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ABSTRACT

Anatomical and Physiological Characteristics of Mesencephalic and Pontine Substrates of Reward

Sandra Boye

The objective of this study was to determine anatomical and physiological characteristics of mesencephalic and pontine substrates of reward.

Male hooded rats were implanted with a fixed monopolar stimulating electrode aimed at the ventral tegmental area and a moveable electrode aimed at the medial pons. After stabilization of self-stimulation, the existence of reward-relevant axonal linkage between fixed mesencephalic self-stimulation sites and several dorsoventral pontine sites was investigated using the behavioral version of the collision test. A combination of eight mesencephalic and 44 pontine sites were sampled in eight subjects. Evidence of direct axonal linkage was found between the lateral hypothalamus-ventral tegmental area and eleven sites in the medial pons.

In a second experiment, estimates of the refractory periods and the conduction velocities of the reward-relevant
neurons linking the lateral hypothalamus-ventral tegmental area and the medial pons were obtained in six of the subjects. Results show that the most excitable reward-relevant neurons have absolute refractory periods and conduction velocities in the range of 0.35 to 0.73 msec and 3.96 to 14 m/sec respectively.
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An important goal in the study of the physiological basis of motivation is the identification of the neural substrate(s) responsible for the transmission and integration of reward signals. In this respect, electrical brain self-stimulation, discovered by Olds and Milner (1954), constitutes a powerful tool. Electrical brain stimulation studies have often employed the self-stimulation paradigm as a model of appetitively motivated behavior: the self-stimulating rat emits an instrumental response with the goal of attaining the delivery of a train of stimulating pulses to a reward-related brain site. Electrical stimulation of the brain can thus be used as a reinforcer of operant behavior. Consequently, by studying goal-directed behavior, such as self-stimulation, we may be in a better position to understand the neural circuitry that mediates reward.

Most of the previous research aimed at identifying and characterizing the substrate(s) for self-stimulation has focussed on the medial forebrain bundle (MFB). Stimulation along this fiber bundle produces strong reward and few concomitant aversive and/or motoric reactions. It has been shown that at least some reward-relevant neurons in the MFB link the lateral hypothalamus and the ventral tegmental area (Shizgal, Bielajew, Corbett, Skelton and Yeomans, 1980; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1980, 1982, 1986; Durivage and Miliaressis, 1987; Gratton and Wise 1988; Malette and
Miliaressis, 1987). Bielajew and Shizgal (1986) have further shown that the normal direction of propagation of at least some reward-relevant neurons in the MFB is descending (action potentials travel in a rostro-caudal direction). Other studies have shown that the refractory periods and conduction velocities of reward-relevant neurons in the MFB are in the range of 0.4 to 1.2 ms (Yeomans 1975, 1979; Rompré and Miliaressis, 1980; Miliaressis and Rompré, 1980; Bielajew, Jordan, Ferne-Enright and Shizgal, 1981; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982, 1986; Macmillan, Simantirakis and Shizgal, 1985; Bielajew, Thrasher and Fouriezos, 1987) and 1 to 8.3 m/sec, respectively (Shizgal et al., 1980; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982, 1986; Durivage and Miliaressis, 1987; Gratton and Wise, 1988). These physiological characteristics suggest that at least a portion of the reward-relevant substrate(s) travelling through the MFB comprises neurons with myelinated axons of small diameter that descend towards the mesencephalon. These findings constitute a major step towards the identification of the reward substrate(s). Unfortunately, inferences of this kind cannot yet be drawn concerning most other neural structures that support self-stimulation because the critical data either have not been collected or are incomplete.

In a previous topographical study, Rompré and Miliaressis (1985) have identified a large and sensitive reward system in the brain stem. The region of positive self-stimulation
sites extends at least four millimeters in the anterior-posterior axis, between the rostral mesencephalon and the caudal pons. In the pons, continuous positive sites were found on the midline between the cerebral aqueduct and the pontine nuclei. Reward thresholds (defined as the minimum stimulation frequency that just failed to induce self-stimulation, see Rompré and Miliareasis, 1985) were lowest in the ventral region of the dorsal raphe, near its junction with the decussation of the superior cerebellar peduncle. In the rostral mesencephalon, a large column of positive sites were found up to 1 mm lateral to the midline, between the central gray and the ventral tegmental area. When going from caudal to rostral areas, the low-threshold sites shifted from dorsal to ventral and from medial to lateral regions, following the trajectory of the tegmental radiations. Rompré and Miliareasis (1985) also observed that self-stimulation thresholds increased substantially in midline regions posterior to the coronal level passing through the dorsal raphe, and suggested that reward-relevant neurons in this area bifurcate laterally as they travel towards the caudal brain stem. Because such an unexpectedly large area of the brain stem appears to contain reward-relevant neurons, it seems reasonable to suspect that the MFB can no longer be considered as the sole point of focus for stimulation-induced reward. One point of interest is the possibility that reward-relevant neurons link the ventral tegmental area and brain stem sites. Indeed, the
continuity of positive sites throughout the mesencephalon in Rompré and Miliareasis' study supports such a hypothesis. The present study was designed to investigate this possibility and to characterize the physiology of the fibers forming this hypothetical link.

In the first experiment, the behavioral version of the collision technique developed by Shizgal et al (1980) was used to reveal the existence of direct axonal linkage between reward-relevant neurons in the rostral mesencephalon and the brain stem. In the second experiment, Yeomans' (1975) double-pulse technique was used to determine the refractory periods of the directly stimulated reward-relevant neurons that link the two sites. Combination of the results stemming from these two experiments will constitute a step forward towards the identification of the reward substrate(s).
EXPERIMENT 1

Introduction

A major challenge in brain stimulation studies is to determine which neurons, located within the stimulation field, are responsible for the observed behavior. Stimulation of reward-relevant sites has been found to elicit, in addition to self-stimulation, other behaviors such as feeding (Hoebel and Teitelbaum, 1962), drinking (Mogenson and Stevenson, 1966), copulation (Caggiula and Hoebel, 1966), exploration (Rolls and Kelly, 1972), escape (Bower and Miller, 1958), circling (Miliaressis and Rompré, 1980), and predatory attack (MacDonnel and Flynn, 1964). One hypothesis proposed to explain the multiple behavioral effects is the presence of functionally different fiber pathways coursing through the stimulation field. Indeed, Nieuwenhuys, Geeraedts, and Veening (1982) have shown that more than 50 different fiber systems run through the MFB. Anatomical overlap prevents easy dissociation of the relevant fibers and thus more sophisticated methods for characterizing, and therefore distinguishing, those stimulated fibers responsible for the rewarding effect are required.

Deutsch (1964) developed an approach that circumvents the problem of non-selectivity of intracerebral stimulation.
This approach consists of studying the trade-off between the stimulation parameters required to maintain self-stimulation performance at a constant level. The hypothesis is that the rules governing the trade-off functions reflect the unique physiological characteristics of the neurons that are responsible for the behavior under study. By combining this psychophysical approach and the collision technique, Shizgal et al. (1980) revealed a reward-relevant axonal link between the lateral hypothalamus and the ventral tegmental area. Their technique is based on the physiological phenomenon of collision -- the conduction failure that occurs when anti- and orthodromic action potentials travelling along the same axon collide and cancel out. Electrical stimulation of an axon produces orthodromic action potentials that propagate towards the terminal and antidromic action potentials that propagate towards the soma. Suppose a two-electrode arrangement implanted in series along an axon, (see Figure 1). If a first (conditioning or C-) pulse is delivered through the electrode closest to the terminal (downstream) and a second (test or T-) pulse is delivered in close succession via the electrode closest to the soma (upstream), the antidromic action potential generated by the downstream electrode will collide with the orthodromic action potential triggered at the upstream electrode, and neither will propagate past the point of collision. Consequently, only the orthodromic signal triggered by the downstream electrode will reach the terminal. If, however, the interval between
Figure 1. Stimulation condition for the collision test.
the delivery of the two pulses is delayed enough to allow the antidromic action potential triggered by the C-pulse and its trailing refractory zone to clear the site of the proximal electrode before the T-pulse is delivered, then collision will not occur and two action potentials will reach the terminal instead of one. The longest inter-pulse interval at which collision occurs is referred to as the collision interval and it represents the sum of the inter-electrode conduction time and the refractory period of the axonal segment beneath the tip of the electrode used to deliver the T-pulse.

The application of the collision technique to the study of behavioral substrates consists of measuring, at different C-T intervals, the frequency of pulse-pairs required to maintain a fixed level of behavior. A collision effect is evidenced by an increase in the required frequency as the C-T interval is reduced. The presence of such an effect indicates that the axons of the neurons responsible for the behavior under study travel through both stimulation fields.

As mentioned earlier, the collision technique has been successfully employed to establish the existence of reward-relevant axonal linkage within the medial forebrain bundle, between the lateral hypothalamus and the ventral tegmental area. More recently, Bielajew et al. (1987) have shown that reward-relevant neurons also directly link the lateral
preoptic area and the lateral hypothalamus, a finding that would suggest continuity between the ventral tegmental area and basal forebrain regions. The present experiment is aimed at extending our knowledge about the anatomy of the reward system by investigating the possibility of a reward-relevant link between the ventral tegmental area and sites within the brain stem.
Method

Subjects

Subjects were eleven male hooded rats of the Long-Evans strain from Charles River breeding farms, weighing between 300-450 g at the time of surgery. They were individually housed in plastic cages and were maintained on a 12 hr light/dark cycle. Food and water were available ad libitum before and after surgery.

Electrodes and Surgery

Each subject was implanted with a moveable and a fixed monopolar electrode. Fixed electrodes were constructed from (0.25 mm) stainless steel wires insulated with Formvar, and crimped to a male amphenol connection. Moveable electrodes consisted of a plastic guide and a stainless steel moveable wire also insulated with Formvar (for further details, see Miliaressis, 1981); the tip of each electrode was honed to a hemispherical shape. An indifferent electrode was wrapped around four to five skull screws. Dental cement was used to fixate the electrode assembly.

Surgery was conducted under general anesthesia induced by sodium pentobarbital (65 mg/kg). With the skull held
horizontally between bregma and lambda, fixed electrodes were aimed at 5.5 mm behind bregma, 1.0 mm lateral to the midline, and 7.8 mm below dura. Moveable electrodes were aimed at the midline, 7.7 mm behind bregma and 6.0 mm below the surface of the skull.

**Apparatus**

Bar-pressing behavior was shaped in a manually-operated set-up and subsequently tested in computer-controlled equipment. Testing chambers measured 25 cm X 25 cm X 70 cm. A rodent lever protruded into the chamber, 6 cm above the floor. Above the lever was a 1.5 cm yellow jewel light which came on when stimulation was available. In the hand-operated set-up, all temporal parameters were controlled by manually-set integrated circuit pulse generators, whereas in the computer-controlled equipment they were controlled by a dedicated microprocessor.

Stimulation pulses were produced by dual constant-current generators (Mundl, 1980). Electric charge build-up at the brain-electrode interface was prevented by connecting stimulator outputs through a 1k resistor during the pulse interval. Current intensity was monitored with an oscilloscope by reading the voltage drop across a 1k resistor in series with the rat.
Procedure

Training and Stabilization

One week after surgery, subjects were shaped to bar-press for electrical stimulation of the ventral tegmental area using 500 msec trains of cathodal rectangular pulses of constant duration (0.1 msec). During the training phase, current intensity and pulse frequency were varied and adjusted to produce maximal response rates. Once vigorous responding was established, subjects were allowed to bar-press freely for one hour daily, for three consecutive days. Subjects were then trained, for an additional three days, to bar-press for trials of 30 sec separated by rest periods of the same duration. Only subjects that could be trained to bar-press for stimulation of the ventral tegmental area were included in the study.

After the initial training session, subjects were trained to bar-press for stimulation at the implantation site of the moveable electrode. If the subject could not be trained, the electrode was descended by 0.32 mm and the new site was tested the following day; the electrode was descended until a site was found where stimulation induced consistent bar-pressing.
Once subjects were shaped to bar-press for stimulation applied through each electrode, current intensities were adjusted to produce a frequency threshold of approximately 26 HZ at each brain site. Frequency thresholds were estimated from the function relating rate of bar-pressing to the stimulation frequency. These functions were obtained by establishing the number of pulse-pairs per stimulation train required to support maximal responding, and then systematically reducing this number until the behavior extinguished. Thresholds were estimated by interpolation and operationally defined as the stimulation frequency required to induce a half-maximal rate of responding. After the completion of the training phase, subjects were transferred to the computer-controlled equipment for collision testing.

Collision Test

The collision test consisted of frequency-threshold determinations for single- and two-electrode stimulation conditions. In the single electrode stimulation condition, frequency thresholds were determined for each electrode independently. In the two-electrode stimulation condition, frequency thresholds were determined using pulse pairs: in the anterior-posterior test, the C-pulse was delivered via the anterior electrode and the T-pulse was delivered via the posterior electrode; this sequence was reversed for the
posterior-anterior test. In the paired-pulse stimulation condition, frequency threshold was defined as the number of pulse pairs required to support a half-maximal rate of bar-pressing.

A given session began with two warm-up single-pulse threshold determinations for each site. Eight single-pulse threshold determinations from each stimulation site were estimated throughout a single session, interspersed among two-electrode threshold determinations. The data from a session were discarded if the standard error of the mean for single-pulse frequency thresholds for one or both electrodes varied by more than 10% (S.E.M./MEAN >10%). Paired-pulse frequency thresholds were determined at 17 different C-T intervals that ranged from 0.2 to 10.0 msec. The order in which different C-T intervals were tested was counterbalanced from day to day.

The effectiveness of paired-pulse stimulation at a given C-T interval was assessed using the formula of Bielajew et al. (1981):

$$E = \left( \frac{FT_{SP_L}/FT_{C-T}}{FT_{SP_L}/FT_{SP_H}} \right)^{-1}$$

where $E = \text{effectiveness of paired-pulse stimulation}$
\( FT_{SP L} \) = lower of the two single-pulse frequency thresholds,
\( FT_{C-T} \) = frequency threshold for paired pulses,
\( FT_H \) = higher of the two single-pulse frequency thresholds.

In the formula above, an effectiveness value (E-value) of 0 results from cases in which one pulse from each pair is lost to collision, and paired-pulse stimulation therefore has the same behavioral weight as single-pulse stimulation; the same number of pulse pairs as single pulses is required to maintain behavioral output at a criterial level. Conversely, an E-value of 1 will result from cases in which both pulses in each pair are effective in triggering action potentials that reach the terminals; the paired-pulse frequency threshold is one-half the frequency threshold for single pulses. For each subject, current intensities were adjusted so as to equate single-pulse frequency thresholds for both stimulation sites. However, because this was not always possible, the denominator of the above-mentioned formula provides a correction factor to compensate for these discrepancies.

At every site, the collision test was first replicated three to four times in the anterior/posterior sequence. If, based on visual inspection, the curve relating paired-pulse
effectiveness to C-T intervals (collision curve) did not show evidence of a collision effect (i.e., no decrease in E-values as the C-T interval is shortened), the electrode was lowered by 0.16 mm and the new site was tested the following day. If, however, an effect was evident (i.e., decreased E-values at short C-T intervals), the collision test was replicated 12 times, alternating between the anterior/posterior and posterior/anterior test sequences.

Histology

At the end of the experiments, subjects were given a lethal dose of sodium pentobarbital and the tissue surrounding the electrode tips was marked by passing a direct anodal current of 100 uA for 15 sec. Subjects were then intracardially perfused with saline (0.9%), followed by a solution containing potassium ferrocyanide (3%), potassium ferricyanide (3%), and trichloroacetic acid (0.5%). The combination of this solution with the iron ion deposits caused by the anodal current results in a blue staining of the lesion site. Brains were then removed and kept in 10% formalin. Forty-eight hours prior to sectioning, brains were immersed in 30% sucrose. Brains were sectioned in 40 um sections and drawings were made under magnification of the fresh slices containing the electrode tracks; they were later stained with Thionin dissolved in 10% formalin.
Curve Fitting

In order to obtain an objective estimate of the collision interval, a non-arbitrary curve-fitting procedure was employed. The procedure basically determines if the data are best represented by a 2- or 3-segment line. In the case where the rise in the curve is abrupt and occurs between two adjacent C-T intervals, the data can be best described by a 2-segment fit composed of a lower segment representing the average of the E-values before the rise and a higher segment representing the average of the E-values after the rise. The longest C-T interval of the lower segment is then joined to the shortest C-T interval of the higher segment to illustrate that the abrupt rise occurs somewhere within this interval. In cases where the rise is gradual and occurs over more than one C-T interval, the collision curve is better described by a 3-segment fit composed of a lower and higher segment, as noted above, and a regression line representing the points that lie along the rise. The procedure calculates the residual sum of squares of the points scattered around all possible combinations of 2- and 3-segment lines fit to the data. The curve which yielded the smallest residual sum of squares was then fit to the data.
Results

The results of the collision experiment are shown first, followed by comparison of the results obtained with the anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior test sequences. Figures 2 to 10 show the results of the anterior-posterior collision tests obtained for each animal. Alpha-numerical digits on the upper-left side of each figure refer to the subjects' identification. The left panel shows histologically verified electrode placements for the fixed electrode. The middle panel shows the individual sites tested with the moveable electrode: open circles represent sites at which evidence of collision was not obtained and filled circles represent sites at which a collision effect was evidenced; open squares represent sites which did not support self-stimulation. The right panel shows the curves obtained from each site. Currents used for testing individual sites are presented in Appendix A.

Figure 2 shows the data for subject M7. The fixed electrode was located 4.3 mm behind bregma, in the posterior part of the lateral hypothalamus. The moveable electrode was located 6.8 mm behind bregma, within the central gray. Evidence of collision was obtained at the first site that was tested (site A). Inspection of the curve reveals stable E-values between the C-I intervals of 10.0 and 1.2 msec. As the inter-pulse interval is shortened from 1.2 to 1.0 msec
Figure 2. Collision data for subject M7. Histology drawings for this and all subsequent figures were made from the Paxinos and Watson (1986) atlas of the rat brain. Numbers on the upper-left of histology drawings refer to the plate numbers of the same atlas.
however, we observe a decrease in E-values. This decrease in paired-pulse effectiveness as the inter-pulse interval is shortened reflects collision of anti- and orthodromic action potentials travelling along the same axons and suggests direct linkage of the two stimulation sites by reward-relevant neurons.

Figure 3 shows the data for subject M1. The fixed electrode was located 5.3 mm behind bregma, within the mammillary peduncle, just ventral to the paranigral nucleus of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was located 6.8 mm behind bregma. Five sites were tested with the moveable electrode over a dorso-ventral distance of approximately 0.8 mm. Evidence of collision was obtained at the first site that was tested with the moveable electrode at a site lateral to the Edinger-Westphal nucleus (site A). Inspection of this curve reveals relatively stable E-values between the C-T intervals of 10.0 and 1.6 msec. A decrease in E-values is observed as the inter-pulse interval is shortened from 1.6 to 1.2 msec. E-values remain low between the C-T intervals of 1.2 and 0.2 msec. Lowering of the electrode by 0.16 mm was sufficient to eliminate the step-like function (site B). We did not obtain evidence of direct axonal linkage between the ventral tegmental area and either site B or C. Evidence of axonal linkage was again obtained near the ventral part of the central gray (site D). Once again, we observe stable E-values at long C-T intervals.
Figure 3. Collision data for subject M1.
(10.0 to 1.2 msec), and a decrease in E-values as the interpulse interval is shortened below 1.2 msec. A collision effect was evidenced a third time in this subject when the electrode was lowered by 0.32 mm to the ventral part of the central gray (site E).

Figure 4 shows the results of the collision tests for subject M4. The fixed electrode was located 5.3 mm behind bregma, within the dorsolateral part of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was found on the midline, 6.3 mm behind bregma. A total of nine sites were tested with the moveable electrode, spanning a dorso-ventral distance of approximately 1.7 mm. A collision effect was not obtained from sites A to G. Evidence of axonal linkage was first obtained at a site dorsal to the caudal linear nucleus (site H). The decision to acknowledge site H as a site linked by reward-relevant fibers to the ventral tegmental area was based on comparison of this curve with the curve obtained with the posterior-anterior test sequence (Figure 15). In contrast to the posterior-anterior curve, the curve obtained with the anterior-posterior test sequence has three points which deviate from the general trend in the data, and thus results in asymmetry between the two curves. Low E-values are observed at 1.6, 3.0, and 4.0 msec (Figure 4H). The small size of the standard errors around these points further suggests that the low E-values associated with each C-T interval are not due to random variability.
Figure 4. Collision data for subject M4.
The lack of congruence between the anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior curve implies that the reward-relevant link between this site and the ventral tegmental area is not direct. Such asymmetry between curves obtained with each of the two test sequences will be discussed below. Evidence of collision was again obtained, after the electrode was descended by 0.32 mm, in the caudal linear nucleus (site 1). We observe stable E-values at long C-T intervals and a decrease in E-values as the C-T interval is reduced from 1.2 to 1.0 msec. Stability in E-values is maintained at inter-pulse intervals below 1.0 msec.

Figure 5 shows the data obtained from subject M6. The fixed electrode was located 5.3 mm behind bregma, at the lateral part of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was located on the midline, 7.3 mm behind bregma. Subject M6 did not self-stimulate at the site of implantation of the moveable electrode. The behavior was established at site A and a total of three sites were tested for collision, over a dorso-ventral distance spanning approximately 0.4 mm. E-values were variable across C-T intervals for sites A and B. A slight lowering of the electrode by 0.16 mm was sufficient to reveal reward-relevant linkage between the ventral tegmental area and the ventral part of the dorsal raphe (site C).
Figure 5. Collision data for subject M6.
Figure 6 shows the data for subject M8. The fixed electrode was located at 5.3 mm behind bregma, within the dorsolateral part of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was located on the midline, 7.64 mm behind bregma. Self-stimulation was not obtained from the implantation site nor from the site below it. The behavior was established at site A and a total of 14 sites were tested with the moveable electrode, over a dorso-ventral distance of approximately 2.5 mm. Evidence of collision was not obtained from sites A to M. Inspection of the curves obtained from these sites reveals that E-values remained variable across C-T intervals for each site. It should be noted that for those sites that were located within the cerebral aqueduct (sites D to H), the neural tissue that was actually stimulated during behavioral testing can be thought of as being located anywhere within the perimeter of the aqueduct, but not below and above the tip of the stimulating electrode; the locations of the stimulated neurons at these sites are therefore undetermined. A collision effect was obtained when the electrode reached the ventral part of the dorsal raphe (site N), a site approximately 0.34 mm posterior to the site at which evidence of collision was obtained in subject M6. The general trend in the data shows a decrease in E-values as the C-T interval is reduced from 1.2 to 1.0 msec, followed by low effectiveness values at C-T intervals less than 1.0 msec. E-values at long C-T intervals are low, however, at 2.0, 3.0, and 5.0 msec, and
Figure 6. Collision data for subject M8.
have large standard errors compared with those points at 1.2, 1.6, 4.0, and 10.0 msec. We observed some signs of infection around the electrode assembly which suggests that the electrodes were probably unstable during behavioral testing. This instability could provide an explanation to the high variability in E-values. Indeed, as has been shown with the data of subjects M1, M4 and M6, a small movement of the electrode tip can result in the stimulation of different reward-relevant fibers. This hypothesis is supported by inspection of Figure 7 which shows the progressive changes occurring in the collision curve obtained from site N with repetitive testing. A clear collision effect was obtained the first time that this site was tested. Notice the stability in E-values at C-T intervals between 10.0 and 1.2 msec. Collision at this site occurs at inter-pulse intervals shorter than 1.2 msec. During subsequent replications of the collision test at this site, the curve degenerated progressively due to the variability of the points at 2.0, 3.0, and 5.0 msec. Because the animal lost its electrode assembly at the end of the sixth replication, a lesion was not made at the tip of the electrode; therefore the location of the sites tested with the moveable electrode may not be as precise as for the other subjects.

Figure 8 shows the data for subject X2. Contrary to the other subjects, the fixed electrode of subject X2 was located on the right side of the brain, 4.8 mm behind
Figure 7. Averaged collision curves for site N of subject MB.
Figure 8. Collision data for subject X2.
bregma, at the medial border of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was implanted 3.0 mm from the surface of the skull because, based on the data from subject M8, we suspected that self-stimulation could be obtained at more dorsal sites in the central gray. The moveable electrode was located on the midline, 8.0 mm behind bregma. Self-stimulation was not obtained from the first 5 sites that were tested. The behavior was established at site A and two sites were tested for collision over a dorso-ventral distance extending approximately 0.2 mm. We did not obtain evidence of direct axonal linkage between site A and the ventral tegmental area. Inspection of the curve obtained from site A reveals stable E-values across all C-T intervals. Again, lowering of the electrode by as little as 0.16 mm was sufficient to reveal evidence of direct axonal linkage of site B with the ventral tegmental area.

Figure 9 shows the data for subject B1. The fixed electrode was located 4.8 mm behind bregma, on the dorsal border of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was located 8.0 mm behind bregma, within the central gray, just ventrolateral to the aqueduct. Evidence of direct axonal linkage was obtained at the site of implantation of the moveable electrode. The general trend in the data shows a decrease in E-values as the C-T interval is decreased from 1.2 to 1.0 msec, followed by low E-values at the shorter C-T intervals.
Figure 9. Collision data for subject Bl.
Figure 10 shows the data for subject M0. The fixed electrode was found at 5.3 mm behind bregma, on the lateral part of the ventral tegmental area. The moveable electrode was located 8.8 mm behind bregma, on the lateral border of the dorsolateral tegmental nucleus. Evidence of collision was obtained at the site of implantation of the moveable electrode (site A). Inspection of the collision curve obtained from this site reveals stable E-values at long C-T intervals which are interrupted by a decrease in the effectiveness of paired-pulse stimulation at C-T intervals shorter than 1.2 msec. E-values at short C-T intervals are variable in comparison to E-values at long C-T intervals.

Figures 11 to 21 have been compiled for comparison of the anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for each site at which a collision effect was evidenced. Numbers on the upper-left part of the figures refer to the subjects' identification. Curves fitted to the data are shown below each individual graph. The curved line joining the upper and lower portions of the collision data results from plotting a linear function in semi-logarithmic space. Posterior-anterior collision curves were not obtained for site N of subject M8 (Figure 18). Due to the changes occurring in the collision curve with subsequent replications, we decided to obtain six replications of the curve before beginning the posterior-anterior test sequence.
Figure 10. Collision data for subject MO.
**Figure 11.** Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M7.
Figure 12. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M1, site A.
Figure 13. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M1, site D.
Figure 14. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject MI; site E.
Figure 15. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M4, site H.
Figure 16. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M4, site I.
Figure 17. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M6.
Figure 18. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M8.
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Figure 19. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject X2.
Figure 20: Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject B1.
Figure 21. Anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves for subject M0.
As mentioned earlier, subject M8 lost his electrode assembly at the end of the sixth replication.

Inspection of the anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision curves obtained from the remaining seven subjects reveals that most of the curves are very similar across test sequences: both have a step-like function which is preceded and followed by relatively stable E-values, and the collision intervals are the same. However, some of the collision curves are not congruent, differing in shape and/or the C-T interval at which collision occurs. The curves obtained from subjects M1, and M4 site H, show such discrepancies (Figures 12 to 15). The differences in the curves obtained from subject M6 (Figure 17) could be due to imbalances in the currents used to test the two sequences. Currents used for the anterior-posterior sequence were 363uA for each site; those for the posterior-anterior sequence were 269uA for the anterior site and 363uA for the posterior site.
Discussion

The most parsimonious interpretation of the collision results obtained from this first experiment is that common reward-relevant fibers are shared by both stimulation sites. These results thus imply that the lateral hypothalamus and the ventral tegmental area are linked by reward-relevant fibers with nontine sites. In a previous collision study, Bielajew et al. (1981) failed to reveal axonal linkage between reward-relevant neurons in the mesencephalic central gray and the anterior medial forebrain bundle. One possibility is that the failure to reveal a direct link was due to the use of fixed stimulating electrodes. It has previously been shown (Rompré and Miliaressis, 1985; Rompré and Boye, submitted) that the range of positive reward-relevant sites in the mesencephalon extend approximately 4 mm in the dorso-ventral plane. Accordingly, the probability of activating common reward-relevant fibers using fixed stimulating electrodes is very low. Miliaressis and Philippe (1983) have shown that the probability of revealing the existence of direct axonal linkage is much greater when moveable electrodes are used; this conclusion is supported by the present results showing that lowering of the electrode by as little as 0.16 mm can make the difference between positive and negative collision results.
The results of this collision experiment place anatomical constraints on neural substrates considered as likely carriers of the reward signal. At least part of the trajectory of the substrate should travel between the central gray-dorsal raphe region and the ventral tegmental area. The results of subject M7 further imply that the extent of this path may be greater, linking the lateral hypothalamus and the medial pons. A summary of the location of sites at which evidence of axonal linkage was obtained is presented in Figure 22. The tips of all rostral electrodes but one were located in the ventral tegmental area; the tip of the rostral electrode of subject M7 was located in the posterior part of the lateral hypothalamus. With the exceptions of subjects M0 and M4, which were the subjects with the longest and shortest inter-electrode distances respectively, evidence of collision was obtained when the tip of the posterior electrode was located between the floor of the cerebral aqueduct and the ventral part of the central gray. The most caudal site that was tested was located more laterally compared to the other sites (Figure 22, panel B). Note the deviation of this point from the cluster of points found on the midline.

Histological analysis tends to suggest that reward-relevant neurons that travel between the mesencephalon and the pons respect a certain anatomical pattern. First, reward-relevant fibers linking the posterior part of the
Figure 22. Schematic representation of results obtained from the collision test in eight subjects.
lateral hypothalamus and the rostral part of the ventral tegmental area to the pons seem to spread between the cerebral aqueduct and the ventral central gray. Reward-relevant neurons linking the caudal part of the ventral tegmental area to the pons seem to pass through more ventral regions of the pons. Second, the reward substrate either bifurcates or converges, depending on the natural direction of propagation, on the midline pons. In effect, evidence of a direct axonal link was found between the dorsal raphe and the right (subject X2) and left (subject B1) ventral tegmental area. Third, histological analysis of the brain of subject NO revealed that the rostral electrode was located in the left ventral tegmental area and the movable electrode was located on the left side of the pons at about 1 mm off the midline. Two possible trajectorial arrangements can explain the evidence of collision. A first possibility is that some reward-relevant neurons remain ipsilateral as they travel between the pons and the ventral tegmental area. A second possibility is that reward-relevant fibers cross the midline twice, thereby returning to the same side of the brain. Although confirmation of these anatomical arrangements requires additional empirical support, they provide a useful feature that can help identify the reward substrate.

An interesting feature stemming from the collision data is the asymmetry between collision curves obtained with the
anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior test sequences. These differences reveal interesting characteristics about the reward-substrate in regions posterior to the ventral tegmental area. According to the model of Shizgal et al. (1980), if paired-pulse effectiveness reflects the summation of neural activity along a fiber bundle not interrupted by any synapses (pure axonal model), the anterior-posterior and posterior-anterior collision tests should yield identical curves. In our study, however, we sometimes observed differences between the collision curves derived with each of the two test sequences. These differences may suggest that other neural mechanisms, which are not yet well understood, contribute to the E-values. One possible neural event that would account for differences in either the shape of the curves or the collision intervals, is the presence of synaptic link(s) between reward-relevant neurons activated by the two electrodes. Due to the unidirectional nature of synaptic transmission, a given curve might exhibit peculiarities which are not observed on the counterpart curve obtained with the opposite test sequence.

With the exception of the collision curves obtained from subjects M1, site E, and subject M6, site C, (Figures 3 and 5), summation levels are relatively low across all sites. The levels of summation obtained from concurrent stimulation of rostral and caudal sites in the present study is lower than those obtained from concurrent stimulation of
ipsilateral sites within the MFB (see Shizgal et al., 1980; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982) but is comparable to the summation levels observed in the bilateral MFB collision test in Shizgal et al's study (1980). Low summation levels were also obtained by Bielajew et al. (1980) when concurrent stimulation was applied to the lateral hypothalamus and the periaqueductal gray. It was proposed by these authors that this was due to stimulation of different reward-relevant fibers with a common output. In the present study, based on the collision data of subjects X2 and B1, it can be assumed that reward-relevant fibers in the medial pons either bifurcate as they travel bilaterally to more rostral areas or that they course bilaterally towards the midline pons where they converge. If this is the case, then reward-relevant fibers projecting to, or descending through, the right hemisphere and stimulated by the pontine electrode could never be stimulated by a mesencephalic electrode located in the left hemisphere, and this would result in an incomplete collision effect. The contralateral reward-relevant fibers stimulated only by the moveable electrode will never undergo collision. If the outputs of these two reward-relevant bundles converge on a common integrator, then summation levels at long C-T intervals should be close to 1. Indeed, the counter model predicts that the process which integrates neural activity triggered by the stimulation electrodes is indifferent to the spatiotemporal distribution of incoming signals (see Gallistel, Shizgal,
and Yeomans, 1981). However, the low summation levels observed in the present study suggest other possibilities. The first possibility is that reward-relevant neural signals transmitted from contralateral sides of the brain are integrated independently by separate integrative processes. A second possibility is that the outputs of the two bundles converge on a common integrator that has poorer spatial integration than temporal integration. Such differences in spatial and temporal summation have been found in the peripheral nervous system (Chung and Wurster, 1978).

Another interesting feature of the collision curves is the increase in paired-pulse effectiveness values at short C-T intervals seen in some of the positive collision curves (see Figures 2,3E,8). Such effects would appear to suggest the contribution of latent addition—action potentials triggered by the summation of two subthreshold stimuli. However, the fact that in these cases, the inter-electrode distances ranged from 2.4 to 4.36 mm and that the highest current intensity was 542 uA, does not provide strong support for the hypothesis of overlapping stimulation fields. Some mechanism(s) other than latent addition, and not understood yet, may have contributed to the E-values at these short C-T intervals.

The results of the present experiment have revealed anatomical characteristics about the reward substrate. The
The next experiment was designed to reveal physiological characteristics of the same neurons.
EXPERIMENT 2

Introduction

In addition to providing evidence of axonal linkage between two brain sites, positive collision results offer a means for estimating the conduction velocity of those fibers undergoing collision. As stated earlier, the collision interval represents the sum of the inter-electrode conduction time and the refractory period of the axonal segment underneath the tip of the electrode delivering the second pulse in each pair. If the refractory period can be estimated and subtracted from this total, then we are left with the time required for action potentials to travel from the site of one electrode tip to the other. This time estimate can then be divided into the distance between the electrode tips to yield an estimate of the conduction velocity of those fibers responsible for the collision effect. Such valuable information can further characterize first-stage reward neurons and narrow the selection of candidate pathways.

The excitability cycle of a neuron is estimated in a way that is analogous to the collision test, but with both pulses (C and T) delivered via the same electrode. The delivery of a subthreshold C-pulse causes a local
disturbance in the membrane potential of the cell but does not trigger an action potential. If, however, a T-pulse of equal intensity is delivered immediately after the C-pulse, the two subthreshold stimuli may summate and cause the cell to fire. This effect is called local potential summation and decays as the C-T interval is increased. If a suprathreshold C-pulse is applied to the membrane, an action potential is triggered and this marks the beginning of the absolute refractory period. During this phase, a T-pulse cannot trigger another action potential in the refractory fibers regardless of the amplitude of the pulse. The absolute refractory period is followed by the relative refractory period. During this time, the threshold for firing is elevated and an action potential can be triggered by a T-pulse only if it is of greater intensity than is required at resting potential.

Early work on the refractory periods of self-stimulation neurons employed one of the techniques developed by Deutsch (1964), which involves measuring bar-pressing rates as a function of C-T interval. Yeomans (1975) has argued that because the relation between pulse frequency and response rate is not linear, manifesting floor and ceiling effects, refractory period estimates obtained by measuring response rates are dependent of the arbitrary choice of stimulation frequency. Yeomans proposed a technique which requires that a full range of frequencies be tested at each C-T interval,
thus yielding a family of frequency-response curves. A scaling procedure is then employed which determines the amount of stimulation required to maintain a constant level of responding at different C-T intervals. The rationale behind this procedure rests on the assumption that at long C-T intervals, both pulses will contribute equally to the behavior. However, at short C-T intervals, the T-pulse will fall within the refractory period of some cells and will fail to trigger action potentials. In this case, action potentials lost to refractoriness must be replaced by additional pulse pairs in order to maintain a constant behavioral output.

The purpose of this second experiment will be to estimate the refractory periods of those reward-relevant fibers undergoing collision in the first experiment. Using these estimates, it will be possible to estimate the conduction velocity of these same fibers. By estimating the refractory periods of the same sites and with the same currents that were used for the collision test, the fibers which are stimulated in the two experiments are kept constant. The results of this second experiment will therefore directly characterize those reward-relevant fibers linking rostral mesencephalic and pontine sites.
Method

Subjects

The same subjects were used as in experiment 1.

Procedure

Whenever possible, refractory periods were estimated for both anterior and posterior sites. Refractory period estimation consisted of single- and double-pulse frequency threshold determinations. A session began with two warm-up single-pulse threshold determinations. Eight additional single-pulse thresholds were determined throughout the session, interspersed among paired-pulse frequency thresholds at 17 different C-T intervals that ranged from 0.2 to 10.0 msec. The data from a session were discarded if the standard error of the mean for single-pulse thresholds varied by more than 10%. Refractory period tests were replicated six times for each site. The order in which different C-T intervals were tested was counterbalanced from day to day.

In order to reduce the contribution of local potential summation, refractory periods were, whenever possible, estimated using pulses of unequal amplitude (C>T).
Yeomans, 1979). Although the use of C-pulses of greater amplitude than T-pulses results in poor definition of the end of recovery, due to the presence of the supernormal period, it has been shown to reduce the contribution of local potential summation at short C-T intervals and therefore allows a more precise estimate of the end of the absolute refractory period of the most excitable neurons (see Miliaressis and Rompré, 1980). In cases where refractory periods were estimated using this technique (C>T), relative T-pulse effectiveness was estimated using the formula of Bielajew et al. (1981):

$$E=\frac{(FT_{SP_{L}})^{-1}}{(FT_{SP_{L}} / FT_{SP_{H}})}$$

where $E$ = relative T-pulse effectiveness,

$FT_{SP_{L}}$ = lower of the two single-pulse frequency thresholds,

$FT_{C-T}$ = frequency threshold for a given C-T interval,

$FT_{H}$ = higher of the two single-pulse frequency thresholds.

In cases where refractory periods could not be estimated using unequal pulses (due to the animal's reaction to the high intensity of the C-pulse), refractory periods were estimated using pulses of equal amplitude. Under these
conditions, $S_P^L$ and $S_P^H$ in the above formula are the same
and thus their ratio reduces to 1. This in turn reduces the
above formula to the one used for pulses of equal amplitude:

$$E = \frac{FT_{SP}}{FT_{C-T}} - 1$$

where $E = \text{relative T-pulse effectiveness}$,

$FT_{SP} = \text{average frequency threshold for single}$

$pulses$,

$FT_{C-T} = \text{frequency threshold for a given C-T}$

$interval$.

In the above formulas, the effectiveness of the T-pulse
in triggering neural responses is scaled relative to the
effectiveness of the C-pulse. If the T-pulse falls within
the absolute refractory period of all the cells stimulated
by the C-pulse, its effectiveness in triggering neural
responses will be 0. Under these conditions, paired-pulse
stimulation will have the same behavioral weight as single-
pulse stimulation. At long C-T intervals, all cells will
have recovered from refractoriness. The T-pulse will now
contribute equally to the behavior as the C-pulse, and its
relative effectiveness will thus be 1. In this case, the
frequency threshold for paired pulses will be one-half that
of single pulses.
Curve Fitting

Using the Biomedical Data Package (BMDP), a curve-fitting procedure was employed to non-arbitrarily determine the function which best represented the general trend of the refractory period data. The procedure fits three segments to the data: an exponentially decaying function to those points characterizing local potential summation, a linear function extending from the lowest E-value to the E-value at which an asymptote is reached, and a horizontal line which maintains this asymptotic value. The curve-fitting procedure, PAR (Derivative-Free Nonlinear Regression), estimates the parameters of a nonlinear function by calculation of the residual sum of squares. Estimation of these parameters is based on five initial values supplied by the experimenter: based on visual inspection of the curve: 1) the time constant of the decay, 2) the y-intercept of the exponential function, 3) the C-T interval corresponding to the lowest E-value among the data points, 4) the E-value at which an asymptote is reached and 5) its corresponding C-T interval. Using these initial estimates, and then systematically varying them, the program calculates the resultant residual sum of squares. When no significant change in the residual sum of squares is observed, the program indicates the parameters that yield the smallest residual sum of squares. These parameters were then used to fit the data.
In some cases where pulses of unequal amplitude were used to estimate refractory periods, the lack of local potential summation prevented the fitting of an exponentially decaying function to those points before the rise. In these cases, a straight line which yielded the smallest residual sum of squares was fit to those points at short C-T intervals.
Results

Refractory period estimates were obtained for every subject except M6 and M8. Subject M6 lost a considerable amount of weight near the end of the first experiment, and it was judged best to sacrifice the animal once enough replications of the collision curves were obtained. Subject M8 lost the electrode assembly at the end of the first experiment. For five of the remaining six subjects, refractory periods were estimated using pulses of unequal amplitude. For the remaining subject, M0, it was not possible to use unequal pulses due to undesirable side-effects induced by the higher intensity of the C-pulse. Figures 23 to 30 show the refractory period curves obtained for each subject. The left panel shows the site from which the estimates were obtained. The right panel shows the refractory period curve that was obtained from that site. The curve fitted to the data is shown below individual graphs. The distortions in the fitted curves result from plotting linear-based graphs onto semi-logarithmic space.

Figure 23 shows the refractory period data obtained from the posterior stimulation site of subject M0. Pulses of equal amplitude were used for estimating the refractory period (C & T = 346 uA). The curve derived from this site conforms well to the predicted phases of the excitability cycle of a stimulated bundle of axons. The initial decline
Figure 23. Refractory period data obtained from the posterior stimulation site of subject MO.
Figure 24. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject MO.
Figure 25 shows the data for subject M4. Pulses of unequal amplitude were used to estimate the refractory period of the ventral tegmental site ($C = 732 \mu A, T = 516 \mu A$). Accordingly, there is no evidence of local potential summation at short C-T intervals and a supernormal period is first evident at 4.0 msec. A supernormal period is sometimes observed when C-pulses that are larger than T-pulses are used. Fibers contributing to the supernormal period are located outside of the suprathreshold region of the T-pulse. These fibers will be stimulated above threshold by the C-pulse and will fire again to the subthreshold T-pulse due to a state of hyperexcitability immediately following the end of the relative refractory period. The data from subject M4 could not be fit with a curve comprising an exponentially decaying function describing local potential summation. Those points before the rise were therefore fit with a straight line which yielded the smallest residual sum of squares. The end of the absolute refractory period was estimated by the curve-fitting procedure at 0.52 msec.

The curve obtained from subject M1 is presented in Figure 26. C-pulses of greater amplitude than T-pulses were used to estimate the refractory period of the ventral tegmental site ($C = 599 \mu A, T = 402 \mu A$). It was not possible to estimate the refractory period of the posterior stimulation site of this subject due to aversive reactions induced by
Figure 25. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject M4.
Figure 26. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject M1.
the C-pulse. The use of C-pulses of greater intensity than T-pulses eliminated the contribution of local potential summation, evidenced by the flatness of the curve at C-T intervals shorter than 0.6 msec. The curve-fitting procedure estimated the end of the absolute refractory period at 0.60 msec.

Figure 27 shows the refractory period curve obtained from the central gray stimulation site of subject M7. Although C-pulses were used that were larger than T-pulses (C = 402 uA, T = 300 uA), there appears to be some residual contribution of local potential summation between the C-T intervals of 0.2 and 0.6 msec. A supernormal period is observed at 5.0 msec. The fitted curve estimated the end of the absolute refractory period of the most excitable neurons at 0.60 msec.

Figure 28 shows the refractory period data for the posterior lateral hypothalamic site of subject M7. The use of C-pulses larger than T-pulses (C = 599 uA, T = 300 uA) reduced the contribution of local potential summation. This portion of the curve was therefore fit with the straight line yielding the smallest residual sum of squares. The fitted curve estimated the end of the absolute refractory period at 0.60 msec.
Figure 27. Refractory period data obtained from the posterior stimulation site of subject M7.
Figure 28. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject M7.
Figure 29 shows the refractory period data obtained from the ventral tegmental stimulation site of subject X2. For this subject, the refractory period estimate was erroneously obtained using T-pulses that were larger than C-pulses (C = 542 uA, T = 769 uA). Because the T-pulse intensity used to estimate the refractory period was larger than the intensity used for that same site during the collision test, the refractory period curve contains the contribution of neurons that did not contribute to the collision effect. Furthermore, reward-relevant fibers responsible for collision were stimulated at many times their thresholds during the refractory period test. This therefore results in a shorter estimate of the beginning of recovery of the most excitable fibers. The curve-fitting procedure estimated the end of the absolute refractory period at 0.35 msec.

The refractory period data obtained from the ventral tegmental site of subject B1 is presented in Figure 30. C-pulses were used that were greater in intensity than T-pulses (C = 346 uA, T = 232 uA). The use of unequal pulses did not completely eliminate the contribution of local potential summation as can be observed at C-T intervals between 0.2 and 0.6 msec. A small supernormal period was observed at 5.0 msec. The fitted curve estimated the end of the absolute refractory period at 0.53 msec.
Figure 29. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject X2.
Figure 30. Refractory period data obtained from the anterior stimulation site of subject B1.
The refractory period estimates obtained in this second experiment have been combined with the appropriate collision curves in order to obtain an estimate of the conduction velocity of those fibers responsible for the collision effect. Because in some cases refractory periods were obtained for only one of the two stimulation sites, this determined which collision curve (anterior-posterior vs posterior-anterior) was used in the estimation of conduction velocities. For subject M4, the inter-electrode distance was measured directly from the tips of the two electrodes following removal of the electrode assembly during perfusion. For the remaining subjects, the distance between electrode tips was estimated by locating the lesion at the tip of each stimulating electrode on fresh coronal sections and then using the Pythagorean theorem. All relevant information pertaining to the derivation of conduction velocities are presented in Table 1. Estimates of conduction velocities for reward-relevant axons undergoing collision in the first experiment range from 3.96 to 14.00 m/sec.
Table 1

Estimates of Conduction Velocity for Reward-Relevant Fibers Linking the Lateral Hypothalamus-Ventral Tegmental Area and Pontine Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.D:</th>
<th>Coll. interval</th>
<th>Refract. period (msec)</th>
<th>Conduct. time (msec)</th>
<th>Interelec. distance (mm)</th>
<th>Conduct. velocity (m/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1(E)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4(H)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4(I)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Refractory period estimates obtained in the present experiment overlap with the range of estimates reported in previous studies (Rompré and Miliaressis, 1980; Shizgal et al., 1980; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982, 1986; Bielajew, Lapointe, Kiss and Shizgal, 1982; Schenk and Shizgal, 1982; Macmillan et al., 1985; Durivage and Miliaressis, 1987; Rompré and Miliaressis, 1987; Gratton and Wise, 1988). For most of the refractory period curves, the estimates obtained with the curve-fitting procedure correspond well with the beginning of recovery that can be inferred de visu. Only in one case, subject M7, were the estimates derived with the curve-fitting procedure shorter than the C-T interval at which recovery, based on visual inspection, appears to begin. The reliability of the estimates derived with the curve-fitting procedure is supported first by the results of previous experiments and second, by the fact that the collision interval is equal to 1.0 msec. If the end of the absolute refractory period of the most excitable fibers were indeed 1.0 msec, this would imply that the time required for action potentials to travel from one electrode tip to the other (4.36 mm) would be 0 msec. In addition, the refractory period curves obtained at the rostral and caudal placements are characterized by a decline in T-pulse effectiveness that follows the initial recovery. This
unusual decrease in T-pulse effectiveness is likely to mask the initial recovery.

The conduction velocity estimates obtained in this second experiment have a wide range, suggesting that reward-relevant fibers linking rostral mesencephalic and pontine areas are heterogeneous. Although these estimates are faster than those reported in previous collision studies, the four slowest estimates (M4 sites H and I, X2 and B1) fall within the previously reported range of 1-8.3 m/sec for MFB reward-relevant fibers. In the case of subject X2, the estimates may be slightly biased. In effect, the refractory periods were estimated with T-pulses that were larger in amplitude than C-pulses. In such a case, there could be a reduction or elimination of relative refractory period contributions which could result in a shorter recovery of the most excitable fibers. The 0.35 msec refractory period estimate obtained with subject X2 might have resulted in an underestimation of the conduction velocity.

The use of the curve-fitting procedure has allowed us, to a certain extent, to obtain non-arbitrary estimates of the collision interval and the end of the absolute refractory period of the most excitable neurons. The decision as to where recovery begins or collision block ends was therefore displaced from the experimenter's judgement to the parameters obtained from the curve-fitting procedure.
However, the conduction velocity estimates are nevertheless biased in that the point chosen along the fitted line to represent either the beginning of recovery or the end of the collision block was dependent on arbitrary criteria. In keeping with criteria used in previous collision studies in which conduction velocities were also estimated (Shizgal et al., 1980; Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982, 1986; Durivage and Miliaressis, 1987; Gratton and Wise, 1988), our criteria for the end of either the collision block or the absolute refractory period of the most excitable neurons was the longest C-T interval before the rise occurs in the respective curves. In estimating the end of the collision block, had we used any point along the rise of the collision curve to represent the collision interval, conduction time would have been judged to be longer, and the estimated conduction velocities slower. For example, the use of the midway point between the lower and higher portion of the collision curve would not be a weak estimate of the collision interval in view of the fact that the observed collision interval in any given collision curve is determined by the C-T intervals that are tested. The end of the collision block could therefore be thought of as occurring anywhere along the rising portion of the curve. In the case of refractory periods, if to estimate the end of the absolute refractory period of the most excitable neurons, we had chosen any point along the rise in the refractory period curve, the estimated conduction time would
have been shorter, and the resulting conduction velocity estimates faster.

Conduction velocity estimates are further biased due to the assumption that is made about the trajectory of the reward-relevant fibers linking the two stimulation sites. When estimating the distance that neural signals triggered at one stimulation site must travel in order to reach the other stimulation site, the distance between electrode tips is measured and it is assumed that reward-relevant fibers undergoing collision link the two brain sites by a straight line. Although the collision technique does not allow us to know the actual trajectory of these fibers, it should be recognized that meandering trajectories would imply faster conduction velocities than those obtained in the present study. It should be noted that although the procedure employed in the present study for locating the electrode tips allows us to be confident of their locations, greater precision can be achieved by measuring the inter-electrode distance straight from the electrode assembly.

One point of interest is the observation that most of the collision intervals occur at 1.0 msec even though there are differences in inter-electrode distances across subjects. One possible explanation is that the resolution in the inter-pulse intervals employed in the present study is not sufficient to allow us to detect subtle differences in the
collision intervals. For example, the inter-electrode distances for subjects M0, M7, X2 and B1 range from 3.78 to 4.36 mm. If we assume that the conduction velocity of the reward-relevant neurons is 8 m/sec (see Bielajew and Shizgal, 1982), then the collision interval should differ by less than 0.07 msec, a difference too small to be detected with the resolution used in the present study.

The inter-electrode distance for subject M1 was 2.42 mm, that is, 1.36 mm less than the shortest distance measured for the previous subjects. Assuming again a conduction velocity of 8 m/sec, the collision interval should be close to 0.83 msec; indeed, the collision interval of subject M1 is 0.8 msec.

Subject M4 also had a collision interval of 1.0 msec. However, this subject's inter-electrode distance was even shorter, and inferred to be 1.9 mm. If these estimates are correct, we then have to assume that collision in this case is due to reward-relevant neurons that have slower conduction velocities.
General Discussion

The results of this study provide anatomical and physiological criteria which could be used to select, among candidate neural pathways, those which best fit the profile of the reward substrate. The candidate neural pathway should, first, travel between the lateral hypothalamus-ventral tegmental area and the medial pons. Second, it should be composed of neurons having absolute refractory periods between 0.35 and 0.73 msec and conduction velocities that range from 3.96 to 14 m/sec. Some likely candidate neural pathways are reviewed below.

Descending pathways

In a study tracing efferent projections of the ventral tegmental area and substantia nigra, Beckstead, Domesick and Nauta (1979) described descending fibers which originate in the ventral tegmental area and extend to the ventral part of the central gray and dorsal raphe nucleus, parabrachial nuclei, locus coerules, and dorsolateral tegmental nucleus. In a similar study, Hosoya and Matsushita (1981) described fibers that originate in the lateral hypothalamic area and descend through the medial forebrain bundle to the ventral tegmental area. A portion of these fibers were further observed to project caudally, enter the central gray, and
terminate densely in the dorsal raphe. Although efferent projections from lateral hypothalamic areas to the central gray-dorsal raphe region are well documented (e.g., Beitz, 1982; Villalobos and Ferssiwi, 1987; Veening, Te Lie, Posthuma, Geeraedts and Nieuwenhuys, 1987) and seem to fit the anatomical criteria established in the present study, the physiology of these fibers has not been studied in sufficient detail to allow comparison of their physiological characteristics to those established in the present study.

Nauta and Domesick (1982) described the distribution of descending components of the medial forebrain bundle; such fibers are described to have origins within various forebrain structures. Upon entering the ventral tegmental area, descending fibers were observed to bifurcate into a lateral and a medial subdivision. The medial subdivision is of interest in the present context, because it travels caudally to the interpeduncular nucleus, the median and dorsal raphe, and other ventral regions of the central gray such as the dorsolateral tegmental nucleus and the locus coeruleus. In a recent electrophysiological study (Rompré and Shizgal, 1986), it was shown that neurons originating in the medial septum, diagonal band of Broca and other forebrain structures, send fibers through the medial forebrain bundle that descend at least as far as the ventral tegmental area. Furthermore, some of these cells were considered as likely mediators of the reward signal in that
they were found to exhibit physiological characteristics (i.e., refractory periods, conduction velocities) that were comparable to criteria that have been established with behavioral methods.

These anatomical and physiological data would suggest that some reward-relevant neurons linking the mesencephalon and the medial pons might be part of a descending neural pathway originating from the basal forebrain.

**Ascending pathways**

Ascending fibers have also been shown to link the dorsal raphe to sites within the medial forebrain bundle. Phillipson (1978) showed that efferents from the dorsal raphe constitute one of the densest projections to the ventral tegmental area. Similar results were obtained by Taber-Pierce, Foote and Hobson (1976). Takagi, Shiosaka, Tohyama, Senba and Sakanaka (1980) proposed two ascending components: one extending from the dorsal raphe to areas between the anterior commissure and anterior hypothalamic nucleus, and another from the dorsal raphe to areas between the ventromedial and posterior hypothalamic nuclei. These authors also showed that ascending fibers from the dorsolateral tegmental nucleus ascend through the MFB. Although these fibers travel from brain stem regions to the MFB, it is not known, based on the description afforded by
these authors, if they directly link these caudal sites to the ventral tegmental area. In a separate study, ascending fibers with origins within the dorsolateral tegmental nucleus, dorsal raphe, and caudal linear nucleus were found to ascend through the MFB to the level of the most anterior part of the dorsal hippocampus (Vertes, 1984). Again, the trajectory of these fibers was not described in sufficient detail to know if they link directly to the ventral tegmental area.

**Noradrenergic pathways**

Early hypotheses involved a role for noradrenaline as a mediator of reward after it was observed that self-stimulation could be obtained from sites near the locus coeruleus or its major rostral efferent, the dorsal tegmental bundle (see Crow, Spear and Arbuthnott, 1972; Ritter and Stein, 1973). Much of the available data are correlational, however, and inconclusive (see Wise, 1978). A major catecholamine system, however, known as the tegmental catecholamine radiations and described by Lindvall and Björklund (1974), corresponds well with the anatomical constraints placed by our collision data. The tegmental catecholamine radiations are fed by the major ascending noradrenergic pathways originating in the brain stem such as the dorsal tegmental bundle, central tegmental tract and the periventricular system. When passing from dorsal to ventral
regions, these tegmental radiations are described to diverge into a fanlike arrangement, in an area immediately rostral to the decussation of the superior cerebellar peduncles. The radiating fibers are described to diverge into median, medial and lateral components. The median flow of fibers was traced by these authors from the rostral part of the dorsal raphe, between the two medial longitudinal fasciculi, to the region dorsal to the interpeduncular nucleus.

Although the trajectory of the tegmental catecholamine radiations conforms to the anatomical constraints placed by the collision data, neurophysiological characteristics of noradrenergic neurons are not compatible with the criteria established in the present study. First, the refractory periods of noradrenergic neurons are longer than 2.0 msec (Takigawa and Mogenson, 1977; Guyenet, 1980), values too long to account for the rising portion of the refractory period curves. Noradrenergic neurons may, however, contribute to the late part of the refractory period curve (C-T > 2.0 msec). Stronger evidence against a first-stage role for noradrenergic neurons is that they are fine and unmyelinated (Foote, Bloom and Aston-Jones, 1983) and consequently, have slower conduction velocities (0.4-0.86 m/sec) than those obtained in the present study (Takigawa and Mogenson, 1977; Guyenet, 1980).
**Serotonergic pathways**

A role for serotonergic neurons in the mediation of brainstem reward was proposed following the observation that self-stimulation could be obtained from the dorsal and median raphe, nuclei rich in serotonergic cell bodies (see Miliaressis, 1977). Parent, Descarries and Beaudet (1981) described a major system of ascending serotonergic fibers, known as the transtegmental system, which conforms to the anatomical boundaries set by the present study. This serotonergic system was observed to originate in the dorsal raphe, and less prominently form the median raphe. The fibers of this system were described to course ventrally, either medial or through the medial longitudinal fasciculi, and penetrate the decussation of the superior cerebellar peduncles. These serotonergic fibers were observed to follow the trajectory of the tegmental catecholamine radiations, but were mostly confined to the median and medial components of the system. Transtegmental fibers were further observed to sweep rostrally through the ventral tegmental decussation and enter the ventral tegmental area.

As is the case with noradrenergic fibers, neurophysiological characteristics of serotonergic fibers are not compatible with the criteria established in this study. The refractory periods of serotonergic neurons are estimated to
range from 1.2 to 5.0 msec (Wang and Aghajanian, 1977). Furthermore, only about 0.7% of MFB serotonergic neurons are myelinated (Azmitia and Gannon, 1983). Although fast-conducting serotonergic fibers project from the raphe magnus to the spinal cord (3.1-6.0 m/sec) (Wessendorf, Proudfit and Anderson, 1981), the conduction velocities of ascending serotonergic neurons have been estimated to range from 0.5 to 1.7 m/sec (Wang and Aghajanian, 1977; Crunelli and Segal, 1982). As with the noradrenergic neurons, these neurophysiological characteristics make it unlikely that serotonergic neurons constitute the directly stimulated reward substrate.

An important characteristic of the reward substrate that would help narrow the selection of candidate pathways would be knowledge of the normal direction of propagation of action potentials within reward-relevant neurons linking the ventral tegmental area with the pons. This can be achieved with the hyperpolarization block technique developed by Bielajew and Shizgal (1986). Using this technique, these authors showed that at least some reward-relevant neurons within the MFB conduct orthodromic action potentials in a rostro-caudal direction. If, in future work, application of this technique to the areas studied in the present work yield similar results, this would provide support for the notion that brain stem reward shares a common substrate with medial forebrain bundle reward. Indeed, the overlap in
estimates of refractory periods and conduction velocities seem to suggest such continuity. Moreover, the collision data of subject M7 further strengthen the idea of a continuous substrate.

A more direct way to test for continuity between the substrate mediating MFB and brain stem reward is to extend the present collision findings in a rostral direction by testing for collision between anterior MFB sites and sites in the brain stem. Based on the results obtained from subject M0, the collision data obtained in the present study could also be extended to caudal and lateral areas. Recall that this subject's posterior electrode was located approximately 1.0 mm lateral to the midline. Replication of such a finding could be followed by application of the collision test to posterior sites at different bilateral distances from the midline but with the anterior electrode implanted at a fixed location. Findings of such a study would yield further information about the trajectory of the reward substrate in pontine regions.

The results of the present study have extended our knowledge about the neural circuitry responsible for brain stimulation reward. It was shown that reward-relevant fibers directly link the lateral hypothalamus-ventral tegmental area to sites in the pons. Furthermore, these fibers were shown to be fast-conducting and have refractory
periods that overlap with estimates obtained from reward-relevant fibers in the MFB. These results bring us one step forward towards the identification of the reward substrate(s).
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# APPENDIX A

## Currents Used For Collision Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Anterior Current (uA)</th>
<th>Posterior Current (uA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP C</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA C</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7 A</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 A</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 B</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 A</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 A</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0 A</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>