

# A novel plasticity rule can explain the development of sensorimotor intelligence

Ralf Der<sup>1</sup> and Georg Martius<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Science, Leipzig, Germany

<sup>2</sup> IST Austria, Klosterneuburg, Austria

April 9, 2018

## Abstract

Grounding autonomous behavior in the nervous system is a fundamental challenge for neuroscience. In particular, the self-organized behavioral development provides more questions than answers. Are there special functional units for curiosity, motivation, and creativity? This paper argues that these features can be grounded in synaptic plasticity itself, without requiring any higher level constructs. We propose differential extrinsic plasticity (DEP) as a new synaptic rule for self-learning systems and apply it to a number of complex robotic systems as a test case. Without specifying any purpose or goal, seemingly purposeful and adaptive behavior is developed, displaying a certain level of sensorimotor intelligence. These surprising results require no system specific modifications of the DEP rule but arise rather from the underlying mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking due to the tight brain-body-environment coupling. The new synaptic rule is biologically plausible and it would be an interesting target for a neurobiological investigation. We also argue that this neuronal mechanism may have been a catalyst in natural evolution.

## 1 Introduction

Research in neuroscience produces understanding of the brain on many different levels. At the smallest scale there is enormous progress in understanding mechanisms of neural signal transmission and processing [1, 2, 3, 4]. At the other end, neuroimaging and related techniques enable the creation of a global understanding of the brain’s functional organization [5, 6]. However, there remains a gap in binding these results together, leaving open the question of how all these complex mechanisms interact [7, 8, 9]. This paper advocates for the role of self-organization in bridging this gap. We focus on the functionality of neural circuits acquired during individual development by processes of self-organization — making complex global behavior emerge from simple local rules.

Donald Hebb’s formula “cells that fire together wire together” [10] may be seen as an early example of such a simple local rule which has proven successful in building associative memories and perceptual functions [11, 12]. However, Hebb’s law and its successors like BCM [13] and STDP [14, 15] are restricted to scenarios where the learning is driven passively by an externally generated data stream. However, from the perspective of an autonomous agent, sensory input is mainly determined by its own actions. The challenge of behavioral self-organization requires a new kind of learning that bootstraps novel behavior out of the self-generated past experiences.

This paper introduces a rule which may be expressed as “chaining together what changes together.” This rule both takes into account temporal structure and establishes the contact to the external world by directly relating the behavioral level to the synaptic dynamics. These features together provide a mechanism for bootstrapping behavioral patterns from scratch.

This synaptic mechanism is neurobiologically plausible and naturally raises the question of whether it is present in living beings. This paper aims to encourage such initiatives by using bioinspired robots as a methodological tool. Admittedly, there is a large gap between biological beings and such robots. Yet, in the last decade, robotics has seen a change of paradigm from classical AI thinking to embodied AI [16, 17] which recognizes the role of embedding the specific body in its environment. This has moved robotics closer to biological systems and supports their use as a testbed for neuroscientific hypotheses [18].

We deepen this argument by presenting concrete results showing that the proposed synaptic plasticity rule generates a large number of phenomena which are important for neuroscience. We show that, up to the




Figure 1: **Controller network connected to the humanoid robot.** The proposed differential extrinsic plasticity (DEP) rule is illustrated in the insets on the right. In addition to the homosynaptic term  $\dot{y}$  of plain differential Hebbian learning, the DEP (3) has the exafferent signal  $\delta\dot{y}$  that may be integrated by a heterosynaptic mechanism. In the simplest case, e. g. with the humanoid robot, the inverse model  $F$  is a one-to-one mapping of sensor to motor values.

level of sensorimotor contingencies, self-determined behavioral development can be grounded in synaptic dynamics, without having to postulate higher level constructs such as intrinsic motivation, curiosity, or a specific reward system. This is achieved with a very simple neuronal control structure by outsourcing much of the complexity to the embodiment (the idea of morphological computation [19, 20]).

The paper comes with a supporting material containing video clips and technical detail that is available at <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>. We recommend to start with Video 1 providing a brief overview.

## 2 Grounding behavior in the synaptic plasticity

We consider generic robotic systems, a humanoid and a hexapod robot, in physically realistic simulations using LPZROBOTS [21]. These robots are mechanical systems of rigid body primitives linked by joints. With each joint  $i$ , there is an angular motor for realizing the new joint angles  $y_i$  as proposed by the controller network and there is a sensor measuring the true joint angle  $x_i$  (like muscle spindles). The implementation of the motors is similar to muscle/tendon driven systems by being compliant to external forces.

### 2.1 Controller network

One theme of our work is structural simplicity, building on the paradigm that complex behavior may emerge from the interaction of a simple neural circuitry with the complex external world. Specifically, the controller is a network of rate-coded neurons transforming sensor values  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  into motor commands  $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)$ . In the application, a one-layer feed-forward network is used, described as

$$y_i = g \left( \sum_{j=1}^n C_{ij} x_j + h_i \right) \quad (1)$$

for neuron  $i$ , where  $h_i$  is the threshold. We use tanh-neurons, i. e. the activation function  $g(z) = \tanh(z)$  to get motor commands between +1 and -1. This type of neurons is chosen for simplicity, but our approach can be translated into a neurobiologically more realistic setting. The setup is displayed in Fig. 1.

This controller network may appear utterly oversimplified. Commonly, and in particular in classical Artificial Intelligence, a certain behavior is seen as the execution of a plan devised by the brain. This would require a highly organized internal brain dynamics, which could never be realized by the simple one-layer network. However, in this paper behavior is an emerging mode in the dynamical system formed by brain, body, and environment [16]. As we demonstrate here, by the new synaptic rule, the above simple feed-forward network can generate a large variety of motion patterns in complex dynamical systems.

### 2.2 Chaining together what changes together

When learning the controller (1) with a Hebbian law, the rate of change  $\dot{C}_{ij}$  of synapse  $C_{ij}$  would be proportional to the input  $x_j$  into the synapse of neuron  $i$  multiplied by its activation  $y_i$ , i. e.  $\dot{C}_{ij} \propto y_i x_j$ .

However, in the concrete settings, this rule produces typically fixed-point behaviors. It was suggested earlier [22, 23, 24] that time can come into play in a more fundamental way if the so called differential Hebbian learning (DHL) is used, i. e. replacing the neuronal activities by their rates of change, so that  $\dot{C}_{ij} \propto \dot{y}_i \dot{x}_j$  (the derivative of  $x$  w. r. t. time is denoted as  $\dot{x}$ ). This rule focuses on the dynamics as there is only a change in behavior if the system is active. As demonstrated in Sect. 5, this may produce interesting behaviors but in general it lacks the drive for exploration that is vital for a developing system.

The main reason for the lack in behavioral richness is seen in the product structure of both learning rules which involves the motor commands  $y$  generated by the neurons themselves. Trivially, once  $y = 0$ , learning and any change in behavior is stopping altogether. Now, the idea is to lift this correlative structure entirely to the level of the outside world, enriching learning by the reactions of the physical system to the controls.

Let us assume the robot has a basic understanding of the causal relations between actions and sensor values. In our approach, this is realized by an inverse model which approximately relates the current sensor values  $x'$  back to its causes, the motor commands  $y$  having a certain time lag w. r. t.  $x'$ . As the model is never exact, it will reconstruct (the efference copy)  $y$  with a certain mismatch  $\delta y$ . Formulated in terms of the rates of change, we write

$$\dot{y} + \delta \dot{y} = F(\dot{x}') \quad (2)$$

with  $F$  the model function and  $\delta y$  containing all (physical) effects that cannot be captured by the model.

The aim of our approach is to make the system sensitive to these effects. This is achieved by replacing  $\dot{y}$  of the DHL rule with  $\tilde{y} = \dot{y} + \delta \dot{y}$ , so that

$$\tau \dot{C}_{ij} = \tilde{y}_i \dot{x}_j - C_{ij} \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau$  is the time scale for this synaptic dynamics and  $-C_{ij}$  is a damping term, see Fig. 1. Because of the normalization introduced below, we do not need an additional scaling factor for the decay time. In principle, the model is relating the changes in sensor values caused by the robot's behavior back to the controller output and the learning rule is extending this chain further down to the synaptic weights. This is the decisive step in the "chaining together what changes together" paradigm. The  $\delta \dot{y}$  in  $\tilde{y}$  contains all physical effects that are extrinsic to the system as they are not captured by the model. They are decisive for exploring the behavioral capabilities of the system. That is why we call the new mechanism defined by Eq. (3) *differential extrinsic plasticity* (DEP).

Optionally, the threshold terms  $h_i$  (1) can also be given a dynamics which we simply define as

$$\tau_h \dot{h}_i = -y_i \quad (4)$$

where  $\tau_h$  defines an empirical time scale. The idea is to drive the neurons away from their saturation regions (close to  $y = \pm 1$ ). As the experiments will demonstrate, using the threshold dynamics favors periodic motion patterns.

The realization of inverse models is a notoriously difficult task if the model is to capture as much as possible of the system dynamics. Here, the role of the model is different, as the extrinsic term  $\delta \dot{y}$  takes the lead in the unfolding of motion patterns. Thus, the task of the model is just to separate between intrinsic and extrinsic effects. Yet, it cannot be chosen arbitrarily as it has to reflect the basic causal relations between sensor and motor values. Depending on the capabilities of the model different routes in the development of behaviors are taken. Throughout this and many other work [25], a simple linear model was appropriate, stipulating  $F(\dot{x}') = M \dot{x}'$  where  $M$  is a weight matrix, relating the sensor values back to motor commands, i. e.

$$\tilde{y}_i = \sum_j M_{ij} \dot{x}'_j. \quad (5)$$

The weights  $M_{ij}$  of the inverse model can be learned off-line from  $(\dot{x}', \dot{y})$  pairs in some idealized situations, like the robot being free of any external forces and constraints, using classical methods (low frequency motor babbling). Alternatively, it can be set by hand in order to guide the self-organization process as done in the experiments with the Hexapod below.

In order to make the whole system exploratory and curious for new behaviors, we introduce an appropriate normalization of the synaptic weights  $C$  and an empirical *gain* factor  $\kappa \sim 1$ . The latter regulates the overall feedback strength in the sensorimotor loop. If chosen in the right range the extrinsic perturbations get amplified and active behavior can be maintained, see Sect. 5 for details. This specific regime, called the edge of chaos, is argued to be a vital characteristic of life and development [26, 27, 28]. The normalization is supported by neurophysiological findings on synaptic normalization [29] such as homeostatic synaptic plasticity [30], and the balanced state hypothesis [31, 32].

While  $\kappa$  is seen to regulate the overall activity,  $\tau$  is found to regulate the degree of exploration. As described in Sect. 5.2 the system realizes a “search and converge” strategy, wandering between metastable attractors (such as walking patterns) with possibly very long transients. The time spent in an attractor (a certain motion pattern) is regulated by  $\tau$ . At the behavioral level, this is reflected by the emergence of a great variety of spatio-temporal patterns—the global order obtained from the simple local rules given by Eqs. (3, 4).

## 2.3 Behavior as broken symmetries

In order to understand how the very specific behaviors can emerge from the generic synaptic mechanism, we have to consider the role of the symmetries. For a discussion, let us consider the system in what we call its least biased initialization, i. e. putting  $C_{ij} = 0$  and  $h_i = 0$  so that all actuators are at their central position. In this situation, the agent obeys a maximum number of symmetries. These are the obvious geometric symmetries but also a bunch of dynamical ones originating from the invariance of the physical system against certain transformations, like inverting the sign of a joint angle. Technically, the symmetries are seen directly by a linear expansion of the system around the resting situation. As the learning rule does not introduce any symmetry breaking preferences, motion can set in only by a spontaneous breaking of the symmetries. In this picture, behavior corresponds to broken symmetry (in space and time) and development to a sequence of spontaneous symmetry breaking events. This is the very reason for the rich phenomenology observed in the experiments, explaining the emerging dimensionality reduction which makes the approach scalable.

Self-organizing behavior as a result of symmetry breaking was observed before [33, 34] with precursors of the newly proposed learning rule. More specifically, related unsupervised learning rules based on the principle of homeokinesis [25] and the maximization of predictive information [35, 36, 37, 38] were studied, which however differ in being biologically implausible due to matrix inversions and leading to less specific behavioral modes.

## 2.4 Neurobiological implementation

In order to understand how the DEP rule can be implemented neurobiologically, we note first that  $x'$  is just the reafference caused by  $y$ . Commonly, the contribution in  $x'$  that cannot be accounted for by the (forward) model is called the exafference. Our extrinsic learning signal  $\delta y$  is the preimage of this exafference using the forward model. With the inverse models used here, this preimage can be obtained explicitly by a simple neural circuitry calculating the difference between the output of the inverse model  $F(x')$  and the efference copy of  $y$ , see Eq. (2). By feeding this signal back to the neuron by an additional synapse, the output of the neuron is shifted from  $y$  to  $\tilde{y}$ . With the modified output, the new synaptic rule corresponds to classical (differential) Hebbian learning. This procedure, although pointing a way to a concrete neurobiological implementation, is a little awkward as the additional signal has to be subtracted again from the neuron output before sending the latter to the motors.

Another possibility is the inclusion of the extrinsic term by a heterosynaptic or extrinsic plasticity [39] mechanism as illustrated in Fig. 1. The additional input from  $\delta y$  has to simulate the effect of depolarization (firing) for the otherwise unchanged synaptic plasticity. This may be accomplished by G protein [40] signaling or the enhanced/inhibited expression of synapse-associated proteins [41], or via other intra-cellular mechanism.

# 3 Results

By the following series of experiments, we demonstrate the potential of the new synaptic plasticity for the self-organization of behavior. Interestingly, the emerging behaviors seem to be purposeful, as if the learning system develops solutions for different tasks like locomotion, turning a wheel, and so forth. In order not to plug in such a task orientation, we always use the same neural network (with appropriate number of motor neurons and sensor inputs) with the DEP rule of Eq. (3), and start all experiments in its least biased initialization.

## 3.1 Early individual development

In a first set of experiments, we study the very early stage of individual development when sensorimotor contingencies are being acquired. The common assumption is that sensorimotor coordination is developed




Figure 2: **Behavior exploration of the humanoid robot: crawling like motion patterns when on the floor** (A). (B) shows the corresponding controller matrices  $C$  revealing a definite structure. Note that the threshold dynamics was included here which is an important factor for this highly organized behavior.

by learning to “understand” sensor responses caused by spontaneous muscle contractions (called motor babbling in robotics). However, this fails by the abundance of sensorimotor contingencies as may be demonstrated by a coarse assessment for our humanoid robot. If we postulate that each of the  $m$  motor neurons has only 5 different output values (rates) we have in each step  $5^m$  possible choices. With  $m = 18$  for the humanoid robot and 50 steps per second, a motion primitive of 1 sec duration has  $5^{18 \cdot 50}$  realizations. The number of possible sensor responses is of the same dimension so that there is no way of probing and storing all sensorimotor contingencies. Alternatively, realizing search by randomly choosing the synaptic connections ( $C_{ij}$  with normalization, gain, and threshold dynamics) yields another tremendous number of possible behaviors, even if we restrict ourselves to the simplified nervous system formulated in Eq. (1).

On the contrary, there is no randomness involved in the DEP approach. Both the physical dynamics and the plasticity rule are purely deterministic. Nevertheless, at the behavioral level, the above mentioned “search and converge” strategy, creates a large variety of highly active, but time-coherent motion patterns, depending on the initial kick, the combination of the parameters  $\tau$  and  $\kappa$ , and the body-environment coupling.

**Self-organized crawling behavior:** In the following example we consider the humanoid robot on level ground with a certain friction and elasticity. Additionally to DEP, in this case, the bias dynamics (4) was used which supports oscillatory behaviors. The robot starts upright with all joints in their center position ( $y_i = 0$ ) slightly above the ground and falls down to its feet and then to its arms, such that the robot is laying face down. The first contact with the ground and the gravitation exert forces on the joints that lead to non-zero sensor readings. This creates a first learning signal and leads to small movements which get more and more amplified and shaped by the body-environment interaction. As a result we observe more and more coordinated movements such as the swaying of the hip to either side. A long transient of different behavioral patterns follows ending up in a forward crawling mode, see Fig. 2 and Video 2. This mode is meta-stable and can be left by perturbations or changes in the parameters. Interestingly, mainly forward locomotion is emerging which is due to the specific geometry of the body. For an external observer this looks as if the robot is following a specific purpose, exploring its environment, which is not built in but emerges. When the parameters of the body are changed, e. g. the strength of certain actuators, different behaviors will come out. For instance, a low crawling mode is generated if the arms are weaker.

### 3.2 Hexapod – emerging gaits

In the humanoid robot case, the preference of forward locomotion can be related back to the specific geometry of the body. If on its hands and knees, the lower legs so to say break the forward-backward symmetry so that backward locomotion is more difficult to achieve. Let us consider now the hexapod robot, Fig. 3, that has almost perfect forward-backward symmetry, which must be broken for a locomotion pattern. This may happen spontaneously but in most experiments motions like swaying or jumping on the spot are observed.

Let us now demonstrate how the system can be guided to break its symmetries in a desired way. This method has essentially two elements. On the one hand, we have to provide additional sensor information to facilitate circular leg movements. This is done by providing the delayed sensor values of the 12 *coxa*-joint sensors. On the other hand, guidance is implemented by structuring the inverse model  $M$  appropriately by hand, which is a new technique for guided self-organization of behavior [42]. The rationale is that those




Figure 3: **Hexapod: emerging gait patterns.** The robot is inspired from a stick-insect and has 18 actuated degrees of freedom (DoF). There are 18 + 12 sensors (joint angle + delayed ones by 0.2 sec). The robot performs different gaits when controlled with DEP: *synchronous wave* (A row 1), *synchronous trot* (A row 2), *tripod* (A row 3), *walk 1* (A row 4), and *walk 2* with their corresponding step pattern in (D) (black means leg is down). The fixed inverse models  $M$  in two configurations are displayed in (B,C). Recorded foot patterns for model  $M$  1 (E top) and model  $M$  2 (E bottom) show the transitions between different gaits. These transitions are either spontaneous or induced by interactions with the environment or by changes in the sensor delay. Markers (red dashed lines and points) indicate the gait patterns for *sync. wave*, *sync. trot*, *tripod* (top) and *tripod*, *walk 1* and *walk 2* (bottom). See also Video 3.

connections in the model are added where correlations in the velocities are desired. For the oscillations of the legs, the delayed forward-backward (anterior/posterior) sensor is linked to the up-down (dorsal/ventral) direction. In order to excite locomotion behavior, the properties of desired gaits can be specified such as in-phase or anti-phase relations of joints. We present here two possibilities where only few such relations are specified in order to give room for multiple behavioral patterns.

In the first configuration the anterior/posterior direction of subsequent legs should be anti-phase resulting in only 4 negative entries in  $M$ , see Fig. 3(B). Note, there are no connections between the left and right legs. In the experiment the robot performs the first locomotion pattern already after a few seconds. A *sync wave* gait emerges where legs on both sides are synchronous and hind, middle, and front leg-pairs touch the ground one after another. This transitions into a *sync trot* gait where hind and front legs are additionally synchronized. After a perturbation (from getting stuck with the front legs) the common *tripod* [43](type c) gait emerges, see Fig. 3.

The second configuration resembles what is observed in biological hexapods, namely that subsequent legs on each side have a fixed phase shift (which we do by linking in  $M$  the delayed sensor and motor of subsequent legs) and that legs on opposite sides are anti-phasic. This results in model  $M$  2, see Fig. 3(C). In the experimental run the initial resting state develops smoothly to the *tripod* gait. Decreasing the time delay of the additional sensors leads first to a gait with seemingly inverse stepping order which we entitle *walk 1* and which is also observed in insects [43](type f). For a smaller delay an inverted ripple gait [44] appears that we call *walk 2*, see Fig. 3 and Video 3.

An important feature of these closed-loop control networks is that they can be used to control a non-trivial behavior with fixed synaptic weights – obtained by taking snapshots or from clustering, see Supplementary Fig. 6. Behavior sequences can easily be generated by just switching between these fixed sets of synaptic weights. We demonstrate this with the humanoid robot with different crawling modes in Video 4(A) and with the hexapod robot by sequencing all of the emergent gaits in Video 4(B). Notably, the transition between the motion patterns is smooth and autonomously performed.

### 3.3 Finding a task in the world

Up to now, we have seen how the DEP rule bootstraps specific motion patterns contingent on the physical properties of the body in its interaction with a static environment. There is a new quality of motion patterns if the robot is interacting with a dynamical, reactive environment. For a demonstration we consider a robot




Figure 4: **Interacting with the environment.** The humanoid robot at the wheel with cranks (A), with two wheels (B), and with two robots, each at one of the handles, sitting (C) and standing (D). See Video 5 and 6.

sitting on a stool with its hands attached to the cranks of a massive wheel, see Fig. 4.

**Rotating the wheel:** Different from a static environment, the massive wheel exerts reactive forces on the robot depending on its angular velocity which is a result of the robot’s actions in the recent past. This response and its immediate influence on the learning process initially leads to a fluctuating relation between wheel and robot which eventually becomes amplified to end up in a meta-stable periodic motion, see Video 5(A). Interestingly, this effect depends crucially on the mass of the wheel — it must be large enough so that, by its inertia, it really can give a feedback to the robotic system.

From the point of view of an external observer, one may say that the learning system is keen on finding a task in the world (rotating the wheel) which channels its search into a definite direction. It cannot be stressed enough that the robot has no knowledge whatsoever about the physical properties and/or the position and dynamics of the wheel. All the robot has is the physical answer of the environment (the wheel) by the reactive forces. In this way the robot is detecting affordances [45] of the environment. An affordance is the opportunity to perform a certain action with an object, like a chair affords sitting and a wheels affords turning.

The constitutive role of the body-environment coupling is also seen if a torque is applied to the axis of the wheel. By this external force we may give the robot a hint what to do. When in the fluctuating phase, the torque immediately starts the rotation which is then taken over by the controller. Otherwise, we can also “advise” the robot to rotate the wheel in the opposite direction, see Video 5(A). This can be considered as a kinesthetic training procedure, helping the robot in finding and realizing its task by direct mechanical influences.

**Multitasking** In a variant of this experiment, also the feet get attached to a separate wheel. Interestingly, because of the simpler physics, the leg-part of the robot needs much less time for finding its task as compared to the upper body, see Video 5(B). Noteworthy is also the lack of synchronization between the two subsystems. At first sight, this is no surprise as the upper and the lower body are physically separated completely (the robot is rigidly fixed on the stool). However, there is an indirect connection given by the fact that each subsystem sees the full set of sensor values. Actually, this might support synchronizing given the correlation affine properties of the DEP rule. Yet, due to the largely different physics, synchronization occurs only temporarily, if at all, so that a kind of multitasking emerges.

**Emerging cooperation:** We have seen above how the exchange of forces with the environment may guide the robot into specific modes. In this paragraph we show how this can be extended to interacting robots by coupling them physically or letting them exchange information. For a demonstration, we extend the wheel experiment by having two robots, each driving one of the cranks, see Fig. 4(C-D). In this setting, the robots can “communicate” with each other by the interaction forces transmitted by the wheel. So, by the induced perturbations of its proprioceptive sensor values, each robot can perceive to some degree what the other one is doing. By the DEP rule these extrinsic effects can get amplified, leading eventually to a synchronized motion, see Video 6. Seen from outside, the robots must cooperate in order to rotate the wheel and it is astonishing that this high-level effect emerges in a natural way from the local plasticity rule.

## 4 Discussion

This paper reports a simple, local, and biologically plausible synaptic mechanism that enables an embodied agent to self-organize its individual sensorimotor development. The reported *in silico* experiments have shown that, at least on the level of sensorimotor contingencies, self-determined development can be grounded in this synaptic dynamics, without having to postulate any higher level constructs such as intrinsic motivation, curiosity, goal orientation, or a specific reward system. The emerging behaviors — from various locomotion patterns to the “understanding” of how to rotate a wheel, to the spontaneous cooperation induced by force exchange with a partner — realize a degree of self-organization unprecedented so far in artificial systems. These do neither require modifications of the DEP rule nor any task-specific information. Our demonstrations use artificial systems, which is often a problem in computational neuroscience and robotics due to a discrepancy between the behavior of artificial and real systems. In our approach this discrepancy problem is circumvented, as the behavior is not the execution of a plan, but is emerging from scratch in the dynamical symbiosis of brain, body, and environment. Commonly, learning to control an actuated system faces the curse of dimensionality, both in model and reality. Without a proper self-organization process or hand-crafted constraints, adding one actuator leads to a multiplicative increase in the time required to find suitable behaviors. We provide evidence for adequate scaling properties of our approach with systems up to 18 actuators developing, without any prestructuring, useful behaviors within minutes of interaction time. Additionally, we have given arguments on a system theoretical level, that, by being at the edge of chaos and allowing for spontaneous symmetry breaking, our approach may scale up to systems of biological dimensions, like humans with their hundreds of skeletal muscles.

The presence of the DEP rule in nature may change our understanding of the early stages of sensorimotor development, as it introduces an apparent goal orientation and a self-determined restriction of the search space. It still remains an open question whether nature found this “creative” synaptic dynamics. The simplicity of the neural control structure and the DEP rule, combined with its potential to generate fitness relevant behavior, are strong arguments for evolution having discovered it. In addition the synaptic rule has a simple Hebbian like structure and may be implemented by combining homosynaptic and heterosynaptic (extrinsic) plasticity mechanisms [39] in real neurons.

The DEP rule may also explain leaps in natural evolution. It is commonly assumed that new traits are the result of a mutation in morphology accompanied by an appropriate mutation of the nervous system, making the likelihood of selection very low, as it is the product of two very small probabilities. With DEP, new traits would emerge by mutations of the morphology alone. For instance, the fitness of an animal evolving from water to land will be greatly enhanced if it can develop a locomotion pattern on land in its individual life time, which could easily be achieved by the DEP rule. Following the argument by Baldwin [46, 47], the self-learning process could be replaced in later generations by a genetically encoded neuronal structure making the new trait more robust.

Adaptability to major changes in morphology may also be necessary for established species during their lifetime. For instance, injuries such as leg impairments or losses have to be accommodated. It has long been known that even small animals such as insects have this capability and substantially reorganize their gait patterns [43]. This could be achieved with special mechanisms, but with DEP it comes for free.

Another point concerns the role of spontaneity and volition in nature. Obviously, acting spontaneously is an evolutionary advantage as it makes prey less predictable to predators. Attempts to explain spontaneity and volition range from ignoring it as an illusion to rooting it deep in thermodynamic and even quantum mechanical randomness [48, 49]. We cannot give a final explanation, but the DEP rule provides a clear example how a great variety of behaviors can emerge spontaneously in deterministic systems by a deterministic controller. The new feature is the role of spontaneous symmetry breaking in systems at the edge of chaos. Similarly, there are recent trends in explaining the apparent stochasticity of the nervous system by the complexity of deterministic neural networks [50, 51, 52].

This paper studies a neural control unit in close interaction with the physical environment. Yet, DEP may also be effective in self-organizing the internal brain dynamics by considering feedback loops with other brain regions. This is possible as the DEP approach does not need an accurate model of the “rest of the brain” — which could never be realized — but requires only a coarse idea of the causal features of the response of the system. In this context our study may provide ingredients required for the big neuroscience initiatives [9] to understand and subsequently realize the functioning brain.



## 5 Methods

### 5.1 Normalization

For controlling the robot we use normalized weight matrices  $C$  in Eq. (1). We have the option to perform a *global* normalization or an *individual* normalization for each neuron:

Global normalization	Individual normalization
the entire weight matrix is normalized $C \leftarrow \kappa C / (\ C\  + \rho)$	each motor neuron is normalized individually $C_{ij} \leftarrow \kappa C_{ij} / (\ C_i\  + \rho)$

For the global normalization the Frobenius norm  $\|C\|$  is used and for the individual normalization  $\|C_i\|$  denotes the norm of the  $i$ -th row (length of synaptic vector of neuron  $i$ ). The regularization term  $\rho = 10^{-12}$  becomes effective near the singularity at  $C = 0$  or  $C_i = 0$ , respectively, and keeps the normalization factor in bounds. Neurobiologically the normalization can be achieved by a balancing inhibition on a fast time-scale accompanied by homeostatic plasticity on a slower time-scale.

With  $\kappa$  small (compared to 1), activity breaks down so that the system converges towards the resting state where  $\dot{x} = 0$ . With  $\kappa$  sufficiently large, this global attractor is destabilized so that modes start to self-amplify ending up in full chaos for large  $\kappa$ . Within an appropriate range of values for  $\kappa$ , the system is led towards an exploratory but still controllable behavior.

The type of normalization has a strong impact on the resulting behavior. The individual normalization leads to behaviors that involve all motors because each motor neuron is normalized independently. To the contrary, with global normalization the overall activity can become restricted to a subset of motors. An example for global normalization is the humanoid robot at the wheel, see Video 5(A), where the legs are inactive because initially the arms are moving more strongly, such that only correlations in the velocities of the upper body build up.

### 5.2 How it works

Let us start with a fixed point analysis of the Hebbian learning case with  $M$  being the unit matrix (as in the humanoid case). Ignoring nonlinearities for this argument (small vectors  $x$  and  $y$ ), the dynamics in the model-world is  $x' = y = \alpha Cx$  where  $\alpha$  is the normalizing factor. The system is in a stationary state if  $x' = x$  which is the case if  $x$  is an eigenvector of  $C$  with eigenvalue  $1/\alpha$ . In such a state the learning dynamics ( $\tau \dot{C}_{ij} = y_i x_j - C_{ij}$ ) converges toward  $C = xx^\top$ , due to the decay term. Using this in the stationary state equation ( $x = \alpha Cx$ ) yields the condition  $x = \alpha x \|x\|^2$  such that any vector  $x$  with  $\|x\|^2 = 1/\alpha$  can be a stationary state, a Hebb state, of the learning system. This means that the Hebb rule generates a continuum of stationary states instead of an exploratory behavior.

In the plain DHL case exists a global stationary state if the system is at rest so that  $C = 0$  (recall plasticity rule:  $\tau \dot{C}_{ij} = \dot{y}_i \dot{x}_j - C_{ij}$ ). However, if  $C \neq 0$ , the normalization may counteract the effect of the decay term in the plasticity rule. Thus, Hebb like states can be stabilized for a while until the regularization term  $\rho$  stops this process and  $C$  decays to zero. The thereby induced decay  $y \rightarrow 0$  generates motion in the system, leading to a learning signal. With  $\kappa$  large, this may avoid the convergence altogether so that the system can find another Hebb state and so forth. However, the activities elicited by this interplay between the normalization and the learning dynamics are rather artificial and less rich as they do not incorporate the extrinsic signals given by  $\delta y$ . In particular, the plain DHL rule has no means of incorporating the extrinsic effects provided by additional sensor information as described in Sect. 5.3.

The novel feature of the proposed DEP rule Eq. (3) is the leading role of the extrinsic signal ( $\delta y$ ). For a demonstration, consider the trivial case  $\dot{y} = 0$  where the body is at rest and will stay there as long as there are no extrinsic perturbations. However, if the body is being kicked by some external force,  $x, x'$  and hence  $\dot{y}$  may vary so that  $C$  changes and the system is driven out of the global attractor if  $\kappa$  is sufficiently large. In fact we observe in the experiments how an initial kick acts like a dynamical germ for the starting of an individual behavior development. Moreover, also in the behaving system, external influences may change the behavior of the system, see for instance the gait switching of the hexapod after the perturbation by the obstacles (Video 3) or the phenomenon of emerging cooperation of the humanoids (Video 5). A quantitative comparison of the learning rules is given in Sect. 5.3.

The next remark concerns the dichotomy between the learning as formulated in the velocities and the control of the system based on the (angular) positions, which is vital for the ‘‘creativity’’ of the DEP rule. This feature of the DEP rule (3) can be elucidated by a self-consistency argument, assuming the idealized case the system is in a harmonic oscillation (an idealized walking pattern, e. g. ) with period  $T$ . By way

of example, let us consider the two-dimensional case with a rotation matrix  $U(s)$ , generating a periodic motion by rotating a vector  $x(\alpha) = (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)^\top$  by an angle  $s$ , i. e.  $U(s)x(\alpha) = x(\alpha + s)$ . We use that  $x'$  is obtained by the time evolution of  $x$  over a finite time step so that  $x'(\alpha) = x(\alpha + \theta) = U(\theta)x(\alpha)$  and  $\langle \dot{x}'\dot{x}'^\top \rangle = U(\theta)\langle \dot{x}\dot{x}^\top \rangle$ . Taking the average over one period we have  $\langle \dot{x}\dot{x}^\top \rangle \propto \langle xx^\top \rangle$  as  $\dot{x}$  is a phase shifted copy of  $x$  times a factor. For the averaging, we consider infinitesimally short time steps so that sums may be replaced with integrals. We obtain  $\langle \dot{x}\dot{x}^\top \rangle \propto \int x(\alpha)x(\alpha)^\top d\alpha \propto I$ , where  $I$  is the unit matrix, because  $\int \cos^2(\alpha)d\alpha = \int \sin^2(\alpha)d\alpha \propto 1$  and  $\int \sin(\alpha)\cos(\alpha)d\alpha = 0$ . Neglecting the extrinsic effects, i. e.  $\delta y = 0$ , under these idealized conditions, we may write in the linear regime  $Mx' = y = Cx$  and with  $C = M\langle \dot{x}'\dot{x}'^\top \rangle \propto MU(\theta)$  we obtain  $x' = U(\theta)x$  corroborating that the periodic regime is stationary if the gain factor is chosen appropriately.

In higher dimensions the argument is more involved but it carries over immediately to the case of rotations about an axis, corresponding to the case that the Jacobian matrix  $J = MC$  has just one pair of complex eigenvalues different from zero. Interestingly, this situation is often observed in the experiments, with the hexapod, e. g. , even though these experiments are very far from the idealized conditions postulated for the above proof.

These patterns are self-consistent solutions of the mentioned dichotomy between control itself and the learning generating it. As the experiments show, these patterns are metastable attractors of the whole-system dynamics, so that globally, the system realizes a “search and converge” strategy by switching between metastable attractors via possibly long transients. At the behavioral level, this is reflected by the emergence of a great variety of spatio-temporal patterns—the global order obtained from the simple local rules given by Eqs. (3, 4).

### 5.3 Comparison of synaptic rules

In this section we want to compare the different synaptic rules. We will consider them in their pure form without the threshold dynamics, i. e.  $h = 0$ . Also in experiments we can confirm that plain Hebbian learning produces fixed point behaviors and thus no continuous motion. Therefore we will only compare DHL with DEP at the example of the hexapod robot. In order to provide a fair comparison the hexapod robot is started in three identical experiments, except for the plasticity rules: DHL:  $\tau\dot{C}_{ij} = \dot{y}_i\dot{x}_j - C_{ij}$ , DEP:  $\tau\dot{C}_{ij} = \tilde{y}_i\dot{x}_j - C_{ij}$  (3) (with unit model), and DEP-Guided with model  $M$  1, see (Fig. 3(B)). Note, that the same synaptic normalization and decay is used everywhere. Since DHL is *not* able to depart from the  $C = 0$  condition, we copy the synaptic weights ( $C$ ) of the DEP run to the DHL experiment after 10 sec. We then consider the eigenvalue spectrum and the corresponding eigenvectors of the matrix  $R = M \cdot C$ . (for DHL and DEP  $M = \mathbb{I}$ ). The matrix  $R$  captures the linearized mapping from  $x$  to  $x'$  – the dynamics of the sensors. For DHL the matrix reduces to have only a single non-zero eigenvalue. This in turn means that all future sensor values are projected onto the corresponding eigenvector and the learning dynamics cannot depart from that. This is demonstrated in Supplementary Fig. 5 and Video 7. Under heavy perturbations the robots controlled by DEP change their internal structure and show subsequently a different behavior. For a different initialization DHL (with normalization) may also produce continuous motion patterns but it is generally much less sensitive to the embodiment and perturbations and often falls into the  $C = 0$  state, which it cannot exit anymore.

### 5.4 Framework

The use of artificial creatures has proven a viable method for testing neuroscience hypotheses, providing fresh insights into the function of the nervous system, see [18], e. g. The benefit of such methods may be debatable with brain processes of higher complexity. So, we focus on the lower level sensorimotor contingencies in settings where the nervous systems cannot be understood in isolation due to a strong brain-body-environment coupling [53, 16]. The method works both with hardware robots or with good physical simulations. The inexorable reality gap between simulation and real robotic experiments is a minor methodological problem because the phenomenon of self-organization is largely independent of the particular implementation, as evidenced by the fact that emerging motion patterns are robust against modifications of the physical parameters of both robot and environment.

The control structure in this paper is deliberately chosen simple in order to demonstrate the potential of the method. Although in larger animals the time lag of sensory feedback is too long for this setting, it may still be successful by integrating sensor predictions, a trick the nervous system is using whenever possible [54]. In the following we discuss several of the methodological issues in detail.




Figure 5: **Comparison of plasticity rules: DHL, DEP, and DEP-Guided (with structured model) (from top to bottom)**. Development of the eigenvalues ( $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_6$ ), real part in (A) and imaginary in (B), of the matrix  $M \cdot C$  over time. After 10 sec (dashed vertical line) the synaptic weights from DEP were copied to DHL in order to get some non-zero initialization. The dashed vertical line at 45 sec marks a strong physical perturbation which leads to changes in behavior for the DEP rule, but not for DHL. See Video 7. Only for DEP the eigenvectors (see Video 7) and the spectrum changes significantly after the perturbations. Parameters: global normalization,  $\kappa = 2.2, h = 0, \tau = 0.7$  sec.

**Initialization:** In order to have reproducible conditions for our experiments, we always start our system under definite initial conditions. We use in all our applications the same plasticity rule (with appropriately chosen time scale  $\tau$  and gain factor  $\kappa$ ) and start moreover always in the same initial conditions for the synaptic dynamics by choosing  $C = 0$  and  $h = 0$ , meaning that all actuators of the joints are in their central position. In a sense, this is also a state of maximum symmetry, as there is (approximately) no difference in moving the joint either forward or backward, so that the observed behaviors are emerging by spontaneous symmetry breaking [33, 34].

**Source of variety:** In common robotics approaches to the self-exploration of sensorimotor contingencies, innovation is introduced by modifying actions randomly [55, 56], relegating the activities of the agent to the intrinsic laws of a pseudo-random number generator that is entirely external to the system to be controlled. This invokes the curse of dimension as the search is not restricted by the specifics of the brain-body-environment coupling. In our system, there is only one intrinsic mechanism – the DEP rule – which generates actions deterministically in terms of the sensor values over the recent past (on a time scale given by  $\tau$ ). Variety is produced by the complexity of the physical world in the sense of deterministic chaos. Another approach to obtain informed exploration is to employ notions of information gain [57, 58] which are unfortunately so far not scalable to the high-dimensional continuous systems used here.

**Simulation:** The experiments are conducted in a physically realistic rigid body simulation tool LPZ-ROBOTS [21]. The tool is open source so that the experiments of this paper can be reproduced, see Supplementary Section B. The humanoid robot, Fig. 2, has the proportions and weight distributions of the human body. The joints are simplified and only one-axis and two-axis joints are used. The degrees of freedom (DoF) are: 4 per leg (2 hip, knee, ankle), 3 per arm (2 shoulder, elbow), 1 for the pelvis (tilting the hip) and 3 in the back (torsion, bending front/back and left/right) summing up to 18 DoF.

The hexapod robot, Fig. 3, is inspired from a stick-insect and has 18 DoF, 3 in each leg: two in the coxa joint and one in the femur-tibia joint ( $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  in [59]). The antennas and tarsi are attached by spring joints and are not actuated.

To implement the actuators we use position controlled angular motors with strong power constraints around the set point to make small perturbations perceivable in the joint-position sensors. In this way they perform more like muscles and tendon systems and make the robot compliant to external forces.

**Internal model:** The appropriate choice and internal representation of inverse models, projecting the sensor values back to the causing motor commands, are topics of much interest in both robotics and neuroscience. Modeling this relationship is generally thought to be a very complex task. As our experiments have shown, different from the realization of a specific behavior (like reaching or grasping), the exploration,

which has no predefined goal, can work with crude models (like the matrix  $M$  in Eq. (5)), producing complex motion patterns which never could be adequately represented by the model. While the specific route followed by the self-exploration may well depend on the quality of the model, self-organization itself is a robust phenomenon that prevails also under obstructive circumstances. The deeper reason is found by understanding behavior as broken symmetry, and individual development as a series of spontaneous symmetry breaking events. By their very nature, the latter are robust phenomena rooted in the system dynamics, but their sequence is prone to the actual situations—in our case the projections made by the model.

## Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the hospitality and discussions in the group of Nihat Ay. We thank Michael Herrmann and Anna Levina and Sacha Sokoloski for helpful comments. GM was supported by a grant of the DFG (SPP 1527) and received funding from the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under REA grant agreement no. [291734].

## References


- [1] Squire, L. *et al.* *Fundamental neuroscience* (Academic Press, 2013), fourth edn.
- [2] Spitzer, N. C. Activity-dependent neurotransmitter respecification. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **13**, 94–106 (2012).
- [3] Scheiffele, P. Cell-cell signaling during synapse formation in the CNS. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* **26**, 485–508 (2003).
- [4] O'Rourke, N. A., Weiler, N. C., Micheva, K. D. & Smith, S. J. Deep molecular diversity of mammalian synapses: why it matters and how to measure it. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **13**, 365–379 (2012).
- [5] Power, J. D. *et al.* Functional network organization of the human brain. *Neuron* **72**, 665 – 678 (2011).
- [6] Hawrylycz, M. *et al.* The Allen Brain Atlas. In Kasabov, N. (ed.) *Springer Handbook of Bio-Neuroinformatics*, 1111–1126 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014).
- [7] Grillner, S., Kozlov, A. & Kotaleski, J. H. Integrative neuroscience: linking levels of analyses. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **15**, 614 – 621 (2005).
- [8] Alivisatos, A. P. *et al.* The brain activity map project and the challenge of functional connectomics. *Neuron* **74**, 970 – 974 (2012).
- [9] Kandel, E. R., Markram, H., Matthews, P. M., Yuste, R. & Koch, C. Neuroscience thinks big (and collaboratively). *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **14**, 659–664 (2013).
- [10] Hebb, D. O. *The Organization of Behavior: A Neuropsychological Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1949), new edn.
- [11] Hopfield, J. J. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **79**, 2554–2558 (1982).
- [12] Keysers, C. & Perrett, D. I. Demystifying social cognition: a Hebbian perspective. *Trends in cognitive sciences* **8**, 501–507 (2004).
- [13] Bienenstock, E. L., Cooper, L. N. & Munro, P. W. Theory for the development of neuron selectivity: orientation specificity and binocular interaction in visual cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **2**, 32–48 (1982).
- [14] Markram, H., Lübke, J., Frotscher, M. & Sakmann, B. Regulation of synaptic efficacy by coincidence of postsynaptic apss and epsps. *Science* **275**, 213–215 (1997).
- [15] Gerstner, W., Kempter, R., van Hemmen, J. L. & Wagner, H. A neuronal learning rule for sub-millisecond temporal coding. *Nature* **383**, 76–78 (1996).

- [16] Pfeifer, R. & Bongard, J. C. *How the Body Shapes the Way We Think: A New View of Intelligence* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006).
- [17] Pfeifer, R., Lungarella, M. & Iida, F. Self-organization, embodiment, and biologically inspired robotics. *Science* **318**, 1088–1093 (2007).
- [18] Floreano, D., Ijspeert, A. & Schaal, S. Robotics and neuroscience. *Current Biology* **24**, R910–R920 (2014).
- [19] Pfeifer, R. & Gómez, G. Morphological computation - connecting brain, body, and environment. In *Creating Brain-Like Intelligence*, 66–83 (Springer, 2009).
- [20] Hauser, H., Ijspeert, A. J., Fuchslin, R. M., Pfeifer, R. & Maass, W. Towards a theoretical foundation for morphological computation with compliant bodies. *Biological Cybernetics* **105**, 355–370 (2011).
- [21] Martius, G., Hesse, F., Güttler, F. & Der, R. LPZROBOTS: A free and powerful robot simulator. <http://robot.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/software>
- [22] Kosko, B. Differential Hebbian learning. In *AIP Conference proceedings*, vol. 151, 277–282 (1986).
- [23] Roberts, P. D. Computational consequences of temporally asymmetric learning rules: I. Differential Hebbian learning. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience* **7**, 235–246 (1999).
- [24] Lowe, R., Mannella, F., Ziemke, T. & Baldassarre, G. Modelling coordination of learning systems: A reservoir systems approach to dopamine modulated pavlovian conditioning. In *Advances in Artificial Life. Darwin Meets von Neumann*, 410–417 (Springer, 2011).
- [25] Der, R. & Martius, G. *The Playful Machine - Theoretical Foundation and Practical Realization of Self-Organizing Robots* (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2012).
- [26] Langton, C. G. Computation at the edge of chaos: phase transitions and emergent computation. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **42**, 12–37 (1990).
- [27] Kauffman, S. *At home in the universe: The search for the laws of self-organization and complexity* (Oxford University Press, 1995).
- [28] Bertschinger, N. & Natschläger, T. Real-time computation at the edge of chaos in recurrent neural networks. *Neural computation* **16**, 1413–1436 (2004).
- [29] Carandini, M. & Heeger, D. J. Normalization as a canonical neural computation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **13**, 51–62 (2011).
- [30] Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. B. Homeostatic plasticity in the developing nervous system. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **5**, 97–107 (2004).
- [31] Tsodyks, M. V. & Sejnowski, T. Rapid state switching in balanced cortical network models. *Network: Computation in Neural Systems* **6**, 111–124 (1995).
- [32] Monteforte, M. & Wolf, F. Dynamical entropy production in spiking neuron networks in the balanced state. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 268104 (2010).
- [33] Der, R. On the role of embodiment for self-organizing robots: behavior as broken symmetry. In Prokopenko, M. (ed.) *Guided Self-Organization: Inception*, vol. 9 of *Emergence, Complexity and Computation*, 193–221 (Springer, 2014).
- [34] Der, R. & Martius, G. Behavior as broken symmetry in embodied self-organizing robots. In *Advances in Artificial Life, ECAL 2013*, 601–608 (MIT Press, 2013).
- [35] Martius, G., Der, R. & Ay, N. Information driven self-organization of complex robotic behaviors. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e63400 (2013).
- [36] Ay, N., Bernigau, H., Der, R. & Prokopenko, M. Information-driven self-organization: the dynamical system approach to autonomous robot behavior. *Theory in Biosciences* **131**, 161–179 (2012).
- [37] Ay, N., Bertschinger, N., Der, R., Güttler, F. & Olbrich, E. Predictive information and explorative behavior of autonomous robots. *The European Physical Journal B* **63**, 329–339 (2008).

- [38] Zahedi, K., Ay, N. & Der, R. Higher coordination with less control – A result of information maximization in the sensorimotor loop. *Adaptive Behavior* **18**, 338–355 (2010).
- [39] Bailey, C. H., Giustetto, M., Huang, Y.-Y., Hawkins, R. D. & Kandel, E. R. Is heterosynaptic modulation essential for stabilizing hebbian plasticity and memory. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **1**, 11–20 (2000).
- [40] Neves, S. R., Ram, P. T. & Iyengar, R. G protein pathways. *Science* **296**, 1636–1639 (2002).
- [41] Rumbaugh, G., Sia, G.-M., Garner, C. C. & Haganir, R. L. Synapse-associated protein-97 isoform-specific regulation of surface AMPA receptors and synaptic function in cultured neurons. *The Journal of neuroscience* **23**, 4567–4576 (2003).
- [42] Martius, G. & Herrmann, J. M. Variants of guided self-organization for robot control. *Theory in Biosci.* **131**, 129–137 (2012).
- [43] Wilson, D. M. Insect walking. *Annual Review of Entomology* **11**, 103–122 (1966).
- [44] Collins, J. & Stewart, I. Hexapodal gaits and coupled nonlinear oscillator models. *Biological Cybernetics* **68**, 287–298 (1993).
- [45] Gibson, J. J. *The theory of affordances, in Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing. Towards an Ecological Psychology.* (Hoboken, NJ, 1977).
- [46] Baldwin, J. M. A new factor in evolution. *American Naturalist* 536–553 (1896).
- [47] Weber, B. H. & Depew, D. J. *Evolution and learning: The Baldwin effect reconsidered* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003).
- [48] Brembs, B. Towards a scientific concept of free will as a biological trait: spontaneous actions and decision-making in invertebrates. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **278**, 930–939 (2011).
- [49] Koch, C. Free Will, Physics, Biology, and the Brain. In Murphy, N., Ellis, G. F. R. & O’Connor, T. (eds.) *Downward Causation and the Neurobiology of Free Will*, 31–52 (Springer, 2009).
- [50] Hartmann, C., Lazar, A. & Triesch, J. Where’s the noise? Key features of neuronal variability and inference emerge from self-organized learning. *bioRxiv* (2014).
- [51] Kenet, T., Bibitchkov, D., Tsodyks, M., Grinvald, A. & Arieli, A. Spontaneously emerging cortical representations of visual attributes. *Nature* **425**, 954–956 (2003).
- [52] Bourdoukan, R., Barrett, D., Deneve, S. & Machens, C. K. Learning optimal spike-based representations. In Pereira, F., Burges, C., Bottou, L. & Weinberger, K. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, 2285–2293 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2012).
- [53] Chiel, H. & Beer, R. The brain has a body: Adaptive behavior emerges from interactions of nervous system, body and environment. *Trends in Neurosciences* **20**, 553–557 (1997).
- [54] Massion, J. Postural control system. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **4**, 877 – 887 (1994).
- [55] Schmidhuber, J. Curious model-building control systems. In *Proc. IJCNN*, 1458–1463 (IEEE, 1991).
- [56] Oudeyer, P.-Y., Kaplan, F. & Hafner, V. V. Intrinsic motivation systems for autonomous mental development. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **11**, 265–286 (2007).
- [57] Frank, M., Leitner, J., Stollenga, M., Förster, A. & Schmidhuber, J. Curiosity driven reinforcement learning for motion planning on humanoids. *Frontiers in Neurobotics* **7** (2014).
- [58] Little, D. Y. & Sommer, F. T. Learning and exploration in action-perception loops. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits* **7** (2013).
- [59] Schilling, M., Hoinville, T., Schmitz, J. & Cruse, H. Walknet, a bio-inspired controller for hexapod walking. *Biological Cybernetics* **107**, 397–419 (2013).

## A Supplementary videos

Videos of the conducted experiments are presented in the following sections. Information on the source-code is given in Supplementary Section B.




Video 1: Overview video summarizing the experimental results of the paper. This video provides a demonstration of the self-organization of behavior created by the novel plasticity rule. Different systems are considered and the plasticity rule is briefly explained. Longer videos for each experiment are provided below. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

### A.1 Self-organized crawling behavior



Video 2: The humanoid robot on the floor developing a crawling behavior. During the initial period it is seen how, from the initialization condition, small movements get amplified into a coherent movement. These get increasingly shaped to fit the situation. From time 4:30 on a stable crawling motions is observed. Parameters: global normalization,  $\kappa = 1.4$ ,  $\tau_h = 0.4$  sec,  $\tau = 4$  sec. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

### A.2 Hexapod walking



Video 3: Hexapod developing different gaits. The internal model is structured to break the symmetries and facilitate a locomotion behavior, model  $M 1$  (A) and  $M 2$  in (B), see Fig. 3(B,C). (A) Initially a synchronous wave gait and then a synchronous trot gait emerges which preserves most of the initial symmetries. After a perturbation by getting stuck on the front legs, new locomotion gaits develop which channel into the well known tripod gait. (B) Due to a different correlation structure imposed by model  $M 2$ , a different set of gaits emerges. See Fig. 3(D,E) for the stepping patterns. Parameters: individual normalization,  $\kappa = 2.2$ ,  $h = 0$ ,  $\tau = 0.4$  sec. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

### A.3 Memorizing and recalling behavior

By either taking snapshots of the synaptic weights, or more objectively, by a clustering procedure, a set of fixed control structures can be extracted. Examples of such a clustering are shown in Supplementary Fig. 6. If these synaptic connections are used in the controller network, the behavior can be reproduced (without synaptic dynamics) in most cases. A demonstration is given in Video 4(A) where 5 clusters from Video 2(A,B) have been selected for demonstration. The switching between behaviors may not be successful if the old behavior does not lie in the basin of attraction of the new one. This happens in particular when starting from inactive behaviors, but this can be helped by a short perturbation. In a second experiment we show how snapshots of the weights taken during Video 3(A,B) can be used to memorize and recall all the different emergent gaits. The synaptic weights have been copied instantaneously without selecting a precise time point or averaging. In fact, during learning for one particular gait a whole series of weights occurred, but apparently any of these weight sets is a viable controller.





Figure 6: Clustering of the controller matrices of Video 2. Displayed are the cluster centers for some of the clusters. The names were given after a visual inspection of their corresponding behavior, see Video 4.



Video 4: Recall and transition between behaviors. (A) Sequence of behaviors generated by switching the synaptic weights to those determined by cluster analysis, see Supplementary Fig. 6. Typically, a fast transition between different behaviors occurs. In some cases, however, an external perturbation is required to facilitate the transition. (B) For the hexapod robot, a set of matrices have been stored by taking snapshots of the synaptic weights as indicated in Fig. 3(E), i. e. at seconds: 23, 26, 39 (faster sync trot, not in Fig. 3), 46 of run 1 and at sec 8, 13, 55 of run 2. No averaging was performed. All previously observed gaits are successfully reproduced with remarkably smooth transition between them. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

### A.4 Humanoid robot at the wheel: find your task in the world




Video 5: The humanoid robot at the wheels. (A) The hand of the robot are connected to the cranks of a massive wheel. By the drive to build up correlations between joint angle velocities, the robot “discovers”




how the crank can be moved in order to realize a stable periodic motion of its internal joint angles. When the wheel is turned in the opposite direction by an external torque the control network is taking up the new direction quickly. Parameters: global normalization,  $\kappa = 0.96, h = 0, \tau = 0.4$  sec. (B) Hand and feet are connected to independent wheels. The feet start to rotate the lower wheel earlier than the hands do, due to simpler physics. This difference also hinders spontaneous synchronization. Note that the trunk is fixed on the stool such that upper and lower body are physically decoupled. Nevertheless, when the lower wheel’s revolution direction gets inverted by external force the arms also stop and need some time to find the rotating motion again. Parameters: individual normalization,  $\kappa = 1.4, h = 0, \tau = 0.4$  sec. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

## A.5 Emerging cooperation



Video 6: Emerging communications by force exchange. Both robots get connected to the wheel, each to one of the cranks. The robots have no information about their partner. Yet they manage to cooperate by “feeling” the others reactive forces. This even works if the robots are not supported by the stool (B) (muscle forces doubled). Parameters: see Video 5(A) but with  $\kappa = 1$ . See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

## A.6 Comparison of synaptic rules



Video 7: Comparison of plasticity rules with the hexapod robot. Left: DHL, middle: DEP, right: DEP-Guided (with structured model, Fig. 3(B)). The insets show the eigenvalue spectrum over time and vertically the first 3 eigenvectors scaled with their corresponding eigenvalues. The robot is initialized with a zero controller as usual. Only DEP departs from this situation. After 10 sec the synaptic weights (C) are copied from DEP to DHL. DHL is not able to maintain a persistent motion, even after a perturbation (at 45 sec). Both DEP settings show smooth behavior and a reaction to the perturbation by a different motion (middle) or changing the gait pattern (right). The eigenvalue spectrum differs across the examples. In the DHL case, there is only one nonzero eigenvalue whereas DEP has about five (see Fig. 5). Its effect becomes visible when the robot is disturbed after 45 sec: DHL remains largely uninfluenced and also the eigenvector does not change its direction (it changes intensity in the visualization because it is scaled with the corresponding eigenvalue). Parameters: see Fig. 5. See <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>.

## B Simulation source code

The experiments can be reproduced by using our simulation software and the following sources. The simulation software can be downloaded from <http://robot.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/software> or <https://github.com/georgmartius/lpzrobots> and has to be compiled on a Linux platform (for some platforms packages are available). The source code for the experiments of this paper can be downloaded from <http://playfulmachines.com/DEP>. Instructions for compilation and execution are included in the bundle.