

An integrated heterogeneous Poisson model for neuron functions in hand movement during reaching and grasp

SHU-CHUAN CHEN^{1,*}, LUNG-AN LI², and JIPING HE³

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID 83201, USA

²Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan

³School of Biological and Health Systems Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85289, USA.

**email*: scchen@isu.edu

SUMMARY: To understand potential encoding mechanism of motor cortical neurons for control commands during reach-to-grasp movements, experiments to record neuronal activities from primary motor cortical regions have been conducted in many research laboratories (for example, (7), (17)). The most popular approach in neuroscience community is to fit the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) model using the firing rates of individual neurons. In addition to consider neural firing counts but also temporal intervals, (5) proposed to apply Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) model. Due to the nature of the data, in this paper we propose to apply an integrated method, called *heterogeneous Poisson regression model*, to categorize different neural activities. Three scenarios are discussed to show that the proposed heterogeneous Poisson regression model can overcome some disadvantages of the traditional Poisson regression model.

KEY WORDS: Firing counts; Poisson regression model; Pooling Poisson regression model; Heterogeneous Poisson model.

1. Introduction

Clinically, trauma or neurological diseases often result in loss or deterioration of motor functions for the patients. Developing a cortically controlled neuroprosthetic system for rehabilitation and recovery of muscle control for motor functions becomes more urgent and demanding for these people to live independently with a higher quality of life. For such systems to be feasible it is critical to have knowledge on how to translate neuronal activities in relevant areas of central nervous system into practical control commands for actual motor behaviors. For the purpose of advancing our knowledge on the potential encoding mechanism of motor cortical neurons for control commands during reach-to-grasp movements, experiments to record neuronal activities have been conducted in many research laboratories ((11), (15)). However there are arguments on how to analyze this type of data due to the unclear nature of the neural code. Two most commonly used coding mechanisms are neuronal firing rates (frequency) and intra-spike intervals (time).

Most neurobiologists adopt the simple approach that frequency (rates) should be used to characterize functions of motor neurons. There are two different approaches to analyze these types of data: discrete time approach and continuous time approach. In the case of continuous time approach, it is to pool the spike times of the trials and then employ a stochastic process, basically a counting process (for example, Poisson Process model). Either the probability distributions of spike trains can be described through the conditional intensity function of the process, or the distribution of the interval time between two spikes can be extended from the stochastic process of spike counts. The difficulty of these methods is the numerical estimation of the parameters for modeling these processes. However, the likelihood of conditional Intensity functions could be handled by generalized linear models ((13)) and software as discussed in (2). From this point of view, (4) proposed to analyze the firing rates

using logistic generalized additive model ((9)) including interactions to tell the difference for firing or not. From the likelihood, Bayesian estimation has been proposed by (3) as well.

One may consider the neuron firing rates to evaluate the difference between neuron functions under different experimental conditions. Some standard statistical methods, for example Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), are commonly applied to study the associations between firing rates and the observed motor behavior under specific experimental conditions. Because of several disadvantages including the basic underline assumption of ANOVA such that the response variables should be continuous for normality, it leads to the loss of statistical power. (5) proposed to consider neural firing counts and temporal intervals and apply ANCOVA model for the analysis.

On the other hand, to overcome the drawback of the counting process model, (12) proposed Inhomogeneous Markov Interval (IMI) Processes. They first discretized spike times into small intervals such that in each interval there is either one or no spike to convert the data into a binary sequence. In this case, numerical integration and particle filters are involved in the estimation algorithms. Their approach took advantage of discrete time approach.

The classical approaches are mainly in discrete time model framework. The time is discretized into consequent small time intervals and transition density is proposed for modeling the behavior from the current interval to the next interval by ensembling all firing of neurons. Although statistical Markov property could not be directly employed, the recursive algorithm could be utilized for tracing the movements. For example, extraction algorithm ((16)) and population vector algorithm ((15)) have been employed to study reaching or drawing movements ((14)).

The objective of this paper is to propose a novel method of analyzing this type of experimental data, which would handle pooled data from various task conditions; while each individual neuron could respond differently as task condition changes. The motivation of the

proposed model, basically from the counting process, and a generalized linear model, Poisson regression model, is computation simplicity for each task condition. When pooling all firing counts from all different conditions, a novel model called heterogeneous Poisson regression models, involving three stages, is proposed.

The layout of the paper is as the follows. The detailed experiment and data description will be briefly described in section 2. In section 3, the statistical analysis methodology called heterogeneous Poisson regression models will be proposed, and three stages for model building will be explained. Three scenarios for which the traditional regression approach do not work are discussed and documented in section 4. Finally, the conclusion is given in the last section.

2. Data Description

To study how the central system controls hand orientation and movement, an experiment was conducted by the Neural Interface Design of the Biodesign Institute at Arizona State University. The experimental protocol is reviewed and approved by ASU Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. The detailed experiment and data description are given in Fan's dissertation ((10)) and also summarized in the paper of (5). The activities of the motor cortical neurons of the trained monkeys were recorded when reaching and grasping the left or right (two directions) target at various orientations (45° , 90° , and 135°). This experiment generated six target conditions based on movement direction and target orientation (denoted by left 45° /left 90° /left 135° /right 45° / right 90° / right 135°). There were total 913 neurons with 18 replicates under each of these six task conditions. That is, for each neuron, the activities were recorded in the total of 108 successful trials. The activities of 913 neurons were then analyzed in this paper. For the primary data analysis, the data was arranged according to the sequence of events on each target condition, then calculated the spike counts in each sequence of the event.

The recorded data of each neuron was organized as the tables shown in Figure 1(b). Not all four epochs of these events are directly relevant to the actual movement. Here we will focus on neuron activities during the time from central pad release to target hit, marked as MT.

[Figure 1 about here.]

3. Statistical Analysis Methodology

If the neural spike counts have a linear trend within MT duration, we expect the total firing counts of a neuron over the time MT, Y , is a quadratic function of time MT.

$$Y = \int_0^{t_0} 0dt + \int_{t_0}^{MT} (a + bt)dt = \alpha_0 + a * MT + \frac{b}{2} * MT^2, \quad (1)$$

where t_0 is the starting time to fire in the MT duration. The Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) approach was proposed in the paper of (5) to analyze the data. However due to the nature of the data, the Poisson regression model might be better than ANCOVA while analyzing such type of count data. Therefore, in this paper, we propose *heterogeneous Poisson model* which consists of three stages that will be presented later.

3.1 Data preprocess

Graphic technique is a powerful tool as a complement to formal statistical methodology to capture the features of spike counts within MT duration time. We used an ad hoc approach to visualize the fit of our statistical model and find potential outliers in the original data set.

We employed the LOWESS (locally weighted scatter plot smoothing) technique which was developed by (6) on the log spike counts to reflect the behavior of spike counts under each experimental condition. Together with the fitted plot by the Poisson regression model, we could view if the spike counts did behave similarly as the pattern indicated by our model. Spike counts are discrete, while LOWESS is a technique by smoothing the data within the neighborhood around the explanatory variable value to obtain a smoothed response value

through a polynomial function. The polynomial is fitted using weighted least squares, giving more weight to points near the point whose response is being estimated and less weight to points further away. By trial and error, we selected the window width to be 18 in our data.

From the plots of values from LOWESS and predicted values by Poisson regression under each target condition, we found most fits are quite reasonable for most neurons. However, we noted a few exceptions, some outliers. We decided to remove those outliers before we fitted the model. First we started by calculating the residuals from the local polynomial as

$$e_i = Y_i - \hat{Y}_i \quad (2)$$

where Y_i is original spike count value and \hat{Y}_i is the fitted value for local polynomial.

We classified the point as an outlier if the residual is $1.5 \times IQR$ (the inter-quartile range) away from the LOWESS fitting. That is, the inter-quartile range is defined by $IQR = Q_3 - Q_1$, where Q_1 is the first quartile and Q_3 is the third quartile of those data within the neighborhood around the value of the explanatory variable. We used $1.5 \times IQR$ to flag any observation which is either greater than $Q_3 + 1.5IQR$ or less than $Q_1 - 1.5IQR$ being considered as a suspicious point that could be called an outlier. Next, the heterogeneous Poisson model will be presented.

3.2 The First Stage: Elementary Models Construction

Poisson regression assumes that the response variable Y follows a Poisson distribution. It assumes the logarithm of its expected value can be modeled by a linear combination of unknown parameters. In fact, the Poisson regression model is a special case of a generalized linear model (GLM) with a log link.

For target conditions determined by directions (left, right), and orientations (45° , 90° , 135°), a Poisson regression model was first fitted on 18 observations of each target condition. The Poisson regression model is constructed as

$$\log(E(Y)) = \alpha + \beta X + \gamma X^2 \quad (3)$$

where Y is the spike counts during the MT stage and X represents the MT duration in microseconds.

Figure 2 shows the sequence of actions within the process of the Poisson regression fitting for each target condition.

[Figure 2 about here.]

First, we check whether the neuron has the second order effect (whether the quadratic term of Poisson regression model is significant) within different target conditions. We found that each neuron acted differently at various target conditions. If the neuron has the second order effect (the quadratic term of Poisson regression model is significant), we mark the neuron with "2" to represent the second order effect on that target condition. Here the sign of "2" or "-2" represents the sign of the second order coefficient in the model. If it is not of the second order effect, we then check the first order model. If yes, we marked the neuron with "1" to represent the first order effect, otherwise marked it with "C" to show no effect. For all the neurons we were able to obtain the elementary models for six target conditions. For example, Table 1 is for four neurons, Sep02set8_sig004a, Sep15set3_sig003a, Aug31set3_sig005a, and Aug19set2_sig002a.

[Table 1 about here.]

We also check if the plots of predicted values by Poisson model are similar to the plot of values from Lowess to diagnose the goodness-of-fitness of the model. For the example of neuron Aug17set1_sig005a in the direction T6 and the orientation 45 degrees, it shows the plot of values from LOWESS is dissimilar to the pattern modeled by the second order Poisson regression model and test the effect of the quadratic term shows not significant. Hence, the fitted plot by the first order of Poisson regression model is similar to the plot of LOWESS, and test the linear term showed a significant effect. For all neurons, the fits are quite reasonable.

3.3 The Second Stage: Initial Model Building

Based on those elementary models of six target conditions described in previous subsection, we will next build the initial heterogeneous Poisson model for pooling all observations from all target conditions. We will explain this stage with an example described as follows. For example, the neuron Sep02set8_sig004a is shown in Table 1(a) to have its elementary models respectively under six target conditions. In which, the highest order among all the target conditions is the second order effect. The initial heterogeneous Poisson model for this neuron proposed in this paper is then described as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log(E(Y)) = & \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X + \gamma_1 X^2 \\
 & + D_{T1A45}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 X + \gamma_2 I_0 X^2) \\
 & + D_{T1A90}(\alpha_3 + \beta_3 I_0 X + \gamma_3 I_0 X^2) \\
 & + D_{T6A45}(\alpha_4 + \beta_4 X + \gamma_4 X^2) \\
 & + D_{T6A90}(\alpha_5 + \beta_5 X + \gamma_5 I_0 X^2) \\
 & + D_{T6A135}(\alpha_6 + \beta_6 X + \gamma_6 X^2)
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where Y is the spike counts during the MT stage and X is the MT duration in seconds for six target conditions respectively. Here, γ_4 and γ_6 are coefficients for possible difference of the quadratic term between baseline and other target conditions. The explanatory variables: D_{T1A90} , D_{T1A135} , D_{T6A45} , D_{T6A90} , and D_{T6A135} , take values on 0 and 1 that represent, except the base line setting condition, other five target categories' indicators. In this analysis, we especially add $I_0 = -1$ for those target conditions that do not have the same effect as the baseline setting condition does. We will explain how we handle these at the next subsection.

3.4 The Third Stage: Final Model Establishment

In this stage we use, once again, the previous neuron as an example to demonstrate how to build the final heterogeneous Poisson model. From the Poisson regression fitting results of initial model, built in the previous stage on all pooled observations of all six target conditions,

we propose to finalize the model by hypothesis testing. As we know some elementary models do not have second order effect on those conditions, it indicates that the neuron function at these target conditions might be the first order effect or no effect when pooling observations. If T1-with-orientation-45 and T6-with-orientation-90 conditions are first order effect, we expect $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_5$ as $I_0 = -1$ in these terms $\gamma_2 I_0 X^2$ and $\gamma_5 I_0 X^2$ of (4) in order that the quadratic term of T1-with-orientation-45 and T6-with-orientation-90 have zero coefficients. If T1-with-orientation-90 condition has no effect, we expect $\beta_1 = \beta_3$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_3$ as well. The results of the fitting by the initial heterogeneous Poisson model for neuron Sep02set8_sig004a was shown in Supplementary material Table 1.

We propose to check the second order and first order effects by considering the following testings:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 \text{ versus } H_a : \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \\
 H_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_3 \text{ versus } H_a : \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_3 \\
 H_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_5 \text{ versus } H_a : \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_5 \\
 H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_3 \text{ versus } H_a : \beta_1 \neq \beta_3
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Under $H_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ in (5), the deviance equals to 1.387 and $df = 1$. We believe zero coefficient of the second order effect at T1-with-orientation-45 due to $P - value = 0.239$. For testing the second order of T1-with-orientation-90 and T6-with-orientation-90, the deviances equal to 3.179 ($P - value = 0.074$) and 3.223 ($P - value = 0.073$) respectively, so it shows the second order effect at T1-with-orientation-90 and T6-with-orientation-90 do not exist. Taking $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_3$, the first order of T1-with-orientation-90 has deviance equal to 0.879 with $df = 1$, so we might have no first order effect at T1-with-orientation-90 ($P - value = 0.348$).

4. Why not traditional approach

In this section, three scenarios that the traditional approach (for example, please refer to (8)) does not work for the analysis of neuron spike data will be presented. Motivating by the finding from these three scenarios, this leads to propose a novel model in the previous section.

Scenario 1: . Consider the baseline setting is the target condition with the highest order effect.

We considered neurons with at least one of elementary models being of the second order effect. The set of neurons with at least one of elementary models being of the second order effect has 444 neurons, 48.63% of 913 neurons. What would it happen if we do not use the proposed model building approach in this paper, instead we followed the traditional approach. For demonstration, taking neuron Sep15set3_sig003a in Table 1(b) as an example, the baseline setting we suggested in our approach was chosen to be the target condition of direction T1 and orientation 45 degree, which is one of the highest order model among all target conditions. Then, a model for pooling all observations from all six target conditions was constructed as (6), (Please refer to p. 310 of (8)) and the results after fitting this traditional regression model are shown in Supplementary material Table 2. We easily see from P-values of those second order effect, it indicates that all target conditions are of the second order effect. However, this result of Supplementary material Table 2 is inconsistent with the result of Table 1(b).

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(E(Y)) = & \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X + \gamma_1 X^2 \\
& + D_{T1A90}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 X + \gamma_2 X^2) \\
& + D_{T1A135}(\alpha_3 + \beta_3 X + \gamma_3 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A45}(\alpha_4 + \beta_4 X + \gamma_4 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A90}(\alpha_5 + \beta_5 X + \gamma_5 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A135}(\alpha_6 + \beta_6 X + \gamma_6 X^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In the set of neurons with at least one of elementary models being of the second order effect, all 444 neurons have inconsistent problems with elementary models if we fitted the traditional approach. On the contrast, if by our proposed model in this paper, except 25 neurons, 94.37 percent neurons are consistent with the elementary models in this scenario. This scenario is taking one of target condition of the second order effect as the baseline setting.

Scenario 2:. Consider the baseline setting is not any target condition with the highest order effect among elementary models of six target conditions.

In this scenario, we considered again the set of neurons with at least one of elementary models being of the second order effect, but we intentionally took one of the target condition not of the second effect as the baseline setting for the model. We took neuron Aug31set3_sig005a in Table 1(c) as a demonstration example. The baseline setting is the target condition with direction T1 and orientation 90 degree, which is not the highest order among all target conditions. The traditional model was constructed as (7) and the results of fitting this model shown in Supplementary Material Table 3(a). Following the backward elimination procedure (Please refer to p. 239-342 of (8)), we sequentially removed non-significant terms of the highest-order effect for each target condition. Doing this by removing the quadratic terms of the largest P-value one target condition by another target condition. After cleaning

up these second order effects, we checked the first-order terms for each target condition too. The process stops if the remaining terms are all significant. The final traditional approach model was shown in (8) and the results of fitting the model was shown in Supplementary material Table 3(b), however the first order effect of baseline turned out to be not significant. This result is not consistent with the result of Table 1(c) because the model of the target condition with direction T1 and orientation 90 degree is of first order effect.

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(E(Y)) = & \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X \\
& + D_{T1A45}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 X + \gamma_2 X^2) \\
& + D_{T1A135}(\alpha_3 + \beta_3 X + \gamma_3 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A45}(\alpha_4 + \beta_4 X + \gamma_4 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A90}(\alpha_5 + \beta_5 X + \gamma_5 X^2) \\
& + D_{T6A135}(\alpha_6 + \beta_6 X + \gamma_6 X^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(E(Y)) = & \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X \\
& + D_{T1A45}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 X + \gamma_2 X^2) \\
& + D_{T1A135}(\alpha_3) \\
& + D_{T6A45}(\alpha_4) \\
& + D_{T6A90}(\alpha_5) \\
& + D_{T6A135}(\alpha_6 + \beta_6 X + \gamma_6 X^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Among 444 neurons of this set we considered, 360 neurons, 81.08%, are not consistent with the elementary models by the traditional approach if the baseline setting is not of the second effect.

Scenario 3: Consider the set of neurons with no target condition of the second order effect, but at least one target condition of the first order effect. The set of neurons with no

target condition of the second order effect, but at least one target condition of the first order effect has 419 neurons among 913 neurons.

For demonstration, taking neuron Aug19set2_sig002a in Table 1(d) as an example, the baseline setting was the target condition of direction T1 and orientation 90 degree, which is one of the highest order model among all target conditions. Then, a model for pooling all observations from all six target conditions was constructed as (9) and the results after fitting this traditional regression model are shown in Supplementary material Table 4. It indicates all target conditions are of the first order effects. It is inconsistent with the result of Table 1(d).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log(E(Y)) = & \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X \\
 & + D_{T1A45}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 X) \\
 & + D_{T1A135}(\alpha_3 + \beta_3 X) \\
 & + D_{T6A45}(\alpha_4 + \beta_4 X) \\
 & + D_{T6A90}(\alpha_5 + \beta_5 X) \\
 & + D_{T6A135}(\alpha_6 + \beta_6 X)
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

All 419 neurons have inconsistent problems with the elementary models by the traditional approach. On the contrary, if the proposed model in this paper is used, except 28 neurons, 93.32 percent neurons will be consistent with its elementary models in scenario 3. This scenario is taking one of target conditions with the first order effect, which is the highest order effect as the baseline setting.

5. Scientific analysis

5.1 Classification of neuron functions

After fitting Poisson regression model, we learn neurons with significant second order effect or first order effect on some target conditions. These information give us more insight on how the electric activities have been changed on different target conditions. A systematic classification has been done for all of the recorded neurons. The 913 neurons were classified into six types, as shown in Figure 3(a). Based on the results obtained by the heterogeneous Poisson models for all neurons, we classify these 913 neurons and the results are shown in Figure 3(b). The results will be discussed next.

[Figure 3 about here.]

5.1.1 *Direction-related-only neurons.* In Table 2(a), it shows two examples of neurons whose functions are only of the first order effects in direction T1 regardless of orientations, but no effect in direction T6. We classify these neurons as being only related to direction T1. In Table 2(b), it's a case showing the first order effect in direction T6 regardless of orientations but no effect in direction T1. These neurons were classified as being only related to direction T6. There are 12 neurons whose functions were classified as direction-related-only. The results are shown in Figure 4(a). They all are of the first order effect in directions, either in T1 or T6 regardless of orientations. And Figure 5(a) shows classification of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.

[Table 2 about here.]

[Figure 4 about here.]

[Figure 5 about here.]

5.1.2 *Orientation-related-only neurons.* Supplementary material Table 5(a) shows cases that neurons are of the first order effects in the orientation 45 degrees regardless of directions

and no effect in other conditions. We classify these neurons whose function are only related to orientation 45 degrees. Similarly, those neurons whose functions are of the second order effects in orientation 45 and 90 degrees regardless of directions are shown in Supplementary material Table 5(b). We classify these neurons as being only related to orientation 45 and 90 degrees. For those neurons their functions are uniformly related between the two directions, we classify them as being only related to orientation as in Supplementary material Table 5(c) or Table 5(d). In total, 41 neurons are classified as orientation-related-only. The results are shown in Figure 4(b). In Figure 7(b), it shows the classification results of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.

5.1.3 *Related to specified direction and specified orientation neurons.* For direction T1 and the orientation 45 degrees in Supplementary material Table 8(a), they are of first order effect but no effect in other conditions, so we classify these neuron as being related to T1-and-orientation-45. Supplementary material Table 8(b) shows the first order effects in orientation 45 and 135 degrees given direction T6. Given the specified direction, there are effects for this target condition where first order or second order in specified orientations as shown in Supplementary material Table 8(c), and we also classify those neurons as being related to direction T1 and the orientation 45, 90, and 135 degrees. In total, 199 neurons are classified as related to specified direction and specified orientation. Figure 4(c) shows the number of neurons on certain orientations and specified directions. In Figure 5(c), it shows the classification results of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.

5.1.4 *Related to specified orientation but with favored direction neurons.* For some neurons, the orientation effect was not uniform between the two directions, so we classify these phonemon on three aspects. First, there are significant effects in certain orientations, but direction T1 is of second order effect as shown in Supplementary material Table 9(a). We classify these neuron as related to orientation 45 and 135 degrees but with favored direction

T1. Second, there are significant effects in certain orientations, but direction T6 is second order effect as in Supplementary material Table 7(b). We classify these neurons as being related to orientation 45 degrees but with favored direction T6. Third, the direction is either of second order effect or first order effect in different orientations as in Supplementary material Table 7(c), we classify those neurons as being related to orientation 90 and 135 degrees but with either direction. Therefore, there are 28 neurons classed as related to specified orientation but with favored direction. Figure 4(d) shows the number of neurons on certain orientations with favored direction respectively. And Figure 5(d) shows classification of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.

5.1.5 *Direction-orientation-both-related neurons.* Supplementary material Table 8(a) shows the significant effects in orientation-45-with-direction-T1 and orientation-90-with-direction-T6. If the significant effects are first order or second order in two target conditions as shown in Supplementary material Table 8(b), we classify these neurons as being orientation-specific and direction-specific. There are 79 neurons classed as orientation-specific and direction-specific, and the number of neurons on certain two target conditions is given in Supplementary material Table 9(a). And Table 9(b) shows classification of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.

As for the remaining neurons, there are 504 neurons with different order effects and they may be considered as having interaction between direction and orientation. In these cases, we utilize a simple counting method to calculate weights on orientation or direction. Here we will show how we calculate weights. We give the score "2" to the second order effect, the score "1" to the first order effect, and the score "0" to no effect. For each direction, the direction weight is the standardized sum of the scores across the orientations. Similarly, for each orientation, the orientation weight is the standardized sum of the scores across the directions. Here the standardization is done by its maximum possible score: the maximum

direction possible score sum is 6 and the maximum orientation possible score sum is 4. The proposed weights are given by (10). Once the weights have been found, we choose the largest weight as the priority of the favored specified direction or favored specified orientation.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Direction weight} &= \frac{\text{Under certain direction, the sum of three orientation order effects}}{6} \\ \text{Orientation weight} &= \frac{\text{Under certain orientation, the sum of two direction order effects}}{4} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For example in Supplementary material Table 10(a), direction T1 and the orientation 135 degrees have the largest weights. Besides, the weight of the orientation 135 degrees is larger than direction T1. We classify these neurons as being interaction between direction and orientation but more favor in orientation. There are 294 neurons classed with more favor in orientation. Table 10(b) shows those neurons with larger weights on direction than orientation, and then we classify these neurons as interaction between direction and orientation but more favor in direction. There are 77 neurons classed with more favor in direction. If equal weights on orientation and direction as in Supplementary material Table 10(c), we classify these neurons as interaction between direction and orientation but equally favor on direction or orientation. There are 133 neurons classed with equally favor on direction or orientation. Based on the results obtained by the heterogeneous Poisson models for 518 neurons with interaction between direction and orientation, we classify them as Supplementary material Table 11.

5.1.6 *Neuron position.* Among 913 neurons of this set we considered, 869 neurons, are recorded neuron position as Supplementary material Figure 1 and Figure 2. For six types of classification, the summary of neuron position is shown in Supplementary material Table 12.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

For the heterogeneous Poisson model we proposed in this paper, we strongly suggest to use the target condition of the highest order effect among all six target conditions to be the

baseline setting for our model. If none of all six target conditions is of the second order effect, we suggest using one of the target conditions being of the first order effect in the initial model building.

Since in the last stage of our model building, we utilize hypothesis testing procedure to find the final model, we recommend to adjust the significance level for multiple tests.

In the first stage of our model building, the elementary model for each target condition we built is the Poisson regression model on observations for that target condition. We believe that model reflects or gives a clue to the true model of that particular neuron under the environment of that target condition. Those observations were independent under each target condition environment for that particular neuron.

As the experiment was conducted independently over various target conditions for the same neuron, we admitted we do not know how to model or estimate the dependence structure relationship between observations of different target conditions of the same neuron in this paper. However, we found the model, the heterogeneous Poisson model proposed in this paper works consistently with elementary models when pooling data across various environments. There are only 53 neurons among 913 neurons we analyzed whose final model changed by our approach compared to its elementary model. We listed them in the appendix. In conclusion, we proposed the heterogeneous Poisson model to analyze the function of central nervous system when pooling various environments.

Acknowledgements

We thank our research assistants, Ms. Wan-Ting Chen and Mr. Tun-Hao Chang for their assistance in this project. Dr. Chen also acknowledge the support from National Center for Theoretical Sciences (South), Taiwan.

References

- Ashe, J. and Georgopoulos, A. (1994). Movement Parameters and Neural Activity in Motor Cortex and Area 5. *Cerebral Cortex* **6**, 590–600
- Brillinger, D. R. (1988). Maximum Likelihood Analysis of Spike Trains of Interacting Nerve Cells. *Biological Cybernetics* **59**, 189–200.
- Brockwell, A. E. and Rojas, A. L. and Kass, R. E. Kass (2004). Recursive Bayesian Decoding of Motor Cortical Signals by Particle Filtering. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **91**, 1899–1907.
- Cadarso-Suárez, C. and Roca-Pardiñas, J. and Molenberghs, G. and Faes, C. and Nácher, V. and Ojeda, S. and Acuña, C. (2006). Flexible Modelling of Neuron Firing Rates across Different Experimental Conditions: an Application to Neural Activity in the Prefrontal Cortex during a Discrimination Task. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* **55**, 431–447.
- Chen, S. C. and Li, L. A. and Shen, L. and He, J. (2012). Influence of Choices of Statistical Models on Neural Spike Trend. *Journal of Data Science* **10**, 619–651.
- Cleveland, W. S. (1979). Robust Locally Weighted Regression and Smoothing Scatterplots. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **74**, 829–836.
- Donohue, J. (2002). Connecting Cortex to Machines: Recent Advances in Brain Interfaces. *Nat. Neuroscience* **5**, 1085–1088.
- Draper, N. R. and Smith, H. (1998). Applied Regression Analysis, the 3rd Edition. A *Wiley-Interscience Publication*
- Hastie, T. J. and Tibshirani, R. J. (1990). Generalized Additive Models. *Chapman & Hall*
- Fan, J. and He, J. (2006). Motor Cortical Encoding of Hand Orientation in a 3-D Reach-to-grasp Task. *In Proc. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* **5**, 1085–1088.
- Fu, Q.G. and Flament, D. and Clotz, J. D. and Ebner, T. J. (1995). Temporal Encoding

- of Movement Kinematics in the Discharge of Primate Primary Motor and Premotor Neurons. *J. Neurophysiology* **73**, 836-854.
- Kass, R. E. and Ventura, V. (2002). A Spike-Train Probability Model. *Neural Computation* **13**, 1713–1720.
- McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J. A. (1989). Generalized Linear Models, 2nd Edition. *Chapman & Hall*, London. **5**, 1085–1088.
- Moran, D. W. and Schwartz, A. B. (1999). Motor Cortical Activity During Drawing Movements: Population Representation During Spiral Tracing. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **82**, 2693–2704.
- Schwartz, A. B. (1994). Direct Cortical Representation of Drawing. *Science* **265**, 540–542.
- Schwartz, A. B. (2004). Cortical Neural Prosthetics. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci* **27**, 487–507.
- Schwartz, A. B. and Kettner, R. E. and Georgopoulos, A. P. (1988). Primate Motor Cortex and Free Arm Movements to Visual Targets in Three-Dimensional Space. *J. Neurosci.* **8**, 2913-2927.

Received October 2017. Revised February 2008. Accepted March 2008.




Figure 1. (a) The sequence of events for the reach-to-grasp task are divided into four epochs: the center holding time (CHT) is for the time from central pad hit to target light on; the cue reaction time (CRT) is for the time from target light on to central pad release; the movement time (MT) is for the time from central pad release to target hit; the target holding time (THT) is for the time from target hit to target release. (b) Organized table of each neuron according to the target conditions, sequence of events. (SC-Spike Counts, T-Time duration of each epoch, direction left/right marked T1/T6, orientation 45°/90°/135° marked A45/A90/A135)




Figure 2. The flow chart of Poisson regression models.




Figure 3. Classification of 913 neurons. First, neuron's function is only related to direction (blue). Second, neuron's function is only related to orientation (orange). Third, neuron's function is related to specified direction and specified orientations (navy blue). Fourth, neuron's function is related to specified orientation but with favored direction (navy orange). Fifth, neuron's function is related both directions and orientations (gray). In addition, six target conditions of the neuron were all no effect (white frame). (a) Results of the Poisson regression model fitting. (b) Results of the heterogeneous Poisson model fitting.




Figure 4. Classification of neurons fitted the Poisson regression models. (a) Neuron's function is only related to direction. (b) Neuron's function is only related to orientation. (c) Neuron's function is related to specified direction and specified orientations. (d) Neuron's function is related to specified orientation but with favored direction.




Figure 5. Classification of neurons fitted the heterogeneous Poisson models. (a) Neuron's function is only related to direction. (b) Neuron's function is only related to orientation. (c) Neuron's function is related to specified direction and specified orientations. (d) Neuron's function is related to specified orientation but with favored direction.

Table 1

Result of the Poisson regression model fitted on observations for each target condition. Here 2 represents the second order, 1 represents the first order, and C represents no effect.


(a) neuron: Sep02set8_sig004a				(b) neuron: Sep15set3_sig003a			
Direction	Orientation			Direction	Orientation		
	A45	A90	A135		A45	A90	A135
T1	-1	C	2	T1	-2	2	1
T6	2	-1	2	T6	-2	1	C

(c) neuron: Aug31set3_sig005a				(d) neuron: Aug19set2_sig002a			
Direction	Orientation			Direction	Orientation		
	A45	A90	A135		A45	A90	A135
T1	-2	1	C	T1	C	1	1
T6	C	C	-2	T6	C	1	C


Table 2
Table of direction-related-only

(a) Related to T1 direction				(b) Related to T6 direction			
Direction	Orientation			Direction	Orientation		
	A45	A90	A135		A45	A90	A135
T1	1	1	1	T1	C	C	C
T6	C	C	C	T6	1	1	1

(a) Fitted the second order of Poisson model



(b) Fitted the first order of Poisson model



sep08set6.sig004a_T1A45

