Mathematical Tools for Neural and Cognitive Science

Fall semester, 2023

Section 6a:

Fitting simple neural models

Fitting models to data

- How do we estimate parameters?
 - formulate model + objective function (common choice: ML)
 - optimize (closed form, gradient descent, etc)
- How good are parameter estimates?
- How well does model fit ?
 - likelihood or posterior comparisons
 - model failures



6a - LNP-STA.key - December 2, 2023











































Some tractable model options

- Low-order polynomial [Volterra '13; Wiener '58; DeBoer and Kuyper '68; ...]
- Low-dimensional subspace [Bialek '88; Brenner etal '00; Schwartz etal '01; Touryan and Dan '02; ...]
- Recursive linear with exponential nonlinearity [Truccolo etal '05; Pillow etal '05]





- McCullough & Pitts (1943), Rosenblatt (1957), etc
- No spikes (output is firing rate)



Simple LNP fitting

- Assuming:
 - stochastic stimuli, spherically distributed
 - average of spike-triggered ensemble (STA) is shifted from that of raw ensemble
- The STA (i.e., linear regression!) gives an **unbiased** estimate of w (for any f). [on board]
- For exponential f, this is the ML estimate! [on board]

[Bussgang 52; de Boer & Kuyper 68]







































ML estimation of LNP

If $f_{\theta}(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x})$ is convex (in argument and theta), and $log f_{\theta}(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x})$ is concave, the likelihood of the LNP model is convex (for all data, $\{n(t), \vec{x}(t)\}$)

Examples: $e^{(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}(t))}$

 $(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}(t))^{\alpha}, \quad 1 < \alpha < 2$

[Paninski, '04]











- Neural response depends on spike history => introduce spike history feedback
- Symmetric nonlinearities and/or multidimensional front-end (e.g., V1 complex cells)
 => spike-triggered covariance, subspace analyses
- White noise doesn't drive mid- to late-stage neurons well
 => cascade LNP on top of an "afferent" model







RGC

LNP

rLNP

40

200 rate







2

2

rate (sp/s)













"Decoding" neural populations? Connecting neural response to behavior Engineering: Brain-Computer Interfaces Test/compare encoding models









I. Simple/intuitive population decoding

• Linear? $\hat{s}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{n} r_n s_n$

(simple, but usually doesn't work well)

• Winner-take-all $\hat{s}(\vec{r}) = s_m, \quad m = \arg \max_n \{r_n\}$

(simple, but discontinuous and noise-susceptible)

• Population vector [Georgopoulos et.al., 1986] (also simple, more robust)





ML decoding for a Poisson-spiking neural population [Ma, Beck, Latham, Pouget, 2006; Jazayeri & Movshon, 2006] $p(\vec{r}|s) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{h_n(s)^{r_n} e^{-h_n(s)}}{r_n!}$ $\log(p(\vec{r}|s)) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_n \log(h_n(s)) - h_n(s) - \log(r_n!)$ If $\sum_{n=1}^{N} h_n(s)$ is constant (i.e., tuning curves "tile"), just minimize the response-weighted sum of log tuning curves.

Special cases allow closed-form solutions:

- Gaussian tuning curves $h_n(s) = \exp\left(-(s-s_n)^2/2\sigma^2\right)$
- von Mises tuning curves $h_n(s) = \exp(\kappa \cos(s s_n))$









1) The ML decoder, assuming independent Poisson responses (the PID):

$$\log L(\theta) = \log\left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} p(r_i | \theta)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log\left(\frac{f_i(\theta)^{r_i}}{r_i!} \exp(-f_i(\theta))\right)$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log(f_i(\theta))r_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log(r_i!) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i(\theta)r_i + B(\theta)$$

For discrimination between two values, likelihood ratio is *linear* function of responses:

$$\log LR(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \log\left(\frac{L(\theta_1)}{L(\theta_2)}\right) = \log L(\theta_1) - \log L(\theta_2)$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^N [W_i(\theta_1) - W_i(\theta_2)]r_i + [B(\theta_1) - B(\theta_2)]$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^N w_i(\theta_1, \theta_2)r_i + b(\theta_1, \theta_2)$$

[Graf, Kohn, Jazayeri & Movshon, 11]



Comparing population decoders

2) Alternatively, compute an SVM on the measured response vectors for each orientation, the empirical linear decoder (ELD):

$$y(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i(\theta_1, \theta_2) r_i + b(\theta_1, \theta_2)$$

3) For each neuron and orientation, shuffle the responses across trials and train a new SVM, the correlation-blind empirical linear decoder (CB-ELD).







