Title:

Automated intracellular pharmacological electrophysiology for ligand-gated ionotropic receptor and pharmacology screening.

Authors:

Riley E. Perszyk[1,2], Mighten C. Yip[1], Ona L. McConnell[3], Eric T. Wang[3], Andrew Jenkins[2,4,*],

Stephen F. Traynelis[2,*], Craig R.Forest[1,*],

Affiliations:

[1] George W Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332, United States of America

[2] Department of Pharmacology and Chemical Biology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA 30322, United States of America

[3] Department of Molecular Genetics & Microbiology, Center for Neurogenetics, Genetics Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32610, United States of America

[4] Department of Anesthesiology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322, United States of America

Corresponding Author

Submitted Manuscript: Confidential

Running Title: Automated intracellular pharmacological electrophysiology.

* Corresponding authors

Craig R.Forest, 315 Ferst Dr NW Rm. 1310, Atlanta, GA 30332, cforest@gatech.edu 404-385-7645;

Andrew Jenkins, Department of Pharmacology and Chemical Biology, 1510 Clifton Rd., Atlanta, GA 30322, ajenki2@emory.edu, (404) 727-3910;

Stephen F. Traynelis, Department of Pharmacology and Chemical Biology, 1510 Clifton Rd NE, Atlanta, GA, 30322, strayne@emory.edu, 404-727-0357.

Total number of pages: 39
Figures: 5
Tables: 4
Abstract: 250 Words
Significance Statement: 66 words
Introduction: 569 Words
Methods: 990 Words
Results: 2094 Words
Discussion: 904 words

Non Standard Abbreviations: BAPTA: 1,2-bis(o-aminophenoxy)ethane-N,N,N′,N′-tetraacetic acid, GABA: γ-aminobutyric acid, GABA$_A$R: GABA Type A Receptor, HEK: Human Embryonic Kidney, HEPES: 4-(2-hydroxyethyl)-1-piperazineethanesulfonic acid, NMDA: N-methyl-D-aspartate, NMDAR: NMDA receptor,

Abstract

Communication between neuronal cells, central to brain function, is performed by several classes of ligand-gated ionotropic receptors. The gold standard technique for measuring rapid receptor response to agonist is manual patch-clamp electrophysiology, capable of the highest temporal resolution of any current electrophysiology technique. We report an automated high-precision patch-clamp system which substantially improves the throughput of these time-consuming pharmacological experiments. The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ enables recording from cells expressing receptors of interest and manipulation of them to enable millisecond solution exchange to activate ligand-gated ionotropic receptors. The solution-handling control allows for autonomous pharmacological concentration-response experimentation on adherent cells, lifted cells, or excised outside-out patches. The system can perform typical ligand-gated ionotropic receptor experimentation protocols autonomously, possessing a high success rate in completing experiments, and up to a 10-fold reduction in research effort over the duration of the experiment. Using it, we could rapidly replicate previous datasets, reducing the time it took to produce an 8-point concentration response curve of the effect of propofol on GABA$_A$R deactivation from likely weeks of recording to ~13 hours of recording. On average, the rate of data collection of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was a data point every 2.1 minutes that the operator spent interacting with the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$. The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ provides the ability to conduct complex and comprehensive experimentation that yields datasets not normally within reach of conventional systems that rely on constant human control. This technical advance can contribute to accelerating the examination of the complex function of ion channels and the pharmacological agents that act on them.

Significance Statement

This work presents an automated intracellular pharmacological electrophysiology robot, patcherBot$_{Pharma}$, that substantially improves throughput and reduces human time requirement in pharmacological patch-clamp experiments. The robotic system includes millisecond fluid exchange handling and can perform highly efficient ligand-gated ionotropic receptor experiments. The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ is built using a conventional patch-clamp rig, and the technical advances shown in this work greatly accelerate the ability to conduct high-fidelity pharmacological electrophysiology.

Introduction

Patch-clamp electrophysiology is an incredibly important technique that has enabled many discoveries in pharmacology, physiology, and neuroscience (Neher and Sakmann 1976, Suk et al. 2019). Patch-clamp recording has the ability to accurately measure the time-course of postsynaptic or post-junctional currents and can fully resolve ion flux and the rapid transitions of individual ionotropic receptors (Neher and Sakmann 1976, Colquhoun and Sigworth 1995, Auerbach and Zhou 2005, Chakrapani et al. 2011). However, extensive effort and time are required to perform this high-resolution technique. Many alternative methods and machines have been developed that attempt to accelerate the collection of data that approximates what patch-clamp electrophysiology can achieve, such as activity-sensitive fluorometric probes and high-throughput machines that patch dissociated cells on planar patch-clamp "chips" (Ai 2015, Yu et al. 2016, Deo and Lavis 2018, Obergrussberger et al. 2018, Liu et al. 2019, Mollinedo-Gajate et al. 2019). However, these methods sacrifice the high precision of patch-clamp electrophysiology in order to achieve higher throughput. For instance, fluorometric probes must be tuned to a specific application, and fully resolving the kinetics or full activity of ionotropic receptors is typically not possible. Imaging experiments also cannot control for confounding voltage fluctuation associated with the measured response. Additionally, for high-throughput patch-clamp systems, performance is limited by their solution handling capabilities, and cost of both equipment and supplies are prohibitive for many studies. Most of these methods are also incapable of measuring cells that are adherent or embedded in tissue (Suter et al. 2010, Campagnola et al. 2014, Annecchino et al. 2017, Wu and Chubykin 2017, Obergrussberger et al. 2018).

Recently, our group has worked on equipping a traditional intracellular electrophysiology rig with the capability to operate autonomously (Kolb et al. 2016, Kolb et al. 2019). Robotic vision, pipette pressure control, and electrode cleaning enable the resulting "patcherBot" to execute the basic steps required to perform patch-clamp electrophysiology without human intervention. Utilizing these automated methods allow for the acceleration of electrophysiology experimentation by reducing the process times of many steps as well as drastically decreasing the amount of required operator-rig interfacing time. The patcherBot is capable of patching over 30 cells sequentially, can run unattended for over 4 hours, and operates at about a 70% success rate (reaching the whole-cell patch-clamp configuration per patching attempt) (Kolb et al. 2019). These advances enable the patcherBot to record spontaneous activity or voltage-dependent biological phenomena, and they can be multiplexed within a single preparation to record from multiple cells simultaneously. Thus, the patcherBot is highly proficient at addressing questions such as connectomics or intrinsic properties of neurons. Despite its many capabilities, this technology cannot perform many assays on ligand-gated ionotropic receptors or pharmacological studies.

Here, we present an implementation of the patcherBot that enables automated intracellular pharmacological electrophysiology (Fig. 1). The "patcherBot$_{Pharma}$" can perform pharmacological concentration-response experiments and can record ligand-gated ionotropic receptor response to fast agonist exposure (ms exchange time) with automated control of the microscope, bath solution, a solution manifold, and a piezoelectric translator. We observe a high-throughput rate of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ unattended, with further improvement using minimal operator assistance. We show the capabilities of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ by replicating a conventional dataset substantially faster — with considerably less human effort — than we had

done previously. The increased efficiency enabled by this patch-clamp electrophysiology system

creates the potential to address scientific questions that were previously considered impractical

because of large, time consuming requirements needed to complete data acquisition using

conventional approaches.

Methods

PatcherBot$_{Pharma}$ Hardware and Software

The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ is built on a standard inverted microscope (Axiovert 200, Ziess) to allow for clearance of the recording electrode and solution handling manifolds. Standard, three-axis micromanipulators were used to translate the recording electrode (PatchStar, Scientifica) and the microscope (Motorized XY Stage [UMS] with Z-focus module, Scientifica). A high sensitivity camera (Retiga Electro, QImaging) is used for computer vision. Electrode pressure was controlled using a custom control box that regulates house-air line to deliver -700 to +1000 mbar using an inline venturi tube (SMC), solenoid valve (Parker Hannifin), and a digital air regulator (ProportionAir) controlled by an Arduino Uno for rapid pressure switching (Kodandaramaiah et al. 2012, Kolb et al. 2016, Kolb et al. 2019). A three-barreled, square cross-section solution manifold (3SG700-5, Warner Instruments) attached to a piezoelectric translator (Burleigh Instruments) was used for cell perfusion similar to many that have been previously published (Glasgow and Johnson 2014, MacLean 2016). Barrels of the solution manifold were connected to 8-valve solution changers (Hamilton Modular Valve Positioner). Custom LabVIEW code (National Instruments) integrating manipulators (electrode and microscope), camera view of the microscope stage, pressure control box, piezoelectric translator, and solution valves was implemented to control the rig and enable automated experimentation (Fig. 1A). Communication between the computer and the amplifier, piezoelectric translator and solution changers was achieved using a DAQ (BNC-2110, National Instruments) with several analog and digital interfaces. The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ LabVIEW code can be found on GitHub (https://github.com/riley-perszyk/patcherBot_pharma) along with a manual detailing the components and the operation of the system.

Transiently Expressing HEK cells

HEK-293 cells (CRL 1573, ATCC; hereafter HEK cells) and a stable GABA$_A$R-expressing cell line were cultured in DMEM (Cat # 10566016, ThermoFisher Scientific) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 10 U/ml penicillin, and 10 µg/ml streptomycin and maintained at 5% CO_2 in a 37°C incubator. For use on the electrophysiology rig, heterologous cells were plated on poly-D-Lysine (PDL) coated glass coverslips (0.1-0.5 mg/mL, Warner Instruments). Recombinant NMDA receptors were transiently expressed from complementary DNA (cDNA) encoding rat GluN1-1a (hereafter GluN1, U08261), and GluN2A (D13211). Calcium phosphate was used to transfect HEK cells in a 24-well plate with 500 ng of DNA at a ratio of 1:1:5 (GluN1:GluN2A:GFP). Four hours after transfection, NMDAR antagonists D,L-2amino-5-phosphonovalerate (200 µM, DL-APV) and 7-chlorokynurenic acid (200 µM) were added to the culture medium to decrease the cytotoxic effect of NMDAR expression.

Stably Expressing HEK cells

cDNAs for mouse *Gabra1*, *Gabrb2*, and the long form of *Gabrg2* were subcloned into the pAC156 plasmid, a generous gift from Albert Cheng. The cDNAs were driven by an EF1alpha promoter. A PGK promoter-driven puromycin resistance cassette was also present in pAC156; both cassettes were flanked by piggybac transposon arms. All three plasmids were co-transfected with the mPB piggybac transposase into HEK 293 cells, selected by puromycin, and sorted into single cells. Clones were assayed for Gabra1, Gabrb2, and Gabrg2 expression by immunofluorescence, and one clone was expanded for further study and use in this manuscript.

9

Trypsin was used to dissociate the cells and plated on the same coverslips, as mentioned above, 24-72 hours before experimentation (shorter time and less PDL for lifted cell, and the inverse for excised patches).

Primary Neuronal Culture

Primary cortical neurons were cultured from the E17.5 rat embryos, of either sex, as previously described (Perszyk et al. 2020). Briefly, cortices were dissected from the embryos and trypsinized (0.25%, 37°C). After rinsing cortical particles with warm Hank's balanced salt solution (HBSS, containing 10 mM HEPES, 2 rinsed), the particles were homogenized in minimum essential media (MEM, Cellgro) containing 10% FBS (MEM/FBS). Cells were plated on coverslips coated with 0.5–1 mg/ml poly-L-lysine in MEM/FBS. Two hours after plating, media was removed and replaced with glia-conditioned Neurobasal medium (Life Technologies, incubated on secondary mouse glia for 24 hrs) with $1\times$ Glutamax (Life Technologies) and $1\times$ B-27 (Life Technologies). Neurons were cultured at 5% CO_2 and 37°C, and every 3–4 days, a 50% media replacement was performed. Neurons were used at DIV14-21. These procedures were approved by the Emory University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and they were performed in accordance with state and federal Animal Welfare Acts and the policies of the Public Health Service.

Whole-cell voltage-clamp recordings

Whole-cell voltage-clamp recordings were performed with thin-walled borosilicate glass electrodes (3-6 MΩ, TW150F-4, World Precision Instruments) filled with solution containing (in mM) 110 Cs-gluconate, 30 CsCl, 5 HEPES, 4 NaCl, 0.5 $CaCl_2$, 2 $MgCl_2$, 5 BAPTA, 2 NaATP,

0.3 NaGTP (pH 7.35). The extracellular recording solution contained (in mM) 150 NaCl, 10

HEPES, 3 KCl, 0.5 $CaCl_2$, 1 $MgCl_2$, and 0.01 EDTA (pH 7.4). Whole cell recording from

primary cortical neurons (examples showing alternative experiment paradigm in the

supplemental) were obtained utilizing an internal solution, containing (in mM) 115 K-gluconate,

20 KCl, 10 HEPES, 2 Mg_2ATP, 0.3 NaGTP, and10 Na_2Phosphocreatine (pH 7.35), and external

solution stated above but with 1mM $CaCl_2$. The electrode cleaning solution (2% Tergazyme in

water) was made fresh daily. Cleaned electrodes were washed in appropriate internal solution.

All solutions were filtered (0.45 μm or 0.22 μm). Responses were recorded using a Multiclamp

700B (Molecular Devices), filtered at 10 kHz (-3 dB), and digitized at 20 kHz.

Analysis and Statistics

Whole-cell rapid solution exchange experiments were analyzed using custom algorithms

(Matlab, Mathworks). The desensitization and deactivation time courses were fitted by

exponential functions based on receptor type. For NMDAR desensitization and $GABA_AR$

deactivation, they were fit by one exponential function,

$$I = A * e^{\frac{-time}{\tau}} + C$$

where I was the current response, A was the amplitude of the response, *time* is the duration after

the peak response or removal of agonist, τ is the time constant, and C is an offset constant.

NMDAR deactivation and $GABA_AR$ desensitization was fit with a dual exponential function,

$$I = A_f * e^{\frac{-time}{\tau_f}} + A_s * e^{\frac{-time}{\tau_s}} + C$$

the two exponentials are designated as fast (A_f, τ_f) and slow (A_s, τ_s). For dual exponential fits, a

weighed tau (τ_w) was calculated,

$$\tau_w = \frac{A_f * \tau_f + A_s * \tau_s}{A_f + A_s}.$$

The Fisher's exact test, two tailed, was used where noted. Mean $\pm$ SEM (standard error of the

mean) is used unless otherwise noted.

Results

For efficient traditional pharmacological experimentation, one must ensure the viability of the available cell pool during sequential experimentation. Especially for ligand-gated ionotropic receptors, this is achieved by lifting cells or pulling patches from the coverslip and performing solution application far from the cells remaining on the coverslip (Fig. 2B). This procedure can be more straightforward than translating the manifold to the cell locations. We first set out to ensure that this could be done reproducibly by the robotic system, since achieving accurate placement of all components is essential for efficient data collection with minimal operator effort. We first verified that the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ could traverse the recording electrode distances on the millimeter scale while ensuring micrometer scale precision at the interface of a multibarrel flow pipe, given that piezoelectric translators typically have a maximum range from 100-300 μm. This is especially important since in one complete cycle of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ operation (patching, experiment manipulation, and electrode cleaning) the electrode will translate roughly 150 mm.

The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ needs to achieve this high level of accuracy and precision at the solution manifold without necessitating manual, time-intensive error correction. Typically, the placement of the electrode at the solution interface is established visually at a predesignated location (beginning of the recording session) then test pulses are conducted to ensure proper placement taking at least 30 second for a highly skilled operator. To test the ability to return to the critical location, we translated the electrode through the various positions required to patch sequentially (4x). After each cycle, the solution exchange around an open-tip electrode was measured by triggering a piezoelectric translation of the solution manifold (exchanging extracellular buffer and a partial salt solution containing 50% extracellular buffer and 50% H_2O).

13

We found that the electrode could be repeatability positioned while retaining the fast solution exchange time, and without placement errors that can lead to recording artifacts (i.e., straying into the adjacent lane before the jump, Fig. 2C).

Lifting cells in the whole-cell configuration and pulling outside-out patches are two of the most common methods of studying ligand-gated ionotropic receptors using rapid solution exchange manifolds. For lifting cells in the whole-cell conformation, we implemented a segmented (100 step) spiral translation method while applying a light suction on the pipette (-40 mbar, Fig. 2D,E). In applying this method, we were able to reliably lift cells while retaining the high-resistance seal that was obtained while breaking through (Fig. 2F). For pulling outside-out patches, we implemented a segmented (100 step) arc translation method while the pipette was at atmospheric pressure (Fig. 2G,H). In applying this method, we were able to repeatedly pull outside-out patches, achieving the characteristic low capacitance and high resistance of this patch-clamp conformation (Fig. 2I).

With these new functionalities, this system proved capable of performing rapid solution exchange experiments as well as executing precise solution application. To demonstrate these capabilities, we recorded from two synaptic ligand-gated ionotropic receptors, $GABA_AR$ and NMDARs, using the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ (Fig. 3). As expected, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was capable of recording NMDAR responses from transiently transfected HEK cells that were lifted off the bottom as well as from outside-out patches excised from HEK cells (Fig. 3A). Additionally, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was capable of recording $GABA_AR$ responses from stably expressing cells, including both long agonist applications as well as brief agonist applications (5 ms, Fig. 3B). In addition to this experimental protocol, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ is

programmed to conduct many other commonly used solution exchange protocols (Supplemental

Fig. 1) as well as voltage-clamp and current-clamp protocols. These can be employed to measure

neuronal activity or study specific voltage-gated channels expressed in heterologous cells. The

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ can implement these experimental protocols on adherent cells, lifted cells or

patches pulled from cells, paired with solution control to measure channel responses in different

conditions (Supplemental Fig. 2).

We subsequently performed a series of pharmacology experiments on GABA$_A$R and

NMDARs where we recorded rapid agonist application to excised outside-out patches to assess

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ performance on the minimum processes required in an experiment

(Supplemental Table 1). Assessment of the overall performance of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ for both

glutamate and GABA receptors revealed that a giga-ohm resistance patch (gigaseal patch) was

obtained 81.2% of the time (108 of 133 attempts). After a gigaseal was achieved, successful

break-in occurred 96.3% of the time to establish the whole-cell conformation (104 of 108

gigaseals). After whole-cell configuration stabilization, the success rate of excising an outside-

out patch was 76.0% (79 of 104 whole-cell conformations). The successful completion of an

experiment based on every outside-out patch pulled was 74.7% (59 of 79 outside-out patches).

Subsequent failure to complete an experiment after obtaining an outside-out patch was due either

to the lack of detectable receptor response upon agonist application or patch integrity breakdown

after initiating the experimental recordings. Taken together the overall success of the

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was 44.4% (59 of 133 attempts). In examining the nature of failed experiments,

we found that the yield of the system is largely based on two main factors, electrode placement

and biological factors.

One major contributing biological factor to experiment failure was the efficiency in the

transient cDNA transfection process used to express the NMDARs. Overall, there was a higher

success rate in achieving a high-quality recording from the stably expressing $GABA_AR$ cells (31

successes out of 51 total attempts) than the transiently transfected NMDAR cells (28 successes

out of 82 total attempts, Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.0039$). Despite expression of GFP, which was

coexpressed with NMDAR subunits, 14 of the 42 pulled patches did not have a current response

of a sufficient amplitude. By contrast, the $GABA_AR$ cell line had a trend of higher reliability:

only 5 of the 31 outside-out patches failed to have detectable current. This suggests that

enhanced yield could result from improved molecular biology methods. Outside of those

biological inefficiencies, monitoring the operation of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ suggests that the

failures at the gigaseal formation step and the outside-out patch-pulling step are due to slight

errors (1-3 μm) in optimally placing the electrode. In this dataset, we had performed a subset of

experiments where an experimenter manually intervened by controlling the final placement of

the electrode once the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ had positioned the electrode 100 μm above the next

selected cell. In these operator-assisted experiments, we observed that the gigaseal yield was

higher with 97.2% and the patch-pulling yield was 88.6%. Specifically, in obtaining gigaseals,

the operator-assisted trials resulted in 35 successes from 36 attempts compared to 9 successes

from 15 attempts (Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.0016$). Additionally, in excising outside-out patches,

the operator-assisted trials resulted in 31 successes from 35 attempts compared to 6 successes

from 9 attempts (Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.1383$). The overall yield (successful experiment

compared to attempt) of these operator-assisted runs was 69.4% (25 good experiments of 36

attempts), as compared to the ~40% success rate of the other experiments (6 good experiments of

15 attempts, Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.0645$). Fully automated electrode placement implemented

in the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ relies on machine vision using camera pixel intensity cross-correlation methods to align a previously stored image of the cell and electrode to make corrections at the beginning of each attempt. These methods work well in placing the electrode somewhere on a cell (~10 μm precision) without operator intervention but lack the accuracy to place it optimally (<1 μm), which appears to have a large impact on overall success. In addition to the losses in efficiency, the machine vision processes are slow due to the necessity to move the electrode or microscope to check for positioning errors. The process time during fully automated patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ operation takes on average 267 ± 35 s (mean ± Standard Deviation, SD) to correct the manipulators, land the electrode on the cell and break-in to the whole-cell conformation. This is compared to 74 ± 10 s (mean ± SD) for the operator-assisted patcherBot$_{Pharma}$, where robotic translations move the stage to the next cell and places the electrode just above the cell (100 μm) before the operator places the electrode on the cell and, in this case also, forms a gigaseal followed by the automated break-in process. Thus, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ can operate fully autonomously, but the speed and performance can be improved by operator intervention during key steps with the current techniques of position error correction.

Operating in this manner, with minor manual interaction, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ can collect experiment electrophysiology recordings proficiently, which is demonstrated by a representative run of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ from the results mentioned previously (Fig. 4). In this experimental run, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was programmed to collect four-phase recordings. During each phase, five technical replicate sweeps were collected, a 10 sec sweep with agonist applied for 0.5 sec. Following each set of recordings, the patch was blown off with high pressure and the open-tip exchange time was determined to validate the electrode positioning. On average, the recording time and position validation totaled 11.2 min. If the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ detects inadequate patch

formation, after the outside-out patch procedure, it terminates the recording and moves on to the

next cell, spending only 1.4 min in doing so. Over this 3.8 hour recording session, highlighted in

Figure 4, 15 cells were attempted to be patched, yielding 12 successful recording sets. During

this time, the operator only interacted with the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ for 15.5 min during recording

(7.1% of the experimental run time) after the 10.3 min of calibration and cell selection. The

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ was recording data for 2.6 hours, which amounts to 72.0% of the operation time.

The GABA$_A$R responses that were collected were of high quality and similar to those previously

reported (Fig. 4B, Table 1). Additionally, the placement of the electrode resulted in consistent

solution exchange times after each patch recording (Fig. 4C).

Next, we performed a case study (Fig. 5) where we sought to measure the main actions of

a widely used anesthetic, propofol (PRO), to highlight the operational procedure and capability

of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ in performing an extended, tedious patch-clamp electrophysiology

experiment. Propofol's main clinical actions are produced by prolonging the deactivation of

GABA$_A$R and have been well characterized (Orser et al. 1994, Adodra and Hales 1995). We ran

the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ with operator assistance for electrode placement (Fig. 5A,B) followed by

manual patch formation, to optimize the time of biological data collection by the

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$. We set out to collect an 8-point concentration response curve of propofol's

effect on GABA$_A$R deactivation, and we split it into two sets and included a propofol-free

control before and after drug application (Fig. 5C). In four, half-day recording sessions (2 per

each concentration set) totaling 12.95 hours of patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ operation, we attempted 42

recordings, obtained 39 gigaseal patches, achieved 28 whole cell conformations, pulled 24

successful outside-out patches, and completed 18 experiments (including 6 incomplete) that

yielded 113 data points (Fig. 5D-E, Table 2, Table 3). After eliminating the recordings with too

large a leak current, too small a response amplitude, or recording artifacts, we were left with 71

data points that were used to calculate the concentration-response relationship of propofol's

ability to prolong the deactivation of $GABA_A$Rs ($EC_{50} = 11.8 \pm 4.6$ µM, Fig. 5D-E).

Of the 12.95 hours of recording, the operator interacted with the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ for 2.49

hours and the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ collected experimental recordings for 9.07 hours, with an

additional 1.39 hours of other automated processing (Table 2). The 2.49 hours of operator

interaction includes cell selection, solution maintenance, electrode placement on the cell, and

gigaseal formation. In each iteration of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ process, it spent 1.99 minutes

cleaning the electrode and the operator spent ~2-3 minutes placing the electrode on the cell and

establishing the whole-cell conformation. If everything was successful, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$

would then proceed to collect the experimental data — in total a 24.6 minute process. If there

was an issue with the stability of the patch during the process of pulling the outside-out patch

(1.73 min process), the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ would clean the electrode and be ready for the next

attempt in less than 2 minutes. Although the experiment yield was not overly high (24/42

attempts were successful) this did not greatly hinder the performance of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$

(Table 4). If every patch attempt was successful, the theoretical maximum number of

experiments the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ could have performed in 12.95 hours was 25.8, which is only

modestly higher than the 18 that we were successfully performed (70% full experiments

performed divided by the maximum). Moreover, the rate of data collection, in terms of operator

effort, was 2.1 minutes per data point. Should patching efficiency be improved further, the

theoretical minimum of operator effort can be reduced to 0.97 minutes per data point.

19

Discussion

Patch-clamp electrophysiology research is a powerful technique, yet many scientists are dissuaded from learning and utilizing this approach because of its time-consuming nature, in terms of both training and execution. Even for skilled practitioners, the complexity and effort required for comprehensive pharmacology experiments (pharmacological screening or evaluation of full concentration-response relationships) can be impractical. Here, we have demonstrated the capabilities of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ for ligand-gated ionotropic receptor pharmacological screening, which makes patch-clamp electrophysiology experimentation rapid, less skill intensive, and more reliable. The automation of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$, namely precise and accurate electrode translations, solution handling, electrode cleaning, and rapid solution exchange greatly expands the repertoire of experiments that the patcherBot can perform. This allows one to conduct nearly any pharmacological experiment typically performed on ligand-gated or voltage-gated ion channels using the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ (e.g. Supplemental Fig. 1 and Supplemental Fig. 2). Additionally, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ has the flexibility to be retooled as needed based off a traditional patch-clamp rig and can run autonomously or with minimal operator intervention to suit the experimental situation. Thus, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ could be set up to patch adherent cells and applied compounds via the bath input, if desired, and the full automated capabilities of the system will be retained if all test compounds can be fully washed out.

The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ has very high yield (80-100%) of obtaining giga-ohm resistance patches and of breaking-in to achieve the whole-cell patch conformation. The methods we have employed to lift isolated patch-clamped cells and to pull outside-out patches are highly reliable (70-90% yield). These capabilities allow the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ to spend more time performing the intended electrophysiology experiment and less time in the process of manually guiding the

position of the patch electrode throughout the course of the full experiment. With this improved

system, the primary determinants for whether a particular experimental attempt concludes in a

successful recording, relies more on biological factors than robotic or operator factors. In our

experiments with heterologous expression systems (namely transfected HEK cells), the yield in

high quality recordings, with high receptor expression, of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ reaches 60-70% of

the cells attempted. With this high efficiency of data collection, we could rapidly replicate

previous datasets by reducing the time it takes to produce an 8-point concentration response

curve of the effects of propofol on GABA$_A$R deactivation from weeks/months of recording down

to ~13 hours of recording.

This system retains the full capabilities of a traditional electrophysiology rigs. We

observed solution exchange times, with our larger three-barreled manifold, in the low

millisecond range (~1-2 ms), which could be reduced further (<1ms) using different solution

manifolds (Glasgow and Johnson 2014, MacLean 2016). This allows for accurate

experimentation and can be used to study rapidly desensitizing receptors, which cannot be

measured on commercially available multi-well high-throughput patch-clamp instrumentation.

The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ system largely comprises typical components of a conventional

electrophysiology rig (Supplemental Table 2), and thus does not require a substantial or

prohibitive cost to upgrade. Running costs are low, comparable to the cost of operating a

traditional patch-clamp rig, and primarily include the cost of the preparation (cell culture costs)

and compounds being evaluated. There are no additional changes in running costs based on each

data point collected, except for reduced glass consumption and perhaps reduced preparation costs

that come with more efficient recording. However, as the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ can be in operation for

extended periods of time and can execute experiments at a high rate, the running costs based on

each day of operation may, in fact, be higher due to the increased bath solution usage and increased use of pharmacological compounds.

There are several improvements to the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ that could further increase its capabilities and productivity. Enhanced machine vision correction methods could allow for more precise placement of the electrode with less computation time thus increasing the unattended success rate and reducing human effort. Algorithms for cell detection could be employed to make cell selection agnostic, with further reduction in human effort and bias (Yip et al. 2021). Systematic collection of data will aid in meta-analysis of experiments, which could identify unrecognized factors that influence experimental results or experimental variability.

The patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ facilitates pharmacological experimentation on ligand gated channels through increased productivity and the ability to address labor-intensive questions (collecting multiple concentration data points or testing more constructs). This allows more complex experimental protocols that include increased number of replicates and more controls. Many neuroscience studies have been cited as having low power in their experimental design (Button et al. 2013), which could be rectified by utilizing the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$. Additionally, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ reduces the chance of human bias when collecting data, as the experiment protocols are explicitly defined prior to experiment execution. Moreover, methods to introduce blinding in the experimental design could be employed along with automated analysis to allow one to easily jump to the final analyzed data point after conducting the experiment. The data collected by the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ might be more reproducible due to enhanced transparency, as the full patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ experiment data log could be documented along with the results (Munafò et al. 2017). With the reduction in human effort that comes with operating the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$, it becomes feasible that a single person could operate multiple patcherBot$_{Pharma}$

at once for increased data collection. In summary, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ enhances the capabilities

of a researcher utilizing patch-clamp approaches by decreasing operator interaction time,

reducing human bias, increasing experiment yield, allowing more complicated experimental

design, and enabling experiments that require high volumes of recordings.

Submitted Manuscript: Confidential

Acknowledgments:

Authorship Contributions:

Participated in research design: Perszyk, Yip, Jenkins, Traynelis, and Forest.

Conducted experiments: Perszyk, Yip, and McConnell.

Contributed new reagents or analytic tools: Perszyk, Yip, McConnell, and Wang.

Performed data analysis: Perszyk, McConnell, and Yip.

Wrote or contributed to the writing of the manuscript: Perszyk, Yip, McConnell, Wang, Jenkins,

Traynelis, and Forest.

References and Notes:

Adodra, S. and T. G. Hales (1995). "Potentiation, activation and blockade of GABAA receptors of clonal murine hypothalamic GT1-7 neurones by propofol." British Journal of Pharmacology **115**(6): 953-960.

Ai, H.-w. (2015). "Fluorescent-protein-based probes: general principles and practices." Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry **407**(1): 9-15.

Annecchino, L. A., A. R. Morris, C. S. Copeland, O. E. Agabi, P. Chadderton and S. R. Schultz (2017). "Robotic Automation of In Vivo Two-Photon Targeted Whole-Cell Patch-Clamp Electrophysiology." Neuron **95**(5): 1048-1055 e3.

Auerbach, A. and Y. Zhou (2005). "Gating reaction mechanisms for NMDA receptor channels." J Neurosci **25**(35): 7914-23.

Button, K. S., J. P. A. Ioannidis, C. Mokrysz, B. A. Nosek, J. Flint, E. S. J. Robinson and M. R. Munafò (2013). "Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience." Nature Reviews Neuroscience **14**(5): 365-376.

Campagnola, L., M. B. Kratz and P. B. Manis (2014). "ACQ4: an open-source software platform for data acquisition and analysis in neurophysiology research." Front Neuroinform **8**: 3.

Chakrapani, S., J. F. Cordero-Morales, V. Jogini, A. C. Pan, D. M. Cortes, B. Roux and E. Perozo (2011). "On The Structural Basis of Modal Gating Behavior in K(+) Channels." Nature structural & molecular biology **18**(1): 67-74.

Colquhoun, D. and F. J. Sigworth (1995). Fitting and Statistical Analysis of Single-Channel Records. Single-Channel Recording. B. Sakmann and E. Neher. Boston, MA, Springer US**:** 483-587.

Deo, C. and L. D. Lavis (2018). "Synthetic and genetically encoded fluorescent neural activity indicators." Current Opinion in Neurobiology **50**: 101-108.

Glasgow, N. G. and J. W. Johnson (2014). Whole-Cell Patch-Clamp Analysis of Recombinant NMDA Receptor Pharmacology Using Brief Glutamate Applications. Patch-Clamp Methods and Protocols. M. Martina and S. Taverna. New York, NY, Springer New York**:** 23-41.

Kodandaramaiah S. B., Franzesi G. T., Chow B. Y., Boyden E. S. and Forest C. R. (2012). Automated whole-cell patch-clamp electrophysiology of neurons in vivo. Nature Methods **9**, 585-587.

Kolb, I., C. R. Landry, M. C. Yip, C. F. Lewallen, W. A. Stoy, J. Lee, A. Felouzis, B. Yang, E. S. Boyden, C. J. Rozell and C. R. Forest (2019). "PatcherBot: a single-cell electrophysiology robot for adherent cells and brain slices." Journal of Neural Engineering **16**(4): 046003.

Submitted Manuscript: Confidential

Kolb, I., W. A. Stoy, E. B. Rousseau, O. A. Moody, A. Jenkins and C. R. Forest (2016). "Cleaning patch-clamp pipettes for immediate reuse." Sci Rep **6**: 35001.

Liu, C., T. Li and J. Chen (2019). "Role of High-Throughput Electrophysiology in Drug Discovery." Current Protocols in Pharmacology **87**(1): e69.

MacLean, D. M. (2016). Constructing a Rapid Solution Exchange System. Ionotropic Glutamate Receptor Technologies. G. K. Popescu. New York, NY, Springer New York**:** 165-183.

Mollinedo-Gajate, I., C. Song and T. Knopfel (2019). "Genetically Encoded Fluorescent Calcium and Voltage Indicators." Handb Exp Pharmacol **260**: 209-229.

Munafò, M. R., B. A. Nosek, D. V. M. Bishop, K. S. Button, C. D. Chambers, N. Percie du Sert, U. Simonsohn, E.-J. Wagenmakers, J. J. Ware and J. P. A. Ioannidis (2017). "A manifesto for reproducible science." Nature Human Behaviour **1**(1): 0021.

Neher, E. and B. Sakmann (1976). "Single-channel currents recorded from membrane of denervated frog muscle fibres." Nature **260**(5554): 799-802.

Obergrussberger, A., T. A. Goetze, N. Brinkwirth, N. Becker, S. Friis, M. Rapedius, C. Haarmann, I. Rinke-Weiß, S. Stölzle-Feix, A. Brüggemann, M. George and N. Fertig (2018). "An update on the advancing high-throughput screening techniques for patch clamp-based ion channel screens: implications for drug discovery." Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery **13**(3): 269-277.

Orser, B., L. Wang, P. Pennefather and J. MacDonald (1994). "Propofol modulates activation and desensitization of GABAA receptors in cultured murine hippocampal neurons." **14**(12): 7747-7760.

Perszyk, R. E., S. A. Swanger, C. Shelley, A. Khatri, G. Fernandez-Cuervo, M. P. Epplin, J. Zhang, P. Le, P. Bulow, E. Garnier-Amblard, P. K. R. Gangireddy, G. J. Bassell, H. Yuan, D. S. Menaldino, D. C. Liotta, L. S. Liebeskind and S. F. Traynelis (2020). "Biased modulators of NMDA receptors control channel opening and ion selectivity." Nat Chem Biol.

Suk, H.-J., E. S. Boyden and I. van Welie (2019). "Advances in the automation of whole-cell patch clamp technology." Journal of Neuroscience Methods **326**: 108357.

Suter, B. A., T. O'Connor, V. Iyer, L. T. Petreanu, B. M. Hooks, T. Kiritani, K. Svoboda and G. M. Shepherd (2010). "Ephus: multipurpose data acquisition software for neuroscience experiments." Front Neural Circuits **4**: 100.

Wu, Q. and A. A. Chubykin (2017). "Application of Automated Image-guided Patch Clamp for the Study of Neurons in Brain Slices." J Vis Exp(125).

Yip M.C., Gonzalez M.M., Valenta C.R., Rowan M.J.M. and C. R. Forest. (2021). "Deep learning-based real-time detection of neurons in brain slices for in vitro physiology." Scientific Reports **11,** 6065.

Yu, H.-b., M. Li, W.-p. Wang and X.-l. Wang (2016). "High throughput screening technologies for ion channels." Acta Pharmacologica Sinica **37**(1): 34-43.

Footnotes:

Potential Conflict of Interest Statement: CRF is an inventor on a US patent application 15/232,770 related to pipette cleaning technology, licensed to Sensapex. MCY has a consulting agreement with Neuromatic Devices which manufactures pipette pressure control systems. SFT is a PI on research grants from Allergan, Biogen, and Janssen to Emory University, is a paid consultant for Janssen, is a member of the SAB for Sage Therapeutics, Eumentis Therapeutics, GRIN2B Foundation, and CureGRIN Foundation, is co-founder of NeurOp Inc and Agrithera, Inc., and receives licensing fees and royalties from Emory. SFT is a co-inventor on Emory University-owned Intellectual Property that includes allosteric modulators of glutamate receptor function. AJ is a co-inventor on Emory University-owned Intellectual Properties that include negative allosteric modulators of $GABA_AR$ receptor function.

Figure Legends:

Fig. 1. Comparison of patcherBot vs patcherBot$_{Pharma}$. (**A**) Cartoon of the previously published PatcherBot (Kolb et al. 2019), assembled from an upright microscope, high sensitivity camera, custom pressure control box, quasi-4 axis electrode manipulator, and a motorized stage. (**B**) Cartoon of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$, assembled from an inverted microscope, high sensitivity camera, custom pressure control box, quasi-4 axis electrode manipulator, a motorized microscope manipulator, two solution valves, and a solution exchange manifold. A manual detailing the components and the operation of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ is provided on GitHub (https://github.com/riley-perszyk/patcherBot_pharma).

Fig. 2. Repeatability of the physical manipulations require for fast-solution exchange electrophysiological experiments. (**A**) Image of the recording chamber. (**B**) Cartoon illustrating the large distances (e.g. X-Y mm scale) the electrode must translate during experimentation. (**C**) Open-tip solution exchange times, using piezo-electric translator, across many repeated experimental cycles (cell locations, solution manifold interface, cleaning/wash bath). (**D-F**) Cell lifting procedure. (**D**) Image of an isolated cell in the whole-cell conformation before lifting (isolated cell are more reliably lifted than those with cellular processes to adjacent cells). (**E**) Spiral path (100 discrete segments) employed to lift isolated cells. (**F**) Resulting resistance plot showing a high resistance seal is robustly maintained during the lifting process. (**G-I**) Patch pulling procedure. (**G**) Image of a cell in the whole-cell conformation before pulling an outside-out patch. (**H**) Arc path (100 discrete segments) employed to pull outside-out patches. (**I**) Resulting capacitance and resistance plots showing successful high-resistance, low-capacitance outside-out patches. We speculate the low resistance prior to pulling the outside-out patches is due to electrical connections due to gap-junctions between multiple cultured cells in physical contact with one another.

Fig. 3. Exemplary fast-solution exchange electrophysiological experimental results. (**A**) NMDAR responses from transiently transfected HEK cells stimulated by 100 μM glutamate and 30 μM glycine. Recordings are from a lifted whole cell (*left)* and an outside-out patch using a 4 MΩ electrode (*right)*, at -60 mV in 0 mM Mg^{2+}. (**B**) GABA$_A$R responses from stably transfected HEK cells (α1β2γ2L) stimulated by 1 mM GABA. Recordings are from a lifted whole cell (*left*, 1 s application) and an outside-out patch (*right*, 5 ms application)

Fig. 4. Representative experimental timeline of patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ operation. (**A**) Timeline of experimental progress. The time periods of operator interaction with the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ and recording duration are highlighted, along with recording outcome. (**B**) GABA$_A$R responses (1 mM GABA, 1 s application) from all successful outside-out patches pulled. Scale bars indicate 20 pA and 0.5 s. (**C**) Post-experiment open-tip position validation utilizing a 50% H$_2$O/50% wash solution. Scale bars indicate 200 pA and 20 ms. The average ($\pm$ SD [Range]) 20-80 rise and fall times for piezoelectric jumps were 3.06 ± 0.78 [1.30 4.11] and 3.56 ± 0.32 [2.27 6.55].

Submitted Manuscript: Confidential

Fig. 5. GABA$_A$R propofol deactivation time-constant concentration response case study; the

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ has the capability to collect pharmacological data at an accelerated rate. **(A)** A

flowchart illustrating the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ operation, timing, and success rate of individual steps.

The manual (*white boxes*) and automated (*grey boxes*) steps are indicated. After the one-time

calibration and cell selection step, the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ loops through and serially records from

the selected cells. Quality control measures are in place to terminate the current experiment and

continue to the next iteration. **(B)** A more detailed depiction of the manual steps is shown. The

calibration and cell selection step (*left,* typically 7-12 cells) including alignment of the coordinate

systems of the electrode and microscope coordinate systems, ensuring the saved locations of the

solution manifold are correct, and then selecting a set of cells for recording. The cell approach

and patching step (*right*) at the beginning of each loop (coinciding with an auditory signal, so the

operator need not always be present) starts when the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ translates the stage to the

next cell selected, then the electrode is brought to a position just above (100 μm) over the cell.

The operator then only needs to lower the electrode to the optimal position on the cell, and has

the option of manually sealing and breaking in or can elect to have the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ conduct

those processes. **(C)** A more detailed look at the experimental protocol step of the

patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ process. In this case, there were 6 sets of solutions that would be used during

each experiment (2 control and 4 propofol solution sets, detailed on the *left*). Each phase of each

experiment would start with the valves changing to the next set to be tested, with a wait step to

allow for the solutions to be primed, followed by the collection of 10 replicates of the intended

jump protocol (*right*). **(D)** The results from one experiment (all phases), showing all replicates

(*top*) and the average (±SD, shown by shaded grey area) response. The desensitization and

deactivation of all recordings were fitted simultaneously and are depicted on the averaged

34

responses (*white line*). **(E)** The relationship between the average (±SEM) deactivation tau and

propofol concentration is shown and fitted with the Hill equation. The 100 μM propofol response

was omitted from fitting due to the reduced response amplitude as a result of the enhanced

desensitized state in the presence of such a high concentration of propofol.

Table 1. Summary of activation and deactivation parameters of GABA$_A$R and NMDARs from Figures 3 and 4.

		Patch Leak (pA)	Response Peak Amplitude (pA)	Response Steady State Amplitude (pA)	Desensitization Extent (SS/Peak %)	Desensitization Tau (ms)	Deactivation Tau (ms)	N
GABA$_A$R	+40 mV	24.9 ± 18.7	586 ± 150	170 ± 54	26.4 ± 1.8%	681 ± 130	216 ± 29	12
	-60 mV	48.3 ± 36.1	173 ± 48	35.9 ± 13.6	24.8 ± 1.1%	965 ± 298	133 ± 6	12
NMDAR GluN2A WT	+40 mV	38.6 ± 32.1	271 ± 104	130 ± 68	34.2 ± 6.4%	388 ± 75	71.9 ± 11.0	11
	-60 mV	140 ± 42.6	326 ± 180	215 ± 139	54.8 ± 6.9%	984 ± 192	81.3 ± 18.4	7

(Header spanning row: **Rapid application of 1 mM GABA or Glutamate for 1 sec**)

Data shown represents the average ± SEM.

Table 2. Census of robotic operation and operator interaction time for the propofol case study.

	Total Operation	Electrode Cleaning (Robotic Control)	Data Collection (Robotic Control)	Patch Establishment (Operator Control)	Non-Recording Time[†]
Total Time (Percent)	12.95 hrs	1.39 hrs (10.7%)	9.07 hrs (70.0%)	2.49 hrs (19.3%)	3.88 hrs (30%)
Time Per Cycle (successful cycle)		1.99 mins	24.6 mins	3.55 mins	5.54 mins
Time Per Data Point (successful cycle)			4.1 mins[↓] (~1 min solution change time) (1.67 min data collection)	2.1 mins[‡]	

[†] The non-recording time is the time the robot is not performing the data collection protocol.

[‡] This rate represents the total time the operator spent interacting with the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ during the entire experiment performance (cell selection, solution maintenance, electrode placement on the cell, and gigaseal formation). The theoretical maximal efficiency of data collection per the operator's effort would be 0.97 mins of the operator's time per data point.

[↓] Each data collection phase equals the solution change time plus the data collection time, however the mean time per data point reflects the additional time needed to pull the patch and validate the jump at the end of the experiment averaged into the timing for each phase.

Table 3. Concentration response of propofol (PRO) on GABA$_A$R activation and deactivation.

GABA$_A$R	Patch Leak (pA)	Response Peak Amplitude (pA)	Response Steady State Amplitude (pA)	Desensitization Extent (SS/Peak %)	Deactivation Tau (ms)	N
Rapid application of 1 mM GABA for 0.5 sec – Propofol concentration set 1						
GABA Control	20.9 ± 7.3	133 ± 36	51.1 ± 12.3	39.3 ± 2.0%	129 ± 11	8
0.5 µM PRO	28.9 ± 13.5	100 ± 20	40.4 ± 8.9	39.6 ± 1.3%	116 ± 13	8
2 µM PRO	16.7 ± 4.5	109 ± 32	45.6 ± 14.9	40.0 ± 1.7%	128 ± 13	6
10 µM PRO	18.8 ± 4.8	96.0 ± 25.2	42.1 ± 11.6	43.1 ± 2.2%	208 ± 20	6
50 µM PRO	16.0 ± 3.0	63.9 ± 17.8	23.5 ± 7.4	33.8 ± 2.7%	331 ± 21	7
PRO washout	15.9 ± 2.8	66.7 ± 22.6	29.2 ± 11.3	41.8 ± 1.7%	143 ± 25	6
Rapid application of 1 mM GABA for 0.5 sec – Propofol concentration set 2						
GABA Control	30.6 ± 6.2	93.6 ± 6.8	30.5 ± 8.1	31.8 ± 7.7%	130 ± 27	6
1 µM PRO	36.5 ± 6.4	72.2 ± 18.0	24.2 ± 6.6	34.9 ± 6.7%	110 ± 15	6
5 µM PRO	34.3 ± 8.2	37.8 ± 9.1	11.1 ± 2.4	30.0 ± 5.1%	198 ± 29	5
20 µM PRO	42.1 ± 8.0	21.5 ± 4.6	6.1 ± 2.2	25.2 ± 6.6%	328 ± 53	5
100 µM PRO	29.0 ± 5.9	8.9 ± 1.2	5.8 ± 7.5	-	415 ± 226	5
PRO washout	24.8 ± 10.1	20.1 ± 6.3	5.3 ± 3.4	25.2 ± 13.5%	129 ± 12	3

Data shown represents the average ±SEM.

Table 4. Performance of the patcherBot$_{Pharma}$ in the propofol case study.

	Counts	Yield	Theoretical Max[†]
Patch Attempts	42		
Successfully established gigaseals	39	93%	
Whole cell conformations obtained	28	72%	
Outside-out patches obtained	24	86%	
Experiments started	24	-	
Successful Experiments	18	75%	25.8
Total Data Points Collected	113		154.8
Data Points Passed Quality Control	71		

[†] The theoretic maximum values were determined by taking the total operation time divided by the total time for one successful cycle. Since there are 6 collected data points per experiment, the theoretical maximum for total collected data points equals the number of experiments multiplied by a factor of 6.

A patcherBot

Electrode Manipulator
Camera
Upright Microscope
Pipette Pressure Control Box
Stage Manipulator

or

B patcherBot_Pharma

Electrode Manipulator
Inverted Microscope
Valve 1
Pipette Pressure Control Box
Microscope Manipulator
Camera
Valve 2

Figure 1

Figure 2

A   NMDAR - GluN1/GluN2A - Transient

B   GABA$_A$R - α1β2γ2L - Stable

Figure 3

Figure 4

A

Manual | **Automated**

Experiment Loop

5-15 min
Calibration & Cell Selection

3 min
Cell Approach & Patching

Breaking in. Whole Cell?
y → ~75%
n

Pull Patch Successful?
y → ~75%
n

Quality Check
y → ~60-80%
n

19 min
Experimental Protocol

1.5 min
Retraction & Cleaning

Failed att. = 5 min.
Succesful att. = 24 min.

B

Calibration & Cell Selection   Manual

Align coordinate planes

Pipette Pressure Control Box

Check and validate experiment locations

a b c

Select cells

Cell Approach & Patching   Partially Manual

Robot moves to next selected cell

Robot brings electrode into view

Operator places electrode on cell

C

Experimental Protocol   Automated

Valve 1   Valve 2

Valve 1
1) Wash
2) GABA
3) GABA + 0.5 µM PRO
4) GABA + 2 µM PRO
5) GABA + 10 µM PRO
6) GABA + 50 µM PRO
7) GABA
8) 50/50 Wash/H_2O

Valve 2
1) Wash
2) Wash
3) 0.5 µM PRO
4) 2 µM PRO
5) 10 µM PRO
6) 50 µM PRO
7) Wash
8) Wash

A B C

Repeat for Valves 2-7

Switch & Prime Valves → Perform Jumps → Check Resistance

One phase of Jumps   Automated

Sweep 1 | Sweep 2 | Sweep 3 | Sweep 4 | Sweep 5

25 pA
0.3 sec

Sweep 6 | Sweep 7 | Sweep 8 | Sweep 9 | Sweep 10

D

Overlaid Raw Responses

Phase A Valves at 2 | Phase B Valves at 3 | Phase C Valves at 4 | Phase D Valves at 5 | Phase E Valves at 6 | Phase F Valves at 7

25 pA
0.3 sec

Mean ± SD Response

E

Measured Tau deactivation
(2 sets of propofol conc.)

Tau (s)

[Propofol] (µM)

Figure 5