

Functional consequences of pre- and postsynaptic expression of synaptic plasticity

Rui Ponte Costa^{1,2}, Beatriz E.P. Mizusaki^{3,4}, P. Jesper Sjöström⁴, and Mark C. W. van Rossum¹

29th October 2016

¹Institute for Adaptive and Neural Computation, School of Informatics

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

²Centre for Neural Circuits and Behaviour

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³Instituto de Física

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brasil.

⁴Centre for Research in Neuroscience

Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery

Program for Brain Repair and Integrative Neuroscience

The Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre

McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Abstract

Growing experimental evidence shows that both homeostatic and Hebbian synaptic plasticity can be expressed presynaptically as well as postsynaptically. In this review, we start by discussing this evidence and methods used to determine expression loci. Next, we discuss functional consequences of this diversity in pre- and postsynaptic expression of both homeostatic and Hebbian synaptic plasticity. In particular, we explore the functional consequences of a biologically tuned model of pre- and postsynaptically expressed spike-timing-dependent plasticity complemented with postsynaptic homeostatic control. The pre- and postsynaptic expression in this model predicts 1) more reliable receptive fields and sensory perception, 2) rapid recovery of forgotten information (memory savings) and 3) reduced response latencies, compared to a model with postsynaptic expression only. Finally we discuss open questions that will require a considerable research effort to better elucidate how the specific locus of expression of homeostatic and Hebbian plasticity alters synaptic and network computations.

29 Introduction

30 Synapses shape the computations of the nervous system. The combination of thousands of excitatory
31 and inhibitory synaptic inputs determine whether a neuron fires or not. Furthermore, the synapse is
32 known to be a key site of information storage in the brain, although not the only one [1]. Changes
33 in the synapses are hypothesized to allow neuronal networks to change function and to adapt
34 through Hebbian and Hebbian-like mechanisms. At the same time, large perturbations in activity
35 levels such as those occurring during synaptogenesis or eye-opening require negative feedback so
36 that the network can keep its activity level within reasonable bounds and continue performing
37 its computational tasks properly [2, 3]. Such homeostatic control of neuronal activity can occur
38 through changes in intrinsic neuronal properties such as control of dendrite excitability [4, 5], somatic
39 excitability [6, 1] and movement of the axon hillock relative to the soma [7]. However, in this review
40 we focus on homeostatic processes at the synapse such as synaptic scaling, which provides a form of
41 negative feedback to counter changes in the activity levels, while providing synaptic normalisation
42 and competition among inputs [8, 9].

43 As we explain in detail in this review, irrespective of whether synaptic plasticity is Hebbian or
44 homeostatic, the expression locus of plasticity matters. A fundamental distinction is whether the
45 change is pre- or postsynaptic. Changes in the number of postsynaptic receptors typically only
46 modify the synaptic gain. However, long-term changes in the presynaptic release probability alter
47 the short-term dynamics of the synapse [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. Synaptic dynamics such as
48 short-term depression and facilitation describe how the synaptic efficacy changes during repeated
49 stimulation of the synapse over a time course of hundreds of milliseconds [13, 17, 18, 19]. These
50 short-term modifications of synaptic efficacy (reviewed in [19]) have been proposed to underlie com-
51 putations like gain control [20], redundancy reduction [21] and adaptive filtering [22]. In the context
52 of a recurrent neuronal network, they can affect the activity dynamics and allow the formation and
53 switching among attractor states [23, 24], and have been proposed as the basis for working memory
54 [25].

55 Synaptic plasticity can thus affect network dynamics, but this poses several questions: What
56 are the functional implications of expressing long-term plasticity pre- or postsynaptically? What
57 are the underlying expression mechanisms? Why is there such a large diversity in the expression?
58 And why is there sometimes both pre- and postsynaptic expression? In this review, we begin
59 by discussing pre- and postsynaptic components of Hebbian and homeostatic synaptic plasticity.
60 Then we examine some of the consequences of the variability of the expression locus of synaptic
61 plasticity, including those that we recently identified using a biologically tuned computational model
62 of neocortical spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) [16].

63 **The biological underpinnings of pre- and postsynaptic expression of plasticity**

64 As old as the field of long-term synaptic plasticity itself is the question of how precisely informa-
65 tion is stored in neuronal circuits. Historically, Donald Hebb and Jerzy Konorski argued for the
66 strengthening of already existing connections between neurons as a means for information storage,
67 whereas Santiago Ramon y Cajal favoured the growth of new connections [26]. Several relatively
68 recent studies have found evidence that the formation of new synapses is important for long-term
69 information storage in neuronal circuits [27, 28, 29, 30]. Indeed, there is strong evidence both in
70 mammals and in the sea slug *Aplysia* that structural plasticity via formation of new afferent inputs
71 is essential for protein-synthesis dependent long-term memories [31]. The creation of new afferents
72 would correspond to an increase in the number of release sites (see Box 1: Methods), but it should
73 be noted that the number of release sites might be different from the number of anatomical contacts
74 [e.g. 32].

75 With already existing connections between neurons, there are essentially only two possible ways
76 of increasing synaptic strength: either presynaptic release is increased, or postsynaptic receptor
77 channels are upregulated [33, 34]. Both can be achieved in a number of ways. The presynaptic
78 release probability is controlled by various factors, such as the number and sensitivity of presynaptic
79 calcium channels, as well as other presynaptic ion channels that can modulate neurotransmitter
80 release (such as the epithelial sodium channel ENaC in case of synaptic scaling at the *Drosophila*
81 neuromuscular junction [35, 36]), the setpoint of presynaptic calcium sensors involved in eliciting
82 neurotransmitter release, e.g. the synaptotagmins 1, 2 and 9 [37], and the size of the pool of readily
83 releasable vesicles as well as its replenishment rate (in case of homeostasis, see [38, 39]) [13, 37].

84 The postsynaptic contribution to the synaptic response is determined by the number and location
85 of postsynaptic receptors, as well as their properties (e.g. conformational state [40] and subunit
86 composition [41, 42]). In addition, the geometry of the extracellular space and the apposition of the
87 release sites have also been suggested as important determinants of the response amplitude [43, 44].

88 Experimentally, determination of the expression locus is far from trivial and a battery of tech-
89 niques has been applied (see Box 1). In long-term potentiation (LTP) experiments, evidence for
90 most of the above mechanisms has been found. The historic pre versus post controversy is now typ-
91 ically interpreted as a reflection of the diversity of LTP phenomena, which we now know depends on
92 multiple factors such as age, synapse state, neuromodulation, synapse type, and induction protocol
93 [33, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52] (but see [53]). A combination of pre- and postsynaptic expression
94 is also possible [33].

95 A similar pre- or postsynaptic expression question exists for synaptic homeostasis. While most
96 studies have focused on postsynaptic expression, also here a wide variety in expression, including
97 presynaptic expression [54, 55, 56], has been observed, and for instance whether the expression is
98 pre- or postsynaptic appears to depend on developmental stage [57, 58]. Sometimes diversity in
99 mechanisms can even be observed within one system. For instance, in homeostatic plasticity experi-

100 ments in the hippocampus both pre- and postsynaptic expression was observed, while some CA3-CA3
101 connections were unexpectedly *reduced* after activity deprivation, other connections strengthened
102 as expected, perhaps to prevent network instability [59]. Also some forms of synaptic scaling at the
103 *Drosophila* and mammalian neuromuscular junction (NMJ) are presynaptic: loss of postsynaptic
104 receptors is compensated by increased transmitter release, which restores the mean amplitude of
105 evoked EPSPs [36, 60]. A presynaptic locus of expression of homeostatic plasticity at the NMJ is
106 perhaps to be expected, given that the postsynaptic partner — the muscle myotube — does not
107 integrate its inputs like a neuron does, but rather serves to fire in response to activation at the syn-
108 aptic input. The pre- and postsynaptic components of the NMJ are therefore tightly co-regulated
109 in synaptogenesis and after damage to ensure proper activation of the muscle [61], so when post-
110 synaptic NMJ sensitivity is reduced, it is in this context not entirely surprising that the presynaptic
111 machinery compensates accordingly by upscaling neurotransmitter release. This example illustrates
112 how the locus of expression must be understood in the context of function of the synapse type at
113 hand.

114 Further indication that the exact expression locus is functionally important comes from the fact
115 that the expression of both short-term plasticity [62] and long-term plasticity [52] can depend on
116 pre- and post-synaptic cell-type. In the case of short-term plasticity, connections from the same
117 presynaptic neurons onto different cells can short-term depress or facilitate depending on the target
118 cell type [63, 64], while multiple connections between two neurons are often highly similar [65].
119 Similarly, while spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) exists at both horizontal and vertical
120 excitatory inputs to visual cortex layer-2/3 pyramidal cells, the mechanistic underpinnings as well
121 as the precise temporal requirements for induction are different [66]. Such specificity suggests that
122 the specific locus of expression of long-term plasticity at a given synapse type is meaningful for the
123 proper functioning of microcircuits in the brain, as otherwise tight regulation of expression locus
124 would not have arisen during the evolution of the brain.

125 **BOX1: Methods to determine the locus of plasticity**

126 The properties of synaptic release can be used to determine the locus of synaptic plasticity by a
127 variety of methods. Among these there are methods for studying vesicle release, such as FM1-43
128 dye labelling to explore changes presynaptic release [67], glutamate uncaging to explore changes
129 in postsynaptic responsiveness or spine size [68, 69], measuring NMDA:AMPA ratio to look for
130 insertion of postsynaptic receptors [70, 48], employing the use-dependent NMDA receptor blocker
131 MK-801 to look for changes in glutamate release [71, 72], or exploring changes in paired-pulse ratio
132 suggesting a change in probability of release [15, 48] (although see [73]).

133 It is also common to employ spontaneous release as a metric of the locus of expression, as each
134 spontaneously released vesicle gives rise to a well-defined single postsynaptic quantal response known
135 as a miniPSC. This approach is often used in studies of homeostatic plasticity (e.g. [74]), because

136 here it is important to measure synaptic changes globally across a majority of inputs to a cell, but
137 this method has also been used to explore Hebbian plasticity [75, 70]. An increase in miniPSC
138 frequency in the absence of a change in miniPSC amplitude is typically interpreted as indicating
139 higher release probability or an increase in the number of synaptic contacts, while an increased
140 miniPSC amplitude is most often thought to reflect an increase in postsynaptic responsiveness
141 due to more efficacious postsynaptic receptors. Alternative interpretations of spontaneous release
142 experiments are, however, also possible, for example in the case of AMPA-fication of silent synapses,
143 which leads to an apparent change in release probability even though unsilencing is a postsynaptic
144 process [75].

145 In the scenario where individual synapses are monitored, it is possible to employ methods that
146 rely on the response variability. One such method is non-stationary noise analysis [76], which has
147 been used to determine the effect of homeostasis on inhibitory connections [77], although this method
148 can be unreliable for dendritic synapses [78]. In the related coefficient of variation (CV) analysis,
149 the peak synaptic response is modelled as a binomial process. The process has as parameters the
150 release probability Pr , and the response to each vesicle, the quantal amplitude q . These parameters
151 are assumed identical across the N release sites, and indeed such coordination has been found [65].
152 The CV — which is experimentally quantified as the response standard deviation over the mean
153 — is independent of q , namely $CV = \sqrt{\frac{1-Pr}{PrN}}$, and therefore an increase in the mean without an
154 increase in CV can be interpreted as a postsynaptic increase of q [79]. Conversely, if plasticity is
155 presynaptically expressed, then a change in CV is expected, since the CV is a measure of noise and
156 since the chief source of noise in neurotransmission is the presynaptic stochasticity of vesicle release.
157 The CV analysis method does, however, come with several caveats. In particular, accidental loss
158 or gain of afferent fibers in extracellular stimulation experiments, or unsilencing or growth of new
159 synapses will confuse the results [79]. It is also not obvious that release is independent at different
160 sites, in which case the binomial model is not suitable [79]. By assuming that one of the parameters
161 does not change during the experiment (e.g. fixed N as is reasonable to assume in some plasticity
162 experiments [80, 81]) the variance and mean of postsynaptic responses can be used to estimate
163 $Pr = \frac{mean}{Nq}$ and $q = \frac{variance}{mean} + \frac{mean}{N}$ [33, 82, 16].

164 An alternative way to determine whether synaptic changes correspond to alterations of release
165 probability or of quantal response amplitude is to examine the postsynaptic response to a pair or a
166 train of presynaptic stimuli. The idea is that when the release probability is high, the vesicle pool
167 will be depleted more quickly, leading to a more strongly depressing train of postsynaptic responses.
168 When combined with CV analysis, this method can be used to measure all three parameters — Pr ,
169 N , and q — of the binomial release model [83]. By fitting these phenomenological models before and
170 after plasticity induction, one can determine which combination of parameters were changed due to
171 plasticity. It should be noted that experimental results from paired-pulse experiments should also
172 be treated with caution. For example, unsilencing or specific postsynaptic upregulation of release

173 sites with quite different release probability may lead to changes in short-term dynamics that could
174 erroneously be interpreted as presynaptic in origin, even though the actual site of expression is
175 postsynaptic [73]. There are also postsynaptic contributions to synaptic short-term dynamics [84,
176 85, 86], that can complicate the interpretation of experiments. It is therefore better to employ several
177 methods in parallel in the same study — such as CV analysis, paired-pulse ratio, NMDA:AMPA
178 ratio, and spontaneous release [15, 48] — to independently verify the locus of expression.

179 Recently, inference methods of short-term plasticity and quantal parameters have been intro-
180 duced [87, 88, 89]. The sampling method of [87] is particularly well suited to deal with the strong
181 correlation and uncertainty in the synapse parameters. Based on this method we revealed interest-
182 ing variations between different neuronal connections and proposed more informative experimental
183 protocols based on irregular spike-trains, which would be promising to apply in plasticity experi-
184 ments.

185 END BOX1

186 Pre- and postsynaptic expression of STDP

187 While the diverse pathways of plasticity induction and expression are increasingly unravelled, their
188 functional roles are still largely an open question. Recently, we have started exploring some of these
189 consequences using computational models of STDP. In STDP experiments, where spikes from the
190 presynaptic neuron are paired with millisecond precision with postsynaptic ones, the question of
191 pre- versus postsynaptic expression has been extensively examined as well. Depending on factors
192 such as synapse type, brain area and experimental conditions, there is evidence for both pre- and
193 postsynaptic changes [15, 48, 90, 91, 66, 92]. Because of the synapse-type specificity of STDP [52],
194 we used STDP data of connections between visual cortex layer-5 pyramidal cells only [93, 15, 48]. At
195 this synapse it has been observed that using STDP induction protocols potentiation has both pre-
196 and postsynaptic components [48], while LTD is expressed presynaptically only [15]. Presynaptic-
197 only time-dependent LTD has also been found in other synapse-types and brain areas [90, 92].

198 Our model of STDP allows for distinct pre- and postsynaptic expression, Fig.1a. This phe-
199 nomenological model relies on three dynamic variables, one which tracks past presynaptic activity
200 $x_+(t)$, and two that track postsynaptic activity, $y_+(t)$ and $y_-(t)$. These traces increase with every
201 spike and decay exponentially between spikes. The plasticity is expressed as a function of the traces,
202 but in contrast to traditional STDP models where just the synaptic weight changes as a function of
203 them [94], here both the release probability and the quantal amplitude are independently modified.
204 In our model, we assume that the number of release sites N is fixed and that it does not change on
205 the time-scale of the experiments, consistent with experimental observations [80, 81]. However, the
206 model could be straightforwardly generalised to also include changes in N .

207 Even though we model the observed phenomenology rather than the biophysical or mechan-
208 istic details, with caution the components of the model can be interpreted to correspond specific




Figure 1: A schematic of our biologically tuned STDP model with pre- and postsynaptic expression. a) The synaptic weight is the product of the release probability P and the quantal amplitude q . Changes in these parameters due to STDP are modelled as functions of presynaptic activity trace x_+ and postsynaptic activity traces y_+ and y_- . b) The fitted model captures the estimated changes in release probability (left) and quantal amplitude (right) for both positive timing (presynaptic spikes 10 ms before postsynaptic ones; blue) and negative timing (presynaptic spikes 10 ms after postsynaptic ones; red), as a function of the frequency of STDP pairings. Symbols indicate data, while lines denote the model fit. c) After LTP, the release probability is enhanced, which leads to stronger short-term depression. The change in short-term synaptic dynamics in the model (bottom) mimics the data (top). Panels b and c are reproduced from [16].

209 physiological components. The presynaptic trace (x_+), for example, could represent glutamate
 210 binding to postsynaptic NMDA receptors, which when depolarised by postsynaptic spikes unblocks
 211 NMDA receptors, leading to classical postsynaptic LTP [34]. Similarly, the postsynaptic trace y_+
 212 can be interpreted as retrograde nitric oxide (NO) signalling, which is read out by presynaptic spikes
 213 and leads to presynaptically expressed LTP [48]. Finally, the postsynaptic trace y_- can be linked
 214 to endocannabinoid (eCB) retrograde release, which triggers presynaptically expressed LTD when
 215 coincident with presynaptic spikes [15, 90, 92].

216 As mentioned above, we fitted our model to experimental data of one synapse type only (layer-
 217 5 pyramidal cells onto layer-5 pyramidal cells in the visual cortex) [93, 15, 48], across different
 218 frequencies and timings. To ensure the biological realism of the model, we further constrained the
 219 model fitting by using data from NO and eCB pharmacological blockade experiments in which either
 220 presynaptic LTD or LTP expression alone was abolished [48]. Furthermore, we verified that our
 221 model captured the expected interaction of short and long-term plasticity correctly (see Fig.1c),
 222 which permits the exploration of the functional implications of changes in short-dynamics due to
 223 the induction of long-term plasticity.

224 In the current model neither LTD nor LTP depend on the state of the synapse - the values of q
 225 and Pr . As a result the current model does not have a (non-trivial) fixed point, and as the fitting
 226 to the data only considered the *relative* changes in these parameters, the initial conditions were
 227 arbitrarily set to $q = 1$. An improved model could include state dependence in the plasticity to

228 1) create a fixed point and a realistic weight distribution, and 2) allow fitting to data that takes
229 into account that plasticity might depend on the state (see also Discussion). Such extensions would
230 however require more data. Similarly it might be possible to model plasticity at the level of voltage
231 [95] or even calcium [96] to capture finer details observed experimentally.

232 **Functional consequences of pre- and postsynaptic STDP expression**

233 The model reveals several functional implications of expressing synaptic plasticity pre- as well as
234 postsynaptically. First, the locus of expression of plasticity will change the trial-to-trial variability
235 of the synaptic response and overall reliability of neurotransmission. Specifically, by increasing the
236 release probability, trial-to-trial reliability from synaptic transmission can be increased. Thus, joint
237 pre- and postsynaptic plasticity can lead to a larger increase in the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) than
238 postsynaptic modification alone (Fig.2a). The functional impact on SNR of this joint modification
239 is consistent with improved sensory perception and its electrophysiological correlates observed in
240 auditory cortex [97].

241 Secondly, the pre- and postsynaptic components can differ in stability properties: some changes
242 might be quick to induce, but hard to stabilise and vice versa. This in turn can provide neuronal
243 networks with the necessary flexibility to quickly adapt to environmental changes. Using a simple
244 receptive field development simulation, we propose that this might enable a form of memory savings.
245 Memory savings is a concept introduced by Hermann Ebbinghaus and means that repeated learning
246 of information is easier, even if the initially learned information appears to have been forgotten [98].
247 When memories were overwritten, the presynaptic component of the old memory was erased quickly
248 but the postsynaptic component stayed largely intact. As a result, information that was initially
249 learned but subsequently overwritten could rapidly be recovered upon relearning, provided that the
250 postsynaptic component had not yet decayed completely (Fig. 2b). This mechanism could thus
251 enable the brain to adapt quickly to different environments or to different tasks without fully for-
252 getting previous learned information. The savings effect mirrors monocular deprivation experiments
253 showing lasting postsynaptic structural effects on spine density that enable more rapid plasticity on
254 repeated monocular deprivation [99, 100].

255 In the STDP data we saw no evidence for any decrease in the postsynaptic component q , perhaps
256 because its decrease may be very slow. Under other protocols, LTD in q has been observed [68]. As
257 it appears unbiological to have no decrease in q , we assumed that a slow homeostatic-like process
258 can decrease q and so over very long times q decays and the hidden memory trace decays with
259 it. Without this homeostatic process, the hidden trace in q would not decay and memory savings
260 would occur for memories of any age. Our model also suggests that presynaptic boutons should be
261 more dynamic during learning. Recently [101] imaged layer-5 pyramidal cell synapses and found
262 that boutons tend to grow more often than spines after an auditory fear conditioning task.

263 Finally, while the effects reported in [16] considered feedforward networks, the changes in release




Figure 2: STDP with pre- and postsynaptic expression improves sensory perception, enables memory savings and shortens response latencies compared to postsynaptic expression alone.

a) Changes in the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) during receptive field learning in the STDP model. The SNR is represented by the gray-scale; the curves represent the various plasticity trajectories starting from the initial condition in the centre. Poisson train inputs that were stimulated at a high rate (“on”) obtain high signal-to-noise ratio (“SNR”) for postsynaptic-only potentiation (dark blue arrows), but combining pre- and postsynaptic potentiation yields considerably better SNR (dark red arrows). Weakly stimulated inputs (“off”) obtain lower SNR in either condition (light blue and light red arrows). These modelling results are in keeping with the observed modifications of *in-vivo* synaptic responses to a tone from on and off receptive field positions (dark and light green arrows) [97].

b) Rapid relearning and memory savings with asymmetrically combined pre- and postsynaptic expression of long-term plasticity. Top: Response of a neuron to two stimuli, red and blue. The neuron is initially trained on the blue stimulus, and becomes over time selective to it. This initial learning is slow because the changes in q (bottom panel) are slow. After learning, the memory is overwritten with the red stimulus. However, when switching back to the initial blue stimulus, the relearning is more rapid than at first exposure. Middle: Presynaptic LTP and LTD can rapidly completely reverse each other. Bottom: LTP has a postsynaptic component that does not reverse quickly, which means a postsynaptic trace is left behind after overwriting with novel information. This hidden trace enables rapid relearning of previously learnt, but overwritten, information.

c) Left: Schematic of a firing-rate model with feedforward and feedback connections as described in [22]. In this network, recurrent synapses are short-term depressing. Changing release probability Pr affects the short-term dynamics, while changing the postsynaptic amplitude q only scales the postsynaptic response. Right: Comparison of changes in the response to a 100ms step stimulus in the recurrent network model when the recurrent synapses are subject to changes in either Pr or q . Increases in the release probability shorten the latency more than increases in the postsynaptic amplitude.

Panels a and b were reproduced from [16].

264 probability under STDP also has consequences for recurrent networks. Excitation-dominated re-
265 current networks connected through strong short-term depressing synapses can have long response
266 latencies, that are governed by the synaptic dynamics. We used the model presented in [22] to
267 examine the effect of different expression loci in a recurrent network. Fig. 2c illustrates the re-
268 sponse of a firing-rate model when the release probability Pr is increased, versus a case in which
269 the quantal amplitude q is increased. The pre- and postsynaptic modifications were set such that
270 the peak responses were identical. In both cases the response latency was shortened, but when
271 release probability was allowed to increase due to LTP, response latency shortened about twice as
272 much compared to the case where only postsynaptic plasticity was enabled.

273 **Possible other consequences of diversity in locus of plasticity**

274 The “embarrassment of riches” in the possible expression sites of plasticity [47], is paralleled in
275 many other biological systems. We mention the work of Eve Marder and co-workers on ion-channel
276 expression [e.g. 102], and Turrigiano has emphasized the multiple ways to achieve homeostasis is
277 puzzling (e.g. review Turrigiano in this issue). Considering Hebbian and homeostatic together (see
278 Chen et al review in this issue), complicates this matter even further. It might have a number of
279 consequences beyond the ones discussed above in the STDP model. First, the multiple expression
280 site provide robustness to the system and multiple ways to maintain the capacity for plasticity,
281 despite internal or external disruption, and compensate for genetic defects. Such redundancy can
282 also be advantageous when an abundance of synapses is subject to somewhat diverse learning rules,
283 as it increases the chance that one or some of the synapses correctly adapts to the task at hand.
284 This diversity argument also occurs on the evolutionary level [103], namely, a population can be
285 functionally similar but diverse in mechanism, allowing for better adaptation of the population as
286 a whole to novel circumstances. Yet, the publication of yet another pathway often makes one want
287 to exclaim “Who ordered that?”, as Rabi did when the sub-atomic muon particle was discovered.

288 Second, the multiple expression sites provide flexibility to local circuits, so that, via synapse-
289 type-specific plasticity, different microcircuit components can be independently regulated [52]. For
290 example, long-term depression (LTD) at layer 4 to layer 2/3 connections, but not at layer 2/3 to 2/3
291 synapses, is more readily induced during the critical period [104, 105], while thalamocortical LTP
292 is already strongly diminished before the critical period has begun [106]. The locus of expression of
293 long-term plasticity at these different synapse types also differs.

294 Similarly, different plasticity protocols are affected by distinct forms of neuromodulation. The
295 neuromodulators can specifically control forms of STDP that express, for example, postsynaptically
296 [107, 108, 109], providing a potential link between behaviourally relevant behaviours and expression
297 loci.

298 Finally, LTD is not necessarily the opposite of LTP, this becomes even more pressing when
299 considering the diversity of expression mechanisms. In virtually all computational models, LTP

300 induction followed by LTD induction returns the synapse to its original state. Instead, in the above
301 STDP model such a protocol might leave the synapse in a different state, even if the apparent
302 synaptic weight is the same, as happens in the case of memory savings. A more direct experimental
303 research of these issues, for instance using learning and subsequent unlearning, would be worthwhile.
304 These considerations also indicates that both the pre- and postsynaptic component need mechanisms
305 to prevent them from saturating and thereby losing the capacity for change. This might be possible
306 by introducing soft-bounds for both the pre and post components, or introduce both pre and post
307 synaptic normalization [110].

308 Discussion

309 To model the impact of synaptic plasticity on circuit computations, it is important to know how
310 synapses change during Hebbian and homeostatic plasticity. Here, we have discussed several
311 possible expression sites of synaptic plasticity. We have demonstrated three candidate effects in an
312 STDP model where both pre- and postsynaptic components are modified: 1) a change in the release
313 probability can improve the SNR in the circuit, 2) the difference in the time scales of modification
314 can lead to the formation of hidden memory traces, and 3) as a result of changes in synaptic
315 dynamics, the response latency in recurrent networks can be shortened with plasticity. The possible
316 functional impact of combining pre- and postsynaptic plasticity is certainly not restricted to the
317 three findings we illustrate here. We have rather just scratched the surface of what is likely an
318 emerging field of study.

319 There is a large range of open issues. For instance, it has long been argued that the stability
320 of memory in spite of continuous molecular turn-over is a quite remarkable problem for nature
321 to solve [111, 112]. How synapses maintain stable information storage while staying plastic still
322 remains unclear. The diversity of plasticity expression mechanisms could allow for a staged process
323 by which initial changes are presynaptic, but later changes are consolidated structurally [32]. It is,
324 however, not unlikely that multiple expression mechanisms are active in tandem. How these pre-
325 and postsynaptic alterations are coordinated to ensure the long-term fidelity of information storage
326 will require extensive further research. State-based models with a large range of transition rates
327 between states have been explored to resolve this issue [113, 114, 115, 116], see also (Liu & Lisman,
328 this issue). As these models are agnostic about expression, the current model could be seen as a
329 biological implementation of such a multi-state model. It would for instance be of interest to know if
330 the fast resetting of synaptic weights known to occur with exposure to enriched environments [117]
331 is pre or post-synaptic. It would also be of interest to research if the storage capacity advantages
332 observed in those more theoretical models will also occur in the current phenomenological model.
333 There is also similarity to a recent study in which homeostasis acted as an independent multiplicative
334 mechanism [118].

335 Another important issue is the weight dependence of long-term plasticity — LTP is hard to

336 induce at synapses that are already strong [119, 120, 121, 93] — which has important implications
337 for the synaptic weight distribution, memory stability [122] and information capacity [123]. It has
338 been shown that presynaptic modifications strongly depend on the initial release probability [33],
339 which is expected as release probability is bounded between 0 and 1. This demonstrates that the
340 weight-dependence can stem from presynaptic considerations. However, postsynaptic mechanisms
341 such as compartmentalisation of calcium signals may also explain this weight dependence, as it leads
342 to large spines with long necks being “write protected” [124, 125, 126, 127]. This finding together
343 with the fact that spine volume is proportional to the expression of AMPA receptors [128] implies
344 that small spines should be more prone to LTP, which is consistent with experimental observations
345 [69]. Such pre- and postsynaptic mechanisms are of course not mutually exclusive and both may
346 contribute to the weight dependence of plasticity [120]. Including these effects would be an obvious
347 next target for the STDP model. Experimentally, it would be of interest to apply protocols [see e.g.
348 87] that can accurately probe the short-term plasticity parameters before and after STDP induction.

349 Long-term synaptic plasticity and homeostatic plasticity have been fruitful modelling topics that
350 have clarified the role of plasticity in biological neuronal networks as well as inspired applications
351 using artificial neuronal networks. Yet, despite experimental evidence for presynaptic components in
352 both Hebbian plasticity and synaptic homeostasis, in the overwhelming majority of computational
353 models presynaptic contributions have been ignored (for an exception, see [129, 130]), or the models
354 are agnostic about the expression and only adjust the synaptic weight. However, as we have seen,
355 this is not a neutral assumption, and may affect the outcome of the plasticity on network function.

356 Interestingly, in recurrent networks short-term plasticity will have an effect on the pre/post
357 activity patterns, and thereby change STDP induction [131, 132, 133]. Theoretically such mutually
358 interacting systems are extremely challenging [134].

359 Our discussion has been restricted to the plasticity of excitatory synapses. Inhibitory neurons,
360 in all their diversity [135, 136, 137], bring yet another level of complexity as differential short-term
361 dynamics of excitatory and inhibitory synapses yields considerably richer dynamics [138, 139, 87, 62].
362 We suspect that only a small fraction of the richness and variety of the experimentally observed
363 plasticity phenomena are understood and currently only a few computational models include them.
364 A continued dialogue between theory and experiment should hopefully advance our understanding.

365 **Acknowledgements**

366 We would like to thank our collaborators over the years for insightful discussions, in particular
367 Rob Froemke, Richard Morris, Zahid Padamsey, Gina Turrigiano and Tim Vogels. We also like
368 to acknowledge the workshop organisers Kevin Fox and Mike Stryker, and the Royal Society for
369 facilitating an inspiring meeting.

370 References

- 371 [1] Zhang, W. & Linden, D. J. The other side of the engram: experience-driven changes in
372 neuronal intrinsic excitability. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **4**, 885–900 (2003).
- 373 [2] Watt, A. J. & Desai, N. S. Homeostatic plasticity and STDP: keeping a neuron’s cool in a
374 fluctuating world. *Front. Synaptic Neurosci.* **2**, 240 (2010).
- 375 [3] Keck, T. e. a. Integrating hebbian and homeostatic plasticity: the current state of the field
376 and future research directions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological
377 Sciences* **369**, 20130154 (2016).
- 378 [4] Poolos, N. P., Migliore, M. & Johnston, D. Pharmacological upregulation of h-channels reduces
379 the excitability of pyramidal neuron dendrites. *Nature neuroscience* **5**, 767–774 (2002).
- 380 [5] Hoffman, D. A., Magee, J. C., Colbert, C. M. & Johnston, D. K^+ channel regulation of signal
381 propagation in dendrites of hippocampal pyramidal neurons. *Nature* **387**, 869–875 (1997).
- 382 [6] Desai, N. S., Rutherford, L. C. & Turrigiano, G. G. Plasticity in the intrinsic electrical
383 properties of cortical pyramidal neurons. *Nat. Neuro.* **2**, 515–520 (1999).
- 384 [7] Grubb, M. S. & Burrone, J. Activity-dependent relocation of the axon initial segment fine-
385 tunes neuronal excitability. *Nature* **465**, 1070–1074 (2010).
- 386 [8] Turrigiano, G. G. Too many cooks? intrinsic and synaptic homeostatic mechanisms in cortical
387 circuit refinement. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **34**, 89–103 (2011).
- 388 [9] Turrigiano, G. The dialectic of hebb and homeostasis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
389 Society B: Biological Sciences* **369**, 20130154 (2016).
- 390 [10] Markram, H. & Tsodyks, M. Redistribution of synaptic efficacy between neocortical pyramidal
391 neurons. *Nature* **382**, 807–810 (1996).
- 392 [11] Zakharenko, S., Zablow, L. & Siegelbaum, S. Visualization of changes in presynaptic function
393 during long-term synaptic plasticity. *Nature Neuroscience* **4**, 711–717 (2001).
- 394 [12] Zakharenko, S. S., Zablow, L. & Siegelbaum, S. A. Altered presynaptic vesicle release and
395 cycling during mglur-dependent ltd. *Neuron* **35**, 1099–1110 (2002).
- 396 [13] Zucker, R. S. & Regehr, W. G. Short-term synaptic plasticity. *Annu Rev Physiol* **64**, 355–405
397 (2002).
- 398 [14] Gerdeman, G. L., Ronesi, J. & Lovinger, D. M. Postsynaptic endocannabinoid release is
399 critical to long-term depression in the striatum. *Nature neuroscience* **5**, 446–451 (2002).

- 400 [15] Sjöström, P. J., Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. B. Neocortical LTD via coincident activation
401 of presynaptic NMDA and cannabinoid receptors. *Neuron* **39**, 641–654 (2003).
- 402 [16] Costa, R. P., Froemke, R. C., Sjöström, P. J. & van Rossum, M. C. Unified pre-and postsyn-
403 aptic long-term plasticity enables reliable and flexible learning. *eLife* **4**, e09457 (2015).
- 404 [17] Abbott, L. F. & Regehr, W. G. Synaptic computation. *Nature* **431**, 796–803 (2004).
- 405 [18] Hennig, M. H. Theoretical models of synaptic short term plasticity. *Frontiers in Computational*
406 *Neuroscience* **7** (2013). URL [http://www.frontiersin.org/computational_neuroscience/](http://www.frontiersin.org/computational_neuroscience/10.3389/fncom.2013.00045/abstract)
407 [10.3389/fncom.2013.00045/abstract](http://www.frontiersin.org/computational_neuroscience/10.3389/fncom.2013.00045/abstract).
- 408 [19] Tsodyks, M. & Wu, S. Short-term synaptic plasticity. *Scholarpedia* (2013). revision #136920.
- 409 [20] Abbott, L. F., Varela, J. A., Sen, K. & Nelson, S. B. Synaptic depression and cortical gain
410 control. *Science* **275**, 220–224 (1997).
- 411 [21] Goldman, M. S., Maldonado, P. & Abbott, L. F. Redundancy reduction and sustained firing
412 with stochastic depressing synapses. *J Neurosci* **22**, 584–591 (2002).
- 413 [22] van Rossum, M. C. W., van der Meer, M. A. A., Xiao, D. & Oram, M. W. Adaptive integration
414 in the visual cortex by depressing recurrent cortical circuits. *Neural Comput* **20**, 1847–1872
415 (2008).
- 416 [23] Barak, O. & Tsodyks, M. Persistent activity in neural networks with dynamic synapses. *PLoS*
417 *Comput Biol* **3**, e35 (2007).
- 418 [24] York, L. C. & van Rossum, M. C. W. Recurrent networks with short term synaptic depression.
419 *J Comput Neurosci* **27**, 607–620 (2009).
- 420 [25] Mongillo, G., Barak, O. & Tsodyks, M. Synaptic theory of working memory. *Science* **319**,
421 1543–1546 (2008).
- 422 [26] Markram, H., Gerstner, W. & Sjöström, P. J. A history of spike-timing-dependent plasticity.
423 *Front Synaptic Neurosci* **3**, 4 (2011).
- 424 [27] Engert, F. & Bonhoeffer, T. Dendritic spine changes associated with hippocampal long-term
425 synaptic plasticity. *Nature* **399**, 66–70 (1999).
- 426 [28] Le Bé, J.-V. & Markram, H. Spontaneous and evoked synaptic rewiring in the neonatal
427 neocortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **103**, 13214–13219 (2006).
- 428 [29] Kwon, H.-B. & Sabatini, B. L. Glutamate induces de novo growth of functional spines in
429 developing cortex. *Nature* **474**, 100–104 (2011).

- 430 [30] Nabavi, S. *et al.* Engineering a memory with LTD and LTP. *Nature* (2014).
- 431 [31] Kandel, E. R. The molecular biology of memory storage: a dialogue between genes and
432 synapses. *Science* **294**, 1030–1038 (2001).
- 433 [32] Loebel, A., Le Bé, J.-V., Richardson, M. J. E., Markram, H. & Herz, A. V. M. Matched pre-
434 and post-synaptic changes underlie synaptic plasticity over long time scales. *The Journal of*
435 *neuroscience* **33**, 6257–6266 (2013).
- 436 [33] Larkman, A., Hannay, T., Stratford, K. & Jack, J. Presynaptic release probability influences
437 the locus of long-term potentiation. *Nature* **360**, 70–73 (1992).
- 438 [34] Bliss, T. V. & Collingridge, G. L. A synaptic model of memory: long-term potentiation in
439 the hippocampus. *Nature* **361**, 31–39 (1993).
- 440 [35] Younger, M. A., Müller, M., Tong, A., Pym, E. C. & Davis, G. W. A presynaptic ENaC
441 channel drives homeostatic plasticity. *Neuron* **79**, 1183–1196 (2013).
- 442 [36] Davis, G. W. & Müller, M. Homeostatic control of presynaptic neurotransmitter release.
443 *Annual review of physiology* **77**, 251–270 (2015).
- 444 [37] Kaeser, P. S. & Regehr, W. G. Molecular mechanisms for synchronous, asynchronous, and
445 spontaneous neurotransmitter release. *Annual review of physiology* **76**, 333 (2014).
- 446 [38] Müller, M., Liu, K. S. Y., Sigrist, S. J. & Davis, G. W. RIM controls homeostatic plasticity
447 through modulation of the readily-releasable vesicle pool. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **32**,
448 16574–16585 (2012).
- 449 [39] Wang, X., Pinter, M. J. & Rich, M. M. Reversible recruitment of a homeostatic reserve pool
450 of synaptic vesicles underlies rapid homeostatic plasticity of quantal content. *The Journal of*
451 *Neuroscience* **36**, 828–836 (2016).
- 452 [40] Lee, H.-K., Barbarosie, M., Kameyama, K., Bear, M. F. & Huganir, R. L. Regulation of
453 distinct AMPA receptor phosphorylation sites during bidirectional synaptic plasticity. *Nature*
454 **405**, 955–959 (2000).
- 455 [41] Kessels, H. W. & Malinow, R. Synaptic AMPA receptor plasticity and behavior. *Neuron* **61**,
456 340–350 (2009).
- 457 [42] Isaac, J. T., Ashby, M. C. & McBain, C. J. The role of the GluR2 subunit in AMPA receptor
458 function and synaptic plasticity. *Neuron* **54**, 859–871 (2007).
- 459 [43] Raghavachari, S. & Lisman, J. E. Properties of quantal transmission at CA1 synapses. *J*
460 *Neurophysiol* **92**, 2456–2467 (2004).

- 461 [44] Lisman, J. E., Raghavachari, S. & Tsien, R. W. The sequence of events that underlie quantal
462 transmission at central glutamatergic synapses. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **8**, 597–609 (2007).
- 463 [45] Larkman, A. U. & Jack, J. J. B. Synaptic plasticity: hippocampal LTP. *Current opinion in*
464 *neurobiology* **5**, 324–334 (1995).
- 465 [46] Frey, U. & Morris, R. G. Synaptic tagging and long-term potentiation. *Nature* **385**, 533–536
466 (1997).
- 467 [47] Malenka, R. C. & Bear, M. F. LTP and LTD: an embarrassment of riches. *Neuron* **44**, 5–21
468 (2004).
- 469 [48] Sjöström, P. J., Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. Multiple forms of long-term plasticity at
470 unitary neocortical layer 5 synapses. *Neuropharmacology* **52**, 176–184 (2007).
- 471 [49] Kullmann, D. M., Moreau, A. W., Bakiri, Y. & Nicholson, E. Plasticity of inhibition. *Neuron*
472 **75**, 951–962 (2012).
- 473 [50] Padamsey, Z. & Emptage, N. Two sides to long-term potentiation: a view towards reconcili-
474 ation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **369**, 20130154
475 (2014).
- 476 [51] Park, P. *et al.* Nmda receptor-dependent long-term potentiation comprises a family of tem-
477 porally overlapping forms of synaptic plasticity that are induced by different patterns of
478 stimulation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **369**, 20130131 (2014).
- 479 [52] Larsen, R. S. & Sjöström, P. J. Synapse-type-specific plasticity in local circuits. *Current*
480 *opinion in neurobiology* **35**, 127–135 (2015).
- 481 [53] Granger, A. J. & Nicoll, R. A. Expression mechanisms underlying long-term potentiation: a
482 postsynaptic view, 10 years on. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **369**, 20130136 (2014).
- 483 [54] Bacci, A. *et al.* Chronic blockade of glutamate receptors enhances presynaptic release and
484 downregulates the interaction between synaptophysin-synaptobrevin-vesicle-associated mem-
485 brane protein 2. *J Neurosci* **21**, 6588–6596 (2001).
- 486 [55] Burrone, J., O’Byrne, M. & Murthy, V. N. Multiple forms of synaptic plasticity triggered
487 by selective suppression of activity in individual neurons. *Nature* **420**, 414–418 (2002). URL
488 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature01242>.
- 489 [56] Thiagarajan, T. C., Lindskog, M. & Tsien, R. W. Adaptation to synaptic inactivity in hippo-
490 campal neurons. *Neuron* **47**, 725–737 (2005). URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.06.037)
491 [2005.06.037](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.06.037).

- 492 [57] Wierenga, C. J., Walsh, M. F. & Turrigiano, G. G. Temporal regulation of the expression
493 locus of homeostatic plasticity. *Journal of neurophysiology* **96**, 2127–2133 (2006).
- 494 [58] Han, E. B. & Stevens, C. F. Development regulates a switch between post- and presynaptic
495 strengthening in response to activity deprivation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106**, 10817–10822
496 (2009). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0903603106>.
- 497 [59] Kim, J. & Tsien, R. W. Synapse-specific adaptations to inactivity in hippocampal circuits
498 achieve homeostatic gain control while dampening network reverberation. *Neuron* **58**, 925–937
499 (2008).
- 500 [60] Ouanounou, G., Baux, G. & Bal, T. A novel synaptic plasticity rule explains homeostasis of
501 neuromuscular transmission. *eLife* **5**, e12190 (2016).
- 502 [61] Sanes, J. R. & Lichtman, J. W. Induction, assembly, maturation and maintenance of a
503 postsynaptic apparatus. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **2**, 791–805 (2001).
- 504 [62] Blackman, A. V., Abrahamsson, T., Costa, R. P., Lalanne, T. & Sjostrom, P. J. Target-
505 cell-specific short-term plasticity in local circuits. *Frontiers in Synaptic Neuroscience* **5**, 11
506 (2013).
- 507 [63] Markram, H., Wang, Y. & Tsodyks, M. Differential signaling via the same axon of neocortical
508 pyramidal neurons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **95**, 5323–5328 (1998).
- 509 [64] Buchanan, K. A. *et al.* Target-Specific Expression of Presynaptic NMDA Receptors in Neo-
510 cortical Microcircuits. *Neuron* **75**, 451–466 (2012).
- 511 [65] Koester, H. J. & Johnston, D. Target cell-dependent normalization of transmitter release at
512 neocortical synapses. *Science* **308**, 863–866 (2005).
- 513 [66] Banerjee, A., González-Rueda, A., Sampaio-Baptista, C., Paulsen, O. & Rodríguez-Moreno,
514 A. Distinct mechanisms of spike timing-dependent LTD at vertical and horizontal inputs onto
515 L2/3 pyramidal neurons in mouse barrel cortex. *Physiological reports* (2014).
- 516 [67] Stanton, P. K., Winterer, J., Zhang, X.-l. & Müller, W. Imaging LTP of presynaptic release
517 of FM1-43 from the rapidly recycling vesicle pool of Schaffer collateral-CA1 synapses in rat
518 hippocampal slices. *European Journal of Neuroscience* **22**, 2451–2461 (2005).
- 519 [68] Dodt, H.-U., Eder, M., Frick, A. & Zieglgänsberger, W. Precisely localized ltd in the neocortex
520 revealed by infrared-guided laser stimulation. *Science* **286**, 110–113 (1999).
- 521 [69] Matsuzaki, M., Honkura, N., Ellis-Davies, G. C. R. & Kasai, H. Structural basis of long-term
522 potentiation in single dendritic spines. *Nature* **429**, 761–766 (2004).

- 523 [70] Watt, A. J., Sjöström, P. J., Häusser, M., Nelson, S. B. & Turrigiano, G. G. A proportional
524 but slower NMDA potentiation follows AMPA potentiation in LTP. *Nature neuroscience* **7**,
525 518–524 (2004).
- 526 [71] Kullmann, D. M., Erdemli, G. & Asztély, F. LTP of AMPA and NMDA receptor-mediated
527 signals: evidence for presynaptic expression and extrasynaptic glutamate spill-over. *Neuron*
528 **17**, 461–474 (1996).
- 529 [72] Hessler, N. A., Shirke, A. M. & Malinow, R. The probability of transmitter release at a
530 mammalian central synapse (1993).
- 531 [73] Poncer, J. & Malinow, R. Postsynaptic conversion of silent synapses during LTP affects
532 synaptic gain and transmission dynamics. *Nature neuroscience* **4**, 989–996 (2001).
- 533 [74] Turrigiano, G. G., Leslie, K. R., Desai, N. S., Rutherford, L. C. & Nelson, S. B. Activity-
534 dependent scaling of quantal amplitude in neocortical neurons. *Nature* **391**, 892–896 (1998).
- 535 [75] Isaac, J., Oliet, S., Hjelmstad, G., Nicoll, R. & Malenka, R. Expression mechanisms of long-
536 term potentiation in the hippocampus. *Journal of Physiology-Paris* **90**, 299–303 (1996).
- 537 [76] Traynelis, S. F., Silver, R. A. & Cull-Candy, S. G. Estimated conductance of glutamate
538 receptor channels activated during EPSCs at the cerebellar mossy fiber-granule cell synapse.
539 *Neuron* **11**, 279–289 (1993).
- 540 [77] Kilman, V., van Rossum, M. C. W. & Turrigiano, G. G. Activity deprivation reduces mIPSC
541 amplitude by decreasing the number of postsynaptic GABA_A receptors clustered at neocortical
542 synapses. *J. Neurosci.* **22**, 1328–1337 (2002).
- 543 [78] Feldwisch-Drentrup, H., Barrett, A. B., Smith, M. T. & van Rossum, M. C. Fluctuations in
544 the open time of synaptic channels: An application to noise analysis based on charge. *Journal*
545 *of neuroscience methods* **210**, 15–21 (2012).
- 546 [79] Faber, D. S. & Korn, H. Applicability of the coefficient of variation method for analyzing
547 synaptic plasticity. *Biophysical journal* **60**, 1288–1294 (1991).
- 548 [80] Bolshakov, V. Y., Golan, H., Kandel, E. R. & Siegelbaum, S. A. Recruitment of new sites of
549 synaptic transmission during the cAMP-dependent late phase of LTP at CA3-CA1 synapses
550 in the hippocampus. *Neuron* **19**, 635–651 (1997).
- 551 [81] Saez, I. & Friedlander, M. J. Plasticity between neuronal pairs in layer 4 of visual cortex
552 varies with synapse state. *The Journal of neuroscience* **29**, 15286–15298 (2009).

- 553 [82] Markram, H., Lübke, J., Frotscher, M., Roth, A. & Sakmann, B. Physiology and anatomy of
554 synaptic connections between thick tufted pyramidal neurones in the developing rat neocortex.
555 *J Physiol* **500** (Pt 2), 409–440 (1997).
- 556 [83] Loebel, A. *et al.* Multiquantal release underlies the distribution of synaptic efficacies in the
557 neocortex. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience* **3**, 27 (2009).
- 558 [84] Rozov, A. & Burnashev, N. Polyamine-dependent facilitation of postsynaptic ampa receptors
559 counteracts paired-pulse depression. *Nature* **401**, 594–598 (1999).
- 560 [85] Rozov, A., Jerecic, J., Sakmann, B. & Burnashev, N. AMPA receptor channels with long-
561 lasting desensitization in bipolar interneurons contribute to synaptic depression in a novel
562 feedback circuit in layer 2/3 of rat neocortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **21**, 8062–8071
563 (2001).
- 564 [86] Heine, M. *et al.* Surface mobility of postsynaptic AMPARs tunes synaptic transmission.
565 *Science* **320**, 201–205 (2008).
- 566 [87] Costa, R. P., Sjostrom, P. J. & van Rossum, M. C. W. Probabilistic inference of short-term
567 synaptic plasticity in neocortical microcircuits. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* **7**,
568 75 (2013).
- 569 [88] Bhumbra, G. S. & Beato, M. Reliable evaluation of the quantal determinants of synaptic
570 efficacy using Bayesian analysis. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **109**, 603–620 (2013).
- 571 [89] Barri, A., Wang, Y., Hansel, D. & Mongillo, G. Quantifying repetitive transmission at chem-
572 ical synapses: A generative-model approach. *eNeuro* **3**, ENEURO–0113 (2016).
- 573 [90] Bender, V. A. & Feldman, D. Two Coincidence Detectors for Spike Timing-Dependent Plas-
574 ticity in Somatosensory Cortex. *The Journal of neuroscience* **26**, 4166–4177 (2006).
- 575 [91] Yang, Y. & Calakos, N. Presynaptic long-term plasticity. *Frontiers in Synaptic Neuroscience*
576 **5** (2013).
- 577 [92] Andrade-Talavera, Y., Duque-Feria, P., Paulsen, O. & Rodríguez-Moreno, A. Presynaptic
578 spike timing-dependent long-term depression in the mouse hippocampus. *Cerebral Cortex* **26**,
579 3637–3654 (2016).
- 580 [93] Sjöström, P. J., Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. B. Rate, Timing, and Cooperativity Jointly
581 Determine Cortical Synaptic Plasticity. *Neuron* **32**, 1149–1164 (2001).
- 582 [94] Pfister, J.-P. & Gerstner, W. Triplets of spikes in a model of spike timing-dependent plasticity.
583 *J Neurosci* **26**, 9673–9682 (2006).

- 584 [95] Clopath, C., Büsing, L., Vasilaki, E. & Gerstner, W. Connectivity reflects coding: a model of
585 voltage-based stdp with homeostasis. *Nat Neurosci* **13**, 344–352 (2010).
- 586 [96] Graupner, M. & Brunel, N. Calcium-based plasticity model explains sensitivity of synaptic
587 changes to spike pattern, rate, and dendritic location. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **109**, 3991–
588 3996 (2012).
- 589 [97] Froemke, R. C. *et al.* Long-term modification of cortical synapses improves sensory perception.
590 *Nature Neuroscience* **16**, 79–88 (2013).
- 591 [98] Ebbinghaus, H. Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology. *Teachers College,*
592 *Columbia University* (1913).
- 593 [99] Hofer, S., Mrsic-Flogel, T., Bonhoeffer, T. & Hübener, M. Experience leaves a lasting struc-
594 tural trace in cortical circuits. *Nature* **457**, 313–317 (2008).
- 595 [100] Hübener, M. & Bonhoeffer, T. Searching for Engrams. *Neuron* **67**, 363–371 (2010).
- 596 [101] Yang, Y. *et al.* Selective synaptic remodeling of amygdalocortical connections associated with
597 fear memory. *Nature Publishing Group* **19**, 1348–1355 (2016).
- 598 [102] Marder, E. & Goaillard, J.-M. Variability, compensation and homeostasis in neuron and
599 network function. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **7**, 563–574 (2006).
- 600 [103] Daniels, B. C., Chen, Y.-J., Sethna, J. P., Gutenkunst, R. N. & Myers, C. R. Sloppiness,
601 robustness, and evolvability in systems biology. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology* **19**, 389–395
602 (2008).
- 603 [104] Corlew, R., Wang, Y., Ghermazien, H., Erisir, A. & Philpot, B. D. Developmental switch in
604 the contribution of presynaptic and postsynaptic NMDA receptors to long-term depression.
605 *The Journal of Neuroscience* **27**, 9835–9845 (2007).
- 606 [105] Banerjee, A. *et al.* Double dissociation of spike timing-dependent potentiation and depression
607 by subunit-preferring NMDA receptor antagonists in mouse barrel cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*
608 **19**, 2959–2969 (2009).
- 609 [106] Crair, M. C. & Malenka, R. C. A critical period for long-term potentiation at thalamocortical
610 synapses. *Nature* **375**, 325–328 (1995).
- 611 [107] Seol, G. H. *et al.* Neuromodulators control the polarity of spike-timing-dependent synaptic
612 plasticity. *Neuron* **55**, 919–929 (2007).
- 613 [108] Pawlak, V., Wickens, J. R., Kirkwood, A. & Kerr, J. N. D. Timing is not everything: neur-
614 omodulation opens the STDP gate. *Frontiers in Synaptic Neuroscience* (2010).

- 615 [109] Frémaux, N. & Gerstner, W. Neuromodulated Spike-Timing-Dependent Plasticity, and The-
616 ory of Three-Factor Learning Rules. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits* **9**, 1178 (2016).
- 617 [110] Zenke, F. & Gerstner, W. Hebbian plasticity requires negative feedback on multiple timescales.
618 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **369**, 20130154 (2016).
- 619 [111] Crick, F. Memory and molecular turnover. *Nature* **312**, 101 (1984).
- 620 [112] Lisman, J. A mechanism for the hebb and the anti-hebb processes underlying learning and
621 memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **86**, 9574–9578 (1989).
- 622 [113] Fusi, S., Drew, P. J. & Abbott, L. Cascade Models of Synaptically Stored Memories. *Neuron*
623 **45**, 599–611 (2005). URL <http://dx.doi.org/ron.2005.02.001>.
- 624 [114] Leibold, C. & Kempster, R. Sparseness constrains the prolongation of memory lifetime via
625 synaptic metaplasticity. *Cerebral Cortex* **18**, 67–77 (2008).
- 626 [115] Barrett, A. B. & van Rossum, M. C. W. Optimal learning rules for discrete synapses. *PLoS*
627 *Comput Biol* **4**, e1000230 (2008).
- 628 [116] Lahiri, S. & Ganguli, S. A memory frontier for complex synapses. In *Advances in Neural*
629 *Information Processing Systems*, 1034–1042 (2013).
- 630 [117] Abraham, W. C., Logan, B., Greenwood, J. M. & Dragunow, M. Induction and Experience-
631 Dependent Consolidation of Stable Long-Term Potentiation Lasting Months in the Hippo-
632 campus. *J. Neurosci.* **22**, 9626–9634 (2002).
- 633 [118] Toyozumi, T., Kaneko, M., Stryker, M. P. & Miller, K. D. Modeling the dynamic interaction
634 of hebbian and homeostatic plasticity. *Neuron* **84**, 497–510 (2014). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.09.036>.
- 635
- 636 [119] Bi, G.-q. & Poo, M.-m. Synaptic modifications in cultured hippocampal neurons: dependence
637 on spike timing, synaptic strength, and postsynaptic cell type. *J. Neurosci.* **18**, 10464–10472
638 (1998).
- 639 [120] Liao, D., Jones, A. & Malinow, R. Direct measurement of quantal changes underlying long-
640 term potentiation in ca1 hippocampus. *Neuron* **9**, 1089–1097 (1992).
- 641 [121] Debanne, D., Gähwiler, B. H. & Thompson, S. M. Heterogeneity of synaptic plasticity at
642 unitary CA1-CA3 and CA3-CA3 connections in rat hippocampal slice cultures. *J. Neurosci.*
643 **19**, 10664–10671 (1999).
- 644 [122] Billings, G. & van Rossum, M. C. W. Memory retention and spike-timing-dependent plasticity.
645 *J Neurophysiol* **101**, 2775–2788 (2009).

- 646 [123] van Rossum, M., Shippi, M. & Barrett, A. Soft-bound synaptic plasticity outperforms hard-
647 bound plasticity (2012). Submitted PlosCB.
- 648 [124] Noguchi, J., Matsuzaki, M., Ellis-Davies, G. C. R. & Kasai, H. Spine-neck geometry determ-
649 ines NMDA receptor-dependent Ca²⁺ signaling in dendrites. *Neuron* **46**, 609–622 (2005).
- 650 [125] Yasumatsu, N., Matsuzaki, M., Miyazaki, T., Noguchi, J. & Kasai, H. Principles of long-term
651 dynamics of dendritic spines. *J Neurosci* **28**, 13592–13608 (2008). URL [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0603-08.2008)
652 [10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0603-08.2008](http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0603-08.2008).
- 653 [126] Kalantzis, G. & Shouval, H. Z. Structural plasticity can produce metaplasticity. *PLoS One*
654 **4**, e8062 (2009).
- 655 [127] O’Donnell, C., Nolan, M. F. & van Rossum, M. C. W. Dendritic spine dynamics regulate the
656 long-term stability of synaptic plasticity. *J Neurosci* **31**, 16142–16156 (2011).
- 657 [128] Matsuzaki, M. *et al.* Dendritic spine geometry is critical for AMPA receptor expression in
658 hippocampal CA1 pyramidal neurons. *Nature neuroscience* **4**, 1086–1092 (2001).
- 659 [129] Senn, W., Markram, H. & Tsodyks, M. An algorithm for modifying neurotransmitter release
660 probability based on pre-and postsynaptic spike timing. *Neural Computation* **13**, 35–67 (2001).
- 661 [130] Lisman, J. & Raghavachari, S. A unified model of the presynaptic and postsynaptic changes
662 during LTP at CA1 synapses. *Sci STKE* **2006**, re11 (2006).
- 663 [131] Wang, Y. *et al.* Heterogeneity in the pyramidal network of the medial prefrontal cortex. *Nat*
664 *Neurosci* **9**, 534–542 (2006).
- 665 [132] Vasilaki, E. & Giugliano, M. Emergence of Connectivity Motifs in Networks of Model Neurons
666 with Short- and Long-Term Plastic Synapses. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e84626 (2014).
- 667 [133] Froemke, R. & Dan, Y. Spike-timing-dependent synaptic modification induced by natural
668 spike trains. *Nature* **416**, 433–8 (2002).
- 669 [134] Gilson, M., Burkitt, A., Grayden, D., Thomas, D. & van Hemmen, J. Emergence of net-
670 work structure due to spike-timing-dependent plasticity in recurrent neuronal networks. I.
671 input selectivity–strengthening correlated input pathways. *Biological cybernetics* **101**, 81–102
672 (2009).
- 673 [135] Markram, H. *et al.* Interneurons of the neocortical inhibitory system. *Nature Reviews Neur-*
674 *oscience* **5**, 793–807 (2004).
- 675 [136] DeFelipe, J. *et al.* New insights into the classification and nomenclature of cortical gabaergic
676 interneurons. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **14**, 202–216 (2013).

- 677 [137] Kepecs, A. & Fishell, G. Interneuron cell types are fit to function. *Nature* **505**, 318–326
678 (2014).
- 679 [138] Galarreta, M. & Hestrin, S. Frequency-dependent synaptic depression and the balance of
680 excitation and inhibition in the neocortex. *Nature neuroscience* **1**, 587–594 (1998).
- 681 [139] Varela, J. A., Song, S., Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. B. Differential depression at excitatory
682 and inhibitory synapses in visual cortex. *The journal of neuroscience* **19**, 4293–4304 (1999).