Reporting Checklist for Nature Neuroscience

This checklist is used to ensure good reporting standards and to improve the reproducibility of published results. For more information, please read Reporting Life Sciences Research.

Please note that in the event of publication, it is mandatory that authors include all relevant methodological and statistical information in the manuscript.

Statistics reporting, by figure

- Please specify the following information for each panel reporting quantitative data, and where each item is reported (section, e.g. Results, & paragraph number).

- Each figure legend should ideally contain an exact sample size (n) for each experimental group/condition, where n is an exact number and not a range, a clear definition of how n is defined (for example x cells from x slices from x animals from x litters, collected over x days), a description of the statistical test used, the results of the tests, any descriptive statistics and clearly defined error bars if applicable.

- For any experiments using custom statistics, please indicate the test used and stats obtained for each experiment.

- Each figure legend should include a statement of how many times the experiment shown was replicated in the lab; the details of sample collection should be sufficiently clear so that the replicability of the experiment is obvious to the reader.

- For experiments reported in the text but not in the figures, please use the paragraph number instead of the figure number.

Note: Mean and standard deviation are not appropriate on small samples, and plotting independent data points is usually more informative. When technical replicates are reported, error and significance measures reflect the experimental variability and not the variability of the biological process; it is misleading not to state this clearly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST USED</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIVE STATS (AVERAGE, VARIANCE)</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM &amp; F/T/Z/R/ETC VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td>error bars are mean +/- SEM</td>
<td>p = 0.044</td>
<td>F(3, 36) = 2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from 15 mice</td>
<td>p = 0.0006</td>
<td>t(28) = 2.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
<td>results from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE NUMBER</td>
<td>WHICH TEST?</td>
<td>SECTION &amp; PARAGRAPH</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>EXACT VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resul, para 1</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>Results, para 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of subjects in Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resul, para 1</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>Results, para 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of subjects in Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supp Fig. 1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b-h</td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of included subjects in Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i</td>
<td></td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supp Fig. 2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supp Fig. 3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 5d-h</td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of included subjects in Experiment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Supp Fig. 4</td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of included subjects in Experiment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 5i</td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of included subjects in Experiment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 5j</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 6a</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Supp Fig. 5</td>
<td>group-level Bayesian model selection</td>
<td>Results, para 20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Number of included subjects in Experiment 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representative figures

1. Are any representative images shown (including Western blots and immunohistochemistry/staining) in the paper? If so, what figure(s)?

   Yes.

   2b, 3a-h, 5a, 5c-h, 6a.
2. For each representative image, is there a clear statement of how many times this experiment was successfully repeated and a discussion of any limitations in repeatability?
   If so, where is this reported (section, paragraph #)?
   
   Yes.

   2b: 9/10 subjects (all but one subject) had a kurtosis higher than that of Gaussian, consistent with the kurtosis of a Student’s t distribution. The t model captured individual subjects’ motor error in both standard deviation (Pearson’s r = 1.0, p < .001) and kurtosis (Pearson’s r = 0.82, p = .004). See Results, para. 1.

   3a-h: Plots of all subjects’ results were shown in Figure 4 and Supplementary Figure 1. The Akaike information criterion with a correction for sample sizes (AICc) was used for model selection. According to the group-level Bayesian model selection, among the seven models, the probability for the U-mix model to be the best model was 65.7%; the probability was 1.3% for Gaussian, 1.0% for LD, 1.0% for t, 1.3% for vG-mix, 28.0% for mG-mix, 1.7% for L-mix. See Results, para. 12.

   5a: The distribution of each subject’s endpoints was close to Gaussian for all the 10 subjects reported. See Results, para. 17.

   5c-h: Plots of all subjects’ results were shown in Supplementary Figures 3 and 4. The Akaike information criterion with a correction for sample sizes (AICc) was used for model selection. According to group-level Bayesian model selection, among the five models, the probability for the U-mix model to be the best model was 63.4%; the probability was 0.7% for Gaussian, 22.3% for vG-mix, 12.7% for mG-mix, 0.9% for L-mix. See Results, para. 18.

   6a: The endpoints were well fit by a bivariate Gaussian distribution for all the 18 subjects reported. See Results, para. 19.

Statistics and general methods

1. Is there a justification of the sample size?
   If so, how was it justified?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   
   Even if no sample size calculation was performed, authors should report why the sample size is adequate to measure their effect size.

   We developed this paradigm in previous work including Zhang et al. (2013). Choice of sample size was based on these results. Now in Methods, last paragraph.

2. Are statistical tests justified as appropriate for every figure?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   
   Yes. See Methods, last paragraph.

   a. If there is a section summarizing the statistical methods in the methods, is the statistical test for each experiment clearly defined?
   
   Yes.

   AICc and group-level Bayesian model selection were used in all experiments. Pearson’s correlation was used in Experiment 1. We verified the assumptions of all of the statistical tests used.

   b. Do the data meet the assumptions of the specific statistical test you chose (e.g. normality for a parametric test)?
      Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?
      
      Yes. See Methods, last paragraph.
c. Is there any estimate of variance within each group of data?
   Is the variance similar between groups that are being statistically compared?
   Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?
   We analyzed subjects individually. Within group variance is not applicable.

d. Are tests specified as one- or two-sided?
   Yes.

e. Are there adjustments for multiple comparisons?
   No. We analyzed subjects individually.

3. Are criteria for excluding data points reported?
   Was this criterion established prior to data collection?
   Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?
   Yes. See Methods, paras 13 & 14. All the criteria were established prior to data collection except the criterion applied to Experiment 3, whose data were collected before the development of the current analyses.

4. Define the method of randomization used to assign subjects (or samples) to the experimental groups and to collect and process data.
   If no randomization was used, state so.
   Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?
   For each experiment, all subjects were assigned to a single group. No randomization needed.

5. Is a statement of the extent to which investigator knew the group allocation during the experiment and in assessing outcome included?
   If no blinding was done, state so.
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

6. For experiments in live vertebrates, is a statement of compliance with ethical guidelines/regulations included?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

7. Is the species of the animals used reported?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

8. Is the strain of the animals (including background strains of KO/transgenic animals used) reported?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

9. Is the sex of the animals/subjects used reported?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   Yes. See Methods, para 2.

10. Is the age of the animals/subjects reported?
    Where (section, paragraph #)?
    Yes. See Methods, para 2.

11. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the light/dark cycle reported?
    Where (section, paragraph #)?
    N/A
12. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the housing group (i.e. number of animals per cage) reported?  
Where (section, paragraph #)?  
N/A

13. For behavioral experiments, is the time of day reported (e.g. light or dark cycle)?  
Where (section, paragraph #)?  
N/A

14. Is the previous history of the animals/subjects (e.g. prior drug administration, surgery, behavioral testing) reported?  
Where (section, paragraph #)?  
N/A

  a. If multiple behavioral tests were conducted in the same group of animals, is this reported?  
  Where (section, paragraph #)?  
  N/A

15. If any animals/subjects were excluded from analysis, is this reported?  
Where (section, paragraph #)?  
N/A

  a. How were the criteria for exclusion defined?  
  Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?  
  N/A

  b. Specify reasons for any discrepancy between the number of animals at the beginning and end of the study.  
  Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?  
  N/A

**Reagents**

1. Have antibodies been validated for use in the system under study (assay and species)?  
   No.

   a. Is antibody catalog number given?  
   Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?  
   N/A

   b. Where were the validation data reported (citation, supplementary information, Antibodypedia)?  
   Where does this appear (section, paragraph #)?  
   N/A

2. Cell line identity  
   a. Are any cell lines used in this paper listed in the database of commonly misidentified cell lines maintained by ICLAC and NCBI Biosample?  
   Where (section, paragraph #)?  
   N/A
b. If yes, include in the Methods section a scientific justification of their use—indicate here in which section and paragraph the justification can be found.

N/A

c. For each cell line, include in the Methods section a statement that specifies:
- the source of the cell lines
- have the cell lines been authenticated? If so, by which method?
- have the cell lines been tested for mycoplasma contamination?

Where (section, paragraph #)?

N/A

Data deposition

Data deposition in a public repository is mandatory for:

- Protein, DNA and RNA sequences
- Macromolecular structures
- Crystallographic data for small molecules
- Microarray data

Deposition is strongly recommended for many other datasets for which structured public repositories exist; more details on our data policy are available here. We encourage the provision of other source data in supplementary information or in unstructured repositories such as Figshare and Dryad.

We encourage publication of Data Descriptors (see Scientific Data) to maximize data reuse.

1. Are accession codes for deposit dates provided?

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

   N/A

Computer code/software

Any custom algorithm/software that is central to the methods must be supplied by the authors in a usable and readable form for readers at the time of publication. However, referees may ask for this information at any time during the review process.

1. Identify all custom software or scripts that were required to conduct the study and where in the procedures each was used.

   N/A

2. If computer code was used to generate results that are central to the paper’s conclusions, include a statement in the Methods section under “Code availability” to indicate whether and how the code can be accessed. Include version information as necessary and any restrictions on availability.

   N/A

Human subjects

1. Which IRB approved the protocol?
   Where is this stated (section, paragraph #)?
   The experiments had been approved by the University Committee on Activities Involving Human Subjects (UCAIHS) of New York University. see Methods, para 1.

2. Is demographic information on all subjects provided?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   A summary of demographic information of all subjects is provided in Methods, para 2.

3. Is the number of human subjects, their age and sex clearly defined?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   A summary of demographic information of all subjects is provided in Methods, para 2.

4. Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria (if any) clearly specified?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   Yes.
   See Methods, paras 13 & 14.

5. How well were the groups matched?
   Where is this information described (section, paragraph #)?
   All subjects in single condition. No groups.

6. Is a statement included confirming that informed consent was obtained from all subjects?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   Yes.
   See Methods, para 1.

7. For publication of patient photos, is a statement included confirming that consent to publish was obtained?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   No photos.

fMRI studies

For papers reporting functional imaging (fMRI) results please ensure that these minimal reporting guidelines are met and that all this information is clearly provided in the methods:

1. Were any subjects scanned but then rejected for the analysis after the data was collected?
   N/A

   a. If yes, is the number rejected and reasons for rejection described?
      Where (section, paragraph #)?
      N/A

2. Is the number of blocks, trials or experimental units per session and/or subjects specified?
   N/A
   Where (section, paragraph #)?

3. Is the length of each trial and interval between trials specified?
   N/A

4. Is a blocked, event-related, or mixed design being used? If applicable, please specify the block length or how the event-related or mixed design was optimized.
   N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reporting Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. | Is the task design clearly described?  
  Where (section, paragraph #)? | N/A |
| 6. | How was behavioral performance measured? | N/A |
| 7. | Is an ANOVA or factorial design being used? | N/A |
| 8. | For data acquisition, is a whole brain scan used?  
  If not, state area of acquisition.  
  a. How was this region determined? | N/A |
| 9. | Is the field strength (in Tesla) of the MRI system stated?  
  a. Is the pulse sequence type (gradient/spin echo, EPI/spiral) stated?  
  b. Are the field-of-view, matrix size, slice thickness, and TE/TR/flip angle clearly stated? | N/A |
| 10. | Are the software and specific parameters (model/functions, smoothing kernel size if applicable, etc.) used for data processing and pre-processing clearly stated? | N/A |
| 11. | Is the coordinate space for the anatomical/functional imaging data clearly defined as subject/native space or standardized stereotaxic space, e.g., original Talairach, MNI305, ICBM152, etc? Where (section, paragraph #)? | N/A |
| 12. | If there was data normalization/standardization to a specific space template, are the type of transformation (linear vs. nonlinear) used and image types being transformed clearly described? Where (section, paragraph #)? | N/A |
| 13. | How were anatomical locations determined, e.g., via an automated labeling algorithm (AAL), standardized coordinate database (Talairach daemon), probabilistic atlases, etc.? | N/A |
| 14. | Were any additional regressors (behavioral covariates, motion etc) used? | N/A |
| 15. | Is the contrast construction clearly defined? | N/A |
| 16. | Is a mixed/random effects or fixed inference used?  
  a. If fixed effects inference used, is this justified? | N/A |
<p>| 17. | Were repeated measures used (multiple measurements per subject)? | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. If so, are the method to account for within subject correlation and the assumptions made about variance clearly stated?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If the threshold used for inference and visualization in figures varies, is this clearly stated?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Are statistical inferences corrected for multiple comparisons?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If not, is this labeled as uncorrected?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are the results based on an ROI (region of interest) analysis?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If so, is the rationale clearly described?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How were the ROI’s defined (functional vs anatomical localization)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is there correction for multiple comparisons within each voxel?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. For cluster-wise significance, is the cluster-defining threshold and the corrected significance level defined?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

Additional Comments