.K., Awasaki, T., Shimada, T., and Ito, K. (2004). Integration of chemosensory pathways in the Drosophila second-order olfactory centers. Curr. Biol. *14*, 449–457.

Thomas, J.B., and Wyman, R.J. (1984). Mutations altering synaptic connectivity between identified neurons in Drosophila. J. Neurosci. *4*, 530–538.

van der Goes van Naters, W., and Carlson, J.R. (2007). Receptors and neurons for fly odors in Drosophila. Curr. Biol. *17*, 606–612.

Wilson, R.I., and Laurent, G. (2005). Role of GABAergic inhibition in shaping odor-evoked spatiotemporal patterns in the Drosophila antennal lobe. J. Neurosci. *25*, 9069–9079.

Wilson, R.I., Turner, G.C., and Laurent, G. (2004). Transformation of olfactory representations in the Drosophila antennal lobe. Science *303*, 366–370.

Zhang, Z., Curtin, K.D., Sun, Y.A., and Wyman, R.J. (1999). Nested transcripts of gap junction gene have distinct expression patterns. J. Neurobiol. *40*, 288–301.