

Ms Ellese Cotterill
Research Student

Dr B. Yates
Department of Otolaryngology,
University of Pittsburgh,
Rm 519,
Eye and Ear Institute,
Pittsburgh PA 15213
United States



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

**Department of
Applied Mathematics and
Theoretical Physics**

February 1, 2016

Dear Dr Yates

Please find enclosed the manuscript “A comparison of computational methods for detecting bursts in neuronal spike trains and their application to human stem cell-derived neuronal networks”.

Accurate identification of patterns of bursting activity is an essential aspect in the analysis of experimental recordings of neuronal activity in a variety of contexts. Despite this, no one widely used method for identifying periods of bursting activity in neuronal spike trains has been adopted in the field. Instead, many methods have been proposed for detecting bursts. However, assessment of these methods has generally only been performed by their original authors, using very specific sets of conditions. In this manuscript we present an unbiased assessment of eight previously published burst detection methods, comparing the performance of recently developed innovative methods for burst detection with well-established techniques.

We develop a list of desirable properties that a method should ideally possess to accurately detect bursts in a variety of spike trains. We assess each method in regards to these properties using both simulated and experimental data, and show that a number of existing techniques perform poorly at detecting bursts in a range of contexts. Based on this, we provide recommendations for the robust analysis of bursting in neuronal spike trains using existing methods. We also employ a number of the high performing burst detection methods to analyse novel recordings of networks of human induced pluripotent stem cell-derived neurons, and describe the ontogeny of bursting activity in these networks over several months of development.

We believe our paper to be of broad relevance to the readership of *J. Neurophysiology*. Many articles that have been previously published in *J. Neurophysiology* employ burst detection techniques that were assessed in our study. Furthermore, perhaps the classic method of burst detection, Poisson surprise, was published here in 1985. Since the choice of burst detector used to analyse experimental recordings of neuronal activity can significantly affect the description of bursting activity, we believe researchers

Centre for Mathematical Sciences
Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WA
U.K.

Tel: +44 1223 337876
Fax: +44 1223 765900
E-mail: ec526@cam.ac.uk

should be aware of the limitations of burst detection techniques and their operating assumptions. We thus believe that our study would be of relevance to the audience of *J. Neurophysiology*, and your journal would allow the recommendations from our analysis to be accessible to a wide range of both computational and experimental neuroscientists working in this area.

This manuscript has not been published before and all authors have approved the final manuscript.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Ellese Cotterill