# Stimulus-dependent suppression of chaos in recurrent neural networks

Kanaka Rajan

Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics Princeton University





$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = -x_i + 9\sum_{j=1}^{N} J_{ij} r_j + h_i$$

$$h_i \rightarrow f_j \qquad Synaptic weights$$

$$\langle J_{ij} \rangle_J = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle J_{ij}^2 \rangle_J = \frac{1}{N}$$

#### Neuronal response function is nonlinear



#### Neuronal response function is nonlinear



#### Neuronal response function is nonlinear











N = 1000

Sompolinsky, Crisanti & Sommer, 1988



N = 1000

Sompolinsky, Crisanti & Sommer, 1988

 $C(\tau) = \langle r(t)r(t+\tau) \rangle$ 



N = 1000

Sompolinsky, Crisanti & Sommer, 1988

#### Drop in variability with constant input



#### Drop in variability with constant input





**Experiments show evidence of input-dependent drop in response variability** 



Churchland, Yu, Cunningham, Sugrue, Cohen, Corrado, Newsome, Clark, Hosseini, Scott, Bradley, Smith, Kohn, Movshon, Armstrong, Moore, Chang, Snyder, Ryu, Santhanam, Sahani & Shenoy, 2010

$$C(\tau) = \langle r(t)r(t+\tau) \rangle$$

 $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0}$ 



$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010

$$C(\tau) = \langle r(t)r(t+\tau) \rangle$$

 $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0}$ 





$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010

$$C(\tau) = \langle r(t)r(t+\tau) \rangle$$

$$I = 0 \qquad I < Icrit \qquad I > Icrit$$

$$r(t) \stackrel{1}{\underset{0.5}{\longrightarrow}} \underbrace{\int_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s}^{0.5}}_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s} \stackrel{1}{\underset{0.5}{\longrightarrow}} \underbrace{\int_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s}^{0.5}}_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s} \stackrel{1}{\underset{0.5}{\longrightarrow}} \underbrace{\int_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s}^{0.5}}_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s} \stackrel{1}{\underset{0.5}{\longrightarrow}} \underbrace{\int_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s}^{0.5}}_{0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad t, s}$$

$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010



$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010





Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010 & 2011



Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010 & 2011



Abbott, Rajan & Sompolinsky, 2010 Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010 & 2011

#### Definition of signal and noise



$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010

#### Definition of signal and noise



$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010

#### Definition of signal and noise



$$N = 1000, g = 1.5, f = 2.5Hz$$

Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010

# Noise drops to 0 as a function of stimulus strength



Thursday, April 7, 2011

 $\mathbf{O}$ 



Rajan, Abbott & Sompolinsky, 2010 & 2011

# Noise has a more interesting dependence on frequency



Thursday, April 7, 2011

Ο

# Noise has a more interesting dependence on frequency



Thursday, April 7, 2011

Ο

#### What of the additional stochastic noise sources in real circuits?



#### What of the additional stochastic noise sources in real circuits?



#### What of the additional stochastic noise sources in real circuits?



signalnoise

# Conclusions

# External stimulus actively suppresses intrinsic noise in chaotic networks

#### This suppression is most effective at intermediate frequencies

# Thank you

L F Abbott, Columbia University Haim Sompolinsky, Hebrew University & Harvard University

and for insights, advice and experimental direction

Mark Churchland & Krishna Shenoy, Stanford University

Support: Swartz Foundation and the Lewis-Sigler Institute

# Spontaneous activity starts at 1 and is chaotic



Figure: Avi Ziskind Sompolinsky, Crisanti & Sommers, 1988