

# Witten-type topological field theory of self-organized criticality for stochastic neural networks

Jian Zhai<sup>1</sup>, Chaojun Yu<sup>1</sup>, You Zhai<sup>2</sup>

1: School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

2: The First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

E-mail: jzhai@zju.edu.cn

May 2021

**Abstract.** We study the Witten-type topological field theory(W-TFT) of self-organized criticality(SOC) for stochastic neural networks. The Parisi-Sourlas-Wu quantization of general stochastic differential equations (SDEs) for neural networks, the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin(BRST)-symmetry of the diffusion system and the relation between spontaneous breaking and instantons connecting steady states of the SDEs, as well as the sufficient and necessary condition on pseudo-supersymmetric stochastic neural networks are obtained. Suppose neuronal avalanche is a mechanism of cortical information processing and storage [1][2][3] and the model of stochastic neural networks[7] is correct, as well as the SOC system can be looked upon as a W-TFT with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry. Then we should recover the neuronal avalanches and spontaneously broken BRST symmetry from the model of stochastic neural networks. We find that, provided the divergence of drift coefficients is small and non-constant, the BRST symmetry for the model of stochastic neural networks is spontaneously broken. That is, if the SOC of brain neural networks system can be looked upon as a W-TFT with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry, then the general model of stochastic neural networks which be extensively used in neuroscience [7] is enough to describe the SOC. On the other hand, using the Fokker-Planck equation, we show the sufficient condition on diffusion so that the behavior of the stochastic neural networks approximate to a stationary Markov process. Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal networks arise from the process, meanwhile some biological laws are conserved.

*Keywords:* Witten-type topological field theory, self-organized criticality, stochastic neural networks, avalanche, Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin-symmetry

## 1 introduction

It is well known that brain neural networks are organized based on self-organized criticality(SOC). The power-law of background neural activities had been discovered in EEG, ECoG and fMRI (see, for example, [8][12][14] [1]etc.). Beggs and Plenz [1][2][3] studied spontaneous activity in an isolated slab of cortical tissue which followed up a much earlier series of experiments on isolated cortical slabs or slices carried out by Burns [4]. Their work revealed that an isolated cortical slab remains silent but excitable by brief current pulses. A strong enough pulse can trigger a sustained all-or-none response that propagates radially from the stimulation site, at a velocity of about  $15(cm/s)$ . Propagation of local field potentials(LFPs) in cortical circuits could be described by the same power-law that govern avalanches.

Can neuronal avalanches and SOC of brain arise from current often utilized general mathematical models for brain neural networks? Cowan, Neuman, Kiewiet and Drongelen [5] analyzed neural networks that exhibits self-organized criticality. Such criticality follows from the combination of a simple neural network with an excitatory feedback loop that generates bistability, in combination with an anti-Hebbian synapse in its input pathway. Using the methods of statistical field theory, they show that the network exhibits hysteresis in switching back and forward between its two stable states, each of which loses its stability at a saddlenode bifurcation. The Biological conservation law as an emerging functionality in dynamical neuronal networks was studied in [6]. However so many different models were utilized in different papers. The lack of unifying mathematical theory and analyzing methods for the SOC impedes the effort to understand the neural information process arisen in our brain.

In [19], a scenario that a generic SOC system can be looked as a Witten-type topological field theory (W-TFT) with spontaneously broken Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin(BRST) symmetry, was proposed. But there are at least two unsolved problems: (1) From the quantum mechanical treatment, it is not clear why the distribution of avalanches must be a power-law; (2) Suppose we identify the instanton-induced  $\mathcal{Q}$ -symmetry breakdown, when the spontaneous breakdown of  $\mathcal{Q}$  symmetry occurs.

In this paper, we consider a general standard model of stochastic neural networks which was extensively used in neuroscience [7]. Suppose the neuronal avalanches is a mechanism of cortical information processing and storage [1][2][3] and the model of the stochastic neural networks[7] is correct, as well as the SOC system can be looked upon as a Witten-type topological field theory (W-TFT) with spontaneously broken Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) symmetry. Then we should recover Beggs and Plenz etc.'s results and find power-law as well as spontaneously broken BRST symmetry from the model of stochastic neural networks. We utilize Parisi-Sourlas-Wu quantization to the stochastic differential equations

(SDEs) of the standard model of stochastic neural networks and find that, provided the divergence of drift coefficients is small and non-constant, the BRST symmetry of the model of stochastic neural networks is spontaneously broken. That is, if the SOC of brain neural networks system can be looked upon as a W-TFT with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry, then the general model of the stochastic neural networks which be extensively used in neuroscience [7] is enough to describe the SOC. At the same time, we solve the stochastic differential equations for the model of stochastic neural networks by numerical method, and try to recover Beggs and Plenz etc.'s results and find power-law. On the other hand, we study the sufficient condition on diffusion so that the limit behavior of solutions to the model of stochastic neural networks approximates a stationary Markov process. The diffusion processes (solutions to the SDEs) take a long time inside some maximal equivalent class of the unperturbed diffusion process, and suddenly departing from one maximal equivalent class (up-state or down-state) and arriving to another (down-state or up-state). Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal network arise from the transitions between the maximal equivalent classes (tunneling effect), meanwhile some biological laws are conserved.

## 2 stochastic neural networks

Consider a neural network of  $N$  neurons where each neuron receiving  $N$  synaptic inputs labeled by  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . The firing rate of input  $i$  is denoted by  $v^i$  and the input rates are represented collectively by the  $N$ -component vector  $v$ . The synaptic current  $I_s^i$  of  $i$ th neuron is generally modeled by (see [7] section 7.2 (7.6))

$$\tau_s dI_s^i = (-I_s^i - E^i(u(t))) dt + \tau_s \alpha_c^i(I_s(t), t) d\eta^i(t), \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau_s$  is the decay constant of synaptic conductance,  $E^i(u) := \partial_{u^i} E(u)$ ,  $\{\eta^i(t)\}_i$  are independent Wiener processes and  $\alpha_c^i$  are diffusion coefficients. For simplicity, assume  $\alpha_c^i(I_s(t), t) = \alpha_c^i(I_s(t))$ .

For constant synaptic current, the firing rate of postsynaptic neuron  $i$  can be expressed as  $F(I_s^i)$  that will be used as the input firing rate at next time, where  $F$  is an increasing function and called an activation function. Assume that the time-dependent input are still given by this activation function

$$u^i(t) = F(I_s^i(t)). \quad (2)$$

$F$  is sometimes taken to be a saturating function such as a sigmoid function. It is also bounded from above, which can be important in stabilizing a network against excessively high firing rates.

## 2.1 Stratonovich interpretation

By Ito formula, (1)(2) imply

$$du^i = \left( -F'(I_s^i) \frac{I_s^i + E^i(u)}{\tau_s} + \frac{1}{2} F''(I_s^i) (\alpha_c^i(I_s))^2 \right) dt + F'(I_s^i) \alpha_c^i(I_s) \circ d\eta^i \quad (3)$$

where, from the view point of self-organized criticality (SOC)[19], we use the Stratonovich interpretation of solutions to SDE (3). Suppose  $u^i$  is the Stratonovich integration of SDE (3). The Ito's equivalent SDE of  $u^i$

$$du^i = \left( -F'(I_s^i) \frac{I_s^i + E^i(u)}{\tau_s} + \frac{1}{2} F''(I_s^i) (\alpha_c^i(I_s))^2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial u^i} (F'(I_s^i) \alpha_c^i(I_s))^2 \right) dt + F'(I_s^i) \alpha_c^i(I_s) d\eta^i. \quad (4)$$

## 2.2 sufficient condition on diffusion so that the limit behavior of the neural network is a stationary Markov process

**Lemma 2.1** *If  $\alpha_{c_0}^i(I_s(t)) := \lim_{c \rightarrow c_0} \alpha_c^i(I_s(t), t) = \sqrt{2T/F'(I_s^i(t))}$ , then there is a stationary solution  $\lim_{c \rightarrow c_0} u_c$  of (4) that is a stationary Markov process with the following stationary density*

$$P_0(u) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(\frac{-1}{T\tau_s} \tilde{E}(u)\right)$$

where  $\tilde{E}(u) := \frac{1}{\tau_s} (\sum_i \int^{u^i} (F^{-1}(r) - \frac{\tau_s T f'(r)}{2f(r)}) dr + E(u))$ ,  $f(r) = F'(F^{-1}(r))$  and

$$Z = \int_u [du] \exp\left(\frac{-1}{T\tau_s} \tilde{E}(u)\right).$$

*Proof.* As  $c \rightarrow c_0$ , (4) is written as

$$du^i = \left( -f(u^i) \tilde{E}^i(u) + T f'(u^i) \right) dt + \sqrt{2T f(u^i)} d\eta^i. \quad (5)$$

Generally, suppose  $u = \{u_i\}_i$  satisfy following stochastic differential equations

$$du_i(t) = b_i(u(t))dt + \sigma_i(u(t))d\eta^i(t).$$

The transition density  $P(u, t|u(t_0), t_0)$  of  $u(t)$  must satisfy the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u^i} \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial u^i} (\sigma_i^2 P) - b_i P \right).$$

It follows that if

$$b_i = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_i^2 \frac{-\tilde{E}^i(u)}{T} + \frac{\partial}{\partial u^i} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2}$$

then  $P_0 = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\frac{-1}{T} \tilde{E}(u))$  is stationary to the Fokker-Planck equation. Note that

$$\tilde{E}(u)(t) = \tilde{E}(u)(0), \quad \forall t \quad (6)$$

is conserved.

Remark. Recall that the drift part of (5) is proportional to the gradient flow of the energy  $\tilde{E}(u)$ . As the parameter  $T$  (temperature) decreases to zero,  $P_0(u)$  will approach a stationary transition density on a set of minima of  $\tilde{E}(u)$ . This is the principle on which simulated annealing is based [18]. A Markov process with a stationary transition probability  $P_0$  is explained by Fig.3. The diffusion processes (solutions to the SDEs (5)) take a long time inside some maximal equivalent class of the unperturbed diffusion process, and suddenly departing from one maximal equivalent class (up-state / down-state) and arriving to another (down-state / up-state). Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal network arise from the transitions between the maximal equivalent classes of steady states, which is an important characteristic of brain neuronal networks.

As  $c \rightarrow c_0$ , the Stratonovich interpretation of SDE (3) is rewritten as

$$du^i = \left( -f(u^i) \hat{E}^i(u) + T f'(u^i) \right) dt + \sqrt{2T f(u^i)} \circ d\eta^i, \quad \hat{E}(u) := \frac{1}{\tau_s} \left( \sum_i \int^{u^i} (F^{-1}(r) dr + E(u)) \right). \quad (7)$$

Since the diffusion term  $\sqrt{2T f(u^i)}$  in (7) depending on  $u$ , to avoid the quantization accounting the curvature of the target manifold, take the transformation

$$\Phi(r) := \int_0^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(s)}} ds$$

and  $x^i = \Phi(u^i)$ . Then

$$dx^i = \left( \frac{-f(u^i) \hat{E}^i(u) + T f'(u^i)}{\sqrt{f(u^i)}} \right) dt + \sqrt{2T} \circ d\eta^i =: A^i(x) dt + \sqrt{2T} \circ d\eta^i \quad (8)$$

is deduced from (7). Its Ito's equivalent SDE

$$dx^i = \left( \frac{-f(u^i) \tilde{E}^i(u) + T f'(u^i)}{\sqrt{f(u^i)}} \right) dt + \sqrt{2T} d\eta^i. \quad (9)$$

Remark that

$$\partial_{x^j} A^i = \partial_{x^i} A^j, \quad (10)$$

and there is a potential function  $V(x)$  such that  $A$  can be rewritten via  $V$ :

$$A^i(x) = \partial_{x^i} V(x). \quad (11)$$

That is, (8) is a Langevin type equation.

### 3 quantization

Generally (3) is rewritten as an  $N$ -dimensional diffusion process

$$dv^i = A^i(v)dt + \sigma^i(v) \circ d\eta_t^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (12)$$

where  $\eta_t$  is the  $N$ -dimensional Wiener process, and  $A(v) = \nabla_v V(v) + \tilde{A}(v)$ . The nonpotential part  $\tilde{A}$  is regarded as a magnetic field.

Following [19], where SOC was interpretation as Witten-type topological field theory with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry [24]. To complete this theory, there are at least two problems need to be fixed. First, the BRST-symmetry breakdown by instantons is only proved in one-dimension ([24]p.170). In multiple dimension case, even without the magnetic part  $\tilde{A}$ , the nonzero average  $\mathbb{Q}_{\alpha\beta}$  of a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -exact operator only implies the perturbative ground state  $\langle \alpha |$  doesn't determine a supersymmetric ground state in the full theory ([23]p.223). It is unclear when a Hamiltonian related to  $A$  is pseudo-Hermitian and when the hopping evolution of instanton and anti-instanton along the magnetic field  $\tilde{A}$  induces pseudo-supersymmetry breakdown. Second, it is not clear why the BRST breakdown must be a power-law.

#### 3.1 Quantization by the De Witt-Faddeev-Popov method

We proceed with quantization [20] of equation (12) by the De Witt-Faddeev-Popov method. Recall the Langevin type equation (9), the partition function is

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int_{\xi} [d\xi] e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau g_{jk} \xi^j \xi^k dt} \frac{\det(\frac{\delta \xi}{\delta v})}{|\det(\frac{\delta \xi}{\delta v})|} = \int_v [dv] e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau g_{jk} (\partial_t v^j - A^j)(\partial_t v^k - A^k) dt} \det(\frac{\delta \xi}{\delta v}) \quad (13)$$

$g^{jk} = (g_{jk})^{-1}$  is the noise-noise correlator

$$\langle \xi^j(t) \xi^k(t') \rangle = g^{jk} \delta(t - t'), \quad d\xi^j(t) := \sigma^j(v) d\eta_t^j$$

which define a metric on the target manifold  $M \ni v$  and which for now is assumed to be independent of the field  $v$ , and  $\det(\frac{\delta \xi}{\delta v})$  is the Jacobian of the map defined by the equation (3). Suppose  $\sigma^j(v) \equiv 1$  (see Appendix for general case). By Gaussian multiple integral, the Jacobian can be represented as the path integral over the fermionic Fadeev-Popov ghosts

$$\tau \det(\frac{\delta \xi}{\delta v}) = \int [d\psi][d\bar{\psi}] e^{i \int_0^\tau \bar{\psi}_j (\delta_k^j \partial_t - \partial_{v,k} A^j) \psi^k dt} \left( \int [d\psi][d\bar{\psi}'] e^{i \int_0^\tau \bar{\psi}'_j \psi^j dt} \right)^{-1}$$

and the partition function now is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &= \int_{v, \psi, \bar{\psi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau g_{jk} (\partial_t v^j - A^j)(\partial_t v^k - A^k) - i \bar{\psi}_j (\delta_k^j \partial_t - \partial_{v,k} A^j) \psi^k dt} \\ &= (\det \mathcal{J})^{-1} \int_{v, B, \psi, \bar{\psi}} e^{-\int_0^\tau i g_{jk} (\partial_t v^j - A^j) B^k + \frac{1}{2} g_{jk} B^j B^k - i \bar{\psi}_j (\delta_k^j \partial_t - \partial_{v,k} A^j) \psi^k dt} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the last equality derived by the Fadeev-Popov method.

### 3.2 BRST symmetry

The partition function is invariant under the nilpotent infinitesimal BRST transformation

$$\{Q, v^j\} = \psi^j, \quad \{Q, \psi^j\} = 0, \quad \{Q, \bar{\psi}_j\} = B_j, \quad \{Q, B_j\} = 0, \quad \{Q, Q\} = 0 \quad (15)$$

and the action is  $Q$ -exact

$$\int_0^\tau i g_{jk} (\partial_t v^j - A^j) B^k + \frac{1}{2} g_{jk} B^j B^k - i \bar{\psi}_j (\delta_k^j \partial_t - \partial_{v^k} A^j) \psi^k dt = \int_0^\tau \{Q, \bar{\psi}_j (i(\partial_t v^j - A^j) + \frac{1}{2} B^j)\} dt \quad (16)$$

where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  is Poisson brackets (see [24](3.65)),  $Q = -i\psi^j B^j$  is the BRST operator.

Suppose  $\partial_{v^j} A^k = \partial_{v^k} A^j$ . As [24](3.62), the action

$$\int_0^\tau i g_{jk} (\partial_t v^j - \sigma A^j) B^k + \frac{1}{2} g_{jk} B^j B^k - i \bar{\psi}_j (\delta_k^j \partial_t - \sigma \partial_{v^k} A^j) \psi^k dt$$

is invariant under the discrete transformation

$$\sigma \rightarrow -\sigma, \quad \psi \rightarrow \bar{\psi}, \quad \bar{\psi} \rightarrow \psi, \quad B \rightarrow B - 2i\sigma A \quad (17)$$

and there is a second BRST operator  $\bar{Q} := -i\bar{\psi}^k (B^k - 2iA^k)$  with  $\sigma = 1$ . It is remarkable that, even if  $\partial_{v^j} A^k \neq \partial_{v^k} A^j$ , utilizing the Poisson brackets we still can prove that  $\bar{Q}$  is nilpotent and

$$\{Q, \bar{Q}\} = 2i \left( \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t v^j - A^j)^2 + (\partial_t v^j - A^j) A^j - i \bar{\psi}^j \partial_{v^k} A^j \psi^k \right) = 2iH. \quad (18)$$

The interaction representations of the BRST operators

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= -i\psi^j B^j = -\psi^j (\partial_t v^j - A^j) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} = -\psi^j \partial_{v^j}, \\ \bar{Q} &= -i\bar{\psi}^k (B^k - 2iA^k) = -\bar{\psi}^k (\partial_t v^k + 2A^k) \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{Q}} = -\bar{\psi}^k (\partial_{v^k} + 2A^k) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{-1}{2} \Delta_x - A \cdot \nabla_x - \text{div}_x(A), \quad (20)$$

are derived by an appropriate quantum

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^j &:= \frac{\delta^R L}{\delta v^j} = \partial_t v^j - A^j \rightarrow \partial_{v^j}, \\ \Pi^j A^j &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} [\partial_{v^j}, A^j]_+ = A \cdot \nabla_v + \frac{1}{2} \text{div}_v A, \\ -i\bar{\psi}^j \psi^k &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\psi^k}, \psi^j]_- = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{jk}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{Q} \bar{\mathcal{Q}} = i \left( \frac{-1}{2} \Delta_x - A \cdot \nabla_x - \text{div}_x(A) \right) = iH. \quad (22)$$

The natural representation of the above algebra of observable operators is on the space of differential forms (see [23](10.214)(10.225))

$$\mathcal{H} = \Omega(M) \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

equipped with the Hermitian inner product

$$(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int_M \bar{\omega}_1 \wedge * \omega_2.$$

### 3.3 pseudo-supersymmetry

Generally [25],  $H$  is pseudo-Hermitian if there is a linear invertible Hermitian  $\Lambda$  and the adjoint operator of  $H$  satisfies

$$H^\dagger = \Lambda H \Lambda^{-1}.$$

If  $Q^\sharp := \Lambda^{-1} Q^\dagger \Lambda$  is nilpotent and  $2H = \{Q, Q^\sharp\}$ , we call the system 2-pseudo-supersymmetric [25]. Furthermore if  $Q$  is BRST and there exists at least one physical state [24], the system is called BRST-supersymmetric. Otherwise the supersymmetries are broken. The BRST-supersymmetry breaking is spontaneous.

In light of (22),  $H$  is pseudo-Hermitian with respect to  $\Lambda$  if and only if

$$-iQ\bar{Q} = H = \Lambda^{-1}H^\dagger\Lambda = -i\Lambda^{-1}\bar{Q}^\dagger\Lambda\Lambda^{-1}Q^\dagger\Lambda.$$

**Proposition 3.1** *The system (12) is 2-pseudo-supersymmetric if there is a linear invertible Hermitian  $\Lambda$  s.t.*

$$\bar{Q} = \Lambda^{-1}Q^\dagger\Lambda.$$

**Corollary 3.2** *If  $A$  is given via a potential  $V$ :  $A = \nabla_v V$ , then the system (12) is 2-pseudo-supersymmetric.*

*Proof.* Take  $\Lambda = \exp\{2V\}$  and note that

$$Q^\dagger\Lambda = \Lambda(-\bar{\psi})(\nabla_v + 2A) = \Lambda\bar{Q}.$$

### 3.4 spectrum

It was proved in [25] that the Hamiltonian  $H$  is pseudo-Hermitian if the spectrum of  $H$  consists of real and the pairs of complex-conjugate energies. It was well known that, when the Hamiltonian is self-adjoint, all eigenvalues must be real. So non-self-adjoint is a necessary condition of pseudo-supersymmetric breaking. It is easy to see that

**Lemma 3.3**  $H$  is self-adjoint in  $L^2$  if and only if

$$A(v) \equiv 0.$$

Moreover  $A(v) = 0$  implies that  $v$  is a steady state of the unperturbed dynamical system of the equation (12).

Consider the spectrum of the Hamilton  $H$  on  $M$  with periodic boundary condition (pbc) (for possible  $\mathcal{PT}$  symmetry, see [22] or [23]p.191).

**Theorem 3.4**  $(\sigma I + H)^{-1}$  ( $\sigma > 0$ ) is compact, positive from  $W^{1,2}(M)$  to itself. Moreover, suppose any two eigenvectors are orthogonal. Then the all eigenvalues of  $H$  are real if and only if  $A(v) \equiv 0$ .

*Proof.* The spectrum problem of the Hamilton  $H$  is equivalent to

$$H_\sigma \Psi := (\sigma I + H)\Psi = (\lambda + \sigma)\Psi$$

that can be extended to a weak form in  $W^{1,2}(M)$

$$\mathcal{H}_\sigma v - \sigma E_1 E \Psi = \lambda E_1 E \Psi,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_\sigma$  is the extension of  $H_\sigma$  on  $W^{1,2}(M)$ ,  $E : W^{1,2} \rightarrow L^2$  and  $E_1 : L^2 \rightarrow (W^{1,2})^*$  are two embedding maps. From the Sobolev th, the embedding map  $E : W^{1,2} \rightarrow L^2$  is compact. while  $E_1 : L^2 \rightarrow (W^{1,2})^*$  is continuous. So  $\mathcal{H}_\sigma^{-1} E_1 E : W^{1,2} \rightarrow W^{1,2}$  is compact.

To study complex eigenvalue of  $H$ , we have to consider the Hilbert space  $W^{1,2}(M)$  of complex valued functions. Then  $H$  is self-adjoint if and only if the all eigenvalues are real. By Lemma 3.3, the all eigenvalues of  $H$  are real if and only if  $A(v) \equiv 0$ .

### 3.5 BRST supersymmetric breaking

It is easy to see that  $H$  is pseudo-Hermitian. First we are looking for eigenvalues

$$H_0 \Phi := \frac{-1}{2} \Delta_x \Phi - A^j(x) \nabla_{x^j} \Phi = \lambda \Phi, \quad \forall x \in M \quad (23)$$

with periodic boundary condition. It is easy to see that any non-zero constant is a ground state. On the other hand, if constant  $\Phi_0 = 1$  is the only ground state, then

$$Q\Phi_0 = 0 \quad (24)$$

and  $H_0$  is BRST-supersymmetric. Generally we have

**Lemma 3.5** Suppose

- either (1)  $\nu(x) \cdot A(x) |\Phi(x)|^2|_M = 0$  and  $\text{div}_x A(x) = 0$ ,
- or (2)  $M$  is star shape and  $\max_{x \in M} |x| |A(x)| < \frac{1}{2}$ ,
- or (3) there is  $V$  such that  $A = \nabla_x V$ .

Then  $H_0$  is BRST-supersymmetric .

*Proof.* (1) Note that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla_x \Phi(x)|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_M A(x) \cdot \nabla_x |\Phi(x)|^2 dx = 0, \quad \forall \Phi \in W^{1,2}(M) \quad \text{with period B.C.} \quad (25)$$

provided  $\nu(x) \cdot A(x) |\Phi(x)|^2|_M = 0$  and  $\text{div}_x A(x) = 0$ . (25) implies that the only ground state is constant.

(2) Multiply  $H_0 \Phi = 0$  by  $x \cdot \nabla_x \Phi$  and integrate over  $M$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla_x \Phi(x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\partial M} (x \cdot \nu(x)) |\nabla_x \Phi(x)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) = \int_M (A(x) \cdot \nabla_x \Phi(x)) (x \cdot \nabla_x \Phi(x)) dx \\ & \leq (\max_{x \in M} |x| |A(x)|) \int_M |\nabla_x \Phi(x)|^2 dx, \quad \forall \Phi \in W^{1,2}(M) \quad \text{with period B.C.} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $\nu(x)$  is the unit outward normal vector of  $\partial M$ , and for star shape domain  $M$ ,  $x \cdot \nu(x) \geq 0$  ( $\forall x \in \partial M$ ). (26) implies that the only ground state is constant again.

(3) Multiplying  $H_0 \Phi = 0$  by  $\exp(2V)\Phi$  and integrating over  $M$ , in light of  $A = \nabla_x V$ , we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_M \exp(2V) |\nabla_x \Phi(x)|^2 dx = 0. \quad (27)$$

Then the only ground state is constant.

Suppose  $\lambda_0^{H_0}$  and  $\lambda_1^{H_0}$  are the 1st and 2nd eigenvalues of  $H_0$ . Then from Lemma 3.5,

$$\lambda_0^{H_0} = 0, \quad \lambda_1^{H_0} \neq 0.$$

We have

**Theorem 3.6** *Suppose  $\text{div}_x A(x) \neq \text{constant}$  and*

$$\sup_{x \in M} |\text{div}_x A(x)| < \min_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}: |\zeta| = \frac{|\lambda_1^{H_0}|}{2}} \frac{1}{2(1 + |\zeta|^2)(1 + \|(H_0 - \zeta)^{-1}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (28)$$

*as well as either (1)  $M$  is star shape and  $\max_{x \in M} |x| |A(x)| < \frac{1}{2}$  or (2) there is  $V$  such that  $A = \nabla_x V$ . Then  $H$  is BRST-supersymmetric breaking.*

*Proof.* In light of Lemma 3.5 and [26](Th.3.16), the first eigenvalue (lowest energy)  $\lambda_0^H$  of  $H$  is in a small neighborhood of  $\lambda_0^{H_0}$  and the corresponding ground state  $\Phi_0^H$  must be non-constant. If not,  $\Phi_0^H \equiv C (\neq 0)$ , then

$$H\Phi_0^H = -C \text{div}_x A(x) = \lambda_0^H C \Rightarrow \text{div}_x A(x) \equiv \lambda_0^H$$

which is contradiction with the assumption  $\text{div}_x A(x) \neq \text{constant}$ .

Remark. Since any  $A \in L^2$  can be decomposed as  $A(x) = \nabla_x V(x) + \tilde{A}(x)$  with  $\text{div}_x \tilde{A}(x) = 0$ , the condition (2) can be replaced by  $\max_{x \in [-1,1]^N} |x| |\nabla_x V(x)| < \frac{1}{2}$ .

#### 4 bio-conservation law and rhythms arisen in the stochastic neural networks

In the remaining of this section, we consider (8) with the function

$$E(u) = \frac{-1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N w_{ij} u^i u^j - \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i u^i \quad (29)$$

that results in

$$E^i(u) = - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{w_{ij} + w_{ji}}{2} u^j - \theta_i, \quad (30)$$

and the activation function

$$u^i(t) = F(I_s^i(t)), \quad F(r) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\beta(r_1 - r_0)}, & \forall r \geq r_1 \\ 1 - e^{-\beta(r - r_0)}, & \forall r \in [r_0, r_1] \\ 0, & \forall r < r_0, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where  $\beta > 0$ ,  $r_0 \in [0, 1)$  and  $r_1 > r_0$ . Comparing with the half-wave rectification  $[I_s^i(t) - r_0]_+$  (see [7] section 7.2 where  $r_0$  is a threshold and the notation  $[\ ]_+$  denotes half-wave rectification), as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ , this activation function converges to Heaviside function. Remark that the conclusions obtained in this section can be easily extended to more general functions  $E$  and  $F$ .

For (31), we have  $F''/(F')^2 = -1/(1 - u^i)$ ,  $F^{-1}(u^i) = \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \frac{1}{1-u^i} + r_0$  and  $f(u^i) = \beta(1 - u^i)$ .

##### 4.1 the BRST supersymmetry of the stochastic neural networks is spontaneously broken

In light of (11) and the topological field theory obtained in the last section, we have

**Theorem 4.1** *There is  $V(x)$  such that  $A(x) = \nabla_x V(x)$ ,  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$  of (19) are the BRST operators of the quantization of (8), and the BRST operators of the quantization of (8) is 2-pseudo-supersymmetric (see Corollary 3.2). The BRST supersymmetry is broken provided  $A$  satisfies (28) and  $\text{div}_x A \neq \text{constant}$  (see Th.3.6). That is, if the self-organized criticality of the neural networks system can be looked upon as a W-TFT with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry, then the stochastic neural networks (8) which be extensively used in neuroscience [7] do simulate the SOC.*

Recall that  $H = \frac{-1}{2}\Delta_x - A \cdot \nabla_x - \text{div}_x(A) = H_0 - \text{div}_x(A)$ , the first non-zero eigenvalue of  $H_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1^{H_0} &= \min_{\|\Phi\|_{L^2}=1, \int_M \Phi=0} \int_M (H_0\Phi) \cdot \Phi = \int_M (H_0\Phi_1^{H_0}) \cdot \Phi_1^{H_0} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_x\Phi_1^{H_0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_M (\text{div}A)|\Phi_1^{H_0}|^2 - \int_{\partial M} \nu \cdot A|\Phi_1^{H_0}|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1^{-\Delta} - \frac{1}{2}\|\text{div}A\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_1^{-\Delta}$  is the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian on  $M = [\frac{-2}{\sqrt{\beta}}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}}]^N$  with pbc, and the pbc is utilized to obtain

$$\int_{\partial M} \nu \cdot A|\Phi_1^{H_0}|^2 = 0.$$

Thus, provided the divergence of drift coefficients of the SDEs (8) is small and non-constant, the BRST symmetry of the stochastic neural networks is spontaneously broken. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\text{div}_x A(x) &= \sum_i \sqrt{\beta(1-u^i)}\partial_{u^i} \left( -\frac{\beta(1-u^i)}{\tau_s} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \frac{1}{1-u^i} + r_0 + \frac{\tau_s T}{2(1-u^i)} + E^i(u) \right) - \frac{\beta T}{\sqrt{\beta(1-u^i)}} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\tau_s} \ln \frac{1}{1-u^i} - \frac{1}{\tau_s} = -\frac{1}{\tau_s}, & \beta \downarrow 0 (\Rightarrow u^i \rightarrow 0), \\ -\infty, & \beta \uparrow \infty. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

and Th.3.6, for  $\beta$  small enough and  $\tau_s$  large enough, the BRST operators are BRST-supersymmetric breaking. That is, if the SOC of cortical neural networks can be looked upon as a W-TFT with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry, then the general model (8) of stochastic neural networks which be extensively used in neuroscience [7] is enough to describe the SOC.

#### 4.2 log spike number vs log window number

We solve the stochastic differential equations by numerical method (SDE TooLBOX [27]), and try to recover Beggs and Plenz etc.'s results and find power-law. Fig 1 shows the simulating results of the size distribution of neural activities (the numbers of synchronized firing neurons in a window (1 sec) v.s. the numbers of the window) for seven different weighted connecting matrices  $W$  from the stochastic neural networks with  $\beta = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_s = 0.001 (= 0.01\text{sec})$ ,  $T = 100$ ,  $N = 20$  (4 inhibited neurons). The weighted connecting matrices  $W$  with at least two stable steady states are selected. The distributing curves of log spike number vs log window number is more likely nonlinear than linear.




Fig.1 (A) The simulations of log spike number vs log window number for the stochastic neural networks with  $\beta=0.1$ ,  $\tau_s=0.001$ ,  $T=100$ ,  $N=20$  (20% inhibited neurons) and seven different weighted connecting matrices  $W$ . (B) Fitting the log spike distributing curve by polynomial function  $y=y(0)(1-x)^a$  with  $a=0.3$ .

#### 4.3 rhythms arising from transitions between up-steady states and down-steady states of the stochastic neural networks

Even though the stochastic neural networks are supersymmetric and the distributing curves of log spike number vs log window number are more likely non-power-law than power-law, similar rhythms discovered in cortical EEG and ECoG can be simulated by the stochastic neural networks.

Fig 2 is an example for  $N = 20$ . Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal network arise from the solution transitioning between up-steady state  $\bar{u}$  and down-steady state  $\underline{u}$  of the diffusion equation (7) (tunneling effect, see Fig 2(A)(B)), meanwhile the biological laws (6) is conserved.

Assume the target manifold  $M$  is a domain with smooth and compact closure in the state space of the diffusion process (7). Suppose  $K$  be the maximal equivalent class of a  $\omega$ -limit set of the unperturbed diffusion process  $X(t)$ . That is, the set containing at least one  $\omega$ -limit set, all whole trajectories of the dynamical system (7) with  $T = 0$  starting from any  $x_0 \in K$ . The **attractable basin**  $D(K)$  of  $K$  is the set of initial states from which the unperturbed diffusion process  $X(t)$  converge to  $K$  with probability one:

$$D(K) := \{x \in M : P\{\exists \tau > 0 \text{ s.t. } X_t \in K, \forall t > \tau | X_0 = x\} = 1\}.$$

Obviously,  $K \subset D(K)$  holds (see Fig 3).

Assume in  $M$  there are a finite number maximal equivalent classes of the unperturbed diffusion process. Denote by  $\partial M$  the boundary of  $M$ . Let  $\mathcal{K} := \{K_n\}_{n=1}^{n_0}$  be all possible maximal equivalent sets of the unperturbed diffusion process in  $M$ . Let  $\rho_0$  be a positive number smaller than half of the minimum of the distances between  $K_i$  and  $K_j$  and between  $K_i$  and  $\partial M$ . Let  $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_0$ . We denote by  $O_\rho(K)$  the  $\rho$ -neighborhood of  $K$ , by  $\partial O_\rho(K)$




Fig.2. Biological conservation law and pairing up- and low-state emerging in dynamical neuronal networks. (A) The sum of the neuron firing rates in a neuronal network between several stable steady states. (B) The firing rates of each neuron in the neuronal network firing between two stable steady states. (C) The potential wave functions of each neuron of the neuronal network firing at one stable steady state. (D) The potential wave functions of each neuron of the neuronal network firing at another stable steady state.

the boundary of  $O_\rho(K)$ . We introduce the random times

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\tau}_0 &= 0, \quad \underline{\tau}_n = \inf \{t \geq \bar{\tau}_n : X^\epsilon(t) \in \bar{M} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{n_0} O_{\rho_0}(K_j)\}, \\ \bar{\tau}_{n+1} &= \inf \{t \geq \underline{\tau}_n : X^\epsilon(t) \in \partial M \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{n_0} \partial O_{\rho_1}(K_j))\} \end{aligned}$$

and consider the Markov chain

$$X^\epsilon(\bar{\tau}_n), \quad \forall n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

From  $n = 1$  on,  $X^\epsilon(\bar{\tau}_n)$  belongs to  $\partial M \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{n_0} \partial O_{\rho_1}(K_j))$ . As far as the times  $\underline{\tau}_n$  are concerned,  $X^\epsilon(\underline{\tau}_0)$  can be any point of  $\bar{M} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{n_0} O_{\rho_0}(K_j)$ ; all the following  $X^\epsilon(\underline{\tau}_n) \in \bar{M} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{n_0} O_{\rho_1}(K_j)$ , until the time of exit of  $X^\epsilon(t)$  to  $\partial M$ , belong to one of the surfaces  $\partial O_{\rho_0}(K_j)$ . After exit to the boundary  $\partial M$ , we have

$$\bar{\tau}_n = \underline{\tau}_n = \bar{\tau}_{n+1} = \underline{\tau}_{n+1} = \dots$$

and the chain  $\{X^\epsilon(\bar{\tau}_n)\}_n$  stops (see Fig 4). The diffusion process (7) takes many times inside some maximal equivalent class of the unperturbed diffusion process, while suddenly




Fig.3. Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal network. (A) ECoG transitioning between up-steady state  $\bar{u}$  and down-steady state  $\underline{u}$ . (B) The maximal equivalent classes where  $\bar{u}$  and  $\underline{u}$  are stable while  $\underline{u}_3$  is unstable.

transitioning at some  $\bar{\tau}_n$  from one maximal equivalent class (up-state or down-state) to another (down-state or up-state). Rhythms of the firing rates of the neuronal network arise from the solution transitioning between the maximal equivalent classes meanwhile the biological law (6) is conserved.




Fig. 4. The diffusion process takes many times inside some maximal equivalent class of the unperturbed diffusion process, while suddenly transitioning from one maximal equivalent class (up-state /down-state) to another (down-state /up-state).

## 5 conclusion

In this paper the quantum field theory is applied to study the phase transitions in large-scale brain activity, and the associated phenomena associated with critical behavior.

Suppose SOC can be interpreted as Witten-type topological field theory with spontaneously broken BRST symmetry [24][19]. The BRST-symmetry breakdown by instantons is proved in one-dimension ([24]p.170). In multiple dimension case, the sufficient and (or) necessary conditions when a Hamiltonian related to the diffusion process (12) is pseudo-Hermitian and pseudo-supersymmetry, as well as the relation between the interaction representations of the BRST operators and the Hamiltonian are discovered. Some examples on the hopping evolution of instanton and anti-instanton along the magnetic field  $\tilde{A}$  inducing pseudo-

supersymmetry and (or) BRST breakdown are given.

Even though the distributing curves of log spike number vs log window number are more likely non-power-law than power-law, the stochastic neural networks do break BRST supersymmetry. Furthermore, the rhythms discovered in cortical EEG and ECoG can be simulated by the stochastic neural networks. The sufficient condition on diffusion so that the limit behavior of the solutions to the stochastic neural networks approximate stationary Markov process is obtained. The diffusion process (7) takes a long time inside some maximal equivalent class of the unperturbed diffusion process( (7) without noise), and suddenly departing from one maximal equivalent class (up-state / down-state) and arriving to another (down-state / up-state). Rhythms of the firing rates of the stochastic neuronal networks arise from the transitions between the maximal equivalent classes (tunneling effect), meanwhile the biological law (6) is conserved.

## 6 Appendix. topological field theory

### 6.1 Quantization of SDE

Consider an SDE for N stochastic variables:

$$\partial_t v^i(t) + A^i(t) = \xi^i(t),$$

where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $A^i = A^i(\varphi)$  is the vector field,  $\xi^i$  is the stochastic noise.

For SOC systems, we may just take the Gaussian white noise as the noise term. And by applying the Parisi-Sourlas-Wu quantization procedure to the SDE above, we get the partition function

$$Z = \int [dv_i] J_P e^{-\int_{t=0}^T g_{ij} K^i K^j / 2},$$

where  $K^i = \partial_t v^i + A_i$ , and  $g^{ij} = (g_{ij})^{-1}$  is the noise-noise correlater

$$\langle \xi^i(s) \xi^j(t) \rangle = g^{ij} \delta(s - t),$$

and the Jacobian  $J_P$  corresponding to the Stratonovich interpretation of SDE is

$$J_P = 2 \sinh\left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{t=0}^T A_i^i\right),$$

where  $A_i^i(v) = \frac{\partial A^i}{\partial v^i}$ .

$J_P$  can be represented as the path integral over the fermionic Fadeev-Popov ghosts according to

$$\det M = \int [d\chi][d\bar{\chi}] \exp(\bar{\chi}_i M_j^i \chi^j).$$

*6.1.1 The Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization procedure of SDE ([24])* In the general case where  $g^{ij}$  is dependent on  $v$ , we can apply the Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization procedure to the SDE, which is guaranteed to produce a BRST invariant quantum action. In the following, we'll give a brief description of this procedure.

To start, consider the classical action :

$$S_c = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t=0}^T dt [g_{ij}(v) K^i K^j],$$

$$K^i = G^i - \dot{v}^i - A^i,$$

where  $\dot{v}^i = \partial_t v^i$ , and  $G^i$  is an auxiliary field, which can be integrated out later.

In the following discussions, the conventions for the Riemannian connection and curvature are given by:

$$\Gamma_{jk}^i = \frac{1}{2} g^{il} (\partial_j g_{lk} + \partial_k g_{lj} - \partial_l g_{jk}),$$

$$R_{ljk}^i = \partial_j \Gamma_{lk}^i - \partial_k \Gamma_{lj}^i + \Gamma_{jm}^i \Gamma_{lk}^m - \Gamma_{km}^i \Gamma_{lj}^m.$$

Now the symmetries of the action are :

$$\delta v^i = \epsilon, \quad \delta G^i = \dot{\epsilon}^i + A_{ij}^i \epsilon^j - \Gamma_{jk}^i K^j \epsilon^k,$$

The next step is to gauge fix the action, which is performed by choosing the gauge fermion as :

$$\Psi = - \int dt \bar{\psi}_i G^i,$$

and the corresponding quantum action is :

$$S_q = S_c - \int dt \{ \bar{\psi}_i [\dot{\psi}^i + A_{ij}^i \psi^j - \Gamma_{jk}^i K^j \psi^k] - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j R_{ml}^{ij} \psi^m \psi^l + B_i^i G^i \}.$$

Accordingly, the BRST transformations are :

$$\delta v^i = -\epsilon \psi^i,$$

$$\delta \psi = 0,$$

$$\delta\bar{\psi}_i = \epsilon B'_i,$$

$$\delta B'_i = 0.$$

$$\delta G^i = -\epsilon[\dot{\psi}^i + A^i_j \psi^j - \Gamma^i_{jk} K^j \psi^k] + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \bar{\psi}_j R^{ij}_{ml} \psi^m \psi^l,$$

and the corresponding BRST charge is on-shell nilpotent, which means that we have to use the classical equations of motion to achieve the nilpotency. So what we really need is the off-shell nilpotent BRST charge. To do that, we modify the transformations as :

$$\delta\bar{\psi}_i = -\epsilon(B_i - \bar{\psi}_j \Gamma^j_{ik} \psi^k),$$

$$\delta B_i = -\epsilon(\Gamma^j_{ik} B_j \psi^k - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_j R^j_{ilk} \psi^l \psi^k),$$

$$B_i = -B'_i + \bar{\psi}_j \Gamma^j_{ik} \psi^k.$$

Now the quantum action is :

$$S_q = \int_{t=0}^T dt \{ \mathcal{Q}, \bar{\psi}_i (\dot{v} + A^i - \frac{1}{2} B^i) \},$$

which is BRST-exact.

*6.1.2 Applying the Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization procedure* We have already shown that our partion function for the SDE is:

$$Z = \int [d\Phi] e^{-S},$$

where  $\Phi$  represents all the fields, and the action is :

$$S = \int_{t=0}^T dt g_{ij}(v) K^i K^j / 2 - \bar{\chi}_i (\dot{\chi}^i + A^i_j \chi^j).$$

We see that by changing  $\chi_i$  to  $\psi_i$ , the term  $\bar{\chi}_i (\dot{\chi}^i + A^i_j \chi^j)$  in the above action  $S$  is contained in the quantum action  $S_q$  :

$$S_q = S_c - \int dt \{ \bar{\psi}_i [\dot{\psi}^i + A^i_j \psi^j - \Gamma^i_{jk} K^j \psi^k] - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j R^{ij}_{ml} \psi^m \psi^l + B'_i G^i \}.$$

So starting from our original action  $S$  we can still get the same final  $\mathcal{Q}$ -exact quantum action  $S_q$  :

$$S_q = \{ \mathcal{Q}, \Psi \},$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q} = \sum_i \psi^i \frac{\delta}{\delta v^i} + (B_i - \bar{\psi}_j \Gamma_{ik}^j \psi^k) \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{\psi}_i} + (\Gamma_{ik}^j B_j \psi^k - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_j R_{ik}^j \psi^l \psi^k) \frac{\delta}{\delta B_i},$$

and  $\Psi$  is the gauge fermion :

$$\Psi = \int_{t=0}^T dt \bar{\psi}_i (\dot{v}^i + A^i - \frac{1}{2} B^i).$$

## 6.2 Obtain the Hamiltonian

In [24], the general definition for the momenta, Hamiltonian, and Poisson brackets are :

$$\Pi_i = \frac{\delta_r L}{\delta \dot{\Phi}^i}, \quad -H = \Pi_i \dot{\Phi}^i - L$$

$$\{X, Y\} = \frac{\delta_r X}{\delta \Phi^i} \frac{\delta_l Y}{\delta \Pi_i} - (-1)^{XY} \frac{\delta_r Y}{\delta \Phi^i} \frac{\delta_l X}{\delta \Pi_i},$$

where  $\Phi$  is the collection of fields, the subscripts r and l denote right and left derivatives, respectively, and the peculiar sign for the Hamiltonian is chosen so that the spectrum of H is bounded below.

As we have shown, our quantum action is:

$$S_q = \int_{t=0}^T dt L = \{\mathcal{Q}, \Psi\},$$

where  $L$  is the Lagrangian :

$$L = -\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} B_i B_j + (\dot{v}^i + A^i) B_i - \bar{\psi}_i (\dot{\psi}^i + A^i_j \psi^j) - \bar{\psi}_i \Gamma_{jk}^i (\dot{v}^j + A^j) \psi^k + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j R_{ml}^{ij} \psi^m \psi^l.$$

Having got the Lagrangian, we are in a position to get the Hamiltonian. The fields and the corresponding momenta are

$$\Phi^i = (v^i, \psi^i),$$

$$\Pi_i = \frac{\delta_r L}{\delta \dot{\Phi}^i} = (B_i - \bar{\psi}_j \Gamma_{ik}^j \psi^k, -\bar{\psi}_i),$$

so from the legendre tranformation  $H = L - \Pi_i \dot{\Phi}^i$  we obtain the Hamiltonian:

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} B_i B_j + A^i B_i - \bar{\psi}_i (\Gamma_{kj}^i A^k + A^i_j) \psi^j + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j R_{ml}^{ij} \psi^m \psi^l.$$

6.2.1 *Passing to the schrodinger picture* To consider the Hamiltonian as an operator, we turn to the Schrödinger picture. The Lagrangian  $L$  and the Hamiltonian  $H$  are related as

$$-L = i\pi_{v^i}\partial_t v^i + i\pi_{\psi^i}\partial_t \psi^i - H,$$

where  $\pi_{v^i}$  and  $\pi_{\psi^i}$  are the canonical momenta, which on passing to the Schrödinger picture

$$\pi_{v^i} \rightarrow -i\partial_{v^i}, \pi_{\psi^i} \rightarrow -i\partial_{\psi^i}.$$

It should be noticed that the reduced Planck constant  $\hbar$  is taken as 1 here.

And from

$$L = -\frac{1}{2}g^{ij}B_iB_j + (\dot{v}^i + A^i)B_i - \bar{\psi}_i(\dot{\psi}^i + A^i_j\psi^j) - \bar{\psi}_i\Gamma^i_{jk}(\dot{v}^j + A^j)\psi^k + \frac{1}{4}\bar{\psi}_i\bar{\psi}_jR^ij_m\psi^m\psi^l,$$

we identify

$$-i\pi_{v^i} = B_i, -i\pi_{\psi^i} = -\bar{\psi}_i.$$

So on passing to the Schrödinger picture, we have

$$B_i \rightarrow -\partial_{v^i}, \bar{\psi}_i \rightarrow \partial_{\psi^i}.$$

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Prof. ShiGang Chen for bringing the subject to our attention and for stimulating discussions.

- [1] J.M. Beggs, D. Plenz. Neuronal avalanches in neocortical circuits. *J Neurosci*,23(35), 11167-11177(2003).
- [2] T. Petermann, T.C. Thiagarajan, M.A. Lebedev, M.A. Nicolelis, D.R.Chialvo, and D. Plenz. Spontaneous cortical activity in awake monkeys composed of neuronal avalanches. *PNAS*,106(37):15921-15926(2009).
- [3] E.D. Gireesh and D. Plenz. Neuronal avalanches organize as nested theta- and beta/gamma-oscillations during development of cortical layer 2/3. *PNAS*, 105(21):7576-7581(2008).
- [4] B.D. Burns. Some properties of isolated cerebral cortex in the unanaesthetized cat. *J. Physiol.*, 112, 156-175(1951).
- [5] J.D.Cowan, J.Neuman, B.Kiewiet and W. van Drongelen. Self-organized criticality in a network of interacting neurons. *J.Stat.Mech.*, P04030(2013).
- [6] B. Podobnik, M. Jusup, Z. Tiganj, WX Wang, J.M. Buldú, and H.E. Stanley. Biological conservation law as an emerging functionality in dynamical neuronal networks. *PNAS*, vol.114(45):11826-11831(2017).
- [7] P.Dayan,L.F.Abbott. Theoretical neuroscience. *MIT Press*,(2001).
- [8] Buzsáki G. Rhythms of the brain. *OXFORD*,(2006).

- [9] del Castillo J and Katz B. Quantal components of the end-plate potential. *J Physiol.*, 124,560-573(1954).
- [10] B. Katz and R. Miledi. The measurements of synaptic delay, and the time course of acetylcholine release as the neuromuscular junction. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. (B)*, 161,483-496(1965).
- [11] C.F. Stevens. Quantal release of neurotransmitter and long-term potentiation. *Cell*, 72(10s):55-63(1993).
- [12] Freeman, W., Zhai, J. Deriving 1/f form of human EEG spectrum from summed random pulse trains. *THE INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON NONLINEAR BRAIN DYNAMICS*, (June 9-10, 2007), Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.
- [13] Freeman, W., Zhai, J. Simulated power spectral density (PSD) of background electrocorticogram (ECoG). *Cogn. Neurodyn.* 3:97-103(2009).
- [14] B.J. He, J.M. Zempel, A.Z. Snyder, M.E. Raichle. The temporal structures and functional significance of scale-free brain activity. *Neuron*, 66, 353-369(2010).
- [15] HJ Jensen. in Self-organized criticality. *Cambridge Univ Press*, (1998).
- [16] J. Touboul, A. Destexhe. Can power-law scaling and neuronal avalanches arise from stochastic dynamics?. *PLoS ONE*, Vol.5(2), e8982(2010).
- [17] E.Wong. Stochastic neural networks. *Algorithmica*,6:466-478(1991).
- [18] S. Kirkpatrick, C.D. Gelatt, Jr. M.P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220,671-680(1983).
- [19] I.V. Ovchinnikov. Self-organized criticality as Witten-type topological field theory with spontaneously broken Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin symmetry. *Physical Review E*, 83,051129(2011).
- [20] G.Parisi and Y.-S.Wu. Perturbation theory without gauge fixing. *Scientica Sinica*, 24,483(1981).
- [21] G.Parisi and N.Sourlas. Supersymmetric field theories and stochastic differential equations. *Nucl. Phys.B*, 206, 321(1982).
- [22] A Sinha and P Roy. Spontaneous PT symmetry breaking and pseudo-supersymmetry. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 39, 377-384(2006)
- [23] K. Hori, S. Katz, A. Klemm, etc. Mirror symmetry. *Clay Math.Mono.*, Vol.1, Ammerican Math. Soc.(2003)
- [24] D. Birmingham, M. Blau, M. Rakowski and G. Thompson. Topological field theory. *Phys. Repts.(Physics Letters)*, 209, Nos.4&5, 129-340(1991).
- [25] A. Mostafazadeh. Pseudo-supersymmetric quantum mechanics and isospectral pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonians. *Nuclear Physics B*, 640, 419-434(2002).
- [26] T.Kato. Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators. *Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg* (1995)
- [27] U. Picchini. SDE Toolbox: Simulation and Estimation of Stochastic Differential Equations with Matlab. <http://sdetoolbox.sourceforge.net..>