Table 1. Comparison of unitary inhibitory postsynaptic currents (IPSCs) generated at basket cell (BC)–BC and BC–principal neuron (PN) synapses in parvalbumin-EGFP and wild-type (WT) mice

	CA1	CA3	DG	DG (WT)
	BC-BC	BC-BC	BC-BC	BC-BC
Chemical interactions (IPSCs)	8 of 9	5 of 6	7 of 9	8 of 10
Latency IPSC	$0.68 \pm 0.03 \text{ ms}$	$0.6 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$0.65 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$0.9 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$
20–80% rise time	$0.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ ms}$	$0.25 \pm 0.02 \text{ ms}$	$0.3 \pm 0.03 \text{ ms}$	$0.2 \pm 0.01 \text{ ms}$
Decay $\tau_{\rm w}$	$1.7 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$1.2 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$	$2.5 \pm 0.4 \text{ ms}$	$2.3 \pm 0.3 \text{ ms}$
Peak amplitude	$208 \pm 54 \text{ pA}$	$160 \pm 46 \text{ pA}$	$93 \pm 22 \text{ pA}$	$104 \pm 28 \text{ pA}$
CV peak amplitude	$18 \pm 1\%$	$16 \pm 2\%$	$26 \pm 4\%$	$26 \pm 2\%$
$ au_1$	$1.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$0.8 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$	$1.0 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$	$1.4 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$
$\tau_2$	$8.0 \pm 1.2 \text{ ms}$	$3.8 \pm 1.0 \text{ ms}$	$10.0 \pm 2.8 \text{ ms}$	$9.3 \pm 1.7 \text{ ms}$
$A_1/(A_1 + A_2)$	$0.9 \pm 0.03$	$0.84 \pm 0.07$	$0.74 \pm 0.08$	$0.81 \pm 0.06$
Percentage of failures	$4 \pm 3\%$	$10 \pm 10\%$	$5 \pm 3\%$	$5 \pm 4\%$
PPD at 50 ms	$36 \pm 2\%$	$37 \pm 4\%$	$24 \pm 4\%$	$26 \pm 4\%$
Reciprocal chemical coupling	1 of 8	3 of 5	3 of 7	4 of 8
Electrical interactions (electrical PSCs)	2 of 9	3 of 6	3 of 9	6 of 10
Peak amplitude	15 pA	$89 \pm 25 \text{ pA}$	$31 \pm 10 \text{ pA}$	$84 \pm 16 \text{ pA}$
	BC-PN	BC-PN	BC-PN	BC-PN
Chemical interactions (IPSCs)	5 of 5	3 of 3	3 of 3	4 of 4
Latency IPSC	$0.9 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$1.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$0.9 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$0.7 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$
20–80% rise time	$0.3 \pm 0.02 \text{ ms}$	$0.3 \pm 0.02 \text{ ms}$	$0.2 \pm 0.03 \text{ ms}$	$0.2 \pm 0.02 \text{ ms}$
Decay $\tau_w$	$3.5 \pm 0.5 \text{ ms}$	$3.3 \pm 0.1 \text{ ms}$	$3.4 \pm 0.4 \text{ ms}$	$3.3 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$
Peak amplitude	$387 \pm 213 \text{ pA}$	$214 \pm 83.5 \text{ pA}$	$81.5 \pm 11 \text{ pA}$	$200 \pm 50 \text{ pA}$
CV peak amplitude	$28 \pm 5\%$	$32 \pm 4\%$	$40 \pm 4\%$	$27 \pm 3\%$
$ au_1$	$1.2 \pm 0.4 \text{ ms}$	$1.2 \pm 0.4 \text{ ms}$	$1.8 \pm 0.7 \text{ ms}$	$1.3 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$
$\tau_2$	$7.3 \pm 1.9 \text{ ms}$	$5.9 \pm 0.2 \text{ ms}$	$8.5 \pm 3.7 \text{ ms}$	$5.6 \pm 0.4 \text{ ms}$
$A_1/(A_1 + A_2)$	$0.6 \pm 0.08$	$0.6 \pm 0.04$	$0.6 \pm 0.2$	$0.5 \pm 0.08$
Percentage of failures	$3\pm2\%$	0%	$5.5 \pm 4\%$	$2.5 \pm 2.5\%$
PPD at 50 ms	$33 \pm 3\%$	$31 \pm 1\%$	$28 \pm 3\%$	$39 \pm 1\%$

Electrical interactions 0 of 5 0 of 3 0 of 3

Values indicate mean  $\pm$  SEM. Numbers given refer to the subset of pairs in which interactions (electrical, chemical, or both) were evident. In total, interactions were observed in approximately > 60% of all pairs of EGFP-positive BCs recorded. Values were measured from average IPSCs (failures included). PPD was determined only in a subset of pairs. CV, coefficient of variation = standard deviation/mean. As the properties of unitary IPSCs at BC-BC synapses in the DG of parvalbumin-EGFP mice were indistinguishable from those of WT mice, it was unlikely that synaptic transmission was altered by the expression of EGFP in the transgenic animals.