

# Voltage to Calcium Transformation Improves Direction Selectivity in *Drosophila* T4 neurons

Firstname Middlename Surname<sup>1\*</sup>, Firstname Middlename Familyname<sup>1,2†§</sup>,  
Firstname Initials Surname<sup>2†¶</sup>, Firstname Surname<sup>2\*</sup>

\*For correspondence:

[email1@example.com](mailto:email1@example.com) (FMS);  
[email2@example.com](mailto:email2@example.com) (FS)

<sup>1</sup>Max Planck Institute of Neurobiology, Martinsried, Germany

<sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work

<sup>‡</sup>These authors also contributed equally to this work

**Present address:** <sup>§</sup>Department, Institute, Country; <sup>¶</sup>Department, Institute, Country

**Abstract** Analyzing how information is transmitted through neurons and synapses is crucial to understand how neural computation is carried out. A critical step in neural information processing is the transformation of voltage into calcium. However, the effect of voltage to calcium transformation on neural responses to different sensory stimuli is not well understood. Here, we use in vivo, two-photon imaging of genetically encoded voltage & calcium indicators - ArcLight and GCaMP6f respectively, to measure responses in *Drosophila* direction-selective T4 neurons. Comparison between ArcLight & GCaMP6f signals revealed calcium signals to have much higher direction selectivity compared to voltage signals. Using these recordings we further build a model which transforms T4 voltage responses to calcium responses. The model reproduces calcium responses across different visual stimuli. These findings reveal that voltage to calcium transformation involving non-linearity & low-pass filtering results in a higher direction selectivity in T4 cells.

## Introduction

In order to guide animal behavior, neurons perform a wide range of computations. Neurons encode information via dynamic changes in neuronal membrane potential and intracellular calcium concentration. Mostly, neurons communicate via chemical synapses which requires the release of neurotransmitters. When the presynaptic membrane is sufficiently depolarized, voltage-gated calcium channels open and allow  $Ca^{2+}$  to enter the cell (Llinás *et al.* 1981). Calcium entry leads to the fusion of synaptic vesicles with the membrane and release of neurotransmitter molecules into the synaptic cleft (Chapman 2002). As neurotransmitters diffuse across synaptic cleft, they bind to receptors in the postsynaptic membrane, causing postsynaptic neuron to depolarize or hyperpolarize, and thus the information gets passed on from presynaptic to postsynaptic neuron (Di Maio 2008). Understanding voltage to calcium transformation in neurons is therefore crucial to understand neural information processing and neural computation.

A classic example of neural computation can be found in how *Drosophila* neurons compute the direction of visual motion (Borst *et al.* 2020). In *Drosophila* visual information is processed via parallel ON (contrast increments) and OFF (contrast decrements) pathways (Joesch *et al.* 2010; Eichner *et al.* 2011). Direction selectivity emerges three synapses downstream of photoreceptors, in T4 and T5 for ON and OFF pathways respectively. Four subtypes of T4 and T5 cells exist, each responding selectively to one of the four cardinal directions (Maisak *et al.* 2013). The underlying mechanisms generating direction selectivity and cellular correlates implementing these mechanisms have been studied extensively over the years. Classically two opposing models have been proposed for

implementation of direction selectivity. Both these models use two input lines, where one of the input line has been asymmetrically delayed compared to other, which is then followed by a nonlinear interaction. The Hassenstein-Reichardt (HR) model, proposes a Preferred Direction (PD) enhancement (Hassenstein & Reichardt 1956), while Barlow-Levick (BL) model proposes a null direction suppression (Barlow & Levick 1965). Studies in T4 & T5 have provided functional evidence for PD enhancement (Fisher *et al.* 2015; Salazar-Gatzimas *et al.* 2016), ND suppression only (Gruntman *et al.* 2018) and combination of both (Haag, Arenz, *et al.* 2016; Haag, Mishra, *et al.* 2017). Two major experimental approaches have been used to record signals from T4 & T5 neurons. One approach has been to use changes in intracellular calcium concentration as an indicator for neural activity and the other has been to record changes in membrane potential as a proxy for neural activity. Here, we used in-vivo two photon imaging of GCaMP6f (Chen *et al.* 2013) & Arclight (Jin *et al.* 2012) to record changes in intracellular calcium concentration and changes in membrane potential respectively.

## Results

We used a driver line to express genetically encoded calcium indicator GCaMP6f (Chen *et al.* 2013) in T4 cells projecting to layer3 of lobula plate, and hence having upward motion as their Preferred Direction (PD) and downward motion as their Null Direction (ND). We then used the same driver line to express genetically encoded voltage indicator Arclight (Jin *et al.* 2012). In order to compare the voltage and calcium signals, we stimulated these flies using the same set of stimuli, while recording the neural activity in T4c cells dendrites in medulla layer 10 using 2-photon microscopy (Denk *et al.* 1990). The complete stimuli set included square-wave gratings and ON edges moving in different directions at varying speeds and contrasts.

Figure 1A shows the change in fluorescence for Arclight (black) and GCaMP (red) in response to grating moving at 4 different speeds and 2 different directions (upper row PD, lower row ND). As the grating stimuli consists of alternate bright and dark bars moving in a certain direction, we see a modulation in the Arclight and GCaMP responses to it. The modulation in GCaMP responses was seen only for slower speeds, while Arclight responses had modulation even for faster speeds. The magnitude of response was much higher for GCaMP ( $\approx 2.0\Delta F/F$ ) compared to Arclight ( $\approx 0.06\Delta F/F$ ). The peak responses (maximum  $\Delta F/F$ ) decreased with increase in stimuli speed both for GCaMP and Arclight (figure 1B). To understand if voltage to calcium transformation affects direction selectivity in T4 cells, we compared its responses to grating moving in PD and ND. GCaMP responses in ND were negligible compared to its responses in PD, while for Arclight responses in ND were significant compared to responses in PD. We quantified the direction selectivity using a Direction Selectivity Index (DSI) calculated as the difference of the peak responses to preferred and null direction, divided by the sum of the peak responses. The results reveal a high degree of direction selectivity of close to 1 for GCaMP, compared to low degree of direction selectivity ( $\approx 0.4$ ) for Arclight (figure 1E).

In a second set of experiments, we used a bright edge moving at 4 different velocities in PD or ND on a dark background. Figure 1C shows Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to these moving edges. As the edge moves from bottom to top of the stimulus arena, it hits the receptive field of T4c neurons only once and there is only a single peak in the response, not a modulation as there was with gratings. The peak response decreased with increase in stimuli speed for GCaMP, while the peak response remained almost constant for Arclight throughout all speeds (figure 1D). Similar to grating responses when comparing edge responses in PD & ND, GCaMP had negligible response in ND while Arclight had significant response in ND compared to responses in PD. The direction selectivity index was again much higher for GCaMP compared to Arclight (figure 1F). These results together show GCaMP signals to have high level of direction selectivity compared to Arclight signals both for grating and edge stimuli.

Spatial contrast i.e. the difference between adjacent luminance values, provides information about objects, textures, and motion and is important for diverse visual processes. We were therefore interested in comparing voltage and calcium signal for different contrast conditions since contrast

computation is essential to visual perception. We varied the stimulus strength by varying the contrast i.e. brightness difference between bright and dark bars for grating, and between moving edge and background for edge stimuli. Figure 2A shows Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to grating moving at 30 deg/s at 4 varying contrasts. Increasing contrast increases stimulus strength, resulting in an increase in response for both Arclight and GCaMP. As discussed earlier, we observe a modulation in the T4c response to gratings caused by alternate bright and dark bars. GCaMP response however is not only modulated, but also rises steadily over time. This is interesting particularly because we do not see such a rise for Arclight responses. For Arclight responses we have only the modulation, whereas for GCaMP responses we have both the modulation and slow rise over time. Figure 2C shows Arclight & GCaMP responses to ON edge moving at same speed at 4 different contrasts. The peak response (maximum  $\Delta F/F$ ) increased with increase in contrast (figure 2D). Similar to previous experiments, the direction selectivity index was much higher for GCaMP ( $\approx 1.0$ ) compared to that for Arclight ( $\approx 0.04$ ) (figure 2E,F).

In the results presented so far we compared responses in two directions - PD and ND. These results show GCaMP responses to have significantly higher direction selectivity index compared to that of Arclight. We next asked how does the comparison look if instead of two directions, responses for 12 directions are taken into account. In figure 3A, B we plot T4c Arclight & GCaMP normalized peak responses for grating moving in 12 directions at 4 varying speeds and contrasts respectively. The directional tuning is much sharper for GCaMP compared to Arclight. To quantify this we calculated directional tuning index  $L_{dir}$  (Mazurek *et al.* 2014) for each speed and contrast stimuli condition. We calculate the index as a vector sum of the peak responses and divide the magnitude of resultant vector by the sum of individual vector magnitudes. The directional tuning index for slower speeds and all contrasts was much higher for GCaMP ( $\approx 0.7$ ) compared to that of Arclight ( $\approx 0.2$ ). These results together show GCaMP to have high degree of directional tuning across different speeds and contrasts compared to Arclight.

How does the voltage to calcium transformation leads to calcium signal with significantly higher direction selectivity and tuning compared to voltage signal ? To address this question, we constructed an algorithmic model (figure 4) which takes Arclight signal as input and outputs GCaMP signal. In order to find the optimal parameter values, we first define an error function. The error is calculated as  $(\text{Model data} - \text{Experiment data})^2 / (\text{Experiment data})^2$ . The model takes as input Arclight data across all stimuli conditions - grating speed(48), grating contrast(48), edge speed(8), edge contrast(8) i.e. a total of 112 different stimuli conditions. Next, the model produces output and totals the error for all stimuli conditions. Then, we use Python's scipy minimize optimize function to find the optimal parameters values of the model that correspond to the minimum error.

We started with a simple model (figure 4A). The model first passes the Arclight signal through a high-pass filter. The high-pass filter would bring input Arclight signal closer to actual voltage signal by removing Arclight indicator dynamics. This is followed by a threshold since voltage changes below a certain threshold would not affect the calcium level in the cell. Now, few experimental observations which we took into consideration for building up the model further were as follows : First, the GCaMP response to grating had modulation only for slower speeds, whereas Arclight showed modulations even at faster speeds(figure 1A). Second the GCaMP responses in addition to modulation also had a steady rise over time whereas Arclight signal only had modulation (figure 1A, 2A). These experimental observations indicate towards GCaMP signal being a low-pass filtered version of the Arclight signal. In the simple model, we used a single low-pass filter followed by a gain and time-shift. Multiplication with a gain factor is required since GCaMP signal have much higher magnitude compared to Arclight. The time-shift aligns the model signal with the calcium signal. However, the simple model with single low-pass filter could not reproduce responses across all stimuli. The total error for complete dataset fit for the simple model was around 34%. Specifically, the simple model's performance for edge responses were not good. For producing the edge responses and modulation in grating responses, the model needs a low-pass filter with a smaller time constant. Whereas to get the steady rise in the grating signal the model needs a low-pass filter

with a larger time constant. Hence, we combined the output of two low-pass filters. Combining the low-pass filters output with an addition (figure 4B) did not lead to much improvement with error being around 37% for complete dataset fit. However, combining both the outputs with a multiplication led to significant decrease in the error. The error for multiplicative model (figure 4C) was around 14%.

The multiplicative model thus has in total 6 parameters - high-pass filter time constant, threshold, low-pass filter 1 time constant, low-pass filter 2 time constant, gain and shift. The multiplicative model was able to reproduce calcium signal across different visual stimuli (figure 5). The model could produce both the modulation and slow rise in the GCaMP signal in response to grating (figure 5 A). The model could also reproduce the ON edge speed tuning responses across different speeds (figure 5 C,D). The directional tuning index  $L_{dir}$  also were similar for model and experimental data across slower speeds and all contrasts (figure 5 E,F). Thus the model is able to successfully reproduce experimental calcium data across different stimuli.

We further asked if the slow rise we observe in GCaMP signal over time is due to T4 cell properties or whether it is due to slow indicator dynamics of GCaMP6f. Hence we used a faster indicator GCaMP8f (Zhang *et al.* 2020). We used the same driver line to express GCaMP8f in T4c cells. We repeated the experiments using grating stimuli in 12 directions at 4 speeds and ON edge in PD and ND. We found T4c cells GCaMP8f responses to be very similar to GCaMP6f responses. We could still observe the modulation and slow rise in the signal (Supplement figure). This shows that slow rise in calcium signal we observe is indeed due to T4 cells intrinsic properties and not due to slowness of GCaMP6f indicator. We further compared the model parameters values for GCaMP6f data fit and GCaMP8f data fit (figure 6). The model parameters had similar values with time constants having slightly smaller values for GCaMP8f as it is a faster indicator.

## Materials and Methods

### Flies

Flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) were raised at 25°C and 60% humidity on a 12 hour light/12 hour dark cycle on standard cornmeal agar medium. For calcium imaging experiments, genetically-encoded calcium indicator GCaMP6f (Chen *et al.* 2013) was expressed in T4 neurons with axon terminals predominantly in layer 3 of the lobula plate. Similarly for voltage imaging experiments, genetically-encoded voltage indicator ArcLight (Jin *et al.* 2012) was expressed in T4 layer 3 neurons. The flies genotype are as follows :


1. w<sup>+</sup> ; VT15785-Gal4AD / UAS-GCaMP6f; VT50384-Gal4DBD / UAS-GCaMP6f
2. w<sup>+</sup> ; VT15785-Gal4AD / UAS-ArcLight; VT50384-Gal4DBD / +

### Calcium & voltage imaging


For imaging experiments, fly surgeries were performed as previously described (Maisak *et al.* 2013). Briefly, flies were anaesthetized with CO<sub>2</sub> or on ice, fixed with their backs, legs and wings to a Plexiglas holder with back of the head exposed to a recording chamber filled with fly external solution. The cuticula at the back of the head on one side of the brain was cut away with a fine hypodermic needle and removed together with air sacks covering the underlying optic lobe. The neuronal activity was then measured from optic lobe on a custom-built 2-photon microscope as previously described (Maisak *et al.* 2013). Images were acquired at 64 x 64 pixels resolution and frame rate 13 Hz with the Scanimage software in Matlab (Pologruto *et al.* 2003).

### Visual stimulation

For the study of visual responses of T4c cells, visual stimuli were presented on a custom-built projector-based arena as described in (Arenz *et al.* 2017). In brief : Two micro-projectors (TI DLP Lightcrafter 3000) were used to project stimuli onto the back of an opaque cylindrical screen covering 180° in azimuth and 105° in elevation of the fly's visual field. To increase the refresh rate




**Figure 1. T4c voltage & calcium speed tuning :** (A) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to grating moving in PD (top row) & ND (bottom row) at 4 different speeds. Data shows the mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell responses measured in 5 different flies. The plots have twin y-axis. The left y-axis of the plot represents Voltage responses i.e. changes in Arclight fluorescence ( $-\Delta F/F$ ) and the right y-axis of the plot represents Calcium responses i.e. changes in GCaMP fluorescence ( $\Delta F/F$ ) (B) T4c peak responses to grating moving in PD(top) & ND(bottom) at 4 different speeds. (C) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to ON-edge moving in PD (top row)& ND (bottom row) at 4 different speeds. Data shows the mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell responses measured in 5 different flies. (D) T4c peak responses to ON-edge moving in PD & ND at 4 different speeds. (E) Direction Selectivity Index (DSI) calculated as difference of peak responses in PD and ND divided by the sum of peak responses for grating (F) Direction Selectivity Index (DSI) for ON-edge.



**Figure 2. T4c voltage & calcium contrast tuning :** (A) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to grating moving in PD (top row) & ND (bottom row) at 4 contrasts. Data shows the mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell responses measured in 5 different flies. The plots have twin y-axis. The left y-axis of the plot represents Voltage responses i.e. changes in Arclight fluorescence ( $-\Delta F/F$ ) and the right y-axis of the plot represents Calcium responses i.e. changes in GCaMP fluorescence ( $\Delta F/F$ ) (B) T4c peak responses to grating moving in PD(top) & ND(bottom) at 4 different contrasts. (C) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) responses to ON-edge moving in PD (top row)& ND (bottom row) at 4 different contrasts. Data shows the mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell responses measured in 5 different flies. (D) T4c peak responses to ON-edge moving in PD & ND at 4 different contrasts. (E) Direction Selectivity Index (DSI) calculated as difference of peak responses in PD and ND divided by the sum of peak responses for grating (F) Direction Selectivity Index (DSI) for ON-edge.






**Figure 3. T4c voltage & calcium direction tuning :** (A) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) normalized peak responses to grating moving in 12 directions at 4 speeds. Data shows the normalized mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell peak responses measured in 5 different flies. (B) T4c Arclight (black) & GCaMP (red) normalized peak responses to grating moving in 12 directions at 4 contrasts. Data shows the normalized mean  $\pm$  SEM of T4c cell peak responses measured in 5 different flies (C) The Directional Tuning Index  $L_{dir}$  for grating moving at 4 different speeds. The Directional Tuning Index is calculated as a vector summation of the peak responses and the magnitude of resultant vector is divided by the summation of individual vector magnitudes. (D) The directional tuning index for grating at 4 different contrasts.


### A Simple Model



### B Additive Model




### C Multiplicative Model




**Figure 4. Models for producing GCaMP responses :** (A) Simple model consisting of High-Pass filter (HP), threshold(trld), Low-Pass filter(LP), gain and shift. (B) Additive model combining output of two low-pass filters via addition. (C) Multiplicative model combining output of two low-pass filters via multiplication.





**Figure 5. The Multiplicative model responses :** (A) T4c GCaMP (red) & Multiplicative model (green) responses to grating moving in PD (top row) & ND (bottom row) at 4 different speeds. (B) T4c GCaMP & model peak responses to grating moving in PD(top) & ND(bottom) at 4 different speeds. (C) T4c GCaMP (red) & Multiplicative model (green) responses to ON-edge moving in PD (top row) & ND (bottom row) at 4 different speeds. (D) T4c GCaMP & model peak responses to ON-edge moving in PD(top) & ND(bottom) at 4 different speeds. (E) The Directional Tuning Index  $L_{dir}$  for GCaMP & model for grating moving in 12 directions at 4 different speeds. (F) The Directional Tuning Index  $L_{dir}$  for GCaMP & model for grating moving in 12 directions at 4 different contrasts.



**Figure 6. Model parameters comparison for GCaMP6f & GCaMP8f** : Data shows mean  $\pm$  SD for optimal parameters for the Multiplicative model. The data were fit for grating moving in 12 directions and 4 speeds, and for ON-edge moving in PD & ND at 4 speeds.

from 60 Hz to 180 Hz (at 8 bit color depth), projectors were programmed to use only green LED (OSRAM L CG H9RN) which emits light between 500 nm to 600 nm wavelength. Two long-pass filters (Thorlabs FEL0550 and FGL550) were placed in front of each projector to restrict the stimulus light to wavelengths above 550 nm. This prevents overlap between GCaMP signal and arena light spectra. To allow only GCaMP emission spectrum to be detected, a band-pass filter (Brightline 520/35) was placed in-front of the photomultiplier. For all stimuli used here, we set the medium brightness to a 8-bit grayscale value of 50, which corresponds to a medium luminance of  $55 \pm 11 \text{ cd/m}^2$ . Stimuli were rendered using custom written software in Python 2.7.

### Stimuli

Stimuli were presented with 3-5 repetitions per experiment in a randomized fashion. To measure the directional and speed tuning, square-wave gratings with a spatial wavelength of  $30^\circ$  spanning the full extent of the stimulus arena were used. The gratings were moved in 12 different directions from  $0^\circ - 360^\circ$  at 4 different speed ( $15 \text{ degree/second} - 120 \text{ degree/second}$ ). Similarly, to measure direction and contrast tuning, square-wave gratings with a spatial wavelength of  $30^\circ$  spanning the full extent of the stimulus arena were used. The gratings moved at a speed of  $30 \text{ degree/second}$  in 12 different directions at 4 different contrast (10% – 100%). Edge responses were measured using ON edge i.e. bright edge moving on a dark background with full contrast. The ON edge moved in preferred direction (upward) or null direction (downward) at 4 different speed ( $15 \text{ degree/second} - 120 \text{ degree/second}$ ).

### Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using custom-written routines in Matlab and Python 2.7, 3.7. Images were automatically registered using horizontal and vertical translations to correct for the movement of brain. Fluorescence changes ( $\Delta F/F$ ) were then calculated using a standard baseline algorithm (Jia *et al.* 2010). Regions of interest (ROIs) were drawn on the average raw image manually by hand in the medulla layer M10 for signals from T4 dendrites. Averaging the fluorescence change over this ROI in space resulted in a ( $\Delta F/F$ ) time course. Voltage imaging with ArcLight and Calcium imaging with GCaMP were performed and analysed using same settings.

## References

1. Hassenstein, B. & Reichardt, W. Systemtheoretische Analyse der Zeit-, Reihenfolgen- und Vorzeichenbewertung bei der Bewegungsperzeption des Rüsselkäfers *Chlorophanus*. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung B* **11**, 513–524. ISSN: 1865-7117 (Oct. 1956).
2. Barlow, H. B. & Levick, W. R. The mechanism of directionally selective units in rabbit's retina. *The Journal of Physiology* **178**, 477–504. ISSN: 00223751 (June 1965).
3. Llinás, R., Steinberg, I. Z. & Walton, K. Relationship between presynaptic calcium current and postsynaptic potential in squid giant synapse. *Biophysical Journal* **33**, 323. ISSN: 00063495 (1981).
4. Denk, W., Strickler, J. H. & Webb, W. W. Two-photon laser scanning fluorescence microscopy. *Science* **248**, 73–76. ISSN: 00368075 (1990).
5. Chapman, E. R. Synaptotagmin: A Ca<sup>2+</sup> sensor that triggers exocytosis? *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* 2002 3:7 **3**, 498–508. ISSN: 1471-0080 (2002).
6. Pologruto, T. A., Sabatini, B. L. & Svoboda, K. ScanImage: Flexible software for operating laser scanning microscopes. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine* **2**, 13. ISSN: 1475925X (May 2003).
7. Di Maio, V. Regulation of information passing by synaptic transmission: A short review. *Brain Research* **1225**, 26–38. ISSN: 0006-8993 (Aug. 2008).
8. Jia, H., Rochefort, N. L., Chen, X. & Konnerth, A. In vivo two-photon imaging of sensory-evoked dendritic calcium signals in cortical neurons. *Nature Protocols* 2010 6:1 **6**, 28–35. ISSN: 1750-2799 (Dec. 2010).
9. Joesch, M., Schnell, B., Raghu, S. V., Reiff, D. F. & Borst, A. ON and OFF pathways in *Drosophila* motion vision. *Nature* 2010 468:7321 **468**, 300–304. ISSN: 1476-4687 (Nov. 2010).
10. Eichner, H., Joesch, M., Schnell, B., Reiff, D. F. & Borst, A. Internal Structure of the Fly Elementary Motion Detector. *Neuron* **70**, 1155–1164. ISSN: 0896-6273 (June 2011).
11. Jin, L. *et al.* Single Action Potentials and Subthreshold Electrical Events Imaged in Neurons with a Fluorescent Protein Voltage Probe. *Neuron* **75**, 779–785. ISSN: 0896-6273 (Sept. 2012).
12. Chen, T.-W. *et al.* Ultrasensitive fluorescent proteins for imaging neuronal activity. *Nature* 2013 499:7458 **499**, 295–300. ISSN: 1476-4687 (July 2013).
13. Maisak, M. S. *et al.* A directional tuning map of *Drosophila* elementary motion detectors. *Nature* **500**, 212–216. ISSN: 1476-4687 (2013).
14. Mazurek, M., Kager, M. & Van Hooser, S. D. Robust quantification of orientation selectivity and direction selectivity. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits* **8**, 92. ISSN: 16625110 (Aug. 2014).
15. Fisher, Y. E., Silies, M. & Clandinin, T. R. Orientation Selectivity Sharpens Motion Detection in *Drosophila*. *Neuron* **88**, 390–402. ISSN: 08966273 (Oct. 2015).
16. Haag, J., Arenz, A., Serbe, E., Gabbiani, F. & Borst, A. Complementary mechanisms create direction selectivity in the fly. *eLife* **5**. ISSN: 2050-084X. doi:10.7554/eLife.17421. <https://elifesciences.org/articles/17421> (Aug. 2016).
17. Salazar-Gatzimas, E. *et al.* Direct Measurement of Correlation Responses in *Drosophila* Elementary Motion Detectors Reveals Fast Timescale Tuning. *Neuron* **92**, 227–239. ISSN: 08966273 (Oct. 2016).
18. Arenz, A., Drews, M. S., Richter, F. G., Ammer, G. & Borst, A. The Temporal Tuning of the *Drosophila* Motion Detectors Is Determined by the Dynamics of Their Input Elements. *Current biology : CB* **27**, 929–944. ISSN: 1879-0445 (Apr. 2017).
19. Haag, J., Mishra, A. & Borst, A. A common directional tuning mechanism of *Drosophila* motion-sensing neurons in the ON and in the OFF pathway. *eLife* **6**. ISSN: 2050084X. doi:10.7554/eLife.29044 (2017).

- 262 20. Gruntman, E., Romani, S. & Reiser, M. B. Simple integration of fast excitation and offset, delayed  
263 inhibition computes directional selectivity in *Drosophila*. *Nature Neuroscience* **21**, 250–257.  
264 ISSN: 1097-6256 (Feb. 2018).
- 265 21. Borst, A., Haag, J. & Mauss, A. S. How fly neurons compute the direction of visual motion.  
266 *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology*  
267 **206**, 109–124. ISSN: 14321351 (Mar. 2020).
- 268 22. Zhang, Y. *et al.* jGCaMP8 Fast Genetically Encoded Calcium Indicators. *figshare*. doi:[10.25378/](https://doi.org/10.25378/JANELIA.13148243.V4)  
269 [JANELIA.13148243.V4](https://doi.org/10.25378/JANELIA.13148243.V4). [https://janelia.figshare.com/articles/online\\_resource/jGCaMP8\\_](https://janelia.figshare.com/articles/online_resource/jGCaMP8_Fast_Genetically_Encoded_Calcium_Indicators/13148243%20https://janelia.figshare.com/ndownloader/files/25776017)  
270 [Fast\\_Genetically\\_Encoded\\_Calcium\\_Indicators/13148243%20https://janelia.figshare.com/](https://janelia.figshare.com/articles/online_resource/jGCaMP8_Fast_Genetically_Encoded_Calcium_Indicators/13148243%20https://janelia.figshare.com/ndownloader/files/25776017)  
271 [ndownloader/files/25776017](https://janelia.figshare.com/articles/online_resource/jGCaMP8_Fast_Genetically_Encoded_Calcium_Indicators/13148243%20https://janelia.figshare.com/ndownloader/files/25776017) (2020).