



HAL
open science

When and How Does the Auditory Cortex Influence Subcortical Auditory Structures? New Insights About the Roles of Descending Cortical Projections

Samira Souffi, Fernando R Nodal, Victoria M Bajo, Jean-Marc Edeline

► **To cite this version:**

Samira Souffi, Fernando R Nodal, Victoria M Bajo, Jean-Marc Edeline. When and How Does the Auditory Cortex Influence Subcortical Auditory Structures? New Insights About the Roles of Descending Cortical Projections. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 2021, 25, pp.690223. 10.3389/fnins.2021.690223 . hal-03299344

HAL Id: hal-03299344

<https://hal.science/hal-03299344v1>

Submitted on 26 Jul 2021

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.



When and How Does the Auditory Cortex Influence Subcortical Auditory Structures? New Insights About the Roles of Descending Cortical Projections

Samira Souffi¹, Fernando R. Nodal², Victoria M. Bajo² and Jean-Marc Edeline^{1*}

¹ Department of Integrative and Computational Neurosciences, Paris-Saclay Institute of Neuroscience (NeuroPSI), UMR CNRS 9197, Paris-Saclay University, Orsay, France, ² Department of Physiology, Anatomy and Genetics, Medical Sciences Division, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Erika Skoe,
University of Connecticut,
United States

Reviewed by:

Josef Syka,
Institute of Experimental Medicine
(ASCR), Czechia
Paul Hinckley Delano,
University of Chile, Chile

*Correspondence:

Jean-Marc Edeline
jean-marc.edeline@u-psud.fr

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Auditory Cognitive Neuroscience,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Neuroscience

Received: 02 April 2021

Accepted: 14 June 2021

Published: xx June 2021

Citation:

Souffi S, Nodal FR, Bajo VM and
Edeline J-M (2021) When and How
Does the Auditory Cortex Influence
Subcortical Auditory Structures? New
Insights About the Roles
of Descending Cortical Projections.
Front. Neurosci. 15:690223.
doi: 10.3389/fnins.2021.690223

For decades, the corticofugal descending projections have been anatomically well described but their functional role remains a puzzling question. In this review, we will first describe the contributions of neuronal networks in representing communication sounds in various types of degraded acoustic conditions from the cochlear nucleus to the primary and secondary auditory cortex. In such situations, the discrimination abilities of collicular and thalamic neurons are clearly better than those of cortical neurons although the latter remain very little affected by degraded acoustic conditions. Second, we will report the functional effects resulting from activating or inactivating corticofugal projections on functional properties of subcortical neurons. In general, modest effects have been observed in anesthetized and in awake, passively listening, animals. In contrast, in behavioral tasks including challenging conditions, behavioral performance was severely reduced by removing or transiently silencing the corticofugal descending projections. This suggests that the discriminative abilities of subcortical neurons may be sufficient in many acoustic situations. It is only in particularly challenging situations, either due to the task difficulties and/or to the degraded acoustic conditions that the corticofugal descending connections bring additional abilities. Here, we propose that it is both the top-down influences from the prefrontal cortex, and those from the neuromodulatory systems, which allow the cortical descending projections to impact behavioral performance in reshaping the functional circuitry of subcortical structures. We aim at proposing potential scenarios to explain how, and under which circumstances, these projections impact on subcortical processing and on behavioral responses.

Keywords: auditory processing, corticofugal projections, inferior colliculus, degraded acoustic conditions, neuromodulation, frontal cortex, auditory plasticity, active listening

INTRODUCTION

The auditory cortex has been viewed as the ultimate step in processing the rich acoustic stream constantly reaching our ears and also as a key structure in cognitive tasks involving auditory stimuli (Weinberger and Diamond, 1987; Edeline, 1999; Weinberger, 2004; Ohl and Scheich, 2005; Fritz et al., 2007). Indeed, the plasticity of auditory cortex network has been described in many situations

ranging from frequency discrimination (Edeline and Weinberger, 1993; Edeline et al., 1993; Fritz et al., 2003, 2005) or spatial discrimination tasks (Lee and Middlebrooks, 2011; Wood et al., 2019) to pitch extraction (Bizley et al., 2013), attentional tasks (Otazu et al., 2009), selective attention (Wittekindt et al., 2014), and predictive coding (Malmierca et al., 2015).

Besides its role in cognitive functions, several recent studies performed on different species have promoted the idea that auditory cortex is also a key structure in building noise-invariant representations of communication sounds (Narayan et al., 2007; Carruthers et al., 2013, 2015; Rabinowitz et al., 2013; Schneider and Woolley, 2013; Mesgarani et al., 2014; Ni et al., 2017; Aushana et al., 2018; Beetz et al., 2018; Town et al., 2018; Souffi et al., 2020). For example, the cortical responses to conspecific vocalizations, and their discriminations by cortical neurons were largely preserved during various types of acoustic alterations performed in the spectral and temporal domain (Souffi et al., 2020).

In this review, we propose new roles of descending cortical projections reaching the auditory thalamus and the inferior colliculus. These two subcortical structures receive the dominant part of the corticofugal inputs and had been explored in a large number of species and under different listening conditions. Therefore, we will focus on the specific effects mediated by those circuits without forgetting that the effects of the cortical descending projections can also modify earlier relay stations. We will describe studies from different animal species (mice, rats, guinea pigs, ferrets, bats, and birds). While the descending cortical projections in the auditory system are potentially equivalent in all species, the frontal circuitry could strongly vary between species making generalization of results more difficult.

In the present review, we will first describe the extent to which cortical neurons robustly code the representation of target stimuli in acoustically challenging conditions. Next, we will examine data suggesting that noise-invariant representations do also exist in subcortical auditory structures. In the last sections of the review, we will point out that, despite numerous experiments which aimed at describing the influence of corticofugal connections at the thalamic and collicular level, it is only the use of cell-targeted activation/inactivation methodologies combined with behavioral tasks that have recently unraveled whether the auditory cortex impacts on subcortical processing in challenging conditions.

EVIDENCE FOR NOISE-INVARIANT REPRESENTATIONS IN AUDITORY CORTEX

Our ears are constantly bombarded by a complex sound mixture, which generates challenging acoustic conditions for speech understanding. These degraded acoustic conditions can be the presence of reverberations, for example created by the shape, size, and objects in the room in closed spaces, the presence of concomitant sound sources with the particular case of the “cocktail party” noise where a target source has to be segregated from other competing sounds (e.g., see Narayan et al., 2007) but also particular environmental conditions that can attenuate

specific frequencies from the signal spectra (Mesgarani et al., 2014; Fuglsang et al., 2017; Bidelman et al., 2018). All these factors lead to difficulties in perceiving target sounds such as speech, communication sounds and music in normal-hearing subjects, but cause even more difficulties for subjects with mild to moderate hearing loss, and are very penalizing for subjects with cochlear implants, a neuroprosthetic device which restores hearing in people suffering from profound deafness. Note also that for patients with cochlear implants, the descending cortical projections to the thalamus and to the inferior colliculus are preserved but the indirect cortical modulation to the auditory periphery is lacking.

Understanding what are the spectro-temporal acoustic cues used by human subjects necessary for auditory perception in challenging conditions and the neuronal mechanisms allowing the auditory system to extract relevant cues for discriminating sounds in those acoustic conditions are major aims in psychoacoustic and auditory neuroscience.

Over the last two decades, most of the studies describing the physiological consequences of adding noise on the neuronal responses to target stimuli have been performed at the level of the primary auditory cortex (A1). In their initial study, Nagarajan et al. (2002) reported that white noise addition reduced auditory responses to conspecific communication sounds (marmoset calls) only at a 0 dB signal to noise ratio (SNR), the lowest SNR tested. This study also pointed out that cortical neurons are particularly robust to spectral degradations since there was little change in evoked responses at presentation of vocoded vocalizations [an artificial signal-processing distortion that remove the spectral content and the frequency modulation (FM) cues but partially preserved the amplitude modulation (AM) cues], even in response to only 2-band vocoded vocalizations. In contrast, temporal-envelope degradations strongly reduced the evoked firing rate and the neural synchronization to the vocalization envelope. Importantly, bandpass filtering the vocalizations between 2-30 Hz did not reduce the firing rate and neural synchronization to the vocalization envelope. Similarly, subsequent studies did not find much alterations of cortical responses for speech-like sounds presented in noise: for example, Shetake et al. (2011) in rats did not find significant reduction in neural discrimination using an index of neuronal population performance at a +12 dB SNR; the neural performance fell close to the chance level only at -12 dB SNR, the lowest SNR tested. In the field L in birds (homologous to primary auditory cortex), the neural discrimination performance was maintained down to a +5 dB SNR (Narayan et al., 2007).

Recent studies in guinea pigs have confirmed that the responses of auditory cortex neurons are particularly resistant to spectral degradations of communication sounds (such as vocoded vocalizations, e.g., Souffi et al., 2020), even in the presence of masking noise (Aushana et al., 2018). At the level of small cortical populations (2–16 simultaneous recordings), the ability to discriminate between conspecific vocalizations remained almost intact despite strong spectral alterations (Aushana et al., 2018; Souffi et al., 2020).

However, analyzing in more detail the responses of individual recordings across several signal-to-noise ratios revealed strikingly

different categories (Ni et al., 2017; marmoset; Souffi et al., 2021: guinea pigs), which ranged from neuronal responses robust to noise and specific to target stimuli, to neuronal responses sensitive to noise and specific to masking noises. In fact, the initial results of Bar-Yosef and Nelken (2007) in the cat primary auditory cortex have already pointed out that some cortical neurons can be more specific to the background noise than to the actual communication sounds. In addition, context seems to be important too, and neurons assigned to a particular category can change category depending on the type of noise, indicating that different types of masking noise activate different subpopulations of neurons in the auditory cortex and subcortical auditory structures (Ni et al., 2017; Souffi et al., 2021).

Several hypotheses have been formulated to account for the performance of auditory cortex neurons in detecting target stimuli in masking noise. For example, it was proposed that noise tolerance is correlated with adaptation to the stimulus statistics, which is more pronounced at the cortical than at the subcortical level in ferrets (Rabinowitz et al., 2013). A dynamic model of synaptic depression was also suggested as a potential mechanism for robust speech representation in the human auditory cortex (Mesgarani et al., 2014). Alternatively, a simple feedforward inhibition circuit operating in a sparse coding scheme was viewed as a mechanism to explain background-invariant responses detected for a population of neurons in the zebra finch secondary auditory cortex (Schneider and Woolley, 2013).

As we will see below, it is important to determine whether these mechanisms only operate at cortical level or whether they are general mechanisms operating at all the levels of the central auditory system.

SUBCORTICAL IMPLICATIONS IN BUILDING NOISE-INVARIANT REPRESENTATIONS

Compared with the large literature focused on the auditory cortex, only a few studies have described the resistance to noise of subcortical neurons. Nonetheless, a direct comparison between the consequences of acoustic degradation in different structures is the most straightforward way for dissecting where invariant representations emerged. At the thalamic level, a massive reduction in firing rate and temporal reliability of evoked responses was reported in rats during the noise condition when target stimuli and background noise were at the same intensity level (0 dB SNR, Martin et al., 2004). In the avian auditory system, Schneider and Woolley (2013) described the emergence of noise-invariant responses for a subset of cells (the broad spike cells) of a secondary auditory area (area NCM), whereas neurons in the field L and the mesencephalicus lateralis dorsalis (homologous of the primary auditory cortex and inferior colliculus, respectively) show background-corrupted responses. They proposed that a sparse coding scheme (in the sense that neurons show less driven response to the same stimulus and respond only to a small subset of the stimuli) operating within the area NCM allows the emergence of this noise-invariant representation. Note that, in

rats, such a sparse representation already exists as early as A1 (Hromádka et al., 2008).

Noise-invariant representations were also reported in A1 of anesthetized ferrets (Rabinowitz et al., 2013). This study suggested a progressive emergence of noise-invariant responses from the auditory nerve to the inferior colliculus (IC) and to A1, and proposed the adaptation to the noise statistics as a key mechanism to account for the noise-invariant representation in A1. However, Lohse et al. (2020) in mice have recently challenged this view. Indeed, they showed that collicular, thalamic and cortical neurons display similar contrast gain control with the slowest time constants in A1 and importantly, the silencing of auditory cortex, did not affect the contrast gain control capacity of neurons in the inferior colliculus or in the medial geniculate body (MGB). Previous studies have already shown adaptation to stimulus intensity of subcortical neurons. First, adaptations of IC neurons to the average stimulus intensity, stimulus variance and bimodality have already been described in guinea pigs with a temporal decay of about 160 ms at 75 dB sound pressure level (SPL, Dean et al., 2005, 2008). Second, adaptation to the noise statistics shifted the temporal modulation function (TMF) of IC neurons to slower modulations, sometimes transforming band-pass TMF to low pass TMF in about 200 ms of noise presentation (gerbils: Lesica and Grothe, 2008).

In fact, Nelken et al. (1999) in cats have previously shown that the addition of low intensity sounds interrupts the phase locking of A1 neurons to the envelope of slowly fluctuating noise (about 10 Hz). This phenomenon has been called “locking suppression.” Moreover, the high sensitivity of this suppression, occurring at intensities lower than the neuron’s threshold (at -15 or -35 dB SNR), seems to be a marked phenomenon at the cortical level, present for only about half of the neurons of the MGB and absent at the level of the IC. The conclusion is that, although the detection of pure tones in fluctuating noise is possible from the IC, the segregation between the representation of sound as a perceptual object separate from noise is more explicit/complete at the cortical level. It should be noted that intracellular recordings did not reveal a particular role of cortical inhibition in the phenomenon of “locking suppression,” it is already detected in the excitatory inputs received by cortical neurons (cats: Las et al., 2005; rats: Hershenhoren and Nelken, 2017).

From recordings obtained in anesthetized guinea pigs in the cochlear nucleus, inferior colliculus, auditory thalamus, A1 and a non-primary auditory cortex, Souffi et al. (2020) reported that higher discrimination performance and more accurate representations in degraded acoustic conditions (presence of masking noise or vocoding) were found in IC and MGB; cortical representations, although less accurate as the subcortical ones, were barely affected under these degraded conditions (Figure 1, modified from Souffi et al., 2020). Furthermore, when neuronal responses in noise were classified among a continuum in five categories from the most robust to noise (signal-like responses) to the most sensitive to noise (masker-like responses, representing accurately the masking noise), it was found, in two noise types, that these categories were distributed in the whole auditory system, with higher proportions of robust responses in inferior colliculus and thalamus (Figure 2, modified from Souffi et al.,





FIGURE 1 | Subcortical neurons better discriminate the vocalizations in quiet as well as in degraded conditions and alterations of slow amplitude modulations are crucial cues for explaining the decrease in discrimination performance at the subcortical and cortical levels. **(A)** From bottom to top, raster plots presenting the neuronal responses recorded in CN, CNIC, MGv, A1, and VRB. Each dot represents an action potential and each line the presentation of one of four original whistles. The gray areas correspond to the evoked activity. The waveforms of the four original whistles are displayed under the raster plots. **(B)** Peristimulus time histograms (PSTHs) of the neuronal responses presented in **(A)**. For all neuronal recordings, the four PSTHs corresponding to the four original whistles have been overlaid. **(C)** The mean values of the neuronal discrimination at the population level ($MI_{Population}$, bits) are presented for populations of 9 simultaneous multiunit recordings obtained with the four original vocalizations in CN (in black), CNIC (in green), MGv (in orange), A1 (in blue), and VRB (in purple). Error bars represent the SE of the mean and horizontal black lines represent the statistically significant differences. Note that, all the subcortical structures discriminate better the original vocalizations than cortical areas. **(D)** Scattergrams showing the modest decrease in $MI_{Population}$ (bits) with the most severe vocoded condition (Voc10, top panel) compared to the strong decrease with the most severe noisy condition (SNR-10, bottom panel). Each cross represents the mean $MI_{Population}$ obtained in degraded and original conditions. **(E)** Percentage of alterations in neuronal population discrimination abilities ($\Delta MI_{Population}$) as a function of the alterations in slow amplitude modulations induced by vocoding (Voc38, Voc20, and Voc10) or by the addition of stationary noise (SNR10, SNR0, and SNR-10). Each dot represents neuronal data ($\Delta MI_{Population}$) in CN (in black), CNIC (in green), MGv (in orange), A1 (in blue) and VRB (in purple). Polynomial curves fitting all acoustic conditions have been generated (color lines). In all conditions (vocoding or noise), there is a limit of AM reduction from which the $\Delta MI_{Population}$ decreases in cortical and subcortical structures. Thus, the reduction of slow AM cues is one of the factors explaining the neuronal discrimination performance at the subcortical and cortical levels. Modified from Souffi et al. (2020). CN, cochlear nucleus; CNIC, central nucleus of the inferior colliculus; MGv, ventral division of the medial geniculate nucleus; VRB, ventrorostral belt (secondary auditory cortex).

2021). In addition, the responses to the signal alone and to the noise alone allowed the assignment of a given recording to one of five categories to be predicted up to 70%. A link between inferior colliculus activity and behavior was pointed out in two studies showing that a tone-versus-noise discrimination task modulates the neuronal activity as early as the inferior

colliculus (Slee and David, 2015; Shaheen et al., 2020). In the first one in ferrets, it was found that in the active condition, collicular responses to reference sounds were mostly suppressed and this effect was frequency-dependent with lower suppression when the target frequency was away to the Best Frequency (BF) of the neuron than when was closer. The second study



quantified the neuronal discriminability in a tone-masking noise task (0 dB SNR) of IC neurons in marmoset (non-lemniscal IC: dorsal and external cortices, and lemniscal IC: central nucleus) and indicated that non-lemniscal IC neurons enhanced their neuronal discriminability in active condition whereas lemniscal IC neurons did not.

All the results together suggest that noise-invariant representations emerge very early in the auditory system under conditions of anesthetized or awake passive listening, without necessarily the involvement of cortical activity (Lohse et al., 2020).

EFFECTS OF THE CORTICOFUGAL DESCENDING PROJECTIONS

A myriad of anatomical studies have described in great detail the corticofugal projections originating from auditory cortex

reaching the different subcortical relays (for reviews see Winer, 2006; Winer and Lee, 2007; Malmierca and Ryugo, 2011), but only a limited set of studies have reported the physiological effects of these projections. In this review, we focus on the descending cortical projections to the thalamus and the inferior colliculus but it should be kept in mind that descending cortical projections have been anatomically described in the dorsal cochlear nucleus (Jacomme et al., 2003). Also, the activity of the auditory nerve and the cochlea could be modulated via the olivocochlear neurons (Aedo et al., 2016; for reviews: Terreros and Delano, 2015; Elgueta and Delano, 2020) that receive direct projections from the auditory cortex (rats: Mulders and Robertson, 2000; Doucet et al., 2002; guinea pig: Coomes and Schofield, 2004; Brown et al., 2013) and the inferior colliculus (Thompson and Thompson, 1993).

For the purpose of the present review, it is particularly important to distinguish the conditions during which these effects have been reported. Some of these studies performed in

571 anesthetized animals have either activated or inactivated auditory
572 cortex neurons and looked for the physiological consequences
573 on the neuronal responses collected in subcortical auditory
574 structures. Other studies, performed in awake behaving animals,
575 have looked at the consequence of silencing the auditory cortex
576 on the animal behavioral performance.
577

578 Auditory Cortical Manipulations in 579 Anesthetized Animals 580

581 The rationale of the electrophysiological experiments performed
582 in anesthetized animals was simply to record in subcortical
583 structures during either inactivation or electrical activation of the
584 auditory cortex. The initial topography of the corticocollicular
585 pathway has been described in cats by Anderson et al. (1980)
586 combining recordings in the primary auditory cortex (A1),
587 the anterior auditory field (AAF) and the secondary auditory
588 cortex (AII) with anterograde ($^3\text{H}^*$ Leucine) tracer injections
589 and showing labeled terminals in IC, including the central
590 nucleus where the changes in position of the labeling agreed
591 with the tonotopic axes of the central nucleus of the IC
592 (CNIC) and the tuning frequency of the neurons recorded at
593 the injection sites. The glutamatergic nature of this pathway
594 was suggested by Feliciano and Potashner (1995) after ablation
595 of the auditory cortex in guinea pigs and determination of
596 the uptake and release of radioactive Aspartate in the inferior
597 colliculus. Initial experiments in cats have silenced the entire
598 auditory cortex by cooling and have reported both excitatory
599 and inhibitory effects on responses of auditory thalamus neurons
600 (Ryugo and Weinberger, 1976) and in the inferior colliculus.
601 In many cases, “On” responses were unaffected whereas long
602 latencies responses were largely reduced (see also in rats, Cotillon
603 and Edeline, 2000). A study in cats sampling neurons in
604 the different MGB anatomical subdivisions (Villa et al., 1991)
605 revealed that the increases in signal-to-noise ratio (evoked
606 divided by spontaneous firing rate) often result from a larger
607 decrease in spontaneous than in evoked activity. Subsequent
608 studies using pharmacological inactivation of auditory cortex by
609 muscimol (a long-lasting GABA_A agonist) or lidocaine (a local
610 anesthetic acting on sodium channels), have reported that cortical
611 inactivation reduced auditory responses in the ventral tonotopic
612 lemniscal division of MGB (MGv) and in the inferior colliculus
613 with a larger (60 vs. 34%) and faster (11 vs. 31 min) reduction
614 for thalamic neurons than for collicular neurons (mustached
615 bat, Zhang and Suga, 1997; Zhang et al., 1997). The effects
616 of stimulating or blocking the activity of the auditory cortex
617 while recording collicular neurons have been studied in different
618 species. For example, Syka and Popelar (1984) in rats showed that
619 most IC neurons, mainly located in the dorsal and caudal IC,
620 reacted with a short excitation (3–15 ms) followed by inhibition
621 lasting 30–150 ms or just inhibition after electrical stimulation
622 of the auditory cortex (bipolar electrodes, single pulses, duration
623 0.2 ms, current 0.2–1.5 mA). Similar approach was used by
624 Torterolo et al. (1998) with electrical stimulation in the guinea
625 pig auditory cortex while recordings were performed in the
626 IC neurons, observing differential effects on spontaneous and
627 driven activity and different latencies depending on whether

the recording was ipsilateral or contralateral to the stimulated
cortex. Jen et al. (1998) recorded neurons in the CNIC of
the big brown bat while blocking with lidocaine or electrically
stimulating the auditory cortex. They showed corticofugal
facilitation or inhibition, with longer latencies with inhibition.
The cortical effect was most effective when it was combined
with sounds of low intensity. The effects of phasic electrical
stimulation of auditory cortex have pointed out the view that
cortico-thalamic projections have an excitatory influence on
thalamic activity. In guinea pigs, auditory cortex stimulation
facilitated tone-evoked responses for more than 2/3 of the MGv
neurons, especially when the BFs of the cortical and thalamic
recordings were similar (He et al., 2002). Surprisingly, a similar
cortical activation tended to induce inhibitory effects in the
non-lemniscal divisions of the auditory thalamus (He, 2003),
potentially due to the activation of GABAergic neurons from
the thalamic reticular nucleus (Cotillon and Edeline, 2000) or
from the IC (cats: Winer et al., 1996). Subsequent intracellular
studies have confirmed this differential effect: depolarizations of
MGB neurons in guinea pigs were only observed in the lemniscal
division whereas hyperpolarizations were only observed in non-
lemniscal MGB neurons (Yu et al., 2004). These changes in
membrane polarizations contribute to a differential change in
the acoustic responses of MGB cells (Xiong et al., 2004). In
addition, they also pointed out that stimulation of the auditory
cortex can modulate evoked responses in the auditory sector
of the reticular nucleus and also promote a more tonic mode
of discharge (Xu et al., 2007). It was speculated that the
systematic selectivity of facilitation and inhibition over the
lemniscal and non-lemniscal MGB is related to the attention shift
within the auditory modality and across the sensory modalities
(Yu et al., 2004).

The techniques used in these initial studies had obvious
limitations. Besides the risks of non-specific effects (such as
lowering the blood temperature during cortical cooling), the
main consequence of global inactivation of the whole auditory
cortex is removing its input onto corticofugal targets, including
MGB and IC cells, but also onto higher cortical areas. Likewise,
cortical electrical stimulation can trigger neuronal discharge in
subcortical cells by both orthodromic and antidromic activation.
In addition, global electrical activation or chemical inactivation
obviously affects all descending projections originating from the
auditory cortex, not only those reaching the subcortical structure
under investigation (the MGB or the inferior colliculus). To
circumvent these limitations, optogenetic tools have been used
in most recent studies, to transiently silence, or activate, auditory
cortex neurons in anesthetized and awake animal.

628 Modulation of Cortical Projections by 629 Optogenetic Techniques 630

631 As described in the first part of this review, some studies have
632 suggested that there was a difference in neuronal adaptation to
633 noise between cortical and subcortical structures (Rabinowitz
634 et al., 2013). A more recent study in mice (Lohse et al.,
635 2020) has reported that the contrast gain control was robust
636 in A1, MGv and CNIC. In these experiments, the degree
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684

of adaptation to high (40 dB) or low (20 dB) contrast to dynamic random chords (DRC) was evaluated in MGv and CNIC during the silencing of cortical neurons (by activating inhibitory GABA interneurons). The contrast gain control was unchanged during cortical silencing both in anesthetized and awake mice at collicular level and in anesthetized animals at thalamic level, which clearly points out that subcortical neurons can exhibit contrast adaptation via intrinsic, cortical-independent mechanisms. Interestingly, cortical silencing had no effect on the shape of the spectro-temporal receptive fields (STRFs, i.e., BF value, spectral and temporal bandwidth, value of the largest weight in the kernel) both in MGv and CNIC. When the cortex was silenced, it is also interesting to note that (i) the reliability of responses to DRC was even increased in the MGv and in the CNIC of awake mice and that (ii) subcortical neurons were better described by a linear model than when the cortex was normally operating, as if the cortical inputs decrease the reliability and the linearity of MGv and CNIC neurons. Interestingly, in anesthetized or awake passively listening animals, the corticofugal projections did not contribute to the contrast adaptation observed in the MGv and CNIC.

However, and as it is the case with cortical cooling, one can consider that silencing the whole auditory cortex does not mimic a physiological situation. The corticofugal projections are topographically organized: Anterograde tracing studies have shown that the location of the terminal fields in the CNIC varies topographically with the location of the injection sites in A1 (rats: Saldaña et al., 1996; gerbils: Bajo and Moore, 2005; ferrets: Bajo et al., 2007, **Figure 3A**). Injecting tracers at two locations in ferret A1, where neurons were tuned to different frequencies, produced two distinct bands of labeling in the CNIC, suggesting that the A1-CNIC projection links neurons in both structures with similar frequency tuning (Bajo et al., 2007). This has been confirmed physiologically in the guinea pig by positioning multi-site probes along the tonotopic axes of A1 and the CNIC (Lim and Anderson, 2007). Thus, the activation or inactivation of projections coming from specific cortical frequency bands would shed light about the direct action of A1 neurons on CNIC cells sharing similar tuning properties and reaching similar frequency regions in MGv or CNIC. In addition and regarding A1-MGv projections, Homma et al. (2017) in ferrets have demonstrated mistuning sensitivity in MGv neurons and that feedback from A1 to MGv is required for the normal ability of animals to detect a mistuned harmonic within a complex sound. These studies confirmed the point-to-point connections between the auditory cortex and the subcortical auditory structures.

In a recent experiment in mice using a combination of cortico-antegrade and collicular retrograde viral transfection, it was possible to achieve viral specific transfection of only cortico-collicular neurons (Blackwell et al., 2020). This combination of techniques ensures that only neurons expressing *Cre* recombinase in the auditory cortex would express ChannelRhodopsin2 (ChR2) or a hyperpolarizing opsin (ArchT) in the auditory cortex. Opsins were expressed in AC-IC projecting neurons, and shining light over AC would directly activate, or suppress, only the cortico-collicular feedback projections (Blackwell et al.,

2020). ChR2 activation of AC-IC neurons resulted in increasing spontaneous activity in IC neurons with decrease driven activity to pure tones and clicks, but with particularly small effects on magnitude. ArchT silencing of the same pathway has no effect on evoked activity on IC neurons. Both optogenetic manipulations suggest that cortico-collicular feedback does not provide strong modulation on passive listening mice under anesthesia or awake conditions. Consistent with the known cortico-collicular projections, the effects were observed mainly for cells located in the dorsal cortex of the IC (DCIC), not in CNIC. The small reduction in evoked response did not affect the selectivity of IC neurons and did not change the noise correlations during spontaneous and evoked activity. In the same experiment, the authors have tried to determine whether modulating the cortical inhibitory interneurons can change collicular responses (Blackwell et al., 2020). Whereas modulating parvalbumin (PV) interneurons had no effect on spontaneous and tone-evoked activity in IC, suppressing the activity of somatostatin (SST) interneurons increased spontaneous activity in IC. Altogether, this careful study performed both in anesthetized and awake, but passively listening, mice has revealed very little effect of the cortico-collicular projections in such listening conditions.

The main question that can be raised is whether the cortico-feedback projections only exert a strong influence behaving, actively listening, animals. To answer this question, it was necessary to train animals in behavioral tasks and determine the impact of temporary suppression of cortical feedback on behavioral performance.

Inactivating Specific Auditory Cortex Projections During Challenging Behavioral Tasks

One of the earliest studies that explored the behavioral consequences of suppressing the corticofugal inputs used Elvax implants to release chronically Muscimol, a GABA_a agonist (Smith et al., 2004). Ferrets bilaterally implanted with muscimol-Elvax over A1 were trained in a sound localization task with short (40 ms) or long (100–1,000 ms) tone bursts. The implanted animals initially displayed lower correct sound localization during the first sessions, but they improved over time and finally reached the same performance as the control animals. Comparing the silencing of primary and non-primary cortical areas (or making lesions of these areas) induced modest but significant deficits in sound localization and pointed out that the largest deficits were when silencing primary auditory cortex (Nodal et al., 2010, 2012).

In such experiments, the global silencing of the cortex was suppressing all cortical activity not only the feedback to the subcortical structures. To address the question of how cortico-collicular projections impact behavioral responses, two different techniques have been used in the same animal model. First, Bajo et al. (2010, **Figure 3B**) have used a chromophore-targeted neuronal degeneration technique to investigate the behavioral consequences of selectively eliminating layer V neurons projecting from primary auditory cortical areas to the inferior colliculus. This approach resulted in a loss of about





FIGURE 3 | The auditory cortex and the corticocollicular projection are essential for experience-dependent plasticity in spatial hearing. **(A)** Anterograde (**top left**) and retrograde (**top right**) tracer injections in the ferret the auditory cortex and in the Inferior Colliculus, respectively, reveal strong corticocollicular projection with terminal labeled fields in the three IC subdivisions (**bottom left**) after Fluororuby injection in A1 and retrogradely labeled cells in A1 (**bottom right**) after green and red fluorescent retrobead injections in the inferior colliculus. Modified from Bajo et al. (2007). **(B)** Chromophore-targeted laser photolysis of the corticocollicular pathway prevents learning-induced auditory plasticity. Corticocollicular layer V neurons were ablated using an infrared laser light (**top left**) following retrogradely neural labeling after microbead injections in the IC (**top right**). Percent of correct responses in a sound localization task plotted against days of training including 10 days with unilateral right earplug (**bottom left**). Data were grouped by left (dashed lines) and right (continuous lines) sound locations with control cases in gray and corticocollicular cases in black. In the bottom right, the mean and SD scores on the first (D1) and tenth day (D10) of monaural earplug are shown. Modified from Bajo et al. (2010). **(C)** Optogenetic silencing of the auditory cortex prevents earplug adaptation but not normal sound localization. Diagram shows the floor plan of the behavioral chamber (**top left**) and sound localization performance (proportion of correct responses at each speaker location). Data from control cases are in black and cases where neural activity in left A1 was optogenetic silenced using ArchT expression and green light illumination during each stimulus presentation in green (**middle panel**). Histological section of a flattened auditory cortex showing GFP immunofluorescence associated with ArchT expression (**top right**). Proportion of correct scores averaged across all speaker locations achieved by each animal in the control and A1 silenced groups (preplug session, 10 days with right earplug, and postplug) (**bottom left**). Proportion of correct responses for the first and last 2 days of monaural occlusion (**middle panel**). Examples of neural optogenetic suppression in A1 are shown in the bottom right panel. Neural responses driven by broadband stimulation [gray rectangles or combined with laser illumination (green rectangles)]. Modified from Bajo et al. (2019). * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$. Scale bars = 1 mm in **(A,C)**, 2 mm in **(B)**. A, anterior; A1, primary auditory cortex; BBN, broadband noise; CNIC, central nucleus of the inferior colliculus; D, dorsal; DCIC, dorsal cortex of the inferior colliculus; ECIC, external cortex of the inferior colliculus; HP, hippocampus; IC, inferior colliculus; IS, injection site; L, lateral; LGN, lateral geniculate nucleus; MGB, medial geniculate body; nBIC, nucleus of the brachium of the inferior colliculus; P, posterior; SC, superior colliculus.

913 two-thirds of the layer V A1 neurons that project to the IC,
 914 without affecting those in surrounding cortical areas or different
 915 cortical layers. Most cortico-collicular axons target the ipsilateral
 916 IC, so this approach allowed assessing the effects of removing
 917 descending axons on one side of the brain, although cross-
 918 projections comprise 15% of the cortico-collicular axons that
 919 were not eliminated. The behavioral results clearly indicate
 920 that ablation of the auditory cortico-collicular pathway from
 921 one hemisphere did not affect sound localization, as measured
 922 by either the initial orienting response to the sound or the
 923 subsequent selection of sound-source location. An interesting
 924 challenge was whether the lesioned animals would be able to
 925 localize sounds in altered conditions of sound localization such as
 926 the one occurring when one ear is occluded and, therefore when
 927 the values of binaural cues used for sound localization change
 928 (this task was initially described in Kacelnik et al., 2006). While
 929 control animals recover their ability to localize sounds accurately
 930 with training, despite the continued presence of a plug in one ear,
 931 this was not the case in ferrets in which the cortico-collicular
 932 projection had been largely removed (**Figure 3B**), suggesting
 933 that descending pathways are essential for recalibration of the
 934 brain's representation of auditory space. This learning deficit
 935 was most pronounced in the hemifield contralateral to the
 936 lesioned pathway, implying that corticofugal modulation of each
 937 IC mediates plasticity in the opposite hemifield (Bajo et al.,
 938 2010). Thus, one function of the auditory cortex in spatial
 939 hearing is to provide signals that are transmitted via descending
 940 cortical pathways to bring about experience-driven changes
 941 in localization.

942 Second, silencing auditory cortex neurons (by light
 943 stimulation of neurons expressing the proton pump ArchT)
 944 during sound presentations in an azimuthal sound-localization
 945 task did not impair the initial animals' behavioral performance
 946 (Bajo et al., 2019, **Figure 3C**): performance of control animals
 947 and the animals in which each stimulus presentation was paired
 948 with optogenetic silencing of A1 neurons localized broadband
 949 noise bursts was equally similar (**Figure 1** in Bajo et al., 2019).
 950 When the animals were trained to re-learn the sound-localization
 951 task after unilateral ear occlusion (after plugging one ear), there
 952 was a massive drop in performance both in controls and in
 953 animals with optogenetic control of A1. Nonetheless, across
 954 10 days of training to perform the task with monaural occlusion
 955 (note that plugging one ear change the values of the binaural
 956 cues but do not eliminate binaural cues), the control animals
 957 considerably improved their performance which was not the
 958 case for the animals for which A1 was silenced during each trial
 959 during sound delivery (**Figure 4** in Bajo et al., 2019, **Figure 3C**).
 960 Thus, suppressing auditory cortex activity did not prevent the
 961 animal to normally localized sounds, but impaired the ability to
 962 adapt to a unilateral earplug.

963 An additional surprising finding was observed when the same
 964 ear was occluded for a second time in control animals that had
 965 previously adapted to the unilateral hearing loss. A much smaller
 966 initial deficit was observed when the ear was replugged than when
 967 the animals first experienced an earplug. Furthermore, most of
 968 the control ferrets achieved their maximum score by \sim day 5 and
 969 remained at around that level until the end of the second period



of monaural occlusion. In contrast, the ArchT animals (that had previously shown impaired adaptation when cortical activity was suppressed) re-tested with the occluded ear but *without silencing*

1027 *the auditory cortex* did not show a better adaptation than during
 1028 the first earplug. Despite a normal activity in the auditory cortex,
 1029 these animals adapted at the same rate as that observed during
 1030 the first period of monaural deprivation when A1 was inactivated,
 1031 and significantly more slowly than the control animals during
 1032 their first period of monaural occlusion. Thus, optogenetic
 1033 suppression of cortical activity not only impairs auditory spatial
 1034 learning, but also results in less effective adaptation when the
 1035 active auditory cortex is subsequently challenged by monaural
 1036 occlusion. When the auditory cortex was again inactivated on
 1037 these animals, their performance was exactly the same as with
 1038 the cortex intact, suggesting that the limited capacity of these
 1039 animals to adapt to the second period of monaural occlusion no
 1040 longer appears to be dependent on the activity of A1 (**Figure 6**
 1041 of Bajo et al., 2019).

1042 Both examples show the relevance of the auditory cortex and
 1043 of the cortico-collicular projections in actively listening animals
 1044 performing challenging behavior tasks.

1045

1046 **DECIPHERING THE MECHANISMS** 1047 **UNDERLYING THE CORTICOFUGAL** 1048 **EFFECTS**

1049

1051 Corticofugal projections are particularly abundant in the auditory
 1052 system (**Figure 4**; Winer, 2006). An important concept that
 1053 has been proposed for understanding the functional role of
 1054 corticofugal projections within the thalamo-cortical sensory
 1055 systems is the distinction between “driver” and “modulator”
 1056 inputs (Sherman and Guillery, 1998, 2002; Guillery and Sherman,
 1057 2002) which have been re-named Class 1 and Class 2 inputs
 1058 (Lee and Sherman, 2010, 2011) based on the initial anatomical
 1059 description by Guillery (1966). In the auditory system, this
 1060 distinction leads to the possibility that the cortical afferents
 1061 from A1 reaching MGv are modulatory inputs for the lemniscal
 1062 (MGv) relay cells (review in Lee and Sherman, 2010, 2011).
 1063 Note also that the impact of the cortical inputs can also
 1064 be indirect via the thalamic reticular nucleus (TRN), which
 1065 can have a stronger influence on the lemniscal division
 1066 than on the non-lemniscal ones (cats: Crabtree, 1998; rats:
 1067 Cotillon-Williams et al., 2008).

1068 From the previous section, it seems that the crucial point that
 1069 needs to be explored is how a cortical input projecting on IC
 1070 cells (or MGv cells) which is, in some contexts, a modulator that
 1071 modestly affects the functional properties of IC cells in awake
 1072 passive animals (Blackwell et al., 2020) becomes a necessary input
 1073 that can be used to drive the animal behavioral response (Bajo
 1074 et al., 2010, 2019). In other words, what are the factors that,
 1075 surprisingly, transform a potential weak and inefficient cortico-
 1076 collicular input into a driving force that can guide the animal
 1077 in its behavior? Could corticofugal projections act as drivers or
 1078 modulators in a context dependent manner? The next question
 1079 is how the subcortical networks are affected by cortical inputs
 1080 depending on the difficulty of the task and the stability of those
 1081 changes in time.

1082 Here, we consider that in anesthetized animals and in awake
 1083 animals that are not engaged in a behavioral challenging task, the

corticofugal descending projections are only parts of the synaptic
 excitatory inputs reaching thalamic and collicular cells. In
 contrast, we would like to propose that the auditory corticofugal
 projections play an essential role during active listening
 associated to challenging behavioral tasks, under the dual control
 of neuromodulatory systems and the frontal cortical areas.

Neuromodulation in the Auditory Cortex

The most obvious factor that can change the way auditory stimuli
 are processed in awake animals between “passive” vs. “actively
 listening” conditions is the involvement of the neuromodulatory
 systems. Among them, the noradrenergic, dopaminergic and
 cholinergic systems have long been implicated in behavioral
 situations and cognitive functions (noradrenergic: Sara, 2009;
 dopaminergic: Seamans and Yang, 2004; Wise, 2004; Schultz,
 2016; Ott and Nieder, 2019; cholinergic: Sarter et al., 2005; Lin
 et al., 2015). Two main properties should be considered about
 these neuromodulatory systems.

First, all brain nuclei at the origin of these neuromodulators
 are engaged, at different degrees, in cognitive functions. For
 example, neurons in the locus coeruleus (LC), the cortical
 source of noradrenaline (NA), are responsive to stimuli of any
 modality associated with reinforcements (Sara and Segal, 1991;
 Aston-Jones et al., 1997; Bouret and Sara, 2004). Dopaminergic
 neurons of the ventral tegmental area (VTA) are activated by
 rewards, and code for specific aspects of rewards such as their
 amount, probability of occurrence, subjective value, as well as
 to any reward-predicting stimuli, and their level of prediction
 of the reward occurrence (reviewed in Schultz, 2016). The
 cholinergic inputs arising from the basal forebrain (BF) area has
 long been involved in learning, acquired-stimulus salience and
 more generally in all situations of “attentional effort” (Sarter
 et al., 2006). In addition, experience dependent adaptation to the
 altered binaural cues was disrupted after the cortical cholinergic
 depletion in ferrets (Leach et al., 2013).

Needless to say, these three neuromodulatory systems do not
 work independently of each others, they all work in concert for
 controlling the state of cortical arousal and allowing cognitive
 performance. In fact, both in cortical and subcortical structures,
 non-synaptic interactions occurring at the presynaptic level are
 common and lead to subtle regulations of the excitatory and
 inhibitory transmission by a synergy between neuromodulators
 (reviewed in Vizi and Lábos, 1991; Vizi et al., 2010; Sperlágħ and
 Vizi, 2011).

More importantly, these three neuromodulators drastically
 modify the processing of acoustic stimuli in the auditory
 cortex, and more generally, in the entire auditory system.
 For example, in guinea pigs, iontophoretic applications of NA
 increase the sharpness of tuning of auditory cortex neurons
 (Manunta and Edeline, 1997, 1998, 1999) and the neuronal
 discrimination performance between conspecific vocalizations
 (Gaucher and Edeline, 2015). Acetylcholine has a dual action on
 auditory cortex neurons. Whereas some effects were attributed
 to muscarinic receptors (mAChR; Guinea pigs: Metherate et al.,
 1990; Mice: Chen and Yan, 2007; Rats: Froemke et al., 2007),
 other studies proposed that the action of nicotinic receptors
 (nAChR) was prominent (Mice: Kawai et al., 2007; Rats:

1141 Liang et al., 2006). In fact, activation of mAChRs tends to
 1142 increase postsynaptic excitability while decreasing intracortical
 1143 transmission via presynaptic receptors, whereas, in contrast,
 1144 activation of nAChRs enhances thalamocortical transmission
 1145 (reviewed in Edeline, 2003; Metherate, 2011). Only a few studies
 1146 have described the dopaminergic modulation in the auditory
 1147 cortex. In monkeys, it was shown that electrical stimulation of
 1148 VTA modifies neuronal activity in the auditory cortex on two
 1149 time scales: (i) effects on the time scale of tens to hundreds
 1150 of milliseconds (Macaque monkeys: Mylius et al., 2015), and
 1151 (ii) effect on the time scale of seconds and minutes that were
 1152 reflected in the spontaneous and evoked activity (Huang et al.,
 1153 2016). In gerbils, systemic administration of D1/D5 dopamine
 1154 receptor agonists enhanced early infragranular auditory-evoked
 1155 synaptic activity, prolonged auditory cortex activation, and
 1156 more effectively recruited horizontal corticocortical networks
 1157 during later phases of evoked activity (Happel et al., 2014).
 1158 Note that neuromodulators alter auditory processing before the
 1159 cortical level: Dopamine modulates the processing of unexpected
 1160 auditory information as early as the inferior colliculus (Rats:
 1161 Valdés-Baizabal et al., 2020), locus coeruleus activation alters
 1162 thalamic and cortical responses to the same extent (Guinea
 1163 pigs: Edeline et al., 2011), the pontomesencephalic cholinergic
 1164 system modulates the activity of auditory thalamus and inferior
 1165 colliculus (Woolf, 1991; Guinea pigs: Schofield et al., 2011), and
 1166 NA modulates the response strength and the response latency as
 1167 early as the cochlear nucleus (Mustached bat: Kössl and Vater,
 1168 1989) and by its action on the olivo-cochlear neurons can also
 1169 modulate the compound action potential (Guinea pig: Mulders
 1170 and Robertson, 2005a,b).

1171 Although not historically considered major modulators of
 1172 cortical processing, neuropeptides and neurohormones are now
 1173 considered as such. For example, growing evidence suggests that
 1174 oxytocin (OT) acts to enhance the salience of socially relevant
 1175 sensory inputs and is important for parental behavior and social
 1176 cognition. This peptide is synthesized in the paraventricular
 1177 nucleus and supraoptic nucleus of the hypothalamus and binds to
 1178 a G protein-coupled receptor with a single isoform (Gimpl and
 1179 Fahrenholz, 2001). A series of studies have looked into the role of
 1180 oxytocin in maternal behavior and in the processing of ultrasonic
 1181 vocalization of pups when separated from the nest. Some studies
 1182 have not found enhanced responses to pup calls between virgin
 1183 and mother mice (Liu and Schreiner, 2007; Shepard et al., 2016;
 1184 Royer et al., 2021). However, pharmacological application of
 1185 oxytocin or optogenetic release of OT on the left auditory cortex
 1186 (Marlin et al., 2015) reduced call-evoked inhibitory post-synaptic
 1187 potentials (IPSCs) within seconds (Figures 6A,B, open and filled
 1188 symbols respectively, and extended data Figure 8 in Marlin
 1189 et al., 2015), whereas the excitatory post-synaptic potentials
 1190 (EPSCs) were gradually modified over minutes (Figures 6A,B,
 1191 filled in Marlin et al., 2015). Therefore, oxytocin seems to rapidly
 1192 disinhibit the auditory cortex (potentially similarly to ACh),
 1193 suggesting that it can regulate attention and increase the salience
 1194 of social stimuli. These results corroborate the effects of oxytocin
 1195 in hippocampal slices (Rats: Owen et al., 2013).

1196 Similar to oxytocin, orexins (Orexin A and B) are
 1197 neuropeptides that profusely innervate the brain, including
 the deep layers of the neocortex (Marcus et al., 2001), and

modulate the action of other classic neuromodulators (Peyron 1198
 et al., 1998; but see Flores et al., 2015 for review). The orexin 1199
 system is comprised of a small population of cells located mainly 1200
 in the lateral hypothalamus. Orexins bind to specific receptors 1201
 (OX1R and OX2R), associated with a Gq protein that activates 1202
 the phospholipase C-protein kinase C pathway producing neural 1203
 depolarization and increasing the membrane resistance by the 1204
 closure of the K⁺ conductance. Functions of the orexin system 1205
 include the modulation of arousal and sleep-wake cycles, energy 1206
 homeostasis, reward processing, stress and emotional behavior 1207
 regulation (for example modulation of fear memory). Orexin 1208
 might directly affect the auditory corticofugal pathways thanks 1209
 to the specific expression of its receptors in layers V and VI (Rats: 1210
 Marcus et al., 2001). In somatosensory and visual cortices, orexins 1211
 induce functional changes in layer VIb neurons (Rats: Bayer 1212
 et al., 2002). Layer VIb auditory neurons project to the inferior 1213
 colliculus (Cats: Winer et al., 1998; Gerbils: Bajo and Moore, 1214
 2005; Guinea pigs: Schofield, 2009). In addition, the effect of the 1215
 orexins might be indirectly mediated by the activation of the 1216
 non-specific thalamocortical projections from the intrathalamic 1217
 and midline nuclei (Bayer et al., 2002). Other indirect pathways 1218
 might involve the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) cholinergic 1219
 basal forebrain and locus coeruleus that show a great expression 1220
 of orexin receptors (Marcus et al., 2001) and are capable as 1221
 discussed above, of modulating auditory processing. 1222

1223 These studies indicate that in addition to the classical
 1224 neuromodulators, oxytocin and orexins are also key actors to
 1225 modulate the action of the cortical descending pathways. 1226

1227 Implications of the Frontal Areas in 1228 Attentional Processes During Active 1229 Auditory Listening 1230

1231 Attention is vital to achieve goals in constantly changing sensory
 1232 environments. Frontal areas have long been suspected to play
 1233 an important role in attentional processes. In primates, the
 1234 auditory cortex projects and receives influence of higher order
 1235 areas in the frontal cortex (Hackett et al., 1999; Romanski et al.,
 1236 1999; Romanski and Averbeck, 2009). Over the last decades,
 1237 electrophysiological recordings combined with behavioral tasks
 1238 have demonstrated on one hand that, correlations of neuronal
 1239 activity exist between the auditory cortex and frontal areas and,
 1240 on the other hand, that there are also causal links between
 1241 these two regions. Indeed, during tone detection tasks, Fritz
 1242 et al. (2010) in ferrets showed that the activity of frontal cortex
 1243 neurons was modulated by task events, but either by increasing
 1244 or suppressing their firing rate to the target stimuli. In contrast,
 1245 they lost responsiveness to identical stimuli presented passively,
 1246 suggesting that frontal responses are tightly linked with the
 1247 behavior. However, in these experiments, only a weak correlation
 1248 between target response strength and task performance was
 1249 observed. When the task was performed with visual cues, about
 1250 one-third of the responsive frontal cells showed responses to
 1251 both auditory and visual targets with similar responses to the
 1252 two sensory modalities. The unimodal cells however presented
 1253 different responses suggesting that some frontal cortex responses
 1254 are modality specific. Interestingly, coherence analysis of local
 field potential (LFP) signals simultaneously recorded in A1

and frontal cortex showed that during active behavior, the synchronous activity between these areas is selectively enhanced when the target stimuli are presented but attenuated for responses to the reference sound. They argued that when an animal is engaged in a behavior, attention enhanced the synchronous activity between A1 and the frontal cortex.

To go further, Atiani et al. (2014) in the same animal model, compared responses obtained in A1, in two cortical belt areas and in dorsolateral frontal cortex during the same auditory discrimination task as Fritz et al. (2010). They showed that contrast enhancement between target and reference responses becomes more pronounced in frontal cortex than in auditory belt areas and than in A1. Thus, the reference responses are gradually suppressed as signals are transmitted through higher-order areas to frontal areas. In fact, recent analyses suggest that the neuronal responses became more categorical in higher cortical areas during task performance (Yin et al., 2020). Overall, these studies pointed out strong relationships between the activity in frontal and auditory cortex when an animal is engaged in an auditory discrimination task (Fritz et al., 2003, 2010; Atiani et al., 2014).

In primates, very few studies have investigated frontal cortical activity in various auditory behaviors to reveal the specific cognitive functions as decision making or reward value, associated with the network frontal cortex-auditory cortex. Tsunada et al. (2019) recorded neural activity from the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (vLPFC) in two monkeys in a frequency discrimination task where they have to determine whether the tone bursts were predominantly “low frequency” or “high frequency.” They showed that post-decision vLPFC activity encodes the key features of the previous completed decision process that are used to generate the next one. Electrical microstimulation at vLPFC sites affected the monkeys’ choices

on the subsequent, but not the current, trial confirming that vLPFC activity is related to the encoding of the past trials and also informative in subsequent trials (for review, Banno et al., 2020).

Recently, Huang and Brosch (2020) recorded neuronal activity from vIFC in parallel with the neuronal activity from the auditory cortex of a single monkey performing two go-no-go behavioral tasks requiring different audiomotor associations and using a sequence of two tones. Interestingly, they showed that, in the auditory cortex, the representations of the two tones were related to behavior. In contrast, in PFC, such a behavioral relevance was observed only for the first tone of the sequence. They thus promote the idea that the audiomotor representations in AC were more strongly related to behavior than those in PFC.

But does the activity in frontal areas provide enough excitatory inputs to drive auditory cortical neurons? Some studies used targeted-stimulation methodologies for demonstrating the relationships between neuronal activity in the frontal cortex and its effect in the auditory cortex in mice (Winkowski et al., 2013, 2018). First, the authors investigated the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) stimulation on the neuronal activity in A1 using two-photon calcium imaging technique in mice (Winkowski et al., 2013). They found a diversity of effects, but often after pairing a particular frequency with the electric stimulation of OFC, the best frequency of A1 neurons in layers II/III changed with a response enhancement near the particular frequency used. Their results suggest that OFC activation could regulate neuronal activity within A1. Optogenetic activation of the mouse OFC in an area where neurons respond to sounds, activate A1 neurons and current source density (CSD) analysis revealed current sinks in layer I and layer IV, providing activation to both pyramidal cells and interneurons (Winkowski et al., 2018).




FIGURE 5 | Potential scenarios involving frontal projections and neuromodulators as key factors to increase the impact of the cortical descending projections on the thalamus and the inferior colliculus. **(A)** In anesthetized animals, or in awake passively listening animals performing easy auditory tasks, there is no or little activation of the frontal areas and of the neuromodulatory systems (symbolized by the shaded arrows). As a consequence, the descending projections from auditory cortex have a negligible effect on the processing of acoustic information by subcortical auditory structures (MGB and IC). **(B)** In awake actively listening animals performing challenging tasks, there is a strong activation of the frontal cortical areas and neuromodulatory systems (symbolized by the solid green lines). This activation sends a strong input to modulate the activity of the auditory cortex, which in turn, reshape the subcortical network (MGB and IC) thus allowing to perform successfully during this task.

Last, in a recent study, Olthof et al. (2019) described in adult rats, that the inferior colliculus, receives dense descending projections not only, from the auditory cortex, but also from the visual, somatosensory, motor, and prefrontal areas suggesting that the inferior colliculus can also integrate information coming from higher cortical areas.

POSSIBLE SCENARIOS

Based on the recent findings presented above, we propose that one of the fundamental roles of the frontal cortical areas and the neuromodulatory systems is to increase the efficacy that the cortical descending pathways exert on the subcortical structures when an animal is performing a challenging complex auditory task (Figure 5).

In anesthetized or awake passive conditions, or during basic auditory tasks, the descending projections from auditory cortex to subcortical structures are probably not necessary: in those cases, when the level of attention is absent (under anesthesia) or low (under passive listening), the frontal cortex and the neuromodulatory systems send no or little information to the cortical auditory areas. Under these conditions, the descending cortical inputs represent only a fraction of the excitatory inputs that subcortical neurons can use to build robust representations of the auditory scene. In contrast, when the task becomes challenging and the attentional level increases, the frontal areas and neuromodulatory systems are strongly activated (Humans: Berry et al., 2015; Du et al., 2016; Dimitrijevic et al., 2019; Monkeys: Lecas, 1995; reviewed in Peelle, 2018) and these inputs drastically change the activity of auditory cortex neurons. As a consequence, the descending cortical inputs to the subcortical auditory structures (MGB, IC, or even dorsal cochlear nucleus) send crucial information about the most adapted behavioral response needed to perform successfully in these difficult conditions. In the case of the experiments discussed in this review, challenging conditions could be, for example, when an animal is engaged in discrimination tasks with noisy stimuli at very low SNRs, or during sound localization with an occluded ear.

Two possibilities can be envisioned for the emergence of the behavioral meaning at the subcortical level. Either the cortical descending inputs allow subcortical structures to generate more robust representations by plasticity mechanisms operating in the subcortical networks.

Alternatively, cortical input maximally account for the information already present at the subcortical level to perform the behaviorally challenging task. Collecting subcortical electrophysiological recordings during these challenging tasks with and without suppressing the descending cortical projections

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. C. (1980). Crossed and descending projections to the inferior colliculus. *Neurosci. Lett.* 19, 1–5. doi: 10.1016/0304-3940(80)90246-3
- Aedo, C., Terreros, G., León, A., and Delano, P. H. (2016). The corticofugal effects of auditory cortex microstimulation on auditory nerve and superior olivary

is probably the only way to determine which of these two assumptions is valid.

It is important to determine what are the relative contributions of the inputs from the frontal areas and from the neuromodulators. For example, data in humans suggest that subjects with a polymorphism of the choline transporter gene that is thought to limit choline transport capacity (Ile89Val variant of the choline transporter gene SLC5A7, rs1013940) do not show a robust activation of the right prefrontal cortex (Brodmann's areas 9) during challenging attentional tasks, whereas control subjects do (Berry et al., 2015). In addition, it is important to point out that the neuromodulators do not impact only the cortical level but also the subcortical structures, and that a single neuromodulator such as noradrenaline can influence auditory responses from cochlear nucleus (Mustached bats: Kössl and Vater, 1989) up to auditory cortex (Guinea pigs: Manunta and Edeline, 1997; Edeline, 1999; Gaucher and Edeline, 2015). Additionally, an important parameter that should be explored in the future is the timing of the network activation leading the animal to successful performance in a challenging task, and the stability of the network activation related to learning. A disruption in the network synchronization, or a delay in the activation of a key structure (as the frontal cortex, auditory cortex or in the release of some neuromodulators) could also contribute to behavior failure.

This dual control allows the auditory cortex to instruct subcortical structures about the meaning of each stimulus, its relationships with rewards, and the exact nature of the behavioral/motor response that need to be applied at the occurrence of a given stimulus in a particular environment. Although speculative, this scenario should be tested in future experiments.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SS and J-ME wrote the initial draft of the review. VMB and FRN revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved all aspects of the review. SS, VMB, and FRN designed the figures of the review. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

FRN and VMB were supported by Wellcome Trust (WT108369/Z/2015/Z) and RNID funding (S52_Bajo). J-ME was supported by grants from the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) (ANR-14-CE30-0019-01). SS was supported by the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale (FRM) grant number ECO20160736099 and by the Entendre Foundation.

- complex responses are mediated via Alpha-9 nicotinic receptor subunit. *PLoS One* 11:e0155991. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155991
- Anderson, R. A., Snyder, R. L., and Merzenich, M. M. (1980). The topographic organization of corticocollicular projections from physiologically identified loci in the AI, AII and anterior auditory cortical fields in the cat. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 191, 479–494. doi: 10.1002/cne.901910310

- 1483 Aston-Jones, G., Rajkowski, J., and Kubiak, P. (1997). Conditioned responses
1484 of monkey locus coeruleus neurons anticipate acquisition of discriminative
1485 behavior in a vigilance task. *Neuroscience* 80, 697–715. doi: 10.1016/s0306-
1486 4522(97)00060-2
- 1487 Atiani, S., David, S. V., Elgueda, D., Locastro, M., Radtke-Schuller, S., Shamma,
1488 S. A., et al. (2014). Emergent selectivity for task-relevant stimuli in higher-order
1489 auditory cortex. *Neuron* 82, 486–499. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2014.02.029
- 1490 Aushana, Y., Souffi, S., Edeline, J. M., Lorenzi, C., and Huetz, C. (2018). Robust
1491 neuronal discrimination in primary auditory cortex despite degradations of
1492 spectro-temporal acoustic details: comparison between guinea pigs with normal
1493 hearing and mild age-related hearing loss. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.* 19, 163–
1494 180. doi: 10.1007/s10162-017-0649-1
- 1495 Bajo, V. M., and Moore, D. R. (2005). Descending projections from the auditory
1496 cortex to the inferior colliculus in the gerbil, *Meriones unguiculatus*. *J. Comp.*
1497 *Neurol.* 486, 101–116. doi: 10.1002/cne.20542
- 1498 Bajo, V. M., Nodal, F. R., Bizley, J. K., Moore, D. R., and King, A. J. (2007). The
1499 ferret auditory cortex: descending projections to the inferior colliculus. *Cereb*
1500 *Cortex* 17, 475–491. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhj164
- 1501 Bajo, V. M., Nodal, F. R., Korn, C., Constantinescu, A. O., Mann, E. O., Boyden,
1502 E. S. 3rd, et al. (2019). Silencing cortical activity during sound-localization
1503 training impairs auditory perceptual learning. *Nat. Commun.* 10:3075.
- 1504 Bajo, V. M., Nodal, F. R., Moore, D. R., and King, A. J. (2010). The descending
1505 corticocollicular pathway mediates learning-induced auditory plasticity. *Nat.*
1506 *Neurosci.* 13, 253–260. doi: 10.1038/nn.2466
- 1507 Banno, T., Lestang, J. H., and Cohen, Y. E. (2020). Computational and
1508 neurophysiological principles underlying auditory perceptual decisions. *Curr.*
1509 *Opin. Physiol.* 18, 20–24. doi: 10.1016/j.cophys.2020.07.001
- 1510 Bar-Yosef, O., and Nelken, I. (2007). The effects of background noise on the neural
1511 responses to natural sounds in cat primary auditory cortex. *Front. Comput.*
1512 *Neurosci.* 1:3. doi: 10.3389/neuro.10.003.2007
- 1513 Bayer, L., Eggermann, E., Saint-Mleux, B., Machard, D., Jones, B. E., Muhlethaler,
1514 M., et al. (2002). Selective action of orexin (Hypocretin) on nonspecific
1515 thalamocortical projection neurons. *J. Neurosci.* 22, 7835–7839. doi: 10.1523/
1516 jneurosci.22-18-07835.2002
- 1517 Beetz, M. J., García-Rosales, F., Kössl, M., and Hechavarría, J. C. (2018). Robustness
1518 of cortical and subcortical processing in the presence of natural masking
1519 sounds. *Sci. Rep.* 8:6863. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-25241-x
- 1520 Beneyto, M., Winer, J. A., Larue, D. T., and Prieto, J. J. (1998). Auditory connections
1521 and neurochemistry of the sagulum. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 401, 329–351. doi: 10.
1522 1002/(sici)1096-9861(19981123)401:3<329::aid-cne3>3.0.co;2-w
- 1523 Berry, A. S., Blakely, R. D., Sarter, M., and Lustig, C. (2015). Cholinergic capacity
1524 mediates prefrontal engagement during challenges to attention: evidence from
1525 imaging genetics. *Neuroimage* 108, 386–395. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.
1526 12.036
- 1527 Beyerl, B. D. (1978). Afferent projections to the central nucleus of the inferior
1528 colliculus in the rat. *Brain Res.* 145, 209–223. doi: 10.1016/0006-8993(78)90858-
1529 2
- 1530 Bidelman, G. M., Davis, M. K., and Pridgen, M. H. (2018). Brainstem-cortical
1531 functional connectivity for speech is differentially challenged by noise and
1532 reverberation. *Hear Res.* 367, 149–160. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2018.05.018
- 1533 Bizley, J. K., Walker, K. M., Nodal, F. R., King, A. J., and Schnupp, J. W.
1534 (2013). Auditory cortex represents both pitch judgments and the corresponding
1535 acoustic cues. *Curr. Biol.* 23, 620–625. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2013.03.003
- 1536 Blackwell, J. M., Lesicko, A. M., Rao, W., De Biasi, M., and Geffen, M. N.
1537 (2020). Auditory cortex shapes sound responses in the inferior colliculus. *Elife*
1538 9:e51890.
- 1539 Bouret, S., and Sara, S. J. (2004). Reward expectation, orientation of attention and
1540 locus coeruleus-medial frontal cortex interplay during learning. *Eur. J. Neurosci.*
1541 20, 791–802. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03526.x
- 1542 Brown, M. C., Mukerji, S., Drottar, M., Windsor, A. M., and Lee, D. J. (2013).
1543 Identification of inputs to olivocochlear neurons using transneuronal labeling
1544 with pseudorabies virus (PRV). *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol. (JARO).* 14, 703–717.
1545 doi: 10.1007/s10162-013-0400-5
- 1546 Carruthers, I. M., Laplagne, D. A., Jaegle, A., Briguglio, J. J., Mwilambwe-Tshilobo,
1547 L., Natan, R. G., et al. (2015). Emergence of invariant representation of
1548 vocalizations in the auditory cortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* 114, 2726–2740. doi: 10.
1549 1152/jn.00095.2015
- 1550 Carruthers, I. M., Natan, R. G., and Geffen, M. N. (2013). Encoding of ultrasonic
1551 vocalizations in the auditory cortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* 109, 1912–1927. doi: 10.
1552 1152/jn.00483.2012
- 1553 Chen, G., and Yan, J. (2007). Cholinergic modulation incorporated with a tone
1554 presentation induces frequency-specific threshold decreases in the auditory
1555 cortex of the mouse. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 25, 1793–1803. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.
1556 2007.05432.x
- 1557 Coomes, D. L., and Schofield, B. R. (2004). Projections from the auditory cortex
1558 to the superior olivary complex in guinea pigs. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 19, 2188–2200.
1559 doi: 10.1111/j.0953-816x.2004.03317.x
- 1560 Coomes Peterson, D., and Schofield, B. R. (2007). Projections from auditory cortex
1561 contact ascending pathways that originate in the superior olive and inferior
1562 colliculus. *Hear Res.* 232, 67–77. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2007.06.009
- 1563 Cotillon, N., and Edeline, J. M. (2000). Tone-evoked oscillations in the rat auditory
1564 cortex result from interactions between the thalamus and reticular nucleus. *Eur.*
1565 *J. Neurosci.* 12, 3637–3650. doi: 10.1046/j.1460-9568.2000.00254.x
- 1566 Cotillon-Williams, N., Huetz, C., Hennevin, E., and Edeline, J. M. (2008).
1567 Tonotopic control of auditory thalamus frequency tuning by reticular thalamic
1568 neurons. *J. Neurophysiol.* 99, 1137–1151. doi: 10.1152/jn.01159.2007
- 1569 Crabtree, J. W. (1998). Organization in the auditory sector of the cat's thalamic
1570 reticular nucleus. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 390, 167–182. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1096-
1571 9861(19980112)390:2<167::aid-cne1>3.0.co;2-#
- 1572 Dean, I., Harper, N. S., and McAlpine, D. (2005). Neural population coding of
1573 sound level adapts to stimulus statistics. *Nat. Neurosci.* 8, 1684–1689. doi: 10.
1574 1038/nn1541
- 1575 Dean, I., Robinson, B. L., Harper, N. S., and McAlpine, D. (2008). Rapid neural
1576 adaptation to sound level statistics. *J. Neurosci.* 28, 6430–6438. doi: 10.1523/
1577 JNEUROSCI.0470-08.2008
- 1578 Dimitrijevic, A., Smith, M. L., Kadis, D. S., and Moore, D. R. (2019). Neural indices
1579 of listening effort in noisy environments. *Sci. Rep.* 9:11278. doi: 10.1038/s41598-
1580 019-47643-1
- 1581 Doucet, J. R., Rose, L., and Ryugo, D. K. (2002). The cellular origin of corticofugal
1582 projections to the superior olivary complex in the rat. *Brain Res.* 925, 28–41.
1583 doi: 10.1016/s0006-8993(01)03248-6
- 1584 Druga, R., and Syka, J. (1984a). Ascending and descending projections to the
1585 inferior colliculus in the rat. *Physiol. Bohemoslov.* 33, 31–42.
- 1586 Druga, R., and Syka, J. (1984b). Neocortical projections to the inferior colliculus
1587 in the rat. (An experimental study using anterograde degeneration techniques).
1588 *Physiol. Bohemoslov.* 33, 251–253.
- 1589 Du, Y., Buchsbaum, B. R., Grady, C. L., and Alain, C. (2016). Increased activity in
1590 frontal motor cortex compensates impaired speech perception in older adults.
1591 *Nat. Commun.* 7:12241. doi: 10.1038/ncomms12241
- 1592 Edeline, J. M. (1999). Learning-induced physiological plasticity in the thalamo-
1593 cortical sensory systems: a critical evaluation of receptive field plasticity, map
1594 changes and their potential mechanisms. *Prog. Neurobiol.* 57, 165–224. doi:
1595 10.1016/s0301-0082(98)00042-2
- 1596 Edeline, J. M. (2003). The thalamo-cortical auditory receptive fields: regulation by
1597 the states of vigilance, learning and the neuromodulatory systems. *Exp. Brain*
1598 *Res.* 153, 554–572. doi: 10.1007/s00221-003-1608-0
- 1599 Edeline, J. M., Manunta, Y., and Hennevin, E. (2011). Induction of selective
1600 plasticity in the frequency tuning of auditory cortex and auditory thalamus
1601 neurons by locus coeruleus stimulation. *Hear Res.* 274, 75–84. doi: 10.1016/j.
1602 heares.2010.08.005
- 1603 Edeline, J. M., Pham, P., and Weinberger, N. M. (1993). Rapid development
1604 of learning-induced receptive field plasticity in the auditory cortex. *Behav.*
1605 *Neurosci.* 107, 539–551. doi: 10.1037//0735-7044.107.4.539
- 1606 Edeline, J. M., and Weinberger, N. M. (1993). Receptive field plasticity in the
1607 auditory cortex during frequency discrimination training: selective retuning
1608 independent of task difficulty. *Behav. Neurosci.* 107, 82–103. doi: 10.1037/
1609 /0735-7044.107.1.82
- 1610 Elgueda, P., and Delano, P. H. (2020). Corticofugal modulation of audition. *Curr.*
1611 *Opin. Physiol.* 18, 73–78. doi: 10.1016/j.cophys.2020.08.016
- 1612 Faye-Lund, H. (1985). The neocortical projection to the inferior colliculus in the
1613 albino rat. *Anat. Embryol. (Berl.)* 173, 53–70. doi: 10.1007/BF00707304
- 1614 Feliciano, M., and Potashner, S. J. (1995). Evidence for a glutamatergic pathway
1615 from the guinea pig auditory cortex to the inferior colliculus. *J. Neurochem.* 65,
1616 1348–1357. doi: 10.1046/j.1471-4159.1995.65031348.x

- 1597 Flores, A., Saravia, R., Maldonado, R., and Berrendero, F. (2015). Orexins and
1598 fear: implications for the treatment of anxiety disorders. *Trends Neurosci.* 38,
1599 550–559. doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2015.06.005 1655
- 1600 Fritz, J., Shamma, S., Elhilali, M., and Klein, D. (2003). Rapid task-related plasticity
1601 of spectrotemporal receptive fields in primary auditory cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* 6,
1602 1216–1223. doi: 10.1038/nn1141 1656
- 1603 Fritz, J. B., David, S. V., Radtke-Schuller, S., Yin, P., and Shamma, S. A. (2010).
1604 Adaptive, behaviorally gated, persistent encoding of task-relevant auditory
1605 information in ferret frontal cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* 13, 1011–1019. doi: 10.1038/
1606 nn.2598 1657
- 1607 Fritz, J. B., Elhilali, M., David, S. V., and Shamma, S. A. (2007). Does attention play
1608 a role in dynamic receptive field adaptation to changing acoustic salience in A1?
1609 *Hear Res.* 229, 186–203. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2007.01.009 1658
- 1610 Fritz, J. B., Elhilali, M., and Shamma, S. A. (2005). Differential dynamic plasticity
1611 of A1 receptive fields during multiple spectral tasks. *J. Neurosci.* 25, 7623–7635.
1612 doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1318-05.2005 1659
- 1613 Froemke, R. C., Merzenich, M. M., and Schreiner, C. E. (2007). A synaptic memory
1614 trace for cortical receptive field plasticity. *Nature* 450, 425–429. doi: 10.1038/
1615 nature06289 1660
- 1616 Fuglsang, S. A., Dau, T., and Hjortkjær, J. (2017). Noise-robust cortical tracking
1617 of attended speech in real-world acoustic scenes. *Neuroimage* 156, 435–444.
1618 doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.04.026 1661
- 1619 Gaucher, Q., and Edeline, J. M. (2015). Stimulus-specific effects of noradrenaline in
1620 auditory cortex: implications for the discrimination of communication sounds.
1621 *J. Physiol.* 593, 1003–1020. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2014.282855 1662
- 1622 Gimpl, G., and Fahrenholz, F. (2001). The oxytocin receptor system: structure,
1623 function, and regulation. *Physiol. Rev.* 81, 629–683. doi: 10.1152/physrev.2001.
1624 81.2.629 1663
- 1625 Guillery, R. W. (1966). A study of Golgi preparations from the dorsal lateral
1626 geniculate nucleus of the adult cat. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 128, 21–50. doi: 10.1002/
1627 cne.901280104 1664
- 1628 Guillery, R. W., and Sherman, S. M. (2002). Thalamic relay functions and their
1629 role in corticocortical communication: generalizations from the visual system.
1630 *Neuron* 33, 163–175. doi: 10.1016/s0896-6273(01)00582-7 1665
- 1631 Hackett, T. A., Stepniewska, I., and Kaas, J. H. (1999). Prefrontal connections
1632 of the parabelt auditory cortex in macaque monkeys. *Brain Res.* 817, 45–58.
1633 doi: 10.1016/s0006-8993(98)01182-2 1666
- 1634 Happel, M. F., Deliano, M., Handschuh, J., and Ohl, F. W. (2014). Dopamine-
1635 modulated recurrent corticoafferent feedback in primary sensory cortex
1636 promotes detection of behaviorally relevant stimuli. *J. Neurosci.* 34, 1234–1247.
1637 doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1990-13.2014 1667
- 1638 He, J. (2003). Corticofugal modulation on both ON and OFF responses in the
1639 nonlemniscal auditory thalamus of the guinea pig. *J. Neurophysiol.* 89, 367–381.
1640 doi: 10.1152/jn.00593.2002 1668
- 1641 He, J., Yu, Y. Q., Xiong, Y., Hashikawa, T., and Chan, Y. S. (2002). Modulatory
1642 effect of cortical activation on the lemniscal auditory thalamus of the Guinea
1643 pig. *J. Neurophysiol.* 88, 1040–1050. doi: 10.1152/jn.2002.88.2.1040 1689
- 1644 Hershnhoren, I., and Nelken, I. (2017). Detection of tones masked by fluctuating
1645 noise in rat auditory cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* 27, 5130–5143. 1690
- 1646 Homma, N. Y., Happel, M. F. K., Nodal, F. R., Ohl, F. W., King, A. J., and Bajo,
1647 V. M. A. (2017). Role for auditory corticothalamic feedback in the perception
1648 of complex sounds. *J. Neurosci.* 37, 6149–6161. doi: 10.1523/jneurosci.0397-17.
1649 2017 1691
- 1650 Hromádka, T., Deweese, M. R., and Zador, A. M. (2008). Sparse representation of
1651 sounds in the unanesthetized auditory cortex. *PLoS Biol.* 6:e16. doi: 10.1371/
1652 journal.pbio.0060016 1692
- 1653 Huang, Y., and Brosch, M. (2020). Associations between sounds and actions in
1654 primate prefrontal cortex. *Brain Res.* 1738:146775. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2020.
1655 146775 1693
- 1656 Huang, Y., Mylius, J., Scheich, H., and Brosch, M. (2016). Tonic effects
1657 of the dopaminergic ventral midbrain on the auditory cortex of awake
1658 macaque monkeys. *Brain Struct. Funct.* 221, 969–977. doi: 10.1007/s00429-014-
1659 0950-2 1694
- 1660 Jacomme, A. V., Nodal, F. R., Bajo, V. M., Manunta, Y., Edeline, J. M., Babalian, A.,
1661 et al. (2003). The projection from auditory cortex to cochlear nucleus in guinea
1662 pigs: an *in vivo* anatomical and *in vitro* electrophysiological study. *Exp. Brain*
1663 *Res.* 153, 467–476. doi: 10.1007/s00221-003-1606-2 1695
- 1664 Jen, P. H., Chen, Q. C., and Sun, X. D. (1998). Corticofugal regulation of auditory
1665 sensitivity in the bat inferior colliculus. *J. Comp. Physiol.* 183, 683–697. doi:
1666 10.1007/s003590050291 1696
- 1667 Kacelnik, O., Nodal, F. R., Parsons, C. H., and King, A. J. (2006). Training-
1668 induced plasticity of auditory localization in adult mammals. *PLoS Biol.* 4:e71.
1669 doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0040071 1700
- 1670 Kawai, H., Lazar, R., and Metherate, R. (2007). Nicotinic control of axon excitability
1671 regulates thalamocortical transmission. *Nat Neurosci.* 10, 1168–1175. doi: 10.
1672 1038/nn1956 1701
- 1673 Kössl, M., and Vater, M. (1989). Noradrenaline enhances temporal auditory
1674 contrast and neuronal timing precision in the cochlear nucleus of the
1675 mustached bat. *J. Neurosci.* 9, 4169–4178. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.09-12-
1676 04169.1989 1702
- 1677 Las, L., Stern, E. A., and Nelken, I. (2005). Representation of tone in fluctuating
1678 maskers in the ascending auditory system. *J. Neurosci.* 25, 1503–1513. doi:
1679 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4007-04.2005 1703
- 1680 Leach, N. D., Nodal, F. R., Cordery, P. M., King, A. J., and Bajo, V. M. (2013).
1681 Cortical cholinergic input is required for normal auditory perception and
1682 experience-dependent plasticity in adult ferrets. *J. Neurosci.* 33, 6659–6671.
1683 doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5039-12.2013 1704
- 1684 Lecas, J. C. (1995). Prefrontal neurones sensitive to increased visual attention in the
1685 monkey. *Neuroreport* 7, 305–309. doi: 10.1097/00001756-199512000-00073 1705
- 1686 Lee, C. C., and Middlebrooks, J. C. (2011). Auditory cortex spatial sensitivity
1687 sharpens during task performance. *Nat. Neurosci.* 14, 108–114. doi: 10.1038/
1688 nn.2713 1706
- 1689 Lee, C. C., and Sherman, S. M. (2010). Drivers and modulators in the central
1690 auditory pathways. *Front. Neurosci.* 4:79. doi: 10.3389/neuro.01.014.2010 1707
- 1691 Lee, C. C., and Sherman, S. M. (2011). On the classification of pathways in the
1692 auditory midbrain, thalamus, and cortex. *Hear Res.* 276, 79–87. doi: 10.1016/j.
1693 heares.2010.12.012 1708
- 1694 Lesica, N. A., and Grothe, B. (2008). Efficient temporal processing of naturalistic
1695 sounds. *PLoS One* 3:e1655. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0001655 1709
- 1696 Lesicko, A. M., and Llano, D. A. (2017). Impact of peripheral hearing loss on top-
1697 down auditory processing. *Hear Res.* 343, 4–13. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2016.05.
1698 018 1710
- 1699 Liang, K., Poytress, B. S., Chen, Y., Leslie, F. M., Weinberger, N. M., and Metherate,
1700 R. (2006). Neonatal nicotine exposure impairs nicotinic enhancement of central
1701 auditory processing and auditory learning in adult rats. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 24,
1702 857–866. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2006.04945.x 1711
- 1703 Lim, H. H., and Anderson, D. J. (2007). Antidromic activation reveals tonotopically
1704 organized projections from primary auditory cortex to the central nucleus of the
1705 inferior colliculus in guinea pig. *J. Neurophysiol.* 97, 1413–1427. doi: 10.1152/jn.
1706 00384.2006 1712
- 1707 Lin, S. C., Brown, R. E., Hussain Shuler, M. G., Petersen, C. C., and Kepecs, A.
1708 (2015). Optogenetic dissection of the basal forebrain neuromodulatory control
1709 of cortical activation, plasticity, and cognition. *J. Neurosci.* 35, 13896–13903.
1710 doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2590-15.2015 1713
- 1711 Liu, R. C., and Schreiner, C. E. (2007). Auditory cortical detection and
1712 discrimination correlates with communicative significance. *PLoS Biol.* 5:e173.
1713 doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0050173 1714
- 1714 Lohse, M., Bajo, V. M., King, A. J., and Willmore, B. D. B. (2020). Neural circuits
1715 underlying auditory contrast gain control and their perceptual implications.
1716 *Nat. Commun.* 11:324. 1715
- 1717 Malmierca, M. S., Anderson, L. A., and Antunes, F. M. (2015). The cortical
1718 modulation of stimulus-specific adaptation in the auditory midbrain and
1719 thalamus: a potential neuronal correlate for predictive coding. *Front. Syst.*
1720 *Neurosci.* 9:19. doi: 10.3389/fnsys.2015.00019 1716
- 1721 Malmierca, M. S., and Ryugo, D. K. (2011). “Descending connections of auditory
1722 cortex to the midbrain and brain stem,” in *The Auditory Cortex*, eds J. A. Winer
1723 and C. E. Schreiner (New York, NY: Springer), 189–208. doi: 10.1007/978-1-
1724 4419-0074-6_9 1717
- 1725 Manunta, Y., and Edeline, J. M. (1997). Effects of noradrenaline on frequency
1726 tuning of rat auditory cortex neurons. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 9, 833–847. doi: 10.1111/
1727 j.1460-9568.1997.tb01433.x 1718
- 1728 Manunta, Y., and Edeline, J. M. (1998). Effects of noradrenaline on rate-level
1729 function of auditory cortex neurons: is there a “gating” effect of noradrenaline?
1730 *Exp. Brain Res.* 118, 361–372. doi: 10.1007/s002210050290 1719
- 1731 1710

- 1711 Manunta, Y., and Edeline, J. M. (1999). Effects of noradrenaline on frequency
1712 tuning of auditory cortex neurons during wakefulness and slow-wave sleep. *Eur.*
1713 *J. Neurosci.* 11, 2134–2150. doi: 10.1046/j.1460-9568.1999.00633.x
- 1714 Marcus, J. N., Aschkenasi, C. J., Lee, C. E., Chemelli, R. M., Saper, C. B., Yanagisawa,
1715 M., et al. (2001). Differential expression of orexin receptors 1 and 2 in the rat
1716 brain. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 435, 6–25. doi: 10.1002/cne.1190
- 1717 Marlin, B. J., Mitre, M., D'amour, J. A., Chao, M. V., and Froemke, R. C. (2015).
1718 Oxytocin enables maternal behaviour by balancing cortical inhibition. *Nature*
1719 520, 499–504. doi: 10.1038/nature14402
- 1720 Martin, E. M., West, M. F., and Bedenbaugh, P. H. (2004). Masking and scrambling
1721 in the auditory thalamus of awake rats by Gaussian and modulated noises. *Proc.*
1722 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 101, 14961–14965. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0306879101
- 1723 Meltzer, N. E., and Ryugo, D. K. (2006). Projections from auditory cortex to
1724 cochlear nucleus: a comparative analysis of rat and mouse. *Anat. Rec. A Discov.*
1725 *Mol. Cell. Evol. Biol.* 288, 397–408. doi: 10.1002/ar.a.20300
- 1726 Mesgarani, N., David, S. V., Fritz, J. B., and Shamma, S. A. (2014). Mechanisms
1727 of noise robust representation of speech in primary auditory cortex. *Proc. Natl.*
1728 *Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 111, 6792–6797. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1318017111
- 1729 Metherate, R. (2011). Functional connectivity and cholinergic modulation in
1730 auditory cortex. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 35, 2058–2063. doi: 10.1016/j.
1731 neubiorev.2010.11.010
- 1732 Metherate, R., Ashe, J. H., and Weinberger, N. M. (1990). Acetylcholine modifies
1733 neuronal acoustic rate-level functions in guinea pig auditory cortex by an action
1734 at muscarinic receptors. *Synapse* 6, 364–368. doi: 10.1002/syn.890060409
- 1735 Mulders, W. H., and Robertson, D. (2000). Evidence for direct cortical innervation
1736 of medial olivocochlear neurones in rats. *Hear Res.* 144, 65–72. doi: 10.1016/
1737 s0378-5955(00)00046-0
- 1738 Mulders, W. H., and Robertson, D. (2005a). Catecholaminergic innervation of
1739 guinea pig superior olivary complex. *J. Chem. Neuroanat.* 30, 230–242. doi:
1740 10.1016/j.jchemneu.2005.09.005
- 1741 Mulders, W. H., and Robertson, D. (2005b). Noradrenergic modulation of
1742 brainstem nuclei alters cochlear neural output. *Hear Res.* 204, 147–155. doi:
1743 10.1016/j.heares.2005.01.009
- 1744 Mylius, J., Happel, M. F., Gorkin, A. G., Huang, Y., Scheich, H., and Brosch,
1745 M. (2015). Fast transmission from the dopaminergic ventral midbrain to the
1746 sensory cortex of awake primates. *Brain Struct. Funct.* 220, 3273–3294. doi:
1747 10.1007/s00429-014-0855-0
- 1748 Nagarajan, S. S., Cheung, S. W., Bedenbaugh, P., Beitel, R. E., Schreiner, C. E.,
1749 and Merzenich, M. M. (2002). Representation of spectral and temporal
1750 envelope of twitter vocalizations in common marmoset primary auditory
1751 cortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* 87, 1723–1737. doi: 10.1152/jn.00632.2001
- 1752 Narayan, R., Best, V., Ozmeral, E., McClaine, E., Dent, M., Shinn-Cunningham,
1753 B., et al. (2007). Cortical interference effects in the cocktail party problem. *Nat.*
1754 *Neurosci.* 10, 1601–1607. doi: 10.1038/nn2009
- 1755 Nelken, I., Rotman, Y., and Bar Yosef, O. (1999). Responses of auditory-cortex
1756 neurons to structural features of natural sounds. *Nature* 397, 154–157. doi:
1757 10.1038/16456
- 1758 Ni, R., Bender, D. A., Shanechi, A. M., Gamble, J. R., and Barbour, D. L. (2017).
1759 Contextual effects of noise on vocalization encoding in primary auditory cortex.
1760 *J. Neurophysiol.* 117, 713–727. doi: 10.1152/jn.00476.2016
- 1761 Nodal, F. R., Bajo, V. M., and King, A. J. (2012). Plasticity of spatial hearing:
1762 behavioural effects of cortical inactivation. *J. Physiol.* 590, 3965–3986. doi: 10.
1763 1113/jphysiol.2011.222828
- 1764 Nodal, F. R., Kacelnik, O., Bajo, V. M., Bizley, J. K., Moore, D. R., and King, A. J.
1765 (2010). Lesions of the auditory cortex impair azimuthal sound localization and
1766 its recalibration in ferrets. *J. Neurophysiol.* 103, 1209–1225. doi: 10.1152/jn.
1767 00991.2009
- 1768 Ohl, F. W., and Scheich, H. (2005). Learning-induced plasticity in animal and
1769 human auditory cortex. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 15, 470–477. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.
1770 2005.07.002
- 1771 Olthof, B. M. J., Rees, A., and Gartside, S. E. (2019). Multiple nonauditory cortical
1772 regions innervate the auditory midbrain. *J. Neurosci.* 39, 8916–8928. doi: 10.
1773 1523/JNEUROSCI.1436-19.2019
- 1774 Otazu, G. H., Tai, L. H., Yang, Y., and Zador, A. M. (2009). Engaging in an auditory
1775 task suppresses responses in auditory cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* 12, 646–654. doi:
1776 10.1038/nn.2306
- 1777 Ott, T., and Nieder, A. (2019). Dopamine and cognitive control in prefrontal cortex.
1778 *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 23, 213–234. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2018.12.006
- 1779 Owen, S. F., Tuncdemir, S. N., Bader, P. L., Tirko, N. N., Fishell, G., and Tsien, R. W. 1768
1780 (2013). Oxytocin enhances hippocampal spike transmission by modulating 1769
1781 fast-spiking interneurons. *Nature* 500, 458–462. doi: 10.1038/nature12330 1770
- 1782 Peelle, J. E. (2018). Listening effort: how the cognitive consequences of acoustic 1771
1783 challenge are reflected in brain and behavior. *Ear Hear* 39, 204–214. doi: 10.
1784 1097/AUD.000000000000494 1772
- 1785 Peyron, C., Tighe, D. K., van den Pol, A. N., de Lecea, L., Heller, H. C., Sutcliffe,
1786 J. G., et al. (1998). Neurons containing hypocretin (orexin) project to multiple
1787 neuronal systems. *J. Neurosci.* 18, 9996–10015. doi: 10.1523/jneurosci.18-23-
1788 09996.1998 1773
- 1789 Rabinowitz, N. C., Willmore, B. D. B., King, A. J., and Schnupp, J. W. H. (2013).
1790 Constructing noise-invariant representations of sound in the auditory pathway. 1774
1791 *PLoS Biol.* 11:e1001710. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001710 1775
- 1792 Romanski, L. M., and Averbeck, B. B. (2009). The primate cortical auditory system 1776
1793 and neural representation of conspecific vocalizations. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 32,
1794 315–346. doi: 10.1146/annurev.neuro.051508.135431 1777
- 1795 Romanski, L. M., Bates, J. F., and Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1999). Auditory belt and 1778
1796 parabelt projections to the prefrontal cortex in the rhesus monkey. *J. Comp.*
1797 *Neurol.* 403, 141–157. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1096-9861(19990111)403:2<141::aid-
1798 cne1<3.0.co;2-v 1779
- 1799 Royer, J., Huetz, C., Occelli, F., Cancela, J. M., and Edeline, J. M. (2021). Enhanced 1780
1800 discriminative abilities of auditory cortex neurons for pup calls despite reduced 1781
1801 evoked responses in C57BL/6 mother mice. *Neuroscience* 453, 1–16. doi: 10.
1802 1016/j.neuroscience.2020.11.031 1782
- 1803 Ryugo, D. K., and Weinberger, N. M. (1976). Corticofugal modulation of the medial 1783
1804 geniculate body. *Exp. Neurol.* 51, 377–391. doi: 10.1016/0014-4886(76)90262-4 1784
- 1805 Saldaña, E. (2015). All the way from the cortex: a review of auditory 1785
1806 corticocollicular pathways. *Cerebellum* 14, 584–596. doi: 10.1007/s12311-
1807 015-0694-4 1786
- 1808 Saldaña, E., Feliciano, M., and Mugnaini, E. (1996). Distribution of descending 1787
1809 projections from primary auditory neocortex to inferior colliculus mimics the 1788
1810 topography of intracollicular projections. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 371, 15–40. doi: 1789
1811 10.1002/(sici)1096-9861(19960715)371:1<15::aid-cne2>3.0.co;2-o 1790
- 1812 Sara, S. J. (2009). The locus coeruleus and noradrenergic modulation of cognition. 1791
1813 *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 10, 211–223. doi: 10.1038/nrn2573 1792
- 1814 Sara, S. J., and Segal, M. (1991). Plasticity of sensory responses of locus coeruleus 1793
1815 neurons in the behaving rat: implications for cognition. *Prog. Brain Res.* 88,
1816 571–585. doi: 10.1016/s0079-6123(08)63835-2 1794
- 1817 Sarter, M., Gehring, W. J., and Kozak, R. (2006). More attention must be paid: the 1795
1818 neurobiology of attentional effort. *Brain Res. Rev.* 51, 145–160. doi: 10.1016/j.
1819 brainresrev.2005.11.002 1796
- 1820 Sarter, M., Hasselmo, M. E., Bruno, J. P., and Givens, B. (2005). Unraveling the 1797
1821 attentional functions of cortical cholinergic inputs: interactions between signal-
1822 driven and cognitive modulation of signal detection. *Brain Res. Brain Res. Rev.*
1823 48, 98–111. doi: 10.1016/j.brainresrev.2004.08.006 1798
- 1824 Schneider, D. M., and Woolley, S. M. N. (2013). Sparse and background-invariant 1800
1825 coding of vocalizations in auditory scenes. *Neuron* 79, 141–152. doi: 10.1016/j.
1826 neuron.2013.04.038 1801
- 1827 Schofield, B. R. (2009). Projections to the inferior colliculus from layer VI cells of 1802
1828 auditory cortex. *Neuroscience* 159, 246–258. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.
1829 11.013 1803
- 1830 Schofield, B. R., Motts, S. D., and Mellott, J. G. (2011). Cholinergic cells of the 1804
1831 pontomesencephalic tegmentum: connections with auditory structures from
1832 cochlear nucleus to cortex. *Hear Res.* 279, 85–95. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2010.
1833 12.019 1805
- 1834 Schultz, W. (2016). Dopamine reward prediction-error signalling: a two-
1835 component response. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 17, 183–195. doi: 10.1038/nrn.
1836 2015.26 1806
- 1837 Seamans, J. K., and Yang, C. R. (2004). The principal features and mechanisms
1838 of dopamine modulation in the prefrontal cortex. *Prog. Neurobiol.* 74, 1–58.
1839 doi: 10.1016/j.pneurobio.2004.05.006 1807
- 1840 Shaheen, L. A., Slee, S. J., and David, S. V. (2020). Task engagement improves neural
1841 discriminability in the auditory midbrain of the marmoset monkey. *J. Neurosci.*
1842 41, 284–297. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1112-20.2020 1808
- 1843 Shepard, K. N., Chong, K. K., and Liu, R. C. (2016). Contrast enhancement without
1844 transient map expansion for species-specific vocalizations in core auditory
1845 cortex during learning. *eNeuro* 3:ENEURO.318-ENEURO.316. doi: 10.1523/
1846 ENEURO.0318-16.2016 1809

- 1825 Sherman, S. M., and Guillery, R. W. (1998). On the actions that one nerve cell can
1826 have on another: distinguishing “drivers” from “modulators”. *Proc. Natl. Acad.
1827 Sci. U.S.A.* 95, 7121–7126. doi: 10.1073/pnas.95.12.7121
- 1828 Sherman, S. M., and Guillery, R. W. (2002). The role of the thalamus in the
1829 flow of information to the cortex. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 357,
1695–1708. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2002.1161
- 1830 Shetake, J. A., Wolf, J. T., Cheung, R. J., Engineer, C. T., Ram, S. K., and Kilgard,
1831 M. P. (2011). Cortical activity patterns predict robust speech discrimination
1832 ability in noise. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 34, 1823–1838. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2011.
07887.x
- 1833 Slee, S. J., and David, S. V. (2015). Rapid task-related plasticity of spectrotemporal
1834 receptive fields in the auditory midbrain. *J. Neurosci.* 35, 13090–13102. doi:
1835 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1671-15.2015
- 1836 Smith, A. L., Parsons, C. H., Lanyon, R. G., Bizley, J. K., Akerman, C. J., Baker,
1837 G. E., et al. (2004). An investigation of the role of auditory cortex in sound
1838 localization using muscimol-releasing Elvax. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 19, 3059–3072.
doi: 10.1111/j.0953-816X.2004.03379.x
- 1839 Souffi, S., Lorenzi, C., Huetz, C., and Edeline, J. M. (2021). Robustness to
1840 noise in the auditory system: a distributed and predictable property. *eNeuro*
1841 8:ENEURO.43–ENEURO.21. doi: 10.1523/ENEURO.0043-21.2021
- 1842 Souffi, S., Lorenzi, C., Varnet, L., Huetz, C., and Edeline, J. M. (2020). Noise-
1843 sensitive but more precise subcortical representations coexist with robust
1844 cortical encoding of natural vocalizations. *J. Neurosci.* 40, 5228–5246. doi: 10.
1523/JNEUROSCI.2731-19.2020
- 1845 Sperlágh, B., and Vizi, E. S. (2011). The role of extracellular adenosine in chemical
1846 neurotransmission in the hippocampus and Basal Ganglia: pharmacological
1847 and clinical aspects. *Curr. Top Med. Chem.* 11, 1034–1046. doi: 10.2174/
156802611795347564
- 1848 Syka, J., and Popelar, J. (1984). Inferior colliculus in the rat: neuronal responses to
1849 stimulation of the auditory cortex. *Neurosci. Lett.* 51, 235–240. doi: 10.1016/
0304-3940(84)90557-3
- 1850 Terreros, G., and Delano, P. H. (2015). Corticofugal modulation of peripheral
1851 auditory responses. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* 9:134. doi: 10.3389/fnsys.2015.00134
- 1852 Thompson, A. M., and Thompson, G. C. (1993). Relationship of descending
1853 inferior colliculus projections to olivocochlear neurons. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 335,
1854 402–412. doi: 10.1002/cne.903350309
- 1855 Torterolo, P., Zurita, P., Pedemonte, M., and Velluti, R. A. (1998). Auditory cortical
1856 efferent actions upon inferior colliculus unitary activity in the guinea pig.
Neurosci. Lett. 249, 172–176. doi: 10.1016/s0304-3940(98)00367-x
- 1857 Town, S. M., Wood, K. C., and Bizley, J. K. (2018). Sound identity is represented
1858 robustly in auditory cortex during perceptual constancy. *Nat. Commun.* 9:4786.
doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-07237-3
- 1859 Tsunada, J., Cohen, Y., and Gold, J. I. (2019). Post-decision processing in primate
1860 prefrontal cortex influences subsequent choices on an auditory decision-
1861 making task. *Elife* 8:e46770. doi: 10.7554/eLife.46770
- 1862 Valdés-Baizabal, C., Carbajal, G. V., Pérez-González, D., and Malmierca, M. S.
1863 (2020). Dopamine modulates subcortical responses to surprising sounds. *PLoS*
1864 *Biol.* 18:e3000744. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3000744
- 1865 Villa, A. E., Rouiller, E. M., Simm, G. M., Zurita, P., de Ribaupierre, Y., and de
1866 Ribaupierre, F. (1991). Corticofugal modulation of the information processing
1867 in the auditory thalamus of the cat. *Exp. Brain Res.* 86, 506–517. doi: 10.1007/
BF00230524
- 1868 Vizi, E. S., Fekete, A., Karoly, R., and Mike, A. (2010). Non-synaptic receptors and
1869 transporters involved in brain functions and targets of drug treatment. *Br. J.
1870 Pharmacol.* 160, 785–809. doi: 10.1111/j.1476-5381.2009.00624.x
- 1871 Vizi, E. S., and Lábos, E. (1991). Non-synaptic interactions at presynaptic level.
Prog. Neurobiol. 37, 145–163. doi: 10.1016/0301-0082(91)90025-v
- 1872 Weedman, D. L., and Ryugo, D. K. (1996). Projections from auditory cortex
1873 to the cochlear nucleus in rats: synapses on granule cell dendrites. *J. Comp.
1874 Neurol.* 371, 311–324. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9861(19960722)371:2<311::
AID-CNE10<3.0.CO;2-V
- 1875 Weinberger, N. M. (2004). Specific long-term memory traces in primary auditory
1876 cortex. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 5, 279–290. doi: 10.1038/nrn1366
- 1877 Weinberger, N. M., and Diamond, D. M. (1987). Physiological plasticity in auditory
1878 cortex: rapid induction by learning. *Prog. Neurobiol.* 29, 1–55. doi: 10.1016/
0301-0082(87)90014-1
- 1879 Winer, J. A. (1992). “The functional architecture of the medial geniculate body
1880 and primary auditory cortex,” in *Springer Handbook of Auditory Research. The*
1881 *Mammalian Auditory Pathway: Neuroanatomy*, Vol. 1, eds D. B. Webster, A. N.
Popper, and R. R. Fay (New York, NY: Springer), 222–409. doi: 10.1007/978-1-
4612-4416-5_6
- Winer, J. A. (2006). Decoding the auditory corticofugal systems. *Hear Res.* 212, 1–8.
doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2005.06.014
- Winer, J. A., Diehl, J. J., and Larue, D. T. (2001). Projections of auditory cortex
to the medial geniculate body of the cat. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 430, 27–55. doi:
10.1002/1096-9861(20010129)430:1<27::aid-cne1013>3.0.co;2-8
- Winer, J. A., Larue, D. T., Diehl, J. J., and Hefti, B. J. (1998). Auditory cortical
projections to the cat inferior colliculus. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 400, 147–174. doi:
10.1002/(sici)1096-9861(19981019)400:2<147::aid-cne11>3.0.co;2-9
- Winer, J. A., and Lee, C. C. (2007). The distributed auditory cortex. *Hear Res.* 229,
3–13. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2007.01.017
- Winer, J. A., Saint Marie, R. L., Larue, D. T., and Oliver, D. L. (1996). GABAergic
feedforward projections from the inferior colliculus to the medial geniculate
body. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 93, 8005–8010. doi: 10.1073/pnas.93.15.
8005
- Winkowski, D. E., Bandyopadhyay, S., Shamma, S. A., and Kanold, P. O.
(2013). Frontal cortex activation causes rapid plasticity of auditory cortical
processing. *J. Neurosci.* 33, 18134–18148. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0180-
13.2013
- Winkowski, D. E., Nagode, D. A., Donaldson, K. J., Yin, P., Shamma, S. A., Fritz,
J. B., et al. (2018). Orbitofrontal cortex neurons respond to sound and activate
primary auditory cortex neurons. *Cereb Cortex* 28, 868–879. doi: 10.1093/
cercor/bhw409
- Wise, R. A. (2004). Dopamine, learning and motivation. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 5,
483–494. doi: 10.1038/nrn1406
- Wittekindt, A., Kaiser, J., and Abel, C. (2014). Attentional modulation of the
inner ear: a combined otoacoustic emission and EEG study. *J. Neurosci.* 34,
9995–10002. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4861-13.2014
- Wood, K. C., Town, S. M., and Bizley, J. K. (2019). Neurons in primary
auditory cortex represent sound source location in a cue-invariant manner. *Nat.*
Commun. 10:3019. doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-10868-9
- Wolf, N. J. (1991). Cholinergic systems in mammalian brain and spinal cord. *Prog.*
Neurobiol. 37, 475–524. doi: 10.1016/0301-0082(91)90006-m
- Xiong, Y., Yu, Y. Q., Chan, Y. S., and He, J. (2004). Effects of cortical stimulation on
auditory-responsive thalamic neurones in anaesthetized guinea pigs. *J. Physiol.*
560(Pt 1), 207–217. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2004.067686
- Xu, M., Liu, C. H., Xiong, Y., and He, J. (2007). Corticofugal modulation of the
auditory thalamic reticular nucleus of the guinea pig. *J. Physiol.* 585(Pt 1),
15–28. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2007.142240
- Yin, P., Strait, D. L., Radtke-Schuller, S., Fritz, J. B., and Shamma, S. A. (2020).
Dynamics and hierarchical encoding of non-compact acoustic categories in
auditory and frontal cortex. *Curr. Biol.* 30, 1649.e5–1663.e5. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.
2020.02.047
- Yu, Y. Q., Xiong, Y., Chan, Y. S., and He, J. (2004). Corticofugal gating of
auditory information in the thalamus: an *in vivo* intracellular recording study.
J. Neurosci. 24, 3060–3069. doi: 10.1523/jneurosci.4897-03.2004
- Zhang, Y., and Suga, N. (1997). Corticofugal amplification of subcortical responses
to single tone stimuli in the mustached bat. *J. Neurophysiol.* 78, 3489–3492.
doi: 10.1152/jn.1997.78.6.3489
- Zhang, Y., Suga, N., and Yan, J. (1997). Corticofugal modulation of frequency
processing in bat auditory system. *Nature* 387, 900–903. doi: 10.1038/43180
- Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the
absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a
potential conflict of interest.
- Publisher’s Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors
and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of
the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in
this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or
endorsed by the publisher.
- Copyright © 2021 Souffi, Nodal, Bajo and Edeline. This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).
The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the
original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original
publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No
use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.