



**HAL**  
open science

## Electrodifusion models of synaptic potentials in dendritic spines

Thibault Lagache, Krishna Jayant, Rafael Yuste

► **To cite this version:**

Thibault Lagache, Krishna Jayant, Rafael Yuste. Electrodifusion models of synaptic potentials in dendritic spines. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience*, 2019, 47 (1), pp.77-89. 10.1007/s10827-019-00725-5 . hal-02911855v2

**HAL Id: hal-02911855**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02911855v2>**

Submitted on 20 Aug 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Electrodiffusion models of synaptic potentials in dendritic spines

Thibault Lagache<sup>1,3,4,†,\*</sup>, Krishna Jayant<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> and Rafael Yuste<sup>1,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York 10027

<sup>2</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Columbia University, New York 10027

<sup>3</sup>Neurotechnology Center, Columbia University, New York 10027

<sup>4</sup>Kavli institute of Brain Science, Columbia University, New York, 10027

<sup>†</sup>Present address: BioImage Analysis Unit, Institut Pasteur, Paris, France

\*Correspondence should be addressed to T.L. (thibault.lagache@pasteur.fr)

### ABSTRACT

The biophysical properties of dendritic spines play a critical role in neuronal integration but are still poorly understood, due to experimental difficulties in accessing them. Spine biophysics has been traditionally explored using theoretical models based on cable theory. However, cable theory generally assumes that concentration changes associated with ionic currents are negligible and, therefore, ignores electrodiffusion, i.e. the interaction between electric fields and ionic diffusion. This assumption, while true for large neuronal compartments, could be incorrect when applied to femto-liter size structures such as dendritic spines. To extend cable theory and explore electrodiffusion effects, we use here the Poisson (P) and Nernst-Planck (NP) equations, which relate electric field to charge and Fick's law of diffusion, to model ion concentration dynamics in spines receiving excitatory synaptic potentials (EPSPs). We use experimentally measured voltage transients from spines with nanoelectrodes to explore these dynamics with realistic parameters. We find that (i) passive diffusion and electrodiffusion jointly affect the dynamics of spine EPSPs; (ii) spine geometry plays a key role in shaping EPSPs; and, (iii) the spine-neck resistance dynamically decreases during EPSPs, leading to short-term synaptic facilitation. Our formulation, which complements and extends cable theory, can be easily adapted to model ionic biophysics in other nanoscale bio-compartments.









Figure 2




b


[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig2.pdf](#)


c




d




e




f



g




h




**a** Figure 3

1- AMPA channel model




2- Calibration of conductance parameters with computed head voltage





3- Calibrated synaptic conductance

Optimal parameters ( $\mu^*, \tau_1^*, \tau_2^*$ )



Synaptic conductance (estimated) [nS]



[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig3.pdf](#)

**b**







Figure 4









Figure 5

EPSP frequency = 20 Hz

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig5.pdf](#)  
EPSP frequency = 50 Hz





## INTRODUCTION

1 Dendritic spines, nanoscale protrusions located along dendrites of principal neurons,  
2 form the primary site of excitatory synaptic input in the mammalian brain [1-3]. Their  
3 function and plasticity are likely essential for neuronal function, memory formation and brain  
4 development [4, 5]. Excitatory neurotransmitters released during synaptic transmission  
5 activate receptors on the spine head, which causes ion channels to open and current to flow  
6 into the spine. This current charges the spine causing an excitatory post-synaptic potential  
7 (EPSP), which subsequently integrates in the dendrite and summates with other excitatory or  
8 inhibitory synaptic potentials on its way to the soma and axon initial segment [6]. When this  
9 summation crosses a threshold, the neuron fires an action potential (AP). Spines thus present  
10 the first node in the path of neuronal integration, and voltage dynamics (i.e. rise time, fall time  
11 and amplitude) within a spine during synaptic input determine the characteristics of the  
12 downstream signal. Voltage recordings from this nanoscale neuronal subdomain have been  
13 challenging, and measurements have often been at odds with each other, specifically with  
14 regard to the spine head EPSP magnitude [7-12] and neck resistance values [7, 8, 12-16].  
15 Recently however, optical and electrical recordings have reported fast and large EPSP values  
16 in the spine [8, 10, 15, 17]. But, given that spines exhibit a stereotypical, but highly variable  
17 geometry [18] comprising a bulbous head (volume ranges  $\sim 0.01-0.3 \mu\text{m}^3$ ) connected to the  
18 parent dendrite across a narrow neck (length ranges  $\sim 0.1-5 \mu\text{m}$ ; diameter ranges  $\sim 5-200 \text{ nm}$ ),  
19 there is a need for models to explore the relationship between geometry and voltage dynamics  
20 during synaptic inputs. Such models may help reconcile the different values that have been  
21 experimentally procured and possibly help develop an intuition on particular functions carried  
22 out by different types of spines.

23 Traditionally, spine biophysics and the EPSP integration in a neuron are modeled  
24 using cable theory [19-23], where neuronal compartments, such as dendritic spines and  
25 dendrites, are regarded as being passive electrical cables. Cable equations treat the membrane  
26 as an RC circuit and compute the time evolution of the signal in the form of partial  
27 differential equations. Traditionally, cable theory neglects the effect of concentration  
28 gradients, which is a reasonable assumption for large neuronal compartments (such as the  
29 original squid giant axon) but may fail to accurately describe electrostatics in nanoscale  
30 structures such as dendritic spines. In addition, the spine neck resistance has been indirectly  
31 estimated with fluorescence recovery after photo-bleaching (FRAP) [13, 14, 24, 25] (i.e.  
32 charged or uncharged dye molecules diffusing back into the spine head upon a spine head  
33 photo-bleaching). Here, the mean escape time  $\tau_e$  of a single diffusive molecule (with diffusion  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

coefficient  $D$ ) from the spine head into the dendrite can be described by the relation [26]  $\tau_e = D^{-1} \left( \frac{V}{4r} + \frac{L^2}{2} + \frac{VL}{\pi r^2} \right) + O(V^{\frac{2}{3}} D^{-1})$ , where  $V$  is the volume of the spine head,  $r$  the radius of the cylindrical neck and  $L$  its length. For a typical spine with head volume  $V = 0.1 \mu\text{m}^3$ , neck length  $L = 1 \mu\text{m}$ , neck radius  $r = 50 \text{ nm}$  and a diffusion constant  $D = 0.5 \times 10^3 \mu\text{m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  (corresponding to the measured coefficient of sodium ions in cytoplasm) [27], we obtain that  $\frac{V}{4Dr} \approx \frac{L^2}{2D} = 1 \text{ ms}$  and  $\frac{VL}{D\pi r^2} = 25 \text{ ms}$ . Thus, in most spine geometries we can approximate  $\tau_e \approx \frac{VL}{D\pi r^2}$ , which is then used to fit the exponential decay rate of the FRAP transient. Neck resistance is finally estimated with  $R_{neck} = R_{cyt} \frac{L}{\pi r^2} = R_{cyt} \frac{D\tau_e}{V}$ , where  $R_{cyt}$ , the longitudinal cytoplasmic resistivity, is assumed to be constant  $\approx 1 - 1.5 \Omega \cdot \text{m}$  [11, 22]

While both cable theory and FRAP measurements are elegant formulations to model and extract spine biophysical parameters [7, 14, 21, 25], they do have limitations and, indeed, many of the estimated values are at odds with many experiments [9, 11, 24]. One critical aspect that is ignored in both approaches is electrodiffusion [28-31], i.e. the effect of the electric field on the concentration gradient, which is important when large longitudinal voltage gradients and concentration changes occur. This aspect becomes more critical in the small dendritic spines where sizeable voltage swings, large concentration changes on the order of  $\sim \text{mM}$ , and appreciable electric field gradients across a nanoscale neck can occur within a few milliseconds. Such effects could modulate both voltage and current transmission at a fundamental level and need to be better understood.

To extend cable theory and accurately describe electrolyte dynamics in biological micro-domains, we use the Poisson-Nernst-Planck (PNP) formalism [29, 32, 33] and explicitly account for the effect of geometry and electrodiffusion. PNP equations have been extensively used to model thin ion channels [34], and, in addition, their steady-state analysis led to the well-known Goldman-Hodgkin-Katz formula and the definition of the reversal potential. However, the PNP equations cannot be analytically solved in complex three-dimensional structures, such as dendritic spines or extracellular space [35, 36]. Previous work modelling electrodiffusion effect in spines [28, 33] have either captured the effects of the PNP purely through numerical simulations [12], examined dynamics under non-electroneutral conditions [12], or solved PNP equations only in cylindrical geometries [28]. Here, we use singular perturbation theory and derive coarse-grained PNP equations to describe voltage and ion concentration dynamics in the spine head during synaptic input, explicitly accounting for the effect of geometry and electrodiffusion. We use recently published measurements of

spontaneous EPSP transients from spines to highlight these effects under different geometries. We find that electrodiffusion can indeed play a significant role in determining the overall EPSP magnitude and time scales. In addition, changes in ion concentration on a millisecond time scale can modulate current across the neck, which suggests that the neck resistance can dynamically vary as a function of synaptic current. We also find that the spine geometry affects its voltage dynamics and that trains of EPSPs could increase voltage responses.

## METHODS

### PNP formalism

We used singular perturbation theory and analyzed the dynamics of both positive and negative ionic charges inside the spine head and neck (Fig. 1a), and derived a novel coarse-grained system of equations that fully captures the coupled dynamics of ions and voltage with the PNP formalism. It uses a coupled system of two differential equations to describe the interacting ion and electrical potential dynamics: (1) the Poisson (P) equation (Eq. 1) that computes the electrical potential rising from the local differences between the concentrations of negative  $c^-(x, t)$  and positive  $c^+(x, t)$  charges,

$$\Delta_x \Phi(x, t) = \frac{e}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_c} (c^-(x, t) - c^+(x, t)) \quad (1)$$

Where,  $\Delta_x = \nabla_x^2$  is the Laplacian operator,  $e$  the elementary electrical charge,  $\epsilon_0$  the vacuum permittivity and  $\epsilon_c$  the relative permittivity of the cytoplasm, and (2), the Nernst-Planck (NP) equation (Eq. 2) which captures the contribution of the electrical field on the concentration gradient;

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t}(x, t) = D \nabla \cdot [\nabla c + v \gamma c \nabla \Phi](x, t) \quad (2)$$

Where,  $D$  is the diffusion constant (that we assumed to be the same for both positive and negative charges),  $\gamma = \frac{e}{kT}$ , and  $v = \pm 1$ , is the ionic valence. An analytical solution to the full system of PNP equations is not possible and hence must be either numerically computed or asymptotically estimated.

### Modeling electrostatics in the spine head and neck

We approximated the geometry of the dendritic spine with a ball (spine head, radius  $R$ ) connected to the parent dendrite across a cylindrical thin neck (length  $L$ , cross-section  $S = \pi a^2$ , with  $a$ , the neck radius, that we assumed to be constant (Fig. 1a). We also assumed that the neck radius is smaller than the head radius  $a < R$ , as corroborated by ultra-structural

1 reconstructions [18] and super-resolution microscopy of living spines[14]. We modeled the  
 2 spine head membrane as an impermeable membrane (no ion leak), with thickness  $d$  and small  
 3 electrical permittivity  $\epsilon_m \ll \epsilon_c$  (Fig. 1a, inset) (Table 1). We also assumed the continuity of  
 4 the electrical field (derivative of the electrical potential) at the membrane boundary, a  
 5 boundary layer condition employed to solve electrostatic equations across dielectric layers  
 6 [37, 38]. Finally, boundary conditions for the potential and ion concentrations at the neck  
 7 entrance were matched to physiological solutions inside the spine neck.

12 Using asymptotic analysis of the Poisson equation, we first show that, apart from the  
 13 thin boundary layer near the membrane, the spine head is electro-neutral with constant  
 14 concentration  $c^+(r, t) \approx c^-(r, t) \approx c_{head}(t)$ , and iso-potential  $\Phi(r, t) \approx \Phi_{head}(t)$  (Fig. 1a)  
 15 (see SI-II-A for details). This constant potential approximation in the bulk was also confirmed  
 16 in recent numerical simulations using finite element, steady-state simulations [12], and is true  
 17 for the entire spine microdomain, except for a thin boundary layer near the membrane- i.e. the  
 18 Debye layer (Fig. 1a, inset). Thus, as traditionally represented in electrical circuit analogy, the  
 19 spine head behaves like a small capacitor connected to the parent dendrite through a resistive  
 20 neck [39]. To obtain the full solution for the potential and the ion concentrations inside the  
 21 entire spine head domain (i.e. bulk and boundary layer), we compute the inner solutions near  
 22 the membrane that both match the boundary conditions and the asymptotic solutions in the  
 23 bulk. Due to the small electrical permittivity of the membrane, the maximal potential drop  
 24 occurs across the membrane bilayer, and bulk potential is given by the capacitor formula

$$36 \quad \Phi_{head}(t) = \frac{(n^+(t) - n^-(t))e}{4\pi c_m R^2} \quad (3)$$

39 Here  $n^+(t)$  and  $n^-(t)$  are the total number of positive and negative ions inside the spine head  
 40 at time  $t$ , and  $c_m$  is the membrane capacitance per unit of surface. Typically,  $c_m \approx 0.01 \text{ Fm}^{-2}$   
 41 (Table 1), and therefore small differences between the total number of positive and negative  
 42 charges inside the head lead to significant changes of the spine head potential. For example,  
 43 inside a spherical spine head with radius  $R = 500 \text{ nm}$ , the resting potential  $\Phi_0 \approx$   
 44  $-60 \text{ mV}$  corresponds to a net excess of  $\approx 12,000$  negative charges, while the total number of  
 45 ions is equal to  $\frac{4}{3}\pi R^3 c_0 \approx 50 \times 10^6$  ions. To put this in context, a typical single ion channel  
 46 can flux several thousand ions per millisecond [40]. Thus, due to the small capacitance of the  
 47 spine head, the entry of relatively few positive charges during synaptic input, even due to a  
 48 single channel opening, will result in a rapid depolarization.

58 The dynamics of ion concentration and potential inside the spine head critically

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 depends on the ionic fluxes with the parent dendrite across the neck. To analyze these fluxes,  
 2 we followed the methodology developed for modeling ion channels [34, 41] and reduced PNP  
 3 equations to one-dimensional equations along the neck's principal axis from the spine head to  
 4 the dendritic shaft (Fig. 1a, see SI-II-B-1 for details). The total flux  $J^+(t)$  of positive and  
 5  $J^-(t)$  of negative ions are the solution of the transport Nernst-Planck equation and thus  
 6 comprise of a diffusion term  $J_{neck}(t)$ , which describes the flux due to concentration gradient,  
 7 and a current term  $I_{neck}(t)$ , which describes the flux of ions driven by the electric field:  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11

$$12 \quad J^+(t) = \frac{1}{2}(J_{neck}(t) + I_{neck}(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad J^-(t) = \frac{1}{2}(J_{neck}(t) - I_{neck}(t)) \quad (5)$$

13 We highlight that, under electro-neutral conditions, the diffusion flux  $J_{neck}(t) = J^+(t) +$   
 14  $J^-(t)$  drives an equal amount of positive and negative charges in the same direction, and thus  
 15 results in no net electrical current. On the other hand, the electrical current results from  
 16 positive and negative ions that move in opposite directions  $I_{neck}(t) = J^+(t) - J^-(t)$ .  
 17 Mathematical analysis of PNP equations inside the neck leads to (see SI-II-B-2 for details)  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23

$$24 \quad J_{neck}(t) = \frac{2DS_e}{L}(c_{head}(t) - c_0) \quad (6)$$

25 and,  
 26  
 27

$$28 \quad I_{neck}(t) = R_{neck}^{-1}(c_{head}(t))(\Phi_{head}(t) - \Phi_0) \quad (7)$$

29 with neck resistance  
 30  
 31  
 32

$$33 \quad R_{neck}(c_{head}(t)) = \frac{L}{2\gamma DS_e(c_{head}(t) - c_0)} \ln\left(\frac{c_{head}(t)}{c_0}\right) \quad (8)$$

34 Previous expressions for the diffusion flux and the current inside the neck were obtained after  
 35 the 1D reduction of PNP equations and their asymptotic approximation. These mathematical  
 36 techniques are similar to those used for modeling ion channels [34, 41, 42] and remain  
 37 accurate as long as the Debye length  $\lambda_D$  (see Table 1) is small compared to the dimensions  
 38 (length and diameter) of the neck. Otherwise, full 3D numerical simulations are required or, if  
 39 the Debye length is actually large compared to neck diameter, other type of asymptotic  
 40 analysis can be applied [43]. Based on previous expressions, we highlight the following  
 41 findings: First, the asymptotic diffusion flux (Eq. 6) is the expression normally used to  
 42 interpret FRAP experiments. This formulation captures only diffusion and neglects the  
 43 contribution of the electric field on ion dynamics. Second, electrodiffusion predicts that  
 44 changes in ion concentration modulate the neck resistance which is not solely dependent on  
 45 geometry as usually assumed in cable theory (Fig. 1b) but also critically depends on the ion  
 46 concentration inside the spine head (Fig. 1c and Eq. 8). For constant ion concentration, neck  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65

resistance reduces to

$$R_{neck}(c_0) = \frac{L}{2\gamma D S c_0 e} \quad (9).$$

## RESULTS

### Fast electrical and slow diffusional dynamics inside the dendritic spine

During synaptic input, both AMPA and NMDA receptors are activated. For the sake of computational simplicity, we chose to neglect NMDA receptors given that AMPA receptors are assumed to be the major source of  $\text{Na}^+$  current. Moreover, by considering the relative permeability of AMPA receptors to main ions and Goldman-Hodgkin-Katz equation, we computed that the reversal potential of AMPA receptors is  $\Phi_{reversal}(t) \approx \gamma^{-1} \ln\left(\frac{c_0}{c_{head}(t)}\right)$  (see SI-II-C-1 for details), and that the synaptic current is governed by the Nernst–Planck equation of transport:

$$I_{synaptic}(t) = -g^+(t) \left( \Phi_{head}(t) - \gamma^{-1} \ln\left(\frac{c_0}{c_{head}(t)}\right) \right) \quad (10).$$

Here  $g^+(t)$  is the time-dependent conductance of AMPA receptors. The ionic influx is thus maximum at resting potential  $\Phi_0 \approx -60$  mV and concentration  $c_0$  and collapses when the spine head potential and concentration increase.

Using charge conservation principles for both positive and negative charges inside the spine head (see SI-II-C-1 for details), together with the capacitance relation (4), we obtained the coarse-grained system of differential equations

$$e v_{head} \frac{d c_{head}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} (I_{synaptic}(t) - J_{neck}(t)) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{and } c_m s_{head} \frac{d \Phi_{head}(t)}{dt} = I_{synaptic}(t) - I_{neck}(t) \quad (12)$$

where diffusive gradient  $J_{neck}(t)$  and neck current  $I_{neck}(t)$  are respectively given by Eq. (6) and (7), and synaptic current  $I_{synaptic}(t)$  is given by Eq. (10). Here  $v_{head} = \frac{4}{3}\pi R^3$  and  $s_{head} = 4\pi R^2$  are the volume and the surface area of the spine head respectively. Equation (11) describes the gradual increase of ion concentration inside the spine head during channel opening, while equation (12) captures the potential dynamics. Equations (11) and (12) are non-trivially coupled because synaptic and neck current depend on spine head potential and concentration.

The coarse-grained system of equations (11-12) is a slow-fast dynamical system. The time constant of concentration changes  $\tau_c = \frac{v_{head} L}{SD} \approx 10 - 100$  ms is much longer than the time

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

scale of voltage transients, which is due to the charging/discharging of the spine head (capacitor) through the neck resistance (time constant  $\tau_\phi = c_m S_{head} \left( R_{neck} + \frac{1}{g^+(t)} \right) \approx 10 - 100 \mu\text{s}$ ) (Supplementary Fig. 1). Thus, for a Heaviside step function input (constant channel conductance,  $g^+(t) = g^+$ ), voltage increase is rapid at the onset of ion-channel opening, with significant depolarization values and reaches a plateau given by  $\Phi_{head} = \frac{\Phi_0}{1 + g^+ R_{neck}(c_0)}$  in less than  $100 \mu\text{s}$  (Fig. 2a). We termed the first few hundred microseconds of the transient as the *electrostatic* phase, which is accurately described by cable theory. The rapid voltage depolarization during the electrostatic phase causes a decrease in synaptic current (Eq. 10 and Fig. 2e), mirrored by an increase in neck current (Fig. 2f) which plateaus as voltage reaches a steady state. Synaptic and neck currents are then equal. Yet, while the synaptic current only involves an influx of positive ions, the neck current is composed of positive and negative ions moving in opposite directions (positive ions are pushed out the spine head and negative ions are pushed in). If we assume that positive and negative ions have the same diffusivity, only half of the entering positive ions are actually pushed out the spine, while the other half stays inside the spine head and is counter-balanced by incoming negative ions. Thus, due to current conservation, there are twice more positive ions that enter the spine than ions that are pushed out, and positive ions that stay inside the spine head are counter-balanced by incoming negative ions (so electro-neutrality is preserved). After few milliseconds, the concomitant accumulation of positive and negative ions inside the spine head leads to a significant increase of ion concentration, corresponding to the *electrodiffusion* phase (Fig. 2b). Thus, concentration changes during the electrostatic phase are negligible and voltage dynamics can be described accurately by cable theory, but become significant during the electrodiffusion phase. Increased ion concentration has two main effects: the decrease of effective neck resistance (Eq. 8 and Fig. 2c) and of reversal potential (Fig. 2d). Synaptic (and neck) current subsequently decreases with concentration, as reversal potential decreases and reduces the synaptic electromotive force.

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

At steady-state, the amplitude of current through the neck  $I_{neck}(\infty)$  is equal to the amplitude of the synaptic current  $I_{synaptic}(\infty)$  and also to twice the diffusive outflux  $J_{neck}(\infty)$ , where  $\infty$  denotes the steady state value for  $t \gg \tau_c$ . These relations lead to an implicit equation for the steady state current that is solved numerically (see SI-II-C-2 for details), and I-V relationship across the spine neck (Fig. 2h and Supplementary Fig. 2)

$$\Phi_{head}(\infty) = \Phi_0 + R_{neck}(\infty)I(\infty) = \Phi_0 + \gamma^{-1} \log \left( 1 + \frac{LI(\infty)}{2DS c_0 e} \right) \quad (13)$$

61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 We stress that steady state voltage and net ion concentration depend solely on spine neck  
2 geometry (Eq. 70-72 in supplementary material and Fig. 2 a-b), whereas their dynamics is  
3 controlled by the size of the spine head, through its volume and membrane capacitance (time  
4 constants on the left hand side of the dynamical system (11-12) and transition phases in Fig.  
5 2).

6  
7  
8  
9 Eq. 13 shows an highly non-linear relation, similar to current rectification observed in  
10 nanofluidic diodes [44] (Fig. 2h, inset). Such a non-linear relationship - a consequence of the  
11 PNP, was also observed with finite element simulations [12] of spine neck electrostatics,  
12 albeit with the assumption that only positive ions contribute to the overall current. This is an  
13 important electrodiffusion effect that arises as ion concentration changes.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Finally, the long and sustained synaptic input (Heaviside function) that leads to significant,  
19 long-term changes in spine head concentration and neck resistance is a condition that we used  
20 only to illustrate the slow-fast dynamics of the coarse-grained system of equations (11-12).  
21 Indeed, the kinetics of opening and closure of AMPA channels is rather of the order of few  
22 milliseconds [22]. To explore whether changes in concentration and neck resistance are  
23 already significant at this time scale during spontaneous synaptic activity, in the following  
24 section, we used recent electrical recordings of voltage transients in spine heads and estimated  
25 the corresponding currents and changes in ion concentration for different putative spine  
26 geometries.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 35 36 **Exploring the role of electrodiffusion with electrical recording data**

37  
38 Recently, we demonstrated the first direct measurements of spontaneous EPSP from  
39 spines using nanopipettes [8]. These recordings revealed voltage changes on a millisecond  
40 time scale with a fast rising phase ( $\approx 1$  ms), followed by a slower decay phase ( $\approx 10$  ms). A  
41 recent study measuring synaptic input currents revealed a similar time scale [15], providing  
42 further evidence that spine electrical transients can be large and fast. These time-scales are  
43 much slower than the estimated charging and discharging time constants of the spine head  
44 capacitor (tens of micro-seconds). Thus, the rising and decay phases likely correspond to the  
45 opening and closing kinetics of ion channels. We used the time course of this published data,  
46 along with models of the rising and decay phase of ion channels [22], to explore the effect of  
47 electrodiffusion under different spine geometries. Although these recordings were made on  
48 spines with relatively long ( $>1$   $\mu\text{m}$ ) necks, the large, fast, and spontaneous millisecond apart  
49 EPSPs could be used as a test input to explore the role of electrodiffusion on different spines  
50 geometries. We modeled the rising phase of synaptic conductance  $g^+(t)$  with a sigmoidal  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



function followed by a mono-exponential decay phase:  $g^+(t) = \frac{g_0 \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1 + \exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$  (Fig. 3a-1). To determine the conductance parameters for each EPSP, we used the following grid-search fitting procedure: First, we considered four different putative spine geometries with either a large (600 nm) or small (300 nm) head diameter, and either a large (70 nm) or thin (40 nm) neck radius (neck length is fixed to  $L = 1 \mu\text{m}$ ). Then, for each individual EPSP and each spine geometry, we determined manually the initial time  $t_i$  of rising phase and corresponding resting potential  $\Phi_0(t_i)$  that slightly varies around -58 mV for each EPSP. We then computed synaptic conductance  $g_{[g_0, \mu, \tau_1, \tau_2]}^+(t)$  for a large range of conductance parameters  $[g_0, \mu, \tau_1, \tau_2]$  (grid search), and solved the dynamical system of equations (11-12) with a finite-elements scheme (time step  $0.1 \mu\text{s}$ ), over time intervals  $[t_i; t_i + 10 \text{ ms}]$ . We then compared the computed head voltage  $\Phi_{head}(t)$  for each set  $[g_0, \mu, \tau_1, \tau_2]$  of conductance parameters with the measured voltage. Finally, the optimal set of parameters for each EPSP was then determined by minimizing the least-square distance between computed and measured voltage over each time interval  $[t_i; t_i + 10 \text{ ms}]$  (Fig. 3a-2). We found similar kinetics parameters for the different spine geometries and EPSPs, with a rapid opening kinetics (median of the 4 EPSPs:  $\mu = 0.52 \text{ ms}$  and  $\tau_1 = 0.11 \text{ ms}$ ) followed by a slower decay (median  $\tau_2 = 3.95 \text{ ms}$ ) (Fig. 3a-3 and Table 1). On the other hand, we found that the conductance amplitude increased with the EPSP amplitude, and was also modulated by the spine geometry: first, synaptic conductance decreased in spines with high neck resistance (small diameter), as a lower current is needed for the head voltage to reach measured value. Moreover, for dendritic spines with smaller head volume, we found that, due to increased head concentration during EPSPs (Fig. 3b), the estimated synaptic conductance was significantly higher (up to +30% for small neck diameter (high resistance/low current) and +200% for larger necks). Because the measured head voltage is equal to the product of the current and the neck resistance, the increased synaptic conductance actually compensated the lower reversal potential and neck resistance due to higher ion concentration (Fig. 3b). Finally, we compared the electrodiffusion response of the different spine geometries for a single EPSP with median kinetics parameters ( $\mu = 0.52 \text{ ms}$ ,  $\tau_1 = 0.11 \text{ ms}$  and  $\tau_2 = 3.95 \text{ ms}$ ) and increasing conductance  $g_0 = 2 \rightarrow 9 \text{ nS}$  (Fig. 4).

Variations of ion concentration were particularly significant within spines with small head (reduced volume) and large necks (high current), leading to important modulation of synaptic current. The dynamics of concentration variations was much slower than the EPSP

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

time course, and, for large EPSPs, we observed that the head concentration did not necessarily return to its resting state  $c_0$  before the arrival of a second EPSP. We thus predict that the concentration increase (i.e. resistance decrease) could result in a significant reduction in neck resistance during repeated synaptic stimulations at high-frequency ( $\geq 50$  Hz) (Fig. 5). This finding has one important implication, i.e., that the effective electrical resistance of the spine neck is fundamentally dynamic as it may vary with synaptic activity and associated changes in concentration. Lacking other compensatory or homeostatic mechanisms, the reduction in neck resistance during a train of EPSPs will effectively reduce the filtering effect of the neck resistance, leading to synaptic facilitation.

## DISCUSSION

The spine neck appears to be an important diffusional barrier, but its role in electrically shaping EPSPs has remained controversial due to the lack and difficulty in performing precise experimental measurements from dendritic spines. This has led to an incomplete and often contradictory understanding of spine electrical properties [7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17, 39, 45]. One way to overcome this problem is with accurate biophysical models. This has been traditionally attempted with cable theory modeling, which is widely used in simulations of neuronal biophysics. However, cable equations traditionally neglect local changes in ionic concentration and the role of electrodiffusion (i.e. electric field effect on ionic gradients), which can become appreciable in small neuronal compartments such as spines [33]. To explore this, we use an electrodiffusion framework and fully model the electrostatics inside the spine during synaptic stimulation. We emphasize that our model does not discard cable theory but actually extends it by considering possible changes in ion concentration at millisecond time-scale in femto-liter compartments such as dendritic spines. Following previous efforts using non electroneutral conditions [33] or numerical simulations [12], here, using singular perturbation theory of the PNP equations to model dynamics, we derive a coarse-grained model that fully captures the coupled dynamics of ion concentration and potential inside the spine head. Specifically, we find that (i) diffusion and electrodiffusion jointly govern the dynamics of spine excitatory post-synaptic potentials (EPSPs); (ii) the spine geometry (both head and neck) plays a key role in shaping the EPSP time course; and, (iii) that the current-voltage relationship across the spine-neck is non-linear, which results in the neck resistance varying as a function of ion concentration and can lead to synaptic facilitation for high frequency EPSPs. We briefly discuss the functional implications of the above findings.

## Effect of electrodiffusion on synaptic potentials in dendritic spines

Using a coupled slow-fast dynamical system analysis with a Heaviside step input waveform, we find that the EPSP voltage transient at a spine head can be divided into an *electrostatic phase* - lasting a few hundred microseconds; and a *electrodiffusional phase* - lasting several milliseconds. Our results show that, during an EPSP, the electrical voltage first rises very fast due to fast charging of the spine head (due to a low membrane capacitance), with a steady-state value determined by  $I_{syn} \times R_{neck}$ , while the diffusion of ions begins to occur only a few milliseconds later. If the EPSP is sufficiently large, it adds a significant electromotive force on the ions, driving them out of the spine head through the neck, contributing to a fast and large synaptic current. After few microseconds (Fig. 2g), the spine head capacitor is charged and the neck current equilibrates with synaptic current. The amplitude of the synaptic current is proportional to the receptors' conductance but also to the difference between head potential and reversal potential, a difference which decreases as ion concentration builds-up in the spine head (Eq. 10). Because of this, the synaptic current also depends on spine geometry and neck resistance. Moreover, increased ion concentration inside the dendritic spine raises the electrical conductivity of the spine neck, i.e. lowers its electrical resistance. Together, decreases of synaptic current and neck resistance as ion concentration builds-up inside the spine head synergistically lower the head potential over millisecond time-scales (Figure 2a). This down-regulation might have important downstream effects by regulating ion flux of voltage dependent receptors. In particular, we hypothesize that concentration builds-up and voltage decrease might down-regulate the influx of calcium ions through NMDAs receptors and its associated synaptic plasticity. Finally, as neck resistance is inversely proportional to the apparent neck cross-section (Eq. 52 in SI), the local membrane curvature and constriction of the neck, or the reduction of the apparent cross-section due to crowding with organelles such as spine apparatus [46], can further increase the neck resistance and the increase voltage gradients across the spine neck.

## Regulation of spine neck resistance by ionic concentration

As expected, we find that the rapid voltage increase during the opening of AMPA receptors drives electrical currents through the spine neck. The neck current here corresponds to an exchange between positive ions flowing from the spine head to the dendrite with negative ions flowing from the dendrite to the spine head. After few microseconds, when the

1 head capacitor is charged, synaptic and neck currents equalize. But, as synaptic current only  
2 involves positive ions, whereas neck current results from an exchange between positive and  
3 negative ions, a fraction of entering sodium ions remains inside the spine, and their relatively  
4 slow diffusion through the neck enables a gradual sodium accumulation inside the head  
5 during receptors opening. At the same time, an inward neck current of negative ions maintains  
6 the overall electro-neutrality.  
7

8  
9  
10 Our model predicts that the currents associated with recorded EPSPs increases ion  
11 concentration inside the spine by up to 90%. This agrees with recent experiments using  
12 fluorescent sodium indicators that reported a up to 5 mM concentration increase leading to a ~  
13 9 mM maximal concentration following the AMPA receptors opening during EPSPs [25] and  
14 large synaptic conductance's ranging between 2-8 nS measured from spines [15]. It is  
15 important to point out that we made two major assumptions when modeling ion dynamics:  
16 First, we neglected the specific dynamics of the different ionic species such as protons, or  
17 potassium and calcium ions, which could further change the electrostatic landscape and  
18 signaling. For example, potassium ions could enter the spine neck from the dendrite via SK  
19 channel dependent shunting [47]. This current could counter the decrease in spine neck  
20 resistance due to the increased sodium concentration and thus tune the net synaptic current.  
21 The second important assumption of our model is that negative charges were only accounted  
22 for by chloride ions, while it is known that negative charges are also partly accounted for by  
23 less mobile proteins [48]. An important effect of lower negative charges' motility and inward  
24 negative current would be to down-regulate changes in ion concentration and electrodiffusion  
25 effects (i.e. lowering neck resistance and reversal potential) (Fig. 6). Moreover, decreased  
26 motility of negative ions would reduce the neck current (see SI-II-B-3 for details). However,  
27 as the neck resistance would be increased and electrodiffusion effect decreased, the voltage in  
28 the spine head during the EPSP would, overall, reach higher values (Fig. 6). We highlight that  
29 we did not consider the extreme scenario where the negative charges would be completely  
30 immobile (diffusion coefficient  $D^- = 0$ ). Indeed, in that case, positive charges might not be  
31 well-mixed in the bulk and shall accumulate near immobile negative charges, and our  
32 mathematical analysis would not be valid anymore as it relies on the bulk electro-neutrality  
33 and the accumulation of excess charges within a small Debye layer. This extreme scenario has  
34 been discussed in [33] and treated mathematically in [49, 50]. Finally, as diffusive extrusion  
35 of accumulated ions from the spine head is relatively slow (ten's to hundreds of milliseconds),  
36 we predict that high-frequency synaptic inputs will lead to a significant decrease in neck  
37 resistance, as the rate of ion concentration buildup in the spine nanodomain will exceed the  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 rate of diffusion through the neck, leading to increase in the effect of the synaptic potentials  
2 on the dendrite. Our analysis thus reveals that electrodiffusion could be a novel physiological  
3 mechanism of post-synaptic facilitation on a millisecond time scale.  
4

5 To finish, we speculate that part of the reason that spine neck resistance measurements  
6 have been at odds with each other could be due to the fact that changes in ion concentration in  
7 the spine dynamically alters its resistance, an effect which critically depends on the  
8 morphology which varies in different spine. Therefore, in addition to the voltage dynamics in  
9 the spine head, the net current through the neck could be influenced by the net ion  
10 concentration inside the spine nanodomain, and care must be taken to measure those in order  
11 to properly interpret the electrical function of spines. The potential effect of ionic  
12 concentration on spine electrical properties is something which is not of purely academic  
13 interest, as the extent to which spines implement electrical compartments and shape the  
14 dynamics and amplitudes of EPSPs is of fundamental importance to neuroscience, because  
15 they serve to mediate most excitatory transmission in the vertebrate central nervous system.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 **Supplementary information (SI) accompanies this manuscript.** SI includes detailed  
30 mathematical derivations of the equations presented here in this manuscript  
31  
32  
33

34 **Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by the NIMH (R01MH101218,  
35 R01MH100561) and the NINDS (R01NS110422). This material is also based upon work  
36 supported by, or in part by, the U. S. Army Research Laboratory and the U. S. Army Research  
37 Office under contract number W911NF-12-1-0594 (MURI). T.L. was partly supported by the  
38 Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale and the Philippe foundation. K.J was supported by the  
39 Kavli Institute of Brain Science at Columbia.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 **Competing Financial Interest:** Authors declare no competing financial interests pertaining  
48 to this study.  
49  
50  
51

52 **Author Contributions:** T.L. and R.Y. conceived the project. T.L performed the modeling  
53 and analysis. K.J assisted with model development and analysis. T.L and K.J wrote the  
54 manuscript. R.Y assembled and directed the team, provided guidance, funding, and edited the  
55 manuscript.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table 1: Parameters of electrodiffusion model**

Variable	Name	Value	Reference
$e$	Elementary charge	$\approx 1.6 \cdot 10^{-19} \text{C}$	
$\epsilon_0$	Vacuum permittivity	$\approx 8.85 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{Fm}^{-1}$	
$\epsilon_c$	Cytoplasmic permittivity	60	[51]
$\epsilon_m$	Membrane permittivity	2 (= phospholipid bilayer)	
$\gamma = \frac{e}{k_B T}$	NP constant	$\approx 37 \text{V}^{-1}$	
$R$	Radius of the spine head	50 – 500 nm	[18]
$L$	Length of the spine neck	0.1 – 2 $\mu\text{m}$	[18]
$a$	Neck radius	30 – 100 nm	[18]
$S = \pi a^2$	Cross section of the spine neck	$0.28 - 3.1 \cdot 10^{-2} \mu\text{m}^2$	
$D$	Diffusion constant of ions	$0.5 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$	[27]
$g_0$	Maximum synaptic conductance	1 – 16 nS	Fitted to data
$c_m$	Membrane capacitance per unit of surface	$0.01 \text{Fm}^{-2}$	[20]
$c_0$	Bulk ion concentration	150 mM	[20]
$\Phi_0$	Resting membrane potential	-60 mV	Fitted to data
$\mu$	Kinetics parameter (1) of ion channel opening (sigmoidal function)	0.27 – 0.71 ms	Fitted to data
$\tau_1$	Kinetics parameter (2) of ion channel opening (sigmoidal function)	0.075 – 0.202 ms	Fitted to data
$\tau_2$	Kinetics parameter of ion channel closure (mono-exponential)	3.76 – 4.54 ms	Fitted to data

$\lambda_D$ $= \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_c}{2e\gamma c_0}}$	Debye length	$\approx 1 \text{ nm}$	
$\delta_1 = \left(\frac{\lambda_D}{R}\right)^2$	Singular perturbation parameter in the spine head	$= 0.02 - 0.002$	
$\delta_2 = \left(\frac{\lambda_D}{L}\right)^2$	Singular perturbation parameter in the spine neck	$= 0.01 - 0.001$	

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Figure Legends

**Figure 1: Modeling the dendritic spine geometry and its electro-diffusional properties** *a)* Spine head contains ion channels. It is connected to the parent dendrite with a thin cylindrical neck. Membrane is modeled as an impermeable dielectric with small electrical permittivity compared to cytoplasm ( $\epsilon_m \ll \epsilon_c$ ). At resting state, the spine head is polarized with negative electrical potential  $\Phi_0 \approx -60$  mV compared to external potential  $\Phi_{ext} \approx 0$  mV. Ion concentration  $c_{head}(t)$  also varies compared to bulk concentration  $c_0$ . Bulk is electroneutral except for a thin boundary layer near the membrane- i.e. the Debye layer (inset), where positive (red line) and negative (blue line) ion concentrations differ due to local variation of the electrical potential (black line). Most of the electrical potential drops through the poorly conducting cell membrane. Equivalent circuit describing the dendritic spine electrostatics is represented:  $C_m$  denotes the capacitance of the head membrane,  $C_{neck}$  and  $R_{neck}$  denote the membrane capacitance and the longitudinal cytoplasmic resistance of the spine neck.  $C_{dend}$  and  $R_{dend}$  denote the membrane and resistance of the dendrite. An additional membrane resistance  $R_{leak}$  models the ion leaks through the dendrite membrane. All of which combine to determine the voltage dynamics inside the spine head. *b)* Geometrical determinants of passive spine neck resistance (ion diffusion coefficient and concentration are respectively fixed to  $D = \frac{1}{4}D_0 = 0.5 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$  and  $c_0 = 150$  mM). *c)* Physiological determinants of spine neck resistance (neck length and radius are respectively fixed to  $L = 1 \mu\text{m}$  and  $r_0 = 50$  nm).

**Figure 2. Slow-fast dynamics of ion concentration and electrical potential within the spine head during a step entry of positive ions (constant synaptic conductance  $g^+(t) = 3$  nS).** *a)* Log plot of the voltage dynamics within different spine geometries, with large ( $R = 600$  nm, dashed line) and small ( $R = 300$  nm, solid lines) head, and different neck diameters (140 nm (red,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 368$  M $\Omega$ ) and 80 nm (grey,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 120$  M $\Omega$ )). The electrostatics forces dominate at small time scales ( $< 100 \mu\text{s}$ ) and diffusion at larger time scales ( $> 1$  ms). Note the deflection of the electrical potential due to concentration changes and diffusion. *b)* Log plot of the concentration dynamics. *c)* Log plot of the neck resistance dynamics. *d)* Log plot of the synaptic reversal potential dynamics. *e)* Log plot of the synaptic current dynamics. *f)* Log plot of the neck current dynamics. *g)* Dynamical model of synaptic and neck currents. *h)* I-V curve of dendritic spine for two different neck diameter (140 nm (grey,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 368$  M $\Omega$ ) and 80 nm (black,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 120$  M $\Omega$ )). The discrepancy between the spine I-V



curve (dashed line,  $(\Delta c > 0)$ ) when ion concentration change and Ohm's law with constant resistance (solid line,  $\Delta c = 0$ ) is highlighted. For thin and highly resistive neck, the spine behaves like a diode (inset scheme).

**Figure 3. Estimation of synaptic conductance and changes in ionic concentration during experimentally measured EPSPs** **a)** Estimating the synaptic conductance during spontaneous activity. 1- Conductance of AMPA receptors is modeled with sigmoidal opening (parameters  $\mu$  and  $\tau_1$ ) and single-exponential closure (parameter  $\tau_2$ ). 2- Optimal conductance parameters  $[g_0, \mu, \tau_1, \tau_2]$  for each EPSP are estimated with a multi-dimensional grid-search algorithm where the conductance  $g^+(t)$ , the synaptic current (Eq. 10) and the voltage (Eq. 12) are computed for a large range of parameters. Best conductance parameters are those minimizing the distance between the computed and measured EPSPs [8]. 3- Boxplots show fitted parameters for the 4 EPSPs recorded experimentally, and optimal conductance is plotted for the different spine geometries (large (diameter = 140 nm,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$ , red) and thin (diameter = 80 nm,  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$ , grey) spine neck, and large (diameter = 600 nm, dashed line) and small (diameter = 300 nm, solid line) spine head). **b)** Dynamics of synaptic current, head concentration, neck resistance and reversal potential as reflected by coarse-grained electro-diffusion model during spontaneous spine activity in the different spine geometries (large (diameter = 140 nm, red) and thin (diameter = 80 nm, grey) spine neck, and large (diameter = 600 nm, dashed line) and small (diameter = 300 nm, solid line) spine head).

**Figure 4: Electrodifussion simulation of a single EPSP with increased synaptic conductances.** Simulations of single EPSPs (conductance  $g^+(t) = \frac{g_0 \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1 + \exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$ , with increasing conductance (from  $g_0 = 2 \text{ nS}$  to  $g_0 = 9 \text{ nS}$ ) and dynamical parameters  $\mu = 0.52 \text{ ms}$ ,  $\tau_1 = 0.11$  and  $\tau_2 = 3.95 \text{ ms}$ ) in 4 different spine geometries.

**Figure 5: Incremental increase of ionic concentration and associated neck resistance decrease during high-frequency synaptic stimulation.** **a)** Relative variations of ion concentration in the spine head ( $R = 300 \text{ nm}$ ) and associated neck resistance for a 20 Hz synaptic stimulation (geometrical neck resistances (i.e. at concentration  $c_0$ ):  $500 \text{ M}\Omega$  (blue)

and 100 M $\Omega$  (red)). The kinetics of the synaptic conductance is  $g^+(t) = g^+ \frac{\exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1+\exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$  with  $g^+ = 2 \text{ nS}$ ,  $\mu = 0.55 \text{ ms}$ ,  $\tau_1 = 0.12 \text{ ms}$  and  $\tau_2 = 4 \text{ ms}$ . **b)** Relative variations for 50 Hz synaptic stimulation.

**Figure 6: Electrodifusion simulation of a single EPSP for decreased diffusivity of negative ions.** Simulations of single EPSPs (conductance  $g^+(t) = \frac{g_0 \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1+\exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$ , with maximal conductance  $g_0 = 5 \text{ nS}$ , and dynamical parameters  $\mu = 0.52 \text{ ms}$ ,  $\tau_1 = 0.11$  and  $\tau_2 = 3.95 \text{ ms}$ ) in 4 different spine geometries. Diffusion coefficient  $D^-$  of negative ions ranges from 0.2  $D^+$  to 1.0  $D^+$ , with  $D^+$  fixed equal to  $D$  (see Table 1).

1. Harris, K.M. and S. Kater, *Dendritic spines: cellular specializations imparting both stability and flexibility to synaptic function*. Annual review of neuroscience, 1994. **17**(1): p. 341-371.
2. Yuste, R., *Dendritic spines and distributed circuits*. Neuron, 2011. **71**(5): p. 772-81.
3. Yuste, R., *Dendritic Spines*. 2010, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
4. Yuste, R. and A. Majewska, *On the function of dendritic spines*. Neuroscientist, 2001. **7**(5): p. 387-95.
5. Yang, G., F. Pan, and W.-B. Gan, *Stably maintained dendritic spines are associated with lifelong memories*. Nature, 2009. **462**(7275): p. 920-924.
6. Stuart, G.J. and N. Spruston, *Dendritic integration: 60 years of progress*. Nature Neuroscience, 2015. **18**(12): p. 1713.
7. Popovic, M.A., et al., *Electrical behaviour of dendritic spines as revealed by voltage imaging*. Nat Commun, 2015. **6**: p. 8436.
8. Jayant, K., et al., *Targeted intracellular voltage recordings from dendritic spines using quantum-dot-coated nanopipettes*. Nature nanotechnology, 2017. **12**(4): p. 335-342.

- 1  
2  
3 9. Grunditz, A., et al., *Spine neck plasticity controls postsynaptic calcium signals through electrical compartmentalization*. The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience, 2008. **28**(50): p. 13457-66.
- 4  
5 10. Acker, C.D., E. Hoyos, and L.M. Loew, *EPSPs Measured in Proximal Dendritic Spines of Cortical Pyramidal Neurons*. eNeuro, 2016. **3**(2).
- 6  
7 11. Harnett, M.T., et al., *Synaptic amplification by dendritic spines enhances input cooperativity*. Nature, 2012.
- 8  
9 12. Cartailleur, J., et al., *Deconvolution of voltage sensor time series and electro-diffusion modeling of synaptic input in dendritic spines*. Neuron, 2017. **(in press)**.
- 10  
11 13. Svoboda, K., D.W. Tank, and W. Denk, *Direct measurement of coupling between dendritic spines and shafts*. Science, 1996. **272**: p. 716-719.
- 12  
13 14. Tønnesen, J., et al., *Spine neck plasticity regulates compartmentalization of synapses*. Nature neuroscience, 2014. **17**(5): p. 678-685.
- 14  
15 15. Beaulieu-Laroche, L. and M.T. Harnett, *Dendritic Spines Prevent Synaptic Voltage Clamp*. Neuron, 2017.
- 16  
17 16. Araya, R., et al., *The spine neck filters membrane potentials*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 2006. **103**(47): p. 17961-17966.
- 18  
19 17. Kwon, T., et al., *Attenuation of Synaptic Potentials in Dendritic Spines*. Cell Rep, 2017. **20**(5): p. 1100-1110.
- 20  
21 18. Arellano, J.I., et al., *Ultrastructure of dendritic spines: correlation between synaptic and spine morphologies* Frontiers Neuroscience, 2007. **1**(1): p. 131-143.
- 22  
23 19. Segev, I. and W. Rall, *Excitable dendrites and spines: earlier theoretical insights elucidate recent direct observations*. Trends in neurosciences, 1998. **21**(11): p. 453-460.
- 24  
25 20. Koch, C., *Cable theory in neurons with active, linearized membranes*. Biological cybernetics, 1984. **50**(1): p. 15-33.
- 26  
27 21. Koch, C. and T. Poggio, *Electrical properties of dendritic spines*. TINS, 1983. **6**: p. 80-83.
- 28  
29 22. Koch, C. and I. Segev, *Methods in neuronal modeling: from ions to networks*. 1998: MIT press.
- 30  
31 23. Jack, J.J.B., D. Noble, and R.W. Tsien, *Electric current flow in excitable cells*. 1975, London: Oxford University Press.
- 32  
33 24. Bloodgood, B.L. and B.L. Sabatini, *Neuronal activity regulates diffusion across the neck of dendritic spines*. Science, 2005. **310**: p. 866-9.
- 34  
35 25. Miyazaki, K. and W.N. Ross, *Sodium dynamics in pyramidal neuron dendritic spines: synaptically evoked entry predominantly through AMPA receptors and removal by diffusion*. Journal of Neuroscience, 2017: p. 1758-17.
- 36  
37 26. Schuss, Z., A. Singer, and D. Holcman, *The narrow escape problem for diffusion in cellular microdomains*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2007. **104**(41): p. 16098-103.
- 38  
39 27. Kushmerick, M. and R. Podolsky, *Ionic mobility in muscle cells*. Science, 1969. **166**(3910): p. 1297-1298.
- 40  
41 28. Qian, N. and T. Sejnowski, *An electro-diffusion model for computing membrane potentials and ionic concentrations in branching dendrites, spines and axons*. Biological Cybernetics, 1989. **62**(1): p. 1-15.
- 42  
43 29. Savtchenko, L.P., M.M. Poo, and D.A. Rusakov, *Electrodifffusion phenomena in neuroscience: a neglected companion*. Nat Rev Neurosci, 2017. **18**(10): p. 598-612.
- 44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 30. Sylantsev, S., et al., *Spike-driven glutamate electrodiffusion triggers synaptic*  
2 *potentiation via a homer-dependent mGluR-NMDAR link*. Neuron, 2013. **77**(3): p.  
3 528-41.
- 4 31. Sylantsev, S., et al., *Electric fields due to synaptic currents sharpen excitatory*  
5 *transmission*. Science, 2008. **319**(5871): p. 1845-1849.
- 6 32. Schuss, Z., B. Nadler, and R.S. Eisenberg, *Derivation of Poisson and Nernst-Planck*  
7 *equations in a bath and channel from a molecular model*. Physical Review E, 2001.  
8 **64**(3): p. 036116.
- 9 33. Holcman, D. and R. Yuste, *The new nanophysiology: regulation of ionic flow in*  
10 *neuronal subcompartments*. Nat Rev Neurosci, 2015. **16**(11): p. 685-92.
- 11 34. Chen, D., J. Lear, and B. Eisenberg, *Permeation through an open channel: Poisson-*  
12 *Nernst-Planck theory of a synthetic ionic channel*. Biophysical Journal, 1997. **72**(1): p.  
13 97-116.
- 14 35. Halnes, G., et al., *Effect of Ionic Diffusion on Extracellular Potentials in Neural Tissue*.  
15 PLoS Comput Biol, 2016. **12**(11): p. e1005193.
- 16 36. Pods, J., J. Schonke, and P. Bastian, *Electrodiffusion models of neurons and*  
17 *extracellular space using the Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations--numerical simulation*  
18 *of the intra- and extracellular potential for an axon model*. Biophys J, 2013. **105**(1): p.  
19 242-54.
- 20 37. Jayant, K., et al., *Programmable ion-sensitive transistor interfaces. II. Biomolecular*  
21 *sensing and manipulation*. Physical Review E, 2013. **88**(1): p. 012802.
- 22 38. Jayant, K., et al., *Programmable ion-sensitive transistor interfaces. III. Design*  
23 *considerations, signal generation, and sensitivity enhancement*. Physical Review E,  
24 2014. **89**(5): p. 052817.
- 25 39. Tsay, D. and R. Yuste, *On the electrical function of dendritic spines*. Trends in  
26 neurosciences, 2004. **27**(2): p. 77-83.
- 27 40. Tovar, R.K. and G.L. Westbrook, *Ligand-Gated Ion Channels*, in *Cell Physiology Source*  
28 *Book (Fourth Edition)*. 2012.
- 29 41. Kosińska, I., et al., *Rectification in synthetic conical nanopores: A one-dimensional*  
30 *Poisson-Nernst-Planck model*. Physical Review E, 2008. **77**(3): p. 031131.
- 31 42. Goldman, D.E., *Potential, Impedance, and Rectification in Membranes*. J Gen Physiol,  
32 1943. **27**(1): p. 37-60.
- 33 43. Singer, A. and J. Norbury, *A Poisson-Nernst-Planck model for biological ion*  
34 *channels—an asymptotic analysis in a three-dimensional narrow funnel*. SIAM Journal  
35 on Applied Mathematics, 2009. **70**(3): p. 949-968.
- 36 44. Schoch, R.B., J. Han, and P. Renaud, *Transport phenomena in nanofluidics*. Reviews of  
37 Modern Physics, 2008. **80**(3): p. 839-883.
- 38 45. Yuste, R., *Electrical compartmentalization in dendritic spines*. Annual review of  
39 neuroscience, 2013. **36**: p. 429-449.
- 40 46. Bourne, J.N. and K.M. Harris, *Balancing Structure and Function at Hippocampal*  
41 *Dendritic Spines* Annu. Rev. Neurosci., 2008. **31**: p. 37-67.
- 42 47. Ngo-Anh, T., et al., *SK channels and NMDA receptors form a Ca(2+)-mediated*  
43 *feedback loop in dendritic spines*. Nat Neurosci., 2005. **8**: p. 642-9.
- 44 48. Delpire, E. and K.J. Staley, *Novel determinants of the neuronal Cl(-) concentration*. J  
45 Physiol, 2014. **592**(19): p. 4099-114.
- 46 49. Cartailleur, J., Z. Schuss, and D. Holcman, *Electrostatics of non-neutral biological*  
47 *microdomains*. Sci Rep, 2017. **7**(1): p. 11269.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
50. Cartailier, J., Z. Schuss, and D. Holcman, *Analysis of the Poisson–Nernst–Planck equation in a ball for modeling the Voltage–Current relation in neurobiological microdomains*. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 2017. **339**: p. 39-48.
51. Zhou, T., et al., *Estimation of the physical properties of neurons and glial cells using dielectrophoresis crossover frequency*. *Journal of biological physics*, 2016. **42**(4): p. 571-586.

Friday, July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Dear Pr. Victor and Destexhe,

We are submitting our revised manuscript entitled "Electrodifusion model of synaptic potentials in dendritic spines" for your consideration as an Article in the Journal of Computational Neuroscience. We would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to the referees' concerns.

To answer Reviewer 1's concerns, we are giving more details in the the Figures titles and have shortened their captions. Also, for reproducibility, we will deposit our Matlab code into ModelDB (<https://senselab.med.yale.edu/modeldb/>) as soon as our manuscript is formally accepted for publication.

To answer the main concerns of Reviewer 2,

1. We now clearly state that PNP modeling does not negate, but complements, cable theory by computing the local changes in ion concentration and the related electro-diffusion effects (i.e., a decrease of reversal potential and neck resistance). We have also highlighted that our computations rely on the 1D reduction of PNP equations inside the neck and on asymptotic analysis. This mathematical analysis remains accurate as long as the Debye length ( $\sim 1\text{nm}$ ) is much smaller than the neck dimensions (length and radius). Otherwise, more extended mathematical analysis or full 3D simulations would be required.
2. We have added two figures to the main manuscript: one that illustrates how varying the synaptic conductance in spines of different geometries affects the voltage, current, ion concentration, neck resistance and reversal potential during a single EPSP. And a second that shows how a decreased motility of negative ions affects the electro-diffusion effects without perturbing the voltage response during a single EPSP in different spine geometries.

Looking forward to a favorable response

Yours sincerely,

Thibault LAGACHE  






Reviewer #1: The objective of this paper is to present theoretical work introducing electrodiffusion into the voltage dynamics in dendritic spines. The approximations result in the spine head as a capacitor, which acts as a reservoir of charges that then are non-linearly drained by the neck under the influence of electrodiffusion.

The paper is succinct and will be of interest to J CNS readers. However, the explanation of the figures in the text and in the captions requires some attention. I think it is important to deposit the model in widely available databases, such as ModelDB.

**Answer: We will deposit our model code (Matlab) in ModelDB (<https://senselab.med.yale.edu/modeldb/>) as soon as our manuscript would be accepted for publication.**

Here are my comments on the figures: There is no point to have Figure 1b. I think a reference suffices.

**Answer: We have now removed panel 1b in figure 1.**

I have a general issue with the figure captions. The title of the captions contains very little information. In contrast, the actual text of the caption is very long with a lot of details that can be added to the figure or are better addressed in the text. This is in particular evident for Figure 2.

**Answer: We have now added more information in Figures' titles, and removed details from captions. In particular, for Figure 2, the title and caption is now:**

***“Slow-fast dynamics of ion concentration and electrical potential within the spine head during a step entry of positive ions (constant synaptic conductance  $g^+(t) = \text{Constant} = 3 \text{ nS}$ ). a) Log plot of the voltage dynamics within different spine geometries, with large ( $R = 600 \text{ nm}$ , dashed line) and small ( $R = 300 \text{ nm}$ , solid lines) head, and different neck diameters (140 nm (red,  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$ ) and 80 nm (grey,  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$ )). The electrostatics forces dominate at small time scales ( $< 100 \mu\text{s}$ ) and diffusion at larger time scales ( $> 1 \text{ ms}$ ). Note the deflection of the electrical potential due to concentration changes and diffusion. b) Log plot of the concentration dynamics. c) Log plot of the neck resistance dynamics. d) Log plot of the synaptic reversal potential dynamics. e) Log plot of the synaptic current dynamics. f) Log plot of the neck current dynamics. g) Dynamical model of synaptic and neck currents. h) I-V curve of dendritic spine for two different neck diameter (140 nm (grey,  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$ ) and 80 nm (black,  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$ )). The discrepancy***

*between the spine I-V curve (dashed line,  $\Delta c > 0$ ) when ion concentration change and Ohm's law with constant resistance (solid line,  $\Delta c = 0$ ) is highlighted. For thin and highly resistive neck, the spine behaves like a diode (inset scheme)."*

What is the importance of the reference in the caption of Fig 3?

**Answer: This was a typo, and we have now replaced it with a standard reference.**

Fig 3b, I couldn't find the correspondence of the traces in each sub-panel to the geometrical conditions.

**Answer: The color code is actually the same than the one used in Fig. 3a. We have now indicated also in the caption of Fig. 3b that grey lines correspond to a thin spine neck (diameter = 80 nm, geometrical resistance  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$ ) and red correspond to a larger neck (diameter = 140 nm, geometrical resistance  $R_{neck}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$ ). Solid lines correspond to smaller spine heads (diameter = 300 nm) and dashed lines to larger ones (diameter = 600 nm). We have also specified the color-code of neck size and corresponding resistances in the lower left subpanel of Fig. 3b.**

The explanation of Figure 4 in the text does not match very well the emphasis of the caption on high-frequency synaptic stimulation.

**Answer: We have now replaced "repeated synaptic stimulations" with "repeated high-frequency ( $\geq 50 \text{ Hz}$ ) synaptic stimulations" in the explanation of Figure 4 in the text.**

Fig 4a and b should have the same Y-axis to have an easier comparison.

**Answer: We have scaled Fig. 4a and 4b to have the same Y-axis.**

I don't want to be too picky, but I hope you agree that kinetics is not the appropriate term (which is about reactions), instead what you are talking about is how things change in time, which is dynamics. This is throughout the text.

**Answer: We have replaced "kinetics" with "dynamics" throughout the text.**



Reviewer #2: The manuscript by Lagache et al. is potentially quite interesting because it simulates an electrodiffusion model of realistic synaptic conductances, which is much more relevant than the steady state conditions explored in a recent Neuron paper (ref 12). But, like many electrodiffusion papers, it does not make fair comparisons to cable modeling. Also it is limited by its initial assumptions, and some results are poorly presented.

Main concerns:

1. The straw man comparison to cable modeling, going back to Qian and Sejnowski 1989 and repeated here on page 2, always refers to models with fixed reversal potentials. But using standard software like NEURON, it is easy to compute concentration changes caused by ion influx, either in a well-mixed compartment or using 1D diffusion, and use these concentrations to update the reversal potential. This approach was already demonstrated by Yamada, Koch and Adams in 1989 and has been used repeatedly to model synapses. In fact, eq. 10 is equivalent to the Ohmic equation for synaptic current with the Nernst potential in place of the reversal potential...

**Answer: In this manuscript, our goal is not to substitute “electro-diffusion” for “cable theory” but rather to complement the standard cable theory that assumes negligible concentration changes and related electrodiffusion effects on the electrical response. Our main contribution is therefore the derivation of the coarse-grained system of dynamical equations (11-12) that couples the voltage and ion concentration dynamics inside the spine head.**

**Electrodiffusion and PNP equations have been used before for modeling synaptic current. In particular, treatment of 1D PNP equations at steady state led to the well-known Goldman-Hodgkin-Katz formula for the reversal potential. We have thus added on page 3 that *“PNP equations have been extensively used to model thin ion channels, and their steady-state analysis led to the well-known Goldman-Hodgkin-Katz formula and the definition of the reversal potential”*. Also, we have clearly stated throughout the manuscript that our main objective is to complement the standard cable theory and model the potential changes in ion concentration and related electrodiffusion effects (e.g. decreasing of the reversal potential and neck resistance) during synaptic EPSPs.**

**Main changes (underlined) are:**

-In the abstract, we added “*However, cable theory generally assumes that concentration changes associated with ionic currents are negligible and, therefore, ignores electrodiffusion,.... To extend cable theory and explore electrodiffusion effects, we use here the Poisson (P) and Nernst-Planck (NP) equations...”.*

-On page 6, we replaced “*Second, the neck resistance is not solely dependent on geometry, as assumed in cable theory models (Fig. 1b)*” with “*Second, electrodiffusion predicts that changes in ion concentration modulate the neck resistance, which is not solely dependent on geometry as usually assumed in cable theory (Fig. 1b)*”

- On page 7, we added “ We termed the first few hundred microseconds of the transient as the *electrostatic* phase, which is accurately described by cable theory.”

-On page 8, we added “*...concentration changes during the electrostatic phase are negligible and voltage dynamics can be described accurately by cable theory,...”*

-On page 11 we added “*However, cable equations traditionally neglect local changes in ionic concentration and the role of electrodiffusion”*

-In Figure 2h, we no longer contrast PNP with cable theory but rather differentiate between “no concentration changes ( $\Delta c = 0$ )” and “ increased ion concentration ( $\Delta c > 0$ ).”

Even eq. 8 could probably be replaced by eq. 9 using local concentrations if the neck was discretized spatially (as was done in ref 12).

**Answer:** Indeed, if we discretize the neck into  $n$  small, identical cylinders, with constant base  $S$  and height  $dl = L/n$  ( $L$  is the total neck length, and  $S$  the neck constant cross-section), and assume that ion concentration  $c_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and resistance  $r_i = \frac{dl}{2\gamma D S c_i e}$  are nearly constant in each small cylinder, then the total resistance of the neck is equal to

$$R = \sum_{i=0}^n r_i = \frac{L}{2\gamma D S e} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_i} \right)$$

As Fick's law ensures that concentration along the neck cylinder is linearly decreasing we then have

$$R = \frac{L}{2\gamma D S e} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_{head}(t) - \frac{i-1}{n-1} (c_{head}(t) - c_0)} \right)$$

In the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the previous sum converges to the integral

$$R = \frac{L}{2\gamma D S e} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{c_{head}(t) - x * (c_{head}(t) - c_0)} = \frac{L}{2\gamma D S e (c_{head}(t) - c_0)} \ln \left( \frac{c_{head}(t)}{c_0} \right)$$

Which exactly corresponds to Eq. 9 of the main manuscript.

For a sake of clarity and concision, we did not include these additional computations in the main manuscript.

The approach used in this paper is, like cable theory, 1D though in principle it could be applied to the 3D domain, which would have been more interesting. The authors should rephrase the relevant parts of the manuscript.

**Answer:** We state in the Introduction that PNP equations cannot be solved analytically in 3D domains and that we had to simplify equations (1D reduction of neck equations) and approximate solutions (singular perturbation theory). Approximations should be accurate as long as the Debye length ( $\sim 1$  nm in experimental conditions) is small compared to the neck diameter. Also, we have now rephrased many parts of the manuscript (see above) to clearly state that PNP equations are actually complementing the cable theory by computing the potential changes in ion concentration during synaptic activity, and the related electrodiffusion effects.


2. As mentioned by the authors on p. 12 most of the negative charge is not ionic and has a lower diffusion constant. While the actual proper value for this parameter is not known, the authors should repeat their simulations with a smaller  $D$  for negative charge, preferably for a few possible values. This may strongly affect the inward negative current.

**Answer:** We have repeated our PNP simulations for a single EPSP, with a fixed synaptic conductance  $g_0 = 5$  ns and decreasing diffusion coefficient  $D^-$  of negative ions compared to positive ions  $D^- = \alpha D^+$  for  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  (new Fig. 6 in the main

manuscript, shown below). We can observe that a decreased motility of negative ions tunes down the neck current, but leads to higher neck resistance (see detailed computations in the Supplementary material section II-B-3). As concentration changes and electrodiffusion effects (decreased neck resistance and reversal potential), that usually tend to lower the voltage inside the spine head, are decreased, we observe that, overall, the spine head depolarization during EPSPs is higher when negative diffusivity is decreased.

We highlight that our mathematical analysis cannot be applied to the extreme case of completely immobile negative charges ( $D^- = 0$ ) because, in that case, positive charges might not be well-mixed in the bulk and shall accumulate near immobile negative charges. This extreme scenario has been discussed in [1] and treated mathematically in [2] and [3]. In addition to the new figure 6, we have added the following paragraph on page 13 of the main manuscript:

*“An important effect of lower negative charges’ motility and inward negative current would be to down-regulate changes in ion concentration and electrodiffusion effects (i.e. lowering neck resistance and reversal potential) (Figure 6). Moreover, decreased motility of negative ions would reduce the neck current (see SI-II-B-3 for details). However, as the neck resistance would be increased and electrodiffusion effect decreased, the voltage in the spine head during the EPSP would, overall, reach higher values (Figure 6). We highlight that we did not consider the extreme scenario where the negative charges would be completely immobile (diffusion coefficient  $D^- = 0$ ). Indeed, in that case, positive charges might not be well-mixed in the bulk and shall accumulate near immobile negative charges, and our mathematical analysis would not be valid anymore as it relies on the bulk electro-neutrality and the accumulation of excess charges within a small Debye layer. This extreme scenario has been discussed in [1] and treated mathematically in [2] and [3].*



**Fig. 6: Electrodiffusion simulation of a single EPSP for decreased diffusivity of**

**negative ions.** Simulations of single EPSPs (conductance  $g^+(t) = \frac{g_0 \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1 + \exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$ , with maximal conductance  $g_0 = 5 \text{ nS}$ , and dynamical parameters  $\mu = 0.52 \text{ ms}$ ,  $\tau_1 = 0.11$  and  $\tau_2 = 3.95 \text{ ms}$ ) in 4 different spine geometries. Diffusion coefficient  $D^-$  of negative ions ranges from  $0.2 D^+$  to  $1.0 D^+$ .

3. The authors should do a better job of explaining "We stress that steady state voltage and net ion concentration depend solely on spine neck geometry, whereas their kinetics is controlled by the size of the spine head, volume and membrane capacitance." (Figure 2, page 8). The result that steady state change in ionic concentration does not depend on head volume is surprising.

**Answer: Steady state voltage and net ion concentration depend solely on steady-state neck current, which in turn, only depends on spine neck geometry (Eq. 70-72 in supplementary material and Fig. 2 a-b). On the other hand, the time constants of the**

dynamical system of equations (11-12) that couple the voltage and ion concentration dynamics depend on the spine head geometry. Indeed, the head volume controls the dynamics of concentration changes, while the head membrane capacitance (which is proportional in internal head membrane surface) determines the charging time constant of the head capacitor. This dependence of kinetics on the head size can be observed in the lower transition phases inside spines with bigger heads in Fig. 2). We have now better explained this statement in the main manuscript: *“We stress that steady state voltage and net ion concentration depend solely on spine neck geometry (Eq. 70-72 in supplementary material and Fig. 2 a-b), whereas their dynamics is controlled by the size of the spine head, through its volume and membrane capacitance (time constants on the left hand side of the dynamical system (11-12) and transition phases in Fig. 2). “*

In addition to changing the neck radius the authors should also provide data on the effect of changing the neck length in Figure 2.

**Answer:** As stated above, the two main parameters affecting the amplitude and dynamics of EPSPs are the size of the spine head and the neck resistance, which is proportional to the length of the neck divided by its cross-section. For concision and clarity, to vary the neck resistance in Fig.2 we chose to only modulate the neck cross-section. As neck resistance is actually the key modulated parameter, we have now added the resistance values corresponding to each neck diameter ( $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$  for diameter = 140 nm, and  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$  for diameter = 80 nm).

They should also discuss whether the 1D simplification may hide mechanisms that would change this result.


**Answer:** After Eq. 6-8, we have now highlighted that expressions for the diffusion flux and the current in the neck were obtained after 1D reduction of PNP equations and asymptotic analysis, and that our analysis will remain accurate as long as the Debye length is small compared to neck dimensions (length and diameter). If not, full 3D simulations will be required, or, if actually the Debye length is large compared to the neck radius, one can use another type of asymptotic analysis as in [4]. We have added the following paragraph after Eq. 8:

*“Previous expressions for the diffusion flux and the current inside the neck were obtained after the 1D reduction of PNP equations and their asymptotic approximation. These mathematical techniques are similar to those used for modeling ion channels*

**[5-7] and remain accurate as long as the Debye length  $\lambda_D$  (see Table 1) is small compared to the dimensions (length and diameter) of the neck. Otherwise, full 3D numerical simulations are required or, if the Debye length is actually large compared to neck diameter, other type of asymptotic analysis can be applied [4].”**

4. Figure 4b may be the most important panel in the manuscript but is difficult to interpret because, if I understand well, a different conductance value was used for each geometry. The authors should use identical conductance values to facilitate comparison of the geometrical effects and, if they want to emphasize the fit to data, they can show several versions of this panel with different conductance values.

**Answer: In Fig. 3b, we indeed fitted the synaptic conductance to voltage data for each EPSP and putative spine geometry. We have now added a figure to the manuscript (new Fig. 4, shown below) to show how varying the synaptic conductance affects the voltage, current, ion concentration, neck resistance and reversal potential in each spine geometry.**



**Fig. 4: Electrodiffusion simulation of a single EPSP for increased synaptic**

**conductances.** Simulations of single EPSPs (conductance  $g^+(t) = \frac{g_0 \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau_2})}{1 + \exp(-\frac{t-\mu}{\tau_1})}$ , with increasing conductance (from  $g_0 = 2$  nS to  $g_0 = 9$  nS) and dynamical parameters  $\mu = 0.52$  ms,  $\tau_1 = 0.11$  and  $\tau_2 = 3.95$  ms) in 4 different spine geometries.

5. The authors do not mention how they solved their equations (Matlab?). They should deposit the model code in a public repository and refer to this in the manuscript.

**Answer: We will deposit our Matlab code in ModelDB (<https://senselab.med.yale.edu/modeldb/>) as soon as our manuscript would be accepted for publication.**

Minor concerns:

1. Table 1: is it correct to use the permittivity for water to simulate cytoplasmic permittivity? Other parameters used, like the diffusion constant, have cytoplasmic values which are lower than those in water. The presence of charges should affect permittivity.

**Answer: In Table 1, we have now replaced the value of water permittivity  $\epsilon_c = 80 \epsilon_0$  with the cytoplasmic permittivity estimated in neurons and glial cells  $\epsilon_c = 60 \epsilon_0$  [8]. However, we highlight that the value of cytoplasmic permittivity only affects the value of the Debye length, which remains much smaller than the dimensions of dendritic spines that we have considered in our model.**

2. Figure 1a legend: what is meant by "At resting state, the spine head is depolarized with negative electrical potential  $\approx -60$  mV"? Why would the spine head be depolarized at rest? This is also what seems to be shown in the inset (difference between  $C_{head}$  to  $C_0$ ) and is confusing.

**Answer: This was a typo, and we have now changed the legend with "At resting state, the spine head is polarized with negative electrical potential  $\Phi_0 \approx -60$  mV compared to external potential  $\Phi_{ext} \approx 0$  mV". At resting state, ion concentration  $c_{head}(t = 0)$  equal to  $c_0$ , and we have also edited the figure accordingly.**



3. page 4: "neck radius is much smaller than the head radius  $a \ll R$ ". One can discuss the meaning of the word 'much' but for some of the cases shown in Figure 2 the ratio is 0.47, which seems "...is smaller than...  $a < R$ ".

**Answer: We have replaced "neck radius is much smaller than the head radius  $a \ll R$ " with "neck radius is smaller than the head radius  $a < R$ ".**

4. Figure 4: it is difficult to interpret the neck resistance values used because nowhere else in the paper actual values for neck resistance are mentioned. Please mention the range of values for the geometries used in Figure 2.

**Answer: We have now added the resistance values corresponding to each neck diameter:  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 120 \text{ M}\Omega$  for diameter = 140 nm, and  $R_{\text{neck}}(c_0) = 368 \text{ M}\Omega$  for diameter = 80 nm.**

5. page 12: "This agrees with... that reported up to 10 mM concentration increase...". The actual study mentions a 5 mM increase leading to a  $\sim 9$  mM maximal concentration. Correct this statement.

**Answer: We have corrected this statement.**

6. The Supplementary Methods often uses jargon that is not referenced: "Debye length", "Debye-Hückle boundary layer"

**Answer: We have replaced "Debye-Hückle boundary layer" with "Debye layer", which is defined in the main manuscript.**

7. Supplementary Methods after eq. 28:  $n_+(t)$  and  $n_-(t)$

**Answer: We have corrected this typo.**

8. Supplementary Methods eq. 55 uses log, corresponding main text eq. 8 uses ln.

**Answer: We have replaced all "log" with "ln" in the supplementary material.**

## References

1. Holcman, D. and R. Yuste, *The new nanophysiology: regulation of ionic flow in neuronal subcompartments*. Nat Rev Neurosci, 2015. **16**(11): p. 685-92.
2. Cartailier, J., Z. Schuss, and D. Holcman, *Electrostatics of non-neutral biological microdomains*. Sci Rep, 2017. **7**(1): p. 11269.
3. Cartailier, J., Z. Schuss, and D. Holcman, *Analysis of the Poisson–Nernst–Planck equation in a ball for modeling the Voltage–Current relation in neurobiological microdomains*. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 2017. **339**: p. 39-48.
4. Singer, A. and J. Norbury, *A Poisson–Nernst–Planck model for biological ion channels—an asymptotic analysis in a three-dimensional narrow funnel*. SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, 2009. **70**(3): p. 949-968.
5. Goldman, D.E., *Potential, Impedance, and Rectification in Membranes*. J Gen Physiol, 1943. **27**(1): p. 37-60.
6. Chen, D., J. Lear, and B. Eisenberg, *Permeation through an open channel: Poisson-Nernst-Planck theory of a synthetic ionic channel*. Biophysical Journal, 1997. **72**(1): p. 97-116.
7. Kosińska, I., et al., *Rectification in synthetic conical nanopores: A one-dimensional Poisson-Nernst-Planck model*. Physical Review E, 2008. **77**(3): p. 031131.
8. Zhou, T., et al., *Estimation of the physical properties of neurons and glial cells using dielectrophoresis crossover frequency*. Journal of biological physics, 2016. **42**(4): p. 571-586.



Click here to access/download  
**Supplemental Materials (Optional)**  
supplementaryMethods2\_tl.pdf

