

# An Electrical Network Model of Plant Intelligence\*

Bikas K. Chakrabarti<sup>(1)</sup> and Omjyoti Dutta<sup>(2)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup>Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhan Nagar, Kolkata-700064.

<sup>(2)</sup>Electrical Engineering Dept. (4th Yr.), Jadavpur University, Kolkata-700032.

## Abstract

A simple electrical network model, having logical gate capacities, is proposed here for computations in plant cells. It is compared and contrasted with the animal brain network structure and functions.

---

\* Talk at the Condensed Matter Days-2002, held in Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, during August 29-31, 2002 (to be published in Ind. J. Phys.).

Considerable investigations and efforts have been made in understanding how the animal and human brains compute and recognise various spatial and temporal patterns [1,2]. The essential model consists of a network of large number (about  $10^{12}$  in case of human,  $10^6$  in case of birds) of two state electrical devices called neurons which are capable of just summing over the various (milli-volt order) input electrical pulses for a short synaptic period (of milli-second order) collected by the ( $10^6$  or so) dendrites of each neuron, and comparing this sum with a threshold. The synaptic interactions among the neurons develop during the "learning" process, and can be both excitatory or inhibitory, rendering the network randomly frustrated. The computational capabilities emerge out of the collective dynamics of the network, which is nonlinear (due to the threshold behaviour of each neuron). For symmetric interactions, one can define an energy function (or free energy at finite noise or "temperature" level) for the network and the local free energy minima corresponds to the various local attractor patterns or memory states of the network (Hopfield [1]). For long-range interactions, the statistical physics of such a network is analytically tractable to a large extent (Amit et al [1, 2]). The processing of informations in such network models and their detailed analysis are now established (see e.g., Nishimori [2]). These demonstrated capabilities of such networks are of course very limited in their emerging computational abilities [2] and far short of anything like consciousness, where some aspects of quantum mechanics (entanglement in the molecules in microtubules of a single neuron) are speculated to be involved [3].

Are the plants around us intelligent? Do they also deserve our attention in this context of modelling for information processing and computation? Plants have remarkable adaptability in changed environments. They survive in every landscape of this earth, representing almost 99% of its biomass. Such marvellous adaptive behaviour must be interpreted to be intelligent; although naive definition of intelligence seem to involve movement of the animal (either bodily or part of it) and plants can not move (bodily) [4]. How such intelligent behaviour of mindless plants, having no brain, compare with those of animals [5]? Plants do not have neuronal cells either.

Almost eighty years back, Bose detected electrical signalling between plant cells in coordinating its responses to the environment [6,7]. Although the chemical diffusion of (uncharged) molecules is a dominant source of signalling between the plant cells, it is a very slow mode. It is now established [7] that some signals are transmitted within the plants at much smaller time

scale (with signal velocity about 30-400 mm/sec, depending on the plant and its environment). Such fast transmissions are due to electrical pulses, generated by ionic motions within the plant cells. Although not the dominant mode, except in some very sensitive plants like *Desmodium* or *Mimosa* [7], the electrical mode (due to migration of  $\text{Ca}^{+}$ ,  $\text{K}^{+}$ , etc ions) generally present in the cells of all the plants [8]. However, these electrically excitable plant cells do not have many dendrites, like for the neurons, nor are they connected by random excitatory/inhibitory (frustrating) interactions.

In absence of the highly connected (frustrated) network of neuron-like units, as in the animal brains, the plants might be utilising the non-linear current (I)-voltage (V) characteristics of their cell membranes for the logical operations (gates). In fact, the plant vacuolar membrane current-voltage characteristics [9] is now established to be equivalent to that of a Zener diode, as indicated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. (a) Typical I-V curves of the plant vacuolar membrane fast-activating channel (from [9]). The current being mainly due to  $\text{Ca}^{+}$  ions and the (reversible) effect of divalent Putrescine ( $\text{C}_4\text{H}_{14}\text{N}_2^{2+}$ ) are shown at two different concentrations. (b) The equivalent Zener diode-like behaviour of the membrane, where the Putrescine concentrations ( $c$ ) modulate the changes in the threshold voltage  $V_T$ .

One can utilise such a threshold behaviour of the plant cell membranes

to develop or model gates for performing simple logical operations. In Fig. 2, such a model network containing four such threshold units; one in the output and the other three in the input. Each of these threshold units is modelled as a binary unit, having two states: 0 and 1. The inter-unit connection strength is denoted here by the matrix  $W$ . The output  $O$  of the network considered can then be expressed as

$$O = \theta(I - \phi), \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  is the step function ( $\theta(x) = 1$  for  $x \geq 0$ ; and 0 otherwise),

$$I = W_1 I_1 + W_2 I_2 + W_3 I_3, \quad (1a)$$

and  $\phi$  is the threshold strength (determined by the threshold voltage  $V_T$ ) for the output unit.  $I_1$ ,  $I_2$ ,  $I_3$  are the inputs to the three input units and  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ ,  $W_3$  are their connectivity strengths with the output unit, as indicated in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. A simple network containing four threshold units (three in the input and one in the output) for performing logical operations like AND, OR, NAND, etc.

For different combinations of  $I_1$ ,  $I_2$  and  $I_3$ , the outputs for different logic gates are given in the Table 1. These can be easily achieved using the combinations of inter-cell connections and the output cell thresholds as:

$$W_1 = W_2 = W_3 = 1, \phi = 3, \quad (2a)$$

for the AND gate;

$$W_1 = W_2 = W_3 = 1, \phi = 1, \quad (2b)$$

for the OR gate; and

$$W_1 = W_2 = W_3 = -1, \phi = -2 \quad (2c)$$

for the NAND gate.

Table I: The input-output (truth) table for the logic gates

Inputs			Output O		
$I_1$	$I_2$	$I_3$	AND	OR	NAND
0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	1
0	1	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	0	1	1
1	1	0	0	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	0

These gate capabilities of simple networks of the plant cell membranes, using their nonlinear characteristics and cosequent threshold behaviour (with adjustable thresholds through changed concentrations of, for example, the putrescine and the interaction matrix  $W$ ) would allow (cf. [2]) simple computations in the electrical channels of the plants. It may be noted that such networks here are much more local and tiny in structure, compared to the massively connected and parallelly working network of animal brains. Also, the network matrix  $W$  elements are either all positive (excitatory) or all negative (inhibitory) in eqns. (2). As such, they do not involve any frustration as in the animal brains and have got consequently several limitations in their computational capabilities; for example, they lack the distributed parallel computational capacity, associate memory, etc.

We are grateful to Indrani Bose, Arnab Chatterjee and Dibyendu Sen-gupta for many useful comments and suggestions.

## References:

- [1] J. J. Hopfield, “Neural Networks and Physical Systems with Emergent Computational Abilities”, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sc. (USA) **79** 2554 (1982); D. J. Amit, H. Gutfreund and Sompolinsky, “Statistical Mechanics of Neural Networks Near Saturation”, Ann. Phys. **173** 30 (1987).
- [2] For reviews see e.g., J. Hertz, A. Krough and R. G. Palmer, *Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA (1991); B. K. Chakrabarti and P. K. Dasgupta, “Modelling Neural Networks”, Physica **186** 33 (1992); H. Nishimori, *Statistical Physics of Spin Glasses and Information Processing*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford (2001).
- [3] R. Penrose, *The Emperor’s New Mind*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford (1999); M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (2000).
- [4] A. Trewavas, “Mindless Mastery”, Nature **415** 841 (2002).
- [5] B. K. Chakrabarti, “Mathematics, Brain Modelling and Indian Concept of Mind”, Proc. Asiatic Soc., Kolkata (in press); also at arXiv:cond-mat/0205094 (2002).
- [6] J. C. Bose, *The Nervous Mechanism of Plants*, Longmans, Green & Co, London (1923).
- [7] V. A. Shepherd, “Bioelectricity and Rhythms of Sensitive Plants: The Biophysical Research of J. C. Bose”, Current Sc. **77** 189 (1999).
- [8] T. Genoud and J.-P. Mètraux, “Crosstalk in Plant Signalling”, Trends in Plant Sc., **4** 503 (1999).
- [9] L. I. Brüggemann, I. I. Pottosin and G. Schonknecht, “Cytoplasmic Polyamines Block Fast-Activating Vacuolar Cation Channel”, The Plant J. **16** 101 (1998).