Shortcuts and checkpoints on the road to skilled movement

Coordinating intricate motor circuits

By Eiman Azim

A split second late or a few inches off the mark, and few would remember. Instead, running with his back to the ball, Willie Mays extended his arm and placed his glove squarely under the 420-foot center field drive. The New York Giants win Game 1 of the 1954 World Series, and Mays, his glove, and “The Catch” earn their place in history.

Few of our limb movements will ever gain such immortality, but what we accomplish every day is remarkable, nonetheless. When we catch a tipped wineglass or launch a dart toward a bullseye, hardly a second thought is given to the intricacy of neural circuits that orchestrate such precise movements.

How do these circuits control skilled behaviors? Because rodent limb movements are strikingly similar to those of primates (1), and mice provide a means of manipulating neural subtypes selectively (2), as a postdoc with Tom Jessell I reasoned that a detailed quantification of mouse reaching, together with a genetic dissection of spinal circuits, might help disentangle core features of mammalian skilled motor control (3).

Reaching appears simple, but deceptively so. Motor neurons fire, propelling the arm to target. Yet reaching does not arise from an isolated burst of motor output; rather, motor neuron activity is continually tweaked to shape appropriate limb kinematics (4–6). One strategy for updating motor output is to use proprioceptive feedback from muscles to evaluate outcome and correct course. But sensory information is slow in its trek from the periphery to the brain, creating at least two challenges for motor systems: how to achieve faster feedback for rapid movements, and how to prevent sensory feedback delays from destabilizing the limb (7) (see the figure, panel A).

**INTERNAL COPIES PROVIDE FEEDBACK.** Rapid movements unfold before sensory information arrives (8), implying the need for a faster source of information to refine motor output. One long-held idea argues that when motor commands direct arm movement, internal copies of these commands are conveyed to the cerebellum and help predict movement outcome to permit rapid course correction (7–9). Nevertheless, it is unclear whether putative internal copy pathways have any influence on motor output. Traditional experimental approaches such as electrical stimulation tend to perturb command and copy simultaneously, emphasizing the need for more-selective access to internal copy circuits.

Propriospinal neurons (PNs) in the cervical spinal cord have been implicated in the control of reaching in cats and primates and have the potential to transmit both motor and internal copy signals. They receive descending motor input and extend bifurcating axonal branches both to forelimb motor neurons and to the lateral reticular nucleus (LRN), a major input to the cerebellum (10) (see the figure, panel B). Manipulating the LRN-directed branch could therefore provide insight into the contribution of internal feedback to skilled movement.

We first needed to resolve whether PNs exist in mice. Collaborating with Bror Alsborn, we combined in vivo electrophysiology with viral labeling to show that PNs are present and, more tellingly, that they represent a subpopulation of V2a neurons (11), one of the cardinal interneuron subtypes involved in motor control (2). This genetic insight made it possible to ablating cervical V2a interneurons, revealing a severe and behaviorally selective perturbation of reaching movements. The similarity of these reaching deficits across species (10) supports the view that PNs have evolved to direct specific features of mammalian forelimb movement (12).

But ablating PNs does not resolve whether the internal copy branch alone can influence molecular, electrophysiological, and behavioral approaches in the mouse to identify and characterize feedback pathways that control goal-directed reaching.
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“Reaching appears simple, but deceptively so.”

late presynaptic and postsynaptic inhibition separately, leaving presynaptic inhibition as a phenomenon in search of a function. Inhibitory neurons are not created equal, and thus molecular differences could provide a means of selective interneuron manipulation. Using the GABA-synthetic gene Gad2 to gain selective access to neurons that contact sensory terminals (16, 17), Andrew Fink combined ChR2-based activation with in vitro electrophysiology to establish that Gad2-expressing neurons mediate presynaptic inhibition at sensory-motor synapses (18). More strikingly, we found that eliminating these neurons unleashes severe limb oscillations during reaching that are absent at rest (figure, panel C), implicating proprioceptive feedback as the trigger. With Larry Abbott, we found that the core features of these reaching deficits can be accounted for by a model of the limb in which sensory feedback gain is high. Thus, a mix of molecules, manipulation, and modeling has uncovered presynaptic inhibition as a sensory gain-control mechanism critical for smooth limb movement.

Whether refined or routine, in the World Series or on backyard bases, movement defines our interaction with the world. Deciphering how intention is converted into action calls for a greater appreciation of the causal link between motor circuits and behavior. Through a reductionist approach in mice, in essence dismantling circuits one neural element at a time, plausible substrates for internal and external feedback control are emerging. Exploring how these and other motor circuits are conserved and modified across species should lead to a clearer understanding of our impressive—on occasion even Mays-like—repertoires of skilled behavior.
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