

Spacek et al., 2021, Figure 3

Figure 3c

Feedback effects on firing rate

```
# Random-intercept, random-slope for single neurons,  
# random intercept for experiments, nested in series  
lmer.3c = lmer(rates ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) + (1 | sid/eid),  
              data = tb %>% drop_na(rates))
```

```
display(lmer.3c)
```

```
## lmer(formula = rates ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) + (1 |  
##   sid/eid), data = tb %>% drop_na(rates))  
##           coef.est coef.se  
## (Intercept) 14.98      3.24  
## feedback    -0.45      1.16  
##  
## Error terms:  
## Groups   Name          Std.Dev. Corr  
## uid      (Intercept) 14.19  
##          feedback     7.61    -0.59  
## eid:sid  (Intercept)  4.45  
## sid      (Intercept)  5.13  
## Residual                8.47  
## ---  
## number of obs: 17640, groups: uid, 44; eid:sid, 12; sid, 8  
## AIC = 125946, DIC = 125942.5  
## deviance = 125936.4
```

```
anova(lmer.3c)
```

```
## Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method  
##           Sum Sq Mean Sq NumDF  DenDF F value Pr(>F)  
## feedback 10.976  10.976     1 43.031  0.153 0.6976
```

Feedback: 14.5 spikes/s

Suppression: 15.0 spikes/s

n = 44 neurons from 4 mice

Figure 3d

Feedback effects on burst ratio

```
# Random-intercept, random-slope for single neurons,  
# random intercept for experiments, nested in series  
lmer.3d = lmer(burstratios ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) + (1 | sid/eid),  
              data = tb %>% drop_na(burstratios))
```

```
display(lmer.3d)
```

```
## lmer(formula = burstratios ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) +  
##      (1 | sid/eid), data = tb %>% drop_na(burstratios))  
##              coef.est coef.se  
## (Intercept)  0.15      0.03  
## feedback    -0.11      0.02  
##  
## Error terms:  
## Groups   Name          Std.Dev. Corr  
## uid      (Intercept)  0.18  
##          feedback    0.15    -0.99  
## eid:sid  (Intercept)  0.02  
## sid      (Intercept)  0.00  
## Residual                0.13  
## ---  
## number of obs: 16545, groups: uid, 44; eid:sid, 12; sid, 8  
## AIC = -19436.5, DIC = -19479.4  
## deviance = -19466.0
```

```
anova(lmer.3d)
```

```
## Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method  
##              Sum Sq Mean Sq NumDF DenDF F value    Pr(>F)  
## feedback  0.44746  0.44746     1  42.96  25.311 9.163e-06 ***  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Feedback: 0.043

Suppression: 0.15

n = 44 neurons from 4 mice

Figure 3e

Feedback effects on orientation selectivity

```
# Random-intercept for single neurons,  
# random intercept for experiments, nested in series  
lmer.3e = lmer(osi ~ feedback + (1 | uid) + (1 | sid/eid),  
              data = tbeg %>% drop_na(osi))  
  
display(lmer.3e)  
  
## lmer(formula = osi ~ feedback + (1 | uid) + (1 | sid/eid), data = tbeg %>%  
##   drop_na(osi))  
##           coef.est coef.se  
## (Intercept) 0.12     0.03  
## feedback    0.00     0.01  
##  
## Error terms:  
## Groups   Name          Std.Dev.  
## uid      (Intercept) 0.07  
## eid:sid  (Intercept) 0.02  
## sid      (Intercept) 0.06  
## Residual                0.04  
## ---  
## number of obs: 136, groups: uid, 44; eid:sid, 12; sid, 8  
## AIC = -329.2, DIC = -368  
## deviance = -354.6  
  
anova(lmer.3e)  
  
## Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method  
##           Sum Sq   Mean Sq NumDF DenDF F value Pr(>F)  
## feedback 0.00061045 0.00061045    1 88.65  0.3047 0.5824  
  
Feedback: OSI = 0.13  
Suppression: OSI = 0.12  
n = 44 neurons from 4 mice
```

Figure 3g

Feedback effects on F1/F0-ratio

```
# Random intercept, random slope for single neurons,  
# random intercept for series  
lmer.3g = lmer(f1f0 ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) + (1 | sid),  
              data = tbegin %>% drop_na(f1f0))
```

```
display(lmer.3g)
```

```
## lmer(formula = f1f0 ~ feedback + (1 + feedback | uid) + (1 |  
##   sid), data = tbegin %>% drop_na(f1f0))  
##           coef.est coef.se  
## (Intercept)  1.22    0.07  
## feedback    -0.14    0.04  
##  
## Error terms:  
## Groups   Name      Std.Dev. Corr  
## uid      (Intercept) 0.39  
##          feedback    0.05    0.78  
## sid      (Intercept) 0.07  
## Residual                0.20  
## ---  
## number of obs: 136, groups: uid, 44; sid, 8  
## AIC = 87, DIC = 56.1  
## deviance = 64.5
```

```
anova(lmer.3g)
```

```
## Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method  
##           Sum Sq Mean Sq NumDF  DenDF F value    Pr(>F)  
## feedback 0.63715 0.63715     1 43.517  15.589 0.0002836 ***  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Feedback: F_1/F_0 -ratio = 1.08

Suppression: F_1/F_0 -ratio = 1.22

n = 44 neurons from 4 mice

Figure 3i

Feedback effects on distribution of cycle average phase differences

```
# Of all bursting phis, how many are phase-advanced?
b_adv = sum(tb3i_db$dbphi > 0)
resb = binom.test(b_adv, length(tb3i_db$dbphi), 0.5)
print(resb)

##
## Exact binomial test
##
## data:  b_adv and length(tb3i_db$dbphi)
## number of successes = 25, number of trials = 29, p-value = 0.0001037
## alternative hypothesis: true probability of success is not equal to 0.5
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.6833594 0.9611052
## sample estimates:
## probability of success
##                0.862069

# Of all non-bursting phis, how many are phase-advanced?
nb_adv = sum(tb3i_dnb$dnbphi > 0)
resnb = binom.test(nb_adv, length(tb3i_dnb$dnbphi), 0.5)
print(resnb)

##
## Exact binomial test
##
## data:  nb_adv and length(tb3i_dnb$dnbphi)
## number of successes = 11, number of trials = 21, p-value = 1
## alternative hypothesis: true probability of success is not equal to 0.5
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.2978068 0.7428694
## sample estimates:
## probability of success
##                0.5238095
```