

1 **Title: Evidence for frequency-dependent cortical plasticity in the human**
2 **brain**

3

4 Authors and affiliations

5 Caroline A Lea-Carnall¹

6 Nelson J Trujillo-Barreto¹

7 Marcelo A Montemurro¹

8 Wael El-Deredy^{1,2*}

9 Laura M Parkes^{1*}

10

11 ¹ Division of Neuroscience and Experimental Psychology, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health,
12 University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom

13 ² School of Biomedical Engineering, University of Valparaiso, Valparaiso 2366103, Chile.

14 * Joint senior authors.

15

16

1 Abstract

2

3 Frequency-dependent plasticity (FDP) describes adaptation at the synapse in response to stimulation
4 at different frequencies. Its consequence on the structure and function of cortical networks is
5 unknown. We tested whether cortical “resonance”, favourable stimulation frequencies at which the
6 sensory cortices respond maximally, influenced the impact of FDP on perception, functional
7 topography and connectivity of the primary somatosensory cortex using psychophysics and functional
8 imaging (fMRI). We co-stimulated two digits on the hand synchronously at, above, or below the
9 resonance frequency of the somatosensory cortex, and tested subjects’ accuracy and speed on tactile
10 localisation before and after co-stimulation. More errors and slower response times followed co-
11 stimulation at above- or below-resonance, respectively. Response times were faster after at-resonance
12 co-stimulation. In the fMRI, the cortical representations of the two digits co-stimulated above-
13 resonance shifted closer, potentially accounting for the poorer performance. Co-stimulation at-
14 resonance did not shift the digit regions, but increased the functional coupling between them,
15 potentially accounting for the improved response time. To relate these results to synaptic plasticity,
16 we simulated a network of oscillators incorporating Hebbian learning. Two neighbouring patches
17 embedded in a cortical sheet, mimicking the two digit regions, were co-stimulated at different
18 frequencies. Network activation outside the stimulated patches was greatest at above-resonance
19 frequencies, reproducing the spread of digit representations seen with fMRI. Connection strengths
20 within the patches increased following at-resonance co-stimulation, reproducing the increased fMRI
21 connectivity. We show that FDP extends to the cortical level and is influenced by cortical resonance.

22

23 **Significance statement**

24 We extend the concept of frequency-dependent plasticity, thus far used to describe synaptic selective
25 adaptation in response to stimulation at different frequencies, to the level of cortical networks. We
26 demonstrate selective changes in perception, functional topography and connectivity of the primary
27 somatosensory cortex following tactile stimulation at different frequencies. Simulation of a network
28 of oscillators incorporating Hebbian learning reproduced these changes and confirmed the influence
29 of intrinsic cortical resonance on plasticity. We thus show that frequency-dependent plasticity extends
30 to the cortical level and is influenced by cortical resonance, of potential importance for optimisation
31 of therapeutic stimulation approaches to augment learning and memory.

32

33 \body

1 **Introduction**

2 Neuroplasticity refers to the brain's ability to modify its internal connections in response to external
3 stimuli or following trauma and underpins many cognitive processes involved in learning and memory
4 formation across our lifespan (1, 2). It is generally accepted that information in the brain is stored as
5 patterns of connectivity (3) and therefore that the act of learning, whether achieved through passive
6 stimulation or active engagement in a task, necessitates activity-dependent changes to network
7 connectivity. This is accomplished by altering synaptic efficacy in response to external stimuli, and
8 cellular-level studies have indicated that long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depression
9 (LTD) are likely to underlie this process (4). LTP is defined as a strengthening of the synaptic
10 connections, it was first described in the 1970s by Bliss and Lømo in their ground-breaking work on
11 hippocampal cells (5) and has since been observed in many regions of the brain. Animal studies have
12 shown that the frequency of synaptic activation modifies plasticity in both glutamatergic and
13 GABAergic synapses (6-10), with reports that high vs. low-frequency stimulation results in long-term
14 potentiation or depression respectively (4). While stimulation frequency appears to be an important
15 factor in plasticity studies, the consequences of frequency-dependent cellular changes on the structure
16 and function of cortical networks are unknown.

17

18 A recent study in humans found distinct frequency-dependent behavioural outcomes after tactile
19 stimulation where low-frequency caused impaired performance, whereas high-frequency stimulation
20 improved performance (11), see (12, 13) for reviews of similar experiments. The primary
21 somatosensory cortex (SI) also shows rapid topographic reorganisation in response to repetitive
22 sensory inputs (14-19). Of particular interest are the perceptual changes that accompany such
23 reorganisation. Tactile acuity improvements following tactile stimulation of a single digit over several
24 hours coincide with increased cortical representation of the stimulated site within SI (16-19).
25 Furthermore, synchronous co-stimulation of two digits has been shown to lead to shifting of the
26 cortical representations of the digit regions towards one another and impaired discrimination
27 performance after stimulation (14, 15). SI therefore appears to be an ideal test-bed in which to study
28 the impact of the frequency of repetitive stimulation on the plasticity of cortical networks, and
29 associated behaviour.

30

31 A missing factor in frequency dependent plasticity studies is the notion of resonance. Neurons, neural
32 assemblies and cortical networks all exhibit resonance characteristics, whereby they respond
33 maximally to repetitive input within a specific favoured frequency range. For example, the human
34 primary somatosensory cortex has a resonance frequency of approximately 20-26 Hz (20, 21).
35 Cortical resonance is determined by both the biophysical properties of the individual neurons and the
36 network connectivity architecture (22, 23); thus, stimulating a network near or far from its resonance

1 frequency may result in different network behaviours which could ultimately affect task performance.
2 A recent computational paper investigating frequency-dependent plasticity (FDP) found that the
3 stimulation frequency responsible for inducing maximum LTP was related to axonal length (24), an
4 anatomical feature of cells which is thought to affect resonance in neural circuits (25, 26). Given this,
5 we wished to examine the effect of repetitive tactile stimulation applied at a range of frequencies, at
6 and away from resonance, on the plastic connectivity properties of the human primary somatosensory
7 cortex.

8

9 We tested the effects of FDP on human performance and brain functional topography and
10 connectivity of the primary somatosensory cortex using psychophysics and functional MR imaging
11 (fMRI) in separate studies. We applied repetitive tactile co-stimulation to 2 digits on the right hand at
12 7 Hz (below-resonance), 23Hz (at-resonance) or 39Hz (above-resonance), and tested subjects'
13 performance on a standard tactile localisation task before and after periods of co-stimulation. Using
14 fMRI, we compared changes in digit region localisation and functional connectivity between the
15 regions before and after co-stimulation at-resonance and above-resonance. To relate the behavioural
16 and imaging results to synaptic plasticity, we implemented a computational model using a network of
17 Wilson-Cowan (WC) oscillators (27, 28) incorporating both Hebbian learning rules and homeostatic
18 scaling mechanisms (29). We stimulated the model with a range of driving frequencies and tested the
19 effect of frequency on the plastic connections, drawing comparisons with our experimental results.
20 The term, "frequency dependent plasticity", has thus far been mostly used to describe the
21 phenomenon at cellular level. Here we extend the concept of spike-timing dependent plasticity to
22 understanding the effects at the systems level and suggest that the phenomenon that starts at the level
23 of the synapse has implications at the macro scale.

1 **Results**

2 **Psychophysics: frequency-dependent mislocalisation errors**

3 The human primary somatosensory cortex is known to exhibit resonance characteristics at
4 approximately 20-26 Hz. We stimulated digits 2 (D2) and 4 (D4) of the right hand simultaneously
5 with a tactile stimulator at 7 Hz (below-resonance), 23 Hz (at-resonance) or 39 Hz (above-resonance),
6 (see Materials and Methods). We used a forced-choice tactile localisation task to test mislocalisation
7 rates and reaction times before and after 20, 40 and 60 mins of co-stimulation (see Fig. 1).

8
9 Two-way repeated measures ANOVA with factors session (pre/post) and driving frequency (below-
10 resonance/at-resonance/above-resonance) was performed on the mislocalisation scores obtained pre
11 stimulation and after 60 minutes of stimulation in R (Version 3.1, R Foundation for Statistical
12 Computing, Vienna, Austria). We found no effect of frequency, a main effect of session ($p < 0.001$,
13 $F = 12.3$) and an interaction between frequency and session ($p < 0.001$, $F = 8.5$). Mislocalisation
14 impairment (scores obtained after 60 minutes of co-stimulation compared to baseline) was
15 significantly greater than zero following above-resonance stimulation only ($p < 0.00001$, difference
16 9.73, 95% CI 6.1, 13.4). Similar statistical analysis was performed for reaction times. We found no
17 main effect of frequency or session but an interaction between frequency and session ($p = 0.003$,
18 $F = 6.6$). Reaction times (after 60 minutes of co-stimulation compared to baseline) were significantly
19 slower following below-resonance stimulation ($p = 0.006$, difference 182 ms, 95% CI 54 ms, 310 ms),
20 and significantly faster following at-resonance stimulation ($p = 0.025$, difference -156 ms, 95% CI -292
21 ms, -21 ms).

22
23 *In summary, co-stimulation at the resonance frequency of the somatosensory cortex resulted in faster*
24 *reaction times with no change in accuracy in the mislocalisation test. In contrast, co-stimulation at*
25 *the above-resonance or below-resonance frequency either deteriorated task performance or slowed*
26 *down reaction times, respectively.*

27 28 **Imaging results: frequency-dependent functional anatomy and connectivity**

29 In order to understand the changes in the functional anatomy and connectivity associated with
30 observed behavioural changes, we repeated the experimental protocol during an fMRI session to test
31 changes in the cortical representations of digits D2 and D4 before and after 46 mins of co-stimulation.
32 Both digit activation maps and functional connectivity changes were compared using the two driving
33 frequencies ‘at-resonance’ and ‘above-resonance’. These two frequencies were chosen because we
34 hypothesised that impaired mislocalisation (found after co-stimulation above-resonance) and faster
35 reaction times (observed after co-stimulation at-resonance) were a result of altered cortical
36 topography and neuronal connectivity within SI. We calculated the Euclidean distance between the

1 cortical maps for D2 and D4, as well as functional connectivity strength between the digit regions.
2 The results of a mislocalisation task (identical to that described in the previous section) administered
3 before and after the scan confirmed the results found in the psychophysics experiment reported
4 previously.

6 *Digit Separation*

7 The mean distance between the centre voxel of the cortical regions of D2 and D4 before and after the
8 two stimulation frequencies is given in Fig. 2A. Following 23 Hz co-stimulation there was a small
9 decrease in the mean distance between the digit regions (0.73 mm, SE 0.70 mm), whereas after co-
10 stimulation at 39 HZ there is a greater reduction in digit separation (3.4mm, SE 1.19 mm). This size
11 of reduction is in line with those seen in previous works (14, 15). A two-way repeated measures
12 ANOVA was performed on the digit separation distances with factors session (pre/post) and driving
13 frequency (at-resonance/above-resonance). We found a trend for main effect of frequency ($p=0.08$,
14 $F=3.4$), a main effect for session ($p=0.01$, $F=10.7$) and a trend for a session by frequency interaction
15 effect ($p=0.069$, $F=3.8$). The difference between the digit regions (post compared to pre-stimulation)
16 was significantly less than zero for the above-resonance only ($p=0.003$, difference -3.4 mm, 95% CI -
17 5.5 mm, -1.3 mm) suggesting that the digit representations shifted/expanded towards one another in
18 this case. The fMRI activation maps for a single participant indicating the digit regions for D2 (blue)
19 and digit 4 D4 (red) pre (left) and post stimulation (right) with 39 Hz driving frequency in the sagittal
20 and axial views is given in Fig. 2B.

22 *Functional Connectivity between the Digit Regions*

23 We calculated partial coherence as a measure of functional connectivity (FC) between the digit
24 regions per participant for each experimental condition (30). Fig. 2C shows the average coherence
25 across all participants for each of the 4 conditions; pre and post-stimulation for both of the driving
26 frequencies 23 Hz and 39 Hz. After stimulation with at-resonance driving frequency (23 Hz), FC is
27 increased between the digit regions (pre-stimulation 0.13 SE 0.02, post-stimulation 0.24 SE 0.02),
28 whereas no change is observed in FC after stimulation at above-resonance driving frequency (39 Hz)
29 (pre-stimulation 0.17 SE 0.03, post-stimulation 0.17 SE 0.02).

31 A two-way repeated ANOVA with factors session (pre/post) and driving frequency (at-
32 resonance/above-resonance) was performed on the FC values. We found a trend towards an effect of
33 session ($p=0.07$, $F=4.4$) no effect of frequency and a significant session by frequency interaction
34 ($p=0.036$, $F=5.2$). FC difference (post-pre) was significantly greater than zero following at-resonance
35 only ($p=0.007$, difference 0.10, 95% CI 0.03, 0.17).

1 *In summary, stimulation at the resonance frequency of the somatosensory cortex resulted in strong*
2 *functional connectivity, without any change in functional anatomy. In contrast, stimulation at the*
3 *above-resonance frequency merged the cortical maps of the two stimulated digits but did not change*
4 *functional connectivity between them.*

6 **Computational results: frequency-dependent Hebbian network formation**

7 To link the psychophysics and imaging results to the reported data at the cellular and molecular level
8 on FDP (3-5, 8, 31), we implemented a simulation of the experiment in an adaptive neuronal network
9 model of coupled oscillators. Our aim was to investigate whether network connections are frequency-
10 dependent. A network model of loosely-coupled WC oscillators (27, 28) was implemented with
11 resonance ~ 15 Hz. Excitatory connections between the units were designed to exhibit Hebbian
12 plasticity (see Materials and Methods for details of the learning rule), and inputs to all units
13 (excitatory and inhibitory), were subject to homeostatic scaling, a mechanism by which individual
14 neuronal units can modulate their incoming activity via their own subcellular structures (32). Two
15 circular patches of size 156 units (radius $350 \mu m$) embedded in a 50×50 network of loosely-coupled
16 WC oscillators (Fig. 3A) were co-stimulated with external driving frequencies between 5 and 50 Hz.

18 *Propagation of the signal through the network*

19 We measured propagation of the driving frequency from the activated patches to the rest of the
20 network by calculating the proportion of units outside the stimulated patches activated above baseline
21 at each frequency (see Materials and Methods).

23 The relative power (compared to a network driven by white noise) of each unit in the network in
24 response to below- or above-resonance stimulation of the two patches (dark red) is shown in Fig. 3B.
25 The proportion of units external to the activated patches that were activated by each of the driving
26 frequencies is shown in Fig. 3C. Driving frequencies below the network resonance frequency (~ 15
27 Hz) do not propagate. Stimulation propagates through the network as the frequency of stimulation
28 increases above the resonance frequency.

30 *Evolution of excitatory connections within the network*

31 We evaluated connection strengths for every pair of units in the network at each driving frequency.
32 There are three types of connections: between units within the stimulated patches (Fig. 3D left);
33 between units within to outside (Fig. 3D middle); and between units outside the patches (Fig. 3D
34 right). Connection strengths between units inside the patches were maximal when the stimulation
35 frequency was close to the resonance frequency of the network. This result mirrors the increase in
36 functional connectivity that was observed in the fMRI data previously (see Fig. 2C) and may account
37 for the faster response time in the behavioural data. Connection strengths between units inside to

1 outside the stimulated patch increased with increasing driving frequency. This mirrors the expansion
2 of the digit representations observed in the fMRI, and may account for the poor performance observed
3 in the psychophysics test. Connection strengths between units outside the stimulated patch were
4 unaffected by stimulation frequency.

5

6 *In summary, these findings indicate that in our model there is a frequency dependence of the*
7 *connectivity strengths.*

1 **Discussion**

2 In this study, we combined psychophysics, neuroimaging and neurocomputational modelling to better
3 understand the neural changes underlying frequency-dependent plasticity. We used an established
4 method of digit co-stimulation (33) to induce plasticity in the human primary somatosensory cortex.
5 We observed that plastic changes were not only modulated by the driving frequency of stimulation,
6 but also depended on whether this frequency was at, above or below the resonance frequency of the
7 primary somatosensory cortex (20-26 Hz) (20, 21).

8
9 Initially, the influence of frequency-specific stimulation on perceptual discrimination was tested by
10 co-stimulation of digits 2 and 4 at one of the three driving frequencies for 1 hour. We found that co-
11 stimulation above-resonance substantially impaired the ability to localise stimuli to one of the digits,
12 probably due to a spreading, expanding or shifting of the digit representations within SI, a process
13 which has previously been shown to correlate with the observed perceptual changes (15). In contrast,
14 co-stimulation at-resonance did not affect mislocalisation, but participants were significantly faster.
15 We hypothesised that close to its resonance frequency, there is a strengthening of the synapses within
16 the stimulated region, resulting in greater efficiency in the Hebbian sense. Co-stimulation below-
17 resonance did not significantly affect performance but slowed reaction times, perhaps reflecting
18 fatigue, and indicating that plastic changes were minimal in this condition (see Fig. 1).

19
20 To validate this interpretation, we performed fMRI prior to and immediately following 46 minutes of
21 the same co-stimulation paradigm using the two driving frequencies at- and above-resonance as both
22 of these cases resulted in a significant change to either performance or reaction time which we
23 hypothesised was attributable to measurable plastic change within SI. We confirmed that the digit
24 regions shift/expand following above-resonance co-stimulation and result in a reduced separation of
25 their centre voxel. Previous studies using similar experimental protocols but using non-continuous co-
26 stimulation over a longer period (3 hours) reported digit shifts comparable to ours and in one case
27 reported that these were associated with worsening task performance (14-16). We also confirmed an
28 increase in functional connectivity between the digit regions following the at-resonance co-
29 stimulation which was not observed for the above-resonance case.

30
31 Given that much of the prior work on FDP is carried out at the microscopic scale, we set out to link
32 our macroscopic psychophysics and imaging observations to previous reports using computational
33 modelling. We implemented a network model of loosely coupled WC oscillators with plastic Hebbian
34 connections to further understand the experimental findings. We selectively stimulated two small
35 patches within the network at a range of driving frequencies and observed the effect on signal
36 propagation and connectivity strength within the stimulated patches and throughout the network. We

1 found that connections in the model behaved differently according to whether they were connecting
2 units inside the patches (Fig. 3D left), or units inside the patches to units outside (Fig. 3D middle), or
3 only connecting units outside the patches (Fig. 3D right). Specifically, we found i) the highest
4 excitatory connection strengths occurred within the patches when driven at close to the resonance
5 frequency and ii) that propagation of the signal was strongest following stimulation above the
6 resonance frequency (Fig. 3B and C). Driving the network at frequencies below its resonance resulted
7 in excitatory connection strengths that were weaker than in the other two conditions and this applied
8 to connections both between network units within the stimulated patches as well as units from the
9 patches to outside. As a result, there was also less propagation of the driving signal across the network
10 (Fig. 3B and C).

11

12 To summarise, we found that **at-resonance** co-stimulation strengthened functional connectivity
13 between the digit regions and speeded up reaction times. Modelling work supported the observations
14 in that the greatest connection strengths within the stimulated patches occurred in this regime. **Above-**
15 **resonance** co-stimulation impaired performance, but did not affect reaction times. Neuroimaging
16 showed no change in FC between the digit regions but indicated that the digit regions had shifted or
17 expanded closer together. Modelling results supported these findings in that connections from the
18 patches to external regions (and therefore signal propagation) were greatest at higher frequencies.
19 Previous experimental work has also shown that repetitively paired pre and postsynaptic spikes at low
20 inter-stimulus intervals result in greater synaptic modification than for larger intervals (34). **Below-**
21 **resonance** co-stimulation did not affect performance but slowed reaction times. Evidence from our
22 modelling work indicated that at lower stimulation frequencies, connectivity within the activated
23 patches, and from the patch to external regions, was lower than the two other stimulus conditions.

24

25 Although we do not account explicitly for plasticity of the inhibitory connections in our model, these
26 results indicate that inhibitory processes at the border of the activated patch may be strengthened
27 maximally during co-stimulation at-resonance, preventing the digit regions from expanding or shifting
28 which would result in impaired performance of the mislocalisation task. There is evidence that during
29 low frequency stimulation, GABA activity restricts excitatory synaptic potentiation, whereas at higher
30 frequencies, the inhibitory connections are weakened (10). This phenomenon may account for the
31 movement of the digit regions and the deterioration in performance that we observed following
32 above-resonance stimulation. In future work, perhaps with higher resolution imaging at higher field
33 strength, it would be interesting to determine whether the observed shift in digit regions is driven by
34 the voxels that respond most strongly to the stimuli, or those with a weaker response, on the edge of
35 the digit regions, corresponding to more sub-threshold activity. Previous studies have found increased
36 coherence between neural regions correlates with faster reaction times (35) which may account for the
37 behavioural changes observed following at-resonance stimulation. It has been suggested that

1 increased coherence allows optimal processing of stimulus input due to synchronised timing of the
2 ongoing neural activity (see (36) for a review). Inclusion of reaction time mechanisms and plastic
3 inhibitory connections are areas for further model development.

4
5 The nature of our co-stimulation (continuous repetitive stimulation at fixed frequency) is somewhat
6 different than has been used in previous work. The majority of studies use intermittent synchronous
7 stimulation at $\sim 1\text{Hz}$ (15, 18, 19, 37), making it difficult to draw comparisons with our study.
8 However, overall, these studies show synchronous stimulation leads to improved 2-point
9 discrimination on the stimulated digits, yet, increased mislocalisation between co-stimulated digits. It
10 is suggested (37) that this is due to an enlargement of cortical representations (leading to poorer
11 localisation), yet also a strengthening of connections within those representations (leading to
12 improved 2-point discrimination). Our results support this notion, in so much that we see spreading of
13 representations underlying poorer mislocalisation (at above-resonance frequencies), yet stronger
14 connections within regions leading to faster reaction times (at-resonance). It would be informative to
15 see if at-resonance continuous stimulation improves 2-point discrimination on a single digit, as would
16 be predicted by the model. Work by Ragert *et al* used pulsed stimulation at 20Hz (1s stimulation
17 every 5s) and found improved 2-point spatial discrimination, but neither mislocalisation nor reaction
18 time was reported, again making it hard to draw comparisons with our work (11). It would be
19 interesting to consider the impact of asynchronous stimulation on our test system. Our previous work
20 (14) shows that asynchronous stimulation results in digit separation, with similar results reported in
21 other human (15) and animal studies (38), and so and it might be predicted that this would also be the
22 case here. It is also important to note that while we apply peripheral stimulation, there is abundant
23 evidence from the somatosensory steady-state response literature (20) that the temporal structure of
24 the stimulation will be reproduced in the cortex.

25
26 Hebbian learning is thought to underlie many forms of memory formation and learning (39). In our
27 model, we developed a Hebbian learning rule, designed to use proportional firing rates as its input so
28 as to be suitable for use with a neural mass model that does not output spikes explicitly. In addition,
29 input to each cell was modulated via homeostatic scaling (29). In this way, units can modulate their
30 excitation levels allowing them to remain within suitable limits such that they are optimally
31 responsive to their dynamic synaptic input levels (40), and remain stable. Other mechanisms of
32 plasticity include long-term depression (41) and short-term potentiation (42), however, these were not
33 included in the current model to simplify the calculations. The inclusion of all these biological
34 processes is also an area for future model development.

35
36 FDP has already been shown to occur in various animal models (3, 5, 31). Inhibitory GABAergic
37 interneurons appear to underlie this frequency dependence by causing hyperpolarisation of post-

1 synaptic neurons during low-frequency stimulation prohibiting glutamate binding and synaptic
2 potentiation (43). At higher driving frequencies, GABA release is decreased, allowing synaptic
3 potentiation to occur (10). Pioneering work by Markram and Tsodyks (44) describes the frequency-
4 dependence of signal potentiation in the rat somatosensory cortex. They found that the boundary
5 between potentiation and depression was dependent on properties of the synapses such as recovery
6 rates (45). These same synaptic properties are also thought to be responsible for the resonance
7 properties of cells (23), and therefore high and low frequency are themselves relative terms,
8 dependent on the cell's intrinsic properties. In this work, we attempt to provide a context to better
9 understand high and low-frequency stimulation in relationship to the resonance of the sensory systems
10 under investigation. Indeed, we find a clear effect of stimulation frequency on cortical plasticity, with
11 different behavioural and imaging outcomes depending on whether the stimulation is above-, at-, or
12 below-resonance. This behaviour may be grounded in the frequency-dependence of LTP, but further
13 work is required to improve our understanding of the potential equivalence of these phenomena.

14
15 In conclusion, by combining 3 separate experimental modalities; psychophysics, MR imaging and
16 computational modelling, we have been able to interrogate this simple model of plasticity in humans.
17 Translation of these key ideas to more complex methods of stimulation would be of great interest. In
18 this paper, we have shown that the frequency of stimulation is crucial to consider when designing
19 protocols aimed at inducing plasticity. For example, in cases where increased performance of a task
20 that has already been learned is required, then we may wish to present the stimuli at the resonance
21 frequency of the system; such as improving motor or language skills after stroke. Alternatively, if re-
22 mapping of the network topography is the aim, to overcome phantom limb pain for example, then
23 stimulation of adjacent regions using above-resonance driving frequency would be optimal. Finally, it
24 is important to note that we measured changes in cortical organisation and connectivity in a *single*
25 *scanning session*, which could be key for clinical applications where assessment of the propensity of
26 the brain to undergo plastic change could be of relevance, for example in stroke or dementia. If it is
27 possible to probe synaptic plasticity in a single session, then there is greater potential for it to be used
28 as a marker or predictor of neurological decline or treatment response.

1 **Materials and Methods**

2 This study was approved by the University of Manchester Ethics Committee and fully informed
3 written consent was obtained from all subjects prior to participation. For full details of the
4 experimental procedure and analysis methods, please see SI Materials and Methods.

6 **Psychophysics**

7 Forty-five healthy right-handed subjects were recruited from the student/staff population (9
8 participants repeated two of the conditions resulting in 54 data sets). Participants were assigned to
9 either the 7 Hz (n=19), 23 Hz (n = 17) or 39 Hz (n = 18) condition. We initially determined
10 participants' sensory threshold of digits 2 and 4 of the right hand using the Presentation system
11 (Neurobehavioural Systems, www.neurobs.com). Participants then completed a mislocalisation test; a
12 two-alternative forced-choice test where subjects had to respond as to which of the two digits had
13 been stimulated, to measure baseline mislocalisation rate. Following this, the two digits were
14 synchronously co-stimulated for three periods of 20 minutes at one of three driving frequencies.
15 Stimulators were driven using Matlab software (<http://www.mathworks.com>) that constructed a sine
16 wave with the desired frequency (7 Hz, 23 Hz or 39 Hz) delivered in-phase to each digit. Every 20
17 mins (until a total of 60 mins of stimulation was complete), the subjects' completed a further
18 mislocalisation test.

20 **Functional MRI**

21 MR data was acquired using a Philips 3 T Achieva system and an 8-channel phased array head coil
22 for signal detection. Ten healthy right-handed subjects were recruited from the student/staff
23 population (5 male). Participants attended two separate identical scanning sessions separated by at
24 least 14 days. The scan protocol consisted of a high-resolution T₁-weighted structural image and a
25 baseline fMRI digit localisation scan. These were followed by 46 mins of additional scanning (results
26 not reported here) while digits 2 and 4 of the subject's right hand received constant synchronous co-
27 stimulation at either one of the two stimulation frequencies (23/39 Hz) and a final fMRI digit
28 localisation scan. In addition to this, participants completed a mislocalisation test immediately prior to
29 and following the scan

31 **Computational Modelling**

32 In this study, we used the WC model as the basic unit of our network (27, 28). The network model we
33 use has been described in detail previously (22), full details are given in SI Materials and Methods,
34 but descriptions of the learning rule and simulations are given here.

36 *The Wilson-Cowan Network Model*

1 The WC equations describe a simple unit intended to represent a cortical minicolumn approximately
 2 $50 \mu m^2$ in size. Units were fixed onto a two-dimensional lattice with periodic boundary conditions in
 3 order to represent a small patch of cortical sheet. All excitatory connections within the network are
 4 plastic and evolve according to a Hebbian learning rule. In addition, inputs to all units are subject to
 5 homeostatic scaling using methodology developed by Remme and Wadman (29).

6 *Hebbian Learning within the model*

8 Hebbian plasticity in the model is implemented through Eq. 1, which specifies the dynamics of the
 9 excitatory connectivity matrix CE . In particular, in the absence of activity from units i and j (that is
 10 $E_i = E_j = 0$), or if the product of the firing rates from units i and j is lower than the threshold h , the
 11 matrix element CE_{ij} will decay towards zero. Otherwise, if both units are active with the product of
 12 the rates E_i and E_j above the threshold h , then there is a positive contribution to the rate of
 13 change of CE_{ij} and the synapse is enhanced. The nonlinear threshold is implemented by the Heaviside
 14 function $\theta(x)$, which is zero for $x \leq 0$ and 1 otherwise.

$$16 \tau_h \frac{dCE_{ij}}{dt} = -CE_{ij} + \gamma E_i E_j \theta(E_i E_j - h) \quad (1)$$

18 Parameters for the plasticity equations are defined as follows $\tau_h = 2.5$ s, $\gamma = 1$, $h = 0.04$. The
 19 parameter h was chosen as the square of the mean firing rate for the excitatory population in response
 20 to white-noise. Therefore, in order for the connectivity to increase between two units, at least 50% of
 21 the excitatory population of each unit must be firing, the parameters τ_h, γ were chosen so that the
 22 slope of the decay (when the two units were not coincidentally firing) was equal to that of the increase.

24 **Simulations**

25 *Propagation of the signal through the network*

26 We generated a network consisting of 50×50 identical units with parameters and connectivity profiles
 27 as described above. Two circular sub-networks (size 156 units each, radius $350 \mu m$) within this
 28 network were stimulated with a range of driving frequencies between 5 and 50 Hz in steps of 1 Hz.
 29 We generated 100 trials consisting of 30,000 time steps for each condition, as this was the length of
 30 time needed for the plastic excitatory connectivity strengths to stabilise. A mean power series was
 31 calculated from the squared complex conjugate of the Fourier coefficients, and normalised by the total
 32 area under the curve for each unit across all trials. The response power at the driving frequency was
 33 recorded per unit per trial and this was then compared to the power of the same unit, calculated in the
 34 same way, in response to white noise input only. The response power for each of two driving
 35 frequencies, 8 Hz and 26 Hz, was calculated per-unit and given relative to the power of the same
 36 frequency in response to white-noise. We used the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test to determine

1 whether the response power at the driving frequency was significantly higher than the power of that
2 frequency at baseline.

3

4 *Evolution of excitatory connectivity within the network*

5 The excitatory connection strength between each coupled pair was classified according to whether it
6 connected units within the patches, units from inside to outside the patches or units outside of the
7 patches. The final connection strength recorded at the end of each trial was averaged over trials per
8 condition and connection type.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 The authors would like to thank Barry Whitnall and the radiologists at Salford Royal NHS Foundation
3 Trust, Karen Lopez, and Daniel Wand. CLC is funded by a doctoral training award from the
4 Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC). NTB is also funded by the EPSRC
5 EP/N006771/1. WED is funded by the Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica,
6 Chile, projects FONDECYT 1161378, and Basal FB0008.

7

1 References

- 2 1. Wieloch T & Nikolich K (2006) Mechanisms of neural plasticity following brain injury. *Curr*
3 *Opin Neurobiol* 16(3):258-264.
- 4 2. Nelson CA (1999) Neural plasticity and human development. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 8(2):42-
5 45.
- 6 3. Bliss TV & Collingridge GL (1993) A synaptic model of memory: long-term potentiation in
7 the hippocampus. *Nature* 361:31-39.
- 8 4. Malenka RC & Bear MF (2004) LTP and LTD: An embarrassment of riches. *Neuron* 44(1):5-
9 21.
- 10 5. Bliss TV & Lomo T (1973) Long-lasting potentiation of synaptic transmission in the dentate
11 area of the anaesthetized rabbit following stimulation of the perforant path. *J Physiol (Lond)*
12 232:331-356.
- 13 6. Xu C, Zhao MX, Poo MM, & Zhang XH (2008) GABA(B) receptor activation mediates
14 frequency-dependent plasticity of developing GABAergic synapses. *Nature neuroscience*
15 11:1410-1428.
- 16 7. Hopkins WF & Johnston D (1984) Frequency-dependent noradrenergic modulation of long-
17 term potentiation in the hippocampus. *Science* 226(4672):350-352.
- 18 8. Caporale N & Dan Y (2008) Spike timing-dependent plasticity: a Hebbian learning rule.
19 *Annu Rev Neurosci* 31:25-46.
- 20 9. Gaiarsa JL, Caillard O, & Ben-Ari Y (2002) Long-term plasticity at GABAergic and
21 glycinergic synapses: mechanisms and functional significance. *Trends Neurosci* 25(11):564-
22 570.
- 23 10. Davies CH, Starkey SJ, Pozza MF, & Collinridge GL (1991) GABA(B) autoreceptors
24 regulate the induction of LTP. *Nature* 349(6310):609-611.
- 25 11. Ragert P, Kalisch T, Bliem B, Franzkowiak S, & Dinse HR (2008) Differential effects of
26 tactile high- and low-frequency stimulation on tactile discrimination in human subjects. *BMC*
27 *Neurosci* 9(9).
- 28 12. Parianen Lesemann FH, Reuter EM, & Godde B (2015) Tactile stimulation interventions:
29 Influence of stimulation parameters on sensorimotor behavior and neurophysiological
30 correlates in healthy and clinical samples. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 51:126-137.
- 31 13. Beste C & Dinse HR (2013) Learning without training. *Curr Biol* 23(11):R489-R499.
- 32 14. Vidyasagar R, Folger SE, & Parkes LM (2014) Re-wiring the brain: Increased functional
33 connectivity within primary somatosensory cortex following synchronous co-activation.
34 *NeuroImage* 92(100):19-26.
- 35 15. Pilz K, Veit R, Braun C, & Godde B (2004) Effects of co-activation on cortical organization
36 and discrimination performance. *Neuroreport* 15:2669-2672.
- 37 16. Pleger B, *et al.* (2001) Shifts in cortical representations predict human discrimination
38 improvement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 98:12255-12260.
- 39 17. Pleger B, *et al.* (2003) Functional imaging of perceptual learning in human primary and
40 secondary somatosensory cortex. *Neuron* 40:643-653.
- 41 18. Hodzic A, Veit R, Karim AA, Erb M, & Godde B (2004) Improvement and decline in tactile
42 discrimination behavior after cortical plasticity induced by passive tactile coactivation. *The*
43 *Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 24:442-446.
- 44 19. Godde B, Ehrhardt J, & Braun C (2003) Behavioral significance of input-dependent plasticity
45 of human somatosensory cortex. *Neuroreport* 14:543-546.
- 46 20. Snyder AZ (1992) Steady-state vibration evoked potentials: description of technique and
47 characterization of responses. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 84:257-268.
- 48 21. Tobimatsu S, Zhang YM, & Kato M (1999) Steady-state vibration somatosensory evoked
49 potentials: physiological characteristics and tuning function. *Clinical neurophysiology :*
50 *official journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology* 110:1953-1958.
- 51 22. Lea-Carnall CA, Montemurro MA, Trujillo-Barreto NJ, Parkes LM, & El-Deredy W (2016)
52 Cortical resonance frequencies emerge from network size and connectivity. *PLoS Comput*
53 *Biol* 12(2).

- 1 23. Hutcheon B & Yarom Y (2000) Resonance, oscillation and the intrinsic frequency
2 preferences of neurons. *Trends Neurosci* 23(5):216-222.
- 3 24. Kumar A & Mehta MR (2011) Frequency-dependent changes in NMDAR-dependent synaptic
4 plasticity. *Front Comput Neurosci* 5.
- 5 25. Silberstein RB (1995) Neuromodulation of neocortical dynamics. *Nunez PL, Neocortical
6 Dynamics and Human EEG Rhythms*, (Oxford University Press, New York), pp 591-627.
- 7 26. Nunez PL, Srinivasan R, & Fields RD (2015) EEG functional connectivity, axon delays and
8 white matter disease. *Clinical neurophysiology : official journal of the International
9 Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology* 126(1):110-120.
- 10 27. Wilson HR & Cowan JD (1972) Excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized
11 populations of model neurons. *Biophys J* 12:1-24.
- 12 28. Wilson HR & Cowan JD (1973) A mathematical theory of the functional dynamics of cortical
13 and thalamic nervous tissue. *Kybernetik* 13:55-80.
- 14 29. Remme MWH & Wadman WJ (2012) Homeostatic scaling of excitability in recurrent neural
15 networks. *PLoS Comput Biol* 8(5).
- 16 30. Sun FT, Miller LM, & D'Esposito M (2004) Measuring interregional functional connectivity
17 using coherence and partial coherence analyses of fMRI data. *Neuroimage* 21(2):647-658.
- 18 31. Markram H, Gupta A, Uziel A, Wang Y, & Tsodyks M (1998) Information processing with
19 frequency-dependent synaptic connections. *Neurobiol Learn Mem* 70(1-2):101-112.
- 20 32. Chen N, Chen X, & Wang JH (2008) Homeostasis by coordination of subcellular
21 compartment plasticity improves spike encoding. *J Cell Sci* 121(17):2961-2971.
- 22 33. Godde B, Stauffenberg B, Spengler F, & Dinse HR (2000) Tactile coactivation-induced
23 changes in spatial discrimination performance. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official
24 journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 20(4):1597-1604.
- 25 34. Dan Y & Poo M (2006) Spike timing-dependent plasticity: from synapse to perception.
26 *Physiological Reviews* 86(3):1033-1048.
- 27 35. Schoffelen JM, Oostenveld R, & Fries P (2005) Neuronal coherence as a mechanism of
28 effective corticospinal interaction. *Science* 308(5718):111-113.
- 29 36. Womelsdorf T & Fries P (2006) Neuronal coherence during selective attentional processing
30 and sensory-motor integration. *J Physiol (Paris)* 100(4):182-193.
- 31 37. Kalisch T, Tegenthoff M, & Dinse HR (2007) Differential effects of synchronous and
32 asynchronous multifinger coactivation on human tactile performance. *BMC Neurosci* 8(58).
- 33 38. Wang X, Merzenich MM, Sameshima K, & Jenkins WM (1995) Remodelling of hand
34 representation in adult cortex determined by timing of tactile stimulation. *Nature*
35 378(6552):71-75.
- 36 39. Hebb DO (1949) *The organization of behavior; a neuropsychological theory*. A Wiley book in
37 clinical psychology. (Wiley, New York).
- 38 40. Pérez-Otaño I & Ehlers MD (2005) Homeostatic plasticity and NMDA receptor trafficking.
39 *Trends Neurosci* 28(5):229-238.
- 40 41. Bear MF & Abraham WC (1996) Long-term depression in hippocampus. *Annu Rev Neurosci*
41 19:437-462.
- 42 42. Erickson MA, Maramba LA, & Lisman J (2010) A single brief burst induces GluR1-
43 dependent associative short-term potentiation: a potential mechanism for short-term memory.
44 *J Cognitive Neurosci* 22(11):2530-2540.
- 45 43. Herron CE, Lester RA, Coan EJ, & Collingridge GL (1986) Frequency-dependent
46 involvement of NMDA receptors in the hippocampus: a novel synaptic mechanism. *Nature*
47 322(6076):265-268.
- 48 44. Markram H & Tsodyks M (1996) Redistribution of synaptic efficacy between neocortical
49 pyramidal neurons. *Nature* 382:807 - 810.
- 50 45. Okatan M & Grossberg S (2000) Frequency-dependent synaptic potentiation, depression and
51 spike timing induced by Hebbian pairing in cortical pyramidal neurons. *Neural Net* 13:699-
52 708.
- 53

- 1 46. Vidyasagar R & Parkes LM (2011) Reproducibility of functional MRI localization within the
2 human somatosensory cortex. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* 34:1439–1444.
- 3 47. Wang Y, Goodfellow M, Taylor PN, & Baier G (2012) Phase space approach for modeling of
4 epileptic dynamics. *Phys Rev E* 85(6 Pt. 1):061918
- 5 48. Wang Y (2013) Multi-scale modelling of epileptic seizure rhythms as spatio-temporal
6 patterns. PhD (University of Manchester).
- 7 49. David O & Friston KJ (2003) A neural mass model for MEG/EEG: coupling and neuronal
8 dynamics. *Neuroimage* 20(3):1743-1755.
- 9 50. Wang Y, Goodfellow M, Taylor PN, & Baier G (2014) Dynamic mechanisms of neocortical
10 focal seizure onset. *PLoS Comput Biol* 10(8):e1003787.
- 11 51. Voges N, Schuz A, Aertsen A, & Rotter S (2010) A modeler's view on the spatial structure of
12 intrinsic horizontal connectivity in the neocortex. *Progress in neurobiology* 92(3):277-292.
- 13 52. Jansen BH & Rit VG (1995) Electroencephalogram and visual evoked potential generation in
14 a mathematical model of coupled cortical columns. *Biological Cybernetics* 73:357-366.
- 15 53. Jansen BH, Zouridakis G, & Brandt ME (1993) A neurophysiologically-based mathematical
16 model of flash visual evoked potentials. *Biological Cybernetics* 68:275-283.

1 **Figure Legends**

2
3 **Fig. 1 Frequency-dependent mislocalisation errors and reaction times in a tactile discrimination**
4 **task during ongoing stimulation at the resonance frequency of the somatosensory cortex (23 Hz,**
5 **blue), below-resonance (7 Hz, black), and above-resonance (39 Hz, red).**

6 Participants completed a forced-choice tactile discrimination task. Mean mislocalisation (and standard
7 error) rates (A) and reaction times (B) at baseline and after 3 periods of 20 mins of simultaneous
8 continuous stimulation of D2 and D4 of the right hand at one of the three frequencies. Stimulation of
9 the digits at the resonance frequency facilitated response time at no cost to performance accuracy;
10 whereas stimulation above or below the resonances frequency either deteriorated performance or
11 increased reaction times, respectively.

12
13 **Fig. 2 Frequency-dependent plasticity of digit region representations**

14 **(A) Digit separation.** Mean distance between the cortical regions of digits D2 and D4 within SI
15 before (blue) and after (red) co-stimulation at-resonance (23 Hz) and above-resonance (39 Hz) (n=9),
16 standard error given as bars. The distance between the maps reduced significantly after above-
17 resonance co-stimulation suggesting the digit regions merge together.

18 **(B) Functional imaging of a single participant.** fMRI Image from a single participant indicating the
19 digit regions for D2 (blue) and D4 (red), pre (left) and post-stimulation (right) with 39 Hz driving
20 frequency in the sagittal and axial views.

21 **(C) Functional connectivity.** Partial coherence averaged across all participants obtained between
22 regions D2 and D4 for each of the 4 conditions; pre (blue) and post-stimulation (red) for both of the
23 driving frequencies 23 Hz (left) and 39 Hz (right) (n=9), standard error given as bars. There is
24 stronger functional coupling between the 2 digits following co-stimulation at 23 Hz.

25
26 **Fig. 3 Computational Results.**

27 **(A) Schematic diagram of the WC model.**

28 Two units are shown, both containing an excitatory (E) and an inhibitory (I) population, the
29 parameters $W_{EE}, W_{EI}, W_{IE}, W_{II}$, describe connectivity within a single unit. Inter-unit connectivity is
30 governed by the connectivity matrices CE and CI . Input to units from other units within the network is
31 subject to homeostatic scaling (see Materials and Methods).

32 **(B) Response power of each unit relative to baseline power for two driving frequencies.**

33 The response power of each unit within the network relative to the power of the same frequency for a
34 network driven by white-noise only is given for two driving frequencies ‘below-resonance’ (8 Hz,
35 top) and ‘above-resonance’ (26 Hz, bottom) applied to the two activated patches (dark red). The scale

1 has been reduced to show the increased power around the edges and especially around and in-between
2 the activated regions.

3 **(C) Proportion of external units with response power higher than baseline, indicating signal**
4 **propagation.**

5 The proportion of units within the network that were external to the activated patches that had
6 response power significantly greater than baseline is given for each of the driving frequencies
7 calculated using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test. It can be seen that propagation is low for
8 driving frequencies lower than the resonance frequency of the network (~15 Hz). For driving
9 frequencies above 25 Hz, the signal has propagated to almost the entire network in many cases. This
10 indicates that propagation of the stimulus to neighbouring units is also frequency-dependent.

11 **(D) Connectivity strength within the network as a function of driving frequency**

12 Mean final connection strength for connections between units inside the stimulated patches (left),
13 show maximal connectivity for driving frequency at approximately 15 Hz, the resonance of simulated
14 network. Connections between units inside the stimulated patch and units outside the patch (middle)
15 show maximal connectivity strengths when stimulated above the resonance frequency. Connections
16 that neither originate in nor target the activated patch (right) act as a control and it can be seen that
17 they are unaffected by stimulus frequency.