

ETH

Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich



Computational models for imaging analyses

Zurich SPM Course

February 6, 2015

Christoph Mathys

What the brain is about

- What do our imaging methods measure?
 - Brain activity.
- But when does the brain become active?
 - When predictions (or their precision) have to be adjusted.
- So where do the brain's predictions come from?
 - From a model.

What does this mean for neuroimaging?

If brain activity reflects model updating, we need to understand **what model** is updated **in what way** to make sense of brain activity.

The Bayesian brain and predictive coding

Model-based prediction updating is described by Bayes' theorem.

 \implies the Bayesian brain



Hermann von Helmholtz

This can be implemented by **predictive coding.**

Advantages of model-based imaging

Model-based imaging permits us

- to **infer** the computational (predictive) mechanisms underlying neuronal activity.
- to **localize** such mechanisms.
- to **compare** different **models**.

How to build a model

Fundamental ingredients:



Example of a simple learning model

Rescorla-Wagner learning:



From perception to action



From perception to action



- In behavioral tasks, we observe **actions** (*a*).
- How do we use them to infer **beliefs** (λ)?
- We invert (i.e., estimate) a **decision model.**

Example of a simple decision model

- Say 3 options A, B, and C have values $v_A = 8$, $v_B = 4$, and $v_C = 2$.
- Then we can translate these values into action probabilities via a «softmax» function:

$$p(a = A) = \frac{e^{\beta v_A}}{e^{\beta v_A} + e^{\beta v_B} + e^{\beta v_C}}$$

• The parameter β determines the sensitivity to value differences



All the necessary ingredients

• Perceptual model (updates based on prediction errors)

• Value function (inferred state -> action value)

• Decision model (value -> action probability)

Reinforcement learning example (O'Doherty et al., 2003)



Reinforcement learning example



Significant effects of prediction error with fixed learning rate

O'Doherty et al. (2003)

Bayesian models for the Bayesian brain



- Includes uncertainty about hidden states.
- I.e., beliefs have **precisions.**
- But how can we make them computationally tractable?

The hierarchical Gaussian filter (HGF): a computationally tractable model for individual learning under uncertainty

θ	State of the world		Model
(k, ω)	Log-volatility x₃ of tendency	Gaussian random walk with constant step size <i>9</i>	$p(x_{3}^{(k)}) \sim N(x_{3}^{(k-1)}, \vartheta)$ $p(x_{3}^{(k)})$ $x_{3}^{(k-1)}$
$x_{2}^{(k-1)} + x_{2}^{(k)} + \cdots$	Tendency x₂ towards category "1"	Gaussian random walk with step size exp(κx ₃ +ω)	$p(x_2^{(k)}) \sim N(x_2^{(k-1)}, \exp(\kappa x_3 + \omega))$ $p(x_2^{(k)})$ $x_2^{(k-1)}$
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ x_1^{(k-1)} \\ 1 \end{array} \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{(k)} \\ x_1 \end{array}$	Stimulus category x ₁ ("0" or "1")	Sigmoid trans- formation of x_2	$p(x_1=1) = s(x_2)$ $p(x_1=0) = 1 - s(x_2)$ $p(x_1=1)$ x_2 0

HGF: variational inversion and update equations

- Inversion proceeds by introducing a mean field approximation and fitting quadratic approximations to the resulting variational energies (Mathys et al., 2011).
- This leads to **simple one-step update equations** for the sufficient statistics (mean and precision) of the approximate Gaussian posteriors of the states *x*_{*i*}.
- The updates of the means have the same structure as value updates in Rescorla-Wagner learning:



• Furthermore, the updates are **precision-weighted prediction errors**.

Model comparison:

	Behavioral study		fMRI study 1		fMRI study 2	
BMS results	PP	XP	PP	ХР	PP	XP
HGF1	0.8435	1	0.7422	1	0.7166	1
HGF2	0.0259	0	0.0200	0	-	-
HGF3	0.0361	0	0.1404	0	0.1304	0
Sutton	0.0685	0	0.0710	0	0.0761	0
RW	0.0260	0	0.0264	0	0.0769	0

HGF: adaptive learning rate

Simulation: $\theta = 0.5$, $\omega = -2.2$, $\kappa = 1.4$



Individual model-based regressors

Uncertainty-weighted prediction error $\sigma_2 \cdot \delta_1$









Figure 2. Whole-Brain Activations by e2

Activations by precision-weighted prediction error about visual stimulus outcome, ε_2 , in the first fMRI study (A) and the second fMRI study (B). Both activation maps are shown at a threshold of p < 0.05, FWE corrected for multiple comparisons across the whole brain. To highlight replication across studies, (C) shows the results of a "logical AND" conjunction, illustrating voxels that were significantly activated in both studies.







Figure 3. Midbrain Activation by e2

Activation of the dopaminergic VTA/SN associated with precision-weighted prediction error about stimulus category, ε_2 . This activation is shown both at p < 0.05 FWE whole-brain corrected (red) and p < 0.05 FWE corrected for the volume of our anatomical mask comprising both dopaminergic and cholinergic nuclei (yellow).

(A) Results from the first fMRI study.

(B) Second fMRI study.

(C) Conjunction (logical AND) across both studies.



first fMRI study



second fMRI study



conjunction across studies

Figure 6. Basal Forebrain Activations by e3

Activation of the cholinergic basal forebrain associated with precisionweighted prediction error about stimulus probabilities ε_3 within the anatomically defined mask. For visualization of the activation area we overlay the results thresholded at p < 0.05 FWE corrected for the entire anatomical mask (red) on the results thresholded at p < 0.001 uncorrected (yellow) in the first (A: x = 3, y = 9, z = -8) and the second fMRI study (B: x = 0, y = 10, z = -8). (C) The conjunction analysis ("logical AND") across both studies (x = 2, y = 11, z = -8).

How to estimate and compare models: the HGF Toolbox

• Available at

http://www.tranlsationalneuromodeling.org/tapas

- Start with README and tutorial there
- Modular, extensible
- Matlab-based

Tiounni +	Slice timir	ng	Smooth	
Coreg *	Norm	•	Segment	
Specify 1st-le	evel	Revi	iew	
Specify 2nd-level		Estimate		
Dy	namic Causal Specify and e	Modelling stimate a dy	mamic causal mo	
SF	PM for function	onal MRI		
Display Ch	eck Reg	Re \$	FMRI \$	
Too 🛊	PPIs	ImCalc	DICOM Import	





neall	Slice	timing	Smooth
Coreg	\$ Norm.	🛊 (Segment
Creatity	tet level		autanu)
Specity	Tst-level		eview
Specify 2	2nd-level	Es	timate
	Dynamic Cau	sal Modelling	
Display	Check Reg	Re ;	; FMRI ‡
Too 🛊	PPIs	ImCalc	DICOM Import
Hala	Utils \$	Batch	Quit



Take home

- The brain is an organ whose job is prediction.
- To make its predictions, it needs a model.
- Model-based imaging infers the model at work in the brain.
- It enables **inference** on **mechanisms**, **localization** of mechanisms, and **model comparison**.



Thank you