

Conformal models for hypercolumns and the visual V1 cortex

Dmitri V. Alekseevsky & Andrea F. Spiro*

Abstract This paper consists of two parts strictly related one to the other. The first is a survey of important facts and leading problems concerning the applications of differential geometry in studies on the functional architecture of the visual system. The second part presents a model for the hypercolumns, which originates from the symplectic model of the primary visual cortex by A. Sarti, G. Citti and J. Petitot, the spherical model of hypercolumns by P. Bressloff and J. Cowan and basic results of the conformal geometry of sphere. The first part is designed for a mathematically oriented audience and provides motivations for the model in the second part.

Keywords Hypercolumns of V1 cortex · Conformal Möbius group · Stability problem · Neurogeometry of early vision.

PACS 87.19.La · 42.66.Ct.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) MSC 92B99

Contents

Introduction	2
<i>First Part</i>	6
1 General principles of the organisation of the visual system	6
2 Models of (linear) visual neurons	9
3 The structure of the visual cortex V1	13
4 The input function	14
5 Information processing in dynamics	16
<i>Second Part</i>	21
6 Petitot's contact model and the symplectic model by Sarti, Citti and Petitot of the V1 cortex	21
7 Bressloff and Cowan's spherical model for the hypercolumns of the V1 cortex	27
8 The conformal sphere and the stereographic projections	30

* Corresponding author

D. V. Alekseevsky, Institute for Information Transmission Problems, B. Karetnuj per., 19, Moscow, 127051, Russia and University of Hradec Králové, Faculty of Science, Rokitsanského 62, 500 03 Hradec Králové, Czech Republic
E-mail: dalekseevsky@iitp.ru

Andrea Spiro, Scuola di Scienze e Tecnologie, Università di Camerino, Via Madonna delle Carceri, I-62032 Camerino (Macerata), Italy
E-mail: andrea.spiro@unicam.it

9	A conformal spherical model for the hypercolumns and associated reduced model .	31
10	Comparison between the reduced conformal model and the Sarti-Citti-Petitot symplectic model	35
11	The V1 reduced conformal models and improvements of the symplectic model for the V1 cortex	36
12	The principle of invariance and application to stability problem	37

Introduction

This paper has a two-fold scope. The first is to give a gentle introduction for the mathematically oriented readers to results, conjectures and problems on the structural architecture of the visual system. This is pursued with a survey, which has also the role of providing foundations and motivations for the second goal, that is the development of a differential geometric model for the hypercolumns, which combines elements of the symplectic model for the primary V1 visual cortex of A. Sarti, G. Citti and J. Petitot and of the spherical model for the hypercolumns of P. Bressloff and J. Cowan. The proposed model naturally stems from Cartan's approach to the conformal geometry. We show that, in neighbourhoods of pinwheels, it reduces to a version of Sarti, Citti and Petitot's symplectic model.

In the survey we give a summary of the main principles of the organisation of the visual system, we recall the mathematical description of the (linear) visual neurons as filters for the energy input function of the retina and we analyse the remapping problem of the information processing in dynamics. We structure the exposition to put in evidence that basic classical notions and results of Differential Geometry and Transformations Groups give adequate tools for modeling visual systems.

Then we focus on the above mentioned model for the hypercolumns of the primary visual cortex. Now we recall some known facts on the V1 cortex and its mathematical models.

D. Hubel and T. Wiesel put forward the idea that the firings patterns of the neurons of the primary visual cortex V1 can be represented in differential geometric terms by means of a fiber bundle over the retina R (see e.g. [20]; see also [30,31,37]). The fiber coordinates of this bundle correspond to several internal parameters (orientation, spatial frequency, ocular dominance, direction of motion, curvature, parameters of the color space, etc.) which affect the firing of visual neurons. N.V. Swindale [38] estimated the dimension of the fibers of this bundle (i.e. the number of internal parameters) as 6 – 7 or 9 – 10.

According to Hubel and Wiesel's results, the simple neurons of the V1 cortex detect contours, that is the level sets with large gradient of the input function I on retina R (= the energy density of the light which hits the retina). Inspired by a conjecture of W. C. Hoffman [19] and Hubel and Wiesel's ideas, J. Petitot [30] proposed a contact model for the V1 cortex, according to which the firings pattern of the cortex is modelled by the projectivised tangent bundle

$\pi : PTR \rightarrow R$ over the retina R , which is identified with the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 ⁽¹⁾. This bundle admits a natural system of coordinates (x, y, θ) , in which (x, y) are coordinates for the points of the retina $R = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ is the so-called *orientation*, i.e. the angle between each line $\mathbb{R}v$ of tangent space $T_{(x,y)}R$ and the axis $0x$. We remark that PTR may be also interpreted as the space of the *infinitesimal curves* (or, more precisely, the *1-jets of the non-parameterised curves*) in $R = \mathbb{R}^2$. It is equipped with the canonical contact 1-form $\eta = dy - \tan \theta dx$.

From a physiological point of view, the V1 cortex consists of *columns*, which are divided into *regular* and *singular*. Each column contains approximately 80-100 visual neurons, 25% of them simple ones. The simple neurons of each column have almost the same receptive field (which we may think as a point z of the retina R) and are modeled by Gabor filters. The firing of a simple neuron, considered as a Gabor filter, depends not only on the receptive field, but also on internal parameters, first of all on the *orientation* on the contour passing through the receptive field of the neuron. The regular and singular columns differ by the following property. All Gabor filters of the simple neurons of a *regular* column have the same orientation θ . This means that all simple neurons of such a regular column fire only when a contour through the receptive field has the orientation θ (up to 15%). In contrast, a *singular column* (also called *pinwheel*) is a column that contains simple cells that detect contours with any orientation.

In Petitot's model all columns of the V1 cortex are assumed to be pinwheels, parameterised by their receptive fields $z = (x, y) \in R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, and the simple cells of each pinwheel are parameterised by their orientation $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. In this way the V1 cortex is mathematically represented by a bundle $P = \bar{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow R$ with coordinates (x, y, θ) . The bundle P is identifiable with the space of infinitesimal curves (= 1-jets).

Notice that recently Franceschiello, Mashtakov, Citti and Sarti [16] successfully explained certain optical illusions in terms of Petitot's contact model equipped with an appropriate sub-Riemannian metric.

Later Petitot's contact model was extended into the *symplectic model* in a paper by Sarti, Citti and Petitot [37]. In such a model the simple cells of the V1 cortex are described in terms of a bundle with two-dimensional fibers. The internal parameters of this model (= the coordinates of the fibers) are the orientation $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ and a (scaling) factor σ , which describes the intensity of response of a neuron to a stimulus. In mathematical language, the simple cells of the V1 cortex correspond to the points of the trivial principal bundle $\pi : P \simeq R \times \text{CO}(2) \rightarrow R$ of the conformal frames of the retina $R = \mathbb{R}^2$, with the structure group $\text{CO}(2) = \mathbb{R}^+ \times \text{SO}(2) \simeq \mathbb{C}^*$. We call this conformal frame bundle the *Sarti-Citti-Petitot (SCP) bundle*.

¹ Note that Petitot's model can be easily adjusted into a slightly more realistic one, in which the retina R is not represented by the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 , but by a (region of the) 2-sphere S^2 .

We think that this very nice model has nevertheless two weak points. First, the model represents the simple cells as points of a fiber bundle and the columns as the two dimensional fibers of the bundle, parameterised by the orientation θ and the scaling parameter σ . This means that the authors consider only singular columns (in fact for a regular column the orientation is a fixed number and is not an internal parameter) while most columns are regular. Second, it provides no physiological explanation for the internal scaling parameter σ .

In order to address these two points and guided Sarti, Citti and Petitot's fundamental idea, we propose here a *conformal model* for hypercolumns, in which the simple neurons are parameterised by the elements of the group $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ of conformal transformations of the sphere S^2 . This model is a modification of the *spherical model* proposed by P. Bressloff and J. Cowan in [3–5], which we now briefly recall and describe how it evolves into our conformal model. After this, we will indicate how our model fixes the above points.

According to Bressloff and Cowan, each hypercolumn H is associated with two pinwheels, say N and S . The simple neurons of H are determined by two parameters, the orientation $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ and the (normalised logarithm of) the spatial frequency $\phi \in [0, \pi]$. Due to this, H is identified with S^2 , where θ and ϕ are the longitude and the ($\frac{\pi}{2}$ -shifted) latitude. Under this identification, the pinwheels N, S correspond to the north and south poles of the sphere, where the orientation (= longitude) θ is not defined. Our conformal model extends the Bressloff-Cowan model replacing the unit sphere S^2 by the total space of the bundle

$$\pi : P^{(1)} = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) / \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = S^2 .$$

Note that, geometrically, this bundle has a natural identification with the bundle $\pi : P^{(1)} \rightarrow S^2$ of the (second order) conformal frames of S^2 [23].

We show that in a small neighbourhood of a pinwheel, say N , the conformal model may be reduced to a simplified model. According to this *reduced model*, the number of internal parameters is reduced from 4 to 2 and the simple neurons of the neighbourhood are parameterised by the points of the total space $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of the SCP bundle $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, as in the symplectic model of the V1 cortex. In other words, *our conformal model reduces to the SCP bundle*.

In the reduced model, the two internal parameters for the fibers over N , $S \in S^2$ (hence, for the simple cells in the two pinwheels of the hypercolumn H) admit an interpretation in terms of Bressloff and Cowan's spherical coordinates (θ, ϕ) . This leads to an interpretation of Sarti, Citti and Petitot's scaling parameter σ in terms of the (normalised logarithm of the) spatial frequency.

Summing up, the problems and the motivations, which the proposed model addresses and from which gets its relevance, can be listed as follows:

- (i) We think that the Sarti-Citti-Petitot modelling space describes the responses of the V1 cortex as if it were mainly determined by the cells in

the singular columns, but it does not clarify the role played by the regular columns. Our modelling space can be considered as a unification of a “slightly generalised” Bressloff and Cowen spherical model and of the Sarti-Citti-Petitot model and consider all simple cells (of the regular and the singular columns) on the same footing. Since our model reduces to a modification of the original Sarti-Citti-Petitot model in the small neighbourhoods of pinwheels, we expect that it might be used to provide a solid foundation for Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s model for the V1 cortex on a large scale.

- (ii) The reduction of our model into a model for the neighbourhoods of pinwheels make manifest a possible origin for the two internal parameters of Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s model and hence a reasonable physiological interpretation for the internal scaling parameter of Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s model (which originally was introduced ad hoc).
- (iii) It is known that the firings of the visual neurons in general depend on many internal parameters. And recently, new mathematical models, which involving more than two internal parameters, have been introduced (see for instance [6]). Our conformal model is one such model: indeed, our proposed modelling space is a bundle with six internal parameters. It also originates very naturally from E. Cartan’s approach to G -structures and to conformal geometry. We think that these aspects combined with the essential role of the conformal group in the remapping problem (see Sect. 5.2 below and [2]) and its tight relations with Sarti-Citti-Petitot’s and Bressloff-Cowan’s model, make the proposed conformal model particularly stimulating.

The paper ends with Sect.12, where we discuss differences between simple and complex neurons. It is known that the complex neurons of the V1 cortex collect information from systems of several simple neurons. The main difference between simple and complex neurons is that the simple neurons are sensible to shifts of contours in their receptive fields, while the complex neurons are not (see e.g. [20,18,8]). In Sect. 12 we state the *Principle of Invariance* and discuss a possible use of this principle to explain such a difference.

The paper is organised into two parts. The First Part begins with a section (Sect. 2), where all the main assumptions and convention used in this paper are listed. Then, in Sect. 3-6, we briefly discuss several topics, as for instance the models of the visual neurons as (linear) filters, Donders’ and Listing’s laws and the Alhazen Visual Stability Problem. Finally, at the end of Sect. 6, a conjecture on a application of the conformal invariants of plane curves for solving the remapping problem is stated. The Second Part starts with Sect. 7 and 8, where we review the models of the V1 cortex proposed by Petitot and by Sarti, Citti and Petitot and of the spherical model of a hypercolumn by Bressloff and Cowan. Then, in Sect. 9-11, we present the conformal model of a hypercolumn and discuss its consequences and applications. The last Sect. 12 is devoted to the Principle of Invariance and its possible applications.

First Part

1 General principles of the organisation of the visual system

In this section, we make explicit the assumptions there we are going to consider throughout the paper and we review some of the basic properties of the visual system from a geometric point of view.

1. We consider only monocular black-white vision (no color) and assume that the brain extracts all visual information from the density of the energy of the light which is incident to the retina R . It is a real valued function I_R of the time and of the points of the retina. However, in static situation (i.e. when the eye and the stimulus are still), the function I_R reduces to a function that depends just on the points of R .

2. We assume that the head is fixed and we consider the eye ball as a rigid ball, which may rotate around its center O . The retina R is considered as a large domain of the eye sphere (= the boundary of the eye ball). Sometimes it is convenient to identify the retina with the whole eye sphere. We also assume that the optical center of the eye, i.e. the *nodal point* \mathcal{N} , is located on the eye sphere. In reality, \mathcal{N} is an inner point the eye ball, but it is very close to the boundary.

3. The image on the retina R of an external surface $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is the *central projection with respect to* \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{S} onto the eye sphere. Such a projection is the map $\varphi_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow R$, which sends each point A of the surface into the point $\bar{A} \neq \mathcal{N}$ of the retina, determined by the intersection between the retina R and the ray $\ell_{A\mathcal{N}}$, originating from A and passing through \mathcal{N} :

$$\mathcal{S} \ni A \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathcal{N}}} \bar{A} = \ell_{A\mathcal{N}} \cap R. \quad (1)$$

Assuming that each $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is the source of an ideal diffused reflected light, the corresponding point $\bar{A} \in R$ receives the light emitted by the point $A = \varphi_{\mathcal{N}}^{-1}(\bar{A})$ with an intensity that depends on the energy density at the emission point.

4. The point \mathcal{F} of the eye sphere, which is opposite to \mathcal{N} , is assumed to be the *center of the fovea*.

5. Let us denote by S_{eye}^2 the eye sphere and by (x, y) the Euclidean coordinates of the tangent plane $T_{\mathcal{F}}S_{\text{eye}}^2$ of the eye sphere at the fovea \mathcal{F} , associated with an orthonormal basis (e_1^0, e_2^0) . The stereographic projection of pole \mathcal{N}

$$\text{st}_{\mathcal{N}} : S_{\text{eye}}^2 \longrightarrow T_{\mathcal{F}}S_{\text{eye}}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2, \quad p \longmapsto \text{st}_{\mathcal{N}}(p) := \ell_{\mathcal{N}p} \cap T_{\mathcal{F}}S_{\text{eye}}^2$$

allows to consider (x, y) as *standard conformal coordinates* of the retina $R \subset S_{\text{eye}}^2$. In these coordinates, the natural metric of the eye sphere, induced by its embedding into the physical Euclidean space $E^3 = \mathbb{R}^3$, has the form

$$g = f(x, y)(dx^2 + dy^2)$$

for some function $f(x, y)$. In a small neighbourhood of the fovea \mathcal{F} , such function $f(x, y)$ is approximately constant and equal to 1, and the coordinates

(x, y) are approximately Euclidean coordinates for the metric g . In this approximation, we may (locally) identify the retina $R \subset S_{\text{eye}}^2$ with the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 .

6. The visual system has a hierarchical structure with a strong feedback. The initial input function I_R , recorded by the photoreceptors (cones and rods), is very irregular. The information processing performed by the retina has the purpose of regularise and contourise the input function I_R and prepare it for decoding. The output of this process is a regularised function $I : R \simeq \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which we call *input (energy) function*. It is coded in terms of excitations of ganglion cells whose long axons terminates on the LGN (lateral geniculate nucleus). The visual information is first sent through the axons from the retina to the LGN, then to the primary visual cortex V1, and after this to the other regions V2, V3. etc., i.e. to all other visual systems. The transformations which change the input function I on the retina into the corresponding functions on the LGN and the V1 cortex are determined by conformal maps between the domains of the functions, each of them equipped with an appropriate metric. These transformations are called *retinotopic* (or *topographic*) mappings.

7. *Visual neurons – simple and complex neurons.* The visual information in the V1 cortex is coded in the firings of the visual neurons. Each visual neuron is working as a filter, a functional on the space of the input functions. In static, the firing of a visual neuron depends only on the restriction $I|_D$ of the input function $I : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to some small domain $D \subset R$, which is called the *receptive field (RF)* of the neuron. The receptive field of some visual neurons shifts before saccades (see Sect. 6).

Hubel and Wiesel divide the neurons into *simple* and *complex*. A *simple neuron* (also called *simple cell*) works as a linear filter, i.e. as an appropriate linear functional on the space of the input functions. Roughly speaking, it computes the average of the restricted input function $I|_D$ onto the RF D , which is determined by a weight function, called *receptive profile (RP)* of the neuron. For a simple neuron, the RP is mathematically described as a *Gabor function*, i.e. a Gauss function modulated by a sine or a cosine (see Sect. 2 for details).

The neurons which are not simple are called *complex neurons* (or *complex cells*). They collect information from systems of many other visual neurons and usually work as non-linear functionals. Several models for the complex cells have been so far proposed. One of the first was proposed by J. A. Movshon, I. D. Thompson and D. J. Tolhurst [29] (see also [8,9]). Following an idea by Hubel and Wiesel, they describe a complex cell as a non-linear filter for the information, which is determined by a system of (linear) simple cells with the same orientation but with different receptive profiles. According to this model, the processing of the information performed by a complex cell consists of a rectification and a combination of the information which is collected from the connected simple cells. A crucial difference between the complex and the simple cells is given by the fact that the reaction to a contours of a complex neuron is invariant under shifts of the contour within its RF. This model till now is in a good correspondence with experiments (see [8]).

One the main limitations of all these models is that they are static, that is they do not take into account the time evolution of the incoming information. In dynamical situations it is expected that all filters are non-linear and that their description is much more complicated. However, in this paper we just consider simple neurons and assume that they react linearly to stimuli. Complex neurons will be briefly discussed only in the last section.

8. The LGN is designed to provide mainly feedback: Only 10%-20% of the received information comes from the retina, the remaining 90%-80% is a feedback from the higher sections of the visual system.

9. There are three pathways from the retina to the V1 cortex: the *P-pathway*, which is responsible for the perception of stable objects, the *M-pathway*, which is important for the perception of moving objects, and the *K-pathway*, for color vision. We will consider only the P-pathway. The structure of the other pathways is more involved: For instance the M-neurons, which give the M-pathway, are non-linear, even on the retina [22].

10. The energy function $I : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the retina R is completely determined by the values c and the corresponding level sets $L_c = \{I = c\}$. But only the level sets, not the values, are truly relevant (just think of the fact that when the light in the room is turned on, the illumination of the retina changes dozens of times). This is consistent with the discovery by Hubel and Wiesel that *the main objects detected in the early vision are the contours, the (non-parametrised) level curves $L_c = \{I = c\}$ of the function I with a large gradient*. Note that each contour is an integral curve of the 1-dimensional distribution given by the Pfaffian system $dI = 0$ and depends just on the conformal class $[\omega]$ of the 1-form $\omega = dI$.

11. A contour L though a point of the retina $z \in R$ is locally approximated by its tangent line $\ell = T_z L \subset T_z R$ at $z = (x, y)$ or, better, by a small interval $b \subset \ell$ of this line, called *bar*. The line ℓ and the bar b are determined by their *orientation* $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, i.e. the angle formed by ℓ and the x -axis. The space of the *infinitesimal contours* (or *orientations*) is the space of the 1-jets of the non-parametrised curves of R , that is the projectivised tangent bundle PTR . It is locally identified with the space of 1-jets $J^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) = \{(x, y, \frac{dy}{dx})\}$ of the functions $y = y(x)$ of the real line.

12. The orientation θ is an important, but not unique, internal parameter, which characterises the local structure of a stimulus in the early vision. The *spatial frequency* p plays also a very important role [7, 36]. Roughly speaking, the spatial frequency is a measure of how often sinusoidal components of the stimulus (as determined by the Fourier transform) repeat per unit of distance. It is measured by number of cycles per degree c/deg . It is not an infinitesimal characteristic of a contour L , but of the structure of the image in a neighbourhood of the contour. More precisely, *it is a datum which is characteristic of the 1-dimensional distribution $I = \text{const.}$ near the contour*. The Fourier analysis allows to approximate the distribution $I = \text{const.}$ by means of a sinusoidal *grating*. This grating is characterised by 4 parameters: *spatial frequency*,

contrast, orientation and phase. All these parameters may be considered as internal parameters, which give information on the infinitesimal characteristics of the image. In this paper, following Bressloff and Cowan, we consider only the orientation and the spatial frequency. J. G. Robson et al. [36] showed that there are many independent channels for the spatial frequency, but some of them correlate. For example, the channel with spatial frequency $p = 14$ c/deg might correlate with a channel with a frequency p' if p/p' is $4/5$ or $5/4$.

13. *Hyper-specialisation of visual neurons.* Each visual neuron fires just when the local internal parameters of the stimulus (as e.g. its orientation, spatial frequency, contrast, etc.) take (approximately) some prescribed values. Actually, the firings of many kinds of visual neurons depend not only on the values of the internal parameters of the stimulus, but also on their rate of change. For this reason in order to perceive a stable object the eye has to constantly move.

2 Models of (linear) visual neurons

A *linear neuron* with receptive field (RF) $D \subset R \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ acts as a linear filter of the form

$$T_W : I \mapsto \int_D W(z) I(z) \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^2} , \quad \text{where } z = (x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^2} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx dy .$$

Up to a constant, any such filter determines the “mean value” of the restriction $I|_D$ of the input function to the receptive field $D \subset R$ weighted by some function $W(z)$, called the *receptive profile (RP) of the neuron*.

Note that any transformation $z \rightarrow \varphi(z)$ changes the coordinate system $z = (x, y)$ into the new coordinate system

$$z'(z) = (x', y') = (x \circ \varphi^{-1}, y \circ \varphi^{-1})$$

and changes the linear filter T_W into the filter $\varphi(T_W) = T_{\varphi(W)}$ with RP

$$\varphi(W)(z') := (J(\varphi)|_{\varphi^{-1}(z')})^{-1} W(\varphi^{-1}(z')) , \quad (2)$$

where $J(\varphi)|_w$ is the Jacobian of the vector-valued function φ at the point w . In other words, the RP of these linear filters transform as *densities*.

2.1 Gauss filters on the plane

The *Gauss filters* are the linear filters with RP given by Gauss probability distributions of \mathbb{R}^2 , i.e. the functions defined as follows. Let us call *mother Gauss filter* the linear filter T_{γ_0} with RP

$$\gamma_0(z) := e^{-1/2|z|^2} .$$

A *Gauss filter* is any filter T_γ that is obtained from T_{γ_0} by a transformation $z \mapsto Az + \tau$ of the group $\text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{R}^2) = \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) \cdot \mathbb{R}^2$ of orientation preserving affine transformations. The RP $\gamma(z) = \gamma_{A, \tau}$ of T_γ is

$$\gamma(z) := \frac{1}{\det A} e^{-1/2 |A^{-1}(z-\tau)|^2}.$$

Clearly, the group $\text{Aff}^+(2)$ acts transitively on the space \mathcal{G} of Gauss filters and its stability subgroup is $\text{SO}(2)$. This action canonically extends to an action of the larger group $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ so that $\mathcal{G} = \text{Aff}^+(2)/\text{SO}(2) = \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(3)$ [25].

The orbit in \mathcal{G} of γ_0 under the *similarity subgroup*

$$\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \text{CO}(2) \cdot \mathbb{R}^2 \simeq \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$$

is an important submanifold $\mathcal{G}_0 = \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)/\text{SO}(2)$ of the manifold of Gauss filters. More precisely, if we identify \mathbb{R}^2 with the plane of complex numbers $\mathbb{C} = \{z = x + iy\}$, then the group $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is identified with the *complex affine group* $\mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$ of the transformations

$$z \mapsto az + b, \quad a \in \mathbb{C}^*, \quad b \in \mathbb{C}.$$

In this way, the Gauss filter associated with $A_{a,b} \in \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ has the RP

$$\gamma_{a,b}(z) = \frac{1}{|a|^2} e^{-\frac{|z-b|^2}{|a|^2}}.$$

Note that, if we denote $\sigma := |a|$, then $\gamma_{a,b} = \gamma_{\sigma,b}$. Hence the subgroup $\mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$ acts simply transitively on \mathcal{G}_0 . The parameter $\sigma = |a|$ is the *standard deviation* and b is the *mean value* of the RP $\gamma_{a,b}$. We remark that, when the standard deviation σ tends to 0, the Gauss functional

$$T_{\gamma_{\sigma,b}}(I(z)) := \int I(z) \gamma_{\sigma,b} \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^2}(z)$$

tends to the Dirac delta function at b , i.e. to the functional $\delta_b(I) = I(b)$. For this reason, *the Gauss filters of \mathcal{G}_0 can be taken as σ -approximations of the functionals $I \mapsto I(b)$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$.*

2.2 Kuffler isotropic neurons and Marr filters

S. Kuffler [20] was the first who detected a response to a stimulus of the retinal ganglion cells in mammals. He described the structure of the isotropic (i.e. rotationally invariant) receptive field of an isotropic neuron as two concentric discs $D' \subset D$ of the retina. The receptive profile W of an *ON-neuron* (respectively, *OFF-neuron*) is rotationally invariant and it is

- positive (resp. negative) in the inner disc D' ,
- negative (resp. positive) in the ring $D \setminus D'$

– with $\int_D W(x, y) \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^2} = 0$.

This explains why the neurons of this kind give no response to the constant input functions.

D. Marr [27] showed that a linear filter with RP given by the Laplacian $\Delta\gamma_{a,b}$ of a Gauss density $\gamma_{a,b} \in \mathcal{G}_0$ gives a realistic model for a Kuffler neuron. He explained that a system of such filters produces a regularisation and contourisation of the input function I . In other words, it transforms the retina image into a graphics picture. This is the aim of the data processing in retina.

Another realistic model for a Kuffler neuron is a linear filter with RP given by the difference of two Gauss functions with the same mean value b , but two different standard deviations σ, σ' .

2.3 Koenderink's Multiscale Geometry of Image Processing

J. Koenderink [24, 15] defined the *Multiscale Geometry* as the geometry which studies the σ -approximations to Differential Geometry for arbitrary resolution parameters σ . In his seminal paper [24], he showed that an image can be embedded into a one-parameter family of derived images, parametrised by the resolutions σ and governed by the heat equation.

2.4 Derived filters and Hansard and Horaud's simple visual cells of order k

Let X be a vector field on \mathbb{R}^2 , identified with a derivation of the algebra of real functions. Given a Gauss filter $T_{\gamma_{a,b}}$, the linear functional $T_{X \cdot \gamma_{a,b}}$ with RP $X \cdot \gamma_{a,b}$ is called *derivative of $T_{\gamma_{a,b}}$ in the direction X* . Integration by parts shows that the limit of $T_{X \cdot \gamma_{a,b}}$ for $\sigma = |a| \rightarrow 0$ is the functional

$$I \mapsto -(X \cdot I)(b) ,$$

i.e., geometrically, the tangent vector $-X_b$ at the point b . For this reason, the functional $T_{X \cdot \gamma_{a,b}}$ can be considered as a σ -approximation of the tangent vector $-X_b$. Similarly, the functional $T_{Y \cdot (X \cdot \gamma_{a,b})}$ is a σ -approximation of the second order differential operator at b given by

$$I \mapsto Y \cdot (X \cdot I)(b) .$$

M. Hansard and R. Horaud [18] proposed a definition of *simple visual neuron of order k* as the filter with RP given by a linear combination of directional derivatives of the form

$$X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot \dots \cdot X_k \cdot \gamma_{a,b} .$$

As above, this operator can be considered as σ -approximation of a linear combination of differential operators of the form $(-1)^\ell X_1 \circ \dots \circ X_k|_b$. This means that, geometrically, a simple neuron of order less than or equal to k computes a

component of the k -th order jet of a contour. Note that the space of the k -jets of non-parametrised curves of the retina $R \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ are locally parametrised by the space of k -jets $J^k(\mathbb{R})$ of the real functions on the real line, i.e. the space of the Taylor polynomials of one variable of degree less than or equal to k .

Following an idea by Hubel and Wiesel, Hansard and Horaud also proposed a definition of *complex visual cells* as compositions of simple visual neurons of the above kind.

2.5 Gabor filters and simple cells of V1 cortex

Roughly speaking, a *Gabor filter* is a linear functional with RP given by a Gauss function modulated by $\cos y$ or $\sin y$. More precisely, let $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^+}$ and $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^-}$ be the Gabor filters determined by the RP

$$\gamma_0^+(z) := \gamma_0(z) \cos y = e^{-1/2|z|^2} \cos y, \quad \gamma_0^-(z) := \gamma_0(z) \sin y$$

(here, $z = x + iy$). These RP conveniently combine into the *complex* RP

$$\gamma_0^{\mathbb{C}}(z) := \gamma_0(z)e^{iy} = e^{-1/2|z|^2+iy} = \gamma_0^+(z) + i\gamma_0^-(z).$$

We call $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^+}$ and $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^-}$ the *even and odd mother Gabor filters*. In analogy with the definition of the Gauss filters, the *Gabor filters* are the filters $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_{a,b}^{\pm}}$ that are obtained from the mother filters $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^{\pm}}$ by the transformations $A = A_{a,b} \in \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$. The RP $\gamma_{a,b}^{\pm}$ of the filters $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_{a,b}^{\pm}}$ are determined by the complex RP profile $\gamma_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ as follows. Denoting $a = \sigma e^{i\theta}$ and $b_1 = \text{Re}(b)$, $b_2 = \text{Im}(b)$ and using (2), the $\gamma_{a,b}^{\pm}$ are the real and imaginary parts of the complex RP

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{a,b}^{\mathbb{C}}(z) &= \gamma_{a,b}^+(z) + i\gamma_{a,b}^-(z) = A(\gamma_0^{\mathbb{C}}(z)) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} e^{-1/2|z \circ A^{-1}|^2 + iy \circ A^{-1}} = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{|z-b|^2}{2\sigma^2} + i \frac{-(x-b_0) \sin \theta + (y-b_1) \cos \theta}{\sigma}}, \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

Since the group $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$ acts simply transitively on the family of all Gabor filters of the plane, these filters constitute a manifold $\mathfrak{G}ab$ which we identify with $\mathfrak{G}ab = \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$.

The Gabor filters give a good model for the simple visual neurons of the V1 cortex. An alternative model of simple neurons is given by the derived filters of first and second orders (see Sect. 2.4) These two models are very close one to the other and, roughly speaking, they both detect the second order jets of the contours.

3 The structure of the visual cortex V1

3.1 Functional architecture of the V1 cortex

The primary visual cortex V1 is a layer which is 2 mm thick. The neurons of the V1 cortex are arranged into a thin folded sheet made of six layers. Hubel and Wiesel discovered that the neurons are organised into vertical columns. Each column consists of 80-100 visual neurons (of which approximately 25% are simple cells) all with approximately identical receptive field (RF). A column is called *regular* if its simple neurons have almost the same orientation. This means that each of them fires only when a contour crosses their RF with the same orientation $\theta_0 \in [0, \pi)$ (up to an error of 15–20%). On the other hand, a column is called *singular* (or *pinwheel*) if it contains simple cells that can detect contours with any orientation. In other words, each column is associated with its RF z and: (a) if the column is regular, the orientation $\theta = \theta(z)$ is uniquely determined by z , while (b) if the column is singular, the orientation $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ is one of the parameters for its simple cells.

The distance between two neighbour pinwheels in the visual cortex is 1-2 mm. They serve as a sort of watch towers, which can detect contours of arbitrary orientation. One of the purposes of the fixational eyes movements is to produce shifts of the retina images to make the contours to intersect the RF of pinwheels, so that they can detect them.

3.2 The V1 cortex as a fiber bundle – The “engrafted variables” of Hubel and Wiesel

Hubel and Wiesel remarked that the firings of the simple neurons depend not only on the coordinates $z = (x, y)$ of their RF, but also on many other internal parameters, which may be considered as fiber-wise coordinates of some fibre bundle over the retina surface. They proposed the first fibre bundle model for the V1 cortex, the so called *ice-cube model* with two internal parameters: the orientation and the ocular dominance.

Hubel wrote in [20] “What the cortex does is to map not just two but many variables on its two-dimensional surface. It does so by selecting as the basic parameters the two variables that specify the visual field coordinates (distance out and up or down from the fovea), and on this map it engrafts other variables, such as orientation and eye preference, by finer subdivisions.”

The complete set of the inner parameters, which are relevant for the visual system, is not known. The most important internal parameters are the *orientation* and the *spatial frequency*, but there are many other relevant parameters, as for instance the parameters of the *color space*, the *contrast*, the *curvature*, the *temporal frequency*, the *ocular dominance*, the *disparity* and the *direction of the motion*.

4 The input function

4.1 Donders' and Listing's laws and Helmholtz's definition of *straight line*

4.1.1 The eye as a rigid ball

From a mechanical point of view, the eye is a rigid ball B_{eye} , which can rotate around its center O . The retina occupies only part of the eye sphere, but, for simplicity, we identify it with the whole eye 2-sphere $S_{\text{eye}}^2 = \partial B_{\text{eye}}$. As we mentioned in Sect. 1, in this paper we constantly assume that the *eye nodal point* \mathcal{N} (or *optical center*) belongs to the eye sphere and that its opposite point \mathcal{F} on the sphere is the center of the fovea.

For a fixed position of the head, there is a standard initial position for the eye sphere S_{eye}^2 , which is described by a canonical orthonormal frame $(\underline{i}, \underline{j}, \underline{k})$, given by the standard frontal direction \underline{i} of the gaze, the vertical direction up \underline{k} and the direction from left to right \underline{j} which is orthogonal to \underline{i} and \underline{k} . This determines the standard “fixed head centred” coordinates (x, y, z) for the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 with the origin $O = (0, 0, 0)$ at the center of S_{eye}^2 .

Any other position of the eye sphere is described by an orthogonal transformation $R \in \text{SO}(3)$ around O (which clearly preserves S_{eye}^2) that maps the orthonormal frame $(\underline{i}, \underline{j}, \underline{k})$ into another $(\underline{i}', \underline{j}', \underline{k}') = R(\underline{i}, \underline{j}, \underline{k})$ with \underline{i}' equal to a new gaze direction. We recall that any transformation of $\text{SO}(3)$ is the rotation $R_{\underline{e}}^\alpha$ through an angle α about the axis determined by a unit vector \underline{e} .

4.1.2 Donders' and Listing's laws

Donders' law states that when the head is fixed, the position of the eye is completely determined by the unit vector \underline{i}' that gives the direction of the gaze. This implies that the set Σ of the possible positions of the eye is a surface in the orthogonal group $\text{SO}(3)$ (corresponding to the set of all admissible gaze directions $\underline{i}' \in S^2$). More precisely, we have

Theorem 1 (Donders' “no twist” law) *If the head is fixed, the direction \underline{i}' of the gaze determines the position of the eye ball and does not depend on the previous eye movements.*

This law implies that there is a (local) section

$$s : S^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{OF}(S^2) = \text{SO}(3)$$

of the orthonormal frame bundle

$$\mathcal{OF}(S^2) = \text{SO}(3) \longrightarrow S^2 = \text{SO}(3)/\text{SO}(2)$$

over the sphere S^2 of unit vectors, which transforms any curve of gaze directions

$$t \longmapsto \underline{i}(t) \in S^2$$

into the curve

$$t \mapsto s(\underline{i}(t)) \in \text{SO}(3) = \mathcal{OF}(S^2) ,$$

given by the rotations $R(t) = s(\underline{i}(t))$ of the eye ball associated with the gaze curve $\underline{i}(t)$.

The surface $\Sigma = s(S^2) \subset \text{SO}(3)$ which is image of the map s is called *Listing's surface*. Listing's law determines Listing's surface.

Theorem 2 (Listing's law) *The change from the standard position with gaze direction \underline{i} to some other position with gaze direction \underline{i}' can be always realised by the rotation $R_{\underline{n}}^\alpha$ through the angle $\alpha = \widehat{ii'}$ about the axis given by the cross product $\underline{n} = \underline{i} \times \underline{i}'$.*

This law implies that Listing's surface $\Sigma \subset \text{SO}(3)$ consists of the rotations around the axes determined by the vectors of the *Listing's plane* $\text{span}(\underline{j}, \underline{k})$.

4.1.3 Helmholtz' physiological definition of a straight line

H. von Helmholtz gave the following physiological definition of a straight line:

A straight line is a curve $\ell = \{\gamma(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 , which is characterised by the following property: when the gaze moves along the curve $\gamma(t)$, the retinal image of ℓ does not change.

Indeed, given a straight line $\ell = \{\gamma(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, let us denote by $\Pi = \Pi_{O, \ell}$ the unique plane which passes through ℓ and the center O of the eye ball. Let also \underline{n} be one of the two unit vectors that are orthogonal to Π . Assume that for the standard position of the eye, the gaze is directed towards the point $\gamma(0) \in \ell$, i.e. $\gamma(0) \in \mathbb{R}\underline{i}$. The image of ℓ on the retina (= the points of S_{eye}^2 which are hit by the light which is diffused by the points of ℓ) is an arc of the intersection $\Pi \cap S_{\text{eye}}^2$. When the gaze moves along the points $\gamma(t)$ of the line, the eye moves by rotations $R_{\underline{n}}^{\alpha(t)}$, each of them about the same axis $\mathbb{R}\underline{n}$. This means that, for any t , each point $x \in S_{\text{eye}}^2$ moves into the position $R_{\underline{n}}^{\alpha(t)}(x)$, and the image of ℓ on the retina is given by the set of points of the eye sphere S_{eye}^2

$$\{x \in S_{\text{eye}}^2 : R_{\underline{n}}^{\alpha(t)}(x) \in \Pi\} = \{x \in S_{\text{eye}}^2 : x \in R_{\underline{n}}^{-\alpha(t)}(\Pi) = \Pi\} = S_{\text{eye}}^2 \cap \Pi ,$$

which is the same set for all t .

4.2 Eye movements

There are several kinds of eye movements. Here, we consider only the *saccades* and the involuntary *fixational eye movements*, which are the particular eye movements that occur when the gaze is “fixed”, i.e. concentrated on a stable external point (see e.g. [35]).

The *saccades* are very rapid rotations of the eyes (up to $700^\circ/\text{sec}$ in humans) of large amplitudes. The *fixational eye movements* include the *tremor*, the *drifts* and the *microsaccades*.

The *tremor* is an aperiodic wave-like motion of the eye of high frequency (40-100 Hz) but of a very small amplitude (in between a few arcsecond and a few arcminutes) [1]. Under the tremor the gaze fills a cone in one tenth of a second. We conjecture that the aim of the tremor is to expand the retinal contours, so that they can be detected by several rows of photoreceptors. This is used to estimate the gradient of the input function at the points of each contour.

The *drifts* occur simultaneously with the tremor and are slow motions of the eye, with frequency 1-20 Hz and amplitudes up to $10'$. During a drift, the image of a fixation point stays within the fovea. The *microsaccades* are fast short jerk-like movements with amplitude $2'-120'$ (see e.g. [33]).

In 1 second the tremor moves along a path, which is equal to 1-1.5 diameters of the cones of the central part of the fovea, a drift moves along 10-15 diameters of the cones and the microsaccades carry an image across dozen to several hundred diameters of the cones.

4.2.1 The purpose of the fixational eye movements

The visual information is determined by the *light rays* that hit the retina. When the eye is fixed, the visual information comes from all light rays passing through the lens of the eye, which – according to the central projection (see n.3 of Sect. 1) – can be identified with the rays passing through the nodal point \mathcal{N} . These rays determine a 2-dimensional submanifold $L(\mathcal{N}) \simeq \mathbb{RP}^2$ of the space $L(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of all lines of \mathbb{R}^3 . Thanks to the fixational eye movements, the brain receives information from a neighbourhood of $L(\mathcal{N})$ in the four dimensional manifold $L(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

The fixational eyes movements produce also small shifts of the retinal image, which allow the contours to intersect the receptive fields of the pinwheels, so that they can be detected by the simple cells of those pinwheels. These movements are essential for perceiving immobile objects: Experiments show that a compensation of the fixational eye movements leads to a loss of perception of stationary objects [42].

5 Information processing in dynamics

5.1 Shifts of receptive fields

In a seminal paper, J. Duhamel et al. [12] described *the predicted shifts of the receptive fields* of the visual neurons in the lateral intraparietal area (LIP) of a macaque. The same phenomenon was later detected for neurons in many other visual systems, including V1, V2, V3, etc. (see [28, 39, 11]). Assume that, before

a saccade, a neuron n with RF z_n detects the retina image \bar{A} of an external point A (i.e. the image \bar{A} is in the RF z_n) and that, after the saccade, the same neuron detects the retina image \bar{B} of another point B (i.e. \bar{B} gets into the RF z_n). Experiments give evidences that the neuron n gets information about B *approximately 100 ms before the saccade*, that is when the retinal image \bar{B} is in the RF of another neuron \tilde{n} . In other words, the neuron reacts *as if* before the saccade the RF field z_n is changed into the RF $z_{\tilde{n}}$ of another neuron, which is able to detect \bar{B} earlier than what is expected. This phenomenon is called *pre-saccadic shift of a RF* (see e.g. [28,39]).

For a long time, it was assumed that the pre-saccadic shift of a RF was an anticipation of the retinal consequences of the saccade. However, if one considers also the standard assumption that the fixational eye movements are stochastic, this would imply that for *any* two points z, \tilde{z} of the retina, there exist neurons with RF at such two points, which can pass pre-saccadic information one to the other. This seems not realistic, because it implies a huge amount of exchanged information between neurons. A solution to this paradox was proposed by M. Zirnsac and T. Moore in [43]. They conjectured that the fixational eye movements are not stochastic and that each “pre-saccadic shift of a RF” is in reality a part of a *remapping process* that selects targets for the saccades. More precisely, Zirnsac and Moore assume that a higher level visual subsystem collects information about all scenery. On the base of this global information, such higher level subsystem selects a future “gaze target” B and sends information about the corresponding internal image \bar{B} to appropriate neurons before the saccade, i.e. before they will actually receive the stimulus. After the saccade, those neurons correct such preliminary information on the basis of the internal image \bar{B}' they actually receive (see e.g. [34]).

Refining the conjecture by Zirnsac and Moore, we think that the microsaccades are not stochastic and are controlled by higher sections of the visual system, while the drift is a stochastic process during which the visual cortex and the oculomotor system receive stochastic information about the stimulus. A microsaccade $\text{Sac}(A, B)$ from a gaze direction A to a gaze direction B serves to change of the retinotopic coordinate system associated with the direction A to the retinotopic coordinate system associated with the direction B . This process is called *remapping*. The stochastic information about the stimulus during the drift after the saccade $\text{Sac}(A, B)$ is encoded into the coordinate system associated with the gaze B .

5.2 Gombrich’s Etcetera Principle and a conjecture on the remappings

The art historian E. Gombrich formulated the following important idea, called *Etcetera Principle*, about the mechanism of the saccadic remappings [17,12]:

“The global pattern in environments such as a forest, beach or street scene enables us to predict more-or-less what we will see, based on the order and

redundancy in the scene and on previous experience with that type of environment. Only a few (3-4) salient stimuli are contained in the trans-saccadic visual memory and update”.

We are going to state a conjecture about the conformal character of remappings, which supports the Etcetera Principle. But before this, we need to recall the Möbius projective model of the conformal sphere.

5.2.1 The Möbius projective model of the conformal sphere

Consider an orthonormal frame (e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3) for the *Minkowski space-time* $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, that is the vector space

$$\mathbb{R}^{1,3} = \mathbb{R}e_0 + \mathbb{R}^3 = \{X = x^0 e_0 + x^1 e_1 + x^2 e_2 + x^3 e_3 = (x^0, \vec{x})\}$$

equipped with the Lorentzian scalar product

$$g(X, Y) = -x^0 y^0 + \vec{x} \cdot \vec{y} . \quad (4)$$

The *light cone* at the origin $0 = (0, \vec{0})$ is the subset of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ defined by

$$V_0 = \{X \in V, g(X, X) = 0\} .$$

Up to a scaling, the (connected component of the identity of the) Lorentz group $G = \text{SO}^o(1, 3)$ has three orbits in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, namely:

- $V_T = G \cdot e_0 = G / \text{SO}(3)$ (the *Lobachevsky space*),
- $V_S = G \cdot e_1 = G / \text{SO}(1, 2)$ (the *De Sitter space*),
- $V_0 = G \cdot p = G / \text{SE}(2)$ with $p = \frac{1}{2}(e_0 + e_1)$ (the *light cone*),

where $\text{SE}(2) = \text{SO}(2) \cdot \mathbb{R}^2$ denotes the group of unimodular isometries of the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 .

Consider the projectivisation $\mathbb{R}P^3$ of the 4-dimensional vector space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and the natural projection

$$\pi : \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}P^3 = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{1,3}) , \quad \pi(v) = [v] = \mathbb{R}v .$$

Using π , the orbits V_T , V_S and V_0 are mapped into the following three G -orbits of $\mathbb{R}P^3$:

- the unit ball $B^3 = \pi(V_T) \simeq V_T$;
- the exterior of the unit ball $\pi(V_S) \simeq V_S / \mathbb{Z}_2$;
- the *projective quadric* or *conformal sphere*,

$$\mathcal{Q} = \pi(V_0) = G / \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = G / (\mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \text{SE}(2)) .$$

The conformal sphere \mathcal{Q} has an identification with the unit sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ by means of a map determined by a choice of a unit time-like vector e_0 . Consider the three dimensional hyperplane $E_{(e_0)}^3 \simeq \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, equipped with the induced Euclidean metric,

$$E_{(e_0)}^3 = e_0 + e_0^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^{1,3} .$$

Each line $[v] = \mathbb{R}v \in \mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \mathbb{P}(e_0^\perp)$ intersects the hyperplane $E_{(e_0)}^3$ at exactly one point $\hat{v} = \mathbb{R}v \cap E_{(e_0)}^3$. This determines a diffeomorphism

$$\psi^{(e_0)} : \mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \mathbb{P}(e_0^\perp) \longrightarrow E_{(e_0)}^3 \simeq \mathbb{R}^3, \quad [v] = \mathbb{R}v \xrightarrow{\psi^{(e_0)}} \hat{v} = \mathbb{R}v \cap E_{(e_0)}^3 \quad (5)$$

and an induced map

$$\tilde{\psi}^{(e_0)} = \psi^{(e_0)}|_{\mathcal{Q}} : \mathcal{Q} = \pi(V_0) \longrightarrow S^2. \quad (6)$$

One can directly check that $\psi^{(e_0)}$ is a diffeomorphism which gives the identification $\mathcal{Q} \simeq S^2$ and induces a Riemannian metric $g^{(e_0)}$ of constant curvature on \mathcal{Q} . A different choice e'_0 of the unit time-like vector determines a new Riemannian metric $g^{(e'_0)}$ on \mathcal{Q} , which is conformal to $g^{(e_0)}$. This defines a conformal structure on $\mathcal{Q} \simeq S^2$. The group G acts on $\mathcal{Q} \simeq S^2$ as the connected Möbius group of conformal transformations.

5.2.2 The \mathcal{Q} -correlation between projective points and projective planes

The Lorentz metric (4) determines a one-to-one correspondence, called *correlation with respect to \mathcal{Q}* , between the projective points and the projective planes of $\mathbb{R}P^3$. It is given by

$$\mathbb{R}P^3 \ni [v] = \mathbb{R}v \quad \xleftrightarrow{1:1} \quad \Pi_v := \mathbb{P}(v^\perp).$$

Under this bijection, the three types of projective points $[v]$, determined by the *timelike*, *spacelike* and *lightlike* points $v \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, respectively, correspond to three kinds of projective planes, namely those not intersecting \mathcal{Q} , those tangent to \mathcal{Q} and those that intersect \mathcal{Q} :

$$\begin{aligned} [n] = \mathbb{R}n \in \pi(V_T) & \longleftrightarrow \Pi_n \text{ such that } \Pi_n \cap \mathcal{Q} = \emptyset ; \\ [m] = \mathbb{R}m \in \pi(V_S) & \longleftrightarrow \Pi_m \text{ such that } \Pi_m \cap \mathcal{Q} = S^1 ; \\ [p] = \mathbb{R}p \in \pi(V_0) & \longleftrightarrow \Pi_p \text{ such that } \Pi_p \cap \mathcal{Q} = [p] . \end{aligned}$$

Note that the map (5) establishes a bijection between the set of all projective planes different from $\mathbb{P}(e_0^\perp)$ and the affine planes in $E_{(e_0)}^3 \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$. In particular, under this correspondence, the projective planes Π_n with $e_0 \neq n \in \pi(V_T)$, are in bijection with the affine planes of \mathbb{R}^3 which do not intersect S^2 .

The following lemma is well known.

Lemma 1 *The stability subgroup $G_{[p]} = \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of a point $[p] \in \mathcal{Q} = S^2$ acts transitively on the orbit V_T and hence on the set $\{\Pi_n, [n] \in \pi(V_T)\}$ of the planes of $\mathbb{R}P^3$ not intersecting $\mathcal{Q} = S^2$.*

5.2.3 A conjecture: The remappings are given by conformal transformations

Let us identify the hyperplane $E_{(e_0)}^3 = e_0 + e_0^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ with the physical 3-dimensional Euclidean space $E^3 = \mathbb{R}^3$ and the unit sphere $S^2 \subset E_{(e_0)}^3$ with the eye sphere $S_{\text{eye}}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The diffeomorphism $\phi^{(e_0)}$ defined in (5) gives an identification between $E_{(e_0)}^3$ and $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \mathbb{P}(e_0^\perp)$ and between $S_{\text{eye}}^2 = S^2 \subset E_{(e_0)}^3$ and the conformal sphere $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}P^3$. Moreover, any Euclidean plane $\Pi \subset E_{(e_0)}^3 = E^3$, which is external to $S_{\text{eye}}^2 = S^2$, corresponds to a projective plane Π_n which is external to \mathcal{Q} , with the only exception of the plane Π_{e_0} .

Consider a plane $\Pi \simeq \Pi_n$ external to S_{eye}^2 and the associated central projection $\phi_N : \Pi \rightarrow S_{\text{eye}}^2$ defined in (1). By the map (5), this projection corresponds to a map $\phi_N : \Pi_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$. A physical rotation R_v^α of the eye, through the angle α about the axis $\mathbb{R}v$, is represented in *retinotopic coordinates* (= coordinates fixed to the eye sphere S_{eye}^2) by the inverse rotation $(R_v^\alpha)^{-1} = R_v^{-\alpha}$. In particular, from the point of view of retinotopic coordinates, an external plane $\Pi = \Pi_n$ changes into the rotated plane $\Pi' = R_v^{-\alpha}(\Pi_n)$. The *problem of remapping* is the problem of determining a bijection between Π and Π' which induces a simple relation between the points of the retina images $\phi_N(\Pi)$ and $\phi_N(\Pi')$.

About this problem, we observe that, by the previous Lemma 1, there is a Lorentz transformation $L_{\Pi, \Pi'}$ in the stability subgroup $G_{[\mathcal{F}]} \subset G = \text{SO}^o(1, 3)$ of the fovea $\mathcal{F} \in S_{\text{eye}}^2 = \mathcal{Q}$, which sends Π to Π' . This leads to the following :

Conjecture. *The brain identifies the points of Π with the points of Π' using the Lorentz transformation $L = L_{\Pi, \Pi'}$, so that the points of the corresponding retina images $\phi_N(\Pi)$, $\phi_N(\Pi')$ on $S_{\text{eye}}^2 = \mathcal{Q}$ are related one to the other by the associated conformal transformation $L|_{\mathcal{Q}}$ of $S_{\text{eye}}^2 = \mathcal{Q}$ (see Sect. 5.2.1).*

We remark that any conformal transformation of $\mathcal{Q} = S^2$ is completely determined by the images under such transformation of just three points of the sphere. This means that the images after remapping of just three retinal points are sufficient to completely reconstruct the global post-saccade retinal image, as the Gombrich Etcetera Principle states.

Note also that if the angle α of the rotation R_v^α is small (as it occurs for the microsaccades and other fixational eyes movements), then the Lorentz transformation $L = L_{\Pi, \Pi'}$ is close to the transformation $R_v^{-\alpha}$.

5.2.4 Consequences for the Alhazen Visual Stability Problem

The *visual stability problem* consists of looking for an explanation of how the brain perceives the stable objects as “stable” in spite of the changes of their retina images, which are caused by eye movements. The problem was first formulated in the eleventh century by the Persian scholar Abu 'Ali al-Hasan ibn al-Hasan ibn al-Haytham (latinised, Alhazen) and, since then, was discussed by many scientists, as R. Descartes, H. von Helmholtz, E. Mach, C. Sherrington and many others (see e.g. [40, 41]).

According to the above conjecture, the after-saccade remappings act on the retina images as conformal transformations. This relates the visual stability problem for contours with the classical mathematical problem of Conformal Geometry about the *characterisation of the curves of the conformal sphere up to conformal transformations* (that is, the conformal version of the Frenet Theory of curves of the Euclidean space). Due to the results by A. Fialkov, R. Sulanke, C. Sharp, A. Shelekhov and many others, this mathematical problem is now solved (see e.g. [14]). V. Lychagin and N. Kononenko [26] recently gave a very general and elegant solution to this problem in terms of differential invariants.

Second Part

6 Petitot's contact model and the symplectic model by Sarti, Citti and Petitot of the V1 cortex

6.1 Petitot's contact model

In 1989, W. Hoffman [19] conjectured that the V1 cortex is representable as a contact bundle over the retina. This conjecture was implemented in the contact model of the V1 cortex proposed by Petitot in the seminal work [30] that laid the foundations of neurogeometry (see also [32]). In this model the V1 cortex is identified with the projectivised cotangent bundle $\pi : PT^*R \rightarrow R$ over the retina R with its natural contact structure. In the next sections we consider some aspects of the differential geometry of the projectivised (co)tangent bundle and their relations with ordinary differential equations and Petitot's theory [32, 30, 37].

6.1.1 The projectivised tangent and cotangent bundles: the generic case

Let M be an n -dimensional manifold and $\tau : TM \rightarrow M$ (resp., $\tau' : T^*M \rightarrow M$) its tangent (resp., cotangent) bundle. Changing the fibers T_zM (resp. T_z^*M) into their projectivisation PT_zM (resp. PT_z^*M) we get the projectivised tangent bundle $\pi : PTM \rightarrow M$ (resp. cotangent bundle $\pi' : PT^*M \rightarrow M$) with fibers isomorphic to the real projective space $\mathbb{R}P^{n-1}$.

Let (x^1, \dots, x^n) be local coordinates on M , $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ the corresponding coordinate vector fields and dx^i the dual coordinate 1-forms. The associated local coordinates for the tangent bundle TM are $(x^1, \dots, x^n, v^1, \dots, v^n)$ where the v^i are the components of $v = \sum v^i \partial_i \in T_xM$. The coordinates (v^1, \dots, v^n) may be considered as homogeneous coordinates of the projective space PT_xM . In the open subsets of PTM where $v^n \neq 0$, the associated non-homogeneous coordinates are

$$u^1 = \frac{v^1}{v^n}, \quad \dots \quad u^{n-1} = \frac{v^{n-1}}{v^n}.$$

This gives local coordinates $(x^1, \dots, x^n, u^1, \dots, u^{n-1})$ for PTM . The projectivised tangent bundle PTM is naturally identified with the space of the 1-jets of the non-parametrised curves of M and, hence, it may be also considered

as the space of the (first order) infinitesimal curves (or contours) in M . Any section (i.e. any field of orientations)

$$s : M \longrightarrow PTM, \quad x \longmapsto [v_x] = \mathbb{R}v_x \in PT_x M$$

defines a first order ODE in the manifold M . The solutions of such equation are the non-parametrised curves γ in M whose tangent lines $[\dot{\gamma}_x]$, $x \in \gamma$, coincide with the lines $[v_x]$. In local non-homogeneous coordinates $(x^i, u^j = \frac{v^j}{v^1})$, the ODE associated with the section s reduces to the following system

$$\frac{dx^j(x^1)}{dx^1} = u^j(x^1, x^2, \dots, x^n), \quad j = 2, \dots, n.$$

Similarly, any set of local coordinates (x^i) for M defines an associated system of local coordinates (x^i, p_j) for the cotangent bundle T^*M , where the p_j are the components of the 1-forms $p = p_1 dx^1 + \dots + p_n dx^n \in T^*M$. In the coordinate domain where $p_n \neq 0$, the projectivised cotangent bundle is identified with the hypersurface $H = \{p_n = 1\} \subset T^*M$ with coordinates

$$(x^1, \dots, x^n, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}).$$

The projectivised cotangent bundle PT^*M is equipped with the canonical contact structure (= maximally non integrable field of hyperspaces) $\mathcal{D} \subset T(PT^*M)$, given by the projectivised spaces of the kernel distribution $\ker \lambda \subset T(T^*M)$ of the *Liouville 1-form* of $\tau' : T^*(T^*M) \rightarrow T^*M$

$$\lambda : T^*M \longrightarrow T^*(T^*M), \quad p \longmapsto \lambda_p := (\tau')^* p.$$

In terms of the coordinates (x^i, p_j) of T^*M , the 1-form λ is just the tautological 1-form

$$p = p_i dx^i \longmapsto \lambda_p = p_i dx^i.$$

The restriction $\lambda_H = p_1 dx^1 + \dots + p_{n-1} dx^{n-1} + dx^n$ of the Liouville form to $H = \{p_n = 1\}$ is a contact form. It defines the contact distribution $\mathcal{D}_H = \ker \lambda_H \subset TH$, spanned by the vector fields

$$\partial_{p_j}, \quad \partial_{x_j} - p_j \partial_{x_n}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

6.1.2 The projectivised tangent and cotangent bundles: the case of a 2-dimensional manifold

Let us now assume that the manifold M is 2-dimensional. In this case, the projectivised tangent and cotangent bundles have a canonical identification

$$PTM = PT^*M$$

determined in the following way: any line $[v] = \mathbb{R}v \in PTM$, generated by some vector $0 \neq v \in T_x M$, is identified with the element $[v^0] \in PT_x^* M$ determined by

the annihilator $0 \neq v^0 \in T_x^*M$ of the line $\mathbb{R}v$. Vice versa, any line $[p] \in PT_x^*M$ gets identified with the line $[p^0] \in T_xM$ for some $0 \neq p^0 \in \ker p$.

Let (x, y) be local coordinates of M and (x, y, p_1, p_2) the associated coordinates for the covectors $p = p_1 dx + p_2 dy \in T_{(x,y)}^*M$. In the open subset with $p_2 \neq 0$, the manifold PT^*M is identified with the hypersurface $H := \{p_2 = 1\} \subset T^*M$. It has the coordinates $x, y, p = -p_1$ and consists of the covectors $\eta = dy - p dx \in T_{(x,y)}^*M$, corresponding to the lines of the (annihilating) vectors $\eta^0 = [\partial_x + p \partial_y] \in PTM$.

The kernel distribution

$$\mathcal{D}_H = \ker \lambda_H \subset TH$$

is contact: It is spanned by the pair of vector fields ∂_p and $\partial_x + p \partial_y$. A section

$$s : M \rightarrow PT^*M = PTM, \quad (x, y) \mapsto [v_{(x,y)}] = [v^1 \partial_x + v^2 \partial_y],$$

that is a *field of orientations*, defines a first order ODE, which in a coordinate domain where $v^1 \neq 0$ has the form

$$\left. \frac{dy}{dx} \right|_x = p(x, y), \quad \text{where} \quad p(x, y) := \frac{v^2(x, y)}{v^1(x, y)} = \tan \theta.$$

Here θ denotes the *orientation* of the covector p : It is the angle between the coordinate direction ∂_x and the line $\mathbb{R}v(x, y)$ with respect to any conformally flat metric $g = \lambda(x, y)(dx^2 + dy^2)$.

We now recall that any (smooth) function $F(x, y)$ on M defines the section of the cotangent bundle T^*M given by

$$dF(x, y) = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} dx + \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} dy \right) \Big|_{(x,y)}.$$

Removing the critical points of F , we get an open subset $M' \subset M$, on which the section $dF : M' \rightarrow T^*M'$ determines a section $[dF] : M' \rightarrow PT^*M' = PTM'$. On the other hand, we recall that locally PT^*M' can be identified with the hypersurface $H = \{p_2 = 1\} \subset T^*M'$ by the map

$$[p_1 dx + p_2 dy] \in PT^*M \mapsto dy + \frac{p_1}{p_2} dx \in H \subset T^*M.$$

Under this identification, the section $[dF]$ has the form

$$[dF] = dy - p(x, y) dx \quad \text{with} \quad p(x, y) = -\frac{\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}}{\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}}.$$

The associated field of orientations $[\partial_x + p(x, y) \partial_y]$ defines the ODE

$$\frac{dy}{dx} = p(x, y). \quad (7)$$

Since the vector field $Z = \partial_x + p(x, y) \partial_y$ preserves the function $F(x, y)$, the integral curves of the ODE are level sets of the function $F(x, y)$, i.e. they are the *contours* determined by F .

6.1.3 The relation between the S^1 -bundle $S(M)$ and the projectivised cotangent bundle of a 2-dimensional manifold

Let g be a Riemannian metric on a 2-dimensional manifold M and $S(M) = S(M, g) \rightarrow M$ the associated S^1 -bundle, given by all unit vectors $v \in T_z M$, $z \in M$, or, equivalently, by the set of all unit covectors $\xi = g(v, \cdot)$, i.e. the hypersurface in T^*M

$$S(M) = \{ \xi \in T^*M, g^{-1}(\xi, \xi) = 1 \}.$$

The total space $S(M)$ of this bundle can be identified with the space of the infinitesimal *oriented* contours and it is equipped with a natural contact structure, given by the contact form $\lambda|_{S(M)}$ obtained by restricting the Liouville form λ of T^*M to $S(M)$.

The contact bundle $S(M) \rightarrow M$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -covering of the contact bundle $PT^*M \rightarrow M$, with projection $\tilde{\pi} : S(M) \rightarrow PT^*M$ given by the map that identifies opposite (co)vectors. Local coordinates (x, y) of M define local coordinates $(x, y, \hat{\theta})$ for $S(M)$, where $\hat{\theta} \in [-\pi, \pi]$ is the angle between the coordinate direction $0x$ and the unit vector $v \in S(M)$.

Any simple smooth curve γ in M has two orientations, determined by the two different ways of moving along γ . Each orientation determines a canonical natural parametrisation $\gamma(t)$ by the arc length t and the canonical lift to $S(M)$

$$\gamma(t) \mapsto (\gamma(t), \hat{\theta}(t)) = \dot{\gamma}(t).$$

Remark. The S^1 -bundles $S(M) \rightarrow M$ and $PTM \rightarrow M$ are locally isomorphic by means of the natural local diffeomorphism

$$(x, y, \hat{\theta}) \rightarrow \left(x, y, \theta = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2} \right).$$

In many papers (see e.g. [3, 37]), the orientation is defined as the angle coordinate $\hat{\theta} \in [-\pi, \pi]$ of $S(M)$. In the discussion below, we will ignore the difference between θ and $\hat{\theta}$ and we will denote by θ the angle coordinate of PTM , so that a line $\xi = [p_1 dx + p_2 dy] \in PT^*_{(x,y)} M$ with $p_2 \neq 0$ has coordinates $(x, y, p = \frac{p_1}{p_2})$. In other words, the triple (x, y, p) corresponds to the projective line, generated by 1-form $dy - p dx$. In term of these coordinates the contact structure $\mathcal{D} = \ker \eta$ is defined by the contact form $\eta := dy - p dx$.

6.1.4 Petitot's contact model

In [30] Petitot identified the retina R with the Euclidean plane $R = \mathbb{R}^2$ with Euclidean coordinates (x, y) and proposed to represent the V1 cortex by the projectivised cotangent bundle

$$\pi : PT^*(\mathbb{R}^2) = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \longrightarrow R = \mathbb{R}^2.$$

In this bundle the fiber $S_z^1 = \pi^{-1}(z)$ at a point $z = (x, y)$ is the projective line (that is, a circle) $PT_z(\mathbb{R}^2) \simeq \mathbb{R}P^1 = S^1$ with the natural coordinate $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ (= the *orientation*) given by the angle between each line $[v]$ and the coordinate line $\mathbb{R}\partial_x$. In Petitot's model, each fiber $\pi^{-1}(z)$ of $PT(\mathbb{R}^2)$ corresponds to a pinwheel with RF z and the simple neurons of such pinwheel are parametrised by their orientations θ .

Let $I(x, y)$ be a (regularised) input function on retina and $C = \{I(x, y) = \text{const.}\}$ a retinal contour. It is a non-parametrised curve, but we may always choose a parametrisation for it, say $z(t) = (x(t), y(t))$, $t \in (a, b)$. If we also assume that $\dot{x}(t) \neq 0$, we may change the parameter t to x and represent the contour C as $z(x) = (x, y(x))$. Denote by $\theta(x) \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ the orientation of the curve $z(x)$. This means that $(x, y(x))$ is a solution to the ODE

$$\frac{dy(x)}{dx} = p(x) := \tan \theta(x). \quad (8)$$

The simple neuron of the pinwheel $S_{z_o}^1 = \pi^{-1}(z_o) = PT(\mathbb{R}^2)|_{z_o}$, corresponding to the orientation θ_o , fires when the contour $C = z(x)$ passes through $z_o = (x_o, y_o)$ and has the orientation $\theta(x_o) = \theta_o$ at that point. It follows that the curve $c(x) = (x, y(x), \theta(x))$ in $PT^*\mathbb{R}^2$, made of all the fired neurons, is a lift of the retinal curve $z(x) = (x, y(x))$ to the V1 cortex $PT^*\mathbb{R}^2$.

The lifted curve $c(x) = (x, y(x), \theta(x))$ is *horizontal*, i.e. it is tangent to the contact distribution \mathcal{D}_H at each point. Indeed, at any point its velocity is

$$\dot{c}(x) = \partial_x + \frac{dy}{dx} \partial_y + \dot{\theta}(x) \partial_\theta \in T(PT\mathbb{R}^2) \simeq TH,$$

which implies that

$$\lambda_H(\dot{c}(x)) = (dy - \tan \theta dx)(\dot{c}(x)) = \frac{dy}{dx} - p(x) = 0.$$

Such horizontal lift to the contact bundle PT^*M is called the *Legendrian lift* of the curve $c(x)$. Due to this, we may say that *the firings of the simple neurons in the pinwheels of the V1 cortex carry out the Legendrian lifts of the contours*. One of the main aims of the processing of the visual system is to integrate the information, which is encoded in the firings of the neurons, and obtain a global description of the curves (contours) that are solutions to the differential equation (8).

The most important retinal contours are the closed contours, which constitute the boundaries of the retinal images of the three dimensional objects. A closed contour divides the retinal plane into two parts. The orientation of the contour allows to determine in which part the image is located.

It would be interesting to understand where and how the visual system determines the orientation of the contours, that is how it lifts the curves of *non-oriented* infinitesimal contours of PT^*R to the curves of *oriented* infinitesimal contours in $S(R)$. Indeed, optical illusions show that when each of the two sides of a closed contour admit meaningful interpretations, the visual system

involuntarily and periodically changes the orientation of the contour. This shows that the orientation of a contour is determined in the higher level of the visual system.

6.2 Sarti, Citti and Petitot's symplectic model

In [37], the authors proposed a symplectisation of Petitot's contact model. They assumed that each simple cell of the V1 cortex is characterised not only by its orientation θ and the point $z \in R$ of the retina, corresponding to its RF, but also by a new parameter σ , called *scaling*. It represents the intensity of the reply to a stimulus. This assumption leads to the extension of Petitot's contact model to the so called *symplectic model*, described as follows. According to this model, the V1 cortex is represented by the principle bundle over the retina $R = \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\pi : P = \mathbb{C}^* \times R \longrightarrow R ,$$

where $\mathbb{C}^* = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^+ = \{\sigma e^{i\theta}\}$ is the group of non zero complex numbers. The \mathbb{C}^* -bundle P can be also identified with the group $P = G$ of similarities of \mathbb{R}^2

$$G := \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = (\mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \text{SO}(2)) \ltimes T_{\mathbb{R}^2} = \mathbb{C}^* \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2 ,$$

where $T_{\mathbb{R}^2} = T_{\mathbb{C}}$ denotes the group of the parallel translations. The same bundle can be also identified with the cotangent bundle with zero section removed $T_{\sharp}^* R$ of the retina. The manifold $P = T_{\sharp}^* R$ has a natural *symplectic structure*, given by the non-degenerate closed 2-form $\omega = d\lambda$ determined by the Liouville form λ . We call the symplectic bundle $\pi : P = G = T_{\sharp}^* R \rightarrow R$ the *Sarti-Citti-Petitot (SCP) bundle*.

The correspondence between simple neurons and elements of the group G is given in detail as follows. Consider the mother Gabor filters $\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^\pm}$, whose RP are the real and imaginary parts of the complex RP defined in Sect. 2.5

$$\gamma_0^{\mathbb{C}}(z) := \gamma_0(z)e^{iy} = e^{-1/2|z|^2+iy} = \gamma_0^+(z) + i\gamma_0^-(z) ,$$

and denote by (n_0^+, n_0^-) the neurons working as the mother Gabor filters $(\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^+}, \mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_0^-})$. As we explained in Sect. 2.5, any element $a \cdot T_b \in G = \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$, transforms the pair of (γ_0^+, γ_0^-) into the pair $(\gamma_{a,b}^+, \gamma_{a,b}^-)$ defined in (3). The symplectic model is based on the assumption that *the simple neurons $(n_{a,b}^+, n_{a,b}^-)$ work as the Gabor filters $(\mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_{a,b}^+}, \mathcal{G}ab_{\gamma_{a,b}^-})$ and are therefore parameterised by the elements the similarity group $G = \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}^* \times R$.*

6.3 Sarti, Citti and Petitot's Principle of Maximal Selectivity

In [37], Sarti, Citti and Petitot also discuss the principle of maximal selectivity, which they formulate as follows:

“The intracortical circuitry is able to filter out all the spurious directions and to strictly keep the direction of maximum response of the simple cells”.

According to this principle, for any input function $I : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, at each point $z = (x, y) \in R$, the visual system selects the pair $(\bar{\theta}_z, \bar{\sigma}_z)$ which corresponds to the neuron with RF z that provides the maximal output for the stimulus. This determines a section of the SCP bundle $\pi : P \rightarrow R$:

$$\rho : R \rightarrow P, \quad \rho(z) := (z, \bar{\theta}_z, \bar{\sigma}_z)$$

Since P is identified with the cotangent bundle $P = T_{\sharp}^*R$, this section can be considered as 1-form ρ on R . Sarti, Citti and Petitot proved that ρ is closed and hence that the surface $\rho(R) \subset T_{\sharp}^*R$ is Lagrangian.

We remark that, for each $z \in R$, the neuron with RF in z and with maximal response must be among those whose Gabor filters detect the orientation of the line $\mathbb{R}v$, $0 \neq v \in \ker dI(z)$, with I input function. This means that the 1-form ρ must have the form $\rho(z) = \lambda(z)dI(z)$ for a function $\lambda(z)$ which depends on the definition of the scaling factors σ . We conjecture that the function λ can be assumed to be constant and that, up to a constant, the restriction of ρ along contours can be identified with their Legendrian lifts.

7 Bressloff and Cowan's spherical model for the hypercolumns of the V1 cortex

P. Bressloff and J. Cowan [3–5] proposed a Riemannian spherical model for a hypercolumn, which is based on two parameters: the orientation θ and the spatial frequency p . They assumed that a hypercolumn H is a domain in the V1 cortex, associated with two pinwheels S, N , corresponding to the minimal and maximal values p_+, p_- of the spatial frequency. According to such a model, the simple neurons of the hypercolumn H are parametrised by their orientation θ and their *normalised spatial frequency* ϕ , given by

$$\phi = \pi \frac{\log(p/p_-)}{\log(p_+/p_-)}.$$

The definition of ϕ is done in such a way that it runs exactly between 0 and π . For any choice of θ and ϕ , the corresponding simple neuron $n = n(\theta, \phi)$ fires only if a stimulus occurs in its RF with orientation θ and normalised spatial frequency ϕ .

Bressloff and Cowan proposed to consider the parameters θ and ϕ as spherical coordinates, with $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ corresponding to the *longitude* and $\phi = \phi' + \pi/2 \in [0, \pi]$ to the *polar angle* or *shifted latitude* (with $\phi' = \phi - \pi/2$

latitude in the usual sense). The shifted latitudes of the pinwheels S, N are $0, \pi$, but the longitude (=orientation) is not defined for them – in fact, the pinwheels are able to detect contours of *any* orientation. Bressloff and Cowan identify the hypercolumn H with the sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$, equipped with the spherical coordinates θ, ϕ . The two pinwheels S, N of H are identified with the south and the north pole of the sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$.

The union of the RF's of the neurons of a column (resp. hypercolumn) is called *the RF of the column (resp. hypercolumn)*. We assume that the RF of the simple neurons are small and can be considered just as points. This assumption yields to a map from the sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$ (representing the hypercolumn H) into a corresponding region $R_H \subset R$ of the retina, which represents the RF of H :

$$z : H_{BC} = S^2 \longrightarrow R_H = z(S^2), \quad n \longmapsto z(n) = \text{receptive fields of } n.$$

The restriction of this map to the complement of the pinwheels N and S may be considered as a bijection (actually, a diffeomorphism)

$$z : H_{BC} \setminus \{S, N\} \longrightarrow R_H \setminus \{z(S), z(N)\}$$

(see Fig.1 and Fig.2). This shows that, in the Bressloff and Cowan spherical model, the parameters θ, ψ are considered as coordinates for the domain $R_H \subset R$ and not as internal parameters.

Bressloff and Cowan used their model to describe the evolution of the excitation of the visual neurons according to the Wolfson-Cowan equation and got many very interesting results. However, in their spherical model the internal parameters are missing and their discussion is mostly focused on the simple neurons of the regular columns.

Note that in the spherical model, the orientation θ is a coordinate on the retina. In the symplectic SCP model the orientation is considered as an internal parameter since only singular points (pinwheels) are considered.

In Sect. 9, we propose a conformal modification of Bressloff-Cowan's model. It is based on the deep idea of Sarti, Citti and Petitot's model that the simple neurons are all obtained from a fixed "mother" neuron by some group of transformations. In the next Sect. 8 we precede the presentation of such conformal modification with a short review of some basic facts on the Riemann spinor model of conformal sphere and on the stereographic projections of S^2 on the plane.




Fig. 1 – Map of orientation, ocular dominance and spatial frequency in V1.
Filled regions correspond to low spatial frequencies, unfilled to high
(Source [5])




Fig. 2 – Map of iso-orientation preference contours (black lines), ocular dominance boundaries (white lines), and spatial frequency preferences of cells in V1.
Red regions correspond to low spatial frequency preference, violet to high
(Source [3])

8 The conformal sphere and the stereographic projections

8.1 The Riemannian spinor model of the conformal sphere

Let us identify the sphere S^2 with the *Riemann sphere*, i.e. the one-point compactification of the complex plane $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2$

$$S^2 = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} ,$$

with the south and north poles identified with the points $S = 0$, $N = \infty$, respectively, and equipped with the standard complex coordinates z for $S^2 \setminus N = \mathbb{C}$ and $w := \frac{1}{z}$ for $S^2 \setminus S = (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \cup \{\infty\}$.

The group $G = \mathrm{SL}(2\mathbb{C})$ acts on $S^2 = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ as the conformal group of the fractional linear transformations

$$z \mapsto Az = \frac{az + b}{cz + d}, \quad a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \det A = 1 ,$$

with kernel $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{\pm \mathrm{Id}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}}\}$. Consider the Gauss decomposition of the group $G = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$:

$$G = G^- \cdot G^0 \cdot G^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mathbb{C} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{C} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad a \in \mathbb{C}^* .$$

The stability subgroups $G_S, G_N \subset G$ of the points $S = 0$ and $N = \infty$ are

$$G_S = B_- , \quad G_N = B_+ , \quad \text{where} \quad B_{\mp} := G_0 \cdot G^{\mp} \simeq \mathrm{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathrm{CO}(2) \cdot \mathbb{R}^2 .$$

Therefore, as a homogeneous manifold, the sphere $S^2 = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is identified with the coset space

$$S^2 = G/B_{\mp} = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})/\mathrm{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) .$$

The *conformal sphere* is the classical sphere S^2 , but considered as the homogeneous space $S^2 = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})/\mathrm{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, thus equipped with the conformal structure which is preserved by the group of transformations $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

8.2 The stereographic projections of the sphere onto the tangent planes at the poles

The *stereographic projection* st_N of S^2 from the north pole N onto the tangent plane Π at the south pole S is the G_N -equivariant conformal mapping

$$\mathrm{st}_N : S^2 \longrightarrow \Pi := T_S S^2$$

that sends each point A of the punctured sphere $S^2 \setminus \{N\}$ (considered as a surface of \mathbb{R}^3) to the point of the intersection \bar{A} between the tangent plane Π (considered as a plane in \mathbb{R}^3) and the ray $\ell_{NA} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with origin N and passing through A .

The map st_N naturally defines complex coordinates on the sphere S^2 as follows. Assume that the sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is defined by the equation

$$X^2 + Y^2 + (Z - 1/2)^2 = 1/4$$

and that $S = (0, 0, 0)$. Then the tangent plane $\Pi = T_S S^2$ (considered as a plane in \mathbb{R}^3) is the plane $Z = 0$ with induced coordinates (x, y) . If we identify Π with the complex line $\Pi = \mathbb{C}$ with complex coordinate $z = x + iy$, the stereographic projection takes the form

$$\text{st}_N : S^2 \ni A = (X, Y, Z) \mapsto z = x + iy := \frac{X + iY}{1 - Z}$$

and its inverse map is

$$\text{st}_N^{-1} : \Pi \ni z = x + iy \mapsto (X, Y, Z) = \frac{1}{1 + |z|^2} (x, y, |z|^2).$$

This expression allows to consider $z = x + iy$ as a holomorphic coordinate on $S^2 \setminus \{N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

A similar definition gives the *stereographic projection* $\text{st}_S : S^2 \setminus \{S\} \rightarrow \Pi' := T_N S^2$ from the south pole. It determines a holomorphic coordinate w on $S^2 \setminus \{S\}$, which satisfies $w = \frac{1}{z}$ on $S^2 \setminus \{N, S\}$. This motivates the previous identification of S^2 as the Riemann sphere $S^2 = \hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

In the holomorphic coordinates z and $w = \frac{1}{z}$, the conformal action of the stability subgroup $G_N = B_+ \simeq \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ on S^2 becomes affine:

$$G_N \ni A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix} : z \mapsto Az = a'z + b' \quad \text{where} \quad a' := a^2, \quad b' := ab.$$

and the lower triangular nilpotent group G^- acts as

$$G^- \ni C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{pmatrix} : z \mapsto C(z) = \frac{z}{1 + cz} = z(1 - cz + (cz)^2 - \dots)$$

We remark that G^- acts as the group of fractional linear transformations which is generated by the holomorphic vector field $z^2 \partial_z$ and acts trivially on the tangent plane $\Pi = T_S S^2$.

9 A conformal spherical model for the hypercolumns and associated reduced model

We now present the conformal modification of Bressloff and Cowan's model of hypercolumns that we advertised above. Let us recall the following two crucial points of Bressloff and Cowan's model:

(a) a hypercolumn H is identified with the sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$ in such a way that the north and south pole of S^2 are identified with the two pinwheels N

and S of H ;

(b) the two parameters (θ, ϕ) for the simple neurons of

$$H \setminus \{N, S\} = S^2 \setminus \{\text{north, south}\}$$

can be also taken as local coordinates for the RF of the hypercolumn H . This implies that these two parameters *cannot be considered as internal parameters*.

We propose to modify such a model by considering each hypercolumn H as a domain in the V1 cortex, which consists of a family of (pairs of) simple cells, parameterised by the elements of the Möbius group $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ of the conformal transformations of S^2 . In this modified model, the simple cells of H no longer correspond to the points of S^2 , but to the elements of the total space of the fiber bundle over the retinal domain $R_H \subset R$

$$G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\pi} S^2 = G/B_{\mp} \xrightarrow{\pi_{BC}} R_H .$$

Note that, geometrically, the bundle $\pi : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow S^2$ is the *Cartan bundle of the second order conformal frames over S^2* (for definition and main properties of this Cartan bundle, see e.g. [23]). Notice also that this model offers a physiological realisation of Tits' presentation of the homogeneous space $S^2 = G/B_{\mp}$. We recall that, according to Tits' point of view, the points of a homogeneous space G/K are identified with the subgroups that are conjugated to a fixed subgroup K . In our case $K = B_{\mp} \simeq \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Tits' approach is important for the extension of the theory of homogeneous spaces to the discrete case. We therefore hope that it will have useful consequences in neurogeometry.

In the proposed model *each point $p \in S^2$ corresponds to a family of simple cells*, which is parameterised by the points of the fiber $G_p = \pi^{-1}(p)$, i.e. the four dimensional stability subgroup $G_p \subset G$. In particular, the north and south poles of the Bressloff and Cowan's model $H_{BC} = S^2$ are now corresponding to the family of simple cells parameterised by the elements of the two subgroups

$$\pi^{-1}(S) = G_S = B_- , \quad \pi^{-1}(N) = G_N = B_+ .$$

Let us discuss in more details the correspondence between the simple cells of the hypercolumn H and the elements of $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. Consider

$$z = x + iy = re^{i\theta'} , \quad w = u + iv = \frac{1}{z}$$

as complex coordinates for the tangent planes $T_S S^2 \simeq \mathbb{C}$ and $T_N S^2 \simeq \mathbb{C}$, and use them as (stereographic) coordinates for $S^2 \setminus \{N\} = \text{st}_N^{-1}(T_S S^2)$ and $S^2 \setminus \{S\} = \text{st}_S^{-1}(T_N S^2)$, respectively.

Note that $r = |z|$ and $\theta' = \arg(z)$ are related with Bressloff and Cowan's coordinates (θ, ϕ) of $H_{BC} = S^2$ by

$$r = 2 \tan(\phi/2), \quad \theta' = \theta. \quad (9)$$

In particular, the spatial frequency p is related with the modulus $r = |z|$ of the stereographic coordinate by

$$r = 2 \tan(\phi/2) = 2 \tan\left(\pi \frac{\log(p/p_-)}{\log(p_+/p_-)}\right). \quad (10)$$

Let us now denote by

$$n_S = (n_S^+, n_S^-) \quad \text{and} \quad n_N = (n_N^+, n_N^-)$$

the pairs of (even and odd) neurons, which work as the even and odd mother Gabor filters, associated with the complex RP

$$\gamma_S^{\mathbb{C}}(z) := \gamma_S(z)e^{iy} = e^{-1/2|z|^2+iy}, \quad \gamma_N^{\mathbb{C}}(w) := \gamma_0(w)e^{iv} = e^{-1/2|w|^2+iv},$$

respectively. Finally, let us denote by $S_S^2 = \{\phi < 0\}$ and $S_N^2 = \{\phi > 0\}$ the lower and higher hemispheres of S^2 , respectively.

Our main assumption is that each simple (even and odd) neuron $n_A = (n_A^+, n_A^-)$, corresponding to an element $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \pi^{-1}(S_S^2)$, is modelled by the Gabor filter with RP

$$\gamma_A^{\mathbb{C}}(z) = A^*(\gamma_S^{\mathbb{C}}(z)) := A^*(\gamma_S^+(z) + i\gamma_S^-(z)) = |cz + d|^4 e^{-|z'|^2+2iy'} \quad (11)$$

where $z' = x' + iy' = A^{-1}z = \frac{dz - b}{-cz + a}$.

In other words, the complex Gabor filter of $n_A = (n_A^+, n_A^-)$ is the filter obtained by the action of the transformation A on the complex mother Gabor filter with RP $\gamma_S^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$.

Similarly, the neurons $n_{A'} = (n_{A'}^+, n_{A'}^-)$ associated with the elements $A' \in G^+ = \pi^{-1}(S_N^2) \subset \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ are modelled by the Gabor filters with the RP

$$\gamma_{A'}^{\mathbb{C}}(w) = A'^*(\gamma_N^{\mathbb{C}}(w)) := A'^*(\gamma_S^+(w) + i\gamma_S^-(w)).$$

At this point it is important to observe that, physiologically, the hypercolumn H consists of a *finite* number of cells. Due to this, it is not realistic to parameterise them by a *non-compact* set, i.e. by the full group $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. To tackle this problem, we correct our original assumptions and assume that H is parameterised by the elements of a *relatively compact subset* of $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ of the form

$$K = K^- \cdot K^0 \cdot K^+,$$

where the sets K^δ , $\delta \in \{-, 0, +\}$, are defined by

$$K^\delta = \{A \in G^\delta : \|A - I\|^2 = \text{Tr}((A - I)\overline{(A - I)}^T) < \rho^2\}$$

for some fixed constant $\rho > 0$. We now need the following theorem.

Theorem 3 Let $\rho > 0$ be a constant such that all elements $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ of the compact subset $K^- \subset G^-$ satisfy $|c| < \rho$. For any given $\varepsilon > 0$, the disc $\Delta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\rho\varepsilon}} \subset \mathbb{C} \simeq S^2 \setminus \{N\}$ of radius $\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\rho\varepsilon}$ and center $0(=S)$ is such that for any $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in K_\rho^-$ and $z \in \Delta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\rho\varepsilon}}$

$$|Az - z| < \varepsilon .$$

Proof It suffices to observe that if $A \in K_\rho^-$ and $z \in \Delta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\rho\varepsilon}}$, then

$$|Az - z| = \left| \frac{z}{cz + 1} - z \right| = \frac{|c||z|^2}{|1 - |c||z||} < \varepsilon \left(\frac{\rho\varepsilon}{(1 + \rho\varepsilon)^2} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\rho\varepsilon}{1 + \rho\varepsilon}} \right) = \varepsilon . \quad \square$$

This theorem shows that, in our model, on a sufficiently small neighbourhood \mathcal{U}_S of the south pinwheel $S \simeq 0$, all elements of the compact set K^- act essentially as the identity map.

Due to this, we may consider a *reduced model*, according to which the neurons, that correspond to the set $\mathcal{W} = \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_S) \subset K$, are parameterised only by the four-dimensional domain $K^0 \cdot K^+$. In other words, the neurons associated with a small neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_S \subset S^2$ are parameterised by the elements of the 2-dimensional fiber bundle $\pi_S : K^0 \cdot K^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_S$.

For simplicity, let us now consider the bundle $\pi_S : K^0 \cdot K^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_S$ as a relatively compact portion of the bundle with two dimensional fiber

$$\pi_S : G^0 \cdot G^+ \rightarrow G^+ = G^0 \cdot G^+ / G^0 \simeq \mathbb{C} \simeq S^2 \setminus \{N\} .$$

We recall that

- the group $G^+ = \mathbb{C}$ acts on $G^+ = G^0 \cdot G^+ / G^0$ by the parallel translations

$$z \mapsto z + b ;$$

- the group $G^0 = \mathbb{C}^*$ acts on G^+ by rotations and homotheties

$$z \mapsto az , \quad a = \lambda e^{i\alpha} .$$

Hence, $G^0 \cdot G^+$ can be identified with the similarity group $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ and our bundle $\pi_S : G^0 \cdot G^+ \rightarrow G^+ \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ is seen to be exactly the SCP bundle $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$.

Remark. The reduced model (which so far has been introduced only for small neighbourhoods of the pinwheels S and N) can be defined also for small neighbourhoods of any other two antipodal points $S', N' \in S^2$. In fact, given such a pair S', N' , with for instance S' in the southern hemisphere, we may always consider:

- a rotation $A \in \text{SO}(2) \subset \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ such that $S' = A(S)$ and $N' = A(N)$
- the corresponding new system of spherical coordinates (ϕ', θ') (with new parallels and meridians) determined by the new poles S', N' .

The above reduced model can be almost verbatim re-defined for any sufficiently small neighbourhood of S' or N' using the new latitude and longitude (ϕ', θ') .

The collection of all reduced models that can be constructed in this way is parameterised by the set of the antipodal pairs (S', N') and it can be considered as a *globalised (reduced) model* for the hypercolumn H . According to such globalised model, any simple neuron corresponding to a sufficiently small region near a point S' works in term of appropriate new coordinates (ϕ', θ') , which are related with the original Bressloff and Cowan coordinates (ϕ, θ) by a rotation $A \in \text{SO}(2)$.

10 Comparison between the reduced conformal model and the Sarti-Citti-Petitot symplectic model

In this section we compare Sarti, Citti and Petitot's model of the V1 cortex with our reduced conformal model.

Both models concerns collections of simple neurons: Sarti, Citti and Petitot's model is for the simple neurons of the pinwheels of the V1 cortex, while our reduced conformal model is for the simple neurons of a hypercolumn. In both models, the collections of simple neurons are identified with a corresponding family of Gabor filters, obtained from a fixed *mother Gabor filter* by the transformations of a group G . In both cases, the group G is $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, but in our reduced model such a group is a reduction of a larger group, namely $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

The construction of Gabor filters from a single mother filter leads to a parameterisation of neurons by (a relatively compact subset of) the total space G of the SCP bundle

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : G = \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{U} \text{ where } \mathcal{U} \text{ is a retinal region } R \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ &\text{(in symplectic model) or is an appropriate small domain of} \\ &\text{the receptive field } R_H \text{ of a hypercolumn } H \text{ (in our reduced model) .} \end{aligned}$$

The group $G = \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{C}^* \cdot \mathbb{C}$ is 4-dimensional and, following Tits' realisation of homogeneous spaces, each $z \in \mathcal{U}$ is identified with the quotient G/G_z with $G_z \subset G$ stabiliser of z . All stabilisers $G_z \simeq \mathbb{C}^*$, $z \in \mathcal{U}$, are isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and, choosing a fixed stabiliser G_{z_o} , the bundle can be trivialised into

$$\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \simeq \mathcal{U} \times G_{z_o} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{C}^* \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^* .$$

In both models, the polar coordinates (ϕ, θ) for the stabiliser $G_{z_o} = \mathbb{C}^* = \{\phi e^{i\theta}\}$ admit a double interpretation:

- (a) They can be considered as fiber coordinates for the (locally trivialised) bundle $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{C}^2) \simeq \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and, for each point $z \in \mathcal{U} \subset R$, they parameterise all simple neurons with RF equal to z . According to this interpretation, they are *internal parameters*.

- (b) There is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $G_{z_o} = \mathbb{C}^*$ and the points of $\mathcal{U} \setminus \{z_o\} \subset R$. Indeed, one may just consider the natural action of $G_{z_o} = \mathbb{C}^*$ on \mathbb{C} and use it to determine a bijection between G_{z_o} and the orbit $G_{z_o} \cdot z'$ of some $z' \neq z_o$. For instance if we assume $z_o = 0$ and $z' = 1$ we have the (identity) map

$$\iota : \mathbb{C}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{z_o = 0\} = \mathbb{C}^* , \quad \phi e^{i\theta} \xrightarrow{\iota} \phi e^{i\theta} \cdot 1 .$$

This bijection allows to consider the pairs (ϕ, θ) also as (polar) coordinates on $\mathcal{U} \setminus \{z_o\} \subset R$, i.e. as *external parameters*.

However we stress the fact that two models refer to very different physiological objects, namely:

- In Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s model, the SCP bundle $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ represents the simple neurons of the pinwheels of V1 cortex. The basis \mathcal{U} of the bundle represents the region of the retina R , given by the RF of all such pinwheels.
- In our reduced conformal model, the SCP bundle $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ parameterises the simple neurons (not necessarily belonging to a pinwheel) corresponding to a small region of a hypercolumn. The basis \mathcal{U} represents the RF of such simple neurons, which are near one of the two pinwheels S or N of the hypercolumn (or near any other point of the Bressloff and Cowan sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$).

11 The V1 reduced conformal models and improvements of the symplectic model for the V1 cortex

We now want to discuss how our reduced model of hypercolumns leads to an extension of Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s symplectic model of the V1 cortex.

Given a hypercolumn H , let us decompose the corresponding Bressloff and Cowan’s sphere $H_{BC} = S^2$ as the union $S^2 = \Sigma_+ \cup \Sigma_-$ of its (southern and northern) hemispheres $\Sigma_{\text{south}} = \Sigma_-$ and $\Sigma_{\text{north}} = \Sigma_+$. According to our reduced model, the systems of simple neurons corresponding to these two hemispheres are represented by the two bundles $\pi_{\pm} : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{C}^* \times \Sigma_{\pm} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\pm}$. These two sets of neurons detect stimuli of low spatial frequencies and of high spatial frequencies, respectively (see Fig. 1). In Sarti, Citti and Petitot’s approach, for each hemisphere we should consider just the neurons of the unique pinwheel (S or N) of the hemisphere. In this way the south hemisphere Σ_- (resp. north hemisphere Σ_+) is represented just by the fiber $\pi_-^{-1}(S) = \mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \text{SO}(2)$ (resp. $\pi_+^{-1}(N) = \mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \text{SO}(2)$).

This idea, combined with the assumption that both RF of the pinwheels S, N are considered as a point of the retina R , leads to a representation of the simple neurons of the V1 cortex by two (not just one) SCP bundles $\pi : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow R$: one is associated with the pinwheels detecting stimuli of low

spatial frequencies, the other with the pinwheels detecting high frequencies stimuli. Notice that the experimental results in [13] support the conjecture of the existence of two independent systems for perceptions of spatial frequencies, one for the higher and another for the lower. This is consistent with the above model.

Following the same line of arguments, another model of the V1 cortex can be proposed. Indeed, representing each hypercolumn H by the fibers over its two pinwheels S and N of the (non-reduced) conformal bundle $p : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow S^2$, i.e. by the fibers

$$p^{-1}(S) = G^- \cdot G^0 = \mathbb{C}^* \rtimes \mathbb{C} , \quad \pi^{-1}(N) = G^0 \cdot G^+ = \mathbb{C}^* \rtimes \mathbb{C} ,$$

we get that the V1 cortex might be represented by two copies of the trivial bundle

$$\hat{p} : \mathbb{V} = (\mathbb{C}^* \rtimes \mathbb{C}) \times R \rightarrow R .$$

The main difference between the previous and this second model is that now, for each point z of the retina, there are *four* (not just *two*) internal parameters, say (ϕ, θ, u, v) , two of them corresponding to the subgroup \mathbb{C}^* and the other two corresponding to the subgroup \mathbb{C} . The two parameters (ϕ, θ) for \mathbb{C}^* can be identified with the internal parameters of the two bundles $\hat{\pi} : \text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow R$ and are related with the spatial frequency and orientation (ϕ, θ) of the Bressloff and Cowan spherical model (see point (b) of Section 10). We do not know the possible physiological interpretation of the remaining two internal parameters (u, v) for the subgroup \mathbb{C} . Maybe they are related with the derivatives of the orientations and spatial frequencies of stimuli.

12 The principle of invariance and application to stability problem

Let K be a group of transformations of a space V and denote by $\mathcal{O} = Kx$ an orbit of one point x of V . Assume that there are uniformly distributed observers along the orbit \mathcal{O} . The following obvious K -invariance principle holds.

Principle of invariance. *Any information, which the observers along \mathcal{O} send to a common center, is invariant with respect to the transformations of the group K .*

This principle can be used to explain the main difference between the firing patterns of simple and complex neurons [20, 18, 8]. As we mentioned in point 7 of Sect. 1, the firing of a complex cell is invariant with respect to shifts of stimuli inside of its receptive field, in contrast with a simple cell. This can be explained by assuming that the RP of all the simple cells connected to the complex cell are derived from a *mother* RP via transformations of the group $K = \mathbb{R}^2$ of translations. By the above Principle of Invariance, the information, which is obtained by the complex cell, is shift invariant. In our reduced model the role of the translation group $K = \mathbb{R}^2$ is played by the group $G^+ \subset \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. In Sarti-Citti-Petitot's model $K = \mathbb{R}^2$ is the translation part of $\text{Sim}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

References

1. E. Ahissar, A. Arieli, Figuring Space by Time, *Neuron* **32** (2001), 185–201.
2. D. V. Alekseevsky, *Conformal model of hypercolumns in V1 cortex and the Möbius group. Application to the visual stability problem* in “Geometric science of information”, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. **12829**, pp. 65–72, *Springer, Cham*, 2021.
3. P. C. Bressloff, J. D. Cowan, A spherical model for orientation as spatial-frequency tuning in a cortical hypercolumn, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **358** (1438) (2003), 1643–1667.
4. P. C. Bressloff, J. D. Cowan, The functional geometry of local and horizontal connections in a model of V1, *J. Physiol. Paris* **97** (2003), 221–36.
5. P. C. Bressloff, J. D. Cowan, The visual cortex as a crystal, *Physica D* **173** (2002), 226–258.
6. E. Baspinar, A. Sarti, G. Citti, *A sub-Riemannian model of the visual cortex with frequency and phase*, *J. Math. Neurosci.* **10** (1) (2020), art. n. 11
7. F. W. Campbell, G. Robson, Application of Fourier analysis to the visibility of gratings, *J. Physiol.* **197** (1968), 551–566.
8. M. Carandini, What simple and complex cells compute? *J. Physiol.* **577**, 463–466.
9. M. Carandini, J. B. Demb, V. Mante, D. J. Tolhurst, Y. Dan, B. A. Olshausen, J.L.Gallant, N.C.Rust, Do We Know What the Early Visual System Does?, *J. Neurosci.* **25**(46) (2005), 10577–10597.
10. G. Citti, A. Sarti ed., *Neuromathematics of Vision*, Lecture Notes in Morphogenesis, Springer, Heidelberg, 2014.
11. C. E. Connor, Shifting Receptive Fields, *Neuron* **29** (2001), 548–549.
12. J. R. Duhamel, C. L. Colby, M. E. Goldberg, The updating of the representation of visual space in parietal cortex by intended eye movements, *Science* **255** (5040) (1992), 90–92.
13. R. M. Everson, A. K. Prashanth, M. Gabbay, B. W. Knight, L. Sirovich, E. Kaplan, *Representation of spatial frequency and orientation in the visual cortex*, *PNAS*, **95** (14) (1998), 8334–8338.
14. A. Fialkow, The conformal theory of curves, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **51** (1942), 435–501.
15. L. M. J. Florack, B. M. ter Haar Romeny, J. J. Koenderink, M. A. Viergever, Scale and the differential structure of images, *Image and Vision Computing*, **10** (6) (1992), 376–388.
16. B. Franceschiello, A. Mashtakov, G. Citti, A. Sarti, Geometrical optical illusion via sub-riemannian geodesics in the roto-translation group, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **65** (2019), 55–77.
17. E. H. Gombrich, *The Sense of Order. A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art*, Phaidon Press Ltd, 1979.
18. M. Hansard, R. Heraud, Differential Model of complex cells, *Neural Comput.* **23** (9) (2011), 1–24.
19. W. C. Hoffman, The visual cortex is a contact bundle, *Appl. Math. Comput.* **32** (1989), 137–167.
20. D. H. Hubel, *Eye, brain, and vision*, W. H. Freeman & Co., New York, 1988.
21. G. Hung, *Oculomotor Control*, in *Wiley Encyclopedia of Biomedical Engineering*, 2019, pages 1–11.
22. E. Kaplan, E. Benardete, The dynamics of primate retinal ganglion cells, *Progress in brain research* **134** (2001), 17–34.
23. S. Kobayashi, *Transformation groups in differential geometry*, *Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg*, 1972.
24. J. J. Koenderink, The structure of images, *Biological cybernetics* **50** (5) (1984), 363–370.
25. M. Lovric, M. Min-Oo, E. A. Ruh, Multivariate normal distributions parametrized as a Riemannian symmetric space, *J. Multivariate Anal.* **74** (2000), 36–48.
26. V. Lychagin, N. Kononenko, Invariants for primary visual cortex. *Differential Geom. Appl.* **60** (2018), 156–173.

27. D. Marr, Vision: A computational Investigation into the human representation and processing of visual information, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1982.
28. D. Melcher, C. L. Colby, Trans-saccadic perception, Trends in Cognitive Sciences **12** (12) (2008), 466–73.
29. J. A. Movshon, I. D. Thompson, D. J. Tolhurst, Spatial summation in the receptive fields of complex cells in the cat's striate cortex, J. Physiol. **283** (1978), 78–100.
30. J. Petitot, The neurogeometry of pinwheels as a sub-Riemannian contact structure, J. Physiol. Paris **97** (2003), 265–309.
31. J. Petitot, Elements of neurogeometry. Functional Architectures of Vision (Translated from the 2008 French edition), Springer, Cham, 2017.
32. J. Petitot, Y. Tondut, *Vers une neurogéométrie. Fibrations corticales, structures de contact et contours subjectifs modaux*, Math. Inform. Sci. Humaines **145** (1999), 5–101.
33. M. Poletti, M. Rucci, A compact field guide to the study of microsaccades: Challenges and functions, Vision research **118** (2016), 83–97.
34. J. Ross, M. C. Morrone, D. C. Burr, Compression of visual space before saccades, Nature **386** (1998), 598–601.
35. M. Rucci, M. Poletti, Control and Functions of Fixational Eye Movements, Annu. Rev. Vis. Sci. **Nov. 1** (2015), 499–518.
36. M. B. Sachs, J. Nachmias, J. G. Robson, Spatial-frequency channels in human vision, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **61** (1971), 1176–1186.
37. A. Sarti, G. Citti, J. Petitot, The symplectic structure of the primary visual cortex, Biol. Cybern. **98** (2008), 33–48.
38. N. V. Swindale, How many maps are in visual cortex, Cerebral Cortex **10** (7) (2000), 634–643.
39. B. A. Wolfe, D. Whitney, Saccadic remapping of object-selective information, Atten. Percept. Psychophys. **77** (2015), 2260 – 2269.
40. R. H. Wurtz, Neuronal mechanisms of visual stability, Vision Research **48** (2008), 2070–2089.
41. R. H. Wurtz, W. M. Joiner, R. A. Berman, Neuronal mechanisms for visual stability: progress and problems, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B **366** (2011), 492–503.
42. A. L. Yarbus, Eye Movements and Vision, Plenum Press, New York, 1967.
43. M. Zirnsak, T. Moore, Saccades and shifting receptive fields: anticipating consequences or selecting targets? Trends Cogn. Sci. **18** (12) (2014), 621–628.