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ABSTRACT

In vertebrate outer retina, changes in the membrane potential of horizontal cells affect the calcium influx and glutamate release of cone photoreceptors via a negative feedback. This feedback has a number of important physiological consequences. One is called background-induced flicker enhancement (BIFE) in which the onset of dim background enhances the center flicker response of horizontal cells. The underlying mechanism for the feedback is still unclear but competing hypotheses have been proposed. One is the GABA hypothesis, which states that the feedback is mediated by γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA), an inhibitory neurotransmitter released from horizontal cells. Another is the ephaptic hypothesis, which contends that the feedback is non-GABAergic and is achieved through the modulation of electrical potential in the intersynaptic cleft between cones and horizontal cells. In this study, a continuum spine model of the cone-horizontal cell synaptic circuitry is formulated. This model, a partial differential equation system, incorporates both the GABA and ephaptic feedback mechanisms. Simulation results, in comparison with experiments, indicate that the ephaptic mechanism is necessary in order for the model to capture the major spatial and temporal dynamics of the BIFE effect. In addition, simulations indicate that the GABA mechanism may play some minor modulation role.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, a brief introduction to the biological background relevant to the research topic is given and then the research objective is stated.

1.1 The outer plexiform layer of mammalian retina

The retina covers the back of the eye where images are formed and light energy is converted into neural signals. Cells in the retina are packed in several layers. The outer plexiform layer (OPL) is the place where photoreceptors make synaptic interactions with bipolar cells and horizontal cells (HCs), and is the first synaptic layer in the visual system. Photoreceptors are light-sensitive cells and can be classified into two major types, rods and cones. Rods are sensitive to very dim light and are responsible for night vision [10]. Vision in bright light depends mainly on cones since they only respond to light of relatively high intensity while the response of rods under such a lighting condition is substantially saturated [10]. Cones also provide the basis for color vision in humans and many other species [10, 146]. In addition, cones respond to light much faster than rods [75]. Consequently, cones can follow flickering stimuli of relatively high frequency whereas rods cannot [26, 93]. Bipolar cells provide the direct pathway for the visual information to flow from photoreceptors to ganglion cells and further into the brain. Horizontal cells receive input from photoreceptors and modulate laterally the responses of adjacent photoreceptors and bipolar cells.

Photoreceptors transduce light energy into graded changes in their membrane potentials. In the dark, photoreceptors depolarize, which opens the voltage-gated calcium channels at the transmitter release sites of photoreceptors’ presynaptic axon terminals [10, 84]. Calcium ions thus flow into photoreceptors and the
resulting elevation in the intracellular calcium concentration signals the release of
the neurotransmitter glutamate, which then induces the depolarization of postsynaptic horizontal cells and either depolarization or hyperpolarization of postsynaptic bipolar cells depending on the specific bipolar cell types [122, 10, 20, 95]. Light stimulation hyperpolarizes photoreceptors and causes their voltage-gated calcium channels to close. As a result, photoreceptors’ intracellular calcium concentration drops and their release of glutamate is suppressed, leading to the hyperpolarization of horizontal cells and the corresponding polarizations of different types of bipolar cells. [122, 10, 59, 95].

The axon terminal of the cone is known as the pedicle. Dendritic terminals (also called spines) of horizontal cells and bipolar cells invaginate into the pedicle to form synapses with the cone at places known as the “triads”. A single cone pedicle of humans and primates has about 30 “triads” [1, 18], and one “triad” typically consists of two horizontal cell spines and one bipolar cell spine [60]. Most mammalian retinas have two types of horizontal cells, A-type and B-type [57, 95]. A prominent feature of horizontal cells in all species studied is that cells of the same type are interconnected by numerous electrical synapses known as gap junctions, forming a large conductive sheet or syncytium over a wide spatial area of the OPL [42, 122, 59, 90, 95]. This network organization allows horizontal cells to integrate synaptic inputs from photoreceptors across a large retinal region, and hence increases the receptive-field sizes of individual horizontal cells [95]. The horizontal cells in this study are of A-type, which is axonless and has a dendritic tree with its terminals ending in cone pedicles [59, 95]. Although an A-type horizontal cell does not have direct synaptic contact with rods, it receives rod inputs indirectly from cones since rod signals can enter cones via rod-cone gap junctions [104, 58, 86, 116, 107, 122, 146, 153].
There also exist rod-rod and cone-cone gap-junctional couplings [109, 116, 146, 153]. However, rods are not modeled explicitly here because, as mentioned above, the A-type horizontal cells considered in this study only interact directly with cones. Therefore, as the next chapter will show, rod signal is expressed as a direct current input in the equation for cones. Furthermore, the coupling among cones is not as strong and extensive as that among horizontal cells [70, 24], so this feature is omitted to simplify the model.

1.2 The background-induced flicker enhancement effect

In cat retina, the onset of diffusive rod-selective dim blue background amplifies the response amplitudes of the membrane potentials of horizontal cells at the center of the retina region stimulated by small-spot cone-selective photopic red flicker [98, 88]. This phenomenon is called the background-induced flicker enhancement (BIFE) effect [98, 88]. To quantify the enhancement, a variable $E$ named “percent enhancement” was defined by

$$E = 100\left(\frac{F_{\text{bkgd}}}{F_{\text{dark}}} - 1\right)$$

where $F_{\text{bkgd}}$ and $F_{\text{dark}}$ are the mean response amplitudes of horizontal cells during background illumination and dark, respectively [34]. Intracellular staining demonstrated that the horizontal cells involved in the BIFE effect are mainly of A-type [98].

There are some characteristic temporal and spatial features associated with the BIFE effect, four of which will be examined carefully in this study. First, the membrane potentials of horizontal cells repolarize slowly (the “sag”) during the hyperpolarized stage in the presence of background, and then generate an “overshoot” or post-inhibitory rebound (PIR) through slow depolarization once the background is turned off [98]. Second, the curve of $E$ as a function of flicker frequency re-
veals a two-limbed nature with $E$ increasing gradually below around 20 Hz and rising up rapidly above this frequency [98]. Third, a phase advance of the flicker waveform is induced by the background. That is, the averaged waveform of one oscillation period of the horizontal cell membrane potential occurs 2~5 ms sooner with background on than that with background off [98]. Finally, for both slit and square regions of flicker stimulus, $E$ decreases monotonically as the size of the flicker stimulus region increases [88].

It is worth mentioning that the BIFE effect is closely analogous to the “suppressive rod-cone interaction” (SRCI) observed in human psychophysics, animal electrophysiology, and human and animal electroretinograms (ERGs) [37, 33, 2, 32, 43]. SRCI is the common phenomenon that cone-mediated sensitivity to small-spot flicker stimuli, especially those of high frequencies, is suppressed when rods are dark-adapted and is enhanced by rod-selective backgrounds [37, 33].

1.3 Hypotheses on cone-horizontal cell feedback mechanism

In addition to the feedforward synaptic transmission from cones to horizontal cells using glutamate as the neurotransmitter, there exists a negative feedback from horizontal cells to cones: hyperpolarized horizontal-cell dendritic terminals somehow increase the flow of calcium ions into cone pedicle, stimulating glutamate release by the cone presynaptic apparatus and leading to depolarized responses of horizontal-cell dendritic terminals [36, 52, 49, 48, 44, 95]. This feedback mediates color opponentness in second-order retinal neurons [53, 121, 146] and plays an important role in the formation of center-surround receptive field organizations of bipolar cells and ganglion cells [10, 52, 87, 95, 139, 142, 146]. It is also generally accepted that the BIFE effect can be accounted for by this feedback: a dim full-field background illumination induces a rod-mediated strong hyperpolarization of horizontal cells across their syncytium, and this hyperpolarization gives rise to, through the feedback, an
augmented calcium entry into cone pedicles; the increase in calcium current is usually linked to enhanced amplitude modulations of the current itself and of the released transmitter glutamate, which then results in enlarged response amplitudes of the postsynaptic horizontal cells [88, 52, 131]. For a schematic illustration of how the cone-horizontal cell feedback might bring on flicker enhancement, please refer to Figure 5 in paper [131].

It remains unclear about the underlying mechanism that relates the hyperpolarization of horizontal cells to the rise of calcium current into cone pedicles during the feedback, and three competing hypotheses were proposed to address this question, namely, the GABA, ephaptic, and pH hypotheses.

The GABA hypothesis

By and large, the GABA hypothesis conceives that γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA) acts as the inhibitory neurotransmitter from horizontal cells to cones. One version of the GABA hypothesis states that depolarized horizontal-cell dendritic terminals in darkness release a substance which blocks the calcium channels on the cone pedicles, with the major candidate for such a substance being GABA; background-induced hyperpolarization of horizontal cells inhibits their release of GABA, allowing more calcium ions to enter the cone synaptic terminals [29, 36, 88, 100]. In addition, this version also proposes that the enhanced entry of calcium ions during background illumination opens calcium-activated chloride channels on the cone pedicle [88]. Figure 9 of paper [88] illustrates the biological model described above. A second version of the GABA hypothesis assumes that GABA released by depolarized horizontal cells slightly hyperpolarizes cones by eliciting, via GABA receptors, a chloride current into cones, and a diminished release of GABA accompanying horizontal-cell hyperpolarization shuts down the chloride channels and hence
depolarizes the cones [13, 16, 54, 87, 145, 146]. It’s natural to expect that this depolarizing cone response would then increase cone calcium influx [52].

The GABA hypothesis has some experimental support. First, many animal species including mammals have one or more types of horizontal cells which contain GABA and express the GABA-synthesizing enzyme glutamic acid decarboxylase (GAD) [19, 38, 47, 67, 77, 105, 112, 132]. Second, horizontal cells release GABA upon depolarization [3, 78, 110, 111, 150]. Third, GABA decreases the calcium conductance in some sensory neurons [22, 27, 28, 29]. Fourth, GABA receptors and associated chloride currents were shown to exist at some nonmammalian and mammalian cone axon terminals [54, 124, 99, 92, 133, 151]. Finally, GABA antagonists used in several pharmacological studies alter the light responses of certain types of cones and horizontal cells, indicating GABA as the feedback neurotransmitter from horizontal cells to cones [66, 82, 83, 129, 145).

However, there are arguments against the GABA hypothesis. For example, an experimental investigation on turtle cones concludes that the GABAergic system may be too weak to generate the cone-horizontal cell feedback response under physiological conditions [125]. Moreover, some experiments demonstrate that feedback responses of cones evoked by surround illuminations are unaffected by GABA antagonists [41, 125, 126, 135] or GABA agonists [126]. Thirdly, it is still controversial whether monkey and human retinal horizontal cells contain GABA [61]. In addition, nonmammalian retinas have two to five types of horizontal cells but usually only one type accumulates and synthesizes GABA, so the other types of horizontal cells in these species must use non-GABAergic transmitter(s) or mechanism(s) for synaptic feedback [67, 112, 124].

In this study, we focus our attention on the first version of the GABA hypothesis for the following reasons. First, GABA and several other related chemi-
cals were shown to have a direct effect on the inward calcium current [9, 22, 27, 29, 40, 79]. Second, the involvement of chloride ions in negative feedback is most likely to be secondary to the calcium influx since cones have calcium-activated chloride currents [7, 14, 52, 62, 80, 88, 100, 127, 135, 134, 147]. Third, most experiments showed that surround illumination increases both the calcium conductance and chloride conductance of the cone membrane [36, 52, 69, 91, 135, 134], which is consistent with the first version of the GABA hypothesis.

The ephaptic hypothesis

The ephaptic hypothesis contends that the feedback from horizontal cells to cones is non-GABAAergic and is achieved through modulation of the electric potential in the intersynaptic cleft between cones and horizontal cells. The hypothesis was initially proposed by Byzov and colleagues [15], and was later modified by Kamermans and colleagues who postulate that hemichannels (half of a gap junction) on the dendritic tips of horizontal cells form the major current sink necessary for an ephaptic mechanism [49, 48]. The hypothesis speculates that in the dark there is a small inward current going from extracellular space into horizontal cell dendritic tips through the intersynaptic cleft and hemichannels, and this current creates a voltage drop over the relatively high resistance of the cleft, making the potential deep in the cleft slightly negative. Light-evoked hyperpolarization of horizontal cells leads to an increase of this hemichannel-mediated current, which results in a larger voltage drop over the intersynaptic resistance and thus a more negative potential in the cleft. Consequently, the nearby voltage-gated calcium channels on the presynaptic membrane of the cone pedicle sense a local cross-membrane depolarization and hence are more prone to open, boosting the calcium influx. In voltage-clamp recordings of cones, this feedback-induced increase of calcium current is observed as a shift of
the cone calcium current-voltage relationship toward more negative potentials. A schematic diagram of the ephaptic feedback mechanism is depicted in Figure 3 in paper [48].

The ephaptic hypothesis is buttressed by a number of findings. First, in goldfish, it was found that horizontal cell hyperpolarization evoked by surround illumination shifts the cone calcium current activation range to more negative potentials in a GABA-independent manner [135]. Second, feedback-mediated responses in cones and horizontal cells can be greatly reduced or eliminated by gap junction blockers such as carbenoxolone [49, 101, 134] and a low concentration of Co$^{2+}$ [30]. Third, immunoreactivity to connexins, the hemichannel-forming proteins, were confirmed to exist on horizontal-cell dendritic tips inside the cone pedicles of carp and zebrafish retinas [46, 49, 114]. Furthermore, feedback responses in cones and horizontal cells are impaired in mutant zebrafish lacking connexin hemichannels which are specific to horizontal cells [44]. In addition, a few ephaptic-hypothesis-based model simulations of the cone-horizontal cell synapse are in line with the experimental investigations of the feedback [30, 31, 44].

The ephaptic hypothesis has some problems, too. For instance, a computational analysis indicates that an effective electrical feedback would require an improbably large intersynaptic resistance and physiological restrictions limit this resistance to values at which the electrical feedback signal generated by horizontal cell hyperpolarization would be negligible [25]. Doubts were also raised over the pharmacological specificity of carbenoxolone since the drug not only blocks hemicannels but also has direct and strong inhibitory effect on photoreceptors’ voltage-gated calcium channels [25, 137, 134]. Hemichannels might produce additional issues since they could be the leakage sites through which small molecules (including neurotransmitters such as GABA) inside the horizontal cell can enter
the intersynaptic cleft [112]. There are other concerns on the feasibility of a hemi-channel-mediated ephaptic mechanism; please refer to papers [25, 112, 117] for details.

The pH hypothesis

The pH hypothesis provides an alternative non-GABAergic feedback mechanism: extracellular pH changes in the intersynaptic cleft mediate the feedback [8, 41]. Specifically, it proposes that horizontal cell hyperpolarization alkalinizes the cleft, and the decrease in extracellular proton concentration then alters the gating of pH-sensitive calcium channels in the presynaptic cone pedicle and results in an increase of cone calcium current in the form of a negative shift of the current’s activation potential [8, 41]. The mechanism by which horizontal cell polarization modulates the extracellular pH is still unknown, although hemichannel-mediated proton transport [48], amiloride-sensitive proton channels [138], or some other proton transport system [12, 41] on the horizontal cell dendritic tips might be possible candidates.

There are experimental studies supporting the pH hypothesis. First, protons were shown to have inhibitory effects on voltage-gated calcium channels [23, 102]. Second, there are experiments reporting that light stimulation induces extracellular alkalinization in distal retina around photoreceptors [89, 148]. Third, the voltage dependence of photoreceptor calcium channels were indeed shifted to more negative potentials upon extracellular alkalinization [6, 8, 41], and it was estimated that an increase of extracellular pH by 0.1 units shifts the calcium channel activation range negatively by about 1.2~1.67 mV for tiger salamander photoreceptors [6, 8]. Finally, prevention of extracellular pH fluctuations with a high concentration of HEPES and some other artificial pH buffers abolishes or substantially attenuates the feedback responses in both cones and horizontal cells in the retinæ of goldfish, newt, tiger salamander and macaque monkey [4, 16, 21, 41, 138], and the reduction
of feedback is positively correlated to elevation of the pH buffering capacity of the bath solution [21].

The legitimacy of the pH hypothesis has also been questioned. One experimental finding demonstrates that glutamate, the neurotransmitter known to depolarize horizontal cells, induces a decrease of proton concentration in the extracellular fluid near the membrane of catfish cone- and rod-driven horizontal cells, which is precisely contrary to the prediction made by the pH hypothesis [65]. In some other experiments on carp and goldfish, the feedback responses of both cones and horizontal cells remain normal in the presence of high concentrations of HEPES [76, 48]. More importantly, it was suggested that, in addition to clamping the extracellular pH, artificial pH buffers induce horizontal-cell intracellular acidification which is known to inhibit hemichannels [31, 117]; therefore the above-mentioned pH buffer experiments supporting the pH hypothesis may fail to distinguish between a pH-mediated and a hemichannel-mediated feedback mechanism [31].

1.4 Research objective

The aim of the present study is not to give a mathematical explanation of the BIFE effect, but to use the BIFE effect as a vehicle to conduct a computational examination of the feedback mechanism between cones and horizontal cells in cat retina. A partial differential equation (PDE) model incorporating both the GABA and ephaptic hypotheses will be developed. This study does not pay particular attention to the pH hypothesis because experimental investigations showed that protons can inhibit calcium channels by both reducing channel conductance directly [17, 102] and by shifting channel activation to more positive potentials [55, 64]. Thus the pH mechanism, if it works, may resemble a combined effects of the GABA and ephaptic mechanisms, and incorporating it into the model will complicate the analysis. The PDE model will be solved by finite difference methods, and simulation results of
the model will be compared with experimental data in cat retina under different spatial and temporal settings. Hopefully, this study provides insights into which mechanism, GABA or ephaptic, might be more appropriate.
CHAPTER 2
THE MATHEMATICAL MODEL

In this chapter, a reaction-diffusion system of partial differential equations is formulated to model the interaction between cones and horizontal cells in a patch of retina on the $xy$-plane. The model is a generalization of a continuum spine formulation developed for dendritic cables with spines [5]. The horizontal cell slab is treated as a two-dimensional continuum with continuously distributed spines forming synapses with cone pedicles. The model incorporates both GABA and ephaptic feedback mechanisms and captures dynamics on two spatial scales: the scale of an individual synapse and the scale of the receptive field. By default, all state variables are functions of the spatial variables $x$ and $y$ and the time variable $t$, and all membrane potentials involved are cross-membrane potential differences (i.e., intracellular potential minus extracellular potential). The model follows the convention in neuroscience with an outward current having a positive sign and an inward current having a negative sign [56].

2.1 The horizontal cells

The membrane potential $V_H$ (mV) in the horizontal cell slab is governed by a current balance equation involving the capacitive, gap-junctional, stem, and ionic currents:

$$C_m \partial_t V_H = \frac{1}{R_s} \nabla^2 V_H + N I_{ss} - I_{ion} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$I_{ss} = \frac{U_H - V_H}{R_{ss}} \quad (2.2)$$

is the point current at $(x,y)$ flowing between an individual spine head with membrane potential $U_H$ (mV) and the horizontal cell slab through a spine stem with lumped Ohmic resistance $R_{ss}$ (MΩ), and $N$ is the physical spine density defined
as the number of spines per unit physical area [5]. $C_m \, (\mu F/cm^2)$ is the specific membrane capacitance. The Laplacian term $\frac{1}{R_s} \nabla^2 V_H$ accounts for the density of the current flowing through the gap-junction-coupled slab of horizontal cells with $R_s \, (M\Omega)$ being the sheet resistance [85, 68]. $I_{ion} \, (\mu A/cm^2)$ is the density of the ionic currents passing through horizontal cell membrane and its expression will be given later in Eqs. (2.7) ~ (2.10).

The spine stem resistance is defined as $R_{ss} = \frac{4LR_i}{\pi d^2}$ with the spine stem being treated as a circular cylinder of diameter $d$, length $L$ and constant intracellular resistivity $R_i$ [113]. In cat, $R_i$ is about 200 $\Omega \cdot cm$ [56, 115], $d$ is about 0.1 $\mu m$, and $L$ is as long as or longer than 5 $\mu m$. For these values, $R_{ss}$ is around 1300 $M\Omega$, which is within the estimated range of $10^7 \sim 10^{10} \Omega$ for $R_{ss}$ [113].

In this study, the model assumes a uniform spine distribution. A typical mammalian cone pedicle makes synaptic contacts with about 60 horizontal cell spines because one cone pedicle is associated with approximately 30 “triads” of invaginated processes of second-order neurons [1] and each “triad” usually contains two horizontal cell dendritic terminals [60]. A modest estimate of cone density for cat retina is roughly $6.4 \times 10^5$ cones/cm$^2$ [120, 143]. Multiplying the number of spines per cone pedicle with the cone density yields a physical spine density of $\overline{N} = 3.84 \times 10^7$ spines/cm$^2$ for cat.

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (2.3) by the passive membrane resistivity $R_m \, (\Omega \cdot cm^2)$, and substituting the known relations for the membrane time constant $\tau_m = R_mC_m$ [56], the horizontal-cell slab length constant $\lambda = \sqrt{R_m/R_s}$ [45, 68], and the dimensionless electronic spine density $\bar{n} = \lambda^2 \overline{N}$, Eq. (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$\tau_m \partial_t V_H = \lambda^2 \nabla^2 V_H + \pi R_s I_{ss} - I_{ion} R_m.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)
A horizontal cell spine head around point \((x, y)\) is modeled as an isopotential compartment with surface area \(A_{sh} \ (\mu m^2)\) and specific membrane capacitance \(C_m\), and its membrane potential \(U_H \ (mV)\) satisfies the following current balance equation

\[
C_{sh} \frac{\partial U_H}{\partial t} = -I_{ss} - I_{syn} - A_{sh} I_{ion}
\]

(2.4)

where \(C_{sh} = A_{sh} C_m \ (\mu F)\) is the capacitance of an individual spine head, \(I_{ss}\) is the same as given in Eq. (2.2), the ionic current density \(I_{ion}\) will be given later in Eqs. (2.7) \~ (2.10), and the synaptic current \(I_{syn}\), activated by transmitter glutamate released from the cone, is defined as

\[
I_{syn} = g_{syn} (U_H - E_{syn})
\]

(2.5)

where the synaptic conductance \(g_{syn} \ (pS)\) is set to be proportional to the value of \([GL] \ (\mu M)\), the extracellular concentration of glutamate, and the synaptic reversal potential \(E_{syn}\) is around zero for glutamate synapse [56]. Hence, the synaptic current can be rewritten as

\[
I_{syn} = (k_{syn}[GL]) U_H
\]

(2.6)

where \(k_{syn}\) is a scaling factor \((pS/\mu M)\).

An evident feature of this continuum formulation of horizontal cells which can be seen in Eqs. (2.3) ~ (2.4) is that there is no direct electrical communication between neighboring spines and hence the voltage spread along the horizontal cell slab is the only way through which the spines can interact with each other [5].

The ionic current density \(I_{ion}\) in Eq. (2.3) and (2.4) consists of a linear leakage current \(I_{leak}^H\) and a nonlinear inward “sag” current \(I_{sag}\). \(I_{sag}\) is included in the model in order to account for the transient “sag” and PIR observed in the voltage recordings of horizontal cells introduced in the previous chapter, and its ex-
pression evolves from a model of the T-type calcium current in thalamic neurons [141, 140]. In fish and mammalian retinal horizontal cells, T-type or T-type-like calcium currents were reported [74, 97, 108, 123] together with N-type, L-type and other types of calcium currents, sodium current, and various types of potassium currents [74, 108, 130]. Specifically, $I_{ion}$ takes the following form

$$I_{ion}(V,h) = I_{leak}^H + I_{sag}$$  

(2.7)

where

$$I_{leak}^H = (V - E_{LH})g_{LH}, \quad I_{sag} = (V - E_{sag})g_{sag}h$$  

(2.8)

In Eq. (2.8), $E_{LH}$ (mV) and $E_{sag}$ (mV) are the reversal potentials for $I_{leak}^H$ and $I_{sag}$, respectively; and $g_{LH}$ (nS/cm$^2$) and $g_{sag}$ (nS/cm$^2$) are the corresponding conductances for $I_{leak}^H$ and $I_{sag}$. The inactivation gating variable $h$ in $I_{sag}$ is governed by

$$\tau_h \partial_t h = h_\infty(V) - h$$  

(2.9)

$$h_\infty(V) = \left[1 + e^{-(V - \theta_h)/\sigma_h}\right]^{-1}$$  

(2.10)

with $\tau_h$ being a constant. The symbols $V$ and $h$ in the above equations stand for the actual state variables $V_H$ and $h_V$ in $I_{ion}$ of Eq. (2.3) and the actual state variables $U_H$ and $h_U$ in $I_{ion}$ of Eq. (2.4). We noticed that, although some studies use the ‘sag’ or ‘rollback’ response of horizontal cells as an index of feedback [51, 138, 31], it was also suggested that the ‘sag’ response is not a sensitive measure of feedback [44]. In the present model, ‘sag’ is not taken as a feedback index.

The concentration of the calcium-blocking agent GABA released by horizontal cells into the intersynaptic cleft, is denoted by $[G]$ (µM), and is modeled as

$$\tau_G \partial_t [G] = k_G(U_H - E_G)$$  

(2.11)
where
\[
E_G = \left(\frac{RT}{F}\right) \ln\left(\frac{[G]/[G_i]}{n_i}\right) = \left(\frac{RT}{F}\ln(10)\right) \log_{10}\left(\frac{[G]/[G_i]}{n_i}\right).
\] (2.12)

\(\tau_G\) and \(k_G\) in Eq. (2.11) are the time constant and scaling factor for GABA kinetics, respectively. Based on the fact that the release of GABA is voltage-dependent [110, 111], GABA is treated as a \(n_i\)-charged particle whose balance between its extracellular concentration \([G]\) and intracellular concentration \([G_i]\) is controlled by the difference between \(U_H\), the membrane potential of horizontal cell spine head, and \(E_G\), the Nernst-type “reversal potential” of GABA. Eqs. (2.11)∼(2.12) are for reverse transport of GABA (i.e., non-vesicular GABA release) since they model both the GABA release from and reuptake into horizontal cells as membrane transport processes [112]. In Eq. (2.12), \(R\) is the gas constant (8.314 J·mol\(^{-1}\)·K\(^{-1}\)), \(T\) is the temperature (in K), and \(F\) is Faraday constant (96485 C·mol\(^{-1}\)). At a temperature of 19°C, \(\frac{RT}{F}\ln(10) = 58\) mV.

### 2.2 The cones

The cone membrane potential \(V_C\) (mV) satisfies the following current balance equation
\[
C_m \frac{d}{dt} V_C = -I_{\text{leak}}^C + I_{\text{dark}} + I_{\text{flick}} + I_{\text{bkgd}}
\] (2.13)

where
\[
I_{\text{leak}}^C = (V_C - E_{LC})g_{LC}
\] (2.14)

is the density of a leakage current (µA/cm\(^2\)) with reversal potential \(E_{LC}\) (mV) and conductance \(g_{LC}\) (nS/cm\(^2\)). \(I_{\text{dark}}\) (µA/cm\(^2\)) is the density of a constant “dark” current representing a steady inward cation current mainly contributed by sodium ions that depolarizes photoreceptor membrane potential in darkness [10, 35, 39, 149]. \(I_{\text{flick}}\) (µA/cm\(^2\)) is the current density transduced by a cone-selective flicker.
stimulus applied to a region $S$ around the center of a patch of isolated retina tissue on the $xy$-plane and has the form of a periodic “square” wave shown in Fig. 2 (b). $I_{bkgd}$ ($\mu$A/cm$^2$) is the density of the current generated by a rod-selective diffusive background illumination, which enters the cone through rod-cone gap junctions [86]. The value of $I_{dark}$ is given in Table 3 and the expressions for $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$ are given in Section 2.3.

The cone calcium current $I_{Ca}$ (pA) is governed by

$$\tau_{Ca} \partial_t I_{Ca} = \frac{(V_C - \alpha U_H - E_{Ca}) g_{Ca}}{(1 + e^{-(V_C - \alpha U_H - A)/B})(1 + k_{OCa}[G])} - I_{Ca} \tag{2.15}$$

where $I_{Ca} < 0$ since the current is inward, $\tau_{Ca}$ (ms) is the time constant, $E_{Ca}$ (mV) is the reversal potential, and $g_{Ca}$ (nS) is the maximum conductance. Here $I_{Ca}$ should be considered as a point current at $(x, y)$ activated by a single cone-horizontal cell synaptic contact around that point. The first term on the right-hand-side of Eq. 2.15 contains a linear current factor $(V_C - \alpha U_H - E_{Ca}) g_{Ca}$ multiplied by a sigmoidal activation function $1/(1 + e^{-(V_C - \alpha U_H - A)/B})$ where $A$ (mV) is the half saturation voltage and $B$ (mV) is a slope factor. The expression of such a product is modified from published models on photoreceptor $I_{Ca}$ [8, 135, 44]. The linear term $-\alpha U_H$ with $\alpha$ being a scaling parameter shifts the cone Ca$^{2+}$ current-voltage relationship to more negative values of $V_C$ when the horizontal cell is hyperpolarized (i.e., when $U_H$ becomes more negative), which is consistent with the ephaptic hypothesis [135, 48, 44] and with the reported nearly linear shift of cone calcium current activation potential induced by horizontal cell hyperpolarization [31, 63]. The expression $1/(1 + k_{OCa}[G])$ is derived from a Hill function on the binding kinetics of GABA to open calcium channels, and represents the fraction of open calcium channels as a function of extracellular GABA concentration $[G]$ with $k_{OCa}$ (1/µM) being the binding constant [152]. Thus, the product of the maximum conductance $g_{ca}$
and the fraction \( 1/(1 + k_{OCa}[G]) \) reflects the GABA-mediated modulation of cone calcium conductance. The last term stands for the removal of calcium from the cone by either extrusion to extracellular space or binding to intracellular stores. A novel feature of the model is that Eq. (2.15) contains both GABAergic and non-GABAergic mechanisms, which enables us to investigate these two feedback effects separately as well as jointly.

Although the calcium current \( I_{Ca} \) modeled in Eq. (2.15) flows into the cone and it is mentioned in the previous chapter that cone has calcium-activated chloride current \( I_{Cl(Ca)} \), these two currents are not included in Eq. (2.13) of cone membrane potential for the following reasons. First, the effect of \( I_{Ca} \) on cone membrane potential is assumed to be small since the calcium conductance is small relative to the total membrane conductance of the cone [62, 135]. Second, it was suggested that, under physiological conditions, the depolarizing effect of \( I_{Ca} \) on cone membrane potential could be counteracted by the hyperpolarizing effect of \( I_{Cl(Ca)} \) [52, 62, 135]. Third, experiments indicate that feedback induced polarization of cone membrane potential, if there is any, is not essential for the transmission of the feedback signal to second-order neurons; rather, it is the direct modulation of cone’s \( I_{Ca} \) (hence intracellular calcium concentration) and the subsequent glutamate release that affects the responses of second-order neurons [15, 52, 62].

The rate of release of glutamate from the cone pedicle into the intersynaptic cleft depends linearly on \( I_{Ca} \) [106, 128, 144] and is described by

\[
\tau_{GL} \partial_t [GL] = -k_{Ca}I_{Ca} - [GL] \tag{2.16}
\]

where \([GL] \) (\( \mu M \)) is the concentration of glutamate in the cleft. In this equation, the time rate of change of glutamate is balanced by its release triggered by the inward cone calcium current (\( I_{Ca} < 0 \)) and its uptake by transporters.
2.3 The overall model

In summary, the continuum two-dimensional model for the cone-horizontal cell interaction takes the following form

\[
\tau_m \partial_t V_H = \lambda^2 \nabla^2 V_H + \frac{nR_s}{R_{ss}} (U_H - V_H) - [(V_H - E_{LH})g_{LH} + (V_H - E_{sag})g_{sag}h_V]R_m
\] (2.17)

\[
C_{sh} \partial_t U_H = -\frac{(U_H - V_H)}{R_{ss}} - k_{syn}[GL]U_H - A_{sh}[(U_H - E_{LH})g_{LH} + (U_H - E_{sag})g_{sag}h_U]
\] (2.18)

\[
C_m \partial_t V_C = - (V_C - E_{LC})g_{LC} + I_{dark} + I_{flick} + I_{bkgd}
\] (2.19)

\[
\tau_G \partial_t [G] = k_G \left( U_H - \frac{(RT/F) \ln([G]/[G_i])}{n_i} \right)
\] (2.20)

\[
\tau_{Ca} \partial_t I_{Ca} = \frac{(V_C - \alpha U_H - E_{Ca})g_{Ca}}{(1 + e^{-(V_C - \alpha U_H - \theta)/B})(1 + k_{OCa}[G])} - I_{Ca}
\] (2.21)

\[
\tau_{GL} \partial_t [GL] = -k_{Ca}I_{Ca} - [GL]
\] (2.22)

\[
\tau_h \partial_t h_V = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(V_H - \theta)/\sigma_h}} - h_V
\] (2.23)

\[
\tau_h \partial_t h_U = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(U_H - \theta)/\sigma_h}} - h_U
\] (2.24)

where each state variable depends on \(x, y\) and \(t\). The applied currents \(I_{flick}\) and \(I_{bkgd}\) in Eq. (2.19) for \(V_C\) are defined with respect to a general two-dimensional flicker stimulus region \(S\) as

\[
I_{flick}(x,y,t) = \begin{cases} A_{flick}H(z(t), \tilde{\beta}_1) & \text{if } (x,y) \in S \text{ & } t \in [t_{flick}^\text{beg}, t_{flick}^\text{end}] \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}
\] (2.25)

and

\[
I_{bkgd}(x,y,t) = \begin{cases} \gamma A_{bkgd}H(t-b_{\text{bkgd}}^\text{beg}, \tilde{\beta}_2)H(t_{\text{end}}^\text{bkgd} - t, \tilde{\beta}_3) & \text{if } (x,y) \in S \\ A_{bkgd}H(t-b_{\text{beg}}^\text{bkgd}, \tilde{\beta}_2)H(t_{\text{end}}^\text{bkgd} - t, \tilde{\beta}_3) & \text{if } (x,y) \in S^c \end{cases}
\] (2.26)

where \(S\) is typically a connected region on the plane and can be defined in polar coordinates as

\[
S = \{(r, \theta) : b(\theta) \leq r \leq a(\theta), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]\}
\]
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for some general functions $a(\theta)$ and $b(\theta)$. The various shapes of $S$ studied in this project are shown in Fig. 2. The functions $H$ and $z$ in Eqs. (2.25) and (2.26) are defined as

$$H(w, \beta) = \frac{1 + \tanh(\beta w)}{2}$$

(2.27)

and

$$z(t) = \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{P}(t - t_{\text{flick}}^\text{beg})\right)$$

(2.28)

where $\beta$ is the slope factor and $P$ is the period of the “square” wave flicker stimulus. The composition of $H$ and $z$ in the expression of $I_{\text{flick}}$ in Eq. (2.25) generates the smooth periodic “square” wave shown in Fig. 2 (b).

To account for the saturation desensitization of rods at their exposure to the bright flicker [96] to some extent, in Eq. (2.26), the magnitude of the background-induced rod-mediated current density $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ inside the flicker stimulus region $S$ is reduced to a fraction $\gamma$ of the magnitude of $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ outside $S$ (see also Fig. 2 (d)). The expression of $\gamma$ is given by

$$\gamma = \frac{b_\gamma}{1 + \exp\left((a - \theta_{\text{tst}})/\sigma_{\text{tst}}\right)}$$

(2.29)

where $a$ is the half width of a slit or square stimulus region, or the radius of a disk stimulus region. The values of the kinetic parameters $b_\gamma$, $\theta_{\text{tst}}$ and $\sigma_{\text{tst}}$ are determined by fitting the model to experimental data, and are summarized in Table 1. Plots of $\gamma$ for different stimulus regions are displayed in Fig. 1. Here $\gamma$ is formulated as a monotonically decreasing function of the size of $S$ (in terms of $a$) by the assumption that the smaller $S$ is, the easier it is for the background-induced current outside but in the immediate neighborhood of $S$ to flow into $S$ (through gap-junctions between photoreceptors) to compensate for the reduction of $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ due to rod desensitization in this region. It will be shown in Fig. 13 of Chapter 4 that the expression for $\gamma$ as a function of $a$ in Eq. (2.29) is necessary for the computational
results of the model with square stimulus (and disk stimulus) to get good fits with the corresponding experimental data, while a constant value of $\gamma$ (e.g., 0.05~0.1) can work well for slit stimulus. Introducing the function $\gamma$ also into the model with a slit stimulus provides a possible unified framework for the model with different stimulus regions.

As shown in Fig. 2 (d), the offset speed of $I_{bkgd}$ is set to be evidently slower than its onset speed to account for the rod after-effect, namely, the slow return of the rod-induced hyperpolarization towards its baseline after the background is turned off [119, 118, 98]. The spatial transitions of the currents $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$ across the stimulus region $S$ studied in this project are also modeled as smooth curves as shown in Fig. 2 (f), and expressions of these two currents defined for specific $S$ are given in Chapter 3. Steady-state values of the state variables in the absence of $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$, which are taken as the initial conditions, are listed in Table 2. Reference parameter values for Eqs. (2.17)~(2.28) are listed in Table 3~5.
Table 1: Parameter values in the expression of $\gamma$ for different stimuli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>slit</th>
<th>square</th>
<th>disk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b_\gamma$</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_{tst}$</td>
<td>50 $\mu$m</td>
<td>50 $\mu$m</td>
<td>50 $\mu$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{tst}$</td>
<td>4000 $\mu$m</td>
<td>300 $\mu$m</td>
<td>300 $\mu$m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Initial values of state variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Initial value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_H$</td>
<td>$-28.32$</td>
<td>mV</td>
<td>membrane potential of HC slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_H$</td>
<td>$-28.24$</td>
<td>mV</td>
<td>membrane potential of HC spine head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_C$</td>
<td>$-25.33$</td>
<td>mV</td>
<td>membrane potential of cone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[G]$</td>
<td>$1.629$</td>
<td>$\mu$M</td>
<td>extracellular concentration of GABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{Ca}$</td>
<td>$-1.375$</td>
<td>pA</td>
<td>cone calcium current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[GL]$</td>
<td>$20.62$</td>
<td>$\mu$M</td>
<td>extracellular concentration of glutamate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_V$</td>
<td>$0.3321$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gating variable of $I_{sag}$ in HC slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_U$</td>
<td>$0.3250$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gating variable of $I_{sag}$ in HC spine head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Supplied reference parameter values for the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>ephaptic coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_h$</td>
<td>-30 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>threshold of $h_\infty$ for gating variable $h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_h$</td>
<td>-2.4 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>slope factor of $h_\infty$ for gating variable $h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{Ca}$</td>
<td>5 ms</td>
<td></td>
<td>time constant for $I_{Ca}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_G$</td>
<td>15 ms</td>
<td></td>
<td>time constant for GABA release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{GL}$</td>
<td>18.18 ms</td>
<td></td>
<td>time constant for glutamate release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_h$</td>
<td>800 ms</td>
<td></td>
<td>time constant for gating variable $h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>-40.8 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>half saturation voltage of $I_{Ca}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{sh}$</td>
<td>1.31 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>average surface area of a spine head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>3 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>activation slope of $I_{Ca}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_m$</td>
<td>1 $\mu$F/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>specific membrane capacitance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{ss}$</td>
<td>0.1 $\mu$m</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC spine stem diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{Ca}$</td>
<td>120 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>reversal potential for $I_{Ca}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{LC}$</td>
<td>-68 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>cone leak potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{LH}$</td>
<td>-60 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC leak potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{sag}$</td>
<td>120 mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>reversal potential for $I_{sag}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>96485 C/mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faraday constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{Ca}$</td>
<td>0.03 nS</td>
<td></td>
<td>peak conductance of $I_{Ca}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{LC}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^5$ nS/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>cone leak conductance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{LH}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^5$ nS/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC leak conductance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{sag}$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^4$ nS/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>conductance for $I_{sag}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[G_i]$</td>
<td>5 $\mu$M</td>
<td></td>
<td>intracellular concentration of GABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{dark}$</td>
<td>6.4 $\mu$A/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>cone dark current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{Ca}$</td>
<td>15 $\mu$M/pA</td>
<td></td>
<td>scale factor for glutamate release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_G$</td>
<td>1 $\mu$M/mV</td>
<td></td>
<td>scale factor for GABA release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{OCa}$</td>
<td>1 l/$\mu$M</td>
<td></td>
<td>binding equilibrium constant for GABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{syn}$</td>
<td>0.1572 pS/$\mu$M</td>
<td></td>
<td>scale factor for $I_{syn}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>1280 $\mu$m</td>
<td></td>
<td>half side-length of HC slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{ss}$</td>
<td>5 $\mu$m</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC spine stem length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_i$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>number of charges per GABA molecule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$3.84 \times 10^7$ 1/cm$^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>physical spine density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>8.314 J/mol$^{-1}$.K$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>gas constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_i$</td>
<td>200 $\Omega$.cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>intracellular resistivity of a spine stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>12 M$\Omega$</td>
<td></td>
<td>sheet resistance of HC slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>292.15 K</td>
<td></td>
<td>temperature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: Computed reference parameter values for the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{sh}$</td>
<td>$C_mA_{sh}$</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>pF</td>
<td>spine head capacitance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_m$</td>
<td>$1/g_LH$</td>
<td>$10^4$</td>
<td>Ω·cm²</td>
<td>passive membrane resistivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{ss}$</td>
<td>$(4L_{ss}R_i)/(\pi D_{ss}^2)$</td>
<td>1273.24 MΩ</td>
<td>spine stem resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{R_m/R_s}$</td>
<td>288.675 μm</td>
<td>HC slab length constant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_m$</td>
<td>$R_mC_m$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>membrane time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}$</td>
<td>$\lambda^2N$</td>
<td>$3.2\times10^4$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>electronic spine density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Reference parameter values for $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>onset-/offset-speed in each flicker cycle of $I_{flick}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>ms⁻¹</td>
<td>onset speed of $I_{bkgd}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_3$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>ms⁻¹</td>
<td>offset speed of $I_{bkgd}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_4$</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>μm⁻¹</td>
<td>spatial transition slope of $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$ across $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{flick}$</td>
<td>$-7.15$</td>
<td>μA/cm²</td>
<td>hyperpolarizing amplitude of $I_{flick}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{bkgd}$</td>
<td>$-7$</td>
<td>μA/cm²</td>
<td>hyperpolarizing amplitude of $I_{bkgd}$ exterior to $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>period of the “square” wave flicker stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{flick}^{beg}$</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>time to turn on flicker stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{flick}^{end}$</td>
<td>4564.29</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>time to turn off flicker stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bkgd}^{beg}$</td>
<td>2121.43</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>time to turn on background illumination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bkgd}^{end}$</td>
<td>3342.86</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>time to turn off background illumination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Spatial geometries of the modeled retina patches and the temporal and spatial characteristics of $I_{\text{flick}}$ and $I_{\text{bkgd}}$. (a), (c) and (e): modeled retina patches occupy the regions inside the thick solid boundaries with the gray areas at the center representing the slit, square and disk flicker stimulus region $S$, respectively. (b): a few cycles of the “square” wave flicker stimulus $I_{\text{flick}}$ inside region $S$. The parameter $\beta_1$ is reduced to 1/10 of its actual value to magnify the smooth shape of the wave form. (d): the background-induced current $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ inside and outside region $S$ as a function of time. (f): $\min(I_{\text{flick}})$ and $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ as a function of $x$ for $y = 0$. The parameter $\beta_4$ is reduced to 1/7 of its actual value to magnify the smooth transition of the two currents across the boundaries of region $S$. 
CHAPTER 3
NUMERICAL METHOD

The model is solved by method of lines. Specifically, the PDE model is first discretized in space using central differences for the spatial derivatives. This generates a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) at each grid point, which is then solved using MATLAB’s built-in stiff ODE solver ode23tb, an L-stable implicit Runge-Kutta method implementing the TR-BDF2 algorithm [81]. The method is second order accurate in both space and time [72]. This chapter focuses on the spatial discretization of the PDE model using finite difference methods since the solution of the resulting ODE system by MATLAB’s built-in ODE solver is fairly routine.

3.1 Numerical method for the model with a slit stimulus

The model to be solved is defined generally over a rectangular region

\[ \Omega = \{(x, y) : x \in [-L_x, L_x], \ y \in [-L_y, L_y]\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions and has a flickering stimulus region along a vertical slit

\[ S = \{(x, y) : x \in [-a, a], \ y \in [-L_y, L_y], \ a < L_x, L_y \} \]. \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

Fig. 2 (a) gives a schematic illustration of the spatial geometry of the modeled region with the simplified setting \( L_x = L_y = L \). If the slit is long enough (i.e., if \( L_y \) is sufficiently large), then, as recognized by Nelson [86], the solution of the model above can be approximated quite well by that with a flickering slit of infinite length given by

\[ S = \{(x, y) : x \in [-a, a], \ y \in (-\infty, \infty), \ a < L_x \} \]. \hspace{1cm} (3.3)
Assuming that $I_{\text{flick}}$, $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ and all parameters are constant in the $y$-direction, the first derivative with respect to $y$ of each state variable in the model with $S$ defined in Eq. (3.3) vanishes. This reduces the model to one spatial dimension along the $x$-axis. In particular, the Laplacian in Eq. (2.17) is replaced by

$$\nabla^2 V_H = \frac{\partial^2 V_H}{\partial x^2} \quad (3.4)$$

since $\partial^2 V_H / \partial y^2 = 0$, and the model equations, (2.17)$\sim$(2.24), remain the same except that the state variables do not depend on $y$ any more. This one-dimensional reduction saves computational time considerably compared to solving the model over a two-dimensional region. The computational work is further reduced by taking advantage of the model’s symmetry about the $y$-axis and considering its solution only for

$$x \in \Omega = [0, L_x] := [0, L] \quad \text{and} \quad S = [0, a] \text{ where } a < L. \quad (3.5)$$

Homogeneous Neumann boundary condition remains unchanged at $x = L$ and is imposed at the origin to preserve the symmetry; hence,

$$\frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=L} = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

The input currents $I_{\text{flick}}$ and $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ are now defined for $x \in [0, L]$ as

$$I_{\text{flick}}(x,t) = \begin{cases} A_{\text{flick}} H(z(t), \beta_1) H(a - x, \beta_4) & \text{for } t \in [t_{\text{flick}}^{\text{beg}}, t_{\text{flick}}^{\text{end}}] \\ 0 & \text{for } t \text{ elsewhere} \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$I_{\text{bkgd}}(x,t) = A_{\text{bkgd}} H(t - t_{\text{bkgd}}^{\text{beg}}, \beta_2) H(t_{\text{end}}^{\text{bkgd}} - t, \beta_3) \left( \gamma + (1 - \gamma) H(x - a, \beta_4) \right). \quad (3.8)$$

Note that the transitions of $I_{\text{flick}}$ and $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ across the stimulus region $S$ are endowed by the smooth function $H$ defined previously in Eq. (2.27).
With the computational domain $\Omega$ given in Eq. (3.5), the model is solved over $N + 1$ equispaced points at

$$x_i = (i - 1)h \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

where

$$h = L/N$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

is the mesh width, the distance between grid points. To take care of the boundary conditions, introduce fictitious points $x_i$ for $i = 0$ and $i = N + 2$ in Eq. (3.9). Letting $V_H(i)$ denote the numerical value of $V_H$ computed at $x_i$ and approximating the first and second spatial derivatives by centered differences, we have

$$\frac{\partial V_H(i)}{\partial x} \approx \frac{V_H(i + 1) - V_H(i - 1)}{2h} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_H(i)}{\partial x^2} \approx \frac{V_H(i - 1) - 2V_H(i) + V_H(i + 1)}{h^2} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)

Eq. (3.11) and the boundary conditions in Eq. (3.6) imply that

$$V_H(i = 0) = V_H(i = 2) \quad \text{and} \quad V_H(i = N + 2) = V_H(i = N).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

Combining the results in Eqs. (3.12) and (3.13), the second differential operator in Eq. (3.4) with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions is then given, in the discretized form, by the following $(N + 1) \times (N + 1)$ differentiation matrix

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \approx D_x^2 = \frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix}
-2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\
1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\
0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -2 & 1 \\
2 & -2 & 0 & 0 & \cdots
\end{bmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.14)
3.2 Numerical method for the model with a square stimulus

The model is defined generally over a rectangular region $\Omega$ given in Eq. (3.1) with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions and has a square flickering stimulus region $S$ given by

$$S = \{(x, y) : x \in [-a, a], y \in [-a, a], a < L_x, L_y\}.$$ (3.15)

For simplicity, we set $L_x = L_y = L$ in Eq. (3.1) and (3.15), and illustrate the regions $\Omega$ and $S$ in Fig. 2 (c). By symmetry of the model about the $x$- and $y$- axes, it’s sufficient to solve it over the following computational domain

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) : x \in [0, L], y \in [0, L]\}$$ (3.16)

with flickering stimulus over the region

$$S = \{(x, y) : x \in [0, a], y \in [0, a], a < L\}.$$ (3.17)

Homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions remain unchanged at $x = L$ or $y = L$ and are imposed at $x = 0$ or $y = 0$ to preserve the symmetry. Thus we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \right|_{x=0} = \left. \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \right|_{x=L} = \left. \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial y} \right|_{y=0} = \left. \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial y} \right|_{y=L} = 0.$$ (3.18)

Letting $T_{\text{flick}} = [t_{\text{flick}}^{\text{beg}}, t_{\text{flick}}^{\text{end}}]$, the input currents $I_{\text{flick}}$ and $I_{\text{bkgd}}$ are now defined for $(x, y) \in [0, L] \times [0, L]$ as

$$I_{\text{flick}}(x, y, t) = \begin{cases} A_{\text{flick}}H(z(t), \beta_1)H(a - x, \beta_4)H(a - y, \beta_4) & \text{for } t \in T_{\text{flick}} \\ 0 & \text{for } t \text{ elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

and

$$I_{\text{bkgd}}(x, y, t) = A_{\text{bkgd}}H(t - t_{\text{bkgd}}^{\text{beg}}, \beta_2)H(t_{\text{bkgd}}^{\text{end}} - t, \beta\alpha_3)$$

$$\times \left( \gamma + (1 - \gamma)f_2\left(H(x - a, \beta_4), H(y - a, \beta_4)\right) \right)$$
where the function $F_2$ is defined as

$$F_2(p, q) = \frac{|p + q| + |p - q|}{2}. \quad (3.19)$$

Note that if $p, q \in \{0, 1\}$, then the function $F_2$ defined in Eq. (3.19) is equivalent to the logic OR operation given by

$$(p \mid q) \quad (3.20)$$

or by

$$(p > 0.5 \mid q > 0.5). \quad (3.21)$$

But if we set

$$p = H(x - a, \beta_4) \quad \text{and} \quad q = H(y - a, \beta_4), \quad (3.22)$$

then neither of two operations given in Eqs. (3.20)~(3.21) will be a smooth function of $x$ and $y$ and the operation given in Eq. (3.20) even fails to define accurately $S^c$, the region outside of the stimulus region. In contrast, the composition of the functions in Eq. (3.19) and (3.22) given by

$$F_2\left(H(x - a, \beta_4), H(y - a, \beta_4)\right) \quad (3.23)$$

has the computationally desirable feature of being a smooth function of $x$ and $y$ and defines the region $S^c$ quite well. In other words, the composite function defined in Eq. (3.23) is essentially a smooth version of a two-dimensional heaviside function (see Fig. 3).

The model is solved over $(N + 1) \times (N + 1)$ equispaced grid points $(x_i, y_j)$ given by

$$x_i = (i - 1)h, \quad y_j = (j - 1)h \quad \text{for} \quad i, j = 1 : N + 1 \quad (3.24)$$

where the one-dimensional mesh width $h$ is the same as given in Eq. (3.10). To take care of the boundary conditions, introduce fictitious points $(x_i, y_j)$ whose coordi-
Figure 3: The smooth two-dimensional Heaviside function defined in Eq. (3.23). In the plot, $F_2(p, q)$ is a smooth function of $x$ and $y$ where $p = H(x - a, \beta_4)$ and $q = H(y - a, \beta_4)$ with $a = 50 \mu m$, $\beta_4 = 0.28 \mu m^{-1}$. The flicker stimulus region $S$ is defined in Eq. (3.15). The majority of points in the region $S$ have function values very close to zero while the majority of points in the region $S^c$ have function values very close to 1.

The coordinates are defined in Eq. (3.24) and whose indices are given as follows

\[(i = 0, j) \quad \text{and} \quad (i = N + 2, j) \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1 : N + 1\]
\[(i, j = 0) \quad \text{and} \quad (i, j = N + 2) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1.\]

Letting $V_H(i, j)$ denote the numerical value of $V_H$ computed at the grid point $(x_i, y_j)$ and approximating the first spatial derivatives by centered difference similar to the one given in Eq. (3.11), we derive from the boundary conditions given in Eq. (3.18)
that

\[ V_H(i = 0, j) = V_H(i = 2, j) \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1 : N + 1 \] (3.25)

\[ V_H(i = N + 2, j) = V_H(i = N, j) \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1 : N + 1 \] (3.26)

\[ V_H(i, j = 0) = V_H(i, j = 2) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1 \] (3.27)

\[ V_H(i, j = N + 2) = V_H(i, j = N) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N + 1. \] (3.28)

With the second spatial derivatives computed by centered difference similar to the one given in Eq. (3.12), the Laplacian in Eq. (2.17) on the discrete grid is approximated, for \( i, j = 1 : N + 1 \), by the following expression

\[
\nabla^2 V_H(i, j) = \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) V_H(i, j)
\approx (D_x^2 + D_y^2)V_H(i, j) = \frac{1}{h^2} \left( V_H(i - 1, j) + V_H(i + 1, j) + V_H(i, j - 1) + V_H(i, j + 1) - 4V_H(i, j) \right)
\] (3.29)

where the values of \( V_H \) at fictitious points, whenever they appear, are replaced by their equivalent values at true grid points as listed in Eqs. (3.25)~(3.28).

Putting the values \( V_H(i, j) \) for \( i, j = 1 : N + 1 \) into a column vector of length \((N + 1)^2\) by redefining

\[ V_H(i + (j - 1)(N + 1)) := V_H(i, j), \] (3.30)

the discrete two-dimensional Laplacian operator in Eq. (3.29) with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions can be written as a \((N + 1)^2 \times (N + 1)^2\) matrix. For example, when \( N = 2 \), the discrete operator with homogeneous Neumann boundary
conditions is a $9 \times 9$ matrix given by

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
-4 & 2 & 2 \\
1 & -4 & 1 & 2 \\
2 & -4 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & 0 & -4 & 2 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & -4 & 1 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & -4 & 2 \\
2 & 1 & -4 & 1 \\
2 & 2 & -4 \\
\end{bmatrix}
$$

where all the entries not shown are zeros.

3.3 Numerical method for the model with a disk stimulus

For convenience, use polar coordinates and define the model over a circular region (Fig. 2 (e))

$$
\Omega = \{(r, \theta) : r \in [0, L], \theta \in [0, 2\pi]\} \quad (3.31)
$$

with flickering stimulus applied on a disk

$$
S = \{(r, \theta) : r \in [0, a], \theta \in [0, 2\pi], a < L\} \quad (3.32)
$$

and the boundary condition

$$
\left. \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial r} \right|_{r=L} = 0. \quad (3.33)
$$

By symmetry, the model can be reduced to one spatial dimension for any fixed $\theta$. Setting $\theta = 0$ and replacing $r$ by $x$ in Eqs. (3.31)$\sim$(3.33), the computational domain $\bar{\Omega}$, the stimulus region $S$, the input currents $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$ now all have exactly the same forms as given in Eq. (3.5), (3.7) and (3.8), respectively; the boundary conditions are also identical with those expressed in Eq. (3.6) where the symmetry at the
origin is preserved for this disk stimulus model; and the Laplacian in Eq. (2.17) is replaced by
\[ \nabla^2 V_H = \frac{\partial^2 V_H}{\partial x^2} + \frac{1}{x} \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x}. \] (3.34)

The model system is still the same as given in Eqs. (2.17)−(2.24) except that all state variables here are functions of \(x\) and \(t\) only.

The model is solved numerically over \(N\) staggered grid points
\[ x_i = \frac{h}{2} + (i - 1)h \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1 : N \] (3.35)
where the mesh width \(h\) is the same as defined in Eq. (3.10). To take care of the boundary conditions, introduce fictitious points \(x_i\) for \(i = 0\) and \(i = N + 1\) in Eq. (3.35). The boundary conditions given in Eq. (3.6) can now be approximated respectively by
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=0} \approx \frac{V_H(i = 1) - V_H(i = 0)}{h} \] (3.36)
and
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial V_H}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=L} \approx \frac{V_H(i = N + 1) - V_H(i = N)}{h} \] (3.37)
which imply that\(^1\)
\[ V_H(i = 0) = V_H(i = 1) \quad \text{and} \quad V_H(i = N + 1) = V_H(i = N). \] (3.38)

The first and second derivatives at true grid points are still approximated by the centered difference formulae given in Eqs. (3.11) and (3.12), except that the index \(i\) now goes from 1 to \(N\). Combining the results in Eq. (3.38) and in Eqs. (3.11)−(3.12) for \(i = 1 : N\), the first and second differential operators in Eq. (3.34) with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions are then given, in the discretized form, by the

\(^1\)The relation \(V_H(i = 0) = V_H(i = 1)\) can also be obtained directly by symmetry about the origin.
following $N \times N$ differentiation matrices, respectively

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \approx D_x = \frac{1}{2h} \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 1 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 \\
\ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
-1 & 0 & 1 \\
-1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \approx D_x^2 = \frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 1 & & & \\
1 & -2 & 1 & & \\
\ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
1 & -2 & 1 \\
1 & -1
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Since in this project we are mainly interested in the values of state variables at $x = 0$, it is not hard to show that, due to the model’s symmetry about the origin, the numerical value of any state variable computed at the point $x_1 = h/2$ is still a second-order accurate approximation to the true solution of that variable at $x = 0$. 
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CHAPTER 4

COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

This chapter presents computational results of the model under various spatial and temporal settings. The values of state variables and the percent enhancement $E$ plotted here are their corresponding values at the origin $(x, y) = (0, 0)$. The size of the flicker stimulus region $S$ is described by the side length of a square-shaped $S$, the width of a slit-shaped $S$, or the diameter of a disk-shaped $S$. In other words, the size of $S$ is equal to $2a$ where $a$ is the half width of $S$ introduced in Chapter 2. The frequency of the flicker stimulus is equal to $1000/P$ with units in Hz where $P$ (ms) is the flickering period. All other parameters not mentioned in each plot below have the same values as those given in Table 1~5 in Chapter 2 except for the ephaptic coefficient $\alpha$ and the GABA release parameter $k_G$. In most plots, four different combinations of the feedback mechanisms are examined, namely, the hybrid case with both ephaptic and GABA mechanisms ($\alpha = 0.88, k_G = 1$), the solely ephaptic case ($\alpha = 0.88, k_G = 0$), the solely GABA case ($\alpha = 0, k_G = 1$), and the null case with neither ephaptic nor GABA mechanisms ($\alpha = 0, k_G = 0$).

4.1 Square $S$: $V_H$ as a function of time

Fig. 4 shows the computed membrane potential $V_H$ in the horizontal cell slab as a function of time for the model with a square-shaped flicker stimulus region $S$. The voltage time traces in all four cases display the “sag” and PIR properties introduced in Chapter 1. The hybrid case where both ephaptic and GABA mechanisms are present generates the percent enhancement ($E = 97.69$) that is closest to the one calculated from experimental voltage recordings under similar conditions ($E = 104$ in Fig. 1 of paper [98]). The solely ephaptic case produces an $E$ value that is a bit less than that of the hybrid case, but is much larger than the $E$ value generated by
the solely GABA case. The null case where both mechanisms are absent fails to generate an enhancement of the flicker response. The sum of the \( E \) values of the solely ephaptic case and the solely GABA case is clearly larger than the \( E \) value in the hybrid case, indicating that there is not a linear summation of the effects of these two feedback mechanisms.

![Graphs showing membrane potential over time for different conditions.](image)

**Figure 4**: Horizontal cell slab membrane potential \( V_H \) as a function of time for the model with a square-shaped flicker stimulus region \( S \). The side length of \( S \) is 250 \( \mu m \), and the flicker frequency is 16 Hz. Note the different vertical scales between plots A, B and plots C, D. Along the horizontal axis of each subplot, the thin long black bar denotes the time interval when the center flicker stimulus is on, and the thick short black bar denotes the time interval when the full-field background illumination is on.
4.2 Square and slit $S$: $E$ as a function of the size of $S$

Fig. 5 shows percent enhancement $E$ as a function of the side length of a square-shaped flicker stimulus regions $S$. The simulation curve computed in the hybrid case gives the best fit with the experimental data. The curve computed in the solely ephaptic case does not fit the data as equally well as the hybrid case, but is much better than the curves in the other two cases. The solely GABA case generates a curve that is way below the experimental data, and the $E$ values on the curve corresponding to the null case stay around zero no matter what the square width is. Fig. 6 shows similar plots for the model with a slit-shaped region $S$, and again the hybrid case gives the best overall fit to the data.

4.3 Square and slit $S$: $E$ as a function of flicker frequency

Fig. 7 shows percent enhancement $E$ as a function of flicker frequency for the model with a square-shaped region $S$. Note that the absolute values of the parameters $A_{flick}$ and $A_{bkgd}$ which reflect the amplitudes of the respective photocurrent $I_{flick}$ and $I_{bkgd}$ are increased here as compared to their values given in Table 5 because the corresponding experimental data were generated under clearly higher light intensities of the flicker stimulus and the background illumination as compared to their respective intensity levels used in producing the voltage recordings and the curve of $E$ vs. square width [98, 88]. Both the hybrid case and the solely ephaptic case display the two-limbed feature of a slow increase in $E$ below 20 Hz and a rapid rise in $E$ above that frequency, but the increase of $E$ in the former case is more prominent. The $E$ values produced in the solely GABA case and the null case tend to decrease as the frequency increases, and they even become negative when the frequency is larger than about 20 Hz.
Figure 5: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of the side length of a square-shaped flicker stimulus region $S$. The solid simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 16 Hz. The open circles in each subplot are experimental data taken from Fig. 5 in paper [88] for a 16 Hz square-shaped $S$ with the flicker being at 650 nm and 6.8 log quanta $\cdot \mu m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ and the background being at 423 nm and 3.4 log quanta $\cdot \mu m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$.

Fig. 8 shows similar plots for the model with a slit-shaped region $S$, and these plots demonstrate essentially the same features as those described above.

4.4 Square and slit $S$: background-induced phase shift

Fig. 9 shows the background-induced phase shift in the flicker response $V_H$ for the model with a square-shaped region $S$. Note that the absolute value of the parameter $A_{bkgd}$ (the hyperpolarizing amplitude of $I_{bkgd}$) is larger here as compared to its value given in Table 5 because the corresponding experimental data were generated under
Figure 6: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of the width of a slit-shaped flicker stimulus region $S$. The solid simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 20 Hz. The open circles in each subplot are experimental data taken from Fig. 6 in paper [88] for a 20 Hz slit-shaped $S$ with the flicker being at 650 nm and $6.8 \log \text{quanta} \cdot \mu \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ and the background being at 420 nm and $3.4 \log \text{quanta} \cdot \mu \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$.

A clearly higher light intensity of the background illumination as compared to its intensity level used in producing the voltage recordings and the curve of $E$ vs square width (see Fig. 5 in paper [98]). Both the hybrid case and the solely ephaptic case produce background-induced phase advances of the response waveform with the amount of advance in the former being slightly larger than that in the latter, while the solely GABA case and the null case produce background-induced phase delays which are inconsistent with experimental observations [98].
Figure 7: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of flicker frequency for the model with a square $S$. The side length of $S$ is 150 $\mu$m. The dotted curve in each subplot consists of points taken from the cubic regression of the experimental data for a 150-$\mu$m square-shaped $S$ with the flicker being at 650 nm and 7.3 log quanta·$\mu$m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ and the background being at 420 nm and 4.4 log quanta·$\mu$m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ (see Fig. 4 in paper [98]). The solid simulation curves were generated at $A_{flick} = -7.7 \mu$A/cm$^2$ and $A_{bkgd} = -7.4 \mu$A/cm$^2$. In C, the solid curve is a cubic regression of the simulated values, and it smooths out some small zigzags appearing at low frequencies in the original simulation curve.

Fig. 10 shows similar plots for the model with a slit-shaped region $S$. Although no experimental data are available for the phase shift of flicker responses under a slit stimulus region, the simulations are consistent with those under square stimuli.
Figure 8: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of flicker frequency for the model with a slit $S$. The width of $S$ is 250 $\mu$m. The dotted curve in each subplot consists of points taken from the cubic regression of the experimental data for a 250-$\mu$m slit-shaped $S$ with the flicker being at 650 nm and 6.8 log quanta $\cdot \mu$m$^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ and the background being at 420 nm and 3.4 log quanta $\cdot \mu$m$^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ (see Fig. 4 in paper [98]). In C and D, the solid curves are cubic regressions of the corresponding simulated values, and they smooth out some small zigzags appearing at low frequencies in the original simulation curves.

4.5 Disk $S$: the curve of $I_{Ca}$ vs. $V_C$

Fig. 11 plots the cone Ca$^{2+}$ current-voltage relationships for the model with a steady disk-shaped center stimulus region both in the presence and absence of a full-field background illumination. This figure is purely a prediction since no experimental data on the cone calcium current-voltage relationship have been found for cat retina. According to the ephaptic hypothesis, background-induced hyperpolariza-
Figure 9: Background-induced phase shift in the flicker response $V_H$ for the model with a square $S$. The side length of $S$ is 424 $\mu$m, and the flicker frequency is 17.39 Hz (the corresponding flicker period $P = 57.5$ ms). All the curves were generated at $A_{bgd} = -7.25$ $\mu$A/cm$^2$. In each subplot, the mean single-cycle waveform of $V_H$ before the onset of background was scaled to that during the presence of background. In addition, the two waveforms in each subplot were placed in the same time window in the sense that the difference between the starting times of the two waveforms is an integer multiple of the flicker period $P$.

The voltage-dependence of horizontal cells shifts the voltage-dependence of $I_{Ca}$ to more negative potentials. The subplot B for the solely ephaptic case is consistent with this. The GABA hypothesis predicts that hyperpolarized horizontal cells will increase calcium channel conductance by reducing their release of the calcium channel blocking agent GABA. Thus the GABA-mediated background-induced feedback will induce an increase in peak $I_{Ca}$, which is shown in the subplot C for the solely GABA case.
Figure 10: Background-induced phase shift in the flicker response $V_H$ for the model with a slit $S$. The width of $S$ is 250 µm, and the flicker frequency is 16 Hz (the corresponding flicker period $P = 62.5$ ms). All the curves were generated at $A_{bkgd} = -7 \mu A/cm^2$. In each subplot, the mean single-cycle waveform of $V_H$ before the onset of background was scaled to that during the presence of background. In addition, the two waveforms in each subplot were placed in the same time window in the sense that the difference between the starting times of the two waveforms is an integer multiple of the flicker period $P$.

The null case in subplot D shows no shift of the curve since no feedback mechanism is present. The hybrid case in subplot A shows both an increase in peak $I_{Ca}$ and a negative shift for some part of the curve, clearly a combined effect of both the ephaptic and GABA mechanisms.
Figure 11: Shift of the voltage dependence of cone $I_{Ca}$ by background illumination for the model with a disk $S$. In each subplot, the steady-state relations between cone $I_{Ca}$ generated within a single synapse and the corresponding cone membrane potentials $V_c$ are plotted, where the solid curve is for the model with only a non-flickering center spot of 65 $\mu$m in diameter, and the dashed curve is for the model with the center spot superimposed by a full-field background illumination.

4.6 Disk $S$: results are similar to those for square $S$

If the diameters of the regions $S$ and $\Omega$ defined in Chapter 3 for a disk-shaped retina patch equal the corresponding side lengths of the regions $S$ and $\Omega$ of a square-shaped retina patch (see also Fig. 2), and if the same set of parameter values are used, then, as expected, the corresponding computational results of the model with these two different spatial settings stay very close to each other. Fig. 12 is a demonstration of this feature, which shows that the change from a square retina patch with
a square stimulus region $S$ to a corresponding disk retina patch with a disk stimulus region $S$ does not shift the curves of $E$ vs. frequency and $E$ vs. the size of $S$ too much. This is also true for the voltage time traces and the background-induced phase advances which are not shown here. Because of this feature, the computational results of the model under a disk-shaped $S$ and those under a square-shaped $S$ can be roughly identified. In addition, numerical solution of the model with a disk-shaped $S$ is much faster than that with a square-shaped $S$ since the former can be reduced to one spatial dimension as explained in Chapter 3. Therefore, to save the computational time considerably in some of the following figures, simulations generated for disk-shaped $S$ are considered as appropriate demonstrations of model behavior and are compared with the corresponding experimental data obtained for square-shaped $S$ whenever the data for disk-shaped $S$ are unavailable.

4.7 The function $\gamma$ is necessary for square and disk $S$

Fig. 13 shows the effect of the function $\gamma$ defined in Eq. (2.29) on the simulation results for different shapes of stimulus regions $S$. Subplot B shows that whether $\gamma$ is a function of the size of $S$ or is a suitably chosen constant does not make too much difference for the model with a slit-shaped region $S$. However, as can be seen from subplot A, for the model with a square- or disk-shaped region $S$, a constant value of $\gamma$ can never generate a good fit between computational results and experimental data, and defining $\gamma$ as the function given in Eq. (2.29) can resolve the fitting issue.

4.8 Examples of model robustness

To test the robustness of the model behavior under changes of parameter values, the model with a disk-shaped stimulus region $S$ is used, and two parameters are chosen to be the varying parameters. One parameter is the horizontal cell spine stem diameter $D_{\text{ss}}$, and the other is the sheet resistance $R_s$ of the horizontal cell slab. $D_{\text{ss}}$
Figure 12: Comparison of results for the model with a disk-shaped $S$ and a square-shaped $S$ where the diameters of the regions $S$ and $\Omega$ of the disk retina patch equal the corresponding side lengths of the regions $S$ and $\Omega$ of the square retina patch, and all the corresponding parameter values are the same. A: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of flicker frequency. The diameter or the side length of $S$ is 150 $\mu$m. The curve of open circles is the same as the dotted experimentally fitted curve for a square $S$ of side length 150 $\mu$m described in Fig. 7. The solid and dashed simulation curves were generated at $A_{flick} = -7.7$ $\mu$A/cm$^2$ and $A_{bkgd} = -7.4$ $\mu$A/cm$^2$. B: Percent enhancement $E$ as a function of the square width or disk diameter of the flicker stimulus region $S$. The solid and dashed simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 16 Hz. The open circles are the same experimental data at 16 Hz for square $S$ as described in Fig. 5.

is set to be 0.1 $\mu$m in this study and is related to the spine stem resistance $R_{ss}$ by the formula $(4L_{ss}R_{i})/({\pi}D_{ss}^2)$, so a range of $D_{ss}$ between 0.025 $\mu$m $\sim$ 1 $\mu$m corresponds to a range of $R_{ss}$ between $1.273 \times 10^7$ $\Omega$ and $2.037 \times 10^{10}$ $\Omega$, which is consistent with the estimated range of $10^7 \sim 10^{10}$ $\Omega$ for $R_{ss}$ [113]. Fig. 14 shows that, as $D_{ss}$ varies within its range above, both the computed curves of $E$ vs. frequency and $E$ vs. the size of $S$ remain fairly close to their corresponding experimental data.

The sheet resistance $R_s$ controls the coupling of horizontal cells and its value is set to be 12 M$\Omega$ in this study, which is within the reported range of 7$\sim$15 M$\Omega$ for $R_s$ [71]. In Fig. 15, $R_s$ is varied between 1.2$\sim$120 M$\Omega$. It can be seen that, even with this broad range of changes in $R_s$, the computed curves of $E$ vs. frequency and $E$ vs. the size of $S$ still follow the corresponding experimental data quite well.
Figure 13: Effects of the function $\gamma$ associated with rod desensitization defined in Eq. (2.29) on the simulation results for disk/square $S$ and for slit $S$. A: Effect of $\gamma$ on the model with a disk/square $S$. The simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 16 Hz. The open circles are the same experimental data at 16 Hz for square $S$ as described in Fig. 5. Solid curve: $\gamma$ is a function of the size of $S$ (in terms of the half width $a$) as given in Eq. (2.29). Dash and dot curve: $\gamma = 0.05$. Dashed curve: $\gamma = 0.1$. Dotted curve: $\gamma = 0.2$. B: Effect of $\gamma$ on the model with a slit $S$. The simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 20 Hz. The open circles are the same experimental data at 20 Hz for slit $S$ as described in Fig. 6. Solid curve: $\gamma$ is a function of the size of $S$ (in terms of the half width $a$) as given in Eq. (2.29). Dashed curve: $\gamma = 0.06$.

What is not shown here is that the characteristic shape of the voltage time traces and the background-induced phase advance are also quite robust with respect to variations of the two parameters above. Thus, the model is robust under the change in spine stem diameter and hence in spine stem resistance, and is also robust with respect to the possible varying coupling strengths among horizontal cells within their slab.

4.9 Summary and conclusion

The model developed in this study displays quite robust behavior with respect to different shapes of the flicker stimulus region and reasonable variations of parameter values. In all the computational results obtained, the solely ephaptic case is able to produce simulations that fit qualitatively well with the experimental data, while
the hybrid case where both ephaptic and GABA mechanisms are present is a bit better. The results generated by the solely GABA case either are not consistent with experimental observations or fail to stay close with the experimental data. These results indicate that the ephaptic mechanism is necessary in order for the model to capture the major spatial and temporal dynamics exhibited by the BIFE effect. The GABA mechanism, although contributing to the increase of percent enhancement under certain conditions, may only have some limited modulatory function.
Figure 15: Robustness of the model with a disk $S$ under the variation of the sheet resistance $R_s$ of the horizontal cell slab. A: Effect of the variation of $R_s$ on the relation between percent enhancement $E$ and flicker frequency. The diameter of $S$ is 150 $\mu$m. The curve of open circles are the same as the dotted experimentally fitted curve for a square $S$ of side length 150 $\mu$m described in Fig. 7. The solid and dashed simulation curves were generated at $A_{\text{flick}} = -7.7 \, \mu\text{A/cm}^2$ and $A_{\text{bkgd}} = -7.4 \, \mu\text{A/cm}^2$. B: Effect of the variation of $R_s$ on the relation between percent enhancement $E$ and the disk diameter of $S$. The solid and dashed simulation curves were generated at a flicker frequency of 16 Hz. The open circles are the same experimental data at 16 Hz for square $S$ as described in Fig. 5.
5.1 Discussion

Consider the relation between percent enhancement $E$ and the size of the flicker stimulus region $S$. The experimental data shown in Fig. 5 for square-shaped $S$ and in Fig. 6 for slit-shaped $S$ indicate that, as the size of $S$ decreases, $E$ increases and gradually levels off. However, the computed $E$ values in the hybrid case and in the solely ephaptic case tend to increase more and more rapidly as the size of $S$ decreases (Fig. 5 A and B, and Fig. 6 A and B). This indicates that, although the model with an ephaptic feedback mechanism can produce results that have an overall good agreement with the experimental data, the model may not be appropriate for situations where the size of $S$ is small (e.g., smaller than 100 µm). There should be some other mechanism dominant for small $S$ that can prevent the $E$ values from going unbounded.

Upon the onset of background illumination, the cone Ca$^{2+}$ current-voltage curve measured experimentally in gold fish and some other species does not have a visible shift in its rightmost branch (i.e., in the more depolarized holding potentials) [41, 135], which looks different from those computed in this study and shown in Fig. 11. But there is one thing in Fig. 11 that is worth noticing. In subplot B, $K_G = 0$ and the rightmost branch of the curve is shifted a little bit up by the background illumination, while in subplot A, $K_G = 1$ and the rightmost branch of the current-voltage curve is dragged down by the background illumination. Thus we can expect that with an appropriate value of $K_G$ between 0 and 1 (maybe just slightly positive), the background-induced vertical shift of the rightmost branch of the curve can be minimized so that the shift there is almost invisible. Now the
resulting overall shift displayed by the computed current-voltage relationship will be similar to those observed in experiments. However, in this computed shift, the GABA mechanism has some small yet nonzero effect since $K_G$ is positive, while the shift generated experimentally was claimed to be GABA-independent since the measurements were carried out in the presence of a high concentration of picrotoxin, which is a GABA$_A$ receptor antagonist and can block all GABA$_A$-receptor-mediated feedback responses [135]. One possible explanation for such a seeming disagreement is as follows. There are suggestions that the GABAergic feedback mechanism examined in this study (i.e., the first version of the GABA hypothesis introduced in Chapter 1) is mediated by GABA$_B$ receptors [27, 73, 87, 100, 135] on which picrotoxin has no effect [103]. This GABA$_B$-receptor-mediated feedback, albeit small, might indeed survive in those experimental conditions and could be used to adjust the computed shift of the current-voltage curve into a shape similar to the experimental one if the feedback strength is appropriate (as reflected by the value of $K_G$).

5.2 Future Directions

Rods are not modeled explicitly in this study. It might be desirable to incorporate rods into the model and also take into account the rod-rod, cone-cone electrical couplings in addition to the rod-cone couplings as introduced in Chapter 1. The study of such a modified model might provide some judgement on the expression of the rod-desensitization-associated function $\gamma$ defined in Eq. (2.29).

This study assumes uniform distribution of horizontal cell spines. However, the distribution of cones in an actual retina is non-uniform with its density in the fovea being the highest and decreasing rapidly towards the peripheral retina [10]. Since A-type horizontal cells only make synaptic contacts with cones, this implies that the distribution of horizontal cell dendritic spines will also be non-uniform. It
is interesting to see if such a modification will affect the light responses of cones and horizontal cells, and if it can improve the agreement between simulation and experiment.

This study assumes that the length constant of the horizontal cell slab remains unchanged. However, there are reports showing that the length constant is dynamic and depends on factors such as light intensity and endogenous dopamine concentration [11, 50, 94, 136, 146]. Incorporating such mechanisms into the model could improve the accuracy of model predictions and make it more flexible to various spatial and temporal settings.

Formulation of a transfer function between light intensity and photocurrent density may be desirable. This will make direct connections between flicker stimulus intensity and $I_{flick}$, and also between the intensity of background illumination and $I_{bkgd}$. Thus a direct study of the influence of background intensity on percent enhancement will be possible. This will also allow a more accurate description of photoreceptor light responses.

The mathematical model and computational code developed in this study provides a basis for the theoretical investigation of the response of the outer retina to various forms of light stimuli such as a moving non-flickering stimulus, and provides the opportunity for comparing the light response to such a stimulus with that to a stationary flickering stimulus.
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