

# Spike Pattern Structure Influences Efficacy Variability under STDP and Synaptic Homeostasis

**Authors:** Zedong Bi<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Changsong Zhou<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Hai-Jun Zhou<sup>1</sup>

## Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Nonlinear Studies, and Beijing-Hong Kong-Singapore Joint Centre for Nonlinear and Complex Systems (Hong Kong), Institute of Computational and Theoretical Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China

<sup>4</sup>Beijing Computational Science Research Center, Beijing, China

<sup>5</sup>Research Centre, HKBU Institute of Research and Continuing Education, Virtual University Park Building, South Area Hi-tech Industrial Park, Shenzhen, China

\*Correspondence to: zedong.bi@gmail.com.

**Abstract:** In neural systems, synaptic plasticity is usually driven by spike trains. Due to the inherent noises of neurons, synapses and networks, spike trains typically exhibit externally uncontrollable variability such as spatial heterogeneity and temporal stochasticity, resulting in variability of synapses, which we call *efficacy variability*. Spike patterns with the same population rate but inducing different efficacy variability may result in neuronal networks with sharply different structures and functions. However, how the variability of spike trains influences the efficacy variability remains unclear. Here, we systematically study this influence when the spike pattern possesses four aspects of statistical features, i.e. synchronous firing, auto-temporal structure, heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations, under spike-timing dependent plasticity (STDP) after dynamically bounding the mean strength of plastic synapses into or out of a neuron (synaptic homeostasis). We then show the functional importance of efficacy variability on the encoding and maintenance of connection patterns and on the early developments of primary visual systems driven by retinal waves. We anticipate our work brings a fresh perspective to the understanding of the interaction between synaptic plasticity and dynamical spike patterns in functional processes of neural systems.

## INTRODUCTION

Neuronal spike trains usually exhibit spatial heterogeneity and temporal stochasticity. For example, firing rates are observed to be long-tailed distributed in many brain areas<sup>1-3</sup>, spatio-temporal correlations within neuronal population often exhibit rich structures<sup>4-7</sup>; and two neurons will not emit the same spike train even if they are receiving exactly the same stimuli<sup>8-10</sup>. The spatial heterogeneity may emerge from neuronal response properties and connection details<sup>11,12</sup>, and the temporal stochasticity may be due to the inner stochasticity of neurons and synapses<sup>8-10</sup>, both of which are inherent properties of neurons, synapses or networks so that the exact spike

patterns are hard to be externally manipulated in a detailed way. As synaptic plasticity is usually driven by spike trains, the variability of spike trains should result in variability of synapses, i.e. the synaptic efficacies can get uncontrollably dissimilar after plasticity even if they start from uniformity. We call this dissimilarity *efficacy variability* of synapses. Synaptic efficacy is observed to widely distribute *in vivo*<sup>3,13</sup>, but this could be induced by deterministic rules. For example, in Hopfield model<sup>14</sup>, the connection strength between a pair of neurons participating in 100 memory patterns should be very different from a pair participating in a single pattern. Here, by *efficacy variability*, we emphasize the dissimilarity caused by the uncontrollable spatio-temporal noises during plasticity.

Efficacy variability may have important biological implications. For example, suppose a function of a neuronal network, say memory<sup>15</sup> or spike sequence generation<sup>16</sup>, requires a connection pattern in which a few synapses (foreground synapses) have stronger efficacies than the others (background synapses). When the efficacy variability is small, both foreground and background synapses tend to be uniform around their mean values respectively, thus the connection pattern is clear-cut. However, when the efficacy variability is large, some foreground synapses can be very weak and some background ones can be very strong, which destroys the connection pattern even if the mean strength of the foreground synapses is still larger than that of the background ones (**Fig. 1a**). As another example, synaptic competition and elimination is a classical scenario for the formation of neural network structure during development, when synapses compete with each other for strength and those that are too weak will disappear<sup>17</sup>. In this case, efficacy variability quantifies the degree of competition. If we suppose that the total synaptic strength before elimination is constrained by, say, synaptic homeostasis<sup>18</sup>, then when the efficacy variability is small, only a few synapses are too weak and get eliminated, and those left also have similar strength; when the efficacy variability is large, a larger portion of synapses get below the elimination threshold, while the remaining ones have wider efficacy distribution with also larger mean value than the case of small efficacy variability (**Fig. 1b**). This is consistent with the scenario found in the early development of auditory cortex<sup>19</sup>: if the spontaneous activity of medial nucleus of the trapezoid body is changed using genetic method, then its feedforward projection to lateral superior olive becomes denser and weaker, which suggests that the normal pattern induces stronger efficacy variability. Due to its important biological implications, it is a surprise that efficacy variability has not become a key concept and attracted sufficient research attention in neuroscience.

Under temporal stochasticity and spatial heterogeneity, spike trains may exhibit a variety of statistical features, which form rich spike pattern structures. Groups of neurons may spurt firing activity (synchronous firing)<sup>20-22</sup>, the spike train of a single neuron can be bursty or regular (auto-temporal structure)<sup>23-25</sup>, firing rates of cortical neurons are typically long-tailed distributed *in vivo* (heterogeneity of rates)<sup>1-3</sup>, and spike trains of different neurons also reveal rich interdependences (heterogeneity of cross-correlations)<sup>4,7,12</sup>. As synaptic plasticity is driven by spike trains, spike pattern structure must have strong influence on efficacy variability, inducing neuronal networks with sharply different structures even under the same population rate.

To understand how different spike patterns influence efficacy variability, it is helpful to first consider a group of particles doing 1-dimensional Brownian motion driven by noises, starting from the zero point. If the noises imposed on different particles have different biases, for example the noises on particle 1 prefer positive direction while those on particle 2 prefer negative direction, then the Brownian motions of different particles will have different drift

velocities, causing displacement variability. If all the noises have zero bias, the displacements of particles can also be different due to diffusion. The variability caused by diffusion not only depends on the strength of noises, but also on their cross-correlation and auto-correlation. Cross-correlated noises can push all the particles to simultaneously move positively or negatively, reducing the displacement variability. Auto-correlated noises can push a particle to jump toward the same direction in several adjacent steps within the time scale of the auto-correlation  $\tau_{auto}$ , increasing the increment of the displacement variance  $\Delta\sigma^2$  during  $\tau_{auto}$ ; as noises separated apart farther than  $\tau_{auto}$  are largely independent, the total variance after  $t$  time of running is about  $\Delta\sigma^2 t / \tau_{auto}$ , which increases with  $\Delta\sigma^2$ . In general, the total variance (ToV) can be written as the summation of the variance caused by drift velocities (DrV) and the variance caused by diffusion (DiV) (**Supplementary Information Section S1**)

$$\text{ToV} = \text{DrV} + \text{DiV}, \quad (1)$$

and during  $t$  time of evolution  $\text{DrV} \propto t^2$  while  $\text{DiV} \propto t$ . During plasticity, DrV is usually caused by the spatial heterogeneity of spike trains. For example, in classical Hebbian learning the synapses sharing the same presynaptic neuron can have different learning rates depending on the firing rates of the post-synaptic neurons; if the plasticity is spike-timing dependent, the heterogeneity of cross-correlations can induce different learning rates even if the firing rates are the same. Because of the inner stochasticity of neurons and synapses, even two neurons receiving exactly the same stimuli emit different spike trains, causing DiV.

In this paper, we will systematically study how four aspects of pattern structure, i.e. synchronous firing, auto-temporal structure, heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations and their interactions influence efficacy variability by taking spike-timing dependent plasticity (STDP)<sup>26</sup> as an example (**Fig. 2ab**). To only focus on the efficacy variability without worrying about the change of the mean, we also introduce synaptic homeostasis, so that the mean strength of plastic synapses into or out of a neuron is dynamically bounded (dendritic or axonal homeostasis, **Fig. 2c**) (see **Methods**). Physiologically, dendritic homeostasis can be due to activity-dependent protein synthesis in post-synaptic neurons<sup>18,27,28</sup>, and axonal homeostasis may be induced by the constraint and reallocation of pre-synaptic resources<sup>29,30</sup>. We first do our study on dendritic and axonal motifs and their interaction (**Fig. 2de**), then we study biologically plausible conductance-based neuronal models and finally investigate the functional implications.

## RESULTS

### Efficacy Variability in Dendritic Motifs

Dendritic or axonal motifs are simple networks in which one neuron receives from many other neurons or many neurons receive from one (**Fig. 2d**). Activities of these neurons are generated using statistical models, so that we can explicitly control different aspects of pattern structure while keeping population rate constant, and study their influences on the efficacy variability without worrying about the feedback of synaptic changes onto spike patterns as usually happens in biologically more realistic models. We mainly focus on dendritic motifs, as results for axonal motifs are similar (**Supplementary Information Section S2.1**). In the main text, we focus to explain the mechanisms of how pattern structures influence the efficacy variability, validations

using spike generating models are presented in details in **Supplementary Information Section S2**.

We first consider synchronous firing. We use  $p$  to represent the number of spikes per neuron during a firing event and  $\tau_{cross}$  to represent the duration of a firing event. In a dendritic motif, synchronous firing influences DiV under STDP by three factors, *spike gathering*, *synapse splitting* and *synapse correlating*. Spike gathering means that if  $p$  increases, spikes of the apical neuron and non-apical neurons are gathered closer, which results in a stronger efficacy change in each STDP updating, thereby increasing DiV. To understand synapse splitting and synapses correlating, suppose a firing event happening during  $[t_1, t_2]$  ( $t_2 = t_1 + \tau_{cross}$ ), then the apical neuron will receive its afferents during  $[t_1 + \tau_{delay}, t_2 + \tau_{delay}]$ , with  $\tau_{delay}$  being the axon delay. If the apical neuron itself fires at  $t_0$  with  $t_1 + \tau_{delay} < t_0 < t_2 + \tau_{delay}$ , then all the in-coming spikes during  $[t_1 + \tau_{delay}, t_0)$  potentiate the corresponding synapses, and all the in-coming spikes during  $(t_0, t_2 + \tau_{delay}]$  depress the corresponding synapses, which makes synapses split into different directions (synapse splitting), increasing the efficacy variability. However, if  $t_0 < t_1 + \tau_{delay}$  or  $t_0 > t_2 + \tau_{delay}$ , the spikes of the non-apical neurons depress or potentiate their out-going synapses simultaneously. In this case, if the depression or potentiation on synapses are similar, then the efficacy variability can be reduced (synapse correlating). This similarity of depression or potentiation can strongly depend on the homogeneity of spike numbers in a firing event. As an example, suppose all neurons fire only one spike in a firing event, then when  $t_0 < t_1 + \tau_{delay}$  or  $t_0 > t_2 + \tau_{delay}$ , the potentiation or depression on all synapses are similar after the firing event; but if half of the non-apical neurons fire no spike, and the other half fire two spikes, the potentiation or depression will be heterogeneous among the synapses, which may fail synapse correlating to reduce the efficacy variability. Obviously, large  $\tau_{cross}$  also discounts the reduction of the efficacy variability by synapse correlating. See **Supplementary Information Section S2.2** and **Supplementary Figure 1** for modeling details.

Now let us add rate heterogeneity. During STDP, both the strengths of potentiation and depression are proportional to the firing rates of the pre- and post-synaptic neurons. Therefore, the trial average of the change of the  $a$ th synapse  $\langle \Delta w_a \rangle \propto (S_p - S_d)r_a r_0$ , with  $r_0$  and  $r_a$  being the rate of the apical and  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and  $S_p - S_d$  quantifying the imbalance of potentiation and depression (*P-D imbalance*). When  $S_p \neq S_d$ ,  $\langle \Delta w_a \rangle \propto r_a$  with non-zero coefficient, so that the heterogeneity of  $r_a$  will make  $\Delta w_a$  drift in different velocities for different  $a$ , inducing DrV. When spike trains are homogeneous Poisson,  $S_p = A_p$  and  $S_d = A_d$ , with  $A_p$  and  $A_d$  being the strengths of the exponentially decayed STDP windows for potentiation and depression (**Fig. 2b**). After adding synchronous firing,  $S_p$  and  $S_d$  can also be influenced by the relative timing of the spike of the apical neuron within a firing event. As an extreme example, if  $t_0 < t_1 + \tau_{delay}$  or  $t_0 > t_2 + \tau_{delay}$ , then all synapses are simultaneously depressed or potentiated, strongly changing P-D imbalance; so DrV can be accordingly changed. See **Supplementary Information Section S2.3** and **Supplementary Figure 2** for modeling details.

Both strong burstiness and strong regularity in auto-temporal structure increase the efficacy variability in dendritic motif. To understand the effect of strong burstiness, consider two adjacent spikes of the apical neuron  $\{t_{0,1}, t_{0,2}\}$  and the spike sequences of the non-apical neurons

$\mathcal{P}_a = \{t_{a,1}, t_{a,2}, \dots, t_{a,l}\}$  in the neighborhood of  $t_{0,1}$ , with  $a = 1, 2, \dots$  being the neuron index. So  $t_{0,1}$  contributes to the efficacy changes mainly from its interaction with  $\mathcal{P}_a$ . As our STDP is additive (**Methods**), the efficacy variance caused by  $t_{0,1}$  is<sup>31</sup>

$$\text{Var}(t_{0,1}) = \sum_{i=1}^l \text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,i})) + \sum_{i \neq j}^l c_{ij} \sqrt{\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,i})) \cdot \text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,j}))} \quad (2)$$

with  $\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,i})$  being the efficacy change of the  $a$ th synapse caused by the pairing of the two spikes  $t_{0,1}$  and  $t_{a,i}$  using STDP, and  $c_{ij}$  is the correlation coefficient between  $\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,i})$  and  $\Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,j})$ . When  $\mathcal{P}_a$  shows strong burstiness, it is clustered into bursting events, which can greatly increase  $c_{ij}$  when  $i$  and  $j$  are nearby in time, thereby increasing  $\text{Var}(t_{0,1})$ . What's more, the burstiness of the apical neuron itself may gather  $t_{0,1}$  and  $t_{0,2}$  closer, correlating the STDP updates caused by these two spikes, i.e.  $\sum_i \Delta w_a(t_{0,1}, t_{a,i})$  and  $\sum_i \Delta w_a(t_{0,2}, t_{a,i})$ , for each  $a$ . This correlation increases the increment of the efficacy variance  $\Delta\sigma^2$  during the time scale  $\tau_{\text{auto}}$  of the bursting events of the apical neuron. As spikes separated apart farther than  $\tau_{\text{auto}}$  are largely independent, the total efficacy variance after  $t$  time of running is approximately  $\Delta\sigma^2 t / \tau_{\text{auto}}$ , which increases with  $\Delta\sigma^2$ . To understand the effect of strong regularity, consider two spikes of the apical neuron  $\{t_{0,1}, t_{0,2}\}$  and two spikes of  $a$ th non-apical neuron  $\{t_{a,1}, t_{a,2}\}$ . Suppose  $t_{0,1} < t_{a,1}$ , then under strong regularity and equal firing rate it is very likely that  $t_{0,2} < t_{a,2}$ , too. This *transient cross-correlation* correlates efficacy changes in adjacent steps, increasing the efficacy variability. Our simulation suggests that the efficacy variability is smallest when CV is within the range 0.3~0.7, which is the range most neurons lie within<sup>23</sup>. The efficacy variability caused by auto-temporal structure is of DiV nature. See **Supplementary Information Section S2.4** and **Supplementary Figure 3** for modeling details.

Heterogeneity of cross-correlations mainly influences the efficacy variability in DrV manner, and this influence depends on the structure of cross-correlations. In a dendritic motif, synapses which tend to inject spikes before or after the firing of the apical neuron get weaker or stronger, and the strength of potentiation and depression also depend on the size, position and duration of the time window of the cross-correlation. Strongest DrV happens when some cross-correlations concentrate onto the negative side of the sharp change point of the STDP time window ( $t_{\text{post}} - t_{\text{pre}} = \tau_{\text{delay}}$ , see **Fig. 2b**), strongly depressing synapses, while the others concentrating onto the positive side, strongly potentiating synapses. See **Supplementary Information Section S2.5** and **Supplementary Figure 4** for modeling details.

When these aspects of pattern structure coexist, the above mechanisms how they influence the efficacy variability still remain valid, but these mechanisms may interact with each other,

inducing more complicated coupling effects. We discuss these coupling cases in details in **Supplementary Information (Section S2.6-S2.9, Supplementary Fig. 5-8)**.

To understand how dendritic and axonal homeostasis interact with each other, we consider a dendritic motif coupled with axonal motifs (**Fig. 2e**), so that synapses of the dendritic motif are also subject to the homeostasis imposed on the axonal motifs. We denote the strength of the link from the  $a$ th non-apical neuron in the coupled dendritic motif to the apical neuron as  $w_{0a}$ , and the mean synaptic strength within the  $a$ th axonal motif as  $\bar{w}_a$ . If  $w_{0a}$  increases, and  $\bar{w}_a$  positively correlates with  $w_{0a}$ , then  $w_{0a}$  can be dragged back by the homeostasis imposed on  $\bar{w}_a$ . Therefore, if the correlation  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  of the STDP updating onto  $w_{0a}$  and  $\bar{w}_a$  is strong, the efficacy variability in the coupled dendritic motif can get smaller than that in the free one.

Synchronous firing increases  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$ , because both the changes of  $w_{0a}$  and  $\bar{w}_a$  after a firing event have a dependence on the relative spike timing of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron within the firing event, and this dependence is strong especially when the adjacent firing events are far apart. Heterogeneity of rates also increases  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$ , because both  $\langle \Delta w_{0a} \rangle$  and  $\langle \Delta \bar{w}_a \rangle$  (with  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denoting trial average) are proportional to the firing rate of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and the proportional coefficient is non-zero at P-D imbalance. Heterogeneity of cross-correlations may also change  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  by introducing correlation between  $\langle \Delta w_{0a} \rangle$  and  $\langle \Delta \bar{w}_a \rangle$ , but this correlation depends on the details of cross-correlation structure in the spike pattern. Auto-temporal structure, however, hardly has effect when other aspects of pattern structures are absent. See **Supplementary Information Section S2.10 and Supplementary Figure 9-11** for more information.

Generally, when the motif size is large, the condition that the efficacy variability in coupled dendritic motif is smaller than that in the free one is (**Supplementary Information eq. S22**)

$$\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a) > \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_a(\Delta \bar{w}_a)}{\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_{0a})}} \quad (3)$$

We summarize the key points in motifs studies in **Figure 3**.

## Efficacy Variability in LIF Networks

Our next goal is to examine whether our results obtained by studying motifs using spike generating models can still be valid in a more biologically plausible manner. We simulate a conductance-based leaky integrate-and-fire (LIF) neuronal random network which contains 2000 excitatory neurons and 500 inhibitory neurons with link probability 0.2. We keep the mean rate of the excitatory population at 20Hz and the time scale of excitatory synaptic conductance at 4ms. When changing the time scale of the inhibitory synaptic conductance  $\tau_{d,i}$  as integer values from 3ms to 14ms, we find the network transits from asynchronous to weak synchronous and then to synchronously bursting state (**Fig. 4a**). (See **Methods** for model details.)

During STDP and synaptic homeostasis, synaptic efficacies and network dynamics interact with each other. To only investigate the influence of dynamics onto the efficacy variability

without worrying about the change of dynamics caused by synaptic changes, we first record all the spikes of the excitatory population keeping efficacies unchanged, then re-evolve excitatory-to-excitatory (E-E) links according to the recorded spike patterns under the rules of STDP and synaptic homeostasis. We find that the variance of efficacies of E-E links experiences a sharp decrease when  $\tau_{d,l}$  changes from 6ms to 7ms, where the network transits from asynchronous state to synchronous state, and gets its smallest value at the weak synchronous state just after the asynchrony-to-synchrony transition.

To separately investigate the contribution of different aspects of pattern structure to the efficacy variability, we shuffle the spike pattern using different methods to destroy specific aspects of pattern structure, and observe how the efficacy variance of E-E links changes after they are evolved according to these shuffled spike patterns under the same STDP and synaptic homeostasis. The spike shuffling methods and their order to be implemented are carefully designed so that when one aspect of pattern structure is destroyed the other aspects remain largely intact (**Supplementary Fig. 12**). For the two spike patterns before and after implementing a shuffling method, we compare their statistics which is closely relevant to the destroyed aspect of pattern structure, and also compare the variance of efficacies when the E-E links are driven by each of them. In this way, we are able to obtain understanding on how different aspects of the pattern structure influence the efficacy variability, and compare this understanding with our results obtained from motif studies.

We use different spike shuffling methods for asynchronous states ( $\tau_{d,l} \leq 6\text{ms}$ ) and synchronous states ( $\tau_{d,l} \geq 7\text{ms}$ ) due to their sharp pattern difference (**Supplementary Information Section S3**). We find that the influences of different aspects of patterns structure onto the efficacy variability are consistent with our results in motifs research (**Supplementary Information Table 1**), and the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis is the main reason of the small efficacy variability in synchronous states. See **Supplementary Information Section S3** and **Supplementary Figure 12-14** for modeling details.

## Biological Implications

In this section we will demonstrate the important biological implications of the efficacy variability on the encoding and maintenance of connection patterns and on the early development of primary visual systems. We conduct simulations in which synaptic plasticity is implemented during self-organized neuronal activity. In this way, we can show that our previous results, which are obtained by studying how neuronal activity influences synaptic plasticity without considering the feedback, can provide important insights into the biological meanings of the efficacy variability in the dynamics-synapse co-evolution situation.

### Encoding and Maintenance of Connection Patterns

Efficacy variability reflects the variance of efficacies caused by the uncontrollable noises during plasticity. Therefore, under spike patterns that cause large efficacy variability, connection patterns cannot be successfully encoded into the network, and can be easily destroyed by the ongoing remnant plasticity during subsequent functioning (**Fig. 1a**). We use the same LIF

network as the previous section to examine the influence of spike pattern structure onto the encoding and maintenance of connection patterns in neuronal networks.

To do this, we create an artificial connection pattern by randomly assigning each E-E link either into the low efficacy group (low group, or LG) or the high efficacy group (high group, or HG), then simulate the network with STDP as well as dendritic and axonal homeostasis being imposed on E-E links. For connection-pattern maintenance, links in HG are assigned to a stronger weight than those in LG in the beginning, and links within the same group have the same weight. For connection-pattern encoding, all links have the same weight at the beginning, but LG and HG links are subject to different artificial drift velocities during plasticity, mimicking encoding processes. In reality, STDP can be both the power of connection-pattern encoding and the source of efficacy variability; but here, we separate the two processes, and control the encoding process using these two velocities, so that our simulation becomes more controllable. Despite the artificiality of the encoding process, we believe our simulation is able to provide sufficient insights onto the function of efficacy variability. After the simulation begins, the efficacy distributions of both HG and LG get wider due to the efficacy variability, and we use signal-to-noise ratio of these two distributions to quantify the quality of the connection pattern. See **Methods** for modeling details.

The connection patterns we use keep the total input strengths to excitatory neurons during ongoing plasticity almost the same as those of the LIF network with uniform unchanged E-E links studied in the previous section. After implementing intrinsic homeostasis<sup>32</sup> by dynamically adjusting the threshold of the excitatory neurons to keep the firing rate of the excitatory population around 20Hz (see **Methods**), we found that the spike patterns of this plastic LIF network remains qualitatively the same as those of the LIF network with uniform unchanged E-E weights, so that we can compare the change of signal-to-noise ratio with  $\tau_{d,i}$  in this plastic network with that of the efficacy variability in the network with uniform unchanged E-E weights (**Fig. 4b**). Consistent with our analysis above (**Fig. 1a**), we find that the capability of this plastic LIF network for faithfully encoding and long-termly maintaining the connection patterns is inversely correlated with the efficacy variability in recurrent connections (**Fig. 4cd**). See **Supplementary Information Section S4.1** and **Supplementary Figure 15,16** for more information.

Experimentally, it is observed that weak synchronous state is advantageous for memory. The absence of the weak gamma-band synchronization during memory encoding in hippocampus is detrimental to subsequent recognition performance<sup>33</sup>, and epileptiform events induce transient epileptic amnesia and accelerate long-term forgetting<sup>34,35</sup>. Our work suggests that working in weak synchronous state may be important for hippocampus to reduce its efficacy variability in recurrent connections, which requires experimental tests.

## **Development of Primary Visual Systems Driven by Retinal Waves**

Next, we discuss the function of efficacy variability during the development of primary visual systems driven by retinal waves. Retinal waves are spontaneous bursts of action potentials that propagate in a wave-like fashion across the developing retina during prenatal and early postnatal period, and retinal waves of the two eyes are not synchronized<sup>36,37</sup>. They induce strong synchrony within a patch of retinal ganglion cells (RGC) of the same eye that sharing similar receptive field (local RGCs), and induces weak synchrony between patches with different



receptive fields or in different eyes (**Fig. 5a**). Retinal waves are found to be crucial to the formation of retinotopic map and eye-specific segregation in superior colliculus (SC) and dorsal lateral geniculate nucleus (dLGN)<sup>38</sup>. The developmental function of retinal wave has been already studied using Hebbian synaptic competition<sup>39,40</sup>, but in this work we provide new understanding on this competition process using the concept of efficacy variability.

Initially, a neuron in SC or dLGN may homogeneously receive input from many patches of local RGCs. (The definition of local RGC patch is casual, but if two RGCs are close enough their synchrony in retinal waves becomes strong and their connections to downstream neurons become similar, in which case they can be regarded to belong to the same patch.) The essential idea of the Hebbian-type competition<sup>39,40</sup> among these patches relies on a positive feedback, i.e. when the synapses from one patch becomes a little stronger than the others, the downstream neuron becomes more responsive to this patch than the others, and this causality then potentiates its outgoing synapses stronger, helping this patch compete over the others under synaptic homeostasis. However, before this causality is reliably established, noise-induced diffusion is the main source of the inter-patch separation. When this initial diffusion is strong, the difference between the synaptic efficacies from these patches can be quickly enlarged, so that the causality takes its effect early; if the initial diffusion is weak, the efficacies from different patches may wriggle around their common starting point for a long time before the causality reliably participates, which hinders the separation process (**Fig. 5b**).

Large initial inter-patch diffusion requires large efficacy variability between neurons in different patches over the efficacy variability between neurons in the same patch (**Supplementary Information eq. S24**). During a retinal wave, most local RGCs are activated synchronously, with similar spike numbers and burst durations, which homogenizes the changes of synapses coming from the same RGC patch during plasticity, thereby reducing the intra-patch efficacy variability. The inter-patch efficacy variability is always larger than that of intra-patch due to the weak inter-patch synchrony, especially between patches with far-apart receptive fields or in different eyes. Therefore, retinal waves are able to introduce strong initial inter-patch diffusion, which helps to establish causality as early as possible. When the inter-patch synchrony is strong, as is the case when two patches in the same eye have nearby receptive fields, the initial inter-patch diffusion is weak, and the causality is also weak (because when the downstream neuron responds to one patch, it also has a high probability to respond to the other one due to the strong inter-patch synchrony), so that the separation may not complete at the end of the critical period of development. In this case, the interaction of inter-patch diffusion and causality is able to produce strong trial-to-trial variability of the difference between the mean efficacies coming from the two patches (**Supplementary Fig. 17h**). This suggests that a downstream neuron in SC or dLGN with receptive field centered at  $O$  can also receive inputs from RGCs with receptive fields centered near  $O$ , but the efficacies of these inputs should be widely distributed. How this may influence computation is an interest of future researches. We developed a computational model to show the contribution of efficacy variability to the inter-patch separation, see **Supplementary Information Section S4.2** and **Supplementary Figure 17** for modeling details.

## DISCUSSIONS

In this paper, we provide clear evidences that efficacy variability is an important dimension of synaptic plasticity, and spike pattern structure has strong influences on efficacy variability. We

systematically study the influences of four aspects of pattern structures, i.e. synchronous firing, auto-temporal structure, heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations, using spike generating models in simple motifs and spike shuffling methods in LIF networks, and then show functional importance of efficacy variability on the encoding and maintenance of connection patterns and on the early developments of primary visual systems driven by retinal waves.

The reason why we focus on these four aspects of pattern structures is because under STDP they are the only four that mainly influence the lowest order of DiV and DrV, i.e. for DiV we suppose that all synapses have the same diffusion strength, for DrV we do not consider correlations between drift velocities of synapses. Strictly speaking, the heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations not only may make different synapses drift in different velocities, but also make them have different diffusion strengths. However, the contribution of the latter to the efficacy variability of the whole network is far less than that of the former, especially in the long run. For simplicity, we do not consider the heterogeneity of diffusion strength in this study, but in principle it can be understood using the mechanisms introduced in this work, especially in **Supplementary Figure 7b** (for heterogeneity of rates) and **Supplementary Figure 4a** (for heterogeneity of cross-correlations).

In this paper, we focus on an additive STDP model with linear accumulation of all possible pre- and post-synaptic spike pairs. Multiplicative STDP with linear weight dependence does not qualitatively change our results as long as the synaptic homeostasis is also multiplicative, as we can take logarithm before making discussions. However, physiologically, STDP may have varieties of complex realizations, depending on synaptic types, spike patterns and even locations of synapses on dendrites<sup>41</sup>. Therefore, the influence of pattern structures on the efficacy variability may be various, and our results need careful revisits before being implemented to understand real biological systems. For example, in the GABAergic synapses onto CA1 pyramidal neurons, pairing single pre- and post-synaptic spikes at short intervals leads to LTP regardless spike orders, and pairing spikes at long intervals leads to LTD<sup>42</sup>. This STDP rule can remove the mechanism of synapse splitting during synchronous firings with short durations and thus reduce the efficacy variability. As another example, in L2/3 synapses of visual cortical slices, the later spikes in each burst are found to be less effective in synaptic modification<sup>43</sup>. This discounts the change of synapses contributed by per spike during bursts and thus may reduce the efficacy variability. Despite of its limitations, our work provides a comprehensive framework to understand the mechanisms how spike patterns influence the efficacy variability, and all these mechanisms should be carefully considered when dealing with more complicated situations.

Although the influence of spike patterns is various across systems, the concept of *efficacy variability* should be of general importance. The stochasticity of synapses and neuronal responses as well as the emergent heterogeneity of rates and cross-correlations in network dynamics together make efficacy variability an unavoidable nature of plasticity. Therefore, it is of great meaning to understand how animals make use of the efficacy variability and get around of it in future researches. We believe that the concept of efficacy variability not only provides a new perspective to understand the function of plasticity, but is also a new angle to review our current knowledge on learning.

## METHODS

Here we describe the plasticity rules and LIF networks used in our simulations.

## STDP and Synaptic Homeostasis

STDP updating caused by each pair of pre- and post-synaptic spike at  $t_{pre}$  and  $t_{post}$  is

$$\Delta w(t_{pre}, t_{post}) = \begin{cases} A_p \exp\left(-\frac{t_{post} - (t_{pre} + \tau_{delay})}{\tau_{STDP}}\right), & t_{post} > t_{pre} + \tau_{delay} \\ -A_d \exp\left(-\frac{(t_{pre} + \tau_{delay}) - t_{post}}{\tau_{STDP}}\right), & t_{post} < t_{pre} + \tau_{delay} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $\tau_{delay}$  is the axonal delay. The contribution of all pairs of pre- and post-synaptic spikes are added together.  $\tau_{STDP} = 20\text{ms}$ ,  $\tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$  throughout the paper.

We use a dynamic bound to model homeostasis which maintains the average value of the mean weights of incoming and out-going synapses of each neuron. The synaptic efficacies are updated every  $\Delta T$  time according to

$$w_{ab}(t + \Delta T) = w_{ab}(t) + \varepsilon \left( w_{bound} - \frac{1}{N_a} \sum_{c=1}^{N_a} w_{ac}(t) \right), \quad \text{for dendritic homeostasis} \quad (5)$$

$$w_{ab}(t + \Delta T) = w_{ab}(t) + \varepsilon \left( w_{bound} - \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{c=1}^{N_b} w_{cb}(t) \right), \quad \text{for axonal homeostasis} \quad (6)$$

with  $N_a$  being the in-degree of the  $a$ th neuron,  $N_b$  being the out-degree of the  $b$ th neuron,  $w_{bound}$  being the ground line of synaptic homeostasis, and  $\varepsilon$  being the plasticity rate.  $\Delta T = 1\text{ms}$  throughout the paper, other parameters are indicated at relevant locations.

## The LIF Neuronal Network

The network consists of 2000 excitatory and 500 inhibitory conductance-based LIF neurons, the links are randomly connected with probability 0.2. Their dynamics are given by

$$C_k \frac{dV_k}{dt} = g_{L,k} (V_{leak} - V_k) + \left( \sum_j g_{ext,k} s_{ext}(t - t_j) + \sum_j g_{E \rightarrow k} s_E(t - t_j) \right) (E_E - V_k) + \sum_j g_{I \rightarrow k} s_I(t - t_j) (E_I - V_k) \quad k = E, I \quad (7)$$

and the dynamics of synaptic conductance is

$$s_k(t) = \frac{\tau_k}{\tau_{d,k} - \tau_{r,k}} \left( \exp\left(-\frac{t - t_j}{\tau_{d,k}}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{t - t_j}{\tau_{r,k}}\right) \right) \quad (8)$$

In the equations above, membrane time constant  $\tau_e = 20\text{ms}$ ,  $\tau_i = 10\text{ms}$ ; leakage conductance  $g_{L,E} = g_{L,I} = 10\text{nS}$ ; inverse voltage  $E_E = 0\text{mV}$ ,  $E_I = -70\text{mV}$ ; link conductances  $g_{E \rightarrow E} = 0.4\text{nS}$ ,

$g_{I \rightarrow E} = 5.8\text{nS}$ ,  $g_{E \rightarrow I} = 0.74\text{nS}$ ,  $g_{I \rightarrow I} = 9.6\text{nS}$ ; the voltage threshold  $\theta = -50\text{mV}$ , reset voltage  $V_r = -60\text{mV}$ , and refractory time  $\tau_{ref,E} = 2\text{ms}$ ,  $\tau_{ref,I} = 1\text{ms}$ ; the rising time of synaptic conductance  $\tau_{r,E} = \tau_{r,I} = 0.5\text{ms}$ , and the decay time of the excitatory current  $\tau_{d,E} = 4\text{ms}$ , while the decay time of the inhibitory current  $\tau_{d,I}$  takes 12 integer values from 3ms to 14ms. Each neuron also receives 1000Hz of total external Poisson input, with conductance  $g_{ext,E} = c \times 0.53\text{nS}$ ,  $g_{ext,I} = c \times 0.75\text{nS}$ , where  $c$  is a coefficient adjusted to conserve the firing rate of the excitatory population at 20Hz, with values 3.13332, 3.28868, 3.38022, 3.44494, 1.63315, 1.50098, 1.30697, 1.06414, 0.845752, 0.636046, 0.421928, 0.327283 for  $\tau_{d,I}$  from 3ms to 14ms as integer values.

Axons have delay  $\tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$ .  $A_p = A_d = 0.0012\text{nS}$ ,  $w_{bound} = 0.4\text{nS}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.001$  in eq.4-6

Simulations are performed using a second order Runge–Kutta scheme with fixed time step,  $\delta t = 0.05\text{ms}$ ; and an interpolation scheme is also used for the determination of the firing times of the neurons<sup>44</sup>. We record 20s of spike trains, and re-evolve E-E links according to STDP and synaptic homeostasis driven by spike trains original or shuffled by different methods. STDP and synaptic homeostasis start after 1s of transient period. The efficacy variance shown in **Figure 4b** is calculated at 20s of biological time.

As this work aims to understand how dynamic patterns influence efficacy variability, instead of how dynamic properties changes with model parameters, averaging configurations of the random LIF networks does not help to gain more insight, only increasing complexity. Therefore, our study focuses on a single typical configuration, thereby fixing dynamics at different  $\tau_{d,I}$ s, except for different trials, we choose different initial states and seeds of random generators which result in trial-to-trial variability. However, we did check our results using other configurations, and found qualitatively the same results.

## Connection-Pattern Maintenance in the LIF Neuronal Network

We create an artificial connection pattern by randomly assigning each E-E link either into the low efficacy group (low group, or LG) or the high efficacy group (high group, or HG). Links in LG or HG are assigned at 0.35nS or 0.45nS at the beginning, so that the mean efficacy of the E-E links (0.4nS) is the same as that of the LIF network mentioned in the previous subsection. We then simulate the network with STDP as well as dendritic and axonal homeostasis being imposed on E-E links. To conserve the firing rate of the excitatory population at 20Hz during plasticity, intrinsic homeostasis<sup>32</sup> is also implemented so that the threshold of all the excitatory neurons  $\theta_E$  is adjusted every 10ms:

$$\theta_E(t) = \theta_E(t - 10\text{ms}) + c(r(t) - r_0) \quad (9)$$

where  $r(t)$  is the firing rate of the excitatory population in the past 1000ms,  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$ ,  $c = 0.001\text{mV} \cdot \text{s}$ . In this way, the dynamic pattern of the LIF network remains qualitatively unchanged in spite of the connection pattern and on-going plasticity, and we can use our understanding on the efficacy variability of the LIF network with uniform unchanged E-E links (**Fig. 4b**) to understand the performance of the connection-pattern maintenance in the plastic network.

Suppose after time  $t$ , the mean and variance of the efficacy distribution of LG are  $\mu_{low}(t)$  and  $\sigma_{low}^2(t)$ , and those of HG are  $\mu_{high}(t)$  and  $\sigma_{high}^2(t)$ . We quantify the quality of the connection pattern using

$$SNR(t) = \frac{\mu_{high}(t) - \mu_{low}(t)}{\sqrt{\sigma_{high}^2(t)\sigma_{low}^2(t)}} \quad (10)$$

and observe how  $SNR(t)$  changes with  $\tau_{d,l}$  (**Fig. 4c**). All the E-E links are bounded within  $[0.25nS, 0.55nS]$  using hard bounds, and we control the simulation time so that most efficacies are far from the boundaries (**Supplementary Fig. 15bc**). The influence of boundaries on connection-pattern maintenance is beyond the scope of the research.

The simulation lasts for 20s biological time, and the plasticity starts after 1s of transient period. Parameters for STDP and synaptic homeostasis are the same as described in the previous subsection.

## Connection-Pattern Encoding in the LIF Neuronal Network

For connection-pattern encoding, we do not consider a detailed learning process, but model the encoding generically by artificial drifts of synaptic efficacies. Specifically, E-E links are also randomly assigned into LG or HG. Initially, LG and HG links are 0.4nS, but they are subject to different drift velocities  $v_{LG}$  and  $v_{HG}$ . So at time  $t$ , the efficacy of a LG link should be

$w_{LG}(t) = w_{STDP}(t) + w_{hom}(t) + v_{LG}t$ , with  $w_{STDP}(t)$  being the contribution of STDP,  $w_{hom}(t)$  being the contribution of dendritic and axonal homeostasis, and  $v_{LG}$  being the velocity of the drift imposed on LG links; and the value of a HG link should be  $w_{HG}(t) = w_{STDP}(t) + w_{hom}(t) + v_{HG}t$ .

The same as the study on connection-pattern maintenance, intrinsic homeostasis is also imposed on the excitatory neurons to keep their mean rate at 20Hz. During the simulation, the mean values of HG and LG are separated apart, while the distribution of HG and LG are continuously broadened (**Supplementary Fig. 16c**). We also use  $SNR(t)$  to quantify the quality of the connection pattern at a given time (**Fig. 4d**).

$v_{HG} = (0.45 - 0.4) / (20 - 1)nS \cdot s^{-1}$  and  $v_{LG} = (0.35 - 0.4) / (20 - 1)nS \cdot s^{-1}$ . Simulations last for 20s biological time, and the plasticity starts after 1s transient period. Parameters for STDP and synaptic homeostasis are kept the same as the previous subsection. All the E-E links are also bounded within  $[0.25nS, 0.55nS]$  using hard bounds, and we control the simulation time so that most efficacies are far from the boundaries.

## Acknowledgments

CZ is partially supported by Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) Strategic Development Fund, NSFC-RGC Joint Research Scheme HKUST/NSFC/12-13/01, NSFC (Grant No. 11275027). HJZ is supported by the National Basic Research Program of China (grant number 2013CB932804) and the National Natural Science Foundations of China (grant numbers 11121403 and 11225526). ZB thanks Dongping Yang for kind helps on coding LIF networks at

the beginning of the research. ZB also thanks David Hansel and Carl van Vreeswijk for helpful discussions during his visit in CNRS UMR 8119 in Université Paris Descartes in 2013.

### **Author contribution**

ZB and CZ conceived the idea, ZB designed and performed the research, HJZ supervised ZB on this work, ZB and CZ wrote the paper.


## References

1. Shafi, M., *et al.*, Variability in neuronal activity in primate cortex during working memory tasks. *Neuroscience* **146**, 1082-1108 (2007).
2. O'Connor, D. H., Peron, S. P., Huber & Svoboda, D. K., Neural activity in barrel cortex underlying vibrissa-based object localization in mice. *Neuron* **67**, 1048-1061 (2010).
3. Buzsáki, G. & Mizuseki, K., The log-dynamic brain: how skewed distributions affect network operations. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **15**, 264-278 (2014).
4. Funahashi, S. & Inoue, M., Neuronal interactions related to working memory processes in the primate prefrontal cortex revealed by cross-correlation analysis. *Cereb. Cortex* **10**, 535-551 (2000).
5. Dragoi, G. & Buzsáki, G., Temporal encoding of place sequences by hippocampal cell assemblies. *Neuron* **50**, 145-157 (2006).
6. Kohn, A. & Smith, M. A., Stimulus dependence of neuronal correlation in primary visual cortex of the macaque. *J. Neurosci.* **25**, 3661-3673 (2005).
7. Schneidman, E., Berry, M. J., Sege, R. & Bialek, W., Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly correlated network states in a neural population. *Nature* **440**, 1007-1012 (2006).
8. Allen, C. & Stevens, C. F., An evaluation of causes for unreliability of synaptic transmission. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **91**, 10380-10383 (1994).
9. Mainen, Z. F. & Sejnowski, T. J., Reliability of spike timing in neocortical neurons. *Science* **268**, 1503-1506 (1995).
10. Shadlen, M. N. & Newsome, W. T., The variable discharge of cortical neurons: implications for connectivity, computation, and information coding. *J. Neurosci.* **18**, 3870-3896 (1998).
11. Roxin, A., Brunel, N., Hansel, D., Mongillo, G. & van Vreeswijk, C., On the distribution of firing rates in networks of cortical neurons. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 16217-16226 (2011).
12. Ostojic, S., Brunel, N. & Hakim, V., How connectivity, background activity, and synaptic properties shape the cross-correlation between spike trains. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 10234-10253 (2009).
13. Song, S., Sjöström, P. J., Reigl, M., Nelson, S. & Chklovski, D. B., Highly nonrandom features of synaptic connectivity in local cortical circuits. *PLoS Biol.* **3**, e68 (2005).
14. Hopfield, J. J., Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **79**, 2554-2558 (1982).
15. Mongillo, G., Barak, O. & Tsodyks, M., Synaptic theory of working memory. *Science* **319**, 1543-1546 (2008).
16. Long, M. A., Jin, D. Z. & Fee, M. S., Support for a synaptic chain model of neuronal sequence generation. *Nature* **468**, 394-399 (2010).
17. Cancedda, L. & Poo, M.-M., in *Encyclopedia of Neuroscience*, Squire, L. R., Ed. (Academic Press, Oxford, 2009), pp. 697-703.


18. Watt, A. J. & Desai, N. S., Homeostatic plasticity and STDP: keeping a neuron's cool in a fluctuating world. *Front. Synaptic Neurosci.* **2**, 5 (2010).
19. Clause, A. *et al.*, The precise temporal pattern of prehearing spontaneous activity is necessary for tonotopic map refinement. *Neuron* **82**, 822-835 (2014).
20. Kamioka, H., Maeda, E., Jimbo, Y., Robinson, H. P. C. & Kawana, A., Spontaneous periodic synchronized bursting during formation of mature patterns of connections in cortical cultures. *Neurosci. Lett.* **206**, 109-112 (1996).
21. Buzsáki, G. & Draguhn, A., Neuronal oscillations in cortical networks. *Science* **304**, 1926-1929 (2004).
22. Bartos, M., Vida & Jonas, I. P., Synaptic mechanisms of synchronized gamma oscillations in inhibitory interneuron networks. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **8**, 45-56 (2007).
23. Softky, W. R. & Koch, C., The highly irregular firing of cortical cells is inconsistent with temporal integration of random EPSPs. *J. Neurosci.* **13**, 334-350 (1993).
24. Schwindt, P. & Crill, W., Mechanisms underlying burst and regular spiking evoked by dendritic depolarization in layer 5 cortical pyramidal neurons. *J. Neurophysiol.* **81**, 1341-1354 (1999).
25. Jacob, V., Petreanu, L., Wright, N., Svoboda, K. & Fox, K., Regular spiking and intrinsic bursting pyramidal cells show orthogonal forms of experience-dependent plasticity in layer V of barrel cortex. *Neuron* **73**, 391-404 (2012).
26. Bi, G. & Poo, M., Synaptic modification by correlated activity: Hebb's postulate revisited. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **24**, 139-166 (2001).
27. Royer, S. & Paré, D., Conservation of total synaptic weight through balanced synaptic depression and potentiation. *Nature* **422**, 518-522 (2003).
28. Fonseca, R., Nägerl, U. V., Morris, R. G. M. & Bonhoeffer, T., Competing for memory: hippocampal LTP under regimes of reduced protein synthesis. *Neuron* **44**, 1011-1020 (2004).
29. Mitra, A., Mitra, S. & Tsien, R., Heterogeneous reallocation of presynaptic efficacy in recurrent excitatory circuits adapting to inactivity. *Nat. Neurosci.* **15**, 250-257 (2012).
30. Stewart, B. A., Schuster, C. M., Goodman, C. S. & Atwood, H. L., Homeostasis of synaptic transmission in *Drosophila* with genetically altered nerve terminal morphology. *J. Neurosci.* **16**, 3877-3886 (1996).
31. DeGroot, M. H. & Morris, H., *Probability and statistics* (Pearson, Boston, ed. 4, 2011), p. 254.
32. Turrigiano, G., Too many cooks? intrinsic and synaptic homeostatic mechanisms in cortical circuit refinement. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **34**, 89-103 (2011).
33. Jutras, M. J., Fries, P. & Buffalo, E. A., Gamma-band synchronization in the macaque hippocampus and memory formation. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 12521-12531 (2009).
34. Butler, C. R. & Zeman, A. Z., Recent insights into the impairment of memory in epilepsy: Transient epileptic amnesia, accelerated long-term forgetting and remote memory impairment. *Brain* **131**, 2243-2263 (2008).




35. Gulyás, A. I. & Freund, T. T., Generation of physiological and pathological high frequency oscillations: The role of perisomatic inhibition in sharp-wave ripple and interictal spike generation. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **31**, 26-32 (2015).
36. Firth, S. I., Wang, C. T. & Feller, M. B., Retinal waves: Mechanisms and function in visual system development. *Cell Calcium* **37**, 425-432 (2005).
37. Ackman, J., Burbridge, T. & Crair, M., Retinal waves coordinate patterned activity throughout the developing visual system. *Nature* **490**, 219-225 (2012).
38. Kirkby, L. A., Sack, G. S., Firl, A. & Feller, M. B., A role for correlated spontaneous activity in the assembly of neural circuits. *Neuron* **80**, 1129-1144 (2013).
39. Butts, D. A., Kanold, P. O. & Shatz, C. J., A Burst-Based “Hebbian” Learning Rule at Retinogeniculate Synapses Links Retinal Waves to Activity-Dependent Refinement. *PLoS Biol.* **5**, e61 (2007).
40. Furman, M., Modeling binocular competition through Hebbian plasticity and constrained connectivity. *Neurocomputing* **121**, 195-206 (2013).
41. Caporale, N. & Dan, Y., Spike timing-dependent plasticity: a Hebbian learning rule. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **31**, 25-46 (2008).
42. Woodin, M. A., Ganguly, K. & Poo, M., Coincident pre- and postsynaptic activity modifies GABAergic synapses by postsynaptic changes in Cl<sup>-</sup> transporter activity. *Neuron* **39**, 807-820 (2003).
43. Froemke, R. C., Tsay, I. A., Raad, M., Long, J. D. & Dan, Y., Contribution of individual spikes in burst-induced long-term synaptic modification. *J Neurophysiol.* **95**, 1620-1629 (2006).
44. Hansel, D., Mato, G., Meunier, C. & Neltner, L., On numerical simulations of integrate-and-fire neural networks. *Neural Comput* **10**, 467-483 (1998).




**Figure 1.** Biological implications of efficacy variability. **(a)** A connection pattern used for, say, memory or spike sequence generation is defined as a few synapses (red) stronger than the others (blue). When the efficacy variability is small (upper), the connection pattern is clear-cut; when the efficacy variability is large (lower), the connection pattern is destroyed even if the mean strength of red synapses is still larger than the blue ones. Widths of arrows indicate synaptic strengths. **(b)** Efficacy variability causes different network structures by controlling the degree of synaptic competition. When the efficacy variability is small (upper), only a few synapses is weaker than the elimination threshold (black dashed vertical line), so most synapses are left and the strengths of them tend to be uniform; when the efficacy variability is large (lower), more synapses are eliminated, and the left ones are more heterogeneous and also stronger than the upper case on average. Dashed arrows represent eliminated synapses.




**Figure 2.** Schematic of key concepts in our modeling work. **(a)** Four aspects of pattern structure studied in this paper. **(b)** The STDP time window used in our work. Note that axons in our work have time delay  $\tau_{delay}$ , synapses are updated according to the spike time of the post-synaptic neuron and the time that the pre-synaptic spike arrives at the terminal. The STDP updatings of all spike pairs are summed together. **(c)** Synapses at a neuron are subject to a soft bound on their mean strength: when the mean strength of synapses into (or out of) a neuron is different from this bound, all the incoming (or outgoing) synapses to that neuron undergo an adjustment. **(d)** Dendritic motif and axonal motif. The dendritic (axonal) homeostasis is imposed onto the apical neuron of a dendritic (axonal) motif. **(e)** A dendritic motif coupled with axonal motifs.



**Figure 3.** Key points to understand the mechanisms of how the four aspects of spike pattern structure influence the efficacy variability under STDP and synaptic homeostasis (see text for explanations).



**Figure 4.** Spike patterns of the LIF network influence the efficacy variability, thereby influencing the performance of the network for encoding and maintaining connection patterns. **(a)** Spike patterns at asynchronous (left,  $\tau_{d,I} = 3\text{ms}$ ), weak synchronous (middle,  $\tau_{d,I} = 7\text{ms}$ ) and synchronously bursting (right,  $\tau_{d,I} = 14\text{ms}$ ) state. **(b)** Efficacy variance as a function of  $\tau_{d,I}$  when synapses are evolved according to original recorded spike patterns, under STDP and both dendritic and axonal homeostasis on links within excitatory population. **(c)** The capability of the network to long-termly maintaining connection patterns (quantified by SNR) changes with  $\tau_{d,I}$  in an inverse way against the efficacy variance. **(d)** The same as **c**, but for the capability of faithfully encoding connection-patterns. In **b-d**, error bars indicate s.e.m. over 24 trials, vertical black lines indicate the transition from asynchronous to synchronous states. Simulation details are explained in **Methods**.



**Figure 5.** Schematic to understand the function of efficacy variability during the competition among RGCs induced by retinal waves. **(a)** Retinal wave induces strong synchrony within a local RGC patch (represented by thick bars), but weak synchrony between patches with different receptive fields in the same eye or in different eyes. Connections from these patches to downstream neurons compete with each other under dendritic homeostasis. **(b)** Initially, synapses from different patches are homogeneous (indicated by the black dot), but noise-induced diffusion separates the synaptic efficacies from the two patches (zigzag arrows of two colors). As these two patches are separated farther, they will be pushed apart stronger by causality (big arrows). If the initial diffusion is strong (solid arrows), they will soon diffuse into strong-causality range, and get separated quickly; if the initial diffusion is weak (dashed arrows), they will stay in the weak-causality range for a longer time.

# **Spike Pattern Structure Influences Efficacy Variability under STDP and Synaptic Homeostasis:**

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**Authors:** Zedong Bi<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Changsong Zhou<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Hai-Jun Zhou<sup>1</sup>

### **Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Nonlinear Studies, and Beijing-Hong Kong-Singapore Joint Centre for Nonlinear and Complex Systems (Hong Kong), Institute of Computational and Theoretical Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China

<sup>4</sup>Beijing Computational Science Research Center, Beijing, China

<sup>5</sup>Research Centre, HKBU Institute of Research and Continuing Education, Virtual University Park Building, South Area Hi-tech Industrial Park, Shenzhen, China

\*Correspondence to: zedong.bi@gmail.com.

## Section S1: The Decomposition of Total Variance of Efficacy

*Key points of this section:*

- 1) *The efficacy variability can be decomposed into the variability caused by the heterogeneity of drift velocities (DrV), and the variability caused by diffusion (DiV).*

The law of total variance says that if the probability space of  $Y$  is decomposed into several subspaces labeled by  $X$ , then the variance of  $Y$  in the whole space is equal to the summation of the variance of the expectations in these subspaces and the expectation of the variances in these subspaces, i.e.

$$\text{Var}(Y) = \text{Var}(E(Y | X)) + E(\text{Var}(Y | X)) \quad (\text{S1})$$

Now suppose that there is a matrix  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$ , each column of which represents the changes of the synaptic efficacies in a network after the plasticity in one trial, and different columns represent different trials. Then eq.S1 can be written as

$$\text{Var}_{S,T}(\Delta\mathbf{W}) = \text{Var}_S(E_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})) + E_S(\text{Var}_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})) \quad (\text{S2})$$

where subscript  $S$  represents integrating over row index, i.e. structural disorder, and  $T$  represents integrating over column index, i.e. trial disorder.

Here,  $E_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})$  represents the trial averages, i.e. expectations of the changes of all synaptic efficacies in the network;  $\text{Var}_S(E_T(\Delta\mathbf{W}))$  is the variance of these expectations, representing DrV.  $\text{Var}_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})$  represents variances caused by diffusion (DiV), and  $E_S(\text{Var}_T(\Delta\mathbf{W}))$  is the mean DiV over all synapses. Eq.S2 is the formal writing of eq.1 in the main text.

The law of total variance can decompose  $\text{Var}_{S,T}(\Delta\mathbf{W})$  in another way

$$\text{Var}_{S,T}(\Delta\mathbf{W}) = \text{Var}_T(E_S(\Delta\mathbf{W})) + E_T(\text{Var}_S(\Delta\mathbf{W})) \quad (\text{S3})$$

Here  $\text{Var}_T(E_S(\Delta\mathbf{W}))$  is the trial-to-trial variability of the mean synaptic efficacy change of the network, but a real biological process only allows a single trial, so this trial-to-trial variability cannot contribute to biological functions except for individual differences. Fortunately,  $\text{Var}_T(E_S(\Delta\mathbf{W})) \sim \mathcal{O}(1/N)$ , where  $N$  is the size of the network. So when  $N$  is large enough, eq.S3 becomes  $\text{Var}_{S,T}(\Delta\mathbf{W}) \approx E_T(\text{Var}_S(\Delta\mathbf{W}))$ . Therefore, we can use the trial expectation of the efficacy variance in a network  $E_T(\text{Var}_S(\Delta\mathbf{W}))$  to represent the total efficacy variance  $\text{Var}_{S,T}(\Delta\mathbf{W})$ , quantifying the efficacy variability. This is what we do in our simulations. Under this insight, eq.S2 becomes

$$E_T(\text{Var}_S(\Delta\mathbf{W})) \approx \text{Var}_S(E_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})) + E_S(\text{Var}_T(\Delta\mathbf{W})) \quad (\text{S4})$$

In dendritic or axonal motifs (**Fig. 2d** in the main text), synapses can be indexed by the non-apical neurons' links. If we use  $a$  to represent this index, eq.S4 can be written as



$$E_T(\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)) \approx \text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a)) + E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a)) \quad (\text{S5})$$

## Section S2: Motif Studies

### Section S2.1: Introduction to Motif Studies

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *We control the activities of neurons in motifs using spike generating models. This does not discount the generality of our results, and is also necessary for investigating the influence of spike patterns on the efficacy variability without worrying about the change of spike pattern caused by the change of synapses, which will happen in more biological models.*
- 2) *The results on dendritic motifs will be exactly the same as those on axonal motifs if the spike pattern is statistically time-reversal invariant.*

We generate the spike trains of neurons in dendritic and axonal motifs using statistical models, and evolve the synapses according to the generated spike trains and additive STDP when dynamically conserving the mean synaptic efficacy using subtractive normalization (synaptic homeostasis), see **Methods** in the main text. Synaptic homeostasis does not influence the efficacy variance in a free motif, but may take its effect when dendritic and axonal motifs are coupled together.

In reality, post-synaptic neurons generate spikes according to its inputs, but here spike trains are model-generated and imposed on these neurons. We argue below that the break of this causality does not discount the generality of our results. Firstly, a neuron in biological system receive and target to various types of neurons with different functions, the motifs here only represent those synapses with similar plasticity rule and strong homeostatic interactions. Thus the activities of biological pre-synaptic neurons which are represented by the pre-synaptic neurons in motifs may influence, but cannot fully determine, the activities of their post-synaptic neurons: noises from other sources can be very strong. Secondly, plasticity and spike evoking are two independent processes: synapses undergo the same plasticity under the same spike pattern, regardless whether the spike pattern is self-organized or model-generated. Therefore we can still gain insight onto the plastic process in self-organized systems even if our spike trains are model-generated. We also argue that the break of this causality is very necessary for our research. In real systems, neural dynamics and plasticity are two interacting processes. Using spike-generating models, we can only investigate how the pattern structure influences the change of synapses without worrying about the change of spike pattern caused by the change of synapses. When discussing biological implications, we use systems with self-organized dynamics, and show that our results can gain rich insights into the behavior of the system to understand the important biological meanings of the efficacy variability.

So what is the relationship between the efficacy variability in dendritic motif and axonal motif? Synapses in our motifs have axonal delay  $\tau_{delay}$ . Suppose that in a dendritic motif the apical neuron fires at  $t_{0,i}$  and the  $a$ th non-apical neuron fires at  $t_{a,j}$ , then the STDP updating will depend on the time difference between the post-synaptic spike time  $t_{0,i}$  and the time that pre-

synaptic spike arrives at the post-synaptic neuron  $t_{a,j} + \tau_{delay}$ , which is  $\Delta t_1 = t_{0,i} - (t_{a,j} + \tau_{delay})$ . Now suppose that we play the whole spike pattern in a time-reversal way, just like showing the dendritic motif a backward movie, then the spike at the apical neuron will be at  $-t_{0,i}$ , and the spike at the  $a$ th non-apical neuron will be at  $-t_{a,j}$ , so after considering the axonal delay, the time difference will be  $\Delta t_2 = -t_{0,i} - (-t_{a,j} + \tau_{delay})$ . Now we reverse the direction of the links in the dendritic motif, so that it becomes an axonal motif, and show it the original *forward* spike trains, then the apical neuron becomes the pre-synaptic neuron, while the  $a$ th non-apical neuron becomes the post-synaptic one, so the time difference will be  $\Delta t_3 = t_{a,j} - (t_{0,i} + \tau_{delay})$ . We see that  $\Delta t_2 = \Delta t_3$ . This means that the forward spike train will change the synapses in a dendritic motif by the same values with the corresponding backward spike train in an axonal motif under STDP. Therefore, the researches on efficacy variability using dendritic motif and axonal motif will get exactly the same results as long as our generated spike trains are statistically time-reversal invariant. Because of the time-reversal invariance of our statistical spike-generating model, we will only focus on dendritic motifs in the following. Results on axonal motifs will be exactly the same.

## Section S2.2: The Influence of Synchronous Firing

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Synchronous firing influences the efficacy variability through the mechanisms of spike gathering, synapse splitting and synaptic correlating.*

We evolve synapses in a dendritic motif according to spike trains generated by Model Sync 1 (**Section S5.1**), and record their variance per spike (variance divided by spike number per neuron) at the end to quantify the efficacy variability. Suppose a firing event happens during  $[t_1, t_2]$  ( $\tau_{cross} = t_2 - t_1$ ), then each neuron, including the apical neuron, in the dendritic motif has probability  $p \in (0,1]$  to fire a spike within this interval. The rate of the occurrence of firing events is  $r_0 / p$ , so that the firing rate of each neuron is kept at  $r_0$ . Suppose that the spike time of the apical neuron during the firing event is  $t_0$ . If  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$ , we always have  $t_0 < t_1 + \tau_{cross} < t_1 + \tau_{delay}$ , which means the apical neuron always receives its afferents after its own firing. In this case, when  $p$  is large, nearly all synapses are depressed almost simultaneously, so the efficacy variability is reduced through *synapse correlating* (see main text). If  $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay}$ , there are chances when  $t_1 + \tau_{delay} < t_0 < t_2 + \tau_{delay}$ , causing *synapse splitting* (see main text); and this chance increases with  $\tau_{cross}$ , so that the efficacy variability increases with  $\tau_{cross}$ . *Spike gathering* (see main text) always increases with  $p$ , but its contribution on the efficacy variability is more obvious when  $p$  is small, where both synapse correlating and synapse splitting are weak. The simulation result is consistent with the analysis above (**Supplementary Fig. 1a**).

To further check the three mechanisms that synchronous firing influences the efficacy variability, we next generate spike trains using two other statistical models. In the first model (Model Sync 2 in **Section S5.1**), the apical neuron can fire only at  $t_2 + \tau_{delay}$  in the firing events,

so that it fires only after receiving all its afferents, which removes synapse splitting. In this case, when  $p$  is small, the efficacy variability still increases with  $p$  because of spike gathering; when  $p$  is large, it decreases with  $p$  because of synapse correlating, and it does not strongly increase with  $\tau_{cross}$  as it does for Model Sync 1 because of the removal of synapse splitting in this model (**Supplementary Fig. 1bc**). In the second model (Model Sync 3 in **Section S5.1**), we model spike trains as inhomogeneous Poisson process, so that different non-apical neurons may fire very different numbers of spikes during a firing event, which results in very different efficacy changes on the corresponding synapses, removing synapse correlating. Therefore, when  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$ , spike gathering makes the efficacy variability continue to increase even when  $p$  is close to one (**Supplementary Fig. 1d**). Actually, for this model the efficacy variability for  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$  is even usually larger than that for  $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 1d**), which will be explained in Miscellaneous (**Section S6.1**).

Experimentally, it is found that synchrony patterns in neuronal network exhibit near-maximal entropy<sup>1,2</sup>. To check the universality of our results, we then generate spikes according to a model based on the one introduced in ref.3, which is shown to possess near-maximal entropy (Model Sync 4 in **Section S5.1**)<sup>4</sup>. We find that the efficacy variability changes in a similar way with  $p$  and  $\tau_{cross}$  as it does in Model Sync 1 (**Supplementary Fig. 1e**).

### Section S2.3: Coupling Heterogeneity of Rates with Synchronous Firing

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Synchronous firing is able to change P-D imbalance.*
- 2) *Heterogeneity of rates changes the efficacy variability in DrV manner by making use of P-D imbalance.*

Next we add the ingredient of rate heterogeneity into the picture, and investigate its effect on the efficacy variability when it is coupled with synchronous firing. Suppose in a dendritic motif the rate of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron is  $r_a$ , the change of its axonal efficacy is  $\Delta w_a$ , then eq.S5 becomes

$$E_T(\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)) \approx E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) + \text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) \quad (\text{S6})$$

where we add the condition to  $r_a$  to emphasize that different non-apical neurons have different firing rates. In this equation,  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  represents DiV, and  $\text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  represents DrV (see the discussion in **Section S1**).

During STDP, both the strengths of potentiation and depression are proportional to the firing rates of the pre- and post-synaptic neurons. Therefore, the expectation of efficacy change of the  $a$ th synapse

$$E_T(\Delta w_a) \propto (S_p - S_d)r_a r_0, \quad (\text{S7})$$

with  $r_0$  and  $r_a$  being the rate of the apical and  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and  $S_p - S_d$  quantifying the imbalance of potentiation and depression (*P-D imbalance*). When  $r_a$  is heterogeneous,  $\text{Var}_a(\mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) \propto (S_p - S_d)^2$  with non-zero coefficient, representing DrV.

For homogeneous Poisson process,  $S_p = A_p$  and  $S_d = A_d$ . After adding synchronous firing,  $S_p$  and  $S_d$  can also be influenced by the relative timing of the spike of the apical neuron within a firing event, influencing DrV. To check this effect, we generate spike trains using Model Long Tail & Model Sync 3 (**Section S5.1**). In this model, spike trains are inhomogeneous Poisson, with the temporal fluctuation of rates determined by firing events. Time-averaged rates of the non-apical neurons are lognormal distributed with mean  $r_0$  and shape parameter  $s$ , with  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$  being the rate of the apical neuron. When  $s = 1$ , the distribution is of long tail; when  $s = 0$ , the distribution is  $\delta$  function so that rates are homogeneous. We find that in this model, synchronous firing contributes to P-D imbalance by strengthening depression process (**Supplementary Fig. 2a**), because the axonal delay in the dendritic motif tends to make the apical neuron receive its afferents from non-apical neurons *after* its own spikes during a firing event (similar phenomenon has been observed in ref. 5).

Now we check the influence of P-D imbalance on DrV. From eq. S7, we know that  $\text{DrV} = \text{Var}_a(\mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) \propto (S_p - S_d)^2$ . As  $\text{DrV} \propto t^2$  and  $\text{DiV} \propto t$ , DrV will dominate in the total variance in the long run, so that  $\mathbb{E}_T(\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a))$  (see eq.S6) should be proportional to  $(S_p - S_d)^2$ . From eq.S7, we also have  $|\mathbb{E}_{a,T}(\Delta w_a)| \propto |S_p - S_d|$ . These two facts make us expect that  $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_T(\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a))} \propto |\mathbb{E}_{a,T}(\Delta w_a)|$ . As  $|\mathbb{E}_{a,T}(\Delta w_a)|$  reflects the P-D imbalance, this proportional relationship reflects that the DrV caused by the heterogeneity of rates is due to the P-D imbalance, which is indeed the case we find in our simulation (**Supplementary Fig. 2b**).

As  $\mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a) \propto r_a r_0$ , and synchronous firing influences the coefficient through P-D imbalance, we should expect that when the properties of synchronous firing changes while keeping  $r_0$  and  $r_a$  unchanged, the change of  $\mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a)$  is proportional to  $r_a$ . Indeed, we find that  $\mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a | p) - \mathbb{E}_T(\Delta w_a | p = 0) \propto r_a$  with  $p$  controlling the strength of firing events (**Supplementary Fig. 2c**). This provides further insight on how synchronous firing changes DrV with the existence of rate heterogeneity.

## Section S2.4: The Influence of Auto-temporal Structure

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Burstiness increases the efficacy variability by the correlation of the efficacy changes caused by adjacent non-apical spikes and by adjacent apical spikes.*
- 2) *Strong regularity increases the efficacy variability through transient cross-correlation.*

We use Gamma processes to model the auto-temporal structure of spike trains (Model Auto in **Section S5.1**). We change the shape parameter  $\alpha$  of the Gamma process while conserving the firing rates. The coefficient of variance (CV) of Gamma process is  $CV = 1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ . When CV gets

larger, spike trains are burstier, when  $CV$  gets smaller, spikes are more regular. We find that both burstiness and strong regularity increases the efficacy variability, and the efficacy variability gets its minimal value when  $CV$  is around 0.3~0.7 (**Supplementary Fig. 3a**).

Next, we want to understand the reason why the efficacy variability changes with  $CV$ . To do this, we write the total change of the  $a$ th synapse as

$$\Delta w_a = \sum_{k=p,d} \Delta w_{a,k} = \sum_{k=p,d} \sum_i \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \quad (\text{S8})$$

with  $\Delta w_{a,p}$  being the total potentiation value,  $\Delta w_{a,p}(t_i, t_{a,j})$  being the potentiation value pairing the  $i$ th spike of the apical neuron and the  $j$ th spike of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and  $\Delta w_{a,d}$  and  $\Delta w_{a,d}(t_i, t_{a,j})$  being the corresponding depression values. For the consistency with previous simulations, we also add axonal delay  $\tau_{delay}$  in the dendritic motif, and the sign of STDP depends on the timing difference of  $t_i$  and  $t_{a,j} + \tau_{delay}$  (**Figure 2b** in main text). The index of  $i$  starts from the beginning of the spike train of the apical neuron. The indexing of  $j$ , however, depends on  $a$ ,  $i$  and  $k$ . For potentiation process ( $k = p$ ), the index of  $j$  starts from the spike immediately before  $t_i - \tau_{delay}$  in the spike train of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and goes backward along the spike train; for depression process ( $k = d$ ), its index starts from the spike immediately after  $t_i - \tau_{delay}$ , and goes forward along the spike train.

Using eq. S8, we can rewrite the variance of efficacy changes like this:

$$\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a) = c_{\text{III}} c_{\text{II}} c_{\text{I}} \cdot \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right) \quad (\text{S9})$$

where

$$c_{\text{III}} = \frac{\text{Var}_a \left( \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right)}{\sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \sum_i \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)}, \quad (\text{S10})$$

$$c_{\text{II}} = \frac{\sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \sum_i \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)}{\sum_i \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)}, \quad (\text{S11})$$

$$c_{\text{I}} = \frac{\sum_i \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)}{\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)}. \quad (\text{S12})$$

To understand the three coefficients, first note that

$$\text{Var}_a \left( \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) = \sum_{k=p,d} \text{Var}_a \left( \sum_i \sum_j \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right)$$

$$+2\rho\sqrt{\text{Var}_a\left(\sum_i\sum_j\Delta w_{a,p}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)\text{Var}_a\left(\sum_i\sum_j\Delta w_{a,d}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

where  $\rho$  represents the correlation coefficient between the total potentiation and depression values imposed on the same synapse. Thus,

$$c_{\text{III}} = 1 + \frac{2\rho\sqrt{\text{Var}_a\left(\sum_i\sum_j\Delta w_{a,p}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)\text{Var}_a\left(\sum_i\sum_j\Delta w_{a,d}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)}}{\sum_k\left(\text{Var}_a\left(\sum_i\sum_j\Delta w_{a,k}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)\right)}, \quad (\text{S14})$$

which quantifies the contribution to the efficacy variability by the correlation between the total potentiation and depression value (*Type III correlation*). Similarly,  $c_{\text{II}}$  quantifies the contribution by the correlation between STDP updatings caused by adjacent spikes of the apical neuron (*Type II correlation*),  $c_1$  quantifies the contribution by the correlation between STDP updatings caused by adjacent spikes of non-apical neurons (*Type I correlation*); and

$\sum_i\sum_j\sum_k\left(\text{Var}_a\left(\Delta w_{a,k}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)\right)$  represents the efficacy variability when all of the three correlations are absent.

Now we analyze the reason why  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  is smallest when  $CV$  is around 0.3~0.7, and gets larger when spike trains are burstier or more regular. We find that  $\sum_i\sum_j\sum_k\left(\text{Var}_a\left(\Delta w_{a,k}(t_i,t_{a,j})\right)\right)$  increases with  $CV$  (**Supplementary Fig. 3b**). However, comparing to  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$ , both its value and increase are small, which means that it is not the main contribution of the value and change of  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$ .  $c_{\text{III}} > 1$  when spike trains are regular, and  $c_{\text{III}} < 1$  when spike trains are bursty (**Supplementary Fig. 3e**), which means that Type III correlation contributes positively to  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  when spike trains are regular, and contributes negatively when spike trains are bursty. However,  $c_{\text{III}}$  changes steepest when  $CV$  is around 0.3~0.7 with  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  being flat, and is flat when  $CV$  gets outside this range while  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  changing steeply (**Supplementary Fig. 3e**), which means that Type III correlation is not the main contribution to the change of  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  with  $CV$ .  $c_{\text{II}}$  gets large when spike trains get bursty or regular (**Supplementary Fig. 3d**), which means that Type II correlation contributes to  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  when spike trains are both bursty or regular.  $c_1$  is large when spike trains are bursty, and monotonically decreases when  $CV$  decreases (**Supplementary Fig. 3c**), which means that Type I correlation significantly contributes  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  when spike trains are bursty, but does not contribute to the increase of  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  when spike trains get regular. From our analysis above, we know that both Type II and Type I correlation contributes to the increase of  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  when spike trains are bursty, and only Type II correlation contributes to its increase when spike trains are regular.

The physical pictures how Type II and Type I correlation contribute to  $\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)$  are already explained in the main text. The physical pictures how  $\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k (\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j})))$  and Type III correlation change with  $CV$  are explained in Miscellaneous (**Section S6.2, S6.3**).

## Section S2.5: The Influence of Heterogeneity of Cross-correlations

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Heterogeneity of cross-correlations can induce heterogeneity of diffusion strengths among synapses in the network.*
- 2) *The same degree of heterogeneity of cross-correlations may induce different  $DrV$ , depending on the positions of cross-correlations relative to the STDP time window.  $DrV$  is large when cross-correlations aggregate near the sharp change point of the STDP time window, and is small when cross-correlations distribute far away from this point.*

We define the cross-correlation of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron and the apical neuron in a dendritic motif as

$$C_{cross,a}(\tau) = \frac{\langle r_a(t)r_0(t+\tau) \rangle - \langle r_a(t) \rangle \langle r_0(t) \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle r_a(t) \rangle \langle r_0(t) \rangle}} \quad (\text{S15})$$

with  $r_0(t)$  and  $r_a(t)$  being the firing rates of the apical neuron and  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  represents time average. So when the two neurons have the same stationary firing rate  $r_0$ , the expectation of the increment of the  $a$ th synapses caused by STDP per unit time is

$$\frac{d\langle \Delta w_a \rangle}{dt} = r_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} C_{cross,a}(\tau) H(\tau) d\tau \quad (\text{S16})$$

with  $H(\tau)$  being the STDP window whose sharp change point is at the axonal delay  $\tau_{delay}$  (**Fig. 2b** in the main text). The heterogeneity of  $d\langle \Delta w_a \rangle / dt$  for different  $a$  is the reason to cause  $DrV$ .

The diffusion strength of the  $a$ th synapse has a strong dependence on the width of the time window of  $C_{cross,a}(\tau)$ . For example, suppose both the time windows of  $C_{cross,1}(\tau)$  and  $C_{cross,2}(\tau)$  are symmetric around  $\tau_{delay}$ , but the time window of  $C_{cross,1}(\tau)$  is narrower than that of  $C_{cross,2}(\tau)$  (**Supplementary Fig. 4a**). Then if  $H(\tau)$  is strictly asymmetric around  $\tau_{delay}$ , we have  $d\langle \Delta w_1 \rangle / dt = d\langle \Delta w_2 \rangle / dt = 0$ ,  $DrV$  being zero. However, as the single-step change of 1<sup>st</sup> synapse is stronger than that of 2<sup>nd</sup> synapse during STDP, the 1<sup>st</sup> synapse tends to diffuse farther away from its initial value than the 2<sup>nd</sup> synapse.

However, as we explained in the Discussion in the main text, we do not seriously consider the heterogeneity of diffusion strengths among synapses in this work, but only consider the heterogeneity of drift velocities. Therefore we construct spike patterns in which  $C_{cross,a}(\tau)$  are  $\delta$  functions (Model Cross-correlation in **Section S5.1**):

$$C_{cross,a}(t - \tau_{delay}) = q\delta(t - \tau_a) \quad (\text{S17})$$

with  $q$  being the strength of the cross-correlation, and  $\tau_a$  indicating its location. We let  $\tau_a$  uniformly distributed within  $[\Delta t - \varepsilon, \Delta t + \varepsilon]$  for different  $a$ , with  $\varepsilon$  quantifying the heterogeneity of cross-correlations and  $\Delta t$  being the average position of cross-correlations. When  $q$  and  $\varepsilon$  are fixed, DrV gets its maximal value when  $\Delta t = 0$  (**Supplementary Fig. 4b**), where the potentiation and depression processes of STDP most split synapses to different directions; DrV gets weaker as cross-correlations gradually moving farther away from the sharp change point  $\tau = \tau_{delay}$  of the STDP time window  $H(\tau)$ . Therefore, the same degree of heterogeneity of cross-correlations may cause different DrV, depending on their positions relative to the STDP time window.

## Section S2.6: The Coupling of Synchronous Firing and Auto-temporal Structure

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Synchronous firing and auto-temporal structure are coupled based on time-rescaling transform (**Supplementary Fig. 5**). Auto-temporal structure then has two aspects: the auto-temporal structure of spikes in the rescaled time (represented by  $CV_{rescale}$ ), and the temporal structure of occurrence of firing events (represented by  $CV_{events}$ ).*
- 2) *Strong burstiness in  $CV_{events}$  increases the efficacy variability; strong regularity in it does not have significant effect on the efficacy variability.*
- 3) *Strong burstiness in  $CV_{rescale}$  increases the efficacy variability; strong regularity in it usually decreases the efficacy variability, except when the amplitudes of firing events are weak so that the spike pattern approaches to asynchrony.*
- 4) *If the firing order of neurons in adjacent firing events are correlated, the efficacy variability may be enlarged by transient cross-correlation.*

The spike pattern of real neural populations possesses both synchronous firing and auto-temporal structure, so it is desirable to know how these two pattern structures interact to influence the efficacy variability. To investigate this issue, we couple them based on time-rescaling transform (**Supplementary Fig. 5**): the rates of neurons  $r(t)$  are determined by the occurrence of firing events, then a rescaled time is defined as cumulative function of  $r(t)$ <sup>6</sup>

$$\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t r(s) ds, \quad (\text{S18})$$

which stretches inter-spike interval in proportion to the firing rate. Auto-temporal structure comes into the picture in two ways: the auto-temporal structure of spikes in the rescaled time, represented by  $CV_{rescale}$ , and the temporal structure of the occurrence of firing events, represented by  $CV_{events}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 5**).

To understand the interaction of synchronous firing and auto-temporal structure, we consider a model in which both the occurrence of firing events and the spike trains in rescaled time are Gamma processes (Model Sync-Auto in **Section S5.2**).

The efficacy variability increases with  $CV_{events}$  almost monotonically (**Supplementary Fig. 6ab**). It increases when  $CV_{events}$  represents strong burstiness, but does not change much when



$CV_{events}$  is in the range of strong regularity. To understand this, note that the burstiness of occurrence of firing events is able to gather spikes closer, thereby enhancing the mechanism of spike gathering caused by synchronous firing (see **Fig. 3** in the main text); when the occurrence of firing events is regular, firing events are far apart, in which case the efficacy variability becomes less sensitive to the mechanism of spike gathering caused by  $CV_{events}$ , because of the exponential decay in the STDP time window.

Comparing to  $CV_{events}$ ,  $CV_{rescale}$  influences the efficacy variability in a more complicated way. When the amplitudes of firing events are weak, the efficacy variability increases both when  $CV_{rescale}$  is too large or too small (**Supplementary Fig. 6cd**), which is similar to how auto-temporal structure influences the efficacy variability when synchronous firing is absent (**Supplementary Fig. 3a**). When firing events are not weak, the key concept to understand its influence is the distribution of spike number of a neuron in a firing event. When  $CV_{rescale}$  represents strong burstiness, this distribution is wide (**Supplementary Fig. 6e**), so that different non-apical neurons in a dendritic motif may fire different number of spikes in a firing event, which makes the STDP updating of the corresponding synapses heterogeneous, increasing the efficacy variability. When  $CV_{rescale}$  reduces into the range of strong regularity, this distribution becomes narrow and also sensitive to  $p = r_0 / r_{events}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 6e**), with  $r_0$  being the firing rate of neurons, and  $r_{events}$  the rate of the occurrence of firing events. On the one hand, this narrow distribution is able to induce synapse correlating (see **Fig. 3** in the main text), which significantly reduces the efficacy variability when  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 6cd**). On the other hand, when  $p = r_0 / r_{events}$  becomes integer, this distribution becomes further narrowed and strongly peaked at a single number (**Supplementary Fig. 6e**). This single-number peaked distribution has two effects. Firstly, it further enhances the mechanism of synapse correlating, which may further reduce efficacy variability when  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$ . Secondly, it makes the firing order of neurons almost unchanged in adjacent firing events: for example, if the firing order in a firing event is  $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c$ , then the order is very likely to be also  $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c$  in the next firing event. This effect induces transient cross-correlation (see **Fig. 3** in the main text), which can increase the efficacy variability especially if it couples with synapse splitting (see **Fig. 3** in the main text) when  $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay}$ , when some synapses are potentiated in several adjacent firing events and the others are depressed also in several adjacent firing events (**Supplementary Fig. 6cd**).

In biological systems, the amplitudes of firing events may exhibit strong variability<sup>7,8</sup>, which further increases the complexity of the problem. Our simulation suggests that the variability of amplitudes may increase the efficacy variability, as the firing events with large amplitudes can gather more spikes closer; and if these amplitudes are also temporal-correlated so that strong firing events tend to appear sequentially, the efficacy variability may be further increased (data not shown). However, we argue that this varying-amplitude situation may be included in the constant-amplitude scenario using  $CV_{events}$ , after noting that strong firing events can be regarded as the burstiness of many small firing events. For simplicity, we will not consider this situation in our following discussion.

## Section S2.7: The Coupling of Auto-temporal Structure and Heterogeneity of Rates

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Heterogeneity of rates does not influence the DiV caused by auto-temporal structure when spike trains are bursty.*
- 2) *When spike trains are regular, heterogeneity of rates destroys transient cross-correlation, decreasing the efficacy variability.*

As a reminder for the readers, we rewrite eq. S6 here

$$E_T(\text{Var}_a(\Delta w_a)) \approx E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) + \text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) \quad (\text{S19})$$

where  $a$  is the index of non-apical neuron,  $T$  represents integrating over different trials, and the conditioning to firing rate  $r_a$  emphasizes that different non-apical neurons have different firing rates.  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  represents DiV, and  $\text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  represents DrV.

We model spike patterns with both auto-temporal structure and heterogeneity of rates as Gamma processes of different rates (Model Auto & Model Long Tail in **Section S5.1**). Differently from synchronous firing (**Supplementary Fig. 2**), auto-temporal structure does not induce P-D imbalance to change DrV, so  $\text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)) = 0$  when the potentiation and depression strength of the STDP time window is equal (i.e.  $A_p = A_d$ ). So we investigate how the heterogeneity of rates influences DiV, i.e.  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$ .

In a random walk, the diffusion variance is proportional to the step number, so if we regard the STDP process as random walk, we should expect  $\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a) \propto r_a$ , which is indeed the case when spike trains are bursty (**Supplementary Fig. 7b**), which makes the heterogeneity of  $r_a$  does not change  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  much as long as the mean of  $r_a$  conserves (**Supplementary Fig. 7a**). However, when spike trains are regular,  $\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a)$  peaks at  $r_a = r_0$  due to transient cross-correlation (see **Fig. 3** in the main text) where  $r_0$  is the firing rate of the apical neuron (**Supplementary Fig. 7b**). Therefore, compared to the case when  $r_a = r_0$  homogeneously,  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  is small when  $r_a$  becomes heterogeneous (**Supplementary Fig. 7a**).

## Section S2.8: The Coupling of Auto-temporal Structure, Synchronous Firing and Rate Heterogeneity

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1)  *$CV_{\text{rescale}}$  does not influence P-D imbalance. The efficacy variability increases with  $CV_{\text{rescale}}$  in DiV manner, so this increase is significant when potentiation and depression are balanced so that DrV is zero, but gets negligible when they are imbalanced.*

- 2)  $CV_{events}$  not only changes DiV but also influences P-D imbalance, thereby changing DrV with the existence of heterogeneity of rates. So the dependence of the efficacy variability on  $CV_{events}$  is complicated.

As we discussed (**Supplementary Fig. 2**), synchronous firing may change P-D imbalance, and rate heterogeneity can make use of this imbalance and change  $\text{Var}_a(E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$ . Now we discuss the case when auto-temporal structure is added into the picture.

As shown in **Supplementary Figure 5**, auto-temporal structure is represented by  $CV_{rescale}$  and  $CV_{events} \cdot CV_{rescale}$  increases DiV, but hardly influences P-D imbalance (**Supplementary Fig. 8a, lower**). So when the strength of firing events is adjusted so that the potentiation and depression almost balance each other (so that  $\text{DrV} = 0$ ),  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  increases with  $CV_{rescale}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 8a, upper**). However, when the potentiation and depression are imbalanced,  $E_a(\text{Var}_T(\Delta w_a | r_a))$  becomes almost independent of  $CV_{rescale}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 8a, upper**). This is because  $CV_{rescale}$  hardly changes DrV: as  $\text{DrV} \propto t^2$  while  $\text{DiV} \propto t$ , the efficacy variability becomes almost the same in the long run when DrV is the same even though DiV is different.

However, the influence of  $CV_{events}$  is complicated, because  $CV_{events}$  not only changes DiV, but also changes P-D imbalance (**Supplementary Fig. 8b, lower**), thereby changing DrV. When the temporal structure of the occurrence of firing events is not considered, we can just say that synapses are potentiated or depressed by the relative timing of the spikes of the apical neuron and non-apical neurons in a firing event. But to be exact, the values of synaptic depression or potentiation also depend on the occurrence of nearby firing events, which is here controlled by  $CV_{events}$ . Because of this reason, we find that the efficacy variability depends on  $CV_{events}$  in a complex non-monotonic way (**Supplementary Fig. 8b, upper**). We leave detailed discussions of this issue to future researches.

## Section S2.9: The Coupling of Heterogeneity of Cross-correlations With the Other Pattern Structures

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) We believe that when adding heterogeneity of cross-correlation, especially when the heterogeneity of cross-correlations is weak, the mechanisms how the other pattern structures influence the efficacy variability remain valid, so their influences should remain qualitatively unchanged.

Without the heterogeneity of cross-correlations,  $E_T(\Delta w_a | r_a) \propto r_a r_0$  with almost the same proportional coefficient for different  $a$ , and synchronous firing can only change this coefficient simultaneously for all  $a$  (**Supplementary Fig. 2c**). However, the heterogeneity of cross-correlation is able to change  $E_T(\Delta w_a)$  in a much finer way, depending on details of the cross-correlation structure in spike patterns. When the heterogeneity of cross-correlations coexists with synchronous firing and rate heterogeneity, they together determine  $E_T(\Delta w_a)$ .

Due to its complexity, we do not explicitly examine the case when heterogeneity of cross-correlations coupling with other pattern structures. As we already explain the physical mechanism how these pattern structures influence the efficacy variability in previous sections, we believe that their influences on the efficacy variability remain qualitatively the same as long as these mechanisms remain valid, which is the case especially when the heterogeneity of cross-correlations is weak.

## Section S2.10: The Coupling of Dendritic and Axonal Homeostasis

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) *Comparing to dendritic homeostasis alone, the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis changes the efficacy variability through the correlation of the STDP change of a link with the mean STDP change in the axonal motif that the link belongs to (represented by  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$ ).*
- 2) *When a single aspect of pattern structure exists, synchronous firing and heterogeneity of rates decrease the efficacy variability through the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis, heterogeneity of cross-correlations changes (not necessarily decreases) the efficacy variability, auto-temporal structure hardly has effect.*
- 3) *Synchronous firing increases  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  by increasing the variance of the correlated component as  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  order, which is of the same order as noises. Heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations increase the variance of the correlated component as  $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$  order, thus will dominate over the effect of synchronous firing in the long run.*
- 4) *When synchronous firing, auto-temporal structure and heterogeneity of rates coexist,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  decreases with  $CV_{\text{rescale}}$  especially at P-D balance; the influence of  $CV_{\text{events}}$  is complicated.*

Synaptic homeostasis may be simultaneously imposed on synapses afferent to or efferent from the same neuron. In our model, both STDP and synaptic homeostasis are additive, so the efficacy of link  $b \rightarrow a$  relative to the mean efficacy of all links is

$$\Delta w_{ab, \text{total}} = \Delta w_{ab} - \Delta \tilde{w}_a - \Delta \tilde{w}_b \quad (\text{S20})$$

with  $\Delta w_{ab}$  being the relative efficacy contributed by STDP,  $\Delta \tilde{w}_a$  and  $\Delta \tilde{w}_b$  being the compensating value due to the synaptic homeostasis imposed on the dendritic and axonal motif that the link belongs to. Now let us investigate what are  $\Delta \tilde{w}_a$  and  $\Delta \tilde{w}_b$ . Suppose  $\Delta \bar{w}_a$  being the mean relative efficacy of the dendritic motif  $\mathcal{D}_{b \rightarrow a}$  that the link  $b \rightarrow a$  belongs to, while  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  being that of the axonal motif  $\mathcal{A}_{b \rightarrow a}$ . Then the synaptic homeostasis imposed on all the axonal motifs coupling with  $\mathcal{D}_{b \rightarrow a}$  changes  $\Delta \bar{w}_a$  by order  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N_{a, \text{in}}})$ , with  $N_{a, \text{in}}$  being the in-degree of neuron  $a$ ; similarly, all the dendritic motifs coupling with  $\mathcal{A}_{b \rightarrow a}$  contribute  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  by  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N_{b, \text{out}}})$ , with  $N_{b, \text{out}}$  being the out-degree of neuron  $b$ . So when  $N_{a, \text{in}}$  and  $N_{b, \text{out}}$  are sufficiently large, all the motifs coupling with  $\mathcal{D}_{b \rightarrow a}$  or  $\mathcal{A}_{b \rightarrow a}$  cannot change  $\Delta \bar{w}_a$  or  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  too

much, which makes  $\Delta\tilde{w}_a \approx \Delta\bar{w}_a$  and  $\Delta\tilde{w}_b \approx \Delta\bar{w}_b$  in a network. In this case, the variance of efficacies that belong to  $\mathcal{D}_{b \rightarrow a}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab, \text{total}}) &\approx \text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab} - \Delta\bar{w}_b) \\ &= \text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab}) + \text{Var}_b(\Delta\bar{w}_b) - 2\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta\bar{w}_b) \sqrt{\text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab}) \cdot \text{Var}_b(\Delta\bar{w}_b)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S21})$$

So under the requirement that the efficacy variance under the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis is smaller than that under dendritic homeostasis alone, i.e.

$\text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab, \text{total}}) < \text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab})$ , we have

$$\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta\bar{w}_b) > \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_b(\Delta\bar{w}_b)}{\text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab})}} \quad (\text{S22})$$

Because  $-1 \leq \text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta\bar{w}_b) \leq 1$ , this condition requires

$$\frac{\text{Var}_b(\Delta\bar{w}_b)}{\text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab})} < 4 \quad (\text{S23})$$

to realize.

Because  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta\bar{w}_b)$  is the key reason why the efficacy variability further changes due to the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis, we use it to quantify the ability of different aspects of pattern structure to change the efficacy variability through dendritic-axonal coupling.

To investigate the influence of dendritic-axonal coupling on efficacy variability, we study a tree-structural motif in which dendritic motif and axonal motifs are coupled together (**Supplementary Fig. 9a**). We compare the efficacy variability in the coupled dendritic motif with that in a free one, and also calculate  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$ , with  $\Delta w_{0a}$  being the efficacy change only contributed by STDP (without counting synaptic homeostasis) at the  $a$ th synapse in the coupled dendritic motif,  $\Delta\bar{w}_a$  being the mean efficacy change contributed by STDP in the  $a$ th axonal motif. Our simulation shows that synchronous firing and rate heterogeneity can increase  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  and accordingly reduce the efficacy variability in coupled dendritic motif, heterogeneity of cross-correlations can also influence (not necessarily increase)  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$ , but auto-temporal structure hardly has effect (**Supplementary Fig. 9b-e**).

The mechanisms of how synchronous firing, heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations influence  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  are already explained in the main text. Here we emphasize that the underlying mechanism of the first one is fundamentally different from those of the latter two. Heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations introduce correlation between the drift velocities of  $\Delta w_{0a}$  and  $\Delta\bar{w}_a$ . As  $\text{DrV} \propto t^2$ , this correlation will dominate in the long term, but in the short term, it may be buried inside the noises of DiV, and this makes  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  gradually increase before it saturates (**Supplementary Fig. 10**). The correlation caused by synchronous firing, however, is due to the correlation of the diffusion noises between  $\Delta w_{0a}$  and  $\Delta\bar{w}_a$ , so  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  saturates almost at the beginning (**Supplementary Fig. 10**). When several aspects of pattern structure couple together,  $\Delta w_{0a}$  and

$\Delta\bar{w}_a$  may be correlated separately by these two mechanisms shortly or long after the beginning, so the correlated component of  $\Delta w_{0a}$  and  $\Delta\bar{w}_a$  may be changed during a long run.

Now let's consider the case when synchronous firing, heterogeneity of rate and auto-temporal structure couple together. When potentiation and depression are imbalanced,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  is mainly contributed by heterogeneity of rates after a long run; when potentiation and depression are balanced,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  is contributed by synchronous firing. Auto-temporal structure can strengthen DiV noises which are of  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  order. In P-D balanced cases,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  increases with  $CV_{rescale}$ , as  $CV_{rescale}$  hardly influences P-D imbalance and its burstiness induces stronger noises to destroy the correlation (**Supplementary Fig. 11a**). The effect of  $CV_{events}$ , however, is more complicated because  $CV_{events}$  itself can influence P-D imbalance, which contributes to  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta\bar{w}_a)$  through heterogeneity of rates (**Supplementary Fig. 11b**).

### Section S3: Efficacy Variability in LIF Network

*Key points of this section:*

- 1) *We use different spike shuffling methods to destroy different aspects of pattern structure in spike patterns generated by a LIF network, and observe how the efficacy variability changes when E-E links are evolved according to the original and shuffled spike patterns under STDP when dendritic and axonal homeostasis are imposed alone or both. We find that the efficacy variability changes in a way consistent with our results from motifs studies.*

The LIF network consists of 2000 excitatory and 500 inhibitory conductance-based LIF neurons, and the links are randomly connected with probability 0.2. As we mentioned in the main text, during the simulation of LIF network, we first record all the spikes of the excitatory population while keeping synaptic efficacies unchanged; and then re-evolve the excitatory-to-excitatory (E-E) links according to the spike pattern originally recorded or shuffled by different methods, under the rules of STDP and synaptic homeostasis. We do this to investigate how different aspects of pattern structure influence the efficacy variability without worrying about the feedback of the changes of synapses onto firing dynamics. Details of the LIF model are presented in **Methods** in the main text.

We use different spike shuffling methods for asynchronous and synchronous states due to the sharp pattern difference in the two types of states. The spike shuffling methods are in the following:

*Rescaling Shuffle (RS):*

This shuffling method aims to destroy the pattern structure of synchronous firing.

Spike times are first projected to the rescaled time through the accumulated function of firing rate (eq. S18):

$$\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t r(s) ds ,$$

then project back to the normal time using  $\Lambda_0^{-1}(s)$ , where  $\Lambda_0(t)$  is the linear function connecting  $(0,0)$  with  $(T, \Lambda(T))$ , with  $T$  being the duration of the spike train. Given a spike pattern,  $\Lambda(t)$  is calculated by accumulating spike number at the times of spikes. So technically, this shuffling method is to first order all the  $M$  spikes in the pattern, then set the time of the  $i$ th spike at  $iT / M$  (**Supplementary Fig. 12**).

#### *Inter-neuron Shuffle (IS):*

This shuffling method is used in asynchronous states, and it aims to destroy auto-temporal structure in the spike train from each neuron.

The spike times of different neurons are randomly swapped (**Supplementary Fig. 12a**).

#### *Translation Shuffle (TS):*

This shuffling method is used in asynchronous states, and it aims to destroy heterogeneity of cross-correlations.

Each spike train is translationally moved by a random displacement. Periodic boundary condition is used to deal with the spikes which are moved out of the boundaries of time (**Supplementary Fig. 12a**).

#### *Whole-population Shuffle (WS):*

This shuffling method is used in asynchronous states, and it aims to destroy heterogeneity of firing rates.

Each spike of the whole population is assigned to a randomly selected neuron (**Supplementary Fig. 12a**).

#### *Whole-population Shuffle within Event (WSWE):*

This shuffling method is used in synchronous states, it destroys both heterogeneity of rates and heterogeneity of cross-correlations, while keeping the spike number in each firing event unchanged.

All the spikes of a neuron within a firing event are simultaneously swapped with all the spikes of another randomly selected neuron within the same firing event (**Supplementary Fig. 12b**).

Numerically, a firing event is defined like this: we first calculate temporal rates of the excitatory population in bins of 0.1ms, then filter these data using Gaussian window of  $\sigma_{window} = 2\text{ms}$ ; a firing event is defined as sequential bins in which the filtered rates are above a small threshold 0.0001.

#### *Inter-neuron Shuffle Within Event (ISWE):*

This shuffling method is used in synchronous states, and it aims to destroy the auto-temporal structure in the rescaled time, while keeping the spike number in each firing event unchanged.

Spike times of different neurons within the same firing event are randomly swapped (**Supplementary Fig. 12b**).

### *Event Time Shuffle (ETS):*

This shuffling method is used in synchronous states, and it aims to destroy the auto-temporal structure of the occurrence of firing events.

All the spikes within the same firing events are translationally moved by a random displacement, while keeping the order of firing events unchanged. Technically, this is realized by first randomly selecting  $N_{event}$  points in the duration  $[0, T]$ , then set the mean spike time of the  $i$ th firing event at the  $i$ th point. Here  $N_{event}$  is the number of firing events, and  $T$  is the duration of spike trains (**Supplementary Fig. 12b**).

### *Notes on the order to implement the shuffling methods:*

As some shuffling methods may destroy more than one aspects of pattern structures, the order of these methods to be implemented must be carefully designed so that when one aspects of pattern structure is destroyed the others remain largely intact. The pattern structures destroyed by each shuffling method are listed in **Supplementary Table S1**, and their order to be implemented is shown in **Supplementary Figure 12**.

The change of efficacy variance caused by different spike shuffling methods are qualitatively the same with the existence of dendritic homeostasis, axonal homeostasis alone or both (**Supplementary Fig. 13a-c**). The change of pattern statistics caused by different shuffling methods are shown in **Supplementary Figure 14** with respect to  $\tau_{d,I}$ . We compare the change of the efficacy variance with the change of these statistics caused by different shuffling methods in **Supplementary Table 1**, and find that they are consistent with our results in motif studies. Because we keep the firing rate of the excitatory population to be constant for different  $\tau_{d,I}$  (see **Methods** in the main text), we can also compare how the efficacy variance and these statistics change with  $\tau_{d,I}$  without worrying about the influence caused by the change of the firing rate.

**Supplementary Table 1** is straightforward to understand, except that WSWE destroys both the heterogeneity of rates and the heterogeneity of cross-correlations in synchronous states, so it is unclear which one of them contributes to the reduction of the efficacy variability caused by WSWE (**Supplementary Fig. 13a-c, lower panels**). To test their contributions, we plot  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  versus  $|\Delta\bar{w} \cdot \sigma_{rate}|$  at different  $\tau_{d,I}$ s for the original patterns, with  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  being the standard deviation of efficacy changes only caused by STDP (without counting homeostasis),  $\Delta\bar{w}$  being the mean of efficacy changes caused by STDP over all the links of the network, and  $\sigma_{rate}$  being the standard deviation of firing rates. Because the efficacy change of a link  $a \rightarrow b$  is proportional to the firing rate of neuron  $a$  and neuron  $b$ , if the efficacy variability is totally due to heterogeneity of rates and P-D imbalance,  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  should be positively correlated with  $|\Delta\bar{w} \cdot \sigma_{rate}|$ . However, we find that this is only the case when  $\tau_{d,I} \leq 10\text{ms}$ ; when  $\tau_{d,I} \geq 1\text{ms}$ ,  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  continues to increase despite of the decrease of  $|\Delta\bar{w} \cdot \sigma_{rate}|$  (**Supplementary Fig. 14i**), which suggests that other factors gradually overwhelm the heterogeneity of rates when  $\tau_{d,I}$  is large and continue to increase  $\sigma_{efficacy}$ . As the heterogeneity of rates increases the efficacy



variability through DrV, the factor can do this in the long run should also be of DrV nature, which can only be the heterogeneity of cross-correlations. This deduction requires that DrV should dominate in  $\sigma_{\text{efficacy}}$  at the end of the simulations. As WSWE destroys both the heterogeneity of rates and the heterogeneity of cross-correlations, which are the two sources of DrV, we can estimate the contribution of DiV by calculating  $\sigma_{\text{efficacy}}$  for the WSWE-shuffled patterns. We find that WSWE shrinks  $\sigma_{\text{efficacy}}$  by 80%~85% when  $\tau_{d,I}$  goes from 7ms to 14ms (data not shown), which suggests that DrV indeed dominates in the  $\sigma_{\text{efficacy}}$  for the original patterns.

When the dendritic or axonal homeostasis is imposed alone, the transition from asynchronous state to synchronous state does not induce sharp change of efficacy variance, and the efficacy variance does not decrease with  $\tau_{d,I}$  in synchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 13ab**).

However, when these two homeostasis coexist, the efficacy variance is strongly reduced at the asynchrony-to-synchrony transition point, and also decreases when  $\tau_{d,I}$  is large enough and the network goes into synchronously bursting states (**Supplementary Fig. 13c**). This means that the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis is the key reason for the reduction of the efficacy variability in synchronous states. To understand this reduction, we record  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  both in the original spike pattern and in the spike patterns treated by different shuffling methods (**Supplementary Fig. 13d**), with  $\Delta w_{ab}$  being the efficacy change on link  $b \rightarrow a$  only caused by STDP (without counting homeostasis), and  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  being the mean efficacy change (also only caused by STDP) of the axonal motif that the link  $b \rightarrow a$  belongs to. We find that

$\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  is far from zero and continuously increases with  $\tau_{d,I}$  in the synchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 13d**), which explains both the sharp reduction of the efficacy variability at the asynchrony-to-synchrony transition point, and why the efficacy variability decreases with  $\tau_{d,I}$  when the network goes into bursting synchronous state when dendritic and axonal homeostasis coexist (**Supplementary Fig. 13c, lower panel**). We also find that WSWE can significantly reduce this correlation, and a further RS can significantly reduce it again (**Supplementary Fig. 13d**). The effect of WSWE represents the roles played by the heterogeneity of rates and the heterogeneity of cross-correlations, and effect of RS represents that of synchronous firing. The reduction of correlation after WSWE is because that the heterogeneity of rates and the heterogeneity of cross-correlations correlate  $\Delta w_{ab}$  and  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  through the correlation of the drift velocities (DrV manner), so that the variance along the correlated component increases as  $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$ ; but synchronous firing correlates them through the correlation of diffusion (DiV manner), so that the variance along the correlated component only increases as  $\mathcal{O}(t)$ , which is of the same order as noises. After RS,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  is reduced to almost zero (**Supplementary Fig. 13d**) because of the P-D balance in asynchronous states (i.e. the spike patterns after RS) induced by  $A_p = A_d$  in our model (**Supplementary Fig. 14h**). Due to this P-D balance, WS (which destroys the heterogeneity of rates) in asynchronous state ( $\tau_{d,I} \leq 6\text{ms}$ ) cannot reduce the efficacy variability, and  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  in asynchronous state is so weak that the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis hardly reduces the efficacy variability (**Supplementary Fig. 13a-c, upper panels**). If  $A_p \neq A_d$ , there will be P-D imbalance

in asynchronous states, so that WS in asynchronous states will be able to significantly reduce the efficacy variance by destroying the heterogeneity of rates, and  $\Delta w_{ab}$  and  $\Delta \bar{w}_b$  will also be correlated in asynchronous states through the heterogeneity of rates, which makes the coupling of dendritic-axonal homeostasis significantly reduce the efficacy variability in asynchronous states; these are indeed what we found in our simulations (data not shown).

To help readers better understand the dynamics of our model, we explain some phenomena observed in **Supplementary Figure 13** and **Supplementary Figure 14** in the Miscellaneous (**Section S6.4**).

## Section S4: Biological Implications

### Section S4.1: Maintenance and Encoding of Connection Patterns

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) A connection pattern is designed so that the dynamics of the LIF network studied in the previous section remains qualitatively unchanged after encoding the connection patterns.
- 2) The capability of the LIF network for faithfully encoding and long-termly maintaining the connection pattern is inversely correlated with the efficacy variability.

We use the same LIF network as the previous section to examine the influence of spike pattern structure on the performance of the maintenance and encoding of connection patterns of neuronal networks. Key results have been pointed out in the main text, and model details have been presented in **Methods** in the main text; here, we repeat key points to understand our models and show more simulation results using figures.

*Connection-pattern maintenance:*

We create an artificial connection pattern by randomly assigning each E-E link either into the low efficacy group (low group, or LG) or the high efficacy group (high group, or HG), then simulate the network with STDP as well as dendritic and axonal homeostasis being imposed on E-E links. Links in HG are assigned to a stronger weight than those in LG in the beginning, and links within the same group have the same weight. During the on-going plasticity, intrinsic homeostasis<sup>9</sup> is also implemented by continuously adjusting the firing threshold of all the excitatory neurons, so that the firing rate of the excitatory population is kept around 20Hz. This connection pattern and the implementation of intrinsic homeostasis keep the dynamic pattern of the LIF network qualitatively the same as the LIF network with uniform unchanged E-E links studied in the previous section, so that we can use our understanding on the efficacy variability of the LIF network with uniform unchanged E-E links to understand the performance of connection-pattern maintenance in the plastic network.

After the start of the simulation, the efficacy distributions of HG and LG are continuously broadened (**Supplementary Fig. 15b**), so that the signal-to-noise ratio  $SNR$  of the two distributions decays with time. As the mean efficacy values of HG and LG (i.e.,  $\mu_{high}(t)$  and  $\mu_{low}(t)$ ) remain largely unchanged,  $SNR(t) \propto t^{-1/2}$  if  $\sigma_{high,low}(t) \propto t^{1/2}$  due to DiV, and

$SNR(t) \propto t^{-1}$  if  $\sigma_{high,low}(t) \propto t$  due to DrV ( $SNR(t) = \frac{\mu_{high}(t) - \mu_{low}(t)}{\sqrt{\sigma_{high}(t)\sigma_{low}(t)}}$ , see **Methods** in the main

text eq.10). We find  $SNR(t)$  indeed decays approximately in power law with time, with the slope in log-log plot being closer to -1/2 (**Supplementary Fig. 15a**), which suggests that DrV is relatively weak in our model during the biological period our simulations last. In asynchronous state, this is because of the P-D *balance* caused by  $A_p = A_d$  in our model (**Supplementary Fig. 14h**), and the weak heterogeneity of cross-correlations (**Supplementary Fig. 14e**); in synchronous state, this is because of the reduction of DrV caused by the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis (see **Section 6.4** for explanations).

All the E-E links are bounded within [0.25nS,0.55nS] using hard bounds, and we control the simulation time so that most efficacies are far from boundaries (**Supplementary Fig. 15b**). The influence of boundaries on connection-pattern maintenance is beyond the scope of the research.

### *Connection-pattern encoding:*

For connection-pattern encoding, we do not consider a detailed learning process, but model the encoding generically by artificial drifts of synaptic efficacies. Specifically, E-E links are also randomly assigned into LG or HG. Initially, both LG and HG links are the same 0.4nS, but they are subject to different drift velocities  $v_{LG}$  and  $v_{HG}$ . So at time  $t$ , the efficacy of a LG link should be  $w_{LG}(t) = w_{STDP}(t) + w_{hom}(t) + v_{LG}t$ , with  $w_{STDP}(t)$  being the contribution of STDP,  $w_{hom}(t)$  being the contribution of dendritic and axonal homeostasis, and  $v_{LG}$  being the velocity of the drift imposed on LG links; and the value of a HG link should be  $w_{HG}(t) = w_{STDP}(t) + w_{hom}(t) + v_{HG}t$ . The same as the study on connection-pattern maintenance, intrinsic homeostasis<sup>9</sup> is also imposed onto excitatory neurons to keep their mean rate at 20Hz. In reality, STDP can be both the power of connection-pattern encoding and the source of efficacy variability; but in our model, we separate the two processes, and control the encoding using  $v_{LG}$  and  $v_{HG}$ , so that our simulation becomes more controllable. Despite the artificiality on connection-pattern encoding, we believe our simulation is able to provide sufficient insights on the efficacy variability.

During the simulation, the mean values of HG and LG are separated apart, while their distributions are broadened (**Supplementary Fig. 16b**). We also use  $SNR(t)$  to quantify the connection-pattern quality. As  $\mu_{high}(t) - \mu_{low}(t) \propto t$ ,  $SNR(t) \propto t^{1/2}$  if  $\sigma_{high,low}(t) \propto t^{1/2}$  due to DiV, and  $SNR(t)$  remains constant if  $\sigma_{high,low}(t) \propto t$  due to DrV. We find that  $SNR(t)$  indeed increases approximately in power law with time, with the slope in log-log plot being closer to 1/2 (**Supplementary Fig. 16a**), which suggests that DrV is relatively weak in our model during the biological period our simulations last.

All the E-E links are also bounded within [0.25nS,0.55nS] using hard bounds, and we control the simulation time so that most efficacies are far from the boundaries.

## Section S4.2: Developmental Functions of Retinal Waves

*Key points of this subsection:*

- 1) A two-layered feedforward network model is built to understand the developmental function of retinal waves (**Supplementary Fig. 17a**). The first layer contains two groups, whose intra-group and inter-group synchrony is controlled by spike-generating models; the second layer is a LIF neuron.
- 2) The neuron in the second layer initially receives equally from the two groups of the first layer, but under STDP and synaptic homeostasis, it may eventually respond to a single group. The difference of the intra- and inter-group efficacy variability controls the initial separation of these two groups before the LIF neuron is reliably more responsive to one group than the other (causality). The larger the difference, the larger the initial separation, and the sooner this causality is established.

To understand the developmental functions of retinal waves, we build up a two-layered feedforward network model (**Supplementary Fig. 17a**). The first layer is divided into two groups, which represent two local RGC patches. Their activities are determined by a spike generating model, which explicitly controls the probability of a neuron to fire during a firing event  $p_{intra}$ , and the portion  $p_{inter}$  of inter-group events within all the firing events happening in one group (**Supplementary Fig. 17b**).  $p_{intra}$  represents the synchrony within the patch of RGCs of the same eye that sharing similar receptive field (local RGCs),  $p_{inter}$  represents the synchrony among patches with different receptive fields or in different eyes. Here, we use a single spike to represent the bursting activity of a RGC during a retinal wave. We also jitter spikes in a firing event by  $[-\tau_{cross}/2, \tau_{cross}/2]$  to model the slight difference of the bursting times of local RGCs caused by, say, propagation of retinal waves. The second layer is a single LIF neuron, modeling a downstream neuron in SC or dLGN.

Initially, all synapses have equal strength, so the LIF neuron in the second layer responds to both groups equally. Then the synapses are evolved according to STDP and dendritic homeostasis when intrinsic homeostasis is also implemented on the LIF neuron to conserve its firing rates (see **Section S5.3** for simulation details). After the simulation begins, the synaptic strengths coming from the two groups start to separate, and we try to understand the competition induced by retinal waves by investigating the properties of this inter-group separation.

At the beginning of the simulation, inter-group separation is largely driven by diffusion (**Supplementary Fig. 17c**). For two synapses  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  coming from the same group, the expectation of the square of their difference at time  $t$  should be  $\langle (x_1 - x_2)^2 \rangle = \sigma_{intra}^2 t$ , with  $\sigma_{intra}^2$  quantifying the intra-group efficacy variability. Similarly, for two synapses  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  coming from different groups,  $\langle (y_1 - y_2)^2 \rangle = \sigma_{inter}^2 t$ , with  $\sigma_{inter}^2$  quantifying inter-group efficacy variability. Then the difference  $\Delta\mu$  between the mean values of the synapses coming from the two groups should be

$$\langle (\Delta\mu)^2 \rangle = \langle (y_1 - y_2)^2 \rangle - \langle (x_1 - x_2)^2 \rangle = (\sigma_{inter}^2 - \sigma_{intra}^2)t \quad (\text{S24})$$

which means that the initial inter-group separation depends on the difference between the inter- and intra-group efficacy variability.

In our model, the synchrony between two neurons in the same group is  $p_{intra}$ , and the synchrony between two neurons in different groups is  $p_{intra}p_{inter}$ . As the activity of the LIF neuron is driven by the firing events of the first layer, and the jitter time window  $\tau_{cross}$  is also short, synchrony controls the correlation between synaptic updatings, which is inversely correlated with the efficacy variability (the mechanism of synapse correlating, see **Fig. 3** in the main text). Initially, synapses from the two groups have the same strength, so that the LIF neuron responds to both groups equally. In this case, inter-group separation can hardly be driven by the stronger causality of the LIF neuron to one group than to the other one, so the separation is caused by diffusion, so  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle \propto t$ ; as simulations goes on, synaptic strengths from the two groups gradually separate apart, so that the LIF neuron becomes more responsive to a group than the other, and this causality makes  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$  grow with  $t$  supra-linearly (**Supplementary Fig. 17d**).

If the initial diffusion, i.e.  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$ , is large, the causality will take its effect soon; if it is weak, causality will participate at later time, thus hinders the separation process (**Fig. 5b** in the main text). To check this effect, we artificially add a small efficacy value  $\delta w$  to all synapses coming from the first group, and add  $-\delta w$  to all synapses coming from the second group every 50ms during our simulation, with  $\delta w$  being drawn uniformly from the interval  $[-w_\varepsilon, w_\varepsilon]$ . In this way, we can increase inter-patch diffusion, while the causality is intact after a long-term average. Consistently with our argument (**Fig. 5b** in the main text), we find that increasing  $w_\varepsilon$  significantly promotes separation in the initial diffusion-dominating range, and hardly has effect in the later causality-dominating range; and the total time needed for this separation is also reduced with  $w_\varepsilon$  (**Supplementary Fig. 17e**).

After simulation for 400s biological time, the separation of the two groups depends on the values of  $p_{intra}$  and  $p_{inter}$ . We find that good separation in our model is realized in the large  $p_{intra}$  and small  $p_{inter}$  range (**Supplementary Fig. 17f**). This is consistent with the dynamic pattern and developmental function of retinal waves: 1) retinal waves induce strong synchrony within a local RGC patch of the same eye, and weak synchrony between patches with different receptive fields or in different eyes; 2) the formation of retinotopic map and eye-specific segregation in SC and dLGN have a crucial dependence on retinal waves. Notably, the initial separation  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$  also get its largest value in the large  $p_{intra}$  and small  $p_{inter}$  range (**Supplementary Fig. 17g**), which suggests that large initial diffusion positively contributes to the inter-patch separation in real physiological process.

When the inter-patch synchrony is strong, as is the case when two patches in the same eye have nearby receptive fields, the initial inter-patch diffusion is weak, and the causality is also weak (because when the downstream neuron responds to one patch, it also has a high probability to respond to the other one), so that the inter-patch separation may not complete at the end of the critical period of development. We find that in this case, the inter-group separation  $|\Delta\mu|$  in the end of the simulation exhibits strong trial-to-trial variability (**Supplementary Fig. 17h**). This variability is due to the interaction between the inter-patch diffusion and the causality: the

stochastic nature of diffusion can induce different initial  $|\Delta\mu|$  values in different trials, and the two groups can be pushed apart stronger by the causality in trials with larger initial  $|\Delta\mu|$ , thereby further increasing its difference from the trials with smaller initial  $|\Delta\mu|$ . In the situations when the separation does not complete at the end of simulation, we also add artificial diffusion, and validate our previous argument that the inter-group separation can indeed be promoted by the artificially added initial inter-group diffusion (**Supplementary Fig. 17h**).

## Section S5: Supplementary Modeling

### Section S5.1: Spike Generating Models

#### *Model Sync 1:*

This model generates synchronous firing pattern with *spike uniqueness*, which means that a neuron can fire no more than one spike in a firing event.

The probability of a neuron to fire in a firing event is  $p$ , and the occurrence of firing events is a Poisson process of rate  $r_0 / p$  with  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$  being the rate of each neuron. Suppose the middle time of the  $i$ th firing event is at  $t_i$ , then the spike times of neurons within this firing event are randomly chosen within  $[t_i - \tau_{cross} / 2, t_i + \tau_{cross} / 2]$ , where  $\tau_{cross}$  is the length of the time window of firing events. Each neuron can fire within each firing event no more than once, so  $0 < p \leq 1$ .

#### *Model Sync 2:*

This model generates synchronous firing pattern with spike uniqueness, but without *synapse splitting* (see **Fig. 3** in the main text).

In a dendritic motif, spikes of non-apical neurons are generated in the same way as Model Sync 1; but if the apical neuron fires in a firing event whose middle time is at  $t_i$ , its spike must be at  $t_i + \tau_{cross} / 2 + \tau_{delay}$ , with  $\tau_{delay}$  being the time delay of axons. In this way, all the spikes of the non-apical neuron always arrive at the apical neuron *before* the firing of the apical neuron itself, removing synapse splitting.

#### *Model Sync 3:*

This model generates a synchronous firing pattern. In this pattern, for neurons which fire in a firing event, their spike numbers in the firing event are different, so that *synapse correlating* is removed because of the dissimilarity of STDP updatings (see **Fig. 3** in the main text).

Spikes trains are inhomogeneous Poisson process with time average rate  $\langle r_0(t) \rangle = 20\text{Hz}$ . The time-dependent rate  $r_0(t)$  is constructed using the occurrence of firing events. Specifically,  $r_0(t)$  is the summation of square-shaped functions of width  $\tau_{cross}$  and area  $p$  contributed by each firing

event. And similar to Model Sync 1, the occurrence of firing events are Poisson process of rate  $\langle r_0(t) \rangle / p$ . Note in this model  $p$  can be larger than 1.

#### *Model Sync 4:*

This model generates synchronous firing pattern with exponentially decaying cross-correlation, based on a model which can generate spike trains with near-maximal entropy.

The spike trains of rate  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$  and synchrony strength  $p$  are first generated by a dichotomized Gaussian approach<sup>3</sup>, which has been shown to have near-maximal entropy<sup>4</sup>. Then the spikes are jittered according to a distribution  $f(t)$  which should satisfy

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t)f(t+\Delta t)dt = \frac{1}{\tau_{cross}} e^{-\frac{|\Delta t|}{\tau_{cross}/2}}$$

so that the spike train would have exponentially decaying cross-correlation of time scale  $\tau_{cross} / 2$ .

To calculate the function  $f(t)$ , we construct Toeplitz matrix of  $f(t)$  and  $\frac{1}{\tau_{cross}} e^{-\frac{|\Delta t|}{\tau_{cross}/2}}$ , denoting as  $F$  and  $X$ . So the equation above can be written as

$$FF^T = X$$

where both  $F$  and  $X$  are symmetric. If  $X$  can be diagonalized as

$$X = P\Lambda P^{-1}$$

the desired matrix  $F$  will be

$$F = P\sqrt{\Lambda}P^{-1}$$

and the middle row of  $F$  is taken as the desired  $f(t)$ . To make this method work, diagonal elements of  $\Lambda$  must be non-negative. As Fourier bases are the eigenvectors of the Toeplitz matrix  $X$  when its size is sufficiently large, and the eigenvalues are just

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\omega t} \frac{1}{\tau_{cross}} e^{-\frac{|t|}{\tau_{cross}/2}} dt = \frac{1}{1 + \tau_{cross}^2 \omega^2 / 4}$$

Thus  $X$  here is always positive definite.

#### *Model Auto:*

Spikes trains are Gamma processes with inter-spike intervals following the distribution

$$p(x | \alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)\beta^\alpha} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-x/\beta}$$

The rate of the Gamma process is  $\beta / \alpha$ , and the coefficient of variance is  $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ .

We use  $\alpha$  to control the burstiness/regularity of the spike train, while adjusting  $\beta$  to keep the firing rate at 20Hz. The spike train becomes more bursty when  $\alpha$  is smaller, and more regular when  $\alpha$  is large.

#### *Model Sync-Auto:*

This model generate synchronous firing pattern with controllable auto-temporal structure. Spike trains are generated in a way similar to Model Sync 3, except that the spike trains are inhomogeneous Gamma processes with shape parameter  $\alpha_{rescale}$  and time-averaged rate  $\langle r_0(t) \rangle = 20\text{Hz}$ , and the occurrence of firing events is a Gamma process with shape parameter  $\alpha_{events}$  and rate  $\langle r_0(t) \rangle / p$ .  $\beta$  values of Gamma processes are adjusted to keep their rates unchanged at different  $\alpha$ .  $CV_{events} = 1/\sqrt{\alpha_{events}}$ ,  $CV_{rescale} = 1/\sqrt{\alpha_{rescale}}$ .

Inhomogeneous Gamma processes with time-averaged rate  $\langle r_0(t) \rangle$ , shape parameter  $\alpha_{rescale}$  and duration  $T$  are generated as follows. Suppose  $\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t r_0(\tau) d\tau$  is the accumulation function of firing rate  $r_0(t)$ , we first generate homogeneous Gamma processes of rate  $\Lambda(T) \langle r_0(t) \rangle / T$ , shape parameter  $\alpha_{rescale}$  and duration  $\Lambda(T)$  in the rescaled time (see **Section S2.5** and eq.S18), then project these Gamma processes to the normal time using  $\Lambda^{-1}(t)$ .

#### *Model Long Tail:*

This model generate long-tailed distributed firing rates for non-apical neurons in dendritic or axonal motif, the firing rate of the apical neuron is always kept at  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$ .

Firing rates of non-apical neurons are lognormal distributed as

$$p(x | m, s) = \frac{1}{sx\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln x - m)^2}{2s^2}\right)$$

The mean of this distribution is at  $\exp(m + \frac{s^2}{2})$ . Parameter  $s$  is used to control the shape, while  $m$  is accordingly adjusted to keep the mean at  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$ . This distribution is a  $\delta$  function when  $s = 0$ , and gradually becomes long tailed when  $s$  increases.

This model can be also combined with Model Sync 3, Model Auto or Model Sync-Auto to introduce heterogeneity of rates into spike patterns with other aspects of pattern structure.

#### *Model Cross-correlation:*

This model generates spike trains in which the cross-correlations between the apical neuron and different non-apical neurons are heterogeneous.

The spike train  $\mathcal{T}_0$  of the apical neuron in dendritic motif is a Poisson process of rate  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$ . To generate the spike train  $\mathcal{T}_a$  of the  $a$ th non-apical neuron, we do as follows: for



each spike at time  $t_i$  in  $\mathcal{T}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_a$  has a probability  $q$  to have a spike at  $t_i - \tau_{delay} - \tau_a$ , with  $\tau_{delay}$  being the axonal delay, and  $\tau_a \in [-\varepsilon + \Delta t, \varepsilon + \Delta t]$  being a fixed value for  $a$ th non-apical neuron, and then a Poisson train of rate  $(1-q)r_0$  is superimposed onto  $\mathcal{T}_a$ . In this way, all neurons in the dendritic motif have rate  $r_0$  and the cross-correlation between the  $a$ th non-apical neuron and the apical neuron is  $C_{cross}(t - \tau_{delay}) = q\delta(t - \tau_a)$ .

In the case of a dendritic motif coupled with many axonal motifs (**Supplementary Fig. 9e, 10**), we first generate  $\mathcal{T}_0$  and  $\mathcal{T}_a$  ( $a = 1, 2, \dots$ ) (defined in the paragraph above) in the coupled dendritic motif according to the method above. To generate the spike train  $\mathcal{T}_{ba}$  of the  $b$ th non-apical neuron in the  $a$ th axonal motif, we do as follows: for each spike at time  $t_i$  in  $\mathcal{T}_a$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{ba}$  has a probability  $q$  to have a spike at  $t_i + \tau_{delay} + \tau_a$  or  $t_i - \tau_{delay} - \tau_a$  for  $\Delta t \geq 0$  or  $\Delta t < 0$  in **Supplementary Figure 9e**, and then a Poisson train of rate  $(1-q)r_0$  is superimposed onto  $\mathcal{T}_{ba}$ . In this way, the cross-correlation between the apical neuron of  $a$ th axonal motif and all its non-apical neurons is uniformly  $C_{cross,a}(t - \tau_{delay}) = q\delta(t - \tau_a)$  or  $C_{cross,a}(t + \tau_{delay}) = q\delta(t + \tau_a)$ , thus the weight change of the  $a$ th link in the coupled dendritic motif  $\Delta w_{0a}$  is positively or negatively correlated with the mean change in the  $a$ th axonal motif  $\Delta \bar{w}_a$  (**Supplementary Fig. 9e**).

## Section S5.2: Spike Pattern Analysis

Here is the methods we use to analyze the pattern structure of excitatory population in the LIF network (**Supplementary Fig. 14**).

*Synchronous Firing:*

We use three parameters  $p_{async}$ ,  $\tau_{inner}$  and  $\tau_{outer}$  to quantify the rate fluctuation in the excitatory population in asynchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14a**). For  $p_{async}$ , we first calculate temporal firing rates of excitatory population according to the spike numbers within bins of 0.1ms. Then  $p_{async}$  is defined as the standard deviation of binned firing rates versus their mean value. For  $\tau_{inner}$  and  $\tau_{outer}$ , we first calculate the connected auto-correlation  $C_{auto,+}(\tau) = \langle r(t)r(t+\tau) \rangle - \langle r(t) \rangle^2$  using these binned firing rates above. We find that  $C_{auto,+}(\tau)$  oscillates, and the oscillation amplitude gradually decays to zero as  $|\tau|$  increases. Therefore, we use  $\tau_{inner}$  to quantify the time scale of its oscillation, and use  $\tau_{outer}$  to quantify the time scale of the decay of amplitude.  $\tau_{inner}$  is defined as the duration between the two times at which  $C_{auto,+}(\tau)$  first drops below 10% of  $C_{auto,+}(0)$  toward positive and negative directions; and  $\tau_{outer}$  is defined as the duration between the two times at which  $C_{auto,+}(\tau)$  last drops below 10% of  $C_{auto,+}(0)$  toward these two directions.

For synchronous states, we use  $p_{sync}$  and  $\tau_{cross}$  to quantify the strength and duration of firing events (**Supplementary Fig. 14b**). We first calculate temporal rates of the excitatory population

in bins of 0.1ms, then filter these data using Gaussian window of  $\sigma_{window} = 2\text{ms}$ . Numerically, *firing events* are defined as sequential bins in which the filtered rates are above a small threshold 0.0001.  $p_{sync}$  is estimated as the average spike number per neuron within a single firing event, and  $\tau_{cross}$  is defined as the average duration between the two bins at which the firing rates drop below 10% of the peak rate within a firing event.

#### *Auto-temporal Structure:*

To calculate  $CV_{rescale}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 14c**), we first order all the spikes in the population (essentially shuffle the spike trains using Rescaling Shuffle, see **Section S3**), then average the  $CV$  values of the ordered indexes over all neurons which fire more than 5 spikes during simulation.

$CV_{events}$  in synchronous states is defined as the  $CV$  value of the mean times of firing events (**Supplementary Fig. 14d**).

#### *Heterogeneity of Cross-correlations:*

HCC (abbreviation for heterogeneity of cross-correlation) index (**Supplementary Fig. 14e**) is used to quantify the heterogeneity of cross-correlations. It is defined and calculated as follows: for link  $a \rightarrow b$  and each spike  $t_i$  of neuron  $a$ , we denote  $\Delta n_{i,a \rightarrow b}$  as the number of spikes of neuron  $b$  within the interval  $[t_i + \tau_{delay}, t_i + \tau_{delay} + \tau_{STDP})$  minus the number of spikes of neuron  $b$  within the interval  $[t_i + \tau_{delay} - \tau_{STDP}, t_i + \tau_{delay})$ . We then define  $\Delta n_{a \rightarrow b} = \sum_i n_{i,a \rightarrow b}$ , which quantifies the tendency that neuron  $b$  fire after neuron  $a$  within the time scale of STDP. And HCC index is defined as the standard deviation of  $\Delta n_{a \rightarrow b}$  over all links in the network, which quantifies the heterogeneity of cross-correlations.

### **Section S5.3: Developmental Functions of Retinal Waves**

The network that we use is a two-layered feedforward network (**Supplementary Fig. 17a**). The first layer contains two groups, with 100 neurons in each group. Activities of these neurons are controlled by a spike generating model. In this model, the occurrence of firing events in each group is a Poisson process with rate  $r_0 / p_{intra}$ , with  $r_0$  being the firing rate of each neuron and  $p_{intra}$  is the probability that a neuron fire in a firing event. Within all firing events of a group,  $p_{inter}$  portion of them occurs simultaneously with a firing event in the other group. All spikes in a firing event are jittered by a randomly chosen value within  $[-\tau_{cross} / 2, \tau_{cross} / 2]$ . In this study, we fix  $\tau_{cross}$  at 2ms. The second layer is a LIF neuron with the same parameter as the excitatory neurons in **Methods** in the main text except for the refractory period  $\tau_{refractory} = 1\text{ms}$ . Axons also have delay  $\tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$ , and intrinsic homeostasis<sup>9</sup> is also implemented by adjusting the firing threshold of the LIF neurons  $\theta_E$  every 10ms:

$$\theta_E(t) = \theta_E(t-10\text{ms}) + c(r(t) - r_0)$$

where  $r(t)$  is the firing rate of the LIF neuron in the past 1000ms,  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$ ,  $c = 0.001\text{mV} \cdot \text{s}$ .

The initial conductance between the two layers is  $0.15\text{nS}$ , STDP parameters are

$A_p = A_d = 3.75 \times 10^{-4}\text{nS}$ , parameters for dendritic homeostasis are  $w_{\text{bound}} = 0.15\text{nS}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ .

Intrinsic homeostasis starts immediately at the beginning, while STDP and dendritic homeostasis start after 10s of transient period, waiting for the adjustment of  $\theta_E$  by intrinsic homeostasis.

## Sections S6: Miscellaneous

To help readers better understand our simulation results in details, we explain the physical pictures behind some phenomena observed in simulations.

### Section S6.1: Why the efficacy variability for $\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}}$ is usually larger than that for $\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}$ , if spikes are generated using Model Sync 3 (Supplementary Fig. 1d)?

When spikes are generated using Model Sync 1, the efficacy variability for  $\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}$  is large because of synapse splitting, and the efficacy variability for  $\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}}$  is small because of synapse correlating. Model Sync 3 destroys synapse correlating by introducing variety of spike numbers in each firing event. However, we find that the efficacy variability for  $\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}}$  usually surpasses that for  $\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}$  after using Model Sync 3. To understand this, note that in Model Sync 3, the number of spikes fired by a non-apical neuron during a firing event follows Poisson distribution  $Poi(\lambda_1)$ , with  $\lambda_1$  being the mean and variance of this distribution. When  $\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}}$ , all these spikes depress the corresponding synapse under STDP. If for simplicity, we suppose that every spike depresses the synapse by the same value  $-\Delta w_1$ , then the total depression value after a firing event follows  $-Poi(\lambda_1 \Delta w_1)$ , whose variance is  $\text{Var}(\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}}) = \lambda_1 \Delta w_1$ . When  $\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}$ , some non-apical spikes potentiate the synapse by  $\Delta w_2$  on average, while the others depress the synapse by  $-\Delta w_2$  on average; if again for simplicity, we suppose that the apical neuron always fire at a fixed relative position within a firing event, say, the middle point, then the total potentiation (depression) value after a firing event follows  $Poi(\lambda_p \Delta w_2)$  ( $-Poi(\lambda_d \Delta w_2)$ ), with  $\lambda_p$  ( $\lambda_d$ ) being the mean number of spikes which potentiate (depress) the synapse, and  $\lambda_p + \lambda_d = \lambda_1$ . The total variance of STDP updatings after a firing event is the summation of the variances contributed by potentiation and depression processes, which is  $\text{Var}(\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}) = (\lambda_p + \lambda_d) \Delta w_2 = \lambda_1 \Delta w_2$ . Therefore, the difference between  $\text{Var}(\tau_{\text{cross}} < \tau_{\text{delay}})$  and  $\text{Var}(\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}})$  depends on the difference of  $\Delta w_1$  and  $\Delta w_2$ . When  $\tau_{\text{cross}} > \tau_{\text{delay}}$  especially when  $\tau_{\text{cross}}$  becomes large,  $\Delta w_2$  gets small because of the exponentially

decaying STDP time window. This is the reason why the efficacy variability for  $\tau_{cross} < \tau_{delay}$  usually surpasses that for  $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay}$  after using Model Sync 3, especially when  $\tau_{cross} > 1.5\tau_{delay}$  (**Supplementary Fig. 1d**).

### **Section S6.2: Why the regularity of spike trains increases the correlation between the total potentiation and total depression values (Supplementary Fig. 3e)?**

**Supplementary Figure 3e** shows that  $\rho$  decreases with  $CV$ , which means that the regularity of spike trains increases the correlation between the total potentiation and total depression values. To understand this, consider three adjacent spikes of the apical neuron in a dendritic motif  $\{t_{0,1}, t_{0,2}, t_{0,3}\}$  and two adjacent spikes of  $a$ th non-apical neuron  $\{t_{a,1}, t_{a,2}\}$ . Because the firing rates of these two neurons are the same and the spike trains are regular, if  $t_{0,1} < t_{a,1}$  then it is very likely that  $t_{0,1} < t_{a,1} < t_{0,2} < t_{a,2} < t_{0,3}$ . If we move  $t_{a,1}$  a little earlier, the STDP depression caused by pairing  $(t_{0,1}, t_{a,1})$  gets stronger, while the potentiation caused by pairing  $(t_{a,1}, t_{0,2})$  gets weaker, which induces positive correlation between depression and potentiation values. As spike trains are regular, moving  $t_{a,1}$  earlier also moves  $t_{a,2}$  earlier at the same time, which strengthens the correlation between the total depression and potentiation values.

### **Section S6.3: Why burstiness increases $\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \Delta w_{a,k}(t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right)$ , i.e. the variance of synapses when all the three types of correlations induced by auto-temporal structure are absent (Supplementary Fig. 3b)?**

Suppose a spike  $t_i$  of the apical neuron, and the spikes  $\{t_{a,1}\}_a$  of all the non-apical neuron which is immediately after  $t_i - \tau_{delay}$  (see **Section S2.4** for the indexing of  $j$ , here  $j = 1$ ). Suppose the mean value of the inter-spike interval is  $\overline{\Delta t}$ , then when spike trains are strictly regular,  $t_{a,1} - t_i$  uniformly distributes within  $[0, \overline{\Delta t}]$  across  $a$ . However, when spike trains get burstier, the distribution of  $t_{a,1} - t_i$  get wider, which increases the variance of  $\Delta w_{a,d}(t_i, t_{a,1})$ . Similar reason also applies to the other indexes of  $j$  as well as the potentiation process.

### **Section S6.4: Explanations of the dynamic patterns of the LIF network**

To help readers understand the dynamics of the LIF network, we briefly explain some phenomena shown in **Supplementary Figure 13** and **Supplementary Figure 14**.

The burstiness of spikes in asynchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14c**) may be due to the strong excitatory and inhibitory couplings of our network model<sup>10</sup>. The regularity represented by small  $CV_{rescale}$  in synchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14c**) is because of the regular firing

due to the fixed refractory period and the supra-threshold input in each synchronization period. The large rate heterogeneity in asynchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14g**) is due to the quenched Gaussian distribution input in random networks and the nonlinear conductance-rate relationship in balanced state<sup>11</sup>; and the reduction of rate heterogeneity in synchronous states is because that in each synchronization period fast excitatory currents and slow inhibitory currents cause transient supra-threshold inputs, which transiently push neurons into the regime of linear conductance-rate relation<sup>12</sup>, and even saturate their rates at  $1/\tau_{refractory}$  when the inputs are too strong. The reason why synchronous states tend to depress synaptic strength (**Supplementary Fig. 14h**) is already explained in **Section S2.3**, also see ref. 5. The heterogeneity of cross-correlations in asynchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14e**) is due to cellular response properties and the network structure, such as unidirectional connection, common inputs etc.<sup>13,14</sup>.

Another interesting phenomenon is the asymmetry of the rising and decaying phases of the synchronization periods in synchronous states. After carefully looking at the spike patterns in synchronous states, we found that neurons tend to start to fire one by one at the rising phases of the synchronous periods, while they tend to shut down simultaneously at the decaying phases. To understand this, note that at the early rising phase, inhibitory neurons do not fire, and the inhibitory currents into the excitatory neurons decay with time. Therefore, neurons which receive larger number of excitatory connections and smaller number of inhibitory connections tend to start to fire before those which receive smaller number of excitatory connections and larger number of inhibitory connections. As inhibitory neurons have smaller membrane time scale, their firing rates can quickly arise once most excitatory neurons start to fire; and then the suddenly increased inhibitory currents quickly shut down all excitatory neurons.


One consequence of this rising-decaying asymmetry is the difference of the efficacy variability between under only dendritic homeostasis and under only axonal homeostasis (**Supplementary Fig. 13ab, lower panels**). As we discussed in **Section S2.1**, the dendritic and axonal homeostasis have exactly the same effect as long as the spike pattern is statistically time-reversal invariant, but this rising-decaying asymmetry apparently destroy this time-reversal symmetry. In our model, we suppose that axons have delay  $\tau_{delay}$ , and STDP depends on the spike time of the post-synaptic neuron and the time when the pre-synaptic spike arrive at the post-synaptic neuron. Therefore, in dendritic motifs, the spike of the apical neuron in a firing event is closer to the “zigzag” rising phase of the spikes of the non-apical neurons during the firing event, which enlarges the efficacy variability; however, in axonal motifs, the spike of the apical neuron is closer to the “clear-cut” decaying phase of the spikes of the non-apical neurons during the firing event, which reduces the efficacy variability. This is why the efficacy variability is larger under dendritic homeostasis than under axonal homeostasis in synchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 13ab, lower panels**).

Another consequence of this rising-decaying asymmetry is the large heterogeneity of cross-correlations in synchronous states (**Supplementary Fig. 14f**). As we discussed above, neurons which receive larger number of excitatory connections and smaller number of inhibitory connections tend to start to fire before those which receive smaller number of excitatory connections and larger number of inhibitory connections in a synchronization period. This results in different cross-correlations between neuron pairs depending on the connection details. WSWE reduces the heterogeneity of cross-correlations (**Supplementary Fig. 14f**) by randomly shuffling the spike trains of all neurons in each synchronization period.

Another interesting problem is how the heterogeneity of cross-correlations in synchronous states contributes to  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  (**Supplementary Fig. 13d**). From **Supplementary Figure 9**, we see that synchronous firing and the heterogeneity of firing rates always positively contributes  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$ , thereby decreasing the efficacy variability through the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis; but the effect of the heterogeneity of cross-correlations depends on the cross-correlation details of spike patterns. As discussed above, cross-correlation in synchronous states comes from the “zigzag” rising phases of synchronous periods, emerging from the underlying connection details. Now we suppose an excitatory neuron  $b$  in the network. If neuron  $b$  fires early in each synchronous period, then its cross-correlations with most neurons it targets to tend to increase the strengths of the synapses between them under STDP; on the contrary, if neuron  $b$  fires later in each synchronous period, then its cross-correlations with most neurons it targets to tend to decrease the strengths of these synapses. Therefore, the heterogeneity of cross-correlations here actually positively contributes to  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$ , thereby decreasing the efficacy variability through the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis. Because the heterogeneity of rates and the heterogeneity of cross-correlations are the main sources of DrV, the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis significantly reduces DrV, making DiV and DrV comparable in the biological time scale our simulations last (note the time-dependent manner of SNR in **Supplementary Fig. 15a** and **Supplementary Fig. 16a**).


## References

45. Schneidman, E., Berry, M. J., Sege, R. & Bialek, W., Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly correlated network states in a neural population. *Nature* **440**, 1007-1012 (2006).
46. Ganmora, E., Segev, R., Schneidman, E., Sparse low-order interaction network underlies a highly correlated and learnable neural population code. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 9679-9684 (2011).
47. Gutnisky, D. A. & Josić, K., Generation of spatiotemporally correlated spike trains and local field potentials using a multivariate autoregressive process. *J. Neurophysiol.* **103**, 2912-2930 (2010).
48. Macke, J. H., Berens, P., Ecker, A. S., Tolias, A. S. & Bethge, M., Generating spike trains with specified correlation coefficients. *Neural Comput.* **21**, 397-423 (2009).
49. Lubenov, E. V. & Siapas, A. G., Decoupling through synchrony in neuronal circuits with propagation delays. *Neuron* **58**, 118-131 (2008).
50. Pillow, J. W., in *Advances in Neural Information Processing System 22*, Bengio, Y., Schuurmans, D., Lafferty, J., Williams, C. & Culotta, A., Eds. (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009), p.p. 1473-1481.
51. Gireesh, E.D. & Plenz, D., Neuronal avalanches organize as nested theta- and beta/gamma-oscillations during development of cortical layer 2/3. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 7576-7581 (2008).
52. Petermann, T. *et al.*, Spontaneous cortical activity in awake monkeys composed of neuronal avalanches. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 15921-15926 (2009).
53. Turrigiano, G., Too many cooks? intrinsic and synaptic homeostatic mechanisms in cortical circuit refinement. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **34**, 89-103 (2011).
54. Ostojic, S., Two types of asynchronous activity in networks of excitatory and inhibitory spiking neurons. *Nat. Neurosci.* **17**, 594-600 (2014).
55. Roxin, A., Brunel, N., Hansel, D., Mongillo, G. & van Vreeswijk, C., On the distribution of firing rates in networks of cortical neurons. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 16217-16226 (2011).
56. Hansel, D. & van Vreeswijk, C., How noise contributes to contrast invariance of orientation tuning in cat visual cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **22**, 5118-5128 (2002).
57. Ostojic, S., Brunel, N. & Hakim, V., How connectivity, background activity, and synaptic properties shape the cross-correlation between spike trains. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 10234-10253 (2009).
58. Trousdale, J., Hu, Y., Shea-Brown, E. & Josić, K., Impact of network structure and cellular response on spike time correlations. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **8**, e1002408 (2012).




**Supplementary Figure 1.** The influence of synchronous firing on the efficacy variability in dendritic motif. **(a)** Variance per spike (variance divided by spike number per neuron) as a function of  $p$  and  $\tau_{cross}$  when spike trains contain synchronous firing and a neuron can fire no more than one spike in a firing event (Model Sync 1 in **Section S5.1**). The horizontal black line represents the axonal delay  $\tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$ . **(b)** The same as **a**, but using a pattern in which the apical neuron always fires its own spike after receiving all its afferents during a firing event (Model Sync 2 in **Section S5.1**), removing synapse splitting. **(c)** Although not apparent in **b**, variance per spike increases with  $\tau_{cross}$  when  $p = 1$  (indicated by the arrow in **b**). Error bars represent the standard error of the mean (s.e.m.). **(d)** The same as **a**, but spike trains are inhomogeneous Poisson process (Model Sync 3 in **Section S5.1**) so that synapse correlating is removed by the variety of spike numbers for different non-apical neurons in a firing event. Note the different horizontal scale for  $p$  from previous panels. **(e)** The same as **a**, but spike trains are generated based on a dichotomized Gaussian approach, so that they have near-maximal entropy (Model Sync 4 in **Section S5.1**). In **a-e**, the dendritic motif has 200 non-apical neurons. Parameters for STDP:  $A_p = A_d = 1$ ; parameters for synaptic homeostasis:  $w_{bound} = 0\text{nS}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.001$  (see **Methods** in the main text eq.4-6 for the meanings of these parameters). Efficacies are 0 at the beginning, and the plotted data are calculated after evolution of 100s biological time, averaged over 24 trials.







**Supplementary Figure 2.** Synchronous firing influences P-D imbalance, and heterogeneity of rates makes use of P-D imbalance to change the efficacy variability in DrV manner. **(a)** The mean efficacy change per spike as a function of  $\rho$  and  $\tau_{cross}$ , when spike trains have synchronous firing and uniform firing rate (Model Long Tail & Model Sync 3 in **Section S5.1**;  $s = 0$ ). Synchronous firing strengthens depression in this model.  $\bar{N}_{spike}$  represents spike number per neuron. **(b)** Square root of the expectation of variance versus mean efficacy change (both normalized by  $\bar{N}_{spike}$ ) after 100s biological time, with the heterogeneity of rates ( $s = 1$ ). Dots represent different  $(\rho, \tau_{cross})$  pairs uniformly sampled within the range in **a**. As the efficacy variance is dominated by DrV in the long run, and the mean efficacy change quantifies the P-D imbalance, the shown linear relationship suggests that DrV caused by the heterogeneity of rates is indeed due to P-D imbalance (see **Section S2.3** of SI text for details). **(c)** Expectation of the efficacy change at  $p \neq 0$  versus expectation of the efficacy change at  $p = 0$  under rate heterogeneity ( $s = 1$ ). Dots sharing the same horizontal value represent the same synapse in the dendritic motif. This panel shows that under rate heterogeneity, synchronous firing changes  $\Delta w_d$  proportionally. In **a-c**,  $A_p = 2, A_d = 1$ . The other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.




**Supplementary Figure 3.** Both strong burstiness and strong regularity increase the efficacy variability. **(a)** Variance per spike as a function of CV. Spikes trains are Gamma processes with conserved rate when CV changes (Model Auto in **Section S5.1**). **(b)** Vertical coordinate is  $E_i \left( \sum_j \sum_k \left( \text{Var}_a \left( \Delta w_{a,k} (t_i, t_{a,j}) \right) \right) \right)$ , representing variance per spike when all the three types of correlations are absent (eq. S9). **(c)**  $c_I$  quantifies the contribution of Type I correlation to the efficacy variability (eq. S12). **(d)**  $c_{II}$  quantifies the contribution of Type II correlation to the efficacy variability (eq. S11). **(e)**  $c_{III}$  quantifies the contribution of Type III correlation to the efficacy variability (eq. S10). Inset:  $\rho$  is the correlation coefficient of the total potentiation and depression values imposed on the same synapse (eq. S13, S14). In **a-e**, error bars represent s.e.m., the other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.




**Supplementary Figure 4.** The influence of heterogeneity of cross-correlations on the efficacy variability. **(a)** Schematic on how heterogeneity of cross-correlations causes heterogeneity of diffusion strengths. The STDP window  $H(\tau)$  is represented by the black curve. Two cross-correlations  $C_{cross,1}(\tau)$  and  $C_{cross,2}(\tau)$ , indicated by the blue and red curve respectively, are symmetric around  $\tau_{delay}$ , but have different widths. Both of them cause zero drift velocity of synaptic efficacies, but the diffusion strength of the 1<sup>st</sup> synapse is stronger than that of the 2<sup>nd</sup> one. **(b)** The same degree of heterogeneity of cross-correlations may induce different DrV, depending on the positions of cross-correlations relative to STDP time window. Spikes are generated according to Model Cross-correlation (**Section S5.2**),  $q = 0.2$ ,  $\varepsilon = 10\text{ms}$ , and  $\Delta t$  represents the average position of time windows of cross-correlations relative to the STDP time window. Error bars represent s.e.m. Other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.




**Supplementary Figure 5.** The scheme to couple synchronous firing and auto-temporal structure. Blue curves represent firing rate (upper) and accumulative function of firing rate (lower) in real time. Blue dots (upper) represent times of firing events, whose temporal structure is quantified by their  $CV_{events}$ . Red dots (lower) represent spikes in the real time and their correspondences in the rescaled time, whose auto-temporal structure is quantified by their  $CV_{rescale}$ .



**Supplementary Figure 6.** How synchronous firing and auto-temperal structure together influence the efficacy variability. **(a)** Variance per spike as a function of  $p$  and  $\tau_{cross}$  at different  $CV_{events}$  values. Spike trains are generated in the scenario of **Supplementary Figure 5**, in which both the occurrence of firing events and the spike trains in the rescaled time are Gamma processes (Model Sync-Auto in **Section S5.1**).  $CV_{rescale} = 0.71$ . The horizontal black line represents the axonal delay  $\tau_{delay} = 1$ ms. **(b)** Variance per spike as a function of  $CV_{events}$  for  $(p, \tau_{cross})$  pairs marked in **a** (with the corresponding colors). Error bars represent s.e.m. **(c)** Variance per spike as a function of  $p$  and  $\tau_{cross}$  at different  $CV_{rescale}$  values.  $CV_{events} = 0.71$ . **(d)** Variance per spike as a function of  $CV_{rescale}$  for  $(p, \tau_{cross})$  pairs marked in **c**. Error bars represent s.e.m. **(e)** Probability distribution of the spike number of a neuron in a firing event at different  $p$  and  $CV_{rescale}$  values indicated by the starting points of arrows. In **a-e**, the other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.




**Supplementary Figure 7.** How heterogeneity of rates and auto-temporal structure together influence the efficacy variability. (a) Heterogeneity of rates does not significantly influence the efficacy variability when spikes are bursty, but removes the increase of the efficacy variability caused by strong regularity. Spike trains are homogeneous Gamma processes with lognormal distributed rate (Model Long Tail & Model Auto in **Section S5.1**). Error bars represent s.e.m. (b) The diffusion of a synapse depends on the firing rate  $r_a$  of the non-apical neuron it links. When spike trains are bursty ( $CV=2$  or  $1.43$ ), diffusion linearly correlates with firing rate. When spike trains are regular ( $CV=0.14$  or  $0.1$ ), diffusion peaks at the firing rate of the apical neuron  $r_0 = 20\text{Hz}$  (indicated by solid arrows), because of transient cross-correlation. Note that when spikes are very regular ( $CV=0.1$ ), diffusion can even peak at  $2r_0$  (dashed arrow). The other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.




**Supplementary Figure 8.** The influence of auto-temporal structure on the efficacy variability when both synchronous firing and rate heterogeneity exist. **(a)** Upper: Variance per spike as a function of  $p$  at different  $CV_{rescale}$  when  $CV_{events} = 0.71$  and  $s = 1$  (Model Long Tail & Model Sync-Auto in **Section S5.1**). Lower: the corresponding mean efficacy changes, which represent P-D imbalance. Note that  $CV_{rescale}$  hardly changes P-D imbalance, and thus hardly changes DrV with the existence of heterogeneity of rates. The arrows indicate the  $p$  value at which the mean efficacy change is almost zero (indicated by the horizontal black line), where the efficacy variability significantly increases with  $CV_{rescale}$  (upper panel) due to DiV effect. Error bars represent s.e.m. in normal scale and relative error corresponding to s.e.m. in log scale. **(b)** The same as **a** except that different lines represent different  $CV_{events}$  values, while  $CV_{rescale} = 0.71$  is kept unchanged. Note that  $CV_{events}$  is able to change P-D imbalance (lower panel), and thus change DrV with the existence of heterogeneity of rates, so that the dependence of the efficacy variability on  $CV_{events}$  is complicated (upper panel). In **a-b**,  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ ,  $A_p = 2$ ,  $A_d = 1$ . The other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 1**.






**Supplementary Figure 9.** How different aspects of pattern structures individually influences the efficacy variability through the coupling of dendritic and axonal homeostasis. **(a)** The tree-structural motif used in our simulations, in which a dendritic motif is coupled with many axonal motifs (the same as **Fig. 2e** in the main text). **(b)** The influence of synchronous firing. Variance per spike as a function of  $p$  in free (red) or coupled (blue) dendritic motif, when spike trains are generated by Model Sync 3 (**Section S5.1**).  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . Inset:  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  (black) and  $\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\text{Var}_a(\Delta \bar{w}_a) / \text{Var}_a(\Delta w_{0a})}$  (orange) as functions of  $p$  (see **eq. S22**). Different colors in the following panels have the same meanings.  $A_p = A_d = 1$ . **(c)** The influence of auto-temporal structure. Spike trains are generated by Model Auto (**Section S5.1**). Theoretically, the small  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  causes only about 1% change of the variance, which can be easily overwhelmed by noises.  $A_p = A_d = 1$ . **(d)** The influence of heterogeneity of rates. Spikes are generated by Model Long Tail (**Section S5.1**).  $A_p = 1.2, A_d = 1$ . **(e)** The influence of heterogeneity of cross-correlations. Spike trains are generated by Model Cross-correlation (**Section S5.1**).  $q = 0.2, \varepsilon = 10\text{ms}$ .  $A_p = A_d = 1$ . Note that the heterogeneity of cross-correlations can make  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  positive or negative, thus reduces or increases the efficacy variability in coupled dendritic motif, depending on its details in spike patterns. In **b-e**, each apical neuron in a dendritic or axonal motif connects with 200 neurons. Error bars represent s.e.m. in normal scale, and relative error corresponding to s.e.m. in log scale. Simulation are run for 100s biological time, with 24 trials. Parameters for synaptic homeostasis:  $w_{bound} = 0\text{nS}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.001$  (see **Methods** in the main text eq.5-6 for the meanings of these parameters).






**Supplementary Figure 10.** The evolution of  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  when it is caused by synchronous firing (SF), heterogeneity of rates (HR) or heterogeneity of cross-correlations (HCC). Note that HR and HCC gradually increase  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$ , but SF saturates  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  almost instantaneously. For SF, spikes are generated using Model Sync 3 (**Section S5.1**),  $A_p = A_d = 1$ ,  $p = 1$ ,  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . For HR, spikes are generated using Model Long Tail (**Section S5.1**),  $A_p = 1.2$ ,  $A_d = 1$ ,  $s = 0.4$ . For HCC, spikes are generated using Model Cross-correlation (**Section S5.1**),  $A_p = A_d = 1$ ,  $q = 0.2$ ,  $\Delta t = 20\text{ms}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 10\text{ms}$ . Error bars represent s.e.m. The other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 9**.




**Supplementary Figure 11.** The influence of auto-temporal structure on  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  when both synchronous firing and heterogeneity of rates exist in the dendritic motif coupling with axonal motifs (**Supplementary Fig. 9a**). **(a)** Upper:  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  as a function of  $p$  for different  $CV_{rescale}$  when  $CV_{events} = 0.71$  and  $s = 1$  (Model Long Tail & Model Sync-Auto in **Section S5.1**). Lower: the corresponding mean efficacy changes within the coupled dendritic motif, representing P-D imbalance. Note that  $CV_{rescale}$  hardly changes P-D imbalance, and thus hardly changes DrV with the existence of heterogeneity of rates. The two arrows indicate the  $p$  value at which the mean efficacy change is almost zero (indicated by the horizontal black line), where the efficacy variability significantly increases with  $CV_{rescale}$  (upper panel) due to DiV effect. **(b)** The same as **a**, but different lines represent different  $CV_{events}$  values, keeping  $CV_{rescale} = 0.71$ . The two arrows indicate the  $p$  value at which the mean efficacy change is almost zero when  $CV_{events} = 0.1$ , and increases with  $CV_{events}$  for  $CV_{events} = 0.1, 0.5, 1$ .  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  increases with P-D imbalance in the long run, so  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{0a}, \Delta \bar{w}_a)$  increases with  $CV_{events}$  (for  $CV_{events} = 0.1, 0.5, 1$ ) at this  $p$  value, which is reversed comparing to other  $p$  values. In **a-b**,  $A_p = 1.2$ ,  $A_d = 1$ ,  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . To increase precision, means and 95% confidence intervals (error bars) of correlations are calculated from 240 trials using Fisher z-transform. Error bars for mean efficacy changes represent s.e.m. calculated from 240

trials. Simulations are run for 20s biological times. The other parameters are the same as **Supplementary Figure 9b**.




**Supplementary Figure 12.** Spike shuffling methods for asynchronous states (a) and synchronous states (b). Green arrows indicate the order to implement these shuffling methods.



**Supplementary Figure 13.** The efficacy variance of all E-E links in the LIF network when they are evolved according to spike patterns original or shuffled by different methods under STDP and synaptic homeostasis. **(a)** Efficacy variance as a function of  $\tau_{d,I}$  when spike patterns are original or shuffled by different methods (see **Section S3** and **Supplementary Fig. 12** for details) when only dendritic homeostasis is imposed. Upper: asynchronous states ( $3\text{ms} \leq \tau_{d,I} \leq 6\text{ms}$ ); lower: synchronous states ( $7\text{ms} \leq \tau_{d,I} \leq 14\text{ms}$ ). Note that in asynchronous states (upper panel), the efficacy variances caused by RS+TS+IS and RS+TS+WS almost overlap. In synchronous states (lower panel), the efficacy variances span a great range, so we use log scale to better show their changes. To help readers compare the efficacy variances just before and after the asynchrony-to-synchrony transition, we use an arrow to indicate the efficacy variance caused by the original spike pattern at  $\tau_{d,I} = 6\text{ms}$  in the lower panel. As we use different shuffling methods for asynchronous and synchronous states, the changes of the efficacy variances caused by shuffled spike patterns are not comparable before and after the transition. **(b)** The same as **a**, but only axonal homeostasis is imposed. **(c)** The same as **a**, but both dendritic and axonal homeostasis are imposed. Note the sharp decrease of the efficacy variance when spike pattern transits from asynchronous to

synchronous state in this case. As the efficacy variances in synchronous states are much smaller than those in asynchronous states, we do not mark an arrow in the lower panel. **(d)**  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  when the LIF network operates in synchronous states.


Dashed lines represent  $\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\text{Var}_b(\Delta \bar{w}_b) / \text{Var}_b(\Delta w_{ab})}$  (eq. S22). In asynchronous states,  $\text{Corr}(\Delta w_{ab}, \Delta \bar{w}_b)$  is close to zero because of the P-D balance caused by  $A_p = A_d$  in our model (not shown). In **a-d**, simulations are run for 20s biological time with 24 trials, and STDP and synaptic homeostasis are imposed after the first 1s of transient period. Error bars represent s.e.m.




**Supplementary Figure 14.** Statistical analysis of the spike patterns of the excitatory population of the LIF network, original or shuffled by different methods. **(a)** The amplitudes  $p_{async}$  of the fluctuation of population rates and the two time scales ( $\tau_{outer}$ ,  $\tau_{inner}$ ) of the oscillating decaying auto-correlation of population rates in the original patterns of asynchronous states (see methods in **Section S5.2**). The fluctuation of population rates in asynchronous states can be regarded as weak firing events, which can increase the efficacy variability by spike gathering (**Fig. 3** in the main text). **(b)** The strengths  $p_{sync}$  and durations  $\tau_{cross}$  of firing events in the original patterns of synchronous states (see methods in **Section S5.2**). Note that  $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$ , therefore synapse correlating (**Fig. 3** in the main text) can hardly take its effect to reduce the efficacy variance. **(c)**  $CV_{rescale}$  in the original and shuffled patterns, indicating the auto-temporal structure in the rescaled time (see methods in **Section S5.2**). Black vertical line indicates the transition from asynchronous states to synchronous states. Note that we use different shuffling methods for these two states. **(d)**  $CV_{events}$  in synchronous states in the original and ETS shuffled patterns, indicating the temporal structure of the occurrence of firing events. **(e)** The index of heterogeneity of cross-correlations (HCC) as a function of  $\tau_{d,l}$  (see methods in **Section S5.2**) in asynchronous states. The difference between indexes for RS shuffled and RS+TS shuffled patterns represents the

above-chance heterogeneity of cross-correlations in the original spike patterns. **(f)** The index of HCC in synchronous states in the original and WSWE shuffled patterns. **(g)** Standard deviation of rate  $\sigma_{rate}$  in the original and shuffled patterns, indicating the heterogeneity of rates. **(h)** Mean efficacy change caused by STDP  $\Delta\bar{w}$  in the original and RS shuffled patterns, indicating P-D imbalance. Note that  $\Delta\bar{w}$  is almost zero at asynchronous states and after RS because of the P-D *balance* caused by  $A_p = A_d$  in our model in asynchronous states. **(i)** Vertical coordinate  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  means the s.d. of the efficacy changes caused by STDP, and horizontal coordinates  $|\Delta\bar{w} \cdot \sigma_{rate}|$  quantifies the s.d. of efficacy changes caused by P-D imbalance and heterogeneity of rates, both in the original patterns. Arrows indicate the increasing of  $\tau_{d,i}$  from 7ms to 14ms, taking integer values. If the efficacy variability is due to P-D imbalance and heterogeneity of rates,  $\sigma_{efficacy}$  should be positively correlated with  $|\Delta\bar{w} \cdot \sigma_{rate}|$ ; their negative correlation when  $\tau_{d,i} \geq 10\text{ms}$  indicates that other factors overwhelm the heterogeneity of rates and continue to increase the efficacy variability when  $\tau_{d,i}$  is large. The factor which can do this in the long run should be of DrV nature, which can only be the heterogeneity of cross-correlations (see **Section S3** text for more explanations). In **a-i**, error bars represent s.e.m., which may not be seen when the error bars are smaller than the symbol sizes. Simulations are run for 20s biological time with 24 trials, and the first 1s of spike trains are regarded as transient period, and excluded from analysis.






**Supplementary Figure 15.** Spike pattern structure influences the capability of the LIF network to maintain connection patterns during an on-going plasticity. **(a)** Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the encoded connection pattern (see **Methods** in the main text for simulation details) as a function of time in log-log plot. Two black dashed lines separately indicate  $-1$  and  $-1/2$  slopes. If the slope of SNR is close to  $-1/2$ ,  $\sigma_{high}^2(t)$  and  $\sigma_{low}^2(t)$  are of order  $\mathcal{O}(t)$ , and DiV is the main reason of SNR decay; if it is close to  $-1$ ,  $\sigma_{high}^2(t)$  and  $\sigma_{low}^2(t)$  are of order  $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$ , and DrV is the main reason. Data are averaged over 24 trials. **(b)** The probability density function (p.d.f.) of HG (blue) and LG (red) when  $\tau_{d,I} = 6$  ms (left) or 7ms (right) at  $t = 20$  s. Data are from one trial.



**Supplementary Figure 16.** Spike pattern structure influences the fidelity of the encoded connection pattern in the LIF network. **(a)** Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the encoded connection pattern (see **Methods** in the main text for simulation details) as a function of time in log-log plot. The black dashed line indicate  $1/2$  slope. As  $\mu_{high}(t) \propto t$ ,  $\mu_{low}(t) \propto t$ , SNR increases as  $\mathcal{O}(t^{1/2})$  means that  $\sigma_{high}^2(t)$  and  $\sigma_{low}^2(t)$  are of order  $\mathcal{O}(t)$ , which represents DiV effect. In the case that  $\sigma_{high}^2(t)$  and  $\sigma_{low}^2(t)$  are of order  $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$  (DrV effect), SNR stops to increase. Data are averaged over 24 trials. **(b)** The probability density function (p.d.f.) of HG (blue) and LG (red) when  $\tau_{d,I} = 6$ ms (upper) or 7ms (lower) at  $t = 20$ s. HG and LG links are subject to drift velocities  $v_{HG}$  and  $v_{LG}$  respectively. Data are from one trial.



**Supplementary Figure 17.** Initial inter-patch diffusion promotes inter-patch separation in the competition of local RGC patches caused by retinal waves. **(a)** Network architecture. Blue and red dots in the first layer are two groups of neurons whose activities are controlled by a spike generating model (**Section S4.2, S5.3**). The yellow dot in the second layer is a LIF neuron. **(b)** The model-generated spike pattern of the first layer. **(c)** One trial of evolution of the mean synaptic efficacies coming from the two groups under STDP and dendritic homeostasis, when  $p_{intra} = 0.8$ ,  $p_{inter} = 0.2$ ,  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . Note that at the beginning the mean efficacies from these two groups can cross over each other several times, suggesting the diffusion-driven nature of their separation. **(d)** Trial average of  $(\Delta\mu)^2$  grows linearly with time at the beginning (inset), but grows supra-

linearly afterwards. This suggests that the inter-group separation is caused by diffusion at the beginning, but is gradually influenced by causality as the separation grows. **(e)**  $t_{OA}$  represents the time that the mean efficacy of the eventually stronger group takes to grow from point  $O$  to point  $A$  (marked in **c**),  $t_{BC}$  and  $t_{OC}$  have similar meanings. During  $O \rightarrow A$ , the inter-group separation is mainly induced by diffusion,  $t_{OA}$  decreases with the artificially added inter-group diffusion strength  $w_\varepsilon$  (**Section S4.2**). During  $B \rightarrow C$ , the separation is mainly induced by causality,  $t_{BC}$  does not significantly change with  $w_\varepsilon$ . The total time  $t_{OC}$  decreases with  $w_\varepsilon$ .  $p_{intra} = 0.8$ ,  $p_{inter} = 0.2$ ,  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . The arrow indicates the  $w_\varepsilon$  value which increases  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$  at early times (here, 4s) by the same amount as the  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$  value when  $w_\varepsilon = 0$ , which gives readers the sense how strong noises we add through  $w_\varepsilon$ . Error bars represent s.e.m. **(f)** Left: The difference  $|\Delta\mu|$  of the mean synaptic efficacies coming from the two groups after evolving for 400s biological time, when  $p_{intra}$  and  $p_{inter}$  take different values while keeping  $\tau_{cross} = 2\text{ms}$ . Right: the same as left, but as a function of the synchrony between two neurons in the same group  $p_{intra}$  and the synchrony between two neurons in different groups  $p_{intra}p_{inter}$ . **(g)** Initial inter-group diffusion (represented by  $\langle(\Delta\mu)^2\rangle$  at early time, here, 4s) as a function of  $p_{intra}$  and  $p_{intra}p_{inter}$ . Comparing to **f**, we see that the large inter-group diffusion contributes to the large group separation when  $p_{intra}$  is large and  $p_{inter}$  is small. **(h)** The distribution of  $|\Delta\mu|$  after 400s at different  $p_{inter}$  values while keeping  $p_{intra} = 1$ . Dots represent median values, and error bars represent quartiles. Note the wide distribution of  $|\Delta\mu|$  when  $p_{inter}$  takes moderate values. Without the causality-driving force, s.d. of  $|\Delta\mu|$  only caused by diffusion are marked by the circles along the solid line, which are much smaller than the widths of the observed distributions of  $|\Delta\mu|$ . After adding  $w_\varepsilon$ , mean values of  $|\Delta\mu|$  increase for the whole range of parameter. The mean increases of  $|\Delta\mu|$  only caused by diffusion (if the causality-driving force is absent) are marked by the squares along the dashed line, which are also much smaller than the observed increases. This panel shows that the coupling of diffusion and causality-driving force promotes the inter-group separations and increases trial-to-trial variability when the separations are not completed. In **d-h**, simulations are run for 240 trials.

	Names of Spike Shuffling Methods	Aspects of pattern structure to destroy				Effects on efficacy variability ( <b>Supplementary Fig.13a-c</b> )	Reason
		SF	HCC	AT	HR		
Asynchronous states ( $\tau_{d,I} \leq 6\text{ms}$ )	RS	×				Slightly decrease	Before shuffling, the weak fluctuation of population rates in asynchronous states increases the efficacy variability through spike gathering ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14a</b> ).
	RS+TS	×	×			Decrease	The stronger heterogeneity of cross-correlations before shuffling ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14e</b> ).
	RS+TS+IS	×	×	×		Decrease	$CV_{rescale}$ is decreased by IS ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14e</b> ).
	RS+TS+WS	×	×	×	×	No obvious change	The P-D balance in asynchronous states caused by $A_p = A_d$ in our model ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14h</b> ) disables heterogeneity of rates to change efficacy variability through DrV.
Synchronous states ( $\tau_{d,I} \geq 7\text{ms}$ )	WSWE		×		×	Strongly decrease	1) Before shuffling, synchronous firing imbalances potentiation & depression ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14h</b> ), which increases the efficacy variability through heterogeneity of rates ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14g</b> ). 2) Shuffling Reduces heterogeneity of cross-correlations ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14f</b> ).
	WSWE+ISWE		×	×	×	Increase	$CV_{rescale}$ is increased by ISWE ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14c</b> ).
	WSWE+ISWE+RS	×	×	×	×	Decrease	Strong synchronous firing before shuffling, and synapse correlating is impossible to reduce efficacy variability before shuffling because of $\tau_{cross} > \tau_{delay} = 1\text{ms}$ ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14b</b> ), therefore the efficacy variability before shuffling is large because of spike gathering and synapse splitting.
	WSWE+ETS		×	×	×	Increase	$CV_{events}$ is increased by ETS ( <b>Supplementary Fig.14d</b> ).

**Supplementary Table 1.** Spike shuffling methods, the aspects of pattern structure that they destroy, and their influences on the efficacy variability. Abbreviations for pattern structures: SF, synchronous firing; HCC, heterogeneity of cross-correlations; AT, auto-temporal structure; HR, heterogeneity of rates. Abbreviations for spike shuffling methods are shown in **Supplementary Figure 12** and **Section S3**.

