Imperial College London

Literature review and thesis proposal
MRes. Neurotechonlogy

Investigating plasticity in Cortico-Basal Ganglia-Thalamus models to improve stimulation-based treatments

---

Aaron Panaitescu
(*CID:* 02054726)

Supervisor:
Dr. Hayriye Cagnan

Word Count: ????

January 30, 2025

Contents

1 Introduction

Parkinson's disease (PD) is characterized by pathological hypersynchrony in Cortico-basal Ganglia-Thalamic (CBGT) circuit, driven by dopaminergic degeneration in the Substantia Nigra pars Compacta (SNc). While deep brain stimulation (DBS) alleviates symptoms by disrupting synchrony, its mechanisms remain not well understood, and therapeutic effects are transient, necessitating continuous stimulation. This goal of this study is to propose a computational framework to investigate multi-site phase-locked stimulation in a spiking CBGT network model with spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) rules, aiming to induce lasting desynchronization through activity-dependent synaptic reorganization.

Methodologically, pathological and healthy network regimes will be established through data-driven tuning of spiking neuron models. Systematic simulations then evaluate multi-site phase-locked stimulation across three experimental axes: (1) STDP enabled/disabled in corticostriatal populations, (2) stimulation applied to different pairs of basal ganglia nuclei and cortical afferents, and (3) closed-loop adaptation to thalamic oscillatory activity. The network will then be analyzed in terms of inter-populational coupling and stability of potential non-pathological state with after stimulation.

This work advances the field in two key directions: (1) integrates phase-locked stimulation with plasticity-targeted protocols, and (2) evaluates stimulation targets across the CBGT circuit focusing on regions with experimentally validated STDP. Results will inform clinical adaptive stimulation protocols that exploit neuroplasticity for lasting symptom relief, while the methodology provides a generalizable computational framework for closed-loop neuromodulation design.

2 Background and literature review

start this off nicely with a diagram of the research gap

2.1 Parkinson's Disease

Parkinson's Disease (PD) is characterized by the loss of dopaminergic neurons and the presence of *Lewy Bodies* (LB) in the *Substantia Nigra pars Compacta* (SNc) [Del Rey et al., 2018]. This dopaminergic depletion in the SNc leads to striatal dopamine deficiency, which in turn leads to excessive synchronization in the basal ganglia. Hyper-synchrony is a hallmark of the PD [Hammond et al., 2007, Helmich et al., 2012], and thus, can be a promising therapeutic target.

add a CBGT diagram

2.2 Deep brain stimulation: theory and practice

Tremor is primarly generated in the Cortical-Basal Ganglia-Thalamic (CBGT) network. Thus, deep brain stimulation (DBS) in this region emerged as an effective tool in the treatment of advanced PD patients [Del Rey et al., 2018]. DBS in PD works through delivering high-frequency stimulation in regions of the CBGT through implanted electrodes. A prominent theory for this method's success is that it enables stimulation driven decorelatation of the different BG nuclei, pushing it to a non-pathological state. There is significant evidence that performing DBS in the STN or the GPi, can have major quality of life improvements in PD patients, reducing tremor and restoring motor control [Rodriguez-Oroz et al., 2005, Rubin and Terman, 2004]. DBS does, however have significant limitations.

Firstly, like any highly-invasive procedure, the implatation procedure has many risks. Advances in electrode technology and surgical techniques have reduced some of these risks. *cite*

Secondly, patient symptoms are only ameloriated while the stimulation is on. This means that the device needs to be on continously, which can induce numerous side effects in patients **citeee** and also creates the need for a continous power supply.

Finally, the mechanism through which DBS reduces tremors is not fully understood yet, there are many questions left to answer. For instance, why does DBS in PD get effective results around 130 Hz, when tremor frequency is on average around 20 Hz.

Therfore, several areas of research emerge in improving stimulation-based treatments of PD: finding non-invasive alternatives [Saturnino et al., 2017, Schwab et al., 2020], eleciting lasting, plastic changes in CBGT circuit, closing the loop and coupling stimulation to the presence of patient symptoms [Beudel et al., 2018], and improving stimulation patterns to harness the exploit the rythmic patterns of activity in the basal ganglia [Cagnan et al., 2017, West et al., 2022].

2.3 Stimulating at the right time

The Parkinsonian state is modulated by the interplay between four pathways in the CBGT the **hyperdirect** excitatory cortico-subthalamic pathway, the **direct** inhibitory striato-pallidal pathway, the **indirect** inhibitory subthalamic-pallido pathway and the inhibitory **pallido-subthalamic** (PS) pathway. In the Parkinsonian state the hyperdirect pathway is down-regulated, while pallido-subthalamic pathway is upregulated, leading to a shift in beta band oscillatory activity from sub-band β_1 to sub-band β_2, which corellates to hyper-synchrony in the basal ganglia [West et al., 2022].

[Cagnan et al., 2017] demonstrated that phase-specific neuromodulation can disrupt pathological synchrony in essential tremor by delivering stimulation pulses locked to thalamic oscillatory phases. Strategies like this and others [Beudel et al., 2018] show the potential for closed-loop, adaptive therapies to address hypersynchrony in the BG.

2.4 Plasticity to recover network states

Neuroplasticity can be defined as "the ability of the nervous system to change its activity in response to intrinsic or extrinsic stimuli by reorganizing its structure, functions, or connections" [Mateos-Aparicio and Rodríguez-Moreno, 2019]. Plasticity occurs at different scales in the brain, ranging from molecular to neural networks. The focus of this project is synaptic plasticity, which occurs between a pre-synaptic and a pos-synaptic neuron. While, the mechanisms of plasticity have been throughly studied **cite**, this understanding is just starting to find its way into clinical applications in neurorehabilitation (e.g. stroke, trauma, spinal cord injury [Cramer et al., 2011]) and neuroprostheses [Lebedev and Nicolelis, 2017].

The potential of plasticity-based treatments in PD depends on the existance of spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) in the synapses of the different BG nuclei, particularly in the STN [Rubin et al., 2012]. Long and short-term plasticity has been found in corticostriatal synapses [Kreitzer and Malenka, 2008, Di Filippo et al., 2009] as well as cell-specific STDP in striatal interneurons [Fino and Venance, 2010]. [Thieu and Melnik, 2024] modeled STDP and random inputs in an STN neurons and found combining the two can increase coupling between neurons.

Coordinated reset stimulation (CRS) delivers brief, phase-targeted electrical stimuli to specific neuronal subpopulations within interconnected neural circuits. CRS has been computationally modeled in a GPe-STN network to sucessfuly disrupt pathological synchronization in the BG [Hauptmann and Tass, 2009, Hauptmann and Tass, 2010].

2.5 Modeling neural networks

Most neuronal dynamics models are defined by defined by rules (ODEs) of how voltage in an unit changes over time in response to voltage in the network and external current (e.g.

noise, stimulation current). The question then becomes what is an unit? There are two broad categories branching out of this question: An unit can be an individual neuron or a cluster of neurons. This section introduces some common types of models, justifying the direction chosen for this project.

Neuron models (or spiking models) work by combining networks of units that individually simulate neuronal action potentials (APs). These networks can then be organized into different nuclei (e.g. STN) and coherced to respect excitatory or inhibitory connections between nuclei. Within this class of models, different schemes for modeling neuronal dynamics exist, such as Integrate-And-Fire (IF) [Gerstner et al., 2014a] and Hodgkin-Huxley [Hodgkin et al., 1952, Gerstner et al., 2014b].

Mean-field models simulate the local field potentials (LFPs) of clusters of neurons and connect these clusters with population-level connectivity rules. (e.g. [Jansen and Rit, 1995, West et al., 2022])

2.5.1 Integrate-And-Fire

IF models treat action potentials as events. This reduction is justified by the fact that the shape of APs is always *approximately* the same, meaning they *cannot* convey information. [Gerstner et al., 2014a] describe a leaky IF model is represented by an electrical circuit with a resistor(R) and a capacitor(C) in parallel ($I(t) = I_R + I_C$), combined with a reset condition when the potential exceeds threshold θ. This can be modeled by,

$$\tau_m \dot{u} = -[u(t) - u_{rest}] + RI(t), \tag{1}$$

Together with the reset condition,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0; \delta > 0} u(t^f + \delta) = u_r, \tag{2}$$

$$t^f = \{t | u(t) = \theta\}. \tag{3}$$

Where u is the membrane voltage, u_{rest} is the resting potential, u_r is the reset potential, $\tau_m = RC$ is the time constant, and I is external current.

These equations describe the update rules in a single unit. Connectivity rules between units can be added to form neural networks. These connections can then be strengthend or weakend depending on spike timings between units, modeling STDP. [Shupe and Fetz, 2021] simulate plasticity in cortical columns; [Kromer et al., 2023] model plasticity between basal ganglia nuclei both using a IF model.

2.5.2 Hodgkin-Huxley

The Hodgkin-Huxley (HH) model [Hodgkin et al., 1952] simulates membrane potential by considering the dynamics of different ion conductances. Each ion has a reversal potential at which the force of the electrical and chemical gradients across the membrane even out. These can be modeled in an electrical circuit as a battery and the total channels of a particular ion can be modeled as a resistor. Each modelled ion has a parallel branch in the corresponding electrical circuit. The following equations adapted from [Gerstner et al., 2014b] describe the HH model:

$$I(t) = I_C(t) + \sum_k I_k(t), \tag{4}$$

Where the current of each ion k can be described in terms of the open probability of a k channel, p_k and the maximum conductance when all k channels are open, g_k:

$$I_k = g_k p_k (u - E_k). \tag{5}$$

In particular Hodgkin and Huxley modeled Na^+, K^+ and a leak L currents:

$$C\dot{u} = g_{Na} m^3 h (E_{Na} - u) + g_K n^4 (E_K - u) + g_L (E_L - u), \tag{6}$$

Where m, h and n are open probabilities for subunints of Na or K channels governed by:

$$\dot{x} = -\frac{1}{\tau_m(u)}[x - x_0(u)], \qquad x \in \{m, h, n\}. \tag{7}$$

As in the IF model these rules describe the dynamics of a single unit, which can subsequently be connected to model a networks of neurons (e.g. [Terman et al., 2002]) and augumented to include plasticity rules [Borges et al., 2016].

2.5.3 Rubin-Terman

[Terman et al., 2002] augumented the HH model to create a subthalamopallido network of the basal ganglia (RT model), where GPe and STN neurons are modeled according following equation,

$$C\dot{u} = -I_L - I_K - I_{Na} - I_T - I_{Ca} - I_{AHP} - I_{s\to d} - I_{s\to s} + I_{app} \tag{8}$$

Where leak (L), K^+, Na^+ and high-threshold Ca^{2+} currents [Song et al., 2000], are described in HH-like equations, and low threshold calcium current I_T is different for GPe and STN neurons. I_{AHP} represents Ca^{2+}-activated, voltage-independent *afterhyperpolarization* (AHP) K^+ current. $I_{s\to d}$ represents the inter-populational influence and is defined by $I_{s\to d} = \sum_j I_{ij}^{ds}$ where $s, d \in \{\text{GPe}, \text{STN}\}$. I_{ij}^{ds} is the current from the presynaptic neuron j in s to the postsynaptic neuron i in d, and is defined by $I_{ij}^{ds} = w_{ij}^{ds} s_{ij}^{ds}(t - \tau_{ds})(u_i - E_{ds})$ where w_{ij} is the synaptic strength, s_{ij}^{ds} is a synaptic variable and τ_{ds} is the transimission delay between d and s. [Madadi Asl et al., 2022] expand on this model by adding inhibitory spike-timing-dependent plasticity to this network with $\Delta w = \eta(\exp(-|\Delta t|/\tau_w) - \alpha)$, where η is the *learning rate*, τ_w is the time constant of the plasticity rule exponential decay and α is the depression factor.

2.5.4 Other modeling approaches

Neuronal populations can also be modeled with networks of coupled phase-oscillators as in [Tass and Majtanik, 2006]. [Duchet et al., 2023] modeled STDP as mean-field phase-locked plasticity in a network of Kuramoto oscillators [Kuramoto, 1984].

[Jansen and Rit, 1995] model cortical columns of neurons by considering the PSPs of excitatory and inhibitory populations in a column to replicate EEG recorded alpha and beta activity. [West et al., 2022] used these building blocks in full CBGT model to study effects on phase-dependent stimulation on coupling.

3 Project Plan

The primary objective of this project is to investigate multi-site phase-locked stimulation in a spiking CBGT network model, with the goal of inducing plastic changes that transition pathological network dynamics of the BG toward a healthy desynchronized state. This work will address two important gaps in the current literature:

1. Integrating phase-locked stimulation with plasticity-targeted protocols, closing the loop in coordinated reset paradigms.
2. Systematically evaluating stimulation targets across the wider CBGT network, with emphasis on regions with experimentally validated synaptic plasticity (e.g., corticostriatal connections) while accounting for uncertainties in plasticity mechanisms at other nodes like the STN.

The selection of a spiking network with STDP rules over phase-oscillator models with phase-dependent plasticity is motivated by the following methodological consideration: Simulating phase-locked stimulation within systems governed by *a priori* phase-triggered plasticity introduces inherent circularity. Such coupling risks conflating stimulation mechanisms with network adaptation rules, effectively predetermining intervention outcomes without much dependence on the physiological constraints. In contrast, spiking networks with STDP decouple the synchronization mechanism from the phase-locked stimulation preserving causal distinction between stimulation protocols and plasticity-driven reorganization.

3.1 Methodology

To achieve these objectives, the following steps are outlined:

1. Implement STDP mechanisms within a spiking CBGT network model.
2. Tune pathological and healthy dynamical modes through data-driven parameter tuning, initially with plasticity disabled.
3. Conduct systematic simulations of multi-site phase-locked stimulation under four experimental conditions:
   - STDP enabled/disabled in specific network nodes
   - Multi-site phase-locked stimulation applied to distinct BG nuclei and cortical afferents

   Quantify network responses by analysing inter-nuclei coupling, and transitions between dynamical states.
4. Derive stimulation protocols optimized for plasticity-driven network desynchronisation.

3.2 Timeline

Gant chart thingy

References

[Beudel et al., 2018] Beudel, M., Cagnan, H., and Little, S. (2018). Adaptive brain stimulation for movement disorders. *Current Concepts in Movement Disorder Management*, 33:230–242.

[Borges et al., 2016] Borges, R., Borges, F. S., Lameu, E. L., Batista, A. M., Iarosz, K. C., Caldas, I. L., Viana, R. L., and Sanjuán, M. A. (2016). Effects of the spike timing-dependent plasticity on the synchronisation in a random hodgkin–huxley neuronal network. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 34:12–22.

[Cagnan et al., 2017] Cagnan, H., Pedrosa, D., Little, S., Pogosyan, A., Cheeran, B., Aziz, T., Green, A., Fitzgerald, J., Foltynie, T., Limousin, P., et al. (2017). Stimulating at the right time: phase-specific deep brain stimulation. *Brain*, 140(1):132–145.

[Cramer et al., 2011] Cramer, S. C., Sur, M., Dobkin, B. H., O'Brien, C., Sanger, T. D., Trojanowski, J. Q., Rumsey, J. M., Hicks, R., Cameron, J., Chen, D., et al. (2011). Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. *Brain*, 134(6):1591–1609.

[Del Rey et al., 2018] Del Rey, N. L.-G., Quiroga-Varela, A., Garbayo, E., Carballo-Carbajal, I., Fernández-Santiago, R., Monje, M. H., Trigo-Damas, I., Blanco-Prieto, M. J., and Blesa, J. (2018). Advances in parkinson's disease: 200 years later. *Frontiers in neuroanatomy*, 12:113.

[Di Filippo et al., 2009] Di Filippo, M., Picconi, B., Tantucci, M., Ghiglieri, V., Bagetta, V., Sgobio, C., Tozzi, A., Parnetti, L., and Calabresi, P. (2009). Short-term and long-term plasticity at corticostriatal synapses: implications for learning and memory. *Behavioural brain research*, 199(1):108–118.

[Duchet et al., 2023] Duchet, B., Bick, C., and Byrne, Ã. (2023). Mean-field approximations with adaptive coupling for networks with spike-timing-dependent plasticity. *Neural Computation*, 35(9):1481–1528.

[Fino and Venance, 2010] Fino, E. and Venance, L. (2010). Spike-timing dependent plasticity in the striatum. *Frontiers in synaptic neuroscience*, 2:1435.

[Gerstner et al., 2014a] Gerstner, W., Kistler, W. M., Naud, R., and Paninski, L. (2014a). *Neuronal dynamics: From single neurons to networks and models of cognition*, chapter 1.3, pages 10–19. Cambridge University Press.

[Gerstner et al., 2014b] Gerstner, W., Kistler, W. M., Naud, R., and Paninski, L. (2014b). *Neuronal dynamics: From single neurons to networks and models of cognition*, chapter 2.2, pages 31–41. Cambridge University Press.

[Hammond et al., 2007] Hammond, C., Bergman, H., and Brown, P. (2007). Pathological synchronization in parkinson's disease: networks, models and treatments. *Trends in neurosciences*, 30(7):357–364.

[Hauptmann and Tass, 2009] Hauptmann, C. and Tass, P. (2009). Cumulative and after-effects of short and weak coordinated reset stimulation: a modeling study. *Journal of neural engineering*, 6(1):016004.

[Hauptmann and Tass, 2010] Hauptmann, C. and Tass, P. A. (2010). Restoration of segregated, physiological neuronal connectivity by desynchronizing stimulation. *Journal of neural engineering*, 7(5):056008.

[Helmich et al., 2012] Helmich, R. C., Hallett, M., Deuschl, G., Toni, I., and Bloem, B. R. (2012). Cerebral causes and consequences of parkinsonian resting tremor: a tale of two circuits? *Brain*, 135(11):3206–3226.

[Hodgkin et al., 1952] Hodgkin, A. L., Huxley, A. F., and Katz, B. (1952). Measurement of current-voltage relations in the membrane of the giant axon of loligo. *The Journal of physiology*, 116(4):424.

[Jansen and Rit, 1995] Jansen, B. H. and Rit, V. G. (1995). Electroencephalogram and visual evoked potential generation in a mathematical model of coupled cortical columns. *Biological cybernetics*, 73(4):357–366.

[Kreitzer and Malenka, 2008] Kreitzer, A. C. and Malenka, R. C. (2008). Striatal plasticity and basal ganglia circuit function. *Neuron*, 60(4):543–554.

[Kromer et al., 2023] Kromer, J. A., Bokil, H., and Tass, P. A. (2023). Synaptic network structure shapes cortically evoked spatio-temporal responses of stn and gpe neurons in a computational model. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 17:1217786.

[Kuramoto, 1984] Kuramoto, Y. (1984). Phase dynamics of weakly unstable periodic structures. *Progress of theoretical physics*, 71(6):1182–1196.

[Lebedev and Nicolelis, 2017] Lebedev, M. A. and Nicolelis, M. A. (2017). Brain-machine interfaces: from basic science to neuroprostheses and neurorehabilitation. *Physiological reviews*, 97(2):767–837.

[Madadi Asl et al., 2022] Madadi Asl, M., Asadi, A., Enayati, J., and Valizadeh, A. (2022). Inhibitory spike-timing-dependent plasticity can account for pathological strengthening of pallido-subthalamic synapses in parkinson's disease. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 13:915626.

[Mateos-Aparicio and Rodríguez-Moreno, 2019] Mateos-Aparicio, P. and Rodríguez-Moreno, A. (2019). The impact of studying brain plasticity. *Frontiers in cellular neuroscience*, 13:66.

[Rodriguez-Oroz et al., 2005] Rodriguez-Oroz, M. C., Obeso, J., Lang, A., Houeto, J.-L., Pollak, P., Rehncrona, S., Kulisevsky, J., Albanese, A., Volkmann, J., Hariz, M., et al. (2005). Bilateral deep brain stimulation in parkinson's disease: a multicentre study with 4 years follow-up. *Brain*, 128(10):2240–2249.

[Rubin et al., 2012] Rubin, J. E., McIntyre, C. C., Turner, R. S., and Wichmann, T. (2012). Basal ganglia activity patterns in parkinsonism and computational modeling of their downstream effects. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 36(2):2213–2228.

[Rubin and Terman, 2004] Rubin, J. E. and Terman, D. (2004). High frequency stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus eliminates pathological thalamic rhythmicity in a computational model. *Journal of computational neuroscience*, 16:211–235.

[Saturnino et al., 2017] Saturnino, G. B., Madsen, K. H., Siebner, H. R., and Thielscher, A. (2017). How to target inter-regional phase synchronization with dual-site transcranial alternating current stimulation. *Neuroimage*, 163:68–80.

[Schwab et al., 2020] Schwab, B. C., König, P., and Engel, A. K. (2020). Spike-timing-dependent plasticity can account for aftereffects of dual-site transcranial alternating current stimulation. *bioRxiv*.

[Shupe and Fetz, 2021] Shupe, L. and Fetz, E. (2021). An integrate-and-fire spiking neural network model simulating artificially induced cortical plasticity. *Eneuro*, 8(2).

[Song et al., 2000] Song, W.-J., Baba, Y., Otsuka, T., and Murakami, F. (2000). Characterization of ca2+ channels in rat subthalamic nucleus neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 84(5):2630–2637.

[Tass and Majtanik, 2006] Tass, P. A. and Majtanik, M. (2006). Long-term anti-kindling effects of desynchronizing brain stimulation: a theoretical study. *Biological cybernetics*, 94:58–66.

[Terman et al., 2002] Terman, D., Rubin, J. E., Yew, A., and Wilson, C. (2002). Activity patterns in a model for the subthalamopallidal network of the basal ganglia. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 22(7):2963–2976.

[Thieu and Melnik, 2024] Thieu, T. and Melnik, R. (2024). The role of spike-timing-dependent plasticity and random inputs in neurodegenerative diseases and neuromorphic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16123*.

[West et al., 2022] West, T. O., Magill, P. J., Sharott, A., Litvak, V., Farmer, S. F., and Cagnan, H. (2022). Stimulating at the right time to recover network states in a model of the cortico-basal ganglia-thalamic circuit. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 18(3):1–32.

Appendices

A First appendix

B Second appendix