This Accepted Manuscript has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version. A link to any extended data will be provided when the final version is posted online.



Research Article: New Research | Neuronal Excitability

Gamma oscillations in the basolateral amygdala: biophysical mechanisms and computational consequences

Feng Feng¹, Drew B. Headley², Alon Amir², Vasiliki Kanta², Ziao Chen¹, Denis Paré² and Satish Nair¹

¹Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, and Department of Bioengineering, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, 65211, USA

²Center for Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience, Rutgers University – Newark, 197 University Ave, Newark, N.I. 07102, USA

https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0388-18.2018

Received: 2 October 2018

Revised: 12 December 2018

Accepted: 22 December 2018

Published: 11 January 2019

Author contributions:

Conceptualization, F.F., D.B.H, D.P., and S.N.; Methodology, F.F., D.B.H, Z.C. and S.N.; Software, F.F. and Z.C.; Formal Analysis, F.F., D.B.H., and Z.C.; Investigation, F.F., D.B.H., A.A., V.K., and Z.C.; Writing – Original Draft, D.B.H.; Writing – Review & Editing, F.F., D.B.H., A.A., V.K., Z.C., D.P., and S.N.; Visualization, F.F and D.B.H; Supervision, D.P. and S.N.; Funding Acquisition, D.P. and S.N.

Funding: http://doi.org/10.13039/100000002HHS | National Institutes of Health (NIH)

MH087755 MH087755 MH109122

Conflict of Interest:

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest associated with the work contained in this manuscript.

Funding: HHS | National Institutes of Health (NIH), MH087755; HHS | National Institutes of Health (NIH), MH109122.

F.F. and D.B.H. These authors contributed equally

Correspondence should be addressed to Satish Nair at nairs@missouri.edu

Cite as: eNeuro 2019; 10.1523/ENEURO.0388-18.2018

Alerts: Sign up at www.eneuro.org/alerts to receive customized email alerts when the fully formatted version of this article is published.

Accepted manuscripts are peer-reviewed but have not been through the copyediting, formatting, or proofreading process.

Copyright © 2019 Feng et al.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium provided that the original work is properly attributed.

1	ilue.
2	Gamma oscillations in the basolateral amygdala: biophysical mechanisms and
3	computational consequences
4	
5	Abbreviated title:
6	Gamma genesis in the basolateral amygdala
7	
8	Authors:
9	Feng Feng ^{1*} , Drew B. Headley ^{2*} , Alon Amir ² , Vasiliki Kanta ² , Ziao Chen ¹ , Denis Paré ² ,
10	Satish Nair ¹
11	
12	Affiliations:
13	Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, and Department of
14	Bioengineering, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, 65211, USA
15	2. Center for Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience, Rutgers University – Newark,
16	197 University Ave, Newark, NJ, 07102, USA
17	*These authors contributed equally
18	
19	Corresponding Author:
20	Satish Nair: nairs@missouri.edu, Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer
21	Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, 65211, USA
22	
23	Number of pages: 49
24	Number of figures: 7
25	Number of tables: 6
26	Number of words: Abstract: 243; Introduction: 579; Discussion: 1488
27	
28	Keywords:
29	Amygdala, gamma oscillations, computational model, biophysical model, extracellular
30	potential
31	
32	Conflict of Interest:
33	The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest associated with the work
34	contained in this manuscript.
35	
36	Author contributions:
37	Conceptualization, F.F., D.B.H, D.P., and S.N.; Methodology, F.F., D.B.H, Z.C. and
38	S.N.; Software, F.F. and Z.C.; Formal Analysis, F.F., D.B.H., and Z.C.; Investigation,
39	F.F., D.B.H., A.A., V.K., and Z.C.; Writing – Original Draft, D.B.H.; Writing – Review &
40	Editing, F.F., D.B.H., A.A., V.K., Z.C., D.P., and S.N.; Visualization, F.F and D.B.H;
41	Supervision, D.P. and S.N.; Funding Acquisition, D.P. and S.N.
42	
43	Acknowledgements:
44	This work was supported by grants NIMH grants MH087755 and MH109122 to SN and
45	MH106403 to DP.

Abstract

46 47

48 49

50

51

52 53

54 55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65 66

67

68

The basolateral nucleus of the amygdala (BL) is thought to support numerous emotional behaviors through specific microcircuits. These are often thought to be comprised of feedforward networks of principal cells and interneurons. Neither wellunderstood nor often considered are recurrent and feedback connections, which likely engender oscillatory dynamics within BL. Indeed, oscillations in the gamma frequency range (40-100 Hz) are known to occur in the BL, and yet their origin and effect on local circuits remains unknown. To address this, we constructed a biophysically and anatomically detailed model of the rat BL and its local field potential based on the physiological and anatomical literature, along with in vivo and in vitro data we collected on the activities of neurons within the rat BL. Remarkably, the model produced intermittent gamma oscillations (~50-70 Hz) whose properties matched those recorded in vivo, including their entrainment of spiking. BL gamma-band oscillations were generated by the intrinsic circuitry, depending upon reciprocal interactions between principal cells and fast-spiking interneurons, while connections within these cell types affected the rhythm's frequency. The model allowed us to conduct experimentally impossible tests to characterize the synaptic and spatial properties of gamma. The entrainment of individual neurons to gamma depended on the number of afferent connections they received, and gamma bursts were spatially restricted in the BL. Importantly, the gamma rhythm synchronized principal cells and mediated competition between ensembles. Together, these results indicate that the recurrent connectivity of BL expands its computational and communication repertoire.

2

Significant Statement

Using *in vitro* and *in vivo* data we develop the first large-scale biophysically and anatomically realistic model of the basolateral amygdala nucleus (BL), which reproduces the dynamics of the *in vivo* local field potential (LFP). Significantly, it predicts that BL intrinsically generates the transient gamma oscillations observed *in vivo*. The model permitted exploration of the poorly understood synaptic mechanisms underlying gamma genesis in BL, and the model's ability to compute LFPs at arbitrary numbers of recording sites provided insights into the characteristics of the spatial properties of gamma bursts. Furthermore, we show how gamma synchronizes principal cells to overcome their low firing rates while simultaneously promoting competition, potentially impacting their afferent selectivity and efferent drive, and thus emotional behavior.

Introduction

The basolateral complex of the amygdala (BLA) supports emotional learning and expression (Ehrlich et al., 2009; Duvarci and Pare, 2014). Central to this function is integrating information from numerous cortical and thalamic regions (Turner and Herkenham, 1991; McDonald, 1998). It is commonly thought that these signals converge on subpopulations of principal cells (PNs), which in turn either synapse on other PNs that promote a particular behavior, or contact interneurons that inhibit PNs supporting a countervailing behavior (LeDoux, 2000; Ehrlich et al., 2009; Duvarci and Pare, 2014). However, recurrent connections also exist within the BLA (Pare et al., 1995; Samson and Pare, 2006; Beyeler et al., 2016), with fast spiking interneurons (FSIs) synapsing on each other and forming reciprocal connections with local PNs (Smith et al., 1998; Woodruff and Sah, 2007). Yet, the importance of these connections for BLA function remains largely unknown.

One possibility is that recurrent connections support the generation of oscillations. Consistent with this possibility, computational models (Traub et al., 1996; Wang and Buzsaki, 1996) as well as *in vitro* (Traub et al., 1996; Sohal et al., 2009) and *in vivo* experiments (Penttonen et al., 1998; Cardin et al., 2009) have revealed that a dense recurrent network of PNs and FSIs produces oscillations in the gamma frequency band. The dominant model for this, known as the Pyramidal-Interneuron Network Gamma (PING) model (Whittington et al., 2000), posits that the firing of PNs excites FSIs, which in turn deliver feedback inhibition, transiently silencing PNs. As the inhibition wanes, PNs regain the ability to fire and can restart the gamma cycle.

Crucially, during affective experiences, the BLA also exhibits gamma oscillations that are especially pronounced in its basolateral nucleus (BL, Bauer et al., 2007). For instance, gamma increases when rodents regulate their anxiety level during open field exploration (Stujenske et al., 2014), or are exposed to emotionally charged stimuli (Bauer et al., 2007). Importantly, the human amygdala also produces gamma oscillations during emotionally arousing stimuli (Oya et al., 2002). Despite the prevalence of gamma oscillations in the amygdala, their cellular basis and function remain unclear.

Numerous functions have been ascribed to gamma oscillations (Wang, 2010), but two stand out in particular. First, they synchronize spiking. PNs in networks exhibiting gamma oscillations tend to fire together more often than expected by chance (Wang and Buzsaki, 1996), robustly driving downstream neurons (Salinas and Sejnowski, 2000, 2002; Zandvakili and Kohn, 2015). Second, they may mediate competitive interactions between PN ensembles (Borgers et al., 2008). During each gamma cycle, the ensemble with the strongest afferent drive will tend to recruit the local FSI network, suppressing weakly driven ensembles (de Almeida et al., 2009).

Computational models of gamma oscillations have not been reported for the amygdala; such models for other brain regions have typically used generic single cell and network configurations, with surrogate local field potential (LFP) models (e.g., Borgers et al., 2008; Palmigiano et al., 2017). To examine whether the intrinsic BL circuitry can produce the poorly-understood transient gamma oscillations and their associated functions, we created a large-scale 27,000 cell multi-compartmental biophysical model of BL, with a detailed LFP model, that recapitulates numerous features of BL activity *in vivo*, such as the properties of gamma oscillations in LFPs and their entrainment of spiking. Using this model, we determined the circuit elements essential for generating gamma oscillations in BL, what aspects of microcircuit architecture affect the participation of neurons in gamma, the spatiotemporal properties of BL gamma bursts, and how these oscillations support information processing.

Materials and Methods

Experimental data

To construct and validate our model, we conducted new analyses on two sets of extracellular recordings that were described in prior publications (Headley et al., 2015; Amir et al., 2018), and on one unpublished dataset. Thus, we briefly describe the methods used in these prior studies so that readers can assess the nature and quality of this data.

152153154

155

156157

158

159160

161162

163

164

165

166167

168169

170

171

172173

174

144145

146147

148

149

150

151

In vivo chronic recordings: All animal procedures were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at Rutgers University, in accordance with the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (Department of Health and Human Services). Unit activity from prefrontal (PFC), perirhinal (PR), and entorhinal (ER) cortices (Headley et al., 2015) was used to generate surrogate spike trains that simulate extrinsic afferents onto the BL model (see BL afferents in Network structure and connectivity, below). This data was acquired in three male Long Evans rats weighing between 350 and 500 g that were implanted with a headcap containing microdrives loaded with tetrodes (20 μ m tungsten wire, impedance <100k Ω). Two independent drives were used to target either prefrontal or perirhinal/entorhinal cortices (PFC: AP +3.0, ML +0.5, DV 3.0; PR: AP -3.0 to -8.0, ML +6.0 to +7.2, DV 5.0; ER: AP -5.4 to -8.0, ML +7.0, DV 5.5; all coordinates in mm, DV was taken with respect to the pial surface). Following recovery from surgery (> 7 days), microdrives were advanced until tetrodes reached their target locations, at which point recordings began. Extracellular signals were amplified with a 96 channel system (Plexon) and digitized (National Instruments) for offline analysis. Unit activity was sorted into single units by high pass filtering wideband LFP with a moving median filter, detection of spikes with amplitude greater than 2 SD, automatic clustering of waveforms in principal component space (KlustaKwik), and manual refinement of cluster assignment (Klusters). Validation of single unit quality and isolation can be found in our prior paper (Headley et al., 2015). Only regular spiking units (putative projection neurons), classified using k-means

clustering of the negative peak to positive peak time interval of their waveform and firing rate, were used. In particular, we focused on a single epoch from each subject (subject 1: 165 s; subject 2: 140 s; subject 3: 160 s) with simultaneous recordings from multiple single units (subject 1: 36; subject 2: 14; subject 3: 20).

Unit and LFP activities from the BL recorded with silicon probes were used to calibrate and validate our model (n = 5). As detailed in Amir et al., 2018, male Sprague Dawley rats (>350 g) were implanted with either a 32 or 64 channel silicon probe (Neuronexus) mounted on a microdrive and targeting the BL nucleus of the amygdala (AP -2.2 to -3.6, ML +5 to 5.3, DV 8.8). Recording hardware and single unit sorting was similar to that described above.

LFP spectra were also recorded from the BL of male Long Evans rats (>350 g, n=7). A microwire (20 μ m tungsten wire, impedance <50k Ω) attached to a fiber optic stub was stereotaxically implanted in the BLA (AP: -2.5, ML: +5.0, DV: -7.5, from brain surface) and fixed to the skull with dental cement (Metabond and Teets Cold Cure). These subjects were also used for optogenetic experiments (AAV5-Syn-Chronos-GFP injected into BL), but this data was excluded from the present study. All recordings were performed at least 24 hours following any optogenetic manipulations. Extracellular recordings from the BL were obtained with a 32 channel digitizing headstage (Intan Technologies).

All the electrophysiological data used in the present study was referenced to a screw fixed to the bone overlaying the cerebellum and was obtained while rats were allowed to behave spontaneously in a neutral plastic enclosure. We only considered data acquired in the quiet waking state, which was identified by the absence of gross body movement and LFPs with relatively low power at frequencies < 4 Hz.

In vitro BL slice recordings: An overdose of isoflurane was administered to deeply anesthetize male Long Evans rats (n = 11, 53 cells). Once all reflexes had ceased they were immediately perfused through the heart with a ice cold modified artificial cerebrospinal fluid solution (aCSF) containing (mM): 103 N-methyl-D-gluconamine, 2.5 KCl, 1.2 NaH₂PO₄, 30 NaHCO₃, 10 MgSO₄ x 7H₂O, 25 glucose, 20 HEPES, 101 HCl, 2 Thiourea, 3 Na-Pyruvate, 12 N-acetyl-L-cysteine, and 0.5 CaCl.

Following 30 seconds of perfusion the brain was rapidly extracted and placed in the cutting solution, which was the same used for perfusion. Slices were cut in the coronal plane on a vibratome with a thickness of 300-400 µm. Following slicing sections were transferred to a chamber containing the perfusion solution at 32° C for 5 minutes. Slices were then placed in a holding chamber with room temperature (22° C) normal aCSF (mM): 124 NaCl, 2.5 KCl, 1.25 NaH₂PO₄, 26 NaHCO₃, 1 MgCl₂, 2 CaCl₂, and 10 glucose (pH 7.2-7.3, 305 mOsm). Slices were then transferred one at a time to a recording chamber perfused with oxygenated aCSF at 32° C.

Under visual guidance by infrared video microscopy we obtained whole cell patch-clamp recordings from BL neurons. We pulled patch pipettes of borosilicate glass with tip resistances of 5-8 M Ω and filled them with a solution of (mM): 130 K-gluconate, 10 N-2-hydroxyethylpiperazine-N'-2'-ethanesulfonic acid, 10 KCl, 2 MgCl₂, 2 ATP-Mg, and 0.2 GTP-tris(hydroxy-methyl)aminomethane (pH 7.2, 280 mOsm). We did not compensate for the liquid junction potential, which is 10 mV with this solution. Current clamp recordings were obtained with a MultiClamp 700B amplifier and digitized at 20 kHz using an Axon Digidata 1550 interface.

Once whole cell access was achieved, we characterized the neuron's electroresponsive properties. Current pulses 500 ms in length were delivered from -200 to 360 pA in steps of 40 pA. Neurons with action potential half-widths less than 0.35 ms were classified as FSIs, while all others were regular spiking.

Model implementation

The single cell and network models were developed using the parallel NEURON 7.4 simulator (Carnevale and Hines, 2005), and simulations were run with a fixed time step of 50 µs. Network models were run using the NeuroScience Gateway (NSG; nsgportal.org) that provides free and easy access to high-performance computers (Sivagnanam et al., 2013). Model results were obtained by averaging five network model runs with different random seeds for data shown in Figures 1G, 3C, 4, and 5E and for selecting groups of neurons were used in Figures 7B-D.

Mathematical equations for voltage-dependent ionic currents: The equation for each compartment (soma or dendrite) followed the Hodgkin-Huxley formulation (Byrne and Roberts, 2004; Kim et al., 2013) in eqn. 1,

238
$$C_m dV_s / dt = -g_L (V_s - E_L) - g_c (V_s - V_d) - \sum_{c} I_{cur,s}^{int} - \sum_{c} I_{cur,s}^{syn} + I_{inj}$$
 (1)

where V_s/V_d are the somatic/dendritic membrane potential (mV), $I_{cur,s}^{int}$ and $I_{cur,s}^{syn}$ are the intrinsic and synaptic currents in the soma, I_{inj} is the electrode current applied to the soma, C_m is the membrane capacitance, g_L is the is the conductance of leak channel, and g_c is the coupling conductance between the soma and the dendrite (similar term added for other dendrites connected to the soma). The intrinsic current $I_{cur,s}^{int}$, was modeled as $I_{cur,s}^{int} = g_{cur} m^p h^q (V_s - E_{cur})$, where g_{cur} is its maximal conductance, m its activation variable (with exponent p), p its inactivation variable (with exponent p), and p its reversal potential (a similar equation is used for the synaptic current p but without p and p is the electrode current p is the electrode current p in the electrode current p in the electrode current p in the electrode current p is the electrode current p in the electrode current p in the electrode current p is the electrode current p in the electrode current p in the electrode current p in the electrode current p is the electrode current p in the electrode current

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{x_{\infty}(V,[ca^{2+}]_i) - x}{\tau_{\chi}(V,[ca^{2+}]_i)}$$
 (2)

where x_{∞} is the steady state gating voltage- and/or Ca²⁺- dependent gating variable and τ_x is the voltage- and/or Ca²⁺- dependent time constant. The equation for the dendrite follows the same format with 's' and 'd' switching positions in eqn. 1.

Principal cell models: To reproduce the range of spike frequency adaptation exhibited by BL PNs (Rainnie et al., 1993), we modeled two types of PNs, one with adaptation (Type-A) and one with continuous spiking (Type-C), differing solely in the magnitude of their Ca²⁺-dependent K⁺ current, either 50 or 0.2 mS/cm², respectively (Kim et al., 2013). We conducted our own study of the relative proportion of these types because our *in vivo* recordings, which our model was compared with, were from adult rats (>350 grams) whereas previous slice work was conducted in younger subjects, and the ionic mechanisms underlying accommodation, such as spike after-hyperpolarizations (AHPs), change with age (Disterhoft and Oh, 2007). Positive current injection into PNs (n=56) evoked either a train of action potentials with increasing interspike intervals (i.e. accommodation) or at a fixed rate (i.e. continuous). This property could be quantified by the adaptation ratio:

267268

269270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277278

279

280

281 282

283

284285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

265 $adaptation\ ratio = \frac{duration\ of\ last\ ISI}{duration\ of\ first\ ISI}$ (3)

with larger values indicating greater adaptation. We set a cutoff of 1.5 to classify PNs adapting. Our previous PN models (Li et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2013; Feng et al., 2016) were revised to incorporate the low- and high-threshold oscillations (LTOs and HTOs, respectively) reported in BLA PNs (Pape et al., 1998) and modeled recently by our group (Alturki et al., 2016). The model PNs had three compartments representing a soma (diameter 24.75 μm, length 25 μm), where GABAergic synapses were placed, an apical dendrite (a-dend; diameter 3µm; length 270 µm) where glutamatergic synapses were located, and another dendrite (p-dend; diameter 5 µm; length 555µm) to match passive properties. Values of specific membrane resistance, membrane capacity and cytoplasmic (axial) resistivity were, respectively, $R_m = 55 \text{ k}\Omega\text{-cm}^2$, $C_m = 2.4 \mu\text{F/cm}^2$, and R_a = 150 Ω -cm. Leakage reversal potential (E_L) was set to -75mV. The resulting V_{rest} was -70.3 mV, input resistance (R_{IN}) was ~140 M Ω , and time constant (τ_m) was ~30 ms, all of which were within the ranges reported in previous physiological studies (Washburn and Moises, 1992). All compartments had the following currents: leak (I_L) , voltage-gated persistent muscarinic ($I_{\rm M}$), high-voltage activated Ca²⁺ ($I_{\rm Ca}$), spike-generating sodium (I_{Na}) , potassium delayed rectifier (I_{DR}) , A-type potassium (I_A) (Li et al., 2009; Power et al., 2011) and hyperpolarization-activated nonspecific cation (I_h) current. In addition, the soma had a slow apamin-insensitive, voltage-independent afterhyperpolarization current (I_{sAHP}) (Power et al., 2011; Alturki et al., 2016). See Tables 1 and 2 for current equations and densities.

Interneuron models: BL also contains local GABAergic interneurons that exhibit various firing patterns, even among neurochemically-homogeneous subgroups (Pape and Pare, 2010; Spampanato et al., 2011). However, the most prevalent are the fast-spiking parvalbumin-positive type, which has been implicated in the genesis of cortical and BL gamma (Borgers et al., 2005; Oren et al., 2006; Atallah and Scanziani, 2009; Amir et al., 2018). Accordingly, we modeled only the fast-spiking type of interneurons (FSI). The FSI model was the same as in Kim et al., 2013, with two compartments, a soma (diameter 15 μ m; length 15 μ m) and a dendrite (diameter 10 μ m; length 150 μ m). Each compartment contained a fast Na⁺ (I_{Na}) and a delayed rectifier K⁺ (I_{DR}) current. The FSI model reproduced the short spike duration (with the spike duration at half

amplitude < 1ms) that characterizes FSIs. The passive membrane properties of FSI cells were as follows: R_m = 20 k Ω -cm², C_m = 1.0 μ F/cm², R_a = 150 Ω -cm. The FSI model also reproduced the non-adapting repetitive firing behavior of fast-spiking cells, as observed experimentally (Rainnie et al., 1993; Woodruff and Sah, 2007).

Network size and cell type proportions: Estimates of the number of neurons in rat BL vary widely (see Chareyron et al., 2011), so we settled on the mean across studies, which was ~72,000. We developed a scaled down (1:2.7) model of this region with 27,000 neurons randomly distributed in a cuboid geometry (1.4×1.4×1.4 mm), ensuring an inter-soma distance > 25 μm. The model included 64% PN_A (n=17,280), 26% PN_C (n=7,020), and 10% FSIs. These proportions were based on *in vitro* results collected for this study and agreed with estimates found in the literature (McDonald and Mascagni, 2001; Muller et al., 2006). The dendrites of all neurons in the network had random orientations (McDonald, 1984).

Mathematical equations for synaptic currents: All excitatory transmission was mediated by AMPA/NMDA receptors, and inhibitory transmission by GABA_A receptors. The corresponding synaptic currents were modeled by dual exponential functions (Destexhe et al., 1994; Durstewitz et al., 2000), as shown in eqns. 4-6,

$$I_{AMPA} = w * G_{AMPA} * (V - E_{AMPA})$$
313
$$G_{AMPA} = g_{AMPA,max} * STP_{AMPA} * r_{AMPA}$$
314
$$r_{AMPA}' = \alpha T max_{AMPA} * ON_{AMPA} * (1 - r_{AMPA}) - \beta_{AMPA} * r_{AMPA}$$
315
$$I_{NMDA} = w * G_{NMDA} * (V - E_{NMDA})$$
316
$$G_{NMDA} = g_{NMDA,max} * STP_{NMDA} * s(V) * r_{NMDA}$$
317
$$r_{NMDA}' = \alpha T max_{NMDA} * ON_{NMDA} * (1 - r_{NMDA}) - \beta_{NMDA} * r_{NMDA}$$
318
$$I_{GABAa} = w * G_{GABAa} * (V - E_{GABAa})$$

$$G_{GABAa} = g_{GABAa,max} * STP_{GABAa} * r_{GABAa}$$

 $G_{GABAa} = g_{GABAa,max} * STP_{GABAa} * r_{GABAa}$ 319 $r_{GABAa}' = \alpha Tmax_{GABAa} * ON_{GABAa} * (1 - r_{GABAa}) - \beta_{GABAa} * r_{GABAa}$ 320
(6)

where *V* is the membrane potential (mV) of the compartment (dendrite or soma) where the synapse is located and *w* is the synaptic weight for the synapse. The synaptic reversal potentials were $E_{\text{AMPA}} = E_{\text{NMDA}} = 0$ mV and $E_{\text{GABAa}} = -75$ mV (Durstewitz et al., 2000; Martina et al., 2001). The voltage-dependent variable s(V) which implements the Mg²⁺ block was defined as: $s(V) = [1 + 0.33 \exp(-0.06 \text{ V})]^{-1}$ (Zador et al., 1990). The terms ON_{NMDA} and ON_{AMPA} are set to 1 if the corresponding receptor is open, else to 0.

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341 342

343 344

345

346 347

348

349 350

351

352

353 354

355

356

The synaptic current rise and decay time constants are determined by αT_{max} and β 328 (Destexhe et al., 1994). Synaptic parameter values are listed in Table 3.

Short-term presynaptic plasticity: All model AMPA and GABA synapses also exhibited short term pre-synaptic plasticity (Kim et al., 2013). Short-term depression was modeled at FSI->PN and PN->FIS connections based on experimental findings of Woodruff and Sah (2007) in BL, while between PNs it was modeled based on results from neocortex (Silberberg et al., 2004) due to the lack of such experimental data in BL. Short term plasticity was implemented as follows (Hummos et al., 2014): For facilitation, the factor F was calculated using the equation: $\tau_F * \frac{dF}{dt} = 1 - F$ and was constrained to be ≥ 1. After each stimulus, F was multiplied by a constant, f (≥ 1) representing the amount of facilitation per pre-synaptic action potential, and updated as $F \rightarrow F * f$. Between stimuli, F recovered exponentially back toward 1. A similar scheme was used to calculate the factor D for depression: $\tau_D * \frac{dD}{dt} = 1 - D$ and D constrained to be \leq 1. After each stimulus, D was multiplied by a constant $d \leq 1$ representing the amount of depression per pre-synaptic action potential, and updated as $D \to D * d$. Between stimuli, D recovered exponentially back toward 1. We modeled depression using two factors d_1 and d_2 with d_1 being fast and d_2 being slow subtypes, and $d = d_1 * d_2$. The parameters for modeling short-term plasticity are listed in Table 4. Our model did not have long-term synaptic plasticity.

Intrinsic connections: Except for FSI-FSI connections with both electrical and chemical synapses, all other connections were implemented as chemical synapses. Connection probabilities have been found to be distance-dependent for PN→PN contacts in BL, and we used 3%, 2%, 1%, and 0.5% probabilities for inter-soma distances of < 50, 50-100, 100-200, and 200-600 µm, respectively (Abatis, 2017). For connections involving interneurons, we used data from in vitro BL reports (Woodruff and Sah, 2007), with connections limited to pairs within ~300 µm of each other. Probabilities in the model for unidirectional connections from FSI→PN were 34% and PN→FSI were 12%. Reciprocal connections between PNs and FSIs were set to 16%. Electrical connections between FSIs were set to 8%. When a pair of FSIs were electrically coupled, they had a 50% probability of a unidirectional chemical synapse, or a 25%

358

359

360

361

362

363

364365

366

367368

369

370

371

372

373

374375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382 383

384 385

386

probability of bidirectional synaptic connectivity. FSI pairs not electrically coupled had a 19% probability of unidirectional connectivity, and a 3% probability of bidirectional probability. These connectivity numbers in our model resulted in an overall synaptic FSI→FSI connectivity of 26%, of which 20% was unidirectional and 3% bidirectional. These probabilities resulted in the following intrinsic connectivity in the model: each PN received 24.98±9.5 (mean±SD, throughout the paper unless otherwise indicated) excitatory connections from other PNs, and 42.6±12.9 inhibitory connections from FSIs; each FSI received 214.8±58 excitatory connections from PNs, and 21.6±7.4 inhibitory connections from other FSIs. Axonal conduction delay on all connections were distance dependent. See Tables 5A and 5B for details.

BL afferents: PFC, PR, and ER strongly project to BL (McDonald and Mascagni, 1997; Shi and Cassell, 1999; Vertes, 2004), so we tailored our extrinsic inputs to match their spiking. To this end, we created surrogate spiking activity derived from putative principal cells simultaneously recorded from the PFC, PR, and ER in vivo during the quiet waking state (QW, Headley et al., 2015). To do this, we created multiple surrogate spike trains where each was a random combination of the temporal firing rate profile of one neuron and the mean firing rate of another. The firing rate profile was the instantaneous firing rate of each unit, which was calculated by taking the inverse of the inter-spike interval in 1 ms steps. The instantaneous firing rate series was rescaled to have a mean rate of 1 Hz. Mean firing rate was the number of spikes dividing by the recording duration. A new spike train was created by multiplying one of the rescaled instantaneous rate series by a mean firing rate randomly drawn from the same population of units, and then passing each time step to a Poisson random number generator. When repeated multiple times, this creates an ensemble of spike trains that matches the distribution of firing rates, autocorrelations, and cross-correlations from the originally recorded ensemble. We generated an ensemble of 1,800 Poisson spike trains to represent the activities of cortical regions upstream of BL, and each of these projected to a random 40 PNs, resulting in ~95% of the PNs receiving at least one extrinsic input. The same extrinsic input also connected to FSIs that were within 300 µm of these 40 PNs with a probability of 0.3%; this resulted in each extrinsic input

connecting to an average of 6 FSIs. Thus, PNs and FSIs (Hubner et al., 2014) received 2.97±1.7 and 3.4±1.9 extrinsic inputs, respectively.

To reproduce membrane potential fluctuation seen *in vivo*, we used a point conductance model that mimics stochastic background synaptic activity using an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (Destexhe et al., 2001). Specifically, stochastic background input I_{bck} had two independent components, excitatory and inhibitory, for both PNs and FSIs, modeled as follows:

394
$$I_{bck} = g_e(t)(V - E_e) + g_i(t)(V - E_i)$$
 (7)

where $g_e(t)$ and $g_i(t)$ are time-dependent excitatory and inhibitory conductances,

respectively; $E_e = 0 \, mV$ and $E_i = -75 \, mV$ are respective reverse potentials. The two are

397 modeled as Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes described below:

398 399

389

390

391

392393

$$\frac{dg_e(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_e} [g_e(t) - g_{e0}] + \sqrt{D_e} \chi_1(t)$$
 (8a)

400
$$\frac{dg_i(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_i} [g_i(t) - g_{i0}] + \sqrt{D_i} \chi_2(t)$$
 (8b)

401 402

403

where g_{e0} and g_{i0} are average conductances, τ_e and τ_i are time constants, D_e and D_i are noise 'diffusion' coefficients, $\chi_1(t)$ and $\chi_2(t)$ are Gaussian white noise of zero mean and unit standard deviation (see Table 6 for these parameter values).

404405

The above two stochastic differential equations can be numerically modeled by using the following update rule:

408
$$g_e(t + \Delta t) = g_{e0} + [g_e(t) - g_{e0}] \exp(-\Delta t/\tau_e) + A_e N_1(0,1)$$
 (9a)

409
$$q_i(t + \Delta t) = q_{i0} + [q_i(t) - q_{i0}] \exp(-\Delta t/\tau_i) + A_i N_2(0,1)$$
 (9b)

where $N_1(0,1)$ and $N_2(0,1)$ are normal random numbers. A_e and A_i are amplitude

411 coefficients with
$$A_e = \sqrt{\partial_e^2[1 - \exp(-2\Delta t/\tau_e)]}$$
 & $A_i = \sqrt{\partial_i^2[1 - \exp(-2\Delta t/\tau_i)]}$

- Table 6 lists the parameters used in the point-conductance model. For each neuron,
- 413 the excitatory and inhibitory conductances were, respectively, 3.2±3 and 21±8 nS for
- 414 PNs and 1.2±0.1 and 5.7±2.6 nS for FSIs. However, the background inputs to FSIs was

weaker to ensure FSIs spike with input from PNs, but not with solely background inputs (Borgers and Kopell, 2003; Economo and White, 2012; Lee and Jones, 2013).

Calculation of LFP: Gamma rhythms are detected by extracellular recordings of LFPs within the brain. In contrast, biophysical models of neuronal networks have typically detected gamma rhythms using other measures, such as network spiking rates (Brunel and Hakim, 1999; Brunel and Wang, 2003; Borgers et al., 2005; Economo and White, 2012; Chalk et al., 2016; Hoseini and Wessel, 2016; Palmigiano et al., 2017) or membrane voltages (Traub et al., 2000; Bathellier et al., 2006; Neymotin et al., 2011), both of which are only indirectly linked to the LFP (Buzsaki et al., 2012; Schomburg et al., 2012). The present study modeled LFPs using a first principles approach.

We first recorded transmembrane ionic currents from each compartment of the model cells using the *extracellular mechanism* in NEURON (Carnevale and Hines, 2005; Parasuram et al., 2016). The extracellular potential arising from each neuronal compartment was then calculated using the line source approximation method, which provides a better approximation than point sources (Gold et al., 2006; Schomburg et al., 2012). The extracellular potential of a line compartment was estimated as

431
$$\emptyset_{EP} = \frac{l}{4\pi\sigma\Delta s} \log \left| \frac{\sqrt{h^2 + r^2} - h}{\sqrt{l^2 + r^2} - l} \right|$$
 (10)

where, I denotes the transmembrane current from just that compartment, Δs the length of the line compartment, r the radial distance from the line, h the longitudinal distance from the end of the line, and $l = \Delta s + h$ the distance from the start of the line (Holt, 1998; Parasuram et al., 2016). We chose a conductivity σ of the extracellular medium to be 0.3S/m (Goto et al., 2010; Einevoll et al., 2013). These individual extracellular potentials were summed linearly (Linden et al., 2013) at 1 ms resolution, to obtain the LFP \emptyset_{LFPS} for an N-neuron network with n-compartment-cells using the equation

439
$$\emptyset_{LFPS} = \sum_{N=1}^{N_neurons} \sum_{i=1}^{n_source} \frac{I_{Ni}}{4\pi\sigma\Delta s_{N_i}} \log \left| \frac{\sqrt{h_{N_i}^2 + r_{N_i}^2} - h_{N_i}}{\sqrt{l_{N_i}^2 + r_{N_i}^2} - l_{N_i}} \right|$$
 (11)

where N_i denotes i^{th} compartment of N^{th} neuron in the network. All 27,000 neurons contributed to the LFP in our study, different from previous studies (e.g. Bezaire et al., 2016) where only a subset of neurons did. This permitted investigation of both the

individual contribution and correlation of all modeled neurons to the LFP at any of the electrode locations.

Since our model spans the entire spatial extent of BL, but only has a fraction of the total number of neurons, the density of neurons in our model is lower than the in vivo case. This means that neurons will, on average, be farther from the simulated LFP electrode than would occur in the actual BL. To correct for this, we rescaled the LFP by a correction factor that was estimated following Linden et al. (2011) who suggest that LFP scales as the square root of the number of neurons, N, for uncorrelated synaptic inputs. However, that scaling factor was derived from a network of pyramidal neurons positioned in a disk with uniformly oriented dendrites, and was not for density per se but actually the radius of the disk with density held constant. To determine the scaling factor in our model, we systematically varied the number of cells used to calculate the LFP from a full model run. Varying the cell count from 1,000 up to 27,000, we found that the standard deviation of the LFP scaled with density following N^{0.67}. Since cell density in rats is reported to range from 2.5×10⁴ to 2×10⁵/mm³ (Tuunanen and Pitkanen, 2000; Salm et al., 2004; Pego et al., 2008; Rubinow and Juraska, 2009; Chareyron et al., 2011), while the model density is 9,840 neurons/mm3 (27,000 neurons, 1.4mm x 1.4mm x 1.4mm), the LFP correction factor would correspondingly range from 1.9 to 7.5 $[(2.5 \times 10^4/9.84 \times 10^3)^{0.67}$ to $(2 \times 10^5/9.84 \times 10^3)^{0.67}$. We chose the average of this range, 4.7, to scale the model LFP.

Multiple extracellular electrodes: To investigate the spatial propagation of model gamma we used a 9×9×9 grid of LFP electrodes evenly spaced throughout the network. Electrode sites were spaced at 125 μm intervals and were at least 200 μm away from the edges of the model. The LFP on each electrode was computed the same as in eqn. 11.

468 469

470

471

472

473

443

444

445

446

447

448 449

450

451

452

453 454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461 462

463

464

465

466 467

Model experiments and statistics

Spectral and cross-correlation analyses: Unless other indicated, spectral decompositions were performed using Morlet wavelets ranging from 1 to 256 Hz in quarter octave steps. The width of the wavelet was seven cycles. To measure the amplitude at a particular frequency and time, we took the absolute value of the complex

valued frequency domain representation of the signal. Phase was measured as the angle of the frequency domain representation.

The distribution of gamma burst properties were compared between the model and *in vivo* cases in Figure 2F. For both cases, wavelet power spectrogram were calculated and the mid-gamma band (64 Hz) was isolated. Peaks were detected and segmented in the time series of the mid-gamma power using a watershed function. To prevent spurious detections of peaks, prior to passing the data to the watershed function we discretized gamma power into bins of half the average change in power between cycles. Once peaks bursts were detected, extracted their peak power (prior to discretization) and duration. Peak powers were transformed into percentile ranks and binned in steps of 5 percentiles, while durations were binned in steps of 5 ms.

For the single neuron resonance analyses (**Figure 2G,H**), we calculated spectrums using the Welch Periodogram method (*pwelch* in MATLAB). The Hamming window taper size was 500 ms, in steps of 250 ms.

For the coherence spectrum between PN and FSI spiking (**Figure 7D**), the crosscorrelation and autocorrelation between these spike trains were calculated with 1 ms resolution. Then, they were converted to the frequency domain using the fast Fourier transform (FFT) and used to calculate coherence:

492
$$Coherence = \left| \frac{XCorr_{PNandFSI}}{\sqrt{ACorr_{PN}ACorr_{FSI}}} \right|$$
 (12)

Since both the PNs and FSIs exhibited gamma periodicity in their autocorrelation function, it was desirable to correct for this when estimating their crosscorrelation. To do this, one can take the inverse FFT of the coherence spectrum, which yields the crosscorrelation function in the time domain, but with periodicities arising from the autocorrelations factored out:

$$Corrected X Corr_{PN and FSI} = invFFT \left(\frac{X Corr_{PN and FSI}}{\sqrt{A Corr_{PN} A Corr_{FSI}}} \right)$$
 (13)

Entrainment to LFPs: For calculating the entrainment and preferred phase of cells, we first bandpass filtered the LFPs in the frequency band of interest using a 2 pole Butterworth filter implemented with the MATLAB function *filtfilt*, which performs forward and backward filtering to minimize phase distortion. A Hilbert transform of the resulting signal was then computed to determine the phase and amplitude at each instant (Amir

et al., 2018). This was used to assign a phase to each spike from a neuron. Entrainment of spiking to the LFP was computed as the mean resultant vector length using the Circular Statistics toolbox in MATLAB (Berens, 2009). This approach matched that in Amir et al., 2018. For our analysis of entrainment when disconnecting specific connections, (see *Circuit elements critical for gamma genesis*), we instead used the pairwise phase consistency measure, which is insensitive to changes in spike count arising from alterations in firing rate (Vinck et al., 2010).

When computing correlation between distance and entrainment (**Figure 3D**), cells were selected only within 100 µm from the four longest diagonals within the modeled cuboid structure, to minimize edge effects. To directly compare the decay in entrainment between PNs and FSIs (Figure 3D), we fit a generalized linear model with a log link function and factors Distance, Cell Type, and their interaction.

Detection of gamma bursts: For gamma burst extraction, we first applied zerophase 60-80Hz Butterworth bandpass filter of order 4, followed by the Hilbert transform
to obtain the analytic signal of the LFP (Dvorak and Fenton, 2014). Instantaneous
gamma amplitude was the modulus of the analytic signal. Gamma burst occurrence was
detected when the amplitude exceeded its mean by two standard deviations. Burst
duration was defined as the duration during which the amplitude was greater than 25%
of the peak value for the burst.

Propagation of gamma bursts: Using the 9×9×9 grid of LFP recording sites (see Multiple extracellular electrodes), we examined the properties of gamma bursts as spatiotemporal events. Near the edges of our model, we found that the gamma bump in the power spectrum shrunk, likely due to the decrease in the number of neurons contributing to the LFP and decrease in the absolute number of connections between PNs and FSIs. Therefore, to compensate, we multiplied the Z-score of the LFP amplitude from each recording site by a correction factor F with the form:

$$F = \sqrt{\frac{GammaAmp_{j}}{TotalAmp_{j}}} / \sqrt{\frac{GammaAmp_{middle}}{TotalAmp_{middle}}}$$
 (14)

where GammaAmp is the area under the curve for the bump in the gamma band after removing a power law fit (Neske and Connors, 2016), TotalAmp is the total area under the curve for the power spectrum, *j* denotes the recording electrode, and *middle*

indicates the value for the electrode in the center of the model. The Z-scored LFP Hilbert transformed amplitude at each site was multiplied by this factor.

We then identified gamma bursts as spatiotemporal events using a four dimensional watershed algorithm that identifies contiguous regions of elevated gamma power that are convex. To minimize spurious detections of gamma bursts driven by small variations in the power, we discretized the Z-scored LFP Hilbert transformed amplitude into bins of 0.1. In order for a region to count as a gamma burst, its peak amplitude had to exceed 2 Z-scores. The borders of the burst region were delineated when power dropped by 25% of the peak. These were criteria were intentionally similar to the ones used for detecting gamma bursts on single electrodes (see *Detection of gamma bursts*).

After identification of a gamma burst, its properties were defined as follows. Gamma burst peak (**Figure 6B1**) was defined as the maximum Z-scored LFP amplitude within the burst. Its time duration (**Figure 6B2**) was calculated as the time duration during which at least one recording site within the watershed region was above the 0.25% of the peak Z-score. Gamma burst volume (**Figure 6B4**) was defined as the number of recording sites that had reached the burst threshold with the same burst region.

To estimate propagation of gamma bursts, we identified the gamma region composed of electrodes with the same watershed label at each time step. Then, a burst center point was defined as the mean coordinate from all electrodes belonging to the same burst region. Gamma burst path length (**Figure 6B5**) was calculated as the total distance that a burst center could travel in space.

To quantify instantaneous gamma burst synchrony (**Figure 6B3**), we calculated the phase locking value (PLV) by using the unbiased PLV (Aydore et al., 2013) of 27 electrodes within a 3×3×3 grid located at the gamma burst peak.

Statistical analysis: Values are mean ± SD unless otherwise stated. Adjusted R² value were reported when data points were fit by a curve in Figure 3D, E. For Figure 5E, ANOVAs was performed on fitted general linear models p values were reported. Two-tailed Ranksum tests were performed and p values were reported for Figure 7B, D. Watson-Williams tests by using Circular Statistics toolbox in MATLAB (Berens, 2009)

564	were performed and p values were reported for Figure 7C. ANCOVA was tested and p
565	values were reported for Figure 7F.
566	
567	The model code will be made available upon publication via the ModelDB public
568	database (http://senselab.med.yale.edu/ModelDB/).
569	

Results:

571 Validation of the BL model

A biophysically realistic computational model of the rat BL was developed based on the known anatomy and cellular neurophysiology (see Materials and Methods for details and supporting empirical references). The model was a cube with PNs and FSIs distributed randomly throughout (Figure 1A,B). The dendritic compartments for both PNs and FSIs were oriented randomly and spanned several hundred microns from the cell body (Figure 1C). Using this model, we tracked both the intracellular and extracellular signals associated with network events (Figure 1D1). The model network included extrinsic afferents contacting both PNs and FSIs and intrinsic connections (Figure 1D2), in keeping with previous anatomical (Pare et al., 1995; Muller et al., 2006) and physiological (Washburn and Moises, 1992; Rainnie et al., 1993; Woodruff and Sah, 2007) observations.

Two types of principal cells with marked (PN_A) or negligible (PN_C) spike frequency accommodation were used based on previous reports and our own investigations (see Materials and Methods, **Figure 1E,F**). Our *in vitro* recordings revealed 41/56 PN_A and 15/56 PN_Cs, so our model used similar proportions (71% PN_A, 29% PN_C). We also included FSIs, which are the prevalent type in BL (McDonald and Mascagni, 2001; Fishell and Rudy, 2011), well characterized biophysically and synaptically (Rainnie et al., 2006; Woodruff and Sah, 2007), and are important for gamma genesis in cortical circuits (Bartos et al., 2007). Point conductance noise levels were adjusted so that the firing rates of PNs and FSIs matched those observed *in vivo* (**Figure 1G**).

The LFP was calculated using the relative location of cellular compartments, their transmembrane currents, and an estimate of the extracellular conductivity (see Materials and Methods). The model LFP exhibited several well-established aspects of real extracellularly recorded action potentials (APs) and excitatory post-synaptic potentials (EPs, **Figure 1H,I**). PNs produced stronger dipoles than FSIs, resulting in greater extracellular potentials. Near the soma, the simulated extracellular action potential was negative going, larger for PNs, and faster for FSIs (**Figure 1J1,2**, note scale difference). A unitary EPSC evoked in a dendritic branch produced an

extracellular negativity near the dendrite that was substantially smaller than that arising from an action potential (**Figure 1J2**). Additionally, the amplitude of extracellular action potentials decreased with distance from the soma similarly between the model and *in vivo* cases (**Figure 1H,K**).

604 605 606

607

608

609

610

611 612

613

614

615

616 617

618

619 620

621622

623

624

625

626 627

628

629630

631

601

602

603

Emergence of gamma oscillations in the BL model

We next examined whether the spontaneous LFP at the center of our BL model (Figure 2A) matched in vivo BL recordings when rats were in a quiet waking state. A characteristic of the LFP in vivo is that its power spectrum can be fit by a 1/fa power law (Buzsaki et al., 2012). BL recordings from Long Evans rats showed a spectrum with the 1/f^a falloff, but also a bump in the gamma band between 54 and 70 Hz (**Figure 2B**, grav lines). A gamma band signal was present in the model's LFP, with similar power (101 mV²/Hz) and peak frequency (64 Hz, **Figure 2B,C**, red line). However, the model's spectrum had substantially less power below 30 Hz. This may reflect the absence of volume conducted activity or a lack of interactions with extrinsic structures. The former possibility was studied by Leski et al., 2013, who showed that lower-frequency LFP components have a larger spatial reach and extended further outside the active population than high-frequency components. It has also been found that increasing the correlations between extrinsic afferents boosts power in the low frequency band (Hagen et al. 2016; Leski et al. 2013). Our model likely underestimates the contribution of correlated extrinsic inputs since our naturalistic spike trains only represented a fraction of the structures projecting to the BL, each presumably with their own correlated spiking. Consistent with this, we found that replacing the naturalistic correlated spiking processes of our extrinsic afferents with rate matched independent Poisson processes further reduced the power of low frequencies (Figure 2B, green line). Importantly, gamma power from 50 to 80 Hz was unaffected by this change, supporting the hypothesis that it is locally generated and not imposed by upstream structures or volume conducted from adjacent regions. In addition, the gamma oscillations in our model occurred as intermittent bursts, like those found in BL in vivo (Figure 2D,E). The probability distribution of gamma bursts with respect to their duration and amplitude was similar between the model and those recorded in vivo (Figure 2F).

Neither the resonance properties of single cells (**Figure 2G1-3**), nor the spectral content in EPSCs and IPSCs (**Figure 2H1,2**) contributed to the gamma in the model. Also, there was no enhancement in the gamma-band when synaptic potentials were driven as Poisson processes with rates ranging from 1 to 200 Hz (**Figure 2H3**). This leaves interactions between PNs and FSIs as the most likely candidate causing gamma.

Entrainment of neurons to gamma in the LFP

We examined whether BL neurons showed a similar entrainment (**Figure 3A**) to *in vivo* recordings (Amir et al., 2018). For neurons within 300 µm of the point where we calculated the LFP we measured their resultant vector (**Figure 3B,C**). Both types of PNs were entrained to the gamma rhythm, spiking during the trough, with a mean resultant vector of 0.19±0.07 (mean±SD) for PN_As, and 0.17±0.06 for PN_Cs. On the other hand, FSIs tended to fire during the ascending phase, and exhibited similar mean entrainment, 0.17±0.04.

PNs and FSIs exhibited decreased entrainment to gamma at longer distances (**Figure 3D**, PN: 50% falloff at 409 μ m, adjusted R² = 0.37, df = 350; FSI: 50% falloff at 355 μ m, adjusted R² = 0.67, df = 146). A generalized linear model also indicated a distance dependent falloff (t-stat = -15.29, df = 496, p = 1.63×10⁻⁴³) and no difference in falloff between cell types (*Distance* x *FSI*, t-stat = -0.95, df = 496, p = 0.34). To rule out the possibility that the decrease in entrainment was driven purely by the distance-dependent decay in a neuron's contribution to the extracellular potential we examined the contributions of individual PNs and FSIs at different distances (**Figure 3E**). Arguing against this, the falloff in the contribution of both PNs and FSIs to the extracellular potential was much sharper than the decay in their entrainment (PN: 50% falloff at 125 μ m, adjusted R² = 0.59, df = 1435; FSI: 50% falloff at 113 μ m, adjusted R² = 0.67, df = 749).

Circuit elements critical for gamma genesis

To identify the circuit elements that support the generation of gamma oscillations, we systematically eliminated each connection type one at a time. Since the firing rates of PNs and FSIs could change dramatically in the disconnected models, we adjusted the

point conductance noise of both cell types to bring them back into agreement with the original unperturbed model. For each perturbed model, we measured the power spectrum of the simulated LFP and unit entrainment to frequencies ranging from 1 to 256 Hz with the pairwise phase consistency measure (PPC), which is unbiased for changes in spike count (Vinck et al., 2010). To clarify the changes we saw in the power spectrum, we calculated the cross-correlation between bursts of PN activity (time points where the firing rate of the PN population exceeded the 75% percentile) and spiking in the FSI population.

Removal of the FSI→PN connection eliminated the mid-gamma bump in the LFP (Figure 4A1), but increased power at frequencies below 20 Hz. Consistent with this, the entrainment of PNs by low frequencies was increased as well (Figure 4A2), with a particularly prominent peak at 6 Hz (Figure 4A2 Inset). Also mirroring the LFP, PN and FSI entrainment to gamma was substantially reduced. This loss was evident in the response of the FSI network to bursts of PN activity, which now lacked a prominent gamma periodicity (Figure 4A3). Instead, FSIs exhibited a slow undulation in firing that was capped with a transient burst of spikes in response to PN firing.

PN→FSI connections were also critical to gamma generation (**Figure 4B1**). Their removal reduced the entrainment of PNs and FSIs in the gamma frequency range (**Figure 4B2**). Compared to the previous model, the increase in power in the low frequency band was smaller, so too was entrainment by PNs (**Figure 4B1,2**). FSIs, on the other hand, were not entrained to the low frequency rhythm, suggesting that it originated with the PN network, from which it was now disconnected. As expected, FSIs no longer responded to bursts of PN activity (**Figure 4B3**).

The elimination of gamma by removing either PN→FSI or FSI→PN connections is in agreement with a PING based mechanism for gamma genesis (Whittington et al., 2000). This does not rule out the importance of connections within the PN and FSI populations. Since these connections were also present in the model, we also examined their contribution.

An interconnected network of FSIs that receives tonic excitatory drive can produce gamma oscillations, so called interneuron network gamma (ING, Whittington et al., 2000), which may occur in the model. Eliminating FSI→FSI connections (including

gap-junctions), shifted the peak frequency to 23 Hz (**Figure 4C1**). Likewise, both PNs and FSIs shifted their maximal gamma entrainment to the new peak frequency (**Figure 4C2**). Since the timescale of feedback inhibition affects the frequency of gamma (Wang and Buzsaki, 1996), the lower frequency likely reflects the increased duration of the PN-evoked FSI burst, which arose from the removal of feedback inhibition generated by FSIs onto themselves (**Figure 4C3**).

Removing PN→PN connections had a modest effect on gamma generation, shifting the peak frequency slightly lower, which was also reflected in the entrainment of PNs to gamma (**Figure 4D1,2**). Notably, there was a large drop in spectral power at lower frequencies, suggesting that it partly depends upon recurrent activity within the PN network. Befitting these minor changes, FSI responses to PN bursts were only marginally affected (**Figure 4D3**).

Altogether these results suggest that reciprocal interactions between PNs and FSIs support the generation of gamma oscillations in BL, and that their frequency is affected by connections within the PN and FSI populations.

Synaptic basis of gamma coordination in single cells

Since gamma in our model was similar to the *in vivo* case, we explored how the convergence of excitatory and inhibitory synapses affects a neuron's entrainment to gamma. We chose 300 PNs and FSIs at random and recorded their EPSCs, IPSCs, spike times, and surrounding LFP (sampled ~200µm away, **Figure 5A**). We limited ourselves to neurons that fired over 100 spikes in the 165 seconds of simulation time, so only PN_cs were present in the PN sample.

Given that synaptic inputs constitute a major determinant of neuronal firing, we first assessed the spectral content of the EPSCs and IPSCs impinging upon PNs and FSIs (**Figure 5B**). On average, IPSCs exhibited a pronounced bump in the mid-gamma band for both cell types. This contrasted with EPSCs, which lacked increased gammaband power for PNs, and only exhibited a shallow increase in FSIs. The presence of a gamma bump in both synaptic current power spectra for FSIs, but not PNs, suggested that the coherence between excitatory and inhibitory synaptic currents differs between

cell types. Indeed, EPSC-IPSC coherence at the gamma frequency was higher in FSIs than in PNs (**Figure 5C**).

To determine whether this effect was related to spiking during gamma (Figure 5D), we calculated the mean EPSCs (Figure 5D1, red lines) and IPSCs (Figure 5D2, blue) during gamma cycles with (solid) and without spikes (dashed), and their difference (Figure 5D3). For PNs, spiking was associated with an increase in EPSCs, which started rising during the latter half of the prior gamma cycle, and peaked at the trough of the oscillation, when PNs normally fire (see Figure 3C). As was evident in the power spectrum for the PN EPSC current (Figure 5B, left, red), no gamma periodicity was evident in the EPSC trace. On the other hand, the IPSCs tracked the ongoing LFP gamma rhythm (Figure 5B, left, blue). While there was a slight decrease in IPSC strength during the first half of the gamma cycles containing spikes, this reversed itself during the latter half, with inhibition increasing following the phase when PN spiking normally occurs (see Figure 3C), likely reflecting feedforward activation of the FSI network.

FSIs exhibited a different pattern of postsynaptic currents during gamma cycles in which they spiked (Figure 5D, right). The EPSCs were entrained to the ongoing gamma rhythm and elevated just before the neuron spiked, during the ascending phase of the gamma cycle. Also unlike PNs, FSIs showed a decrease in IPSC amplitude throughout the gamma cycle in which they spiked, followed by a return to baseline. One similarity between PNs and FSIs was that their IPSCs were similarly entrained to the gamma rhythm. These results suggest that PN spiking during a gamma cycle is mostly dependent on the presence or absence of an EPSC, while FSIs are more likely to spike when both EPSC amplitudes are increased and IPSCs are decreased. Despite these differences, it is worth noting that PNs and FSIs tended to spike during the phase of the gamma cycle when EPSCs were at their maximum and IPSCs were at their minimum. Our finding that spiking during gamma cycles was accompanied by both EPSCs and disinhibition of IPSCs supports the claim that the gamma in the BL network arises through a PING mechanism, rather than the Recurrent-Excitation-Inhibition (REI) mechanism found in models of visual cortex (Chariker et al., 2018).

Since spiking during gamma depends on the pattern of postsynaptic currents, it could be that a neuron's entrainment to gamma depends on how many excitatory and inhibitory synapses it receives. For each neuron, we measured their entrainment to gamma using the resultant vector metric and determined how it varied as a function of their number of excitatory and inhibitory afferents (**Figure 5E**). For PNs and FSIs there was a significant positive relationship between entrainment and the number of inhibitory afferents received (PN: F(1,296) = 35.8, $p = 6.3 \times 10^{-9}$; FSI: F(1,296) = 770.3, $p = 2.3 \times 10^{-84}$). However, the number of excitatory afferents did not alter entrainment in PNs (F(1,296) = 0.16, p = 0.69), but decreased it in FSIs (F(1,296) = 264.8, $p = 5.7 \times 10^{-43}$). Notably, FSI entrainment was enhanced when both inhibitory and excitatory afferents increased in tandem (F(1,296) = 5.1, p = 0.025). Overall, the dependence of PN and FSI entrainment on the number of inhibitory connections agrees with the relatively strong gamma periodicity of IPSCs.

Spatiotemporal properties of gamma bursts

Gamma oscillations not only persist in time but extend across space. This introduces uncertainty about the amplitude and duration of gamma bursts when recording from single sites. This is not a problem for our model, which can support an arbitrary number of recording sites arranged in any desired configuration. Thus, we characterized gamma bursts as spatiotemporal phenomena.

A 9×9×9 grid of recording sites with an interelectrode spacing of 125µm spanned the entire BL model (**Figure 6A**). Spatiotemporal gamma bursts were identified in a four dimensional space (3 spatial and 1 temporal). We measured gamma amplitude at each site and identified spatially contiguous regions of elevated gamma power at each time step. To count as a burst power had to peak above 2 standard deviations of the mean and the edges of the burst were thresholded at 25% of the peak power.

By surveying the entirety of each gamma burst we could unambiguously measure their properties (**Figure 6B**). Gamma burst peak amplitudes hugged the cut-off threshold we had set at 2 z-scores, with a mean of 2.8, and less than 1% above 5 (**Figure 6B1**). Burst durations were 108 ms on average, enough time to encompass several gamma cycles (**Figure 6B2**). We also measured the mean phase locking of the

LFP in the gamma band surrounding the location of peak power in the gamma burst. Most bursts had an average phase locking value of 0.87 (**Figure 6B3**), indicating that at the center of the burst, adjacent LFP recording sites were highly phase coherent.

Tracking across multiple recording sites revealed the spatial properties of gamma bursts. Localized increases in gamma power could start in one part of the model, spread to adjacent areas, and then dissipate. Most bursts were local, encompassing 44.3 recording sites on average out of a possible 729 total (6% of the BL volume, **Figure 6B4**). If the mean volume of a gamma burst were arranged as a sphere, it would have a radius of ~270 µm. Despite being local, the center of the burst could move throughout the BL, with bursts on average traversing 472 µm from their start to end times (**Figure 6B5**). Taking the distance a burst traveled, and dividing that by the burst duration, we could measure the average speed of its center, which was 4.4 µm/ms (**Figure 6B6**), or 68 µm per gamma cycle (assuming a cycle duration of ~15 ms).

These results highlight the fact that gamma bursts, even in relatively small nuclear structures like BL, can be highly localized. However, they are not spatially confined; they can emerge at one location and terminate in another. Such propagation may mediate interactions between distant cell populations.

Computation in the BL network

To explore how the microcircuitry generating gamma affects the interaction between BL neurons, we randomly assigned PNs in the network to one of two populations (Group 1 and Group 2), each receiving a different set of extrinsic afferents (**Figure 7A1**). The simulated LFP was recorded from the center of the model, along with the spiking activity, IPSCs, and EPSCs of nearby neurons. Each population had its extrinsic afferents driven as Poisson processes at a fixed rate (**Figure 7A2-4**). For these simulations we used a reduced BL model limited to 1,000 neurons, with similar connectivity rules and proportions of cells types as found in the full model.

We first examined how increases in afferent drive to Group 1 PNs affected synchronous spiking within each group (**Figure 7B1**). Randomly selected pairs of neurons had their spike cross-correlations calculated. A robust gamma frequency periodicity was evident in the cross-correlation function of both groups (**Figure 7B2-4**),

with the group receiving the strongest afferent drive exhibiting greater synchronous spiking (**Figure 7B2**, Group 1 > Group 2, ranksum test z-value = 11.8, p = 6.8×10^{-32} ; **Figure 7B4**, Group 2 > Group 1, z-value = -13.7, p = 1.6×10^{-42}). When both groups were driven with equal strength there was not significant difference in their spiking synchrony (**Figure 7B3**, Group 1 = Group 2, z-value = 0.2, p = 0.81).

Previous analyses revealed that EPSCs in FSIs had a gamma component (**Figure 5B,D**), so we next determined whether the more strongly driven PN group (Group 1) contributed to this effect. Spikes times were recorded in tandem with the phase of the mean EPSC current in the gamma band across all FSI neurons (**Figure 7C1**). PNs tended to spike before the peak of the EPSC, with a quarter cycle lag (**Figure 7C2-4**). Whichever group was driven strongly had greater entrainment to the FSI EPSCs (**Figure 7C2**, Group 1 > Group 2, Group 1 spike resultant vector, RV = 0.54, Group 2 RV = 0.5, Watson-Williams test, p = 1.1×10^{-16} , **Figure 7C4**, Group 2 > Group 1, Group 1 RV = 0.5, Group 2 RV = 0.54, p = 4.1×10^{-13}). When both groups were driven equally their entrainment with FSI EPSCs did not differ (**Figure 7C3**, Group 1 = Group 2, Group 1 RV = 0.56, Group 2 RV = 0.56, p = 0.17).

Given that FSI spiking depends upon EPSCs, it should be the case that their spiking will be controlled mostly by the PN population more entrained to the EPSC rhythm, i.e. the strongly driven group. We examined this by measuring the cross-correlation between PNs from each group and all spikes emitted by the FSI network (Figure 7D1) after correcting for the autocorrelations inherent in both spike trains. This revealed a peak in the cross-correlation at a 4 ms lag (Figure 7D2 Inset), consistent with the previous analysis (Figure 7C2-4). Casting the normalized cross-correlation function into the frequency domain returned a measure of coherence between PN and FSI spiking. This revealed that the more strongly driven PN group had higher coherence with the FSI population, particularly in the gamma band (Figure 7D2, Group 1 > Group 2, ranksum test, z-value = 2.6, p = 0.009; Figure 7D4, Group 2 > Group 1, ranksum test, z-value = -3.7, p = 2.3×10⁻⁴), and there was no difference when both groups were equally driven (Figure 7D3, Group 1 = Group 2, z-value = -0.3, p = 0.79).

Since the more strongly activated PN group exerts a greater influence over the FSI network, it seemed likely that this would lead to suppression of the weaker PN

ensemble. Indeed, we found that as Group 2 was more strongly excited, it diminished the firing of Group 1 (**Figure 7E1**). Presumably this effect was mediated by the PN→FSI connection, which were also critical for generating the gamma rhythm. Eliminating these connections reduced the difference in firing rates between Groups 1 and 2 (**Figure 7E2**), suggesting that the FSI network may mediate competition between PN ensembles.

If FSIs allow for competition between ensembles of PNs, and FSIs tend to project locally, one would expect that any competition effect will operate when the groups of PNs overlap spatially – sharing the same FSI network – and not when they are far apart from one another. To explore this possibility, we returned to the original full model with 27,000 neurons. Our spatial analyses of gamma bursts revealed that they spanned an average radius of ~270 μ m (**Figure 6B4**), so we created spheroidal subgroups of PNs with a similar size that were driven by Poisson afferents. When those groups overlapped in the model, they exhibited the competition effect (**Figure 7F1**). Increasing the afferent drive onto Group 2 reduced the firing rate of Group 1, whose drive was held constant. However, if they were completely separated then no competition was evident (**Figure 7F2**, for Group 1 interaction between separation × Group 2 afferent drive, ANCOVA, F(1,3474) = 7.8, p = 0.005). Also in agreement with the stronger Group 1 exerting downward pressure, for Group 2 we found a significant main effect increase in firing rate upon spatial separation (F(1,3471) = 120.5, p = 1.4×10^{-27}).

The above analyses suggest that the competition between ensembles arose from the heightened gamma-band interaction between a strongly driven group of PNs and the local FSI network. Since the competition was reflected mainly as a suppression of spiking, it was probably mediated by IPSCs impinging upon the PN network. Moreover, since PN spikes tended to precede FSI spikes (**Figure 7D2 Inset**), the dominant PN group should, on average, control the inhibitory rhythm, which would periodically modulate neuronal responsiveness to excitatory drive, as found in sensory cortices (Cardin et al., 2009; Ni et al., 2016). To examine this, we measured the relationship between EPSC strength and spiking probability during different gamma phases. For the weakly driven group, the trough phase of the gamma cycle showed the strongest relationship between EPSC strength and spiking probability, likely because of the

(Figure 7G bottom right).
onto PNs. Doing so diminished the gamma phase dependence of sensitivity to EPSCs
$PN \rightarrow FSI$ connections eliminates gamma in the network while sparing inhibitory drive
determine whether this dependence was specific to gamma generation. Removing the
the peak, it shunted EPSCs and degraded their ability to drive spiking. We sought to
waning inhibition (Figure 7G, bottom left). Once that inhibition was reinstated during

Discussion:

A biophysically and anatomically detailed 27,000-cell model of BL produced transient gamma oscillations with properties similar to those seen *in vivo*. This concordance extended to gamma band entrainment and preferred phase of PN and FSI spiking. BL gamma arose from reciprocal interactions between PNs and FSIs, which suggests a PING mechanism of rhythmogenesis. Having established the validity of our model, we explored questions that could not be tested experimentally. Underscoring the importance of inhibitory connectivity, both PNs and FSIs were more synchronized to gamma if they received a greater number of inhibitory afferents. Finally, this connectivity produced lateral inhibition, which mediated competition between ensembles of PNs, with the more strongly driven PN population exerting greater control over the FSI network. It is noted that computational models of transient gamma have not been reported for the amygdala, and the ones reported for other brain regions are typically not biophysically or anatomically detailed to the extent that we present here.

Emulation of BL gamma

BL has similar cell types and connectivity as found in cortical circuits (Swanson, 2003). A majority of its neurons are composed of PNs and FSIs (Rainnie et al., 1993; Rainnie et al., 2006), are reciprocally connected with each other (Muller et al., 2005; Woodruff and Sah, 2007), and like cortex (Braitenberg and Schüz, 1991) the BL receives a substantial portion of its input from other cortical regions (Sah et al., 2003). Also as in cortex, examples abound of gamma oscillations recorded from the amygdala (e.g. Oya et al., 2002; Bauer et al., 2007; Stujenske et al., 2014), and *in vitro* slice preparations can be coaxed into generating gamma through pharmacological manipulations (Sinfield and Collins, 2006; Randall et al., 2011) similar to those used in cortical slices (Whittington et al., 2000). Thus, the importance of BL gamma oscillations seems assured, and yet our understanding of how BL produces gamma is limited.

As a first step we examined a fundamental question: are the local circuits present in that area sufficient to produce the intermittent rhythm measured *in vivo*? Doing this required collating the anatomical and physiological properties of BL neurons into a model and driving it with spike trains mirroring those found in upstream areas. Then, we

calculated the extracellular field that could be picked up by recording electrodes (Pesaran et al., 2018). Upon running our simulations, the LFP exhibited a peak in the gamma band that was in the same range of frequencies and amplitudes as observed *in vivo*. Moreover, the spiking of both PNs and FSIs were entrained to the gamma rhythm as found *in vivo* (Amir et al., 2018). This concordance suggested that the BL network, as captured by our model, is sufficient for the generation of gamma like that seen *in vivo*.

However, the model exhibited far less power in the low frequency bands. Given the concordance between our model of the extracellular field for both action potentials and activity in the gamma band, we suspect that this discrepancy reflects the extrinsic origins of low frequency activity. One possible source is volume conduction from adjacent cortical regions. It may also be that afferent synapses from upstream areas contribute to the low frequency band. Supporting this argument, driving the model with spike trains derived from cortical recordings increased power in the low frequency band compared with rate matched Poisson inputs. Besides neo- and paleocortical afferents, BLA neurons receive direct projections from the ventral hippocampus, and in turn respond to hippocampal theta (Bienvenu et al., 2012) and intermittent sharp wave associated population bursts (Girardeau et al., 2017), both of which occupy the low frequency range.

BL microcircuitry presented unique challenges to gamma rhythmogenesis

The generation of gamma oscillations in our BL model was not a foregone conclusion. While qualitatively the BL network contains the microcircuitry required for producing gamma oscillations, quantitative differences in the properties of this network from previous PING models may have precluded gamma generation.

For a PING rhythm to emerge PNs must fire in advance of FSIs (Whittington et al. 2000), and thus increasing the average firing rates of PNs contributes to the strength of gamma oscillations produced in PING models and in slices (Adesnik and Scanziani 2010). PN firing rates in the BL are smaller than those in the cortical models used to simulate gamma by at least a factor of 6 (Börgers and Kopell 2008; Hoseini and Wessel 2016; Chariker et al. 2018), which may have diminished the network's ability to produce

a PING type gamma rhythm. Also important is the strength of inhibitory feedback in the network (Börgers et al. 2012). Two factors that contribute to this are the strength of connections between PNs and FSIs and the number of FSIs in the network. We and others have found that the BL has a lower proportion of interneurons (McDonald and Mascagni 2001) compared with standard PING models (Börgers and Kopell 2008; Hoseini and Wessel 2016; Chariker et al. 2018). Moreover, the connection probability between PNs and FSIs in BL is lower (Woodruff and Sah 2007) than the aforementioned models. Thus, *a priori* the BL network may not be capable of producing gamma, and so our model was essential to at least test the possibility theoretically.

Another difference between our BL model and cortical-based PING models is a lower proportion of recurrent connectivity among PNs. Brunel and Wang (2003) found that including recurrent connections between excitatory units in a PING model could downshift the frequency of the network oscillation by half. On the other hand, our BL PING model has fairly little dependence on these connections, since their elimination did not substantially affect the prominence or peak frequency of gamma (Figure 4D). In addition, other models of gamma generation depend on the recurrent excitation among excitatory units. For instance, the REI model (Chariker et al. 2018) contains a network of reciprocally connected excitatory and inhibitory units. Unlike PING models, the gamma-periodic bursts of activity depend upon the buildup of recurrent excitation in the PN network, which raises the membrane potential for all units in the network, and drives them to fire synchronously. This mechanism for producing gamma is distinctly not PING, since the excitatory and inhibitory units activate simultaneously, instead of with the inhibitory units following the excitatory. Moreover, since BL PNs and FSIs in vivo fire during different phases of the gamma cycle (Amir et al. 2018), it is likely that the REI mechanism does not operate within the BL.

Thus, our model establishes the sufficiency of the BL network to produce gamma oscillations, and for those to arise via a PING mechanism. Despite that, it was also possible that any gamma produced by the model would be of insufficient power to comprise what is observed in the LFP *in vivo*. To address this, our model included a realistic estimation of the local field potential, which most PING models lack (Brunel and Hakim, 1999; Brunel and Wang, 2003; Borgers et al., 2005; Economo and White, 2012;

Chalk et al., 2016; Hoseini and Wessel, 2016; Palmigiano et al., 2017; Traub et al., 2000; Bathellier et al., 2006; Neymotin et al., 2011; Chariker et al., 2018). Since our model LFP exhibited gamma oscillations that were close to the frequency and power of those recorded *in vivo*, it establishes the sufficiency of the local microcircuitry in BL to explain the gamma observed in LFP recordings *in vivo*.

Circuit contributions to the properties of gamma oscillations

Cortical gamma oscillations are thought to arise from an interaction between PNs and FSIs, whereby PNs strongly drive a recurrently connected network of FSIs, that in turn inhibit PNs for a short period of time, after which PNs are able to restart the cycle over again. We determined if a similar mechanism was operating in our BL simulations, and investigated qualitative and quantitative features of the underlying microcircuits. Systematically removing each class of connections revealed that either the connections from PNs to FSIs or vice versa were crucial for generating the gamma rhythm, which is in agreement with a PING type mechanism. Although interactions between FSIs are sufficient to produce a gamma rhythm (Whittington et al., 2000), this was not the case in our model. Instead, they affected the peak frequency. This could be functionally relevant because presynaptic receptors specific to synapses between interneurons (e.g. Cossart et al., 2001) may be able to regulate the frequency of gamma rhythms.

The dynamics of EPSCs and IPSCs in our model (**Figure 5B,D**) mostly aligned with those from a recent *in vitro* model of cortical gamma (Salkoff et al., 2015). Using paired whole-cell patch clamp recordings, synaptic currents were recorded in one cell, and correlated with the spiking of an adjacent one. The power spectrum of IPSCs in PNs and FSIs exhibited a prominence in the low gamma band, while EPSCs in PNs did not. Moreover, they observed that IPSCs weakened prior to PN and FSI spiking, after which they rebounded. We observed that pattern for PNs, while for FSIs the IPSCs returned to baseline after spiking. Another significant difference was that they only observed substantial increases in EPSC amplitude surrounding spikes from FSIs, but not PNs. This likely resulted from the fact that whereas FSIs receive convergent inputs from many PNs (Oswald et al., 2009), excitatory synapses are sparsely shared between PNs; in all likelihood the afferents that elicited spiking in one PN did not collateralize

onto another. In contrast, we could monitor both the EPSC and spiking in the same cell and found a robust EPSC increase during PN spiking.

One unknown aspect of gamma generation that cannot be readily explored at present either in vivo or in vitro is the contribution of a neuron's particular complement of excitatory and inhibitory afferents to its entrainment by the gamma rhythm. In addressing this, we found that the number of inhibitory afferents was particularly important for how a neuron would be affected by gamma. PNs and FSIs with more inhibitory contacts were more strongly entrained to gamma, while only FSIs showed a significant reduction in entrainment as the number of excitatory afferents increased. In agreement with these results, a previous study from our group (Amir et al., 2018) found that PNs that received a monosynaptic input from a nearby FSI showed stronger entrainment to gamma. However, our model differed from this study regarding the contribution of excitatory connections onto FSIs. In Amir et al. (2018) the presence of an excitatory monosynaptic contact onto an FSI was associated with increased entrainment, whereas in our model it was not. Perhaps resolving this disagreement, we found that a concomitant increase in both excitatory and inhibitory contacts onto an FSI raised entrainment beyond what was expected by either connection type alone. Thus, our two studies could be reconciled if BL FSIs that receive more afferents from PNs also receive more from other FSIs. Perhaps this suggests that inhibitory and excitatory afferents need to be tuned for single neurons to be strongly entrained by the gamma rhythm. This may be reflected by experience-dependent plasticity of inhibitory networks (Donato et al., 2013).

103010311032

1033

1034

1035

10361037

1038

1039

1009

1010

10111012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

Computations emerging from gamma generating circuits in BL

In cortical networks, several functions have been ascribed to gamma, but a particular emphasis has been placed on their ability to synchronize spiking (Tiesinga et al., 2008) and mediate competition between cell assemblies (Borgers et al., 2005; de Almeida et al., 2009; Palmigiano et al., 2017). Our model exhibited both of these phenomena. PNs synchronized their spiking by phase-locking to the gamma rhythm. This could be crucial to BL function since its neurons fire at very low rates, and so it is likely they need to coordinate their activity to drive robust post-synaptic integration. We also found that

activating a subset of PNs in the network drove a suppression of those that received a weaker input, and that gamma genesis played a critical role in this effect. This competition may be important in the BL for the selective recruitment of particular PN ensembles, allowing it to drive its many downstream targets with greater specificity.

Conclusions

Gamma oscillations are a feature of cortical processing that is also expressed in BL, where they are likely generated via similar mechanisms, and perhaps perform the same functions. Moving forward, there are two reasons why having a detailed biophysical model of gamma generation in BL is important. First, we need a better understanding of the variety of situations that bring about and alter gamma oscillations, and a concrete model provides a framework in which these observations can be integrated with one another. Second, a biophysically detailed model can serve as a testbed for exploring the means and algorithms that might be used to alter these oscillations (Witt et al., 2013), and the functions of the BL itself.

Current Type	Gating Variable	α	β	$oldsymbol{\chi}_{\infty}$	$\tau_x(ms)$
,	p=3	$\frac{-0.4(V+30)}{\exp[-(V+30)/7.2]-1}$	$\frac{0.124(V+30)}{\exp[(V+30)/7.2]-1}$	$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}$	$\frac{0.6156}{\alpha + \beta}$
I _{Na}	q=1	$\frac{-0.03(V+45)}{\exp[-(V+45)/1.5]-1}$	$\frac{0.01(V+45)}{\exp[(V+45)/1.5]-1}$	$\frac{1}{\exp[(V+50)/4]+1}$	$\frac{0.6156}{\alpha + \beta}$
I _{Kdr}	p=1	exp[-0.1144(V + 15)]	exp[-0.0801(V + 15)]	$\frac{1}{\exp[(-V-15)/11]+1}$	$\frac{50*\beta}{1+\alpha}$
I _H	q=1	exp[0.0832(V + 75)]	exp[0.0333(V + 75)]	$\frac{1}{\exp[(V+81)/8]+1}$	$\frac{\beta}{0.0081(1+\alpha)}$
I _{KM}	p=2	$\frac{0.016}{\exp[-(V+52.7)/23]}$	$\frac{0.016}{\exp[(V + 52.7)/18.8]}$	$\frac{1}{\exp[(-V - 52.7)/10.3] + 1}$	$\frac{1}{\alpha + \beta}$
,	p=2	-	_	$\frac{1}{\exp[(-V - 30)/11] + 1}$	$\frac{2.5}{\exp\left[\frac{-(V+37.1)}{32.3}\right] + \exp\left[\frac{(V+37.1)}{32.3}\right]}$
I _{Ca}	q=1	-	_	$\frac{1}{\exp[(V+12.6)/18.9]+1}$	420
I _{Nap}	p=1	-	-	$\frac{1}{\exp[(-V - 48)/5] + 1}$	$2.5 + 14 * \exp[- V + 40 /10]$
I _{sAHP}	p=1	$\frac{0.0048}{\exp[-5\log_{10}([Ca]_{i2}) - 17.5]}$	$\frac{0.012}{\exp[2\log_{10}([Ca]_{i2}) + 20]}$	$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}$	48

Table 1. Gating parameters of ion channels in BL PN neurons

Conductance (mS/cm²)	I _{Na}	I _{DR}	I _M	I _H	I _{Ca}	I _{Nap}	I _A	I _{sAHP}	I _{leak}	τ _{Ca} (ms)
	Soma	45	2	2.24	0.015	0.55	0.559	2	50/0.2 Types: A/C	0.025	1000
3-comp PN	Prox. P_dend	45	2	1.792	0.015	0.55	0.447	-	-	0.0471	-
model	P_dend	45	2	-	0.015	0.55	-	-	-	0.0471	-
	Prox. A_dend	45	2	2.24	0.015	0.55	0.559	2	-	0.0471	-
	A_dend	45	2	-	0.015	0.55	-	2	-	0.0471	-

1059 Table 2. Maximal conductance densities in model BL PN neurons

Table 3. Parameters related to synaptic connections

Parameters		AMP	A			NMDA				GABA			
Connection type	Reversa I potential (mV)	Rise/decay time constant (ms)	Conduct ance (nS)	Strengt h (mean/ var.)	Reversal potential (mV)	Rise/decay time constant (ms)	Conduct ance (nS)	Strength (mean/var.)	Reversal potential (mV)	Rise/decay time constant (ms)	Conducta nce (nS)	Strength (mean/va r.)	
PN to PN	0	0.3/6.9 (Mahanty and Sah, 1998) (Guzman et al., 2016)	1	5/3	0	3.7/125 (Weisskopf et al., 1999)	0.5	2/1	ŀ		ŀ	-	
PN to FSI	0	0.1/2.4 (Mahanty and Sah, 1998) (Guzman et al., 2016)	1	7/2	0	3.7/125 (Weisskopf et al., 1999)	0.5	7/2	1		1	1	
FSI to PN							-	-	-75	0.5/6.80 (Galarreta and Hestrin, 1997)	0.6	12/2	
FSI to FSI					-1		-	1	-75	0.5/6.80 (Galarreta and Hestrin, 1997)	0.2	20/10	
FSI to FSI (gap junction)						-				junction cou 0.05(Woodruff			

		Parameters				
Connection	Short-term dynamics	D (Maximum limit)	d ₁ /d ₂	$ au_{D1}/ au_{D2}$ (ms)		
FSI-PN	depression	0.6	0.9 / 0.95	40 / 70		
PN-PN	depression	0.5	0.9 / 0.95	40 / 70		
PN-FSI	depression	0.7	0.9 / 0.95	40 / 70		

Table 4. Parameters related to short-term presynaptic plasticity

Type Parameters	PN to PN					
Connection range (µm)	<=50	[50,100]	[100,200]	[200,600]		
Connectivity	3%	2%	1%	0.5%		

Table 5. Connection probabilities. **5A.** PN-PN connections

Type Parameters	Gap Junction between FSIs	FSI to FSI				Unidirection al FSI to PN	Unidirectio nal PN to FSI	Reciproc al PN to FSI
Overall connectivity	8%	26%			34%	12%	16%	
		Unidir	ectional	Bi-directional				
Connectivity of Subtype		Between coupled FSIs	Between uncoupled FSIs	Between coupled FSIs	Between uncoupled FSIs	-		
Симуре		50%	19%	25%	3%	-		

5B. FSI-FSI and PN-FSI connections

1083 Note:

- Connectivity data in Table 5A was from study of Abatis, 2017, and data in Table 5B was from in vitro BLA reports (Woodruff and Sah, 2007) limiting connectivity from/to FSIs to within ~300 μm (also see, Cammarota et al., 2013).
- 2. For all chemical synaptic connections, we designed axonal conduction delay to be $Del = \frac{Dis}{v} + mini_{del} + fluc + dt \text{ where } Del \text{ denotes calculated conduction delay } (ms), Dis \text{ is the intersoma distance } (\mu m), v \text{ denotes conduction velocity } (mm/ms, 1mm/ms) \text{ was used in this study }), mini_{del} \text{ denotes minimal conduction delay } (mini_{del} = 0.8 \text{ ms} \text{ was used in this study}), fluc \text{ denotes random fluctuation of conduction delay } (ms, fluctuation of uniformly distribution of (-0.1,0.1) ms was used in this study), and <math>dt$ denotes simulation time step, with dt = 0.05 ms was used in this study.

Table 6. Parameters related to point-conductance model

Parameters		Excitatory	/ source	Inhibitory source				
Neuron type	g_{e0} (nS)	$\partial_e(nS)$	$\tau_e(\text{ms})$	$E_e(mV)$	g_{i0} (nS)	∂_i (nS)	$\tau_i(\text{ms})$	$E_i(mV)$
for PN	3.2	3	2.728	0	21	8	10.49	-75
for FSI	1.2	0.1	2.728	0	5.7	2.6	10.49	-75

1098	Reterences:
1099 1100 1101	Abatis MN, R.; Perin, R.; Giobellina, G.; Bito, H.; Markram, H.; Stoop, R. (2017) The role of local excitatory networks in the lateral amygdala in emotional memory learning. In: Society for Neuroscience. Washington, DC.
1102 1103	Adesnik H, Scanziani M (2010) Lateral competition for cortical space by layer-specific horizontal circuits. Nature 464:1155-1160.
1104 1105	Alturki A, Feng F, Nair A, Guntu V, Nair SS (2016) Distinct current modules shape cellular dynamics in model neurons. Neuroscience 334:309-331.
1106 1107 1108	Amir A, Headley DB, Lee SC, Haufler D, Pare D (2018) Vigilance-associated gamma oscillations coordinate the ensemble activity of basolateral amygdala neurons. Neuron 97:656-669 e657.
1109 1110	Atallah BV, Scanziani M (2009) Instantaneous modulation of gamma oscillation frequency by balancing excitation with inhibition. Neuron 62:566-577.
1111 1112	Aydore S, Pantazis D, Leahy RM (2013) A note on the phase locking value and its properties. Neuroimage 74:231-244.
1113 1114	Bartos M, Vida I, Jonas P (2007) Synaptic mechanisms of synchronized gamma oscillations in inhibitory interneuron networks. Nat Rev Neurosci 8:45-56.
1115 1116	Bathellier B, Lagier S, Faure P, Lledo PM (2006) Circuit properties generating gamma oscillations in a network model of the olfactory bulb. J Neurophysiol 95:2678-2691.
1117 1118	Bauer EP, Paz R, Pare D (2007) Gamma oscillations coordinate amygdalo-rhinal interactions during learning. J Neurosci 27:9369-9379.
1119	Berens P (2009) CircStat: A Matlab toolbox for circular statistics. J Stat Softw 31:1-21.
1120 1121 1122	Beyeler A, Namburi P, Glober GF, Simonnet C, Calhoon GG, Conyers GF, Luck R, Wildes CP, Tye KM (2016) Divergent routing of positive and negative information from the amygdala during memory retrieval. Neuron 90:348-361.
1123 1124	Bezaire MJ, Raikov I, Burk K, Vyas D, Soltesz I (2016) Interneuronal mechanisms of hippocampal theta oscillations in a full-scale model of the rodent CA1 circuit. Elife 5.
1125 1126 1127	Bienvenu TC, Busti D, Magill PJ, Ferraguti F, Capogna M (2012) Cell-type-specific recruitment of amygdala interneurons to hippocampal theta rhythm and noxious stimuli <i>in vivo</i> . Neuron 74:1059-1074.

1128	neurons with sparse, random connectivity. Neural Comput 15:509-538.
1130 1131	Borgers C, Kopell NJ (2008) Gamma oscillations and stimulus selection. Neural Comput 20:383-414.
1132 1133 1134	Borgers C, Epstein S, Kopell NJ (2005) Background gamma rhythmicity and attention in cortical local circuits: a computational study. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 102:7002-7007.
1135 1136 1137	Borgers C, Epstein S, Kopell NJ (2008) Gamma oscillations mediate stimulus competition and attentional selection in a cortical network model. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105:18023-18028.
1138 1139	Borgers C, Talei Franzesi G, Lebeau FE, Boyden ES, Kopell NJ (2012) Minimal size of cell assemblies coordinated by gamma oscillations. PLoS Comput Biol 8:e1002362.
1140 1141	Braitenberg V, Schüz A (1991) Anatomy of the cortex : statistics and geometry. Berlin ; New York: Springer-Verlag.
1142 1143	Brunel N, Hakim V (1999) Fast global oscillations in networks of integrate-and-fire neurons with low firing rates. Neural Comput 11:1621-1671.
1144 1145 1146	Brunel N, Wang XJ (2003) What determines the frequency of fast network oscillations with irregular neural discharges? I. Synaptic dynamics and excitation-inhibition balance. J Neurophysiol 90:415-430.
1147 1148	Buzsaki G, Anastassiou CA, Koch C (2012) The origin of extracellular fields and currentsEEG, ECoG, LFP and spikes. Nature reviews Neuroscience 13:407-420.
1149 1150 1151	Byrne JH, Roberts JL (2004) From molecules to networks : an introduction to cellular and molecular neuroscience. In, pp xii, 583 p. ill. (some col.) 528 cm. + 581 CD-ROM (584 583/584 in.). Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier Academic Press,.
1152 1153 1154	Cammarota M, Losi G, Chiavegato A, Zonta M, Carmignoto G (2013) Fast spiking interneuron control of seizure propagation in a cortical slice model of focal epilepsy. J Physiol 591:807-822.
1155 1156 1157	Cardin JA, Carlen M, Meletis K, Knoblich U, Zhang F, Deisseroth K, Tsai LH, Moore CI (2009) Driving fast-spiking cells induces gamma rhythm and controls sensory responses. Nature 459:663-667.

1158 1159	Carnevale NT, Hines ML (2005) The NEURON Book. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1160 1161	Chalk M, Gutkin B, Deneve S (2016) Neural oscillations as a signature of efficient coding in the presence of synaptic delays. Elife 5.
1162 1163	Chareyron LJ, Banta Lavenex P, Amaral DG, Lavenex P (2011) Stereological analysis of the rat and monkey amygdala. J Comp Neurol 519:3218-3239.
1164 1165 1166	Chariker L, Shapley R, Young LS (2018) Rhythm and synchrony in a cortical network model. The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience.
1167 1168 1169	Cossart R, Tyzio R, Dinocourt C, Esclapez M, Hirsch JC, Ben-Ari Y, Bernard C (2001) Presynaptic kainate receptors that enhance the release of GABA on CA1 hippocampal interneurons. Neuron 29:497-508.
1170 1171 1172	de Almeida L, Idiart M, Lisman JE (2009) A second function of gamma frequency oscillations: an E%-max winner-take-all mechanism selects which cells fire. J Neurosci 29:7497-7503.
1173 1174	Destexhe A, Mainen ZF, Sejnowski TJ (1994) An efficient method for computing synaptic conductances based on a kinetic model of receptor binding. 6:14-18.
1175 1176 1177	Destexhe A, Rudolph M, Fellous JM, Sejnowski TJ (2001) Fluctuating synaptic conductances recreate <i>in vivo</i> -like activity in neocortical neurons. Neuroscience 107:13-24.
1178 1179	Disterhoft JF, Oh MM (2007) Alterations in intrinsic neuronal excitability during normal aging. Aging Cell 6:327-336.
1180 1181	Donato F, Rompani SB, Caroni P (2013) Parvalbumin-expressing basket-cell network plasticity induced by experience regulates adult learning. Nature 504:272-276.
1182 1183 1184	Durstewitz D, Seamans JK, Sejnowski TJ (2000) Dopamine-mediated stabilization of delay-period activity in a network model of prefrontal cortex. Journal of neurophysiology 83:1733-1750.
1185 1186	Duvarci S, Pare D (2014) Amygdala microcircuits controlling learned fear. Neuron 82:966-980.
1187 1188	Dvorak D, Fenton AA (2014) Toward a proper estimation of phase-amplitude coupling in neural oscillations. J Neurosci Methods 225:42-56.

1189 1190 1191	Economo MN, White JA (2012) Membrane properties and the balance between excitation and inhibition control gamma-frequency oscillations arising from feedback inhibition. PLoS Comput Biol 8:e1002354.
1192 1193	Ehrlich I, Humeau Y, Grenier F, Ciocchi S, Herry C, Luthi A (2009) Amygdala inhibitory circuits and the control of fear memory. Neuron 62:757-771.
1194 1195 1196	Einevoll GT, Kayser C, Logothetis NK, Panzeri S (2013) Modelling and analysis of local field potentials for studying the function of cortical circuits. Nat Rev Neurosci 14:770-785.
1197 1198 1199	Feng F, Samarth P, Pare D, Nair SS (2016) Mechanisms underlying the formation of the amygdalar fear memory trace: A computational perspective. Neuroscience 322:370-376.
1200 1201	Fishell G, Rudy B (2011) Mechanisms of inhibition within the telencephalon: "where the wild things are". Annu Rev Neurosci 34:535-567.
1202 1203	Galarreta M, Hestrin S (1997) Properties of GABAA receptors underlying inhibitory synaptic currents in neocortical pyramidal neurons. J Neurosci 17:7220-7227.
1204 1205	Girardeau G, Inema I, Buzsaki G (2017) Reactivations of emotional memory in the hippocampus-amygdala system during sleep. Nat Neurosci 20:1634-1642.
1206 1207	Gold C, Henze DA, Koch C, Buzsaki G (2006) On the origin of the extracellular action potential waveform: A modeling study. J Neurophysiol 95:3113-3128.
1208 1209 1210	Goto T, Hatanaka R, Ogawa T, Sumiyoshi A, Riera J, Kawashima R (2010) An evaluation of the conductivity profile in the somatosensory barrel cortex of Wistar rats. J Neurophysiol 104:3388-3412.
1211 1212	Guzman SJ, Schlogl A, Frotscher M, Jonas P (2016) Synaptic mechanisms of pattern completion in the hippocampal CA3 network. Science 353:1117-1123.
1213 1214 1215	Hagen E, Dahmen D, Stavrinou ML, Linden H, Tetzlaff T, van Albada SJ, Grun S, Diesmann M, Einevoll GT (2016) Hybrid scheme for modeling local field potentials from point-neuron networks. Cerebral cortex 26:4461-4496.
1216 1217 1218	Headley DB, DeLucca MV, Haufler D, Pare D (2015) Incorporating 3D-printing technology in the design of head-caps and electrode drives for recording neurons in multiple brain regions. J Neurophysiol 113:2721-2732.

1219	theory in neurobiology. In: California Institute of Technology.
1221 1222	Hoseini MS, Wessel R (2016) Coherent and intermittent ensemble oscillations emerge from networks of irregular spiking neurons. J Neurophysiol 115:457-469.
1223 1224 1225 1226	Hubner C, Bosch D, Gall A, Luthi A, Ehrlich I (2014) Ex vivo dissection of optogenetically activated mPFC and hippocampal inputs to neurons in the basolateral amygdala: implications for fear and emotional memory. Front Behav Neurosci 8:64.
1227 1228 1229	Hummos A, Franklin CC, Nair SS (2014) Intrinsic mechanisms stabilize encoding and retrieval circuits differentially in a hippocampal network model. Hippocampus 24:1430-1448.
1230 1231	Kim D, Pare D, Nair SS (2013) Mechanisms contributing to the induction and storage of Pavlovian fear memories in the lateral amygdala. Learn Mem 20:421-430.
1232	LeDoux JE (2000) Emotion circuits in the brain. Annu Rev Neurosci 23:155-184.
1233 1234 1235	Lee S, Jones SR (2013) Distinguishing mechanisms of gamma frequency oscillations in human current source signals using a computational model of a laminar neocortical network. Front Hum Neurosci 7:869.
1236 1237 1238	Leski S, Linden H, Tetzlaff T, Pettersen KH, Einevoll GT (2013) Frequency dependence of signal power and spatial reach of the local field potential. PLoS Comput Biol 9:e1003137.
1239 1240 1241	Li G, Nair SS, Quirk GJ (2009) A biologically realistic network model of acquisition and extinction of conditioned fear associations in lateral amygdala neurons. J Neurophysiol 101:1629-1646.
1242 1243 1244	Linden H, Hagen E, Leski S, Norheim ES, Pettersen KH, Einevoll GT (2013) LFPy: a tool for biophysical simulation of extracellular potentials generated by detailed model neurons. Front Neuroinform 7:41.
1245 1246	Linden H, Tetzlaff T, Potjans TC, Pettersen KH, Grun S, Diesmann M, Einevoll GT (2011) Modeling the spatial reach of the LFP. Neuron 72:859-872.
1247 1248	Mahanty NK, Sah P (1998) Calcium-permeable AMPA receptors mediate long-term potentiation in interneurons in the amygdala. Nature 394:683-687.

1249 1250	Martina M, Royer S, Pare D (2001) Cell-type-specific GABA responses and chloride homeostasis in the cortex and amygdala. J Neurophysiol 86:2887-2895.
1251 1252	McDonald AJ (1984) Neuronal organization of the lateral and basolateral amygdaloid nuclei in the rat. J Comp Neurol 222, 589-606.
1253 1254	McDonald AJ (1998) Cortical pathways to the mammalian amygdala. Prog Neurobiol 55:257-332.
1255 1256 1257	McDonald AJ, Mascagni F (1997) Projections of the lateral entorhinal cortex to the amygdala: a Phaseolus vulgaris leucoagglutinin study in the rat. Neuroscience 77:445-459.
1258 1259	McDonald AJ, Mascagni F (2001) Colocalization of calcium-binding proteins and GABA in neurons of the rat basolateral amygdala. Neuroscience 105:681-693.
1260 1261 1262	Muller JF, Mascagni F, McDonald AJ (2005) Coupled networks of parvalbumin- immunoreactive interneurons in the rat basolateral amygdala. J Neurosci 25:7366- 7376.
1263 1264 1265	Muller JF, Mascagni F, McDonald AJ (2006) Pyramidal cells of the rat basolateral amygdala: synaptology and innervation by parvalbumin-immunoreactive interneurons. J Comp Neurol 494:635-650.
1266 1267 1268	Neske GT, Connors BW (2016) Synchronized gamma-frequency inhibition in neocortex depends on excitatory-inhibitory interactions but not electrical synapses. J Neurophysiol 116:351-368.
1269 1270 1271	Neymotin SA, Lazarewicz MT, Sherif M, Contreras D, Finkel LH, Lytton WW (2011) Ketamine disrupts theta modulation of gamma in a computer model of hippocampus. J Neurosci 31:11733-11743.
1272 1273	Ni J, Wunderle T, Lewis CM, Desimone R, Diester I, Fries P (2016) Gamma-Rhythmic Gain Modulation. Neuron 92:240-251.
1274 1275 1276	Oren I, Mann EO, Paulsen O, Hajos N (2006) Synaptic currents in anatomically identified CA3 neurons during hippocampal gamma oscillations <i>in vitro</i> . J Neurosci 26:9923-9934.
1277 1278 1279	Oswald AM, Doiron B, Rinzel J, Reyes AD (2009) Spatial profile and differential recruitment of GABAB modulate oscillatory activity in auditory cortex. J Neurosci 29:10321-10334.

1280 1281 1282	Oya H, Kawasaki H, Howard MA, 3rd, Adolphs R (2002) Electrophysiological responses in the human amygdala discriminate emotion categories of complex visual stimuli. J Neurosci 22:9502-9512.
1283 1284	Palmigiano A, Geisel T, Wolf F, Battaglia D (2017) Flexible information routing by transient synchrony. Nat Neurosci 20:1014-1022.
1285 1286	Pape HC, Pare D (2010) Plastic synaptic networks of the amygdala for the acquisition, expression, and extinction of conditioned fear. Physiol Rev 90:419-463.
1287 1288	Pape HC, Pare D, Driesang RB (1998) Two types of intrinsic oscillations in neurons of the lateral and basolateral nuclei of the amygdala. J Neurophysiol 79:205-216.
1289 1290 1291	Parasuram H, Nair B, D'Angelo E, Hines M, Naldi G, Diwakar S (2016) Computational modeling of single neuron extracellular electric potentials and network local field potentials using LFPsim. Front Comput Neurosci 10:65.
1292 1293 1294	Pare D, Smith Y, Pare JF (1995) Intra-amygdaloid projections of the basolateral and basomedial nuclei in the cat: Phaseolus vulgaris-leucoagglutinin anterograde tracing at the light and electron microscopic level. Neuroscience 69:567-583.
1295 1296 1297	Pego JM, Morgado P, Pinto LG, Cerqueira JJ, Almeida OF, Sousa N (2008) Dissociation of the morphological correlates of stress-induced anxiety and fear. Eur J Neurosci 27:1503-1516.
1298 1299 1300	Penttonen M, Kamondi A, Acsady L, Buzsaki G (1998) Gamma frequency oscillation in the hippocampus of the rat: intracellular analysis <i>in vivo</i> . Eur J Neurosci 10:718-728.
1301 1302 1303	Pesaran B, Vinck M, Einevoll GT, Sirota A, Fries P, Siegel M, Truccolo W, Schroeder CE, Srinivasan R (2018) Investigating large-scale brain dynamics using field potential recordings: analysis and interpretation. Nat Neurosci.
1304 1305 1306	Power JM, Bocklisch C, Curby P, Sah P (2011) Location and function of the slow afterhyperpolarization channels in the basolateral amygdala. J Neurosci 31:526-537.
1307 1308 1309	Rainnie DG, Asprodini EK, Shinnick-Gallagher P (1993) Intracellular recordings from morphologically identified neurons of the basolateral amygdala. J Neurophysiol 69:1350-1362.

1310 1311 1312	Rainnie DG, Mania I, Mascagni F, McDonald AJ (2006) Physiological and morphological characterization of parvalbumin-containing interneurons of the rat basolateral amygdala. J Comp Neurol 498:142-161.
1313 1314 1315	Randall FE, Whittington MA, Cunningham MO (2011) Fast oscillatory activity induced by kainate receptor activation in the rat basolateral amygdala <i>in vitro</i> . Eur J Neurosci 33:914-922.
1316 1317 1318	Rubinow MJ, Juraska JM (2009) Neuron and glia numbers in the basolateral nucleus of the amygdala from preweaning through old age in male and female rats: a stereological study. The Journal of comparative neurology 512:717-725.
1319 1320	Sah P, Faber ES, Lopez De Armentia M, Power J (2003) The amygdaloid complex: anatomy and physiology. Physiol Rev 83:803-834.
1321 1322	Salinas E, Sejnowski TJ (2000) Impact of correlated synaptic input on output firing rate and variability in simple neuronal models. J Neurosci 20:6193-6209.
1323 1324	Salinas E, Sejnowski TJ (2002) Integrate-and-fire neurons driven by correlated stochastic input. Neural Comput 14:2111-2155.
1325 1326 1327	Salkoff DB, Zagha E, Yuzgec O, McCormick DA (2015) Synaptic mechanisms of tight spike synchrony at gamma frequency in cerebral cortex. J Neurosci 35:10236-10251.
1328 1329 1330	Salm AK, Pavelko M, Krouse EM, Webster W, Kraszpulski M, Birkle DL (2004) Lateral amygdaloid nucleus expansion in adult rats is associated with exposure to prenatal stress. Brain Res Dev Brain Res 148:159-167.
1331 1332 1333	Samson RD, Pare D (2006) A spatially structured network of inhibitory and excitatory connections directs impulse traffic within the lateral amygdala. Neuroscience 141:1599-1609.
1334 1335 1336	Schomburg EW, Anastassiou CA, Buzsaki G, Koch C (2012) The spiking component of oscillatory extracellular potentials in the rat hippocampus. J Neurosci 32:11798-11811.
1337 1338	Shi CJ, Cassell MD (1999) Perirhinal cortex projections to the amygdaloid complex and hippocampal formation in the rat. J Comp Neurol 406:299-328.
1339 1340	Silberberg G, Wu C, Markram H (2004) Synaptic dynamics control the timing of neuronal excitation in the activated neocortical microcircuit. J Physiol 556:19-27.

1341 1342 1343	Sinfield JL, Collins DR (2006) Induction of synchronous oscillatory activity in the rat lateral amygdala <i>in vitro</i> is dependent on gap junction activity. Eur J Neurosci 24:3091-3095.
1344 1345 1346	Sivagnanam S, Majumdar A, Yoshimoto K, Astakhov V, Bandrowski A, Martone M, Carnevale N (2013) Introducing the Neuroscience Gateway. In: Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Science Gateways: CEUR Workshop Proceedings.
1347 1348 1349	Smith Y, Pare JF, Pare D (1998) Cat intraamygdaloid inhibitory network: ultrastructural organization of parvalbumin-immunoreactive elements. J Comp Neurol 391:164-179.
1350 1351	Sohal VS, Zhang F, Yizhar O, Deisseroth K (2009) Parvalbumin neurons and gamma rhythms enhance cortical circuit performance. Nature 459:698-702.
1352 1353	Spampanato J, Polepalli J, Sah P (2011) Interneurons in the basolateral amygdala. Neuropharmacology 60:765-773.
1354 1355 1356	Stujenske JM, Likhtik E, Topiwala MA, Gordon JA (2014) Fear and safety engage competing patterns of theta-gamma coupling in the basolateral amygdala. Neuron 83:919-933.
1357 1358	Swanson LW (2003) The amygdala and its place in the cerebral hemisphere. Ann N Y Acad Sci 985:174-184.
1359 1360	Tiesinga P, Fellous JM, Sejnowski TJ (2008) Regulation of spike timing in visual cortical circuits. Nat Rev Neurosci 9:97-107.
1361 1362 1363	Traub RD, Whittington MA, Colling SB, Buzsaki G, Jefferys JG (1996) Analysis of gamma rhythms in the rat hippocampus <i>in vitro</i> and <i>in vivo</i> . J Physiol 493 (Pt 2):471-484.
1364 1365 1366	Traub RD, Bibbig A, Fisahn A, LeBeau FE, Whittington MA, Buhl EH (2000) A model of gamma-frequency network oscillations induced in the rat CA3 region by carbachol <i>in vitro</i> . Eur J Neurosci 12:4093-4106.
1367 1368	Turner BH, Herkenham M (1991) Thalamoamygdaloid projections in the rat: a test of the amygdala's role in sensory processing. J Comp Neurol 313:295-325.
1369 1370	Tuunanen J, Pitkanen A (2000) Do seizures cause neuronal damage in rat amygdala kindling? Epilepsy Res 39:171-176.

1371 1372	Vertes RP (2004) Differential projections of the infralimbic and prelimbic cortex in the rat. Synapse 51:32-58.
1373 1374 1375	Vinck M, van Wingerden M, Womelsdorf T, Fries P, Pennartz CM (2010) The pairwise phase consistency: a bias-free measure of rhythmic neuronal synchronization. Neuroimage 51:112-122.
1376 1377	Wang XJ (2010) Neurophysiological and computational principles of cortical rhythms in cognition. Physiol Rev 90:1195-1268.
1378 1379	Wang XJ, Buzsaki G (1996) Gamma oscillation by synaptic inhibition in a hippocampal interneuronal network model. J Neurosci 16:6402-6413.
1380 1381	Washburn MS, Moises HC (1992) Electrophysiological and morphological properties of rat basolateral amygdaloid neurons <i>in vitro</i> . J Neurosci 12:4066-4079.
1382 1383 1384	Weisskopf MG, Bauer EP, LeDoux JE (1999) L-type voltage-gated calcium channels mediate NMDA-independent associative long-term potentiation at thalamic input synapses to the amygdala. J Neurosci 19:10512-10519.
1385 1386 1387	Whittington MA, Traub RD, Kopell N, Ermentrout B, Buhl EH (2000) Inhibition-based rhythms: experimental and mathematical observations on network dynamics. Int J Psychophysiol 38:315-336.
1388 1389 1390	Witt A, Palmigiano A, Neef A, El Hady A, Wolf F, Battaglia D (2013) Controlling the oscillation phase through precisely timed closed-loop optogenetic stimulation: a computational study. Front Neural Circuits 7:49.
1391 1392	Woodruff AR, Sah P (2007) Networks of parvalbumin-positive interneurons in the basolateral amygdala. J Neurosci 27:553-563.
1393 1394	Zador A, Koch C, Brown TH (1990) Biophysical model of a Hebbian synapse. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 87:6718-6722.
1395 1396	Zandvakili A, Kohn A (2015) Coordinated Neuronal Activity Enhances Corticocortical Communication. Neuron 87:827-839.

Figure titles and legends:

1397

1398

1399 1400

1401

14021403

1404

14051406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1415

14161417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

14251426

1427

Figure 1: Construction of a biophysically accurate BL model. (A) Our BL model was a cube structure comprised of 27,000 PNs and FSIs randomly distributed throughout. Local cell densities in 100x100x100 µm cubes (red = PN, blue = FSI) are illustrated for a typical case. For this example PNs the densities spanned 0 to 19,000/mm³ (median = $7,000/ \text{ mm}^3$). FSI densities ranged from 0 to $5,000/\text{mm}^3$ (median = $1,000/\text{mm}^3$). (B) A slice through the model shows the inhomogeneity of cell densities for PNs and FSIs. (C) The dendritic processes of the neurons contained in a particular voxel are illustrated. These were randomly oriented and spanned several hundred microns as also shown in the three orthogonal views. (D) 1: PNs and FSIs were distributed in space so that they spanned a volume equal to the area of the BL in the rat. Virtual current clamp electrodes (ic) could be placed into any cell, and virtual extracellular electrodes (lfp) could be placed anywhere in the model volume. PNs are indicated by red triangles and FSIs are blue circles. 2: PNs and FSIs were connected amongst themselves and with each other. Extrinsic glutamatergic afferents fed onto both cell types. Neither FSIs nor PNs formed autapses. (E) The relative proportions of the three cell types were determined by patching neurons in BL slices prepared from adult Long Evans rats, the same age and strain used for our local field potential recordings. The cutoff for determining which PNs exhibited adaption was set to 1.5, which was between the two peaks in the distribution of adaptation ratios. (F) Example recordings from neurons in the slice receiving current injection were comparable to those of our model neurons. (G) The firing rate distributions for neurons in our model overlapped with the mean rates reported from the BL in vivo in a previous study (Amir et al., 2018). (H) Example spike waveforms recorded with a silicon probe in vivo. Red traces are from putative PNs, while blue are FSIs. The intensity of the color is scaled to the peak of the spike waveform. (I) Left: For both a model PN and FSI we delivered a suprathreshold EPSC to the apical dendrite and recorded the extracellular action potential (AP) at different distances along the long axis of the neuron, and either at 50 or 100µm lateral. Near the cell body the field was negative, and it decayed rapidly with distance. Positive dendritic return currents were evident as well. The FSI extracellular spike waveform was both smaller and faster than the PN's. Right: Subthreshold stimulation resulted in a much

weaker extracellular waveform (note the scale bar) reflecting the EPSC (EP) that was negative going near the stimulated dendritic branch. (J) 1: Directly overlaying the extracellular action potentials from both cell types illustrates that those arising from PNs were much slower than those from FSIs. Amplitudes were rescaled so both spike waveforms occupy the same vertical extent of the graph. 2: AP amplitudes were much stronger than EP amplitudes for both cell types. (K) For extracellular APs recorded with silicon probes *in vivo* we measured how their amplitudes decayed with distance. The drop in amplitude was fit by an exponential curve (black line). The gray region is the 95% confidence bounds. Measuring the decay in our model extracellular action potentials along the lateral axis, we found that it fit within the *in vivo* distribution.

14381439

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

14341435

1436

1437

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

14461447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

14531454

1455

14561457

1458

Figure 2: The model LFP exhibits gamma oscillations that are similar to those seen in vivo. (A) The local field potential was measured at the center of the model. (B) The power spectrum of the model LFP (red) is compared with the spectra from the BL of seven rats during quiet waking (gray Gaussian). Driving the model with a homogenous Poisson input (green) still induces gamma oscillations. (C) The frequency where the gamma bump peaked was measured for each subject (black bars), the probability distribution was fit with a normal curve (gray Gaussian). The model's peak frequency was 64Hz (red line), which fell within the in vivo distribution. (D) Gamma oscillations occurred as intermittent bursts in vivo and in the model. There was a stronger low frequency component *in vivo* (black), but filtering that out (yellow) revealed a comparable signal amplitude to our model (blue). (E) The model had a similar wavelet spectrogram to that observed in vivo. (F) Gamma bursts were detected in the wavelet power spectrograms and categorized based on their amplitude percentile and duration. The relationship between these features was characterized by a probability distribution. Bursts arising from the model or in vivo exhibited a similar distribution of durations when stratified by amplitude, with higher amplitude bursts tending to last longer. (G) 1: Each simulated cell type was placed in current clamp and driven with a frequency modulated sinusoid. 2: Neurons responded to this input with an oscillating membrane potential that decayed with increasing frequency. 3: The impedance spectrum of the neuronal responses did not exhibit any peaks in the gamma band. (H) 1: An extracellular

electrode was placed near either a PN or FSI and synaptic inputs to those neurons were driven (stim). 2: The extracellular field responding arising from a single EPSC or IPSC was measured for each cell, and normalized to the strength of the PN EPSC. There was no bump in the gamma band. 3: Driving the synaptic inputs with Poisson trains at rates indicated by the x-axis did not show any obvious boost in power in the gamma range either.

146414651466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

14761477

1478

1479

1480

1481

1482

1483

14841485

14861487

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

Figure 3: Spiking in the model was entrained to the gamma rhythm similarly to cells in vivo. (A) Example trace of the calculated extracellular field from the center of the model and a raster plot of corresponding spiking from neurons within 300 µm (1026 PNs, 111 FSIs). Gamma bursts were evident, particularly following band-pass filtering around the peak gamma frequency. The group firing rates of FSIs and PNs exhibited modulations by the gamma rhythm, with the effect being more evident for FSIs. Spikes from individual neurons (each row is a different cell) did not spike on every gamma cycle. (B) Left: Spiking from units (AP) within 300 µm of where the extracellular field was measured (LFP) were associated with the phase of the ongoing gamma oscillations. Right: Distribution of gamma phases when spikes occurred for 3 example PNs and FSIs, sorted by the strength of their phase locking. Dashed gray schematizes the corresponding gamma cycle. (C) Left: The distribution of mean phases across each cell type. Both types of PNs preferentially spiked near the trough of the gamma oscillation, while FSIs spiked shortly thereafter during the ascending phase. Right: The distribution of phase-locking across cell types matched what we found for BL neurons in vivo. (D) Left: Spiking was sampled from neurons spanning 800 µm away from the point where we measured the extracellular field, and neurons were sorted by their distance from that spot. Right: The farther a neuron was from the site were gamma was measured, the less phase-locked it was. Black lines are exponential fits. (E) Left: The extracellular field arising from individual neurons was singled out to examine their distance dependent contribution. Right: Neurons farther from the recording site contributed less to the extracellular field, and this fell off faster than the decay in the resultant vector in panel D.

Figure 4: Connections between PNs and FSIs were critical for genesis of the gamma rhythm. **(A)** Removal of connections from FSIs to PNs. 1: Comparison of power spectrum between the original and perturbed model. Gray traces are derived from the unmodified model and are the same across all graphs in each row. The green traces are the power spectrum with the particular connection removed. 2: Entrainment to LFP oscillations for different cell types. 3: Average modulation of FSI firing rate triggered on PN population bursts. **(B)** Removal of connections from PNs to FSIs. **(C)** Removal of connections between FSIs. **(D)** Removal of connections between PNs. For all graphs the solid line is the mean while the shaded region denotes ±1SD.

1499 1500

1501

1502

1503

1504 1505

1506

1507

1508 1509

15101511

1512

1513

1514

15151516

1517

15181519

1520

1490

1491

1492

1493

1494

14951496

14971498

Figure 5: EPSCs and IPSCs entrained neurons in the gamma band. (A). Left: For PNs and FSIs we measured the membrane voltage (ic) and their transmembrane currents while voltage clamped (vc) at the reversal potentials for either EPSCs (0 mV) or IPSCs (-75 mV). Middle: Traces from an example PN. In addition to the transmembrane currents and voltages were recorded, we also bandpass filtered the EPSC and IPSC traces around the gamma peak. Right: Examples traces from an FSI. (B) The mean power spectrums of the EPSC and IPSC traces for each cell type. PNs showed greater power for IPSCs across all frequencies compared with EPSCs. FSIs had similar power levels across the spectrum for EPSCs and IPSCs. The spectrum of IPSCs from both cell types contained a bump in the gamma band. (C) The coherence of the EPSCs and IPSCs for each cell type. PNs had a dip in coherence around the peak gamma frequency, while FSIs showed a prominence. Shaded regions denote SD. (D) Synaptic currents were aligned to the phase of gamma cycles and centered on ones that either had, or did not have, spiking (thin blue and red lines, solid lines from cycles with spikes, dashed for cycles without spikes). The difference in the PSCs between the spike and no spike conditions is shown below (thick red and blue lines). IPSCs were modulated by gamma phase for both cell types, while only FSIs exhibited modulation of their EPSCs to gamma. (E) For each cell we plotted the number of excitatory (x-axis) or inhibitory (yaxis) connections they received and their corresponding entrainment. Each scatter point is a different cell. The shaded background is the result of a linear fit that estimates the resultant vector strength based on the number of inhibitory connections, excitatory

1521 connections, and their product (interaction term). Contours in black indicate the actual 1522 resultant vector values associated with each color.

15231524

1525

1526

1527

15281529

1530

Figure 6: Spatiotemporal properties of gamma bursts. (**A**) *Left:* A 9×9×9 array of electrodes was inserted into the model and the envelope of the gamma band was extracted. *Right:* A cube of amplitude values was generated and short lasting, spatially localized, increases in gamma power were readily evident. (**B**) We examined the properties of these bursts, in particular their 1: amplitude, 2: duration, 3: phase synchrony at their peak, 4: number of sites they encompassed, 5: length of the path they took through the BL from initiation to termination, 6: speed that they traversed that path.

153115321533

1534

15351536

1537

1538

15391540

15411542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

15491550

1551

Figure 7: Gamma promoted synchrony between PNs responding to extrinsic afferents and the competition between weakly and strongly driven populations. (A) Two separate ensembles of PNs were targeted by extrinsic afferents (Group 1 – orange vs. Group 2 – green), that received different subsets of afferents. Groups could be driven independently, with 2: Group 1 receiving 20 Hz stimulation while Group 2 had 5 Hz, 3: Group 1 - 20 Hz, Group 2 - 20 Hz, or 4: Group 1 - 5 Hz, Group 2 - 20 Hz. (B) 1: Spikes were recorded from both groups of PNs and 2-4: we calculated their crosscorrelation functions. (C) 1: Spikes from PNs and the mean EPSC across all FSIs were recorded. 2-4: Probability histograms of the EPSC gamma phases associated with spiking from either Group 1 or Group 2. The strongly driven group exhibits greater entrainment. (D) 1: The coherence between PN spiking and FSI spiking for each group. 2-4: FSIs were more coherent in the gamma-band with the population that received the strongest afferent drive. Inset: PN preceded FSI spiking by 4 ms on average. (E) 1: Group 1 receives 20 Hz extrinsic drive while Group 2 receives a varying amount. Increasing the firing rate of extrinsic afferents onto Group 2 diminished the firing rate of Group 1. 2: The difference in firing rate between these groups was weakened when connections from PNs to FSIs were removed. (F) Analysis of competition between groups in the full model when they either 1: fully overlap or 2: are entirely segregated in space. (G) Top: Gamma cycles were divided into four phases and for each phase the

spike probability was measured as a function of the EPSC strength. Bottom left: For the				
weakly driven group there was increased sensitivity for EPSCs during the trough and				
ascending phases of gamma, but a dampening of responsiveness during the				
descending and peak phases. Bottom right: When connections from PNs to FSIs were				
removed, the discrepant sensitivities for EPSCs across the four phases were				
diminished. Graphs are either mean or mean±SE when a shaded region is present.				













