NEURAL CONTROL THEORY

A cognitive modeling history

- Cybernetics (40s) Goals. Neurophysiologists (McCulloch & Rosenblueth), mathematicians (Weiner) and engineers (Forrester). Too behaviourist, classical control.
- GOFAI (60s-) Representation and computation.
 Turing machines, von Neumann architecture, etc.
 Largely ignores time
- Contemporary (90s-) Time is essential, obvious to neurophysiologists. Idea: reintroduce modern control theory

Standard control system

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t)$$
$$\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}(t)$$



Neural control theory

- The synaptic dynamics dominate the overall population dynamics.
- We need to use the *intrinsic* synaptic dynamics to characterize 'neural' control theory

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-t/\tau}$$

• Laplace transform is:

$$h(s) = \frac{1}{1+s\tau}$$

Neural control theory

Put this into the control diagram (leaving out the C and D matrices)



Neural control theory

• So,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau^{-1} + s)\mathbf{x}(s) &= \tau^{-1} \left[\mathbf{A}' \mathbf{x}(s) + \mathbf{B}' \mathbf{u}(s) \right] \\ s\mathbf{x}(s) &= \tau^{-1} \left[\mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{I} \right] \mathbf{x}(s) + \tau^{-1} \mathbf{B}' \mathbf{u}(s) \end{aligned}$$

• Recall also,

$$s\mathbf{x}(s) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(s) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(s)$$

• Equating the two and solving gives the 'translation' $\mathbf{A}' = \tau \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}$ $\mathbf{B}' = \tau \mathbf{B}$

Generic neural subsystem

- GNS: a theoretical subsystem that can be mapped to any spiking neural population involved in some dynamic transformation
- Let's introduce some general notation by looking at different levels of description
- Then we'll write the equations for each principle of the NEF

Basic-level description



Higher-level description



Generic neural subsystem



So we can see $\omega_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \left\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{i}^{\alpha} \mathbf{M}^{\alpha\beta} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{j}^{\alpha F\beta} \right\rangle_{m}$

Principle 1: Representation

Encoding

$$\sum_{n} \delta(t - t_{in}) = G_i \left[\alpha_i \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_i \mathbf{x}(t) \right\rangle_m + J_i^{bias} \right]$$
• Decoding

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \sum_{i} a_i(\mathbf{x}(t))\boldsymbol{\phi}_i^{\mathbf{x}}$$

• where

$$a_i(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \sum_n h_i(t) * \delta(t - t_{in})$$
$$= \sum_n h_i(t - t_{in})$$

Principle 2: Transformation

Principle 3: Dynamics

Allowing x(t) to be the neural repn (and hence state variable) and u(t) to be the input, we have the following

$$\sum_{n} \delta(t - t_{in}) = G_i \left[\alpha_i \left\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_i \left(h_i(t) * \left[\mathbf{A}' \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}' \mathbf{u}(t) \right] \right) \right\rangle_m + J_i^{bias} \right]$$

- In fact this could be written more generally by having the control system be any f(A,B,x,u,t)
- Principle 2 then tells us how to compute *f*



- NPH & VN turn velocity signals into eye position commands
- Difficult problem to solve, but simple to formulate:

 $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}$

$$\mathbf{A} = 0$$
$$\mathbf{B} = 1$$

 So, in 'neural control' we have (assuming input and recurrent time constants are equal)

$\mathbf{A}' = 1$ $\mathbf{B}' = \tau$



• Substitute this into the encoding equation: $a_j(t) = G_j \left[\alpha_j \left\langle x(t) \tilde{\phi}_j \right\rangle + J_j^{bias} \right]$ Gives $a_j(t) = G_j \left| \alpha_j \left\langle h(t) * \tilde{\phi}_j \right| A' \sum_i a_i(t) \phi_i^x + B' u(t) \right| \right\rangle + J_j^{bias} \right|$ $= G_j \left| h(t) * \left| \sum_{i} \omega_{ji} a_i(t) + B' \tilde{\phi}_j u(t) \right| + J_j^{bias} \right|$ • Where

 $\omega_{ji} = \alpha_j A' \phi_i^x \tilde{\phi}_j$

- If we expect any error in *x*(*t*), we won't be able to build a perfect integrator... and we expect error
- We can think of error as being captured by some gain, *k*, in the circuit (which is a function of *x*)
- This gain effectively acts to modify *A*, and any deviation of *A* from 0 (or 1 in the neural case) moves the circuit over time, even with no input

Effective time constant

• So, A acts like a rate constant: $A = -\frac{1}{\tau_{eff}}$ • Or, in neural terms: $-\frac{1}{\tau_{eff}} = \frac{A'-1}{\tau}$ $\tau_{eff} = \frac{\tau}{1-A'}$

 So, an increase in synaptic time constant will lengthen the effective time constant

Integrator and synaptic TC



Representation error

- Since we can set A', and setting it to 1 gives an infinite time constant, the only remaining source of error is representational
- So, looking at the deviation from identity (as we've graphed many times) gives insight into the dynamics of the system
- You can see stable points and drift speed directly from this graph





Fixed points in integrator

• Effect of number of neurons and membrane time constants



Tunable filter

- We can take this a step further and tune A' directly with a neural ensemble $A'(t) = \sum b_l(t)\phi_l^{A'}$
- Direct substitution gives $a_{j}(t) = G_{j} \left[\alpha_{j} \left(h(t) * \tilde{\phi}_{j} \left[\sum_{l} b_{l}(t) \phi_{l}^{A'} \sum_{i} a_{i}(t) \phi_{i}^{x} + B'u(t) \right] \right) + J_{j}^{bias} \right]$
- Using an intermediation population gives
 a_j(t) = G_j [α_j (h(t) * φ̃_j [Σ_m c_m(t)φ^p_m + B'u(t)]) + J^{bias}_j]
 Using a 2D population is most efficient

Tunable filter



Humans and goldfish

• Humans (left) have more neurons, and hence slower drift (70s vs 10s)

• Both have centripital drift (i.e. A'<1)



Working memory

- Just another integrator...
- Defined over the co-efficients in the highdimensional vector space representing functions
- This model was one of the first successful ones of parametric working memory (observed e.g., in LIP)

Implementation (2000 neurons, 5000 iterations)



Predictions

 For narrow stimuli central cells (+) have decreased firing rate but peripheral cells (o) have increased firing rate.



Predictions

• For multiple stimuli whose centers are too close together, there are two kinds of error, *forgetting* and *blending*.

