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Bains AS, Schweighofer N. Time-sensitive reorganization of the somatosensory cortex poststroke depends on interaction between Hebbian and homeoplasticity: a simulation study. J Neurophysiol 112: 3240–3250, 2014. First published October 1, 2014; doi:10.1152/jn.00433.2013.—Together with Hebbian plasticity, homeoplasticity presumably plays a significant, yet unclear, role in recovery postlesion. Here, we undertake a simulation study addressing the role of homeoplasticity and rehabilitation timing poststroke. We first hypothesize that homeoplasticity is essential for recovery and second that rehabilitation training delivered too early, before homeoplasticity has compensated for activity disturbances postlesion, is less effective for recovery than training delivered after a delay. We developed a neural network model of the sensory cortex driven by muscle spindle inputs arising from a six-muscle arm. All synapses underwent Hebbian plasticity, while homeoplasticity adjusted cell excitability to maintain a desired firing distribution. After initial training, the network was lesioned, leading to areas of hyper- and hypoexcitability due to the loss of lateral synaptic connections. The network was then retrained through rehabilitative arm movements. We found that network recovery was unsuccessful in the absence of homeoplasticity, as measured by reestablishment of lesion-affected inputs. We also found that a delay preceding rehabilitation led to faster network recovery during the rehabilitation training than no delay. Our simulation results thus suggest that homeoplastic restoration of prelesion activity patterns is essential to functional network recovery via Hebbian plasticity.
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The mechanisms underlying the subpar effects of too early rehabilitation are not well understood. Abnormal cortical patterns of excitation and inhibition occur both near (Clarkson et al. 2010; Liepert et al. 2000; Mittmann et al. 1998; Qu et al. 1998; Schiene et al. 1996) and far from the lesion (Buchkremer-Ratzmann and Witte 1997; Butefisch et al. 2003). Such abnormal excitability and resulting abnormal activity patterns are in part due to the loss of efferent connections from lesioned cells to local and distant areas (Buchkremer-Ratzmann and Witte 1997; Sober et al. 1997). Locally, pyramidal cells send lateral projections up to 2 mm away (Boucsein et al. 2011) with net excitatory effects to nearby cells and net inhibitory effects to more distant cells, via connections to local GABAergic neurons (Derdikman et al. 2003). Computer simulation studies using such “Mexican hat” connectivity patterns (Sirosch and Miikkulainen 1997; Stevens et al. 2013; Sullivan and de Sa 2006; Wilson et al. 2010) have supported the experimental findings that lesions yield complex changes in activity, with zones of abnormally low and high excitability (Goodall et al. 1997; Sober et al. 1997). Abnormal hyperexcitability, if exacerbated by activity due to early and intense use of the affected limb, can cause cell death and lesion enlargement (Risedal et al. 1999), presumably via abnormally high levels of NMDA activity (Humm et al. 1999; Risedal et al. 1999). In surviving cells, hyperexcitability enhances Hebbian plasticity-like long-term potentiation (LTP) perilesionally (Hagemann et al. 1998). Such increased plasticity may be beneficial to recovery (Hagemann et al. 1998; Murphy and Corbett 2009), because it can help in the strengthening and reemergence of remaining weak afferent synapses from stroke-affected inputs (Jones 2000; Sanes and Donoghue 2000; Sigler et al. 2009; Winship and Murphy 2009). However, increased LTP may also lead to maladaptive plasticity and poor cortical reorganization if existing inputs are further strengthened at the expense of the reemergence of weak afferent synapses.

In addition to Hebbian plasticity-like LTP, homeoplasticity has been proposed to play a significant role postlesion (Murphy and Corbett 2009; Nahmani and Turrigiano 2014). Homeoplasticity, which is ubiquitous in the brain, acts to maintain desired firing rates and patterns (Desai et al. 1999; LeMasson et al. 1993; Turrigiano 2011). In response to abnormally low or high activity after lesion, homeoplasticity may thus enhance or decrease excitability, respectively, to restore prelesion firing levels (Murphy and Corbett 2009).

Experimentally, it is difficult to study the interacting effects of homeoplasticity, LTP, and enhanced inputs due to rehabilitative training on cortical reorganization and recovery postle-
sion (Murphy and Corbett 2009; Nahmani and Turrigiano 2014). In addition, rehabilitative training will affect the network differently at different times poststroke depending on the level of “spontaneous recovery” achieved before training. Here, we aim at better understanding these interactions in computer simulations to guide future experimental work and, eventually, clinical practice regarding the optimal timing of rehabilitation. We make the following two hypotheses. First, homeoplasicity, together with Hebbian plasticity, enhances recovery and prevents maladaptive cortical reorganization. Second, rehabilitation training delivered too early, before homeoplasicity has compensated for activity disturbances postlesion, is less effective for network recovery than training delivered after a delay.

To test these hypotheses, we developed a simplified somato-sensory cortical network of neurons that received simulated arm muscle spindle inputs and lateral connections via Mexican hat-like connectivity. All synapses were modifiable via Hebbian plasticity; cell activity was adjusted via homeoplasicity. After initial cortical organization in response to arm reaching movements, the network was partly lesioned to simulate a stroke. We first tested the specific contribution of homeoplasicity to network reorganization and then tested the effect of rehabilitation timing.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Arm and Muscle Spindle Simulations

We simulated a planar two-joint kinematic human arm model with shoulder and elbow joints. Each joint was spanned by an extensor and flexor muscle pair, as well as a biarticular pair (Fig. 1) (Katayama and Kawato 1993). These muscles are abbreviated as Sh-Fl and Sh-Ex for the shoulder, El-Fl and El-Ex for the elbow, and Bi-Fl and Bi-Ex for the biarticular pair, with Fl and Ex denoting flexor and extensor. Each muscle was passively stretched and contracted during reaching movements and gave rise to two spindle activities, one based on muscle length (similar to a group II fiber) and the other on the sum of length and stretch velocity (similar to a group Ia fiber).

Planar point-to-point movements were generated via a minimum jerk model (Flash and Hogan 1985). Inverse kinematics generated shoulder and elbow angles. Movement endpoints were randomly selected with the constraint that changes in shoulder and elbow angles during each movement were required to be less than π/4 and π/3 radians, respectively. The time MT allowed for each movement was based on a modified Fitts’s law $MT = \log_2(a + distance)$ (MacKenzie 1989), where distance is the Cartesian distance between consecutive endpoints and $a = 1.3$. The stretch lengths and velocities of each muscle were normalized to between 0 and 1 to keep all spindle activity ranges equal. Time step length was 0.01 s.

Cortical Network Simulations

A 400-cell (20 × 20) network arranged in a doughnut-shaped grid received the 12 spindle inputs. This represented a small patch of primary sensory cortex. Before training, initial connection weights from spindles to cortical cells were all-to-all, chosen randomly from the range [0,1] before being normalized to sum to 1 for each cell. Cells were laterally connected to each other with Mexican hat connectivity (Kohonen 1982; Lytton et al. 1999; Sirosch and Mikulainen 1997; Sober et al. 1997; Stevens et al. 2013; Sullivan and de Sa 2006; Wilson et al. 2010). The lateral weight $L_{ij}$ from cell $j$ to $i$ was defined as:

$$L_{ij} = \frac{A_i}{\sigma_i \sqrt{2\pi} e^{-\frac{d^2}{2\sigma_i^2}}} - \frac{A_i}{\sigma_i \sqrt{2\pi} e^{-\frac{d^2}{2\sigma_i^2}}}$$

where $d$ is the grid distance between the cells, and other parameter values are given in Table 1.

Positive and negative lateral input weights to each cell were normalized to sum to 9 and $-9$, respectively. Such bias in the strength of lateral vs. afferent input has been found in cortical pyramidal cells.
Table 1. Values of all the parameters used in the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican hat parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_r )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_r )</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_i )</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_i )</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plasticity parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_{\text{hebb}} )</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_{\text{hom}} )</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_{\text{hom}} )</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cell dynamics parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta t )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau )</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Boussen et al. 2011; Stepanyants et al. 2009). Normalization constants and difference-of-Gaussian parameters were heuristically chosen based on two criteria. 1) Formation of contiguous cell neighborhoods (as defined by strong input weights from the same subset of spindles) following initial training. 2) Large activity disturbances throughout the network following lesions targeting given neighborhoods (see Lesioning).

Each cell was modeled as a simple leaky integrator neuron (Arbib 1995). The change in “membrane voltage” of cell \( i \) at time \( t \) was given by:

\[
\frac{\Delta x_{ij}}{\Delta t} = -x_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{12} S_{ik} f_{ik} + \sum_{j=1}^{400} L_{ij} y_{ij}, \quad i \neq j
\]

(1)

where \( x_{ij} \) is the voltage for cell \( i \) at time \( t \), \( y_{ij} \) is the activity for cell \( j \) \((i \neq j)\) at time \( t \), \( L_{ij} \) is the lateral connection weight from cell \( j \) to \( i \), \( S_{ik} \) is the synaptic connection weight from spindle \( k \) to cell \( i \), \( f_{ik} \) is the activity of spindle \( k \) at time \( t \), \( \tau \) is the cell excitation constant, and \( \Delta t \) is the time step length in seconds. The voltage \( x_{ij} \) was then passed through a sigmoidal response curve to give a final cell activity, or “firing rate,” \( y_{ij} \):

\[
y_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{- \left( \alpha x_{ij} + \beta y_{ij} \right)}}.
\]

(2)

where both the slope \( \alpha \) and the offset \( \beta \) are adjusted via homeoplastic mechanisms in Eqs. 4 and 5 below.

**Hebbian Plasticity and Homeoplasitcity**

At each time step, afferent and lateral (positive and negative) weights were modified via Hebbian-type learning as follows:

\[
w_{ij, t+\Delta t} = w_{ij} + \eta_{\text{hebb}} y_{pre, j} y_{\text{post}, i}
\]

(3)

where \( y_{pre, j} \) and \( y_{\text{post}, i} \) are the presynaptic cell or spindle activity and postsynaptic cell voltage, respectively, at time \( t \), and \( \eta_{\text{hebb}} \) is the Hebbian learning rate (Castillo et al. 2011; Citri and Malenka 2008; Foldiak 1990; Madison et al. 1991). Only the magnitude, not the sign, of the weights could change. Weights were renormalized after each update to prevent runaway weight values. The normalization created competition between weights, whereby one weight to a cell could not increase without decreasing the contributions of other weights. Such competitive Hebbian learning is known to lead to regular map formation in models of sensory cortex (Kohonen 1982; Linsker 1989; Malsburg 1973; Wilson et al. 2010).

To model homeoplasticity, the slope and the offset of each cell’s response curve (Eq. 2) were modified at each time step with the goal of maintaining an exponential firing rate distribution with a desired mean, according to Butko and Triesch (2006) and Triesch (2005). For cell \( i \), the changes of sigmoidal parameters \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) in Eq. 2 are given by:

\[
\Delta a_i = \eta_{\text{hom}} \left[ \frac{1}{a_i} + x_i - \left( 2 + \frac{1}{\mu_{\text{hom}}} \right) y_i + \frac{1}{\mu_{\text{hom}}} y_i^2 \right]
\]

\[
\Delta b_i = \eta_{\text{hom}} \left[ 1 - \left( 2 + \frac{1}{\mu_{\text{hom}}} \right) y_i + \frac{1}{\mu_{\text{hom}}} y_i^2 \right]
\]

where \( \eta_{\text{hom}} \) is a learning rate and with \( \mu_{\text{hom}} \) the mean of the exponential distribution (see Table 1 for parameter values and initial values).

**Initial Network Training**

Using spindle activities generated by 400 simulated arm movements (a total training length of 24,693 time steps) as inputs, we trained 10 different networks with a different random number generator seed for each network. The distribution of MT during these 400 movements was 0.62 ± 13 s (mean ± SD).

**Lesioning**

After initial training, the 10 cortical networks were lesioned by removing all cells with an input weight from the shoulder flexor length/velocity spindle (abbreviated as the Sh-FI Len/Vel spindle) >0.1. Lesioning a specific spindle is similar to experimental approaches targeting the somatotopic representations of specific limbs or limb segments (see for instance, Brown et al. 2009; Kleim et al. 2003; Nudo et al. 1996).

**Rehabilitation Training**

After lesioning, the poststroke rehabilitation phase consisted of the same sequence of arm movements as in the training phase under each of the following conditions.

**Simulated experiment 1: Hebbian/Homeoplastic vs. Hebbian-only rehabilitation.** To test the importance of homeoplasticity in network recovery, rehabilitation training with both Hebbian and homeoplastic mechanisms active was compared with training with only the Hebbian mechanism active (\( \eta_{\text{hom}} = 0 \)).

**Simulated experiment 2: Delay vs. No Delay rehabilitation.** To test the effect of rehabilitation timing, training was given either immediately after lesion (No Delay condition) or after a delay period (Delay condition). During the delay, only spindle activity stemming from the home position lengths of the six muscles was provided as input to the network. These activities were between 0.4 and 0.6 for all 12 spindles, 5
days after lesion (No Delay condition). To quantify abnormal activity, the mean cell activities taken
across all time steps in initial training were subtracted from the mean cell activities during the period of interest (e.g., during rehabilitation) on a cell-by-cell basis. The mean ± SD of the absolute value of this change in mean activity was then calculated across cells and across simulations arising from different random number seeds.

**Spindle input weight map and proportion changes.** We measured the degree of recovery by comparing the input maps before lesion and at different time points after lesion. Specifically, for each spindle, 20 × 20 input weight maps were created by plotting the strength of input from this spindle to each of the 400 cells. Comparisons between post- and prelesion maps were quantified using the weight proportion change for each spindle, calculated as follows. The sum of input weight to all surviving cortical cells for a given spindle was divided by the sum of input weights to all surviving cells from all 12 spindles (there were 400 surviving cells prelesion, but this was reduced after lesion). This proportion (expressed as a percentage) was then compared at different times postlesion to the spindle’s average proportion prelesion (across the final 6,000 time steps of training, i.e., after map organization had converged). Recovery had occurred when the difference in proportion from prelesion was no longer significantly different from 0% for the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl Len/Vel spindle. Significance was defined at the P = 0.05 level using the Wilcoxon signed rank test, using the 10 network simulations as the sample. Weight proportion change thus allowed an intuitive link with experimental work, where the reduction or expansion of somatotopic representations of different limb segments is one of the outcomes of interest after postinfarct rehabilitation or skill learning (Kleim et al. 1998; Nudo et al. 1996; Plautz et al. 2000).

**Cell allegiance changes.** At any single time point, one spindle has the largest input weight to a given cortical cell. Because of competitive Hebbian plasticity, this spindle can eventually have a lower weight to the cell than one of the other 11 spindles. If this happens, it is termed an “allegiance change,” since the cell changes the spindle with which it has the strongest allegiance. Allegiance changes were used to quantify the degree of synaptic plasticity occurring postlesion, since such plasticity was necessary for reorganization of cortical inputs. To compare the Hebbian/Homeoplastic and Hebbian-Only conditions, the number of allegiance changes per cell was computed over the entire rehabilitation training.

**Parameter sensitivity analyses.** To check that the simulation results were not based on precisely tuned parameters alone, we ran rehabilitation simulations with different delay lengths (0, 12.5, 25, 37.5, 50, 62.5, and 75%), Hebbian learning rates (0, 0.0003, 0.003, 0.03, and 0.3), and homeoplastic learning rates (0, 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, and 0.1). For each parameter, we ran six simulations with different random number seeds and computed lesion-targeted Sh-Fl Len/Vel input weight proportion change to quantify the degree of recovery.

**RESULTS**

**Initial Network Training**

As expected with competitive Hebbian learning, the initial random distribution of input weights from a given spindle to the cortical network (representing a small patch of primary sensory cortex) became organized into well-defined neighborhoods of relatively high input strength (Fig. 2A). During the final 6,000 time steps of training, each spindle contributed between 7.8 and 8.8% (averaged across time steps and simulations) of the total cortical input weight. The similar contributions reflected the similar percentage of total input activity accounted for by each spindle over time, averaging between 8.2 and 8.5%. Note that because of correlations or anticorrelations in spindle activities (see APPENDIX), spindle pairs had overlapping and nonoverlapping weight map distributions, respectively. Because there was very large overlap in the map
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*Fig. 2. Effects of initial training, lesion, and rehabilitation on spindle weight input representations in experiment 1. A: input weight maps from shoulder muscle spindles to cortical cells at end of training. Brightness denotes strength of input weight. White border denotes area to be lesioned. B: input weight maps for shoulder spindles after Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition. Here and in C, hatched region denotes lesion. C: input weight maps for shoulder spindles after Hebbian-Only condition. Note the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle shows diminished areas of representation compared with the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition in B. D: percent difference from prelesion of each spindle’s input weight proportion after lesion and at the end of rehabilitation. Error bars represent mean ± SD. 0% denotes recovery of the prelesion proportion. E: percent difference from prelesion of each spindle’s input weight proportion during rehabilitation. Note for the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle, recovery only occurs in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition.*
distributions of length/velocity and length-only spindles arising from the same muscle, only results for the length/velocity spindles are shown hereafter.

**Effects of Targeted Lesion**

To simulate a stroke lesion, all cells with input weights from the Sh-Fl length/velocity spindle > 0.1 were removed from the network. This lesion criterion resulted in 31 ± 7.0% (mean ± SD) of cells being lesioned and removed from each network. The postlesion input weight proportion for the targeted Sh-Fl spindle was reduced by 43 ± 8.7% across simulation seeds (Fig. 2D). The Bi-Fl spindle also experienced a weight proportion decrease of 32 ± 11% due to its significant cortical representation overlap with the Sh-Fl spindle.

Lesions caused large disturbances in mean cell activities of surviving cells by removing a large fraction of lateral connections. Figure 3, A and B, demonstrates this for one network by showing mean network activity after initial training either pre- or postlesion (computed over the same 3,000 time steps of spindle activity). The lesion caused persistent hyperactivity in local areas of the network, which then inhibited surrounding areas, causing them to exhibit low activity.

**Experiment 1: Essential Role of Homeoplasticity in Recovery**

We next addressed our first hypothesis, that homeoplasticity enhanced recovery of spindle input weight representations in the network after lesion. Figure 2 shows that the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle recovered its prelesion input weight proportion by the end of the rehabilitation training in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic rehabilitation (recovery defined in MATERIALS AND METHODS using the Wilcoxon signed rank test). In contrast, in the Hebbian-Only rehabilitation, there was no recovery: the postlesion Sh-Fl proportion remained significantly different from prelesion. Similarly, the other spindles recovered in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition but did not recover their prelesion proportions in the Hebbian-Only condition.

The different recovery patterns seen in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic and Hebbian-Only conditions were driven by greatly different cell activity patterns during rehabilitation training. Figure 3, C and D, shows the mean cell activities during rehabilitation for both Hebbian-Only and Hebbian/Homeoplastic rehabilitation. Compared with the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition, activity remained persistently high or low in localized areas in the Hebbian-Only condition, similar to the activity patterns seen immediately after lesion in Fig. 3B. Under the Hebbian-Only condition, the absolute value of the change in mean cell activities compared with initial training was 0.13 ± 0.14 (mean ± SD across simulations and surviving cells). Such large changes in mean contrasted to the small activity changes in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition, which showed an absolute value of 0.041 ± 0.029 (P < 1e-172, using the Wilcoxon rank sum test to compare conditions; significantly different between conditions).

The difference in cell activities under each condition was driven by the presence or absence of homeoplasticity. Importantly, the direct effect of homeoplasticity on cell activity was the first link in a chain whereby homeoplasticity ultimately affected Hebbian plasticity and hence network reorganization.

The next link connected activity levels with cell membrane potentials. Although the activity of any cell in isolation had no way of affecting the cell’s own membrane potential, in the laterally connected network the activity could affect the membrane potentials of other cells. Thus by altering the activities of the cells, homeoplasticity also indirectly changed the distribution of membrane potentials in the network. This effect is seen in the different distributions of mean cell membrane potentials (mean taken over rehabilitation training) under the Hebbian/Homeoplastic and Hebbian-Only conditions (Fig. 4A).

In the final link, homeoplasticity’s effect on membrane potentials allowed it to affect Hebbian weight plasticity (see Eq. 3) and hence network reorganization, quantified here by cell allegiance changes during rehabilitation. Figure 4B demonstrates the close relationship between membrane potential and allegiance changes. By affecting the membrane potentials of the cells, homeoplasticity affected Hebbian spindle input weight changes through the membrane potential term in the Hebbian rule (Eq. 3). In particular, cells in the Hebbian-Only condition with near-zero mean membrane potential did not exhibit the allegiance changes needed for recovery: under the Hebbian-Only condition, 34.9 ± 17.1% (mean ± SD across simulations) of cells had few (less than 10) allegiance changes during rehabilitation training, vs. only 1.0 ± 0.91% for the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition. The cells with < 10 allegiance changes in the Hebbian-Only condition are shown in Figure 4C, along with the number of allegiance changes in the same cells under the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition. This demonstrates that the same cells that contributed little to reorganization in the Hebbian-Only condition were not similarly impotent in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition.
Importantly, for the cells with <10 allegiance changes in the Hebbian-Only condition, the input weight from the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle decreased by $-0.016 \pm 0.046$ (mean ± SD). In contrast, in the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition, input weight from the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle increased by $0.031 \pm 0.079$ (Fig. 4D). This illustrates the connection between reorganization and recovery: cells with few allegiance changes experienced little gain in Sh-Fl input strength, so the chain mechanistically linking homeoplasticity to reorganization and increased allegiance changes also linked it to recovery.

**Experiment 2: Effect of Delayed Rehabilitation Training**

We found our second hypothesis, that rehabilitation delivered immediately after lesion (No Delay condition) is less effective than one delivered after a delay (Delay condition; see Fig. 1B), was true due to the following mechanism. Driven by similar activity from all spindles during the delay period, many cells decreased their input weights from previously strongly connected spindles and increased weights from previously weakly connected spindles, making weights more similar (or “flattened”) across spindles. For each cell, this change was gauged by calculating the standard deviation of input weights across all 12 spindles before and after the delay, since more flattened weights would give rise to a smaller standard deviation. Indeed, the input weight standard deviation per cell fell from $0.053 \pm 0.017$ (mean ± SD) immediately postlesion to $0.026 \pm 0.025$ after the delay. In particular, since the lesion left alive only cells with weak weights from the Sh-Fl spindle, the flattening of input weights increased weight from this spindle on average. Immediately postlesion, the average input weight value from the Sh-Fl spindle was $0.048 \pm 0.024$ per cell (mean ± SD across simulations and surviving cells), which it increased to $0.064 \pm 0.017$ after the delay (see Fig. 5, A and B).

Thus rehabilitation after delay began with similar weight values from all spindles. This allowed the Sh-Fl weights to compete more effectively with spindles that would have had much higher weights before the delay, thereby speeding recovery (Fig. 5C). Although recovery of weight proportions for lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle occurred in both conditions, recovery occurred after 13,032 time steps of rehabilitation in the No Delay condition but only after 4,550 time steps in the Delay condition, a 65% faster recovery (Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to measure recovery, as explained in MATERIALS AND METHODS).

The beneficial effect of delay depended on homeoplasticity: in a simulation of Hebbian-Only plasticity during the delay, input weights did not flatten to the same degree during the delay. In particular, the average Sh-Fl weight remained at $0.052 \pm 0.024$ (mean ± SD across simulations and surviving cells) after delay without homeoplasticity, little-changed from immediately postlesion compared with the Sh-Fl weights after the delay with homeoplasticity.

**Experiment 3: Effects of Elbow-Only Training after Lesion**

During Elbow-Only training postlesion, the input weight proportion from the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle showed no recovery of representation across all simulation seeds (see Fig. 6). The spindle’s input weight proportion immediately after lesion was reduced by $44.8 \pm 4.7\%$ (mean ± SD) compared with prelesion, and after postlesion training it was still reduced by $33.3 \pm 9.1\%$. There was also loss of representation of the shoulder extensor spindle Sh-Ex due to its inactivity during the Elbow-Only training. Immediately after lesion, it had increased its weight proportion by $45.7 \pm 10.1\%$ compared with prelesion, but by the end of training this had become a decrease of $10.5 \pm 5.9\%$.
Parameter Sensitivity Analyses

We ran parameter sensitivity analyses for the delay length, Hebbian learning rate, and homeoplastic learning rate. The mean time courses of Sh-Fl recovery for all altered parameter values are shown in Fig. 7. To test different delays, the same number of time steps of rehabilitation were applied to the network after varying delay lengths. As shown in Fig. 7A, recovery during rehabilitation training was slowest with no (0%) delay, as in our main results. This confirmed that the benefits of delay were not dependent on the precise delay length, perhaps excluding delay lengths much shorter than those shown in Fig. 7A.

Figure 7, B and C, shows the recovery results for the Hebbian and homeoplastic learning rates, respectively. Very low learning rates did not achieve recovery within the length of rehabilitation training, while high rates led to unstable recovery, suggesting unstable weight maps that changed drastically based on recent spindle input. High Hebbian learning rates yielded much more frequently changing recovery levels than high homeoplastic learning rates, however.

DISCUSSION

In this simulation study, we explored the influence of cellular Hebbian and homeoplastic mechanisms on recovery post-stroke. We notably aimed to answer two important questions regarding neural plasticity mechanisms and rehabilitative therapy in the period post-stroke. The first question was whether homeoplacticity was, in addition to Hebbian plasticity, necessary for recovery following a lesion; the second question was whether administering rehabilitation training after a delay period aided recovery.

Regarding the first question, our results clearly showed that recovery in our model was only possible in the presence of both homeoplasticity and Hebbian plasticity. Homeoplasticity abolished local high or low cortical activity patterns seen immediately post-lesion. As shown in Fig. 4, this led to very...
different cell membrane potential distributions in the Hebbian/ Homeoplastic and Hebbian-Only conditions, which in turn led to different amounts of network reorganization (quantified by cell allegiance changes). In the Hebbian/Homeoplastic condition, the ubiquity of nonzero mean membrane potentials allowed many allegiance changes and thus allowed inputs from the lesion-affected spindle to establish strong connections to the surviving cells. In contrast, in Hebbian-Only networks, local high or low activity patterns were persistent. This, in turn, drove maladaptive plasticity and poor map reorganization by causing many mean cell membrane potentials to remain close to zero, thus preventing reemergence of strong weights from the lesion-targeted Sh-Fl spindle. Parameter sensitivity analyses revealed that it was the presence of both Hebbian and homeoplasticity that was important, not the precise values of their learning rates, since poor recovery only occurred with extreme changes in these learning rates. Note that our explanation of the role of homeoplasticity poststroke is different from, but not mutually exclusive with, previous suggestions that a homeoplastic response to the low levels of perilesional activity immediately postlesion leads to the hyperexcitability seen in the days after lesion (Murphy and Corbett 2009; Nahmani and Turrigiano 2014).

Interestingly, another simulation study reached a similar conclusion on the complementary roles of homeoplasticity and Hebbian plasticity but during visual cortical development (Toyoizumi and Miller 2009). Homeoplasticity was a necessary addition to Hebbian plasticity to allow robust equalization in the representation of both eyes in normal development and overrepresentation of one eye in monocular deprivation. Similar to the present model, homeoplasticity allowed strengthening of initially weak input weights, permitting them to compete effectively for cortical representation against other inputs. Note that in the Toyoizumi and Miller model, very noisy cell activity could compensate for a lack of homeoplasticity (a possibility not explored here); however, compensation was not robust to parameter changes.

Regarding the second question, we found that although recovery and the alleviation of maladaptive plasticity was possible under both No Delay and Delay conditions, a delay led to faster recovery during a subsequent rehabilitation dose. In the Delay condition, during the delay, homeoplasticity led to a “flattening” of input weight distributions; that is, the spindle input weights to each cortical cell became more evenly distributed across all spindles. This was quantified by the overall decrease after delay of the standard deviations of spindle weight values arriving at each cell. This allowed reemergence of weights from the lesion-affected spindles by the beginning of rehabilitation training (Fig. 5), acting as a seed upon which further strengthening and reorganization of lesion-affected spindle weights occurred quickly. In contrast, in the No Delay condition, more time during training was required to achieve any initial weight reemergence. In a link with experiment 1, homeoplasticity was required for Sh-Fl reemergence during the delay. This spontaneous reorganization depended on the same effects of homeoplasticity on persistent high or low cortical activity explored in experiment 1.

This homeoplastic-dependent mechanism of weight flattening may partially explain (along with activity-induced cell death) poor outcomes seen in rodents and humans when exposed to rehabilitation very early after stroke (Bland et al. 2000; Humm et al. 1999; Kozlowski et al. 1996; Risedal et al. 1999). Note that although the model predicts the same level of recovery after extensive training in both the Delay and No Delay condition, faster recovery in the Delay condition suggests that a limited dose produces better recovery in a short time if given after a delay. Whether this phenomenon occurs biologically could be tested experimentally in rodents by using different rehabilitation dose lengths and different delays before rehabilitation onset to see if for short doses, some delay is beneficial to recovery. This is important clinically because the majority of stroke patients receive only a limited dose of physical therapy that may be insufficient to maximize recovery (Lang et al. 2009).

Further experimental work could also attempt to reduce the ability of peri-infarct cells to undergo homeoplastic adjustments to test our prediction that homeoplasticity is necessary for recovery. However, homeoplasticity in vivo is controlled through a variety of signaling pathways, some of which overlap with LTP pathways (Guzman-Karlsson et al. 2014; Turrigiano 2012; Turrigiano 2011). To minimize overlap, targets for reducing homeoplasticity might be found at the ends of these pathways at the gene transcription or protein trafficking level. For example, genes or promoter sequences for homeostatic processes, such as Na$^{+}$/K$^{+}$, K$^{+}$, or K$^{+}$, K$^{+}$ channel subunits (McClung and Nestler 2003) affecting excitability, could be turned off after lesion with optogenetically controlled transcriptional repressors.

Previous experimental work in poststroke monkeys (Nudo et al. 1996) provided a useful benchmark against which to test the capability of our model to reproduce basic biological outcomes. In that work, lesion-targeted inputs only regained
cortical representation if their use was forced during rehabilita-
tion. If they remained unused, they failed to regain representa-
tion while allowing other, unlesioned inputs to gain further representation. Here, experiment 3 showed similar results: simulated disuse of the shoulder after lesioning cells with strong Sh-Fl input prevented recovery of prelesion representa-
tion of the Sh-Fl input (Fig. 6). This occurred because relative Sh-Fl spindle inactivity failed to provide the presynaptic ac-
tivity necessary to increase its input weights via Hebbian plasticity (see Eq. 3). This led to the inactive spindles having reduced input weight relative to active spindles, which, be-
cause of competitive Hebbian plasticity, increased the active spindles’ overall representation beyond prelesion levels.

Limitations and Future Work

Computer simulations of motor recovery poststroke have several benefits when pursued in concert with experimental studies. Simulation allows rapid iteration of theoretical exper-
iments that is not possible biologically. Although simulation results do not amount to proof, they do provide predictions to be developed into hypotheses for testing in vivo. However, the simplifications inherent in simulations necessarily impose a number of limitations on our results.

First, although we proposed here that homeoplasticity (mod-
eled as adjustment of cell excitability) is an important factor in recovery, there are a number of other processes occurring after stroke, including changes in cell signaling and gene regulation prompted by cell death (reviewed in Murphy and Corbett 2009). Experiments that induce lesions with reduced cell death, and hence without some of these secondary lesion effects, could be undertaken by using local cortical cooling (Orton et al. 2012) or blockade of glutamatergic signaling through drug injection (Malmierca et al. 2003).

Second, our model contains highly simplified neuron mod-
els. However, we do not expect large changes in results with more complex spiking neurons, because homeoplasticity works over long time scales that filter out individual spikes.

Third, the lack of closed-loop control of the simulated arm meant there was no degradation in arm control after the stroke and no need to produce compensatory actions to achieve reaching goals. Interaction between compensatory behavior and plastic mechanisms presumably further impairs recovery by reinforcing abnormal motor control and will need to be addressed in future models.

While our model is a model of sensory cortex recovery poststroke, recent related modeling studies have explored re-
organization in the motor system poststroke. Reorganization of motor system poststroke, unlike purely "unsupervised" sensory system reorganization, requires learning rules that depend on feedback from the environment. In Han et al. (2008), reorga-
nization depends on both error-based, or supervised, and un-
supervised learning rules. In an article based on this work, Reinkensmeyer et al. (2012) proposed that reorganization of motor cortical activity to relearn how to flex a simulated wrist depends on reinforcement learning.

Future models of reorganization of the motor system post-
stroke should aim at better understanding the combined roles of different plastic processes in stroke reorganization. Impor-
tantly, they should study how the role of homeoplasticity proposed here interacts with feedback-driven plastic rules in the motor system (Takiyama and Okada 2012). In addition, future models could incorporate interhemispheric effects of lesions (Levitan and Reggia 1999; Reggia 2004) and better link to anatomy. For instance, they could draw on previous work using connectome data to model brain regions as graphical network nodes and evaluating the effects of node deletion on network dynamics (Alstott et al. 2009; Honey and Sporns 2008; Rubinov et al. 2009).

Finally, a crucial aspect of plasticity that is not included in the current model is that various forms of plasticity, such as dendritic and axonal sprouting and LTP, are modulated as a function of time after stroke (i.e., metaplasticity). Following stroke, specific features of brain function revert to those seen at an early stage of development, with the subsequent process of "recovery recapitulating ontogeny" (Cramer and Chopp 2000). In particular, genetic changes in the perilesional area allow for a window of increased plasticity that makes it easier for perilesional neurons to modify existing connections and form new ones in response to motor training (see Murphy and Corbett 2009 for review). Sensorimotor training during this window can drive plasticity more effectively, which benefits recovery if the training involves appropriate rehabilitative movements. On the assumption that rehabilitative training is given before this increased plasticity subsides, our model predicts that a limited dose of training produces better recovery if given after a delay. This prediction, combined with better characterization of the poststroke plasticity window, has important clinical implications for optimally timing the limited dose of physical therapy received by most patients.

APPENDIX

To better characterize the network inputs and understand the pattern of input weights seen after training, the correlations between spindle activities were calculated. Spearman's rank correlation coef-
ficient was used because this measure is nonparametric and does not require the relationship between variables to be linear, only mono-
tonic. The resulting correlation matrix is shown in Fig. A1.
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