Joey Velez-Ginorio¹,

in conversation with Nada Amin³, Steve Zdancewic¹, Konrad Körding^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer and Information Science; University of Pennsylvania ²Department of Neuroscience; University of Pennsylvania

Harvard John A. Paulson School Of Engineering And Applied Sciences; Harvard University





neurons X When do neurons* represent **True**?

Joey Velez-Ginorio¹,

in conversation with Nada Amin³, Steve Zdancewic¹, Konrad Körding^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer and Information Science; University of Pennsylvania

²Department of Neuroscience; University of Pennsylvania

³Harvard John A. Paulson School Of Engineering And Applied Sciences; Harvard University





Joey Velez-Ginorio¹,

in conversation with Nada Amin³, Steve Zdancewic¹, Konrad Körding^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer and Information Science; University of Pennsylvania ²Department of Neuroscience; University of Pennsylvania

Harvard John A. Paulson School Of Engineering And Applied Sciences; Harvard University





<u>Response 1</u>: "I often say neural *activity* represents some behavior or aspect of behavior if there's a strong enough correlation e.g. neural activity represents monkey hopping if it can be linearly decoded. So I guess the logic would be a neuron represents X when its firing pattern strongly relates to X."

<u>Response 1</u>: "I often say neural *activity* represents some behavior or aspect of behavior if there's a strong enough correlation e.g. neural activity represents monkey hopping if it can be linearly decoded. So I guess the logic would be a neuron represents X when its firing pattern strongly relates to X."

<u>Response 2</u>: "Hm. Maybe something like – you get a consistent membrane potential across the neuron when X is in the representation. Invariant to any other features of the representation."

<u>Response 1</u>: "I often say neural *activity* represents some behavior or aspect of behavior if there's a strong enough correlation e.g. neural activity represents monkey hopping if it can be linearly decoded. So I guess the logic would be a neuron represents X when its firing pattern strongly relates to X."

<u>Response 2</u>: "Hm. Maybe something like – you get a consistent membrane potential across the neuron when X is in the representation. Invariant to any other features of the representation."

<u>Response 3</u>: "...The classic neuro/ml approach tends to focus on there being some decodable correlate of X, e.g. if X is linearly decodable from neural activity. I would add that *how a putative representation is used to drive some behavior* is also an important aspect."

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$\mathtt{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$extsf{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.

$$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 3.98 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$extsf{True} \,\mapsto \, egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.



Step 3: Relate the descriptions. $Corr^*(\begin{bmatrix} 3.98\\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1.0\\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}) \approx \underline{0.99}$







Step 1: Describe as a vector. $\begin{array}{c} \blacksquare \end{array} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 1.3 & \dots & 8.23 \\ 4.2 & \dots & 0.53 \end{bmatrix}$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.



When do neurons* represent



Step 1: Describe as a vector. $\begin{bmatrix}
1.3 & \dots & 8.23 \\
4.2 & \dots & 0.53
\end{bmatrix}$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.

$$egin{array}{c} egin{array}{c} egin{array}{c} 1.3 & \ldots & 8.23 \ 4.2 & \ldots & 0.53 \end{array} \end{array}$$



Step 3: Relate the descriptions. $Corr^* \begin{pmatrix} 0.49 & \dots & 4.5 \\ 3.7 & \dots & 0.04 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1.3 & \dots & 8.23 \\ 4.2 & \dots & 0.53 \end{bmatrix}) \approx \underline{0.99}$

But...



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$\mathtt{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$extsf{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$extsf{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.

$$\hookrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0.3\\13.1\\10.3\\3.4 \end{bmatrix}$$



Step 3: Relate the descriptions.

$$Corr^*(\left[egin{array}{c} 0.3 \\ 13.1 \\ 10.3 \\ 3.4 \end{array}
ight], \left[egin{array}{c} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}
ight]) pprox 0.12$$



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$\mathbf{True} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0.3\\ 2.1\\ 2.8\\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$\mathbf{True} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.8 \\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.

$$\mathbf{True} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0.3\\ 2.1\\ 2.8\\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.

$$\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0.3\\13.1\\10.3\\3.4 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 3: Relate the descriptions.

$$Corr^*(egin{array}{c} 0.3\\ 13.1\\ 10.3\\ 3.4 \end{bmatrix},egin{array}{c} 0.3\\ 2.1\\ 2.8\\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix})pprox 0.99$$



David Poeppel

Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

David Poeppel

Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector.
True
$$\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0.3\\ 2.1\\ 2.8\\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$$

David Poeppel

Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

"...there is absolutely no mapping to date that we understand in even the most vague sense."

David Poeppel

Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

- 1. What properties should this mapping have?
- 2. What's the domain of this map?

"Look at the unknown! And try to think of a familiar problem having the same or a similar unknown."

- George Polya, How to solve it





"...he formulated and strongly advanced full abstraction, the study of the relationship between operational and denotational semantics."



"...he formulated and strongly advanced full abstraction, the study of the relationship between operational and denotational semantics." a solution to the mapping problem.

Step 1: Describe True as a vector.		
$\texttt{True} \mapsto$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.3 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.8 \\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$	



"...he formulated and strongly advanced full abstraction, the study of the relationship between operational and denotational semantics." a solution to the mapping problem.

- What properties should this mapping have?
 Answer: It should be fully abstract
- 2. What's the domain of this map?Answer: A programming language

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$\mathtt{True} \mapsto egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$extsf{True} \ \mapsto \ egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition: A fully abstract map $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ preserves equivalences and distinctions i.e. $f \simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$ $f \not\simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \not\simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$extsf{True} \ \mapsto \ egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition: A fully abstract map $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ preserves equivalences and distinctions i.e.



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$extsf{True} \ \mapsto \ egin{bmatrix} 1.0 \ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition: A fully abstract map $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ preserves equivalences and distinctions i.e. $f \simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$ $f \not\simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \not\simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$ $f \not\simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \not\simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$ $f \not\simeq_s g \implies \llbracket f \rrbracket \not\simeq_t \llbracket g \rrbracket$

2. What's the domain of this map?

2. What's the domain of this map?

Bootstrapping in a language of thought: A formal model of numerical concept learning

Steven T. Piantadosi^{a,*}, Joshua B. Tenenbaum^b, Noah D. Goodman^c

^a Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, University of Rochester, United States ^b Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT, United States ^c Department of Psychology, Stanford University, United States

One-knower	Two-knower
λ S . (if (singleton? S) "one" undef)	λS. (if (singleton? S) "one" (if (doubleton? S) "two" undef))
Three-knower	CP-knower
λ S . (if (singleton? S) "one" (if (doubleton? S) "two" (if (tripleton? S) "three" undef))	λ S . (if (singleton? S) "one" (next (L (set-difference S (select S)))))

2. What's the domain of this map?

Bootstrapping in a language of thought: A formal model of numerical concept learning

Steven T. Piantadosi^{a,*}, Joshua B. Tenenbaum^b, Noah D. Goodman^c

^a Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, University of Rochester, United States ^b Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT, United States ^c Department of Psychology, Stanford University, United States



Programming languages are sufficiently expressive to describe the abstract relations that cognitive scientists are interested in!



"...he formulated and strongly advanced full abstraction, the study of the relationship between operational and denotational semantics." a solution to the mapping problem.

- What properties should this mapping have?
 Answer: It should be fully abstract
- 2. What's the domain of this map?Answer: A programming language

But...



Modelling terms

(Bool-I1)

1 Syntax

Defining syntax of expressions, values, types, and contexts.

UNDER COL



Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$\texttt{True} \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda x. \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda y. \hspace{0.2cm} x \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$extsf{True} \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda x. \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda y. \hspace{0.2cm} x \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.

Step 1: Describe **True** as a vector using a fully abstract map.

$$extsf{True} \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda x. \hspace{0.2cm} \lambda y. \hspace{0.2cm} x \hspace{0.2cm} \mapsto \hspace{0.2cm} \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2: Describe neurons as a vector.



Step 3: Relate the descriptions. $Corr^*(\begin{bmatrix} 3.98\\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1.0\\ 0.0 \end{bmatrix}) \approx \underline{0.99}$