Functional segregation of monaural and binaural selectivity in the pallid bat auditory cortex

Khaleel A. Razak

Department of Psychology and the Graduate Neuroscience Program, University of California, Riverside

Abbreviated title: Cortical mechanisms of sound localization

Department of Psychology
University of California
900 University Avenue
Riverside, CA – 92521
Email: khaleel@ucr.edu
Phone: 951-827-5060

Key words: auditory cortex, sound localization, binaural, monaural, echolocation, leveltolerance

Number of text pages:31

Number of Figures:7

Number of Tables: 0

I report no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements: I thank Dr. Zoltan Fuzessery and Dr. Len Kitzes for useful discussions of the data. This study was funded by the National Science Foundation (IOS 1252769).

Abstract

Different fields of the auditory cortex can be distinguished by the extent and level tolerance of spatial selectivity. The mechanisms underlying the range of spatial tuning properties observed across cortical fields are unclear. Here, this issue was addressed in the pallid bat because its auditory cortex contains two segregated regions of response selectivity that serve two different behaviors: echolocation for obstacle avoidance and localization of prey-generated noise. This provides the unique opportunity to examine mechanisms of spatial properties in two functionally distinct regions. Previous studies have shown that spatial selectivity of neurons in the region selective for noise (noise-selective region, NSR) is level tolerant and shaped by interaural level difference (ILD) selectivity. In contrast, spatial selectivity of neurons in the echolocation region ('FM sweep-selective region' or FMSR) is strongly level dependent with many neurons responding to multiple distinct spatial locations for louder sounds. To determine the mechanisms underlying such level dependence, frequency, azimuth, rate-level responses and ILD selectivity were measured from the same FMSR neurons. The majority (~75%) of FMSR neurons were monaural (ILD insensitive). Azimuth tuning curves expanded or split into multiple peaks with increasing sound level in a manner that was predicted by the rate-level response of neurons. These data suggest that azimuth selectivity of FMSR neurons depends more on monaural ear directionality and rate-level responses. The pallid bat cortex utilizes segregated monaural and binaural regions to process echoes and prey-generated noise. Together the pallid bat FMSR/NSR data provide mechanistic explanations for a broad range of spatial tuning properties seen across species.

1. Introduction

The auditory cortex, like other sensory cortices, consists of multiple fields distinguished by response selectivity that optimize representations of different attributes of sensory input. Spatial selectivity is one such property that distinguishes auditory cortical fields, leading to hypotheses about differential contributions of these fields to sound localization behavior (Harrington et al., 2008; Malhotra et al., 2004; Stecker et al., 2005; Woods et al., 2006). These differences include sharpness of spatial selectivity, sound level tolerance and presence of multi-peaked azimuth tuning curves. The mechanisms that differentiate spatial selectivity between cortical fields are unclear and thereby motivated the main aim of this study.

The subject of this study is the pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), a species that listens to prey-generated noise (e.g., walking, rustling, 5-40 kHz band) to localize and hunt terrestrial prey (e.g., crickets, scorpions). Echolocation with downward frequency modulated (FM) sweeps (60→30 kHz, 2-5 msec) is used for orientation and obstacle avoidance (Bell 1982, Barber et al., 2003). The midbrain-thalamus-cortex connections form parallel pathways selective for noise and downward FM sweeps (Fuzessery, 1994; Razak and Fuzessery, 2002; Razak et al., 2007). In the auditory cortex, there are two regions with functional properties that suggest involvement in prey localization (noise-selective region, NSR) and echolocation (FM sweep-selective region, FMSR), respectively (Razak and Fuzessery 2002, Razak 2011). The FMSR receives most of its input from the dorsal division of the medial geniculate body while the NSR receives its input primarily from the ventral division of the medial geniculate body (Razak et al., 2007). This organization provides the opportunity to compare sound localization mechanisms in two functionally distinct regions using behaviorally relevant sounds.

Previous studies have shown a number of differences in spatial tuning properties between the NSR and the FMSR. 2D spatial receptive fields (SRF) in the FMSR are significantly more level dependent than in the NSR (Razak et al., 2015). FMSR neurons are

narrowly tuned to locations near the midline at low sound levels. FMSR SRFs expand considerably and many neurons respond to multiple non-contiguous locations with increasing sound level. NSR neurons are level tolerant and as a population, represent locations across the entire contralateral field. These data suggest that mechanisms of azimuth tuning in the FMSR are different than in the NSR. By recording interaural level difference (ILD) and azimuth selectivity from the same neurons, Razak (2011, 2012) showed that ILD response is the primary determinant of NSR azimuth selectivity. How azimuth selectivity is shaped in the FMSR is not known. Therefore, the main aim of this study was to test the relative contributions of monaural and binaural responses to azimuth selectivity in the FMSR, by recording frequency, ILD, azimuth selectivity and rate-level responses of the same FMSR neurons. FMSR data were compared with published NSR data (Razak 2011, 2012) to determine mechanistic differences between the regions. The results show that most FMSR neurons, in sharp contrast to NSR, are monaural (ILD insensitive). FMSR neurons with monotonic rate-level functions show level dependent expansion of azimuth tuning. Neurons with non-monotonic rate-level functions show fragmentation of azimuth tuning into multiple peaks. These data indicate that the cortical region involved in obstacle avoidance with echolocation uses a different set of mechanisms to process spatial information than the region involved in localizing prey.

2. Materials and Methods

Pallid bats were netted in Arizona, New Mexico and California and held in a 11 × 14 ft room at the University of California, Riverside. The bats were able to fly in this room and were provided crickets/mealworms and water *ad libitum*. The room was maintained on a reversed 12:12 light cycle. All procedures followed the animal welfare guidelines required by the National Institutes of Health and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

119 *2.1 Surgical procedures*

120 Recordings were obtained from adult pallid bats (n=5) anesthetized with isoflurane
121 inhalation, followed by ani.p. injection of pentobarbital sodium (30 µg/g bodywt) and
122 acepromazine (2 µg/g body wt). Both male and female bats were used. Up to four different
123 recording sessions separated by 2-4 days were conducted in each bat. The skin was sutured and
124 the bat was allowed to recover per approved protocol between each recording session. Each
125 session lasted between 8-12 hours. To expose the auditory cortex, the head was held in a bite
126 bar, a midline incision was made in the scalp, and the muscles over the dorsal surface of the
127 skull were reflected to the sides. The front of the skull was scraped clean and a layer of glass
128 microbeads applied, followed by a layer of dental cement. The bat was then placed in a
129 Plexiglas holder. A cylindrical aluminum head pin was inserted through a cross bar over the
130 bat's head and cemented to the previously prepared region of the skull. This pin served to hold
131 the bat's head secure during the recording session. The location of A1 was determined relative
132 to the rostrocaudal extent of the midsagittal sinus, the distance laterally from the
133 midsagittal sinus, and the location of a prominent lateral blood vessel that travels parallel to the
134 midsagittal sinus (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002). The size of the exposure was ~2 mm². Exposed
135 muscle was covered with petroleum jelly (Vaseline) and exposed brain surface was covered
136 with paraffin oil to prevent desiccation.

137 *2.2 Recording and stimulus protocols*

138 Experiments were conducted in a warm (~80°F), 8x8 square feet sound attenuation room
139 lined with anechoic foam (Gretch-Ken Industries, Oregon). All recordings were obtained from
140 the right hemisphere simply due to ease of access within the sound booth. A previous study
141 that examined ILD selectivity indicated qualitatively similar responses in both hemispheres of

the pallid bat's cortex (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002). Bats were kept anesthetized throughout the course of the experiments with additional pentobarbital sodium (one-third of presurgical dose) injections. Acoustic stimulation and data acquisition were driven by custom written software (Batlab, written by Dr. Don Gans, Kent State University) and a Microstar digital signal processing board. Programmable attenuators (PA5, Tucker-Davis Technologies, Florida) allowed control of sound intensities before amplification by a stereo power amplifier (Yamaha AX430). Extracellular single-unit recordings were obtained using glass electrodes (1M NaCl, 2-10 M Ω impedance) at depths between 200 and 600 μ m (layers III-V in pallid bat, Martin del Campo et al., 2014). Penetrations were made orthogonal to the surface of the cortex. Action potentials were amplified by a Dagan extracellular preamplifier (2400A) and a spike signal enhancer (FHC, Maine) and band-pass filtered (0.3-3 kHz, Krohn-Hite, MA). Waveforms and post-stimulus time histograms were stored using the Microstar DSP board and Batlab software. All data shown are from single-unit recordings identified by the consistency of action potential amplitude and waveform displayed on an oscilloscope. Responses were quantified as the total number of spikes elicited over 20 stimulus presentations at 1 Hz repetition rate. Spikes were counted over a 200 msec window from sound onset.

To record ILD, rate-level responses and azimuth selectivity from the same FMSR neurons, a sequential dichotic/free-field stimulation protocol was used as described previously (Razak 2011, 2012). Dichotic stimulation to determine ILD selectivity was achieved using two LCY-K100 ribbon tweeters (Madisound, Wisconsin) fitted with funnels that were inserted into the external auditory canal. The amplifier-speaker-funnel frequency response curve measured with a ¼ inch microphone (Bruel and Kjaer, Denmark) was flat within ± 3 dB for frequencies from 8-35 kHz. The roll-off from 35-80 kHz was gradual at a rate ~ 20 dB/octave. Distortion products were not present in the speaker output for the sound levels used in these studies.

After recording ILD selectivity (see below), the speaker funnels were removed from the external auditory canal and a free-field speaker was used to determine azimuth selectivity of the same neuron. Free-field stimulation was achieved with a third LCY-K100 speaker that was moved manually to different locations (75° contralateral to 75° ipsilateral in azimuth with a 15° resolution) on a semi-circular loop (40 cm radius with the bat's head as center). The loop was mounted on a vibration isolation table (TMC, Massachusetts). The bat was placed on the edge of the table such that its head was at the center of the loop. The bat's snout faced 0° azimuth/elevation. The cross-bar holding the head pin was secured behind the bat, leaving no interference between the free-field speaker and the bat's head.

2.3 Stimuli used

The FMSR was targeted for recordings in this study because this region contains neurons with response properties indicative of involvement in echolocation. The echolocation calls of adult pallid bats are typically $60 \rightarrow 30$ kHz downward FM sweeps with durations between 2-5 msec. The FMSR is located rostromedial to the NSR and contains neurons with characteristic frequencies (CF) between 30 and 70 kHz and strong selectivity for the downward FM sweeps used by the pallid bat to echolocate (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002, 2006, 2008). These neurons rarely respond to noise of any bandwidth, providing a relatively easy way to distinguish the two regions. To isolate single neuron responses, search stimuli were presented from the free-field speaker positioned at 0° azimuth and elevation (to mimic echoes along the flight path). The search stimuli used were linear downward $60 \rightarrow 30$ kHz or $70 \rightarrow 20$ kHz FM sweeps (2-5 msec duration, intensities between 0 – 70 dB SPL, 1 Hz repetition rate, 1 msec rise/fall time). Upon isolation of a neuron, the CF was determined by presenting tones (5-10 msec duration, 1 msec rise/fall times, 1 Hz repetition rate) with frequencies between 25-70 kHz (1 or 5 kHz step) and levels between 0 – 70 dB SPL (5 dB step). The free-field speaker was at

0° azimuth/elevation for CF determination. The CF was defined as center of a range of tone frequencies that elicited action potentials to at least five successive stimulus repetitions at the lowest level tested. After identifying the CF, a downward FM sweep with the CF as the approximate center frequency, duration between 2-5 msec and bandwidths between 20-40 kHz was used as stimulus to record the following response properties:

2.3.1 FM sweep response threshold: The free-field speaker at 0° azimuth/elevation was used for this purpose. The level of the FM sweep was increased from 0 – 70 dB SPL (5 dB steps to start and 1 dB steps closer to threshold) to identify minimum threshold (MT) of the neuron. The MT was defined as the lowest level of the FM sweep presented from 0° azimuth/elevation to which the neuron responded to at least five successive presentations.

2.3.2 ILD selectivity: The ILD selectivity was determined using dichotic stimulation (speaker funnel inserted into the ears) with a fixed sound level at the contralateral (CL) ear (10-20 dB above MT). The intensity of the FM sweep at the ipsilateral (IL) ear was varied from 20 dB below to 20 dB above CL ear intensity, in 5 or 10 dB steps. This covers the behaviorally relevant range of ILDs for the pallid bat (Fuzessery 1996). The speaker funnels were not sealed in the meatus to facilitate sequential dichotic/free-field stimulation of the same neurons. The attenuation of sound level at the opposite ear was at least 25 dB and permitted the presentation of ± 20 dB ILDs. However, because the funnels were not sealed in the meatus, it was not possible to test very loud sounds in the CL ear due to possible crossover effects. The data presented in this study must therefore be considered with this caveat. In data presentation below, negative ILDs denote more intense IL ear sound than at the CL ear. Positive ILDs indicate CL > IL ear intensity.

Previous studies of the pallid bat cortex (both NSR and FMSR) have shown that almost all neurons are excited only by monaural CL ear stimuli or not at all by monaural stimuli. There is rarely any excitatory response to monaural stimulation of the IL ear (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002; Razak and Fuzessery, 2010, Razak, 2011, 2012). Therefore, for monaural stimulation, pallid bat cortical neurons are either EO or OO. With binaural stimulation, neurons were considered binaurally inhibited (EO/I) if the response declined to at least 50% of the maximal monaural CL ear response with increasingly negative ILD. The neuron was considered peaked (P or OO/FI) if the response to binaural stimulation was at least twice the response to monaural CL stimulation and the response subsequently decreased at least 25% of maximum with increasing IL intensity. A neuron was considered monaural (EO/O, ILD insensitive) if the ILD response was within 50% of maximum for IIDs between +20 to -20 dB. Because monaural IL response is rare, the 'EI' and 'EO' description is used in this paper to describe EO/I and EO/O responses in this study (Kitzes et al., 1980, Irvine et al., 1996). ILD sensitivity is stable across the range of intensities tested in the pallid bat auditory cortex (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002). Therefore, ILD selectivity was determined only for a single CL intensity in this study. This allowed additional time to characterize azimuth and sound level tuning from many of the same neurons.

2.3.3 Azimuth selectivity: After ILD selectivity was determined with dichotic stimulation, the speaker funnels were removed from the ears and stimulation was switched to the free-field speaker to determine azimuth selectivity. Speaker positions between -75° (negative indicates IL loci) and $+75^{\circ}$ (positive indicates CL loci) in 15° steps were tested. Locations behind the animal were not studied. Azimuth selectivity for FM sweeps was determined at an intensity of 10 dB above MT in all neurons. In the majority of neurons, azimuth selectivity was also determined at one or more additional levels between 15 and 30 dB above MT to characterize the stability of

azimuth selectivity across sound level in FMSR neurons. The range of sound levels tested is low to moderate because many of the neurons recorded were non-monotonic for sound levels and behaviorally, the pallid bat uses low amplitude echolocation calls resulting in a narrow range of behaviorally relevant echo levels (Griffin 1958).

2.3.4 Rate-level responses: In a subset of neurons, the rate-level function was also obtained with the free-field speaker at 0° azimuth/elevation. The response of the neuron to the FM sweep presented between 0-70 dB SPL (5 or 10 dB resolution) was recorded. Rate-level functions were categorized as ‘non-monotonic’ if the response declined by at least 30% relative to the peak response with increasing level. If the response was within 30% of peak response at the highest level tested, the neuron was categorized as ‘monotonic’.

3. Results

A previous study of the pallid bat FMSR reported on the effect of sound levels on 2D spatial receptive fields (Razak et al., 2015). However, the ILD selectivity or the rate-level responses of these neurons were not known to determine mechanisms of spatial selectivity. The current study reports novel data from FMSR in which ILD, azimuth selectivity and rate-level functions were recorded from the same neurons to determine the mechanisms of azimuth tuning. Comparison of these results with published data from the NSR collected using identical methods (Razak 2011, 2012) will identify the azimuth tuning mechanisms used by different cortical fields involved in two different behaviors.

3.1 ILD and azimuth selectivity of FMSR neurons

Both ILD and azimuth selectivity data were obtained from 51 FMSR neurons. Two main types of ILD selectivity functions were recorded in the FMSR (Figure 1A,C). In

neurons classified as binaurally inhibited (EI), responses decreased below 50% of maximum as the sound level in the IL ear was increased (e.g., Figure 1A). In neurons classified as monaural (EO or ILD insensitive), response was within 50% of maximum response at all ILDs tested (e.g., Figure 1C). One major finding of this study was that the vast majority of neurons in the FMSR were monaural (Figure 2). FMSR neurons typically have CFs > 35 kHz (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002, 2006, 2008). In this frequency range, ~75% of neurons were monaural and only ~25% of neurons were EI. The preponderance of EO compared to EI neurons in the FMSR was seen across different CF ranges. All 51 neurons responded to monaural CL ear stimuli, but only two neurons responded to both monaural CL and IL ear stimuli. Therefore, neurons classified as 'EE' were very rare in the FMSR. The cortical locations of neurons with different binaural/azimuth selectivity was not systematically mapped here, but it did not appear that EI neurons were more likely to be found in any restricted part of the FMSR. The dominant trend was simply that most FMSR neurons were EO.

A previous study showed that spatial selectivity in the FMSR was strongly level dependent. However, the binaural or rate-selectivity of these neurons were not known and it was not clear if specific classes of FMSR neurons displayed different level dependences. To address the mechanisms of level dependence in FMSR neurons, azimuth selectivity was recorded at two or more sound levels from the 47/51 FMSR neurons with identified ILD responses. Figure 1B, D serves to illustrate the differences in level tolerance of EI and EO FMSR neurons. The ARF of the EI neuron was relatively similar at the two sound levels tested (Figure 1B). The ARF of the EO neuron (Figure 1D) expanded considerably with an increase of 5 dB in stimulus level. Although only a 5 dB range of levels was tested in these two neurons, the contrast between these neurons serves to illustrate a major finding of this study. In general testing ARFs over a range of levels between 10-30 dB above threshold indicate that EO FMSR

neurons are relatively narrowly tuned, with single peaked ARF, only near threshold. With increasing levels, the ARFs broadened (e.g., Figure 3A-C) and/or began to show multiple peaks (e.g., Figure 3D-F). Even a 10 dB increase in sound level rendered sharply tuned FMSR neurons non-selective for azimuth (e.g., Figure 3B). Notably, in neurons that exhibited multiple peaks, the troughs at higher intensities appear near azimuth locations that produced peak responses at lower intensities.

Two measures of azimuth selectivity were used to quantify degree of level tolerance – 50% azimuth and 50% bandwidth (BW). The 50% azimuth is the azimuth location at which response declines to 50% of maximum response as the sound is moved to increasingly IL locations. For example, the neuron shown in Figure 1B has a 50% azimuth of 3° and 8° at the two levels tested (MT+10 and MT+15 dB), respectively. The 50% azimuth instability index (50% AII) quantifies the change in 50% azimuth per dB change in intensity. The 50% AII for the neuron in Figure 1B for example is 1 deg/dB $((8-3)/5)$. For the neuron shown in Figure 1D, the 50% AII is 1.6 deg/dB $((-44+52)/5)$.

The 50% BW is the range of azimuth locations that produce 50% of maximum response. For example, the neuron shown in Figure 1D exhibited 50% bandwidth of 83° (inner two arrows) and 124° (outer two arrows) at 10 and 15 dB above threshold, respectively. The 50% bandwidth instability index (50% BWII) is the degree change in 50% bandwidth per dB increase in sound intensity. The 50% BWII for the neuron shown in Figure 1D is 8.2 deg/dB $((124-83)/5)$.

The mean ($\pm$ s.e.) 50% AII in EOFMSR neurons was 2.32 ± 0.33 deg/dB. In EI FMSR neurons, the 50% AII was 0.83 ± 0.26 deg/dB. A one-way ANOVA (Tukey post-hoc pairwise comparison) was used to compare the 50% AII values of EI and EO FMSR neurons along with

previously published 50% AII value for NSR neurons (0.69 ± 0.07 deg/dB, Razak 2011, 2012). This analysis shows that the mean 50% AII was significantly different between the groups ($p < 0.001$), with pairwise comparisons indicating that the EO FMSR neurons had a significantly higher mean 50% AII than both of the other two groups ($p < 0.05$). There was no difference in 50% AII between NSR and EI FMSR neurons ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that the level tolerance of the 50% azimuth of EI FMSR neurons was similar to those observed in the NSR. Thus, monaural FMSR neurons displayed greater level dependence than binaurally inhibited FMSR neurons.

In FMSR neurons in which the azimuth selectivity functions showed $>50\%$ decline in response on both sides of a peak, it was possible to calculate the 50% BW at the various sound levels tested (e.g., Figure 1D). The mean ($\pm$ s.e.) 50% BW of EO FMSR neurons was 4.4 ± 0.54 deg/dB, which was significantly higher (t-test, $p < 0.0001$) than that found in the NSR (1.7 ± 0.32 deg/dB, Razak 2011, 2012). This indicates that the change (typically expansion) in azimuth selectivity per dB change in SPL is ~ 2.6 times greater in the FMSR than in the NSR. Taken together, it is concluded that the vast majority of FMSR neurons are ILD insensitive and have level dependent azimuth selectivity. The relative ILD insensitivity in the FMSR is in stark contrast to the strong ILD selectivity observed in the NSR of the pallid bat auditory cortex in which $>75\%$ of the neurons show either EI or P type selectivity (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002, Razak 2011, 2012).

3.2 Rate-level functions and azimuth selectivity

As shown in Figure 3D-F, azimuth selectivity became multi-peaked with increasing sound level in some FMSR neurons. The appearance of a trough at azimuth locations that produced peak response at lower sound levels suggested that the sound level sensitivity of

neurons shapes azimuth selectivity. To test this hypothesis, both rate-level functions and azimuth selectivity were recorded from 39 FMSR neurons. Rate-level functions were measured with FM sweeps as stimuli presented from a speaker at 0° in relation to the bat's snout.

Nineteen neurons were classified as non-monotonic and 20 were classified as monotonic. Figure 4 shows two examples of non-monotonic FMSR neurons (Figure 4A, D). These neurons were strongly tuned for sound level, with responses declining from maximum to zero within a 20 dB intensity change. Both neurons were typical of the vast majority of FMSR neurons in that they were monaural (Figure 4B, E). The ARFs of these neurons showed multiple peaks with increasing sound level (Figure 4C, F). The trough in the responses of both neurons around 0° occurs as the sound level increases into the non-monotonic realm of their respective rate-level sensitivity functions. An extension of this hypothesis is that neurons with monotonic rate-level sensitivity should simply show expanding azimuth functions (single peak expansion) with increasing sound level. Figure 5 shows two examples of monotonic FMSR neurons (Figure 5A, D). These neurons were monaural as well (Figure 5B, E). ARFs of these neurons expanded with increasing sound level without fragmenting into multiple peaks.

Across the population of 39 neurons, a strong relationship was observed between rate-level and azimuth functions. A criterion of 30% trough magnitude (response between peaks declines by at least 30% of both peaks) was used to classify a neuron's azimuth selectivity as multi-peaked. 16 out of 19 (84.2%) neurons classified as non-monotonic were also multi-peaked at the higher sound levels. 17/20 (85%) of neurons classified as monotonic showed expanding azimuth functions with a single peak. These distributions are significantly different ($\chi^2=18.68$, $df=1$, $p<0.0001$). It must be noted that there was a much higher percentage of neurons with non-monotonic rate-level responses in the pallid bat auditory cortex than reflected by the distribution presented above (Measor and Razak, in preparation). Neurons with monotonic

rate-level functions were specifically targeted here to test the proposed mechanism. Rate-level functions were measured by presenting the FM sweep stimuli at 0° azimuth. This will stimulate both ears. Therefore, this measure cannot be accurately termed as ‘monaural rate-level function’. However, because only two of the neurons recorded responded to monaural IL ear input and because most neurons are ILD insensitive, it can be concluded that the rate-level sensitivity of FMSR neurons is driven primarily by the input at the CL ear.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of the peak azimuth values of FMSR neurons recorded near threshold (MT+10 dB). These are the sound levels at which the azimuth selectivity is narrow. The vast majority of neurons have best azimuth of <30°. This is appropriate for echolocation behavior because most relevant echoes are likely to arrive along the flight path centered near the azimuth (and elevation) midline. The pinna directionality shifts between ~30° and midline as frequency of the sound increased from 30 to 70 kHz (Fuzessery, 1996). The distribution of best azimuth near threshold overlaps with the azimuth locations for which the pinna is most sensitive adding support to the suggestion that monaural ear directionality shapes azimuth selectivity in the FMSR. Taken together these data suggest that level selectivity driven by monaural CL ear input, but not ILD selectivity, shapes azimuth selectivity of FMSR neurons.

3. Discussion

This study used a sequential dichotic/free-field stimulation paradigm to record frequency, ILD, and azimuth tuning and rate-level responses from the same neurons in the FMSR, a region putatively involved in echolocation behavior of the pallid bat. The main finding of this study is that the vast majority of FMSR neurons are monaural (EO) with azimuth tuning that expands with sound level in two different ways depending on rate-level responses.

In neurons with monotonic rate-level functions, azimuth tuning expands about a single peak. In some cases, even a 10 dB increase in sound level causes a narrowly tuned neuron to respond to all locations tested. In neurons with non-monotonic rate-level functions azimuth tuning expands and fragments into multiple peaks. Approximately 25% of FMSR neurons are binaurally inhibited (EI). These neurons exhibit relatively more level tolerant azimuth tuning. Taken together with previous studies of the noise selective region (NSR), a region putatively involved in prey localization, these data indicate two parallel pathways in the pallid bat auditory system that utilize monaural and binaural systems for two different behaviors.

The data from this study provide novel insight into how various types of azimuth tuning, including multi-peaked neuron, are shaped. Multi-peaked spatial tuning has been reported in auditory cortex of many species (cat: Rajan et al., 1990a,b; Clarey et al., 1994; Stecker et al., 2005b, ferret: Mrsic-Flogel et al., 2005; macaque monkey: Woods et al., 2006). By studying binaural, rate-level responses and azimuth selectivity of the same neurons, it can be seen that monaural (EO) FMSR neurons with monotonic rate-level functions show a single peaked azimuth receptive field that expands with sound level. Azimuth tuning of monaural FMSR neurons with non-monotonic rate-level functions also show expansion with sound level, but typically with fragmentation into multiple peaks. The pallid bat FMSR data show that a combination of ILD insensitivity and non-monotonic rate-level response will give rise to multi-peaked ARFs. Similar responses will arise for combinations of non-monotonic rate-level function and binaural types such as EE/O, EE/F and EO/F neurons found more commonly in other species' cortex. Thus, the nature of overlap between the binaural representation and monaural rate-level responses will determine if single or multi-peaked ARFs are present at any sound level tested (Nakamoto et al., 2004; Semple and Kitzes, 1983).

3.1 Mechanisms of azimuth tuning in FMSR versus NSR

FMSR neurons respond to CL ear input with minor or no influence from the IL ear either monaurally or binaurally. The ARF of these neurons is strongly dependent on the sound level. As has been previously suggested in IC (Semple et al., 1983) and cortical (Middlebrooks and Pettigrew 1981, Mrsic-Flogel et al., 2005; Reale et al., 2003) neurons, the level dependent expansion of ARF is likely a reflection of the monaural ear directionality of the pallid bat for frequencies >30 kHz. Spatially confined responses are seen along the acoustic axis at low levels. The sensitive area expands with increasing level. In the absence of any inhibition driven by the IL ear, the ARF expands with increasing sound level. Whether the ARF simple expands or becomes multi-peaked depends on the rate-level responses of the neuron. Taken together, these data suggest that ear directionality and CL ear driven rate-level response shape azimuth responses in most neurons in the cortical region selective for FM sweeps used in echolocation. Current studies are testing this hypothesis by recording from FMSR neurons before and during pinna/tragus manipulation. Approximately 25% of FMSR neurons that exhibit binaural selectivity (EI) are relatively more level-tolerant and may provide more stable information relevant to sound locations.

Azimuth is represented quite differently in the NSR. Previous studies of the pallid bat auditory cortex have shown that the majority (70-80%) of NSR neurons (CF<35 kHz) are ILD selective (Razak and Fuzessery, 2002; 2010; Razak, 2011, 2012). Two binaural clusters distinguished by ILD selectivity dominate the NSR. The rostral part of the NSR contains neurons classified as peaked (OO/FI or EO/FI or predominantly binaural) because they respond poorly or not at all to monaural stimuli to either ear, but respond best to binaural stimuli with ILD ~0 dB. Predictably, these neurons respond best to azimuth angles ~0° and this cluster may serve as an acoustic fovea that enhances localization acuity near the midline (Dingle et al., 2010). The caudal part of the NSR contains EI neurons. Less than 10% of the neurons in the

425 NSR are monaural. The azimuth selectivity of both peaked and EI neurons can be predicted by
426 their ILD sensitivity (Razak 2012). 2D spatial representation in the NSR depends on
427 overlapping ILD and frequency maps (Razak et al., 2015). Thus the NSR depends on ILD
428 selectivity while the FMSR may depend on monaural ear directionality and rate-level response
429 to shape azimuth selectivity.

430 Together, these data suggest that the monaural and binaural systems in the pallid bat are
431 used for two different behaviors, echolocation and passive prey-localization, respectively.
432 Figure 7 provides a summary schematic of major trends in the overlapping representation of
433 frequency, binaural properties and response selectivity. CFs increase in a caudolateral to
434 rostromedial direction. The FMSR, tuned between 30-70 kHz and selective for the downward
435 FM sweep direction and rates present in natural echolocation call, overlaps with monaural
436 selectivity. The NSR, tuned between 5-40 kHz and selective for noise bursts, overlaps with
437 two major classes of binaural selectivity (peaked and EI). Approximately 10-20% of FMSR
438 and NSR neurons show reversal of this major trend, but is not indicated in the schematic
439 because no predictable arrangement of EI and EO neurons are seen in the FMSR and NSR,
440 respectively.

441 In the cat inferior colliculus central nucleus (ICc), combined electrophysiology and
442 retrograde labeling identified relatively distinct regions of monaural and binaural inputs (Loftus
443 et al., 2010). The binaural inputs sculpted in the superior olivary complex and the monaural
444 inputs from the cochlear nucleus and ventral nucleus of lateral lemniscus provide input to
445 segregated functional zones of the ICc. Segregation of anatomical inputs from monaural and
446 binaural brainstem nuclei into the IC is also seen in gerbils (Cant and Benson, 2006). In the rat
447 auditory thalamus, differences in level tolerant azimuth selectivity in parallel streams may
448 correspond to these segregated inputs (Yao et al., 2015). The pallid bat auditory system may

have utilized this, presumably common mammalian, arrangement to create response selectivity in the IC (Fuzessery 1994) for sounds used in the two different behaviors in the segregated input-based functional zones. Future studies that determine ILD selectivity of IC neurons in relation to location in the IC and response selectivity, combined with retrograde tracer injections, will be necessary to test this hypothesis. The differential distribution of binaural selectivity in the cortical FMSR and NSR may be inherited from the IC along mostly parallel midbrain-thalamus-cortex pathways (Razak et al., 2007) that maintain the binaural/monaural functional segregation.

3.2 Functional significance of monaural FMSR neurons

Cortical binaural selectivity has been categorized across a number of species. The virtual absence of ‘EE’ type neurons and the preponderance of monaural cells in the pallid bat cortex (FMSR) appear to be a major difference with other species (cat: Imig and Adrian 1977, Middlebrooks et al., 1980, Reale and Kettner, 1986, Semple and Kitzes, 1983; ferret: Kelly and Judge, 1984; guinea pig: Rutkowski et al. 2000; rat: Kelly and Sally, 1988; big brown bat: Shen et al. 1997). This raises the question about why the FMSR is dominated by monaural cells with level dependent azimuth selectivity. These properties suggest that the FMSR, unlike the NSR, will provide poor location information. FMSR neurons are selective for space only for low sound levels. This is paradoxical given that the pallid bat depends on echolocation to localize and avoid obstacles along the flight path. For a large obstacle, or when the bat is close to an obstacle, returning echoes will be relatively loud. Because azimuth selectivity is broad and level dependent, a question arises as to how the bat accurately localizes and avoids the obstacle. It is possible that the EO neurons are involved primarily in detection of echoes, while the more level tolerant EI neurons play a role in localization. Alternately, timing codes (Furukawa and Middlebrooks, 2002) and/or population level representation (Zhou and Yang,

2012; Miller and Recanzone, 2009) may provide more level-tolerant spatial information even though individual cells' response rates do not. Another possibility is that the pallid bat may engage in low amplitude echolocation behavior and use the narrow azimuth receptive fields of EO neurons for sound localization. The pallid bat, being a gleaner that depends on passive hearing for prey localization (Bell 1982), does not produce loud echolocation calls. Such a foraging strategy may have evolved in response to the ability of prey species to detect the loud echolocation calls of bats and produce defense behaviors (Holderied et al., 2011, Kawahara and Barber, 2015, Roeder, 1966). The pallid bat also performs 'intensity compensation' whereby the level of the outgoing call is reduced if the returning echoes were loud (Barber, personal communication). At low sound levels, the spatial tuning of high frequency neurons monaural neurons functioning near their thresholds is narrow. The spatial resolution afforded by small receptive fields at low sound levels may facilitate localization. For louder sounds, the same neurons have broader azimuth receptive fields, allowing the FMSR to respond to loud sounds from a broader region of space, thus aiding detection of nearby or large obstacles. Thus, the monaural FMSR system may be an adaptation for the bat to perform both detection and localization by actively controlling the sound level of the outgoing pulse.

3.3 Methodological issues

The functional organization of the pallid bat auditory cortex described above must be considered within the context of three methodological issues. First, the conclusion that most FMSR neurons are monaural is based on measuring ILDs with a single CL ear sound level with ILDs varied over ± 20 dB SPL. Additional CL ear sound levels were not tested because Razak and Fuzessery (2002) showed that the majority of FMSR neurons are monaural when tested at multiple CL ear sound levels. This was true even for a broader range of ILDs tested (± 30 dB SPL). Limited time allocated to testing ILDs allowed other response properties to be recorded

from the same neurons here. However, it remains possible that some neurons in the current study may show different ILD responses at different sound levels. The conclusion that FMSR neuron azimuth selectivity is strongly level dependent is based on recordings obtained over a range of 30 dB above MT. This is a relatively narrow range, but the strong level dependence even within this range is supportive of the main conclusion that FMSR azimuth responses are level dependent. Moreover, the comparison with the NSR is also over similar range of levels and the contrast between the two regions in terms of level dependence is stark. Finally, recordings were obtained under sodium pentobarbital anesthesia. It might be possible that level tolerance may be higher in FMSR recordings from un-anesthetized animals (Mickey and Middlebrooks, 2003). It is unlikely that the effects of the anesthetic is different between the NSR and FMSR and therefore does not dilute the conclusion that these two regions use different mechanisms to represent space.

4. Conclusions

The cortical regions putatively involved in prey localization and echolocation utilize different mechanisms of spatial representation with the NSR depending on overlapping binaural and frequency selectivity (Razak 2011, 2012; Razak et al., 2015) and the FMSR depending on monaural ear directionality and rate-level response (this study). Parallel pathways and multiple cortical fields with differential response selectivity are common in sensory systems. In the auditory cortex, different regions can be distinguished based on spatial selectivity. For example in the macaque, caudal belt areas have sharper spatial tuning compared to more rostral areas (Tian et al., 2001; Woods et al., 2006). Likewise in the cat, the posterior auditory field neurons are more spatially sensitive and level tolerant than those in anterior auditory field and primary auditory cortex (Stecker et al., 2003; Harrington et al., 2008). Studies of NSR and FMSR of the pallid bat auditory cortex collectively explain how

521 different cortical regions combine ear directionality, binaural selectivity, rate-level functions
522 and frequency tuning to compute spatial information across multiple sound levels.

523

524

525

526

527

528

529 **References**

530 Barber JR, Razak KA, Fuzessery ZM (2003) Can two streams of auditory information be
531 processed simultaneously? Evidence from the gleaning bat *Antrozous pallidus*. J Comp Physiol
532 A 189:843-855.

533 Bell GP (1982) Behavioral and ecological aspects of gleaning by the desert insectivorous bat,
534 *Antrozous pallidus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *BehavEcolSociobiol* 10: 217-223.

535 Cant NB, Benson CG (2006) Organization of the inferior colliculus of the gerbil
536 (*Merionesunguiculatus*): differences in distribution of projections from the cochlear nuclei and
537 the superior olivary complex. J Comp Neurol. 495:511-528.

538 Clarey JC, Barone P, Imig TJ (1994) Functional organization of sound direction and sound
539 pressure level in primary auditory cortex of the cat. J Neurophysiol. 72:2383-405.

540 Dingle RN, Hall SE, Phillips DP (2010) A midline azimuthal channel in human spatial
541 hearing. *Hear Res.* 268:67-74.

542 Furukawa S, Middlebrooks JC (2002) Cortical representation of auditory space: information-
543 bearing features of spike patterns. *J Neurophysiol.* 87:1749-1762.

544 Fuzessery ZM, Wenstrup JJ, Pollak GD (1990) Determinants of horizontal sound location
545 selectivity of binaurally excited neurons in an isofrequency region of the mustache bat inferior
546 colliculus. *J Neurophysiol.* 63:1128-1147.

547 Fuzessery ZM (1994) Response selectivity for multiple dimensions of frequency sweeps in the
548 pallid bat inferior colliculus. *J Neurophysiol.* 72:1061-1079.

549 Fuzessery ZM (1996) Monaural and binaural spectral cues created by the external ears of the
550 pallid bat. *Hear Res.* 95:1-17.

551 Griffin DR (1958). *Listening in the dark.* Yale University Press.

552 Harrington IA, Stecker GC, Macpherson EA, Middlebrooks JC (2008) Spatial sensitivity of
553 neurons in the anterior, posterior, and primary fields of cat auditory cortex. *Hear Res.* 240:22-
554 41.

555 Holderied M, Korine C, Moritz T (2011) Hemprich's long-eared bat (*Otonycteris hemprichii*) as
556 a predator of scorpions: whispering echolocation, passive gleaning and prey selection. *J Comp*
557 *Physiol A* 197:425-433.

558 Imig TJ, Adrian HO (1977) Binaural columns in the primary field (A1) of cat auditory cortex.
559 *Brain Res.* 138:241-257.

560 Irvine DRF, Rajan R, Aitkin, LM (1996) Sensitivity to interaural intensity differences of
561 neurons in primary auditory cortex of cat. I. Types of sensitivity and effects of variations in
562 sound pressure level. J Neurophysiol 75:75-96.

563 Kawahara AY, Barber JR (2015) Tempo and mode of antibat ultrasound production and sonar
564 jamming in the diverse hawkmoth radiation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 112:6407-6412.

565 Kelly JB, Sally SL (1988) Organization of auditory cortex in the albino rat: binaural response
566 properties. J Neurophysiol. 59(6):1756-1769.

567 Kelly JB, Judge PW (1994) Binaural organization of primary auditory cortex in the ferret
568 (*Mustelaputorius*). J Neurophysiol. 71:904-913.

569 Kitzes LM, Wrege KS, Cassady JM. (1980) Patterns of responses of cortical cells to binaural
570 stimulation. J Comp Neurol. 192:455-472.

571 Loftus WC, Bishop DC, Oliver DL (2010) Differential patterns of inputs create functional
572 zones in central nucleus of inferior colliculus. J Neurosci. 30:13396-13408.

573 Malhotra S, Hall AJ and Lomber SG (2004) Cortical control of sound localization in the cat:
574 unilateral cooling deactivation of 19 cerebral areas. *J. Neurophysiol.* 92:1625-1643.
575

576 Martin del Campo H, Measor K, Razak KA (2014) Parvalbumin and calbindin expression in
577 parallel thalamocortical pathways in a gleaning bat, *Antrozous pallidus*. J Comp Neurol.
578 522:2431–2445.
579

580 Mickey BJ, Middlebrooks JC (2003) Representation of auditory space by cortical neurons in
581 awake cats. J Neurosci. 23:8649-8663.

582 Middlebrooks JC, Dykes RW, Merzenich MM (1980) Binaural response-specific bands in
583 primary auditory cortex (AI) of the cat: topographical organization orthogonal to isofrequency
584 contours. *Brain Res.* 181:31-48.

585 Middlebrooks JC and Pettigrew JD (1981) Functional classes of neurons in primary auditory
586 cortex of the cat distinguished by sensitivity to sound location. *J. Neurosci.* 1:107-120.

587 Miller LM, Recanzone GH (2009) Populations of auditory cortical neurons can accurately
588 encode acoustic space across stimulus intensity. *ProcNatlAcadSci* 106:5931-5.

589 Mrsic-Flogel TD, King AJ, Schnupp JW (2005) Encoding of virtual acoustic space stimuli by
590 neurons in ferret primary auditory cortex. *J Neurophysiol.* 93:3489-3503.

591 Nakamoto KT, Zhang J, Kitzes LM (2004) Response patterns along an isofrequency contour in
592 cat primary auditory cortex (AI) to stimuli varying in average and interaural levels.*J*
593 *Neurophysiol.* 91:118-135.

594 Rajan R, Aitkin LM, Irvine DR (1990a) Azimuthal sensitivity of neurons in primary auditory
595 cortex of cats. II. Organization along frequency-band strips. *J. Neurophysiol.* 64:888-902.

596 Rajan R, Aitkin LM, Irvine DR, McKay J (1990b) Azimuthal sensitivity of neurons in primary
597 auditory cortex of cats. I. Types of sensitivity and the effects of variations in stimulus
598 parameters. *J Neurophysiol.* 64:872-887.

599 Razak KA, Fuzessery ZM (2002) Functional organization of the pallid bat auditory cortex:
600 Emphasis on binaural organization. *J Neurophysiol* 87: 72-86.

601 Razak KA, Fuzessery ZM (2006) Neural mechanisms underlying selectivity for the rate and
602 direction of frequency-modulated sweeps in the auditory cortex of the pallid bat. *J*
603 *Neurophysiol.* 96:1303-1319.

604 Razak KA, Shen W, Zumsteg T, Fuzessery ZM (2007) Parallel thalamocortical pathways for
605 echolocation and passive sound localization in a gleaning bat, *Antrozous pallidus*. *J Comp*
606 *Neurol* 500:322-338.

607 Razak KA and Fuzessery ZM (2008) Facilitatory mechanisms underlying selectivity for
608 frequency modulated sweeps in the auditory cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 28:9806-9816.

609 Razak KA, Fuzessery ZM (2010) GABA shapes a systematic map of binaural sensitivity in the
610 auditory cortex. *J Neurophysiol.* 104:517-528.

611 Razak KA (2011) Systematic representation of sound locations in the primary auditory cortex. *J*
612 *Neurosci.* 31:13848-13855.

613 Razak KA (2012) Mechanisms underlying azimuth selectivity in the auditory cortex of the
614 pallid bat. *Hear Res.* 290:1-12.

615 Razak KA, Yarrow S, Brewton D (2015) Mechanisms of sound localization in two functionally
616 distinct regions of the auditory cortex. *J Neurosci.* 35:16105-16115.

617 Reale RA, Kettner RE (1986) Topography of binaural organization in primary auditory cortex
618 of the cat: effects of changing interaural intensity. *J Neurophysiol* 56: 663–682, 1986.

619 Reale RA, Jenison RL, Brugge JF (2003) Directional sensitivity of neurons in the primary
 620 auditory (AI) cortex: effects of sound-source intensity level. *J Neurophysiol.* 89:1024-1038.

621 Roeder KD (1966) Auditory system of noctuid moths. *Science.* 154:1515-1521.

622 Rutkowski RG, Wallace MN, Shackleton TM, Palmer AR. Organization of binaural
 623 interactions in the primary and dorsocaudal fields of the guinea pig auditory cortex. *Hear Res*
 624 145: 177–189, 2000.

625 Semple MN, Aitkin LM, Calford MB, Pettigrew JD, Phillips DP (1983) Spatial receptive fields
 626 in the cat inferior colliculus. *Hear Res.* 10:203-215.

627 Semple MN, Kitzes LM (1993) Binaural processing of sound pressure level in cat primary
 628 auditory cortex: evidence for a representation based on absolute levels rather than interaural
 629 level differences. *J Neurophysiol.* 69:449-461.

630 Shen JX, Chen QC, Jen PH-S (1997) Binaural and frequency representation in the primary
 631 auditory cortex of the big brown bat *Eptesicus fuscus*. *J Comp Physiol [A]* 181: 591–597.

632 Stecker GC, Harrington IA, Macpherson EA, Middlebrooks JC (2005) Spatial sensitivity in the
 633 dorsal zone (area DZ) of cat auditory cortex. *J Neurophysiol.* 94:1267-1280.

634 Wenstrup JJ, Fuzessery ZM, Pollak GD (1988) Binaural neurons in the mustache bat's inferior
 635 colliculus. II. Determinants of spatial responses among 60-kHz EI units. *J Neurophysiol.*
 636 60:1384-1404.

637 Woods TM, Lopez SE, Long JH, Rahman JE, Recanzone GH (2006) Effects of stimulus
 638 azimuth and intensity on the single-neuron activity in the auditory cortex of the alert macaque
 639 monkey. *J Neurophysiol.* 96:3323-3337.

640 Yao JD, Bremen P, Middlebrooks JC (2015) Transformation of spatial sensitivity along the
641 ascending auditory pathway. J Neurophysiol. 113:3098-3111.

642 Zhou Y, Wang X (2012). Level dependence of spatial processing in the primate auditory
643 cortex. J Neurophysiol. 108:810-826.

644

Figure legends

Figure 1: Examples of IID and azimuth selectivity of FMSR neurons. (A) A neuron classified as binaurally inhibited (EI) based on its ILD response to a 60-30 kHz downward FM sweep (FM60-30). This neuron responded to monaural CL ear stimulation, but not to IL ear stimulation. ILD selectivity was recorded by presenting a constant intensity in the contralateral (CL) ear and by varying the ipsilateral (IL) ear intensity from 20 dB below to 20 dB above the CL ear intensity. Positive ILDs indicate sounds louder in the CL ear while negative ILDs indicate sounds that favor the IL ear. When tested binaurally, the response of this neuron decline below 50% of maximum response with increasing IL ear level. In this and other relevant graphs, the 'number of spikes' is the total spike count in response to 20 stimulus repetitions. (B) The azimuth selectivity of the same neuron shown in (A) recorded at two different sound levels with FM60-30 as stimulus. The dashed line indicates 50% of maximum response. The vertical arrows point to the 50% azimuth (azimuth at which response declines below 50% of maximum response). The ARFs show relatively little change at the two sound levels tested. (C) A neuron classified as EO (monaural or ILD insensitive) because its ILD response (to a 50-30 kHz downward FM sweep) was within 50% of maximum response. (D) The ARF of the same neuron as in (C) serves to illustrate the main contrast between EI and EO FMSR neurons. The ARF of this neuron in response to the FM50-30 stimulus expanded significantly even with a 5 dB SPL increase in sound level. The two left-most arrows measure the 50% azimuth at the two sound levels. The two inner arrows measure the 50% bandwidth (BW, range of azimuths producing >50% of maximum response) at the lower sound level. The two outer arrows measure the 50% BW for the louder sound. Both 50% azimuth and 50% BW of this monaural FMSR neuron are sound level dependent.

668 **Figure 2:** Distribution of ILD tuning types within the FMSR (n=51 neurons). The vast
669 majority of FMSR neurons were ILD insensitive (monaural or EO). P-peaked (predominantly
670 binaural or OO/FI); EI (binaurally inhibited); OTHER-neurons with ILD functions that were
671 not classifiable according to the criteria used.

672 **Figure 3: Sound level dependence of FMSR neuron azimuth selectivity.** (A-C) Azimuth
673 selectivity expanded with increasing stimulus level in these three example FMSR neurons. MT:
674 minimum threshold. Positive azimuth angles refer to contralateral azimuth and negative values
675 refer to ipsilateral azimuth. (D-F) Three example FMSR neurons in which azimuth selectivity
676 functions expanded with multiple peaks even with a 10 dB increase in stimulus level.

677 **Figure 4: Neurons with non-monotonic rate-level responses show multi-peaked azimuth**
678 **receptive fields with increasing level.** The left column shows rate-level responses (A), ILD
679 selectivity (B) and azimuth selectivity (C) of an example FMSR neuron. The right column (D-
680 F) shows the same properties for a second example neuron. Both neurons showed non-
681 monotonic rate-level responses and were ILD insensitive (EO neurons). The ILD selectivity was
682 recorded with CL ear intensity at 35 dB SPL for both neurons (note thresholds are different for
683 responses obtained with speaker in ear canal *versus* speaker in free-field). The azimuth
684 selectivity of both neurons was strongly sound level dependent such that the azimuth selectivity
685 expanded and showed multiple peaks with increasing level.

686 **Figure 5: Neurons with monotonic rate-level responses show single peak expansion of**
687 **azimuth selectivity with sound level.** The left column shows rate-level function (A), ILD
688 selectivity (B) and azimuth selectivity (C) of an example FMSR neuron. The right column (D-
689 F) shows the same properties for a second example neuron. Both neurons showed monotonic
690 rate-level responses and were ILD insensitive (EO neurons). The ILD functions were recorded

691 with CL ear level at 55 dB SPL and 60 dB SPL for the neurons shown in B and E, respectively.
692 The azimuth selectivity of both neurons was level dependent such that the azimuth selectivity
693 expanded with sound level, but without fragmenting into multiple peaks.

694 **Figure 6: Overlap of neural and pinna sensitivity in the echolocation frequency range.**

695 Distribution of peak azimuth values recorded at MT+10 dB in the FMSR of the pallid bat
696 cortex. The shaded box represents the azimuth at which the bat's pinna is most sensitive in the
697 30-70 kHz range used in echolocation (adapted from Fuzessery, 1996).

698 **Figure 7: Schematic of overlapping tonotopic, binaural and response selectivity maps in**

699 **the pallid bat auditory cortex.** The major trend in terms of functional organization in the
700 pallid bat cortex is the close association between monaural selectivity and FMSR on the one
701 hand and binaural selectivity and NSR on the other. This overlap causes distinct spatial tuning
702 properties in the two regions involved in two different behaviors. Approximately 10-20% of
703 neurons in NSR and FMSR reverse the trend (not shown in schematic). The numbers and
704 arrows point to CF representation and direction of tonotopy. NSR: noise selective region,
705 FMSR: FM sweep selective region, EO: monaural, EI: binaural inhibition.

706

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7