Analytic model of response statistics in noisy neural populations with divisive normalization

Daniel Herrera-Esposito, Johannes Burge

Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania

Normalized

responses

 $\bullet y_1$

 $\rightarrow y_2$

 $(\div) \# \to y_n$

dherresp@sas.upenn.edu jburge@psych.upenn.edu

Correlated

x correlation

Uncorrelated

Background

Divisive normalization and neural noise interact in complex ways

Population response depends on noise-normalization interaction

However, this interaction is poorly understood

(Robbe et al. 2024, Coen-Cagli, Solomon 2019)



Unnormalized

responses

 x_{2}

 $\cdot x_n - \cdot$

Pooling

Single pair correlation

Effect of input noise (Σ)





A single input noise correlation can affect all output statistics via normalization.

Goal

Analytic model of response statistics with noise-normalization interaction

Model

Input noise added pre-normalization

Normalization signal depends on input mean and noise structure



Output response statistics





Population correlations

 Ψ_s structured input correlations. α parametrizes $\Sigma: \Psi = \mathbf{I}(1 - \alpha) + \alpha \cdot \Psi_s$

Distance dependent correlations



Random correlations

Output covariance is correlated with input covariance. Pre-normalization correlations can be inferred from output correlations.

Effect of normalization matrix (B)

Structured normalization weights

B can instantiate diverse forms of normalization (e.g. feature specific)

 \mathbf{B}_s has structured weights. β parametrizes $\mathbf{B}: \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}(1 - \beta) + \beta \cdot \mathbf{B}_s$

Auxiliary variables: $v_i = \sum_{j \neq i} x_j^2 B_{jj}$ $N = x_i x_j$ $D = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x}$ **Final expressions**

 $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] \approx f(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{B})$ $\operatorname{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] \approx g(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{B})$

Efficient and differentiable Can be fit to neural response statistics Can be optimized for computational goals

Output response statistics: Exact formulas for isotropic case $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] = a \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu} \qquad \quad \operatorname{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] = b \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T + c \cdot \mathbf{I}$

 $a = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{2\sigma^2}\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2}{2}\right)} {}_1F_1\left(\frac{1}{2};\frac{n+2}{2};\frac{-||\boldsymbol{\mu}||^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad b = \frac{1}{(n+2)\sigma^2} {}_1F_1\left(1;\frac{n+4}{2};\frac{-||\boldsymbol{\mu}||^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - a^2 \quad c = \frac{1}{n} {}_1F_1\left(1;\frac{n+2}{2};\frac{-||\boldsymbol{\mu}||^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$

Effect of input mean (μ)







Structured normalization can transform uncorrelated input noise into structured output mean and structured output correlations

Noise-normalization interaction alters output response statistics differently than normalization without noise.

Conclusions

Complex neural response properties emerge from noise-normalization

Future work

Implement model variants (halfsaturation constant, exponent, stochastic gain)

Output response statistics



Normalization induces output correlations from independent input noise

Stimulus dependence

Output correlations depend on μ

 $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \sin(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \epsilon \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \sin(\boldsymbol{\theta} + k) + \epsilon$



dependent output correlations

interaction:

- Saturating responses
- Stimulus-dependent correlations - Spontaneous activity differences

Both input noise and normalization affect output mean and covariance due to their interaction

Potential contributor to observed neural response properties

Normative modeling of noise and normalization interactions for specific functions and tasks

Fit model to neuronal response data

Goris RLT et al. (2024) Nat Rev Neurosci; Coen-Cagli R; Solomon SS(2019) J. Neurosci; Weiss O; Bounds HA; Adesnik H; Coen-Cagli R (2023) PLoS Comput Biol; Carandini M; Heeger, DJ (2012) Nat Rev Neurosci; Schwartz O; Simoncelli EP (2001) Nat Rev Neurosci; Verhoef BE; Maunsell JHR (2017) Nat Neurosci