

Resonance and selective communication via bursts in neurons having subthreshold oscillations

Eugene M. Izhikevich *

The Neurosciences Institute, 10640 John Jay Hopkins Drive, San Diego, CA 92121, USA

Accepted 22 August 2002

Abstract

Revealing the role of bursts of action potentials is an important step toward understanding how the neurons communicate. The dominant point of view is that bursts are needed to increase the reliability of communication between neurons [Trends Neurosci. 20 (1997) 38]. In this paper we present an alternative but complementary hypothesis. We consider the effect of a short burst on a model postsynaptic cell having damped oscillation of its membrane potential. The oscillation frequency (eigenfrequency) plays a crucial role. Due to the subthreshold membrane resonance and frequency preference, the responses (i.e. voltage oscillations) of such a cell are amplified when the intra-burst frequency equals the cell's eigenfrequency. Responses are negligible, however, if the intra-burst frequency is twice the eigenfrequency. Thus, the same burst could be effective for one cell and ineffective for another depending on their eigenfrequencies. This theoretical observation suggests that, in addition to coping with unreliable synapses, bursts of action potentials may provide effective mechanisms for selective communication between neurons.

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Frequency preference; Resonators; Doublet; Triplet; Burst; Hopf bifurcation

1. Introduction

Understanding the nature of neuronal code is one of the most fundamental problems in neuroscience (Singer, 1999): What is it in the spike train of a presynaptic neuron that is important for the postsynaptic one? Is the 'information' encoded in the mean firing rate, in the interspike intervals, or in something else? Answering these questions is

essential for our understanding of the functioning of the nervous system.

In this short paper we approach the problem by asking a simpler question—*What is the functional importance of generating a doublet, triplet, or a short burst of spikes instead of a single spike?* The prevailing answer to this question, influenced by the half a century history of treating neurons as spatio-temporal integrators, says that bursts increase reliability of communication between neurons. Indeed, sending a short burst of spikes instead of a single spike increases the chances that at least one of the spikes (or exactly one; see Lisman, 1997) could avoid synaptic transmission

* <http://www.nsi.edu/users/izhikevich>

E-mail address: eugene.izhikevich@nsi.edu (E.M. Izhikevich).

failure. The timing of spikes within the burst does not play any role in this. Moreover, it is commonly assumed that the shorter the interspike interval, the better: If two spikes within a burst trigger the synaptic transmission, the combined post-synaptic potential is larger when the interval between the spikes is smaller, as we illustrate in Fig. 1a.

In this paper, we argue that this classical view is only half of the story. The mechanism described above is indeed valid, but only for postsynaptic neurons exhibiting non-oscillatory PSPs, as in Fig. 1a. Such neurons are often called integrators in the computational neuroscience literature (as reviewed by Izhikevich, 2000), to distinguish them from resonators discussed next.

Many cortical (Llinas et al., 1991; Gut Freund et al., 1995; Hutcheon et al., 1996a,b), thalamic (Pedroarena and Llinas, 1997; Hutcheon et al., 1994; Puil et al., 1994), and hippocampal (Cobb et al., 1995) neurons exhibit oscillatory potentials, as in Fig. 1b and c. The responses of such neurons are sensitive to the timing of spikes within the burst. We illustrate this in Fig. 1b and c using the classical Hodgkin–Huxley model having fast synaptic conductances and in Fig. 2b using other conductance-based models (with the currents

shown next to voltage traces). The first spike evokes a damped oscillation of the membrane potential, which results in an oscillation of distance to the threshold, and hence an oscillation of the firing probability. All of these oscillations have the same period—the eigenperiod. The effect of the second spike depends on its timing relative to the first spike: If the interval between the spikes is near the eigenperiod or its multiple, the second spike arrives during the rising phase of oscillation, and it increases the amplitude of oscillation even further, as in the middle trace of Fig. 1b. In this case the effects of the spikes add up. If the interval between spikes is near half the eigenperiod, the second spike arrives during the falling phase of oscillation, and it leads to a decrease in oscillation amplitude, as in the bottom trace of Fig. 1b. The spikes effectively cancel each other out in this case. The same phenomenon occurs for inhibitory synapses, as we illustrate in Fig. 1c. Here the second spike increases (decreases) the amplitude of oscillation if it arrives during the falling (rising) phase.

This mechanism is related to the well-known phenomenon of subthreshold membrane resonance, as reviewed by Hutcheon and Yarom








Fig. 1. Illustration of exponential and oscillatory convergence of membrane potential to the rest state. (a) Voltage variable in the Morris and Lecar (1981) system exhibits exponential (non-oscillatory) convergence to the rest state. The response of such a system is large when the two spikes arrive with a small delay. (b) Voltage variable in the Hodgkin and Huxley (1952) model exhibits damped oscillation. Its response is large when the distance between the spikes is near the period of oscillation (resonant doublet). In this case the second spike adds to the first one. The model's response is diminished when the distance is half the period (non-resonant doublet). The second spike 'cancels' the effect of the first one. (c) The same as in b, but the doublet is inhibitory.

a. Exponential Decay to Rest



b. Oscillatory Decay to Rest



Non-resonant Burst

Resonant Burst

Fig. 2. Examples of subthreshold behavior in electrophysiological models of neurons. (a) Neurons having exponential (non-oscillatory) decay to the rest state prefer high frequency of the input (vertical bars below the voltage traces). An input burst of four spikes is more effective when the interspike interval is small. (b) Neurons having oscillatory potentials: a single spike (left) evokes damped oscillations of membrane potential with certain frequency (eigenfrequency). An incoming burst of pulses is not effective if its interspike frequency is twice the eigenperiod; see non-resonant bursts in the middle). The burst is effective when the interspike frequency equals the eigenfrequency (resonant burst in the right). Action potentials are cut. Currents used: persistent sodium $I_{Na,p}$, transient potassium I_K , delay current (low-threshold potassium) $I_{K(D)}$, hyperpolarization-activated I_h , and Ohmic leak current I_{leak} .

(2000): subthreshold response of the neuron depends on the frequency content of the input doublet, triplet, or a short burst of spikes. We say that the burst is resonant, if its interspike interval is near the eigenperiod of the post-synaptic cell, and non-resonant otherwise. A key observation is that the same burst can be resonant for one neuron and non-resonant for another depending on their eigenperiods. For example, in Fig. 3 neurons B and C have different periods of subthreshold oscillations: 12 and 18 ms, respectively. By sending a burst of spikes with interspike interval of 12 ms, neuron A can elicit a response in neuron B, but not in C. Similarly, the burst with interspike interval of 18 ms elicits response in neuron C, but not in B. Thus, neuron A can selectively affect either neuron B or C by merely changing the interspike frequency of bursting without changing the efficacy of synaptic connections. The existence of such a selective communication between neurons is a novel hypothesis, which was briefly mentioned earlier (Izhikevich, 2001) and it is the major point of this paper.

2. Multiple inputs

Fig. 3 illustrates the essence of the mechanism of selective communication via bursts. However, being part of a large network, neurons B and C are likely to receive hundreds of other inputs at the same time, which would inevitably interfere with their responses. In Fig. 4 we consider such a case. Neuron B receives random uncorrelated spike train (trace 2) via 1000 fibers marked as N (one random spike per fiber per s). The strength of synaptic connections is chosen so that the random input evokes subthreshold activity of B with occasional action potentials, as we depict in trace 1. As the neuron exhibits oscillatory potentials, its activity is rhythmic even though the random input is not. The period of rhythmic activity varies, but it is near the eigenperiod of the neuron—around 10 ms.

We are interested in the response of neuron B to doublets arriving from neuron A and having resonant (10 ms) and non-resonant (5 ms) interspike intervals. We depict the resonant case in the




Fig. 3. Selective communication via bursts: neuron A sends bursts of spikes to neurons B and C that have different eigenperiods (12 and 18 ms, respectively). Both are simultaneous of Hodgkin–Huxley model). As a result of changing the interspike frequency, neuron A can selectively affect B or C without changing the efficiency of synapses.




Fig. 4. A random spike train N depicted in trace 2 evokes noisy rhythmic activity in neuron B (trace 1) with the eigenperiod around 10 ms (simulation of the Hodgkin–Huxley model receiving 200 random spikes within 200 ms time interval). In the left-hand side of the figure ('Resonance-Doublet') we superimpose a 10 ms doublet from neuron A with the same spike train N. Depending on the timing of the doublet relative to the phase of subthreshold oscillation, neuron B can fire earlier (trace 3, action potential is cut off) or may not fire at all (trace 4). Trace 5 is the superposition of traces 1, 3 and 4. One can clearly see that activity of B is sensitive to the presence and timings of the 10 ms doublet. When the same random spike train N is superimposed with a 5 ms doublet (right-hand side of the figure—'Non-Resonant Doublet'), neuron B is not sensitive to the presence of doublet and/or its timings. Traces 3 and 4 are almost identical to trace 1, as one can see from their superimposition (trace 5).

left-hand side of Fig. 4. To demonstrate that activity of neuron B is sensitive to the resonant doublet, we run our simulation with the same input N, the same initial conditions, but with (trace 3) and without (trace 1) input from neuron A. Contrasting traces 1 and 3, one can see that

neuron B is indeed sensitive to the presence of the resonant doublet. It fires earlier in trace 3. The mechanism of such a response is similar to the one depicted in Figs. 1b and 3: both pulses arrive during the rising phase of oscillation of the membrane potential of neuron B. Each pulse

increases the amplitude of oscillation, thereby provoking early firing. In trace 4, we shift the timing of doublet so that the pulses arrive during the falling phase of oscillation. Each pulse decreases the amplitude of oscillation, thereby impeding firing. To compare traces 1, 3, and 4, we depict their superposition as trace 5. One can clearly see that the presence and timing of the resonant doublet can produce transient but noticeable change in the membrane potential.

In the right-hand side of Fig. 4 we depict responses of neuron B to the non-resonant doublet (5 ms) from neuron A. Since the doublet has interspike interval half of the period of oscillation, one pulse arrives during the rising phase of oscillation, and the other during the falling phase. The first pulse increases the amplitude of oscillation, but the second decreases it. They effectively cancel each other out, as in the bottom of Fig. 1b. As a result, trace 3 is similar to trace 1. In trace 4 the doublet arrives with a half-period delay, so that the first pulse arrives during the falling phase of membrane potential, and the second arrives during the rising phase. In this case the first pulse decreases the amplitude of oscillation, and the second pulse increases it. Again, they effectively cancel each other out. Thus, the membrane potential of neuron B is sensitive neither to the presence nor to the timing of such a non-resonant doublet. One can clearly see this in trace 5, which is a superposition of traces 1, 3, and 4 (if membrane potential of neuron B is so near the threshold that any small perturbation can trigger the action potential, then the non-resonant doublet or even a single spike would make a difference).

3. Hopf bifurcation and resonance

We have used here the classical Hodgkin–Huxley model because it can easily exhibit subthreshold oscillation of membrane potential due to the interplay between transient sodium and potassium currents. Such oscillations can also occur, e.g. due to the alternating activation of persistent sodium and potassium (Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000; Llinas et al., 1991) currents or h-current (Hutcheon et al., 1996a), an interplay between

activation and inactivation of a window inward current, activation of low-threshold (Hutcheon et al., 1994) or P/Q type (Pedroarena and Llinas, 1997) calcium currents, or some combinations of the above currents, as we illustrate in Fig. 2. Thus, damped oscillations are ubiquitous in neural models. However, we fail to identify any ‘magical’ set of channels that would always result in oscillatory potentials, since changing the maximal conductances and shapes of (in)activation curves can result in non-oscillatory potentials (unpublished observation).

Using dynamical system theory (Kuznetsov, 1995), one can show that damped oscillations always occur when neuron dynamic is near Andronov–Hopf bifurcation (this is sufficient but not necessary condition). For example, the Hodgkin–Huxley model and all the models in Fig. 2 reside near Andronov–Hopf bifurcation. Taking advantage of this mathematical fact, we have shown analytically (see review by Izhikevich, 2000) that frequency preference, resonance, and selective communication are universal phenomena, which do not depend on the ionic mechanism or the details of equations describing neuron dynamics as long as the model is near Andronov–Hopf bifurcation.

4. Discussion

Neurons exhibiting subthreshold oscillations have attracted much attention recently because they can exhibit frequency preference and resonance (see review by Hutcheon and Yarom, 2000). Most researchers are interested in how such neurons can contribute to synchronization and its role in neuronal processing (see review by Singer, 1999; Desmairons et al., 1999; Lampl and Yarom, 1993, 1997). Here we propose an alternative hypothesis on the importance of subthreshold oscillations—selective communication via short bursts of spikes. Indeed, neurons with subthreshold oscillatory potentials prefer rhythmic input with certain frequencies, i.e. resonant input, but bursting is such a rhythmic input. The same burst of action potentials can be resonant for some neurons and non-resonant for others, depending

on their eigenfrequencies. By generating such a burst, a neuron can selectively affect some neurons, but not the others. This is the key to our hypothesis of selective communication. Incidentally, our hypothesis also provides an alternative interpretation of the functional importance of bursting activity.

There are many cells, including neocortical pyramidal neurons, that rarely exhibit subthreshold oscillatory potentials. Such cells would not show frequency preference to incoming bursts, but they can still communicate selectively with other neurons by sending bursts provided that the postsynaptic neurons have oscillatory potentials.

5. Methods

We have used the [Hodgkin and Huxley \(1952\)](#) model with original values of parameters except for $I = 5$, which makes subthreshold oscillation of membrane potential more pronounced. The synaptic conductance is modeled as the ‘ α -function’

$$g_{\text{syn}}(t) = \alpha t e^{-t/\tau}$$

where $t \geq 0$ is the elapsed time after spike, $\tau = 2$ ms and $\alpha = 0.015$ (in [Figs. 1b and c and 3](#)) or $\alpha = 0.005$ (in [Fig. 4](#)). To obtain the subthreshold oscillations with 18 ms period (the bottom trace in [Fig. 3](#)), we rescale time in the Hodgkin–Huxley model by the factor of 2/3, i.e. we multiply the right-hand side of the Hodgkin–Huxley four-dimensional system by 2/3. The spike train N in [Fig. 4](#) is a superposition of 200 random spikes uniformly distributed over the time interval [0, 200] ms. All simulations are performed in MATLAB, The MathWorks Inc.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Gerald Edelman, Elisabeth Walcott and Douglas Nitz for reading the first draft of the manuscript and making a number of useful suggestions. This research was carried out as part of theoretical neurobiology program at The

Neurosciences Institute, which is supported by Neurosciences Research Foundation.

References

- Cobb, S.R., Buhl, E.H., Halasy, K., Paulsen, O., Somogyi, P., 1995. Synchronization of neuronal activity in hippocampus by individual GABAergic interneurons. *Nature* 378, 75–78.
- Desmaisons, D., Vincent, J.-D., Lledo, P.M., 1999. Control of action potential timing by intrinsic subthreshold oscillation in olfactory bulb output neurons. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 15, 10727–10737.
- Gutfreund, Y., Yarom, Y., Segev, I., 1995. Subthreshold oscillations and resonant frequency in guinea-pig cortical neurons physiology and modeling. *Journal of Physiology London* 483, 621–640.
- Hodgkin, A.L., Huxley, A.F., 1952. A quantitative description of membrane current and application to conduction and excitation in nerve. *Journal of Physiology* 117, 500–544.
- Hutcheon, B., Yarom, Y., 2000. Resonance, oscillation and the intrinsic frequency preferences of neurons. *Trends Neuroscience* 23, 216–222.
- Hutcheon, B., Miura, R.M., Yarom, Y., Puil, E., 1994. Low-threshold calcium current and resonance in thalamic neurons a model of frequency preference. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 71, 583–594.
- Hutcheon, B., Miura, R.M., Puil, E., 1996a. Subthreshold membrane resonance in neocortical neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 76, 683–697.
- Hutcheon, B., Miura, R.M., Puil, E., 1996b. Models of subthreshold membrane resonance in neocortical neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 76, 698–714.
- Izhikevich, E.M., 2000. Neural excitability, spiking and bursting. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* 10, 1171–1266.
- Izhikevich, E.M., 2001. Resonate-and-fire neurons. *Neural Networks* 14, 883–894.
- Kuznetsov, Y., 1995. *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory*. Springer, New York.
- Lampl, I., Yarom, Y., 1993. Subthreshold oscillations of the membrane potential: a functional synchronizing and timing device. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 70, 2181–2186.
- Lampl, I., Yarom, Y., 1997. Subthreshold oscillations and resonant behavior: two manifestations of the same mechanism. *Neuroscience* 78, 325–341.
- Lisman, J., 1997. Bursts as a unit of neural information: making unreliable synapses reliable. *Trends Neuroscience* 20, 38–43.
- Llinas, R.R., Grace, A.A., Yarom, Y., 1991. In vitro neurons in mammalian cortical layer 4 exhibit intrinsic oscillatory activity in the 10–50-Hz frequency range. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 88, 897–901.
- Morris, C., Lecar, H., 1981. Voltage oscillations in the barnacle giant muscle fiber. *Biophysical Journal* 35, 193–213.

- Pedroarena, C., Llinas, R.R., 1997. Dendritic calcium conductances generate high-frequency oscillation in thalamocortical neurons. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 94, 724–728.
- Puil, E., Meiri, H., Yarom, Y., 1994. Resonant behavior and frequency preference of thalamic neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 71, 575–582.
- Singer, W., 1999. Time as coding space. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 9, 189–194.