

Neural Sampling by Irregular Gating Inhibition of Spiking Neurons and Neural Attractors

Lorenz K. Müller, Giacomo Indiveri

May 16, 2016

Abstract

A large body of experimental evidence and of theoretical studies in neuroscience cast sensory processing in the brain as the process of inferring maximally consistent interpretations of imperfect sensory input. Within this context, we propose that Gamma-band inhibition could play a computational role in such process. Specifically, we propose a neural network model in which this periodic inhibitory signal, commonly observed in cortical circuits, enables the network to carry out such a sampling mechanism. We show analytically how it implements a Monte-Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) sampler, and describe how it can be used to model both attractor networks as well as single spiking neurons. By applying the analysis to spiking neurons, we show how the model gives rise to a new noise-free mechanism that can be used to implement stochastic plasticity mechanisms in low-resolution spiking neural networks, therefore enabling the construction of compact and low-power neuromorphic computing hardware.

1 Introduction

A fundamental question in computational neuroscience is related to how the brain can reconcile noisy sensory inputs and its internal models of the world to reach maximally consistent abstract interpretations of the physical causes of the sensory input. It has been argued that the dynamics and spiking behavior of neurons can be interpreted as an expression of a sampling process by means of which the brain performs such inference operations [FBOL10; BOLF11]. This approach is appealing because it allows drawing parallels between neural dynamics and well-established algorithms such as Markov-Chain Monte-Carlo (MCMC) sampling [BBNM11; PBBSM13] or restricted Boltzmann-Machines (RBM) [MUA10; NBRCID13], and various constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) solvers [MMI15a; HJM13].

A key problem in such models is related to how probabilistic behavior can be implemented within these models. Up to now there have been two major approaches proposed: either the neuron model has been assumed to be the intrinsically stochastic [BBNM11] (an optimal solution from the theory point of view, but non-ideal for corresponding hardware implementations), or given a deterministic neuron model, such as an integrate-and-fire one, an external source of noise or stochastic input has been used [MUA10; PBBSM13]. In this paper we focus on a different approach that is based on the interactions between coupled oscillators that have slightly different frequencies (e.g., arising from device mismatch in hardware implementations). In [MMI15b], we

have already shown how networks of neurons subject to gating inhibitory signals, e.g., derived from local sources of gamma oscillations, can produce stochastic search ...

A by-product of this approach is a new mechanism that could underlie the implementation of stochastic synaptic weights. Stochastic synaptic weights are of interest because they may improve learning capabilities [SHKSS14; NPJASC15] and allow for novel models of neuronal sampling, such as the ones we suggest in this paper.

In related works we have applied similar distributed Markov chain samplers to potential VLSI implementation of artificial neural networks [MI15; Mul15] and CSP solvers [MMI15a].

2 Theory and Results

2.1 The Gating Inhibition Sampling Network

In this section we will describe a network, the Gating Inhibition Sampling Network (or GISnet), an abstract, mathematically tractable model of biological neural networks. Nodes in this network change their states at Poisson distributed times that correspond to periods of lifted gating inhibition; communication between nodes is mitigated by weights that are random variables and nodes take new states according to which of their possible values received maximal input.

A GISnet, see Fig. 1, consists of interconnected nodes that represent populations of neurons or single neurons. In the following superscripts will be used to denote the membership of a quantity to a node. Each node represents a variable. The state of node i at any time is given by two vectors $\vec{V}_i(t)$ and $\vec{I}_i(t)$: $\vec{V}_i(t)$ represents the discrete output value of the variable corresponding to the node in a one-hot encoding (one entry is one, the others zero). If the k th entry of $\vec{V}_i(t)$, i.e. $V_i^k(t)$ is one, the corresponding variable has state k . The input vector $\vec{I}_i(t)$ keeps track of inputs to the node. The vector $\vec{I}_i(t)$ has one entry I_i^k for each possible value V_i^k .

Intuitively one may think of the vector \vec{V} as the vector that identifies in a one-hot encoding which of k mutually exclusive attractor states (or ‘patterns’) receives the highest input in the input vector \vec{I} . This (and only this) ‘winning’ population then may be able to influence the competitions in other nodes.

The nodes communicate through connections between different possible values; each connection between node i and k is weighted according to a weight matrix \mathbf{W}_{ik} that specifies the impact state V_i^q of node i has on input channel I_k^r of node k . Note that for each pair i, k there is a full weight matrix (corresponding to connections between different possible values nodes i and k can encode).

A GIS-node can only change its output value at special time *points* that we will refer to as ‘spike windows’ or ‘update times’. Let $s^i(t)$ be the function that takes value one, in spike windows of i and zero otherwise. The spike-windows $S^i = \{t | s^i(t) = 1\}$ of node i are Poisson-distributed in time with a fixed average density of R (the spike-rate of the node); notably these spike-windows are determined ‘a priori’ in the sense that they are independent of the input node i receives. The ‘a priori’ determined spike windows are a key difference to models in the vein of [BBNM11] or [NPM09].

At a spike window node i takes a new value $V_i^q(t)$ depending on its recent inputs. Specifically it takes the value $V_i^q(t)$ for which node i received the highest weighted input, $q = \operatorname{argmax}_x (I^x(t)_i)$; the input $I^q(t)_i$ to node i is given by

$$I^q(t)_i = \sum_j \vec{V}_j \mathbf{W}_{ij} \quad (1)$$

I wouldn’t give this network a name (here at least). Readers are often confused and assume that this is a well established model (it also happened for the PBMnets)

This part is too dense and cryptic. You should try to simplify it as much as possible.

We should stick to the “spiking” terminology

We should explicitly say that there is a strong WTA mechanism in place.

how are the inputs connected to the I_{is} and V_{is} ?

Aren’t these time windows or periods? Isn’t this when there is no inhibition? I would stick to the neural network terminology.




Figure 1: A GISnet consisting of three nodes; the inputs and outputs to these nodes are vectorial. In \vec{I}_k inputs from ‘active’ presynaptic values are aggregated; at input independent ‘spike-windows’ the node ‘activates’ the value with the highest summed input. Connection weights like \mathbf{W}_{ik} are random variables.

Where the sum over j goes over all upstream connected neurons. In words, at a spike window, each possible value of the node sums its current input from connected variable values, weighted by the (random variable) weight matrices; then the value with the highest input becomes the node’s new value.

Note that it is irrelevant how often an upstream neuron has changed its state (‘spiked’) since the downstream neuron’s last spike window, only the current state at the update time matters. If there is ambiguity about which value received the highest input (i.e. if there is no unique $\text{argmax}_x(I^x(t)_i)$, the node maintains its previous value (‘tie-breaking’ mechanisms other than this ‘hysteretic’ one could also be used).

Since the spike-times are independent of other state variables, we can analyse this continuous time system as a discrete time system: Each discrete time-step corresponds to a time t_s at which one of the nodes may change its state. Then we can say for the discrete time system that at each round one (uniformly) random node undergoes a state change (this state ‘change’ may be the trivial transition from a state to itself).


Notably the corresponding discrete-time system is Markovian, which simplifies its analysis.

Why not start with a single neuron first and move to the network/node later?

2.2 Single Neurons as GIS Nodes

Here we layout under what circumstances spiking neurons can be modeled as GIS nodes. In Fig. 2 the GIS node used to implement a single neuron is shown.

Let us consider a neuron that receives strong shunting inhibition that is at Poisson times briefly lifted. During that short open window the membrane of the neuron will see the current influx through other activated ion channels and will evaluate, whether their combined conductance is high enough to overcome its spiking threshold; in other words, it measures whether it has received higher input to the inhibitory or excitatory



(a) Schematic neuron modelled by GIS node (b) The corresponding GIS node.

Figure 2: (a) A neuron under gating inhibition that releases at Poisson distributed times (rate $1/\tau_G$) for a short time (τ_{open}). At these times it evaluates whether the sum of EPSPs (time constant τ_e) or IPSPs (time constant τ_i) is greater. Typically assume $\tau_i \approx \tau_e$, $\tau_{open} \ll \tau_e$ and $\tau_e < \tau_G$. (b) If the neuron gets above threshold input (i.e. more excitatory than inhibitory input $I^e > I^i$) it emits a spike (i.e. goes to state V^e). The connection weights out of V^i are zero, those out of V^e are random variables dependent on the interplay of postsynaptic gating inhibition and PSP shape.

‘mode’ (for a typical biological neuron with a bias to the inhibitory one). In the latter case, the neuron sends a spike to all downstream connected neurons that gets multiplied by the synaptic weight; this spike may or may not have an effect on the downstream neuron, depending on whether it is relieved of its gating inhibition within the PSP time constant (τ_e or τ_i). This varying impact of spikes is modelled in the GISnet by the fact that weights are random variables. The case of inhibition exceeding excitation, in which no output (spike) is produced, can be incorporated into a GISnet simply by making all outgoing connections of the ‘inhibitory’ node state have zero weight.

Let us consider the distribution of weights we need to assume to correctly describe a spiking neuron as a GIS node. If we assume some fixed, post-synaptic kernel and a sufficiently short window during which the neuron’s gating inhibition is released and it integrates its inputs on to the membrane potential the effective weight the incoming spike will have, is simply the integral over the post-synaptic kernel for the duration of the time window; to obtain a probabilistic weight we assume (as previously) that the presynaptic spike time and the release of inhibition occur at random time points. Note that in this way the effective weight distribution is generated by the interplay of the post-synaptic kernel shape and the time-constant of the lifted gating inhibition. For a gating window of duration τ_G and a gating function

$$G(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < \tau_G \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

we obtain

$$W_{eff} = \int_0^{\Delta t} \text{PSP}(t) \cdot (1 - G(t + \delta t)) dt \quad (3)$$

where $\text{PSP}(t)$ is the post-synaptic potential at time t , Δt is its maximal duration and δt is a random variable that expresses the time that passed between the arrival of the presynaptic spike and the onset of the relief of gating inhibition on the postsynaptic neuron. δt is a random variable and thereby W_{eff} is a random variable too. In the case

Is it time constants, or pulse duration?

of independent Poisson distributions for pre- and postsynaptic spike windows, δt is distributed according to

$$p(\delta t) \propto \exp(-t/\lambda) \quad (4)$$

where λ is the rate of the postsynaptic spike windows.

Note that for a box-shaped postsynaptic potential and $\Delta t \ll \tau_G$ we obtain a Bernoulli distribution for W_{eff} .

A simple biological observation complicates this picture somewhat and deviates from the PBM model: A neuron can in principle spike more than once, if it receives a very high input; unless the ‘short open window’ is shorter than a potential refractory period.

The issue of multiple response spikes in a single inhibition relief window steps outside the proposed GIS model. The issue can be dismissed if we assume a neuron model whose refractory time constant is longer than the spike window opened by intermittently inactive shunting inhibition. However, the possibility of spiking more than once makes the network more ‘expressive’ (there is a greater number of possible states) and could have useful effects. Namely if the single neuron has a linear transfer-function, this would probably lead to a linear response with Gaussian noise in the limit of a high fan-in, low leak neuron.

We need to expand/clarify this point

2.3 Attractor networks as GISnets

In [MMI15b] we studied WTA networks under oscillatory inhibition and demonstrated that they approximately sample from the here defined GISnet distribution. The MCMC operator given in [MMI15b] with purely empirical justification, is in fact the MCMC operator of a GISnet. In this sense this paper provides the top-down perspective to complement the bottom-up approach we took in [MMI15b].

2.4 The Associated MCMC Sampler

Here we will describe a method of obtaining the limiting distribution of a GISnet. The key question is how to construct the transition matrix T of the corresponding MCMC sampler, since this fully determines its behaviour. Let the system be in state s_i , what is the probability that it will transition into state s_j ? We study three cases for different relationships between s_i and s_j .

1. *s_i and s_j differ in more than one variable.* In this case the probability T_{ij} is set to zero, because it is impossible for multiple variables to change their state at the same time in a GISnet (time is continuous and state changes are instantaneous, so that the probability of two occurring simultaneously vanishes).
2. *s_i and s_j differ in exactly one variable.* In this case $T_{ij} = P(v_{up}) \cdot P(v_{new} = v(s_j)|s_i, v_{up})$, where $P(v_{up})$ is the probability that the variable v in which s_i and s_j differ is the one that changes its state and $P(v_{new} = v(s_j)|s_i, v_{up})$ is the probability that v takes the value it has in s_j given that the system state at the change is s_i and that v_{up} is the variable that changes its state. We will shortly address how to construct these probabilities from the network connectivity.
3. *s_i and s_j are the same state.* In this case we can construct T_{ij} using the fact that the previous item implicitly defines the probability $p_{\neq} = P(s_i \neq s_j)$ by the relation $p_{\neq} = \sum_{j \neq i} T_{ij}$, so that $T_{ii} = 1 - p_{\neq}$ by virtue of the normalization of $\sum_j T_{ij}$.

The probability $P(v_{up})$ is simply set to $\frac{1}{n_N}$ where n_N is the number of nodes in the PBMnet: Each node updates at Poisson distributed time points and it is therefore equally likely that any node is the next one to update. For notational simplicity we will consider the special case where each variable has two possible states $\{0, 1\}$ and all weights are Bernoulli variables of absolute value α or always zero. Then $\mathbf{W}_{ij,\text{eff}} = \hat{\mathbf{W}}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{ij,p}$, where $\mathbf{b}_{ij,p}$ is a matrix of Bernoulli variables with probability p and $\hat{\mathbf{W}}$ is a matrix whose entries are either zero or α . The general case without these restrictions is straight forward to write down based on this simpler case, but is notationally cumbersome. Instead of summing up weights, in this case we simply count numbers of inputs to a particular state. Let i be the updating node and let u_i be the number of potential inputs to state 0 of i and t_i the total number of potential inputs to node i . The number of potential inputs to state 1 is then $t_i - u_i$. In formulas we define

$$t_i = \sum_j \vec{V}_j \mathbf{W}_{ij}, \quad (5)$$

$$u_i = \sum_j V_j^0 \vec{W}_{ij}^0. \quad (6)$$

By assumption every potential input is set to zero with probability p . In this formulation the node receives an effective number $t_{i,\text{eff}}$ of inputs. This number is distributed according to

$$P(t_{i,\text{eff}} = k) = \binom{t_i}{k} (1-p)^k p^{t_i-k}. \quad (7)$$

The aforementioned conditional transition probability $P(v_{\text{new}} = 0 | s_{\text{prev}}, v_{up})$ is the probability that most of the received inputs go to state 0:

$$P(v_{\text{new}} = 0 | s_{\text{prev}}, v_{up}) = \sum_{k=0}^{t_i} \underbrace{\binom{t_i}{k} (1-p)^k p^{t_i-k}}_{P(t_{i,\text{eff}}=k)} \underbrace{\sum_{l=0}^{k/2-1} \frac{\binom{u_i}{k-l} \binom{t_i-u_i}{l}}{\binom{t_i}{k}}}_{P(u_i > t_i - u_i)}, \quad (8)$$

which simplifies to

$$P(v_{\text{new}} = 0 | s_{\text{prev}}, v_{up}) = \sum_{k=0}^{t_i} (1-p)^k p^{t_i-k} \sum_{l=0}^{k/2-1} \binom{u_i}{k-l} \binom{t_i-u_i}{l} \quad (9)$$

and finally yields

$$T_{ij} = \frac{1}{n_N} \sum_{k=0}^{t_i} (1-p)^k p^{t_i-k} \sum_{l=0}^{k/2} \binom{u_i}{k-l} \binom{t_i-u_i}{l}. \quad (10)$$

Note that the above is dependent on the previous state and the target state because u_i and t_i depend on them.

Using the above construction, we can evaluate the probability distribution induced by a certain connectivity by finding the limiting distribution of the associated MCMC sampler. To get this one still has to solve a large system of linear equations (the limiting distribution is the eigenvector with eigenvalue one of the transition matrix).

This is somewhat dissatisfying as the problem of how to construct a weight matrix that produces a desired distribution (or models a set of given samples) is still open (because it is difficult to invert the process that lead from connectivity to limiting distribution). In the next section we will tackle this problem from a different avenue: the single node perspective.

2.5 The Single Node Activation Function

A more concise way of describing nodes in a GISnet can be obtained by studying their individual activation functions. The activation function expresses what the output response of a single node is for a given network state and connectivity.

node?

By definition we need to evaluate which mode receives the highest input. For a binary node this means we want to find (for given network state \vec{v} , and weight tensor W) the probability that the input to one node exceeds the input to the other. We can equivalently assess the probability that the difference of the two inputs exceeds zero. In this formulation it becomes clear that a binary PBM node is equivalent to a McCulloch-Pitts neuron [MP43] with stochastic synapses. Note that the McCulloch-Pitts Neuron with Bernoulli distributed synaptic weights has recently also been studied in [Mul15; NPJASC15]. Consider the activation a of a McCulloch-Pitts neuron with Bernoulli input weights:

PBM?

$$a_i = I_i^1 - I_i^0 = \sum_j V_j^1 (\vec{W}_{ij}^1 - \vec{W}_{ij}^0) = \sum_j \vec{V}_j \mathbf{U}_{ij} \quad (11)$$

where V^j are the presynaptic activities, \mathbf{U}_{ij} is a redefined connection weight (the difference between the weights to the two states) Further we assume $\vec{V}^j \mathbf{U}_{ji} = q_j \cdot b_p$ to be fixed up to a Bernoulli variable b_p with probability p_{on} ; then we can write

$$a_i = \sum_j q_j b_p. \quad (12)$$

a_i is now a sum over weighted Bernoulli trials. The central limit theorem states that the mean of a sufficiently large number of independent random variables is approximately normally distributed [BZ10] (if the random variables have well defined means and variances, which is the case here). Formulaically this yields for a neuron with sufficiently many inputs

$$a_i = \sum_j q_j b_p \approx \mathcal{N}(\langle p_{on} q_i \rangle_i, \langle p_{on}(1 - p_{on}) q_i \rangle_i), \quad (13)$$

where the angular brackets denote an average. The probability that a_i is greater than zero then is

$$p(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) > 0) = \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{-\mu}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right), \quad (14)$$

where we introduced $\mu = \langle p_{on} q_i \rangle_i$ and $\sigma = \langle p_{on}(1 - p_{on}) q_i \rangle_i$.

This to some extent validates the intuition from section 2.2 that the activation is a linear response with Gaussian noise, however the variance of the noise increases with increasing mean.

For higher order nodes (with more than 2 competing modes) we can make similar considerations. Here the input to a single state of the node must exceed the input to all others for that node to become active. The probability of state i becoming active is then

$$p(i \text{ is active}) = \prod_{i \neq j} (I_i > I_j) = \prod_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{\mu_j - \mu_i}{\sqrt{2(\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_j^2 + 2\sigma_i\sigma_j)}}\right) \quad (15)$$

where μ_i and σ_i are the mean and variance of the Gaussian approximation to the input to state i as introduced for the binary node.

3 Conclusion

In this paper we described an abstract neural network whose functional behaviour it is to sample in a Markovian manner from a probability distribution defined by its weights. This model can be viewed as the previously missing top-down perspective of our model of the putative functional role of gamma oscillations.

We further showed that this model can be viewed as a generalization of McCullough-Pitts-Neurons with probabilistic synapses and highlighted a new mechanism that could underlie the generation of probabilistic synaptic weights. While biological substrates have been hypothesised to directly tune the full distribution of the postsynaptic potentials evoked by single synapses [AL15] and the reliability of neurotransmitter release of a particular synapse can be highly variable [BS09], neuromorphic systems currently lack such capabilities. The proposed mechanism could be implemented in any neuromorphic platform that offers parametric changes of the PSP shape, such as [QMCOSI15].

The analytically tractable GISnet model will allow us to formulate theoretically well motivated learning rules for networks under gating inhibition in future work. Further the computational efficiency of the generation of stochasticity in this model will lend itself to direct mapping to neuromorphic hardware.

References

- [1] Laurence Aitchison and Peter E Latham. “Synaptic sampling: A connection between PSP variability and uncertainty explains neurophysiological observations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.04544* (2015).
- [2] Pietro Berkes, Gergő Orbán, Máté Lengyel, and József Fiser. “Spontaneous cortical activity reveals hallmarks of an optimal internal model of the environment”. In: *Science* 331.6013 (2011), pp. 83–87.
- [3] Gerhard Bohm and Günter Zech. *Introduction to statistics and data analysis for physicists*. DESY, 2010.
- [4] Tiago Branco and Kevin Staras. “The probability of neurotransmitter release: variability and feedback control at single synapses”. In: *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 10.5 (2009), pp. 373–383.
- [5] Lars Buesing, Johannes Bill, Bernhard Nessler, and Wolfgang Maass. “Neural dynamics as sampling: A model for stochastic computation in recurrent networks of spiking neurons”. In: *PLoS computational biology* 7.11 (2011), e1002211.
- [6] József Fiser, Pietro Berkes, Gergő Orbán, and Máté Lengyel. “Statistically optimal perception and learning: from behavior to neural representations”. In: *Trends in cognitive sciences* 14.3 (2010), pp. 119–130.
- [7] Stefan Habenschuss, Zeno Jonke, and Wolfgang Maass. “Stochastic computations in cortical microcircuit models”. In: *PLoS computational biology* 9.11 (2013), e1003311.
- [8] W.S. McCulloch and W. Pitts. “A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity”. In: *Bull. Math. Biophys.* 5 (1943), pp. 115–133.
- [9] Paul Merolla, Tristan Ursell, and John Arthur. “The thermodynamic temperature of a rhythmic spiking network”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.5473* (2010).
- [10] Hesham Mostafa and Giacomo Indiveri. “Stochastic Interpretation of Quasi-periodic Event-based Systems”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.02930* (2015).
- [11] Hesham Mostafa, L. K. Müller, and Giacomo Indiveri. “An event-based architecture for solving constraint satisfaction problems”. In: *Nature Communications* 6 (2015), pp. 1–10. doi: [10.1038/ncomms9941](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9941).
- [12] Hesham Mostafa, L. K. Müller, and Giacomo Indiveri. “Rhythmic inhibition allows neural networks to search for maximally consistent states”. In: *Neural Computation* 27 (2015), pp. 2510–2547. doi: [10.1162/NECO_a_00785](https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00785). URL: http://ncs.ethz.ch/pubs/pdf/Mostafa_etal15.pdf.
- [13] Lorenz K. Muller. “Algorithms for Massively Parallel Event-Based Hardware”. In: *PhD Thesis, University of Zurich* (2015).
- [14] E. Neftci, J. Binas, U. Rutishauser, E. Chicca, G. Indiveri, and R. Douglas. “Synthesizing cognition in neuromorphic electronic systems”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110.37 (2013), E3468–E3476. doi: [10.1073/pnas.1212083110](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212083110). URL: http://ncs.ethz.ch/pubs/pdf/Neftci_etal13.pdf.
- [15] Emre O Neftci, Bruno U Pedroni, Siddharth Joshi, Maruan Al-Shedivat, and Gert Cauwenberghs. “Unsupervised Learning in Synaptic Sampling Machines”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04484* (2015).

- [16] B. Nessler, M. Pfeiffer, and W. Maass. “STDP enables spiking neurons to detect hidden causes of their inputs”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*. Ed. by Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. Lafferty, C.K. I. Williams, and A. Culotta. Vol. 22. 2009, pp. 1357–1365.
- [17] Mihai A Petrovici, Johannes Bill, Ilja Bytschok, Johannes Schemmel, and Karlheinz Meier. “Stochastic inference with deterministic spiking neurons”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3211* (2013).
- [18] Ning Qiao, Hesham Mostafa, Federico Corradi, Marc Osswald, Fabio Stefanini, Dora Sumislawska, and Giacomo Indiveri. “A Re-configurable On-line Learning Spiking Neuromorphic Processor comprising 256 neurons and 128K synapses”. In: *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 9.141 (2015). ISSN: 1662-453X. DOI: [10.3389/fnins.2015.00141](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00141). URL: http://www.frontiersin.org/neuromorphic_engineering/10.3389/fnins.2015.00141/abstract.
- [19] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. “Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from over-fitting”. In: *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15.1 (2014), pp. 1929–1958.

A Appendices

A.1 Continuous Time Sampling

Here we define our notion of continuous time sampling (CTS). While it is very intuitive what one would mean by CTS, we hope to avoid possible confusion in the following by giving a definition.

When trying to assess the underlying probability distribution of a discrete sampling process one can accumulate samples in a histogram over the entire space of permissible states and then normalize this histogram after having observed sufficiently many samples. An analogous process for the time-continuous sampler integrates the time the system spends in each state over a sufficiently long time and then normalizes this histogram.

There are two ways to interpret this time-continuous sampling process:

1. Each time the system switches state constitutes a weighted sample of the state that is left (consider also ending the sampling process as switching the state), where the weight is given by the time spent in that state.
2. The dynamical system proposes a sample at every infinitesimal time point and the sum performed to accumulate the histogram, becomes an integral over time.

Either way, we define the normalized histogram of times spent in a certain state as a probability distribution over these states and we interpret the unfolding time course of the dynamical system as a set of samples that induce this distribution. The former interpretation has the advantage of giving a clear sense to what constitutes a sample.

Formally these interpretations could be written as follows:

$$p(y) = \lim_{T_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^{T_s} \delta(x(t) = y) dt}{T_s} = \lim_{T_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{x_i} \delta(x_i = y) t_{x_i}}{T_s} \quad (16)$$

where $p(y)$ is the probability of state y under the dynamical system, $x(t)$ is the time course of the state of the dynamical system and $\delta(q)$ is one if q is true and zero otherwise.

The x_i are all members of the set of states that were occupied by the system just before a state transition and the t_{x_i} are the corresponding times since the last transition. Practically T_s is a large but finite sampling time.

A justification why this definition is ‘sensible’ could be given as follows. For a *discrete* time sampling process the probability $p(y)$ of sample y , expresses how likely it is to find the system in state y if it is probed at a random time step t of its dynamics. Using the above definition of $p(y)$ for a *continuous* sampling process, $p(y)$ expresses how likely it is to find the system in state y if it is probed at a random time point t of its dynamics.

An alternative approach is to eliminate the meaning of ‘time’ in the sampling process and go to an event-based discrete time sampler that represents the distribution [BBNM11]

$$p(y) = \lim_{T_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{x_i} \delta(x_i = y)}{Z}, \quad (17)$$

where Z is an appropriately chosen normalization constant and the sum runs over all sample-events that occurred.

In addition to having the property of generating a specific limiting distribution over long sampling times, a useful *pseudo-random* sampler should provide samples, so that samples are independent over sufficiently many time steps and should consequently provide unbiased samples from the probability distribution after some burn-in time (in which the initial state is forgotten). Similarly a continuous time sampler should provide samples that are independent if a sufficiently long time passes between them.