


Enhancing the causal predictive power in recurrent network models of neural dynamics

Jiayi Zhang¹, Tatiana A. Engel²


¹Lewis-Sigler Institute of Integrative Genomics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
²Princeton Neuroscience Institute, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA



Lewis-Sigler Institute
for Integrative Genomics




Motivations




- **Optogenetics** enables an unprecedented precision for **observing** and **perturbing neural circuits in actions**.
- **Designing perturbations** that test current theories or enhance insights into circuit mechanisms **remains an open challenge**¹.
- RNNs that replicate observed neural dynamics might serve as **“digital twins”** of brain circuits².
- **Can these digital twins help with designing effective perturbation patterns for causal validation of circuit mechanisms?**

Twins cannot predict random perturbations




- **Ground-truth (GT) RNN**: a 200-node RNN trained to perform the delayed decision-making task from Daie et al., 2021¹.
- **Twin RNNs**: 200-node RNNs trained to replicate responses of the GT-RNN, matching unit activity one-to-one.
- **Random patterned perturbations**: stimulate the same random ensembles of units in the GT-RNN and its twins; measure R^2 between twin and GT-RNN trajectories.




Likely cause: Task related trajectories are low-dimensional.
Low-dimensional data cannot sufficiently constrain the full connectivity of twin models.


Fitting models of varying dimensionality



Data uniquely constrain RNNs in low-D latent space




All twins harbor the same low-D latent structure, despite their discrepancies with the GT in the full space.




x-axis: R^2 (GT before & after perturbation)
y-axis: R^2 (GT vs. Twin after perturbation)

Twins can predict GT trajectories with high accuracies when perturbations are directed along the latent directions!



Latent circuit inference




Latent circuits (100 replicates, size 4-10 nodes): small RNNs trained to replicate observed neural dynamics y as a high-dimensional embedding of latent nodes activity x . The latent circuits are also required to perform the task.


Under successful inference, low-D connectivity is a latent structure within the full connectivity:

$$Q^T W_{\text{rec}} Q \sim w_{\text{rec}}$$

Fitting experimental data




Latent circuits fitted to data align with theoretical results



Smaller latent circuits are comparable at predicting post-perturbation neural responses despite higher validation loss.

*Best 20 models of each size plotted; y-axis limited to 2.



Conclusions

- Low-dimensional data **do not uniquely constrain** high-dimensional RNNs, which undermines their interpretability and causal predictive power.
- Trained RNNs connectivity harbors **unique low-dimensional structure**, which offers maximal predictive power for guiding perturbations.
- When fitting experimental data, validation loss **does not reflect** performances in perturbation predictions.

References

1. Daie, K., Svoboda, K., & Druckmann, S. (2021). Targeted photostimulation uncovers circuit motifs supporting short-term memory. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-00776-3>
2. Finkelstein, A., Fontolan, L., Economo, M. N., Li, N., Romani, S., & Svoboda, K. (2021). Attractor dynamics gate cortical information flow during decision-making. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-021-00840-6>
3. Langdon, C., Engel, T.A. (2025). Latent circuit inference from heterogeneous neural responses during cognitive tasks. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-025-01869-7>
4. Friedrich, J., Zhou, P., & Paninski, L. (2017) Fast online deconvolution of calcium imaging data. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005423>