

SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE  
1995 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 REVISION  
of abstract submitted earlier.  
Remit a nonrefundable \$35 for each  
replacement abstract. Replacement  
abstracts must be RECEIVED by May  
11, 1995.

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.)  
David Somers

Dept. of Brain & Cognitive Sciences  
M.I.T., E25-618  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Fax: (617) 253-9829  
Office: (617) 253-5428 Home: (617) 497-2316

SMALLEST  
RECOMMENDED  
TYPE SIZE: 10 POINT

SAMPLE:  
1995 Annual Meeting  
San Diego, California  
November 11-16, 1995

POSTMARK  
DEADLINE:

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1995

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: 86

2nd theme title: Sensory Systems  
theme letter: F  
2nd topic title: Visual Psycho-  
physics & behav topic number: 88

Special Requests (e.g., projection,  
video, or computer requirements)

Include nonrefundable Abstract Handling  
Fee of \$35 payable to the Society for Neuro-  
science, IN U.S. DOLLARS DRAWN ON A U.S.  
BANK. 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)

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

ANALYSIS OF TEMPORAL DYNAMICS OF ORIENTATION SELECTIVITY  
IN FEEDBACK AND FEEDFORWARD MODELS OF VISUAL CORTEX.  
D. Somers, S.B. Nelson<sup>†</sup>, and M. Sur<sup>\*</sup>, Dept. of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT,  
Cambridge, MA and Dept. of Biology<sup>†</sup>, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

We previously demonstrated that inclusion of massive, local intracortical excitatory  
feedback into model visual cortical circuits affords a concise account of a diverse set of  
data on orientation selectivity (Somers et al '95, JNS, *in press*). One potential difficulty  
for feedback models is to account for data indicating sharp tuning within 50 msec of  
response onset (Celebrini et al., '93). We have investigated the temporal dynamics of  
orientation selectivity in feedback, feedforward, and inhibitory model cortical circuits.

Sharp tuning (HW < 30°) at response onset could be achieved in all three network  
forms. In networks with poorly tuned thalamocortical inputs, feedforward inhibition  
was critical to rapid tuning. With weak feedforward inhibition, strong feedback caused  
damped oscillations and sharpening effects evolved over ~100 msec. As feedforward  
inhibition was increased, oscillations disappeared and feedback sharpening effects  
occurred within a 5-50 msec transient period. This sharpening was masked by thalamo-  
cortical transients. As transient responses rise and fall, feedforward tuning broadens  
and sharpens (by 5-20°). Local feedback damped these tuning changes while yielding  
a net sharpening. Thus both feedforward and feedback inputs can provide significant  
contributions to the early phase of orientation tuning.

Membrane integration properties also contributed to rapid tuning: preferred ori-  
entation responses had shorter latencies than non-preferred responses, and inhibitory  
neurons, because of shorter time constants, often fired before excitatory neurons. This  
permitted di-synaptic inhibition from preferred orientations to suppress even the first  
spike of non-preferred responses. Latency differences were enhanced by feedback  
and feedback inhibition also contributed to suppression of non-preferred spikes. In-  
terestingly, latency differences caused non-preferred transient responses to peak after  
preferred responses had fallen, thus producing brief but substantial (30°) changes in the  
preferred orientation (Shevelev et al., '93). [Supported by MH10671 and EY07023.]

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.