

**SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE
1994 ABSTRACT FORM**

Read all instructions before typing abstract.
See **Call for Abstracts** and reverse of this sheet.
Complete abstract and all boxes
at left and below before making copy
(please type or print in black ink).

Check here if this is a RE-
PLACEMENT of abstract sub-
mitted earlier. REMIT a nonre-
fundable \$35 for each replacement
abstract.
Replacement abstracts must be
RECEIVED by MAY 12, 1994.

First (Presenting) Author

Provide full name (no initials), address, and phone numbers of first author on abstract. You may present (first author) only one abstract. (Please type or print in black ink.)

Dr. David Colton Somers
Dept. of Brain & Cognitive Sciences
MIT, E25-618
45 Carleton Street
Cambridge, MA 02139 Fax: (617) 253-9829
Office: (617) 253-5428 Home: (617) 497-2316

**SMALLEST
RECOMMENDED
TYPE SIZE: 10 POINT**

SAMPLE:
1994 Annual Meeting
Miami Beach, Florida
November 13-18, 1994

**POSTMARK
DEADLINE:**

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1994

An asterisk must be placed after the sponsor's (signing member) name on the abstract.

Presentation Preference

Check one: poster slide

Themes and Topics

See list of themes and topics, pp. 17-18. Indicate below a first and second choice appropriate for programming and publishing your paper.

1st theme title: Sensory Systems
theme letter: F

1st topic title: Visual Cortex:
Striate topic number: 91

2nd theme title: Sensory Systems
theme letter: F

2nd topic title: Visual psycho-
physics & beh. topic number: 93

Special Requests (e.g., projection/video requirements)

Include nonrefundable ABSTRACT HANDLING FEE of \$35 payable to the Society for Neuroscience. IN U.S. DOLLARS DRAWN ON A U.S. BANK ONLY. Purchase orders will not be accepted. Submission of abstract handling fee does not include registration for the Annual Meeting.

KEY WORDS: (see instructions p. 4)

1. <u>cortical circuits</u>	3. <u>feedback regulation</u>
2. <u>computer model</u>	4. <u>contextual influences</u>

Signature of Society for Neuroscience member required below. No member may sign more than one abstract. The signing member must be an author on the paper and an asterisk must be placed after the sponsor's (signing member) name on the abstract.

The signing member certifies that any work with human or animal subjects related in this abstract complies with the guiding policies and principles for experimental procedures published by the Society. This signature acknowledges that each author on this abstract has seen and approved the final version of the abstract and has given consent to appear as an author.

DAVID C. SOMERS (617) 253-5428
Society for Neuroscience member's signature Printed or typed name Telephone number

EFFECTS OF LONG-RANGE CONNECTIONS ON GAIN CONTROL IN AN EMERGENT MODEL OF VISUAL CORTICAL ORIENTATION SELECTIVITY. D. Somers*, S.B. Nelson, and M. Sur, Dept. of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139.

We previously constructed a model visual cortical circuit with short-range (< 300μ) intracortical excitatory and inhibitory connections which yielded emergently sharp orientation selectivity (Somers et al '93). The model predicts a small contribution to orientation tuning from direct inhibitory inputs to single cells, but a substantial contribution from the distributed inhibitory inputs to a cortical column. Intracortical excitation selectively amplifies responses to preferred stimuli, and inhibition primarily regulates the gain of excitatory feedback. Here we demonstrate that cortical gain also depends on stimulus contrast: the gain rises to boost mild suprathreshold stimuli and drops off as stimulus strength increases. This mechanism yields cortical contrast response functions that rise more rapidly and saturate more quickly than do their geniculate inputs.

We have added to our model two forms of longer range cortical connections: very sparse inhibitory inputs from oblique or cross orientations (300 - 600μ) and more extensive excitatory inputs from iso-orientations (≥ 1mm). Long range inhibitory connections comprise less than 20% of inhibitory and less than 5% of all model synapses. Although long-range inhibitory connections are not required to achieve sharp orientation tuning, these connections permit the circuit to maintain sharp orientation selectivity and contrast gain control across the full range of suprathreshold stimulus contrasts (Skottun et al. '87). As in the short-range model, inhibition is strongest at the preferred orientation and has predominately distributed rather than direct effects on tuning. Adding long-range excitatory connections produces biphasic effects that depend on stimulus context. Strong iso-orientation surround stimuli can up- or down-modulate the responses to stimuli within the classical receptive field; responses to subthreshold or weak center stimuli are amplified, while those to strong center stimuli are reduced. Supported by McDonnell-Pew, MH10671, EY06363, and EY07023.