

TECHNICAL COMMENT

NEUROSCIENCE

Comment on “Principles of connectivity among morphologically defined cell types in adult neocortex”

Alison L. Barth,¹ Andreas Burkhalter,² Edward M. Callaway,^{3*} Barry W. Connors,⁴ Bruno Cauli,⁵ Javier DeFelipe,^{6,7} Dirk Feldmeyer,⁸ Tamas Freund,⁹ Yasuo Kawaguchi,¹⁰ Zoltan Kisvarday,¹¹ Yoshiyuki Kubota,¹⁰ Chris McBain,¹² Marcel Oberlaender,¹³ Jean Rossier,¹⁴ Bernardo Rudy,^{15*} Jochen F. Staiger,^{16*} Peter Somogyi,¹⁷ Gabor Tamas,¹⁸ Rafael Yuste¹⁹

Jiang *et al.* (Research Article, 27 November 2015, aac9462) describe detailed experiments that substantially add to the knowledge of cortical microcircuitry and are unique in the number of connections reported and the quality of interneuron reconstruction. The work appeals to experts and laypersons because of the notion that it unveils new principles and provides a complete description of cortical circuits. We provide a counterbalance to the authors' claims to give those less familiar with the minutiae of cortical circuits a better sense of the contributions and the limitations of this study.

There is no doubt that the data described in Jiang *et al.* (1) will be a valuable source for descriptions of connectivity between defined neurons.

Some of the authors' observations are new, some confirm previous observations, and some are at odds with previous studies. Because no single method used to identify cortical connections (such as paired recordings used by Jiang *et al.*) can provide a definitive description of the connectivity between specific identified cell types, the observations that conflict with previous results must be further explored. The limitations of this study must be recognized, and further experiments must be conducted to unambiguously resolve these issues.

Because Jiang *et al.* present a large and complex data set and the literature on cortical circuits is very extensive, it is beyond the scope of this Comment to delve into all of the issues that are raised. We highlight some key limitations of the study, as well as limitations of other studies, to exemplify what challenges lie ahead. The primary method used was to simultaneously record intracellularly from up to eight neurons in cortical brain slices. Each cell is sequentially activated while recording from others to test for possible connections. By recording from many neurons at once, there is a combinatorial explosion in the numbers of cell pairs that can be sampled, allowing for the generation of a very large sample (more than 11,000 pairs in Jiang *et al.*). However, many connections are cut during the preparation of brain slices. The effects can be enormous and depend on slice thickness, the distance of recorded cells from the slice surface, and the distances between recorded cells (2). All of these parameters were biased toward connec-

tion loss—slices were thin, cells were close to the surface (within 15 to 60 μm), and to fit eight electrodes in the recording space, sampled cells were far apart. These factors result in a failure to detect connections and, accordingly, the paper detected no connections whatsoever between layer 5 excitatory neurons and extremely few between layer 2/3 excitatory neurons (only 1.8% connectivity rate). These numbers contrast with numerous published studies, and the authors suggest that other studies used slices from immature animals and that connections are eliminated as animals mature. The authors fail to cite or address previous studies from adult animals [e.g., (3)] in which connections were assessed using sharp electrode recordings (which sample deeper cells) and thicker slices that revealed connection rates comparable to those in younger animals (typically at least 10 to 20% connected pairs).

Moreover, not all connections are cut equally, and the loss of connectivity depends on the trajectory of the axon of different cell types and the plane of sectioning, as well as laminar location and distance (2). Therefore, the connectivity matrix reported by Jiang *et al.* is likely scaled down and distorted.

This is just one example of a discrepancy with published studies and a single example of a limitation of the methods used; not all discrepancies can be so easily resolved based on the published literature. Other limitations include the use of current clamp to measure synaptic responses, which will bias conclusions of connectivity depending on the input resistance of the postsynaptic cells and will favor large connections, and the exclusive usage of potassium gluconate-based intracellular solution, which is associated with severe space-clamp problems (4). Further experi-

ments using complementary approaches and direct comparisons across ages will be necessary to resolve discrepancies between this study and the published literature.

Concerning the identification and classification of cell types, community efforts to arrive at a unified nomenclature (5) have not resulted in complete agreement. However, there is consensus that multiple parameters must be measured and used. Jiang *et al.* defined their cells primarily based on morphological reconstructions. The computational methods for classification were not confirmed with external validators provided by different methods. This is necessary because, by definition, any classification algorithm used will generate a classification, regardless of whether it is real.

Using these methods, the authors claim to have discovered several “new cell classes,” but it is not clear that their groupings really represent distinct groups or are new. They imply, for instance, that, other than Martinotti cells, no other interneuron types were previously described in layer 5. This is at odds with publications reporting vasointestinal peptide (VIP) bipolar interneurons in layer 5 [e.g., (6) and earlier references therein]

¹159C Mellon Institute, Department of Biological Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, 4400 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA. ²Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO 63110, USA. ³Systems Neurobiology Laboratories, The Salk Institute for Biological Studies, 10010 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA. ⁴Department of Neuroscience, Division of Biology and Medicine, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA. ⁵Neuroscience Paris Seine (NPS), Cortical Network and Neurovascular Coupling (CNVC), CNRS UMR 8246, Inserm U 1130, UPMC UM 119, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 9 Quai Saint Bernard, 75005 Paris, France. ⁶Laboratorio Cajal de Circuitos Corticales, Centro de Tecnología Biomédica, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Campus Montegancedo S/N, Pozuelo de Alarcón, 28223 Madrid, Spain. ⁷Instituto Cajal (CSIC), Avenida Doctor Arce 37, 28002 Madrid, Spain. ⁸Institut für Neurowissenschaften und Medizin (INM-2), Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, Germany. ⁹Department of Cellular and Network Neurobiology, Laboratory of Cerebral Cortex Research, Institute of Experimental Medicine, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, H-1450 Budapest, POB 67, Hungary. ¹⁰Division of Cerebral Circuitry, National Institute for Physiological Sciences, 5-1 Myodaiji-Higashiyama, Okazaki, Aichi 444-8787, Japan. ¹¹University of Debrecen, Department of Anatomy, Histology, Embryology, Laboratory for Cortical Systems Neuroscience, Nagyerdei krt. 98, 4012 Debrecen, Hungary. ¹²Laboratory of Cellular and Synaptic Neurophysiology, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 35 Convent Drive MSC3715, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹³Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Computational Neuroanatomy Group, D-72076 Tübingen, Germany. ¹⁴Neuroscience Paris Seine, Université Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC) Paris VI, 7-9 Quai Saint Bernard, 75005 Paris, France. ¹⁵Neuroscience Institute, Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative Care, and Pain Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, Smilow Research Center, 522 First Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA. ¹⁶University Medicine Goettingen, Center for Anatomy, Institute for Neuroanatomy, Kreuzberggring 36, D-37075 Goettingen, Germany. ¹⁷Medical Research Council Brain Network Dynamics Unit, Department of Pharmacology, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, Oxford, OX1 3TH, UK. ¹⁸Research Group for Cortical Microcircuits of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Department of Physiology, Anatomy and Neuroscience, University of Szeged, Közép Fásor 52, Szeged, H-6726 Hungary. ¹⁹Kavli Institute of Brain Science, Columbia University, Department of Biological Sciences, West 120 Street, New York, NY 10027, USA.

*Corresponding author. Email: jochen.staiger@med.uni-goettingen.de (J.S.); rudyb01@med.nyu.edu (B.R.); callaway@salk.edu (E.C.)

and the studies on fast-spiking parvalbumin (PV) basket cells in this layer [recently reviewed by (7)]. The authors redefine and rename interneuron types resulting in claims of novel cell classes and improper acknowledgment of much of the literature. For instance, their new cell types in layer 5—including the shrunken cell (SC), the horizontally elongated cell (HEC), and the VIP-expressing bitufted cell (BTC)—appear to correspond to previously described interneurons: (i) SCs resemble small and nest basket cells (8); (ii) HECs resemble layer 5a fast-spiking basket cells that have an axonal arbor that is horizontally focused in the narrow layer 5a [e.g., (9, 10)]; and (iii) the VIP-expressing BTCs likely correspond to the VIP bipolar interneurons previously described in layers 2 to 6 (6). A more careful comparison to the cell types described in the literature and analysis should be performed before it is concluded that a new cell type has been discovered. Last, given the large sample presented by Jiang *et al.*, it is surprising that several well-documented interneuron types, such as cholecystokinin (CCK) basket cells

and γ -aminobutyric acid-releasing (GABAergic) projection cells (11, 12), were missed, although their representation is likely much higher than 1 in 1000. This suggests that the selection of types to categorize and illustrate might have been biased.

Contrary to the authors' claim that they have provided "the most complete wiring diagram of neocortical microcircuits to date," their description is incomplete, partly arbitrary, and also not definitive. The completeness of their description does not rival the accumulated knowledge from decades of studies on cortical connectivity using a diverse range of complementary and powerful techniques. It ignores cortical layers 4 and 6 and focuses largely on the diversity of inhibitory neurons in layers 2/3 and 5, with little consideration for the diversity of excitatory neuron types, and there is no consideration of gap-junction coupling, a major feature of the connectivity between interneurons. We hope that our colleagues will recognize that this study adds to a growing body of knowledge about the cell types and connec-

tivity of the cerebral cortex, but we are far from finished.

REFERENCES

1. X. Jiang *et al.*, *Science* **350**, aac9462 (2015).
2. A. Stepanyants, L. M. Martinez, A. S. Ferecskó, Z. F. Kisvárdy, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 3555–3560 (2009).
3. A. M. Thomson, D. C. West, Y. Wang, A. P. Bannister, *Cereb. Cortex* **12**, 936–953 (2002).
4. S. R. Williams, S. J. Mitchell, *Nat. Neurosci.* **11**, 790–798 (2008).
5. G. A. Ascoli *et al.*, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 557–568 (2008).
6. A. Prönnke *et al.*, *Cereb. Cortex* **25**, 4854–4868 (2015).
7. A. Naka, H. Adesnik, *Front. Neural Circuits* **10**, 35 (2016).
8. Y. Wang, A. Gupta, M. Toledo-Rodriguez, C. Z. Wu, H. Markram, *Cereb. Cortex* **12**, 395–410 (2002).
9. G. Doron, M. von Heimendahl, P. Schlattmann, A. R. Houweling, M. Brecht, *Neuron* **81**, 653–663 (2014).
10. W. Muñoz, R. Tremblay, B. Rudy, *Cell Reports* **9**, 2304–2316 (2014).
11. A. Caputi, S. Melzer, M. Michael, H. Monyer, *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **23**, 179–186 (2013).
12. R. Tomioka *et al.*, *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **21**, 1587–1600 (2005).

29 February 2016; accepted 3 August 2016
10.1126/science.aaf5663



Comment on "Principles of connectivity among morphologically defined cell types in adult neocortex"

Alison L. Barth, Andreas Burkhalter, Edward M. Callaway, Barry W. Connors, Bruno Cauli, Javier DeFelipe, Dirk Feldmeyer, Tamas Freund, Yasuo Kawaguchi, Zoltan Kisvarday, Yoshiyuki Kubota, Chris McBain, Marcel Oberlaender, Jean Rossier, Bernardo Rudy, Jochen F. Staiger, Peter Somogyi, Gabor Tamas and Rafael Yuste (September 8, 2016)
Science 353 (6304), 1108. [doi: 10.1126/science.aaf5663]

Editor's Summary

This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Article Tools | Visit the online version of this article to access the personalization and article tools:
http://science.sciencemag.org/content/353/6304/1108.1 |
| Permissions | Obtain information about reproducing this article:
http://www.sciencemag.org/about/permissions.dtl |

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published weekly, except the last week in December, by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. Copyright 2016 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science; all rights reserved. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.