

Electroencephalographic field influence on calcium momentum waves

Lester Ingber*

Lester Ingber Research

(Dated: February 13, 2019)

Macroscopic electroencephalographic (EEG) fields can be an explicit top-down neocortical mechanism that directly drives bottom-up processes that describe memory, attention, etc. The top-down mechanism considered are macrocolumnar EEG firings in neocortex, as described by a statistical mechanics of neocortical interactions (SMNI), developed as a magnetic vector potential \mathbf{A} . The bottom-up process considered are Ca^{2+} waves prominent in synaptic and extracellular processes that are considered to greatly influence neuronal firings. Here, the complimentary effects are considered, i.e., the influence of \mathbf{A} on Ca^{2+} momentum, \mathbf{p} . The canonical momentum of a charged particle in an electromagnetic field, $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{A}$ (SI units), is calculated, where the charge of Ca^{2+} is $q = 2e$, e is the magnitude of the charge of an electron. Calculations demonstrate that macroscopic EEG \mathbf{A} can be quite influential on the momentum \mathbf{p} of Ca^{2+} ions, in both classical and quantum mechanics. This suggests that, instead of the common assumption that Ca^{2+} waves contribute to neuronal activity, they may in fact at times be caused by the influence of \mathbf{A} of larger-scale EEG.

PACS numbers: 87.19.L-, 05.10.Gg, 87.50.yg, 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Multiple Scales

There is a growing awareness of the importance of multiple scales in many physical and biological systems, including neuroscience [1, 2]. As yet, there do not seem to be any explicit top-down mechanisms that directly drive bottom-up processes that describe memory, attention, etc. Of course, there are many top-down type studies demonstrating that neuromodulator [3] and neuronal firing states, e.g., as defined by electroencephalographic (EEG) frequencies, can modify the milieu of individual synaptic and neuronal activity, which is still consistent with ultimate bottom-up paradigms. However, there is a logical difference between top-down milieu as conditioned by some prior external or internal conditions, and some direct top-down processes that directly cause bottom-up interactions specific to short-term memory (STM). Here, the operative word is “cause”. This study crosses molecular (Ca^{2+} ions), microscopic (synaptic and neuronal), mesoscopic (minicolumns and macrocolumns), and microscopic (regional scalp EEG) scales.

B. Magnetism Influences in Living Systems

There is a body of evidence that suggests a specific top-down mechanism for neocortical STM processing.

An example of a direct physical mechanism that affects neuronal processing not part of “standard” sensory influences is the strong possibility of magnetic influences in birds at quantum levels of interaction [4–6]. It should be noted that this is just a proposed mechanism [7].

The strengths of magnetic fields in neocortex may be at a threshold to directly influence synaptic interactions with astrocytes, as proposed for long-term memory (LTM) [8] STM [9, 10] Magnetic strengths associated by collective EEG activity at a columnar level gives rise to even stronger magnetic fields. Columnar excitatory and inhibitory processes largely take place in different neocortical laminae, providing possibilities for more specific mechanisms.

C. SMNI Context

Since 1981, 30+ papers on a statistical mechanics of neocortical interactions (SMNI) applied to columnar firing states, have detailed properties of short-term memory — e.g., capacity (auditory 7 ± 2 and visual 4 ± 2), duration, stability, primacy versus recency rule, Hick’s law — and other properties of neocortex by scaling up to macrocolumns across regions to fit EEG data [11–16]. SMNI not only details STM, testing SMNI at columnar scales, but also scaled-SMNI at relatively macroscopic scales has very well modeled large EEG databases, testing SMNI at regional scales.

Experimental research reported in 2012 supports information/memory processing by coherent columnar firings across many neurons [17, 18]. This new experimental confirmation greatly enhances the importance the SMNI approach.

The influence on the momentum of a Ca^{2+} ion from macrocolumnar EEG fields as measured on the scalp, is thereby considered as the processing of information. SMNI calculates the influence of these regional synchronous firings at molecular scales that drive most influential Ca^{2+} interactions across synapses. The roles of Ca^{2+} in neocortex, while not completely understood, are very well appreciated as being quite important. It is likely that Ca^{2+} waves are instrumental in tripartite

* ingber@alumni.caltech.edu

synaptic interactions of astrocytes and neuronal synapses [19–21].

Columnar EEG firings calculated by SMNI lead to electromagnetic fields which can be described by a vector potential. This is referred to as the SMNI vector potential (SMNI-VP). An early discussion of SMNI-VP contained in a review of short-term memory as calculated by SMNI was not as detailed [16], and a previous paper outlined the approach taken here, but only in a classical physics context [22]. Current research is directed to more detailed interactions of SMNI-VP firing states with Ca^{2+} waves.

II. CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM CONSIDERATIONS

A. Effective Momentum $\mathbf{\Pi}$

The effective momentum, $\mathbf{\Pi}$, affecting the momentum \mathbf{p} of a moving particle in an electromagnetic field, is understood from the canonical momentum [23–25], in SI units,

$$\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{A} \quad (1)$$

where $q = 2e$ for Ca^{2+} , e is the magnitude of the charge of an electron = 1.6×10^{-19} C (Coulomb), and \mathbf{A} is the electromagnetic vector potential. (In Gaussian units $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{A}/c$, where c is the speed of light.) \mathbf{A} represents three components of a 4-vector [26]. In the standard gauge, the 3-vector components of this 4-vector potential related to magnetic fields are of interest.

$\mathbf{\Pi}$ can be used in quantum as well as in classical calculations. Quantum mechanical calculations including these effects are likely important as it is clear that in time scales much shorter than neuronal firings Ca^{2+} wave packets spread over distances the size of typical synapses [27]. The gauge of \mathbf{A} is not specified here, and this can lead to important effects especially at quantum scales [28].

B. Quantum Calculation

The Lagrangian L , the argument of the exponential defining this probability distribution, includes the canonical energy $\mathbf{\Pi}^2/(2m)$, which explicitly contains a $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ interaction term. The $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ effect is simply calculated here with the same answer as in the classical case: The momentum representation of such a Gaussian wave function is itself a Gaussian wave function. The field \mathbf{A} is shown to be quite insensitive to a reasonable spatial location, so we just have to consider the expectation of momentum \mathbf{p} , which essentially gives back the classical value. This is made more explicit as follows:

The 3-dimensional Gaussian wave function in \mathbf{r} -space of a Ca^{2+} ion is derived as follows. The normalized wave function at time $t = 0$ in momentum space is

$$\phi(\mathbf{p}, 0) = (2\pi(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2)^{-3/4} e^{-i(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{p}_0)^2/(4(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2)} \quad (2)$$

where squared vectors represent inner products, e.g., $(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2 = \Delta\mathbf{p} \cdot \Delta\mathbf{p}$. ϕ develops in time as $\exp(-iHt)$ with Hamiltonian/Energy H ,

$$\phi(\mathbf{p}, t) = \phi(\mathbf{p}, 0) e^{-i((\mathbf{p}+q\mathbf{A})^2 t)/(2m\hbar)} \quad (3)$$

The normalized wave function in coordinate space is given by a Fourier transform in \mathbf{k} -space, which can be taken in \mathbf{p} -space using $\mathbf{p} = \hbar\mathbf{k}$,

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = (2\pi\hbar)^{-3/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3\mathbf{p} \phi(\mathbf{p}, t) e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}/\hbar} \quad (4)$$

This integral yields

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \alpha^{-1} e^{-\beta/\gamma - \delta}$$

$$\alpha = (2\hbar)^{3/2} (2\pi(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2)^{3/4} \left(\frac{it}{2m\hbar} - \frac{1}{4(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2} \right)^{3/2}$$

$$\beta = \left(\mathbf{r} - \frac{q\mathbf{A}t}{m} - \frac{i\hbar\mathbf{p}_0}{2(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2} \right)^2$$

$$\gamma = 4 \left(\frac{i\hbar}{2m} + \frac{\hbar^2}{4(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2} \right)$$

$$\delta = \frac{\mathbf{p}_0^2}{4(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2} + \frac{iq^2\mathbf{A}^2 t}{2m\hbar} \quad (5)$$

In coordinate space ψ exhibits a direct dependence on \mathbf{A} in the displacement $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{r} - q\mathbf{A}t/m$.

Note that

$$(\Delta\mathbf{p})^2(\Delta\mathbf{r})^2 \geq (\hbar/2)^2 \quad (6)$$

where $((\Delta\mathbf{r})^2)^{1/2}$ is the spatial 1/2-width of the packet. With the variance of ψ in terms of $1/\Delta\mathbf{p}$ instead of $\Delta\mathbf{r}$, a factor of $\hbar^{-3/2}$ is introduced into $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ in order that the wave function in coordinate space be properly normalized. The dispersion of the wave packet in time can be seen in the factors and terms in $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$, above.

If just the effects of \mathbf{A} on the wave function is required, using \mathbf{p} -space is more straightforward than a typical $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ calculation that does a partial integration to get $\partial\mathbf{A}/\partial t$, giving $-\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{E}$, in terms of the coordinate \mathbf{r} and electric field \mathbf{E} , but \mathbf{r} is not as directly observed as is \mathbf{p} . Also note that the quantum expected value of \mathbf{p} from $\int \phi^* \phi \mathbf{p}$ returns just \mathbf{p}_0 , the same as the classical value.

C. A of Wire

For a wire/neuron carrying a current \mathbf{I} , measured in A (not bold \mathbf{A}) = Amperes = C/s,

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{\mu}{4\pi} \int \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{r} \mathbf{I} \quad (7)$$

where the current is along a length z (a neuron), observed from a perpendicular distance r from the line of thickness r_0 . Neglecting far-field retardation effects, this yields

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{\mu}{4\pi} \mathbf{I} \log \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right) \quad (8)$$

Similar formulae for other geometries are in texts [26]. The point here is the insensitive log dependence on distance. The estimates below assume this log factor to be of order 1. However, especially in this neocortical EEG context, the (oscillatory) time dependence of $\mathbf{A}(t)$ derived from $\mathbf{I}(t)$ is influential in the dynamics of Ca^{2+} waves.

The magnetic field \mathbf{B} derived from \mathbf{A} ,

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \quad (9)$$

is still attenuated in the glial areas where Ca^{2+} waves exist, and its magnitude decreases as inverse distance, but \mathbf{A} derived near the minicolumns will be used there and at further distance since it is not so attenuated. The electrical dipole for collective minicolumnar EEG derived from \mathbf{A} is

$$\mathbf{E} = \frac{ic}{\omega} \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{ic}{\omega} \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \quad (10)$$

μ_0 , the magnetic permeability in vacuum = $4\pi 10^{-7}$ H/m (Henry/meter), where Henry has units of kg-m-C⁻², is the conversion factor from electrical to mechanical variables. Near neurons, $\mu = 10 \mu_0$ [29], giving $\mu = 4\pi 10^{-6}$ H/m.

The contribution to \mathbf{A} can be viewed as including many such minicolumnar lines of current across 100's to 100's of macrocolumns that typically contribute to large synchronous bursts of EEG [30].

D. Numerical Effects of A on p

The momentum \mathbf{p} at issue is calculated for comparison to the vector potential. In neocortex, a Ca^{2+} ion with mass $m = 6.6 \times 10^{-26}$ kg, has speed on the order of 50 $\mu\text{m/s}$ [31] to 100 $\mu\text{m/s}$ [21]. This gives a momentum on the order of 10^{-30} kg-m/s. A study of molar concentrations gives an estimate of a Ca^{2+} wave as comprised of tens of thousands of such ions [21].

$q\mathbf{A}$ can be calculated at several scales:

In studies of small ensembles of neurons [32], an electric dipole moment \mathbf{Q} is defined as $\mathbf{I}z\hat{r}$, where \hat{r} is the direction unit-vector, leading to estimates of $|\mathbf{Q}|$ for a pyramidal neuron on the order of 1 pA-m = 10^{-12} A-m. Multiplying by 10^4 synchronous firings in a macrocolumn gives an effective dipole moment $|\mathbf{Q}| = 10^{-8}$ A-m. Taking z to be $10^2 \mu\text{m} = 10^{-4}$ m (a couple of neocortical layers) to get \mathbf{I} , this gives an estimate $|q\mathbf{A}| \approx 2 \times 10^{-19} \times 10^{-6} \times 10^{-8} / 10^{-4} = 10^{-27}$ kg-m/s,

Estimates at larger scales [33] give a dipole density $\mathbf{P} = 0.1 \mu\text{A}/\text{mm}^2$. Multiplying this density by a volume of $\text{mm}^2 \times 10^2 \mu\text{m}$ (using the same estimate above for z), gives a $|\mathbf{Q}| = 10^{-9}$ A-m. This is smaller than that above, due to this estimate including cancellations giving rise to scalp EEG, while the estimate above is within a macrocolumn (the focus of this study), leading to $|q\mathbf{A}| = 10^{-28}$ kg-m/s.

The above calculations show how important the effect of $q\mathbf{A}$ from macroscopic EEG, on the order of 10^{-27} kg-m/s can be on the momentum \mathbf{p} of a Ca^{2+} ion, on the order of 10^{-30} kg-m/s. The EEG effect on the displacement of the \mathbf{r} coordinate in the ψ wave function, $q\mathbf{A}t/m$, is on the order of $1.5 \times 10^{-2}t$ m which within 100 ms is on the order of 1.5×10^{-3} m, assuming the wave function is still coherent at that time. If we assume the extent of $\Delta\mathbf{r}$ can be on the order of a synapse [27], then this spatial extent is on the order of about $\mu\text{m} = 10^4 \text{ \AA}$. (Typical synaptic gaps are on the order of a few nm.) If this is correct, then the displacement of \mathbf{r} by the \mathbf{A} term is much larger than $\Delta\mathbf{r}$.

If the uncertainty principle is close to saturation, we can take $\Delta\mathbf{p} \geq \hbar(2\Delta\mathbf{r}) = 1.054 \times 10^{-34} / (2 \times 10^{-6}) = 5 \times 10^{-29}$ kg-m/s. This would make $\Delta\mathbf{p}$ about the same as \mathbf{p} .

III. SMNI

A. SMNI Dipoles

A dipole model for collective minicolumnar oscillatory currents is considered, corresponding to top-down signaling, flowing in ensembles of axons, not for individual neurons. The top-down signal is claimed to cause relevant effects on the surrounding milieu, but is not appropriate outside these surfaces due to strong attenuation of electrical activity. However, the vector potentials produced by these dipoles due to axonal discharges do survive far from the axons, and this can lead to important effects at the molecular scale, e.g., in the environment of ions [24, 34].

The SMNI columnar probability distributions, derived from statistical aggregation of synaptic and neuronal interactions among minicolumns and macrocolumns, have established credibility at columnar scales by detailed calculations of properties of STM. Under conditions enhancing multiple attractors, detailed in SMNI with

a “centering mechanism” effected by changes in background synaptic activity, multiple columnar collective firing states are developed. It must be stressed that these minicolumns are the entities which the above dipole moment is modeling. The Lagrangian of the SMNI distributions, although possessing multivariate nonlinear means and covariance, have functional forms similar to arguments of firing distributions of individual neurons, so that the description of the columnar dipole above is a model faithful to the standard derivation of a vector potential from an oscillating electric dipole.

Note that this is not necessarily the only or most popular description of electromagnetic influences in neocortex, which often describes dendritic presynaptic activity as inducing large scale EEG [35], or axonal firings directly affecting astrocyte processes [36]. This work is only and specifically concerned with electromagnetic fields in collective axonal firings, directly associated with columnar STM phenomena in SMNI calculations, which create vector potentials influencing ion momenta just outside minicolumnar structures.

B. SMNI Ca^{2+} -Wave Calculations

The SMNI approach is a bottom-up mesoscopic aggregation from microscopic synaptic scales to columnar and then scaled to relatively macroscopic regional scales of neocortex, and has been merged with larger non-invasive EEG scales — all at scales much coarser than molecular scales. Here it is calculated how an SMNI vector potential (SMNI-VP) constructed from magnetic fields induced by neuronal electrical firings, at thresholds of collective minicolumnar activity with laminar specification, can give rise to causal top-down mechanisms that effect molecular excitatory and inhibitory processes in STM and LTM.

While many studies have examined the influences of changes in Ca^{2+} distributions on large-scale EEG [37], future work will examine the complimentary effects on Ca^{2+} ions at a given neuron site from EEG-induced magnetic fields arising from other neuron sites. Here, sufficient calculations claim the importance of macroscopic EEG \mathbf{A} , arising from microscopic synchronous neural activity, on molecular momenta \mathbf{p} in Ca^{2+} ions.

C. Ca^{2+} Momenta

The time dependence of Ca^{2+} wave momenta is typically calculated with simulations using rate equations [38], within multivariate differential equations describing interactions among quite a few neuronal elements and parameters. In this study, the resulting flow of Ca^{2+} wave momenta will be further determined by its interactions in $\mathbf{\Pi}$, the canonical momenta which includes \mathbf{A} .

D. SMNI-VP

The outline of coupling the SMNI-VP with Ca^{2+} waves follows.

Similar to the scaling of mesoscopic columnar firings to an electric potential Φ describe regional EEG that was fitted to large data sets [15], here columnar firings are scaled to describe the effective current \mathbf{I} giving rise to the vector potential \mathbf{A} .

In previous work [15], a scaled macrocolumnar electric potential Φ_ν at scalp region ν was derived with first and second moments of the SMNI Lagrangian, given by

$$m \equiv \langle \Phi_\nu - \phi \rangle = a \langle M^E \rangle + b \langle M^I \rangle = ag^E + bg^I$$

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \langle (\Phi_\nu - \phi)^2 \rangle - \langle \Phi_\nu - \phi \rangle^2 = a^2 g^{EE} + b^2 g^{II} \quad (11)$$

where the M^G -space drifts, g^G , and diffusions, $g^{GG'}$, are derived in SMNI for excitatory ($G = E$) and inhibitory ($G = I$) firing states, and are highly nonlinear in M^G .

Similarly, here

$$\mathbf{A} = cM^E \hat{\mathbf{r}} + dM^I \hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad (12)$$

where c and d are scaled to the order of 10^4 pA, as discussed above.

This results in a Lagrangian L for the combined EEG- Ca^{2+} system,

$$L = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (\dot{\Phi}_\nu - m)^2 + \frac{1}{2m} (\mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{A})^2 \quad (13)$$

where the $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ interaction term mentioned above can be explicitly recognized. This Lagrangian is the argument of the exponential defining the conditional probability density for developing from a state at time $t-1$ to time t . The variational principle obeyed by this Lagrangian permits optimization of parameters to find most likely states that best fit EEG data, i.e., including macrocolumnar parameters within regions, long-ranged connectivity and time delays across regions [15].

The duration of a Ca^{2+} wave can be on the order of 500 ms, so that the momenta of such ions can be importantly influenced during relatively long EEG events like N100 and P300 potentials, reflecting latencies on the order of 100 ms and 300 ms, common in selective attention tasks which span these events [30].

If we assume that the current lies along $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, then \mathbf{A} only has components along $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, and

$$\mathbf{\Pi} = p_x \hat{\mathbf{x}} + p_y \hat{\mathbf{y}} + (p_z + qA_z) \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (14)$$

The influence of time-dependent Ca^{2+} waves is introduced in the post-synaptic and pre-synaptic SMNI parameters, which here also are time-dependent as functions of changing Ca^{2+} ions. Such parameters are present at neuronal scales and are included in microscopic ordinary differential equation calculations. However, as in the original development of SMNI, these parameters are developed to mesocolumnar scales.

SMNI mesoscopic firings are concisely described by coupled stochastic differential equations, nonlinear in the drifts and covariance in terms of M^E and M^I variables, and mesoscopic synaptic and neuronal parameters. It has been most productive to cast these coupled equations into mathematically equivalent conditional probability distributions, which are better suited to handle algebraic intricacies of their rather general nonlinear time-dependent structure, and which afford the use of powerful derivations based on the associated variational principle, e.g., Canonical Momenta Indicators and Euler-Lagrange equations. This is all rigorously derived and calculated in many preceding SMNI papers, and required developing powerful numerical algorithms to fit these algebraic models to data [39, 40] and to develop numerical details of the propagating probability distributions using PATHINT [41] and PATHTREE [42].

E. Coupled SMNI-VP Ca^{2+} System

A calculation based on SMNI would incorporate scaled multivariate neuronal processes, directly influenced by Ca^{2+} molecular processes, into the Lagrangian of these probability distributions.

Another alternative, forsaking some power of the probabilistic framework, is to use reasonably accurate most-probable path ordinary differential equation [43], replacing the SMNI stochastic differential equations, to include together with the molecular and microscopic and development.

IV. CONCLUSION

For several decades biological and biophysical research into neocortical information processing has explained neocortical as specific bottom-up molecular and smaller-scale processes [44]. It is clear that most molecular approaches consider it inevitable that their approaches at molecular and possibly even quantum scales will yet prove to be causal explanations of relatively macroscopic

phenomena.

Over the past three decades, with regard to STM and LTM phenomena, which themselves are likely components of other phenomena like attention and consciousness, the SMNI approach has yielded specific details of STM not present in molecular approaches [16]. The SMNI calculations detail information processing capable of neocortex using patterns of columnar firings, e.g., as observed in scalp EEG [18], which give rise to a SMNI vector potential \mathbf{A} that influences the molecular Ca^{2+} momentum \mathbf{p} .

We are left with a conjecture, simply noting that a $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ effect could be seen as a predominance of Ca^{2+} waves in directions closely aligned to the direction perpendicular to neocortical laminae (\mathbf{A} is in the same direction as the current flow, typically across laminae, albeit they are convoluted), especially during strong collective EEG (e.g., strong enough to be measured on the scalp, such as during selective attention tasks). Since the spatial scales of Ca^{2+} wave and macro-EEG are quite disparate, an experimenter would have to be able to correlate both scales in time scales on the order of tens of milliseconds.

The basic premise of this study is robust against any theoretical modeling, as experimental data is used wherever possible for both Ca^{2+} ions and for large-scale electromagnetic activity. The theoretical construct of the canonical momentum $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{A}$ is firmly entrenched in classical and quantum mechanics. Calculations demonstrate that macroscopic EEG \mathbf{A} can be quite influential on the momentum \mathbf{p} of Ca^{2+} ions, in both classical and quantum mechanics.

Thus, a single Ca^{2+} ion can have a momentum appreciably altered in the presence of macrocolumnar EEG firings, and this effect is magnified when many ions in a wave are similarly affected. Therefore, large-scale top-down neocortical processing giving rise to measurable scalp EEG can directly influence molecular-scale bottom-up processes. This suggests that, instead of the common assumption that Ca^{2+} waves contribute to neuronal activity, they may in fact at times be caused by the influence of \mathbf{A} of larger-scale EEG. Such a top-down effect awaits forensic in vivo experimental verification, requiring appreciating the necessity and due diligence of including true multiple-scale interactions across orders of magnitude in the complex neocortical environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank Paul Nunez and William Ross for verification of some experimental data, and Charlie Gray for a preprint.

-
- [1] C. Anastassiou, R. Perin, H. Markram, and C. Koch, *Nature Neuroscience* **14**, 217 (2011).
 [2] P. Nunez, R. Srinivasan, and L. Ingber, in *Multiscale Analysis and Nonlinear Dynamics*, edited by M. Pesen-

son (Wiley, New York, 2012) p. (to be published).

- [3] R. Silberstein, in *Neocortical Dynamics and Human EEG Rhythms*, edited by P. Nunez (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 1995) pp. 628–681.

- [4] I. Kominis, *Zeno is pro Darwin: quantum Zeno effect suppresses the dependence of radical-ion-pair reaction yields on exchange and dipolar interactions*, Tech. Rep. arXiv:0908.0763v2 [quant-ph] (University of Crete, Greece, 2009).
- [5] C. Rodgers and P. Hore, PNAS **106**, 353 (2009).
- [6] I. Solov'yov and K. Schulten, Biophys. J. **96**, 4804 (2009).
- [7] S. Johnsen and K. Lohmann, Phys. Today **61**, 29 (2008).
- [8] G. Gordon, K. Iremonger, S. Kantevari, G. Ellis Davies, B. MacVicar, and J. Bains, Neuron **64**, 391 (2009).
- [9] M. Banachlocha, Brain Res. Bull. **73**, 21 (2007).
- [10] J. A. Pereira and F. Furlan, Progress in Neurobiology **92**, 405 (2010).
- [11] L. Ingber, Physica D **5**, 83 (1982), http://www.ingber.com/smni82_basic.pdf.
- [12] L. Ingber, Phys. Rev. A **28**, 395 (1983), http://www.ingber.com/smni83_dynamics.pdf.
- [13] L. Ingber, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 3346 (1984), http://www.ingber.com/smni84_stm.pdf.
- [14] L. Ingber, Phys. Rev. E **49**, 4652 (1994), http://www.ingber.com/smni94_stm.pdf.
- [15] L. Ingber, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 4578 (1997), http://www.ingber.com/smni97_cmi.pdf.
- [16] L. Ingber, in *Short-Term Memory: New Research*, edited by G. Kalivas and S. Petralia (Nova, Hauppauge, NY, 2012a) pp. 37–72, Invited Paper. http://www.ingber.com/smni11_stm_scales.pdf.
- [17] S. Liebe, G. Hoerzer, N. Logothetis, and G. Rainer, Nature **January** (2012), doi: 10.1038/nm.3038.
- [18] R. Salazar, N. Dotson, S. Bressler, and C. Gray, Science **November** (2012), doi:10.1126/science.1224000.
- [19] C. Agulhon, J. Petravicz, A. McMullen, E. Sweger, S. Minton, S. Taves, K. Casper, T. Fiacco, and K. McCarthy, Neuron **59**, 932 (2008).
- [20] A. Araque and M. Navarrete, Phil. Tran. R. Soc. B, 2375 (2010).
- [21] W. Ross, Nature **13**, 157 (2012).
- [22] L. Ingber, Current Progress Journal **1**, 4 (2012b), http://www.ingber.com/smni12_vectpot.pdf.
- [23] R. Feynman, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (W.A. Benjamin, New York, 1961).
- [24] R. Feynman, R. Leighton, and M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1964).
- [25] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics, 2nd ed.* (Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1980).
- [26] J. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics* (Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962).
- [27] H. Stapp, *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993).
- [28] J. Tollaksen, Y. Aharonov, A. Casher, T. Kaufherr, and S. Nussinov, New J. Phys. **12**, 1 (2010).
- [29] D. Georgiev, *Electric and magnetic fields inside neurons and their impact upon the cytoskeletal microtubules*, Tech. Rep. Cogprints Report (Cogprints, U. Southampton, UK, 2003) <http://cogprints.org/3190/>.
- [30] R. Srinivasan, W. Winter, J. Ding, and P. Nunez, J. Neurosci. Methods **166**, 41 (2007), <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2151962/>.
- [31] S. Bellinger, Neurocomputing **65**, 843 (2005).
- [32] S. Murakami and Y. Okada, J. Physiol. **575**, 925 (2006).
- [33] P. Nunez and R. Srinivasan, *Electric Fields of the Brain: The Neurophysics of EEG, 2nd Ed.* (Oxford University Press, London, 2006).
- [34] G. Giuliani, Eur. J. Phys. **31**, 871 (2010).
- [35] P. Nunez, *Electric Fields of the Brain: The Neurophysics of EEG* (Oxford University Press, London, 1981).
- [36] J. McFadden, NeuroQuantology **5**, 262 (2007).
- [37] P. Kudela, G. Bergey, and P. Franaszczuk, Biophys. J. **97**, 3065 (2009).
- [38] N. Carnevale and M. Hines, *The NEURON Book* (Cambridge U Press, Cambridge, UK, 2006).
- [39] L. Ingber, *Adaptive Simulated Annealing (ASA)*, Tech. Rep. Global optimization C-code (Caltech Alumni Association, Pasadena, CA, 1993) <http://www.ingber.com/#ASA-CODE>.
- [40] L. Ingber, in *Stochastic global optimization and its applications with fuzzy adaptive simulated annealing*, edited by J. H.A. Oliveira, A. Petraglia, L. Ingber, M. Machado, and M. Petraglia (Springer, New York, 2012c) pp. 33–61, Invited Paper. http://www.ingber.com/asa11_options.pdf.
- [41] L. Ingber and P. Nunez, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 5074 (1995), http://www.ingber.com/smni95_stm.pdf.
- [42] L. Ingber, C. Chen, R. Mondescu, D. Muzzall, and M. Renedo, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 056702 (2001), http://www.ingber.com/path01_pathtree.pdf.
- [43] H. Dekker, Phys. Lett. A **80**, 99 (1980).
- [44] M. Rabinovich, P. Varona, A. Selverston, and H. Arbaranel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 1213 (2006).

\$Id: smni12_eeg_ca,v 1.96 2012/11/29 18:33:55 ingber
Exp ingber\$