

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/161343>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Release your inhibitions: the role of postinhibitory rebound and synaptic inhibition in the generation of expiratory activity

Robert TR Huckstepp² Gregory D Funk¹

¹ Department of Physiology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

² School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

Breathing in mammals is a fundamental behaviour produced by movements generated and controlled by the central nervous system. The formation of the diaphragm in mammals has led to a unique phenomenon, inspiratory led breathing. In fact, in most mammals at rest, only inspiration is active – expiration is passive. As such research into mechanisms of respiratory rhythm generation has focussed on the inspiratory oscillator, the preBötzinger Complex (preBötC). Whilst we now understand a large number of fundamental properties underlying the behaviour of the preBötC, much less is known about its expiratory counterpart that generates active expiration under conditions of increased respiratory drive; e.g., exercise.

At birth, the expiratory oscillator, referred to as the parafacial respiratory group (pFRG), is comprised of at least two neuronal subpopulations that discharge during the late expiratory phase (active expiration). One subpopulation is indistinguishable from chemosensitive neurons in the retrotrapezoid nucleus (RTN); they are CO₂ sensitive, glutamatergic and have the same molecular profile; e.g., they express NK1R, Phox2b, and Galanin but do not express TH¹⁻³. The other subpopulation is CO₂ insensitive, inhibitory and does not express NK1R, Phox2b, or Galanin³ - clearly distinct from chemosensitive RTN neurons. During development the expiratory oscillator changes dramatically: its activity becomes suppressed at rest⁴; it loses its chemosensitivity; the Phox2b positive subpopulation of neurons appears to be lost; and it contains both glutamatergic and GABAergic neurons^{4,5}. Rhythmic respiratory activity of the chemosensitive neurons also disappears. Based on these differences, the adult expiratory oscillator is referred to as the lateral parafacial region (pFL). The mechanisms underlying this transformation are unknown, as the majority of studies into active expiratory behaviour have focussed on the motor output and defining the conditions that recruit the pFL, including REM sleep, elevated CO₂ and reduced O₂.

In this issue of the *Journal of Physiology* Magalhães *et al.*, have performed the first electrophysiological characterization of pFL neurons and unmasked the synaptic and intrinsic membrane properties that shape their expiratory discharge. Single cell PCR revealed not only a lack of markers of RTN neurons, but also the absence of TASK2 or GPR4 that have, somewhat controversially, been linked to the intrinsic chemosensitivity of RTN neurons. These data provide molecular evidence that the pFL and RTN are functionally distinct, and may explain the CO₂/pH insensitivity in pFL neurons⁶.

Most importantly, the impressive 3 hour long whole-cell recordings in an *in situ* preparation performed by Magalhães *et al.* have revealed that the rhythmic bursting behaviour of pFL neurons during hypercapnia is determined by an interaction between intrinsic membrane properties and changes in inhibitory synaptic input. pFL neurons lack persistent sodium channels (INaP)⁶, which underlie the intrinsic oscillatory properties of many neurons, including respiratory neurons. They share many conductances with cardiac pacemakers, including TREK-1, HCN, NALCN and Cav3.1/3.2, where oscillatory bursting is induced by a TREK-1 hyperpolarising current⁷, which activates HCN⁸, which works in conjunction with NALCN^{9,10} to generate a slow membrane depolarisation that activates Cav3.1/3.2 and triggers the burst. Importantly, while these conductances may facilitate oscillatory firing of pFL neurons during active expiration, their relative densities do not support intrinsic oscillatory behaviour. When synaptically isolated, pFL neurons fire tonically, perhaps explaining why abdominal activity becomes tonic in the absence of network activity. Thus, recruitment of active, rhythmic expiration by elevated CO₂ does not result from the activation of intrinsic oscillatory properties, but from changes in the pattern of synaptic inhibition. The

expiratory oscillator is silent at normal levels of CO₂ (normocapnia) because the membrane potential of pF_L neurons remains subthreshold due to post-synaptic GABAergic and glycinergic inhibition. While always subthreshold, their membrane potential varies throughout the respiratory cycle - they are most hyperpolarised during inspiration, more depolarised during post-inspiration as GABAergic inhibition is released and depolarised even further during phase 2 expiration when glycinergic inhibition is also removed⁶. When CO₂ levels increase, pF_L neurons hyperpolarize even further during inspiration due to increased frequency of GABA and glycinergic iPSCs. Release from this inhibition results in a greater than normal post inspiratory depolarization (and discharge in some cycles) due to a Cav3.2 T-type Ca²⁺ channel-mediated postinhibitory rebound, which is enhanced due to greater inhibition during the inspiratory phase and reductions in post inspiratory glycinergic iPSCs. As expiration proceeds inhibitory signalling is further diminished⁶ and pF_L neurons continue to depolarize and discharge during phase 2 expiration.

These data of Magalhães *et al.*, significantly advance understanding of the regions and mechanisms underlying active expiration. The proposed model also differs markedly from the contemporary hypothesis that active expiratory firing of pF_L neurons is driven by a decrease in inhibitory input coupled to increased excitatory input from RTN neurons that have a strong local projection to the pF_L⁵. These data also suggest that excitatory input into the pF_L does not play a major role in the generation of active expiration. Glutamatergic sEPSCs were observed during all phases of the respiratory cycle and were not altered by hypercapnia. Moreover, release from fast synaptic excitation did not alter pF_L neuronal firing⁶. Thus, excitatory input may simply provide a tonic depolarising input that works in conjunction with release from inhibitory input and PIR to induce rhythmic pF_L behaviour⁶. An important caveat of the study is that Magalhães *et al.*, only recorded from glutamatergic neurons, though we know local GABAergic interneurons are also present⁶. It is therefore possible that excitatory RTN neurons project to GABAergic pF_L neurons, that in turn provide inhibitory drive to pF_L neurons, from which excitatory pF_L neurons may rebound. This would provide a source of GABAergic input that could work in conjunction with glycinergic inputs that may come from the BotC as proposed by Magalhães *et al.*,⁶ or from inhibitory preBotC neurons¹¹.

In summary, this exciting study by Magalhães *et al.*⁶ has inverted our thinking about the inner workings of the expiratory oscillator. Rather than a tonically suppressed oscillator that escapes inhibition when respiratory drive is high, it now appears that inhibition is necessary to suppress active expiration at rest, and that increases in inspiratory phase inhibition and decreases in expiratory phase inhibition are necessary to drive active expiration under conditions of elevated CO₂.

References:

- 1 Onimaru, H. *et al. J Neurosci* 28, 12845, (2008).
- 2 Bautista, T. G. *et al. Neuroscience* 384, 1-13, (2018).
- 3 Onimaru, H. *et al. in Progress in Brain Research* Vol. 209 (eds Gert Holstege, Caroline M. Beers, & Hari H. Subramanian) 57-71 (Elsevier, 2014).
- 4 Pagliardini, S. *et al. J Neurosci* 31, 2895-2905, (2011).
- 5 Biancardi, V. *et al. J Comp Neurol* 529, 853-884, (2021).
- 6 Magalhães, K. *et al. J Physiol* This issue, (2021).
- 7 Unudurthi, S. D. *et al. J Am Heart Assoc* 5, e002865-e002865, (2016).
- 8 Wahl-Schott, C. *et al. Current Opinion in Pharmacology* 15, 83-90, (2014).
- 9 Liang, D. *et al. Nature Communications* 12, 287, (2021).
- 10 Lu, T. Z. & Feng, Z. P. *Mol Neurobiol* 45, 415-423, (2012).
- 11 Yang, C. F. *et al. Front Neuroanat* 14, (2020).