T in e ordering in the evolution of inform ation processing and m odulation system s

Nestor Caticha and O sam e K inouchi Instituto de F sica, Universidade de Sao Paulo CP66318, CEP 05315-970, Sao Paulo, SP Brazil

Abstract

The ideas of optim ization of learning algorithm s in Arti cial N eural N etw orks are reviewed emphasizing generic properties and the online implementations are interpreted from a biological perspective. A simple model of the relevant subsidiary variables needed to improve learning in arti cial fædforward networks and the time ordering' of the appearance of the respective information processing systems is proposed. We discuss the possibility that these results m ight be relevant in other contexts, not being restricted to the simple models from which they stem. The analysis of a few examples, which range from the lowest cellular scale to the macroscopic level, suggests that similar ideas could be applied to biological system s.

1 Introduction

1.1 Evolution and Optim ization

In the study of learning processes in articical systems, the search for general results can be pursued by concentrating on the statistical mechanics of simple models (W atkin, R au and Biehl1993). R ather than being interested in their peculiarities, the aim is to unearth properties that, by recurrently appearing in several of those models, may represent candidates of that sought after generality. The ubiquity of these features may be an indication of their importance in more complex systems, not am enable to an analytical approach, and thus help in suggesting what are the important macroscopic variables in these systems.

The de nition of e ciency of an arti cial neural network (ANN) depends on the task for which it has been de ned. W hile criteria such as rotem em orization, generalization ability or ease of training may be used to label and judge an ANN; adaptiveness, biological plausibility or implementation possibilities can also be relevant parameters. The fact that a given ANN scores well in one or other particular area may be enough to permit its survival as a useful object of study. The construction of new ANN's from scratch or the evolution to di erent arti cialmachines from previous ones, will not be seen as the teleological drive towards the perfect machine, for perfectness is not de ned in this multidimensional value space. This evolution leads, instead of a single line or lineage, rather to the construction of a multibranched system.

Not to be thought of as a one dimensional process, this tree or bush can nevertheless be used to de ne a single lineage process. Starting from the tip of one branch and going backwards through the tree, a trajectory can be distinguished from the neighboring paths that may eventually converge with it as the historical path is retraced. Suppose this backward trajectory is painted in a di erent color from other separating branches. Now we have an evolution path for which there is at least a pseudo teleological dynam ics. Some quality measure, call it Q can be de ned along this path, and as the path is traveled along the forward time direction, then a drive towards better Q can be identified.

In a competitive environment, the capacity to appropriately dealwith and e ciently process information may contribute to give an individual the necessary these to be successful. While the build up of better information processing devices is not the generic objective of naturally evolving organisms, it is not totally indefensible that a painted line in a biological evolution tree can be identified where the quantity Q is, at least bosely, associated with the capacity to deal with information in a certain speci c manner. One of the most fundamental information processing capabilities is the extraction of statistical regularities from the environment, i.e. statistical inference, while other such as memory or sensory processing may be thought in portant inasmuch as they contribute to the former and enhance the organism's predictive capacity.

In the last few years several papers have addressed the problem of determ ining optim al generalization learning algorithms in ANN (K inouchi and Caticha 1992, 1993, 1993b, 1996, Biehl and Schwarze 1993, W atkin 1993, C opelli and C aticha 1995, Biehl, R iegler and Stechert 1995, C opelli, K inouchi and C aticha 1996, Sim onetti and C aticha 1996, Van den B roeck and R eim ann 1996, O pper 1996, O pper and W inther 1996, C opelli et al 1997, W inther, Lautrup and Zang 1997) The idea of optim ization of learning algorithm s, whether applied to on or o ine learning, in a supervised or not m anner, is based on the fact that a given m achine w ill be expected to perform satisfactorily in a rather restricted environm ent. A lthough these algorithm sm ay turn out to be som ew hat adaptive¹, it is unreasonable to expect the sam e algorithm to be optim al under general conditions. How ever, the speci cation of a restricted set of environm ental variables de nes the learning scenario and m akes the optim ization problem well posed. The learning scenario w ill de ne the \evolutionary pressures" which w ill m old the learning algorithm s. Q is here identi ed w ith the generalization ability.

The object of this communication is to deal with the problem of optimization, rst by quickly reviewing results obtained in relation to ANN learning from examples and then by giving an interpretation, from a biological point of view, of several features that appear to be characteristic of optimized learning algorithms. This is done in the hope that, if the features reject properties of learning in general, rather than simply showing elects restricted to the particular chosen scenarios and architectures, then a simple model of the time evolution towards more sophisticated biological information processing can be suggested. The main point we want to stress is that a 'time' ordering can be seen to arise in the complexi cation of the learning algorithms due to the importance of behavioral variables in the elecient modulation of synaptical plasticity.

¹ Tolerance to sm all changes in the distribution of examples, drift in the underlying rules it tries to infer, or to changing levels of corruption of the data by noise.

1.2 Learning in the presence of Partial Information.

The optim al learner relies on several auxiliary quantities that describe the (jpint) probability distribution of examples, that is the learning scenario. In the absence of information on one or more such quantities a full optim ization cannot be carried out. Nevertheless, in the presence of partial information (sub)optim al algorithm s can be found. W ill the inclusion of one more such variable in the 'information pool' always lead to an increase in Q? Not necessarily, for it may depend on which other variables are available. For example, consider two auxiliary quantities A and B. Let A represent that A is missing from the information pool. Appropriate choices, for A and B can be made such that Q (A ; B) = Q (A; B) < Q (A ; B) < Q (A; B).

We now in agine the steps towards constructing the necessary hardware by some sort of evolution. A new piece of hardware that m easures A will not be useful and therefore not included if the necessary hardware to measure B is not yet present. It can be said that B potentiates A as useful information. Evolution can take a path (A; B)! (A; B)! (A; B), but not (A; B)! (A; B).

This is what we mean by a time ordering' in the appearance of the dierent moduli that measure the several relevant variables. It is an argument for at least time ordering in the built up of functional modularity, but might be useful also for physical modularity development in the presence of some functional localization.

W hether a sim ilar claim holds for the sequential construction of inform ation processing m oduli in biological systems evolving under natural selection, is a very interesting but still not clear proposition. We want to present a simple example to show that this, in fact, may be the case.

2 Optimal Learning in a class of ANN

2.1 Modulated Hebbian-like Learning

We review results for a class of feedforward ANN where optim ization has been previously studied in the case of supervised learning. It includes the simple perceptron with continuous or binary weights, boolean or linear output, boolean reverse wedge perceptron, tree parity and tree com m ittee m achines. For optim al unsupervised learning see (Van den Broeck and Reim ann 1996).

The functions (f : R^N) R or f 1g); these machines in plan ent, depend on a set of N parameters or coupling weights fJ_{ig} which are inspired by synaptice ciencies in a biological neural system and are supposed to play a similar role. The object of learning is to modify the set of weights of a student network in order to approximate a function f_0 , unknown except for the information contained in the learning set L = fS; $_{b}g_{=1;...P}$, i.e., the values f $_{b}g$ of the function at P instances of the inputs fS g: The outputs $f_{b}g$ could even be corrupted by some noise process. Optimization will have, in this work, the aim of maximizing the ability of generalization, i.e. rule inference. W hile optim al o -line learning has also been studied, we concentrate in what follows in the properties of on-line learning, because of its more biological appeal. We consider the case of single on line presentation of examples with no iteration. These conditions are introduced in order to have manageable models from an analytical point of view, but are not responsible for the properties we want to discuss,

which are still present under m ore general conditions or in other m ore com plex m odels.

For simplicity we discuss the simplest of all feedforward networks, the single layer boolean perceptron, nevertheless the results are representative of what is found for the other architectures mentioned above. The output $_{\rm h}$ of the perceptron is given by the sign of the post-synaptic eld $h = S \cdot J = J$, and the function f_0 it is learning is an ANN of sim ilar architecture, a teacher perceptron with an unknown set of N real weights fB ig. W e will call $b = S \cdot B = B$; the teacher's eld. For these machines the generalization error e_g , which measures the probability of disagreement between teacher and student perceptrons is a monotonically decreasing function of the overlap $= J \cdot B = JB$, for the perceptron: $e_g = \frac{1}{2} \arccos s$.

During learning, the presentation of a new example to a network induces a change J_i in each synaptic' weight J_i . We take this change to be of a Hebbian nature in that it is proportional to the intensity of the pre-synaptic input S_i and to the desired output $_b$. This so-called Hebbian term, $J_i / _b S_i$, could in principle be modulated by a series of other processes, increasing or decreasing its importance, in order to enable the system to learn more e ciently. This modulation can be represented by the introduction of a modulation function F, such that now $J_i / F_b S_i$ takes into account other factors of which at this point we have no inform ation.

W hile ad hoc algorithm building, i.e. choosing F, calls for intuition, previous experience and som e luck, the constructive nature of the optim ization procedure furnishes a set of variables Z, on which the m odulation function depends as well as the function F itself. If optim ization is carried under no restrictions, the set Z will include all the variables which, if known, would contribute to achieve optim al generalization. Several of them, call it the set H, will not be accessible or hidden', while the rem aining variables, belonging to V, are accessible or Visible'. That is: Z = H [V. The set Vis the pool of available inform ation referred to in the previous section. A vailability conditions m ay, how ever, lim it the set V, thereby restricting the learning scenario, leading to suboptim al learning conditions.

W e m ention what seems to be just a silly technical point, but will be seen to be relevant in section (3). It concerns the presence of the correlation term ${}_{b}S_{i}$ in the change of J_{i} . O ne could very well optimize learning algorithms within the class of changes $J_{i} = W S_{i}$, modulated by an a priori unknown function W, obtaining exactly the same results as before. The optim all algorithms work neither by pure correlation nor error correction, they might resemble both types of paradigms in di erent proportions in di erent stages of the learning process³.

2.2 The Optim al M odulation Function.

The evolution we want to discuss is restricted to the possible changes in the function F and the set V, that is to the possible modulation mechanisms and to their overall in pact on the generalization ability of systems restricted to Hebbian synaptic modi cation. The general form of the optimal

² All vectors are written in boldface, e.g. J; while their lengths, e.g. J are not.

³For the perceptron, at the early stages the algorithm is simple Hebb or pure correlation, while it resembles an error correcting (relaxation) algorithm later on.

modulation function is then

$$F_{H_{y}}^{opt} = J < \frac{b}{h} \quad h >_{H_{y}}$$

proportional to the expectation value of the di erence between the elds averaged over the unknown quantities (H), given the pool of available data (V). This form holds for the linear, boolean and reverse wedge perceptron as well as related architectures such as the tree parity and committee m achines. For fully connected architecture, although optimization has not been totally completed, preliminary results show that the main feature still holds, that is, the modulation functions are still expected values of the form < :::> H iv

Learning in the presence of restricted inform ation can be studied by accordingly limiting the set of available variables V. By starting with an empty V and sequentially promoting dimension of the set of from H to V several dimension in the space of algorithms can be deneed. All lead from the simple Hebbian (F = 1) to the fully modulated optimal algorithm. An increase in the algorithms' complexity occurs along each trajectory. We can rule out a trajectory to be a product of hatural evolution' if there is a single step where the performance fails to improve, on the grounds of a cost-bene t argument.

2.3 Common Features of Optim al M odulation Functions

Optim alalgorithms, independently of the machine architectures so far studied, share som e characteristics.

First of all, the synaptic change depends on the example through the eld h; not only through its sign $_{\rm h}$ ⁴, which determ ines if the student agrees or not with the teacher on that particular instance; but also through its absolute value, hj. This is used in evaluating the importance of any h ism atch' between the answer expected by the student and the actual teacher's version. A m all' hjm ay reduce the importance of an error, whereas a 'large' hj could indicate a particularly important example, with a potentially high value of inform ation. The scale in which 'm all' is distinguished from 'large' how ever is not the same throughout the learning process but can depend on several factors.

The modulation function is time dependent, meaning that the optim allannealing is built into the modulation function. This is better described in terms of perform ance dependence (K inouchi and C aticha 1993) rather than time. While the learning of a stationary rule takes place, the generalization error decreases monotonically, and therefore time and perform ance are interchangeable. However, if the learner has to adapt to a time dependent rule then time duration of the learning process boses in portance. Perform ance though, if and when it can be estimated at all, will still remain of value in determining the amount of elective learning the machine has undergone. It is fundamental to note that the main role of the perform ance determination, and therefore of the overlap , is in establishing the relevant scale of the led h, and thereby aid in gauging the importance of the main atch 'or surprise in having expected a dil erent answer from that of the teacher.

⁴ in the case of multilayer (ML) networks, this should read: elds fhg and total output sign (fhig)

Learning in the presence of noise (Biehl et al 1995, C opelli et al 1996, Heskes 1994) introduces a host of interesting variations. We will restrict to the case of output or multiplicative noise which is characterized by a single parameter , the (independent) probability of a training label being inverted. Under this conditions a new feature sets in and can be dubbed 'con dence'. The importance of a surprise m ay be watered down if the teacher is not reliable and there is trade o between surprise and con dence. The cross over from being surprised to not trusting the teacher depends both on the estim ated perform ance and the noise level 5 .

O fthe di erent features on which the modulation function depends, we now ask: in what order will they appear in a successive construction of the set V? The set Z of relevant variables is determined by unrestricted optimization. For the boolean perceptron we have fb; b; ;h; h; ; g. The teacher internal eld b is certainly not available, although in the conditions of supervised learning, its sign b, or at least a noise corrupted version of it, is. The values of the overall internal post-synaptic eld h or the student network output h could be used. The average perform ance or generalization error e_g or the overlap or its estimate m ay be present. The noise level , just an estimate of it (B ishlet al1995) or at least the know ledge of the existence of noise could also be available ⁶.

The suboptimization in the presence of a dierent set of variables may lead to dierential performances. But not always. As one of the most interesting cases, we consider the slightest increase in complexity that a pure unm odulated Hebbian learning algorithm could undergo. The putative in proved algorithm s can be obtained by nding the optim alm odulation functions among the possible $F(h; b)^7$, F(; b) or still F(; b). It turns out that modulating with F() leads to an in provem ent over plain Hebbian⁸. But the best possible modulation within the class of functions that depend only on e_{α} or is F = 1 (!) (Copelli et al 1996), i.e. the information they bring is, at this point in the algorithm development process, irrelevant. There is no advantage in developing hardware to measure any of those if the necessary hardware to measure is not already there. The inclusion of the perform ance e_{σ} leads to an improvement once is available. This translates into an annealed algorithm. At this point, inclusion of the noise level will lead into further in provement of the learning algorithm. The condence, or lack of it, in the supervised information leads to a possible rejection of outliers. Therefore the performance ordering Q() = Q(;) < Q(;h) < Q(;h;) suggests a time ordering for the construction of V to be ()! (;h)! (;h;), and not ()! (;)! (;h;).

The next section will try to make a parallel between these ideas and some biological examples. Before that, we point out the physical meaning of these variables. While (< 0) > 0 signals (dis) agreem ent of the student with the supervisor, j jindicates how sure was the student in predicting the answer. A large negative indicates a big, surprising mistake. The capacity of measuring it is tantam ount to being able to be surprised, whereas the possibility of modulating learning with

⁵ C on dence' also appears in the M L case, as di erent branches can, under optim al conditions, determ ine which branch ought to be mostly blam ed for an overall error or equivalently having the least con dence in its partial answer, even in the absence of noise.

⁶ In a more general setting, the distribution of examples should be taken into account, since biases in the inputs will certainly interfere with what student network is considered optimal. Here we will restrict to the case of uniform ly, independent, random ly distributed examples.

⁷ In this case it depends on the stability = h_b or = h in the presence of noise

⁸T hat is easy, since several h dependent algorithm s can be devised that are nonoptimal improvements over the pure unmodulated Hebbian algorithm.

a depending function in plies in the use of the expected vs. actual answerm ism atch in learning. The in uence of perform ance on the learning algorithm is done by furnishing the appropriate scale in which surprises are to be judged. A big surprise of an unexperienced learner should not be as important as that of a more advanced student. Neither a big surprise will have the same e ect in a gullible student as in one which knows that the incoming information is not completely reliable.

P ractical algorithm builders m ay very well complain that these variables, such as or are not available to the student network at all but only certain estimations can at best be made. And in doing so they will discover the main point we want to stress. Optimization methods will determ ine

rstly, the lim its of learning and secondly, the possible reliance on some usually hidden quantities in order to attain them. This reliance, rather than ham pering the utility of the optim ization ideas, is one of its main results. By showing which these variables are, it provides a necessary pressure to develop algorithms or hardware which perm it their more e cient determ ination ⁹ This is the most obvious consequence. Whether sim ilar ideas apply to biological evolution is an intriguing thought. H ints that this may be so will be considered in the next section.

3 Some examples drawn from Biology

3.1 Disclaimer

Life in the real world is not as clear cut as in the simple laboratories of the theories reviewed above. In trying to interpret experimental data, a translation of the mathematical language we have employed is necessary. This translation can be done at dimensional levels, ranging from the cellular to the behavioral levels.

There is an extensive literature regarding receptive eld and synaptic plasticity, (e.g. Cruikshank and W ienberger 1996, Churchland and Sejnow ski 1996) and references therein. We certainly can make no attempt at any comprehensive review, but will recall some examples that seem to be natural in the light of previous sections. By selectively choosing only some of those that seem to be on our side we do not wish to imply lack of di erent mechanisms nor exclude other laws. The critical interpretation of experimental work is left to the experts, and we only use their conclusions. We also claim no nal conclusion, only present a set of experimentally backed up hints about the relevance of the previous theoretical results.

3.2 Examples

F irst of all there is the question about the H ebbian nature of synaptic plasticity or of its extensions, such as the Stent-H ebb law e.g. (C hurch land and Sejnow ski1996). The sheer variety of plastic neural circuitry suggests that there very well may be other than just H ebbian-like m echanism s to encode inform ation in the intercellular interactions. Standard H ebbian theories hold that it is the pre-post-synaptical neural activity correlation of activities that governs the change of synaptic e ciencies.

⁹The creation of estimators for the hidden parameters can be viewed as a second order learning process: learning to learn more e ciently (K inouchi and C aticha 1993, B iehlet al 1995, C oehn and Jain 1994)

The necessity as well as su ciency of Hebbian mechanisms to explain a set of experiments has been satisfactorally established. There is, however, in some other cases evidence for neurom odulated synaptic plasticity which transcends mere correlation mechanisms.

The rst example we deal with is the experiment of (C arew, H aw kins, A bram s and K andel, 1984) as discussed by (C ruikshank and W ienberger 1996). In this experiment in the Aplysia, (a) the increase of the synaptic coupling between a pre-synaptic sensory neuron and a post-synaptic m otor neuron was induced by correlated activity in both neurons, suggesting a H ebbian m echanism. This was obtained under sensorial stimulation, which caused strong activity of the m otor neuron.

To verify su ciency they tested (b) the e ect of simple activity correlation. This was obtained by inducing post-synaptic depolarization, and therefore activity, through the injection of current into the cell, in the absence of external stimulation. C orrelation was thus shown insu cient, since alone it did not induce synaptic strengthening. Finally, in experiment (c) its necessity was also discarded by showing an increase in synaptic e ciency in the conditions of the rst experiment modiled by hyperpolarizing the post-synaptic neuron and thus eliminating the activity correlation.

W ithout the modulation due to behavioral context no signi cant plasticity occurs in experiment (b). This would be represented in our 'modulated H ebbian' model by a small or absent modulation function F, which could be due to a behavioral feedback. We want to stress the dierence between what has been called H ebbian in Physics and Physiology. Physicists have used the desired response be instead of the actual postsynaptic activity $_{\rm J}$ in defining the H ebbian change. This dierence is irrelevant for clamped neuron experiments. Synaptic changes, such as the ones described in section 2, proportional to $S_{\rm i}$ $_{\rm J}$, where = $_{\rm J}$ $_{\rm b}$ have been term ed predictive H ebbian learning (M ontague, D ayan, Person and Sejnow ski, 1995).

A nother set of experiments (A hissar et al. 1992) deals with the role of behavioral context in the changes of the functional connection (fc) between neurons in the auditory cortex of monkeys. Instead of measuring single synaptic plasticity, they obtained the fc, which is the elective interaction that arises from contributions from all possible pathways between the two neurons, from the C ross C orrelation H istogram s (C C H) technique. The ratio of the fc after and before the conditioning, which they term ed the Strengthening Factor (SF), was plotted against the C ontingency Factor (C F), the integrated coactivity (induced gain) during conditioning, obtained from the C C H s, divided by its value before conditioning. A lthough both in the presence of behavioral relevant context and in its absence, SF and C F were positively correlated, in the form er case this relation was much m ore striking. Their conclusion, that in a behavioral relevant context, coactivity leads to a much higher fc change than when behaviorally irrelevant, is in accordance to what we discussed in section (2).

A mong other possible examples, we mention, very brie y, that the in uence of surprise in synaptic plasticity in the cerebellum of monkeys, has been reported by G ilbert and T hach (K andel and Schwartz 1986).

We conclude by mentioning a few facts, very suggestive at the light of what we expounded in the previous sections, that occur, not at the cellular level, but at neuropsychological one. Several works (e.g. K andel and Schwartz 1986, Shallice 1988) have pointed the amygdala as responsible for identifying the mism atch' or surprise element in the processing of new information. Work on prefrontal syndrom e patients has, on the other hand, indicated the role of the prefrontal lobe in evaluating perform ance levels related to working m em ory (bnline') procedures (e.g. W illiam s and G olm an-R akic 1996) have been reported to stick to strategies that were once successful (perseverance e ect) even if its clear, to a norm al control, that the underlying rule has changed. Perseverance can be attributed to the lack of feedback from the working m em ory self-evaluation m echanism.

By excluding di erent variables in the set V, di erent types of lesions can be modeled in a feedforward net. The degradation of the performance Q when the self-evaluation module is ine ective shows perseverance' e ects when learning rules that may change unexpectedly in time. This is in contrast to the adaptive optimal algorithm which detects poor performance and can e ectively start relearning once the rule changes. We stress the fact that the optimal perceptron has not been built explicitly to present these perseverance e ects when lesioned, but that it is uniquely deduced from the probability distribution associated to the task at hand by the sole requirement of having maximal generalization ability (K inouchi and C aticha 1993, 1993b) for its particular architecture (see also (C hangeux 1992, Levine, Leven and P rueitt 1992)).

On the basis of our earlier remarks it is clear that the surprise measuring hardware is expected to be an older structure than the performance measuring hardware. That this 'time ordering' between the amygdala and the prefrontal lobe holds, is well known and therefore may come as no surprise (K andel and Schwartz 1986). That this is in accord with the theory developed for such simple systems as the feedforward networks here discussed is where we think the real surprise lies. W hether other time ordering sequences can be thus identiced will be the subject of future studies.

Finally at an even m ore m acroscopic level, we mention the Rescorla-W agner model (Rescorla and W agner 1972, G luck and Bower 1988, G luck 1991), widely studied in animal psychology and also used to model hum an categorization, to support the study of these networks. M athem atically, the Rescorla-W agner model is a simple perceptron, since decisions are based on weighted sum sof signals, learning with an A daline algorithm. The reason this is sensible is that, although at the m icroscopic level we have to deal with extrem ely complex networks, hum ans frequently use simple algorithms for inference and detection of statistical regularities. There is evidence that hum ans fail on some nonlinearly separable tasks (Thorpe, O'R eagan and Pouget 1990) of an automatic and non-linguistic nature, suggesting that modeling problem -solving mechanisms by even a simple perceptron may be relevant in these cases. Since the optim al algorithm perceptron takes into account the am ount of surprise, stage of learning and a condence measure in order to learn electively, we suggest that modeling at m acroscopic levels by perceptron architectures can only be ruled out affer the inclusion of these properties into the model, otherwise, failure to reproduce experimental results may lie som ewhere else and not in the simple network. This work was supported by CNPq and C apes.

REFERENCES

A hissar E., Vaadia E., A hissar M., Bergm an H., A rieli A. and A beles M., Science 257 1412 (1992).
BiehlM., Riegler P. and Stechert M., Phys. Rev. E 52 R 4624 (1995).
BiehlM. and Schwarze H., J. Phys. A : M ath. Gen. 26 2651 (1993).
C arew T., Hawkins R., A bram s T., and K andel E. J. Neurosci. 4 1217 (1984)
C hangeux J.P. La Recherche 244 23 705 (1992)
C hen D.S. and Jain R.C., IEEE Trans. Neural Networks 5 467 (1994).

Copelli M. and Caticha N., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 28 1615 (1995).

Copelli M., Kinouchi O. and Caticha N., Phys. Rev. E 53 6341 (1996).

Copelli M ., Eichhorn R ., Kinouchi O ., Biehl M . Sim onetti R ., Riegler P . and Caticha N ., Europhys. Lett. 37 (6), pp. 427 (1997)

Churchland P. and Sejnow skiThe Computational Brain (M IT Books; Cambridge M ass) (1996)

Cruikshank S. and Weinberger N. Brain Research Review 22 191 (1996)

Gluck M.A. and Bower G.H., J. Exp. Psychology: General 117 227 (1988).

Gluck M.A., Psychological Science 2 50 (1991).

Heskes T., in Proceedings of the ZiF Conference on Adaptive Behavior and Learning, Eds. J Dean, H.Cruse and H.Ritter (University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany, 1994).

KandelE.R. and Schwartz J.H. (Eds.), Principles of Neural Science (Elsevier, Holland, 1986).

KinouchiO.and Caticha N., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 25 6243 (1992).

KinouchiO.and Caticha N., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 26 6161 (1993).

K inouchiO.and Caticha N., in Proceedings of the W orld Congress on NeuralNetworks - W CNN'93 pg. 381-384 vol. III (Portland - 1993).

KinouchiO.and Caticha N., Physical Review E 54 R54 (1996).

Levine D S., Leven S. and Prueitt P S. in M otivation, Em otion and G caldirection in Neural Nets, Levine D S. and Leven S. Eds. (Hillsdale, NJ; Erlbaum) (1992)

Montague P R, Dayan P, Person C. and Sejnow skiNature 377 725 (1995)

OpperM.Phys.Rev.Lett. 77 4671 (1996)

Opper M. and Haussler D., in Proceedings of the IV th Annual Workshop on Computational Learning Theory (COLT 91), (Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, 1991).

Opper M. and KinzelW., in Physics of Neural Networks III, Eds. E. Domany, J. L. Van Hemmen and K. Schulten (Springer, Berlin, 1994).

OpperM.and W interO.Phys.Rev.Lett. 76 1964 (1996)

Rescorla R.A. and W agner A.R., in Classical conditioning: II. Current research and theory, Eds. A. H.Black and W.F. Prokasy (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1972).

Shallice T. From Neuropsychology to Mental Structure (Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Press) (1988)

Sim onettiR. and Caticha N., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 29 4859 (1996).

Sutton R.S. and Barto A.G., Psychological Review 88 135 (1981).

Thompe S.J., O'Reagan K. and Pouget A., in NeuralNetwoks: From Models to Applications, Eds. L. Personnaz and G.D reyfus (ID SET, Paris, 1990).

Van den Broeck C. and Reim ann P., Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 2188 (1996).

W atkin T.L.H., Europhys. Lett. 21 871 (1993).

Watkin T.L.H., Rau A. and BiehlM., Rev. Mod. Phys. 65 499 (1993).

W illiam s, G.V. and Goldman-Rakic P.S.Nature 376 572 (1996)

W inter O., Lautrup B. and Zang J-B., Phys. Rev. E 55 936 (1997).