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Abstract

Motion vision is essential for navigating through the environment. Due to its genetic amenability, the fruit fly Drosophila has served for long as a model organism for studying optomotor behavior as elicited by large-field horizontal motion. However, the neurons underlying the control of this behavior have not been studied in Drosophila so far. Here we report the first whole-cell recordings from three cells of the horizontal system (HSN, HSE and HSS) in the lobula plate of Drosophila. All three HS-cells are tuned to large-field horizontal motion in a direction-selective way: They become excited by front-to-back motion and inhibited by back-to-front motion in the ipsilateral field of view. The response properties of HS-cells like contrast and velocity dependence are in accordance with the correlation-type model of motion detection. Neurobiotin injection suggests extensive coupling among ipsilateral HS-cells and additional coupling to tangential cells that have their dendrites in the contralateral hemisphere of the brain. This connectivity scheme accounts for the complex layout of their receptive fields and explains their sensitivity to ipsilateral as well as to contralateral motion. Thus, the main response properties of Drosophila HS-cells are strikingly similar to the responses of their counterparts in the blow fly Calliphora although we found substantial differences with respect to their dendritic structure and connectivity. This long awaited functional characterization of HS-cells in Drosophila provides the basis for the future dissection of optomotor behavior and the underlying neural circuitry by combining genetics, physiology and behavior.
Introduction

Flies rely heavily on visual motion information to navigate safely through the environment (Borst and Haag 2002). Once airborne, they use the characteristic flow-fields caused by their self-motion to correct for deviations from a straight flight path. The precision and reliability of these so-called optomotor responses, combined with the small size of their brain, make flies an ideal organism to study the underlying neural circuitry (Götz 1964; Heisenberg et al. 1978; Chan et al. 1998; Frye and Dickinson 2001; Egelhaaf et al. 2003).

Detailed anatomical maps describing the cell types of the optic lobes (Strausfeld 1976; Fischbach and Dittrich 1989; Scott et al. 2002) are at hand. In the blow fly Calliphora, about 60 motion sensitive neurons, the so called Lobula Plate Tangential Cells (LPTCs), extract information about large- and small-field motion from the optic flow. Some LPTCs synapse directly onto descending neurons to ultimately control head movement and locomotion (Grunenberg and Strausfeld 1990; Gilbert et al. 1995; Chan et al. 1998).

To analyze neuronal function different approaches were pursued in big and small flies. In Calliphora the response properties of LPTCs have been characterized in greatest detail by intracellular recording (Borst and Haag 2002). Among them, cells of the vertical system (VS) respond preferentially to vertical motion (Hengstenberg et al. 1982) and motion elicited by rotation around an axis in the horizontal plane of the animal (Krapp et al. 1998). Horizontal system- (HS) cells respond to translation (Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b) and rotational motion around the vertical axis of the fly (Krapp et al. 2001). Their tuning to specific optic flow fields can be explained by dendritic input from opposing arrays of local motion detectors built from columnar elements (Borst and Egelhaaf 1990; Single and Borst 1998; Joesch et al. 2008; Raghu
et al. 2007; Raghu et al. 2009) as well as input from other LPTCs (Haag and Borst 2004; Haag and Borst 2007; Elyada et al. 2009; Haag and Borst 2008; Farrow et al. 2006; Farrow et al. 2005).

In *Drosophila*, mainly genetic techniques have been used to disrupt parts of the circuitry and to compare the behavior of wild type and mutant flies (Götz 1964; Götz 1965; Heisenberg and Buchner 1977; Heisenberg, 1972). This approach also allows studying the functional role of small columnar neurons in the medulla presynaptic to LPTCs that could not be recorded electrically so far. In large flies some example recordings (Douglass and Strausfeld 1995; Douglass and Strausfeld 1996; Douglass and Strausfeld 2003; Gilbert and Strausfeld 1991) of a small number of the about 50 different columnar neurons could be obtained. Yet, their small size and the low feasibility of this approach did not provide an exhaustive picture of the cellular mechanisms of visual motion detection in the medulla of dipteran flies.

Recent studies on the behavior of wild type (Tammero et al. 2004; Duistermars et al. 2007; Mronz and Lehmann 2008; Fry et al. 2009) and transgenic *Drosophila* with certain types of columnar neurons blocked (Rister et al. 2007; Katsov and Clandinin 2008; Zhu et al. 2009) provided new insights into motion vision and optomotor behavior. However, these studies also revealed the limitations of behavioral experiments as read-out for the functional role of a specific class of neurons. Moreover, the interpretation of such studies in *Drosophila* relies heavily on physiological data from large flies as only one functional description of LPTCs in *Drosophila* is available so far (Joesch et al. 2008).

We close this gap by characterizing the response properties of the three HS-cells in *Drosophila* that are supposed to mediate yaw turning behavior. We show that their dendritic structure and connectivity to other LPTCs are different compared to
large flies. Nevertheless, their complex receptive fields, contrast dependence and velocity tuning corroborate findings on HS-cells in Calliphora. HS-cells in Drosophila are similarly tuned to rotational large-field horizontal motion and match the predictions of a correlation type model of visual motion detection.
Materials and Methods

Flies

Flies were raised on standard cornmeal-agar medium with a 12 hr light / 12 hr dark cycle, 25 °C, and 60 % humidity. We used female experimental flies, one day after eclosion. The line NP 0282 (established by the NP consortium (for screening see Otsuna and Ito 2006)) expresses Gal4 in two of the three HS-cells (HSN and HSE, Fig. 1A) and in unidentified neurons of the central brain. UAS-mCD8-GFP was used to highlight entire cells and UAS-mCD8-TN-XL-8aa (Joesch et al. 2008) was used to predominantly label cell bodies.

Visually Guided Whole-Cell Recording

Patch-clamp recordings were performed as described previously (Joesch et al. 2008). Flies were anesthetized on ice and waxed on a Plexiglas holder. The head was bent down to expose the caudal backside of the head, and the extended proboscis was fixed. Aluminum foil with a hole of ~1–2 mm sustained by a ring-shaped metal holder was placed on top of the fly and separated the upper wet part (covered with ringer solution (Wilson et al. 2004)) of the preparation from the lower dry part. Water-immersion optics was used from above; visual patterns (see below) were presented to dry and fully intact compound eyes. A small window was cut into the backside of the head, and during mild protease treatment (protease XIV, E.C.3.4.24.31, P-5147, Sigma Aldrich; 2 mg/ml, max 4 min), the neurolemma was partially digested and the main tracheal branches and fat body were removed. The protease was rinsed off carefully and replaced by ringer solution. A saline jet was generated with a ringer-
filled electrode in order to remove the extracellular matrix and to expose the HS-cell
somata for recording.

Genetically labeled green fluorescent HS-cell somata were approached with a patch
electrode filled with a red fluorescent dye (intracellular solution (Wilson and Laurent
2005) containing additional 5 mM Spermine (S-2876, Sigma Aldrich) and 30 mM
Alexa-Fluor-568-hydrazide-Na (A-10441, Molecular Probes) adjusted to pH = 7.3).

Recordings were established under visual control with a 40x water-immersion
objective (LumplanF, Olympus), a Zeiss Microscope (Axiotech Vario 100, Zeiss,
Oberkochen, Germany), fluorescence excitation (100 W fluorescence lamp, heat filter,
neutral-density filter OD 0.3; all from Zeiss, Germany) and a dual-band filter set
(EGFP/DsRed, Chroma Technology, Vermont, USA). During the recordings, the
fluorescence excitation was shut off to prevent blinding of the fly. Patch electrodes of
6-8 MΩ resistance (thin wall, filament, 1.5 mm, WPI, Florida, USA) were pulled on a
Sutter- P97 (Sutter Instrument Company, California, USA). A reference electrode
(Ag-AgCl) was immerged in the extracellular saline (pH 7.3, 1.5 mM CaCl2, no
sucrose). Signals were recorded on a NPI BA-1S Bridge Amplifier (NPI Electronics
GmbH, Tamm, Germany), low-pass filtered at 3 kHz, and digitized at 10 kHz via a
digital-to-analog converter (PCI-DAS6025, Measurement Computing, Massachusetts,
USA) with Matlab (Vers. 7.3.0.267, Mathworks, Massachusetts, USA). After the
recording, several images of each Alexa-filled LPTC were taken at different depths
along the z-axis (HQ-filter set Alexa-568, Chroma Technology, USA) with a CCD
camera (Spot Pursuit 1.4 Megapixel, Visitron Systems GmbH, Puchheim, Germany).

**Immunohistochemistry**
Female flies were dissected three to five days after eclosion. Their brains were removed and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde for 30 minutes at room temperature. Subsequently, the brains were washed for 45-60 minutes in PBT (phosphate buffered saline (pH 7.2) including 1% Triton X-100). For antibody staining, the samples were incubated in PBT including 2% normal goat serum (Sigma Aldrich, G9023) for 1 hour at room temperature followed by incubation with primary antibodies (1:200, overnight at 4 °C). Primary antibodies were removed by several washing steps (5 x 20 minutes in PBT) and secondary antibodies were added (1:200, overnight at 4 °C). The samples were further washed with PBT (3 x 20 minutes) followed by final washing steps in PBS (3 x 20 minutes). The stained brains were mounted in Vectashield (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame) and analyzed by confocal microscopy (see below).

The following primary and secondary antibodies were used: Alexa Fluor 488 rabbit anti-GFP-IgG (A-21311, Molecular Probes), mouse anti-Dlg (4F3, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank (DSHB) and Alexa Fluor 594 goat anti-mouse IgG (A11005, Molecular Probes).

**Intracellular Dye Filling**

Flies expressing mCD8-GFP driven by G73 were decapitated. The cut heads were fixed in a layer of two-component glue (UHU Plus; UHU GmbH & Co. KG, Baden, Germany), with the facet eyes looking downward into the glue. After hardening of the glue (~2 min) the specimen were covered with Ringer’s solution, and the cuticle at the backside of the fly’s head was removed with sharp needles (Neolus, Gx3/4 in. 0.4 x 20 mm). This procedure allowed direct access to the brain. The main tracheal branches were removed. Dye fillings were performed using quartz electrodes (QF 100-60-10; Sutter Instrument, Novato, CA) pulled on a laser puller (P-2000; Sutter)
Instrument). Electrodes were filled with a 10 mM Alexa Fluor 594 solution (A10442; Invitrogen GmbH) and backfilled with 2 M KAc/0.5 M KCl solution. Impaled cells were loaded by negative current pulses for a few seconds. Subsequently, the brains were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde for 15 minutes.

Confocal Microscopy & Reconstruction

Serial optical sections were taken at 0.5 µm intervals with 1024 x 1024 pixel resolution using confocal microscopes (LEICA TCSNT) and oil-immersion 40x (n.a. = 1.25) or 63x (n.a. = 1.4) Plan-Apochromat objectives. The individual confocal stacks were analyzed using Image J (NIH, U.S.A) software. The size, contrast and brightness of the resulting images were adjusted with Photoshop® CS (Adobe Systems, San Jose, CA).

Cells were manually traced using previously described custom written software (Cuntz et al. 2008) resulting in detailed cylinder models. Lobula Plate volumes were reconstructed manually by outlining their outer borders in each slice and sampling surface meshes. Cylinder and volume models were visualized using the Blender animation system (http://www.blender.org).

Neurobiotin Staining

HS-cells were targeted and perfused with patch electrodes as described above. 2 - 4% Neurobiotin (Vector Labs, Burlingame) was added to the intracellular solution. Neurobiotin and Alexa Fluor-568 were coinjected via ± 0.2 nA current pulses for up to 10 min. For initial identification, the perfused individual HS-cell was imaged with the fluorescence microscope and CCD camera as described above. Staining against Neurobiotin with Streptavidin Alexa Fluor-568 conjugate (Invitrogen, 1:100) was
performed as described above, except that whole fly heads were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (2 h) before dissection in PBS. Perfusion of a single HS cell never resulted in more than one Alexa-568-filled cell. Only after labeling of Neurobiotin with Streptavidin- Alexa-568 conjugate did other cells light up. The second red label was used to prevent spectral overlap with the green fluorescence of genetically labeled neurons.

Visual Stimulation

For visual stimulation a custom built LED arena was used based on the open-source information of the Dickinson Laboratory (http://www.dickinson.caltech.edu/panelspage). Our arena consists of 15 by 8 TA08-81GWA dot matrix displays (Kingbright, California, USA), each harboring 8 by 8 individual green (568 nm) LEDs, covering 170° in azimuth and 85° in elevation of the fly’s visual field with an angular resolution of about 1.4° between adjacent LEDs. The arena is capable of frame rates above 600 fps with 16 intensity levels. To measure the velocity tuning, patterns were generated in which four consecutive frames were used to define one image. This resulted in 64 equidistant intensity levels available per pixel. Each dot matrix display is controlled by an ATmega644 microcontroller (Atmel, California, USA) that obtains pattern information from one central ATmega128 based main controller board, which in turn reads in pattern information from a compact flash (CF) memory card. For achieving high frame rates with a system of this size, each panel controller was equipped with an external AT45DB041B flash memory chip for local pattern buffering. Matlab was used for programming and generation of the patterns as well as for sending the serial command
sequences via RS-232 to the main controller board and local buffering. The luminance range of the stimuli was 0-8 cd/m².

Large-field stimuli covered the whole extent of the arena. To study direction selectivity, sine gratings of four different orientations (spatial wavelength: 42.5° for the horizontal, 45° for the vertical and 32° for the diagonal patterns) moving in eight different directions at a temporal frequency of 1Hz were presented.

For the velocity tuning, two sine-gratings of either 22.4° or 44.8° spatial wavelength were presented moving at 9 different angular velocities corresponding to temporal frequencies of 0.1 to 5 Hz. The sequence of velocities was changed during experiments.

To study contrast dependency, a square-wave grating of 34° spatial wavelength moved at a constant angular velocity of 34°/s corresponding to a temporal frequency of 1Hz. Contrast was calculated as \((I_{\text{max}} - I_{\text{min}})/(I_{\text{max}} + I_{\text{min}})\). With the 16 intensity levels of the LEDs, seven pattern contrasts could be obtained ranging from 100 % down to 6.7 % at the same mean luminance. To obtain a lower contrast of 3.3 %, four consecutive image frames were used to define one image as described above.

The square-wave grating (spatial wavelength: 22.4°, angular velocity: 22.4°/s) used for either ipsilateral or contralateral stimulation covered about 56° in azimuth and 85° in elevation and was displaced by ±15° relative to frontal gaze.

The local response characteristics of HS-cells were determined using a previously described stimulus (Nordstrom et al. 2008; Wertz et al. 2009). A small bar of 5.6° length and 1.4° width was moved horizontally from the contra- to the ipsilateral side and back again at different elevations or vertically downward and upward at different positions along the azimuth. For both the vertical and horizontal stimulus an area of
about 145° along the azimuth and 85° of elevation was covered. A typical response trace for the horizontal and the vertical local stimulus is shown in Suppl. Fig. 2.

Data Analysis

Data were acquired and analyzed with the data acquisition and analysis toolboxes of Matlab. Receptive fields were calculated by binning the responses of single HS-cells to horizontal stimulation (~5.6° elevation and ~5.6° azimuth) and subtracting the mean response during null direction from the mean response during preferred direction motion. The receptive fields of all HS-cells of a certain type were averaged, smoothed by convolving them with a 3x3 kernel approximating an isotropic Gaussian function, and normalized to maximal value.

The horizontal and vertical sensitivity components for the vector fields were calculated locally and used to calculate a single local vector for each region which results in the shown vector fields. Importantly, it was recently shown that these x- and y-components are fully sufficient to determine the local orientation tuning and directional preference of the cell (Wertz et al. 2009).

For analyzing the velocity dependence the mean response of the first 500 ms after the onset of PD motion was taken. In all other cases the mean over the whole stimulus duration was calculated. The mean potential during 500ms before stimulus onset was used as a baseline and subtracted from this response.
Results

Based on anatomical similarity to the three horizontally sensitive LPTCs in blow flies (Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b), the horizontal system of *Drosophila* has been proposed to consist of the three giant output neurons HSN, HSE and HSS (Heisenberg et al. 1978; Fischbach and Dittrich 1989). The dendrites of these cells reside in a thin anterior layer of the Lobula Plate (Fig. 1A) where they cover the dorsal, middle and ventral part of this retinotopically organized neuropile, respectively (Heisenberg et al. 1978; Scott et al. 2002). Their axons project centrally to the lateral protocerebrum where they are supposed to synapse onto descending neurons (Eckert and Meller 1981; Haag et al. 2007) and thus to control optomotor turning responses induced by horizontal optic flow.

We performed *in-vivo* whole cell recordings from the somata of HS-cells and characterized their response properties during large-field visual motion (Fig. 1B). In the first series of experiments reproducible recordings from identified cells were enabled using the NP 0282 Gal4 driver line. At the level of the Lobula Plate, NP 0282 specifically labels HSN and HSE (Fig. 1A). Despite the lack of HSS, NP 0282 was chosen to express a green fluorescent marker that highlights the soma (Joesch et al. 2008) of HSN and HSE under the fluorescence microscope. The recording electrode was visualized by adding a red fluorescent dye to the electrode solution, which allowed directing the electrode under visual guidance towards the green cell bodies. During the recording, the cells became perfused with the red dye and the recorded signals could be assigned to the specific cell type. In these recordings, HS-cells exhibited a resting membrane potential of about -55 mV (corrected for liquid junction potential) and an input resistance of 10 - 20 MΩ (n = 25). At rest, all recorded HS-
cells showed small and rapid spontaneous membrane fluctuations of high frequency (Fig. 1C).

**HSN and HSE are tuned to horizontal motion in a direction-selective way.**

When stimulated with a large-field sine grating (spatial wavelength = 42.5°) moving front-to-back in front of the ipsilateral eye (including an area of back-to-front motion in the contralateral eye), HS-cells canonically exhibited a graded depolarization superimposed by spike-like events (Fig. 1C). Motion in the opposite direction led to a hyperpolarization of the membrane potential and a reduction of the fast spike-like events. Presentation of sine gratings moving in four different orientations and a total of eight different directions revealed a strong directional tuning of both HSN and HSE (black and grey bars, respectively, Fig. 1D) to large-field horizontal motion, similar to their counterparts in *Calliphora*. Ipsilateral front-to-back motion elicited the strongest activation (preferred direction, PD) and back-to-front motion the strongest inhibition (null direction, ND). Typically, ND responses were smaller in amplitude than PD responses. Diagonal motion led to weaker responses and almost no responses were elicited by vertical motion in either direction. Thus, HS-cells in *Drosophila* are tuned to large-field horizontal motion in a directional selective way.

**HS-cell responses suggest input from correlation-type motion detectors**

According to the correlation-type model for elementary motion detection (Reichardt 1961; Borst and Egelhaaf 1989), motion information is extracted from the retinal image by a multiplicative interaction of luminance signals from two neighboring receptors after delaying one of them in time. Large-field directional
selectivity of LPTCs can then arise from spatial integration of input from two arrays
of such detectors, one excitatory and the other inhibitory, that compute local motion
information with opposite preferred direction (Single et al. 1997; Single and Borst
1998; Raghu et al. 2007; Raghu et al. 2009; Joesch et al. 2008). The output of such a
correlation-type model has certain features that we tested for in HS-cell responses.
These features are the appearance of a velocity optimum (Reichardt 1961) (Fig. 2A),
the linear dependency of this velocity optimum on the spatial wavelength of the
moving grating (Fig. 2B), the dependence of the response on the magnitude of
contrast (Buchner 1984) (Fig. 2C) and the independence of the sign of contrast
(Egelhaaf and Borst 1992) (Fig. 2D). To characterize the velocity dependence of HS-
cells in response to PD motion, we presented sine gratings of 22° or 44° spatial
wavelength (inset Fig. 2A) at nine different velocities (Fig. 2A). For both patterns the
HS-cell response increased non-linearly, exhibited a maximum response at an angular
velocity of 22°/s and 44°/s, respectively, and declined at higher velocities (Fig. 2A).
For both patterns this resulted in a maximal response at around 1 Hz (velocity [deg/s]
divided by spatial wavelength [deg]), which represents the so called temporal
frequency optimum, a hallmark of the correlation-type detector model (Fig. 2B).
The dependency of the response on the magnitude of contrast was shown by
presenting square-wave gratings (spatial wavelength: 34°) of different contrast
ranging from 3.3 to 100 % which were moving at a constant velocity of 34°/s (Fig.
1C). For both PD and ND motion the response amplitudes increased with pattern
contrast and PD responses saturated at higher contrast (Fig. 2C). Furthermore, the
correlation-type motion detector reports the direction of movement independent of the
sign of contrast. In accordance with this prediction, a moving dark bar on a light
background or a moving light bar on a dark background evoked depolarizing PD
responses for front-to-back motion and hyperpolarizing ND responses for back-to-
front motion (Fig. 2D). In these experiments a still bar was presented to the
contralateral field of view, began to move at time a, entered the ipsilateral field of
view at time b, continued its way and stopped at a lateral position at time c. From
there it moved back by reversing the sequence c’, b’ and a’ (Fig. 2D). Regressive
motion of the bar through the contralateral visual field of view elicited a depolarizing
response, which was, however, smaller than that caused by ipsilateral progressive
motion (see below). Taken together, the response properties of HS-cells are indicative
of presynaptic computations according to the correlation-type model of motion
detection.

**HS-cells of one hemisphere have strongly overlapping, binocular receptive fields**

The environment, as scanned by the ipsilateral compound eye, is mapped
retinotopically onto the columnar elements that are supposed to provide the synaptic
input to the giant HS-cell dendrites in the Lobula Plate (Strausfeld 1984; Braitenberg
1970). As a consequence of this layout, the position and the branching pattern of an
HS-cell within the Lobula Plate (Fig. 3A) should be predictive of its ipsilateral
receptive field (Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b). To analyze the dendritic structure of
all three HS-cells in detail we filled HSS of one hemisphere with a red fluorescent dye
in three flies, in which HSN and HSE were labeled with GFP, and reconstructed their
dendritic trees from confocal image stacks (Suppl. Fig. 1, Fig. 3A). The dendrites of
HSN, HSE and HSS cover dorsal, equatorial and ventral parts of the Lobula Plate
where they occupy on average 70 %, 90 % and 75 % of the total area, respectively.
The overlap of their dendritic spanning fields is extremely large (Fig. 3B); HSE
covers about 90 % of HSN and about 80 % of HSS. A dendritic branch of HSE
reaches close to the dorsal most boundary of HSN (Fig. 3A). Even HSN and HSS dendrites overlap to about 20 %. Any deviation of the receptive field from this anatomical map can possibly be attributed to input from neurons other than the columnar ones.

In the course of our experiments we occasionally recorded from genetically unlabeled HS-cells in different genotypes that represented control situations and identified the recorded cells by filling them with the red-fluorescent dye of the electrode solution. The recordings of these cells were indistinguishable from our previous recordings of genetically labeled HSE and HSN and included recordings from HSS-cells that were not highlighted by the Gal4-driver in the previous experiments. We analyzed the receptive fields of genetically labeled and unlabeled HSN-, HSE- and HSS-cells, respectively, by presenting a small vertical bar (5.6° high and 1.4° wide) moving horizontally at different positions subtending 145° along the azimuth and about 85° of elevation (see methods section and Wertz et al. 2009; Nordstrom et al. 2008). A typical response trace recorded during such an experiment is shown in Suppl. Fig. 2. The relatively large membrane potential fluctuations in response to this local motion stimulus suggest a rather unexpected (Borst and Haag 1996) short electrotonic distance from the dendrite to the recorded soma or alternatively active processes that enhance signal propagation (Gouwens and Wilson 2009). However, these results and the presence of small EPSPs in all recordings suggest that even potential unitary events propagate well to the soma.

We binned the response within a time window that corresponded to motion of about 5.6° along the azimuth and plotted the normalized response amplitudes (PD - ND) in false color code against the position of the bar on the arena (Fig. 3C). As the arena is only curved in the horizontal direction, the size of the bar as stated above is
only valid for the equatorial position and appeared slightly smaller to the fly in the dorsal and ventral part of the visual field. Our analysis revealed that HSN-, HSE- and HSS-cells in Drosophila have large receptive fields that cover at their largest extent over 60° of elevation. HS-cells are most sensitive to motion at positions corresponding to their dendritic trees in the Lobula Plate, which is dorsal for HSN, equatorial for HSE and ventral for HSS (Fig. 3A and C). In contrast to Calliphora (Hausen 1982b), however, HSE in Drosophila seems to be maximally sensitive in the lateral visual field and not in the frontal one.

To estimate the amount of overlap between the receptive fields of HSN, HSE and HSS, a threshold of either 25 % or 50 % of the maximal response was set. The areas where the responses of HSN, HSE or HSS exceeded the threshold were encircled in blue, red and green, respectively (Fig. 3D). If a threshold of 25% is used, the receptive fields of HSN and HSS overlap strongly with that of HSE. The receptive field of HSN reaches almost as far ventrally as that of HSE and that of HSS nearly as far dorsally as that of HSE. In an equatorial area extending up to 40° in the dorso-ventral axis the receptive fields of all three HS-cells overlap. Even if a threshold of 50 % is used, there is a small equatorial region, where the receptive fields of all three HS-cells intersect. The huge overlap of the receptive fields of HSN, HSE and HSS corresponds in part to the overlap of their dendrites stated above. However, the dorso-ventral extension of the receptive field of HSE seems to be somewhat smaller than expected from its dendritic spanning field (compare Figs. 3B, C and D). One explanation might be that we miss signals from remote dendrites due to recording from the soma and thus underestimate the size of the receptive field. In contrast, the lack of dendritic branches of HSN in the ventral area indicates that the ventral
extension of the receptive field of HSN cannot be explained by direct input to the
dendrite alone (compare Fig. 3B and D).

Another interesting feature of the receptive fields of HSN and HSE is their
sensitivity to contralateral motion (Hausen 1982a; Krapp et al. 2001) (Fig. 4). We
presented moving square-wave gratings in either the ipsilateral or the contralateral
part of the visual field to investigate this in further detail. The pattern covered about
56° in azimuth and 85° in elevation. To prevent stimulation of the area of binocular
overlap, which consists of three vertical rows of ommatidia (Heisenberg and Wolf
1984), the pattern was displaced by +/- 15° with respect to the frontal gaze of the fly
(Fig. 4). Motion in front of the ipsilateral eye elicited canonical PD and ND responses
i.e. a depolarization for front-to-back and a hyperpolarization for back-to-front
motion. Contralateral back-to-front motion, however, elicited a robust depolarization
whereas contralateral front-to-back motion did not elicit a noticeable response. Thus,
HSN and HSE are tuned to rotational panoramic motion stimuli as they arise from
rotation of the animal around the vertical body axis. Importantly, their sensory input is
not confined to the retinotopically organized columnar neurons that impinge onto their
dendritic tree.

We characterized the receptive fields in further detail by presenting a local bar
moving vertically in addition to the horizontally moving bar as shown above (see
methods section and Nordstrom et al. 2008; Wertz et al. 2009). From the responses to
local horizontal and vertical motion, we calculated response vectors that indicate by
their orientation the local preferred direction and by their length the strength of the
response. Motion vectors calculated this way were recently shown to be identical to
resulting motion vectors calculated from periodic gratings that drifted in many
different orientations and directions (Wertz et al. 2009). All local vectors together
constitute the optic flow field of a given HS-cell (Fig. 5). All three HS-cells exhibited a slight vertical sensitivity. HSN (Fig. 5A) and to a weaker extent HSE (Fig. 5B) depolarize in response to upward motion in the fronto-dorsal and fronto-equatorial part of their receptive fields. HSS shows a similar sensitivity to upward motion in a more ventro-lateral position (Fig. 5C).

Dye-coupling suggests that HS-cells are part of a network of electrically coupled neurons.

In *Calliphora*, complex receptive fields of VS- and HS-cells arise from electric coupling to other LPTCs and descending neurons (Cuntz et al. 2007; Haag and Borst 2004). Injection of Neurobiotin, a molecule sufficiently small to pass Innexin-based gap junctions, and double recording revealed that neurons that allow the spread of neurobiotin are indeed electrically coupled in *Calliphora* (Haag and Borst 2005).

We investigated whether this holds also true for HS-cells in *Drosophila*. For that purpose, Neurobiotin was added to the intracellular solution in the recording electrode. GFP-labeled HSN- or HSE-cells were filled via their somata. We used patch electrodes instead of sharp electrodes to avoid unspecific labeling that might be caused by brief penetration of other neurons. Perfusion with Alexa-568 allowed for immediate identification of the recorded neuron. Later, the spread of Neurobiotin was detected by staining with Streptavidin-coupled Alexa-568 (Joesch et al. 2008). As the initially perfused free Alexa-568 never stained other cells except the injected one, we concluded that fluorescence after streptavidin-Alexa-568 labeling in other cells is due to direct or indirect coupling via electrical synapses to the recorded cell (Fig. 6).
When we injected Neurobiotin into either HSN (Fig. 6A, B) or HSE (Fig. 6C), one or both of the remaining ipsilateral HS-cells were typically labeled. In contrast to similar experiments in *Calliphora*, no CH-cells were found to be co-labeled (Haag and Borst 2005). From this observation we conclude that HS-cells in *Drosophila* are directly or indirectly coupled with each other. Nevertheless, we observed additional staining in fibers other than the three HS-cells in the same Lobula Plate (Fig. 6A and C). Unfortunately the staining was too weak to enable unequivocal identification of these processes. In these cases the arborization of an LPTC in the contralateral Lobula Plate was also labeled (filled arrows in Fig. 6A and C) that might belong to the unidentified ipsilateral processes mentioned before. This cell represents a likely candidate neuron to provide contralateral input to HS-cells (Fig. 2, 3 and 4). In addition, HS-cells were extensively dye-coupled to descending neurons (open triangles in Fig. 6A and C) that could not be identified individually. One frequently labeled neuron has a prominent arborization on the contralateral side and probably connects the output region of HS-cells of both hemispheres (arrowhead in Fig. 6A and C). Taken together, our findings suggest that HS-cells are part of a complicated network of electrically coupled neurons. This network comprises descending neurons, ipsilateral HS-cells and LPTCs from the same and the contralateral hemisphere so far unidentified in *Drosophila*. The columnar input to the ipsilateral dendrite and the electric coupling to the LPTC network are likely sufficient to account for the wide receptive fields and rotational tuning of HS-cells.
Discussion

*Drosophila* reacts to horizontally drifting retinal images with compensatory yaw-torque responses to stabilize straight flight segments (Heisenberg and Wolf 1984). The giant HS-cells in the Lobula Plate are thought to play a key role in the control of this behavior. However, their exact role remains elusive. Patch-clamp recordings in *Drosophila* were only established recently (Wilson et al. 2004) and physiological data from *Drosophila* HS-cells were not available so far. We used the Gal4/UAS-system (Brand and Perrimon 1993) to fluorescently label two of the three HS-cells, HSN and HSE, which allowed for the investigation of their basic anatomy (Fig. 1 and 3) and targeting for reliable recordings from their somata (Fig. 1 - 3); neighboring HSS-cells were recorded and filled without the use of genetic labeling (Fig. 3 and 5). In *Drosophila*, whole-cell recordings are so far only feasible from the soma. They allow for reliable and stable recordings for up to one hour. We describe the response characteristics of all three giant neurons of the HS-system in *Drosophila*, their directional selective output, receptive field organization and network interactions.

Basic response properties of *Drosophila* HS-cells.

Concerning their basic response properties, we found that HS-cells in *Drosophila* are largely similar to their counterparts in *Calliphora* (Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b). They respond to horizontal motion with graded membrane potential changes in a directional selective way (Fig. 1). Their responses are indicative of input from elementary motion detectors of the correlation-type (Fig. 2), as they are independent of the sign of contrast and exhibit a velocity optimum that linearly depends on the spatial wavelength of the moving periodic grating. Such a dependency
results in a single temporal frequency optimum and is a characteristic feature of presynaptic computations according to the correlation-type detector model (Reichardt 1961; Borst and Egelhaaf 1989). The temporal frequency optimum of 1 Hz (Fig. 2B) precisely matches the results from our previous account on *Drosophila* VS-cells (Joesch et al. 2008) and findings from H1-cells in *Calliphora* (Haag et al. 2004). However, recordings from HS-cells in *Calliphora* resulted in higher values of 2 – 5 Hz (Hausen 1982b), suggesting slight differences between the two fly species. The quadratic dependence of the response on the contrast predicted by a correlation-type detector model is generally found only in the low contrast range (Buchner 1984). However, a detailed and satisfying analysis of the low contrast regime can not be performed using our LED arena. At higher contrasts, the responses saturate (Fig. 2C) probably due to a gain control mechanism in elementary motion detectors. The cellular implementation of these motion detectors is still an open question in the field.

**Anatomical layout of HS-cell dendrites and receptive fields.**

The image of the environment is represented by retinotopically organized columnar maps in the optic lobes (Strausfeld 1976; Braitenberg 1970; Strausfeld 1984). Within this arrangement, the dendrite of each of the HS-cells occupies about 40-45 % of the Lobula Plate in *Calliphora* (Hausen 1982a), but 70-90 % in *Drosophila*. In *Calliphora*, the dendrites of HSN and HSS overlap to some extent with those of HSE, but not with each other. In *Drosophila*, in contrast, we find an area in the Lobula Plate, where all three cells overlap (Fig. 3A). Thus, the overlap is much larger in *Drosophila* (Heisenberg et al. 1978) than in *Calliphora*. In both cases female flies were studied to exclude sex-specific differences. Such differences in LPTC anatomy and number between different dipteran species have been described and were
linked to differences in flight style and behavior (Buschbeck and Strausfeld 1997; Nordstrom et al. 2008).

The areas covered by the dendrites of HSN, HSE and HSS correspond to the centers of large dorsal, equatorial and ventral receptive fields, respectively. Yet, the ipsilateral receptive field of HSN exceeds the area occupied by its dendrite in the Lobula Plate significantly (Fig. 3). In addition, HSN and HSE are both sensitive to contralateral motion. These receptive fields of HS-cells can be explained by assuming 1) dendritic input from local motion detectors, 2) electric coupling to neighboring HS-cells and 3) input from contralateral neurons tuned to regressive motion. The evidence for this input organization is discussed below.

(1) Ipsilateral columnar input.

The excitatory and inhibitory responses of HS-cells suggest that *Drosophila* HS-cells receive input from two types of elementary motion detectors with opposite preferred direction (Borst and Egelhaaf 1990; Borst et al. 1995; Single and Borst 1998). Further evidence for this scheme comes from the localization of excitatory cholinergic and inhibitory GABAergic synapses on the dendritic tips of VS- and HS-cells in *Drosophila* (Raghu et al. 2007; Raghu et al. 2009) and the simultaneous integration of excitatory and inhibitory input with separate reversal potentials during grating motion (Joesch et al. 2008).

The retinotopic arrangement of the detectors is further supported by our finding that HS-cells respond to local motion stimuli with a strong preference for horizontal motion. Moreover, gradual changes in local PD with a bias to upward motion were observed in the dorsofrontal (HSN and HSE) and ventrolateral (HSS) margins of the receptive field (Fig. 5). Sensitivity to vertical motion in parts of the
receptive field was also reported for HS-cells in Calliphora and was attributed to the arrangement of the ommatidial lattice in the corresponding parts of the eye (Hausen 1982b). Most likely this holds also true for Drosophila (Heisenberg and Wolf 1984). Neurobiotin did not spread from HS- to vertically sensitive LPTCs in Drosophila (Fig. 6) although connections between HSN and lateral VS-cells were reported in Calliphora (Haag and Borst 2005). However, in Calliphora these connections are supplied via the dCH cell (Haag and Borst 2007) and CH-cells could not be found in Drosophila so far.

(2) Coupling to neighboring HS-cells

In flies, electrical connectivity schemes based on Neurobiotin coupling were previously shown to be in accordance with data obtained from double recordings (Haag and Borst 2005; Fan et al. 2005). As our Neurobiotin injections resulted in highly reproducible patterns of stained cells, we conclude that it is a useful tool for studying direct or indirect electrical coupling. However, dye-coupling alone does not allow to draw conclusions about the strength and functional significance of these connections.

Direct electric coupling between neighboring HS-cells or via descending neurons is suggested by the spread of Neurobiotin (Fig. 6) and provides the most plausible explanation for the observed broad ipsilateral receptive field of HSN (Fig. 3). A similar ipsilateral coupling has been found in the VS-cell network in Drosophila (Joesch et al. 2008) and within and between the HS- and VS-system of Calliphora (Haag and Borst 2004; Farrow et al. 2005; Haag and Borst 2007). In the VS-system of Calliphora lateral connections are thought to be responsible for the large receptive fields and, hence, the robustness of the response against inhomogeneous contrast
distribution in the visual scene (Cuntz et al. 2007). However, HS-cells in *Calliphora*
are coupled to each other only indirectly via the dorsal and ventral CH-cell (Haag and
Borst 2002; Cuntz et al. 2003), which, by this way, receive graded input from HS-
cells. In response to large-field motion, CH-cells in turn inhibit so-called figure-
detection neurons, thereby tuning them to small-field motion (Warzecha et al. 1993;
Cuntz et al. 2003; Egelhaaf 1985; Haag and Borst 2002). It is unclear how *Drosophila*
solves this problem.

The fact that CH-cells were never detected in our experiments matches their
absence in any of the Gal4 screens and any of the detailed anatomical descriptions
reported so far in *Drosophila* (Fischbach and Dittrich 1989). The weakly stained
fibers next to HS-cells (Fig. 6) in the ipsilateral Lobula Plate could not be identified
due to their week Neurobiotin labeling. The very strong and reliable coupling of HS-
and CH-cells in *Calliphora* makes it unlikely that these weakly stained fibers
represent the processes of *Drosophila* CH-cells. They could rather belong to the
heterolateral projecting neurons (see below).

(3) Input from neurons with contralateral receptive fields.

In addition to two sources of ipsilateral input, we found sensitivity to contralateral
back-to-front motion in HSN and HSE. The heterolateral projecting LPTCs detected
after Neurobiotin injection (Fig. 5A and C) are good candidates to provide this input.
They might correspond to either H1 or H2, two heterolateral spiking neurons that
provide input to contralateral HS-cells in *Calliphora* (Haag and Borst 2001; Hausen
1982a; Hausen 1982b; Horstmann et al. 2000). Both cells have their dendrites in the
contralateral Lobula Plate where they respond to back-to-front motion with an
increase in spike frequency. The axonal arborization of H1 is in the ipsilateral Lobula
Plate. H2 axons project to the output region of HS-cells in the ipsilateral protocerebrum, where they make electric contacts with HS-cells. Due to the many other labeled cells and relatively weak labeling of the heterolateral neurons we could not determine if Neurobiotin labeled H1, H2 or a third cell type. As in *Calliphora* (Götz and Buchner 1978; Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b; Reichardt and Egelhaaf 1988; Hausen and Wehrhahn 1989), HSS in *Drosophila* does not respond to motion in the contralateral visual field.

Ultimately, navigation and course control in flies rely on the analysis of optic flow. Neurons that contribute to the underlying computations possess wide dendritic fields and further increase their receptive fields by connections to functionally related ipsilateral and contralateral neurons. Our data suggests that this principle is retained in the HS-system of *Drosophila*, but it remains to be analyzed how the observed differences to *Calliphora* translate into differences in optomotor behavior.

**Behavioral relevance**

HS-cells are supposed to be key-players for the control of optomotor turning responses elicited by horizontal motion. This notion is mostly based on the observation that electrical responses of HS-cells in *Calliphora* and optomotor torque responses in *Musca* and *Drosophila* show a similar dependence on spatial features of moving visual stimuli (Götz and Buchner 1978; Hausen 1982a; Hausen 1982b; Reichardt and Egelhaaf 1988; Hausen and Wehrhahn 1989). In addition, elimination of the HS-system in *Musca* by laser ablation (Geiger and Nässel 1981) and the *omb* mutation in *Drosophila* (largely missing HS-cells and many other LPTCs and
columnar neurons absent, (omb, Heisenberg et al. 1978)) lead to severe deficits in the
execution of optomotor yaw responses.

We found that HSN and HSE in Drosophila are tuned to binocular rotational
motion around the vertical body axis (Fig. 3 and 4). Their responses exhibit a similar
dependency on features of the stimulus as optomotor yaw-torque responses, in
particular a temporal frequency optimum of about 1 Hz (Fig. 2A and B) (Götz 1964;
Buchner 1984). Thus, our experiments corroborate their functional contribution to
compensatory turning behavior. This consent, however, is somewhat questioned by
recently published behavioral experiments that report an optimum response between 5
and 10 Hz (Duistermars et al. 2007; Fry et al. 2009). At this frequency, however, HS-
cell responses (Fig. 2) and previously measured yaw-torque (Götz 1964) were reduced
to less than half of the maximal response. It remains speculative if this discrepancy
can be attributed to differences in the stimulus presentation.

Further measurements are required to investigate if HS-cells in Drosophila
also encode information about the structure of the visual surround during translational
motion, as is suggested from experiments in blow flies (Boeddeker and Egelhaaf
2005; Kern et al. 2005). Also, lateral expansion stimuli need to be analyzed as they
were reported to elicit larger optomotor responses than rotational ones (Tammero et
al. 2004; Duistermars et al. 2007). In summary, HS-cell output very likely feeds into
multisensory neural circuits that control different behaviors of the fly (Frye and
Dickinson 2001; Frye and Dickinson 2004).

Concluding remarks

HS-cells in Drosophila and large dipteran flies have largely similar response
properties despite substantial differences in the organization of the neural circuitry for
the detection of horizontal optic flow. Their responses are indicative of a correlation-
type motion detector model. The overlap and relative size of ipsilateral HS-cell
dendrites is larger in Drosophila. CH-cells, that link the HS- and VS-system in
Calliphora and that are key elements of a circuitry dedicated to the detection of small
moving objects, were not found in Drosophila. In addition, Drosophila HS-cells
exhibit a somewhat lower temporal frequency optimum than their counterparts in
Calliphora. These differences might reflect adaptations to different lifestyles, as the
basic response properties of large-field motion-sensitive neurons seem to match
differences in flight style (O'Carroll et al. 1996). Our functional and anatomical
characterization of the HS-cell circuitry in Drosophila can now serve to dissect (a) the
presynaptic motion detection circuitry and (b) the exquisite control mechanism of
compensatory optomotor responses by combining genetic manipulation of neuronal
function with physiological recording and behavioral analysis.
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Figure 1. Basic anatomy and response properties of HS-cells in *Drosophila*.

(A) The Gal4-line NP0282 drives expression of the fluorescent marker mCD8-GFP in two neurons of the Lobula Plate. Based on their anatomy and on comparable neurons in large dipteran flies these neurons were previously described as the northern (HSN) and equatorial (HSE) cells of the *Drosophila* HS-system. Their dendrites cover large overlapping areas (frontal section) in a thin anterior layer (horizontal section) of the Lobula Plate. For whole cell recordings from these neurons only their somata were fluorescently labeled (see methods). Scale bars 25 µm. (B) Scheme of the recording setup and preparation of the fly under the fluorescence microscope. In the lower dry half of the preparation the fly is looking at moving patterns presented on a LED arena. (C) Canonical response of an HSN-cell plotted against time. A vertical sine grating (λ = 42.5°) moving horizontally (temporal frequency = 1 Hz) elicits a directionally selective response. Large-field rotation with an ipsilateral front-to-back component (preferred direction, PD) elicits a strong depolarization. Motion in the opposite direction (null direction, ND) elicits a strong hyperpolarization of the membrane potential. Small, fast membrane fluctuations increase in size during PD-motion. (D) Directional tuning. Plotted is the mean response amplitude during 5 s grating motion (same stimulus as in (C)) in four different orientations and a total of eight different directions. HSN and HSE respond strongest to horizontal motion. Error bars indicate SEM.
Figure 2. HSN and HSE responses match the predictions of a correlation-type motion detector. (A) Velocity dependence. Two sine gratings of different spatial wavelength ($\lambda = 22.4^\circ$ and $\lambda = 44.8^\circ$) moving at nine different velocities elicited a velocity optimum that depended on the spatial wavelength of the pattern. Plotted is the mean response during the first 500 ms after onset of PD motion, normalized to the maximal response for each fly. N = 10 for each grating, error bar: SEM. (B) Constant temporal frequency optimum of 1 Hz. Same data as in (A) plotted against the temporal frequency ($\text{tf} = \text{velocity} / \lambda$). (C) Contrast dependence. Square wave gratings ($\lambda = 34^\circ$) of different contrast moving in PD or ND ($\text{tf} = 1 \text{ Hz}$) were presented. Plotted is the mean response during 5 s of motion normalized to the maximal response of each HS-cell. Response amplitudes increase with contrast, but exhibit saturation. N = 19, error bars: SEM. (D) Independence of the sign of contrast. Example trace of an HS-cell responding to a light bar on a dark background and a dark bar on a light background moving in PD and ND (width of the bar: 8.5°, maximal contrast). The direction of motion is reported by the membrane potential independent of the sign of contrast. a, b and c and a’, b’ and c’ mark the time points at which the bar occupied the respective positions on the arena (see inset). Note that HS-cells respond to motion on the contralateral side (a to b and b’ to a’) as well. Ipsilateral motion elicited stronger responses (b to c and c’ to b’).
Figure 3. Dendritic structure and receptive fields of HSN, HSE and HSS.

(A) Reconstruction of the dendritic arborization of HSN (blue), HSE (red) and HSS (green) in the Lobula Plate from confocal image stacks (HSN and HSE were GFP-labeled and HSS was filled with Alexa Fluor 594). Scale bar: 20 µm. (B) Outline of the dendritic spanning field of HSN (blue), HSE (red) and HSS (green) from (A). In particular the spanning fields of HSE and HSS cover large parts of the Lobula Plate and the dendrites of all three HS-cell dendrites overlap extensively. (C) Receptive fields of HSN, HSE and HSS. Plotted are response amplitudes (PD - ND) elicited by a small bar moving horizontally at different elevations normalized to the maximal response. HSN, HSE and HSS are most responsive to motion at positions covered by their own dendritic trees in the Lobula Plate (that is more dorsal for HSN, equatorial for HSE and more ventral for HSS). HSN and HSE additionally respond to contralateral motion. All HSS responses were recorded from cells (n = 5) without GFP expression, all HSN responses from genetically labeled cells (n = 7). Data for HSE are from unlabeled (n = 4) and GFP labeled (n = 4) cells. (D) Overlap of the receptive fields. The amount of overlap between the receptive fields of HSN (blue), HSE (red) and HSS (green) was estimated by applying a threshold of 50 % or 25 % of the maximal response in (C). For both thresholds the receptive fields of all three HS cells intersect in the equatorial area. Compare to the overlap of the dendritic trees in (B).
Figure 4. Sensitivity to contralateral motion.

Square wave gratings ($\lambda = 22.4^\circ$) were presented in either the contra- or the ipsilateral visual field as shown in the schematic drawing (sparing the frontal region of binocular overlap). Contralateral back-to-front motion elicited a weak depolarization of the membrane potential in HS-cells and a strong depolarization in response to ipsilateral front-to-back motion. $N = 6$, error bar: SEM.
**Figure 5. Vector fields of HSN (A), HSE (B) and HSS (C).**

Local preferred direction and response strength of all three HS-cells are indicated by the orientation and lengths of the motion vectors (arrows). Vectors were calculated by subtracting PD- and ND-responses to small bars moving either horizontally or vertically at different positions (compare Fig. 3). Similar to HSN and HSE the maximum sensitivity in the ventral receptive field of HSS corresponds to the area occupied by its dendritic tree in the Lobula Plate (not shown). As the other HS-cells, HSS responds mainly to horizontal motion. However, all HS-cells show a slight sensitivity to upward motion in mostly the center of their receptive field. All responses from HSS (n = 6) and HSE (n = 9) were recorded from unlabeled cells. HSN vector maps were calculated from the local responses of labeled (n = 4) and unlabeled cells (n = 1).
**Figure 6. Spread of Neurobiotin within the HS-circuitry.**

The spread of Neurobiotin, which can pass through Innexin junctions, provides indirect evidence for electric coupling among HS- and other cells. Neurobiotin was injected into either HSN (A and B) or HSE (C) and visualized with Streptavidin coupled to a red fluorescent dye. Co-staining was detected in neighboring HS-cells (named in (A) to (C)), unidentified ipsilateral descending neurons (open triangle), cells projecting to the contralateral protocerebrum where HS-cell axons terminate (arrowheads in (A) and (C)), contralateral LPTCs (filled arrows in (A) and (C)) and occasionally in unidentified fibers in the same Lobula Plate (open arrows in (A) and (C)). The figure shows composite images of maximum intensity projections of confocal image stacks taken from neighboring regions of the brain. Scale bars: 50 µm.
Supplementary Figure 1. Anatomy of all three HS-cells.

The Gal4-line NP0282 drives expression of the green fluorescent marker mCD8-GFP in HSN and HSE. HSS was labeled by injection of the red fluorescent dye Alexa Fluor 594 into its axon. This image was generated by collapsing a confocal image stack used for the reconstruction shown in Fig. 3A.
Supplementary Figure 2. Analysis of the receptive fields of HS-cells.

Recording traces of an HSN-cell in response to a local motion stimulus. (A) A small vertical bar (1.4° by 5.6°) was moving alternately in preferred and null direction at different elevations from dorsal to ventral eliciting depolarizing and hyperpolarizing deflections of the membrane potential. These deflections are largest in the dorsal field of view (beginning of the trace) and absent in the most ventral area (end of the trace). Upward deflections of the lower trace indicate times at which the bar was moving. (B) Same as (A) only that a horizontal bar is moving alternately downward and upward at consecutive positions along the azimuth from contralateral to ipsilateral.
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