Fish in the matrix: motor learning in a virtual world
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There are two fundamentally different forms of sensory information that are being processed by the brain. The form that is more commonly studied—also the form that neuroscientists mostly worry about— is the kind that informs the brain about what is happening in the outside world. This kind of information is represented by neural activity that is evoked by changes in the environment due to all possible kinds of physical or biological events. We live, after all, in a constantly changing world and it clearly helps to be informed speedily of these changes. A large part of neuroscience is involved with the study of how this kind of sensory evoked activity is represented at different stages of processing in the brain and how it gets filtered for optimal extraction of the information that is most relevant for the generation of adaptive behaviors.

The zebrafish is a good model system to address these kinds of questions, since its translucence and small size makes it ideally suited for monitoring neural activity throughout the brain with modern optical methods. This striking advantage features prominently in other articles in this special issue and there are multiple examples across many modalities where such studies have added to our understanding of how sensory information is represented in the brain (Niell and Smith, 2003; Randys and Engert, 2008; Nambir et al., 2008; Del Bene et al., 2009; Blumbagen et al., 2011; Grama and Engert, 2012) and how this neural activity ultimately leads to the generation of specific behaviors. Thus, fish have been shown to turn in specific directions with direct sensory input (McLean et al., 2008), and to change the threshold for escape turns according to situational context (Mu et al., 2012).

The topic of this review is not related to this kind of question at all. Rather, it addresses the issue of how the second form of sensory information gets processed, namely the kind of sensory activity that results from the motion of the animal itself. Such self-generated sensory stimuli are termed reafference and they occur across many modalities whenever any movement is executed. When walking forward we experience reverse optic flow, that is, we perceive the world to be moving in the opposite direction. We also experience pressure on the bottom of our feet and air might flow over our skin. Whenever we vocalize we experience a very distinct auditory reafference, namely the sound of our own voice, of course, needs to get processed quite differently than somebody else’s utterance and such reafference clearly is a useful thing to pay attention to when we learn to sing or speak. I’m sure we can, with some creative thinking, even come up with good examples of olfactory reafference.

The main difference between this reafferent signal and the initially mentioned form of sensory input, commonly known as the exafference, is that it does not inform us about what effect the world has on us, but rather tells us what effect we have on the world. As such it informs the brain about the success and accuracy of ongoing movements and is immensely useful for—and most likely central to—all forms of motor learning and motor adaptation. The easiest way one can imagine such a learning process to take place, is that the reafference gets compared, somewhere in the brain, to an expected value, most likely represented by an efference copy, that is, a copy of the motor-command that is usually available in many brain regions. As soon as a difference is detected between expected outcome and actual reafference, plasticity mechanisms need to kick in, in order to adjust future motor-commands.

It is clear that such motor learning phenomena cannot be studied in paralyzed—and much less in anesthetized—animals, since here the actual execution of a behavior is the origin and cause of sensory stimulation.

If the goal is then to study the neural dynamics underlying these reafferent signals, a way has to be found that allows the monitoring of neural activity, ideally at cellular resolution and throughout the whole brain, while the animal is interacting with its environment. An additional requirement for such an experimental set-up is that it ought to allow control over the reafferent signal. In order
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FIGURE 1 | Existing methods for simultaneous behavior and neural recording. (A) A fly in a flight arena while whole-cell recordings are made from VS cells (from the Dickinson lab, Maimon et al., 2010, reproduced with permission). (B) A mouse walking on a suspended ball through a virtual reality environment while its brain is two-photon scanned (from the Tank lab, Dombeck et al., 2007, reproduced with permission; Harvey et al., 2009). (C) Diagram illustrating the closed-loop experimental setup in a larval zebrafish. A moving grating is shown to a head-restrained larva (the grating speed is represented by the red arrow) and its behavior is monitored with a high-speed camera. When the fish swims the stimulus slows down such that the relative motion between the larva and the moving grating resembles freely swimming conditions. The scale bar at the bottom right is 1 mm. (D) Left: Photomicrograph of a fish suspended in mid-water from five pipettes, two of which double as recording electrodes. Right: Example of a two-channel recording of a fictive swim. The left (blue) and right (red) signals are out of phase, as in earlier fictive swimming publications such as Masino and Fetcho (2005).

Reafference is not necessary for appropriate and meaningful behavior in a virtual world. Often it is sufficient to provide meaningful and consistent feedback to a single modality and then the absence of feedback in remaining input channels gets quickly ignored.

Good examples for such phenomena are found in current attempts to develop brain machine interfaces that allow monkeys as well as human subjects to move cursors over computer screens, or operate machinery simply by thinking about it. These serve probably as the best examples for the necessary plasticity in such closed systems since here the brain has very little a priori information of how activity in specific neuronal ensembles leads to changes in the environment via the motor systems that connect the two.

As such it is obvious that the brain needs to learn how to control the environment through these novel means, presumably via established algorithms of motor learning.
An intriguing finding in the zebrafish studies – as well as the preceding experiments on flies – was that animals are able to adapt their behavior to different conditions of the virtual environment with surprising speed. Very similar adjustments to artificially induced changes in reafference were found in a series of landmark studies in the weakly electric fish. Here changes in the reafference of the animal’s electric discharge was found to be canceled precisely when the strength of the reafference was artificially manipulated (Bell, 1981; Bell et al., 1997). Furthermore, this adjustable subtraction of an expected value from the actual reafference was not limited to weakly electric fish; similar adaptations were found in many ray finned fishes that are true interactive behavior in a vertebrate model organism. Hopefully, this will serve to illuminate how large populations of neurons, across many brain areas, work together to generate flexible behavior.

To summarize, these closed-loop implementations of fish behavior in virtual environments allow first forays into the study of entire neural ensembles, spanning from sensory input all the way to motor output, in a behaving animal that is flexibly adjusting its behavior in responses to changes in the feedback it receives from the environment. It thus opens the way for many similar experiments in which we can exhaustively study neural activity during true interactive behavior in a vertebrate model organism. Hopefully, this will serve to illuminate how large populations of neurons, across many brain areas, work together to generate flexible behavior.
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