

A long journey into reproducible computational neuroscience research

Meropi Topalidou, Arthur Leblois, Thomas Boraud, Nicolas P. Rougier

► To cite this version:

Meropi Topalidou, Arthur Leblois, Thomas Boraud, Nicolas P. Rougier. A long journey into reproducible computational neuroscience research. Fourth International Symposium on Biology of Decision Making (SBDM 2014), May 2014, Paris, France. hal-01090648

HAL Id: hal-01090648 https://inria.hal.science/hal-01090648

Submitted on 3 Dec 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



IN A PREVIOUS MODELING STUDY, LEBLOIS ET AL. (2006) DEMONSTRATED AN ACTION SELECTION MECHANISM IN CORTICO-BASAL GANGLIA LOOPS BASED ON COMPETITION BETWEEN THE POSITIVE FEEDBACK, DIRECT PATHWAY THROUGH THE STRIATUM AND THE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK, HYPERDIRECT PATHWAY THROUGH THE SUBTHALAMIC NUCLEUS.

IN GUTHRIE ET AL. (2013), AUTHORS INVESTIGATED HOW MULTIPLE LEVEL ACTION SELECTION COULD BE PERFORMED BY THE BASAL GANGLIA. TO DO THIS, THE MODEL IS EXTENDED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH KNOWN ANATOMY AND ELECTRO-PHYSIOLOGY IN THREE MAIN AREAS. FIRST, TWO-LEVEL DECISION MAKING HAS BEEN INCORPORATED, WITH A COGNITIVE LEVEL SELECTING BASED ON CUE SHAPE AND A MOTOR LEVEL SELECTING BASED ON CLE POSITION. WE SHOW THAT THE DECISION MADE AT THE COGNITIVE LEVEL CAN BE USED TO BIAS THE DECISION AT THE MOTOR LEVEL. WE THEN DEMONSTRATE THAT, FOR ACCURATE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION BETWEEN DECISION-MAKING LEVELS, LOW EXCITABILITY OF STRIATAL PROJECTION NEURONS IS NECESSARY, A GENERALLY OBSERVED ELECTROPHYSIOLOGICAL FINDING. SECOND, INSTEAD OF PROVIDING A BIASING SIGNAL BETWEEN CUE CHOICES AS AN EXTERNAL INPUT TO THE NETWORK, WE SHOW THAT THE ACTION SELECTION PROCESS CAN BE DRIVEN BY REASONABLE LEVELS OF NOISE. FINALLY, WE INCORPORATE DOPAMINE MODULATED LEARNING AT CORTICOSTRIATAL SYNAPSES. AS LEARNING PROGRESSES, THE ACTION SELECTION BECOMES BASED ON LEARNED VISUAL CUE VALUES AND IS NOT INTERFERED WITH BY THE NOISE THAT WAS NECESSARY BEFORE LEARNING.

HOWEVER, THE MODEL WAS NOT REPRODUCIBLE FROM THE ARTICLE DESCRIPTION ...

Tools

Safari browser (native)

IF REPRODUCIBILITY IS THE HALLMARK OF SCIENCE, NON-REPRODUCIBILITY SEEMS TO BE THE HALLMARK OF COMPUTATIONAL NEUROSCIENCES. GUTHRIE ET AL. (2013) IS A PROTOTYPIC CASE OF SUCH NON-REPRODUCIBLE COMPUTATIONAL NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH EVEN THOUGH THE PROPOSED MODEL GIVES A FAIR ACCOUNT OF DECISION MAKING IN THE BASAL GANGLIA COMPLEX.

WHILE TRYING TO REPLICATE RESULTS STARTING FROM THE ARTICLE DESCRIPTION, WE SOON REALIZED SOME INFORMATION WERE UNDISCLOSED, SOME OTHER WERE AMBIGUOUS AND THERE WERE ALSO SOME FACTUAL ERRORS. EVEN AFTER ACCESSING THE ORIGINAL SOURCES (GOOD LINES OF PASCAL), WE WERE STILL UNABLE TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE MODEL WORKED. IN THE END, ONLY THE ORIGINAL MATERIAL (A WINDOWS EXECUTABLE) ALLOWED US TO ACCESS THE MISSING INFORMATION AND AFTER TWO MONTHS OF INTENSIVE REFACTORING, WE WERE FINALLY ABLE TO REPLICATE RESULTS USING ONLY 200 LINES OF PYTHON.

Name	Elements	Size	Threshold (h)	Noise	Initial state
Cortex motor	Linear neuron	1×4	-3	1.0%	0.0
Cortex cognitive	Linear neuron	4×1	-3	1.0%	0.0
Cortex associative	Linear neuron	4×4	-3	1.0%	0.0
Striatum motor	Sigmoidal neuron	1×4	0	0.1%	0.0
Striatum cognitive	Sigmoidal neuron	4×1	0	0.1%	0.0
Striatum associative	Sigmoidal neuron	4×4	0	0.1%	0.0
GPi motor	Linear neuron	1×4	+10	3.0%	0.0
GPi cognitive	Linear neuron	4×1	+10	3.0%	0.0
STN motor	Linear neuron	1×4	-10	0.1%	0.0
STN cognitive	Linear neuron	4×1	-10	0.1%	0.0
Thalamus motor	Linear neuron	1×4	-40	0.1%	0.0
Thalamus cognitive	Linear neuron	4×1	-40	0.1%	0.0

C Connectivity					
Source	Target	Pattern	Weight (W)	Gain (G)	Plastic
Cortex motor	Thalamus motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	0.4	No
Cortex cognitive	Thalamus cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	0.4	No
Cortex motor	STN motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	1.0	No
Cortex cognitive	STN cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	1.0	No
Cortex motor	Striatum motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.005)$	1.0	Yes
Cortex cognitive	Striatum cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.005)$	1.0	Yes
Cortex motor	Striatum associative	$(1,i) \rightarrow (*,i)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.005)$	0.2	Yes
Cortex cognitive	Striatum associative	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,*)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.005)$	0.2	Yes
Cortex associative	Striatum associative	$(i,j) \rightarrow (i,j)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.005)$	1.0	Yes
Thalamus motor	Cortex motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	1.0	No
Thalamus cognitive	Cortex cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	1.0	No
GPi motor	Thalamus motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	-0.5	No
GPi cognitive	Thalamus cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	-0.5	No
STN motor	GPi motor	$(1,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	1.0	No
STN cognitive	GPi cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	1.0	No
Striatum cognitive	GPi cognitive	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	-2.0	No
Striatum motor	GPi motor	$(i,1) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	-2.0	No
Striatum associative	GPi motor	$(*,i) \rightarrow (1,i)$	1.0	-2.0	No
Striatum associative	GPi cognitive	$(i,*) \rightarrow (i,1)$	1.0	-2.0	No

HTTP://DANA.LORIA.FR