

Stochastic cellular automata model of neural networks

A. V. Goltsev,^{1,2} F. V. de Abreu,¹ S. N. Dorogovtsev,^{1,2} and J. F. F. Mendes¹

¹*Departamento de Física da Universidade de Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal*

²*A.F. Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute, 194021 St. Petersburg, Russia*

We propose a stochastic dynamical model of neural networks with complex architectures. We discuss activation of neural networks by a stimulus, pacemakers and spontaneous activity. This model has a complex phase diagram with self-organized active neural states, hybrid phase transitions, and a rich array of activities. We show that if spontaneous activity (noise) reaches a threshold level then global neural oscillations emerge. Stochastic resonance is a precursor of this dynamical phase transition. These oscillations are an intrinsic property of even small groups of 50 neurons.

PACS numbers: 05.10.-a, 05.40.-a, 87.18.Sn, 87.19.ln

Understanding the dynamics and structure of neuronal networks is a challenge for biologists, mathematicians and physicists. Neurons form complex nets of connections, where dendrites and axons extend, ramify, and form synaptic links between neurons. Due to long axons the structure of a typical neuronal network has small-world properties [1, 2, 3, 4]. Complex architectures of this kind are known to strongly influence processes taking place in networks [5]. Apart from this heterogeneous and compact structure, neural networks are noisy [6]. This makes a stochastic approach to neuronal activities unavoidable [6, 7]. Intuitively, noise is damaging. However in neural networks noise can play a positive role, supporting oscillations and synchrony [6, 7] or causing stochastic resonance [8]. Origin of these phenomena is a topic problem of great importance for understanding of brain functioning [6, 8]. Recent investigations [9] revealed that global activation of living neural networks induced by a stimulus can be explained on the base of the concept of bootstrap percolation—a version of cellular automata—without going into details of neuron dynamics.

In the present paper we propose a stochastic cellular automata model of neural networks. These networks include two neural populations, excitatory and inhibitory neurons, and have a complex network architecture. Their stochastic dynamics takes into account processes of spontaneous neural activity, which plays the role of noise, the activation of neurons by a stimulus or neural pacemakers, and interactions between neurons. Although the model is simple, it demonstrates various patterns of self-organization of neural networks, hybrid phase transitions, hysteresis phenomena, neural avalanches and a rich set of dynamical phenomena driven by noise: decaying and stable oscillations, and stochastic resonance. At a critical noise a neural network undergoes a dynamical phase transition from a state with incoherent neurons to a state with synchronized neurons and global oscillations.

Model.—We consider a neural network with two types of neurons – excitatory and inhibitory neurons (see below). The total number of neurons is N . The fractions of excitatory and inhibitory neurons are g_e and $g_i = 1 - g_e$, respectively. Neurons are linked by directed edges and

form a network with an adjacency matrix a_{nm} where $n, m = 1, 2, \dots, N$. An entry a_{nm} is equal to 1 if there is an edge directed from neuron n to neuron m otherwise $a_{nm} = 0$. Each neuron can be in either an active or inactive state. We define $s_m(t) = 1$ if neuron m is active at moment t , and $s_m(t) = 0$ if this neuron is inactive. The total input $V_m(t)$ (post-synaptic potential) at neuron m is the sum of inputs from nearest neighbor neurons:

$$V_m(t) = \sum_n s_n(t) a_{nm} J_{nm}, \quad (1)$$

where synaptic efficacy $J_{nm} = \pm 1$ if neuron n is excitatory or inhibitory, respectively. Dynamics is not changed qualitatively if $|J_{nm}|$ are different for these neurons. Active excitatory (inhibitory) presynaptic neurons give positive (negative) inputs to a postsynaptic neuron, while inactive neurons give no input. The states of neurons at each moment t are determined by the following rules:

- (i) An excitatory (inhibitory) neuron is activated at a rate f_e (f_i) by a stimulus or spontaneously (spontaneous activity).
- (ii) In addition, an excitatory (inhibitory) neuron is activated at a rate μ_{1e} (μ_{1i}) by nearest neighbor active neurons if the total input $V(t)$ at this neuron is at least a threshold value Ω , i.e., $V(t) \geq \Omega$.
- (iii) An activated excitatory (inhibitory) neuron is inactivated (i.e., it stops firing) at a rate μ_{1e} (μ_{1i}) if the total input $V(t)$ becomes smaller than Ω .
- (iv) An activated excitatory (inhibitory) neuron spontaneously stops firing at rate μ_{2e} (μ_{2i}).

In the brain, neurons receive fluctuating inputs and generate irregular spike trains [6]. We represent the activation by fluctuating inputs as the stochastic process (ii) with the rates μ_{1e} and μ_{1i} of the order of the average firing rate. This determines the time scale in the model. Even if the total input is on average larger than Ω , it sometimes falls below Ω . As a result, the neuron stops firing. Process (iv) is meant to represent this. For other models with binary variables see [10].

In order to describe the dynamics of neural networks, we introduce mean values of $s_n^{(a)}(t)$ for excitatory, $a = e$, and inhibitory, $a = i$, populations,

$$\rho_a(t) \equiv \sum_n s_n^{(a)}(t)/(g_a N), \quad (2)$$

where the sum is over neurons of type a , g_a is their fraction. We name $\rho_e(t)$ and $\rho_i(t)$ “activities” of the excitatory and inhibitory populations. $\rho_e(t)$ and $\rho_i(t)$ are the probabilities that a randomly chosen excitatory or inhibitory neuron, respectively, is active at time t . We consider neurons on the top of a sparse random uncorrelated directed network. These networks are small worlds and can have an arbitrary degree distribution. They often are considered as a good approximation to real networks [2]. They can be studied analytically by use of the mean-field theory [5] and easily modeled for simulations. However, they do not take into account high clustering coefficients and degree correlations of real neural networks [3].

Basic equations.—Let us derive dynamical equations for the activities $\rho_e(t)$ and $\rho_i(t)$. We introduce the probabilities $\Psi_e(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))$ and $\Psi_i(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))$ that at time t the total input to a randomly chosen excitatory or inhibitory neuron, respectively, is at least Ω . If at time t an excitatory neuron is inactive, which takes place with probability $1 - \rho_e(t)$, then an external field activates this neuron at the rate f_e . This gives a contribution

$$f_e[1 - \rho_e(t)] \quad (3)$$

to the rate $\dot{\rho}_e(t) \equiv d\rho_e(t)/dt$. If at time t the total input to an inactive neuron is at least Ω , which takes place with probability $\Psi_e(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))$, then this neuron is activated at the rate μ_{1e} . This gives one more positive contribution

$$\mu_{1e}[1 - \rho_e(t)]\Psi_e(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t)). \quad (4)$$

If at time t an excitatory neuron is active, which takes place with probability $\rho_e(t)$, and the total input from activated nearest neighbor excitatory neurons is smaller than Ω , which takes place with probability $1 - \Psi_e(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))$, then such an active neuron can stop firing at the rate μ_{1e} . The active neurons also can stop spontaneously firing with rate μ_{2e} . These processes give two negative contributions:

$$- \mu_{1e}\rho_e(t)[1 - \Psi_e(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))] - \mu_{2e}\rho_e(t). \quad (5)$$

Summing all contributions, we obtain a rate equation,

$$\dot{\rho}_a(t) = f_a - \nu_a \rho_a(t) + \mu_{1a} \Psi_a(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t)). \quad (6)$$

Here $\nu_a \equiv f_a + \mu_{1a} + \mu_{2a}$, and $a = e, i$. We believe that the mean-field equation (6) is exact for sparse uncorrelated directed networks in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Our simulations of the model on classical random graphs support this. Similar rate equations were derived for disease spreading and contact processes on complex networks [13, 14].

To clarify the relative role of activation and deactivation processes, we rewrite Eq. (6) as follows:

$$\dot{\rho}_a/\nu_a = F_a(1 - Q_a) - \rho_a + (1 - F_a)(1 - Q_a)\Psi_a(\rho_e, \rho_i), \quad (7)$$

where $\rho_a = \rho_a(t)$. Dimensionless parameters $F_a \equiv f_a/(f_a + \mu_{1a})$ and $Q_a \equiv \mu_{2a}/\nu_a$ determine the relative strength of stimulation and the spontaneous deactivation of neurons. The rates ν_e and ν_i set the time scale.

The probabilities Ψ_e and Ψ_i are determined by the network structure. Below we will study a directed classical random graph which is the simplest model of uncorrelated complex networks [2, 5]. A directed edge between each pair of N neurons is present with a given probability c/N . The parameter c is the mean input and output degrees. The probability that a neuron has n input edges is $P_n(c) = c^n e^{-c}/n!$ (input degree distribution). The probability that a randomly chosen neuron has k inputs from activated excitatory neurons and l inputs from activated inhibitory neurons is $P_k(g_e \rho_e c) P_l(g_i \rho_i c)$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_e(\rho_e, \rho_i) &= \Psi_i(\rho_e, \rho_i) = \sum_{k \geq \Omega} \sum_{l=0}^{k-\Omega} P_k(g_e \rho_e c) P_l(g_i \rho_i c) \\ &= e^{-g_e \rho_e c} \sum_{k \geq \Omega} \frac{(g_e \rho_e c)^k}{k! (k - \Omega)!} \Gamma(k - \Omega + 1, g_i \rho_i c), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\Gamma(k, x)$ is the upper incomplete gamma function.

Neural networks can also be activated by pacemakers (neurons that permanently fire). Let excitatory and inhibitory pacemakers be chosen with given probabilities F_e and F_i from excitatory and inhibitory neurons, respectively. The stochastic dynamics of remaining neurons (activities $\tilde{\rho}_e(t)$ and $\tilde{\rho}_i(t)$) are governed by rules (ii)-(iv). In the same way as for Eq. (7), we obtain

$$\dot{\rho}_a/\nu_a = F_a - \rho_a + (1 - F_a)(1 - Q_a)\Psi_a(\rho_e, \rho_i), \quad (9)$$

where we define $\rho_a \equiv F_a + (1 - F_a)\tilde{\rho}_a(t)$, the total activity of the neural population a , $a = e, i$. Equations (7) and (9) differ only by the first term on the right-hand side. A similar equation at $Q_a = 0$ was derived with another approach in [12]. Thus, activation by a stimulus or randomly chosen pacemakers produce similar effects.

Within the model one can also take into account synaptic delays. Introduce time T_{ab} for the transmission of a nerve signal from a neuron of type a to a nearest neighbor neuron of type b , where $a, b = e, i$. Then, in Eq. (7) replace $\Psi_a(\rho_e(t), \rho_i(t))$ by $\Psi_a[\rho_e(t - T_{ea}), \rho_i(t - T_{ia})]$.

Steady states.—The steady states of the model are determined by Eq. (7) at $\dot{\rho}_a = 0$. Steady solutions of Eq. (7) generalize the standard bootstrap percolation to a directed random graph with two types of vertices. A particular case with $g_i = 0$, $F_e = F_i$, and $Q_e = Q_i = 0$ was studied in Refs. [9]. Activation processes are shown in Fig. 1 at $F \equiv F_e = F_i$, $Q_e = Q_i = 0$ when $\rho_e = \rho_i$. One




FIG. 1: Activity ρ_e of excitatory neurons versus the activation parameter F at different fractions of inhibitory neurons g_i from numerical solution of Eq. (7) at $c = 20$, $\Omega = 3$. The jump and hysteresis disappear if $g_i > g^* \simeq 0.43$. Arrows show increasing and decreasing F . The insert shows results at $c = 1000$, $\Omega = 30$. Our simulations confirm these results.

can see that by increasing the activation parameter F , the activity ρ_e (and ρ_i) undergoes a jump at a critical point F_c . A similar jump was observed in living neural networks in vitro [9]. If F approaches F_c from below, then $\rho_a = \rho_a^{(c)} - A(F_c - F)^{1/2}$. This singular behavior evidences the existence of long-range correlations between neurons and the emergence of neural avalanches: the activation or deactivation of one neuron triggers the activation or deactivation of a large cluster of neurons. This phenomenon is similar to one that was found near the point of the emergence of a giant k -core [15]. At $F = F_c$ the probability $G(s)$ that an avalanche has a size s is

$$G(s) \propto s^{-3/2}. \quad (10)$$

We calculated $G(s)$ exactly at $g_i = 0$ and believe that Eq. (10) is valid for $g_i \neq 0$. Similar neuronal avalanches were observed in the cortex [16]. Thus the transition at F_c is a hybrid phase transition (combines a jump and a singularity). By increasing g_i the size of the jump decreases. There is a special critical point g^* at which the jump is zero, and the phase transition is continuous. There is no phase transition if $g_i > g^*$, or if Ω is larger than a critical threshold (see Fig. 1).

Relaxation.—Let us consider the relaxation of neural networks to a steady state. We represent $\rho_a(t)$ as $\rho_a + \delta\rho_a(t)$ where $\delta\rho_a(t)/\rho_a \ll 1$, and ρ_a is the equilibrium activity of population a . Linearization of Eqs. (7) with respect to $\delta\rho_a(t)$ gives two coupled linear equations:

$$\nu_a^{-1} d\delta\rho_a(t)/dt = -\delta\rho_a(t) + D_{ae}\delta\rho_e(t) + D_{ai}\delta\rho_i(t), \quad (11)$$

where $D_{ab} \equiv (1 - F_a)(1 - Q_a)\partial\Psi_a(\rho_e, \rho_i)/\partial\rho_b$ for $a, b = e, i$. We look for a solution in the form $\delta\rho_a(t) = A_a e^{-\gamma t}$ with unknown A_a and γ . The solution exists if the determinant of this set of equations is zero. This condition gives

$$\gamma = \nu_e \{B_1 + B_2 \pm [(B_1 - B_2)^2 + 4\alpha D_{ei} D_{ie}]^{1/2}\} / 2, \quad (12)$$




FIG. 2: There are three regions on the $\alpha - F$ plane: (I) with exponential relaxation; (II) with decaying oscillations; (III) with stable oscillations. The boundaries α_{c1} and α_{c2} , given by equations $\text{Im}\gamma = 0$ and $\text{Re}\gamma = 0$, are shown at $g_i < g^*$ (solid lines), and $g_i > g^*$ (dashed lines). (a) $c = 20$, $\Omega = 3$, $g_i = 0.4$ and 0.47 . (b) $c = 1000$, $\Omega = 30$ $g_i = 0.475$ and 0.478 .

where $\alpha \equiv \nu_i/\nu_e$, $B_1 = 1 - D_{ee}$, $B_2 = \alpha(1 - D_{ii})$. Equation (12) is valid in the general case $\Psi_e \neq \Psi_i$. For the classical random graph, using Eq. (8), one can prove that $D_{ee}, D_{ie} > 0$ while $D_{ei}, D_{ii} < 0$. Therefore γ in Eq. (12) may be a complex number in certain ranges of parameters c , g , F , and α . Where $\text{Im}\gamma = 0$, relaxation is exponentially fast with the rate γ . For example, at $\alpha = 1$, we have $\gamma = \nu_e(1 - D_{ee} - D_{ii}) \geq 0$. In this case γ tends to 0 if $F \rightarrow F_c$ from below as at a continuous phase transition. However γ is always finite above the critical point F_c . If $\text{Re}\gamma > 0$ and $\text{Im}\gamma \neq 0$, then relaxation is in the form of decaying oscillations. If $\text{Re}\gamma < 0$ and $\text{Im}\gamma \neq 0$, then any small deviation from a steady state leads to oscillations around the state with an increasing amplitude. However, in this case the linear approximation, Eq. (11), is not valid, and it is necessary to solve Eqs. (7). These three regions are shown in Fig. 2. We solved Eqs. (7) numerically in the case $F_e = F_i = F$, $Q_e = Q_i = 0$. We found that there is a region of g_i , which includes the special point g^* , where $\text{Re}\gamma < 0$ and $\text{Im}\gamma \neq 0$ if $0 < \alpha < \alpha_{c2} = (D_{ee} - 1)/(1 - D_{ii}) < 1$, i.e., when inhibitory neurons have slower dynamics compared to the dynamics of excitatory neurons. It turns out that in this region the neural system displays stable oscillations around the steady state. Figure 2 shows that the larger the mean degree c and the threshold Ω the broader is the region with oscillations. We obtained similar results for the model with synaptic delays. In particular, there is a region of g_i where oscillations emerge at $\alpha = 1$ and $T_{ee} = T_{ei} = 0$ if $T_{ie} = T_{ii} > T$ where T is a threshold. The firing rate μ_1 in human brains is typically in the range 1 - 400 Hz. In our model a frequency of oscillations ω_o is in several times smaller than μ_1 . This gives ω_o in the range of the waves observed in brain, i.e., $\omega_o \lesssim 100$ Hz.

Replacing f_a by $f_a(t) = f_a + A_a \sin(\omega t)$ in Eq. (6), we




FIG. 3: (color online). Fractions $R_e = \rho_e g_e$ and $R_i = \rho_i g_i$ of active excitatory and inhibitory neurons versus time. (a)-(c): $\alpha = 1$ (region (I)). (d)-(f): $\alpha = 0.4$ (region (II)). (g)-(i): $\alpha = 0.05$ (region (III)). Solid (dashed) lines show theoretical R_e (R_i) from Eqs. (7). Blue (red) symbols refer to R_e (R_i) from simulations at $N = 10000$ (1st row), 1000 (2nd row), and 50 (third row). $F = 0.05$, $g_i = 0.4$, $c = 20$, $\Omega = 3$.

study the response of the model, $\rho_a + \Delta\rho_a \sin(\omega t + \varphi_a)$, to a small periodic stimulation, $A_a \ll f_a$. If F approaches the boundary between regions (II) and (III), see Fig. 2, the response $(\Delta\rho_a/A_a)^2 \propto 1/[(\omega - \text{Im}\gamma)^2 + (\text{Re}\gamma)^2]$ is enhanced because $\text{Re}\gamma = 0$ at the boundary. Therefore the transition from a state with incoherent neurons to a state with global oscillations is a dynamical phase transition with a sharp boundary (in the thermodynamic limit). In our model the stochastic neural activity plays the role of noise while interactions between neurons produce non-linear effects. Thus the observed strong enhancement of the response is actually stochastic resonance [8, 17]. *Simulations.*—Our simulations supported the theoretical results. Figure 3 shows a full set of regimes. One can see that in regimes with exponential relaxation and decaying oscillations the stochastic activity decreases with increasing N . Already at $N = 1000$ a stimulation with $F > F_c$ activates a finite fraction of neurons in agreement with the theory, though there are strong stochastic fluctuations around the steady state. In a small network of 50 neurons stochastic effects are strong and suppress the global activation. In Fig. 3 we also compare oscillations predicted by Eq. (7) to our simulations. Their period and shape depend on the parameters of the model such as F , α , c , Ω , and g_i . The theory and simulations are in very good agreement at $N = 10000$. Actually we found good agreement with only $N = 1000$. Surprisingly, the predicted oscillations emerge even in small groups of 50 neurons where strong stochastic effects and non negligible clustering could be expected. For $c = 20$ and $N = 50$ the mean clustering coefficient is $C = c/N = 0.4$ [2, 5] that

is close to $C = 0.53$ in macaque visual cortex [3]. This intrinsic property of small groups of neurons to oscillate may be very important for understanding of communication between neuronal groups in brain [18].

In conclusion, based on experiments and ideas of cellular automata, we developed a model of neural networks with excitatory and inhibitory neurons and a complex network architecture. We derived rate equations describing the evolution of the global neuronal activity. These equations are exact for infinite uncorrelated complex networks with arbitrary degree distributions, though for brevity, we presented results only for classical random graphs. This model shows that global oscillations and stochastic resonance are intrinsic properties of this non-linear dynamical system. The oscillations emerge when noise, i.e., the spontaneous neural activity, reaches a threshold level while stochastic resonance is a precursor of global oscillations. We also showed that the network structure is important. The larger the connectivity the broader is the region with global oscillations. Our simulations revealed that even small groups of 50-1000 neurons display oscillations similar to large networks.

This work was partially supported by projects POCI: BIA-BCM/62662, FIS/71551, SAU-NEU/103904 and the ARTEMIS and SOCIALNETS EU projects. We thank D. Holstein for help in simulations.

-
- [1] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* **393**, 409 (1998).
 - [2] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47 (2002); S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, *Adv. Phys.* **51**, 1079 (2002); M. E. J. Newman, *SIAM Review* **45**, 167 (2003).
 - [3] O. Sporns *et al*, *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **8**, 418 (2004).
 - [4] G. Buzsáki *et al*, *Trends Neurosci.* **27**, 186 (2004).
 - [5] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1275 (2008).
 - [6] G. B. Ermentrout *et al*, *Trends Neurosci.* **32**, 428 (2008).
 - [7] A. A. Faisal *et al*, *Nat. Neurosci.* **9**, 292 (2008).
 - [8] M. D. McDonnell and D. Abbott, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **5**, e1000348 (2009).
 - [9] J.-P. Eckmann *et al*, *Phys. Rep.* **449**, 54 (2007); I. Breisky *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 188102 (2006); J. Soriano *et al*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 13758 (2008).
 - [10] D. J. Amit, *Modeling brain function* (Cambridge University Press, NY, 1989).
 - [11] B. Derrida *et al*, *Europhys. Lett.* **4**, 167 (1987).
 - [12] C. van Vreeswijk and H. Sompolinsky, *Neural Comput.* **10**, 1321 (1998).
 - [13] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3200 (2001); *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 066117 (2001).
 - [14] M. Catanzaro, M. Boguñá, and R. Pastor-Satorras, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 056104 (2005).
 - [15] S. N. Dorogovtsev *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 040601 (2006); *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 056101 (2006).
 - [16] D. Plenz and T. C. Thiagarajan, *Trends Neurosci.* **30**, 101 (2007).
 - [17] L. Gamaitoni *et al*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 223 (1998).
 - [18] P. Fries, *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **9**, 474 (2005).