Supplementary Methods: Modelling synaptic depression

The justification of the model was described previously (Wang and Manis 2008; Yang and Xu-Friedman 2008), and was based primarily on the model of Dittman *et al.* (2000), which is itself similar to models going back to Liley and North (1953). Briefly, we calculated the relative size of the ith EPSC in a train of stimuli by:

$$
EPSC_i = F D_i S_i \tag{1}
$$

where F is the probability of release, D_i is the proportion of release sites that are ready to release on the i^{th} pulse, S_i is the proportion of receptors that are available (i.e. not desensitized). We did not model changes in *F*, as facilitation does not appear to be present under our conditions.

 The number of release-ready sites, *D*, is reduced by release, such that immediately after a release event, *D* decreases by *FDi*, and then recovers to resting levels at a rate depending on a calcium-dependent process:

$$
\frac{dD(t)}{dt} = (1 - D(t)) \left(\frac{k_{\text{max}} - k_0}{1 + K_{\text{D}} / CaD(t)} + k_0 \right),\tag{2}
$$

where k_0 is the resting recovery rate, and $CaD(t)$ is the calcium-bound state of a sensor that drives a rapid recovery process of rate *k*max. The interaction between the rapid recovery process and the calcium-bound sensor is modelled as a simple affinity given by K_D . *CaD* increments after each EPSC, and decays to resting levels by a simple exponential, given by:

$$
CaD_{i+1} = CaD_i e^{-\Delta t/\tau_D} \tag{3}
$$

These equations yield an analytical expression for D_{i+1} based on the preceding pulse:

$$
D_{i+1} = 1 - (1 - (1 - F)D_i)e^{-k_0\Delta t} \left(\frac{K_{\rm D}/CaD_i + 1}{K_{\rm D}/CaD_i + e^{-\Delta t/\tau_D}}\right)^{-(k_{\rm max} - k_0)\tau_{\rm D}}
$$
(4)

1

where Δt is the interval between pulses.

 Extracellular glutamate in the synaptic cleft drives desensitization according to a simple binding reaction:

$$
S = K_S / (K_S + [glutamate]),
$$
\n(5)

where K_S is the binding affinity of the receptor for extracellular glutamate. After the ith release event, the glutamate concentration increments by the amount just released (*FDi*), and then decays exponentially back to resting levels, so that the glutamate concentration at the $(i + 1)$ th pulse is given by:

$$
[glutamate]_{i+1} = ([glutamate]_i + FD_i)e^{-\Delta t/\tau_s}, \qquad (6)
$$

where Δt is the interval between pulses, and τ_s is the rate of glutamate clearance.

 The 7 free parameters of the model were fit to recorded PPR and trains data for a given cell using a least-squares approach. Parameters for the high-, middle-, and low-depressing endbulbs are given in Supplementary Table 3.

Supplementary Table 1: Correlations between parameters measured off PPR recovery or train depression curves.

Supplementary Table 2: Principal components analysis. Rows represent the eigenvectors for each principle component *Xi*.

Supplementary Table 3. Parameters used for the models in Fig. 4. The model is described in detail in Yang & Xu-Friedman (2008), and the Supplementary Methods.

Supplementary Table 4. Steady-state conductance amplitudes predicted by the three depression models at three stimulation frequencies. In addition, the rightmost column indicates the postsynaptic threshold measured in current-clamp experiments after a train of 30 pulses normalized to threshold at the beginning $(N = 4$ experiments).

Depression model

Supplementary Table 5. Comparison between sibling and non-sibling inputs onto the same target bushy cell using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test for individual measures. Data are from 10 pairs of siblings compared against the overall distribution of distances (i.e. 190 comparisons). *P* values below 0.05 are highlighted in bold. The main text and Fig. 6 report the plots and P-values for measures grouped together.

