

Fast Cl -type inhibitory neuron with delayed feedback has non-Markov output statistics

Alexander K.Vidybida
Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics
Metrologichna str., 14-B, Kyiv 03680, Ukraine

July 6, 2022

Abstract

For a class of fast Cl -type inhibitory spiking neuron models with delayed feedback stimulated with a Poisson stochastic process of excitatory impulses, it is proven that the stream of output interspike intervals cannot be presented as a Markov process of any order.

Keywords: Poisson stochastic process; spiking neuron; probability density function; delayed feedback; fast Cl -type inhibition; non-Markov stochastic process

1 Introduction

Spiking statistics of various neuronal models under a random stimulation has been studied in the framework of two main approaches. The first one is named in [1] as “Gaussian”, because it describes random stimulation by means of Gaussian noise, see e.g. [2]. This approach has developed into the well-known diffusion approximation methodology, see [3]. The second approach is named in [1] as “quantal”, because it takes into account the discrete nature of the influence any input impulse may have on its target neuron. The wide area of research and applications known as spiking neural networks, see [4] for a review, could be considered as utilizing the quantal approach.

For a recent review of mathematically rigorous results regarding neuronal spiking statistics in the both approaches see [5].

We study here mathematically rigorously, in the framework of quantal approach, spiking statistics of inhibitory neuron model belonging to a class of models (see Sec. 2, below) with fast Cl -type inhibitory delayed feedback (see Fig. 1, below).

1.1 Biological inspiration

Neurons, which send inhibitory impulses onto their own body or dendrites are known in real nervous systems, see [20, 21, 22, 23].

The chief inhibitory neurotransmitter in the nervous system is Gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA). The GABA can activate several types of receptors, the main of which are GABA_a and GABA_b. If GABA_a receptors are activated, the excitable membrane becomes permeable for Cl⁻ ions. If a neuron is partially excited, that is its membrane is depolarized, the Cl⁻ current cancels this depolarization since the Cl⁻ reversal potential is close/equal to the resting potential. For the same reason, the Cl⁻ current through open GABA_a channels does not appear, if the membrane is at its resting potential.

Another case is with GABA_b receptors activation. This causes K⁺ ions permeability. The outward K⁺ current is able to hyperpolarize membrane even below its resting potential.

The remarkable difference between GABA_a and GABA_b mediated inhibition is rather different kinetics of the corresponding Cl⁻ and K⁺ currents. Namely, according to [24], the Cl⁻ current rise time is 1 - 5 ms, and the decay time constant is about 10 - 25 ms. The K⁺ current rise time is 10 - 120 ms, and the decay time constant is about 200 - 1600 ms. The K⁺ current can be even slower, see [22, 25, 26].

Inspired by this contrast in the speed of Cl⁻ and K⁺ transients, we idealize the Cl⁻ current kinetics as having infinitesimally short rise time and infinitely fast decay, both can be achieved with infinitely large Cl⁻ conductance at the moment of receiving inhibitory impulse. This kind of the Cl⁻ current kinetics does ensure the perfect reset of the membrane voltage to the resting state at the moment when inhibitory impulse arrives. Within the limited experimental data set available for inhibitory autapses, see [24], a single impulse delivered through a single synapse ensures only partial reset. In this point, our statement of the problem diverges from the current data. At the same time, in the artificial neuromorphic systems, see [6, 7], the complete reset may well be realized. Considering a partial reset would inappropriately increase the paper's dimensions.

Below, it is expected that a neuron sends back to itself its output impulses through a delayed feedback line, which ends with a GABA_a autapse, see Prop1-Prop3, in Sec. 2.2. This construction is stimulated with a Poisson stream of excitatory input impulses. For this configuration it has been proven in the previous paper [8] for the case of Poisson input stream and for a concrete neuronal model — the inhibitory binding neuron¹ with threshold 2 —, that statistics of its interspike intervals (ISIs) is essentially non-Markov². In paper [13], it

¹Detailed description of the binding neuron model can be found in [9].
See also https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Binding_neuron.

²Sometimes, a concept of a point stochastic Markov process is confused with a process whose consecutive realizations are uncorrelated. Actually, the latter one is a renewal process, which is a specific case of Markov process. As regards a general Markov process, its realizations can well be correlated, see e.g. [10]. In this paper, we do not study correlations (which itself is an interesting topic, which could be addressed separately), but prove that the output statistics does not have the Markov property defined, e.g., in [11, Ch.2 §6]. Some interesting remarks about non-markoviannes can be found in [12].

has been proven for the Poisson input and for a class of excitatory neuronal models that the presence of delayed feedback makes their activity non-Markov. In this paper, we use the approach developed in [13] in order to refine and extend methods of [8] making them applicable to any inhibitory neuron with fast Cl -type inhibition satisfying a number of simple and natural conditions, see Cond0-Cond4, below. The stimulation is assumed to be a Poisson stochastic process. Under those conditions, we prove rigorously that ISI statistics of a neuron with delayed fast Cl -type inhibitory feedback stimulated with a Poisson point stochastic process of input impulses cannot be represented as a Markov chain of any finite order. Finally, it should be mentioned that our consideration is valid also for artificial hardware neurons, see [27, 28], and abstract neurons used in mathematical studies, provided that Cond0-Cond4 and Prop1-Prop3, below, are satisfied.

2 Definitions and assumptions

2.1 Neuron without feedback

We assume that a neuron satisfies the following conditions:

- Cond0: Neuron is deterministic: Identical stimuli elicit identical spike trains from the same neuron.
- Cond1: Neuron is stimulated with input Poisson stationary stream of excitatory impulses.
- Cond2: Neuron may fire a spike only at a moment when it receives an input impulse.
- Cond3: Just after firing, neuron appears in its resting state.
- Cond4: The output interspike interval (ISI) distribution can be characterized with a probability density function (pdf) $p^0(t)$, which is *continuous* with

$$p^0(0) = 0, \tag{1}$$

positive:

$$t > 0 \Rightarrow p^0(t) > 0, \tag{2}$$

and bounded:

$$\sup_{t>0} p^0(t) < \infty. \tag{3}$$

By t we denote the ISI's length. Also, we impose on the function $p^0(t)$ the following condition: $t < 0 \Rightarrow p^0(t) = 0$ in order to have it defined for all real numbers.

These conditions are, with some modifications, similar to those assumed in [13] for a class of excitatory neurons. The modifications are as follows:

Cond3 — we assume that after firing a neuron appears in its resting state with all excitation canceled, while in [13] it is a standard state, which not necessarily is the resting one.

Cond4 — the requirement of continuity of $p^0(t)$ is added as compared to [13]. This addition has a pure mathematical nature and seems to be valid for any “good” neuronal model (without feedback). The subsequent proof of non-markoviannes relies on it.

The Cond3, above, limits the set of models as compared to [13]. Namely, it claims that the standard state of [13, Cond3] must be exactly the resting state of neuron. This requirement is imposed due to the specifics of Cl -type fast inhibition. For our approach, it is important that after receiving inhibitory impulse, the neuron appears in exactly the same state as immediately after firing. And the state after receiving Cl -type inhibitory impulse can be only the resting state, see Sec. 1.1, above.

It seems that these conditions are satisfied for many threshold-type neuronal models known in the literature, see [14, 15, 16, 17] and citations therein. But this still has to be proven by calculating corresponding $p^0(t)$. At least, all the five conditions are satisfied for the binding neuron model and for the basic leaky integrate-and-fire (LIF) model, both for Poisson stimulation. See [18, 19], where $p^0(t)$ is calculated exactly for each model, respectively.

2.2 Feedback line action

We expect that the feedback line satisfies Prop1, Prop2 of [13], which are reproduced below for completeness. The Prop3 of [13] should be modified for the Cl -type fast inhibition as shown below:

- Prop1: The time delay in the line is $\Delta > 0$.
- Prop2: The line is able to convey no more than one impulse.
- Prop3: The impulse conveyed to the neuronal input is the fast Cl -type inhibitory impulse. This means that after receiving such an impulse, the neuron appears in its resting state. This exhausts the action of the inhibitory impulse in a sense that it has no influence on further neuronal states created by next excitatory impulses. It as well does not affect neuron being in its resting state.

The Prop1 expects that the delay is always the same and each impulse, entered the line is delivered to its output and effects the neuron. Thus, we do not consider here cases when the transmission is unreliable, or the delay time is not constant.

The validity of the Prop2 depends on relation between the conduction velocity, recovery time and the line’s length. Also Prop2 seems plausible if the firing frequency is low.

The Prop3 just characterizes a neuronal model as inhibitory with GABA_a-type autapse. Its validity depends on the fact that the Cl^- reversal potential

is identical to the resting potential. In some cases this is fulfilled, see [24]. It is also expected that a single AP delivered by a feedback line is potent enough for canceling any excitation present. Taking into account that observed single GABA_a IPSP peak value rarely exceeds 6 mV, this may require the delay line sprouting into several autaptic endings.

The important for us consequence of the Prop2, above, is that at any moment of time the feedback line is either empty, or conveys a single impulse. If it does convey an impulse, then its state can be described with a stochastic variable s , $s \in]0; \Delta]$, which we call further “time to live”, see Fig. 1. The variable s denotes the exact time required by the impulse to reach the output end of the line, which is the neuron’s input for inhibitory impulses, and to leave the line with the consequences described in the Prop3, above. Here, Δ denotes the delay duration in the feedback line. Notice, that at the beginning of any ISI, the line is never empty.




Figure 1: Neuron with delayed feedback. As **neuron** in the figure, we consider any neuronal model, which satisfies the set of conditions Cond0 - Cond4, above.

3 Results

Our purpose here is to prove the following Theorem³:

Theorem 1 *Let a neuronal model satisfies conditions Cond0-Cond4, above. Suppose that the model is extended by introducing a delayed fast Cl-type inhibitory feedback line, which satisfies the Prop1-Prop3, above. Then, in the stationary regime, the output stream of ISIs of the neuron cannot be presented as a Markov chain of any finite order.*

3.1 Proof outline

Let $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)dt_{n+1}$ denote the conditional probability to get the duration of $(n + 2)$ -nd ISI in the interval $[t_{n+1}; t_{n+1} + dt_{n+1}[$ provided that previous $n + 1$ ISIs have duration t_n, \dots, t_0 , respectively. From the definition in [11, Ch.2 §6], one can obtain the necessary condition

$$p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_1, t_0) = p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_1), \quad (4)$$

³A similar theorem for the *excitatory* feedback line has been proven in [13].

required for the stochastic process $\{t_j\}$ to be n th order Markov chain. Notice, that (4) must be satisfied for any values of the variables t_i , $i = 0, \dots, n + 1$.

We intend to prove that the relation (4) does not hold for any n . For this purpose we calculate exact expression for $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$ as

$$p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0) = \frac{p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, t_n, \dots, t_0)}{p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)} \quad (5)$$

from which it will be clearly seen that the t_0 -dependence in $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$ cannot be eliminated whatever large the n is. In the Eq. (5), expression $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_1)$ denotes the joint probability density function of ISIs duration of neuron with the fast CL -type inhibitory delayed feedback.

Let us introduce the conditional joint probability density $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$, which denotes the conditional probability density to get $n + 2$ consecutive ISIs $\{t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0\}$ provided that at the beginning of the first ISI (t_0) the time to live of impulse in the feedback line is equal to s . This conditional probability can be used to calculate required joint pdfs as follows

$$p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) = \int_0^\Delta p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s) f^{inh}(s) ds, \quad (6)$$

where $f^{inh}(s)$ is the stationary pdf which describes distribution of times to live at the beginning of any ISI in the stationary regime.

In what follows we analyze the structure of functions $f^{inh}(s)$ and $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$. It appears that $f^{inh}(s)$ has a singular component $a\delta(s - \Delta)$ with $a > 0$, and $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$ has jump discontinuities at definite hyperplanes in the $(n + 3)$ -dimensional space of its variables (t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0, s) . After integration in (6), some of those discontinuities will survive in the $(n + 2)$ -dimensional space of variables (t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) , and exactly one of those survived has its position depending on t_0 . The t_0 -dependent jump discontinuity will as well survive in the $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$ for any n , provided that t_n, \dots, t_0 satisfy the following condition:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n t_i < \Delta, \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta > 0$ is the full delay time in the feedback line. Taking into account that the equation in the necessary condition (4) must hold for any set of t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 , we conclude that (4) cannot be satisfied for any n .

3.2 The proof

3.2.1 Structure of functions $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$

Specifics of the feedback line action together with condition (7) results in a very simple structure of

$p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$ at different parts of the integration domain in (6). Those parts are defined as follows:

$$D_k = \{s | \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i < s \leq \sum_{i=0}^k t_i\}, \quad k = 0, \dots, n, \quad D_{n+1} = \{s | \sum_{i=0}^n t_i < s \leq \Delta\}.$$

As regards the structure itself, the following representation can be derived similarly as it was done in [13]:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s) &= p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_{k+1} | \Delta) \times \\ &\times p^{inh}\left(t_k | s - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i\right) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} p^0(t_i), \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad s \in D_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s) &= \\ &= p^{inh}\left(t_{n+1} | s - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i\right) \prod_{i=0}^n p^0(t_i), \quad s \in D_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_{k+1} | \Delta) &= \\ &= p^{inh}\left(t_{n+1} | \Delta - \sum_{i=k+1}^n t_i\right) \prod_{i=k+1}^n p^0(t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here $p^{inh}(t | s)$ denotes the conditional pdf to get ISI of duration t if at its beginning, time to live of impulse in the feedback line is s .

Representation of $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s)$ by means of $p^0(t)$ and $p^{inh}(t | s)$ found here is similar to that found in [13] for the excitatory case. But the structure of function $p^{inh}(t | s)$, used in that representation, is different.

3.2.2 Structure of function $p^{inh}(t | s)$

Expect that at the beginning of an ISI, there is an impulse in the feedback line with time to live s . Then the probability that this ISI will have its duration $t < s$ does not depend on the feedback line presence. Therefore,

$$t < s \Rightarrow p^{inh}(t | s) = p^0(t). \quad (11)$$

In the opposite situation, receiving of an ISI duration greater than s happens if (i) the neuron is not firing during interval $]0; s[$ and (ii) the neuron starts at its resting state (Prop3, above) at the moment s and fires at $t > s$. Realizations of events (i) and (ii) depend on disjoint segments of the input Poisson

stream (Cond1, above). Therefore, (i) and (ii) are statistically independent. The probability of (i) is as follows:

$$\mathbf{P}^0(s) = 1 - \int_0^s p^0(t) dt. \quad (12)$$

The probability of (ii) is $p^0(t - s)$. This gives

$$t > s \Rightarrow p^{inh}(t | s) = \mathbf{P}^0(s)p^0(t - s). \quad (13)$$

It can be concluded from (11) and (13) that

$$\lim_{t \uparrow s} p^{inh}(t | s) = p^0(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \downarrow s} p^{inh}(t | s) = 0.$$

Now, taking into account (1) and (2) from Cond4, above, we conclude that the function $p^{inh}(t | s)$ considered as a function of two variables (t, s) , $t \geq 0$, $s \in]0; \Delta]$ has a jump discontinuity along the straight line $t = s$. The magnitude of this jump is $p^0(s)$, and it is strictly positive for positive t . Concrete values of $p^{inh}(t | s)$ along the line $t = s$ does not matter and can be chosen arbitrarily.

Finally, for $p^{inh}(t | s)$ we have⁴

$$p^{inh}(t | s) = \chi(s - t)p^0(t) + \mathbf{P}^0(s)p^0(t - s), \quad (14)$$

where $\chi(s)$ is the Heaviside step function.

3.2.3 Structure of probability density function $f^{inh}(s)$

Everywhere in this paper we expect that all pdfs $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ have achieved their stationary form, and we analyze the stationary regime. But any stationary regime arises from some initial distribution. In principle, different initial distributions may result in different final stationary distributions.

As it can be concluded from (8)-(10), the only quantity, which might depend on initial conditions in the right-hand side of representation (6) is the pdf $f^{inh}(s)$.

Before the stationary regime is achieved, $f^{inh}(s)$ is changed after each firing:

$$f_{n+1}(s) = \int_0^\Delta \mathbf{P}(s | s') f_n(s') ds', \quad (15)$$

where the transition function $\mathbf{P}(s | s')$ gives the probability density to find at the beginning of an ISI an impulse in the line with time to live s provided that

⁴Compare this with [29, Eq. (11)], where $p^{inh}(t | s)$ is calculated exactly for the binding neuron model stimulated with Poisson stream.

at the beginning of the previous ISI, there was an impulse with time to live s' . In the stationary regime, the pdf $f(s)$ must satisfy the following equation

$$f^{inh}(s) = \int_0^{\Delta} \mathbf{P}(s | s') f^{inh}(s') ds', \quad (16)$$

Now, the question of existence and uniqueness of the stationary regime might be resolved by analyzing Eqs. (15) and (16) for convergence and uniqueness. This is expected to do in another paper. In this paper we assume that sequence $\{f_n^{inh}(s)\}$ of pdfs generated by Eq. (15) converges to some pdf for any initial $f_0(s)$, and admit that there might be different limiting distributions for different $f_0(s)$.

The exact expression for $\mathbf{P}(s | s')$ is found in [13, Eqs.(11)-(13)]. It appears that the structure of $f^{inh}(s)$, which follows from (16) is exactly the same as it has been found in [13] for the excitatory case. This structure is as follows⁵

$$f^{inh}(s) = g(s) + a\delta(s - \Delta), \quad (17)$$

where $a > 0$ and $g(s)$ is bounded continuous function vanishing out of interval $]0; \Delta[$.

3.2.4 Form of $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ and $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ after integration in (6)

Let $D = \bigcup_{k=0}^n D_k$. At D , representations (8) and (10) are valid. Also at D , $f^{inh}(s)$ reduces to $g(s)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 | s) f^{inh}(s) ds &= \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n p^{inh} \left(t_{n+1} | \Delta - \sum_{i=k+1}^n t_i \right) \times \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq k}}^n p^0(t_i) \int_{D_k} p^{inh} \left(t_k | s - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \right) g(s) ds. \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

The first factor (with fixed k , $0 \leq k \leq n$) in the r.h.s. of Eq. (18) is as follows:

$$p^{inh} \left(t_{n+1} | \Delta - \sum_{i=k+1}^n t_i \right).$$

⁵Compare this with [30, Eqs. (14)-(16)], where $f(s)$ is calculated exactly for the binding neuron model.

Due to Eq. (14), this factor does have a jump discontinuity along the hyperplane $\sum_{i=k+1}^{n+1} t_i = \Delta$ in the space of variables (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) . Notice, that the position of this hyperplane does not depend on t_0 for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$.

The second factor in the r.h.s. of Eq. (18) is as follows: $\prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq k}}^n p^0(t_i)$, and it

is continuous.

The third factor in the r.h.s. of Eq. (18) can be transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{D_k} p^{inh} \left(t_k \mid s - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \right) g(s) ds &= \\
&= \int_{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j}^{\sum_{j=0}^k t_j} p^{inh} \left(t_k \mid s - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \right) g(s) ds = \\
&= \int_0^{t_k} p^{inh}(t_k \mid s) g \left(s + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \right) ds = \\
&= \int_0^{t_k} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_k - s) g \left(s + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \right) ds. \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

The last expression is continuous with respect to variables (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) . Therefore, one can conclude that expression (18) does not have a jump discontinuity, which position depends on t_0 .

Consider now the remaining part of integral in (6). With (9) taken into account one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{D_{n+1}} p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0 \mid s) f^{inh}(s) ds &= \\
&= \prod_{i=0}^n p^0(t_i) \int_{D_{n+1}} p^{inh} \left(t_{n+1} \mid s - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) f^{inh}(s) ds. \quad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first factor, $\prod_{i=0}^n p^0(t_i)$ is continuous and strictly positive for positive

t_i . The second factor can be transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{D_{n+1}} p^{inh} \left(t_{n+1} \mid s - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) f^{inh}(s) ds &= \\
&= \int_{\sum_{i=0}^n t_i}^{\Delta} p^{inh} \left(t_{n+1} \mid s - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) f^{inh}(s) ds = \\
&= \int_0^{\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} p^{inh}(t_{n+1} \mid s) f^{inh} \left(s + \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) ds. \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us use representations (14) and (17) in order to figure out which kind of discontinuities does the expression (21) have. Due to (14) and (17), expression (21) will have four terms. The first one we get by choosing the first term both in (14) and (17):

$$A_{11} = \int_0^{\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} \chi(s - t_{n+1}) p^0(t_{n+1}) g \left(s + \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) ds.$$

This term is either equal to zero, if $t_{n+1} > \Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i$, or otherwise transforms into a continuous function of variables (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) . Moreover,

$$\lim_{t_{n+1} \uparrow \Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} A_{11}(t_{n+1}) = 0.$$

The second one we get by choosing the second term in (14) and the first term in (17):

$$A_{21} = \int_0^{\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_{n+1} - s) g \left(s + \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \right) ds.$$

This is as well a continuous function of variables (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) .

The third one we get by choosing the first term in (14) and the second term

in (17):

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{12} &= \\
&= a \int_0^{\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} \chi(s - t_{n+1}) p^0(t_{n+1}) \delta\left(\sum_{i=0}^n t_i + s - \Delta\right) ds = \\
&= a \chi\left(\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} t_i\right) p^0(t_{n+1}). \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

This term has a jump discontinuity along the hyperplane

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n+1} t_i = \Delta. \quad (23)$$

The forth one we get by choosing the second term in (14) and the second term in (17):

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{22} &= \\
&= a \int_0^{\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_{n+1} - s) \delta\left(\sum_{i=0}^n t_i + s - \Delta\right) ds = \\
&= \mathbf{P}^0\left(\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^n t_i\right) p^0\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n+1} t_i - \Delta\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This is as well a continuous function of variables (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) .

After taking into account the above reasoning, we conclude that the required joint probability density has the following form

$$p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) = p^w(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) + a \chi\left(\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} t_i\right) \prod_{j=0}^{n+1} p^0(t_j). \quad (24)$$

where function $p^w(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ does not have a jump discontinuity depending on t_0 , and the second term in (24) does have such a discontinuity along the hyperplane (23).

Form of $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ after integration

If (7) is satisfied, then we have similarly to (8), (9)

$$\begin{aligned}
p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0 | s) &= p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_{k+1} | \Delta) \times \\
&\times p^{inh}\left(t_k | s - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i\right) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} p^0(t_i), \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad s \in D_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, n-1,
\end{aligned}$$

$$p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0 | s) = p^{inh} \left(t_n | s - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} t_i \right) \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} p^0(t_i), \quad s \in D_n.$$

Again due to (7), and in analogy with (10) we have instead of the last two equations the following one:

$$p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0 | s) = p^{inh} \left(t_k | s - \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq k}}^{k-1} t_i \right) \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq k}}^n p^0(t_i), \\ s \in D_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, n. \quad (25)$$

It is clear that expression similar to (9) turns here into the following

$$p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0 | s) = \prod_{i=0}^n p^0(t_i), \quad s \in D_{n+1}. \quad (26)$$

Now, due to (25), (26) we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0) &= \int_0^{\Delta} p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0 | s) f^{inh}(s) ds = \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq k}}^n p^0(t_i) \int_{D_k} p^{inh} \left(t_k | s - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i \right) g(s) ds + \\ &\quad + \prod_{i=0}^n p^0(t_i) \int_{D_{n+1}} f^{inh}(s) ds. \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

From calculations similar to those made in Eq. (19) it can be concluded that $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ is continuous at the domain defined by (7).

3.2.5 t_0 -dependence cannot be eliminated in $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$

Now, with representations (24) for $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ and (27) for $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ we can pose a question about the form of $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$. The latter can be found as defined in (5). First of all notice that due to (27) and Cond4, $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ is strictly positive for positive ISIs. This allows us to use it as denominator in the definition (5). Second, it can be further concluded from (27) and Cond4, that $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ is bounded. The latter together with continuity of $p^{inh}(t_n, \dots, t_0)$ means that any discontinuity of jump type present in the $p^{inh}(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ appears as well in the $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$. It follows from the above and from Eq. (24) that the conditional pdf $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$

can be represented in the following form:

$$p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0) = p^w(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0) + Z(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) \chi \left(\Delta - \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} t_i \right), \quad (28)$$

where $p^w(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$ does not have any jump type discontinuity which position depends on t_0 , and $Z(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0)$ is strictly positive function:

$$Z(t_{n+1}, \dots, t_0) = \frac{a \prod_{i=0}^{n+1} p^0(t_i)}{p(t_n, \dots, t_0)}.$$

Thus the representation (28) proves that for any n , conditional pdf $p^{inh}(t_{n+1} | t_n, \dots, t_0)$ does depend on t_0 (the second term in (28)) and this dependence cannot be eliminated. \square

See also Appendix, below, where the above general reasoning is illustrated for the LIF neuronal model with threshold 2 (that is two input impulses applied in a short succession are able to trigger, see (31), below).

4 Discussion and Conclusions

The question as to what extent the stream of neuronal output impulses can be modeled as Poisson stream has been discussed in neuroscience, see [31]. The experimentally observed presence of memory in the ISIs output of real neurons has been reported many times, see [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. Also several theoretical models of how the memory could appear are offered, see [15, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43].

In this paper we use the quantal approach, as it is defined in [1] in order to prove that the Markov property is broken in the ISI output stream of a neuronal model belonging to a defined class of models, equipped with delayed fast C -type inhibitory feedback, which is stimulated with a Poisson stochastic process of input excitatory impulses. Several previous results obtained in the quantal approach are used in this paper, see [8, 13, 18, 29, 30].

In all these papers (as in many other computational neuroscience works) it is assumed that input impulse has zero duration and is modeled as the Dirac δ -function in time. On the other hand, the data of papers [24, 21], which inspired this study, suggest that observed there width of inhibitory impulse is comparable with or even longer than the delay time for autaptic selfinhibition. In the case of that extended impulses it is not clear which figure should be considered as the delay. In this connection, it should be taken into account that any extended in time impulse can be represented as a sum of short impulses precisely positioned at different moments of time. For each short impulse component the delay value, either axonal, or synaptic, or both is precisely defined. Of course, we cannot expect here that each short impulse component performs a complete reset of

membrane potential. Therefore, additional analysis is required, which is out of scope of this paper. On the other hand, for neurocybernetical artificial devices, see, e.g. [6, 7], situation with short impulse and long delay seems to be more natural due to specifics of digital devices.

The first results this paper is based on are obtained for the binding neuron (BN) model. Namely, in [18] under Poisson stimulation the output ISI pdf and mean ISI are obtained for the BN with threshold (Th) 2, and the mean ISI for Th = 3. In [8, 29, 30] a BN model with Th = 2 and with delayed feedback, either excitatory or inhibitory, stimulated with Poisson stream is considered. For this case, the ISI pdf is found and also it is proven that the output ISI stream is non-Markov. In [13], any neuronal model from a defined class is considered. A delayed feedback is assumed *excitatory*, and stimulation is Poissonian. For this case, it is proven that the output stream is non-Markov.

In this paper, a class of neuronal models with delayed *Cl*-type *inhibitory* feedback is considered.

The memory property in output ISI streams is often discussed in terms of correlation coefficient (CC), e.g. [42]. Unfortunately, the expressions obtained in this paper cannot be used for conclusions made in terms of CC. This is because all expressions, including $p(t_1, t_0)$ are obtained under restriction (7), whereas in order to calculate CC one needs to know $p(t_1, t_0)$ for all $t_0 > 0$, $t_1 > 0$. Nevertheless, expressions derived in this paper under restriction (7) allows one to show that the Markov property is broken in the output ISI due to delayed feedback. Another reason for neuronal activity to be non-Markov in a network is offered in [43].

In further work, it is expected to extend obtained here exact expressions to the full range of ISI values and to compare our findings with those obtained in terms of CC. This includes also a quantitative estimation of how much the statistics is non-Markov and to what extent it might be approximated by a Markov/renewal process. Also, a general renewal stochastic process can be considered as a stimulus instead of Poisson one. The latter can be achieved if to find adequate expression for Eq. (13), which in its current form is valid for Poisson stimulation only.

Acknowledgements This paper was partially supported by the Program "Structure and Dynamics of Statistical and Quantum-Field Systems" of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Project PK No 0117U000240.

Some calculations in the Appendix are made with the help of free Computer Algebra System Maxima, see <http://maxima.sourceforge.net/>.

A Appendix

Here we give a simple example of the proven property. Namely, we consider $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ and show that t_0 -dependence cannot be eliminated for a LIF model, stimulated with Poisson stream.

For the two values of $n = 1, 2$, Eq. (6) due to (7), (14), (18)-(20), (27), turns into the following two equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
p^{inh}(t_1, t_0) &= p^0(t_1) \int_0^{t_0} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_0 - s) g(s) ds + \\
&+ p^0(t_0) \int_0^{t_1} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_1 - s) g(s + t_0) ds + \\
&+ p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0) \int_0^{\Delta - t_0 - t_1} f(s + t_0 + t_1) ds, \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p^{inh}(t_2, t_1, t_0) &= \\
&= p^{inh}(t_2 | \Delta - t_1) p^0(t_1) \int_0^{t_0} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_0 - s) g(s) ds + \\
&+ p^{inh}(t_2 | \Delta) p^0(t_0) \int_0^{t_1} \mathbf{P}^0(s) p^0(t_1 - s) g(s + t_0) ds + \\
&+ p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0) \int_0^{\Delta - t_0 - t_1} p^{inh}(t_2 | s) f(s + t_0 + t_1) ds, \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let the neuronal model be the basic LIF model characterized with the firing threshold V_0 , input impulse height h and relaxation time τ . Assume that

$$0 < h < V_0 < 2h. \quad (31)$$

Assume also that the neuron is stimulated with a Poisson stream of intensity λ . For this case, it is proven in ([19, Eqs. (14),(21)]) that

$$p^0(t) = \lambda^2 t e^{-\lambda t}, \text{ provided } t \in [0; T_2], \quad (32)$$

where

$$T_2 = \tau \log \frac{h}{V_0 - h}.$$

Assume, for simplicity, that $\Delta < T_2$. This allows to obtain exact expressions for $\mathbf{P}^0(s)$ and $p^{inh}(t | s)$:

$$\mathbf{P}^0(s) = e^{-\lambda s} (\lambda s + 1), \quad (33)$$

$$p^{inh}(t | s) = \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t} (t \chi(s - t) + \chi(t - s) (t - s) (\lambda s + 1)).$$

If we put $\chi(0) = 0.5$, then $\chi(-x) = 1 - \chi(x)$ and the last expression can be transformed as follows

$$p^{inh}(t | s) = \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t} (t + \chi(t-s)s(\lambda(t-s) - 1)). \quad (34)$$

Under the assumptions of this Appendix, it appears that the kernel of integral equation (16), above, is exactly the same as for the binding neuron model with excitatory feedback. The latter case has been studied in [30, Eqs. (14)-(16)], where the unique solution to Eq. (16) is found. The unknown in general case quantities from Eq. (17), above, under assumptions of this Appendix can be taken from [30]:

$$g(s) = \frac{a\lambda}{2} \left(1 - e^{-2\lambda(\Delta-s)} \right), \quad (35)$$

$$a = \frac{4e^{2\lambda\Delta}}{(2\lambda\Delta + 3)e^{2\lambda\Delta} + 1}. \quad (36)$$

After substituting (32)-(36) into (29) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_1, t_0) &= \frac{\lambda^4 e^{-\lambda(t_0+t_1)} t_0 t_1}{6((2\lambda\Delta + 3)e^{2\lambda\Delta} + 1)} \times \\ &\quad \times \left(2\lambda e^{2\lambda\Delta} (\lambda(t_0^2 + t_1^2) + 3(2\Delta - t_0 - t_1)) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 3(e^{2\lambda(t_1+t_0)} + 6e^{2\lambda\Delta} + 1) \right). \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

Notice, that $p^{inh}(t_1, t_0)$ is strictly positive for strictly positive t_1, t_0 . This allows one to use it safely as denominator in the definition of conditional probability (5), above. Also, as it may be observed from (37), the $p^{inh}(t_1, t_0)$ is continuous and bounded. This means, that $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ as it is defined in (5), will preserve any discontinuity which may appear in the $p^{inh}(t_2, t_1, t_0)$, which is the numerator in (5) for $n = 1$.

Consider now Eq.(30) for $p^{inh}(t_2, t_1, t_0)$. After partial simplifications, it turns into the following:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{inh}(t_2, t_1, t_0) &= \\ &= p^{inh}(t_2 | \Delta - t_1) \frac{\lambda^4 t_0 t_1 e^{-\lambda(t_0+t_1)}}{6((2\lambda\Delta + 3)e^{2\lambda\Delta} + 1)} \times \\ &\quad \times \left(3(1 - e^{2\lambda t_0}) + 2\lambda t_0 e^{2\lambda\Delta} (\lambda t_0 + 3) \right) + \quad (a) \\ &+ p^{inh}(t_2 | \Delta) \frac{\lambda^4 t_0 t_1 e^{-\lambda(t_0+t_1)}}{6((2\lambda\Delta + 3)e^{2\lambda\Delta} + 1)} \times \\ &\quad \times \left(3e^{2\lambda t_0} (1 - e^{2\lambda t_1}) + 2\lambda t_1 e^{2\lambda\Delta} (\lambda t_1 + 3) \right) + \quad (b) \\ &+ \lambda^2 t_2 e^{-\lambda t_2} p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0) \times \\ &\quad \times \chi(\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2) \int_{t_2}^{\Delta-t_0-t_1} g(s + t_0 + t_1) ds + \quad (c) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t_2} p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_0^{\min(t_2, \Delta - t_0 - t_1)} (t_2 - s)(\lambda s + 1) g(s + t_0 + t_1) ds + \quad (d) \\
& + a p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0) p^{inh}(t_2 | \Delta - t_0 - t_1). \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

The summands (a) and (b) in Eq. (38) correspond to the first and second term of the right-hand side in Eq.(30), respectively. The remaining three ones correspond to the the third term of the right-hand side in Eq.(30). It is easily seen that both (a) and (b) are continuous with respect to t_0 . The term (d) is as well continuous in t_0 , because function $\min(x, y)$ is continuous on x and y . The term (c) is as well continuous because

$$\lim_{\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2 \rightarrow 0} \chi(\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2) \int_{t_2}^{\Delta - t_0 - t_1} g(s + t_0 + t_1) ds = 0.$$

Consider the final term in Eq. (38). For the sake of clarity, we omit the factor $a p^0(t_1) p^0(t_0)$ having in mind that it is continuous and strictly positive for $t_0 > 0$, $t_1 > 0$. The remaining expression is as follows

$$\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t_2} (t_2 - \chi(t_2 + t_1 + t_0 - \Delta)(\Delta - t_0 - t_1)(\lambda(\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2) + 1)). \quad (39)$$

This expression, if considered as a function of t_0, t_1, t_2 has a step-like discontinuity along the hyperplane

$$t_2 + t_1 + t_0 = \Delta. \quad (40)$$

Indeed, if $t_2 + t_1 + t_0 < \Delta$, then (39) turns into

$$\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t_2} t_2.$$

Otherwise, if $t_2 + t_1 + t_0 > \Delta$, then (39) turns into

$$\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t_2} (t_2 - (\Delta - t_0 - t_1)(\lambda(\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2) + 1)).$$

The difference between the two expressions is as follows

$$\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t_2} (\Delta - t_0 - t_1)(\lambda(\Delta - t_0 - t_1 - t_2) + 1). \quad (41)$$

This difference vanishes along the hyperplane

$$t_2 + t_1 + t_0 = \Delta + \frac{1}{\lambda}$$

only (due to (7), we do not consider the case $t_0 + t_1 = \Delta$). Comparing the last equation with (40), we see that the jump (41) is strictly positive along the hyperplane (40). The same is valid for the last term in (38). Taking into account that the other four terms in (38) are continuous in t_0 , and what is said after Eq.




Figure 2: Different values of $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ for different t_0 . Here $\Delta = 7$ ms, $\lambda = 0.3$ ms $^{-1}$, $t_1 = 3$ ms both for (a) and (b). The $t_0 = 3.5$ ms for (a) and $t_0 = 1.5$ ms for (b). The curves are calculated based on Eqs. (34)-(38).

(37), we conclude that $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ has a nonzero jump along the hyperplane (40). For a fixed t_1, t_2 and infinitesimally small $\epsilon > 0$ consider two different values of t_0 : $t_0^\pm = \Delta - t_1 - t_2 \pm \epsilon$. It is clear from the above that when t_0 value obtains infinitesimally small change from t_0^+ to t_0^- , the $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ gets finite change due to the jump (41), which means that t_0 -dependence in $p^{inh}(t_2 | t_1, t_0)$ is indeed present (at least due to the discovered jump discontinuity) and cannot be eliminated. This is illustrated in Fig. 2.

References

- [1] R. B. Stein, Some models of neuronal variability, *Biophysical Journal* **7**(1) (1967) 37–68.
- [2] H. L. Bryant and J. P. Segundo, Spike initiation by transmembrane current: a white-noise analysis, *The Journal of Physiology* **260**(2) (1976) 279–314.
- [3] R. M. Capocelli and L. M. Ricciardi, Diffusion approximation and first passage time problem for a model neuron, *Kybernetik* **8**(6) (1971) 214–223.
- [4] S. Ghosh-Dastidar and H. Adeli, Spiking neural networks, *International Journal of Neural Systems*, **19**(4) (2009) 295–308.
- [5] L. Sacerdote and M. T. Giraudo, Stochastic integrate and fire models: A review on mathematical methods and their applications, *Stochastic Biomathematical Models, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2058.*, eds. M. Bachar, J. J. Batzel and S. Ditlevsen (Springer-Verlag, 2013), pp. 99–148.
- [6] R. Sarpeshkar, Neuromorphic and biomorphic engineering systems *McGraw-Hill Yearbook of Science & Technology 2009*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009), pp. 250–252.

- [7] D. Brüderle, M.A. Petrovici, B. Vogginger, B. et al., A comprehensive workflow for general-purpose neural modeling with highly configurable neuro-morphic hardware systems *Biol Cybern*, **104**(4) (2011) 263–296.
- [8] K. G. Kravchuk and A. K. Vidybida, Firing statistics of inhibitory neuron with delayed feedback. II: Non-markovian behavior, *BioSystems* **112**(3) (2013) 233–248.
- [9] A. K. Vidybida, Binding neuron, *Encyclopedia of information science and technology*, ed. M. Khosrow-Pour (IGI Global, 2014), pp. 1123–1134.
- [10] B. Lindner, A brief introduction to some simple stochastic processes *Stochastic Methods in Neuroscience*, ed. C. Laing and G.J. Lord (Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1–28.
- [11] J. L. Doob, *Stochastic processes* (Wiley, 1953).
- [12] N. G. van Kampen, Remarks on Non-Markov Processes, *Brazilian Journal of Physics* **28**(2) (1998) 90–96.
- [13] A. K. Vidybida, Activity of excitatory neuron with delayed feedback stimulated with Poisson stream is non-Markov, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **160** (2015) 1507–1518.
- [14] A. N. Burkitt, A review of the integrate-and-fire neuron model: I. homogeneous synaptic input, *Biological Cybernetics* **95**(1) (2006) 1–19.
- [15] M. J. Chacron, K. Pakdaman and A. Longtin, Interspike interval correlations, memory, adaptation, and refractoriness in a leaky integrate-and-fire model with threshold fatigue, *Neural Computation* **15**(2) (2003) 253–278.
- [16] R. Jolivet, T. J. Lewis and W. Gerstner, Generalized integrate-and-fire models of neuronal activity approximate spike trains of a detailed model to a high degree of accuracy, *Journal of Neurophysiology* **92**(2) (2004) 959–976.
- [17] R. Jolivet, A. Rauch, H. Lüscher and W. Gerstner, Predicting spike timing of neocortical pyramidal neurons by simple threshold models, *J Comput Neurosci* **21**(1) (2006) 35–49.
- [18] O. Vidybida, Output stream of a binding neuron, *Ukrainian Mathematical Journal* **59**(12) (2007) 1819–1839.
- [19] O. K. Vidybida, Output stream of leaky integrate and fire neuron, *Reports of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine* **2014**(12) (2014) 18–23.
- [20] J. M. Bekkers, Neurophysiology: Are autapses prodigal synapses?, *Current Biology* **8**(2) (1998) R52–R55.

- [21] A. Bacci, J. R. Huguenard and D. A. Prince, Functional autaptic neurotransmission in fast-spiking interneurons: A novel form of feedback inhibition in the neocortex, *The Journal of Neuroscience* **23**(3) (2003) 859–866.
- [22] A. Bacci, J. R. Huguenard and D. A. Prince, Long-lasting self-inhibition of neocortical interneurons mediated by endocannabinoids, *Nature* **431** (2004) 312–316.
- [23] T. C. Smith and C. E. Jahr, Self-inhibition of olfactory bulb neurons, *Nature Neuroscience* **5**(8) (2002) 760–766.
- [24] L. S. Benardo, Separate activation of fast and slow inhibitory postsynaptic potentials in rat neocortex in vitro, *Journal of Physiology* **476.2** (1994) 203–215.
- [25] J. F. Storm, Four voltage-dependent potassium currents in adult hippocampal pyramidal cells, *Biophys.J.* **53** (1988) p. 148a.
- [26] J. Storm, Potassium currents in hippocampal pyramidal cells, *Progress in Brain Research* **83** (1990) 161–187.
- [27] J. L. Rosselló, V. Canals, A. Morro and A. Oliver, Hardware implementation of stochastic spiking neural networks, *International Journal of Neural Systems* **22**(4) (2012) p. 1250014.
- [28] R. Wang, G. Cohen, K. M. Stiefel, T. J. Hamilton, J. Tapson and A. van Schaik, An FPGA implementation of a polychronous spiking neural network with delay adaptation, *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **7**(14) (2013).
- [29] A. K. Vidybida and K. G. Kravchuk, Firing statistics of inhibitory neuron with delayed feedback. I. output ISI probability density, *BioSystems* **112**(3) (2013) 224–232.
- [30] A. K. Vidybida, Output stream of binding neuron with delayed feedback, *14th International Congress of Cybernetics and Systems of WOSC, Wrocław, Poland, September 9-12, 2008*, eds. J. Józefczyk, W. Thomas and M. Turowska (Oficina Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, 2008), pp. 292–302.
- [31] B. B. Averbeck, Poisson or not Poisson: Differences in spike train statistics between parietal cortical areas, *Neuron* **62**(3) (2009) 310–311.
- [32] S. B. Lowen and M. C. Teich, Auditory-nerve action potentials form a nonrenewal point process over short as well as long time scales, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **92**(2) (1992) 803–806.
- [33] S. Shinomoto, Y. Sakai and S. Funahashi, The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process does not reproduce spiking statistics of cortical neurons, *Neural Computation* **11** (1999) 935–951.

- [34] R. Ratnam and M. E. Nelson, Nonrenewal statistics of electrosensory afferent spike trains: implications for the detection of weak sensory signals, *The Journal of Neuroscience* **20**(17) (2000) 6672–6683.
- [35] M. P. Nawrot, C. Bousein, V. Rodriguez-Molina, A. Aertsen, S. Grün and S. Rotter, Serial interval statistics of spontaneous activity in cortical neurons in vivo and in vitro, *Neurocomputing* **70** (2007) 1717–1722.
- [36] G. Maimon and J. A. Assad, Beyond Poisson: Increased spike-time regularity across primate parietal cortex, *Neuron* **62**(3) (2009) 426–440.
- [37] J. P. Rospars and P. Lánský, Stochastic model neuron without resetting of dendritic potential: application to the olfactory system, *Biol. Cybern.* **69**(4) (1993) 283–294.
- [38] P. Lánský and R. Rodriguez, Two-compartment stochastic model of a neuron, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **132**(1–2) (1999) 267–286.
- [39] E. Benedetto and L. Sacerdote, On dependency properties of the ISIs generated by a two-compartmental neuronal model, *Biol Cybern* **107**(1) (2013) 95–106.
- [40] R. E. Kass, V. Ventura and E. N. Brown, Statistical issues in the analysis of neuronal data, *Journal of Neurophysiology* **94**(1) (2005) 8–25.
- [41] O. Avila-Akerberg and M. J. Chacron, Nonrenewal spike train statistics: causes and functional consequences on neural coding, *Experimental Brain Research* **210**(3-4) (2011) 353–371.
- [42] F. Farkhooi, E. Muller and M.P. Nawrot, Adaptation reduces variability of the neuronal population code, *Phys Rev E* **83**(5) (2011) : 050905.
- [43] B. Cessac, A discrete time neural network model with spiking neurons: II: Dynamics with noise, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **62**(6) (2011) 863–900.