

Regular Paper

# Sparse Estimation of Spike-Triggered Average

SHIMPEI YOTSUKURA<sup>1</sup> TOSHIAKI OMORI<sup>2</sup> KENJI NAGATA<sup>1</sup> MASATO OKADA<sup>1,3,a)</sup>

Received: April 25, 2013, Revised: June 9, 2013,  
Accepted: July 25, 2013

**Abstract:** The spike-triggered average (STA) and phase response curve characterize the response properties of single neurons. A recent theoretical study proposed a method to estimate the phase response curve by means of linear regression with Fourier basis functions. In this study, we propose a method to estimate the STA by means of sparse linear regression with Fourier and polynomial basis functions. In the proposed method, we use sparse estimation with L1 regularization to extract substantial basis functions for the STA. We show using simulated data that the proposed method achieves more accurate estimation of the STA than the simple trial average used in conventional method.

**Keywords:** spike-triggered average, linear regression, L1 regularization, model selection, curve fitting

## 1. Introduction

Neurons are encoders that transform time series of inputs into spikes. Spike-triggered analysis has been used extensively to estimate the statistical properties of the time-varying inputs inducing the spikes [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. In particular, the spike-triggered average (STA), first-order statistics of the spike-triggered analysis, corresponds to an average of time series of inputs that induce the spikes. The STA has been used in physiological experiments to estimate receptive fields in neural systems [6], [7], [8].

To obtain the STA from experimental results, we need to observe a spike train from a specific neuron and calculate an average of time series of inputs that induce the spike train. In previous studies, the STA has been calculated simply as a trial average of inputs inducing a finite number of spikes [9]. However, the number of observable spikes from a specific neuron is limited in physiological experiments. Due to this limitation, the STA calculated as the simple trial average is rather noisy, which makes it difficult to obtain the true STA accurately.

A recent study proposed a method to estimate phase response curve (PRC) by using linear regression with Fourier basis functions [10]. The PRC is a periodic function that characterizes the response properties of single neurons. This method has been shown to accurately estimate the PRC from experimental data. Since the STA is known to be proportional to a derivative of the PRC [9], it would seem that the linear regression would be effective for estimating the STA as well as the PRC. However, the STA would be a discontinuous function whereas the PRC is a periodic continuous function. This would make it difficult to estimate the STA using linear regression with only Fourier basis functions,

and it is unclear what kinds of basis functions are appropriate to estimate the STA by linear regression.

In this paper, we propose an algorithm to estimate the STA based on sparse estimation by using L1 regularization [11], [12], [13], [14]. In the proposed method, essential basis functions for the STA are extracted automatically by means of sparse linear regression using the L1 regularization. Appropriate basis functions for estimating the STA are evaluated by applying the proposed method to simulated data obtained using the Morris-Lecar model [15]. We show using the simulated data that the proposed method can estimate the STA more accurately than the conventional method using the simple trial average.

## 2. Spike-Triggered Average

In this study, we propose an algorithm to estimate the suprathreshold STA [9], [16]. The neuron is assumed to emit a spike when a membrane potential of a neuron exceeds a firing threshold  $V_{th}$ . We inject an input current  $I(t)$  into the neuron as

$$I(t) = I_0 + \xi(t), \tag{1}$$

where  $I_0$  is a constant current and  $\xi(t)$  is a stochastic current obeying the white Gaussian noise with the average 0 and the variance  $\sigma^2$ . The constant current  $I_0$  is set to be sufficiently large to generate spikes without stochastic input  $\xi(t)$ . As shown in **Fig. 1**, we assume that the neuron generates spikes at time  $t_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ) by the constant and stochastic currents. The STA,  $C_0(\tau)$ , is defined as

$$C_0(\tau) = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \xi(t_k - \tau), \tag{2}$$

where  $K$  indicates the number of spikes.  $\xi(t_k - \tau)$  represents the stochastic current that comes  $\tau$  before the  $k$ -th spike. Namely, the STA is an average of the stochastic current  $\xi(t_k - \tau)$  preceding spikes.


Although the definition of the STA,  $C_0(\tau)$ , assumes an infinite

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Frontier Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277–8561, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University, Nada, Kobe 657–8501, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Brain Science Institute, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama 351–0198, Japan

<sup>a)</sup> okada@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp



**Fig. 1** A schematic diagram of the spike-triggered average (STA). We inject an input current  $I(t)$  into the neuron where  $I(t)$  consists of the constant current  $I_0$  and the stochastic current  $\xi(t)$  and the neuron generates spikes at time  $\{t_k\}$ . The STA is defined as the average of the stochastic current  $\xi(t_k - \tau)$  preceding the spike time  $t_k$  by the interval  $\tau$ .

number of spikes, we cannot obtain an infinite number of spikes in physiological experiments. The STA is therefore calculated approximately with a finite number of spikes  $K$  obtained from experimental and numerical data. We show an example of the STA calculated as the trial average with the finite number of spikes in **Fig. 2** (a). We found that the STA calculated as the trial average is noisy, and thus it is difficult to calculate the STA accurately using the conventional method based on the trial average. Hereafter, we call the STA calculated by the trial average with the finite number of spikes simply the STA data.

### 3. Proposed Method


In this section, we propose an algorithm to estimate the STA with linear regression based on L1 regularization in order to accurately estimate the true STA from noisy STA data.

#### 3.1 Sparse Estimation of the STA Based on L1 Regularization


In this study, we propose an algorithm to estimate the true STA,  $C_0(\tau)$ , from the STA data by using linear regression with basis functions. We consider a situation in which we obtain the STA data with  $N$  points  $\{(\tau_1, C(\tau_1)), \dots, (\tau_N, C(\tau_N))\}$  by physiological experiments. Each value of the STA data,  $C(\tau_i)$ , is assumed to consist of the true STA,  $C_0(\tau_i)$ , and noise.

The true STA,  $C_0(\tau)$ , is assumed to be expressed by a linear combination of basis functions  $\{f_j(\tau)\}$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} C_0(\tau) &= a_1 f_1(\tau) + \dots + a_M f_M(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^M a_j f_j(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$



(a) STA data in the case of  $K = 10^3$ .



(b) STA data in the case of  $K = 10^6$ .

**Fig. 2** Examples of STA data obtained by the type I Morris-Lecar model. (a) STA data in the case in which the number of spikes,  $K$ , is  $10^3$ . The STA data is noisy if the number of spikes,  $K$ , is small. (b) STA data in the case in which the number of spikes,  $K$ , is  $10^6$ . The STA data converges to the true STA if the number of spikes,  $K$ , is sufficiently large. The true STA can be a discontinuous periodic function since  $C_0(0)$  is not equal to  $C_0(T)$ , as shown in (b). Here the firing period  $T$  is set to be 1.

where  $M$  is the number of basis functions and  $\{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$  are real coefficients. We consider a linear regression problem to determine the coefficients  $\{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$  based on the STA data  $\{(\tau_1, C(\tau_1)), \dots, (\tau_N, C(\tau_N))\}$  in order to obtain the regression model of the STA.

If we use an excessive number of basis functions in the linear regression, we run the risk of overfitting, which would result in a failed estimation of the true STA since the regression model is strongly influenced by the noise in such cases. Thus, we need to extract only essential basis functions to estimate the STA accurately.

In this study, we introduce L1 regularization [11], [12], [13], [14] in order to extract essential basis functions automatically based on the STA data. The L1 regularization is defined to determine the coefficients  $\{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$  so as to minimize the following objective function:

$$E(a_1, \dots, a_M) = \sum_{i=1}^N (C(\tau_i) - C_0(\tau_i))^2 + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j |a_j|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left( C(\tau_i) - \sum_{j=1}^M a_j f_j(\tau_i) \right)^2 \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j |a_j|. \quad (4)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\lambda_j$  are assumed to be positive constants. The first term of the objective function  $E$  represents a discrepancy between the regression model and the STA data. The second term is a penalty term that prevents absolute values of coefficients from increasing. By this penalty term, the coefficients  $\{a_j\}$  for redundant basis functions are likely to be exactly zero. Thus, essential basis functions can be extracted using the L1 regularization, and the model selection can be realized automatically. This kind of estimation using Eq. (4) is called sparse estimation.

### 3.2 Design of Basis Functions and Regularization Weights

The accuracy of the regression in Eq. (3) is determined by what kinds of functions we prepare for redundant basis functions  $\{f_1(\tau), \dots, f_M(\tau)\}$ . Fourier basis functions were used in the linear regression of the phase response curve (PRC) in a previous study by Galán et al. [10]. The PRC describes a phase shift induced by perturbation given to a periodically firing neuron and characterizes the response properties of single neurons. Since the PRC is a periodic function, the previous study [10] used the Fourier basis functions.

Ermentrout et al. analytically showed that the STA is proportional to a derivative of the PRC [9]. Therefore, we consider a regression of the STA using the Fourier basis functions as well as the PRC. Since a derivative of a continuous function is not always continuous, the STA, which is proportional to a derivative of the PRC, can be discontinuous. Actually, as shown in Fig. 2 (b), the STA can be discontinuous since  $C_0(0)$  is not equal to  $C_0(T)$ . If we perform a regression of the STA using only Fourier basis functions, it is expected that high-frequency components of the Fourier basis functions are needed to express the discontinuity of the STA, even when the true STA may not include the high-frequency components.

In this study, we used the Fourier basis functions and polynomial basis functions in order to express the discontinuity of the STA, as

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_0(\tau) = & a_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{D_f} a_{(k+1)} \cos(2k\pi\tau) \\
 & + \sum_{k=1}^{D_f} a_{(k+D_f+1)} \sin(2k\pi\tau) \\
 & + \sum_{k=1}^{D_p} a_{(k+2D_f+1)} \tau^k, \quad (5)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the firing period  $T$  is set to be 1.  $D_f$  and  $D_p$  are the maximum order of the Fourier and polynomial basis functions, respectively. Here, it is unclear which order of the Fourier and polynomial basis functions are needed in advance. We perform sparse regression using a sufficiently large number of the Fourier and polynomial basis functions by setting the maximum order of each kind of basis functions  $D_f$  and  $D_p$  to be sufficiently large.

The sparse estimation is conducted using the L1 regularization to extract only essential basis functions for the STA.

The regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  in Eq. (4) should be determined in order to perform the L1 regularization. Absolute values of the coefficients for high-frequency components of the Fourier basis functions are expected to be relatively small in the true STA. On the other hand, noise contains large high-frequency components. In this study, we propose a method that strongly penalizes extraction of high-frequency components of Fourier basis functions. For this purpose, we set the regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  as

$$\lambda_j = \begin{cases} (j-1)\lambda & \text{(if } 2 \leq j \leq D_f + 1\text{)} \\ (j - D_f - 1)\lambda & \text{(if } D_f + 2 \leq j \leq 2D_f + 1\text{)} \\ \lambda & \text{(otherwise),} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a positive constant. In Eq. (6), the regularization weights are set to be proportional to the frequency of the Fourier basis functions. Namely, the regularization weight  $\lambda_j$  for  $k$ -th order Fourier basis functions  $\cos(2\pi k\tau)$  and  $\sin(2\pi k\tau)$  is set to be  $\lambda_j = k\lambda$ . The constant  $\lambda$  is determined so as to minimize a generalization error calculated by a cross-validation method.

## 4. Results

In this section, we apply the proposed algorithm to STA data obtained by simulation using a neuron model.

### 4.1 Morris-Lecar Model

In this study, we used the Morris-Lecar model as a neuron model [15], [17]. In this model, the dynamics of the membrane potential  $V(t)$  obey the following differential equation:


$$\begin{aligned}
 C \frac{dV(t)}{dt} = & -\bar{g}_{Ca} m_\infty(V(t))(V(t) - V_{Ca}) \\
 & -\bar{g}_K w(t)(V(t) - V_K) - \bar{g}_L (V(t) - V_L) \\
 & + I(t). \quad (7)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, Eq. (7) describes the relationship between ion currents and the membrane potential. We describe further details of the Morris-Lecar model in the Appendix.

Neurons are classified into type I and II neurons according to their firing properties [16], [17], [18]. The Morris-Lecar model can mimic both types by using appropriate parameter settings. We show the difference in firing properties between the two in Fig. 3. For both type I and II neurons, a neuron fires periodically if it receives a sufficiently large constant current  $I_0$ . Firing frequency of the type I neuron is continuous, as shown in Fig. 3 (a), whereas that of the type II neuron changes discontinuously, as shown in Fig. 3 (b). We apply the proposed method to the STA data of both type I and II obtained by the Morris-Lecar model.

### 4.2 Settings of Numerical Simulations and Sparse Estimation

The STA data is numerically obtained by the Morris-Lecar model with the constant and stochastic currents  $I(t) = I_0 + \xi(t)$ . The constant current  $I_0$  is set to be sufficiently large to generate spikes periodically without stochastic current. We apply the sparse estimation algorithm to the STA data. In this section, the




**Fig. 3** Firing properties of neurons. Firing frequency of type I neuron is continuous whereas that of type II neuron is discontinuous.

estimation of the STA is performed in two ways. The first case is the proposed method, in which the regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  are assumed as in Eq. (6). In the second case, the regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  are set to be constant  $\lambda$ . The value of  $\lambda$  is determined by using 10-fold cross-validation.

We use the STA data calculated using the number of spikes  $10^2, 10^3, 10^4,$  and  $10^5$  in type I neuron and the STA data calculated using the number of spikes  $10^3, 10^4, 10^5,$  and  $10^6$  in type II neuron. The maximum order of the Fourier basis functions  $D_f$  and that of the polynomial basis functions  $D_p$  are set to be sufficiently large as  $D_f = 25$  and  $D_p = 50$ , results of the proposed method are found to be robust for sufficiently large values of  $D_f$  and  $D_p$  (data not shown).

**4.3 Results of the Proposed Method**

In this section, we show the results of the proposed method. Namely, we perform sparse estimation with the regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  obeying Eq. (6). The solid line in **Fig. 4** (a) shows the regression model estimated by the proposed method. Here, the proposed method is applied to the STA data calculated using the number of spikes  $K = 10^3$ . We find that the discontinuity  $C(0) \neq C(T)$  is expressed in the regression model estimated by the proposed method. From **Table 1** (a), we also find that one polynomial basis function is extracted in addition to Fourier basis functions. Furthermore, the low-frequency components of the



**Fig. 4** Results of the proposed method applied to noisy STA data that were obtained using the Morris-Lecar model. (a) Results for type I neuron. (b) Results for type II neuron. Dots represent the noisy STA data calculated by using the small number of spikes ( $K = 10^3$  for type I neuron and  $K = 10^5$  for type II neuron). The solid line shows a regression model of the STA estimated from the noisy STA data by using the proposed method while the dashed line shows less noisy STA data calculated by using a sufficiently large number of spikes ( $K = 10^6$  for type I neuron and  $K = 10^7$  for type II neuron).

**Table 1** The number of the basis functions extracted by the proposed method, and the number of all basis functions. Top row shows the number of spikes  $K$  used to calculate the STA data. Middle row shows the number of both Fourier and polynomial basis functions. Bottom row shows the number of the polynomial functions only.


$K$	$10^2$	$10^3$	$10^4$	$10^5$
No. extracted / All	3/101	7/101	9/101	25/101
(polynomial)	1/50	1/50	4/50	3/50

(a) Results for type I neuron.


$K$	$10^3$	$10^4$	$10^5$	$10^6$
No. extracted / All	0/101	3/101	6/101	9/101
(polynomial)	0/50	1/50	1/50	2/50

(b) Results for type II neuron.

Fourier basis functions are extracted by strongly penalizing high-frequency components. As discussed above, we see that essential basis functions of the STA are extracted and the model selection is accurately realized by the proposed sparse estimation. **Figure 4** (b) and **Table 1** (b) show estimated results for type II neuron.



(a) The generalization error in type I neuron.




(b) The generalization error in type II neuron.

**Fig. 5** Generalization error in the proposed method. The proposed method was applied to the STA data obtained by simulation using the Morris-Lecar model. (a) The generalization error in type I neuron. (b) The generalization error in type II neuron. The horizontal axis represents the number of spikes,  $K$ , and the vertical axis represents the generalization error. Even when the number of spikes used in the proposed method was only ten percent of that used in the conventional method, the proposed method had a similar performance to the conventional method.


We find that essential basis functions of the STA are extracted in the case of type II neuron as in the case of type I neuron.

Next, we evaluate the discrepancy between the conventional method using the simple trial average and the proposed method. We evaluate the generalization error calculated by the root mean square error between the target STA data and the regression model. The target STA data corresponds to the STA data with the sufficiently large number of spikes. The number of spikes of the target STA data is set to be  $K = 10^6$  for type I neuron and  $K = 10^7$  for type II neuron.

As shown in Fig. 5, the discrepancy of the proposed method using the STA data with the number of spikes  $K$  is similar to that of the conventional method using the STA data with the number of spikes  $10K$ . From these results, we find that even when the number of spikes used in the proposed method is only ten percent of that used in the conventional method, the proposed method had a similar performance to the conventional method.



(a) Results for type I neuron.



(b) Results for type II neuron.

**Fig. 6** Results of L1 regularization in the case when  $\lambda_j = \lambda$ . (a) Results for type I neuron. (b) Results for type II neuron. Dots represent the noisy STA data calculated by using the small number of spikes. A solid line is the regression model of the STA estimated by L1 regularization from the noisy STA data. A dashed line represents the less noisy STA data calculated by using the sufficiently large number of spikes.

**Table 2** The number of extracted basis functions in the case of  $\lambda_j = \lambda$ , and the number of all basis functions.

$K$	$10^2$	$10^3$	$10^4$	$10^5$
No. extracted / All	1/101	16/101	27/101	44/101
(polynomial)	0/50	0/50	1/50	5/50

(a) Results for type I neuron.

$K$	$10^3$	$10^4$	$10^5$	$10^6$
No. extracted / All	4/101	19/101	19/101	47/101
(polynomial)	0/50	1/50	1/50	1/50

(b) Results for type II neuron.

#### 4.4 Case of Constant Regularization Weights

In this section, we consider a case in which all the regularization weights  $\lambda_j$  for both Fourier and polynomial basis functions are constant value  $\lambda$ , not dependent on  $j$ . We show the results of this case in Fig. 6 and Table 2. As shown in Fig. 6, the high-frequency components of the Fourier basis functions are extracted due to noise in the STA data, and the regression model is too wavy. The polynomial functions are difficult to extract, as shown in Table 2, since the discontinuity,  $C(0) \neq C(T)$ , is intended to be expressed by the high-frequency components of the Fourier basis functions, not the polynomial basis functions. Thus, we fail to

extract only low-frequency components and the regression model is strongly influenced by the noise.

As discussed above, the proposed method is effective for estimating the true STA from the experimental STA data in the case of Section 4.3. On the other hand, it is difficult to extract important components in the case of Section 4.4.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an algorithm to estimate the STA using linear regression with the L1 regularization. We introduced sparse estimation using L1 regularization to estimate the STA and employed Fourier basis functions and polynomial basis functions in the linear regression. Using simulated data obtained by the Morris-Lecar model, we have shown that extraction of the basis functions with high generalization performance can be achieved by penalizing the extraction of high-frequency components of the Fourier basis functions. We have also shown that even when the number of spikes used in the proposed method is only ten percent of that used in the conventional method, the proposed method has a similar performance to the conventional method.

**Acknowledgments** This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 25120010 (for T. Omori), 25106506 (for K. Nagata) and 25120009 (for M. Okada).

## References

[1] De Boer, E. and Kuyper, P.: Triggered Correlation, *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, Vol.15, pp.169–179 (1968).

[2] Bryant, H.L. and Segundo, J.P.: Spike Initiation by Transmembrane Current: A White-Noise Analysis, *J. Physiol.*, Vol.260, pp.279–314 (1976).

[3] Chichilnisky, E.J.: A Simple White Noise Analysis of Neuronal Light Responses, *Network: Comput. Neural Syst.*, Vol.12, pp.199–213 (2001).

[4] Dayan, P. and Abbott, L.F.: *Theoretical Neuroscience: Computational and Mathematical Modeling of Neural Systems*, MIT Press (2001).

[5] Simoncelli, E.P., Paninski, L., Pillow, J. and Schwartz, O.: Characterization of Neural Response with Stochastic Stimuli: *The Cognitive Neurosciences*, Gazzaniga, M. (Ed.), MIT Press (2004).

[6] Fries, P., Reynolds, J.H., Rorie, A.E. and Desimone, R.: Modulation of Oscillatory Neuronal Synchronization by Selective Visual Attention, *Science*, Vol.291, No.5508, pp.1560–1563 (2001).

[7] Segev, R., Goodhouse, J., Puchalla, J. and Berry II, M.J.: Recording Spikes from a Large Fraction of the Ganglion Cells in a Retinal Patch, *Nat. Neurosci.*, Vol.7, pp.1155–1162 (2004).

[8] Farrow, K., Haag, J. and Borst, A.: Nonlinear, Binocular Interactions Underlying Flow Field Selectivity of a Motion Sensitive Neuron, *Nat. Neurosci.*, Vol.9, pp.1312–1320 (2006).

[9] Ermentrout, G.B., Galán, R.F. and Urban, N.N.: Relating Neural Dynamics to Neural Coding, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol.99, 248103 (2007).

[10] Galán, R.F., Ermentrout, G.B. and Urban, N.N.: Efficient Estimation of Phase-Resetting Curves in Real Neurons and its Significance for Neural-Network Modeling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol.94, 158101 (2005).

[11] Tibshirani, R.: Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso, *J. Royal. Statist. Soc. B*, Vol.58, No.1, pp.267–288 (1996).

[12] Kabashima, Y., Wadayama, T., and Tanaka, T.: A Typical Reconstruction Limit for Compressed Sensing Based on  $L_p$ -Norm Minimization, *J. Stat. Mech.*, Vol.2009, L09003 (2009).

[13] Mimura, K.: Compressed Sensing –Sparse Recovery and its Algorithms–, *Theory and Scientific Applications in Time-Frequency Analysis*, Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, No.1803, pp.26–56, (2012) (in Japanese).

[14] Tomioka, R. and Sugiyama, M.: Dual Augmented Lagrangian Method for Efficient Sparse Reconstruction, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, Vol.16, No.12, pp.1067–1070 (2009).

[15] Morris, C. and Lecar, H.: Voltage Oscillations in the Barnacle Giant Muscle Fiber, *Biophys. J.*, Vol.35, No.1, pp.193–213 (1981).

[16] Omori, T., Aonishi, T. and Okada, M.: Switch of Encoding Characteristics in Single Neurons by Subthreshold and Suprathreshold Stimuli, *Phys. Rev. E*, Vol.81, 021901 (2010).

[17] Rinzel, J. and Ermentrout, G.B.: Analysis of Neural Excitability and Oscillations, *Methods in Neuronal Modeling*, Koch, C. and Segev, I. (Eds.), MIT Press (1998).

[18] Mato, G. and Samengo, I.: Type I and Type II Neuron Models are Selectively Driven by Differential Stimulus Features, *Neural Comput.*, Vol.20, No.10, pp.2418–2440 (2008).

## Appendix

### A.1 Morris-Lecar Model

The Morris-Lecar model is a system obeying the following equation:

$$C \frac{dV(t)}{dt} = -\bar{g}_{Ca} m_\infty(V(t))(V(t) - V_{Ca}) - \bar{g}_K w(t)(V(t) - V_K) - \bar{g}_L(V(t) - V_L) + I(t), \quad (A.1)$$

$$\frac{dw(t)}{dt} = \phi \frac{w_\infty(V(t)) - w(t)}{\tau_w(V(t))}, \quad (A.2)$$

$$m_\infty(V(t)) = 0.5 \left\{ 1 + \tanh \left( \frac{V(t) - V_1}{V_2} \right) \right\}, \quad (A.3)$$

$$w_\infty(V(t)) = 0.5 \left\{ 1 + \tanh \left( \frac{V(t) - V_3}{V_4} \right) \right\}, \quad (A.4)$$

$$\tau_w(V(t)) = \frac{1}{\cosh \left( \frac{V(t) - V_3}{2V_4} \right)}. \quad (A.5)$$

The variable,  $V(t)$ , represents the membrane potential of a neuron and  $w(t)$  is a gate variable of potassium.  $V_{Ca}$ ,  $V_K$  and  $V_L$  are the reversal potentials of calcium, potassium, and leak channel, respectively.  $\bar{g}_{Ca}$ ,  $\bar{g}_K$ , and  $\bar{g}_L$  represent the maximum value of channel conductance.  $C$  is a membrane capacitance. The parameters are set as shown in **Table A-1**.

**Table A-1** Parameters of the Morris-Lecar model.

	$V_1$	$V_2$	$V_3$	$V_4$	$\bar{g}_{Ca}$	$\bar{g}_K$	$\bar{g}_L$
type I	-1.2	18	12	17.4	4.0	8.0	2
type II	-1.2	18	2	30	4.4	8.0	2

	$V_{Ca}$	$V_K$	$V_L$	$C$	$\phi$	$V_{th}$	$I_0$	$\sigma$
type I	120	-84	-60	20	0.04	-13.3	41	5
type II	120	-84	-60	20	1/15	-11.0	90	10



**Shimpei Yotsukura** was born in 1989. He received his B.E. degree from Hokkaido University in 2012. He is currently working towards an M.Sc. degree in complexity science and engineering at the Graduate School of Frontier Sciences, the University of Tokyo. His research interests include computational

neuroscience and machine learning.



**Toshiaki Omori** received his B.S. degree in physics from University of Tsukuba in 1999, and his Ph.D. degree in Information Science from Tohoku University in 2004. He was a predoctoral research fellow of JSPS from 2003 to 2004, a postdoctoral researcher at “Intelligent Cooperation and Control”, Japan Science and Technology

Agency (JST) from 2004 to 2006, and a postdoctoral research fellow of JSPS from 2006 to 2008. He was a visiting researcher at University of Arizona, U.S.A. in 2007. He became a research assistant professor and an assistant professor at the University of Tokyo in 2008. He is currently an associate professor at the Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University. His research interests include machine learning theory and its applications, probabilistic information processing, and computational neuroscience.



**Kenji Nagata** received his M.E. and Ph.D. degree in computational intelligence and systems science from Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan, in 2006 and 2008 respectively. He is currently an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Frontier Science, the University of Tokyo. His research interests include learning

theory and theory and application of Markov chain Monte Carlo method.



**Masato Okada** received his B.S. degree from Osaka City University in 1985, and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Osaka University in 1987 and 1997, respectively. From 1987 to 1989, he worked at Mitsubishi Electric Corporation. From 1989 to 1991, he was a student at the Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka

University, and from 1991 to 1996 he was a research associate at Osaka University. From 1996 to 2001, he was a researcher at the Kawato Dynamic Brain Project. From 2001 to 2004, he was a deputy laboratory head in the Laboratory for Mathematical Neuroscience, RIKEN Brain Science Institute. From 2002 to 2005, he was a researcher at “Intelligent Cooperation and Control”, PRESTO, JST. He is currently a professor at the Graduate School of Frontier Sciences, the University of Tokyo. His research interests include computational aspects of neural networks and statistical mechanics for information processing.