

General representation of collective neural dynamics with columnar modularity

Myoung Won Cho and Seunghwan Kim[†]

Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics & NCSL, Department of Physics,
Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang, Gyeongbuk, 790-784, Korea

(dated: May 23, 2019)

We exhibit a mathematical framework to represent the neural dynamics at cortical level. The description of neural dynamics with columnar modularity is based both on neuroscience and informatics, whereas they correspond with the conventional formulas in statistical physics. As we showed in visual map formations [1], neural systems can share the well-known properties in other physical systems. We insist that the typical characters of self-organizing map is determined not by the detailed and complex interaction rules but by the topology of lattice and feature space. The collective neural phenomena can be understood and predicted through some parameters in a general energy form with symmetry transform invariance. We apply our method to already exhibited and verified models in cortical map formations, such as the elastic net model and Kohonen's self-organizing feature map algorithm, in addition our suggestion for the lateral interaction model in ref. [1, 2].

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

After the detailed dynamics of single neuron are revealed, there are much challenge at cellular level to explain how brains think. Those studies of physical models, such as the networks of coupled oscillators [3, 4], are focused on getting biological realism of the neural computation models. However the success of the basic neural network models, based on the connectional framework between simple cells, in the application of an alladaptive systems, they are inherently problematic in the apprehension of collective neural phenomena and higher cognitive behavior in real brain. And also there are attempt to see through the neural processing at different levels, the functional modularity of neurons or the symbolic processing architecture. Before the physiological evidence of repetitive cortical blocks, there were proposals of the modularity within neighbor neurons, called cell assemblies (CAs), considering the high dimensional attribute and faculty of neurons [5]. It is tendency of neurons to aggregate together with similar functional specializations and make organizations hierarchically. Though different classifications and names for neural clusters, we adopt the suggestion that neuron-minicolumn - (hypercolumn) - macrocolumn - cortex area - hemisphere, where minicolumn is a candidate for "the repeating pattern of circuitry" or "the iterated modular unit" [6].

In this paper, we will exhibit an original mathematical framework, noted briefly and named the fibre bundle map (FBM) methods in ref. [1], and show how to represent neural dynamics generally with functional modularity. Obviously there exist another mathematical framework to represent the neural dynamics in reduced space.

Kohonen set up the mathematical preliminaries, called the feature maps, in vector space and led the successive models in artificial and physiologic neural networks [7]. Symbolic processing architectures also suggest the description of neural computations at the cognitive and rational bands. The feature vector space or the symbolic sets can be a kind of FBM representations. But the FBM methods have interest in the changes after "excitatory" or "inhibitory" activity rather than the effective representation of neural state. Indeed, the properties of dynamic progress are determined not by the individual neural state but by the algebraic structure between actions. The mathematical framework of FBM based on manifold theory is related with important concepts in statistical and quantum field theory, and help to comprehend collective neural phenomena intuitively. We suggest the general energy form of neural dynamics via two different ways. One is a method through the least action principle or the gauge theory. This method is so powerful to predict the general formula of energy functions in cortical map formations only using the symmetry between the feature states (or called gauge symmetry in quantum mechanics). Considering the transform invariant properties, it is generally assumed that the energy of map formations takes the form at a continuum limit

$$E[\psi] = \int d\mathbf{r} \left[\frac{v}{2} \psi(\mathbf{r} - i\mathbf{A})^2 + \frac{m^2}{2} \psi^2 + \frac{g}{4!} \psi^4 \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the feature state at position \mathbf{r} . An arbitrary vector \mathbf{A} , called the vector potential in physics, is important value to determine the typical spacing in developed feature maps. Such energy form can explain the typical characters of emergent self-organizing feature maps in experiments and simulations, and predict phase transitions according to the changes in parameters however the parameters should be determined through the next method. Another way to build the formula of neural dynamics is through the detailed description of indi-

[†]Electronic address: mwocho@postech.edu

[†]Electronic address: swan@postech.edu

vidual interactions between neurons. Comparing to previous equation forms, the formulas in FBM's have some peculiar characters. The interactions between neurons are notated by the inner products rather than their distance, and classified according to the number of coupling. We assume that the energy function for neural dynamics can be expanded in a power series, i.e.,

$$E[\mathbf{x}] = E^{(0)} + \sum_{\mathbf{x}} B(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} D(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}} G(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}; \mathbf{w}) + \dots \quad (2)$$

However, for the statistical analysis of dynamics, we have to approximate the form in Eq.(2) at a continuum limit and obtain again the form in Eq.(1). Other models described in feature vector space can be revised into the energy form in Eq.(2), that will show the different opinions about which factor determines the typical parameters and causes the phase transitions in self-organizing maps.

We will apply the FBM methods to the visual map formation models. The cortical map formations in orientation and ocular dominance columns is one of the most studied problems in brain. A considerable amount of different models for pattern formations is proposed, and some of which are compared with the experimental findings and in competition [8, 9]. The theoretic analysis of pattern formation are reported within a few of models. Obermayer et al. presented a statistical-mechanical analysis of pattern formation and compared predictions quantitatively with experimental data using the Kohonen's self-organizing feature map (SOFM) approaches. Wolf et al. obtained again the conditions for the emergence of columnar patterns in the SOFM algorithm. The studies of the elastic net model also show the bifurcation and emergence of the columnar patterns [10, 11]. Scherf et al. investigated pattern formations in ocular dominance columns with more detailed model, which covers the results of the SOFM algorithm and the elastic net model [12]. Wolf and Geisel predicted the influence of the interactions between ocular dominance and orientation columns on the pinwheel stability without model dependency and demonstrated it in the simulations using the elastic net model. The lateral (or neighbor) interaction models are also successful scheme based on physiology. Recently, we predicted the bifurcation of inhomogeneous solutions also in lateral interaction models, and derive the typical properties in observed patterns, such as the orthogonality and the correlation function [1]. In particular, we showed that the pinwheels in orientation maps are equivalent structure with the vortex in magnetism using the spin-like Hamiltonian models, which comply with the form in Eq.(2). We rewrite other models described in feature vector maps, such as the elastic net model and

the SOFM algorithm, according to the form in Eq.(2). These three models focus on the different but possible interactions in vivo; feedforward competitions, lateral interactions and winner take all activity. The descriptions of models in such an expansion reveal the typical properties of interactions per models. The effective dynamics in elastic net model equivalent with those in lateral models and can be represented by spin-like Hamiltonian also. Moreover, finding the quadratic interaction term $D(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$ in Eq.(2), becomes the linear analysis of model itself and reveals how the columnar patterns emergent. The dynamics in SOFM algorithm are related with the quartic interaction term. Our results show that the neural dynamic procedures from learning algorithms can be expressed and treated through conventional physics theories.

II. REPRESENTATION OF NEURAL STATE WITH FUNCTIONAL MODULARITY

The structures and connections in cerebral cortex are more complex and modular than those in the artificial neural networks. Neurons tend to be vertically arrayed in the cortex, forming cylinders known as cortical columns. Traditionally, six vertical layers have been distinguished and classified into three different functional types. The layer IV neurons (IN box), first get the long-range input currents, and send them up vertically to layer II and III (INTERNAL box) that are called the true association cortex. Output signals are sent down to the layer V and VI (OUT box), and sent further to the thalamus or other deep and distant neural structures. Lateral connections also occur in the superficial (layer II and III) pyramidal neurons. In columnar (or horizontal) clustering, there are minicolumns, which are consisted of about 100 neurons and 30 μm in diameter in monkeys, and macrocolumns, which are 0.4 - 1.0 mm and contain at most a few hundred minicolumns. On the wider discrimination, there are 52 cortex areas in each human hemisphere; a Brodmann area averages 21 cm^2 and 250 million neurons grouped into several million minicolumns [6].

The columnar modules can be regarded as a kind of multi-layered neural networks and would have complex functional attributes. Most neurons in brain have the attribute of selective response to a received activity, and their preferred patterns become useful representation of the functional attributes of small networks. A traditional and useful representation of single cell state is the pattern vector notation $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i v_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is correspond with the activity of the i -th neuron. If neurons at position \mathbf{r} respond selectively to a input pattern vector \mathbf{v} and make output pattern vectors \mathbf{w} per each input signal, we can represent their functional attribute compactly as,

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}); \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{F} is a nonlinear response or posterior probability function. If \mathcal{F} is ignored, this leads to a simple pattern




FIG. 1: A network with columnar modules. The functional attributes of each module $w^{(i)}$ is represented as simple linear associator if there is no hidden layers. Input signals are driven by feedforward synapses with weights W , and outputs interconnected by recurrent synapses with weights J . Information (or the functional attributes of neurons) are encoded in the neighbor synaptic weight within columnar modules $w^{(i)}$ (intrinsic type) or in the feedforward synaptic weight W (extrinsic type).

associator called the linear associator. The experiments of the response properties to the external stimuli through electrode penetration can be understood as the measurement of the product between the associator $w^{(i)}$ and the input signal ξ ,

$$jw^{(i)}(\xi) = \sum_j w_j^{(i)} \xi_j \quad (4)$$

where the activity of the output j is correspond with the measurement of the number of action potential or the frequency of spikes. Regarding the physiologic experiments, such as complex cells in primary visual cortex [13] or object perception in inferotemporal (IT) cortex [14], the response properties of neurons are more complex and become the combination of simple patterns, and then the functional attribute of the columnar module is represented by the summation of the associators in Eq.(3).

If the output signal is considered to be common with the input (or $w^{(i)}$ is diagonalized), a vector notation can replay the functional representation of the columnar module. The signal vectors with the high-dimensional components, that the amount of receptor cells, used to be represented more efficiently. The feature vector codes are, so to say, a reduced dimensional representation with the most prominent components on other basis. For example, given pattern vector, we can extract the feature components, that are the center of the pattern $(x; y)$ and the maximal variance vector $(v_x; v_y)$. With the ocular dominance z , the feature vector with 5 components,

$$= (x; y; v_x; v_y; z) \quad (5)$$

is a usual representation of the orientation and the ocular dominance columns in visual cortex. Extraction of the significant features in the input data is the purpose of

an unsupervised learning rule and also expected to be a principle character of artificial and physiologic neural networks. In the studies of the statistical structure of natural images, the response properties of visual neurons, the spatially localized and oriented, are considered to be due to the efficient coding of natural images [15].

Sometimes single neurons can have high dimensional attributes. If the meaning of activity is characterized from where the current are, the attribute of neurons is determined by the strength of connections with the external cells. For example, the ocular dominance in the primary visual cortex are determined whether it is dominated by left or right eyes (or LGN). We call this the extrinsic information coding type, which is realized by the connectivity with far aparted neurons cross cortex areas, whereas the intrinsic type is realized by the synaptic plasticity between close neurons within a columnar module. We don't distinguish the coding types in the representations of neural functional states. But there are some considerable different between them in the detailed mechanisms of synaptic plasticity and information transmission. One of them is the normalization of a different signals with neighbors or the winner-take-all (WTA) process if hard competitions. In the intrinsic coding type, networks cannot know which neurons match mostly with the input signals before their response. The winner have to be determined after the lateral inhibitory activity (the lateral feedback control). Whereas in the extrinsic coding type, the correspondence with input signals is determined by the connection strength with the incentive cells, and the total response activity cross networks to the different current can be normalized before lateral interactions. The competitive Hebbian models, such as the elastic net model and the SOFM algorithm, require the feedforward control of response normalization (or competition with neighbors) and depict the feature vectors in the visual cortex through the connectivity between the cortex and retinas (or LGNs) [12]. We will show in sec.V that the effect of the lateral inhibitory activity and the feedforward competition of a different signals are equivalent and can be described with common interaction form. However, the extrinsic encoding type is problematic in huge networks or out of sensory area in brain for information transmissions. We consider that the intrinsic type, encoding information in spatial or temporal correlated signals, would be the prominent strategy at neocortex except for the primary sensory area.

III. FIBRE BUNDLE MAP AND DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRIC CONCEPTS

The fibre bundle map (FBM) methods represent the neural attributes in a further developed mathematical framework - called fibre bundle in manifold theory [16, 17]. When trivial bundle, a total space E is composed of a base (or lattice) space B and a fibre F . In our interests, a code (or feature, model) space become

the fibre, where the cortex area becomes the base space. The signal vector or feature vector space defined by the Cartesian components or the symbolic set in the symbolic computational architecture also becomes fibre. A typical definition in fibre bundle is the transition function (or symmetry) group G of homeomorphism of fibre F . Sometimes the transition group replaces the fibre, $G = F$ (i.e. principal fibre bundle), and the neural attributes would be represented by the group elements. The principal fibre bundles are important in physics because they admit connections (or vector potential) A and are related with the Yang-Mills gauge theories.

The self-organizing feature map achieved by locally gathering similar interests means there are smooth variance of features with neighbor neurons. In other words, the properties of "organized" and "optimized" feature maps is related with those of "continuous" and "flat" functions in manifold. If G is a continuous group, the feature maps are described by a set of variables, called a field, $\phi(r)$ or

$$\phi(r) = \sum_j \phi_j(r) \exp(i a_j(r)) = \phi_a(r) \quad (6)$$

where $\phi_a(r)$ are arbitrary internal phase of neuron at position r and a are the basis of the Lie group. If there is no difference of features with neighbors at small region near position r , we can denote $\nabla \phi(r) = 0$ (or $\nabla \phi(r) = 0$). If there exists small tilting of phase angle at position r and a vector $A(r)$ denote the difference between phase angles, the revised derivative, called the covariant derivative, is $(\nabla - iA(r)) \phi(r) = 0$ (or $\nabla \phi(r) - A(r) \phi(r) = 0$). If the covariant derivative vanishes (said to be flat or parallel translated in manifold theory) for all r , the fields would be the minimum solutions of the integral

$$S = \int dr \sum_j (\nabla - iA) \phi_j^2; \quad (7)$$

which means the emergent self-organizing feature maps is a kind of solutions in the least action principle.

The symmetry property also helps to guess the energy function of map formations. For example, the features of orientation columns in the visual cortex has $U(1)$ (or $O(2)$) symmetry ($\phi = \sum_j \phi_j e^{i\theta_j}$ for the angle of the preferred pattern $\theta = 2\pi$). However we perform a rotation in all the preferred angles $\theta = 2\pi$ through same angle $\theta = 2\pi$ (called global gauge transform), the energy functions should remain invariant. Sometimes the rotation angle can have a dependency on position r , called the local gauge transform, and the energy functions may take the form in Eq.(1) where $A = A(r)$.

The most typical properties of orientation maps in experiments and simulations can be predicted through the energy form

$$E[\phi] = E^0 + \frac{v}{2} \int dr \sum_j (\nabla - iA) \phi_j^2; \quad (8)$$

When $v > 0$, there would be the topological excitation states with the singularity, called pinwheels in the




FIG. 2: A simulation results of orientation map formation. The orientation maps have $U(1)$ (or $O(2)$) symmetry and the major characters of developed map can be predicted only using the symmetry properties.

orientation map such as vortices in magnetism, where the change in energy due to formation of a pinwheel is $E = (\sum_j v_j \int) \ln(L/a)$. The vector A , called the vector potential in physics and the connection in manifold, occurs due to the competitive behavior between neurons or the inhibitory lateral interactions and causes the phase transition to inhomogeneous states. If $\nabla \phi \neq 0$, columnar patterns, called the linear zones in orientation maps, would be emergent with the wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi / |\nabla \phi|$ and the autocorrelation function is measured as the zeroth Bessel function $J_0(\nabla \phi r)$. The orthogonal property with the contour lines and the area boundary is due to the properties of continuous fields. From the equilibrium condition $E = 0$ or $\nabla^2 \phi = 0$, the normal component of $\nabla \phi$ vanishes at the area boundary since the integral along a narrow rectangular loop over the area boundary $\oint_C \nabla \phi \cdot dr$ vanishes due to the divergence theorem. Such perpendicularity with the area boundary is also manifested in other static field solutions, such as the magnetic field. We derived the energy term in Eq.(8) at a continuum limit from the spin-like Hamiltonian model [1]. Other orientation development models should satisfy the energy form in spite of each different interaction rules. These results say that the major features of self-organizing map are universal and can be understood through the experience in other physical systems.

The structure of transition group between features can be presumed with several algebraic descriptions: (1) In the primary sensory areas, the transition functions can be inferred from the symmetry in external activities or patterns. The symmetry group corresponding with the feature space is clear and complete. (2) If two different features, $\phi_1(r)$ and $\phi_2(r)$, are occupied at a common cortex, the imposed restriction for normalization is $\int \phi_1(r)^2 + \int \phi_2(r)^2 = \text{const}$ for all position r . For example, the symmetry group of the orientation and ocular dominance columns in primary visual cortex is not $O(2) \times O(1)$ but $O(3)$. A typical character of two combined feature

maps is that the contour lines of them meet at right angle, because of $r_1 r_2 = 0$ with the equilibrium conditions $E = 0$ or $r^2 = 0$ for $r = 1, 2$. The orthogonal property between the orientation and ocular dominance maps is reported also in animal experiments [18]. (3) Like the primary auditory cortex, the transition functions corresponding with the features are not consist complete group but be ordered sequentially. In this cases the extreme (the maximal or minimal) features tend to exist at the boundary of feature map. (4) Some measurements in biologic experiments, such as the correlation between activity, give information about the difference between codes. However there are no experimental evidence, we can guess the relative distance between codes and classify them according to their category, such as human faces, monkey faces or shapes in inferotemporal cortex. Such homomorphic representation of group structure is useful for the problems of functional area differentiations at macroscopic level. (5) At high cognitive area, it is not easy to infer the transition function group because the code space is embedded on very large and high dimensional manifold. If we cannot guess any more symmetry or relative distance between codes, symbolic sets will be available, where they are complete groups also.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF DETAILED NEURAL INTERACTIONS

The description of neural dynamic at high level also should be based both on neuroscience and informatics. One important principle is the Hebbian rule [5]: roughly speaking, if there are two simultaneously active neurons on either side of a connection then the weight of that connection is increased. It is believed that neurons discover significant patterns or features in the input data, which is the purpose of the unsupervised or self-organizing learning, from the Hebbian rule. A series of experiments prove the Hebbian rule in biology, and show that the synaptic plasticity is a redistribution of the available synaptic efficacy and not an increase in the efficacy [9, 20]. In other words, the neural plasticity at network level is understood to increase the probability of the reactivity for given environmental experience with the bounded total synaptic strength. So it is reasonable that the neural dynamics with functional modularity is described by the slight movement of the internal phase to the input pattern per activity.

As reduced dynamic methods, the formulas in FBM have some different character with those in the feature vector space. In the feature vector representation, the change in the feature state at position r , r would be described as the difference vector with the stimuli vector \mathbf{r} , such as $\partial_t \mathbf{r} / (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r})$, and the energy functions are consisted of $\int \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}^2$ (or its power terms). Whereas, the energy functions in the FBM are consisted of the inner products, such as $(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r})$. If there are automatic normalization of the synaptic weights or the afferent sig-

nals within a columnar module, that $j = \text{const}$, the energy form of both types works equivalently. The energy functions with the terms of inner products or more meaning in physiology as shown in Eq.(4). Sometimes the inner product is adjusted to be nonnegative value considering the physiologic circumstances.

Hereafter we will denote the external stimuli beyond cortex area as j . The likelihood to experience certain stimuli from external environment (or other cortex areas) is stochastic and the potential function of external stimuli is defined as the probabilistic distribution of the input signals:

$$V(\mathbf{j}) = \sum_{j \in D} P(j) \mathbf{j} \quad (9)$$

where $P(j)$ is the probability to experience a signal j in the input data set $D = \{j(t_1); j(t_2) \dots\}$. In statistics notation, $P(j)$ is 'the prior probability' that the signal j is observed, and $P(j|\mathbf{j})$ is correspond with 'the posterior probability' $P(\mathbf{j}|j)$. It is natural that the states of neurons are determined according to the density of driven external stimuli. Some animal experiments of synaptic plasticity show the cortical rearrangement after differential stimulation. In the experiment of a monkey, repeated use of the tips of certain fingers cause the population increment of the corresponding neurons in the primary somatosensory cortex [23]. However, if the neural dynamics is described by only $E = V(\mathbf{j})$, the solutions indicate only the collapse of whole neurons to single feature state corresponding to the maximal probable activity. We can expect that the observed cortex maps in vivo are far from the equilibrium state because the relaxation process in neuron systems is very slow, and they will reach to single state finally. But in the view of the learning rules, neurons have to tendency to avoid occupying common state with others. It is expected that neurons represent features responding to 'many' inputs (the coarse coding principle). On the other hand, it is efficient for neural networks when an object is coded by a small population that is active for an event (the sparse coding principle). We expect that neural networks achieve the sparseness owing to (1) competition or inhibitory interactions between neighbors and (2) dynamic or thermal fluctuations.

The neighborhood function $J(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$, the connectivity between neurons (or columnar modules) at position \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} within a cortex area, has two types according to the control mechanisms. In lateral feedback control (what Kohonen called activity-to-activity kernel), the neighborhood function J is regarded to be excitatory for closer distance and inhibitory for longer distance - so called Mexican hat type. Whereas in lateral control of plasticity (or activity-to-plasticity kernel), the lateral interactions is nonnegative and may take on the Gaussian form [24]. The term of neighbor interactions in FBM methods takes the exchange energy form

$$E^{(2)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} J(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}) \quad (10)$$

or

$$E^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} J(x;y) \langle x \rangle^y \langle y \rangle + \langle x \rangle \langle y \rangle^y : \quad (11)$$

Indeed the mathematical frameworks and formulas in FBM methods resemble those in statistical quantum field theory. If we assume \hat{y} and \hat{x} are creation and annihilation operators, the term $\hat{y} J(x;y) \hat{x}$ means the phenomena that a created activity (or a package of spikes) at position x is translated with kernel J and annihilated at position y . We consider interactions with higher powers are possible and assume the general energy form in Eq.(2), where the quadratic interaction term $D(x;y)$ need not to be always agreed with the neighborhood function $J(x;y)$. The interaction function of powers will be inferred depending on each mechanisms.

In neural architecture, the notation of entropy or free energy is introduced ahead in the learning rules based on the probability theory. The minimum description length (MDL) principle [25] explains well the aim of the learning algorithm, that find a method of coding each input data that minimizes the total cost of communicating the input data to a receiver. Usually the cost functions in the unsupervised learning algorithms have similar form of the Helmholtz free energy that

$$F = E - TS \quad (12)$$

where the parameter T is a positive constant that determines the importance of the second term relative to the first rather than a temperature notation yet. The first term measures the expected energy of describing the input data using their stochastic distribution. If we define it using the notation in Eq.(9),

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \sum_{r \in L} V(r) = \sum_{r \in L} \sum_{j_r \in D} P(j_r) P(j_r | r) \\ &= \sum_{r \in L} \sum_{j_r \in D} P(r, j_r) \\ &= \sum_{r \in L} \sum_{j_r \in D} P(r) P(j_r); \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

for lattice space L and code space F . $P(j_r)$ is the probability of feature state in cortex area or the prior probability of model. The second term in Eq.(12) assesses the entropy or sparseness of the code by assigning a cost depending on how activity is distributed among the code sets. There are several definition for S and a general form is

$$S = - \sum_{j_r \in D} P(j_r) \log P(j_r) \quad (14)$$

where $-\log P(j_r)$ is the code cost, the number of bits requires to communicate the code according to Shannon's coding theorem. We expect that the thermal fluctuations in neural dynamics are caused due to the perturbations in external activity and the nonlinearity in dynamics. However, there are some hardship to adapt the

fundamental assumption or definition of temperature in thermal physics into the cortical dynamics because the real neural networks are not exactly closed, conserved nor thermal equilibrated systems, in spite of the suggestions for the probabilistic decision neural networks such as Boltzmann machines [26]. We think the neural networks should be treated as far from but in relaxation to the equilibrium state.

V. APPLICATION TO VISUAL MAP FORMATION MODELS

The coding in the primary visual cortex has some peculiar characters. The most probable activity, oriented bar or grid patterns in natural images, is 'degenerated', so the major deviations of feature maps happen on the reduced manifold from the whole pattern space. The conventional spin vector $(S^x; S^y; S^z)$ can serve as a useful representation of the feature states with the preferred orientation $\theta = (1/2) \tan^{-1}(S_x/S_y)$ and the ocular dominance S_z , where the phenomena in visual map formations has analogy with well-known properties in magnetism.

A. The lateral interaction models

A trivial description of neural dynamics is the summation of the neighbor interactions and the external stimuli terms:

$$E[\mathbf{x}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} J(x;y) x_y + \sum_x V(x) : \quad (15)$$

If the response function in Eq.(9) is considered as a linear function or $\langle x \rangle = x$, the energy function is described like the form in Eq.(2) that

$$E[\mathbf{x}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} D(x;y) x_y + \sum_x B(x) x \quad (16)$$

where $D(x;y) = J(x;y)$ and $B(x) = \sum_{j_r \in D} P(j_r) h_{j_r}^x$, the probabilistic average of external stimuli. When $D(x;y) = D(x-y)$, the dynamics in the Fourier space is given by

$$\partial_t q / \mathcal{D}(q) = q + h_{j_r}^x : \quad (17)$$

In degenerated map such as the visual cortex, the external stimuli $h_{j_r}^x$ is considered to be constant or vanished and $\mathcal{D}(q)$ is expected to determine the typical appearance of developed feature maps. The approximated energy at a continuum limit takes the form in Eq.(8) where $A = q$ is the maximum point of $\mathcal{D}(q)$ and $v = \mathcal{D}''(q) = a^2$ for the lattice constant a . The lateral interaction models take the activation kernel, usually so-called "Mexican hat" function (positive feedback in the center, negative in the surround). For an example, a




FIG. 3: The two types of neighbor interaction functions and control mechanisms [24]. (a) The lateral interaction models adopt lateral activity control and the activation kernel, usually so-called "Mexican hat" function (positive feedback for close distance and negative for longer distance). (b) The plasticity control with nonnegative kernel requires feedforward competition (or feedforward normalization of activity over networks). The elastic net model assume the nearest neighbor interactions (or elastic force), whereas the SOM algorithm take the neighbor function on Gaussian form with the hard competition (or winner-take-all activity).

well-known Mexican hat function, called the difference of Gaussians (DOG) filter, is described as

$$J(x; y) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} - k e^{-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{2\sigma_2^2}} \quad (18)$$

where k is the strength of inhibitory activity. If the strength of inhibitory activity k is larger than threshold k_c , $D(q)$ has an non-vanishing maximum point q and columnar patterns such as the band-like patterns in ocular dominance columns or the strip-like patterns in orientation columns will emerge with the wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi/\tilde{q}$ [1].

B. The elastic net model

The competitive Hebbian models require the feedforward competition and the nonnegative neighborhood function (or plasticity control kernel). In the FBM methods, the feedforward competition and normalization is described in higher terms of the nonlinear response function in the external potential, Eq.(9). A trivial nonlinear form of the response function would be that

$\tilde{x} = x + x^2$. But if considering the normalization of activity, the response function is given like that

$$(\tilde{x} - x)' = \frac{\tilde{x}_k P_x (1 + \tilde{x}_k - x)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_y (1 + \tilde{x}_k - y)} \quad (19)$$

for the number of sites N . The energy form in Eq.(16) is obtained again with

$$D(x; y) = J(x; y) + C(x; y) \quad (20)$$

and

$$C(x; y) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_z (x - y - 1) h_{jk}^2 i_{\text{D}} : \quad (21)$$

If we consider the stimuli with the activity center z is scattered by the gaussian form

$$j_k = j_z e^{-\frac{x^2 + z^2 - 2xz}{2\sigma_s^2}} \quad (22)$$

for the feedforward cooperation range σ_s , we can calculate the correlation between the external stimuli at position x and y ,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{jk}^2 j_y i_{\text{D}} &= \frac{1}{a^2} \int dz d j_z P(j_z) (j_z)^2 \\ &= \int e^{-\frac{x^2 + z^2 - 2xz}{2\sigma_s^2}} e^{-\frac{y^2 + z^2 - 2yz}{2\sigma_s^2}} \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\sigma_s^2} = a^2\right) e^{-\frac{x^2 + y^2 - 2xy}{2\sigma_s^2}} h_{jk}^2 i_{\text{D}} : \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

This result means that the correlation of external stimuli $C(x; y)$ can act as the inhibitory interaction term however the neighborhood function J is nonnegative kernel. For an example, the elastic net model is described by an iterative procedure with the update rule:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1}(x) - x_t(x) &= \sum_{y \neq x} (x - y) \\ &+ \sum_{y \neq x} \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{y^2 + (x-y)^2 - 2y(x-y)}{2\sigma_s^2}}}{e^{-\frac{y^2 + (x-y)^2 - 2y(x-y)}{2\sigma_s^2}}} \right) \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where x is the feature vector of visual map with Cartesian components in Eq.(5) [8, 27]. At each iteration, a stimulus v is chosen at random according to given probability distribution $P(v)$. The first term in Eq.(24) means the elastic force or the excitatory interactions between the nearest-neighbors, and the second term implies the stimuli scattered with a activity center and normalized. In our notations, the neighborhood function become $J(x; y) = \sum_{z \neq x} (x - y - z)$ or the laplacian operator at a continuum limit. We can consider $\tilde{x} = x + x^2$ from the linear terms in Eq.(24), and obtain

$$C(x; y) = \frac{h_{jk}^2 i_{\text{D}}}{N} \sum_z (x - y - 1) e^{-\frac{x^2 + y^2 - 2xy}{2\sigma_s^2}} : \quad (25)$$

There are also interaction terms of higher power but the quadratic interaction term $D(x; y)$ determines the major characters of developed feature maps. We transform it to fourier space and obtain

$$D(q) = \tilde{q}^2 + \frac{h_{jk}^2 i_{\text{D}}}{2\sigma_s^2} \sum_z 1 - e^{q^2 \frac{z^2}{2\sigma_s^2}} : \quad (26)$$

It has maximum point at

$$q = \frac{1}{\sigma_s} \ln \frac{1}{-h_{jk}^2 i_{\text{D}}} ; \quad (27)$$

which is correspond with the analytic results with different approaches [10, 12].

We show that the elastic net model and the lateral interaction models can be described by common energy form in Eq.(16) with $D(x) = h_+(x) - h_-(x)$ for positive

functions h_+ and h_- . This result means that two models have equivalent effective interactions and share statistical properties, in spite of their different control mechanisms. The emergence of columnar patterns are possible when h_- is relatively larger than h_+ . The lateral interaction models consider h_- as the lateral inhibitory interaction term whereas the elastic net model suggest it as the correlated external stimuli term.

C. Kohonen's SOFM algorithm

In Eq.(16), the neighbor interaction term J means the exchange of spontaneous spikes, created without external activity. We can expect the possibility of spontaneous firing considering the property of coupled nonlinear oscillators with small dynamic fluctuations. But several experiments have been suggested that the organization of feature maps is possible after exposure to the external activity. That means the possibility of spontaneous firing are small ($J \rightarrow 0$) and the most intracellular interactions would be achieved by indirect currents of external activity. If we take the second hand interactions as the effective energy, we have $E[\mathbf{J}] = V(\mathbf{J}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_j J_j$ or

$$E[\mathbf{J}] = \sum_k B_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k C_k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k J_k \quad (28)$$

If $B(x) = h_{jk}^2 i_{jk}$ is constant, the first term (const) $\sum_k J_k$ supports the lateral interaction models again. The Kohonen's SOFM algorithm ignores it or considers $h_{jk}^2 i_{jk}$ to be vanished, and focus on the lateral currents induced by feedforward normalized stimuli, $(C_k) - (J_k)$. Moreover, the SOFM algorithm requires the hard competition, called the "winner take all" (WTA) case. As α_s approaches zero in Eq.(22), the activity is localized only around the winning neuron and the correlation of external stimuli in Fourier space is $C(q) = \sum_k h_{jk}^2 i_{jk} q^2$. The neighborhood function takes on the gaussian form $J(x;y) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} |x-y|^2 / \sigma^2}$ for the lateral cooperation range σ . Therefore we obtain the effective interaction term in Fourier space

$$C(q)J(q) = 2 \sum_k \frac{1}{\sigma^2} h_{jk}^2 i_{jk} q^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2} q^2 \sigma^2} \quad (29)$$

It has the minimum point at

$$q = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (30)$$

which agrees with previous analytic results [12, 28, 29] and always positive if $\sigma > 0$. Kohonen's SOFM algorithm is said to be robust in learning rules because it

always success in achieving an array of different feature detectors.

V. DISCUSSION

The physical models of neural networks based on neuroscience have to target to interpret both the physiologic phenomena and the computational architectures. Considering the development of functional area in whole brain, we need more adaptable theories than the basic neural architecture with connectionism. In this paper, we show the conventional expressions in physics can serve as appropriate and effective descriptions of neural dynamics. As we showed in visual map formations [1], the collective neural dynamics can be much alike well-known phenomena in other physics systems. We expect that the theoretic experience in physics will offer intuitive appreciation of the physiologic phenomena and sophisticated mechanisms in the computational architectures. The assumption that micolumns is a candidate for the processing elements in networks is optional but successful in explanation of map formations at cortical level. The formation of structure in micolumn is also due to the functional grouping between neurons with similar interests, and expected to be certified with more fundamental interactions at neuron level.

In the assumption of the columnar module, we classify the synaptic connection types and anticipate different functional characters in computational processing. (1) In the connectivity between close neurons within a columnar module, the functional attributes of neurons and the associative memory is realized. (2) By the connectivity between the columnar modules, noted by the neighborhood function J , within a cortex area, the networks control laterally the output activity between neighbors (3) Via the connection between far aparted neurons cross cortex areas, neurons get driven-activity from external environment or other functional cortex areas. The columnar modules become elements (or nodes) again with high dimensional attributes in networks of neural networks. If the neighborhood function $J(x;y)$ is specified depending on the positions x and y rather than their distance, the connectivity between columnar modules also work in information memorize. The connection strength between columnar modules within or beyond cortex areas would be strengthened also if there are much communications between them according to the Hebbian rule. But we consider that the enhancement of connectivity between columnar modules is for the efficient communications rather than information encoding.

[1] M. W. Cho and S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 18101 (2004).

[2] J. D. Cowan and A. E. Friedman, in Neural Information

Processing (NIPS) (1990), vol. 2.

[3] T. N. Ishikawa, Y.-C. Lai, and F. C. Hoppensteadt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 108101 (2004).

- [4] T. Aonishi, K. Kurata, and M. Okada, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 2800 (1999).
- [5] D. O. Hebb, *The organization of behavior: A neurophysiological theory* (John Wiley and Sons (New York), 1949).
- [6] W. H. Calvin, in *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks*, edited by M. A. Arbib (MIT Press, 1998), pp. 269{272.
- [7] T. Kohonen, *Self-organization and associative memory* (Springer-Verlag, 1984).
- [8] E. Erwin, K. O. Obermayer, and K. Schulten, *Neural computation*, 7, 425 (1995).
- [9] N. V. Swindale, *Network: Comput. Neural Syst.* 7, 161 (1996).
- [10] F. Hoyer, F. Wolf, T. Geisel, S. Lowel, and K. Schmidt, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks* (Paris, 1995), vol. I, pp. 535{540.
- [11] G. J. Goodhill and A. C. Inger, *Network: Comput. Neural Syst.* 11, 153 (2000).
- [12] O. Scherf, K. Pawelzik, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel, *Phys. Rev. E* 59, 6977 (1999).
- [13] D. H. Hubel and T. N. S. Wiesel, *J. Physiol. (London)* 140, 106 (1962).
- [14] K. Taniguchi, Y. Yamane, M. Nishizaki, and M. Tanifuji, *Nat. Neurosci.* 4 (2001).
- [15] B. A. Olshausen and D. J. Field, *Nature (New York)* 381, 607 (1996).
- [16] D. Martin, *Manifold Theory - An Introduction for Mathematical Physicists* (Ellis Horwood, 1991).
- [17] C. Nash and S. Sen, *Topology and geometry for physicists* (Academic Press, 1983).
- [18] K. Obermayer and G. G. Blasdel, *J. Neurosci.* 13, 4114 (1993).
- [19] H. Markram and M. Tsodyks, *Nature* 382 (1996).
- [20] Y. Fregnac, pp. 845{846 (1998).
- [21] P. Dayan and L. F. Abbott, *Theoretical Neuroscience* (The MIT Press, 2001).
- [22] K. D. Miller, J. B. Keller, and M. P. Stryker, *Science* 245, 605 (1989).
- [23] W. M. Jenkins, M. M. Merzenich, M. T. Ochoa, E. Alvarado, and T. Guic-Robles, *J. Neurophysiol.* 63, 82 (1990).
- [24] T. Kohonen, *Self-organizing maps* (Springer, 1995).
- [25] J. Rissanen, *Stochastic complexity in statistical inquiry* (World Scientific, 1989).
- [26] G. E. Hinton and T. J. Sejnowski, in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (New York: IEEE, 1983), pp. 448{453.
- [27] R. Durbin and G. Mitchinson, *Nature (London)* 343, 341 (1990).
- [28] F. Wolf, K. Pawelzik, O. Scherf, T. Geisel, and S. Lowel, *J. Physiol. (Paris)* 94, 525 (2000).
- [29] K. Obermayer, G. G. Blasdel, and K. Schulten, *Phys. Rev. A* 45, 7568 (1992).