

---

# On the Relation of Impulse Propagation to Synaptic Strength

---

Lan Sizhong  
NZQRC  
Beijing, China  
lsz@nzqrc.cn

## Abstract

In neural network, synaptic strength could be seen as probability to transmit impulse, and function could exist from transmission probability to synaptic strength. If the function satisfies constraint such as continuity and monotonicity, neural network would always go to one unique fixed point. A biological image classifier is proposed to utilize this fixed point.

## 1 Introduction

This paper proposes an image classifier inspired by biological neural network. Compared to the known image classifiers [1, 2, 3] based on artificial neural network (ANN) [4] and backpropagation [5], our approach is more biologically relevant in two aspects. First, the training and testing of this classifier is entirely neurobiological process, and no arithmetic operations (e.g., +, -,  $\times$  and /) is required (although our simulations are run with computer). Second, instead of computing and comparing cross-entropy, its classification criterion is simplified to counting synaptic connections fired, which is probably the most intrinsic capability of intelligence.

Our classifier is built on the model of synaptic connection and neural network. For synaptic connection, rather than describe its strength with weight scalar as in the perceptron [6, 7] for machine learning, we see its strength as probabilistic capability [8] to transmit action potential or impulse. And there are experiments results showing that "neurons that fire together wire together" [9, 10], that is, synaptic connection strengthens or weakens over time in response to increases or decreases in impulse transmission [11, 12]. This biochemical mechanism, called synaptic plasticity, inspires us that there might be a relation between the synaptic strength and the transmission probability. Specifically, it would be a function from transmission probability to synaptic strength, which is also probability in our model. We find out that, with reasonable constraints of continuity, monotonicity and derivative on this function, the synaptic strength under impulse has a tendency towards a unique fixed point, and stays fixed after arriving at the fixed point. With those constraints, neural network of many synaptic connections under stimulus, as a whole, also has this tendency towards a unique fixed point.

The tendency towards this unique fixed point is where our image classifier weighs in. We will train ten neural networks by stimulating them each with image of digit from 0 to 9, until they reach fixed points. And then we will classify digit images by stimulating the neural networks with those images and making classification decision by which neural network has the most synaptic connections fired. We will show that, with careful choice of function as mentioned, the classification turns out to be approximately linear.

The remainder of paper goes as follows. Section 2 presents the model of synaptic connection, the unique existence of synaptic strength's fixed point, and the tendency towards it. Likewise, Section 3 presents the model of neural network and its fixed point. Section 4 provides details about

the implementation of our classifier. Section 5 concludes with discussion on how to improve the prediction accuracy of the classifier. Each section has its simulations.

## 2 Synaptic connection and its fixed point

Figure 1: The synaptic connection with strength  $s$  is directed from neuron 1 to neuron 2. Synaptic connection receives nerve impulse from neuron 1 with probability  $x$  and propagate impulse to neuron 2. As a result, neuron 2 receives impulse with probability  $y$ .




Figure 1 shows our model of a synaptic connection. If we **assume** synaptic strength  $s$  to be the probability (capability) of propagating a nerve impulse successfully through the connection, we have  $y=xs$  where random variables  $x, s, y \in [0, 1]$ . We name  $x$  impulse probability, and  $y$  propagation probability because it measures the rate of successful propagation given impulse  $x$ . Now in the sense that impulse propagation affects synaptic strength, we further **assume** that there exists a function

$$s^* = \lambda(y). \quad (1)$$

Here random variable  $s^* \in [0, 1]$  represents the target strength a connection will be strengthened or weakened to over time if the connection is under propagation probability  $y$  constantly, while strength  $s$  in  $y=xs$  represents current strength. By  $y=xs$  and Equation (1), we have  $s^* = \lambda(y) = \lambda(xs)$  which says, under constant impulse probability  $x$ , the connection initialized with strength  $s$  will develop to have strength  $s^*$  over time. Now with these two assumptions, we could put constraints on function  $\lambda$  of Equation (1) to see how they affect the dynamics of connection strength.

**Constraint 1:**  $\lambda$  is continuous on  $y$ .

In that case, given any  $s$ ,  $\lambda(xs)$  in is a continuous function from unit interval  $[0, 1]$  to unit interval  $[0, 1]$ , and there must exist a fixed point  $s^+ \in [0, 1]$  such that  $s^+ = \lambda(xs^+)$ : connection strength will fixate at  $s^+$ , no longer strengthened or weakened. Moreover, as illustrated in Figure 2, given any initial value the strength always goes to fixed point.




Figure 2: Two examples of  $\lambda(xs)$  on  $s$  are depicted as red bold lines, and fixed points as blue dots. **(a)** Given any initial  $s_1 < \lambda(xs_1)$ , there must exist a fixed point  $s^+ \in (s_1, 1]$ ; strength  $s$  tends to increase from  $s_1$  as long as target strength  $\lambda(xs) > s$ . Given any initial  $s_2 > \lambda(xs_2)$ , there must exist a fixed point  $s^+ \in [0, s_2]$ ; strength  $s$  tends to decrease from  $s_2$  as long as target strength  $\lambda(xs) < s$ . Controlled by these two tendencies,  $s$  will reach and stay at fixed point. **(b)** There are three fixed points  $\{0, s^+, 1\}$ . Starting from any initial  $s_1 \in (0, s^+)$ , strength decreases to 0. Starting from any initial  $s_2 \in (s^+, 1)$ , strength increases to 1. So strength tends to leave unstable fixed point  $s^+$ .

To verify connection strength's tendency towards fixed points, we design Algorithm 1 to simulate our connection model. In this simulation<sup>1</sup>, recent successful propagations is recorded, and the success

<sup>1</sup>Source code can be found at <https://github.com/lansiz/neuron>.

rate is supposed to approximate propagation probability  $y$ ; the connection strength changes by a small step each iteration to the direction of target strength. As shown in Figure 3, we run the simulation for four typical  $\lambda$  functions, and the strength trajectories resulted shows that constraint of continuity guarantees the tendency towards fixed points given any initial strength.

Algorithm 1: connection strength's tendency to fixed points

---

```

Input: impulse probability  $x$ , initial strength  $s_0$ , function  $\lambda$ .
initialize propagation recorder ( $10^4$ -entries array)  $recorder \leftarrow 0$  and pointer  $p \leftarrow 0$ .
initialize current strength  $s \leftarrow s_0$ .
for  $i=0$  to  $iterations$  do
     $recorder[p] \leftarrow 0$ 
    pick two random numbers  $r1$  and  $r2$  from uniform distribution  $Unif(0, 1)$ .
    if  $x > r1$  and  $s > r2$  then propagate successfully  $recorder[p] \leftarrow 1$  end if
    if propagation recorder has been traversed once ( $i > 10^4$ ) then
         $y \leftarrow ones/10^4$  where  $ones$  is the number of 1 in  $recorder$ .
        target strength  $s^* \leftarrow \lambda(y)$ .
        if  $s^* > s$  then increase current strength  $s \leftarrow \min(s+10^{-4}, 1)$  end if
        if  $s^* < s$  then decrease current strength  $s \leftarrow \max(0, s-10^{-4})$  end if
    end if
    forward recorder pointer  $p \leftarrow (p+1) \bmod 10^4$ .
end for
return the trajectory of strength  $s$ .

```

---




Figure 3: Simulations results for four typical  $\lambda$  functions. For each  $\lambda$ , simulation is parameterized with impulse probability  $x=.8$  and initial strength  $s_0$ . In each subfigure, the left diagram depicts  $\lambda(y)$  as black line, its horizontally scaled  $\lambda(xs)$  in red line and fixed points as blue dots; the right diagram shows the strength trajectories starting from 11 incremental  $s_0$ . **(a)**  $\lambda(y)=.9y+.05$ . There exists a single fixed point. All strength trajectories converge to it. **(b)**  $\lambda(y)=.5\sin(4\pi y)+.5$ . Three fixed points. Higher  $s_0$  converges to higher fixed point; lower  $s_0$  converges to lower one; No convergence to the middle unstable fixed point. **(c)**  $\lambda(y)=-y+1$ . One single fixed point. All trajectories converge. **(d)** Discontinuous  $\lambda$ . No fixed point. No convergence of trajectories.

Following Constraint 1, we take another **Constraint 2**:  $\lambda$  is strictly monotonic on  $y$ . That is,  $\lambda'(y) > 0$  for any  $y \in [0, 1]$  or  $\lambda'(y) < 0$  for any  $y \in [0, 1]$ . In that case, function  $\lambda$  has inverse function  $\lambda^{-1}$  which is also strictly monotonic, and for any fixed point  $s^+ \neq 0$  we have  $x = \lambda^{-1}(s^+)/s^+$ . Let  $x = \theta(s) = \lambda^{-1}(s)/s$ . Then  $\theta$  is a many-to-one mapping if the strength has more than one fixed point. For the strength to have one single fixed point given impulse  $x$ , function  $\theta$  must be strictly monotonic on  $s$  such that  $\theta'(s) > 0$  for any  $s$  or  $\theta'(s) < 0$  for any  $s$ . That introduces to  $\lambda$  **Constraint 3**:  $(\lambda^{-1})'(s)s > \lambda^{-1}(s)$  for any  $s \in (0, 1]$ , or  $(\lambda^{-1})'(s)s < \lambda^{-1}(s)$  for any  $s \in (0, 1]$ . These three constraints combined is a necessary condition for the unique existence of strength's fixed point. They are not sufficient one because, e.g.,  $\lambda(y) = .8y$  allows a single fixed point at  $s=0$  and yet its reverse function doesn't satisfies Constraint 3.

Among the four  $\lambda$  functions in Figure 3, monotonically increasing  $\lambda(y) = .9y + .05$  and monotonically decreasing  $\lambda(y) = -y + 1$  obey all three constraints, each having one single fixed point of strength.

This type of  $\lambda$  functions are of our interest because not only themselves, but also their derived functions  $y=\lambda^{-1}(s)$ ,  $x=\theta(s)$ , and  $s=\theta^{-1}(x)$  are continuous and strictly monotonic, which is the purpose of our putting constraints on  $\lambda$ . With these functions, we could (1) as shown in Figure 4, given any impulse  $x\in[0, 1]$ , identify without ambiguity the fixed point  $s^+$  of connection strength; (2) given any connection strength  $s^+\in[0, 1]$  at fixed point, identify without ambiguity impulse  $x$  and propagation  $y$ . Our interpretation is, synaptic connection at fixed point "stores" the information of what (impulse) it senses and how it responds (with propagation).




Figure 4: Simulation results on the relation of fixed point strength and impulse probability. Simulation is parameterized with  $\lambda$  and incremental  $x$ , and run ten trails for each  $x$ . The averages of ten  $s^+$  at incremental  $x$  are connected by red line. The blue line represents  $s^+=\theta^{-1}(x)$ . (a) Simulation is parameterized with  $\lambda(y)=.9y+.05$  and results match  $\theta^{-1}(x)=.05/(1-.9x)$  which is monotonically increasing. (b) Simulation is parameterized with  $\lambda(y)=-y+1$  and results match  $\theta^{-1}(x)=1/(1+x)$  which is monotonically decreasing.

### 3 Neural network and its fixed point

Figure 5: The neural network (of one or multiple agents) consists of  $n\geq 2$  neurons and  $c\geq 1$  directed synaptic connections. Each neuron **independently** receives stimulus from environment with probability and propagates out nerve impulses through synaptic connections.




Figure 5 shows our model of neural network. As with a single synaptic connection, we could describe neural network in terms of stimulus, synaptic strength and propagation. We define (1) stimulus as an  $n$ -dimensional vector  $X\in[0, 1]^n$  in which each  $x_i$  is the probability of neuron  $i$  receiving stimulus; (2) connections' strength as a  $c$ -dimensional vector  $S\in[0, 1]^c$  in which each  $s_{ij}$  is the strength of connection from neuron  $i$  to neuron  $j$ ; (3) propagation as a  $c$ -dimensional vector  $Y\in[0, 1]^c$  in which each  $y_{ij}$  is the propagation probability of connection from neuron  $i$  to neuron  $j$ .

Stimulus and strength determines the propagation within neural network, so there exists a mapping  $\Psi : (X, S)\rightarrow Y$ . Presumably, the mapping  $\Psi$  is continuous on  $S$ . By Equation (1), there exists a mapping  $\Lambda : Y\rightarrow S^*$ , where  $S^*\in[0, 1]^c$  is  $c$ -dimensional vector of connections' target strength; each connection from neuron  $i$  to  $j$  has its own target strength function  $\lambda_{ij}$ ;  $s_{ij}^*=\lambda_{ij}(y_{ij})$  for any  $s_{ij}^*$  in  $S^*$ . (Mapping  $\Lambda$  could be visualized as a vector of functions such that  $\Lambda_{ij}=\lambda_{ij}$ .) With mapping  $\Psi$  and  $\Lambda$ , we have a composite mapping  $\Lambda\circ\Psi : (X, S)\rightarrow S^*$ . If each  $\lambda_{ij}$  function is continuous on its  $y_{ij}$ , mapping  $\Lambda\circ\Psi$  must be continuous on  $S$ , and according to Brouwer's Fixed Point theorem [13] given  $S$  there exists one fixed point  $S^+\in[0, 1]^c$  such that  $\Lambda\circ\Psi(X, S^+)=S^+$ .

Given stimulus, connections in neural network shall tend to their fixed points, and consequently so shall neural network as a whole. To verify this tendency, we design Algorithm 2 to simulate neural network under stimulus, which extends Algorithm 1 with propagation path finding across connections. In Figure 6, simulation results for the four typical  $\lambda$  functions show the tendency.

We can see the definitions and reasoning about neural network align with those about one neural connection, except that definitions are multidimensional for neural network. In fact, neural connection is a special case of neural network with  $c=1$  and  $n=2$ . (In this sense, neural network can be visualized to be an "aggregate connection".) So far, we show that continuity of  $\lambda$  function, one of the three

---

Algorithm 2: neural network's tendency to fixed points

---

**Input:** stimulus vector  $X$ , initial strength vector  $S_0$ , mapping  $\Lambda$ .  
initialize current strength  $S \leftarrow S_0$ .  
**for**  $l=0$  **to**  $iterations$  **do**  
    form a vector  $V$  of  $n$  random numbers from  $Unif(0,1)$ .  
    form a set  $fired$  with any index  $k$  that satisfies  $X_k > V_k$ .  
    form a set  $newlyfired \leftarrow fired$ .  
    **while**  $newlyfired \neq \emptyset$  **do**  
        form a set  $propagated \leftarrow \emptyset$ .  
        **for**  $i$  in  $newlyfired$  **do**  
            **for**  $s_{ij}$  in  $S$  **do**  
                pick a random number  $t \sim Unif(0,1)$ .  
                **if**  $s_{ij} > t$  **do**  
                    add  $j$  to  $propagated$ .  
                    record propagation for connection from  $i$  to  $j$ .  
                **end if**  
            **end for**  
        **end for**  
         $newlyfired \leftarrow propagated / fired$ .  
         $fired \leftarrow fired \cup propagated$ .  
    **end while**  
    update  $S$  by propagation record and  $\Lambda$  as in Algorithm 1.  
**end for**  
**return** the mean of all entries in  $S$ .

---




Figure 6: Simulation results for a neural network with  $n=8$  and  $c=18$ . For each simulation, all connections shares the same  $\lambda$  function;  $X$  is randomized. **(a)**  $\lambda(y) = .9y + .05$ . Neural network has one single fixed point and strength mean tends to it. **(b)**  $\lambda(y) = .5\sin(4\pi y) + .5$ . More than two fixed points for trajectories to converge to because neural network's fixed points are the combination of all connections' two stable fixed points. **(c)**  $\lambda(y) = -y + 1$ . One single fixed point to converge to. **(d)** Discontinuous  $\lambda$ . No fixed point. No convergence of strength mean.


constraints specified in last section, makes sure neural network goes to fixed point (if exists). With all three constraints, we have: **(1)**  $\Lambda$  is one-to-one mapping and thus has inverse mapping  $\Lambda^{-1} : S \rightarrow Y$ ; **(2)** there exists a mapping  $\Theta : X \rightarrow S^+$ , because under stimulus  $X$  neural network will go to the unique fixed point  $S^+$  no matter what initial strength  $S_0$  it starts with; **(3)** if  $\Theta$  is a one-to-one mapping,  $\Theta$  has inverse mapping  $\Theta^{-1} : S^+ \rightarrow X$ . With mapping  $\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda^{-1}$ ,  $\Theta$  and  $\Theta^{-1}$  being one-to-one, given  $S^+$  we can identify  $X$  and  $Y$  without ambiguity. Therefore, the same interpretation with respect to one connection could apply here: neural network "stores" information about stimulus on many neurons and propagation across many connections.

For  $\Theta$  to be one-to-one, all neurons must have outbound connection. Otherwise, e.g., for a neural network with three neurons (say 0, 1 and 2) and two connections (say  $0 \rightsquigarrow 1$  and  $1 \rightsquigarrow 2$ ), stimulus  $X_1=(1, 1, 0)$  and  $X_2=(1, 1, 1)$  will lead to the same fixed point  $S^+$  because stimulus on neuron 3, no matter what it is, affects no connection. Or equivalently, for  $\Theta$  to be one-to-one, the definition of  $X$  should consider only the neurons with outbound connections such that  $X$ 's dimension  $\dim(X) \leq n$ . In the perspective of information theory [14], many-to-one  $\Theta$  introduces equivocation to neural network at fixed point, as if information loss occurs due to noisy channel. If  $\dim(X) > \dim(S) = c$ , mapping  $\Theta$  conducts "dimension reduction", and information loss is bound to occur.

A connection could be affected by stimuli on multiple neurons. Consider a neural network with four neurons and three connections ( $0 \rightsquigarrow 2$ ,  $1 \rightsquigarrow 2$  and  $2 \rightsquigarrow 3$ ). And let stimulus be on neuron 1 and 2 such that  $X=(x_0, x_1)$ . When the neural network is at fixed point, stimulus on neuron 3 will be  $x_0 s_{02} + x_1 s_{12} - s_{02} s_{12} Pr(0, 1)$  where  $Pr(0, 1)$  is the probability of both neuron 0 and 1 being stimulated, and hence the strength of  $2 \rightsquigarrow 3$  will be affected by  $Pr(0, 1)$ . In our model of neural network, stimulus on neurons are independent of each other such that  $Pr(0, 1) = x_0 x_1$ . Otherwise, if  $Pr(0, 1) \neq x_0 x_1$ ,  $Pr(0, 1)$  cannot be deduced from stimulus' definition  $X=(x_0, x_1)$ , and hence given mere  $X$  there would be uncertainty about  $S^+$  since  $s_{23}$  is affected by the hidden  $Pr(0, 1)$ . In that case, if  $Pr(0, 1)$  varies, mapping  $\Theta$  doesn't exist unless stimulus is redefined to be  $X=(x_0, x_1, Pr(0, 1))$ . If  $Pr(0, 1)$  is fixed and yet unknown, mapping  $\Theta$  exists and the neural network at fixed point actually gains information about  $Pr(0, 1)$ .

## 4 Propagation Path Depth

Figure 7: This neural network extends the one in Figure 5 by putting constraints on its connections, such that each stimulus  $x_i$  only stimulates a "string" of neurons which has  $d$  connections. Suppose that each string is sufficiently long.



We design a neural network, as shown in Figure 7, to investigate the relation between the count of connections propagated and the stimulus from environment. In this neural network, **(1)** each neuron under stimulus has outbound connection; **(2)** stimuli on neurons are independent of each other; **(3)** each connection is affected by one single stimulus; **(4)** all connections share the same target strength function  $\lambda$  (Equation (1)) which obeys the three constraints in Section 2, and specifically, function  $\lambda$  is monotonically increasing. By the conclusions in last section, there exists a one-to-one mapping  $\Theta : X \rightarrow S^+$  where  $X$  is  $k$ -dimensional and  $S$  is  $(k \times d)$ -dimensional.

Let us start with one neuron string in the neural network. Consider a string is at fixed point under its stimulus  $\tilde{x}$ , which here we name training stimulus as it turns to be. Now suppose that strength of connections in the string could somehow fixate permanently (even if the stimulus is deprived or changed), and we put on the string an another stimulus  $x$  which here we name testing stimulus. Let testing stimulus  $x=1$ , which means the first neuron of string being stimulated every iteration. Then for the count of connections propagated down along the string, a random variable denoted by  $z$ , its expected value  $E(z)$  must monotonically increases as  $\tilde{x}$  increases. Let  $E(z) = \phi(\tilde{x})$ . Simulation results in Figure 8 suggests strong monotonicity of  $\phi$ . Generally, given any testing stimulus  $x$  the count of connections propagated has expected value  $x E(z) = x \phi(\tilde{x})$ .

Back to the neural network. Given training stimulus vector  $\tilde{X}$  and testing stimulus vector  $X$ , the count of connections propagated for the whole neural network, a random variable denoted by  $Z$ , has expected value

$$E(Z) = \sum_i^k x_i E(z_i) = \sum_i^k x_i \phi(\tilde{x}_i) = X^T \phi(\tilde{X}). \quad (2)$$




Figure 8: Simulation results of  $E(z)=\phi(\tilde{x})$  for different  $\lambda$  functions. **(a)** Our choices of  $\lambda$  are of the form  $\lambda(y)=\beta(\frac{1}{1+\exp(-\alpha y)}-.5)+\gamma$  which is a sigmoid function shifted and scaled by parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ . Several  $\lambda$  depicted share the same  $\beta=1.8$  and  $\gamma=.05$ , and have different  $\alpha=1, 3, 5, 9, 13, 17, 19$  from bottom to top. Bigger  $\alpha$  makes propagation path deeper along neuron string. **(b)** With  $\lambda$  parameterized by  $\alpha=9$ , the distribution of  $z$  is approximated by  $2 \times 10^5$  trails. **(c)** For each  $\lambda$  function depicted in **(a)**,  $E(z)$  given  $\tilde{x}$  is estimated by the sample mean. With careful choice of  $\lambda$ , e.g.,  $\alpha=9$  makes  $E(z)=\phi(\tilde{x}) \approx 8.66\tilde{x}$ . **(d)** For each  $\lambda$  function,  $\sigma(z)$  given  $\tilde{x}$  is estimated.

Here  $\phi$  on vector  $\tilde{X}$  is entrywise. If, as in Figure 8 our choice of function  $\lambda$  makes  $\phi(\tilde{x}) \approx \xi \tilde{x}$  where  $\xi \gg 0$ , we have  $E(Z) \approx \xi \sum_i^k x_i \tilde{x}_i = \xi \tilde{X}^T X$  which says, given a neural network trained by stimulus  $\tilde{X}$ , its count  $Z$  of connections propagated under testing stimulus  $X$  has mean  $\xi \tilde{X}^T X$ .

We can use this neural network to build a linear classifier. Let's say there are  $g$  classes. For each class  $i$ , we adopt  $\delta_i(X) = \xi \tilde{X}_i^T X$  as its discriminant function where  $\tilde{X}_i$  is known parameter vector. Given testing stimulus  $X$ , this classifier shall classify  $X$  to the class with the largest value for its discriminant function [15], and the decision boundaries between classes shall be linear. Now we let neural network (characterized by  $\xi$ ) take over the computation of  $\xi \tilde{X}^T X$  by **(1)** taking  $\tilde{X}$  as training stimulus vector; **(2)** taking  $X$  as testing stimulus vector; **(3)** taking the count  $Z$  of connections propagated as value of  $\xi \tilde{X}^T X$ .  $Z$  deviates from true value of  $\xi \tilde{X}^T X$  randomly, of course. For any two discriminant functions  $\delta_i(X)$  and  $\delta_j(X)$ , given  $X$ , if  $Z_i > Z_j$ , decision is to be made that  $E(Z_i) = \xi \tilde{X}_i^T X > \xi \tilde{X}_j^T X = E(Z_j)$  and thus  $\delta_i(X) > \delta_j(X)$  on the assumption that  $Z_i$  and  $Z_j$  might have their distributions well separated from each other. Essentially, the neural network reduces the computation (dot product of vectors) of  $\delta_i(X)$  to simple counting of connections propagated. Our linear classifier needs  $g$  neural networks to compute parallelly.

We experiment with this classifier to classify digit images<sup>2</sup>. Here are the settings: **(1)** There are  $g=10$  discriminant functions for digits (classes) from 0 to 9, and ten corresponding neural networks each of which has  $k=64$  neuron strings since each image has  $8 \times 8=64$  pixels; **(2)** connections share the same  $\lambda$  function of the form in Figure 8 with parameters  $\alpha=10$ ,  $\beta=1.8$  and  $\gamma=.05$ ; **(3)** pixel value is transformed to value between 0 and 1 (by dividing 16) as stimulus probability; **(4)** each neural network is trained by one single image, and classifier is tested by many images; **(5)** if multiple discriminant functions are tested to have equal maximum values, randomly pick one of them as target class. With random choices of ten training images, the classifier has prediction accuracy  $\sim 30\%$ , which is considerably better than blind guess (10%); trained by "average images" that are pixel-wise average of all images of the same digit, the accuracy is  $\sim 40\%$ . Notice that the training images directly parameterize discriminant functions, so optimization could be done by the selection of "best fitting" training images.

The classifier and its mathematical reasoning take root in synaptic connection model in Section 2. For synaptic connection, we assumed probabilistic strength for impulse propagation, target strength function  $\lambda$  and constraints on  $\lambda$  with respect to continuity, monotonicity and derivative. These assumptions and constraints empirically seem neurophysiologically reasonable if not proven


<sup>2</sup>1797 images loaded with Python code "from sklearn import datasets; datasets.load\_digits()".

(and among them Constraint 3 is the most demanding). Both training and testing could be purely neurobiological development and activities where not a single arithmetic operation is involved; its classification criterion, i.e. deciding which neural network has the most connections propagated, is probably the most primitive sense that an agent could possibly develop. Such projection on neural reality might bring new insights, hopefully.

## 5 Discussion

Different from the deterministic classification by cross-entropy, the classifier in last section makes decision based on r.v.  $Z$ , so classification result varies for the same testing image. Let a testing image  $X_u$  of digit  $u$  has  $Z_{uv}$  in neural network trained by image  $\tilde{X}_v$  of digit  $v$ . Figure 9 shows examples of  $Z_{uv}$ 's distributions. To improve prediction accuracy, we should distance  $E(Z_{vv})$  from the other nine  $E(Z_{uv})$  where  $u \neq v$  such that  $Z_{vv}$ 's distribution overlap other  $Z_{uv}$ 's as less as possible.

Figure 9: KDE estimate of ten  $Z_{u0}$ 's distributions, and their mean depicted as vertical lines.  $Z_{00}$ 's distribution and mean are in red, while other nine  $Z_{u0}$  where  $u \neq 0$  are in gray. The neural network is trained by "average image" of digit 0. Each  $Z_{u0}$  takes  $10^4$  samples.



By generalizing Equation (2) to  $E(Z) = \sum_i^k x_i \phi_i(\tilde{x}_i)$ , the distance between  $E(Z_{uv})$  and  $E(Z_{vv})$  is

$$\Delta_{uv} = E(Z_{vv}) - E(Z_{uv}) = \sum_i^k (x_i^v - x_i^u) \phi_i^v(\tilde{x}_i^v). \quad (3)$$

Given  $X_u, X_v, \tilde{X}_v \in [0, 1]^k$ , to increase  $\Delta_{uv}$  neural network should be redesigned by elaborating  $\phi_i^v(\tilde{x}_i^v)$ :

- If  $\phi_i^v(\tilde{x}_i^v) = \xi \tilde{x}_i^v$  as with the classifier in last section,  $\Delta_{uv} = \xi \sum_i^k (x_i^v - x_i^u) \tilde{x}_i^v \leq \xi k$ .  $\Delta_{uv}$  increases as  $\xi$  does. However,  $\xi$  is limited by propagation path depth according to Figure 8. To overcome this limit, we must increase propagation path breadth by allowing one pixel stimulate many neuron strings or generally a neuron tree. Increasing  $\xi$  comes at a price that  $Z_{uv}$  and  $Z_{vv}$ 's variance gets bigger so that they have more of their distributions overlapped, which could offset the effect of increasing  $\Delta_{uv}$ .
- If  $\phi_i^v(\tilde{x}_i^v) = \xi_i \tilde{x}_i^v$ ,  $\Delta_{uv} = \sum_i^k \xi_i \tilde{x}_i^v (x_i^v - x_i^u)$ . And suppose that  $\sum_i^k \xi_i = h_\xi$ . Then we must selectively increase  $\xi_i$  of sum terms to maximize  $\Delta_{uv}$ . We would select the  $\xi_i$  with the biggest  $\tilde{x}_i^v (x_i^v - x_i^u)$  such that this  $\xi_i = h_\xi$  and the others  $\xi_i = 0$ . In this case, not only  $\Delta_{uv}$  maximizes but also  $Z_{uv}$ 's variance greatly reduces if not entirely vanishes.
- When  $X_u$  and  $X_v$  varies randomly, we should select  $m > 1$  sum terms with biggest  $\xi_i$  and distribute  $h_\xi$  to them with  $\xi_i$  proportional to their  $\tilde{x}_i^v$ , to reduce the chance of  $\Delta_{uv} < 0$ . With that, terms with big positive  $\tilde{x}_i^v (x_i^v - x_i^u)$  are weighted (notice that bigger  $\tilde{x}_i^v$  has bigger  $x_i^v$  and hence  $x_i^v - x_i^u$  statistically), and terms with small or negative  $\tilde{x}_i^v (x_i^v - x_i^u)$  are suppressed. Meanwhile,  $Z_{uv}$ 's variance is controlled because in those selected terms  $x_i^u$  are statistically small. Tradeoff should be considered in deciding  $m$  value, of course. The selection of sum terms and distribution of  $h_\xi$  could be neurobiologically carried out over time, if stronger training stimulus not only strengthens connections more but also replicates neurons more.

Therefore, with careful design of  $\phi_i^v(\tilde{x}_i^v)$  and neural networks, we could have an image classifier which improves its prediction accuracy during training, again, by biological development instead of external computation. Admittedly, the theory here and its neurobiological interpretation is rather speculative, and the missing simulations or experiments could be intricate considering neuron replication.



## References

## References

- [1] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2012.
- [2] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [3] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015.
- [4] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [5] P. Werbos. *Beyond regression: new tools for prediction and analysis in the behavioral sciences*. Harvard University, 1975.
- [6] F. Rosenblatt. The perceptron: a probabilistic model for information storage and organization in the brain. *Psychological Review*, 65(6):386–408, 1958.
- [7] Y. Freund Robert and E. Schapire. Large margin classification using the perceptron algorithm. *Machine Learning*, 37(3):277–296, 1999.
- [8] T. Branco and T. Staras. The probability of neurotransmitter release: variability and feedback control at single synapses. *Nat Rev Neurosci.*, 10(5):373–83, 2009.
- [9] D. Hebb. *The organization of behavior: a neuropsychological theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1949.
- [10] S. Lowel and W. Singer. Selection of intrinsic horizontal connections in the visual cortex by correlated neuronal activity. *Science*, 255(5041):209–212, 1992.
- [11] J. Hughes. Post-tetanic potentiation. *Physiol Rev.*, 38(1):91–113, 1958.
- [12] I. Antonov, I. Antonova, E. Kandel, and R. Hawkins. Activity-dependent presynaptic facilitation and hebbian ltp are both required and interact during classical conditioning in aplysia. *Neuron*, 37(1), 2003.
- [13] I. Istratescu. *Fixed point theory: an introduction*. Springer, 1981.
- [14] C. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [15] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer, 2009.