

Introduction to Neural and Cognitive Modelling

Assignment 3

Deadline: 25 October 2025, 11:59 PM

1 General Instructions

1. All assignments should be implemented in Python, preferably using a Jupyter Notebook for clarity and reproducibility.
2. Submit a single PDF report along with your `.ipynb` notebook. Bundle them in a `.zip` file and upload to Moodle.
3. Academic honesty is expected at all times. Plagiarism will result in a score of **0**.
4. Start early. **The deadline is strict; no extensions will be granted.**

2 Dendrites and the Passive Cable Equation (20 marks)

2.1 Objective

Use a Brian2 implementation of a passive cable to study voltage propagation along a dendrite in space and time. Simulate pulse inputs, multi-site spike patterns, parameter changes, and compare steady states with analytical results.

2.2 Setup and Notes

- Use `neurodynex3.cable_equation.passive_cable` and `neurodynex3.tools.input_factory`.
- Example: `passive_cable.getting_started()` runs a demo pulse.
- Use default cable parameters unless specified.
- When plotting, scale Brian2 quantities to physical units, e.g., `voltage_monitor.t / b2.ms` and `voltage_monitor[0].v / b2.mV`.

2.3 Tasks

2.3.1 Spatial and temporal evolution of a pulse input (5 marks)

- Cable length: 800 μm
- Step current: 0.8 nA, duration 0.1 ms, applied at $t = 1.0$ ms, $x = 200$ μm
- Simulation time: 3 ms

Deliverables:

- Report maximum depolarization (value, location, and time)
- Plot $V_m(t)$ at $x = 0, 100, \dots, 600$ μm for $t \in [0, 3]$ ms
- Plot $V_m(x)$ for $x \in [0, 800]$ μm at $t = 1.0, 1.1, \dots, 1.6$ ms (all curves on one plot)
- Discuss and interpret results

2.3.2 Spatio-temporal input pattern (5 marks)

Three short pulses (100 μs , 0.8 nA) at:

A: ($t = 1.0$ ms, $x = 100$ μm)

B: ($t = 1.5$ ms, $x = 200$ μm)

C: ($t = 2.0$ ms, $x = 300$ μm)

- (a) Plot soma voltage ($x = 0$) for $t \in [0, 5]$ ms, report maximal depolarization. (3 marks)
- (b) Reverse order (C, B, A), overlay with original trace, report maxima and discuss effects. (2 marks)

2.3.3 Effect of cable parameters (4 marks)

Compare two parameter sets:

- Set 1 (default): $R_m = 1.25 \text{ M}\Omega \cdot \text{mm}^2$, $C_m = 0.8 \text{ pF/cm}^2$
- Set 2 (myelinated-like): $R_m = 5.0 \text{ M}\Omega \cdot \text{mm}^2$, $C_m = 0.2 \text{ pF/cm}^2$

Inject a brief pulse at $t = 0.05$ ms, $x = 400$ μm , simulate for 0.2 ms with `b2.defaultclock.dt = 0.005*ms`.

- Plot $V_m(t)$ at $x = 500$ μm for both parameter sets on the same axes. Discuss effects on amplitude and kinetics.

2.3.4 Stationary solution and comparison with theory (6 marks)

- Cable length: $L = 500 \mu\text{m}$, constant current $I_0 = 0.1 \text{ nA}$ at $x = 0$, simulate until steady state (100 ms), `b2.defaultclock.dt = 0.1*ms`
- (a) Sketch expected $V_m(t)$ qualitatively at $x = 0$ and $x = L$, then simulate and plot. (2 marks)
- (b) Compute characteristic length λ and compare with spatial decay. (2 marks)
- (c) Bonus: Derive analytical steady-state solution for finite cable, overlay with simulation, discuss convergence. (2 marks)

2.4 Deliverables

- Jupyter Notebook with all simulation code, parameter settings, plots (labelled with axes and units), short answers, and discussions.
- Report `b2.defaultclock.dt` and number of compartments for each simulation.

2.5 Marks Distribution (20 total)

- Spatial and temporal evolution of a pulse input: 5 marks
- Spatio-temporal input pattern: 5 marks
- Effect of cable parameters: 4 marks
- Stationary solution and comparison with theory: 6 marks

3 Facilitation Effect - Synaptic Simulation Model (20 marks)

3.1 Objective

Simulate synaptic facilitation and how repeated presynaptic spikes affect postsynaptic potentials.

3.2 Setup and Notes

- Use a conductance- or current-based synaptic model in Brian2.
- Facilitation can be modeled by increasing synaptic efficacy:

$$u \rightarrow u + U(1 - u) \quad \text{per spike,} \quad \tau_F \text{ decay back to baseline}$$

where u is the utilization factor and U is the facilitation increment.

- Inject presynaptic spike trains of varying frequencies (10 Hz, 50 Hz, 100 Hz) and record postsynaptic voltage or current.
- Plot postsynaptic responses and measure peak amplitudes for each spike.

3.3 Tasks

1. Single presynaptic spike: plot Post-Synaptic Potential (PSP), report peak. (4 marks)
2. Train of 5 spikes at 50 Hz: plot PSPs, report facilitation. (6 marks)
3. Repeat for 10 Hz and 100 Hz: discuss frequency dependence. (6 marks)
4. Bonus: Vary τ_F to compare facilitation with/without recovery, discuss effect. (4 marks)

3.4 Deliverables

- Jupyter Notebook with simulation code, plots (labelled axes and units), and discussions.
- Report parameters used for facilitation (U , τ_F , number of spikes, frequency).

4 Discussion (10 marks)

1. In the passive cable experiments, voltage propagation shows exponential decay with distance. Suppose dendrites had no leak channels ($R_m \rightarrow \infty$).
 - Predict qualitatively how this would alter voltage spread, and
 - Discuss whether such a system could still function biologically.
2. In the facilitation model, repeated presynaptic spikes increase the utilization factor u , leading to stronger postsynaptic responses.
 - Why does facilitation show stronger effects at intermediate frequencies (e.g., 50 Hz) compared to very low (10 Hz) or very high (100 Hz) frequencies?
 - Relate this to the interaction between spike timing and τ_F .
3. Compare the role of the membrane time constant (τ_m in the cable equation) and the facilitation time constant (τ_F in synaptic plasticity).
 - How are these two constants similar in shaping temporal dynamics of neurons?
 - How do they differ in their biological interpretations?
 - What would happen if both were very small versus very large?
4. Imagine a neuron that integrates inputs from multiple dendritic cables, each with different R_m and C_m values, and synapses that exhibit facilitation.

- How would spatial filtering (cable properties) and temporal filtering (facilitation) together determine whether the soma fires?
- Propose one concrete example of how these combined effects might enhance or suppress information transfer in real neural circuits.

5 Grading Scheme

- Part A: Passive Cable — 20 marks
- Part B: Synaptic Facilitation — 20 marks
- Discussion — 10 marks
- Viva during Evaluation — 50 marks

Total Marks: 100

HAPPY DEEPAVALI!

