

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: December 2, 2024)

We exhibit a mathematical framework to represent the neural dynamics at cortical level. Our description of neural dynamics with columnar and functional modularity, named fibre bundle representation (FBM) method, is based both on neuroscience and informatics, whereas they correspond with the conventional formulas in statistical physics. In spite of complex interactions in neural circuitry and various cortical modification rules per models, some significant factors determine the typical phenomena in cortical dynamics. The FBM representation method reveals them plainly and gives profit in building or analyzing the cortical dynamic models. Not only the similarity in formulas, the cortical dynamics can share the statistical properties with other physical systems, which validated in primary visual maps [1]. We apply our method to proposed models in visual map formations, in addition our suggestion using the lateral interaction scheme. In this paper, we will show that the neural dynamic procedures can be treated through conventional physics expressions and theories.

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 [2, 3], 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 small adaptive 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 [4]. 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” [5].

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 columnar and 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 [6]. 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 interested in the manifold structure of frequent inputs in feature space and its corresponding Lie group. 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, named from fibre bundle theory, is related with important concepts in statistical and quantum field theory, and help to comprehend collective neural phenomena intuitively. The general energy form in cortical dynamics can be build via two different ways. One, the energy function and the pattern properties in cortical map formations can be inferred only using the topologic properties. Because of the invariance properties under the symmetry transform in cortical and phase space, the energy of cortical map formations takes the form

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

at a continuum approximation. The fields notation $\psi(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the feature state at position \mathbf{r} . A arbitrary vector \mathbf{A} , called the vector potential in physics, is important value to determine the typical spacing in developed feature maps. This is just Ginzburg-Landau energy form with gauge invariance and explain the typical characters of emergent self-organizing feature maps in experiments and simulations. Phase transitions can be predicted when the changes in parameters, whereas the parameters

*Electronic address: mwcho@postech.edu

†Electronic address: swan@postech.edu

are obtained from the detailed interaction mechanisms. Another way is to build models through the detailed description of individual neural interactions. Comparing to previous formulas in high or low-dimensional feature vector representations, the formulas in FBM representations 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 in cortical dynamics can be expanded in a power series, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\psi] = & E^{(0)} - \sum_{\mathbf{x}} B(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\psi(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{y}) \\
& - \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\psi(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{y})\psi(\mathbf{z}) \\
& - \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})\psi(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{y})\psi(\mathbf{z})\psi(\mathbf{w}) + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

For the statistical analysis of dynamics, we have to approximate this and obtain again the energy form in Eq.(1) at a continuum limit. When we rewrite the development rule through the formula in Eq.(2), we can take up the essence of different mechanisms and comprehend their results effectively.

We apply our methods to the models in primary visual map formations. 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 [7, 8]. The theoretic analysis of pattern formation are reported within a few of models. Miller *et al.* formulated correlation-based models describing how ocular dominance and orientation columns develop [9, 10, 11]. 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 [12]. The studies of the *elastic net* model also show the bifurcation and emergence of the columnar patterns [13, 14, 15]. 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 [16]. 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 [17]. The lateral (or neighbor) interaction models are also successful scheme based on physiology [18, 19, 20]. 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 map 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 models focus on the different but possible interactions *in vivo*; Hebbian competitions and lateral interactions. We can rewrite them in FBM representations and express through the form in Eq.(2). As other physical systems, functional matrix $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ in Eq.(2) is consequence term in cortical dynamics. Moreover, finding the quadratic interaction term $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ becomes the linear analysis of model itself and reveals how the columnar patterns emerge. $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ does mean always the neighbor connectivity and composed of different interactions depending on models. But the effective interaction functions take common shape, called the Mexican hat type, for all models in spite of different assumption in activity controls. These results show how such different models can share the statistical properties in dynamics.

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 [5].

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 neural systems. A traditional and useful representation of neural state is the vector notation $\mathbf{u} \in V$, sometimes called the high-dimensional feature vector representation, where $u_i \in R$ is correspond with the activity of the i -th neuron in layer. If a columnar module (or single neuron) at position \mathbf{r} re-




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

spond selectively to a input vector \mathbf{u} and make output vector \mathbf{v} (or output v) per each input signal, we can represent their functional attribute compactly as,

$$w(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{v} \circ \Theta \circ \mathbf{u}^T, \quad (3)$$

where Θ is a nonlinear response or posterior probability function. If Θ is ignored, this leads to a simple pattern 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 $w(\mathbf{r})$ and the input signal \mathbf{u}' ,

$$|w(\mathbf{r}) \circ \mathbf{u}'| = |\mathbf{v}| \Theta(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}') \quad (4)$$

where the activity of the output $|\mathbf{v}|$ 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 [21] or object perception in inferotemporal (IT) cortex [22], the response properties of columnar modules can be the combination of different patterns and then the functional form in Eq.(3) takes the the summation of associators. When the output \mathbf{v} is common with the favoriest input \mathbf{u} such as Hopfield networks [23] or the favoriest input is only concerned, a vector notation can replay the representation of functional attributes in columnar modules.

Fig.1 depicts a neural network with columnar modules, and the neural attribute is expected to be achieved by the connectivity within a columnar module $w(\mathbf{r})$. When simple-cell layer models, the connectivity with the external cells \mathbf{W} is considered to vest the neural selectivity. For example, the ocular dominance of neuron in the primary visual cortex is determined whether it is more

connected with left or right eye (or LGN) cells. 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 can take common representations of neural attributes between two coding types, but there exist some different ground when building actual models. Moreover, the extrinsic encoding type is problematic in huge networks because too massive connections are required when the meaning of activity is characterized only from where the current are. We expect that the intrinsic type, encoding information in spatial or temporal correlations within a signal band, is essential in huge networks and would be the prominent strategy at neocortex except for the primary sensory area.

III. FIBRE BUNDLE MAP REPRESENTATIONS

The signal vectors with the high-dimensional components, that the amount of receptor cells, used to be represented more efficiently. In the “low-dimensional” feature vector representations, each component stands for a selected response property. For example, the features of orientation columns are denoted by Cartesian components $\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = (q(\mathbf{r}) \sin(2\phi(\mathbf{r})), q(\mathbf{r}) \sin(2\phi(\mathbf{r})))$ for preferred orientation $\phi(\mathbf{r})$ and degree of preference for that orientation $q(\mathbf{r})$ at each cortical location \mathbf{r} [19]. In FBM representations, however they sometimes takes similar forms with the low-dimensional feature vector representations, the feature components are approximated with different standpoint.

The FBM representation method bases on a mathematical framework - called *fibre bundle* in manifold theory [24, 25]. A total space E , depicts the neural attributes at a cortical area, is composed of a base (or lattice) space B and a fibre F when trivial bundle. In our interests, a feature (or code, model) space become the fibre, where the cortex locations are the elements in the base space. A typical definition in fibre bundle is the transition function (or symmetry) group G of homeomorphism of fibre F and the transition group sometimes replaces the fibre, $G = F$ (i.e. *principal fibre bundle*) The principal fibre bundles are important in physics because they admit connections (or vector potential) \mathbf{A} and are related with the Yang-Mills gauge theories. For a continuous group G , the features are described by a set of variables, called fields $\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ and

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}) = |\psi(\mathbf{r})| \exp(-i\phi_a(\mathbf{r})\tau^a) = \psi_a(\mathbf{r})\tau^a \quad (5)$$

where $\phi_a(\mathbf{r})$ is arbitrary internal (feature) phase at position \mathbf{r} and τ^a is a basis of the Lie group. The bases can be taken as the amount of receptor cells. But the frequent input patterns usually occupy small regions in the total pattern space and the major variance of feature components occurs within a embedded submanifold with high stimuli density. As shown in Fig. 2, the bases can




FIG. 2: Probabilistic external stimuli and a potential function. The transformed bases $\tau^{1'}$ and $\tau^{2'}$ are the principal directions of external stimuli density at a point.

be transformed according to the principal directions of external stimuli density at each point and the dominant cortical dynamics are described with a few of field components. So the reduced feature components is related with the statistical structure of external patterns and the feature extraction is achieved by symmetry breaking in cortical dynamics.

The differential geometric concepts in FBM representations furnish an intuitive explanation for emergent cortical maps. The self-organizing feature maps 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 “float” functions in manifold. If there is no difference of features with neighbors at small region near position \mathbf{r} , we can denote $\nabla\psi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ (or $\nabla\phi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$). If there exists small tilting of phase angle at position \mathbf{r} and a vector $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ denote the difference between phase angles, the revised derivative, called the *covariant derivative*, is $(\nabla - i\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}))\psi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ (or $\nabla\phi(\mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = 0$). If the covariant derivative vanishes (said to be flat or parallel translated in manifold theory) for all \mathbf{r} , the fields ψ would be the minimum solutions of the integral

$$S = \int d\mathbf{r} |(\nabla - i\mathbf{A})\psi|^2. \quad (6)$$

The symmetry property also help 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 ($\psi = |\psi|e^{i\phi}$ for the angle of the preferred pattern $\phi/2$). However we perform a rotation in all the preferred angles $\phi/2$ through same angle $\chi/2$ ($\phi \rightarrow \phi + \chi$




FIG. 3: 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.

- called ‘global’ gauge transform), the energy functions should remain invariant. Sometimes the rotation angle χ can have a dependency on position \mathbf{r} , called the ‘local’ gauge transform, and the energy functions may take the form in Eq.(1) where $\mathbf{A} = \nabla\chi(\mathbf{r})$. That means the emergent self-organizing feature maps is a kind of stationary field solutions. The major features in cortical maps are universal and can be understood through the experience in other physical systems.

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

$$E[\phi] = E' + \frac{v}{2}|\psi|^2 \int d\mathbf{r} |\nabla\phi - \mathbf{A}|^2. \quad (7)$$

When $v > 0$, there would be the topological excitation states with the singularity, called pinwheels in the orientation map such as vortices in magnetism, where the change in energy due to formation of a pinwheel is $\Delta E = (\pi v |\psi|^2) \ln(L/a)$. The vector \mathbf{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. For example, the band patterns in ocular dominance and the linear zones in orientation columns emerge when there are non-vanishing vector potential and the wavelength is $\Lambda = 2\pi/|\mathbf{A}|$. If $|\mathbf{A}| \neq 0$, periodic patterns, such as the band patterns in ocular dominance and the linear zones in orientation columns, would emerge with the wavelength $\Lambda = 2\pi/|\mathbf{A}|$. The orthogonal property with the contour lines and the area boundary is due to the properties of continuous fields. From the equilibrium condition $\delta E/\delta\phi \sim 0$ or $\nabla^2\phi \sim 0$, the normal component of $\nabla\phi$ vanishes at the area boundary since the integral along a narrow rectangular loop over the area boundary $\oint_C \nabla\phi \cdot d\hat{n}$ 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.(7) at a continuum limit from the spin-like Hamiltonian model [1]. Other orientation development models should be satisfy the energy form in spite of each different interaction rules.

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 [4] : 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, through 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 [26, 27]. 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 feature representations, the formulas in FBM have some different character with those in the low-dimensional feature vector. In the low-dimensional feature vector representations, the change in the feature state at position \mathbf{r} , $\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}$ is described as the difference vector with the stimuli vector $\Phi'_{\mathbf{r}}$, such as $\partial_t \Phi_{\mathbf{r}} \propto (\Phi'_{\mathbf{r}} - \Phi_{\mathbf{r}})$, and the energy functions are consisted of $|\Phi_{\mathbf{r}} - \Phi'_{\mathbf{r}}|^2$ (or its power terms). Whereas, the energy functions in the FBM representations are consisted of the inner products, such as $\psi(\mathbf{r})\psi'(\mathbf{r})$. The energy functions with the terms of inner products offer more meaning in physiology. Sometimes the inner product is adjusted to be nonnegative value considering the physiologic circumstances. If there are automatic normalization of the synaptic weights or the afferent signals within a columnar module, that $|\psi| = \text{const}$, the energy form of both types works equivalently. Sometimes the normalization constraint in the local synaptic weight is not given and involved in the plasticity rule (Hebb rule with subtractive normalization [28]). When the energy function is given like that

$$E[\psi] = a\psi^2 - b\psi^4, \quad (8)$$

the stability of synaptic weight will be achieved from that

$$\partial_t |\psi|^2 \propto |\psi|^2 \left(1 - 2\frac{b}{a} |\psi|^2 \right). \quad (9)$$

This indicates that $|\psi|^2$ will relax over time to the value b/a .

Hereafter we will denote the external stimuli from 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 :

$$V(\psi) = - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} P(j|\mathcal{D}) \Theta(j\psi) \quad (10)$$

where $P(j|\mathcal{D})$ is the probability to experience a signal j in the input data set $\mathcal{D} = \{j(t_1), j(t_2) \dots\}$. In statistics notations, $P(j|\mathcal{D})$ is ‘the prior probability’ that the signal j is observed, and $\Theta(j\psi)$ is correspond with ‘the posterior probability’ $P(\psi|j)$. If the response function in Eq.(10) is considered as a linear function or $\Theta(x) = x$, the energy function is described like the form in Eq.(2) that

$$V(\psi) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}} B(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (11)$$

where $B(\mathbf{x}) = \langle j_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the linear average of external stimuli. A trivial nonlinear form of the response function would be that $\Theta(x) = x + \eta x^2$. When the sum over synaptic weights is constrained by subtractive normalization and the response function is given like that

$$\Theta(j_{\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}}) \simeq \frac{j_{\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}}(1 + \eta j_{\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}})}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{y}} (1 + \eta j_{\mathbf{y}}\psi_{\mathbf{y}})} \quad (12)$$

for the number of sites N , the potential function takes that

$$V(\psi) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}} B(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (13)$$

where the correlation (or scattering) function

$$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{2\eta}{N} (\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) - 1) \langle j_{\mathbf{x}} j_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (14)$$

Frankly speaking, the feedforward normalization of afferent signals is achieved when the correspondence of neurons to input signals is determined by the connectivity with the incentive cells (or extrinsic coding type). When intrinsic coding type, networks cannot know which neurons match mostly with the input signals before their response and the winner have to be determined after the lateral inhibitory activity. 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) [16]. Another choice of the external potential function is that

$$V(\psi) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) Q(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (15)$$

where

$$Q(\mathbf{x}) = \langle j_{\mathbf{x}} j_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}, \quad (16)$$




FIG. 4: The two types of neighbor interaction functions and control mechanisms. (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 SOFM algorithm take the neighbor function on Gaussian form with the hard competition (or winner-take-all activity).

which is the covariance matrix when the vector representation. This is obviously correspond with the simplest plasticity rule in single cell layer that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}) \propto v(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (17)$$

for the inputs $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$, the synaptic weights in a single neuron $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x})$ and the output $v(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$ at location \mathbf{x} .

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 [29]. 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 (Fig.4a). Whereas in lateral control of plasticity (or activity-to-plasticity kernel), the lateral interactions is nonnegative and may take on the Gaussian form (Fig.4b). The effect of feedforward competition in afferent signals is equivalent with those of the lateral inhibitory activity and the competitive Hebbian models takes the lateral control of plasticity. The term of neighbor interactions in FBM methods takes the exchange energy form

$$E^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (18)$$

or

$$E^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{4} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\psi(\mathbf{x})^\dagger \psi(\mathbf{y}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{y})^\dagger). \quad (19)$$

If we assume ψ^\dagger and ψ are creation and annihilation operators, the term $\psi(\mathbf{y}) J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x})$ can be regarded as the description of phenomena that a created activity at position \mathbf{x} is translated with kernel J and annihilated at position \mathbf{y} . Sometimes there are additional term $-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2$,

which is originated from the self-relaxation term in the integrate-and-fire models. We can consider also the interactions with higher powers and take the general energy form in Eq(2). The actual interaction functions of powers are composed of several interactions depending on mechanisms and the quadratic interaction term $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ need not to be always agreed with the neighborhood function $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. In next section, we will compare how the effective interaction function $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is composed per models.

Now we would annex the thermodynamic concepts to cortical dynamics. In neural processing architecture, the notation of entropy or free energy is introduced ahead based on the information theory. In the view of the learning rules, it is natural that neural states are occupied by features corresponding to frequent 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 and neurons expected to avoid occupying common state with others (the *sparse coding* principle). Besides the competitive or inhibitory activity, thermodynamic behavior in networks is contrived to achieve the sparseness. The *minimum description length* (MDL) principle [30] 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

$$F = E - TS \quad (20)$$

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 stochastical distribution. If we use the notation in Eq.(10), the energy is describe by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= (1/N) \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{L}} V(\psi_{\mathbf{r}}) \\ &= (1/N) \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j_{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{D}} P(\psi_{\mathbf{r}} | j_{\mathbf{r}}) P(j_{\mathbf{r}} | \mathcal{D}) \\ &= (1/N) \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{L}} P(\psi_{\mathbf{r}} | \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}} P(\psi) P(\psi | \mathcal{D}), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

for the lattice space \mathcal{L} and the code space \mathcal{F} . $P(\psi)$ is the probability of feature state ψ in cortex area or the prior probability of model ψ . The second term in Eq.(20) assesses the entropy or sparseness of the code by assigning a cost depending on how activity is distributed among the code sets. According to Shannon’s coding theorem, the amount of information is defined

$$S = -K \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}} P(\psi) \ln P(\psi) \quad (22)$$

where K is a positive units-dependent constant and $-\ln P(\psi)$ is the code cost, the number of bits requires to communicate the code. Eq.(21) and Eq.(22) remind the Helmholtz's free energy in density matrix formulation,

$$F[\rho] = \text{Tr } \rho \{H + k_B T \ln \rho\} \quad (23)$$

for the density matrix ρ with K being identified with Boltzmann's constant k_B . The connections between information theory and statistical mechanics are rigorously inspected [31, 32, 33]. From a point of learning algorithm, there are suggestions for the probabilistic decision neural networks such as *Boltzmann machines* [34]. However, there are some hardship to adapt the fundamental assumption in statistical thermodynamics into the cortical dynamics in real brain, because neural networks in real brain are not exactly closed, conserved nor thermal equilibrated systems. The relaxation process is also very slow and the observed maps often do not satisfy all of the equilibrium conditions. The map formations in visual cortex have occurred for several weeks or months after birth, called a critical period. In observed orientation preference maps, the non-uniforming directions of gradient ($\nabla\phi_{\parallel} \neq \text{const}$, however $|\nabla\phi_{\parallel}| \simeq \text{const}$ for the longitudinal component ϕ_{\parallel}) and non-vanishing singular points (or pinwheels) show that systems is frozen in relaxation process [1].

V. APPLICATION TO VISUAL MAP FORMATION MODELS

According to 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 [35]. Oriented bar or grid patterns are the most probable activity and the feature (or field) components with $O(2)$ symmetry are meaningful representation in orientation columns. Besides ocular dominance columns, the total features are expanded to $O(3)$ symmetry components with the restriction of synaptic normalization within columns. The conventional spin vector (S^x, S^y, S^z) can serve as a useful representation of the feature states with the preferred orientation $\phi = (1/2)\tan^{-1}(S_x/S_y)$ and the ocular dominance S_z , and the phenomena in the primary visual map formations has analogy with the statistical properties in magnetism [1]. In the cortical dynamics, the primary visual map formations is one of the most investigated problems and bears various actual models, most of which are written in high- or low-dimensional feature vector representation method. We rewrite them in FBM representations and classify the character of mechanisms according to their effective interaction terms, where

$$D = J \quad (\text{Lateral interaction models}) \quad (24)$$

$$D = J + C \quad (\text{Elastic net model}) \quad (25)$$

$$D = CJ \quad (\text{SOFM algorithm}) \quad (26)$$

$$D = (1 - J)^{-1} \quad (\text{Correlation-based models}) \quad (27)$$

for the neighbor connectivity $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and the activity correlations $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \simeq D(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)$ takes the Mexican hat type function for all cases and periodic patterns, such as linear zones in orientation or parallel bands in ocular dominance columns, emergent when $\tilde{D}(q)$ in fourier space has non-vanishing minimum point q^* with the wavelength $\Lambda = 2\pi/q^*$.

A. Lateral Interaction Models

A trivial cortical dynamic model is the summation of the neighbor interactions and the external stimuli terms :

$$E[\psi] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_{\mathbf{y}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x}} V(\psi_{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (28)$$

If the external potential term takes $V(\psi) = -B(\mathbf{x})\psi_{\mathbf{x}}$, we obtain

$$E[\psi] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{x}} B(\mathbf{x}) \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \quad (29)$$

for $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. The external stimuli $B(\mathbf{x})$ is considered to be constant or vanished in reduced feature space, which is composed of low-frequency patterns in orientation maps, the matrix function $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is expected to determine the typical appearance of developed feature maps. When $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = D(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)$, the energy form at a continuum approximation in Eq.(7) is obtained where $|\mathbf{A}| = q^*$ is the maximum point of $\tilde{D}(q)$ in the fourier space and $v = -\tilde{D}''(q^*)/a^2$ for the lattice constant a . The lateral interaction models take the *activation kernel*, or Mexican hat function (positive feedback in the center, negative in the surround). For an example, a well-known Mexican hat function, called the difference of Gaussians (DOG) filter, is described as

$$J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \varepsilon \left(e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/2\sigma_1^2} - k e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/2\sigma_2^2} \right) \quad (30)$$

where k is the strength of inhibitory activity. Another example of Mexican hat function modified from a wavelet is that

$$J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \varepsilon \left(1 - k \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{2\sigma_l^2} \right) e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/2\sigma_l^2} \quad (31)$$

for the lateral cooperation range σ_l . If the strength of inhibitory activity k is larger than threshold $k_c (= 1/4)$, $\tilde{D}(q)$ has a non-vanishing maximum point at $q^* = (1/\sigma)\sqrt{4 - 1/k}$ [1].

B. The Elast-Net Model

The competitive Hebbian models require the feed-forward competition and the nonnegative neighborhood

function (plasticity control kernel). With the external potential in Eq.(13), the energy function of the elastic net model takes the form in Eq.(28) or Eq.(29), where

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (32)$$

If we consider the stimuli with the activity center \mathbf{z} is scattered by the gaussian form

$$j_{\mathbf{x}} = j_{\mathbf{z}} e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}|^2/2\sigma_s^2} \quad (33)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \langle j_x j_y \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} &= \frac{1}{a^2} \int d\mathbf{z} d\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{z}} P(j_{\mathbf{z}}|\mathcal{D}) (j_{\mathbf{z}})^2 \\ &\quad \times e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}|^2/2\sigma_s^2} e^{-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{z}|^2/2\sigma_s^2} \\ &= \pi(\sigma_s^2/a^2) e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/4\sigma_s^2} \langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

This result means that the correlation of external stimuli $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ 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:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi_t(\mathbf{x}) &= \alpha \sum_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|=a} (\Phi(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi(\mathbf{y})) \\ &\quad + \beta(\mathbf{v} - \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \frac{e^{-|\mathbf{v}-\Phi(\mathbf{x})|^2/2\sigma_s^2}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}} e^{-|\mathbf{v}-\Phi(\mathbf{y})|^2/2\sigma_s^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where

$$\Phi = (x, y, q \sin(2\phi), q \cos(2\phi), z) \quad (36)$$

is the feature vector of visual map with Cartesian components with the retinal location (x, y) and the coular dominance z [7, 13]. At each iteration, a stimulus vector \mathbf{v} is chosen at random according to given probability distribution $P(\mathbf{v})$. The first term in Eq.(35) 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 $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \alpha \delta(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| - a)$ or the laplacian operator at a continuum limit. We can consider $\eta = \beta/8\pi^2\sigma_s^6$ from the linear terms in Eq.(35), and obtain

$$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\beta}{N} \frac{\langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}}{4\pi a^2 \sigma_s^4} (\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) - 1) e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/4\sigma_s^2}. \quad (37)$$

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

$$\tilde{D}(\mathbf{q}) = -\alpha q^2 + \beta \frac{\langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}}{\sigma_s^2} (1 - e^{-q^2 \sigma_s^2}). \quad (38)$$

It has maximum point at

$$q^* = \frac{1}{\sigma_s} \sqrt{\ln \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} \right)}, \quad (39)$$

which is correspond with the analytic results with different approaches [14, 16].

C. Self-Organizing Map models

In Eq.(28), the neighbor interaction term $\psi J \psi$ 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 when small dynamic fluctuations and some experiments certify them [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. 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 ($J \ll j$) and the most intracellular interactions would be achieved by indirect currents of external activity. If we take the secondhand interactions as the effective energy, we have $E[\psi] = V(\psi)(\frac{1}{2} \psi J \psi)$ or

$$E[\psi] = - \left(\sum B\psi + \frac{1}{2} \sum \psi C \psi \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum \psi J \psi \right). \quad (40)$$

If $B(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is constant for all position \mathbf{x} , the first term ($\text{const} \times \psi J \psi$) supports the lateral interaction models again. Some other model ignores $B(\mathbf{x}) = \langle j_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ or consider it to The Kohonen's SOFM algorithm ignores this term or considers $B(\mathbf{x}) = \langle j_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ to be vanished, and focus on the lateral currents induced by feedforward normalized stimuli, $(\psi C \psi) \times (\psi J \psi)$ and the effective interaction term is

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{z}} C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) J(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (41)$$

Moreover, the SOFM algorithm requires the hard competition, called the “winner take all” (WTA) case. As σ_s approaches zero in Eq.(33), the activity is localized only around the winning neuron and the correlation of external stimuli in fourier space is $\tilde{C}(\mathbf{q}) = \beta \langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} q^2$. The neighborhood connectivity takes on the Gaussian form $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/2\sigma_l^2}$ for the lateral cooperation range σ_l (lateral plasticity control). Therefore we obtain the effective interaction term

$$\tilde{D}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{C}(\mathbf{q}) \tilde{J}(\mathbf{q}) = \pi \sigma_l^2 \beta \langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} q^2 e^{-q^2 \sigma_l^2/2} \quad (42)$$

in fourier space or

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \beta \langle j^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} \left(1 - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{2\sigma_l^2} \right) e^{-|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2/2\sigma_l^2} \quad (43)$$

in real space. Eq.(42) has the minimum point at

$$q^* = \sqrt{2}/\sigma_l, \quad (44)$$

which agrees with previous analytic results [12, 16, 42] and always positive if $\sigma_l > 0$. Kohonen's SOFM algorithm is said to be robust in learning rules because it always success in achieving an array of different feature detectors.

D. Correlation-Based Learning Models

Some methods consider the summation of all possible indirect intracortical interactions. In our representation, the energy function takes that

$$E[\psi] = -\frac{1}{2}V(\psi)(\psi\psi + \psi J\psi + \psi J\psi\psi J\psi + \dots) \quad (45)$$

or

$$E[\psi] = -\frac{1}{2}V(\psi)\psi(\mathbf{x})D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (46)$$

where

$$D = 1 + J + J^2 + \dots = (1 - J)^{-1} \quad (47)$$

and the real parts of the eigenvalues of J are expected to be less than 1. Miller's ocular dominance development model uses a high-dimensional feature vector coding for the strength of connection from each cortical location to each retinal (or LGN) location. The correlation-based models based on the synaptic plasticity depending on the correlations among the activities of competing inputs, which is left and right eyes (ocular dominance columns) or ON-center and OFF-center cells (orientation preference columns) [9, 11]. A simply modified equation in the correlation-based learning models is that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{W} \propto \mathbf{D}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Q} \quad (48)$$

for the recurrent weight matrix \mathbf{J} and the matrix inverse $\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J})^{-1}$ [43]. In Miller's original representation, the input stimuli term is described by an arbor function, expressing the location and overall size of the receptive fields. The synaptic weight is represented by transforming to sum and difference values :

$$\mathbf{W}_+ = \mathbf{W}_R + \mathbf{W}_L \text{ and } \mathbf{W}_- = \mathbf{W}_R - \mathbf{W}_L \quad (49)$$

in ocular dominance columns (or $\mathbf{W}_\pm = \mathbf{W}_{ON} \pm \mathbf{W}_{OFF}$ in orientation columns).

VI. 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 is appropriate and effective in the descriptions of neural dynamics at cortical level. 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 minicolumns 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 minicolumn 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 $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is specified depending on the positions \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{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, and there are some models holding the updating rule in the recurrent weight matrix J , such as Goodall rule. [44]. We expect that the enhancement of connectivity between columnar modules proceed to the efficient communications between neurons.

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. FBM representation method suggests how neurons find features in the activity and build knowledge at cortical level. For example, difference looks of an object form a submanifold in pattern space and the feature components in transformed and reduced feature space will contains decomposed information of patterns such as angle or distance from viewpoint.

In this paper, we did not fully apply the thermodynamic behavior in cortical dynamics. There are some models which contain thermodynamic approach. The basic ingredients of Tanaka's Potts spin models are those of the lateral interaction models but he took a probabilistic evolution rather than a energy gradient flow [45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. Rao *et al.* presented a

model which uses the thermodynamic effect as an essential ingredient - the “competition” term, in map formations [50]. However there is no negative interactions, the thermodynamic effect can make to avoid neurons oc-

cupying common feature states. We expect temperature will become an important factor in other problems, such as cortical map differentiation.

-
- [1] M. W. Cho and S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 18101 (2004).
 - [2] T. Nishikawa, Y.-C. Lai, and F. C. Hoppensteadt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 108101 (2004).
 - [3] T. Aonishi, K. Kurata, and M. Okada, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2800 (1999).
 - [4] D. O. Hebb, *The organization of behavior : A neurophysiological theory* (John Wiley and Sons, New York), 1949).
 - [5] W. H. Calvin, in *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks*, edited by M. A. Arbib (MIT Press, 1998), pp. 269–272.
 - [6] T. Kohonen, *Self-organization and associative memory* (Springer-Verlag, 1984).
 - [7] E. Erwin, K. Obermayer, and K. Schulten, Neural comput. **7**, 425 (1995).
 - [8] N. V. Swindale, Network: Comput. Neural Syst. **7**, 161 (1996).
 - [9] K. D. Miller, J. B. Keller, and M. P. Stryker, Science **245**, 605 (1989).
 - [10] K. D. Miller, NeuroReport **3**, 73 (1992).
 - [11] K. D. Miller, J. Neurosci. **14**, 409 (1994).
 - [12] F. Wolf, K. Pawelzik, O. Scherf, T. Geisel, and S. Löwel, J. Physiol. (Paris) **94**, 525 (2000).
 - [13] R. Durbin and G. Mitchinson, Nature (London) **343**, 341 (1990).
 - [14] F. Hoffmann, F. Wolf, T. Geisel, S. Löwel, and K. Schmidt, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks* (Paris, 1995), vol. I, pp. 535–540.
 - [15] G. J. Goodhill and A. Cimponeriu, Network: Comput. Neural Syst. **11**, 153 (2000).
 - [16] O. Scherf, K. Pawelzik, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 6977 (1999).
 - [17] F. Wolf and T. Geisel, Nature **395**, 73 (1998).
 - [18] N. V. Swindale, Proc. R. Soc. B **208**, 243 (1980).
 - [19] N. V. Swindale, Proc. R. Soc. B **215**, 211 (1982).
 - [20] J. D. Cowan and A. E. Friedman, in *Neural Information Processing (NIPS)* (1990), vol. 2.
 - [21] D. H. Hubel and T. N. N. Wiesel, J. Physiol. (London) **140**, 106 (1962).
 - [22] K. Tsunoda, Y. Yamane, M. Nishizaki, and M. Tanifuji, Nat. Neurosci. **4** (2001).
 - [23] J. Hopfield, Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A **9**, 2554 (1982).
 - [24] D. Martin, *Manifold Theory - An Introduction for Mathematical Physicists* (Ellis Horwood, 1991).
 - [25] C. Nash and S. Sen, *Topology and geometry for physicists* (Academic Press, 1983).
 - [26] H. Markram and M. Tsodyks, Nature **382** (1996).
 - [27] Y. Frégnac, pp. 845–846 (1998).
 - [28] E. Oja, Journal of Mathematical Biology **16**, 267 (1982).
 - [29] T. Kohonen, *Self-organizing maps* (Springer, 1995).
 - [30] J. Rissanen, *Stochastic complexity in statistical inquiry* (World Scientific, 1989).
 - [31] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **106**, 620 (1957).
 - [32] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **108**, 171 (1957).
 - [33] W. T. Grandy, Am. J. Phys. **65** (1997).
 - [34] 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.
 - [35] B. A. Olshausen and D. J. Field, Nature (New York) **381**, 607 (1996).
 - [36] R. Llinás, *I of the Vortex From Neurons to Self* (The MIT Press, Cambridge (Massachusetts), 2003).
 - [37] O. Creutzfeldt, *Cortex Cerebri* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1995).
 - [38] M. Steriade, D. Contreras, D. R. Curro, and A. Nunez, J. Neurosci. **13**, 3284 (1993).
 - [39] M. Tsodyks, T. Kenet, A. Grinvald, and A. Arieli, Science **286**, 1943 (1999).
 - [40] M. Sanchez-Vives and D. McCormick, **3**, 1027 (2000).
 - [41] C. J. Wilson and P. M. Groves, Brain Res. **220**, 67 (1981).
 - [42] K. Obermayer, G. G. Blasdel, and K. Schulten, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 7568 (1992).
 - [43] P. Dayan and L. F. Abbott, *Theoretical neuroscience* (The MIT Press, London, 2001).
 - [44] M. C. Goodall, Nature **185**, 557 (1960).
 - [45] S. Tanaka, in *Theory of self-organization of cortical maps*, edited by D. S. Touretzky (San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1989), pp. 451–458.
 - [46] S. Tanaka, NEC Res. Develop. **98**, 1 (1990).
 - [47] S. Tanaka, Neural Networks **3**, 625 (1990).
 - [48] S. Tanaka, Biol. Cybern **64**, 263 (1991).
 - [49] S. Tanaka, Biol. Cybern. **65**, 91 (1991).
 - [50] R. P. N. Rao, B. A. Olshausen, and M. S. Lewicki, *Probabilistic models of the brain* (The MIT Press, Massachusetts, 2002).