Interhemispheric plasticity is mediated by maximal potentiation of callosal inputs
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Central or peripheral injury causes reorganization of the brain’s connections and functions. A striking change observed after unilateral stroke or amputation is a recruitment of bilateral cortical responses to sensation or movement of the unaffected peripheral area. The mechanisms underlying this phenomenon are described in a mouse model of unilateral whisker deprivation. Stimulation of intact whiskers yields a bilateral blood-oxygen-level-dependent fMRI response in somatosensory barrel cortex. Whole-cell electrophysiology demonstrated that the intact barrel cortex selectively strengthens callosal synapses to layer 5 neurons in the deprived cortex. These synapses have larger AMPA receptor- and NMDA receptor-mediated events. These factors contribute to a maximally potentiated callosal synapse. This potentiation occludes long-term potentiation, which could be rescued, to some extent, with prior long-term depression induction. Excitability and excitation/inhibition balance were altered in a manner consistent with cell-specific callosal changes and support a shift in the overall state of the cortex. This is a demonstration of a cell-specific, synaptic mechanism underlying interhemispheric cortical reorganization.

The corpus callosum is a large fiber bundle which connects contralateral brain regions. After unilateral perturbations such as stroke or amputation, interhemispheric connectivity is altered and often leads to bilateral somatomotor cortical hyperactivity in patients with poor recovery. This study reports that callosal targeting of deprived layer 5 neurons is maximally potentiated in mouse primary somatosensory barrel cortex after unilateral whisker denervation. These neurons also experience an increase in excitability and spontaneous excitatory amplitudes. These results should be relevant to the cortical responses observed in human patients after unilateral nerve transection, amputation, or stroke.

Results

ION Transaction Produces a Bilateral S1BC BOLD fMRI Response. Mice underwent a unilateral ION transection and were imaged in an 11.7-T MRI (schematic in Fig. 1A). The intact S1BC demonstrated an increased response to contralateral whisker stimulation, and a recruitment of stimulus evoked IMRI BOLD response in deprived S1BC (Fig. 1B and C). Synaptic strength was measured by a demonstration of a cell-specific, synaptic mechanism underlying interhemispheric cortical reorganization.

Significance

The corpus callosum is a large fiber bundle which connects contralateral brain regions. After unilateral perturbations such as stroke or amputation, interhemispheric connectivity is altered and often leads to bilateral somatomotor cortical hyperactivity in patients with poor recovery. This study reports that callosal targeting of deprived layer 5 neurons is maximally potentiated in mouse primary somatosensory barrel cortex after unilateral whisker denervation. These neurons also experience an increase in excitability and spontaneous excitatory amplitudes. These results should be relevant to the cortical responses observed in human patients after unilateral nerve transection, amputation, or stroke.
Selective Strengthening of Callosal Synapses to L5 Principal Neurons in Deprived S1BC. We next sought to identify the synaptic locus of changes occurring in deprived S1BC which responds to intact, ipsilateral whisker stimulation. The same ChR2 virus was injected into intact S1BC and neurons in L2/3 and L5 of deprived S1BC were patched for recording (Fig. 2A). No change was observed in callosal strength to L2/3 neurons (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.94\); Fig. 2B and SI Appendix, Table S2). Deprived L5 neurons experience an increase in strength from callosal inputs; L5a and L5b were recorded in equal proportions (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.0006\); Fig. 2C and SI Appendix, Table S2). There was no difference in the connection probability of neurons in L2/3 or L5 responding to callosal stimulation between groups (SI Appendix, Fig. S3). Local L5 to L5 electrical stimulation did not detect different Sr-mEPSC amplitudes between groups (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.15\); Fig. 2D and SI Appendix, Table S3). Callosal connections are reciprocal; therefore we tested whether there were changes from deprived to intact S1BC. We measured Sr-mEPSC amplitudes from deprived to intact S1BC but did not observe a change in evoked AMPAR-mediated amplitudes (SI Appendix, Fig. S4 and Table S4). This demonstrates that the plasticity is likely unidirectional: from intact to deprived S1BC.

NMDAR Matches AMPA and Ifenprodil Sensitivity Increases at Callosally Targeted Deprived L5 Neurons. Deprived L5 neurons experience increased amplitudes of AMPAR-mediated callosal responses. Because NMDARs are also involved in synaptic plasticity, the AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was measured. AMPAR- and NMDAR-mediated currents elicited by LED stimulation were recorded in contralateral L5 neurons. A biocytin-filled L5 neuron and schematic are in Fig. 3A. The AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was not significantly different between groups (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.72\); Fig. 3B and SI Appendix, Table S5), indicating the increased AMPAR activity is matched by an increase in NMDAR activation in deprived L5 neurons targeted by the CC. We also measured the effects of ifenprodil, a GluN2B antagonist, on NMDAR-mediated callosal events. Ifenprodil sensitivity was doubled, indicating an increased proportion of the NMDAR-mediated current comprises GluN2B-containing receptors (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.01\); Fig. 3C and SI Appendix, Table S6). Decay kinetics of NMDAR-mediated events were not significantly altered between groups (SI Appendix, Fig. S5 and Tables S5 and S6). The increased prevalence of GluN2B-containing NMDARs may support CC strengthening.

Spontaneous Activity in Deprived S1BC L5 Neurons Has Larger Excitatory, but Not Inhibitory, Events. Unilateral whisker deprivation drives remarkable alterations in intact and deprived S1BC. Spontaneous activity may also be impacted by whisker deprivation, which could alter overall neural activity. Spontaneous excitatory postsynaptic currents (sEPSCs) and spontaneous inhibitory post synaptic currents (sIPSCs) were measured in sham and deprived L2/3 and L5 neurons. No change was detected in L2/3 sEPSC or sIPSC frequency or amplitude (sEPSC: Student’s t test, amplitude \(P = 0.16\), frequency \(P = 0.35\); Fig. 4A and SI Appendix, Table S7; sIPSC: Student’s t test, amplitude \(P = 0.8\), frequency \(P = 0.3\); Fig. 4B and SI Appendix, Table S7). L5 neurons experience an increase in sEPSC amplitude, but no change in frequency (Student’s t test: amplitude \(P = 0.01\), frequency \(P = 0.6\); Fig. 4C and SI Appendix, Table S7), suggesting a postsynaptic mechanism. The sEPSC amplitudes did not increase multiplicatively (note the lack of overlap between the sham scaled and deprived lines) (Kolmogorov Smirnov Test: \(P < 0.001\); Fig. 4D).

The sIPSC frequency and amplitudes were not different between groups (Student’s t test: amplitude \(P = 0.24\), frequency \(P = 0.87\); Fig. 4E and SI Appendix, Table S7). These results indicate that increased spontaneous excitatory amplitudes in deprived S1BC were not matched by spontaneous inhibitory events. There were no changes in sEPSC or sIPSC amplitudes or frequencies in intact L5 neurons experience increased amplitudes of AMPAR-mediated callosal responses. Because NMDARs are also involved in synaptic plasticity, the AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was measured. AMPAR- and NMDAR-mediated currents elicited by LED stimulation were recorded in contralateral L5 neurons. A biocytin-filled L5 neuron and schematic are in Fig. 3A. The AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was not significantly different between groups (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.72\); Fig. 3B and SI Appendix, Table S5), indicating the increased AMPAR activity is matched by an increase in NMDAR activation in deprived L5 neurons targeted by the CC. We also measured the effects of ifenprodil, a GluN2B antagonist, on NMDAR-mediated callosal events. Ifenprodil sensitivity was doubled, indicating an increased proportion of the NMDAR-mediated current comprises GluN2B-containing receptors (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.01\); Fig. 3C and SI Appendix, Table S6). Decay kinetics of NMDAR-mediated events were not significantly altered between groups (SI Appendix, Fig. S5 and Tables S5 and S6). The increased prevalence of GluN2B-containing NMDARs may support CC strengthening.

Spontaneous Activity in Deprived S1BC L5 Neurons Has Larger Excitatory, but Not Inhibitory, Events. Unilateral whisker deprivation drives remarkable alterations in intact and deprived S1BC. Spontaneous activity may also be impacted by whisker deprivation, which could alter overall neural activity. Spontaneous excitatory postsynaptic currents (sEPSCs) and spontaneous inhibitory post synaptic currents (sIPSCs) were measured in sham and deprived L2/3 and L5 neurons. No change was detected in L2/3 sEPSC or sIPSC frequency or amplitude (sEPSC: Student’s t test, amplitude \(P = 0.16\), frequency \(P = 0.35\); Fig. 4A and SI Appendix, Table S7; sIPSC: Student’s t test, amplitude \(P = 0.8\), frequency \(P = 0.3\); Fig. 4B and SI Appendix, Table S7). L5 neurons experience an increase in sEPSC amplitude, but no change in frequency (Student’s t test: amplitude \(P = 0.01\), frequency \(P = 0.6\); Fig. 4C and SI Appendix, Table S7), suggesting a postsynaptic mechanism. The sEPSC amplitudes did not increase multiplicatively (note the lack of overlap between the sham scaled and deprived lines) (Kolmogorov Smirnov Test: \(P < 0.001\); Fig. 4D).

The sIPSC frequency and amplitudes were not different between groups (Student’s t test: amplitude \(P = 0.24\), frequency \(P = 0.87\); Fig. 4E and SI Appendix, Table S7). These results indicate that increased spontaneous excitatory amplitudes in deprived S1BC were not matched by spontaneous inhibitory events. There were no changes in sEPSC or sIPSC amplitudes or frequencies in intact L5 neurons experience increased amplitudes of AMPAR-mediated callosal responses. Because NMDARs are also involved in synaptic plasticity, the AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was measured. AMPAR- and NMDAR-mediated currents elicited by LED stimulation were recorded in contralateral L5 neurons. A biocytin-filled L5 neuron and schematic are in Fig. 3A. The AMPAR/NMDAR ratio was not significantly different between groups (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.72\); Fig. 3B and SI Appendix, Table S5), indicating the increased AMPAR activity is matched by an increase in NMDAR activation in deprived L5 neurons targeted by the CC. We also measured the effects of ifenprodil, a GluN2B antagonist, on NMDAR-mediated callosal events. Ifenprodil sensitivity was doubled, indicating an increased proportion of the NMDAR-mediated current comprises GluN2B-containing receptors (Student’s t test: \(P = 0.01\); Fig. 3C and SI Appendix, Table S6). Decay kinetics of NMDAR-mediated events were not significantly altered between groups (SI Appendix, Fig. S5 and Tables S5 and S6). The increased prevalence of GluN2B-containing NMDARs may support CC strengthening.
Callosal projections from intact to deprived S1BC produce larger AMPAR-mediated events to L5 neurons after unilateral whisker deprivation. (A) Experimental design; asterisk is ChR2 injection site (green). (B) No change in light-evoked Sr-mEPSC amplitudes from intact to deprived L2/3. (C) Sr-mEPSCs are significantly larger to L5. (D) No change between local L5 to L5 electrically evoked Sr-mEPSC amplitudes. Average (Center) and representative (Right) traces are displayed in B–D. Bar graphs represent mean; error bars are SEM; * denotes statistical significance. n, number of cells.

Increased Excitability Is Restricted to L5 Neurons in Deprived S1BC. L5 neurons in deprived S1BC have increased sEPSC amplitudes in addition to stronger callosally targeted synapses, which may contribute to altered intrinsic properties in deprived L5 neurons. The resting membrane potential (Vm), input resistance, and rheobase values were measured in S1BC L2/3 and L5 neurons. L2/3 cells did not demonstrate significant changes in Vm (Student’s t test: P = 0.1; Fig. S4 and SI Appendix, Table S8), input resistance (Student’s t test: P = 0.8, Fig. S5B) or rheobase values (Student’s t test: P = 0.6; Fig. 5 C and D and SI Appendix, Table S9). L5 neurons in deprived S1BC had significantly depolarized Vm (Student’s t test: P = 0.01; Fig. S5E and SI Appendix, Table S9), lower rheobase values (Student’s t test: P = 0.02; Fig. 5 G and H and SI Appendix, Table S9), but no change in input resistance (Student’s t test, P = 0.79; Fig. 5F and SI Appendix, Table S9). These results demonstrate that L5 neurons in deprived S1BC are more excitable. Intrinsic properties in L5 neurons of intact S1BC were also measured, but no changes were observed compared with sham (SI Appendix, Fig. S4D and Table S10). Deprived L5 neurons selectively experience a change in their intrinsic properties in response to altered circuit activity.

Potentiation of Callosal Inputs to L5 Principal Neurons Occludes LTP, Which Can Be Rescued After LTD. Little is known about what kind of plasticity the CC can undergo. A pairing protocol was used to elicit robust potentiation of callosal excitatory postsynaptic potentials in sham animals (Fig. 6A). This result indicates that callosal synapses to L5 principal cells remain plastic beyond the critical period, similar to other connections between L2/3 and L5 neurons (13) (protocols in SI Appendix, Fig. S6A–C). The role of NMDARs in callosal LTP was tested with bath application of the NMDAR antagonist APV, or the GluN2B antagonist ifenprodil, in callosal LTP in sham animals increased with each subsequent pairing (Fig. 6B), while intact to deprived LTP achieved only a minimal increase in potentiation with the third pairing (Fig. 6B). The values were statistically significant between the two groups at the second LTP pairing step.

In deprived S1BC, LTP could not be elicited at callosal inputs to L5 neurons (Fig. 6A). To determine the magnitude of callosal LTP capacity, multiple LTP inductions were performed, with 10-min recording intervals between each step. Callosal LTP in sham animals increased with each subsequent pairing (Fig. 6B), while intact to deprived LTP achieved only a minimal increase in potentiation with the third pairing (Fig. 6B). The values were statistically significant between the two groups at the second LTP pairing step.

Fig. 2. Callosal projections from intact to deprived S1BC produce larger AMPAR-mediated events to L5 neurons after unilateral whisker deprivation. (A) Experimental design; asterisk is ChR2 injection site (green). (B) No change in light-evoked Sr-mEPSC amplitudes from intact to deprived L2/3. (C) Sr-mEPSCs are significantly larger to L5. (D) No change between local L5 to L5 electrically evoked Sr-mEPSC amplitudes. Average (Center) and representative (Right) traces are displayed in B–D. Bar graphs represent mean; error bars are SEM; * denotes statistical significance. n, number of cells.

Fig. 3. NMDAR activity increases to match AMPAR in callosally targeted deprived L5 neurons, and indicates an increase in ifenprodil sensitivity. (A) Biocytin filled L5 principal neuron surrounded by callosal ChR2-YFP expressing terminals (Left); experimental schematic (Right). (B) No change in AMPAR/NMDAR ratio from intact to L5 neurons in deprived S1BC. (C) Deprived L5 neurons display increased ifenprodil sensitivity. Bar graphs represent mean; error bars are SEM; * denotes statistical significance. n, number of cells.
An LTP rescue experiment was performed by first inducing LTD and subsequently LTP in L5 neurons. This protocol elicited LTP in callosal synapses in both groups (Fig. 6E). LTP alone versus LTP rescue magnitudes were similar in sham (Student’s t test: $P = 0.92$), but rescued LTP was larger than LTP alone in deprived S1BC ($Student’s t test: P = 0.02$). LTP can be induced at callosal synapses to deprived L5 neurons; thus this synapse maintains the necessary machinery to undergo LTP.

**Discussion**

Dramatic bilateral changes in cortical circuitry occur after unilateral whisker deprivation, summarized in *SI Appendix, Fig. S6G*. Intact whisker stimulation recruits a bilateral BOLD fMRI S1BC response. In the deprived S1BC, a stronger AMPAR-mediated postsynaptic response in L5, but not L2/3, neurons to callosal inputs was detected. Sham animals demonstrate remarkable capacity for LTP; however, with multiple inductions along the CC, LTP was not elicited in deprived L5 neurons. This indicates that these synapses have been maximally potentiated.

Fig. 4. Changes in spontaneous activity are restricted to sEPSCs in deprived L5 neurons. (A and B) The sEPSC and sIPSC amplitudes and frequency are not significantly altered in L2/3 (Left and Center); average traces (Right). (C) The sEPSC frequency is unchanged, but amplitude is larger in deprived L5 neurons. (D) The changes in sEPSC amplitude are not multiplicative. (E) The sIPSC frequency and amplitude are unchanged between groups. Bar graphs represent mean; error bars are SEM; * denotes statistical significance.

Fig. 5. Intrinsic properties of deprived L5 neurons demonstrate an increase in excitability; no change is detected in L2/3. Deprived L5 neurons have a higher Vm, (B) input resistance, and (C) rheobase values. (D) Representative traces. Deprived L5 neurons have (D) a higher Vm, (F) no change in input resistance, and (G) a lower rheobase value. * denotes statistical significance. Bar graphs represent mean; error bars are SEM; * denotes statistical significance. n, number of cells.
Glutamatergic responses of deprived L5 neurons to callosal inputs influence interhemispheric plasticity and bilateral cortical activity patterns. The adaptations of deprived L5 neurons are likely a mixture of Hebbian and homeostatic mechanisms (22, 23). Deprived L5 neurons demonstrate increased excitability, and larger sEPSC amplitudes. This increase in size was not multiplicative, indicating this was not a strictly homeostatic response to whisker denervation. These larger events comprise callosal, lateral, and intracortical inputs. Post synaptic modifications selectively occurred at callosal synapses onto L5 neurons, not callosal synapses to L2/3 cells, nor local L5 to L5 connections. The increased sEPSC amplitudes may indicate either that callosal synapses comprise the majority of inputs or that other inputs also increased their response size but were not recruited by local stimulation. The increased callosal drive to L5 neurons may be balanced by a reduction in feed-forward whisker stimuli. An increase in spontaneous event amplitudes and intrinsic excitability could signal a shift in the state of the deprived cortex to increase responsiveness to the intact whisker stimuli.

Intact S1BC selectively targets L5 neurons in deprived S1BC after unilateral whisker deprivation. These results beg the question: Why L5? These neurons coordinate bilateral whisker information (5), and detect salient stimuli (24). L5 neurons are connected to widespread brain regions, including S2, M1, thalamus, and medial prefrontal cortex (25). L5 neurons are important for sensory detection and signal output. L5a and L5b may have different plasticity rules (26), but, for callosally targeted neurons in these experiments, both layers were represented equally and were not altered between groups. L5’s capacity to evoke widespread changes, combined with bilateral stimuli integration, may explain why changes occur specifically in L5.

Bilateral S1BC BOLD fMRI responses to intact whisker stimulation were detected. These results are consistent with the requirement of the intact S1BC’s presence to recruit deprived S1BC stimulus response (10). However, resting state fMRI (rsfMRI) did not detect significant changes in S1BC bilateral connectivity. This may be due to the local restriction of plasticity to L5, or because anesthetized depth affects connectivity (27). Indeed, there is active discussion in the literature which has not yet reached a consensus on what circuit-level information rs-fMRI can extract about functional connectivity (28). Our model presents a useful tool for probing connectivity with rsfMRI; however, higher-resolution scans with laminar discrimination or an awake preparation would be required to negate some of these confounds. Overall, the increase in evoked synaptic strength from

---

**Fig. 6.** Unilateral ION occludes callosal LTP from intact to deprived S1BC. LTD is similar between groups. (A) Robust callosal LTP to L5 neurons in sham is elicited; there is no LTD in deprived S1BC. (B) Multiple rounds of LTD induction produce progressively larger potentiation in sham, but deprived L5 neurons do not achieve LTD after multiple inductions. (C) LTD levels were equal between groups. (D) Multiple LTD inductions produced equal magnitudes between groups. (E) LTD induction before LTP protocol elicited LTD in the sham animals; deprived L5 LTP is rescued along the CC. Box plots represent mean; middle line is the median; error bars are minimum and maximum values; * denotes statistical significance.
the intact to deprived S1BC may not translate to a visible change in connectivity. Unilateral sensory deprivation can unmask previously sub-threshold callosal inputs and increase receptive field size (29). Stroke reduces GABAergic-mediated callosal inhibition to perilesional areas, which does not change intrinsic properties but does unmask previously subthreshold inputs to L2/3 neurons in vivo (30). Despite the different injury model, the lack of change in L2/3 is consistent with our findings, and the hypothesis that a reduction in evoked interhemispheric inhibition elicits larger callosal responses may be applicable in our model, where, thus far, we have only demonstrated no change in spontaneous inhibitory events. Adult unilateral whisker deprivation triggers a recruitment of deprived S1BC to intact, ipsilateral whisker stimulation. The increased excitability combined with potentiated callosal synapses to deprived L5 cells could shift the state of deprived S1BC so it can be driven by intact S1BC. This recruitment may serve to increase the processing power of the intact whisker set, as seen in recruitment of deprived brain areas to process spared senses (31). Additionally, it may drive activity to prevent lateral plasticity, namely, blocking neighboring somatosensory areas from colonizing space in deprived S1BC (10). This lack of lateral plasticity could be beneficial: amputees with high levels of lateral reorganization have elevated incidence of phantom limb pain (32). However, brain reorganization after injury is critical for patients’ rehabilitation (33).

This work may have relevance to the human brain. Unilateral stroke in somatomotor cortex demonstrates an initial increase in bilateral fMRI activity, which gradually returns to baseline in patients with optimal recovery (34). Similarly, shutting down deprived cortex with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) provides phantom limb pain relief in amputees (35). These effects might be mediated by the CC, but little is known about its role in interhemispheric plasticity. Here we have described the effects of unilateral whisker deprivation on specific receptors, synapses, and cell types which underlie alterations in callosal communication between bilateral somatosensory hemispheres. This circuit characterization lays the groundwork for understanding how unilateral perturbations may contribute to changes observed in humans using noninvasive imaging techniques. For example, if the phenomenon we describe is involved in beneficial recovery, interventions such as rTMS can be designed to speed up or otherwise enhance recovery by targeting deeper cortical layers (36). Understanding the circuit level changes may enhance our ability to aid patients’ recovery from stroke or amputation by providing a guide for more specific, targeted interventions.

Materials and Methods

Animals. All procedures were approved by the National Institutes of Health Animal Care and Use Committee, facilities accredited by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care. For complete methods referring to housing, stereotaxic injections of viruses, and ION transaction surgery, please see SI Appendix, Animal Procedures.

Electrophysiology. All whole-cell slice electrophysiological recordings were performed 2 wk after ION transection or sham surgeries. For complete methods, please see SI Appendix, Electrophysiology.

fMRI. The fMRI experiments were performed under ketamine/xylazine anesthesia 2 wk after ION transection or sham surgeries in an 11.7-T MRI. Please see SI Appendix, fMRI for more details.
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