

Two symmetry breaking mechanisms for the development of orientation selectivity in a neural system

Myoung Won Cho^{1,*}

¹*Department of Global Medical Science, Sungshin Women's University, Seoul 142-732*

(Dated: May 23, 2022)

Orientation selectivity is a remarkable feature of the neurons located in the primary visual cortex. Provided that the visual neurons acquire orientation selectivity through activity-dependent Hebbian learning, the development process could be understood as a kind of symmetry breaking phenomenon in the view of physics. The key mechanisms of the development process are examined here in a neural system. Found is that there are at least two different mechanisms which lead to the development of orientation selectivity through breaking the radial symmetry in receptive fields. The first, a simultaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, bases on the competition between neighboring neurons, and the second, a spontaneous one, bases on the nonlinearity in interactions. It turns out that only the second mechanism leads to the formation of a columnar pattern which characteristics accord with those observed in an animal experiment.

PACS numbers: 84.35.+i, 87.18.Sn, 89.75.Fb

Keywords: Neural network, Self-organizing pattern, Orientation selectivity, Symmetry breaking

I. INTRODUCTION

The primary visual cortex (V1) is the first cortex area which receives visual signals from the retina via the lateral geniculate nucleus (LGN). The V1 neurons have the typical property to make distinct responses to a small set of visual stimuli[1]. They have individual receptive fields on the retina, where the center of the receptive fields becomes the primary feature of the V1 neurons. The next important feature is the orientation selectivity, through which the V1 neurons detect local bars or edges at the early stage of visual processing. The neuronal responses also discriminate small changes in spatial frequencies and colors. Furthermore, the V1 neurons have ocular dominance (OD), namely turning to one of the two eyes. It is not that the V1 neurons have individual features randomly. They cluster together with others exhibiting similar features and form a columnar pattern structure, or the called self-organizing feature map[2]. The distribution of receptive field centers forms the retinotopic map. And, a columnar pattern of orientation selectivity (or OD) becomes the orientation preference (OP) (or OD) map.

A number of models have been suggested to unravel the mechanism of visual map formation[3, 4]. Some of them adopt low-dimensional vectors to represent the features of the V1 neurons[5–11]. For example, the features of V1 neuron i can be expressed by the vector with five components $(x_i, y_i, p_i \cos 2\phi_i, p_i \sin 2\phi_i, z_i)$, where (x_i, y_i) and $(p_i \cos 2\phi_i, p_i \sin 2\phi_i)$ represent the center of receptive field (or retinotopy) and the orientation preference, respectively. And, z_i represents the ocular dominance. The abstract models provide with the advantageousness in simulation and analysis of visual map formation. They

help to reproduce or explain the typical characteristics of columnar patterns observed in V1 easily. Interestingly, ignoring retinotopy, the low-dimensional vector corresponds with a spin model vector[12, 13]. Moreover, the many characteristics of an OP or OD map have analogy with those of a magnetic system[5, 8]. For example, an OP map embraces singular points, dubbed pinwheels, around which preferred angles change by multiples of 180° along a closed loop. Pinwheels corresponds to (in-plane) vortices in magnetism, and are used to be annihilated during the visual map formation as vortices do[14, 15].

Meanwhile, some other models adopt high-dimensional feature vectors, which components represent the afferent connectivity from the retina ganglion cells (RGCs) (or the LGN cells) to the V1 neurons in usual. A high-dimensional feature representation model, reflecting more biological factors, is essential for inquiring how the V1 neurons acquire their typical features through a learning process. A correlation-based learning model, adopting high-dimensional feature vectors, was suggested to explain the formation of the OP or the OD map[16–18]. And, it was introduced a simplified version of the correlation-based learning model, which adopts only linear interaction terms[19]. It was also demonstrated that such a linear learning model can lead to the formation of a retinotopic (or topographic) map[20].

Analytically, the development of a typical feature in a neural system relates to the existence of a symmetric property in external inputs. It is the symmetry in left and right RGC activities which becomes the origin of the OD development[19]. And, the translational symmetry in RGC activities becomes the cause of the retinotopic map regulation[20]. Note that the organization of a columnar pattern relates to the translational symmetry in lateral interactions.

Analogically, the rotational symmetry in visual inputs may relate to the development of orientation selectivity.

*Electronic address: mwcho@sungshin.ac.kr

ity; however, there are different opinions about the detail mechanism. The discharges of RGCs are determined by the convolution visual inputs with center-surround receptive fields, where the center is either ON or OFF while the surround is the opposite. A major suggestion is that the two different types of receptive field is the essence of the orientation selectivity development: There are the models which explain the feature development by the competition or the Moiré interference between ON- and OFF-center type RGCs[17, 18, 21]. On the other hands, there is the suggestion that the development of orientation selectivity is possible independently of OFF-center RGCs[22]. It is known that the receptive field of neurons have a near Gaussian distribution shape when a topographic map develops in a neural network with homogeneous input neurons[20]. The neurons would acquire the feature of orientation selectivity additionally if they lost the radial symmetry in the receptive fields,

Based on the view, the development of orientation selectivity is investigated here in a learning model. The model, derived from biological neural dynamics and synaptic plasticity, has an extended form of the linear learning model which was studied for the topographic map formation. Observed is that there are at least two different mechanisms which lead to the symmetry breaking in receptive fields for the development of orientation selectivity. The first is a simultaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, bases on competitive interactions between neurons: Under a large degree of competition, receptive fields should be squeezed in order to reduce the overlap with neighbors. While the first mechanism is regardless of nonlinear interactions, the second requires a high order interaction term for the development of orientation selectivity. The second is a spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, through which the radial symmetry of receptive fields are broken independently of interactions with neighbors. Both the mechanisms lead to the development of an OP columnar pattern with singular points; however, the emergent columnar pattern has the characteristics being somewhat different (or coincide) with those in experimentally observed ones when the first (or the second) mechanism leads the symmetry breaking phenomenon.

II. THE MODEL

Suppose a neural network composed of input-output two layers, where output neurons have flexible feedforward (unidirectional) connections from input neurons and static lateral (bidirectional) connections with other output neurons. Suppose the continuous function $\phi_\ell(t)$ ($\in [0, 1]$) stands for the firing probability of neuron ℓ at position $\mathbf{r}_\ell = (x_\ell, y_\ell)$ and time t averaged over trials. Labeling input and output neurons with indices (a, b) and (i, j) , respectively, suppose the firing probability of neurons are expressed by the equation

$$\phi_a(t) = \eta_a(t) + h_a(t) \quad (1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i(t) = \eta_i(t) + \sum_a [D_{ia}\phi_a](t) + \sum_{j,a} [D_{ij}D_{ja}\phi_a](t) \quad (2) \\ + \sum_{a,b} [D_{iab}^{(3)}\phi_a\phi_b](t). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\eta_\ell(t)$, assumed to be generated by Poisson process, represent endogenous neural firings due to noisy currents and $h_a(t)$ neural firings due to external visual inputs. With the brief notation $[D_{i\ell}\phi_\ell](t) \equiv \int ds D_{i\ell}(s)\phi_\ell(t-s)$ and $[D_{iab}^{(3)}\phi_a\phi_b](t) \equiv \int ds ds' D_{iab}^{(3)}(s, s')\phi_a(t-s)\phi_b(t-s')$, the interaction strengths are expressed in the form

$$D_{i\ell}(s) = \lambda(s)W_{i\ell} \quad (3)$$

and

$$D_{iab}^{(3)}(s, s') = \lambda^{(3)}(s, s')W_{ia}W_{ib}. \quad (4)$$

Here $\lambda(s)$ and $\lambda^{(3)}(s, s')$ relate to the time delay in firing propagation, and $W_{i\ell}$ are the scaled coupling strengths. Experimentally, $\lambda(s)$ and $\lambda^{(3)}(s, s')$ could be measured by the derivative of the firing propagation probability with the respect to the scaled coupling strengths[23].

Meanwhile, a biological synapse changes its efficacy depending on the precise difference between post- and presynaptic firing times[24, 25]. According to the mechanism, the called spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) rule, the rate of change in feedforward connection strength can be expressed in the from

$$\Delta W_{ia} = \int dt \int dt' F(t-t')\phi_i(t)\phi_a(t'). \quad (5)$$

Here $F(t)$ describes the dependence of the synaptic modification on the difference between the post- and the presynaptic spike times. Usually $F(t)$ produces long-term potentiation (LTP) or positive change in a synapse when $t > 0$, and long-term depression (LTD) or negative change otherwise.

Substitution of Eq.(2) into Eq.(5) leads to the learning model for the visual map formation expressed as

$$\Delta W_{ia} = \sum_j J_{ij,a}W_{ja} + \sum_b W_{ib}C_{ba} + \sum_{b,c} W_{ib}W_{ic}V_{bca}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$J_{ij,a} = W_{ij} \sum_a \int dt \int dt' F(t-t') [\lambda\phi_a](t)\phi_a(t') \quad (7)$$

$$C_{ba} = \int dt \int dt' F(t-t') [\lambda\phi_b](t)\phi_a(t') \quad (8)$$

$$V_{bca} = \int dt \int dt' F(t-t') [\lambda^{(3)}\phi_b\phi_c](t)\phi_a(t') \quad (9)$$

First, the expectation value $J_{ij,a}/W_{ij}$ produce a similar value for all a when the activity of input neurons are similar, and become a positive value when $F(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ because $\lambda(t)$ has positive values only for small




FIG. 1: Learning results in a network composed of two layers with one-dimensional structure. Interaction parameters are given by (a) $(\alpha, \beta, \sigma, \alpha', \beta') = (0.3, 0.05, 16, 0, 0)$ and (b) $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta', \sigma_1) = (0, 0, 0.3, 0.05, 16)$, and $\gamma = 0.02$ and $\Lambda_{abc}^- = 0$ for all cases. The network size is $N = 40$ and $M = 50$ for output and input layers, respectively.

positive values of t in usual. Considered the lateral connections W_{ij} become positive in short-range and negative in long-range in a cortex area, the lateral interactions is expressed in the form

$$J_{ij,a} = J_{ij} \equiv \varepsilon_{ij} - \gamma, \quad (10)$$

where ε_{ij} equal unity for a nearest-neighbor pair (i, j) , and vanish otherwise. It is also possible to derive the negative part of the lateral interactions independently of inhibitory connections if the firing propagations and the form of $F(t)$ are considered in detail[20, 22, 23].

Meanwhile, C_{ab} is determined by the firing correlation of between two input neurons. If $\int dt F(t) < 0$ and $F(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$, the expectation value changes its sign from positive to negative with decreasing input correlation, where the correlation decreases with the distance between input neurons in usual[23]. Based on the property, the input correlation matrix is expressed in the from

$$C_{ab} = \alpha \exp \left[-\frac{\Lambda_{ab}}{\sigma^2} \right] - \beta, \quad (11)$$

where Λ_{ab} is set by $|\mathbf{r}_a - \mathbf{r}_b|^2/2$.

Similarly, the tensor V_{abc} is determined by the firing correlation of three input neurons, which has the dependency on not only the distance between but also the linearity of neural positions because of frequent edge patterns in natural images. On that account, the input correlation tensor is expressed in the form

$$V_{abc} = \alpha' \exp \left[-\frac{3\Lambda_{abc}^+}{2\sigma_1^2} - \frac{3\Lambda_{abc}^-}{2\sigma_2^2} \right] - \beta'. \quad (12)$$

Here $\Lambda_{abc}^\pm = \text{tr}(\Sigma) \pm \sqrt{[\text{tr}(\Sigma)]^2 - 4 \det(\Sigma)}$ are the eigenvalues of the 2×2 covariance matrix $\Sigma = E[(\mathbf{r} - \bar{\mathbf{r}})(\mathbf{r} - \bar{\mathbf{r}})^\top]$ with $\bar{\mathbf{r}} = E[\mathbf{r}] = (1/3) \sum_{\mu=a,b,c} \mathbf{r}_\mu$, or the variance along the major and minor axis in the multivariate Gaussian distribution of $\mathbf{r}_a, \mathbf{r}_b, \mathbf{r}_c$ three positions. Note that Λ_{ab} in Eq. (11) also becomes the variance in the distribution of $\mathbf{r}_a, \mathbf{r}_b$ two positions.

In addition, it is assumed that the length of the feed-forward connection vector $|\mathbf{W}_i|^2 = \sum_a W_{ia}^2$ for all i is normalized to unity during the evolution.

III. RESULTS

It is possible to predict from the previous studies what features would emerge when the learning rule has no nonlinear term. Reported was that a linear model with the form $\Delta W_{ia} = [JW + WC]_{ia}$ could lead to the development of a topographic map when both J and C produce positive values for close neurons and negative values otherwise[20]. Especially, the solution of the linear model is well studied for a neural network with a one-dimensional lattice structure: Close output neurons would have connections from close input neurons, where in-coming connections into the output neurons and outgoing connections from the input neurons form a near Gaussian distribution. Here the distribution of in-coming connections from input neurons to an output neuron becomes the receptive field of the output neuron. However the nonlinear term is considered, the correlation tensor V should exert the same effects on the network formation with the correlation matrix C because the three-point correlations contain no more typical feature for the one-dimensional lattice structure. Figure 1(a) (or (b)) show the emergent connection structure in a neural network when only J and C (or V) provides with valid coefficients.

Meanwhile, the learning model has the possibility to have the other type solutions when the neural network has a two-dimensional lattice structure. The Gaussian distribution form of receptive fields could polarized when they have difference variances along major and minor axes. And then, it deserves that the neurons acquire orientation selectivity through breaking of the radial symmetry in the receptive field.

In order to investigate what factor causes such symmetry breaking, it is first examined the effects of the parameter γ , determining the degree of competition between neurons, on the network formation. It is known that there is a critical value in the degree of competition only above which localized receptive fields develop[20]. If the degree of competition becomes more severe, the form of receptive fields would be distorted to reduce the overlap between neighbors.

Figure 2(a) shows the emergent receptive fields for different γ , where the effects of the tensor V is ignored by setting $(\alpha', \beta') = (0, 0)$ so that the network formation is led by only the linear interaction terms. In comparison with the near isotropic shape for an intermediate value of γ in the left figure, the form of receptive fields become elliptical for a large value of γ in the right figure. A similar phenomenon is observed when the network formation is led by not C but V (Fig. 2(b)). Namely, the symmetry breaking mechanism is regardless of the nonlinearity in the learning model.

Nevertheless, the emergent columnar patterns in Fig. 2(a) and (b) have something difference characteristics with experimentally observed ones. They possess a single singular point, around which the preferred angle changes by 360° along a closed loop; however, pinwheels




FIG. 2: Emergent receptive fields in a network composed of two layers with square lattice structure. The lines represent the direction of and the degree of orientation selectivity. Interaction parameters are given by (a) $(\alpha, \beta, \sigma, \alpha', \beta') = (0.1, 0.03, 20, 0, 0)$ and (b-c) $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta', \sigma_1) = (0, 0, 0.1, 0.02, 20)$ with $\sigma_2 = 5$ and 0.4 , respectively, in the network of size $(N, M) = (2 \times 2, 10 \times 10)$. The parameter γ is given by 1 in the left figures, and 4, 4, 2, respectively, in the right figures.




FIG. 3: Illustration of singularities, around which the orientation changes by multiples of (a-b) 360° or (c) 180° along a closed loop.

in an OP map are singular points around which the preferred angle changes by 180° (see Fig. 3). In addition, although pinwheels, understood as a topologically excited state, are used to disappear during a cortical development process, the singular points do not vanish to the end in the simulations[5, 14]. The phenomenon is caused by that the singular points develop inevitably when a group of neurons acquire orientation selectivity simultaneously through the squeeze of neighboring receptive fields.

Next, the emergent shape of receptive fields is examined when the correlation tensor V has a high degree of




FIG. 4: Change in the eccentricity of receptive fields, depending on σ_2 . Interaction parameters $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta', \sigma_1, \gamma) = (0, 0, 0.1, 0.01, 20, 0)$ have been used in a network of size $(N, M) = (1 \times 1, 8 \times 8)$.

anisotropy, where the degree is controlled by the ratio of σ_2 to σ_1 . Figure 2(c) shows that orientation selectivity develops when σ_2 is much smaller than σ_1 and the effect of the correlation matrix C is ignored by setting $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$. Observed is that the neurons acquire orientation selectivity independently of the degree of competition, but form different columnar patterns depending on the degrees. They have similar preferred angles with neighbors for a small γ in the left figure and different ones for a large γ in the right figure. The effect of competition on the columnar pattern accords with the prediction in the most low-dimensional feature representation models: The degree of competition determines the gradient when the preferred angles change smoothly along a direction in a patch of the columnar pattern[5–11].

Compared with the first mechanism, the second deserves to be a spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism because a single neuron could acquire orientation selectivity independently of the existence of or the interaction with neighboring neurons. In addition, the existence of a singular point is not indispensable to the emergence of orientation selectivity, as shown in Fig. 2(c). It is also investigated the change in the eccentricity of receptive fields, depending on σ_2 for a fixed σ_1 , in a neuron system with a single output neuron (Fig. 4). The graph exhibits that the isolated neuron could have an elliptical receptive field when σ_2 is larger than a critical value, and the eccentricity decreases with increasing σ_2 .

Finally, it is examined the development of a columnar pattern with the orientation selectivity as well as the topography in a larger lattice structure (Fig. 5). The center of receptive fields form a proper topographic map, and the polarity of them an OP map. The OP map have several singular points around which the preferred angles change by multiples of 180° .




FIG. 5: Distribution of (a) orientation selectivity and (b) topography after learning in a network composed of two layers with square lattice structure. Interaction parameters $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta', \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \gamma) = (0, 0, 0.5, 0.1, 20, 0.4, 1)$ have been used in a network of size $(N, M) = (15 \times 15, 10 \times 10)$.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper, it has been examined in a learning model that the development of orientation selectivity and the formation of columnar patterns. The model is a much simplified one in consideration of the complex development process and the detail structure of early visual systems, such as the genetic effects, the relay of visual signals via LGN, the different types of RGCs, and so on; however, such a minimal model is helpful to understand

the essential mechanisms for the development of typical properties in a neural network.

In the case of retinotopy or OD, it is known that a linear model can lead to the development of the neural feature and the formation of a proper columnar pattern. The key mechanism of both the feature development is the (block) diagonalization of the input correlation matrix depending on the symmetry in visual inputs[19, 20]. Analogically, it was also suggested that the development of orientation selectivity may be explained similarly by the diagonalization of the correlation matrix via the rotational symmetry in visual inputs[22]. Nevertheless, it has been not demonstrated until now whether the development of a proper OP map is possible just by adjusting the form of the correlation matrix in a linear model.

Observed in this paper is that the development of orientation selectivity is possible in a linear model; however, the feature development mechanism does not relate to the correlation matrix diagonalization. The mechanism bases on the competitive relationship between neighbor neurons, where the degree is determined not in the input correlation but in the lateral interaction matrix. Nevertheless, it is difficult to explain the OP development in the brain by the the first mechanism. However the mechanism leads to the development of a columnar pattern with different preferred angles and singular points; the emergent pattern has different characteristics with experimentally observed ones.

Meanwhile, the other mechanism of orientation selectivity development is found when the model is extended to have a high order interaction term. The requisite of the nonlinearity for the model seems to be natural in consideration of that the effect of frequent lengthy patterns in visual scenes can be reflected only by the input correlation between three or more neurons. The characteristics of an emergent columnar pattern also coincide with those in the experimentally observed ones. The second is a kind of spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, i.e., a single neuron could acquire orientation selectivity independently of the interactions with neighbors. The spontaneousness is in close connection with the instability of pinwheels, i.e., individual receptive fields should have orientation selectivity independently, like spins do, if pinwheels are indeed topologically excited states. The second mechanism is also an interesting one in the view of physics if it is considered that there are several models to explain a spontaneous symmetry breaking phenomenon by the effect of a higher-order interaction term[26].

[1] D. H. Hubbel and T. N. Wiesel, *J. Physiol.* **160**, 106 (1962).
 [2] T. Kohonen, *Self-organization and associative memory* (Spinger-Verlag, 1984).
 [3] E. Erwin, K. Obermayer, and K. Schulten, *Neural comput.* **7**, 425 (1995).

[4] N. V. Swindale, *Network: Comput. Neural Syst.* **7**, 161 (1996).
 [5] M. W. Cho and S. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 18101 (2004).
 [6] R. Durbin and G. Mitchison, *Nature* **343**, 341 (1990).
 [7] K. Obermayer, G. G. Blasdel, and K. Schulten, *Phys.*

- Rev. A **45**, 7568 (1992).
- [8] M. W. Cho and S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 68701 (2005).
- [9] F. Hoffsümmer, F. Wolf, T. Geisel, S. Löwel, and K. Schmidt, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Article Neural Networks* (Paris, 1995), vol. I, pp. 535–540.
- [10] O. Scherf, K. Pawelzik, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 6977 (1999).
- [11] G. J. Goodhill and A. Cimponeriu, Network: Comput. Neural Syst. **11**, 153 (2000).
- [12] S. Tanaka, in *Theory of self-organization of cortical maps*, edited by D. S. Touretzky (San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1989), pp. 451–458.
- [13] J. D. Cowan and A. E. Friedman, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **3**, 26 (1991).
- [14] F. Wolf and T. Geisel, Nature **395**, 73 (1998).
- [15] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1181 (1973).
- [16] K. D. Miller, J. B. Keller, and M. P. Stryker, Science **245**, 605 (1989).
- [17] K. D. Miller, J. Neurosci. **14**, 409 (1994).
- [18] K. D. Miller, **3**, 73 (1992).
- [19] P. Dayan and L. F. Abbott, *Theoretical Neuroscience* (The MIT Press, London, 2001).
- [20] M. W. Cho and M. Y. Choi, Neural Networks **31**, 46 (2012).
- [21] S. Paik and D. L. Ringach, Nature Neurosci. **14**, 919 (2011).
- [22] M. W. Cho and M. Y. Choi, J. Korean Phys. Soc. **55**, 2532 (2009).
- [23] M. W. Cho and M. Y. Choi, J. Korean Phys. Soc. **64**, 1213 (2014).
- [24] M. F. H. Markram, J. Lübke and B. S. B, Science **275**, 213 (1997).
- [25] G. q. Bi and M. m. Poo, J. Neurosci. **18**, 10464 (1998).
- [26] J. Goldston, Il Nuovo Cimento **19**, 154 (1961).