

# Supporting Information

Puig *et al.* 10.1073/pnas.0712219105

## SI Methods

**Identification of FSi in VGAT-Venus Transgenic Rats *in Vivo*.** In each experiment, a VGAT-Venus transgenic rat was implanted with two stimulating electrodes, one in the dorsal raphe (DR) and another in the dorsal striatum (STR). Cortico-raphe (1) (CR,  $n = 24$ ) and crossed-corticostriatal (2) (CCS,  $n = 48$ ) projection neurons were identified by antidromic electrical stimulation from DR and the contralateral striatum, respectively (Fig. S1A). We did not find any unit projecting to DR and contralateral striatum simultaneously ( $n = 72$ ), an indication that CCS and CR pyramidal neurons may belong to different populations. Neurons with brief action potentials ( $<1$  ms, first plus second phases, Fig. S2A), and no antidromic responses were considered putative FSi. At the end of the recording session, units were stained with a juxtacellular injection of neurobiotin using 500-ms cycles of positive current pulses (200 ms on/300 ms off,  $<8$  nA) (3) (Fig. S1B, *Left*). Next, we examined whether there was colocalization of neurobiotin and Venus immunofluorescence. Venus-positive cells (interneurons) were further processed for PV immunoreactivity (Fig. S1B *Middle*).

During the positive pulses of the juxtacellular stainings, FSi were depolarized to high firing rates ( $>100$  Hz) and often showed an increase in the amplitude of action potentials. Conversely, all of the

other classes of neurons displayed much lower discharge frequencies ( $<50$  Hz) and clear activity-dependent amplitude attenuation (Fig. S1B and C). Most FSi could not be recovered after the staining; however, the maximum frequency induced during the depolarizing phases could be assessed. Three FSi reconstructed with NeuroLucida exhibited basket cell-like morphology (4–6) (Fig. S1B *Right*), but other FSi could not be classified because of poor axonal labeling. Identified pyramidal neurons exhibited longer spike widths and lower discharge rates compared to FSi. However, there was some overlap in the distributions (see Fig. S2B and Table 1). Remarkably, 10 of 10 PV-positive cells tested emitted high-frequency bursts of action potentials when the striatum was stimulated. The short delay of the responses ( $\approx 6$  ms) strongly suggested a monosynaptic activation (Fig. S1D). Because the striatum does not project back to cortex directly, the high discharge rate recorded during the excitations was likely caused by a feedforward activation from CCS pyramidal cells that had been antidromically activated in the striatum (Fig. S5B). Interestingly, five of these FSi were also excited by DR stimulation (feedforward activation from CR pyramidal neurons antidromically activated in the DR). Therefore, some FSi may receive convergent input from pyramidal neurons belonging to distinct brain circuits (Fig. S1D). Only 1 of 72 pyramidal cells recorded was activated by striatal stimulation, and the firing rate was much lower than that elicited in FSi (Table S1).

1. Puig MV, Artigas F, Celada P (2005) Modulation of the activity of pyramidal neurons in rat prefrontal cortex by raphe stimulation *in vivo*: involvement of serotonin and GABA. *Cereb Cortex* 15:1–14.
2. Morishima M, Kawaguchi Y (2006) Recurrent connection patterns of corticostriatal pyramidal cells in frontal cortex. *J Neurosci* 26:4394–4405.
3. Pinault D (1996) A novel single-cell staining procedure performed *in vivo* under electrophysiological control: morpho-functional features of juxtacellularly labeled thalamic cells and other central neurons with biocytin or neurobiotin. *J Neurosci Methods* 65:113–136.
4. Kawaguchi Y, Kubota Y (1993) Correlation of physiological subgroupings of nonpyramidal cells with parvalbumin- and calbindinD28k-immunoreactive neurons in layer V of rat frontal cortex. *J Neurophysiol* 70:387–396.
5. Kawaguchi Y, Kubota Y (1997) GABAergic cell subtypes and their synaptic connections in rat frontal cortex. *Cereb Cortex* 7:476–486.
6. Uematsu M *et al.* (2008) Quantitative chemical composition of cortical GABAergic neurons revealed in transgenic Venus-expressing rats. *Cereb Cortex* 18:315–330.











**Table S1. Differences between early and late neocortical FSi and pyramidal neurons (continues from Table 1)**

	Early FSi	Late FSi	All Fsi	Pyr
STR excitation, %	77 (20/26)	87 (13/15)	81 (33/41)	1.3 (1/72)
Delay, ms	7.3 ± 4.9	4.5 ± 2.2*	6.2 ± 3.9	4
Duration, ms	10.9 ± 5.3	10 ± 5.1	10.4 ± 5.2	11
Success rate	238 ± 385	476 ± 1,376	293 ± 756	7.2
DR excitation, %	10 (3/30)	47 (7/15)	24 (11/45)	0 (0/72)
Delay, ms	4.3 ± 0.6	7.3 ± 2.4*	6.5 ± 2.3	—
Duration, ms	9 ± 2.7	14.6 ± 5.4	12.4 ± 5.1	—
Success rate	17 ± 15	18 ± 25	17.6 ± 20.6	—

Most FSi emitted high-frequency bursts of action potentials when the striatum (STR) was stimulated, whereas less FSi were activated by dorsal raphe (DR) stimulation. The majority of neurons were recorded in the secondary motor area, a region where crossed-corticostriatal (CCS) pyramidal neurons are more abundant than corticoraphe (CR) neurons. Hence, FSi recorded in the secondary motor area are more likely to receive profuse inputs from nearby CCS cells. Interestingly, more late FSi appeared to be activated by CCS and CR neurons compared to early FSi. Furthermore, the mean delay of STR excitations in late cells was significantly shorter than in early cells. This may be caused by a more abundant innervation of CCS neurons onto late FSi. \*, Late vs. early,  $P < 0.05$ , unpaired  $t$  test. (.), number of cells. Mean ± SD.