

**Local and Global Neural Mechanisms
Underlying the Robust Velocity Coding of
Natural Images**

Paul Barnett

Discipline of Physiology

School of Molecular and Biomedical Science

The University of Adelaide

October 2009

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis Abstract

Interpreting motion in the natural world presents a major challenge for visual systems. Natural scenes vary enormously in structure, luminance and contrast, all parameters known to modulate the response of biological motion detectors. Nevertheless, many animals overcome this challenge and adopt visually guided behaviour for which the accurate estimation of self-motion and image velocity is required.

It is generally accepted that Reichardt correlator-like computations underlie local motion detection in insects. Reichardt correlators, however, generate ambiguous estimates of velocity, because they are sensitive to several additional image parameters, such as those mentioned above. How does the visual system generate accurate estimates of apparent image velocity when the elements underlying local motion detection produce ambiguous velocity signals?

This thesis investigates the neural processing of image velocity. I performed sharp electrode intracellular recordings from identified motion sensitive neurons in the lobula plate of the hoverfly, *Eristalis tenax*. A series of natural and artificial images were used to investigate the processing of a vast range of scenes.

I show that the horizontal system (HS) neurons have a remarkable capacity to estimate image velocity reliably for vastly different natural scenes. This property is at odds with the HS neurons' responses to experimenter-defined stimuli. I reveal several activity dependent features of the neural response that may reconcile the ability to accurately encode the velocity of natural images with the mechanisms underlying motion processing. Images that were initially weak neural drivers have long latencies, with responses continuing to increase in magnitude over several hundred milliseconds. Images that were initially strong neural drivers, reached peak responses more rapidly followed by significant reductions in response over longer time scales. Despite being different in sign and time course, these two activity dependent changes in response act as near-ideal normalisers for images that would otherwise produce highly variable response magnitudes.

By analysing the time course of neural response and manipulating image contrast, I show that this property is likely to emerge from a combination of static and dynamic non-linearities. When image contrast is reduced, thus reducing the range of input signals to local motion detectors, the essential non-linearity of the Reichardt correlator model provides a good prediction of global responses. Thus, suggesting an important role for non-linear mechanisms being recruited by high contrast local features in the robust encoding of natural scenes.

Finally, I use an experimental paradigm that reduces the influence of spatial integration and thus enables the analysis of responses equivalent to the outputs of individual local motion sensitive elements presynaptic to the HS neuron. I show evidence for an adaptive gain reduction that affects the sensitivity of individual motion detector responses to subsequent features. This gain reduction is facilitated by local neighbouring motion stimulation and is thus, well suited to take advantage of the predictable nature of natural scenes.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below*) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

1. Nordström, K. Barnett, PD., Moyer de Miguel, IM., Brinkworth, RSA. and O'Carroll, DC. (2008) Sexual dimorphism in the hoverfly motion vision pathway. *Current Biology* 18: 661–667. DOI 10.1016 DOI 10.1016/j.cub.2008.03.061

Copyright: © 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

2. Barnett, PD., Nordström, K. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009). Motion adaptation and the velocity coding of natural scenes, Submitted to *Current Biology*, MS Current-Biology-D-09-00354

Copyright: © 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

3. Barnett, PD. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009) Receptive fields of fly motion detecting neurons integrate local features within natural scenes unpredictably.

4. Barnett, PD., Nordström, K. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009) Local motion detection: temporal and spatial modulation of gain and transient responses to features

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I owe a great deal of thanks for the ongoing support and help I received from my three supervisors, David O'Carroll, Karin Nordström, and Russell Brinkworth. I received more help and support throughout the duration of my candidature than I could have ever expected, thank you dearly.

Thanks to all the members of the O'Carroll lab who have been present at one stage or another and helped me throughout my candidature, Irene Moyer de Miguel, Adam Kane, Joanne Wilkins, Yun Leung (Esther), Bart Geurten, Marcel Mertes, Jodi Gray, Sharn Perry, Melissa Walker, Lachlan Dowd.

Special thanks to Steve Weiderman and Douglas Bolzon who not only continually provided constructive and critical conversations but also friendship and support in the lab at all times.

Outside of the lab I must also thank my friends: El Geko, Sprat Cat, Lukozade, Stefan, Bergs, Moff, Bod, Gerry, Puff, Lara, Stevey D, and Bryant for housing me and maintaining my sanity, albeit marginally on occasions, throughout the whole PhD.

Finally, a big thanks to Mum, Dad and the Sister.

Statement of Contributions to Jointly Authored Works

The following states the contribution of the authors to the following published works

1. Nordström, K., Barnett, PD., Moyer de Miguel, IM., Brinkworth, RSA. and O'Carroll, DC. (2008) Sexual dimorphism in the hoverfly motion vision pathway. *Current Biology* 18: 661–667. DOI 10.1016/j.cub.2008.03.061

Conceptualization: Receptive field mapping and analysis techniques were developed by David O'Carroll. The primary observation resulted from collection of various receptive fields from motion sensitive neurons collected during electrophysiological experiments (see below). The interpretation of these results was shared amongst all the coauthors.

Realization: Electrophysiological recordings were conducted by Karin Nordström, Paul Barnett, and Irene Moyer de Miguel. Anatomy was done by Paul Barnett. Stimulus movies were collected and modified by Russell Brinkworth. Data collection and analysis was primarily done by Karin Nordström.

Documentation: Karin Nordström and David O'Carroll were primary writers of the paper, with contributions from Paul Barnett and Russell Brinkworth. Figures were made by Karin Nordström, except for the anatomy where Paul Barnett developed the images and movies.

2. Barnett, PD., Nordström, K. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009) Motion adaptation and the velocity coding of natural scenes. Submitted to *Current Biology*, MS Current-Biology-D-09-00354

Conceptualization: All the coauthors were involved in the conceptualization and development of ideas included throughout the paper.

Realization: Electrophysiological recordings were conducted by Paul Barnett and Karin Nordström. Data analysis was done by Paul Barnett.

Documentation: Paul Barnett, Karin Nordström and David O'Carroll were all involved in writing the paper. Figures were made by Paul Barnett.

3. Barnett, PD. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009) Receptive fields of fly motion detecting neurons integrate local features within natural scenes unpredictably.

Conceptualization: Both authors were involved in the conceptualization and development of ideas included throughout the paper.

Realization: Electrophysiological recordings were conducted by Paul Barnett. Analysis was done by Paul Barnett.

Documentation: Paul Barnett and David O'Carroll wrote the paper. Paul Barnett made the figures.

4. Barnett, PD., Nordström, K. and O'Carroll, DC. (2009) Local detector analysis reveals a locally mediated mechanism of motion adaptation.

Conceptualization: Paul Barnett and David O'Carroll conceived the experiments. Paul Barnett, Karin Nordström and David O'Carroll all contributed to the development of ideas.

Realization: Electrophysiological recordings were conducted by Paul Barnett. Analysis was done by Paul Barnett.

Documentation: Paul Barnett primarily wrote the paper. Karin Nordström and David O'Carroll provided significant written contributions and editing. Paul Barnett made the figures.

I agree with the above statements of contributions and give permission for the papers to be included in this thesis.

Paul Barnett:

Karin Nordström:

Irene Moyer de Miguel:

Russell Brinkworth:

David O'Carroll:

Author's Comments

All publications within this thesis are in the exact form of the original articles as published or as submitted in cases where the article are not yet in press, with the following exceptions:

Typesetting has been altered so that there is a consistent format throughout the entire thesis.

The figures have been inserted into the text at appropriate places, which may differ from the final published version of the papers.

Figures are referenced throughout the text as they are in the published or submitted versions of the papers, but are captioned based on their chapter and figure number, e.g. Figure 1 in Chapter 2 is captioned as Figure 2.1.

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	9
1.1 Motion vision and velocity estimation	9
1.2 Optic flow and the optomotor response	11
1.3 The motion-processing pathway in flies	14
1.3.1 Optics and photoreception	14
1.3.2 Early visual processing.....	17
1.3.3 Feature and target motion detection	19
1.3.4 Wide-field motion detection: The lobula plate tangential cells ..	19
1.3.5 Horizontal System (HS) neurons	22
1.3.6 Vertical System (HS) neurons	23
1.3.7 Local motion sensitivity	24
1.3.8 Descending and pre-motor neurons	25
1.4 Mechanisms of visual motion detection	26
1.4.1 Feature-based tracking schemes	26
1.4.2 Gradient schemes	27
1.4.3 The Hassenstein-Reichardt correlator and motion energy models	28
1.4.4 Response characteristics of the Reichardt correlator	30
1.4.5 Behavioural evidence for the Hassenstein - Reichardt correlator underlying motion detection in insect.....	31
1.4.6 Neurophysiological evidence for the Hassenstein-Reichardt correlator underlying motion detection in insects.....	32
1.4.7 Velocity estimation	34
1.5 Natural scenes	35
1.6 Naturalistic motion	38

1.7 Additional Neural Processes	41
1.7.1 <i>Static nonlinearities</i>	41
1.7.2 <i>Dynamic nonlinearity: motion adaptation</i>	43
1.8 Approach and aims of this thesis	49
1.9 References	50

Chapter 2: Sexual Dimorphism in the Hoverfly

Motion Vision Pathway	69
2.1 Context	69
2.2 Summary	71
2.3 Results and Discussion	72
2.3.1 <i>Receptive field analysis</i>	72
2.3.2 <i>Sexual dimorphism of HSN</i>	74
2.3.3 <i>Sexual isomorphism in HSNE</i>	77
2.3.4 <i>HSN as a fronto-dorsal yaw detector</i>	80
2.3.5 <i>Conclusion</i>	83
2.4 Experimental procedures	84
2.5 Acknowledgements	87
2.6 References	88
2.7 Supplemental Results and Discussion	90
2.7.1 <i>Male Calliphora HSN</i>	90
2.7.2 <i>Lateral sensitivity of HSNE</i>	90
2.7.3 <i>Role of a small HSN</i>	93
2.8 Supplemental References	99

Chapter 3: Motion adaptation and the velocity coding of natural scenes.....	101
3.1 Context	101
3.2 Summary	103
3.3 Introduction	104
3.4 Results	106
3.4.1 <i>Accurate encoding of image velocity by HS neurons</i>	<i>106</i>
3.4.2 <i>Saturation and artificial manipulation of contrast.....</i>	<i>111</i>
3.4.3 <i>Motion adaptation reduces response variance across the image set.....</i>	<i>116</i>
3.4.4 <i>Natural scenes and urban scenes rescale differently</i>	<i>121</i>
3.5 Discussion	124
3.5.1 <i>Velocity constancy and natural image coding</i>	<i>124</i>
3.5.2 <i>Saturation and the coding of natural images.....</i>	<i>124</i>
3.5.3 <i>Adaptation and its role in natural image coding</i>	<i>125</i>
3.5.4 <i>Higher order scene statistics – urban and natural scenes.....</i>	<i>127</i>
3.6 Experimental Procedures	129
3.6.1 <i>Experiments.....</i>	<i>129</i>
3.6.2 <i>Data acquisition and analysis.....</i>	<i>129</i>
3.6.3 <i>Image collection and display.....</i>	<i>130</i>
3.6.4 <i>Image manipulation.....</i>	<i>131</i>
3.7 References	133
3.8 Supplemental Data	138
3.8.1 <i>Measuring image contrast</i>	<i>138</i>
3.8.2 <i>Image contrast manipulation</i>	<i>141</i>
3.8.3 <i>Motion adaptation and response normalization</i>	<i>143</i>
3.8.4 <i>Contrast gain.....</i>	<i>148</i>

3.9 Supplemental References 150

Chapter 4: Receptive fields of fly motion detecting neurons integrate local features within natural scenes unpredictably.151

4.1 Context 151

4.2 Summary 153

4.3 Introduction 154

4.4 Results 157

4.4.1 *Natural images induce large response fluctuations in HS neurons to constant velocity stimuli 157*

4.4.2 *Receptive field size and shape influences neuron pattern dependence..... 160*

4.4.3 *Differences in response are not merely a consequence of different neuronal receptive fields 163*

4.4.4 *Artificially lowering image contrast produces unpredictable changes pattern dependence 165*

4.4.5 *Local motion responses to natural scenes show pronounced pattern dependence 169*

4.4.6 *Local motion responses are a poor predictor of neural pattern dependence produced when the entire receptive field is stimulated 175*

4.5 Discussion 177

4.5.1 *Absolute magnitude of responses 177*

4.5.2 *The existence of local hyperpolarizing transients in the model data..... 179*

4.5.3 *Nonlinear spatial integration across the receptive field..... 180*

4.5.4 *Function of the narrow male HSN in feature detection 181*

4.6 Experimental Procedures 182

4.6.1 *Experiments and neuron identification 182*

4.6.2 *Data acquisition and analysis..... 182*

4.6.3	<i>Statistics</i>	183
4.6.4	<i>Image collection and display</i>	183
4.6.5	<i>Local motion detector analysis</i>	183
4.6.6	<i>Model predictions</i>	184
4.7	References	186
4.8	Supplemental data	190
4.8.1	<i>Natural scenes</i>	190
4.8.2	<i>Model predictions of pattern dependence</i>	191
4.8.3	<i>Justification for using weighted linear spatial integration of local motion responses</i>	194
4.9	Supplemental References	196

Chapter 5: Local motion detection: temporal and spatial modulation of gain and transient responses to features 197

5.1	Context	197
5.2	Summary	199
5.3	Introduction	200
5.4	Results:	203
5.4.1	<i>Local motion detector analysis</i>	203
5.4.2	<i>Response characteristics of local motion-sensitive elements supplying the HS neurons</i>	205
5.4.3	<i>Feature-feature interactions to transient stimuli depend on the temporal order of contrasts within a stimulus ensemble</i>	210
5.4.4	<i>Global effects of feature-feature interactions within an image</i> .	217
5.4.5	<i>Simultaneous stimulation of neighbouring local motion sensitive elements recruits a powerful reduction of motion detector gain for subsequent features</i>	224
5.5	Discussion	229

5.5.1 *Reconciling model response magnitude with neuron response* 229
5.5.2 *Reconciling model response magnitude with neuron response for local transient responses* 230
5.5.3 *Locally acting response-gain reduction* 231
5.5.4 *Higher order structure and its influence on local adaptation..* 232

Experimental Procedures 234

5.5.5 *Experiments and neuron identification* 234
5.5.6 *Data acquisition and analysis*..... 234
5.5.7 *Statistics*..... 234
5.5.8 *Images and display*..... 235
5.5.9 *Local motion detector analysis* 235
5.5.10 *Model predictions*..... 235

5.6 References 238

Chapter 6: Discussion242

6.1 Summary of findings 242

6.2 Mechanisms of natural image contrast invariance 244

6.2.1 *Response saturation* 244
6.2.2 *Response normalization*..... 245
6.2.3 *Local gain control*..... 245

6.3 Why do insects use Reichardt correlator like computations for motion detection? 248

6.4 Velocity estimation in the insect visual system 250

6.4.1 *The HS neurons as velocity estimators*..... 250
6.4.2 *Behavioural evidence for velocity estimation*..... 252
6.4.3 *Small-field motion detection* 253
6.4.4 *Multiple speed tuning channels*..... 254

6.5 Limitations of the current study 255

6.5.1 *Naturalistic conditions* 255

6.6 Future directions 256

6.7 References 258