Simulating Microinjection Experiments in a Novel Model of the Rat Sleep-Wake Regulatory Network

Cecilia G. Diniz Behn and Victoria Booth

Departments of Mathematics and Anesthesiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Submitted 25 August 2009; accepted in final form 22 January 2010

INTRODUCTION

Studies of the brain stem and hypothalamic neuronal populations involved in the regulation of sleep and wake states suggest that changes in neurotransmitter levels play an important role in the initiation and maintenance of sleep-wake behavior (see Lydic and Baghdoyan 2005, 2008 for review). For example, wakefulness is characterized by the expression of high levels of noradrenaline by the locus coeruleus (LC), serotonin by the dorsal raphe (DR), and acetylcholine by pontine nuclei including the laterodorsal tegmentum (LDT) and the pedunculopontine tegmentum (PPT) through the ascending reticular activation pathway to thalamocortical regions. In contrast, sleep states are generally characterized by a reduction in the levels of all these neurotransmitters in higher brain regions with the exception of acetylcholine which returns to waking levels during rapid eye movement (REM) sleep.

The regulation of the expression of these neurotransmitters results from modulation of activity in the associated neuronal nuclei by network interactions. Although the LC and DR are accepted components of the sleep-wake network, recent anatomical and physiological studies have identified new brain stem and hypothalamic populations that may be involved in the network and have proposed different versions of network architecture (Saper et al. 2005). Network components involved in the regulation of REM sleep have been of particular interest. The classical conceptual model has been one of cholinergic regulation of REM sleep, proposed by McCarley and Hobson (1975), wherein reciprocal interactions between monoaminergic REM-off populations and cholinergic REM-on pontine populations govern transitions between non-REM (NREM) and REM sleep. More recent studies have implicated a role for GABA in the control of REM sleep (Brown et al. 2008; Datta and Maclean 2007; Lu et al. 2004; Luppi et al. 2006; Mallick et al. 2001; Sapin et al. 2009). However, the exact architecture of the regulatory network has not been completely determined.

We propose a mathematical modeling framework that is uniquely suited for investigating the structure and dynamics of the sleep-wake regulatory network. This framework is based on a novel population firing rate model formalism in which we modify the traditional firing rate model formalism to explicitly include neurotransmitter concentration variables reflecting the release of transmitter to postsynaptic targets. The dynamics of neurotransmitter concentrations follow saturating expression profiles consistent with experimental observations. Coupling between populations occurs as a result of transmitter concentration levels in postsynaptic populations. In this formalism, time scales characteristic of specific neurotransmitter expression in postsynaptic targets or of postsynaptic receptor activation can be explicitly distinguished. More importantly, experimental studies have manipulated the neurotransmitter environments in specific nuclei through targeted microinjection of transmitter agonists and antagonists to probe the regulatory network. Our modeling formalism allows direct simulation of this type of experimental protocol.

The specific network structure of brain stem and hypothalamic nuclei that we consider is based on known neural pathways and neurotransmitter effects. It includes the mutual inhibitory interaction between wake-promoting nuclei in the brain stem and sleep-promoting nuclei in the hypothalamus that forms the basis of the conceptual flip-flop model for sleep generation (Saper et al. 2001). It also contains reciprocal interactions between pontine REM-promoting nuclei and wake-promoting nuclei, whose activity ceases during REM sleep, similar to the reciprocal interaction model for REM regulation (Massaquoi and McCarley 1992; McCarley and Hobson 1975). The network structure is similar to that used in other mathematical models of the sleep-wake regu-
neurotransmitter concentrations released by presynaptic populations, \( C_i(t) \), where the subscript \( i \) allows for multiple neurotransmitters. In this way, firing rate in a postsynaptic population \( X \), \( F_X(t) \), is modeled by the standard equation of the following form

\[
F_X = \frac{\sum g_{X,i} C_i - F_X}{\tau_X} \tag{1}
\]

where the steady-state firing rate \( F_{\text{ss}}(\cdot) \) is a saturating function, the \( g_{X,i} \) are constant weights, and \( \tau_X \) is the time constant associated with the response of the postsynaptic population. For the steady-state firing rate function, we use the standard sigmoidal function

\[
F_X(c) = X_{\text{max}} \left(0.5 \left[ 1 + \tanh\left[ \left( c - \beta_X \right)/\alpha_X \right] \right] \right) \tag{2}
\]

characterized by parameters \( X_{\text{max}} \), \( \alpha_X \), and \( \beta_X \) (Fig. 1B). This functional form ensures that sufficient release of inhibitory neurotransmitters silences the population and excessive release of excitatory neurotransmitters causes firing to saturate at a maximal rate. \( X_{\text{max}} \). Intrinsic population properties such as excitability of individual neurons and local connectivity can be used to determine the parameters governing the slope of the sigmoid (\( \alpha_X \)) and the activation threshold (\( \beta_X \)).

Neurotransmitter concentration, \( C_i(t) \), depends on the firing rate of the postsynaptic population, generically referred to as \( F_X(t) \). In our formalism, \( C_i(t) \) evolves to a nonlinear function of \( F_X(t) \) as described by the following equation

\[
C_i' = \frac{C_i(F_X) - C_i}{\tau_i} \tag{3}
\]

where steady-state neurotransmitter release, \( C_{\text{ss}}(\cdot) \), is a saturating function and \( \tau_i \) is the associated time constant. Because different microdialysis techniques lead to differences in absolute reported neurotransmitter concentrations, we normalize each neurotransmitter concentration between 0 and 1. The functional form of \( C_{\text{ss}}(\cdot) \), \( C_{\text{ss}}(f) = \tanh(f/\gamma) \), prescribes the relationship between presynaptic firing rate and neurotransmitter release, and the shape of this function was chosen to be consistent with experimental data (Aston-Jones and Bloom 1981; Lydic and Baghdoyan 1993) (Fig. 1C). In particular, neurotransmitter concentration increases monotonically with presynaptic firing rate and approaches a saturating level (normalized to 1) at maximum firing rate. The time scale described by \( \tau_i \) reflects the time dynamics associated with neurotransmitter release at the level of the population rather than at an individual synapse. The temporal resolution of current microdialysis techniques does not allow direct measurement of \( \tau_i \). However, recent results using voltammetric techniques have shown that the rate constants for release and clearance of evoked dopamine are on the order of seconds (Garris and Wightman 1994), and we chose values for \( \tau_i \) to be consistent with this result.

In a network model, all coupling between populations is mediated through neurotransmitter concentrations: \( C_{\text{ss}}(\cdot) \) describes how firing activity in the postsynaptic population results in production of neurotransmitter, and \( F_{X_{\text{ss}}}(\cdot) \) determines how neurotransmitter levels affect activity in the postsynaptic population. By explicitly modeling the dynamics of each neurotransmitter, the formalism allows for distinct time scales associated with the release of each neurotransmitter or with specific postsynaptic receptor dynamics. This contrasts with many firing rate model formalisms in which the dynamics of inputs from all presynaptic sources are described by a single time constant (Dayan and Abbott 2001; Deco et al. 2008; Phillips and Robinson 2007, 2008; Wilson and Cowan 1972). A more detailed comparison of our formalism with other firing rate models is provided in the DISCUSSION.

Neurotransmitter release is correlated with, but not determined by, the firing rate of the presynaptic population, and variability of release grows with concentration level (Aston-Jones and Bloom 1981). This
Simulating microinjection experiments

To simulate microinjection of neurotransmitter agonists and antagonists in this modeling framework, we introduced a variable for concentration levels of each agonist and antagonist in the targeted population. The agonist and antagonist variables were denoted by $P_i(t)$ and $Q_i(t)$, respectively, where $i$ indicates the affected transmitter. The dynamics of the agonist and antagonist variables are described by a positive initial value, simulating the bolus injection, followed by a slow decay representing diffusion and reuptake. The slow decay is governed by a time constant, $\tau_P$ or $\tau_Q$, that is chosen to reflect the time scale of the observed effects of the agonist or antagonist

$$\frac{dP_i}{dt} = -\frac{P_i}{\tau_P} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dQ_i}{dt} = -\frac{Q_i}{\tau_Q}$$

For the microinjection experiments we simulate, these effects last for $\sim 4$ h (Mallick et al. 2001).

We model the net effect of the endogenously released neurotransmitter and the injected neurotransmitter agonist or antagonist by appropriately scaling or augmenting endogenous neurotransmitter in the targeted population. High concentrations of injected neurotransmitter or neurotransmitter agonist often affect the release of endoge-
nous neurotransmitter (Kalnsner 1990; Starke et al. 1989). To reflect this interaction in agonist microinjection simulations, we replace the variable for endogeneous neurotransmitter concentration as released by the presynaptic population, \( C_i(t) \), in the targeted population \( X \) with the following expression

\[
C_{iX}(t) = m_i(t)C_i(t) + P_i(t)
\]  

(5)

The scaling factor \( m_i(t) \) reflects the effect of the agonist on transmitter release. It is set to 1 if \( P_i \) levels are low (less than a specified minimum value) but, for higher \( P_i \) levels, it increases from 0 to 1 as \( P_i \) decreases from a maximum initial value (Fig. 1D, middle).

To capture the decrease in the effects of endogeneous neurotransmitter caused by microinjection of an antagonist, we replace the variable for endogeneous neurotransmitter concentration, \( C_i(t) \), in the target population \( X \) with a value scaled by the level of antagonist

\[
C_{iX}(t) = [1 - Q_i(t)]C_i(t)
\]  

(6)

As \( Q_i \) decays to 0, transmitter concentration in the target population, \( C_{iX} \), regains the full level of transmitter released by the presynaptic population, \( C_i(t) \) (Fig. 1D, bottom).

Applying the neurotransmitter model formalism to a sleep-wake regulatory network

Using the firing rate model formalism described above, we constructed a model of the rodent sleep-wake regulatory network (Fig. 2). This formalism is well suited to model neural regulation of sleep-wake behavior because specific patterns of spike timing in the constituent neuronal populations seem to be less important in supporting each behavioral state compared with the overall profiles of population activity and resultant neurotransmitter release. The structure of the network model was based on experimental characterization of the relevant anatomy and physiology (see Saper et al. 2005 for review). The network included wake-promoting, sleep-promoting, and REM sleep-promoting neuronal populations and their associated neurotransmitters (Table 1).

![Schematic of the model sleep-wake regulatory network](http://jn.physiology.org/)

**TABLE 1. Summary of the wake-, sleep-, and REM-sleep promoting neuronal populations and associated neurotransmitters included in the model network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Neurotransmitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wake-promoting</td>
<td>Dorsal raphe (DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus coeruleus (LC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake/REM active subpopulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WR) of laterodorsal tegmental nucleus and pedunculopontine tegmental nucleus (LDT/PPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep-promoting</td>
<td>Ventrolateral preoptic area (VLPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM-promoting</td>
<td>REM active subpopulation (R) of LDT/PPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Firing rates of each population, \( F_X(t) \) (in Hz, \( X = LC, DR, VLPO, R, \) or \( WR \)) are governed by equations of the form given in Eq. 1 and the concentrations of neurotransmitter released by each population, \( C_i(t) \), are described by equations of the form given in Eq. 3 \( i = N \) (NE) for \( Y = LC; i = S \) (5-HT) for \( Y = DR; i = G \) (GABA) for \( Y = VLPO; i = A(R) \) (ACh) for \( Y = R; \) and \( i = A(WR) \) (ACh) for \( Y = WR \). When possible, the parameter values in the model were based on experimental data (see APPENDIX for details).

The neurotransmitter-mediated coupling between populations included in the model network is based on established anatomy and physiology. Briefly, the monoaminergic wake-promoting populations, LC and DR, inhibit both the sleep-promoting VLPO and the REM-active subpopulation of the LDT/PPT, but not the wake/REM active LDT/PPT subpopulation (Thakkar et al. 1998). On the other hand, the sleep-promoting VLPO inhibits all wake-promoting and REM-promoting populations. The cholinergic REM- and wake/REM-active populations excite the LC and DR. These interactions are reflected in the network structure included in the argument, \( \Sigma g_{iX}C_i \), of the steady-state firing rate functions, \( F_X(\cdot) \), for each population.

Within this network structure, specific subcomponents reflect conceptual models of the interaction of these populations that are current in the literature. Specifically, mutual inhibition between the monoaminergic wake-promoting populations (LC and DR) and the GABAergic sleep-promoting population (VLPO) provides the basis for the conceptual sleep-wake flip-flop switch (Saper et al. 2001) that is thought to be the generative mechanism for production of and transitions between NREM sleep and wake. Additionally, reciprocal connectivity between monoaminergic wake-promoting populations (LC and DR) and cholinergic REM-promoting populations (LDT/PPT) reflects the reciprocal interaction hypothesis of NREM-REM cycling (Massaquoi and McCarley 1992; McCarley and Hobson 1975). The LC, DR, and VLPO are modeled as self-inhibitory while self-excitatory projections are included in the cholinergic REM- and wake-promoting subpopulations of the LDT/PPT. This self-excitation reflects the glutamatergic positive feedback projection to the LDT/PPT via the pontine reticular formation (reviewed in Datta and Maclean 2007). In addition, random excitatory inputs to the wake-promoting populations (LC and DR) were included to simulate activity of top-down excitatory projections from thalamocortical circuits (Aronsten and Goldman-Rakic 1984; Jodo et al. 1998).

**Homeostatic sleep drive \( h \)**

The concept of a homeostatic sleep drive was formalized with the designation of “Process S” in the two process model of sleep regulation (Borbely 1982; Borbely and Achermann 1999). Process S describes a drive to sleep that increases during time awake and decreases during sleep. Although the biological substrate of homeostatic sleep drive probably involves multiple mechanisms, the neuromodulator adenosine is one important element (reviewed in Basheer et al. 2004;
Huang et al. 2007). Briefly, extracellular adenosine concentrations in the basal forebrain and cortex increase with time in wakefulness (Porkka-Heiskanen et al. 2000), microinjection of adenosine into these areas promotes sleep (Basheer et al. 1999; Van Dort et al. 2009), and microinjection of adenosine A1 receptor antagonist increases wakefulness (Thakkar et al. 2003; Van Dort et al. 2009). The somnogenic effect of adenosine may arise from the action of adenosine at several sites in the sleep-wake regulatory network: adenosine inhibits activity in wake-promoting populations including LDT/PPT (Raimnie et al. 1994), basal forebrain (Kalinchuk et al. 2008; Porkka-Heiskanen et al. 1997; Portas et al. 1997), and orexin neurons (Liu and Gao 2007). Furthermore, adenosine promotes activity in the sleep-promoting VLPO both indirectly (Chamberlin et al. 2003; Morairty and Gallopin et al. 2005) and, possibly, directly (Gallopin et al. 2005).

We modeled the homeostatic slow drive through the variable \( h \) that increases during wakefulness and decreases during sleep states, reflecting extracellular adenosine concentrations. Because dissociated activity among wake-promoting populations may not be sufficient to initiate wakefulness (Gervasoni et al. 2000), the model criterion for activity among wake-promoting populations may not be sufficient to increase \( F_{VLPO} \) during sleep and \( F_{VLPO} \) decreases during wakefulness and decreases during sleep states, reflecting extracellular adenosine concentrations. Consequently, activity among wake-promoting populations may not be sufficient to initiate wakefulness (Gervasoni et al. 2000), and the model criterion for activity among wake-promoting populations may not be sufficient to initiate wakefulness (Gervasoni et al. 2000). In simulations of the model network, states of wake, NREM sleep, and REM sleep, mean bout durations, and numbers of bouts across 12 h (Fig. 4). Additionally, the general pattern of sleep and wake states matched those experimentally observed in the rat, including bidirectional transitions between wake and NREM sleep and transitions from NREM sleep to REM sleep followed by wakefulness (Weitzman et al. 1980). Both wake and NREM states showed large numbers of bouts with brief (<1 min) durations that are typical in the rat (Lo et al. 2004).

To understand how the network generates these stereotypical rodent sleep-wake patterns, we now discuss the key mechanisms that govern network state transitions. Wake bouts occurred as a result of two different effects. Brief wake bouts (Fig. 5A, upward arrows) were typically initiated by random excitatory inputs to the LC and DR populations. Because the neurotransmitter formalism introduces a slight time lag between the activation of LC/DR activity and the onset of full-strength NE/5-HT inhibition, these brief activations result in moderate levels of LC/DR activity and low levels of NE/5-HT release that, in turn, cause slight decreases in VLPO activation and GABA levels (see Fig. 3C, top 3 traces). Therefore brief activations of LC/DR can occur without a full transition of the network out of NREM sleep, and thus the model predicts that concurrent activity in wake- and sleep-promoting populations is possible for short periods of time.

Longer wake bouts were the result of a network transition to full LC and DR activation and maximal concentrations of NE and 5-HT, as well as activation of the cholinergic wake-promoting subpopulation of LDT/PPT. Full-strength monoaminergic inhibition to VLPO silenced VLPO activity and thereby reduced associated GABA release. These network transitions between wake and NREM sleep resulted from the homeostatic modulation of the VLPO activation threshold. As this threshold decreases during wake with the growth of the homeostatic sleep drive variable \( h \), inhibition from wake-promoting populations is no longer sufficient to prevent VLPO activation, and the onset of activity in the VLPO initiates a transition from wake to NREM sleep (Fig. 5A). Similarly, transitions from NREM sleep to wake occur when recovery of the homeostatic sleep drive increases the VLPO activation threshold to terminate VLPO firing. When wake-promoting populations are re-
leased from inhibition, the network transitions from NREM sleep to wake. This transition mechanism is consistent with the sleep-wake flip-flop conceptual model (Saper et al. 2001). In our model, this transition usually involves activation of the cholinergic REM-on population; thus the transition sequence is NREM sleep to REM sleep to wake.

Two separate mechanisms may initiate a transition from NREM sleep to REM sleep. One mechanism depends on the homeostatically driven transition from NREM sleep to wake. We can understand the details of this transition by considering network behavior in the absence of noisy components. In the deterministic network during the NREM state, activity in the sleep-promoting VLPO decreases as the homeostatic sleep drive recovers. The attenuation of VLPO inhibition to the REM-promoting LDT/PPT populations allows them to activate and initiate REM sleep. The combination of reduced inhibition from VLPO and increased excitation from LDT/PPT causes wake-promoting LC/DR to activate, thereby terminating the REM bout. This stereotypical and homeostatically driven pattern of NREM–REM–wake cycling corresponds to a stable periodic solution of the deterministic network (Fig. 5B) and is generally preserved in the noisy system.

The reliable activation of the REM-promoting population at the NREM sleep to wake transition is an inherent feature of the network structure. Periodic cycling in activation of the REM-promoting population, and LC and DR, similar to REM-on/REM-off oscillations in the reciprocal interaction model for REM sleep cycling (Massaquoi and McCarley 1992; McCarley and Hobson 1975), can occur in the network, but is not obtained for our default parameter values. The existence of this cycling pattern depends on the activation threshold of the REM-promoting population: cycling appears for low values of the threshold but not at higher values (Fig. 5C). While the default activation threshold does not permit this periodic cycling, the model trajectory is influenced by proximity to the periodic solution during the network transition from NREM sleep to wake. Therefore the REM-promoting population activates transiently despite ongoing inhibition as decreasing GABAergic inhibition from the VLPO is replaced by increasing monoaminergic inhibition from LC and DR.

The second mechanism for REM sleep initiation is related to noise in the network. Variability of neurotransmitter release results in varying levels of inhibition to and self-excitation by the REM-promoting population. If, during the NREM state, higher ACh release from the LDT/PPT populations is combined with lower levels of GABAergic inhibition, the model trajectory can be transiently attracted to the periodic REM-on/REM-off cycle described above (Fig. 5A, downward arrow). The wake bout after these spontaneous REM bouts is typically brief, and, while VLPO activation may be slightly inhibited, the network rarely transitions out of NREM sleep. During the wake state, this mechanism for REM sleep initiation is not
possible because high levels of LC/DR activation prohibit periodic cycling between the REM-promoting population and LC/DR. Thus this network structure never permits direct transitions from wake to REM sleep, consistent with experimental data (Benington and Heller 1994).

Model sensitivity to parameters

The model includes >60 parameters that describe intrinsic properties of neuronal populations (\(X_{\text{max}}, \alpha_X, B_X, \tau_X\) for \(X = \text{LC}, \text{DR}, \text{R}, \text{WR}, \text{and VLPO}\)); intrinsic properties of neurotransmitters/neurotransmitter release [\(\gamma_i\) and \(\tau_i\) for \(i = N, S, A(R), A(WR), \) and \(G\)]; coupling parameters (\(g_{\text{LCX}}, g_{\text{DRX}}, \) etc.); parameters governing the homeostatic sleep drive; parameters associated with noise; and parameters associated with simulated microinjections. Full parameter sets are given in the Appendix.

To evaluate model sensitivity to parameters, we performed simulations with each parameter varied by ±10% and assessed the effects on network behavior. In general, network behavior was robust to these variations of parameters (data not shown). The percent of total time spent in each state changed by less than ±8% as the result of variation in any of these parameters. Effects on mean bout durations and bout frequency were slightly more pronounced and typically reflected a loss of state consolidation associated with increases in bout frequency and decreases in mean

![Figure 4](image-url)  
**Fig. 4.** Structure of simulated sleep-wake behavior is consistent with experimental data quantifying behavior of adult male Sprague-Dawley rats during the 12-h light period (Blanco-Centurion et al. 2007) as seen in the comparisons of the following standard measures. A: percent time spent in each state. B: mean bout duration. C: mean number of bouts over 12 h. Means and SD of model results determined from 10 simulation runs.

![Figure 5](image-url)  
**Fig. 5.** Network mechanisms drive state transitions. A: approximately 30 min of 2-h simulation in Fig. 3B showing details of transitions in population firing rates (colors same as in Fig. 3). Brief awakenings (upward arrows) and spontaneous REM sleep (downward arrow) may occur during NREM sleep. The homeostatic sleep drive \(h\) (orange curve, bottom panel) increases during wake and decreases during sleep. B: in the deterministic network \([h(t) = 0, \sigma_i(t) = 0\) for \(i = N, S, G, A(R), A(WR)\), see Appendix for details], firing rates follow a regular cycle of NREM sleep–REM sleep–wake. Transitions between wake and NREM sleep are governed by the homeostatic sleep drive, \(h\) (orange curve, bottom panel), and its effect on the VLPO activation threshold. C: when \(F_{\text{VLPO}}\) activity is high and the activation threshold parameter for the REM-promoting population is in the appropriate range (\(\beta_{\text{h}} = -0.51\), \(h\) set constant to 0.4), periodic cycling between activity in \(F_{\text{C}}\) and activity in \(F_{\text{VLPO}}\) can occur. Although the default \(\beta_{\text{h}}\) parameter value (\(\beta_{\text{h}} = -0.5\)) does not correspond to the cycling regimen, the underlying dynamics of the full network are affected by their proximity to the periodic solution.
bout durations. Interestingly, increasing/decreasing a parameter did not necessarily result in reciprocal effects: often, both variations promoted fragmentation of behavioral states.

In addition to general parameter sensitivity, we investigated the importance of relative magnitudes among some sets of parameters. These relative differences often reflected physiological features of neuronal populations or neurotransmitter actions. For example, the ordering $\tau_{A(R)} = \tau_{A(WR)} = \tau_G < \tau_N = \tau_i$ reflects the faster action of ionotropic neurotransmitters ACh and GABA compared with the action of metabotropic NE and 5-HT (Destexhe et al. 1994). To determine the importance of these relative orderings, we ran simulations in which differences in intrinsic properties and differences in dynamics were systematically eliminated from modeled populations and neurotransmitters, respectively. To equalize population parameters, the slopes for the neuronal population steady-state functions were set to reflect fast ($\alpha_X = 0.25$) or slow ($\alpha_X = 0.75$) activation. To equalize parameters for time dynamics, the time constants for neuronal populations and neurotransmitter concentration were set to fast ($\tau_X = \tau_i = 10$ s) or slow scales ($\tau_X = \tau_i = 25$ s).

When representative parameters were used to ascribe equal properties to all populations and all neurotransmitters, the balance of time spent in wake and sleep was affected more substantially compared with changes observed under $\pm 10\%$ variations in parameters (data not shown). For example, when all populations were given equal slow properties and characteristics ($\tau_{X} = \tau_{i} = 25$ s; $\alpha_{X} = 0.75$; $\gamma_{i} = 4$), the percent time in wakefulness more than doubled. Typically, equal properties for populations and/or neurotransmitters caused an increase in percent time in wake and decrease in percent time in NREM sleep. These changes were caused by differences in both bout frequency and mean bout duration. Both increases and decreases in the percent time in REM sleep were observed, although there was a consistent decrease in REM bout duration, regardless of whether the parameters specified fast action or slow action. These results indicate that maximal REM bout durations are obtained in our network structure when parameters dictating dynamic properties of populations and transmitters differ in their relative magnitudes.

**Simulation of GABA agonist/antagonist microinjection in the LC**

Simulated microinjection of GABA agonist and antagonist into the LC had a robust effect on REM sleep by producing increases and decreases, respectively, in total REM sleep and REM bout duration in the 4 h after microinjection (Fig. 6). These effects were consistent with microinjection experiments (Mallick et al. 2001). To determine the mechanism responsible for the changes in REM bout duration, we analyzed microinjection simulations in the deterministic model (Fig. 7). In the control case, REM bouts were terminated by the onset of inhibition to the REM-promoting population from coordinated activity in LC and DR. In the presence of microinjected GABA agonist, LC is tonically inhibited. Therefore firing in the DR precedes firing in the LC and lasts longer before triggering a transition to wake. The combined reduction in LC activity and LC/DR coordination results in a longer mean REM bout duration (Fig. 7B). Conversely, in the presence of a GABA antagonist, tonic inhibition to the LC is reduced. This allows strong anticipatory firing in the LC, which precedes activity in the DR and increases combined LC/DR inhibition, thereby accelerating REM bout termination (Fig. 7C). Thus the LC activation profile modulates changes in REM bout duration. With the addition of noise in the full system, this mechanism was preserved.

**FIG. 6.** Microinjection of GABA agonist/antagonist into LC alters the structure of simulated sleep-wake behavior. All results are reported for the 4 h after simulated microinjection. A: microinjection of the GABA agonist/antagonist increase/decrease, respectively, the percent time in REM sleep. With the GABA agonist, there is also a tendency toward an increase in NREM sleep, which comes at the expense of time in wakefulness. B: increased/decreased mean REM bout durations contribute to the effects on percent time in REM sleep. In addition, the GABA agonist-induced decrease in REM sleep is caused by a decrease in mean wakebout duration. C: microinjection of GABA agonist also increases the number of REM bouts. [Initial condition for GABA agonist simulation $P_{R}(0) = 2.0$ and for GABA antagonist simulation $Q_{R}(0) = 1.0$; see APPENDIX for details. Means and SD of model results determined from 10 simulation runs; *$P < 0.01$ in ANOVA with control data.]
This is reflected in the slightly higher peak value of decrease to lower than normal levels to allow VLPO activation. During wakefulness, and the VLPO activation threshold must associated noradrenergic inhibition to VLPO remain higher.

During wake to NREM sleep transition (Fig. 7B). In the presence of GABA agonist, overall levels of inhibition to LC during NREM sleep are lower, and brief wakes occur as in control conditions. However, the changes in the homeostatically regulated NREM sleep-REM sleep-wake cycle discussed above are reflected in the slight increases in wake and NREM bout durations and slight decreases in bout frequency.

In summary, changes in LC activation levels induced by simulated microinjection of GABA agonist and antagonist directly affected both wake bout duration, because the LC is one of the primary wake-promoting populations, and REM bout duration, because LC activity influences activation of the REM-promoting population. These changes also affected the mean percent time spent in states of wake and REM sleep. The change in wake bout duration can be propagated through the network to affect the homeostatic drive and NREM bout duration, as observed in the deterministic model. In the full model in the presence of noise (Fig. 6). Most notably, in the full model under GABA agonist microinjection, overall levels of inhibition to LC during NREM sleep are lower, and brief wakes occur as in control conditions. However, the changes in the homeostatically regulated NREM sleep-REM sleep-wake cycle discussed above are reflected in the slight increases in wake and NREM bout durations and slight decreases in bout frequency.

Simulation of ACh agonist/antagonist microinjection in the LC

Simulated microinjection of cholinergic agonist and antagonist in the LC also resulted in widespread effects on sleep-wake architecture for the 4 h after microinjection (Fig. 8). Many of these effects reflected mechanisms linked to LC activation and paralleled changes elicited by simulated GABA antagonist and agonist microinjection. For example, simulated microinjection of ACh agonist in the LC caused a decrease in mean REM bout duration similar to that observed with simu-
runs; for details. Means and SD of model results determined from 10 simulation duration and a decrease in the number of NREM bouts.

Simulated microinjection of ACh agonist/antagonist into LC alters the structure of simulated sleep-wake behavior. All results are reported for the 4 h after simulated microinjection. A: microinjection of ACh agonist/antagonist decreased/increased the percent time spent in REM sleep. Reciprocal changes were observed in the percent time spent in wake. B: changes in mean wake and REM bout durations contributed to the changes in time spent in these states. In addition, mean NREM bout durations were increased in the presence of the ACh agonist. C: in the presence of the ACh agonist, the number of NREM and REM bouts was decreased. [Initial condition for ACh agonist simulation \( P_c(0) = 0.8 \) and for ACh antagonist simulation \( Q_c(0) = 0.53 \); see Appendix for details. Means and SD of model results determined from 10 simulation runs; * \( P < 0.01 \) in ANOVA with control data.]

Likewise, the changes to REM and wake bout durations caused by simulated ACh antagonist in the LC are similar to those of simulated GABA agonist microinjection. Specifically, mean REM bout duration is increased because reduced cholinergic excitation to LC attenuates NE inhibition to the REM-promoting population, thus requiring higher levels of coordinated LC/DR activity to terminate the REM bout. Mean wake bout duration is decreased because reduced LC activity levels reduce NE inhibition to the VLPO and allow earlier VLPO activation to truncate wake bouts.

Despite these similarities, ACh agonist/GABA antagonist and ACh antagonist/GABA agonist pairs may exert different effects across sleep-wake states because neurotransmitter agonists affect sleep-wake behavior in all states, whereas antagonists act only when the appropriate state-dependent neurotransmitter is present. For example, the reduction in REM frequency caused by the microinjected cholinergic agonist was not observed under microinjected GABA antagonist. In the presence of ACh agonist, LC receives tonic cholinergic agonist input that prevents complete termination of its activity during the NREM state and sustains its inhibitory input to the REM-promoting population. This maintained inhibition suppressed both spontaneous REM bouts and activation of the REM-promoting population at the homeostatically regulated transitions out of NREM sleep. Thus the number of REM bouts was very low for the first hour of the simulation (Fig. 9A). As the level of injected ACh agonist decayed, the number of REM bouts recovered to levels closer to control. In contrast, simulated GABA antagonist microinjection did not significantly affect the number of REM bouts.

This difference between tonic activity of an injected agonist and state-dependent activity of an injected antagonist is also evident in the simulated ACh antagonist microinjections. Simulated ACh antagonist microinjections do not affect brief wake bouts because the random, excitatory inputs to LC are not presumed to be cholinergically mediated. Therefore in contrast to simulated GABA agonist microinjections, brief wakes persist under simulated ACh antagonist conditions (Fig. 9B). In the figure, probability density functions for wake bout durations show peaks at short durations (<1 min) for the control and simulated ACh antagonist microinjections, especially in the second to fourth hours of the simulations (top and bottom). This peak is notably absent in the probability density functions for the first to third hours of the simulated GABA agonist (middle) but reappears in the fourth hour as the effect of the simulated agonist dissipates and brief wakes resume. As a result of the maintenance of brief wakes under simulated ACh antagonist conditions, NREM bout durations in this condition are not affected, even though, through the mechanisms of the deterministic model, shorter wake bouts act to reduce NREM bout durations. The influence of shorter wake bouts in the deterministic model on wake bout durations in the noisy model is shown by the shift of the secondary lower peaks to shorter durations in the simulated GABA agonist and ACh antagonist simulations (middle and bottom) compared with the control case (top, vertical line indicates the mean wake bout duration in the deterministic model).

In summary, many of the effects of changes in LC activation levels by simulated microinjection of ACh agonist and antagonist mirror those of simulated GABA antagonist and agonist, respectively. Exceptions can be attributed
to the difference in the state dependence or independence of action of an injected agonist and antagonist. Specifically, sustained LC activity during NREM sleep under simulated microinjection of ACh agonist caused a significant reduction in the number of REM bouts that did not occur with the simulated GABA antagonist. Additionally, simulated ACh antagonist did not affect the efficacy of the random, excitatory inputs to the LC to induce brief wakens, unlike simulated GABA agonist.

\[ \text{Model prediction for modulation of REM frequency but not duration} \]

Despite the expected parallels between ACh agonist/GABA antagonist and ACh antagonist/GABA agonist pairs, simulation results for cholinergic agonists/antagonists contrasted with experimental observations. One inconsistency was that experimental microinjection of cholinergic agonists/antagonists into the LC significantly affected frequency of REM bouts with less influence on REM bout duration (Mallick et al. 2001). The discrepancies between these results and our simulations suggest that REM sleep control may not be a direct result of LC activity and are further addressed in the DISCUSSION. However, as a first step in revising network structure/interactions, we analyzed the network behavior to identify mechanisms that affected the frequency of REM sleep without affecting mean REM bout duration.

The primary mechanism that satisfied these criteria was modulation of the activation threshold \( \beta_R \) for the steady-state firing rate function of the REM-promoting population, \( F_{R,S}(\cdot) \). Lower activation thresholds increased REM frequency and higher activation thresholds decreased REM frequency without altering mean REM bout duration (Fig. 10). Similar changes were observed in the number of wake and NREM bouts caused by an overall change in cycle length. Although mean REM and wake bout durations were not affected, the altered frequency of REM bouts resulted in changes to fragmentation of NREM sleep and associated changes in mean NREM bout durations. Increases or decreases in the frequency of NREM bouts did not compensate for the changes in mean NREM bout durations as reflected by the altered total amounts of NREM sleep. These results suggest that initiation of REM sleep results from direct modulation of activation in REM-promoting populations while maintenance of REM sleep can be governed by network dynamics.

\[ \text{DISCUSSION} \]

In this study, we introduced a novel modeling framework for investigating the structure and dynamics of sleep-wake regulation. The model simulates realistic rat sleep-wake behavior and the modulation of this behavior with microinjection of GABAergic and cholinergic agonists/antagonists into one of the key wake-promoting populations. Furthermore, detailed analysis of network dynamics provides insights into the mechanisms underlying agonist/antagonist modulation of baseline behavior.

\[ \text{Advantages and limitations of the modeling formalism} \]

In our firing rate formalism, we allow for the time evolution of both the postsynaptic response to total input and the total input in response to presynaptic population activity. Most firing rate models assume that one of these processes is instantaneous; either setting firing rate equal to the steady-state firing rate function (Deco et al. 2008; Phillips and Robinson 2007, 2008; Steyn-Ross et al. 2005; Wilson et al. 2005, 2006) or setting total input as the weighted sum of all presynaptic firing rates (Wilson and Cowan 1972) (also reviewed in Ermentrout 1998). Of those models that allow for time dynamics of total input, some consolidate the dynamics of all presynaptic sources under one time constant (Phillips and Robinson 2007, 2008), whereas others, similar to our formalism, allow for...
determined from 10 simulation runs; *P < 0.01 in ANOVA with control data.)

A distinct advantage of modeling individual neurotransmitter dynamics is the ability to directly incorporate data from microdialysis and microinjection experiments into the modeling formalism. Tamakawa et al. (2006) simulated several pharmacological microinjection experiments to help to constrain their choice of sleep-wake network model structure. However, their simulations involved static changes to parameters associated with activity in the target populations and did not address the dynamic properties of the microinjection, such as decay of the injected agents or effects on physiological transmitter release. Furthermore, because the changes were global and constant throughout the simulation, they could not consider the state-dependent action of microinjected neurotransmitter antagonists. In our simulations, agonists persist in the network during all states, so every state and state transition may be affected by their presence. In contrast, antagonists exert an effect only when the relevant neurotransmitter is present. Because the presence of specific neurotransmitters in these populations is state dependent, this implies that antagonists directly affect only a subset of states and state transitions. By explicitly modeling neurotransmitters, we can incorporate microinjection experiments in a dynamic, physiologic framework while analyzing the action of agonists and antagonists. Finally, while we concentrated on simulating microinjection experiments in this study, our formalism allows simulation of different techniques for administration of pharmacological agents to brain regions. As an example, microdialysis administration of a neurotransmitter agonist can be simulated by slow increases of the agonist variable $P_i(t)$ and of the scaling factor of endogenous release $m_i(t)$ to saturating levels reflecting the equilibration of the agent in the perfusion fluid in the dialysis probe (Watson et al. 2006).

Despite these advantages, this formalism does have several limitations. The main limitation is the sparse data pertaining to the dynamics of neurotransmitter release on a population scale. Although we have inferred appropriate time scales from dopamine voltammetry experiments (Garris and Wightman 1994), current limitations in experimental techniques make it difficult to establish appropriate dynamics for the neurotransmitters involved in sleep-wake regulation. Furthermore, this formalism is subject to the limitations of all firing-rate models. In particular, it assumes that population activity can be modeled with a single average firing rate: populations with heterogeneous intrinsic properties may need more complex steady-state firing profiles or may even need to be modeled with multiple firing-rate models as with the REM- and wake/REM-promoting subpopulations of LDT/PPT. Current experimental data indicate that our assumptions of averaged firing rates are reasonable, but these assumptions must be constantly re-evaluated in the face of new experiments.
Comparison with experimental results

Mallick et al. (2001) studied the effects of microinjection of GABAergic and cholinergic agonists and antagonists into LC in Wistar rats. They found that microinjection of GABA increased total REM sleep by increasing mean REM bout durations, whereas microinjection of the GABA antagonist picROTOXIN had the opposite effect. They also noted that the GABA and picROTOXIN microinjections increased and decreased, respectively, time in active waking with compensatory changes in slow wave sleep; changes in frequency or mean duration of these states were not reported.

Because of differences between our control dataset (Blanco-Centurion et al. 2007) and the control data reported by Mallick and colleagues, possibly because of the use of different rat strains, we could not quantitatively compare our results. However, we qualitatively compared the overall trends on sleep-wake patterns observed in our simulations with the differences they identified. Although our results regarding changes in REM sleep were consistent with data reported by Mallick and colleagues, our simulations showed opposite effects on wake and NREM sleep.

Because wake-promoting LC neurons are under tonic GABAergic inhibition (Kawahara et al. 1999), it is surprising that increases in GABAergic inhibition increase wakefulness. One possible explanation of this apparent contradiction involves the mechanism for sleep homeostasis. In our model, the variable \( h \) associated with sleep homeostasis increases during wake and decreases during sleep with constant rates such that the amount of change is dependent on the time spent in each state. However, if the rate of increase and decrease depended on factors such as LC activity, the lower levels of activity caused by GABA microinjection may translate to an extension of wake bouts. In future work, a refined, dynamic sleep homeostat could be used to explore this potential mechanism.

Mallick et al. (2001) also found that microinjection of the cholinergic agonist carbachol in the LC increased total REM sleep by increasing the frequency of REM sleep and that microinjection of the cholinergic antagonist scopolamine decreased REM sleep by decreasing the frequency of REM initiation. There were trends toward increased/decreased REM bout durations with carbachol and scopolamine, respectively, but these differences were not significant. They did not report any changes to other behavioral states.

Our simulations of cholinergic agonist and antagonist microinjections showed opposite effects on total REM sleep and primarily attributed these changes to differences in mean bout duration, although simulated cholinergic agonist did affect mean number of REM bouts. Our results are consistent with experiments in cats (Masserano and King 1982; Vanni-Mercier et al. 1989), suggesting that the role of cholinergic agonists/antagonists in the regulation of REM sleep may differ between species. Apparent species differences may also be caused by the challenge of localizing microinjections in the small rodent brain (Brown et al. 2006), or they may reflect a limitation in the current model structure. Alternatively, the net effect of a cholinergic agonist on LC population activity may not be purely excitatory given the presence of local GABAergic cells within the LC (Iijima and Ohtomo 1988) and different muscarinic cholinergic receptor subtypes on LC cells (Baghdoyan 1997). In vitro studies have identified an excitatory effect of activation of M2 muscarinic receptors in the LC (Egan and North 1985), but inhibitory actions of other receptor subtypes have been indicated in nearby pontine structures (Egan and North 1986; Gerber et al. 1991). The discrepancies between model and experimental results suggest that variations in network structures for REM regulation should be considered, and they highlight the utility of formal mathematical modeling for constraining conceptual models.

Probing the mechanisms for REM sleep generation

Recent experimental evidence has challenged the cholinergic hypothesis for REM sleep regulation in rodents, and several competing conceptual models of REM sleep regulation have been proposed. Because GABA is the neurotransmitter responsible for the slowing and eventual cessation of activity in the DR and LC that gates the production of REM sleep (Gervasoni et al. 1998; Nitz and Siegel 1997), these models focus on the importance of recently identified REM-active GABAergic populations (Brown et al. 2008; Lu et al. 2006; Luppi et al. 2006; Sapin et al. 2009) and attribute to the cholinergic system varying levels of involvement in REM sleep initiation and maintenance.

Several groups have suggested modifications of the reciprocal interaction model in which LC/DR and LDT/PPT act on intermediate GABAergic populations that ultimately control different aspects of REM sleep. In the cellular-molecular network (CMN) model of REM sleep proposed by Datta and MacLean (2007), ACh from LDT/PPT promotes activity in populations involved in specific aspects of REM sleep, termed REM sleep-sign generators. Simultaneously, local GABAergic populations inhibited LC and DR to facilitate disinhibition of the REM sleep-sign generators. Hence, the roles of these generators in governing specific REM sleep signs were reconciled with significant roles for LC/DR and LDT/PPT. Mallick et al. (2001) also invoked the presence of local GABAergic populations in LC and DR. They suggested that the counterintuitive effects of microinjected cholinergic agonists/antagonists in the LC on REM sleep were caused by local GABAergic mediation of standard cholinergic effects (Mallick et al. 2001). This hypothesis highlights the importance of considering mechanistic differences between the effects of endogenous and exogenous neurotransmitter.

Other groups have rejected the cholinergic hypothesis altogether. Lu et al. (2006) proposed that control of REM sleep is achieved through a REM-on/REM-off flip-flop switch resulting from reciprocal GABAergic inhibition between REM-on neurons in the sublaterodorsal nucleus (SLD) and precoeruleus (PC) and REM-off neurons in the ventrolateral part of the periaqueductal gray matter (vIPAG) and lateral pontine tegmentum (LPT). They noted that LC/DR and LDT/PPT may help to modulate REM sleep, but they did not consider these populations to play essential roles in the circuitry. Luppi and colleagues have proposed that the vIPAG is the most important structure for REM control and that vIPAG contains both REM-on and REM-off neurons (Luppi et al. 2006; Sapin et al. 2009). Local interactions within the vIPAG, as well as interactions with other GABAergic and monoaminergic structures, govern transitions into REM sleep.

McCarley and colleagues suggested a conceptual model that incorporates both cholinergic and GABAergic mechanisms in
the control of REM sleep (Brown et al. 2008). In their proposed model, there is mutual GABAergic inhibition between REM-on neurons in the subcoeruleus and pontine nucleus oralis and REM-off neurons in the LPT, and ACh excites the REM-on neurons and inhibits the REM-off neurons. This provides essential cholinergic modulation of the GABAergic flip-flop structure. Furthermore, because the REM-on GABAergic neurons in subcoeruleus inhibit the LC and DR, indirect reciprocal interaction between monoaminergic and cholinergic populations continues to play a role in this conceptual model of REM sleep regulation.

Although these conceptual models specify the roles of different populations during REM sleep and the projections that cause or reinforce these state-dependent behaviors, they rarely account for mechanisms of transition in and out of REM sleep. In addition, conceptual models often fail to address mechanisms for the regular alternation between NREM and REM sleep that is a feature of normal sleep in several species including humans (Carskadon and Dement 2000). It has been difficult to establish similar periodicity in the polyphasic sleep-wake behavior of rodents. However, if the mechanisms for generating REM sleep are similar across species, the structure of a REM sleep generating network should suggest a basis for NREM-REM periodicity. Dynamic mathematical modeling of the REM-on/REM-off flip-flop switch suggested that both inhibition from the VLPO cluster to the extended VLPO and a drop in extended VLPO activity before sleep onset were necessary to achieve NREM-REM alternation (Rempe et al. 2009), but physiological support for these predictions has not yet been established. However, NREM-REM alternation was an important feature of the McCarley-Hobson reciprocal interaction model (Massaquoi and McCarley 1992; McCarley and Hobson 1975). Although the control parameter regimen (describing rat sleep-wake behavior) for our model did not produce regularly occurring NREM-REM alternation, our network structure admits a similar periodic mechanism.

Control of REM sleep must be understood in the larger context of the regulation of sleep-wake behavior. However, it can be difficult to infer the state-dependent dynamics that result from a given conceptual model. Therefore formal dynamic modeling approaches complement ongoing experimental studies to evaluate proposed network structures and shape our understanding of REM sleep regulation.

APPENDIX

Simulation results in Figs. 3–10 were obtained with equations and parameter values given here except where noted below and in the figure captions. When possible, parameter values were based on experimental data. When such data were unavailable, we chose parameters that were consistent with available experimental characterizations of neuronal populations, neurotransmitter actions, and the state-dependent behavior we expected from the network. Additional details are provided below.

For each neuronal population, the postsynaptic firing rate, \( F_i(s) \) (in Hz, \( X = LC, DR, VLPO, R, \) or \( WR \)), is governed by an equation of the following form

\[
F_i(s) = \frac{F_X(\sum s_{i,X} C_i) - F_X}{\tau_X}
\]

where the steady-state firing rate \( F_X(s) \), is a saturating function, its argument is summed over the neurotransmitters \( i \) = norepinephrine (N), serotonin (S), GABA (G), or acetylcholine (A) released to the postsynaptic population \( X \), the \( s_{i,X} \) are constant weights, and \( \tau_X \) is the time constant associated with the response dynamics of the postsynaptic population. The individual equations for each population are given by the following

\[
F_{LC} = \frac{F_{2LC}[s_{2LC} C_A - s_{2LC} C_K - s_{2LC} C_G + \delta(t)] - F_{LC}}{\tau_{LC}}
\]

\[
F_{DR} = \frac{F_{2DR}[s_{2DR} C_A - s_{2DR} C_S - s_{2DR} C_G + \delta(t)] - F_{DR}}{\tau_{DR}}
\]

\[
F_{VLPO} = \frac{F_{2VLPO}[s_{2VLPO} C_A - s_{2VLPO} C_S - s_{2VLPO} C_G - s_{2VLPO} C_R] - F_{VLPO}}{\tau_{VLPO}}
\]

\[
F_{R} = \frac{F_{2R}[s_{2R} C_A - s_{2R} C_S - s_{2R} C_G - s_{2R} C_R] - F_{R}}{\tau_{R}}
\]

\[
F_{WR} = \frac{F_{2WR}[s_{2WR} C_A - s_{2WR} C_G - s_{2WR} C_R] - F_{WR}}{\tau_{WR}}
\]

The constant weights \( s_{i,X} \) are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
s_{2LC} & = 3.5; \\
s_{2DR} & = 2.5; \\
s_{2VLPO} & = 1.5; \\
s_{2R} & = 2.5; \\
s_{2WR} & = 1.5;
\end{align*}
\]

and were chosen to produce appropriate steady-state behavior in each postsynaptic population during wake, NREM sleep, and REM sleep. For example, because VLPO has a sleep-active firing profile, the parameters \( s_{2VLPO} \) and \( s_{2VLPO} \) were chosen sufficiently large to silence VLPO activity when \( F_{LC} \) and \( F_{DR} \) firing rates were high (as in waking).

The time constants (s) for the firing rate equations are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_{LC} & = 25; \\
\tau_{DR} & = 25; \\
\tau_{VLPO} & = 10; \\
\tau_{R} & = 1; \\
\tau_{WR} & = 10; \\
\end{align*}
\]

The ordering \( \tau_R < \tau_WR = \tau_{VLPO} < \tau_{LC} = \tau_{DR} \) reflects the difference in activation rates between populations with autoexcitatory synapses and populations with autoinhibitory synapses. As described in results, this difference is necessary to obtain sufficiently long REM bout durations.

Inputs to the LC and DR populations include the term \( \delta(t) \) that represents excitatory pulses of random amplitude (mean amplitude of 8 and SD of 0.1) that occur according to a Poisson process with an average rate of 0.003 Hz. The pulses instantaneously activate and decay exponentially with a time constant of 10 s.

For the neuronal populations LC, DR, R, and WR, the steady-state firing rate function has the form \( F_X(c) = X_{max}(0.5[1 + \tanh(c - \beta_X \gamma_X)]) \) with parameters as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
LC_{max} & = 6.5 \text{ Hz}; \\
DR_{max} & = 6.5 \text{ Hz}; \\
R_{max} & = 5 \text{ Hz}; \\
WR_{max} & = 5 \text{ Hz}; \\
VLPO_{max} & = 5 \text{ Hz}; \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_{LC} & = 0.75; \\
\alpha_{DR} & = 0.75; \\
\alpha_R & = 0.25; \\
\alpha_{VLPO} & = 0.25; \\
\beta_{LC} & = 2; \\
\beta_{DR} & = 2; \\
\beta_R & = 0.5; \\
\beta_{VLPO} & = 0.2; \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_X & = -7h; \\
\end{align*}
\]

Parameters describing maximal physiological firing rates of neuronal populations, \( X_{max} \) for \( X = LC, DR, R, WR, \) and VLPO were based on...
experimental data (Aston-Jones and Bloom 1981; Dutta and Siwek 2002; Hobson et al. 1975; Lydic et al. 1983; Steriade et al. 1990; Szymusiak et al. 1998; Trulson and Jacobs 1979; Wu et al. 1999, 2004). The $\alpha_C$ parameters control the slope of the sigmoid describing steady-state firing rates for each population; smaller parameters correspond to steeper slopes. Our choice of $\alpha_C = \alpha_{\text{VLO}} = \alpha_{\text{VLPO}} < \alpha_{\text{LC}} = \alpha_{\text{DR}}$ reflects the autoinhibition in the LC and DR populations that dictates a slower activation rate (Hobson et al. 1975). The $\beta_X$ parameters control the activation thresholds of each postsynaptic population. Therefore we chose the $\beta_X$ in conjunction with the coupling parameters, $g_{X,Y}$, to yield appropriate steady-state firing rates in the postsynaptic population in wake, NREM sleep, and REM sleep. The steady-state firing rate function for VLPO takes a similar form, but the threshold is modulated by the homeostatic sleep drive

$$F_{\text{VLPO}}(c) = V_{\text{LPO}} \max [0.5(1 + \tanh[c - \beta_{\text{VLPO}}(h)/\alpha_{\text{VLPO}}])]$$  

(15)

For the neurotransmitters released by the LC, DR, VLPO, REM-active, and wake/REM-active populations, the normalized neurotransmitter concentrations $C_i(t)$ are determined by equations of the following form

$$C_i'(t) = C_{\text{eq}}(F_X) - C_i/t, \tau_i$$

(16)

where $i = N$ for $X = \text{LC}$; $i = S$ for $X = \text{DR}$; $i = G$ for $X = \text{VLPO}$; $i = A(R)$ for $X = R$; and $i = A(WR)$ for $X = \text{WR}$. Total ACh concentration, $C_{\text{ACh}}$, released to postsynaptic populations is the sum of $C_{\text{AChWR}}$ and $C_{\text{AChVLPO}}$.

The steady-state neurotransmitter release function, $C_{\text{eq}}(\cdot)$, is a saturating function of the form $C_{\text{eq}}(f) = \tanh(f/\gamma_{i})$, and $\tau_i$ is the time constant associated with neurotransmitter release at the population level. As noted previously, although current microdialysis techniques do not allow direct measurement of the rate constants of neurotransmitter release, $\tau_i$ for $i = N, S, A(R), A(WR)$, and $G$, we chose the time scale for these rate constants to be consistent with voltammetric data for the release and clearance of evoked dopamine (Garris and Wightman 1994). The slopes of the steady-state transmitter release functions (Hz) and time constant parameters (s) are

$\gamma_N$, 5; $\gamma_S$, 5; $\gamma_{A(R)} = \gamma_{A(WR)}$, 3; $\gamma_G$, 4; $\tau_N$, 25; $\tau_S$, 25; $\tau_{A(R)} = \tau_{A(WR)}$, 10; $\tau_G$, 10.

The relative magnitudes of $\tau_{A(R)} = \tau_{A(WR)} = \tau_N < \tau_S = \tau_G$ reflect the faster action of ionotropic neurotransmitters ACh and GABA compared with the action of metabolotropic NE and 5-HT (Destexhe et al. 1994). For each neurotransmitter, the steady-state function $C_{\text{eq}}(\cdot)$ is multiplicatively scaled by a random parameter $\sigma(t)$ (of normal distribution, unit mean and SD of 0.1) varying according to a Poisson process with an average rate of 10 Hz.

As described in METHODS, the homeostatic sleep drive, $h$, is governed by the following equation

$$h' = H[(F_{\text{LC}} + F_{\text{DR}}) - \theta_h] \left(1 - \frac{\theta_h}{\tau_{\text{aw}}}\right) - H[\theta_{\text{aw}} - (F_{\text{LC}} + F_{\text{DR}})] \frac{h}{\tau_{\text{aw}}}$$

(17)

where $\theta_h = 3$ Hz and $H[z]$ is the Heaviside function defined as $H[z] = 0$ if $z < 0$ and $H[z] = 1$ if $z \geq 0$. The time constants for the increase of $h$ during wake and its decrease during sleep states are $\tau_{\text{aw}} = 600$ s, and $\tau_{\text{as}} = 320$ s, respectively.

For the simulations of microinjection of transmitter agonists and antagonists in the LC shown in Figs. 6–9, the governing equation for $F_{\text{LC}}$ is

$$F_{\text{LC}} = F_{\text{LC}}(\text{g}_{\text{AChLC}} C_{\text{AChLC}} - \text{g}_{\text{NLC}} C_N - \text{g}_{\text{GLC}} C_{\text{GLC}} + \delta(t)) - F_{\text{LC}}/\tau_{\text{LC}}$$

(18)

where the terms $C_A$ and $C_G$ in Eq. 10 are replaced by $C_{\text{AChLC}}$ and $C_{\text{GLC}}$, respectively, representing the effect of ACh and GABA in the LC. For the agonist microinjection simulations, $C_{\text{AChLC}}$ and $C_{\text{GLC}}$ are given by the following expression

$$C_{\text{AChLC}} = m(t) C_i + P_i$$

(19)

where $i = G$ and $A$. The term $P_i$ represents the concentration of agonist and its decay is described by

$$P_i' = -P_i/t$$

(20)

with time constants set to $\tau_p = 10,000$ s. The factor $m(t)$ scales the level of endogenous neurotransmitter $C_i$ in the LC according to the following rule

- $m(t) = 1$ if $P_i$ levels are low (less than or equal to $i_{\text{min}}$)
- $m(t) = 1 - (P_i - i_{\text{min}})/(i_{\text{max}} - i_{\text{min}})$ if $P_i$ level are higher (greater than $i_{\text{min}}$).

Minimum and maximum values for GABA and ACh agonist concentrations are $i_{\text{min}} = 0.3, G_{\text{max}} = 2.5, A_{\text{min}} = 0.3, \text{and } A_{\text{max}} = 2$, respectively. For the antagonist microinjection simulations, total ACh and GABA concentration levels in the LC were scaled by the antagonist concentration, $Q$ ($i = A$ and $G$). Thus in these simulations, $C_{\text{AChLC}}$ and $C_{\text{GLC}}$ are given by the following expression

$$C_{\text{AChLC}} = (1 - Q) C_i$$

(21)

where the decay of antagonist concentration is governed by

$$Q' = -Q/\tau_Q$$

(22)

with time constants set to $\tau_q = 10,000$ s. Initial values for $P_i$ and $Q$ were zero in all simulations except in Figs. 6, 7, and 9, where microinjection of GABA agonist results were obtained with $P_i(0) = 2.0$ and GABA antagonist results with $Q_i(0) = 1.0$, and in Figs. 8 and 9, where ACh agonist microinjection was simulated by $P_i(0) = 0.8$ and ACh antagonist by $Q_i(0) = 0.55$. Value of these initial conditions were chosen such that agonist and antagonist effects were maintained over simulations of 4 h and produced distinguishable changes in sleep-wake microarchitecture. Larger or smaller values of initial conditions resulted in the same qualitative changes in sleep-wake patterning but with differences in the magnitude of the effects.
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