

Trial-Shuffle Method for Inferring Information Transfer in Spike-train Data Sets

Benjamin L. Walker¹, Katherine A. Newhall¹

¹ Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA

Abstract

Understanding information processing in the brain requires the ability to determine the functional connectivity between the different regions of the brain. We present a method using transfer entropy to extract this flow of information between brain regions from spike-train data commonly taken in neurological experiments. Transfer entropy is a statistical measure based in information theory that attempts to quantify the information flow from one process to another, and has been applied to find connectivity in simulated spike train data. Due to statistical error in the estimator, inferring functional connectivity requires a method for determining significance in the transfer entropy values. We discuss the issues with numerical estimation of transfer entropy and resulting challenges in determining significance before presenting the trial-shuffle method as a viable option. The trial-shuffle method, for spike train data that is split into multiple trials, determines significant transfer entropy values independently for each individual pair of neurons, rather than globally comparing all neuron transfer entropy values. We establish the viability of this method by showing that it performs comparably or better to a previous approach in the literature based on the false positive detection rate. We then investigate the performance of the trial-shuffle method in terms of information flow within a network as we vary model parameters.

Introduction

Understanding the flow of information in the brain is a key step in determining how the brain processes information. Methods for observing this flow of information include non-invasive methods such as MEG or calcium imaging that produce a pseudo-continuous image of activity in a brain region [1, 2] but lack high spatial resolution. Another approach, multi-unit recording, is an invasive

method that inserts electrode arrays into the brain to detect when nearby neurons fire [3, 4], producing a detailed measurement of the activity of a small number of neurons. This data can be processed to produce a list of spike-times for each observed neuron known as spike-train data [5]. Analyzing this spike train data can provide a window into how the neurons in the brain interact by identifying causal influences instead of just correlations in average activity.

Early methods of analyzing spike train data include cross-correlation and mutual information [5–7]. These methods seek to measure the similarity of the two spike trains, under the assumption that a causal relation between them will lead to a higher degree of similarity. However, these methods are symmetric, and so even if they do reveal a strong similarity they cannot indicate what the direction of causality is. This desire to reveal the causal relations in data has led to recent investigations into the use of transfer entropy (TE), an asymmetric statistic in information theory [8, 9].

Transfer entropy measures information transfer from a source process to a target process by quantifying the improvement in the ability to predict the future of the target process given knowledge of the past of the source process, over just knowledge of the past of the target. Uncorrelated processes will have an exact TE value of 0, and higher TE values generally correspond to greater transfers of information. Transfer entropy is defined on a pair of processes, but through pairwise evaluation can be extended to an entire network of processes such as a social network [10] or neuronal network [2, 11].

When computationally estimating TE values, statistical noise and bias in the estimator often causes positive TE values when no causal relationship is present. A natural way to determine whether the computed TE value is significant above the noise level is to choose a cutoff that represents the minimum TE value that corresponds to a significant transfer of information. However, TE values depend on the amount of information present, so neurons with higher firing rates will naturally have higher TE values. Because of this, an effort must be made to normalize the TE values onto the same scale before they can be compared, which previous papers have attempted [11, 12], a process we would like to avoid.

Our analysis is motivated by experimental data collected on ferrets performing an attention task [13]. This data consists of sets of 64 12-second trials performed consecutively, with recordings taken from two multi-electrode recorders, one each in the frontal lobe and the parietal lobe. Inspired by this, we consider analysis of models where the network is divided into two densely connected clusters with sparse interconnection, and analyzing simulated data that is split into many short trials instead of one long recording as used previously [14]. Because the data consists of recordings of only a handful of neurons from two distant brain regions, it is unlikely that any two observed neurons will have a direct, structural connection. We must instead be able to detect indirect connections between the neurons, where the signal passes through one or more intermediary neurons, if we want to be able to find any flow of information present between the regions.

We have found that the methods used in previous literature are not effective at determining significance of TE values on this sort of data. We define criteria

for judging the efficacy of methods at this task, and propose the trial-shuffle method to meet these criteria.

Our method makes use of the large number of separate trials to independently assess significance in each pair of observed processes by statistically comparing the distribution of TE values to a known baseline distribution, which we establish by comparing the same pair of neurons across different trials. This bypasses the problem of normalization and prevents focus on only the largest TE values within the network. We then consider how this pairwise analysis can be used to test for course-grain flow of information between the two regions, and the effects of partial observation where not all neurons are recorded. Furthermore, our method uses neither human intervention (e.g. [11, 12]) nor knowledge of the underlying network topology (e.g. [14]) to determine significance. The latter is especially important as it is a requirement for analyzing experimental data.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We begin by describing transfer entropy and our network model, based on the integrate-and-fire neuron model. We then review the factors that affect TE estimation, in particular when applied to our neuron model. Specifically, we look at how TE estimation is influenced by neuron firing rate, coupling strength, trajectory length, and indirect connections. Next, we explain what constitutes, in our view, a good method for determining significance of estimated TE values. We propose the trial-shuffle method and show how it outperforms other existing or simpler methods. Finally, we use the trial-shuffle method to understand how the parameters in the network model affect the ability to detect transfer of information.

Overview of Transfer Entropy and Neuronal Network Model

In this section we will first review the mathematical formulation of transfer entropy, and then present our neuronal network model. In the remainder of this section, we will discuss the issue with numerically estimating transfer entropy values and their significance. Specifically, we look at the effects of firing rate, coupling strength and network path length separation on the numerically estimated transfer entropy values.

Definition of Transfer Entropy

Transfer entropy quantifies the improved predictability about the future of a given temporal sequence Y when including the history of another temporal sequence X , over just the history of Y . Thereby, it attempts to measure the influence of X on Y , and in the context of neuronal networks, measure the functional connectivity from X to Y . Specifically, the transfer entropy from the discrete sequence of random variables X_t to Y_t is expressed as [15]

$$TE_{X \rightarrow Y} = H(Y_t | Y^-) - H(Y_t | Y^-, X^-) \quad (1)$$

where $H(A|B)$ denotes the conditional Shannon entropy

$$H(A|B) = \sum_{i,j} p_{A,B}(a_i, b_j) \log \frac{p_B(b_j)}{p_{A,B}(a_i, b_j)}.$$

Here, we write the formula for discrete random variables A and B with probability mass functions $p_A(a)$, $p_B(b)$ and joint probability mass function $p_{A,B}(a, b)$. In Eq (1), Y_t is the value of sequence Y at time t , and X^- and Y^- refer to the past states of the sequences X_t and Y_t .

In practice, we do not know the true distributions of the random variables, only a collection of observations. The probability distributions must therefore be estimated from these observations.

We use a MATLAB toolbox [14] to numerically estimate the discrete transfer entropy values.

The code takes as input a collection of sequences of sorted spike times. For each pair, it counts occurrences of spikes in both processes separated by a specified delay, and uses these counts to estimate the probability distributions that appear in the TE formula, resulting in a TE value for each pair of processes.

However, with this estimation method, even totally independent sequences will likely produce positive transfer entropy values due to statistical noise. This means that we can only claim that a positive transfer entropy value indicates information transfer if it is large relative to the bias of the estimator, which depends on the input series. After discussing the issues with determining a significant value, we will present our method for determining significance and demonstrate its ability to predict flow of information between two model brain regions.

Neuronal Network Model

We create synthetic data consisting of sequences of spike-times by numerically simulating networks of model neurons. This allows us to control the network structure and therefore the flow of information. For our purposes of studying transfer entropy, we are not concerned with the exact biological details of how the spike times are generated, therefore we choose the computationally simpler model of integrate-and-fire neurons over for example the more realistic Hodgkin-Huxley neuron model. Specifically, in a network of n neurons, the neuronal membrane potentials V_i obey the stochastic differential equation

$$dV_i = \alpha_i(\mu_i - V_i)dt + \beta_i dW_i + \sum_{j,k} c_{ji} \delta(t - \tau_{jk} - d_{ji})dt \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$ is the drift coefficient, $\beta_i > 0$ is the noise coefficient, μ_i is a constant driving input and the $W_i(t)$ are independent standard Brownian motion processes. Whenever a potential V_j reaches the threshold value of 1, the neuron is said to fire a spike and its potential is reset to 0. The potentials of the other neurons i are altered by a value c_{ji} after a delay d_{ji} . The times τ_{jk} are the prior spike times of neuron j .

Neuronal networks are generally sparse, so most values of c_{ji} are 0, but when nonzero, excitatory connections are positive and inhibitory connections are negative. We solve Eq. (2) using a modified Euler-Maruyama method. Each neuron in the network is chosen to be either excitatory or inhibitory. If excitatory, outgoing connections from the neuron, with index j , have $c_{ji} = w_E > 0$, and if inhibitory, $c_{ji} = w_I < 0$.

We will consider a few classes of network topology. For investigation of basic properties, we consider several results from directed chain networks. A directed chain network simply consists of n neurons with connections from neuron k to neuron $k + 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$.

We then construct a more realistic model based on experimental data that focuses on the interaction of two regions of the brain. To model this in our simulated data, we use a variation of the Gilbert model [16] designed to create a two-region network. In the Gilbert model, for each pair of nodes there is an independent chance of an edge being drawn with fixed probability p . We modify this by dividing the nodes into two regions, and using different probabilities depending on whether or not the pair of nodes are in the same region. We require a large number of connections within each cluster and a small number of connections between the regions. Depending on the parameters of the simulation, the connections between regions may be allowed in one, both, or neither direction. All possible connections, taken to be from neuron i to neuron j , are initialized with an independent probability of

$$p_{\text{inside}} = \frac{2k_1}{n}$$

if the neurons are in the same cluster. For a pair of neurons which are in different regions, the probability is either

$$p_{A \rightarrow B} = \frac{4k_A}{n^2} \quad \text{or} \quad p_{B \rightarrow A} = \frac{4k_B}{n^2}$$

depending on the direction of the connection. The parameter k_1 is the average number of outgoing connections a neuron has to other neurons within its region, k_A is the average number of outgoing connections in total from region A to region B, and vice versa for k_B . For example, for a two-region network in which there are only connections from region A to region B, one would set $k_A > 0, k_B = 0$.

Properties of Transfer Entropy on our Model

We will begin by illustrating how the transfer entropy estimation is affected by the input. We show that the estimated TE values can drastically vary independent of the actual causal relation between the neurons. This demonstrates the need for careful determination of the significance of TE values to infer functional connectivity.

Relation between Transfer Entropy bias and Trajectory Length

While theoretically, only correlated sequences would have non-zero transfer entropy values, in practice, the estimation of distributions leads to a positive bias in the estimated TE values. By the law of large numbers, the bias decreases as the observation length of the processes increases and more data is used to estimate the distributions.

To get an intuitive idea of how this error should behave, consider first the simpler case of trying to estimate entropy of a stationary process. Consider a stationary process $Y_t \in \{0, 1\}$ consisting of a sequence of independent, identically distributed Bernoulli random variables with mean p . Clearly the entropy of such a process will be

$$H(Y) = -(p \log p + (1 - p) \log(1 - p)) = \theta(p)$$

If we do not know p , and only know observations of Y_t for $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then we can't compute $\theta(p)$. Instead, we can let \hat{p} be an estimator of p and then estimate the entropy as $\hat{H}(Y) = \theta(\hat{p})$. The question arises: what will be the error in this estimate?

Clearly $\theta(p)$ is a concave function, which tells us that for any imperfect estimator \hat{p} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \theta(\hat{p}) < \theta(\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \hat{p})$$

by Jensen's inequality. We will specifically consider the estimator $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_t$

which is unbiased ($\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \hat{p} = p$) so from the above equation it will always produce an entropy estimate less than the true value. The estimator \hat{p} is distributed as $\frac{1}{n} \text{Binomial}(n, p)$, and by taking a Taylor expansion about the peak p of the distribution of \hat{p} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \theta(\hat{p}) \approx \theta(p) + \theta'(p) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} [\hat{p} - p] + \frac{1}{2} \theta''(p) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} [(\hat{p} - p)^2] = \theta(p) + \frac{\theta''(p)}{2} \text{Var}(\hat{p})$$

We find that the bias in this entropy estimator is approximately

$$\frac{1}{2} \theta''(p) \text{Var}(\hat{p}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{1-p} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \frac{p(1-p)}{n} = -\frac{1}{2n}$$

Given this inverse relationship with the sample length in the simple entropy case, we might expect to see the same inverse relationship when estimating transfer entropy of our spike train data. To demonstrate this relationship, we simulated a network of 50 neurons with no connections, and estimated the TE for various observation lengths. These TE values, averaged over the population, are shown in Fig 1(a). We can see that the estimated TE between independent processes does decay with increased observation time, and for sufficiently long time it follows an inverse relationship.

Firing Rate vs. Transfer Entropy

When determining significance, one might attempt to compare computed TE values across all pairs in the network to obtain a single cutoff value, above which indicates a transfer of information. However, since factors like firing rate affect the magnitude of the TE values, pairs with greater TE values do not necessarily have a stronger flow of information or even a connection at all. Intuitively, this increase in TE value with firing rate can be understood by considering that spike train data consists of a sequence of correlated Bernoulli random variables which maximize their entropy at $p = 0.5$. Because the neuron firing rate per bin is much less than 0.5, an increase in firing rate increases the entropy of the process and correspondingly increases the transfer entropy. Due to the nature of the estimator, we would also expect that independent processes have higher estimated TE values when firing rates are higher.

Given this, we would like to understand the effect that the firing rate of neurons has on the estimated TE between them. We expect that higher firing rate neurons will have inflated TE values, independent of whether or not the pairs are actually connected. Fig 1(b) shows the sharp increase in TE values for higher firing rate neurons, for a collection of neurons with no connections between them. This demonstrates why some sort of normalization is required if one wishes to compare estimated TE values from different pairs of neurons with different firing rates, especially for a collection of heterogeneous neurons as one might find *in vivo*. This normalization is difficult even for just the firing rate due to its asymmetric non-linear dependence shown in Fig. 1(b). Furthermore, firing rate is not the only factor influencing TE values.

Coupling Strength vs. Transfer Entropy

Naturally, neurons connected with a higher coupling strength will generally have higher TE values observed between them. This bears relevance on our ability to detect weaker connections, which are harder to detect when the signal-to-noise ratio is low. We illustrate this effect with a pair of neurons by varying their coupling strength.

The data, as shown in Fig 1(c), suggests that for small coupling strength the estimated TE values are roughly proportional to the square of the coupling strength. As might be expected, once the coupling strength is comparable to the distance between the reset value and the firing threshold of the model neurons, the target neuron always fires after the source neuron does and therefore further increasing the coupling strength does not actually increase the transfer of information from the source neuron to the target neuron, causing the TE value to plateau. Notice how a low-firing rate, strongly coupled neuron pair and a high-firing rate, weakly coupled neuron pair could therefore both produce the same TE value.

Indirect Connections

Another issue in detecting functional connections in experimental data is that typically only a fraction of neurons are observed, so it is unlikely that one would always observe pairs of directly connected neurons. In order to detect functional connectivity, we must therefore be able to detect indirect connections. Here, we review how estimated transfer entropy values are affected by increasingly indirect connections. Fig 1(d) shows the transfer entropy computed down the length of three chains of varying coupling strength. All three chains show that the direct connection from the head neuron to the first neuron down the chain is very significant, but they vary significantly in how the transfer entropy values decay further down the chain. In the weakest coupling strength chain, the values decay almost immediately to noise levels, meaning detecting more than one or two neurons down the chain would be difficult. In the medium coupling strength chain, there appears to be an exponential decay, falling to noise levels after about 5 neurons. However, in the strongest coupling strength chain, there is a seemingly linear decay of transfer entropy, but it does not decay down to 0. Because the value of $w_E = 1.5$ here is greater than the firing threshold of 1, this parameter allows for a wave of firing to consistently move from the head neuron all the way down the chain, which leads to high TE values for even the furthest neuron down the chain.

Trial-Shuffle Method for Significance Testing

The main goal of this paper is to find a good method for determining significance of transfer entropy values given the data format consisting of many short trials. As shown in the previous section, simply looking for the largest TE values across all pairs of neurons in a network will generally overlook weak connections and favor high firing-rate neurons. Circumventing this by first normalizing the TE values [11] is difficult due to the complicated dependence on factors like firing rates of the source and target neurons. Rather, we wish to circumvent such problems by considering statistical methods that avoid global comparisons of TE values. To this end, we first lay out guidelines for what constitutes a good statistical method before presenting the trial-shuffle method as a candidate. We end the section by showing how this trial-shuffle method outperforms a method used in prior literature for assessing significance of TE values.

Conditions

We propose the following four guiding criteria for a method to determine flow of information:

1. Strong ability to find weak/indirect connections in a network
2. Robust handling of heterogenous networks
3. No human input into the significance determination process

4. No knowledge of underlying network topology required

The reasons for these conditions are as follows: The method must be effective at detecting connections. Strong, direct connections are trivial to detect, but when investigating functional connectivity it is important to be able to detect weak and indirect connections. So, our first condition is that the method must be effective at detecting connections that are weak or indirect. As we have established previously, neurons with higher firing rates can have falsely inflated TE values, and this could lead to false detection if the method does not carefully handle it. Unlike in many artificial neuron models, real experimental data show neurons exhibiting a high variability in firing rate.

This motivates the second condition, that the method is clearly robust in handling neurons of different firing rate.

The third condition, pertaining to the method’s design, is that the method should not involve human decision-making at any point in the process. With an increased focus on big data in computational neuroscience, human analysis falls flat in terms of scalability. Our last condition is motivated by the experimental data: the method must require no information beyond the spike train data. Because the experimental data consists only of recorded spike trains, a method that can actually be applied to it must require no further information about the network.

The Trial-Shuffle Method

In order to automatically handle the effects of varying neuron firing rate and other factors on the estimated TE values, we consider the usage of pairwise methods that determine the significance of the TE value between each pair of neurons in isolation from all other pairs. This prevents the possibility of neurons being overshadowed by other neurons with higher estimated TE values.

Prior literature has used methods in which a statistical baseline is computed using some sort of Monte Carlo method, and then the TE values are compared to this baseline distribution [17]. Inspired by typical experimental data consisting of multiple repeated trials, we create a baseline for each pair of neurons by computing the TE from the source neuron in one trial to the target neuron in a different trial. Due to the time separation between trials, there cannot be actual transfer of information between the neurons, and any positive TE values must therefore be insignificant.

To apply this idea, a number of “replaced” trials are assembled, where the data for each neuron is taken from a different original trial. For example, one might combine the data for neuron 1 from trial 1, neuron 2 from trial 2, etc. into a single replaced trial. By assembling the data this way, we can compute all the pairwise TE values for a shuffled trial and produce baseline values for all pairs simultaneously. Since typically fewer neurons are observed than exist trials, it is possible to construct data in this way, with each spike train in a shuffled trial coming from a different experimental trial. This method is also not limited to having fewer observed neurons than trials. In such a case, not

all the baselines could be computed simultaneously, but could still be computed independently.

We create a number of different shuffled trials to obtain a distribution of insignificant TE for each individual pair of neurons to serve as the baseline distributions for comparison. At the same time, we compute all of the pairwise TE values for each of the experimental trials, without shuffling. These values are collected to create the experimental distribution of TE values for each neuron. At this point, we deem the connection to exhibit a significant transfer of information if the values in the experimental distribution for that pair of neurons are statistically significantly greater than those in the respective baseline distribution.

To determine significance, we must test whether the distribution of estimated TE values from each of the trials is significantly greater than the distribution of TE values taken from time-shuffled comparisons.

This is determined using a signed-rank test. To extend this to a determination of overall connectivity between regions, the total number of significant connections between regions is added up in each direction, and a p-value is produced by comparing against the binomial distribution, which would give the expected number of significant connections found under the null hypothesis of region independence. If this hypothesis is rejected, we consider there to be directed information transfer in the appropriate direction.

Validation of Method

Previous literature has determined significance of estimated TE values by comparing them to a cutoff chosen to enforce a certain false positive rate [14].

To define a false positive, we classify a directed pair of neurons (a, b) as such:

1. Direct Connection - Neuron a has a direct structural connection to neuron b ($c_{ab} \neq 0$)
2. Indirect Connection - A sequence of multiple structural connections connect neuron a to neuron b .
3. No Connection - It is impossible to reach neuron b from neuron a traveling through the network.

We define a false positive as a connection of type 3, where no transfer of information is possible, that is detected as having a significant transfer of information.

To extend this approach to the multiple trial data format, we take the mean TE value across all of the trials for each pair of neurons, and then apply the standard false positive cutoff approach by choosing the cutoff to be the value such that only 5% of unconnected pairs of neurons have a mean TE value above the cutoff. A pair of neurons whose mean TE is above the cutoff is then deemed significant.

However, determining whether a given detected connection is a false positive requires that we know the true network topology, not just the spike trains. Since

we are trying to build a method that can extract a large-scale property from this true network topology, taking only spike-train data as an input, the false positive method is not available to us, but rather, provides a good benchmark to understand the performance of our trial-shuffle method relative to a previously used approach in the literature.

For our comparison test, we begin by creating a network according to the Gilbert model as explained previously, and then use both the false positive method and our trial-shuffle method to identify connections. To parallel previous work [14] we will report the fraction of connections that were identified for various lengths of connection, and we will also compare the number of false positives from each method.

Fig 2 shows the percentage of connections present in the network that are identified as significant by each method. Only connections among excitatory neurons are considered, as inhibitory connections do not transfer much information in the spike-train data. Connections of length above 4 are not shown as they are not present in great enough quantity to produce meaningful information. Throughout the parameter space (three typical cases shown) the trial-shuffle method performed at least comparably to the false positive method. The three cases shown have roughly the same firing rate activity, which is achieved by lowering the coupling strength within the network while increasing the external drive to the neurons when going from panel (a) to (b) to (c) in Fig 2. In panels (a) and (b), the cases of higher coupling strengths the trial-shuffle method significantly outperformed the false positive method, especially when considering indirection connections. This is expected, as the indirect connections, which have lower transfer entropy when compared to the direct connections, are not overshadowed by higher TE direct connections in the trial-shuffle method, and are therefore more easily detected.

It is important to note that the false positive method performs similarly in each of these three cases, and its decay with connection length is controlled by the fact that TE values are smaller (see Fig. 1(d)), and therefore less are chosen as significant. The trial-shuffle method is able to perform better with higher coupling to detect indirect connections because these transfer entropy values are compared independently from the higher TE valued directly connected pairs. As the coupling strength lowers, and less information is passed through indirect connections, the trial-shuffle method loses this advantage, performing equally to the false positive method.

While the false positive method always has a false positive rate of 5% by design, the trial-shuffle method for the three cases above has false positive rates of 14.8% in the case of (a), 13.4% in the case of (b) and 4.3% in the case of (c). Having a higher false positive rate is not necessarily a bad thing, as we are specifically trying to construct a method to understand large-scale flow of information rather than a detailed and accurate description of network connections. When there is a large amount of information flowing from one region of our model network to the other, as is the case with stronger coupling within the network, we might expect to pick up this flow of information between unconnected neuron pairs. Specifically, in all of these cases, the false detection rate of

connections from region B to A, the direction in which there are no connections present, was under 5%. Furthermore, we reiterate the fact that the false positive method requires the answer as an input, while the trial-shuffle method does not get this added information. Therefore, even with higher false positive rates, the trial-shuffle method is an appropriate method to use from the viewpoint of the requirements listed above under Conditions.

Inferring Information Transfer

We will now present some results showing the ability of the trial-shuffle method to determine the flow of information. We will also show how the ability of the method to correctly determine the causal links between regions in the two-region system depends on the parameters used.

A natural question is the relationship between the coupling strength of two neurons and our ability to detect a connection between them. Obviously, we would expect a stronger connection to be more likely to be detected as significant. To investigate this, we created a directed chain network of 20 neurons, and investigated the detected connections originating from the neuron at the head of the chain. In theory, this neuron is connected to all 19 neurons down the chain from it; however, when the coupling strength is low these connections will likely not all be able to be detected. For an ensemble of 1000 trials, we observed how many neurons down the chain were detected as connected to the head neuron, and these results are shown in Fig 3. We therefore see, depending on the coupling strength, how long a sample must be taken to reliably detect direct connections or some indirect connections.

Especially visible in the $t_{max} = 100$ case is the nonlinear structure of the data. As the coupling strength increases, the probability of detecting a connection to the first neuron increases quadratically. This intuitively aligns with what we previously found in Fig 1(c), that the transfer entropy itself increases quadratically with coupling strength. After the coupling strength is high enough that the first connection can be very consistently detected, the second connection does not immediately become detectable. Instead, there is a region in which increasing the coupling strength does not increase the length of connection detected.

The most important thing we want to understand is how the degree of connectivity in the two-region network relates to the ability of our method to correctly identify the flow of information. We will be again considering the two-region network with unidirectional flow, e.g. from region $A \rightarrow B$ but not from $B \rightarrow A$. The connectivity can be influenced both by the edge probability parameters k_1 and k_A and the number of neurons N in the network. We would like to find a way to quantify the amount of inter-region connectivity across networks with variation in all of these parameters. To this end, we introduce a variation of the global efficiency [18], which is the average of the inverse shortest path length between all pairs of nodes. Our variation measures the directed efficiency from region A to B by considering only those paths from a neuron in region A to a neuron in region B, and then averaging the inverse shortest path length.

We generated a large number of networks of varying sizes from $n = 50$ to 1000, $k_1 = 2$ or 3, and $k_A \in \{n/2, n/2 + 1, \dots, 2n\}$, leading to a wide range of directed efficiencies. For each of these networks we run 10 sessions to get a quantification of the spread in potential detection. Fig 4 shows the number of detected connections for each network against the directed efficiency. This confirms the expected, that more connected networks have a higher number of connections detected. At an efficiency of approximately 0.28, the method begins to always detect the regions as being connected, although it frequently still does so for lower values. Also of interest is the fairly narrow spread in detection across the substantial variation in parameters for the lower efficiency range. This suggests that our method is stable across a variety of networks.

We would also like to see how the ability of our method to detect connections improves using trials of increasing time length. Recall Fig 1(a), which shows that the noise in the TE estimator is inversely proportional to the length of time in the trial. This suggests that a longer trial should have a higher signal-to-noise ratio and correspondingly better detection. Additionally, since neurons are actually connected in this network, the longer time means that there are more chances for a neuron to affect another, meaning there is more information transfer for the method to find. Fig 5 shows the number of significant connections detected between regions in each direction, for a network that only contained $A \rightarrow B$ inter-region connections with 50 neurons. In line with our expectations, we see a steady increase in the number of connections we detect as the length of the simulation increases.

Discussion

We introduced a novel trial-shuffle method for determining the significance of transfer entropy values in an objective way for data comprised of multiple trials. Our results and analysis showed that the most notable improvement of the trial-shuffle method over the false positive method established in the literature is in the detection of indirect connections. This improvement is likely due to the fact that the weaker indirect connections correspond to lower TE values because the connections are legitimately less significant. In establishing significance, our method accounts for the variability in transfer entropy values (c.f. Fig. 1), unlike the false positive method in which high firing rate disconnected neuron pairs can overshadow lower firing rate weakly connected pairs. Furthermore, the trial-shuffle method does not require knowledge of the underlying network topology. For these reasons, our method will likely be suitable for finding flow of information in experimental data for which the network structure is not known and connections are often weak or indirect given that only a small fraction of the network is observed.

Instead of shuffling together spike train data from different trials, a simpler idea to create a pairwise baseline would be to randomize the spike times of each trial, shuffling them in time. This will create baseline data that has the same firing rate as the actual trial, but the time shuffling will certainly destroy

all causality. We implemented this method, but when testing it on simulated data we found that it resulted in too many false positives, such that it would frequently find bidirectional flow of information on a two-region network when actually the information flowed only in one direction. We hypothesize that the loss of the temporal structure in the data causes the time shuffling to fail, as the trial-shuffle method preserves this structure.

Our method focused on data separated into trials, to allow for a course-grained shuffling in time. The time shuffling method is another extreme of this shuffling in which the data is shuffled on the order of a single observation time step. The fact that the time shuffle method fails to accurately determine significance whereas the trial-shuffle method does not suggests that shuffling is only valid when done on a sufficiently course timescale. There is presumably some “minimum time window” that could be shuffled. We hypothesize that this time window must be greater than the timescale at which information flows through the network. Breaking up data on such a timescale and then shuffling it will allow the trial-shuffle method to be extended to spike train data consisting only of a single long recording, instead of a number of separate recorded trials, as long as analysis confirmed a robust choice of shuffling timescale.

Real-world data brings many additional challenges when looking for functional connectivity. We expect connections to be in general weaker, and the number of neurons is many times greater than used in our simulated tests. This is balanced to a degree by the fact that neurons in the brain are extremely well organized to facilitate the flow of information, in contrast to the random connections in our simulated network. This may lead to greater sensitivity of the method, as detection could depend heavily on whether an organized pathway is actually picked up by the probes.

We might try to mitigate this by obtaining more data, as we have shown the ability to detect connections scales with the amount of observed data. Depending on the nature of the experiment, it may or may not be possible to increase the length of the observed trials. Instead, more data could be obtained by increasing the number of trials. However, the analysis requires that the same neurons be recorded consistently over all of the trials, and small movements of the probes over time can potentially cause neurons to be lost in the recording. These challenges in obtaining large amounts of experimental data highlight the importance of a statistical analysis that is as powerful as possible.

A modification to the neuronal network model could allow for testing on a more organized network in future work. Various methods exist to organize information flow in a neuronal network, including Spike-timing Dependent Plasticity (STDP) and other extensions of the Hebbian learning philosophy. A meaningful external drive could also be applied to create a source of non-random information. These methods could be used to create a network that has more concentrated connections that direct information flow instead of diffusing it as in a random network. Computational advances could also help bridge the wide gap between the number of neurons we used in simulated networks, up to 1000, and the many billions of neurons actually present in the human brain. This would allow us to see the effect that the vastly sparser observation has on the results,

when coupled with the increase in organization as described above.

Many variations and extensions of transfer entropy have been explored in the literature. While we used a basic transfer entropy in our analysis, our method can be trivially generalized to any measure of connectivity. Of particular interest are multivariate extensions of transfer entropy, which in addition to controlling for information contained in the past of the target process, can control for information present in other processes besides the source, so that the transfer entropy value reflects the information coming from the source neuron and not from any of the other neurons.

These tools, combined with an effective method to determine significance such as the trial-shuffle method, could be used to create functional connectivity graphs that show how information is actually moving between the neurons based on spike train data. This would then allow a more in-depth understanding of how the neuronal networks in the brain actually process information.

References

1. Orlandi JG, Stetter O, Soriano J, Geisel T, Battaglia D. Transfer entropy reconstruction and labeling of neuronal connections from simulated calcium imaging. *PloS one*. 2014;9(6):e98842.
2. Vicente R, Wibral M, Lindner M, Pipa G. Transfer entropy: a model-free measure of effective connectivity for the neurosciences. *Journal of computational neuroscience*. 2011;30(1):45–67.
3. Green J. A simple microelectrode for recording from the central nervous system. *Nature*. 1958;182(4640):962–962.
4. Humphrey DR, Schmidt EM. In: Boulton AA, Baker GB, Vanderwolf CH, editors. *Extracellular Single-Unit Recording Methods*. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press; 1990. p. 1–64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1385/0-89603-185-3:1>.
5. Brown EN, Kass RE, Mitra PP. Multiple neural spike train data analysis: state-of-the-art and future challenges. *Nature neuroscience*. 2004;7(3):456–461.
6. Borst A, Theunissen FE. Information theory and neural coding. *Nature neuroscience*. 1999;2(11):947–957.
7. Nirenberg S, Carcieri SM, Jacobs AL, Latham PE. Retinal ganglion cells act largely as independent encoders. *Nature*. 2001;411(6838):698–701.
8. Schreiber T. Measuring information transfer. *Physical review letters*. 2000;85(2):461–464.
9. Kaiser A, Schreiber T. Information transfer in continuous processes. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*. 2002;166(1):43–62.

10. Ver Steeg G, Galstyan A. Information transfer in social media. In: Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web. ACM; 2012. p. 509–518.
11. Gourévitch B, Eggermont JJ. Evaluating information transfer between auditory cortical neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2007;97(3):2533–2543.
12. Li Z, Li X. Estimating temporal causal interaction between spike trains with permutation and transfer entropy. *PloS one*. 2013;8(8):e70894.
13. Sellers KK, Yu C, Zhou ZC, Stitt I, Li Y, Radtke-Schuller S, et al. Oscillatory dynamics in the frontoparietal attention network during sustained attention in the ferret. *Cell reports*. 2016;16(11):2864–2874.
14. Ito S, Hansen M, et al. Extending Transfer Entropy Improves Identification of Effective Connectivity in a Spiking Cortical Network Model. *PloS one*. 2011;6(11):e27431.
15. Wibral M, Vicente R, Lindner M. Transfer Entropy in Neuroscience. In: Directed Information Measures in Neuroscience. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg; 2014.
16. Gilbert EN. Random graphs. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 1959;30(4):1141–1144.
17. Bauer M, Cox JW, Caveness MH, Downs JJ, Thornhill NF. Finding the direction of disturbance propagation in a chemical process using transfer entropy. *IEEE transactions on control systems technology*. 2007;15(1):12–21.
18. Latora V, Marchiori M. Efficient behavior of small-world networks. *Physical review letters*. 2001;87(19):198701.




Figure 1: (a) Black: Relationship between observation length and estimated TE averaged over a simulated network of disconnected neurons. Red line gives a sample slope of -1 . (b) Relationship between neuron firing rate and calculated TE values showing an asymmetric non-linear dependence. (c) Relationship between coupling strength and TE values showing an initial quadratic dependence before saturating due to the target neuron always firing after the source neuron. (d) Computed TE values for indirectly connected neurons down a chain with three different coupling strengths $w_E = 0.5, 0.8, 1.5$ showing that higher w_E causes significant TE values further down the chain. When $w_E > 1$ the TE does not decay to 0 as the target neuron is guaranteed to fire upon receiving a spike from the source neuron.




Figure 2: Comparison of the false positive and trial-shuffle methods in terms of fraction of detected connections vs. path length in the network. For all frames $n = k_A = 50, k_B = 0$ (a) $w_E = 0.7, w_I = -0.8, \mu = 0$ and $k_1 = 2$ (b) $w_E = 0.4, w_I = -0.5, \mu = 0.2$ and $k_1 = 3$ (c) $w_E = 0.27, w_I = -0.3, \mu = 1$ and $k_1 = 3$.




Figure 3: For a range of connection strengths w_E and three total simulation times t_{max} , how many neurons down the chain are detected as connected to the head, on average.




Figure 4: $A \rightarrow B$ efficiency vs detection. The red line indicates the significant level of connections indicating transfer of information between regions.




Figure 5: Number of detected connections vs. simulation time for each trial. Blue = $A \rightarrow B$, red = $B \rightarrow A$. The black line indicates the level above which the number of connections is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).