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In brief
Kocaturk et al. show that cholinergic interneurons (CINs) innervate diverse populations of GABAergic interneurons (GINs). CIN stimulation triggers multiphasic responses in GINs involving synaptic and heterosynaptic mechanisms. Further, tyrosine hydroxylase-expressing interneurons (THINs) participate in the CIN-mediated disynaptic inhibition of SPNs via heterotypic electrical coupling with neurogliaform interneurons.

Highlights
- CINs innervate at least four populations of striatal GINs
- Mechanisms of innervation are complex involving nAChRs, mAChRs, glutamate, and GABA
- THINs participate in the CIN-mediated disynaptic feedforward inhibition of SPNs
- This principally involves heterotypic electrical coupling between THINs and NGFs
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SUMMARY

Cholinergic interneurons (CINs) are essential elements of striatal circuits and functions. Although acetylcholine signaling via muscarinic receptors (mAChRs) has been well studied, more recent data indicate that postsynaptic nicotinic receptors (nAChRs) located on striatal GABAergic interneurons (GINs) are equally critical. One example is that CIN stimulation induces large disynaptic inhibition of striatal projection neurons (SPNs) mediated by nAChR activation of GINs. Although these circuits are ideally positioned to modulate striatal output, the neurons involved are not definitively identified because of an incomplete mapping of CINs-GINs interconnections. Here, we show that CINs modulate four GINs populations via an intricate mechanism involving co-activation of presynaptic and postsynaptic mAChRs and nAChRs. Using optogenetics, we demonstrate the participation of tyrosine hydroxylase-expressing GINs in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs via heterotypic electrical coupling with neurogliaform interneurons. Altogether, our results highlight the importance of CINs in regulating GINs microcircuits via complex synaptic/heterosynaptic mechanisms.

INTRODUCTION

The striatum possesses the highest density of acetylcholine (ACh) in the basal ganglia (BG, Mesulam et al., 1984), underlying the importance of ACh signaling in this structure. Striatal cholinergic interneurons (CINs) are responsible for the bulk of striatal ACh (Zhou et al., 2002).

Striatal muscarinic receptors (mAChRs) signaling has received particular attention because of their wide cellular distribution because they are expressed on the axon terminals of most striatal afferents, as well as by all striatal neurons examined, including the striatal projection neurons (SPNs; for review, see Assous, 2021; Goldberg et al., 2012). However, the functional role of mAChRs expressed by striatal GABAergic interneurons (GINs) is less known, with only a few electrophysiological studies (Elghaba et al., 2016; Koos and Tepper, 2002; Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019).

The main role of nicotinic receptors (nAChRs) in the central nervous system has been suggested to be via the modulation of neurotransmitters release by presynaptic receptors (Dajas-Bailador and Wonnacott, 2004; Dani, 2001; Dani and Bertrand, 2007). Perhaps the most studied role of striatal nAChRs in this regard involves their expression on presynaptic dopaminergic and glutamatergic afferents, where they modulate the release of dopamine and glutamate (Rice and Cragg, 2004; Zhang and Sulzer, 2004; Zhou et al., 2001). However, we now know that CINs can also exert fast synaptic effects by activating subpopulations of striatal GINs via postsynaptic nAChRs, as has been observed in other brain structures, including the cortex and hippocampus (Assous, 2021; Bell et al., 2011; Dannenberg et al., 2017).

Indeed, stimulation of striatal cholinergic fibers evokes polysynaptic GABA\textsubscript{A} inhibitory post synaptic potentials / currents (IPSP/Cs) in CINs mediated by activation of type II, β2 subunit-containing nAChRs ([β2-nAChRs], presumably expressed by striatal GINs (Dorst et al., 2020; Sullivan et al., 2008). Further, earlier indirect evidence demonstrated that nAChRs activation facilitates GABA-mediated inhibition of SPNs (de Rover et al., 2002; Koos and Tepper, 2002), and blockade of α4/β2 nAChRs shortened SPN spike latencies following activation of corticostriatal projections (Matityahu et al., 2022).

We have previously demonstrated that optogenetic activation of CINs elicits large disynaptic GABAergic IPSP/Cs in SPNs that are secondary to β2-nAChR activation (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2014b; Witten et al., 2010). The optically elicited IPSCs are kinetically biphasic consisting of a fast and a slow component, respectively, involving GABA\textsubscript{A\textsubscript{fast}} and GABA\textsubscript{A\textsubscript{slow}}-mediated currents (English et al., 2012). Although this nicotinic-mediated circuit is positioned to play a central role in the regulation of striatal neuronal activity and related functions, its neuronal composition is still mostly unknown. Although the GABA\textsubscript{A\textsubscript{fast}} seems to rely on nicotinic activation of neurogliaform interneurons (NGFs) (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2016), the source(s) of the GABA\textsubscript{A\textsubscript{slow}} is still unclear but seems to involve multiple GINs targeted in the Htr3a-Cre mice (Faust et al., 2016).

Here, we performed a comprehensive analysis of the interconnections between CINs and various populations of GINs. By combining excitatory and inhibitory opsins, we dissected the participation of distinct populations of GINs in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs. Our results demonstrate a heretofore unknown...
organizational complexity of the CINs-GINs circuits, which play an important role in the regulation of striatal output activity. This study also underscores the relevance of relatively under-studied postsynaptic nAChRs in the striatum and their potential implications for the development of targeted pharmacological approaches to treat associated disorders such as Parkinson’s disease, dystonia, Tourette syndrome, or nicotine addiction.

RESULTS

CIN innervation of GINs
Our approach to identify the innervation of diverse populations of striatal GINs by CINs was to generate double-transgenic mice in which CINs (targeted via the expression of choline acetyltransferase, ChAT) natively express channelrhodopsin (ChR2) (ChAT-ChR2-eYFP) crossed with various Cre-expressing lines targeting different populations of GINs. Using a similar approach, we have previously demonstrated the cholinergic innervation of NGFs and fast-adapting interneurons (FAIs) (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2015).

CIN innervation of tyrosine hydroxylase-expressing interneurons (THINs)
Pharmacological studies demonstrated that most THINs respond to ACh agonists with strong depolarizations and action potential (AP) firing because of activation of nAChRs (ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2013a). Further, recent evidence demonstrates monosynaptic connectivity between CINs and THINs (Dorst et al., 2020).

Here, we used double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::TH-Cre mice and transduced THINs with adeno-associated virus (AAV)-Flex-td-Tomato (N = 16 mice; Figures 1A–1C). Optogenetic activation of CINs evoked large excitatory postsynaptic potentials (EPSPs) in almost all recorded THINs (n = 27/28; EPSP: 11.49 ± 3.41 mV; IPSP: 95.7% ± 10.56%; p = 0.0037; CNQX/APV versus MEC: −25.63 ± 6.81 mV; p = 0.021; n = 7; Figures S1A and S1B).

Next, we tested the involvement of mACHRs on the slow IPSP/Cs induced by the stimulation of CINs. Atropine (10 μM) almost completely abolished the CIN-induced IPSP/Cs in THINs (−22.2 ± 0.71 mV; [−95.7%] versus control; p = 0.035, t = 3.12, two-tailed paired t test; n = 5; Figures 1H and 1I), demonstrating its muscarinic nature.

Surprisingly, we also found that atropine significantly reduced the size of nAChR-mediated EPSP/Cs in THINs (−11.3 ± 4.15 pA; [−17.3%]; p = 0.02, t = 2.72, two-tailed paired t test; n = 12; Figure S1C). However, this reduction was not reproduced with the M1 mAChR antagonist, VU0255035 (p = 0.18, two-tailed paired t test; n = 11; Figure S1D), or scopolamine, which significantly increased the EPSP/Cs (+14.18 ± 7.64 mV; [24.5%]; p = 0.00033, two-tailed paired t test; n = 16; Figure S1E), consistent with the elimination of the mACHR-mediated IPSCs.

These results demonstrate that CINs innervate striatal THINs with an intricate dual effect involving a nAChR-mediated excitation and a muscarinic-mediated inhibition (Figure 1J).

CIN innervation of spontaneously active bursty interneurons (SABIs)
To examine the connectivity between CINs and SABIs, we used double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:Htr3a-Cre mice and transduced Htr3a interneurons with td-Tomato as described above (N = 28 mice; Figures 2A–2C and S1F). As we described (Assou et al., 2018; Faust et al., 2015, 2016), targeted GINs in the Htr3a-Cre mice include fast spiking interneurons (FSIs) and NGFs, as well as FAIs and SABIs (Table S1). Optogenetic activation of CINs evoked large EPSP/Cs in all recorded SABIs (n = 67, EPSP: 11.49 ± 0.85 mV, n = 57; EPSC @ Vh = −70 mV: −65.51 ± 6.34 pA, p = 0.18, two-tailed paired t test; n = 41, τ = 142.8 ± 64.02 ms; IPSC amplitude: 7.88 ± 0.10 pA, n = 32, τ = 278.7 ± 31.8 ms; Figures 2F–2H and S1G–S1I) that were sufficient to trigger AP firing and characteristic bursts in cell-attached recordings (Figure 2D). In most SABIs, the cholinergic-elicited EPSP/C was followed by an IPSC/C presenting slower kinetics (n = 54/67, IPSP amplitude: −2.38 ± 0.27 mV, n = 41, τ = 142.8 ± 64.02 ms; IPSC amplitude: 7.88 ± 0.10 pA, n = 32, τ = 278.7 ± 31.8 ms; Figures 2F–2H and S1G–S1I). Application of DHβE reduced the amplitude of the excitatory response (−1.64 ± 0.41 mV; [−18.3%] versus control; Figures 2F and 2G). The remaining EPSP/C was not affected by MLA but was greatly reduced by MEC (−4.78 ± 0.46 mV; [−69.4%] versus MLA; one-way ANOVA, F(1,558, 21.81) = 77.4; Tukey’s multiple comparisons, control versus DHβE: p = 0.0067; DHβE versus MLA: p = 0.248; MLA versus MEC: p = 3 × 10−7; n = 15; Figure 2G), indicating a mixed type II and type III nAChR composition.

Then we tested the effect of glutamate receptor antagonists. Bath application of AMPA and NMDA receptor antagonists (10 μM CNQX and 10 μM APV, respectively) reduced slightly but significantly the amplitude of the cholinergic-elicited excitatory response. Subsequent application of MEC largely abolished the remaining EPSCs (one-way ANOVA, F(1,015, 6.088) = 16.4, p = 0.0064; Tukey’s multiple comparisons, control versus CNQX/APV: −3.68 ± 0.67 pA; [−10.56%], p = 0.0037; CNQX/APV versus MEC: −25.63 ± 6.81 pA; [−82.2%], p = 0.021; n = 7; Figures S1A and S1B).
amplitude of the EPSC following CINs optogenetic activation
(−9.35 ± 5.66 pA [-14.1%]; p = 0.133, t = 1.652, two-tailed
paired t test; n = 10; Figure S1G).

We then tested the involvement of mAChRs on the CIN-
induced slow IPSC/P; atropine (10 μM) dramatically reduced
the IPSC/P (−6 ± 1.72 pA [−69.77%]; p = 0.005, t = 3.496, n =
12, two-tailed paired t test; Figures 2H and 2I), demonstrating
its muscarinic nature.

Atropine (10 μM) also significantly reduced the amplitude
of the EPSP/C in SABIs (−12.9 ± 3.48 pA [−21.3%]; p = 0.0023,
t = 3.71, n = 15, two-tailed paired t test; Figure S1H). However,
this was not reproduced by application of another mAChR
antagonist, scopolamine, which significantly increased the size
of the EPSC (+10.34 ± 3.628 pA [+22.79%]; p = 0.015, t = 2.85,
n = 12, two-tailed paired t test; Figure S1I), consistent with the
blocking of the slow mACHR-mediated IPSC in SABIs.

These results demonstrate that CINs innervate striatal SABIs
involving dual nAChR-mediated excitation and muscarinic-
mediated slow inhibition (Figure 2J).

**CIN innervation of low threshold spike interneurons (LTSIs)**
Pharmacological and optogenetic studies indicate that mACHR
activation inhibits low threshold spike interneurons (LTSIs; El-
ghaba et al., 2016; Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019). The effect
of nAChR activation in LTSIs seems dual with a direct excitatory
effect through β2-nAChRs and an indirect inhibitory effect via
increasing GABA_A currents (Elghaba et al., 2016; Luo et al.,
2019).
2013b; but see Munoz-Manchado et al., 2016). However, direct nAChR activation of LTSIs has not yet been shown using optogenetic stimulation of CINs (English et al., 2012; Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019).

To examine the connectivity between CINs and LTSIs, we used double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::Htr3a-Cre mice and transduced LTSIs with td-Tomato (N = 16 mice; Figures 3A–3C, S2A, and S2B). Optogenetic stimulation of CINs evokes a long pause response in LTSIs (Figures 3D and 3E) (Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019). In some instances (~25%), the pause is followed by periods of burst activity as previously described (data not shown; Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019). Consistent with a previous study, we demonstrate that the inhibition of LTSIs was mediated by mACHRs because it was blocked by atropine (10 μM; Figure 3D) (Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019) (~7.75 ± 2.8 pA [-83.86%] versus control; p = 0.0252, two-tailed paired t test, t = 2.77; n = 5; Figures 3F, 3G, and S2C).

We observed that the pause is preceded by a small EPSP/C (~7.12 ± 1.19 pA, τ = 38.18 ± 5.25 ms, n = 25) sometimes sufficient to elicit AP firing (Figure 3E). Bath application of MEC almost completely abolished the CIN-induced EPSP (~3.37 ± 0.45 pA [-84.9%], two-tailed paired t test, t = 7.56, n = 9, p = 6.54 × 10^-16; Figures 3H and 3I), demonstrating the involvement of nAChRs. Interestingly, AMPA and NMDA receptor antagonists also significantly reduced the EPSP (10 μM CNQX and 10 μM APV, respectively; ~10.3 ± 4.43 pA [-78.2%]; p = 0.04, paired t test, t = 2.327, n = 5; Figures 3J and 3K). Further, in some cells, we tested the impact of MEC applied after CNQX/APV.
Figure 3. Cholinergic innervation of LTSIs

(A) Schematic illustrating the experimental design using double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:SST-Cre mice injected with a Cre-dependent td-Tomato AAV in the striatum. Inset: typical responses of a striatal LTSI to negative and positive somatic current injections.

(B) Left: confocal photomicrographs showing transduction of LTSIs (red) and CINs (green).

(C) Confocal photomicrographs of an LTSI, filled with biocytin (streptavidin 405, blue) and surrounded by ChR2-expressing axons/cells (green).

(D) Cell-attached recording of an LTSI showing spontaneous tonic activity. LTSI responds to optogenetic stimulation of CINs (blue bar) with a few APs followed by a long pause.

(E) Current-clamp recordings of a spontaneously active LTSI responding to CIN stimulation with an AP followed by a long pause. Right: enlargement of the dashed window, showing the excitation-inhibition sequence.

(F) Voltage-clamp recording of an LTSI. CIN stimulation evokes a modest EPSC followed by a slow IPSC (black trace, control). Application of atropine (10 μM, blue trace) almost completely abolishes the IPSC.

(G) IPSC reduction following atropine application (two-tailed paired t test, n = 5).

(H) Voltage-clamp recording of an LTSI showing that the CIN-induced EPSC is dramatically reduced by MEC (5 μM, red).

(I) EPSC reduction following MEC application (two-tailed paired t test, n = 9).

(J) Voltage-clamp recording of an LTSI showing that the CIN-induced EPSC is dramatically reduced by AMPA and NMDA antagonists (CNQX 10 μM and APV 10 μM, respectively, gray).

(K) EPSC reduction following CNQX/APV application (two-tailed paired t test, n = 5).

(L) Application of MEC significantly reduced the EPSC in comparison with CNQX/APV incubation (two-tailed paired t test, n = 5).

(legend continued on next page)
Subsequent application of MEC further reduced or completely abolished the remaining EPSCs (p = 0.041, t = 2.97, n = 5, two-tailed paired t test; Figure 3L). This suggests a mixed mechanism combining direct nAChR-mediated activation of LTSIs of moderate amplitude and a larger effect mediated by glutamate receptor activation. The next question was whether the glutamate component is due to nicotinic-induced glutamate release from cortical and/or thalamic afferents or by glutamate co-release from CINs (Nelson et al., 2014a). We recorded optogenetic responses in LTSIs under tetrodotoxin (TTX) + 4-aminopyridine (4-AP) to block polysynaptic responses, which dramatically reduced the EPSC amplitude (–6.71 ± 1.93 pA [–84.9%]; p = 0.01, t = 3.47, n = 8, two-tailed paired t test; Figures 3M and 3N). These results demonstrate that the mACHR-mediated slow kinetic IPSC is monosynaptic, but the glutamatergic component is polysynaptic, likely mediated by the activation of presynaptic nAChRs located on striatal afferents (Figure 3O).

Finally, we observed that both application of CNQX/APV revealed longer-latency fast IPSCs in LTSIs following CIN optogenetic stimulation (Vh = −45 mV, 16/27; Figures S2C–S2F). These IPSCs are mediated by GABA_A receptors because they can be abolished by a selective antagonist (bicuculline 10 μM; p = 3.7 × 10−6, t = 7.09, n = 16, two-tailed paired t test; Figures S2C–S2E). Given that CINs provide suprathereshold EPSP in THINs (see above) and that THINs innervate LTSIs (Assou et al., 2017), we hypothesize that these fast GABA_A IPSCs likely involve this polysynaptic circuit (Figure S2F).

**CIN innervation of FSIs**

Presynaptic mACHR activation on FSIs has been shown to reduce the GABAergic inhibition on SPNs, whereas postsynaptic nAChR activation led to large depolarization in FSI (Koo and Tepper, 2002). However, in other studies, ACh agonist effects on FSIs were more moderate (Luo et al., 2013a) or non-existent (Munoz-Manchado et al., 2016).

To examine the responses of FSIs to optogenetic stimulation of CINs, we used double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::Htr3a-Cre mice and transduced Htr3a interneurons with td-Tomato (N = 9 mice; Figures 4A–4C and S3A). As mentioned, FSIs represent a large proportion of the Htr3a-transduced cells (Faust et al., 2015).

Optogenetic stimulation of CINs evoked a mixed excitatory/inhibitory response in FSIs revealed in current clamp recordings after eliciting AP firing by somatic current injection (n = 10/15 FSIs; Figures 4D and 4E). In voltage clamp, a 2-ms optical pulse elicited an EPSC (–44.24 ± 11.09 pA; n = 16; Figure 4F) with a fast decay time constant (τ = 5.44 ± 0.65 ms) consistent with the co-involvement of postsynaptic glutamate receptors (CNQX/APV: −40.51 ± 10.63 pA [−64.58%] versus control; p = 0.0029, t = 3.81, two-tailed paired t test; n = 12; Figures 4G–4H, S3B, and S3C), as well as postsynaptic nAChRs (MEC: −26.20 ± 7.28 pA [−86.53%] versus CNQX/APV condition; p = 0.016, t = 3.6, two-tailed paired t test, n = 6; Figures 4I–4J). MLA significantly reduced the EPSCs induced by CIN optogenetic activation (−8.19 ± 2.1 pA [−26%]; p = 0.008, t = 3.89, n = 7, two-tailed paired t test; Figures 4I and 4J) demonstrating the involvement of presynaptic nAChRs expressed by glutamatergic afferents. However, subsequent application of CNQX/APV further reduced the amplitude of the early EPSC (−18.54 ± 8.9 pA [−79.6%]; p = 0.04, t = 2.09, n = 7, two-tailed paired t test; Figures S3B and S3C), consistent with the existence of a direct glutamatergic input from CINs to FSIs (Nelson et al., 2014a) (Figure S3D).

The early EPSC is often followed by a slow IPSC (n = 12/20; 24.78 ± 10.02 pA; τ = 139.8 ± 49.23 ms; Figures 4K–4M) that exhibits properties consistent with GABA_Aslow (Banks et al., 1998; English et al., 2012; Pearce, 1993; Tamas et al., 2003). Indeed, the CIN-induced IPSC is abolished by bicuculline (10 μM: −23.15 ± 10.08 pA [−93.42%]; p = 0.04, t = 2.296, two-tailed paired t test; n = 13; Figures 4K and 4L), and the decay time constant is increased by blocking GABA reuptake (N0711, 10 μM: τ_control: 190.7 ± 55.9 ms, τ_N0711: 579.3 ± 100.7 ms [303.8% increase]; n = 7, p = 0.0141, t = 3.423, two-tailed paired t test; Figures 4K–4M). Given that NGFs are (so far) the only source of GABA_Aslow-mediated IPSCs in the striatum (Ibáñez-Sandoval et al., 2011; Tepper et al., 2018), we hypothesize that the IPSC is due to the nAChR-mediated activation of NGFs (Figure 4O) (English et al., 2012; Luo et al., 2013a).

Bath application of bicuculline revealed a late phase of EPSP barrages in a proportion of FSIs (n = 6/12 FSIs; Figures 4N–4Q). These asynchronous late EPSPs (amplitude: 21.77 ± 5.14 pA, charge transfer: 2.447 ± 1.09 pC; n = 6) could be blocked by glutamate receptor antagonists (CNQX/APV, 10 μM, [−90.2%]; p = 0.0107, t = 3.964, two-tailed paired t test; n = 6; Figures 4N–4P), suggesting the existence of tonic GABAergic inhibition of glutamatergic release from unidentified intrastriatal terminals that is triggered by ACh release from CINs.

 Altogether, our results demonstrate a complex regulation of FSIs by CINs with (1) an initial fast excitation mediated by postsynaptic nAChRs, presynaptic nAChRs expressed by glutamatergic striatal afferents, and direct glutamate release by CINs; (2) a disynaptic slow inhibitory component likely involving CINs activation of NGFs; and (3) a late phase of glutamatergic EPSP barrages masked by tonic GABAergic inhibition (Figure 4Q).

**Involvement of THINs and LTSIs in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs**

Optogenetic activation of CINs evokes a disynaptic inhibition of SPNs composed of distinct GABA_Afast and GABA_Aslow components (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2014b). These compound IPSCs are due to activation of β2-nAChRs located on diverse striatal GINs. Although the GABA_Aslow has been demonstrated to be due to activation of β2-nAChRs located on NGFs, the source of the GABA_Afast current is still unclear but involves, at least partially, striatal GINs...
Figure 4. Cholinergic innervation of FSIs

(A) Schematic illustrating the experimental design using double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:Htr3a-Cre mice injected with a Cre-dependent td-Tomato AAV in the striatum. Inset: typical responses of an FSI to negative and positive somatic current injections.

(B) Confocal photomicrographs showing striatal transduction of Htr3a-Cre interneurons (red) and CINs (green).

(C) Confocal photomicrographs of a recorded FSI, filled with biocytin (streptavidin 405, blue) and surrounded by ChR2-expressing axons/cells (green).

(D) Left (black): large somatic current injection triggers AP firing in an FSI. Middle (blue): optogenetic stimulation of CINs evokes a brief increase in AP firing followed by a brief pause in firing. Right: enlargement around the optogenetic stimulation.

(E) Pie chart of the proportion of recorded FSIs responding to CIN optogenetic stimulation with sequential excitatory/inhibitory responses shown in (D).

(F) Voltage-clamp recording showing a CIN-induced EPSC in an FSI (black). The EPSC is significantly reduced by bath application of CNQX (10 μM, gray) and APV (10 μM, gray) and almost completely abolished by subsequent addition of MEC (5 μM, red).

(G) EPSC reduction following CNQX/APV application (two-tailed paired t test, n = 12).

(H) EPSC reduction following subsequent application of MEC (two-tailed paired t test, n = 6).

(I) The CIN-induced EPSC in FSI is significantly reduced by bath application of MLA (500 nM, orange).

(J) EPSC reduction following application of MLA (two-tailed paired t test, n = 7).

(K) When clamped at −45 mV, the majority of FSIs respond to CIN optogenetic stimulation with an IPSC following the EPSC (n = 12/20). The decay kinetics of the IPSC are significantly increased by application of the GABA transport blocker, NO711 (10 μM, purple), and completely abolished by bicuculline (10 μM, blue).

(L) IPSC decay time constant following application of bicuculline (two-tailed paired t test, n = 13).

(M) IPSC decay time constant following application of NO711 (two-tailed paired t test, n = 7).

(N) Application of bicuculline revealed a late excitatory phase.

(O) This was observed in n = 6/12 FSIs recorded in these conditions (Vh = −45 mV).

(P) These EPSC barrages can be blocked by bath application of CNQX 10 μM and APV 10 μM (gray, two-tailed paired t test, n = 6).

(Q) Summary schematic showing the connectivity between CINs and FSIs involving postsynaptic nAChRs, presynaptic nAChRs activation of striatal glutamatergic afferents, and disynaptic GABA-mediated inhibition likely via CIN activation of NGFs.

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01; see text for exact p values.
Figure 5. Influence of THINs in the nicotinic-mediated disynaptic inhibition of SPNs

(A) Schematic illustrating the experimental design using double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:TH-Cre mice injected with a Cre-dependent HaloR3.0 AAV in the striatum. This allows the optogenetic activation of CINs with blue light and the inhibition of THINs with yellow light.

(B) Confocal photomicrographs showing striatal transduction of THINs (red, HaloR3.0-mCherry) and CINs (green, ChR2-eYFP).

(C) Optogenetic activation of CINs with blue light evokes large depolarization and AP firing in a THIN (blue traces). Concomitant inhibition of THINs with yellow light (500 ms) evokes a large hyperpolarization preventing CIN-induced AP firing.

(D) Schematic illustrating the experimental design where recordings are obtained from SPNs while (1) activating CINs with blue light and (2) inhibiting THINs with yellow light.

(E) SPNs were filled with biocytin and revealed with streptavidin 405 nm (blue). Inset: enlargement of an SPN dendrite showing abundant spines.

(F and G) Optogenetic activation of CINs evokes large disynaptic compound IPSC in SPNs (recorded with CsCl internal; see STAR methods), including a fast and a slow IPSC (GABA_{A_{fast}} and GABA_{A_{slow}}, respectively, blue traces). Concomitant inhibition of THINs induced a reduction in GABA_{A_{fast}} and GABA_{A_{slow}} (F, examples of individual traces; G, average responses).

(H and I) Reduction of GABA_{A_{fast}} (H) and GABA_{A_{slow}} (I) following optogenetic inhibition of THINs (two-tailed paired t test, n = 20).

(J) Linear regression and Pearson r analysis demonstrating that the reductions of GABA_{A_{fast}} and GABA_{A_{slow}} are correlated.

(legend continued on next page)
targeted in the Htr3a-Cre mouse (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2016). Using an optogenetic approach in double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2::Htr3a-Cre mice injected with a Cre-dependent HaloR3.0 AAV, we were able to disassociate the CINs-Htr3a INs-SPNs cell circuit on a trial-by-trial basis and demonstrate the involvement of the Htr3a-targeted INs in this circuit (Faust et al., 2016).

Here, we used a similar approach to test the involvement of LTSIs and THINs in this disynaptic circuit. First, we demonstrated that yellow light does not interfere with the disynaptic IPSCs measured in SPNs because there was no significant difference between blue light stimulation and blue + yellow light stimulation in ChAT-ChR2-eYFP mice (N = 5 mice; GABA\textsubscript{Afast}: \(-7.99 \pm 6.83\ pA [-1.3\%], p = 0.26, t = 1.17\); GABA\textsubscript{Aslow}: \(-5.04 \pm 5.67\ pA [-1.48\%], p = 0.39, t = 0.89, n = 16\), two-tailed paired t test; Figures S4A–S4E).

Next, we used double-transgenic ChAT-ChR2-eYFP-SST-Cre mice and transduced LTSIs with HaloR3.0 (N = 5 mice; Figures S5A–S5H). Stimulation of CINs evoked small-amplitude depolarization in LTSIs. Further, HaloR3.0-expressing LTSIs were strongly hyperpolarized by yellow light (590 nm; Figure S5C). The optogenetic inhibition of LTSIs did not significantly reduce the amplitude of either GABAergic current in SPNs (GABA\textsubscript{Afast}: \(-20.98 \pm 13.29\ pA [-4.05\%], p = 0.14, t = 1.58\); GABA\textsubscript{Aslow}: \(-6.37 \pm 8.99\ pA [-2.1\%], p = 0.49, t = 0.71, n = 14\), two-tailed paired t test; Figures S5D–S5H), demonstrating that LTSIs are not involved in this disynaptic circuit.

Then we tested the involvement of THINs using a similar approach. ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:TH-Cre mice were injected with a Flex-HaloR3.0 AAV (N = 11 mice; Figures 5A–5K). Optogenetic stimulation of CINs evoked AP firing in recorded THINs (n = 7; Figure 5C) consistent with the results described above (see Figure 1). On alternate trials, concomitant optogenetic inhibition of HaloR3.0-expressing THINs significantly hyperpolarized THINs and blocked AP firing in response to CIN stimulation (n = 7; Figure 5C), confirming the efficacy of the optogenetic approach. Next, we repeated the same stimulation protocol while recording from SPNs (Figures 5D and 5E). Yellow light illumination produced a small but significant reduction in the amplitude of the GABA\textsubscript{Afast} (\(-16.32 \pm 4.64\ pA [-7.95\%]; p = 0.0023, t = 3.514\), two-tailed paired t test; n = 20; Figures 5F–5H), demonstrating that THINs participate in this circuit. Surprisingly, the inhibition of THINs produces a more important reduction of the GABA\textsubscript{Afast} (\(-22.37 \pm 4.56\ pA [-14.8\%]; p = 9.7 \times 10^{-5}\), two-tailed paired t test; n = 20; Figures 5F, 5G, and 5I).

Finally, application of carbenoxolone (100 \(\mu\)M), which disrupts gap junction coupling (Connors, 2012), caused a significant reduction of the amplitude of the inward current measured in NGFs (p = 0.018; two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni’s multiple comparisons test F(18,72) = 70.71; p < 10\(^{-6}\); n = 10; Figures 6E and 6F). Further, we performed dual whole-cell recordings of THINs and NGFs and found that all tested pairs were reciprocally electrically connected (n = 3/3; Figures 6G and 6H).

Interestingly, these gap junctions are cell-type selective because THINs are not electrotonically coupled with LTSIs also targeted in the NPY-GFP mice (Table S1). Indeed, THIN optogenetic stimulation evokes powerful GABAergic IPSCs in most LTSIs (n = 7/9; data not shown; see Assous et al., 2017), further demonstrating the specificity of the striatal microcircuitry (Assous and Tepper, 2019; Tepper et al., 2018). Altogether, these results indicate that the decrease in the CIN-induced GABA\textsubscript{Aslow} IPSCs in SPNs following the inhibition of THINs (and possibly GABA\textsubscript{Afast}) is likely indirect, mediated by NGFs as a result of heterotypic electrical coupling.

**Electrical coupling between THINs and NGFs and disynaptic inhibition of SPNs**

Consistent with our data, carbenoxolone significantly reduced the amplitude of the GABA\textsubscript{Afast} and GABA\textsubscript{Aslow} components (N = 7 mice; Figures 7A–7E; GABA\textsubscript{Afast}: \(-192 \pm 36.7\ pA [-62.5\%], p = 4.7 \times 10^{-4}, t = 5.23; GABA\textsubscript{Aslow}: \(-191.6 \pm 45.5\ pA [-71.4\%], p = 4.7 \times 10^{-4}, t = 4.21, n = 20\), two-tailed paired t test; Figures 7B–7D) demonstrating the importance of gap junctions in this disynaptic circuit. Interestingly, we found a significant correlation between the reduction of the GABA\textsubscript{Afast} and GABA\textsubscript{Aslow} components following carbenoxolone.
application ($r = 0.877$, $r^2 = 0.77$, $p < 0.0001$, Pearson r correlation; Figure 7E), suggesting that both GABAAfast and GABAAslow components involve gap junctions.

Then, we used a similar double-optogenetic approach as described in Figure 5, using ChAT-ChR2-eYFP:TH-Cre mice injected with a Cre-dependent ChR2 AAV in the striatum. This allows the optogenetic activation of THINs with blue light while recording from GFP-identified NGF interneurons. (B) Typical response of an NGF interneuron to somatic current injection. (C) THINs optogenetic stimulation evokes depolarization in an NGF ($n = 17/28$). (D) Inward currents and “spikelets” recorded in an NGF following THIN optogenetic stimulation. (E) THINs were optogenetically stimulated with a train of blue light pulses (5p, 20 Hz), followed by a single long optogenetic pulse (200 ms), NGF responded to the stimuli with inward currents that were dramatically reduced by carbenoxolone (100 μM, gray).

(F) Reduction of the THIN activation-induced EPSC following carbenoxolone application (two-way ANOVA, $n = 10$). (G and H) Dual whole-cell recordings of THINs and NGFs in TH-Cre:NPY-GFP mice. (G) Negative and positive somatic current injection in a THIN triggered, respectively, hyperpolarization and depolarization in a connected NGF ($n = 3$). (H) Negative and positive somatic current injection in an NGF triggered, respectively, hyperpolarization and depolarization in an electrically coupled THIN ($n = 3$).

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; see text for exact $p$ values.
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**Figure 6. Electrical coupling between THINs and NGFs**

(A) Schematic illustrating the experimental design using double-transgenic TH-Cre:NPY-GFP mice injected with a Cre-dependent ChR2 AAV in the striatum. This allows the optogenetic activation of THINs with blue light while recording from GFP-identified NGF interneurons. (B) Typical response of an NGF interneuron to somatic current injection. (C) THINs optogenetic stimulation evokes depolarization in an NGF ($n = 17/28$). (D) Inward currents and “spikelets” recorded in an NGF following THIN optogenetic stimulation. (E) THINs were optogenetically stimulated with a train of blue light pulses (5p, 20 Hz), followed by a single long optogenetic pulse (200 ms), NGF responded to the stimuli with inward currents that were dramatically reduced by carbenoxolone (100 μM, gray).

(F) Reduction of the THIN activation-induced EPSC following carbenoxolone application (two-way ANOVA, $n = 10$). (G and H) Dual whole-cell recordings of THINs and NGFs in TH-Cre:NPY-GFP mice. (G) Negative and positive somatic current injection in a THIN triggered, respectively, hyperpolarization and depolarization in a connected NGF ($n = 3$). (H) Negative and positive somatic current injection in an NGF triggered, respectively, hyperpolarization and depolarization in an electrically coupled THIN ($n = 3$).

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; see text for exact $p$ values.
suggesting that the further reduction of the GABA_Afast and GABA_Aslow components would involve gap junctions. These results may imply that gap junctions other than the one linking the THINs and the NGF are involved in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs.

**DISCUSSION**

Postsynaptic striatal nAChRs containing the β2 subunit, selectively expressed by striatal interneurons, are known to be involved in the powerful disynaptic inhibition of SPNs and play an important role in the regulation of striatal neuronal activity (English et al., 2012; Faust et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2014b). Circuits dependent on these receptors provide a way for CINs to rapidly control striatal output after synchronization by a common excitatory afferent, such as the parafascicular nucleus (Aceves Bueno et al., 2019; Assous and Tepper, 2019; Oz et al., 2022; Rehani et al., 2019). However, the downstream intrastriatal circuitry and subtypes of GINs involved have not yet been precisely characterized. One reason has been the largely incomplete mapping and pharmacology of the interconnections between CINs and the diversity of striatal GINs and their intrastriatal connectomes. Here, we demonstrate that CINs innervate a large diversity of GINs involving different synaptic circuits and receptor subtypes.

During this circuit analysis, we were able to test, using double optogenetics, the participation of the diverse populations of GINs in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs induced by CIN population stimulation.

It has been shown previously that THINs express functional nAChRs because THINs respond strongly to local application of nicotinic agonists (Ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2013a). Further, using multiple simultaneous whole-cell recordings, it has been demonstrated that CINs directly innervate THINs (Dorst et al., 2020). Here, we demonstrate a dual control of THINs activity by CINs. Optogenetic stimulation of CINs evokes large suprathreshold nicotinic-mediated excitatory responses in THINs involving partially β2-containing nAChRs, as well as another subtype of nAChR different from the α7*-containing nAChR, possibly a β4*-containing nAChR (Ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2013a). Notably, the nicotinic EPSP is often followed by a mAChR-mediated IPSC/P responsible for a prolonged pause in THINs spontaneous activity. This demonstrates the existence of functional modulation of neuronal excitability via both nAChRs and mAChRs. This dual mechanism of
regulation of THINs activity by CINs should exert a large influence on intrastratal functioning given the widespread targets of THINs (SPNs, LTSIs, CINs) (Assous et al., 2017, 2018; Dorst et al., 2020; Ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2010). Further, given the importance of other cholinergic systems in the generation of θ oscillation in the hippocampus, it is plausible that the oscillatory activity induced in several populations of interneurons by CINs could be responsible for the propagation of θ oscillations in the striatum whose source(s) is still unidentified (Lalia et al., 2017; Vandecasteele et al., 2014).

SABIs also receive suprathreshold nicotinic-mediated excitation after optogenetic stimulation of CINs. SABIs have been described as a population of interneurons selectively targeting other interneurons, but not SPNs (Assous et al., 2018), which could be compared with the VIP + interneurons in the cortex. VIP cortical interneurons also express nAChRs, and the resulting depolarization causes a disinhibition of principal neurons essential for the modulation of behavioral state (Fu et al., 2014). Although the functional role of the CIN innervation of SABIs remains to be elucidated, it is likely that the extreme bursting activity induced by CIN optogenetic stimulation is sufficient to silence the striatal targets of SABIs resulting in the disinhibition of SPNs (Assous et al., 2018). Disinhibition of SPNs has been suggested to play a role in transition from down state to up state and/or the creation of cell assemblies (Berke, 2011; Humphries, 2011; Lee et al., 2017; Plenz and Kitai, 1998).

Consistent with previous studies, we found that optogenetic stimulation of CINs evokes a long pause in the firing activity of LTSIs that is mediated principally by mAChR activation and a participation of GABA_A receptors possibly via CIN activation of THINs (Assous et al., 2017; Elghaba et al., 2016; Frost Nylen et al., 2021; Hjorth et al., 2020; Melendez-Zaidi et al., 2019). Here, in addition to confirming these data, we also show the presence of an EPSC/P in most recorded LTSIs that involve both nAChRs and glutamate receptor activation. Although the nAChR activation is consistent with previous reports demonstrating j2-nAChR expression by LTSIs (Elghaba et al., 2016; Luo et al., 2013a), in addition we found that the glutamatergic response is due to the stimulation of presynaptic nAChRs on glutamatergic afferents.

Reports on CIN regulation of FSIs have been contradictory, where ACh application either evoked no postsynaptic responses (Munoz-Manchado et al., 2016), a slight depolarization (Luo et al., 2013a, 2013b), or a large depolarization (Koos and Tepper, 2002). Recently, it was demonstrated that tonic activation of nAChRs on FSIs participates in modulating corticostriatal feedforward inhibition by maintaining a GABAergic brake (Matityahu et al., 2022). Here, we showed a complex mechanism of regulation of FSIs by CINs where optogenetic activation of CINs triggers mixed excitatory/inhibitory responses in FSIs. Interestingly, we demonstrate that the glutamatergic component involves both the activation of presynaptic nAChR located on glutamatergic afferents and co-release of glutamate by CINs (Nelson et al., 2014a). Further, CIN optogenetic stimulation triggers GABA_Aslow-mediated inhibitory responses in the majority of FSIs, suggesting the involvement of NGFs. Indeed, these GABA_Aslow responses have previously been observed only when studying the connectivity of NGFs with SPNs or CINs (English et al., 2012; Ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2011) and not for any other tested GINs. This would suggest that NGFs and FSIs would be reciprocally syntaptically connected (Lee et al., 2017). Remarkably, incubation with a GABA_A receptor antagonist revealed glutamatergic asynchronous EPSCs, suggesting the disinhibition and burst firing of striatal glutamatergic axons. Previous literature highlighted an important role of GABA in the regulation of corticostrial glutamate release (Du et al., 2017; Logie et al., 2013; Paille et al., 2013). In addition, GABAergic transmission can control the temporal window of spiking of SPNs by regulating the generation and propagation of plateau potentials (Du et al., 2017). Interestingly, GABA_Aslow originating from NGF interneurons were the most efficient for dendritic plateau inhibition in SPNs (Du et al., 2017). We propose that CIN activation of NGFs tonically inhibits corticostriatal terminals that densely innervate FSIs (Assous and Tepper, 2019; Koos and Tepper, 1999; Mallet et al., 2005). This mechanism may be important for prolonging the period of membrane depolarization and input integration in FSIs.

While investigating the influence of THINs in the dysinaptic inhibition of SPNs following CIN optogenetic activation, we found that optogenetic inhibition of THINs elicits a significant decrease of both GABA_Afast and GABA_Aslow in SPNs. Our previous results demonstrate that THINs evoke GABA_Afast only in SPNs (Assous et al., 2018; Ibañez-Sandoval et al., 2010; Xenias et al., 2015). Hence our present circuit analysis data support the involvement of the THINs in the dysinaptic GABA_Afast IPSC in SPNs, providing a mechanism through which THINs, under the influence of CINs, could rapidly regulate the activity of striatal outputs independently from any extrinsic cortical or thalamic input.

The reduction of GABA_Aslow in SPNs following optogenetic inhibition of THINs was more surprising. Previously, the CIN-induced GABA_Aslow in SPNs was attributed solely to CIN activation of NGF interneurons (English et al., 2012). Here, we demonstrate the existence of electrotonic coupling between NGFs and THINs. The pharmacological disruption of gap junctions abolishes the effect of THIN optogenetic inhibition on the fast and slow component, demonstrating the importance of electrical coupling in this nicotinic-mediated dysinaptic circuit. Importantly, these results help clarify our previous data where we demonstrated that Hr3a-targeted GINs were involved in both the GABA_Afast and the GABA_Aslow component (Faust et al., 2016). Although the reduction of the slow component was attributed to NGF neurons, we could not explain the reduction of the fast component. Indeed, FSIs do not participate in this circuit (English et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2014b), FAIs are also not involved (Faust et al., 2015) and SABIs do not significantly innervate SPNs (Assous et al., 2018), suggesting that NGFs could be necessary and sufficient to drive both the GABA_Afast and GABA_Aslow component. The data presented here reconcile these results demonstrating that electrotonic coupling between NGF and other populations of GINs, e.g., THINs, can explain (1) the reduction of the fast component reported previously (Faust et al., 2016) and (2) the reduction of the slow component demonstrated here. Interestingly, pharmacological disruption of gap junctions has an additional effect in comparison with inhibiting the THINs. This may suggest an insufficient inhibition of THINs.
using this method. Instead, this could imply that other gap junctions are involved in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs, including homotypic gap junctions between NGFs (English et al., 2012) and/or other heterotypic electrotomic coupling that is still undescribed. The existence of heterotypic gap junctions electrotomically linking NGFs and other striatal GINs suggests that NGFs are in position to control striatal network activity and could contribute to oscillatory activity by synchronizing interneuron networks as observed in cortical and hippocampal circuits (Overstreet-Wadiche and McBain, 2015; Zsiros et al., 2007; Zsiros and Maccaferri, 2005).

In contrast, we report that LTSIs are not involved in the disynaptic inhibition of SPNs following CINs optogenetic activation. This is consistent with the modest excitation of LTSIs by CINs and their lack of electrotomic coupling with THINs (Assous et al., 2017). Instead, LTSIs receive GABAergic innervation from THINs, demonstrating the intricacy and diversity of striatal interneuronal interconnections consisting of cell-type-selective chemical and electrotomic synapses (Assous et al., 2017).

Overall, our data demonstrate several complex and heterogeneous mechanisms of regulation of striatal GINs by CINs involving various subtypes of nAChRs, mAChRs, and glutamatergic and GABAergic receptors, as well as functional heterotypic electrotomic coupling. These results lay out valuable organizational principles of the synaptic organization among striatal interneurons where spontaneously active CINs would coordinate hierarchically the activity of GINs, thereby influencing striatal output activity. Further studies will be required to elucidate the role of these circuits in striatal-related functions (Abbondanza et al., 2022). Indeed, although CINs have been demonstrated to play an important role in behaviors such as reward processing and cognitive flexibility (Aoki et al., 2015; Apicella, 2017; Assous, 2021; Bradfield et al., 2013), as well as in associated neurological disorders including Parkinson’s disease, obsessive-compulsive disorders, and Tourette syndrome, the involvement of specific subtypes of presynaptic and postsynaptic nAChRs is yet to be determined. A better understanding of striatal nAChR expression and function may lead to the development of targeted therapeutic approaches for the treatment of these prevalent BG-related disorders.

**Limitations of the study**

We demonstrated that THINs and SABIs seem to express mixed type II and type III nAChRs based on the partial blockade provided by DhijE. However, even though DhijE is considered a selective antagonist for type II nAChRs, it also inhibits other j2-nAChRs, including some type III nAChRs. Hence it is possible that these neurons express only type III nAChRs. Further, we found that atropine significantly reduces the fast nAChR-mediated EPSP/C in THINs and SABIs. However, these results were not reproduced with another non-specific mAChR antagonist (scopolamine), as well as by a selective M1 mAChR antagonist (VU0255035, tested on THINs). These results highlight that at a micromolar concentration, atropine may also act as a channel blocker for nAChRs (Zwart and Vijverberg, 1997). Finally, we used carbenoxolone to demonstrate the existence of gap junctions between THINs and NGFs, which exhibit limited efficacy and selectivity (Connors, 2012). This is one of the reasons we also performed complex dual whole-cell recordings of these two rare GIN populations.
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## Key Resources Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antibodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streptavidin, Alexa Fluor™ 405 conjugate</td>
<td>Thermo Fischer Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#: S32351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit Polyclonal anti-GFP, Alexa Fluor™ 488</td>
<td>Thermo Fischer Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#: A-21311; RRID:AB_221477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacterial and virus strains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAAV-FLEX-ttdTomato</td>
<td>Edward Boyden</td>
<td>Addgene viral prep # 28306-AAV5; RRID:Addgene_28306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAAV-EF1α-double floxed-hChR2(H134R)-mCherry-WPRE-HGHpA</td>
<td>Karl Deisseroth</td>
<td>Addgene viral prep # 20297-AAV5; RRID:Addgene_20297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAV-EF1α-DIO-eNpHR3.0-mCherry-WPRE(AAV5)</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Karl Deisseroth)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor™ 594 Hydrazide</td>
<td>Thermo Fischer Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#: A10438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biocytin</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: B4261; CAS: 576-19-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dihydro-β-erythroidine hydrobromide</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 2349; CAS: 29734-68-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyllycaconitine citrate salt</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: M168; CAS: 112825-05-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecamylamine hydrochloride</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 2843; CAS: 110691-49-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atropine methyl nitrate</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: A0382; CAS: 52-88-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopolamine hydrobromide</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 1414; CAS: 114-49-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU 0255035</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 3727; CAS: 1135243-19-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO-711 hydrochloride</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: N142; CAS: 145645-62-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(S),9(R)-(−)-Bicuculline methiodide</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: 14343; CAS: 40709-69-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN2X disodium salt</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 1045; CAS: 479347-85-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL-APV</td>
<td>Tocris</td>
<td>Cat#: 0105; CAS: 76326-31-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrodotoxin</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: T8024; CAS: 4368-28-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Aminopyridine</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#: A0152; CAS: 504-24-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental models: Organisms/strains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse: B6.Cg-Tg(Chat-COP4* H134R/EYFP,Slc18a3) 6Gfng/J</td>
<td>The Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Strain #:014546; RRID:IMSR_JAX:014546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse: Sst[tm1.1(m22)]/J</td>
<td>The Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Strain #:013044; RRID:IMSR_JAX:013044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse: B6.FVB-Tg(Npy-hrGFP)1Low/J</td>
<td>The Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Strain #:006417; RRID:IMSR_JAX:006417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse: Tg(Th-cre)Fl12Gsat/Mmucd</td>
<td>MMRRC</td>
<td>017262-UCD; RRID:MMRRC_017262-UCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse: Tg(Htr3a-cre)NO152Gsat/Mmucd</td>
<td>MMRRC</td>
<td>036680-UCD; RRID:MMRRC_036680-UCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software and algorithms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphPad Prism 9</td>
<td>GraphPad Software</td>
<td>RRID:SCR_002798; <a href="http://www.graphpad.com/">http://www.graphpad.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 7</td>
<td>Cambridge Electronic Device</td>
<td>RRID:SCR_014276; <a href="http://ced.co.uk/products/signal">http://ced.co.uk/products/signal</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axograph Version 1.7.6</td>
<td>AxoGraph</td>
<td>RRID:SCR_014284: <a href="https://axograph.com">https://axograph.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact
Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Maxime Assous (assous.maxime@gmail.com).

Materials availability
This study did not generate new unique reagents.

Data and code availability
- All data reported in this paper will be shared by the lead contact upon request.
- This paper does not report original code.
- Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available from the lead contact upon request.

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

All procedures used in this study were performed in accord with the National Institutes of Health Guide to the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals and with the approval of the Rutgers University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

Subjects were adult male and female mice, 3–6 months of age. ChAT-ChR2-eYFP mice (Tg(Chat-COP4*H134R/eYFP,Slc18a3)6Gfng/J; Jackson Labs, Bar Harbor, MA, USA) were crossed with either 1) BAC transgenic TH–Cre [Tg(TH–Cre)12Gsat; Gene Expression Nervous System Atlas (GENSAT)] 2) Htr3a-Cre mice [(Tg (HTR3a-Cre)NO152Gsat/Mmucd, MMRRC, University of California, Davis, (Gerfen et al., 2013)], or 3) SST-Cre mice (Sst-IRES-Cre, Stock No: 013044, The Jackson laboratory). To test the presence of electrical coupling between THINs and NGF interneurons we used double transgenic TH–Cre crossed with (BAC) transgenic mice that express the humanized Renilla green fluorescent protein (hrGFP) (Stratagene) under the control of the mouse NPY promoter (NPY-GFP, stock 006417; The Jackson Laboratory, Table S1). Double transgenic mice (ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::TH-Cre, ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::Htr3a-Cre, ChAT-ChR2-eYFP::SST-Cre and TH-Cre::NPY-GFP) were genotyped and those found to be positive for both transgenes of interest were used for all recordings. Mice were housed in groups of up to four per cage and maintained on a 12-h light cycle with ad libitum access to food and water.

METHOD DETAILS

Intracerebral viral injection
The surgery and viral injections took place inside a Biosafety Level-2 isolation hood. Mice were anesthetized with isoflurane (1–2.5%, delivered with O2, 1 L/min) and mounted in a stereotaxic frame. Bupivacaine was injected under the scalp for local anesthesia at the site of the surgery. Coordinates to target the striatum were 0.6 mm anterior and 1.9 mm lateral to bregma. A replication non competent adeno-associated virus (AAV5-CAG-Flex-td-Tomato, University of North Carolina, Vector Core Services, Chapel Hill, NC) was delivered by glass pipette to two sites, 2.5 mm and 3.0 mm ventral to brain surface, for a total volume of 0.8 μL at 9.2 nL/5sec using a Nanoject II Auto-Nanoliter Injector (Drummond Scientific Company). Following viral delivery the pipette was left in place for 10 min before being slowly retracted. Mice were then treated with ketoprofen and buprenorphine for analgesia. Expression of the viral transgene was allowed for at least 4 weeks before animals were used for histology or physiology.

Preparation of brain slices
Adult mice (3–6 months old) were deeply anesthetized with an intraperitoneal injection of 80 mg/kg ketamine and 20 mg/kg xylazine before being transcardially perfused with ice-cold N-methyl D-glucamine (NMDG)-based solution containing (in mM): 103.0 NMDG, 2.5 KCl, 1.2 NaH2PO4, 30.0 NaHCO3, 20.0 HEPES, 25.0 Glucose, 101.0 HCl, 10.0 MgSO4, 2.0 Thiourea, 3.0 sodium pyruvate, 12.0 N-acetyl cysteine and 0.5 CaCl2 saturated with 95% O2 and 5% CO2, pH 7.2–7.4. After decapitation, the brain was quickly removed into a beaker containing the ice-cold oxygenated NMDG-based solution before obtaining 300 μm parahorizontal slices using a vibratome (VT1200S; Leica Microsystems). Sections were immediately transferred to recover in well oxygenated NMDG-based solution at 35°C for 5 min, after which they were transferred to well oxygenated normal Ringer’s solution at 25°C until placed in the recording chamber constantly perfused (2–4 mL/min) with oxygenated Ringer’s solution at 32–34°C. Drugs were dissolved freshly each day in Ringer’s solution and applied in the perfusion medium.

Fluorescence and differential interference contrast imaging and recording
For recording striatal interneurons transduced with fluorescent AAV, slices were initially visualized under epifluorescence illumination with a digital frame transfer camera (Cooke SensiCam) mounted on an Olympus BX50-WI epifluorescence microscope with a 40X long working distance water-immersion lens. Once a fluorescent interneuron was identified, visualization was switched to
We used bicuculline (10 μM, Sigma) to block GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors. Dihydro-β-erythroidine hydrobromide (DHβE; 1 μM, Tocris) was used to block nAChRs that contain β2-subunits including Type II nicotinic receptors (α4β2), and some heteromeric Type III nAChRs (β2*-containing). Methyllycaconitine citrate (MLA; 500 nM, Tocris) was used as an antagonist of nAChRs containing the α7 subunit (Type I nAChRs) mostly expressed presynaptically by glutamatergic afferents in the striatum, mecamylamine hydrochloride (MEC; 5 μM, Tocris) was used as a non-selective nAChRs antagonist that preferentially block Type III nAChRs [heteromeric α3β2] (Albuquerque et al., 1995, 2009). Atropine (Sigma, 10 μM) and scopolamine (Tocris, 10 μM) were used as non-selective mAChRs antagonists and VU0255035 (Tocris, 10 μM) as a selective M1 mAChR antagonist. CNQX (10 μM, Tocris) and APV (10 μM, Tocris) to block respectively AMPA and NMDA glutamate receptors. We used tetrodotoxin (TTX, 1 μM, Sigma) in association with 4-aminopyridine (4-AP, 200 μM, Tocris) to isolate monosynaptic responses. Finally, to block gap junction (electrotonic) communication we used carbenoxolone (100 μM, Tocris).

**Drugs**

**Imaging**

Mice were deeply anesthetized with an intraperitoneal injection of 80 mg/kg ketamine and 20 mg/kg xylazine. Brain tissue was fixed by transcardial perfusion of 10 mL of ice-cold artificial cerebrospinal fluid (adjusted to 7.2–7.4 pH), followed by perfusion of 90–100 mL of 4% paraformaldehyde, 15% picric acid diluted in phosphate buffer. Fixed brains were extracted and post-fixed overnight in the same solution. 50 μm sections were cut on a Vibratome 3000. Sections were mounted in Vectashield (Vector Labs, Burlingame, CA) and representative photomicrographs were taken using a confocal microscope (Fluoview FV1000, Olympus) using 10x or 40x objectives. Comparable photomicrographs were taken using the same laser settings.

After whole-cell recording, slices containing biocytin-filled neurons were transferred into 4% paraformaldehyde with 15% picric acid in 0.1 M PB for overnight fixation (4°C). After multiple washes in PBS, sections were incubated in PBS containing 0.05% Triton (3 h) followed by a blocking solution containing normal donkey serum (10%) and 0.05% Triton (2 h). Then, sections were incubated overnight with Streptavidin, Alexa Fluor 405 conjugate (Thermofisher, 1:1000) and an antibody against GFP (rabbit polyclonal anti-GFP, Invitrogen, 1:1000). Sections were then mounted in a fluorescence medium (ProLong Glass Antifade Mountant, Invitrogen) and representative photomicrographs were taken at 10x and 40x using a confocal microscope (Fluoview FV1000, Olympus). Images were processed using ImageJ software.

**QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

Patch-clamp recordings were analyzed using Signal, version 5 (Cambridge Electronic Design) and Axograph (version 1.3.4). Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 9 software (San Diego, CA, USA). The statistical analyses were two-tailed statistical tests with alpha risk set at 0.05. All data were tested for normality using the Shapiro–Wilk test. For two-group comparisons we used two-tailed paired or unpaired t test depending on if the data resulted from the same cells or not, respectively. Further, one-way and two-way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s post hoc test were used when comparing more than two datasets. In each experiment, results are presented as amplitude difference, percent change, p value(s), t value(s), statistical test used and cell number. Further animal number is indicated in each respective results section. Correlations between reduction of GABA<sub>Fast</sub> and GABA<sub>Slow</sub> were done using a Pearson r correlation. Statistical significance is defined as *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, and ****p < 0.0001, if not noted otherwise.