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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>FIGURE NUMBER</td>
<td>WHICH TEST</td>
<td>SECTION &amp; PARAGRAPH #</td>
<td>EXACT VALUE</td>
<td>DEFINED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>one-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Fig. legend</td>
<td>9, 9, 10, 15 mice from at least 3 litters/group</td>
<td>Methods para 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results para 6</td>
<td>unpaired t-test</td>
<td>Results para 6</td>
<td>15 slices from 10 mice</td>
<td>Results para 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE NUMBER</td>
<td>WHICH TEST?</td>
<td>SECTION &amp; PARAGRAPH #</td>
<td>EXACT VALUE</td>
<td>DEFINED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>d' of 3 mice, hit rate of 3 mice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Shuffled data set</td>
<td>Results para 4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>target responsive neurons from 5 mice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Shuffled data set</td>
<td>Results para 4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>foil responsive neurons from 5 mice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov test</td>
<td>Results para 3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>target responsive neurons from 5 mice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Fig. legend</td>
<td>144, 94, 159, 79</td>
<td>144 excitatory neurons, 94 PV+ neurons, 159 SOM + neurons, 79 VIP+ neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d,f, h</td>
<td>Fisher's exact test</td>
<td>Results para 5</td>
<td>PV: 31, SOM: 20, VIP: 59</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i</td>
<td>Kruskalwalis</td>
<td>Fig. 3i legend</td>
<td>PV: 31, SOM: 20, VIP: 59 Exc: 437</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Data</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Repeated measures ANOVA + Tukey's post-hoc</td>
<td>Fig. legend 148</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Data</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Repeated measures ANOVA + Tukey's post-hoc</td>
<td>Fig. legend 148</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i</td>
<td>Wilcoxon signed-rank test (grouped); paired two-tailed t-test (individual)</td>
<td>Results para 10 9, 6</td>
<td>9 neurons when suppressing PV or SOM; 6 neurons when suppressing VIP</td>
<td>Results para 10 mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>fig. legend all = 13 PV = 7 SOM = 5 VIP = 2</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>fig. legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 12 3</td>
<td>ChAT-cre animals</td>
<td>Results para 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 14 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Results para 15 median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5g</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 13 4</td>
<td>4 sites in 3 animals</td>
<td>Figure legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5i</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 14 11, 12</td>
<td>11 sessions’ hit rate with atropine, 12 session’s hit rate with saline</td>
<td>Results para 13 mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5j</td>
<td>Wilcoxon signed-rank test</td>
<td>Results para 14 16 (atropine), 12 (saline)</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>Results para 14 error bar shows mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m</td>
<td>Wilcoxon signed-rank test (two-tailed)</td>
<td>Results para 14 9</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>Results para 14 mean, all data points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6i</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6j</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6k</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6l</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6n</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6o</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6p</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6q</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6s</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6t</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6u</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6w</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6x</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6y</td>
<td>unpaired two-tailed t-test &amp; ANOVA &amp; Tukey’s post-hoc</td>
<td>Results para 15 15, 19, 7, 5</td>
<td>15 excitatory neurons, 19 interneurons (overall comparison); 7 PV, 7 SOM, and 5 VIP neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend median with IQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6z</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 7</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>paired two-tailed t-test</td>
<td>Results para 15 5</td>
<td>Number of neurons</td>
<td>Figure Legend mean +/- SEM</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)?

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 #)?

---

**Staining:** Extended Data Figure 9c-e; Extended Data Figure 14

**Extended Data Figure 9** histology is quantified in Extended Data Figure 9b. For Extended Data Figure 14, approach is reported in Methods on page 38.
## 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.
   - **Yes.** In all cases, we achieved significance for the appropriate level of statistics. Across the dozens of experiments, in the 1-2 sub-cases where significance was not achieved, that is also reported. Sample size calculations were made for whole-cell recordings as reported in methods on pages 32-33.

2. **Are statistical tests justified as appropriate for every figure?**
   - Where (section, paragraph #)?
   - **Yes.** General approach is discussed in methods and detailed in the text of legends.
   - **a.** If there is a section summarizing the statistical methods in the methods, is the statistical test for each experiment clearly defined?
     - Yes, this is distributed across methods for each specific modality (physiology, pages 32-33; imaging, pages 30-31; behavior, pages 27-28)
   - **b.** Do the data meet the assumptions of the specific statistical test you chose (e.g. normality for a parametric test)?
     - Yes, in the methods.
   - **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 #)?
     - Yes, we use SEM unless otherwise indicated.
   - **d.** Are tests specified as one- or two-sided? **Yes**
   - **e.** Are there adjustments for multiple comparisons? **Yes**

3. **To promote transparency, *Nature Neuroscience* has stopped allowing bar graphs to report statistics in the papers it publishes. If you have bar graphs in your paper, please make sure to switch them to dot-plots (with central and dispersion statistics displayed) or to box-and-whisker plots to show data distributions.**
   - All graphs are shown with each individual data point for all small n experiments. For imaging data, we show distributions but then also included bar plots to summarize the data.

4. **Are criteria for excluding data points reported?**
   - Was this criterion established prior to data collection?
   - Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?
   - Yes, particularly for the whole-cell recordings. We established the 30% change in Ri and Rs threshold before recordings (page 32). In addition, we ensured that changes in Inhibition or Excitation were not correlated with Ri and Rs (page 32).

5. **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 #)?
   - No randomization was used in this study.
6. Is a statement of the extent to which investigator knew the group allocation during the experiment and in assessing outcome included?
   No blinding was done.

   If no blinding was done, state so.

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

7. For experiments in live vertebrates, is a statement of compliance with ethical guidelines/regulations included?
   Yes, page 24.

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

8. Is the species of the animals used reported?
   Yes, page 24

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

9. Is the strain of the animals (including background strains of KO/transgenic animals used) reported?
   Yes, page 24

   Where (section, paragraph #)?

10. Is the sex of the animals/subjects used reported?
    No

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

11. Is the age of the animals/subjects reported?
    Yes, page 24

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

12. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the light/dark cycle reported?
    No

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

13. For animals housed in a vivarium, is the housing group (i.e. number of animals per cage) reported?
    No

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

14. For behavioral experiments, is the time of day reported (e.g. light or dark cycle)?
    No

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

15. Is the previous history of the animals/subjects (e.g. prior drug administration, surgery, behavioral testing) reported?
    No, all animals used in this study were used only for the indicated experiments.

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

16. If any animals/subjects were excluded from analysis, is this reported?
    N/A

    Where (section, paragraph #)?

a. If multiple behavioral tests were conducted in the same group of animals, is this reported?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
a. How were the criteria for exclusion defined?
   Where is this described (section, paragraph #)?

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 #)?

Reagents

1. Have antibodies been validated for use in the system under study (assay and species)?

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

   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 #)?

   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.

   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 availability

Provide a Data availability statement in the Methods section under "Data availability", which should include, where applicable:

- Accession codes for deposited data
- Other unique identifiers (such as DOIs and hyperlinks for any other datasets)
- At a minimum, a statement confirming that all relevant data are available from the authors
- Formal citations of datasets that are assigned DOIs
- A statement regarding data available in the manuscript as source data
- A statement regarding data available with restrictions

See our data availability and data citations policy page for more information.

Data deposition in a public repository is mandatory for:

a. Protein, DNA and RNA sequences
b. Macromolecular structures
c. Crystallographic data for small molecules
d. 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.

Where is the Data Availability statement provided (section, paragraph #)?

### 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.

   **OK**

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.

   Yes we have included this section and have made code available.

### Human subjects
1. Which IRB approved the protocol?
   Where is this stated (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

2. Is demographic information on all subjects provided?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

3. Is the number of human subjects, their age and sex clearly defined?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

4. Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria (if any) clearly specified?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

5. How well were the groups matched?
   Where is this information described (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

6. Is a statement included confirming that informed consent was obtained from all subjects?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

7. For publication of patient photos, is a statement included confirming that consent to publish was obtained?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

### 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?
   Where (section, paragraph #)?
   N/A

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
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.
   N/A
   a. How was this region determined?
   N/A

9. Is the field strength (in Tesla) of the MRI system stated?
   N/A
   a. Is the pulse sequence type (gradient/spin echo, EPI/spiral) stated?
   N/A
   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?
    N/A
    a. If fixed effects inference used, is this justified?
    N/A

17. Were repeated measures used (multiple measurements per subject)?
    N/A
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<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</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the assumptions made about variance clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If the threshold used for inference and visualization in figures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varies, is this clearly stated?</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the corrected significance level defined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

Additional Comments