nature neuroscience

Corresponding Author: Sonja B. Hofer

Manuscript Number: NN-A53567

Manuscript Type: Article

Main Figures: 7

Supplementary Figures: 10

Supplementary Tables: 0

Supplementary Videos: 0

Reporting Checklist for Nature Neuroscience

This checklist is used to ensure good reporting standards and to improve the reproducibility of published results. For more information, please read Reporting Life Sciences Research.

Please note that in the event of publication, it is mandatory that authors include all relevant methodological and statistical information in the manuscript.

Statistics reporting, by figure

- Please specify the following information for each panel reporting quantitative data, and where each item is reported (section, e.g. Results, & paragraph number).
- Each figure legend should ideally contain an exact sample size (n) for each experimental group/condition, where n is an exact number and not a range, a clear definition of how n is defined (for example x cells from x slices from x animals from x litters, collected over x days), a description of the statistical test used, the results of the tests, any descriptive statistics and clearly defined error bars if applicable.
- For any experiments using custom statistics, please indicate the test used and stats obtained for each experiment.
- Each figure legend should include a statement of how many times the experiment shown was replicated in the lab; the details of sample collection should be sufficiently clear so that the replicability of the experiment is obvious to the reader.
- For experiments reported in the text but not in the figures, please use the paragraph number instead of the figure number.

Note: Mean and standard deviation are not appropriate on small samples, and plotting independent data points is usually more informative. When technical replicates are reported, error and significance measures reflect the experimental variability and not the variability of the biological process; it is misleading not to state this clearly.

		TEST USED		n			DESCRIPTIVE STATS (AVERAGE, VARIANCE)		P VALUE		DEGREES OF FREEDOM & F/t/z/R/ETC VALUE	
	FIGURE NUMBER	WHICH TEST?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	EXACT VALUE	DEFINED?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	REPORTED?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	EXACT VALUE	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	VALUE	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #
example	1a	one-way ANOVA	Fig. legend	9, 9, 10, 15	mice from at least 3 litters/group	Methods para 8	error bars are mean +/- SEM	Fig. legend	p = 0.044	Fig. legend	F(3, 36) = 2.97	Fig. legend
example	results, para 6	unpaired t-test	Results para 6	15	slices from 10 mice	Results para 6	error bars are mean +/- SEM	Results para 6	p = 0.0006	Results para 6	t(28) = 2.808	Results para 6

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

		TEST USED		n			DESCRIPTIVE STATS (AVERAGE, VARIANCE)		P VALUE		DEGREES OF FREEDOM & F/t/z/R/ETC VALUE	
	FIGURE NUMBER	WHICH TEST?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	EXACT VALUE	DEFINED?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	REPORTED?	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	EXACT VALUE	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #	VALUE	SECTION & PARAGRAPH #
+ -	1c	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 2, figure 1 legend	5,5	Brain slices containing V1 from mice co-injected in dLGN and LP (2 mice)	Figure 1 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 2	0.0317	Results paragraph 2, figure 1 legend	Degrees of Freedom (DOF) = 8; value (U) = 21.5	
+ -	2d	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 3, figure 2 legend	202, 429, 114	Responsive LP/ dLGN boutons, V1 neurons from 6, 6 and 4 mice respectively	Figure 2 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 3	[8.0293e-32] LP/dLGN 0.0366 V1/LP 1.4626e-26 V1/dLGN 7.6239e-28	Results paragraph 3	[DOF=2; chi-sq=143.1993] DOF = 629,314,542; U = 58476;z = -2.5068 U = 26468; z = 10.768 U= 47442; z = 11.0367	
+ -	2e	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 3, figure 2 legend	202, 429, 114	Responsive LP/ dLGN boutons, V1 neurons from 6, 6 and 4 mice respectively	Figure 2 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 3	[2.9741e-13] LP/dLGN 0.3504 V1/LP 3.9555e-09 V1/dLGN 3.7959e-13	Results paragraph 3	[DOF=2; chi-sq=57.6873] DOF = 629,314,542; U = 67183; z = -1.5683 U = 22800; z = 6.0651 U = 42042; z = 7.4098	
+ -	3c	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 4, figure 3 legend	1825, 2317, 356	Receptive fields from LP boutons, dLGN boutons, V1 neurons from 13, 7 and 4 mice respectively	Figure 3 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 4	[0 (<10^-323)] LP/dLGN 0 (<10^-323) V1/LP 6.4533e-66 V1/dLGN 1.2102e-25	Results paragraph 4	[DOF=2; chi-sq=1.9173e+03] DOF = 4140,2179,2671; U = 5427865; z = 43.1155 U = 2178156; z = 17.2122 U = 619295; z = 10.5716	
+ -	3d	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 4, figure 3 legend	1825, 2317, 356	Receptive fields from LP boutons, dLGN boutons, V1 neurons from 13, 7 and 4 mice respectively	Figure 3 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 4	[3.4373e-212] LP/dLGN 2.8481e-210 V1/LP 3.9720e-38 V1/dLGN 7.1481e-04	Results paragraph 4	[DOF=2; chi-sq=973.8267] 4140,2179,2671; U = 4964258; z = 30.9818 U = 2132308; z = 12.9940 U = 525790; z= 3.6745	

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

+ -	4d	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 6,7, figure 4 legend	273353, 1380, 87804	Pairs (all-way combinations) of receptive fields from dLGN, V1, LP from 7, 4 and 13 mice respectively	Figure 4 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 6,7	[0 (<10^-323)] 1.6528e-19 LP/V1 1.5204e-262 LP/dLGN 0 (<10^-323)	Results paragraph 6,7	[DOF=2; chi-sq=4.5034e+04] DOF = 274731,889182, 3361155; U = 162666202; z = -9.1535 U = 3.9483e+09; z = 34.6464 U = 2.1547e+10; z = 211.7785	
+ -	4e	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum		11, 11, 9	dLGN, LP imaging regions with at least 50 receptive fields and V1 imaging regions with at least 10 receptive fields		Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 6,7	[3.6545e-06] LP/dLGN 2.4454e-04 LP/V1 5.9127e-04 V1/dLGN 0.0042		[DOF=2; chi-sq=25.0391] DOF = 20,18,18; U = 187; z = 3.9399 U = 165; z = 3.7227 U = 52; z = -3.1909	
+ -	5c	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 10, figure 5 legend	21,31; 21,30	All closed-loop and dark sessions for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Figure 5 legend	Sessions mean and standard error to the mean (SEM)	Results paragraph 10	Dark-LP/VR-LP 0.06 Dark-dLGN/ VR-dLGN 0.03 VR: dLGN/LP 0.0808 Dark: dLGN/LP 0.0348	Results paragraph 10	DOF = 50; DOF = 49; U = Dark-LP/VR-LP = 489; Dark-dLGN/VR-dLGN = 798.5; VR: dLGN/LP = 403; Dark: dLGN/LP = 429;	
+ -	6c	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 13	18,31	All open-loop sessions from dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)		Sessions mean and SEM	Results paragraph 13	Running Speed (RS) = 0.2672 Visual Flow speed (VF) = 0.9421	Results paragraph 13	DOF = 47; U: RS = 504; VF = 446	
+ -	6e	Z-test of proportions	Results paragraph 14	2159,1617	All boutons with |PP| > 0.16 for RS or VF for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)		Proportions	Results paragraph 14	1e-45, 1e-6	Results paragraph 14	Z = -14.19 Z = 4.85	
+ -	6f	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 15, figure 6 legend	2159,1617	All boutons with |PP| > 0.16 for RS or VF for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Figure 6 legend	Median and interquartile range	Results paragraph 15	0.000000001	Results paragraph 15	DOF = 3774 U = 4267349	
+ -	7d	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 16, figure 7 legend	18,31	All open-loop sessions from dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Figure 7 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Results paragraph 16	RS-VF = 0.0036; RS+VF = 0.0004	Results paragraph 16	DOF = 47; U: RS-VF = 309; RS+VF = 621	
+ -	7e	Wilcoxon signed-rank	Results paragraph 17, figure 7 legend	334,206; 99,276	Only session pairs where no drift of imaging sites was observed across trial types for RS +VF boutons and RS-VF boutons for dLGN (10 sessions; 7 mice) and RS+VF and RS-VF boutons for LP (13 sessions; 8 mice)	Figure 7 legend	Mean and SEM	Results paragraph 17	dLGN: RS+VF = 0.67; RS-VF = 7.88e-11; LP: RS+VF = 0.96; RS-VF = 5.64e-4	Results paragraph 17	U dLGN: RS+VF = 28720; RS-VF = 16231; LP: RS+VF = 2463; RS-VF = 23690	

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

+ -	Suppl. 4c	chi-sq test for uniformity of distribution	Supplementary figure 4 legend	1825, 2317, 356	Receptive field subfields from LP boutons, dLGN boutons, V1 neurons from 13, 7 and 4 mice respectively	Supplementary figure 4	distributions shown	Supplementary figure 4	LP 0 (<10^-15) dLGN 0 (<10^-15) V1 0.0327	Supplementary figure 4 legend	chi-sq(5)=90.5649 chi-sq(5)=335.5723 chi-sq(5)=12.1573	
+ -	Suppl. 4e	[Kruskal-Wallis] Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 4 legend	471, 590, 89	Receptive fields from LP boutons, dLGN boutons, V1 neurons with both ON and OFF subfields	Supplementary figure 4	Median	Supplementary figure 4	[1.7424e-58] LP/dLGN 5.8716e-59 LP/V1 1.8586e-05 V1/dLGN 1.7106e-05	Supplementary figure 4 legend	[chi-sq=265.9893; DOF=2] DOF = 1059,558,677; U = 330728; z=16.2581 U = 138443; z=4.5196 U = 38087; z=4.5371	
+ -	Suppl. 5c	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 5 legend	18,34,14	Only well isolated units from 8 mice for LPMR,LPLR and dLGN were included	Supplementary figure 5 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 5	LPMR/LPLR 0.0635; LPMR/dLGN 0.0013 LPLR/dLGN 1.9136e-04	Supplementary figure 5 legend	DOF = 50,30,46 Z = -1.8980; Z = -3.5495; Z = -4.0557	
+ -	Suppl. 5d	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 5 legend	18,34,14	Only well isolated units from 8 mice for LPMR,LPLR and dLGN were included	Supplementary figure 5 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 5	LPMR/LPLR = 0.3459; LPMR/dLGN = 0.0013; LPLR/dLGN = 4.9745e-4	Supplementary figure 5 legend	DOF = 50,30,46 Z = -0.9426; Z = -3.2105; Z =. -3.4821	
+ -	Suppl. 5f	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Results paragraph 5; Supplementary figure 5 legend	18,34,12	Only well isolated units from 8 mice for LPMR,LPLR and dLGN were included	Supplementary figure 5 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Results paragraph 5; Supplementary figure 5	LPMR/LPLR = 0.2482; LPMR/dLGN = 5.2412e-06; LPLR/dLGN = 1.7499e-06	Results paragraph 5	DOF = 50,28,44 Z = 1.1547; Z = 4.5549; Z = 4.7803	
+ -	Suppl. 5h	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 5 legend	16,10,12	Only well isolated units from 8 mice for LPMR,LPLR and dLGN were included	Supplementary figure 5 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 5	LPMR/LPLR = 0.1625; LPMR/dLGN = 3.8245e-04; LPLR/dLGN = 0.0017	Supplementary figure 5 legend	DOF = 24,26,20 Z = 1.3967; Z = 3.5519; Z = 3.1329	
+ -	Suppl. 7d.e.f	chi-sq test for uniformity of distribution	Supplementary figure 7 legend	11,13,8	dLGN, LP imaging regions with at least 35 receptive fields and all V1 imaging regions from 5, 7, and 4 mice respectively	Supplementary figure 7 legend	distributions shown	Supplementary figure 7	dLGN 0.0091 LP 0.5235 V1 0.0244	Supplementary figure 7 legend	chi-sq(11) = 25.00 chi-sq(11) = 10.0769 chi-sq(11) = 22.00	
+ -	Suppl. 9a	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 9 legend	18,31	All open-loop sessions for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Supplementary figure 9 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 9	0.6325, 0.2257, 0.0684		DOF = 47; U = 488.5, 521, 380.5	
+ -	Suppl. 9b	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 9 legend	18,31	All open-loop sessions for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Supplementary figure 9 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 9	0.0054, 0.6560, 0.0001	Supplementary figure 9 legend	DOF = 47; U = 610.5, 497, 284.5	

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

+ -	Suppl. 9c	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 9 legend	18,29	All dark sessions for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice)	Supplementary figure 9 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 9	0.1109, 0.5766, 0.0684		DOF = 45; U = 359, 406, 515.5	
+ -	Suppl. 9d	Wilcoxon rank-sum	Supplementary figure 9 legend	18,29	All dark sessions for dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice), containing boutons with PP > 0.16	Supplementary figure 9 legend	Sessions mean and SEM	Supplementary figure 9	0.0965		DOF = 49; U = 393.5	
+ -	Suppl. 10c	Z-test of proportions	Supplementary figure 10 legend	2159,1617	All boutons from dLGN (8 mice) and LP (10 mice) with PP>0.16 for RS or VF, with significant correlations	Supplementary figure 10 legend	Proportions	Supplementary figure 10	1e-38, 1e-11	Supplementary figure 10 legend	Z = -12.92; Z = 6.66	

Representative figures

1. Are any representative images shown (including Western blots and immunohistochemistry/staining) in the paper?

   If so, what figure(s)?

Fig. 1
Fig. 2a,b,c
Fig. 3b
Fig. 5b
Fig. 7b
Supplementary Fig. 1
Supplementary Fig. 2
Supplementary Fig. 3
Supplementary Fig. 5a
Supplementary Fig. 8

2. For each representative image, is there a clear statement of how many times this experiment was successfully repeated and a discussion of any limitations in repeatability?

   If so, where is this reported (section, paragraph #)?

yes, numbers of n are reported in each figure legend.

Statistics and general methods

1. Is there a justification of the sample size?

   If so, how was it justified?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   Even if no sample size calculation was performed, authors should report why the sample size is adequate to measure their effect size.

No sample size calculation was performed. The sample sizes are considered adequate for the experiments and consistent with the literature.

2. Are statistical tests justified as appropriate for every figure?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

Statistics are chosen based on the data points and their distribution properties.

   a. If there is a section summarizing the statistical methods in the methods, is the statistical test for each experiment clearly defined?

There is no section in the methods but the statistical tests are clearly stated for each analysis and figure panel.

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

b. Do the data meet the assumptions of the specific statistical test you chose (e.g. normality for a parametric test)? Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?	Yes. Non-parametric tests are used throughout.
c. Is there any estimate of variance within each group of data? Is the variance similar between groups that are being statistically compared? Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, either the standard error of the mean or interquartile range were reported both in the figures and in the corresponding results sections.
d. Are tests specified as one- or two-sided?	All tests were two-sided
e. Are there adjustments for multiple comparisons?	Significance statements are adjusted for multiple comparisons where appropriate.
3. Are criteria for excluding data points reported? Was this criterion established prior to data collection? Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?	Some recordings in awake mice were excluded based on the running profile of the animals. This is described in paragraph 5 of the methods section.
4. Define the method of randomization used to assign subjects (or samples) to the experimental groups and to collect and process data. If no randomization was used, state so. Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
5. Is a statement of the extent to which investigator knew the group allocation during the experiment and in assessing outcome included? If no blinding was done, state so. Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
6. For experiments in live vertebrates, is a statement of compliance with ethical guidelines/regulations included? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in the first paragraph of the methods section.
7. Is the species of the animals used reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in the first paragraph of the methods section (mice).
8. Is the strain of the animals (including background strains of KO/ transgenic animals used) reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in the first paragraph of the methods section.
9. Is the sex of the animals/subjects used reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in the first paragraph of the methods section.
10. Is the age of the animals/subjects reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, a minimum age is given in the first paragraph of the methods section.

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

11. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the light/dark cycle reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in paragraph 5 of the methods section.
12. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the housing group (i.e. number of animals per cage) reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	2-4 mice per cages.
13. For behavioral experiments, is the time of day reported (e.g. light or dark cycle)? Where (section, paragraph #)?	Yes, described in paragraph 5 of the methods section.
14. Is the previous history of the animals/subjects (e.g. prior drug administration, surgery, behavioral testing) reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
a. If multiple behavioral tests were conducted in the same group of animals, is this reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
15. If any animals/subjects were excluded from analysis, is this reported? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
a. How were the criteria for exclusion defined? Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
b. Specify reasons for any discrepancy between the number of animals at the beginning and end of the study. Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?	N/A

Reagents

1. Have antibodies been validated for use in the system under study (assay and species)?	N/A
a. Is antibody catalog number given? Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
b. Where were the validation data reported (citation, supplementary information, Antibodypedia)? Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?	N/A

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

2. Cell line identity

a. Are any cell lines used in this paper listed in the database of commonly misidentified cell lines maintained by ICLAC and NCBI Biosample?

Where (section, paragraph #)?

N/A

b. If yes, include in the Methods section a scientific justification of their use--indicate here in which section and paragraph the justification can be found.

N/A

c. For each cell line, include in the Methods section a statement that specifies:

- the source of the cell lines
- have the cell lines been authenticated? If so, by which method?
- have the cell lines been tested for mycoplasma contamination?

Where (section, paragraph #)?

N/A

Data deposition

Data deposition in a public repository is mandatory for:

a. Protein, DNA and RNA sequences
b. Macromolecular structures
c. Crystallographic data for small molecules
d. Microarray data

Deposition is strongly recommended for many other datasets for which structured public repositories exist; more details on our data policy are available here. We encourage the provision of other source data in supplementary information or in unstructured repositories such as Figshare and Dryad.

We encourage publication of Data Descriptors (see Scientific Data) to maximize data reuse.

1. Are accession codes for deposit dates provided?

Where (section, paragraph #)?

N/A

Computer code/software

Any custom algorithm/software that is central to the methods must be supplied by the authors in a usable and readable form for readers at the time of publication. However, referees may ask for this information at any time during the review process.

1. Identify all custom software or scripts that were required to conduct the study and where in the procedures each was used.

All analysis software was custom written and will be made available upon request

2. If computer code was used to generate results that are central to the paper's conclusions, include a statement in the Methods section under "**Code availability**" to indicate whether and how the code can be accessed. Include version information as necessary and any restrictions on availability.

All analysis software was custom written and will be made available upon request

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

Human subjects

1. Which IRB approved the protocol?

   Where is this stated (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

2. Is demographic information on all subjects provided?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

3. Is the number of human subjects, their age and sex clearly defined?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

4. Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria (if any) clearly specified?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

5. How well were the groups matched?

   Where is this information described (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

6. Is a statement included confirming that informed consent was obtained from all subjects?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

7. For publication of patient photos, is a statement included confirming that consent to publish was obtained?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

fMRI studies

For papers reporting functional imaging (fMRI) results please ensure that these minimal reporting guidelines are met and that all this information is clearly provided in the methods:

1. Were any subjects scanned but then rejected for the analysis after the data was collected?

   N/A

   a. If yes, is the number rejected and reasons for rejection described?

      Where (section, paragraph #)?

      N/A

2. Is the number of blocks, trials or experimental units per session and/or subjects specified?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

3. Is the length of each trial and interval between trials specified?

   N/A

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

4. Is a blocked, event-related, or mixed design being used? If applicable, please specify the block length or how the event-related or mixed design was optimized.	N/A
5. Is the task design clearly described? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
6. How was behavioral performance measured?	N/A
7. Is an ANOVA or factorial design being used?	N/A
8. For data acquisition, is a whole brain scan used? If not, state area of acquisition.	N/A
a. How was this region determined?	N/A
9. Is the field strength (in Tesla) of the MRI system stated?	N/A
a. Is the pulse sequence type (gradient/spin echo, EPI/spiral) stated?	N/A
b. Are the field-of-view, matrix size, slice thickness, and TE/TR/ flip angle clearly stated?	N/A
10. Are the software and specific parameters (model/functions, smoothing kernel size if applicable, etc.) used for data processing and pre-processing clearly stated?	N/A
11. Is the coordinate space for the anatomical/functional imaging data clearly defined as subject/native space or standardized stereotaxic space, e.g., original Talairach, MNI305, ICBM152, etc? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
12. If there was data normalization/standardization to a specific space template, are the type of transformation (linear vs. nonlinear) used and image types being transformed clearly described? Where (section, paragraph #)?	N/A
13. How were anatomical locations determined, e.g., via an automated labeling algorithm (AAL), standardized coordinate database (Talairach daemon), probabilistic atlases, etc.?	N/A
14. Were any additional regressors (behavioral covariates, motion etc) used?	N/A
15. Is the contrast construction clearly defined?	N/A
16. Is a mixed/random effects or fixed inference used?	N/A

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197

a. If fixed effects inference used, is this justified?	N/A
17. Were repeated measures used (multiple measurements per subject)?	N/A
a. If so, are the method to account for within subject correlation and the assumptions made about variance clearly stated?	N/A
18. If the threshold used for inference and visualization in figures varies, is this clearly stated?	N/A
19. Are statistical inferences corrected for multiple comparisons?	N/A
a. If not, is this labeled as uncorrected?	N/A
20. Are the results based on an ROI (region of interest) analysis?	N/A
a. If so, is the rationale clearly described?	N/A
b. How were the ROI's defined (functional vs anatomical localization)?	N/A
21. Is there correction for multiple comparisons within each voxel?	N/A
22. For cluster-wise significance, is the cluster-defining threshold and the corrected significance level defined?	N/A

Additional comments

Additional Comments	

Nature Neuroscience: doi:10.1038/nn.4197