

1 **Accommodation to hyperpolarization of human**
2 **axons assessed in the frequency domain**

3 James Howells¹, Hugh Bostock² and David Burke³

4 ¹*Brain & Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

5 ²*Sobell Department of Motor Neuroscience and Movement Disorders, Institute of Neurology, University*
6 *College London, Queen Square, London, UK*

7 ³*Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

8

9

10 ***Corresponding Author:***

11 James Howells

12 Level 2, Medical Foundation Building

13 The University of Sydney

14 92-94 Parramatta Rd, Camperdown 2050, N.S.W., Australia.

15 Email: james.howells@sydney.edu.au

16 ***Running title:*** *Low-frequency resonance in human axons*

17 ***Keywords:*** *axonal excitability, frequency domain, resonance, motor axons, sensory*

18 *axons, HCN channels, I_h , mathematical modelling*

19 ***Number of pages:*** 45

20 ***Number of figures:*** 9

21 ***Number of tables:*** 2

22 ***Word count (excluding title page, references, tables, figure legends and appendix):***

23 6582

24 **Abstract**

25 Human axons *in vivo* were subjected to subthreshold currents with a threshold-
26 “ZAP” profile (Impedance [Z] Amplitude Profile) to allow the use of frequency domain
27 techniques to determine the propensity for resonant behavior, and to clarify the relative
28 contributions of different ion channels to their low-frequency responsiveness. Twenty-
29 four studies were performed on the motor and sensory axons of the median nerve in 6
30 subjects. The response to oscillatory currents was tested between ‘DC’ and 16 Hz. A
31 resonant peak at ~2 to 2.5 Hz was found in the response of hyperpolarized axons, but
32 there was only a small broad response in axons at resting membrane potential (RMP).
33 A mathematical model of axonal excitability developed using DC pulses provided a
34 good fit to the frequency response for human axons, and indicated that the
35 hyperpolarization-activated current I_h , and the slow potassium current I_{Ks} are principally
36 responsible for the resonance. However the results indicate that if axons are
37 hyperpolarized more than -60% of resting threshold, the only conductances that are
38 appreciably active are I_h and the leak conductance – i.e., that the activity of these
39 conductances can be studied *in vivo* virtually in isolation at hyperpolarized membrane
40 potentials. Given that the leak conductance dampens resonance it is suggested that the -
41 60% hyperpolarization used here is optimal for I_h . As expected differences between the
42 frequency responses of motor and sensory axons were present and best explained by
43 reduced G_{Ks} , up-modulation of I_h and increased persistent Na^+ current, I_{NaP} (due to
44 depolarization of RMP) in sensory axons.

45

46 **New and Noteworthy**

47 The low-frequency response of human axons was studied *in vivo* using a novel
48 application of frequency-domain and threshold-tracking techniques.

49 Studying the response to subthreshold oscillatory input currents at different
50 membrane potentials allows the separation of relative ion channel contributions to
51 axonal excitability based upon their voltage dependence and gating kinetics.

52 At hyperpolarized membrane potentials, hyperpolarization-activated
53 conductances which flow through HCN channels are responsible for low-frequency
54 resonance in human axons which is modulated by leak conductances.

55 **Abbreviations**

56 FFT, Fast Fourier Transform; f_{\max} , frequency corresponding to the maximal
57 ‘threshold impedance’ (Z_{\max}); G_{Lk} , leak conductance; G_{Ks} , slow-potassium conductance;
58 G_H , hyperpolarization-activated conductance; HCN, hyperpolarization-activated cyclic
59 nucleotide-gated channels; I_h , hyperpolarization-activated cation current; I_{Ks} , slow-
60 potassium current; I_{NaP} , persistent Na^+ current; K_f , fast potassium; K_s , slow potassium;
61 RMP, resting membrane potential; SNR, signal to noise ratio; ZAP, Impedance[Z]
62 Amplitude Profile; ‘ $Z_{\text{threshold}}$ ’, threshold analog of impedance; $Z_{0.5}$, magnitude of
63 ‘threshold impedance’ at 0.5 Hz; Z_{\max} , maximal magnitude of ‘threshold impedance’

64 **Introduction**

65 In humans, studies of the excitability of human peripheral nerve axons have
66 been undertaken using threshold-tracking techniques and have provided insight into the
67 biophysical determinants of excitability in health and disease (Bostock et al. 1998;

68 Burke et al. 2001; Kiernan et al. 2000; Krishnan et al. 2009). Traditionally conditioning
69 stimuli have been square-wave currents, either subthreshold and long-lasting, or brief
70 and at or above threshold. The contribution of the inwardly rectifying current, I_h , is
71 apparent in the accommodation to hyperpolarizing changes in membrane potential, but
72 this requires long and strong hyperpolarization before it can be appreciated fully
73 (Howells et al. 2013; Howells et al. 2012; Tomlinson et al. 2010).

74 The accommodation to hyperpolarization is mediated by several conductances.
75 For example, over the voltage range in which they overlap, changes in the rectifying
76 conductances G_{Ks} (slow potassium) and G_H (hyperpolarization-activated) have
77 synergistic effects: hyperpolarization of the membrane potential leads to a lessening of
78 the hyperpolarizing conductance G_{Ks} and an increase in the depolarizing conductance
79 G_H . Both changes act to limit the hyperpolarization.

80 The disentanglement of the relative contributions has traditionally focussed on
81 the overall picture of excitability, with the effects of G_{Ks} also present in the
82 accommodation to depolarizing currents and in the late subexcitable period following an
83 action potential (Kiernan et al. 2000). To complicate the picture further, it is difficult to
84 separate these slowly rectifying currents from the leak conductance (G_{Lk}), which is
85 independent of membrane potential. Despite these issues, this ‘whole-of-excitability’
86 approach has allowed the development of mathematical models which have been
87 successful in describing the biophysical basis of axonal excitability in health and a
88 variety of disease processes (Howells et al. 2012; Krishnan et al. 2009; Lin et al. 2006).

89 The use of frequency as a probe of structure and function is well established.
90 Cole and Curtis (1936) described the impedance of nerve and muscle in terms of an
91 equivalent electrical circuit consisting of a parallel resistance and capacitance, and this

92 model was later extended on functional grounds to include an inductive element to
93 explain the rectifying properties of axon membranes (Cole 1941; Cole and Baker 1941).
94 Puil and colleagues (1986) introduced a frequency probe, which they called the ZAP
95 (Impedance[Z] Amplitude Profile) as an efficient means to probe the passive and active
96 properties of trigeminal root ganglion neurons in guinea pigs. The ZAP is essentially a
97 small amplitude sinewave current whose instantaneous frequency is continuously
98 increased from start to end. The response voltage to such a current provides a frequency
99 response profile within a single sweep, and this depends on the particular membrane
100 structure and the composition and state of the ion channels present in the membrane
101 (Hutcheon and Yarom 2000; Llinás 1988). To date, studies have focussed on the low-
102 frequency subthreshold resonance that underlies θ -rhythms in central neurons (Hu et al.
103 2009; Hu et al. 2002; Hutcheon et al. 1996; Pike et al. 2000; Wang et al. 2006;
104 Zemankovics et al. 2010). Hu and colleagues (2002) found that θ -resonances occurred
105 at hyperpolarized and depolarized membrane potentials, mediated by HCN and K_s
106 channels, respectively, and they termed these H- and M-resonances. No studies have
107 been performed on axons, and the techniques have not been applied previously to
108 human tissue *in vivo*.

109 Experiments *in vivo* on human subjects inevitably rely on indirect techniques,
110 and conclusions are more convincing when supported by different approaches. In the
111 present study a new protocol was developed to assess the suitability of using threshold
112 tracking techniques to investigate the responses of human axons in the frequency
113 domain. Motor and sensory axons of the median nerve were subjected to subthreshold
114 oscillatory currents, both at resting and hyperpolarized membrane potentials. The
115 results were interpreted with the help of a previously described model of axonal

116 excitability (Howells et al. 2012), and used to re-examine the nature of the differences
117 between motor and sensory axons.

118 **Materials and Methods**

119 Twenty-four experiments were performed on six subjects. The experiments
120 each lasted ~ 2 hours, and they were carried out on separate days. The subjects
121 provided written consent prior to the study, which was approved by the Human
122 Research Ethics Committee of The University of Sydney and conformed to the
123 *Declaration of Helsinki*.

124 All excitability measurements were made using the QTRAC threshold-tracking
125 software (© Institute of Neurology, University College London, UK). The ZAP
126 protocol was developed in QtracS, and synchronized the delivery of the stimulus
127 command signals with the acquisition of the compound action potentials via a data
128 acquisition system (PCI-6221, National Instruments, Austin, TX). The compound
129 action potentials were amplified using a purpose-built low-noise amplifier, and mains
130 frequency noise was removed using a Humbug noise eliminator (Quest Scientific,
131 Vancouver) before being digitized by the data acquisition system.

132 The ZAP protocol was applied to motor and sensory axons of the median nerve
133 at the wrist. The pulse protocols in the present study required the delivery of long
134 subthreshold pulses, which necessitated special stimulation measures to prevent
135 polarization of electrodes and long-term polarization of resting membrane potential
136 (RMP). Skin impedance at the stimulus sites was reduced using abrasive tape (Red Dot
137 Trace Prep, 3M), followed by cleaning with an alcohol swab. The optimal cathode
138 location (at the wrist) was sought using a saline-soaked gauze-covered electrode before

139 applying the final stimulation cathode. Disposable self-adhesive Ag/AgCl electrodes
140 (Unilect 1010M) were used for stimulation, ground and EMG recording electrodes. The
141 anode was remote from the median nerve, approximately 10 cm proximal to the cathode
142 and toward the radial edge of the forearm. Compound muscle action potentials
143 (CMAPs) were recorded from the thenar eminence, with the reference electrode on the
144 distal phalanx of digit 1. Self-adhesive Ag/AgCl ring electrodes (RE-D, Electrode
145 Store) were used for recording compound sensory action potentials (CSAPs) of the
146 index finger, with the active electrode on the proximal phalanx of digit 2, and the
147 reference 4 cm distal (Eduardo and Burke 1988). The ground electrode was placed on
148 the dorsum of the hand for both motor and sensory recordings. Skin temperature was
149 monitored using a thermistor (YSI-409B) located close to the site of stimulation, and
150 recordings began when the temperature was stable and above 32°C.

151

152 **‘Threshold ZAP’ protocol**

153 A threshold analog of the ZAP (impedance [**Z**] amplitude profile) technique
154 introduced by Puil and colleagues (1986) was developed for these experiments to enable
155 the *in vivo* study of the frequency response of human axons. This protocol utilizes the
156 empirical observation of Bostock and Baker (1988) that the excitability changes to
157 subthreshold polarization (threshold electrotonus) mirror the underlying electrotonic
158 changes in membrane potential. The suitability of this approach was first assessed by
159 testing the linearity of the correlation between membrane potential and excitability in a
160 mathematical model of the human motor axon (see first section of Results).

161 The threshold to various conditioning currents was tested using a 1-ms test
162 pulse, with the aim of minimizing test stimulus intensities, conditioning currents, and

163 therefore pulse energies. As in all threshold-tracking studies a stimulus-response
164 relationship was recorded and then used to establish the current required to produce the
165 target CMAP or CSAP (50% of maximum in this instance) that was used for the rest of
166 the protocol. This current is referred to as the ‘threshold’ for the target potential.

167 The ‘threshold ZAP’ protocol measured the response to a linear “chirp” signal
168 (or swept sinewave), whose frequency was increased linearly from DC to 16 Hz over 4 s
169 and 16 s for human and model studies, respectively. The amplitude of the ZAP was a
170 fixed fraction of the unconditioned (control) threshold . It is described by the equation:

171

$$ZAP(t) = a * \sin\left(\pi * \frac{f_{max}}{T} * t^2\right)$$

172

173 where, a is the amplitude of the chirp , f_{max} is the maximal frequency (in Hz; 16 in the
174 present study), T is the length of the ZAP stimulus (in seconds) and t is time (in
175 seconds).

176 The low-frequency range employed in the present study is likely to exclude a
177 significant tissue filtering contribution to the frequency dependence, because extra-
178 neural impedance can be regarded as essentially resistive at these frequencies (Gabriel
179 1996; Logothetis et al. 2007).

180 To examine the role of I_h in the frequency response of human axons, the ZAP
181 signal was superimposed on a hyperpolarizing current of 60% of the control threshold
182 (i.e. -60% of the current required to produce a 50% CMAP or CSAP). This level was
183 chosen as the strongest level of hyperpolarization achievable without unintended
184 stimulation of axons by the supposedly subthreshold current, while still likely to be
185 strong enough to exclude significant involvement of K_s channels, which might

186 otherwise contribute to low-frequency attenuation (Howells et al. 2012). Subsequent
187 findings supported this choice.

188 The ZAP started 200 ms after the onset of the constant polarization. This delay
189 was sufficiently long to be after the majority of the ‘fast’ accommodation and was
190 chosen to correspond to the time delay used in conventional I/V measurements, from
191 which the threshold conductance is estimated (Kiernan et al. 2000).

192 The underlying threshold electrotonus in response to the 60% hyperpolarization
193 was recorded in detail during the period of ‘fast’ accommodation and then more slowly
194 at time points corresponding to every 500 ms during the ZAP current.

195 The entire protocol was balanced to prevent polarization of the electrodes and
196 resting membrane potential. On the sweep following every conditioning stimulus an
197 ‘anti-stimulus’ was delivered which was equal in magnitude but opposite in polarity.

198 For the experimental studies on human subjects, the stimulus threshold was
199 sampled 128 times every 31.25 ms (32 Hz) during the 4,000-ms ZAP current, to
200 facilitate analysis using a Fast Fourier Transform (FFT).

201 The QtracS protocol automatically advanced the test condition (test stimulus
202 location within ZAP or threshold electrotonus) when 2 acceptable measurements were
203 made. A measurement was deemed acceptable if the response was within 5% of the
204 target, or if the test threshold resulted in responses which bracketed the target.

205 **Analysis of frequency-response curves**

206 In the time domain, the threshold was tracked 128 times at evenly-spaced
207 conditioning test intervals of 31.25 ms throughout the ZAP. As in the calculation of
208 threshold electrotonus, the excitability at each time point was calculated as the
209 normalized threshold reduction:

$$Excitability \text{ (threshold reduction, \%)} = \frac{threshold_{control} - threshold_{ZAP}}{threshold_{control}}$$

210 The analysis of frequency response was performed offline, using a custom script
 211 written in Matlab (R2012a). For the recordings made with polarization, the effects of
 212 threshold electrotonus were first subtracted from the ZAP response. Any residual trend
 213 in the ZAP response was removed prior to conversion to the frequency domain using a
 214 FFT.

215 In a manner analogous to that introduced by Puil and colleagues (1986), a new
 216 measure, ' $Z_{threshold}$ ' relating the response (excitability) to input waveforms, was
 217 constructed as follows:

$$'Z'_{threshold} = \frac{FFT(Excitability)}{FFT(input)}$$

218 ' $Z_{threshold}$ ' is a complex-valued data set with real (resistive) and imaginary
 219 (reactive) components, and is the threshold analog of impedance, much as 'threshold
 220 electrotonus' results from and is related to electrotonic changes in membrane potential.
 221 The phase of the 'threshold impedance' ($\phi_{threshold}$) represents the difference in phase
 222 between the threshold response and input current waveforms.

223 The frequency response curve was constructed by plotting the magnitude of
 224 'threshold impedance' ($|Z_{threshold}'|$) versus frequency, from which the spectral
 225 parameters: $Z_{0.5}$, Z_{max} , f_{max} , Q were calculated. Using the definitions from earlier
 226 studies (Hutcheon et al. 1996; Orio et al. 2009; Zemankovics et al. 2010): $Z_{0.5}$ is defined
 227 as the impedance at 0.5 Hz; Z_{max} and f_{max} are the maximal impedance and corresponding
 228 frequency; and Q the ratio of Z_{max} to $Z_{0.5}$.

229 The suitability of this approach was examined in a mathematical model by
 230 comparing the electrical impedance (calculated using membrane potential) to the new

231 measure of ‘threshold impedance’ (see Results). The results based on ZAP currents
232 were then compared to measurements based on pure single-frequency sinusoidal input
233 currents.

234 **Modelling**

235 A mathematical model of the excitability of human motor and sensory axons,
236 based on the motor axon model of Bostock et al. (1991b) and developed in Howells et
237 al. (2012), was used to examine the basis of the low-frequency response of human
238 motor and sensory axons. This model consists of two compartments, a node and an
239 internode linked by the ‘Barrett-Barrett’ paranodal pathways through and under the
240 myelin sheath (Barrett and Barrett 1982). Na^+ currents (transient and persistent), slow
241 and fast K^+ currents, leak and pump currents along with the internodally located
242 hyperpolarization-activated conductance I_h are the key determinants of the excitability
243 of large myelinated fibres and are represented in this model. The equations and
244 parameters describing this model are listed in full in the Appendix.

245 The models were subjected to the same ZAP protocol, with the exception that
246 the target threshold was defined as the minimal threshold to generate an action potential.

247 If alterations in model parameters resulted in much larger oscillations of
248 excitability, the ZAP amplitude was decreased to maintain linearity of the response.

249 **Results**

250 **Linearization of the ZAP protocol**

251 The amplitude of the ZAP was chosen to be sufficiently large to give a good
252 signal-to-noise ratio, but small enough to maintain linearity of the response (Koch
253 1984). The linearity of the underlying membrane potential response was assessed using

254 a 10% ZAP superimposed on a hyperpolarization of 60% (of the control threshold; Fig
255 1a) using the mathematical model in Howells et al. (2012). The maximal peak-to-peak
256 membrane potential deflection was 9.6 mV (blue trace in Fig 1b) which is well below
257 the 20-mV criterion for linearity established by Hutcheon and colleagues (1996).

258 An additional measure of the nonlinearity of the response was made by
259 averaging the response to this initially downward-going ZAP and its mirror (i.e. an
260 initially upward-going ZAP) and subtracting the electrotonic response to the DC
261 polarization. The peak nonlinearity calculated this way was 0.1 mV and occurred
262 between the peak deflections at a time corresponding to 1.9 Hz.

263 **Linearity of excitability as an output measure**

264 In a bid to assess the suitability of threshold to a linear systems formulation, a
265 ZAP input stimulus was applied to the motor axon model (Fig. 1a), and both the
266 resultant membrane potential (Fig. 1b) and excitability (Fig. 1c) were calculated. For
267 both of these input signals (RMP and -60%), excitability was linearly correlated to
268 membrane potential ($R^2 = 0.9998$). Electrical impedance was transformed to the
269 frequency domain and calculated in the usual way using the ratio: $\text{FFT}(V)/\text{FFT}(I)$, and
270 the magnitude and phase are shown in Fig 1e,h. By analogy with the term ‘threshold
271 electrotonus’ used for the threshold analog of membrane potential, the proposed
272 measure ‘ $Z_{threshold}$ ’ was calculated as $\text{FFT}(\text{excitability})/\text{FFT}(I)$. Its magnitude and
273 phase are shown in Fig 1f,i. Under the present experimental conditions there was a tight
274 correlation in the modelled data between ‘ $Z_{threshold}$ ’ and $Z_{electrical}$ as shown in Fig. 2.
275 At hyperpolarized membrane potentials the magnitude and phase for both measures
276 were linearly correlated from DC to 16 Hz ($R^2 = 0.9997, 0.997$, respectively; Fig 2b,c
277 green to blue data). At RMP the magnitude and phase were also correlated ($R^2 = 0.90$,

278 0.98, respectively; yellow to red data), though at low frequencies ($< \sim 2$ Hz; yellow data
279 points), the magnitude of ' $Z_{threshold}$ ' appears to be underestimated using the ZAP
280 protocol.

281 For comparison, the electrical impedance was calculated in response to single
282 frequency sinusoids at selected frequencies and the magnitude and phase are plotted in
283 Fig 1d,g. A linear regression of the magnitude and phase of $Z_{electrical}$ calculated this
284 way versus the data derived using a ZAP stimulus gave good correlations with R^2
285 values of 0.95 and 0.98, respectively.

286 ***In vivo* measurement of the frequency response of human axons**

287 Excitability (measured as reduction in threshold) is an effective *in vivo* measure
288 of the response to an input current. However, unlike studies of resonance and the
289 frequency preference of membrane potential in neurons (Hu et al. 2002; Hutcheon et al.
290 1996; Orio et al. 2009; Puil et al. 1986; Puil et al. 1988; Puil et al. 1994; Wang et al.
291 2006; Zemankovics et al. 2010), the time taken to record each data point with threshold
292 tracking is much greater. This imposes a limit on both the frequency resolution and the
293 maximal frequency recorded. The ZAP recordings for the modelled data involve
294 polarizing currents longer than 16 s, with sampling of at least 512 points. Such
295 measurements are impracticable in human subjects, as they would result in unacceptably
296 long polarizing currents and recordings which could take up to 32 hours. A
297 compromise was made to record 128 time points over a 4-s ZAP, and a comparison of
298 these 4-s vs 16-s recordings is shown for the model in Fig. 3. Apart from a loss of low-
299 frequency phase resolution (< 1 Hz for -60%, and < 2 Hz for RMP) and some folding
300 back of higher frequencies at frequencies $> \sim 8$ Hz, acceptable recordings could be

301 recorded in a fraction of the time. The regression lines for amplitude and phase were
302 close to the line of identity (see legend to Fig. 3).

303 Balancing the stimulation protocol led to a near doubling of the recording time,
304 but prevented polarization of the electrodes and damage to the skin. An average of
305 1507 stimulus sweeps were delivered [range 1057 to 2351] for each recording, resulting
306 in ~12 sweeps / sample point (this includes balance, control stimulus and stimulus /
307 response sweeps), resulting in a ‘cost’ for each data point of ~53 seconds.

308 Most experiments were complete within 2 hours, and in recordings with good
309 signal-to-noise ratios the tracking was faster and the studies were complete within 1.5
310 hours. Even though the protocol was balanced and should not have any long-term effect
311 on axonal excitability, the 24 recordings were made on different days.

312 The resonance protocol was well tolerated by all subjects, and Fig. 4 shows that
313 despite these challenges a resonant peak was clearly visible in all recordings,
314 particularly during hyperpolarization (shown in blue).

315 **Frequency-response curves**

316 The individual responses to the unpolarized ZAP current are shown in Figure 4
317 (top row, red traces), and their near perfect superimposition shows little variation
318 between subjects in both motor and sensory axons. For each time point the maximal
319 difference between any two pairs of responses at RMP was, on average, 5.5% and 6.1%
320 for the motor and sensory axons, respectively. As is usual for the response to
321 hyperpolarization (see Howells et al. 2012; Tomlinson et al. 2010), there was
322 considerable variability between subjects in the ‘threshold electrotonic’ responses, -
323 180%(range: -222 to -144%) for motor axons and -135% (range: -154 to -113%) for
324 sensory axons. The mean ‘threshold electrotonic responses were significantly different

325 between motor and sensory axons ($p=.006$). However after subtraction of the
326 electrotonic response to 60% hyperpolarization, the average maximal difference
327 between any two responses during hyperpolarization was 11.4% and 12.7% for the
328 motor and sensory axons, respectively. The lesser hyperpolarization in sensory axons
329 and the variability of the threshold electrotonic baseline confirm earlier findings
330 (Bostock et al. 1994; Howells et al. 2013; Howells et al. 2012; Lin et al. 2002;
331 Tomlinson et al. 2010). This enhanced variability with hyperpolarization probably
332 contributes to the greater variability of the resonant peak in the hyperpolarized axons
333 (Fig. 4 middle row). The peak impedance magnitude (Z_{\max} , listed in Table 1) was
334 inversely and linearly correlated to the mean threshold electrotonic level for both motor
335 and sensory axons with R^2 values of 0.83 and 0.89 respectively.

336 The ‘threshold impedance’ across the studied frequency range was greater in
337 motor axons than sensory for both RMP ($p<.009$) and hyperpolarization ($p<.01$).

338 In hyperpolarized motor and sensory axons there was a resonant peak in all
339 subjects, though the ‘noise’ between adjacent measurements in the frequency domain
340 also contributed to the variation in the derived spectral parameters. To mitigate this
341 point-to-point variation, the spectral parameters were also calculated after first fitting a
342 Pearson Type IV function to the data (Orio et al. 2009). This function fitted the
343 frequency-response curves well for the hyperpolarized data (Table 1) and, on the whole,
344 reduced the variation in the parameters (see bracketed values in Table 1).

345 The resonant responses to oscillatory inputs of both motor and sensory axons
346 were greater at hyperpolarized membrane potentials than at RMP, as evidenced by the
347 greater Z_{\max} and Q-values (Fig. 4 and Table 1) and were comparable to studies of
348 neuronal cells in which the frequency response has been shown to have a voltage

349 dependence (Gutfreund et al. 1995; Hu et al. 2002; Hutcheon et al. 1996; Wang et al.
350 2006). The resonant frequency for the hyperpolarized axons occurred at 2.1 and 2.5 Hz
351 for the motor and sensory axons respectively.

352 .

353 **Computational Model**

354 **Assessment of the mathematical models in the frequency domain**

355 The recorded responses to the ZAP protocol were then compared to the
356 responses of the mathematical models in Howells et al. (2012), derived using DC
357 conditioning stimuli (Fig. 5). The motor and sensory models provided good fits to the
358 mean changes in excitability in response to the ZAP protocol measured at RMP (Fig. 5:
359 compare upper red and black traces in the top row; with correlation coefficients of 0.99
360 and 0.95 for motor and sensory axons, respectively). With a 60% hyperpolarization
361 correlations were similarly tight ($R^2 = 0.98, 0.96$), but the motor axon model had a
362 slightly more hyperpolarized baseline than the group data (motor model, -204%; motor
363 data -180), and the sensory axon model slightly depolarized when compared to the
364 sensory group data (sensory model, -126%; sensory data, -135. These shifts are small
365 and could result from differences in activation of I_h between subjects (Howells et al.
366 2013; Howells et al. 2012; Tomlinson et al. 2010) and/or variation in extracellular K^+
367 levels (Boërio et al. 2014).

368 In the frequency domain, the modelled excitability data showed the same key
369 features of resonance as the group data, both qualitatively and quantitatively, namely a
370 voltage-dependent resonant peak that was greater in motor axons than sensory. The
371 summary statistics of the modelled spectral data are given in Table 2.

372 **The voltage dependence of the frequency response**

373 Given the good fit of the modelled data to the experimental data, the voltage
374 dependence of the frequency response was modelled for motor axons at RMP (0%) and
375 with background hyperpolarizations of 30, 60 and 90% of the control threshold (Fig. 6).

376 As described in the methods, the majority of the early phases of threshold
377 electrotonus were complete by the start of the ZAP protocol (200 ms after the onset of
378 the hyperpolarization; Fig. 6a). The resonant response grew with hyperpolarization, as
379 previously reported for various neurons in guinea pigs and rats (Gutfreund et al. 1995;
380 Hutcheon et al. 1996; Wang et al. 2006), to a peak which was maximal in the present
381 study with a 60% hyperpolarization (Fig. 6b,c).

382 **The contribution of slowly rectifying conductances to the frequency response**

383 The mathematical model was used to explore the role of key ion channels to the
384 observed resonance in human motor axons (Fig. 7). The frequency response and its
385 voltage-dependence is reflected in, and indeed driven by, the interaction between I_{Ks} ,
386 I_{NaP} , I_h and I_{Lk} .

387 **At RMP** the response to the ZAP input was dominated by I_{Ks} in a frequency-
388 dependent manner, with the greatest response at low frequencies and a gradual decline
389 in amplitude with increasing frequency (see green in the left column of Fig. 7).
390 Unsurprisingly I_h did not contribute significantly to the frequency response at rest.

391 **With 60% hyperpolarization** slow K^+ channels were largely deactivated. Less
392 than 1% of K_s channels were open, and because membrane potential was below the
393 equilibrium potential for K^+ , these channels passed a small *depolarizing* current. In
394 contrast, roughly one third of HCN channels were activated, with I_h opposing low-
395 frequency inputs preferentially providing the mechanism for resonance in
396 hyperpolarized axons.

397 **Conductances that alter the magnitude of the frequency response**

398 The influence of the leak conductance (G_{Lk}) was smaller at RMP (grey curves in
399 left column of Fig. 7) and increased with polarization, consistent with an ohmic
400 conductance modelled with a reversal potential near resting membrane potential. The
401 effect of G_{Lk} can be seen purely in terms of its effect on the input conductance, and its
402 ability to ‘leak’ current across the membrane. G_{Lk} opposed fluctuations in membrane
403 potential independent of frequency, and therefore progressively suppressed resonance
404 with increasing polarization. This implies that the 60% hyperpolarization used here
405 may be optimal for studying I_h . At 60% hyperpolarization the magnitude of I_{Lk} is
406 comparable to that of I_h (compare grey and red curves in right column of Fig. 7), but
407 importantly it varies in phase with and proportional to changes in membrane potential.

408 In contrast an increase in the fraction of sodium channels operating in a
409 persistent mode *amplifies* resonance at RMP, and its effect on the frequency-response
410 curves *diminishes* rapidly with hyperpolarization, as seen in Figure 7.

411 **Sensitivity of frequency response to key currents**

412 A sensitivity analysis was performed on each of the key conductances in the
413 model of a motor axon. For each conductance, the effect of complete removal of the
414 conductance and a doubling of the conductance were compared to the normal level in
415 the unaltered model. The ZAP measurements were then made at the same membrane
416 potentials (RMP and -60%) as in the unaltered model.

417 The frequency response at RMP, was sensitive to a reduction in G_{Ks} (compare
418 dotted and thin red curves in Fig 8b) with no appreciable contribution by G_H . As
419 previously discussed, G_{Lk} attenuates and P_{NaP} amplifies resonance at RMP (compare red
420 curves in Fig 8c and d).

421 With 60% hyperpolarization, P_{NaP} and G_{Ks} have a negligible effect on $Z_{electrical}$
422 , with G_H responsible for the resonance which is sensitively modulated by leak
423 conductances (removal of G_{Lk} increases Z_{max} by 166% and doubling G_{Lk} decreases Z_{max}
424 by 38%).

425 **Do sensory axons behave as relatively depolarized motor axons?**

426 The model was used to assess the possibility that differences in the frequency
427 response of motor and sensory axons can be attributed to differences in their resting
428 membrane potentials. Figure 9 shows that the discrepancy in response between the
429 motor and sensory models is reduced by 94.9% (RMP) and 99.7% (60%
430 hyperpolarization) when the motor model is depolarized by 3-mV. However, this
431 degree of depolarization reduced the discrepancy in the frequency response curves by
432 97% (RMP) and 29.2% (60% hyperpolarization) implying that there are probably other
433 differences between sensory and motor axons.

434 **Discussion**

435 The present study has examined the low-frequency response of human axons
436 *in vivo* using a novel application of frequency-domain and threshold-tracking
437 techniques. Studying the response to subthreshold oscillatory input currents at different
438 membrane potentials allows the separation of the ion channel contributions to axonal
439 excitability based upon their voltage dependence and gating kinetics. We provide
440 evidence that changes in excitability reflect changes in membrane potential, at least
441 under the conditions of the present studies. The findings using the ZAP protocol and
442 their compatibility with studies that have relied on square-wave DC pulses validates the
443 present approach as a technique for studying ion channel function in human axons

444 *in vivo*. In the absence of evidence for K_{IR} channels in myelinated axons of the
445 peripheral nervous system, we attribute inward rectification to HCN channels in the
446 following discussion.

447 Traditional threshold-tracking techniques probe the slowly-gated inwardly-
448 rectifying conductance G_H using long-lasting hyperpolarizing square-wave conditioning
449 currents, but these conditioning stimuli do not easily separate out the contributions of
450 voltage-dependent (G_{Ks}), and ohmic (G_{Lk}) conductances. This new protocol attempts to
451 address these limitations by adding frequency-domain techniques to further distinguish
452 these conductances.

453 There are a number of ways in which channel activity could be modulated
454 through intra- or extra-cellular mechanisms affecting the gating or changes in channel
455 expression. The present study focusses on overall channel activity not the mechanisms
456 underlying any differences in activity.

457 The mathematical models of the behavior of human sensory and motor axons
458 described in Howells et al. (2012) were subjected to this new frequency probe, and
459 adequately describe the response to oscillatory inputs. This provides independent
460 validation of these models, which were then used to examine the factors responsible for
461 generating and amplifying (or attenuating) resonance in human axons.

462 One limitation of this technique as implemented in the current study is the time
463 taken for an entire recording. Depending on the application, there are several strategies
464 that could be employed in future studies. The standard FFT approach requires a
465 uniform spacing of data points collected in the time domain, but sampling at high
466 frequencies during the low-frequency component of the ZAP is costly. Non-uniform
467 sampling techniques could be employed to speed up the protocol. Reducing the

468 sampling interval to 62.5 ms, would limit the upper frequency studied to 8 Hz, but
469 would nearly halve the recording time. Reducing the sweep length would also have a
470 major impact on the recording time but unfortunately would also reduce the resolution
471 in the frequency domain. Another approach may be to measure pure sinusoids at
472 desired frequencies only. A careful analysis of the minimum number of data points
473 required to resolve amplitude and phase of the threshold response would need to be
474 performed, but a rough estimate based on an angular resolution of 45° would require 8
475 data points / frequency studied.

476 **Excitability as a measure of membrane potential**

477 Direct comparisons of the threshold and electrotonic responses in the same
478 axons are difficult and not possible in human axons *in vivo*. The present study has
479 compared these responses in a model of human axons that had previously been
480 validated using DC pulses (Howells et al. 2012), and has found a tight correlation of
481 excitability and membrane potential for hyperpolarized axons over this frequency range.
482 This confirms the conclusions of Bostock and Baker (1988).

483 The relationship between changes in excitability and the underlying membrane
484 potential has greatly assisted the interpretation of axonal excitability studies (Bostock et
485 al. 1998). The linearity of such a relationship is not a requirement for the analysis of
486 such data and has never been tested in these studies. However, in the present study
487 which uses a linear systems formulation, the linearity of the relationship is crucial. The
488 theoretical basis of such a relationship, comes from the observation that the current-
489 voltage curves of myelinated axons are linear for short pulses, leading Bostock et al.
490 (1991a) to argue that the current threshold is consequently proportional to the voltage
491 threshold.

492 **Comparison with the responses produced by DC conditioning stimuli**

493 The ‘threshold impedance’ data presented in this study can be related to the
494 threshold conductance derived from the current-threshold relationship in conventional
495 excitability studies (Howells et al. 2012). The reciprocal of the slope of the current-
496 threshold relationship gives the threshold impedance, albeit in response to a 200-ms
497 square pulse (giving a period for the first harmonic of 400 ms). The fundamental
498 frequency is thus of 2.5 Hz, comparable to the resonant frequencies for the
499 hyperpolarized axons presented in this study. Using the model data from Howells et al.
500 (2012), the threshold impedances would be: motor 4.06 (60%), 1.75 (0%); sensory 3.56
501 (60%), 1.33 (0%). These values compare favourably to the data shown in Fig. 4.

502 The ZAP protocol provided the opportunity to test the models developed in
503 Howells et al. (2012) against a different stimulus paradigm, and also to test the model in
504 the frequency domain. Without further modification, the models provided a remarkably
505 good fit to the ZAP data (Fig. 5), providing independent verification of the dynamics of
506 the modelled conductances of motor and sensory axons.

507 **Factors contributing to resonance in hyperpolarized motor and** 508 **sensory axons**

509 Two mechanisms are required to generate resonance in axons. The combination
510 of suitable low-pass and high-pass filters allows such a resonance to occur, and this is
511 realised electrically in tuned (RLC) circuits which consist of the parallel combination of
512 a Resistor, inductor (**L**) and Capacitor (Hutcheon and Yarom 2000). The input
513 conductance and membrane capacitance form the necessary low-pass filter, limiting the
514 rate at which membrane potential changes can occur in response to input stimuli
515 according to the membrane time constant (RC). The high-pass filtering is achieved by

516 the so-called ‘inductive’ reactances which slowly oppose changes in membrane
517 potential.

518 **Low-frequency attenuation**

519 In human axons, the slow rectifying conductances, G_H and G_{Ks} , provide the
520 ‘inductive’ attenuation of output responses at low frequencies. The modelling in this
521 study provided support for the view that G_{Ks} and G_H play complementary roles (Howells
522 et al. 2012). G_{Ks} contributes to the low-frequency attenuation at less-hyperpolarized
523 membrane potentials in motor axons, while G_H attenuates the low-frequency response
524 for hyperpolarization below RMP (Biel et al. 2009). The modelling demonstrated that
525 the action of I_h was confined to frequencies below ~ 3 Hz, and that I_{Ks} had a more
526 gradual attenuation across the frequencies studied. This suggests that I_{Ks} also
527 contributes to the high-frequency attenuation of responses by augmenting the input
528 conductance (Hutcheon and Yarom 2000).

529 **High-frequency attenuation**

530 As previously discussed, the low-pass filtering of the membrane is due to the
531 parallel combination of the nodal capacitance and input conductance. As the membrane
532 capacitance is essentially constant, the low-pass filtering is governed by changes in the
533 input conductance which itself is the parallel combination of all open channels. For the
534 axons in the present study these are predominantly G_{Lk} and G_{Ks} . G_{Lk} increases and G_{Ks}
535 decreases with hyperpolarization from rest, providing a complementary control over the
536 input conductance and thereby the low-pass filtering of the membrane (Hutcheon and
537 Yarom 2000).

538 **Amplifiers and suppressors of resonance**

539 In contrast to the effects of I_{Lk} on the frequency response, I_{NaP} potentiates the
540 response of human axons to oscillatory input currents. This confirms previous studies
541 which have examined the effect of TTX on the frequency-response curve and have
542 shown a significant decrease in the magnitude of the resonant peak, particularly at
543 depolarized membrane potentials (Gutfreund et al. 1995; Hu et al. 2002; Hutcheon et al.
544 1996; Wang et al. 2006).

545 **Differences between motor and sensory axons**

546 It is tempting to attribute the observed differences in the frequency response of
547 motor and sensory axons to differences in their resting membrane potentials. Figure 9
548 shows that the responses of the motor model do indeed approximate those of the
549 sensory model more closely when it is depolarized by an amount equivalent to a 3-mV
550 depolarization of RMP (compare discrepancy between the blue and red traces in the
551 lower plot to the black and red traces in the middle plot). On closer examination
552 however, the low-frequency attenuation for the hyperpolarized axons is not improved by
553 depolarization, and there is a suggestion that at higher frequencies depolarization
554 attenuates the responses of motor axons further. We therefore suggest that, while a
555 difference in membrane potential may be a major contributor to the difference in the
556 responses of sensory and motor axons, other factors are important.

557 The key differences between the motor and sensory models (reported by
558 Howells et al. 2012) are likely to contribute to the differential frequency responses.
559 These differences are a near-halving of nodal G_{Ks} , up-modulation of I_h and an increase
560 in I_{NaP} (the latter secondary to depolarization of resting membrane potential) in sensory
561 axons.

562 **Application of this technique to resonance under other conditions**

563 The present study has examined the mechanisms underlying low-frequency
564 resonance of hyperpolarized human axons, but this *in vivo* technique could also be used
565 to study the interactions of other voltage-gated ion channels using different frequencies
566 and with different levels of polarization. There was evidence in the present study that
567 resonance may occur with *depolarization*: in some subjects the balancing anti-stimulus
568 excited axons at higher frequencies (not shown). Such activity is comparable to the M-
569 resonance observed in rat hippocampal pyramidal cells (Hu et al. 2002), and it is likely
570 that the rhythmic spontaneous activity recorded from *demyelinated* rat spinal root axons
571 would also have demonstrated a resonant peak in the frequency domain (Baker and
572 Bostock 1992).

573 One extension of this study could involve studying resonant behavior during
574 depolarization, and this might have more relevance to ectopic activity in demyelinating
575 neuropathies.

576 **Functional consequences**

577 The primary motivation for studying the low-frequency resonance of human
578 axons in this study was to resolve the contributions of I_h , I_{Ks} and I_{Lk} to excitability.
579 Conventional excitability studies using steady DC currents such as threshold
580 electrotonus can provide only limited insight into the relative contributions of the
581 activity of different channels at different membrane potentials. The fact that a
582 low-frequency resonance was found in healthy axons of peripheral nerve raises the
583 questions: “Are there functional consequences of this resonance in healthy axons of
584 peripheral nerve”, or “is it merely an expected consequence of the time-domain
585 properties of ion channels”?

586 The low-frequency response was not substantially different in the
587 hyperpolarized axons of motor and sensory nerve. Considering the different functional
588 requirements of these axons, perhaps the basis of such a resonance is common and
589 relates to the activation of I_h during activity-dependent hyperpolarization.

590 While it might be attractive to relate the resonance explored here to the ectopic
591 firing of peripheral axons, ectopic discharge rates are too high, at least in sensory axons
592 (Burke and Applegate 1989; Culp et al. 1982; Ochoa and Torebjörk 1980). There is
593 thus little reason to argue for an important role for I_h in ectopic activity in large
594 myelinated axons. However, in contrast to central neurons (and the heart),
595 rhythmogenesis is not a desirable property of peripheral axons. Monnier (1952)
596 observed that stability in normal peripheral axons was achieved by significant damping
597 of resonance, which he called “pararesonance”. The pattern of resonance in his work is
598 not unlike the resonance seen in the current study.

599

600 References

- 601 **Baker M, and Bostock H.** Ectopic activity in demyelinated spinal root axons of the rat. *J Physiol*
602 451: 539-552, 1992.
- 603 **Barrett EF, and Barrett JN.** Intracellular recording from vertebrate myelinated axons:
604 mechanism of the depolarizing afterpotential. *J Physiol* 323: 117-144, 1982.
- 605 **Biel M, Wahl-Schott C, Michalakakis S, and Zong X.** Hyperpolarization-activated cation channels:
606 from genes to function. *Physiol Rev* 89: 847-885, 2009.
- 607 **Boërio D, Bostock H, Spescha R, and Z'Graggen WJ.** Potassium and the excitability properties
608 of normal human motor axons in vivo. *PLoS One* 9: e98262, 2014.
- 609 **Bostock H, and Baker M.** Evidence for two types of potassium channel in human motor axons
610 in vivo. *Brain Res* 462: 354-358, 1988.
- 611 **Bostock H, Baker M, Grafe P, and Reid G.** Changes in excitability and accommodation of
612 human motor axons following brief periods of ischaemia. *J Physiol* 441: 513-535, 1991a.
- 613 **Bostock H, Baker M, and Reid G.** Changes in excitability of human motor axons underlying
614 post-ischaemic fasciculations: evidence for two stable states. *J Physiol* 441: 537-557, 1991b.
- 615 **Bostock H, Burke D, and Hales JP.** Differences in behaviour of sensory and motor axons
616 following release of ischaemia. *Brain* 117: 225-234, 1994.
- 617 **Bostock H, Cikurel K, and Burke D.** Threshold tracking techniques in the study of human
618 peripheral nerve. *Muscle Nerve* 21: 137-158, 1998.
- 619 **Burke D, and Applegate C.** Paraesthesiae and hypaesthesia following prolonged high-
620 frequency stimulation of cutaneous afferents. *Brain* 112: 913-929, 1989.
- 621 **Burke D, Kiernan MC, and Bostock H.** Excitability of human axons. *Clin Neurophysiol* 112:
622 1575-1585, 2001.
- 623 **Cole KS.** Rectification and inductance in the squid giant axon. *J Gen Physiol* 25: 29-51, 1941.
- 624 **Cole KS, and Baker RF.** Transverse impedance of the squid giant axon during current flow. *J*
625 *Gen Physiol* 24: 535-549, 1941.
- 626 **Cole KS, and Curtis HJ.** Electric impedance of nerve and muscle. In: *Cold Spring Harbor*
627 *symposia on quantitative biology* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 1936, p. 73-89.
- 628 **Culp WJ, Ochoa JL, and Torebjörk E.** Ectopic impulse generation in myelinated sensory nerve
629 fibers in man. In: *Abnormal nerves and muscles as impulse generators*, edited by Culp WJ, and
630 Ochoa JLOxford University Press, 1982, p. 490-512.
- 631 **Eduardo E, and Burke D.** The optimal recording electrode configuration for compound sensory
632 action potentials. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 51: 684-687, 1988.
- 633 **Gabriel C.** Compilation of the dielectric properties of body tissues at RF and microwave
634 frequencies AFOSR/NL, 1996.
- 635 **Gutfreund Y, Yarom Y, and Segev I.** Subthreshold oscillations and resonant frequency in
636 guinea-pig cortical neurons: physiology and modelling. *J Physiol* 483: 621-640, 1995.
- 637 **Howells J, Czesnik D, Trevillion L, and Burke D.** Excitability and the safety margin in human
638 axons during hyperthermia. *J Physiol* 591: 3063-3080, 2013.
- 639 **Howells J, Trevillion L, Bostock H, and Burke D.** The voltage dependence of I(h) in human
640 myelinated axons. *J Physiol* 590: 1625-1640, 2012.
- 641 **Hu H, Vervaeke K, Graham LJ, and Storm JF.** Complementary theta resonance filtering by two
642 spatially segregated mechanisms in CA1 hippocampal pyramidal neurons. *J Neurosci* 29:
643 14472-14483, 2009.
- 644 **Hu H, Vervaeke K, and Storm JF.** Two forms of electrical resonance at theta frequencies,
645 generated by M-current, h-current and persistent Na⁺ current in rat hippocampal pyramidal
646 cells. *J Physiol* 545: 783-805, 2002.

647 **Hutcheon B, Miura RM, and Puil E.** Subthreshold membrane resonance in neocortical neurons.
648 *J Neurophysiol* 76: 683-697, 1996.

649 **Hutcheon B, and Yarom Y.** Resonance, oscillation and the intrinsic frequency preferences of
650 neurons. *Trends Neurosci* 23: 216-222, 2000.

651 **Kiernan MC, Burke D, Andersen KV, and Bostock H.** Multiple measures of axonal excitability: a
652 new approach in clinical testing. *Muscle Nerve* 23: 399-409, 2000.

653 **Koch C.** Cable theory in neurons with active, linearized membranes. *Biol Cybern* 50: 15-33,
654 1984.

655 **Krishnan AV, Lin CS-Y, Park SB, and Kiernan MC.** Axonal ion channels from bench to bedside: a
656 translational neuroscience perspective. *Prog Neurobiol* 89: 288-313, 2009.

657 **Lin CS-Y, Kiernan MC, Burke D, and Bostock H.** Assessment of nerve excitability properties in
658 peripheral nerve disease. In: *Peripheral Nerve Diseases*, edited by Kimura J. Amsterdam:
659 Elsevier, 2006, p. 381-403.

660 **Lin CS-Y, Kuwabara S, Cappelen-Smith C, and Burke D.** Responses of human sensory and
661 motor axons to the release of ischaemia and to hyperpolarizing currents. *J Physiol* 541: 1025-
662 1039, 2002.

663 **Llinás RR.** The intrinsic electrophysiological properties of mammalian neurons: insights into
664 central nervous system function. *Science* 242: 1654-1664, 1988.

665 **Logothetis NK, Kayser C, and Oeltermann A.** In vivo measurement of cortical impedance
666 spectrum in monkeys: implications for signal propagation. *Neuron* 55: 809-823, 2007.

667 **Monnier AM.** The damping factor as a functional criterion in nerve physiology. *Cold Spring*
668 *Harb Symp Quant Biol* 17: 69-95, 1952.

669 **Narayanan R, and Johnston D.** The h channel mediates location dependence and plasticity of
670 intrinsic phase response in rat hippocampal neurons. *J Neurosci* 28: 5846-5860, 2008.

671 **Ochoa JL, and Torebjörk HE.** Paraesthesiae from ectopic impulse generation in human sensory
672 nerves. *Brain* 103: 835-853, 1980.

673 **Orio P, Madrid R, de la Pena E, Parra A, Meseguer V, Bayliss DA, Belmonte C, and Viana F.**
674 Characteristics and physiological role of hyperpolarization activated currents in mouse cold
675 thermoreceptors. *J Physiol* 587: 1961-1976, 2009.

676 **Pike FG, Goddard RS, Suckling JM, Ganter P, Kasthuri N, and Paulsen O.** Distinct frequency
677 preferences of different types of rat hippocampal neurones in response to oscillatory input
678 currents. *J Physiol* 529: 205-213, 2000.

679 **Puil E, Gimbarzevsky B, and Miura RM.** Quantification of membrane properties of trigeminal
680 root ganglion neurons in guinea pigs. *J Neurophysiol* 55: 995-1016, 1986.

681 **Puil E, Gimbarzevsky B, and Spigelman I.** Primary involvement of K⁺ conductance in
682 membrane resonance of trigeminal root ganglion neurons. *J Neurophysiol* 59: 77-89, 1988.

683 **Puil E, Meiri H, and Yarom Y.** Resonant behavior and frequency preferences of thalamic
684 neurons. *J Neurophysiol* 71: 575-582, 1994.

685 **Tomlinson S, Burke D, Hanna M, Koltzenburg M, and Bostock H.** In vivo assessment of HCN
686 channel current (I_h) in human motor axons. *Muscle Nerve* 41: 247-256, 2010.

687 **Wang WT, Wan YH, Zhu JL, Lei GS, Wang YY, Zhang P, and Hu SJ.** Theta-frequency membrane
688 resonance and its ionic mechanisms in rat subicular pyramidal neurons. *Neuroscience* 140: 45-
689 55, 2006.

690 **Zemankovics R, Kali S, Paulsen O, Freund TF, and Hajos N.** Differences in subthreshold
691 resonance of hippocampal pyramidal cells and interneurons: the role of h-current and passive
692 membrane characteristics. *J Physiol* 588: 2109-2132, 2010.

693

694

695 **Author contributions**

696 All authors contributed to all aspects of the study, and have approved the final
697 version of the manuscript.

698 **Acknowledgements**

699 The authors wish to thank Adelle Coster and Hans Coster for valuable
700 discussions during the preparation of the manuscript. This research was supported by
701 the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia.

702 **Disclosures**

703 H.B. receives royalties from the sales of the QTRAC software. J.H. and D.B.
704 have no conflicts of interest to report.

705

706 **Tables**

707

708 **Table 1. Spectral parameters**

Subject	Z_{0.5Hz}	Z_{max}	Q	f_{max}
Motor 0%				
1	1.1 [1.6]	2.3 [2.2]	2.1 [1.4]	2.0 [7.2]
2	1.5 [1.5]	2.4 [2.1]	1.6 [1.4]	7.5 [6.2]
3	1.2 [1.2]	2.0 [1.9]	1.7 [1.6]	3.5 [5.7]
4	1.2 [1.5]	2.5 [2.2]	2.1 [1.4]	4.5 [4.9]
5	1.5 [1.4]	2.5 [2.2]	1.7 [1.5]	3.3 [5.4]
6	1.3 [1.3]	2.7 [2.3]	2.0 [1.8]	7.3 [6.2]
Mean	1.3 [1.4]	2.4 [2.1]	1.9 [1.5]	4.7 [5.9]
Motor 60%				
1	1.4 [1.7]	3.9 [3.9]	2.8 [2.3]	2.75 [2.4]
2	1.7 [1.4]	3.7 [3.6]	2.2 [2.6]	2.5 [2.5]
3	2.0 [1.8]	4.4 [4.1]	2.2 [2.3]	2.25 [2.3]
4	3.6 [2.9]	5.3 [4.7]	1.5 [1.6]	2.0 [1.8]
5	5.0 [3.7]	5.8 [5.2]	1.2 [1.4]	2.0 [1.7]
6	4.1 [3.0]	6.0 [5.5]	1.5 [1.9]	2.25 [2.0]
Mean	3.0 [2.4]	4.8 [4.5]	1.9 [2.0]	2.3 [2.1]
Sensory 0%				
1	0.5 [1.1]	1.8 [1.5]	3.7 [1.3]	9.25 [7.5]
2	0.8 [1.1]	2.3 [1.9]	2.9 [1.7]	3.5 [5.7]
3	1.1 [1.0]	2.1 [1.7]	1.9 [1.6]	4.75 [5.2]
4	0.9 [1.4]	2.1 [1.8]	2.2 [1.3]	2.0 [6.5]
5	1.4 [1.3]	2.2 [1.7]	1.6 [1.3]	4.8 [6.8]
6	0.8 [1.2]	1.8 [1.7]	2.2 [1.4]	9.25 [7.2]
Mean	0.9 [1.2]	2.1 [1.7]	2.4 [1.4]	5.6 [6.5]
Sensory 60%				
1	1.9 [1.9]	3.6 [3.2]	1.9 [1.7]	4.25 [3.0]
2	0.8 [1.3]	3.9 [3.3]	4.6 [2.6]	3.5 [2.7]
3	2.6 [2.2]	5.1 [4.5]	1.9 [2.0]	2.0 [2.2]
4	2.6 [2.3]	4.7 [4.3]	1.8 [1.9]	2.0 [2.4]
5	2.3 [2.6]	5.2 [4.4]	2.3 [1.7]	2.0 [1.8]
6	2.9 [2.4]	4.0 [3.5]	1.4 [1.5]	2.0 [2.8]
Mean	2.2 [2.1]	4.4 [3.9]	2.3 [1.9]	2.6 [2.5]

709

710 Derived parameters summarizing the frequency response of motor axons and sensory axons at RMP (0%)

711 and with a 60% hyperpolarization. Bracketed values were calculated after first smoothing the data with a

712 Pearson Type IV function.

713

714 **Table 2. Spectral parameters derived from modelled data**

	$Z_{0.5\text{Hz}}$	Z_{max}	Q	f_{max}
Motor 0%	1.2 [1.4]	2.4 [2.3]	1.9 [1.6]	4.5 [4.9]
Motor 60%	2.9 [2.6]	4.9 [4.6]	1.7 [1.8]	2.3 [2.1]
Sensory 0%	0.9 [1.1]	1.8 [1.8]	1.9 [1.6]	9.3 [6.5]
Sensory 60%	2.3 [2.2]	4.1 [3.9]	1.8 [1.8]	2.0 [2.6]

715

716 Bracketed values were calculated after first smoothing the data with a Pearson Type IV function.

717

718 **Figures**

719 **Figure 1. Measures of impedance and ‘threshold impedance’ in a model of human motor**
720 **axons. a.** DC to 16Hz ZAP stimulus (10% of threshold) applied at RMP (red) and with 60%
721 hyperpolarization (blue). **b,e,h.** Response, electrical impedance magnitude and phase
722 measured using membrane potential. **c,f,i.** Response, ‘impedance’ magnitude and phase
723 measured using threshold change. **d,g.** Impedance magnitude and phase difference measured
724 using membrane potential and individual sinewave stimuli at frequencies of 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.5, 2,
725 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 16 Hz.

726 **Figure 2. Correlation of electrical impedance and ‘threshold impedance’ measures in the**
727 **model. a.** Correlation of excitability and membrane potential in response to the same input
728 stimulus (data from Fig. 1b,c) **b.** Magnitude of ‘threshold impedance’ vs conventional
729 electrical impedance (data from Fig. 1e,f). **c.** Phase difference between response and input
730 measured using the threshold and membrane potential methods (data from Fig. 1 h,i). The
731 yellow to red data points correspond to data gathered at RMP and are graded according to
732 frequency (see scale, lower left). Similarly the green to blue data points correspond to the
733 hyperpolarized data.

734 **Figure 3. Comparison of Frequency Response Curves derived from 16-s and 4-s ZAPs.** Blue
735 and red traces are from 4-s ZAP stimuli at RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization. Grey traces
736 are for the corresponding 16-s ZAP stimuli. **a.** Membrane potential change. **b.** Electrical
737 impedance magnitude (linear regression of 16-s vs 4-s data: $y=0.98*x -0.001$, $R^2=0.94$; i.e. close
738 to the line of identity). **c.** Phase difference between membrane potential and stimulus current
739 (linear regression: $y=1.10*x+0.053$, $R^2=0.86$).

740 **Figure 4. Excitability changes in response to ZAP conditioning.** *Upper Row:* Superimposed
741 responses of the six subjects at RMP (red) and with hyperpolarization (blue) in motor and

742 sensory axons. *Middle Row*: Mean (\pm SEM) magnitude of threshold impedance versus
743 frequency (n=6). *Bottom Row*: Mean (\pm SEM) phase difference between response and input
744 stimulus.

745 **Figure 5. Comparison of modelled and observed data.**

746 Observed data (mean [solid lines] \pm SEM [dashed lines] for RMP [red] and 60%
747 hyperpolarization [blue]) and modelled data (black lines). *Top Row*, Response to input ZAP at
748 RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization. *Bottom Row*, Magnitude of ‘threshold impedance’
749 $|Z_{threshold}'|$ versus frequency for the axons at RMP and with hyperpolarization.

750 **Figure 6. Voltage dependence of the frequency response in the model motor axon.**

751 **a** Threshold electrotonic responses at RMP (0%, red) and for 30 (green), 60 (blue) and 90%
752 (cyan) hyperpolarizations. **b**. Response to ZAP conditioning superimposed on the
753 hyperpolarizations in *A*. **c**. Magnitude of the threshold impedance calculated from the
754 responses in *b*. **d**. Phase of the threshold impedance, corresponding to the difference
755 between response and input stimulus.

756 **Figure 7. Ion channels contributing to the low-frequency resonance.** Membrane potential
757 (EN, top), currents (*I*, middle) and channel open fractions (bottom) for motor axons in
758 response to the ZAP protocol modelled at RMP (left column), and with -60% hyperpolarization
759 (right column).

760 **Figure 8. Sensitivity of frequency response to key currents.** Thin lines correspond to the
761 unaltered model (same as Fig 1e). The dotted lines correspond to the removal of a
762 conductance, and the thicker lines are with the same conductance doubled. The red and blue
763 lines are modelled at RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization, respectively. **a**. G_H (maximal
764 conductance of I_h). **b**. G_{Ks} (maximal conductance of slow K^+ channels). **c**. G_{Lk} (maximal
765 conductance of ohmic ‘leak’ channels). **d**. P_{NaP} (fraction of Na^+ channels operating in a

766 persistent mode). Note: RMP and hyperpolarization were clamped for each conductance
767 alteration to maintain the same average potential as in the unaltered data.

768 **Figure 9. Do sensory axons behave as relatively depolarized motor axons?**

769 Observed excitability responses (mean \pm SEM) to ZAP function (a.) and frequency-response
770 curves (b.) for motor (black) and sensory (red) axons at RMP and with a 60% hyperpolarization.
771 Modelled excitability (c.) and frequency-response (d.): motor model (black), sensory model
772 (red). Depolarised motor model (blue) and sensory model (red) excitability (e.) and frequency
773 response (f.).

774

775 **Appendix**

776 **Modelling equations and parameters**

777 **Membrane potential:** (asterisks denote internodal parameters)

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -\frac{I_{Na} + I_{Kf} + I_{Ks} + I_{Lk} + I_{pump} + I_{external} + I_{BB}}{C_n + C_{myelin}}$$

$$\frac{dE^*}{dt} = -\frac{I_{Kf^*} + I_{Ks^*} + I_h + I_{pump^*} + I_{Lk^*} - I_{BB} - C_{myelin} \frac{dE}{dt}}{C_{ax}}$$

778 **Capacitance:**

$$C_n = 1.4 \quad C_{myelin} = 1.55 \quad C_{ax} = 327 \text{ pF}$$

779 **Ion concentrations:**

$$[Na]_i = 9 \quad [Na]_o = 144.2 \quad [K]_i = 155 \quad [K]_o = 4.5 \text{ mM}$$

780 **Sodium current:**

$$I_{Na} = P_{Na}(m^3 h)z(Na) \quad I_{NaP} = P_{Na} \left(\frac{P_{NaP}}{100} m_p^3 \right) z(Na)$$

$$z(Na) = \frac{EF^2}{RT} \left(\frac{Sel_{Na} \{ [Na]_o - [Na]_i \exp\left(\frac{EF}{RT}\right) \} + (1 - Sel_{Na}) \{ [K]_o - [K]_i \exp\left(\frac{EF}{RT}\right) \}}{1 - \exp\left(\frac{EF}{RT}\right)} \right)$$

781 **Fast potassium current:**

$$I_{Kf} = G_{Kf} n^4 (E - E_{Kf}) \quad I_{Kf^*} = G_{Kf^*} n^{*4} (E^* - E_{Kf})$$

782 **Slow potassium current:**

$$I_{Ks} = G_{Ks} s (E - E_{Ks}) \quad I_{Ks^*} = G_{Ks^*} s^* (E^* - E_{Ks})$$

783 **Leak current:**

$$I_{Lk} = G_{Lk} (E - E_r) \quad I_{Lk^*} = G_{Lk^*} (E^* - E_r)$$

784 **Barrett-Barrett current:**

$$I_{BB} = G_{BB} (E - E^*)$$

785 **Current through HCN channels:**

$$I_h = G_h q (E^* - E_h)$$

786 **Equilibrium potentials:**

$$E_x = \frac{RT}{F} \ln \left(\frac{[K]_o + Sel_x [Na]_o - Sel_x [K]_o}{[K]_i + Sel_x [Na]_i - Sel_x [K]_i} \right) \text{ for } x = K_f, K_s, h$$

$$Sel_{Na} = 0.9, \quad Sel_{Kf}, Sel_{Ks} = 0, \quad Sel_h = 0.097$$

787 **Voltage dependence and kinetics:**

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = \alpha_m (1 - m) - \beta_m m \quad \text{and similarly for } m_p, h, n, s, n^*, s^*, q$$

$$\alpha_m, \alpha_{m_p}, \alpha_n, \alpha_s = \frac{A(E - B)}{1 - \exp((B - E)/C)} \quad \alpha_h, \beta_m, \beta_{m_p}, \beta_n, \beta_s = \frac{A(B - E)}{1 - \exp\left(\frac{E - B}{C}\right)}$$

$$\beta_h = \frac{A}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{B - E}{C}\right)} \quad \alpha_q = A \exp\left(\frac{E - B}{C}\right)$$

$$\beta_q = A / \exp((E - B)/C)$$

	<i>A (ms⁻¹, at 36°C)</i>	<i>Q10</i>	<i>B (mV)</i>	<i>C (mV)</i>
α_m	6.54 (6.25)		-18.5 (-18.3)	10.3
β_m	0.302 (0.289)	2.2	-22.8 (-22.6)	9.16
α_{m_p}	3.27 (3.13)		-36.5 (-36.3)	10.3
β_{m_p}	0.151 (0.145)		-40.8 (-40.6)	9.16
α_h	0.126 (0.153)	2.9	-115.1 (-113.8)	15.6 (11.9)
β_h	8.60 (10.5)		-32.9 (-31.6)	19.0 (14.5)
α_n	0.0221		-90.8	7.7
β_n	0.0393		-73.6	7.35
α_s	0.00563	3.0	-23.5	12.7
β_s	0.00341		-91.1	11.7
α_q, β_q	0.00522		-107.3 (-94.2)	-12.2

788 Sensory parameters (bracketed values)

789

790 **Maximum conductances and permeabilities:**

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Motor</i>	<i>Sensory</i>
PNaN (cm ³ s ⁻¹ x 10 ⁻⁹)	Permeability of Na ⁺ channels at the node	4.35	4.35
PNaP% (%)	% of Na ⁺ channels that are persistent	1.07	1.07
GKsN (nS)	Max. conductance of slow K ⁺ channels at the node	56.7	29.1
GKsI (nS)	Max. conductance of slow K ⁺ channels at the internode	0.57	1.74
GKfN (nS)	Max. conductance of fast K ⁺ channels at the node	18.2	19.4
GKfI (nS)	Max. conductance of fast K ⁺ channels at the internode	207	205
GH (nS)	Max. conductance of I _h	2.95	4.1
GLkN (nS)	Leak conductance at the node	1.97	1.69
GLkI (nS)	Leak conductance at the internode	4	3.65
GBB (nS)	Barrett-Barrett conductance	35.9	40.3

791

792 **Resting membrane potential:**

EIR (mV) (<i>I_{pump}</i>)	Internodal resting membrane potential (<i>internodal pump current; nA</i>)	-84.6 (-7.86 x 10 ⁻³)	-81.3 (-4.3 x 10 ⁻³)
ENR (mV) (<i>I_{pump*}</i>)	Nodal resting membrane potential (<i>nodal pump current; nA</i>)	-84.4 (-3.33 x 10 ⁻²)	-80.3 (-5.44 x 10 ⁻²)

793

Figures

Figure 1. Measures of impedance and 'threshold impedance' in a model of human motor axons. **a.** DC to 16Hz ZAP stimulus (10% of threshold) applied at RMP (red) and with 60% hyperpolarization (blue). **b,e,h.** Response, electrical impedance magnitude and phase measured using membrane potential. **c,f,i.** Response, 'impedance' magnitude and phase measured using threshold change. **d,g.** Impedance magnitude and phase difference measured using membrane potential and individual sinewave stimuli at frequencies of 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 16 Hz.

Figure 2. Correlation of electrical impedance and 'threshold impedance' measures in the model. **a.** Correlation of excitability and membrane potential in response to the same input stimulus (data from Fig. 1b,c) **b.** Magnitude of 'threshold impedance' vs conventional electrical impedance (data from Fig. 1e,f). **c.** Phase difference between response and input measured using the threshold and membrane potential methods (data from Fig. 1 h,i). The yellow to red data points correspond to data gathered at RMP and are graded according to frequency (see scale, lower left). Similarly the green to blue data points correspond to the hyperpolarized data.

Figure 3. Comparison of Frequency Response Curves derived from 16-s and 4-s ZAPs. Blue and red traces are from 4-s ZAP stimuli at RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization. Grey traces are for the corresponding 16-s ZAP stimuli. **a.** Membrane potential change. **b.** Electrical impedance magnitude (linear regression of 16-s vs 4-s data: $y=0.98*x -0.001$, $R^2=0.94$; i.e. close to the line of identity). **c.** Phase difference between membrane potential and stimulus current (linear regression: $y=1.10*x+0.053$, $R^2=0.86$).

Figure 4. Excitability changes in response to ZAP conditioning. *Upper Row:* Superimposed responses of the six subjects at RMP (red) and with hyperpolarization (blue) in motor and sensory axons. *Middle Row:* Mean (\pm SEM) magnitude of threshold impedance versus frequency (n=6). *Bottom Row:* Mean (\pm SEM) phase difference between response and input stimulus.

Figure 5. Comparison of modelled and observed data.

Observed data (mean [solid lines] \pm SEM [dashed lines] for RMP [red] and 60% hyperpolarization [blue]) and modelled data (black lines). *Top Row,* Response to input ZAP at RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization. *Bottom Row,* Magnitude of 'threshold impedance' $|Z_{threshold}'|$ versus frequency for the axons at RMP and with hyperpolarization.

Figure 6. Voltage dependence of the frequency response in the model motor axon.

a Threshold electrotonic responses at RMP (0%, red) and for 30 (green), 60 (blue) and 90% (cyan) hyperpolarizations. **b.** Response to ZAP conditioning superimposed on the hyperpolarizations in *A.* **c.** Magnitude of the threshold impedance calculated from the responses in *b.* **d.** Phase of the threshold impedance, corresponding to the difference between response and input stimulus.

Figure 7. Ion channels contributing to the low-frequency resonance. Membrane potential (EN, top), currents (I, middle) and channel open fractions (bottom) for motor axons in response to the ZAP protocol modelled at RMP (left column), and with -60% hyperpolarization (right column).

Figure 8. Sensitivity of frequency response to key currents. Thin lines correspond to the unaltered model (same as Fig 1e). The dotted lines correspond to the removal of a conductance, and the thicker lines are with the same conductance doubled. The red and blue lines are modelled at RMP and with 60% hyperpolarization, respectively. **a.** G_H (maximal

conductance of I_h). **b.** G_{Ks} (maximal conductance of slow K^+ channels). **c.** G_{Lk} (maximal conductance of ohmic 'leak' channels). **d.** P_{NaP} (fraction of Na^+ channels operating in a persistent mode). Note: RMP and hyperpolarization were clamped for each conductance alteration to maintain the same average potential as in the unaltered data.

Figure 9. Do sensory axons behave as relatively depolarized motor axons?

Observed excitability responses (mean \pm SEM) to ZAP function (**a.**) and frequency-response curves (**b.**) for motor (black) and sensory (red) axons at RMP and with a 60% hyperpolarization. Modelled excitability (**c.**) and frequency-response (**d.**): motor model (black), sensory model (red). Depolarised motor model (blue) and sensory model (red) excitability (**e.**) and frequency response (**f.**).




Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Figure 4.




Figure 5.




Figure 6.




Figure 7.




Figure 8.




Figure 9.