

## Spiking activity propagation in neuronal networks: Reconciling different perspectives on neural coding

### Supplementary material

Arvind Kumar<sup>†</sup>, Stefan Rotter & Ad Aertsen

*Bernstein Center Freiburg, and  
Faculty of Biology,  
Albert-Ludwig University  
Freiburg, Germany.*

<sup>†</sup> *Corresponding author : [arvind.kumar@biologie.uni-freiburg.de](mailto:arvind.kumar@biologie.uni-freiburg.de)*

number of pages: 3

## Network model

### Neurons

The neurons in the network were modeled as leaky integrate-and-fire neurons, with the sub-threshold dynamics of the membrane potential  $V^i(t)$  in neuron  $i$  described by:

$$C \frac{d}{dt} V^i(t) + G_{\text{rest}} [V^i(t) - V_{\text{rest}}] = I_{\text{syn}}^i \quad (1)$$

where  $I_{\text{syn}}^i$  is the total synaptic input current into neuron  $i$  and  $C$ ,  $G_{\text{rest}}$  reflect the passive electrical properties of its membrane at rest ( $V_{\text{rest}} = -70$  mV) When the membrane potential reached a fixed spike threshold  $V_{\text{thresh}}$  above rest, a spike was emitted, the membrane potential was reset to its resting value, and synaptic integration was halted for 2 ms, mimicking the refractory period in real neurons.

### Network

We simulated a six layer feed-forward network (FFN) with 150 excitatory neurons in each layer. All the neurons were driven by excitatory and inhibitory Poisson type spike trains to obtain an average firing rate of 2 Hz in all the neurons. Neurons from layer 'N' made connections exclusively with neurons in layer 'N+1' with a connection probability  $\epsilon$ . This connection probability was a free parameter in the model and was systematically varied from 0.1 to 1. Neurons in the last layer did not send out connections.

### Synapses

Inter-group synaptic input was modeled by transient conductance changes, using alpha-functions

$$G(t) = \begin{cases} J \frac{t}{\tau} e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}} & \text{for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } t < 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Synaptic conductance transients were taken to have a uniform rise time of  $\tau = 0.33$  ms. We refer to the peak amplitude ' $J/e$ ' of the conductance transient at  $t = \tau$  as the 'strength' of the synapse. Generally, excitatory and inhibitory synapses had different strengths  $J_e$  and  $J_i$  assigned.

Assuming fixed synaptic couplings, the total excitatory conductance  $G_{\text{exc}}^i(t)$  in neuron  $i$  was given by

$$G_{\text{exc}}^i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{K_{\text{exc}}+K_{\text{ext}}} \sum_k g_{\text{exc}}(t - t_k^j - D). \quad (3)$$

The outer sum runs over all excitatory synapses ( $K_{\text{exc}} + K_{\text{ext}}$ ) on this particular neuron, the inner sum runs over the sequence of spikes arriving at a particular synapse. A neuron received  $K_{\text{exc}}$  exclusively from the neurons in the previous group.  $K_{\text{exc}}$  was determined by the number of neurons in a group and the inter-group connection probability ( $\epsilon$ ). In all the simulations

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

neurons received  $K_{\text{ext}} = 1000$  external excitatory inputs which were modeled as uncorrelated Poisson type spike trains. Similarly, the total inhibitory conductance  $G_{\text{inh}}^i(t)$  in neuron  $i$  was given by

$$G_{\text{inh}}^i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{K_{\text{inh}}} \sum_k g_{\text{inh}}(t - t_k^j - D). \quad (4)$$

In the network studied here, neurons received  $K_{\text{inh}} = 250$  external inhibitory inputs which were modeled as uncorrelated Poisson type spike trains. Neurons did not receive any inhibition from within the network i.e. from previous group.

A uniform transmission delay of  $D = 2$  ms was imposed for all synapses, in all simulations.

Thus, the total synaptic current into neuron  $i$  was

$$I_{\text{syn}}^i(t) = -G_{\text{exc}}^i(t) [V^i(t) - V_{\text{exc}}] - G_{\text{inh}}^i(t) [V^i(t) - V_{\text{inh}}], \quad (5)$$

with  $V_{\text{exc}} = 0$  mV and  $V_{\text{inh}} = -80$  mV denoting the reversal potentials of the excitatory and the inhibitory synaptic currents, respectively.

Together with inter-group connection probability ( $\epsilon$ ), the synaptic strength  $J_e$  was a free parameter and was varied from 0.15 mV to 0.75 mV.

### Stimuli

We used two different stimulus classes to study the activity propagation in the FFN. Activity in the FFN was initiated by stimulating all neurons in the first group with a pulse packet (PP), or with asynchronous firing rate.

**A Pulse packet** is a volley of spikes with a Gaussian shape, characterized by its strength, i.e. the number of spikes in the volley ( $\alpha$  here we used  $\alpha = 100$ ), and its temporal dispersion of the spikes, i.e. the standard deviation of the spike timings in the volley ( $\sigma$  here we used  $\sigma = 10$  ms).

**Asynchronous firing rate** was modeled as homogeneous and uncorrelated Poisson type spike trains. Each neuron in the first group of the FFN received 200 homogeneous and uncorrelated Poisson type spike trains for a finite interval of 500 ms with at a given rate ( $10 \text{ spikes/s} \leq \text{fr}_{\text{stim}} \leq 50 \text{ spikes/s}$ ).

### Simulation Tools

All network simulations were written in python (<http://www.python.org>) using PyNN (<http://neuralensemble.org/trac/PyNN>) as interface to the simulation environment NEST (<http://www.nest-initiative.org>). The dynamical equations were integrated at a fixed temporal resolution of 0.1 ms. Simulation management was performed using the python package NeuroTools (<http://neuralensemble.org/trac/NeuroTools>).