Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Neural Networks

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/neunet



# Initiation and termination of integration in a decision process

# Tobias Larsen<sup>\*,1</sup>, Rafal Bogacz

Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

# ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Decision making Choice Neural integrator Optimality-sequential sampling

# ABSTRACT

Experimental data indicate that simple motor decisions in vertebrates are preceded by integration of evidence in certain cortical areas, and that the competition between them is resolved in the basal ganglia. While the occurrence of cortical integration is well established, it is not yet clear exactly how the integration occurs. Several models have been proposed, including the race model, the feed forward inhibition (FFI) model and the leaky competing accumulator (LCA) model. In this paper we establish qualitative and quantitative differences between the above mentioned models, with respect to how they are able to initiate the integration process without integrating noise prior to stimulus onset, as well as the models' ability to terminate the integration after a decision has been made, to ensure the possibility of subsequent decisions. Our results show that the LCA model has advantages over the race model and the FFI model in both respects, leading to shorter decision times and an effective termination process.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

# 1. Introduction

In simple decision tasks where a subject has to make a choice based on a visual stimulus, experimental data show that populations of sensory neurons represent evidence supporting alternative choices in their firing rate. For example, in tasks in which an animal has to decide the direction of prevailing motion in a stimulus, the activity of medial temporal (MT) neurons is higher if the motion in the stimulus moves in the neuron's preferred direction. Thus the firing rate of MT neurons provides information useful for making the decision, and we refer to MT firing rate in this task as the evidence.

However, this representation of sensory evidence is often noisy due to the noise present in the stimulus and the sensory pathways (Britten, Shadlen, Newsome, & Movshon, 1993). Consequently, in order to correctly evaluate the evidence, there is a need to accumulate the evidence over time, and the longer the time, the greater the chance of making the correct choice.<sup>2</sup> The data also indicate that such an evidence accumulation occurs in certain cortical neuron populations, and that these neurons representing alternative responses integrate the evidence supporting corresponding choices over time (Gold & Shadlen, 2001; Huk &

\* Corresponding author.

Shadlen, 2005; Kim & Shadlen, 1999; Mazurek, Roitman, Ditterich, & Shadlen, 2003; Roitman & Shadlen, 2002; Schall, 2001; Shadlen & Newsome, 2001). Furthermore, the data from these twoalternative choice tasks show that: (i) The activities of these integrator neurons are at a base level before stimulus onset. (ii) After stimulus onset, the activity of both integrators increase, but while the integrator neurons corresponding to the strongest alternative continue to increase, the activity of neurons corresponding to the weaker alternative drops to the base level. (iii) After a decision has been made, both activity levels settle back to the base level. The experimental findings (i) and (ii) are apparent in Fig. 1, but (iii) can only be seen in an experiment where measurements are continued after the response is given (e.g. Figure 2 in Shadlen and Newsome (1996)).

Several models have been proposed to describe the integration and decision making process, including the race model (Vickers, 1970), the Feed Forward Inhibition (FFI) model (Shadlen & Newsome, 2001) and the Leaky Competing Accumulator (LCA) model (Usher & McClelland, 2001). These models differ in their inhibitory connections, as shown schematically in Fig. 2 and described in detail in the next section. The race model, which lacks inhibitory connections altogether, predicts that neurons integrating evidence for the winning alternative, as well as those integrating for the losing alternative, should increase their firing rate throughout the duration of the stimulus presentation, and thus is inconsistent with the observation that neuronal activity supporting the weaker alternative decreases during the decision process. Since this makes the race model biologically implausible, its inclusion in this paper is for comparison and engineering reasons, as it might be favourable to find the simplest model that gives the same performance, whether it is implemented in the brain or not.



E-mail address: larsent@tcd.ie (T. Larsen).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> New address: TCIN, Lloyd Institute, Trinity College, College Green, Dublin 2, Ireland.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In these experiments, the reward given for each stimulus is the same, so that the evidence upon which the decision is made are purely sensory, and not affected by reward expectation.



**Fig. 1.** Time course of target discrimination of a visuomovement cell in the Frontal Eye Field after trials were separated into short (top), middle (middle) and long (bottom) saccade latency groups. In A and B the data are aligned on stimulus presentation and movement initiation respectively. A *left* and B *left* show the neuron activity when either the target or a distractor was present in the measured cell's Response Field (RF). A *right* and B *right* are divided into Discrimination Duration (DD) and Motor Duration (MD) time.

Source: Reproduced with permission from Thompson et al. (1996).

In contrast, both FFI and LCA models (and their spiking neuron equivalents mentioned in the next section) have been shown to be consistent with both behavioural and neurophysiological data from decision making tasks (Mazurek et al., 2003; Shadlen & Newsome, 2001; Usher & McClelland, 2001; Wang, 2002), though the most successful model in describing human behavioural data from two alternative choice tasks is the diffusion model (Ratcliff, 1978; Ratcliff & McKoon, 2008). In the diffusion model a single integrator integrates the difference in evidence between the competing alternatives towards a decision threshold, either positive or negative. The diffusion model is not directly implementable, but since the integrators in the FFI model also integrate the differences between sensory evidence, the linear version of the FFI model is equivalent to the diffusion model (Bogacz, Brown, Moehlis, Holmes, & Cohen, 2006). The LCA model can also closely approximate the diffusion model for certain values of its parameters (Bogacz et al., 2006). The FFI and LCA models make different experimental predictions, as described in the Discussion, but the experiments testing them have not been performed yet. Therefore, on the basis of existing experimental data it is still unclear which of these two models is the more biologically plausible.

However, from an ecological point of view, a model allowing better performance would give an evolutionary advantage, and if such a model fulfils other requirements, such as energy efficiency and biological plausibility, it may be more likely to have been chosen in the course of evolution. Although it is known that animals and humans do not always employ optimal strategies (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984), such an ecological approach has been proved to be very successful in generating experimental predictions in psychology, biology and neuroscience (Anderson, 1990; Belovsky, 1984; Olshausen & Field, 1996; Salinas, 2006). Therefore, in this article we compare the performance of decision making models in which sensory evidence is cortically integrated according to FFI, LCA, a recently proposed improved version of the race model (Stafford, Humphries, & Chambers, 2005) and a novel version of the FFI model with an integration threshold, and describe the predictions of this analysis. In particular, we compare how the above models are able to integrate sensory evidence without integrating noise before stimulus onset and after stimulus offset.

As a measure of performance, we use decision time for a given error rate, as the ability to make faster decisions for *any* given error rate has been shown mathematically to maximize reward rate (Bogacz et al., 2006), because the ability to make faster rewarded decisions leads to more reward per unit of time. This measure of performance has also been used in previous studies comparing decision making models (Bogacz & Gurney, 2007; Bogacz et al., 2006; Bogacz, Usher, Zhang, & McClelland, 2007; McMillen & Holmes, 2006).

For a choice between two alternatives based on noisy evidence, the optimal performance is achieved by the decision rule defined by the Sequential Probability Ratio Test (SPRT) (Wald, 1947). This test is optimal in that for any accuracy in a two alternative task, the SPRT gives the fastest decision time compared with any other statistical test (Wald & Wolfowitz, 1948). A decision maker employing SPRT will therefore maximise the rate of receiving rewards for correct choices in a wide range of tasks involving a choice between two alternatives (Bogacz et al., 2006).

There exists a generalization of SPRT for choices between multiple alternatives, called Multihypothesis SPRT (MSPRT) (Dragalin, Tartakovsky, & Veeravalli, 1999). In a choice between multiple alternatives, MSPRT was shown in McMillen and Holmes (2006) to achieve better performance than simple networks, including the race model and the LCA model. However, the decision processes of the brain do not necessarily rely solely on networks with simple architectures as in Fig. 2. It has been proposed that while the cortical regions integrate evidence supporting various alternatives, the basal ganglia resolves the competition between the alternatives (Frank, 2006; Gurney, Prescott, & Redgrave, 2001; Redgrave, Prescott, & Gurney, 1999). It has been shown recently that many aspects of the network involving the cortex and basal ganglia are exactly those required to implement MSPRT (Bogacz & Gurney, 2007).



Fig. 2. The architectures of the race (a), the feed forward inhibition (b) and the leaky competing accumulator (c) models for two alternatives. Arrows indicate excitatory connections, dots indicate inhibitory connections. In each panel, the left column of circles corresponds to populations of neurons providing sensory evidence for the two alternatives, while the right column of circles corresponds to populations of cortical integrator neurons.

Bogacz and Gurney (2007) showed that the circuit of basal ganglia and cortex can implement the MSPRT for different cortical integrative networks including the race model (Vickers, 1970), the FFI model (Shadlen & Newsome, 2001) and the LCA model (Usher & McClelland, 2001). These networks were originally proposed as complete models of a decision process, but with the MSPRT evaluating whether sufficient evidence has been integrated, they only handle the evidence integration. Since the MSPRT ensures optimal decisions, the model of the cortico-basal ganglia circuit achieves exactly the same decision time (for given error rate) no matter which of the models (race, FFI, LCA) is used to describe the cortical integration, and hence none of the integrative networks should have an evolutionary advantage over the other.

The problem with this comparison is that in any realistic system, there is a period before the integration where no evidence is presented to the integrators, and if nothing is done to prevent it, noise will be integrated in this period thereby altering the starting point of the actual evidence integration. This means that even though two models have the same performance when integrating evidence, they might behave differently before the integration, thereby having different overall performances.

A similar problem arises at the end of a decision. Once a decision has been made, the neural integrators need to reduce the firing rate to a base firing rate to allow for subsequent decisions.

In the following article, we investigate which of the proposed models of cortical integration provides the most efficient initiation and termination for the integration processes, thereby having an evolutionary advantage over the others. We will consider these cortical models as a part of a decision network also involving the basal ganglia.

Although the decision network involving cortical integrators and the basal ganglia can optimise the choice between multiple alternatives, for simplicity of explanation, we analyse the choice between two alternatives, because this is the only case in which the dynamics of cortical integration models can be visualised in two-dimensional state-space and can be easily understood. Nevertheless, our results naturally generalise to multiple alternatives.

#### 2. Review of decision models

This section first describes the experimental paradigms that decision making models seek to characterise. Then it describes the models of the two parts of the brain's decision making network: cortical models of evidence integration, and the model of competition resolution in the basal ganglia.

# 2.1. Experimental paradigms

Many of the two alternative choice experiments are variations of the same basic setup: A visual stimulus is presented to a subject and after some time, a choice based on the stimulus must be indicated. In these experiments the stimulus is designed in such a way that there is a continuous flow of evidence to be evaluated. A typical stimulus consists of a display of randomly moving dots with some dots coherently moving in one direction (Britten et al., 1993). The task is then to decide the direction of the prevalent motion.

There are two main variations of this paradigm. In the interrogation – or response signal paradigm – the subject has to give the response at a particular time (usually indicated to the subject by an additional stimulus), while in the free response paradigm they are free to respond at any time. In this article, we focus on the free response paradigm.

# 2.2. Models of evidence integration

The models reviewed in this subsection were originally proposed as models for the entire decision process, i.e., to describe both evidence integration and competition resolution. However, since in this article we assume that the competition resolution is implemented in the basal ganglia, we only review the evidence integration of the models.

In this subsection we focus on the population level models describing the average activity of neuronal populations rather than of individual neurons. Consequently, all these models include cortical *integrators* with activity denoted by  $y_i$  accumulating evidence supporting alternative *i*. In their original descriptions, these models assume that at the beginning of the integration process the starting point of integration is  $y_1(0) = y_2(0) = 0$ . The models can also be classified as Sequential Sampling Models (Ratcliff & Smith, 2004) as they assume that new evidence is added to the evidence accumulated so far as it is presented.

In all models described in this subsection we additionally assume that the activity levels of the integrators cannot be negative, so that if  $y_i + dy_i < 0$ , then  $y_i$  is set to 0.

#### 2.2.1. Race model

Although earlier Sequential Sampling Models had been proposed (e.g. LaBerge, 1962), the Accumulator Model (Vickers, 1970) and the Poisson Counter Model (Pike, 1966) were the first models that were able to correctly predict the skewed shape of reaction time (RT) distributions (Ratcliff & Smith, 2004). In both of these models (and in LaBerge, 1962, as well), two separate integrators  $y_i$  are accumulating evidence supporting competing responses (see Fig. 2(a)). This can be described in the continuous time limit as

$$dy_1 = x_1 dt + c dW_1$$

$$dy_2 = x_2 dt + c dW_2$$
(1)

where  $dy_i$  is the change in accumulated evidence in integrator *i* during time dt,  $x_i$  is the mean level of evidence supporting alternative *i*,  $dW_i$  is an independent noise process with mean 0 and variance dt, and *c* describes the amount of noise. We refer to the model described in the above equation as the race model.

# 2.2.2. Race model with threshold

The race model suffers from the problem that it integrates noise even in the absence of evidence because it has no method for initiating the integration. This happens even though the noise is Gaussian with mean 0, because the activity levels of integrators are not allowed to be negative, and the integration therefore has a boundary at 0 which results in an average increase in activity. This results in a variance of the starting point of integration  $(y_1(0), y_2(0))$  that is proportional to the time allowed to elapse before the stimulus onset. As a solution to this problem, a decay of activity (described by parameter k) can be introduced to the race model when the activity level of integrators is below a certain integration threshold,  $\theta_{int}$ , thereby creating a race model with threshold (RwT). This model is a simplified version of work presented in Stafford et al. (2005).

$$dy_{i} = \begin{cases} (x_{1} - ky_{1})dt + cdW_{1} & \text{if } y_{1} < \theta_{int}, \\ x_{1}dt + cdW_{1} & \text{if } y_{1} \ge \theta_{int} \end{cases}$$
(2)  
$$dy_{2} = \begin{cases} (x_{2} - ky_{2})dt + cdW_{2} & \text{if } y_{2} < \theta_{int}, \\ x_{2}dt + cdW_{2} & \text{if } y_{2} \ge \theta_{int}. \end{cases}$$

This mechanism ensures that the model integrates evidence only if the input is sufficiently high to push the activity level of an integrator above the integration threshold  $\theta_{int}$ . The introduction of a leak only for weakly active neurons is not biologically plausible, but the model was originally formulated by Stafford et al. (2005) in a biologically plausible way. In particular, in their original model, each integrator has a constant leak, and sends excitatory feedback to itself which balances the leak and thus allows perfect integration. However, the feedback is provided via another neuronal population which transmits the feedback only when the activity of integrator  $y_i \ge \theta_{int}$ , thus it results in a leaky integration when  $y_i < \theta_{int}$ .

#### 2.2.3. Feed forward inhibition model

In the FFI model, each integrator, in addition to accumulating evidence from the appropriate input, receives inhibition from the competing input channels (see Fig. 2(b))

$$dy_{1} = (x_{1}dt + cdW_{1}) - v(x_{2}dt + cdW_{2})$$
(3)  
$$dy_{2} = (x_{2}dt + cdW_{2}) - v(x_{1}dt + cdW_{1})$$

where v is the weight of the inhibitory connection, set to v = 1 in the original description of the model (Shadlen & Newsome, 2001).

A spiking neuron version of this model has also been developed (Mazurek et al., 2003), and has been shown to successfully describe both the responses of integrator neurons in the lateral intraparietal (LIP) area and the reaction times in a motion discrimination task (see Section 2.1) (Mazurek et al., 2003).

#### 2.2.4. Feed forward inhibition model with threshold

The FFI model has the same problem with integration initiation as the race model, and in a similar attempt to resolve it, a leak can be introduced whenever the activity of the integrators are below a threshold.

$$dy_{1} = \begin{cases} ((x_{1} - ky_{1})dt + cdW_{1}) - v(x_{2}dt + cdW_{2}) & \text{if } y_{1} < \theta_{int}, \\ (x_{1}dt + cdW_{1}) - v(x_{2}dt + cdW_{2}) & \text{if } y_{1} \ge \theta_{int} \end{cases}$$
(4)

$$dy_2 = \begin{cases} ((x_2 - ky_2)dt + cdW_2) - v(x_1dt + cdW_1) & \text{if } y_2 < \theta_{int}, \\ (x_2dt + cdW_2) - v(x_1dt + cdW_1) & \text{if } y_2 \ge \theta_{int}. \end{cases}$$

# 2.2.5. Leaky competing accumulator model

In the LCA model two leaky integrators accumulate evidence in support of the alternatives, and they inhibit each other (see Fig. 2(c)). A two alternative LCA is described by

$$dy_1 = (x_1 - wy_2 - ky_1)dt + cdW_1$$
(5)

$$\mathrm{d}y_2 = (x_2 - wy_1 - ky_2)\mathrm{d}t + c\mathrm{d}W_2$$

where k is the leak from the integrators and w is the weight of the inhibitory connection between the two integrators.

Due to the leak from integrators, the LCA model has an inherent initiation process that ensures that noise is not integrated significantly in the absence of stimuli (Brown et al., 2005), as will be described in detail in Section 4.2.

A spiking neuron model of integration has been proposed by Wang (2002), in which the integrator neurons project to a population of inhibitory neurons which inhibit all integrators. This model has also been demonstrated to successfully describe the responses of integrator neurons in the area LIP. It has been shown that a population-level model with the architecture of the Wang model predicts approximately the same dynamics of integration process as the LCA model (Bogacz et al., 2006). Due to the close relation of the Wang model to the LCA model we do not analyse the Wang model in this paper separately, but we note that we consider the Wang model as a possible biologically realistic implementation of the LCA model.

#### 2.3. Model of competition resolution in basal ganglia

This subsection briefly reviews the involvement of the basal ganglia in decision making and how the MSPRT is related to the disinhibition of motor actions. The basal ganglia is a set of subcortical nuclei connected with one another and with the cortex. The output nuclei in their default state send inhibition to the thalamus and the brainstem thus blocking execution of motor actions, and the actions are selected when the activity of corresponding neurons are decreased (Chevalier, Vacher, Deniau, & Desban, 1985; Deniau & Chevalier, 1985). On the basis of these properties, Redgrave et al. (1999) have suggested that the basal ganglia acts as a "central switch" resolving the competition between cortical regions which vie for behavioural expression.

Gold and Shadlen (2001) formulated the goal of the decision process as choosing the alternative with the highest mean evidence (Gold & Shadlen, 2001, 2002). Hence the problem of decision making between N alternatives can be formulated in statistical terms as a choice between N hypotheses  $H_i$ . Each hypothesis  $H_i$  states that of all the alternatives, the sensory input supporting alternative i has the highest mean (Bogacz & Gurney, 2007; Gold & Shadlen, 2001, 2002). In the original formulation of the MSPRT (Baum & Veeravalli, 1994), at each moment of time and for each alternative, the probability  $P_i$  of the hypothesis  $H_i$  given the sensory evidence observed so far is evaluated, and the decision is made as soon as any  $P_i$  exceeds a decision threshold.

It has been proposed that the basal ganglia is organised into channels defined as groups of neurons representing individual motor actions, and these channels traverse all basal nuclei (Alexander, Crutcher, & DeLong, 1990). Bogacz and Gurney (2007) proposed that in the case of motor decisions, the firing rate of channel *i* of the output nuclei of the basal ganglia is proportional to  $OUT_i = -\log P_i$ . Hence the decision needs to be made as soon as any  $OUT_i$  decreases below a decision threshold, which is consistent with the selection by disinhibition mentioned above. Computing  $-\log P_i$  from Bayes theorem gives (Bogacz & Gurney, 2007)

$$OUT_i = -y_i + \ln \sum_{k=1}^N \exp y_k \tag{6}$$

where  $y_i$  is the integrated evidence supporting alternative *i*, which can be computed using the various models presented in Section 2.2. Eq. (6) includes two terms, the first  $(-y_i)$  describing the amount of integrated evidence supporting alternative *i*, and

the second describing the amount of conflict between alternatives (as it involves the summation over all alternatives). Thus the more conflict between alternatives, the higher  $y_i$  needs to be for  $OUT_i$  to decrease below the decision threshold. The details of how the computation of Eq. (6) could be performed in the cortico-basal ganglia circuit can be found in Bogacz and Gurney (2007).

Note that in this model the cortex and basal ganglia do not operate sequentially, but rather in parallel: the cortical neurons integrate sensory evidence, while the basal ganglia continuously monitor whether sufficient information has been accumulated. Such a parallel involvement of the cortex and basal ganglia is supported by experimental data showing that basal ganglia neurons gradually change their firing rate during the decision process long before the response is initiated (see Samejima, Ueda, Doya, and Kimura (2005) or Williams, Neimat, Cosgrove, and Eskander (2005), Figure 5).

# 3. Methods of simulation

To assess the integration of evidence in RwT, FFI, FFIwT and LCA models we compare the performance of decision networks in which evidence is integrated according to one of these models and the competition is resolved by the MSPRT model of the basal ganglia.

The models were simulated using the Euler method with an integration constant of 0.001s. The performance of these decision networks is described by error rate (ER) - defined as a proportion of trials in which the alternative with lower  $x_i$  is chosen, and decision time (DT) - defined as the interval from stimulus onset until decrease of any OUT<sub>i</sub> below the decision threshold. In the models simulated, there always exists a speed-accuracy tradeoff controlled by the decision threshold. Hence, to be able to compare the DT of different networks, it is necessary to ensure that they produce the same ER. This is done by altering the decision threshold until the desired ER is met with the desired precision (Bogacz et al., 2006; McMillen & Holmes, 2006). In the simulations described in this article, DT is compared for ER = 1%. For a given tested value of the decision threshold, the simulated decision process is repeated until it is established whether this decision threshold results in ER = 1% with confidence intervals ±0.2%.

Due to the noisy nature of the simulations, there is an inherent possibility that the decision threshold will not be crossed in finite time. This possibility is usually marginal, but with decreasing decision threshold the probability increases. For this reason the simulations are implemented with a time limit of 14 s that if exceeded will terminate that particular simulated decision, and the trial is discarded.

In all our simulations, the number of alternatives (and thus the number of basal ganglia channels, N) is 2, and with  $x_1 > x_2$  we assume that the first alternative is the correct choice. In all the simulations, each trial is divided into an initial time and a decision time as shown in Fig. 3. At the beginning of the initial time, the integrators are set to  $y_1(0) = y_2(0) = 0$ . In the initial time the input parameters are:  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0, c = 0.33$ , and in the decision time the input parameters are:  $x_1 = 4.5, x_2 = 3, c = 0.33$ . These values are estimated from a representative subject of an experiment described by Bogacz et al. (2006), and kept fixed for all simulations.

# 4. Results

This section starts with an analysis of dynamics of the integration models which helps with the understanding of the comparison of performance presented in Section 4.2. Then the ability of the models to terminate the decision process is compared.



**Fig. 3.** Changes of input parameters  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$  and c with stimulus onset dividing a simulated trial into an initial time without stimulus, and a decision time with stimulus.

#### 4.1. Dynamics of integration process

In order to get an understanding of the models' behaviour, it is useful to analyse their potential fields (vector fields) in the different stages of decision making. Fig. 4 compares the potential fields of the RwT ((a), (e)), the FFI ((b), (f)), the FFIwT ((c), (g)) and the LCA ((d), (h)) models before and after stimulus onset. The axes describe the levels of activity in each of the two integrators,  $y_1$ and  $y_2$ . The vector field in each panel shows how the integration process would behave on average (i.e., without noise) in a current state. Each arrow shows how the integrators would, on average, change their activity from that particular state. The lengths of the arrows denote the relative strength of the activity change but cannot be compared between panels.

The black line in each of the panels shows the development of the activity in the integrators during a single simulation of an integration process.

# 4.1.1. Before stimulus onset

The upper row of panels in Fig. 4 illustrates the dynamics of the models when there is no stimulus input ( $x_1 = x_2 = 0$ ).

In this case the integrators in the race model will have no preferred direction of change (as according to Eq. (1),  $E(dy_1) = E(dy_2) = 0$ ), and will exhibit random walk behaviour based on the noise levels. This is also the case in the RwT model when both integrators are above the integration threshold (there are no arrows in top right part of Fig. 4(a)). However, in the RwT model each integrator will have a preferred direction of change towards 0 for  $y_i < \theta_{int}$  as shown in Fig. 4(a). This means that even though noise might raise the activity of an integrator by chance, it will, provided the activity has not crossed  $\theta_{int}$ , drift back towards 0, thereby limiting the possible starting points of integration.

The FFI model does not have an integration threshold, and the integrators have no preferred direction of change. Fig. 4(b) shows that even though the integrators on average have no preferred direction, they only change along diagonal lines with the same slope. This is due to the fact that the slope of each step of the integration path is  $\frac{dy_2}{dy_1}$  and from Eq. (3) it is equal to  $\frac{dy_2}{dy_1} = -1$  for v = 1. This is the case for all inputs and is therefore independent of the noise. The sum of activity of integrators only increases when the integrator that receives the least input is at 0 and therefore unable to drop any further.

The integration path in the FFIwT follows roughly the same diagonal lines as FFI without a threshold, even though due to the leak, the slope will not always be -1. When comparing Fig. 4(b) and (c) it can be seen that the leak ensures that the activity is kept closer to (0, 0) thereby constraining the potential starting points.

In the LCA model without a stimulus, each of the integrators has an inherent drift towards 0 (Brown et al., 2005) due to leak of activity, as can be seen in Fig. 4(d). This is effectively ensuring that the starting point of integration will be kept close to (0, 0).



**Fig. 4.** The potential fields before stimulus onset and with stimulus for the race with threshold (RwT) ((a), (e)), the feed forward inhibition (FFI) ((b), (f)), the feed forward inhibition with threshold (FFIwT) ((c), (g)) and leaky competing accumulator (LCA) ((d), (h)) models respectively. The paths show the evolution of the models in a single simulated trial. The following parameters of the models were used: RwT:  $\theta_{int} = 0.33$ , k = 10. FFI: v = 1. FFIwT: v = 1,  $\theta_{int} = 0.33$ . LCA: k = 10, w = 10.

#### 4.1.2. With stimulus

The lower row of panels in Fig. 4 illustrates the dynamics of the models when the stimulus is present. Recall from Section 3 that we choose  $x_1 > x_2$  thus we assume that the first alternative is the correct choice.

Once the stimulus is presented, each of the integrators in the RwT model increases its activity. As the activity increases, change in activity decreases until the leak and the evidence input evens out (i.e.,  $x_i - ky_i = 0$ ). If the integration threshold  $\theta_{int}$  is situated before this point (where  $y_i = \frac{x_i}{k} = 0.3$  for the losing alternative in our simulations), the integration will continue without boundaries, as seen in integrator  $y_1$  in Fig. 4(e), but if the integration threshold is situated after this point, the integration may saturate, as seen in integrator  $y_2$  in Fig. 4(e). Once  $\theta_{int}$  has been crossed, the change in activation is constant, only depending on the evidence input.

The FFI model's crossed inhibitory connections from inputs to the integrator units will result in the level of activity in the losing integrator decreasing towards 0. This is the desired behaviour, as it mimics the behaviour of integrating neurons observed in the brain. To ensure that the activity of the losing integrator decreases towards 0, the weight of the inhibition (v) must obey  $v \ge x_2/x_1$ , where  $x_2$  is the mean input to the incorrect alternative. For this to be true for all  $x_1 > x_2$ , the inhibition weight must be 1. As in the case before stimulus, the model changes its state only along a line with a slope of -1, or along one of the axes.

The FFIwT has the same behaviour as described for the FFI and must also have v = 1 in order for the losing alternative to decrease its activity towards 0. In addition to this, the integration threshold must be positioned low enough to allow the integrator for the winning alternative to drift across the threshold. Otherwise, the model would be equivalent to adding a leak to the integrators without the threshold. To allow for this, the threshold must be set less than or equal to  $\frac{x_1-x_2}{k} = 0.15$ . In Fig. 4(g) the threshold is set higher to illustrate the problem. Note that although the RwT model is simulated for the same parameters as the FFIwT model,

the former is able to cross  $\theta_{int}$  (Fig. 4(e)) while the latter is not (Fig. 4(g)).

When the stimulus is presented to the LCA model, an attracting line (the diagonal line in Fig. 4(h)) with a slope of -1 appears in the state space and it is situated a distance  $\frac{x_1+x_2}{\sqrt{2}\cdot(k+w)}$  from (0, 0) (Bogacz et al., 2006). The intuition for the existence of this line is the following. When the stimulus is turned on, both integrators increase their activity levels, which corresponds to movement towards the attracting line. However, when they are sufficiently active, the inhibition starts to play a bigger role, so that if one increases, the other needs to decrease, which corresponds to the movements along the attracting line. The average direction of evolution along the attracting line depends on which of the alternatives has higher mean input, resulting in integration saturation at the point in the state space where the losing integrator is 0 and the value of the winning integrator is defined by the attracting line, see Fig. 4(h). Thus in the LCA model the integration reaches a natural saturation point, which does not happen in the other models.

#### 4.2. Performance with initial time

In this subsection we compare the performance of decision making models in which evidence is integrated according to the RwT, FFI, FFIwT or LCA model, and the competition is resolved in the MSPRT model of basal ganglia. By introducing an initial time, we also introduce the possibility that on stimulus onset the starting point of integration is not at 0. Such a distribution of the starting points will increase ER for a given decision threshold. Since we compare the performance for the same ER, the decision threshold will need to be adjusted, which will give longer DTs. If the distributions of the starting points are different for the four models, they will have different DTs for the same ER.

The performance of decision networks also depends on the parameters of the integration models (i.e., k,  $\theta_{int}$ , v, w). In order to make a fair comparison between the models of integration,



**Fig. 5.** Decision times (DTs) for decision making networks in which the competition resolution is implemented in MSPRT model of basal ganglia and the integration is performed by one of the following models: (a) race with threshold, (b) feed forward inhibition and (c) leaky competing accumulator. DTs are shown for initial times between 0 and 1500 ms, and different values of the parameters of integration models.



**Fig. 6.** Comparison of decision times for varying leak and integration threshold in the Feed Forward Inhibition with Threshold model with v = 1, initial time 500 ms and error rate 1%.

we need to compare the models for their best parameters; hence before we perform the comparison we first find the optimal parameters for each model of integration.

#### 4.2.1. Optimal parameters for the RwT model

When simulating the RwT model, there are two parameters to optimise; the leak (k) and the integration threshold ( $\theta_{int}$ ). However simulations (not shown here) show that as long as the  $\theta_{int}$  is set accordingly, there is no difference in performance for different values of k, as long as it is of a magnitude comparable to the inputs. Thus in simulations of decisions with integration by the RwT model in Fig. 5(a) the leak is fixed at 10.

Fig. 5(a) show that the optimal value of the integration threshold is around 0.3–0.35. When the integration threshold is set at this level, the initial time before stimulus onset does not influence the DT, which can be seen as the "valley" in Fig. 5(a). The intuition for why the integration threshold should be around 0.3 can be provided by an analysis of the potential field for the RwT model (Fig. 4(e)). It can be seen that when  $y_2 = 0.3$ , the potential field is perpendicular to  $y_2$ . This happens because at this point  $x_2 = y_2 \cdot k$  and the leak therefore balances the input, hindering any further integration. The higher above  $x_2/k$  the threshold is set, the lesser is the chance of  $y_2$  crossing the threshold, but this also slows down the integration of the winning channel.

If the integration threshold is set too low, the losing integrator will drift across the integration threshold. If the integration threshold is set too high, none of the integrators will cross the integration threshold. This suggests that the optimal integration threshold is between  $x_1/k$  and  $x_2/k$ . From a biological point of view, it does not seem likely for a system to use such a specific, input dependent parameter unless there is some automatic setting procedure.

It is also worth noting in Fig. 5(a) that if there is no initial time, increasing the integration threshold increases DT. This follows from the fact that the leak in the RwT model introduces forgetting of information, hence the higher the integration threshold, the more early evidence is discarded by the model, necessitating longer DT to gain required accuracy.

#### 4.2.2. Optimal parameters for the FFI model

There is only one parameter to set when simulating the FFI model, and that is the weight of the inhibitory connections. However, we have argued that to get the desired behaviour of the integrator neurons, the inhibition weight has to be 1. This is however not the optimal parameter when there is an initial time and the output from FFI projects to the MSPRT model of the basal ganglia. Simulations for input parameters given in Section 3 shows that the inhibition weight that gives the shortest DTs for the FFI model is approximately 0.6 (see Fig. 5(b)).

# 4.2.3. Optimal parameters for the FFIwT model

The motivation for introducing the threshold to the FFI model was to decrease the variation in starting points while maintaining near perfect integration, thereby improving on the performance with initial time. Because there are two parameters to set in the FFIwT model ( $\theta_{int}$  and k), we find the optimal parameter setting by fixing the initial time to 500 ms and, through an exhaustive parameter search, compare the decision times for all values of  $\theta_{int}$  and k in a range tested. Note that the points where either  $\theta_{int} = 0$  or *leak* = 0 corresponds to the FFI model without threshold.

However, as can be seen in Fig. 6, the optimal performance is achieved for the parameters that reduce the FFIwT model to the FFI model. This shows that there is no performance gain by introducing the leak. The reason for this is that the integration threshold  $(\theta_{int})$  needs to be set low to allow for the winning alternative to drift across it, but this low threshold is not enough to constrain the starting point sufficiently. Recall from Section 4.1 that the highest  $\theta_{int}$  that can be exceeded by integrators after stimulus onset without the help of noise is given by  $\frac{x_1}{k}$  in the RwT model, and by  $\frac{x_1-x_2}{k}$  in the FFIwT model, so to allow effective evidence integration after stimulus onset,  $\theta_{int}$  needs to be set to a lower value in the FFIwT model than in the RwT model. But setting  $\theta_{int}$  to a lower value impairs noise suppression in the initial time, which



**Fig. 7.** Comparison of decision times and error rates for varying initial times for leaky competing accumulator (LCA), feed forward inhibition (FFI) and race with threshold (RwT) models, each using its optimal parameters found in Section 4.2. Figure (a) shows the decision times for a 1% error rate. Figure (b) compares error rates for a fixed decision time of 220 ms. To simulate the response-signal paradigm, the integration process was stopped 220 ms after stimulus onset, and the alternative corresponding to the integrator with the highest activity level was chosen.

explains why the RwT, but not the FFIwT, can suppress the noise effectively.

Comparing Fig. 5(b) (for initial time 500 ms) and 6 (note that the scale of the decision time axis is different between Figs. 5 and 6) one can observe that there is no performance gain associated with this addition to the model, hence we will not discuss the FFIwT model further.

# 4.2.4. Optimal parameters for the LCA model

When simulating the LCA model, there are two parameters that can be optimised, the leak (k) and the weight of the mutual inhibition (w). However, as shown by Bogacz et al. (2006) the LCA model shows best performance if it is balanced, i.e., the mutual inhibition weight, w, is equal to the integrators own decay, k. The LCA model is therefore only tested with the balanced parameters.

Simulations show that the optimal value for k and w is  $\approx$ 10, as seen in Fig. 5(c). It shows that the "valley" in this parameter space is much wider than with the RwT model, suggesting that the LCA model is a more robust model when it comes to parameter variations.

# 4.2.5. Comparison of performance

Fig. 7(a) compares DTs for the models with their best parameters found from Fig. 5. It shows that the LCA model is significantly faster than the RwT model with the DT of the FFI model growing rapidly with increasing initial time. Comparing the LCA and the RwT models performances across different values of initial times with a paired *t*-test confirms that the LCA model is significantly (with a *p*-value of  $3.1 \times 10^{-11}$ ) faster than the RwT model.

Fig. 7(b) compares the three models with respect to another performance criterion, the error rate for fixed decision time, and thus simulates the subjects' performance in the response-signal paradigm described in Section 2.1 (see caption for details). It shows the same results as Fig. 7(a), i.e., that the LCA model is significantly more accurate than the RwT model, with the FFI model having a steady rise in error rate with increasing initial time.

Since the FFI model does not include any mechanisms preventing noise integration in the initial time, it is not surprising that its performance is worse than those of the LCA and RwT models. However, it is worth discussing the reasons for the difference between the LCA and RwT models. As mentioned in Subsection *Optimal parameters for the RwT model*, the decay in the RwT model introduces forgetting information presented before exceeding the integration threshold, which has detrimental effects on performance. By contrast, in the LCA model, the decay of information can be balanced by mutual inhibition preventing the forgetting of information (Bogacz et al., 2006; Usher & McClelland, 2001), as we now explain. In the LCA model, the position along the attracting line (diagonal line in Fig. 4(h)) expresses the difference between the activities of integrators  $a = y_1 - y_2$  (Bogacz et al., 2006; Usher & McClelland, 2001). When k = w, the changes in a can be computed by subtracting Eq. (5):

$$da = dy_1 - dy_2 = x_1 + c \cdot dW_1 - x_2 - c \cdot dW_2.$$
(7)

Thus the position along the attracting line accumulates the difference between the inputs to the integrators without the decay of information. The information decays only if the activity of one of the integrators decreases to 0, but this is likely to happen only in the initial time (Fig. 4(d)) or when high confidence in the choice has been reached (Fig. 4(h)).

Thus in summary, the decision network integrating information with the LCA model achieves shortest DT, because it is likely to discard information in the initial time and at the end of decision process but not during the critical period after stimulus onset.

#### 4.3. Sensitivity to parameter variations

Even though the LCA model performs better under optimal parameter settings, it is unlikely that these exact parameters will be implemented biologically. In this section we will therefore test how sensitive the FFI and the LCA models are to the parameter settings. We will test the FFI model with unequal forward inhibition weights, i.e., where the weight of the inhibitory connection from sensory neuron 1 to integrator  $2(v_1)$  is different from the weight of the inhibitory connection from sensory neuron 2 to integrator 1  $(v_2)$ . We also test the LCA model with unequal mutual inhibition weights i.e., where the weight of the inhibitory connection from integrator 1 to integrator 2  $(w_1)$  is different from the weight of the inhibitory connection from integrator 2 to integrator 1  $(w_2)$ ; with unequal inhibition (w) and leak (k) weights to test how well the LCA model performs when the parameters are not balanced for optimality; as well as with different evidence input for the losing alternative  $(I_2)$  to test whether the performance is a result of a specific level of conflict.

In these simulations it makes a difference whether the stronger weights are afferents to the winning or the losing alternative, and it is therefore necessary to randomize which alternative is correct, and change the simulations accordingly.

The results are shown in Fig. 8. Fig. 8(a) and (b) show that the FFI and the LCA model both produce robust results for small changes



**Fig. 8.** Decision times for decision making networks in which the competition resolution is implemented in an MSPRT model of basal ganglia and the integration is performed with varying parameters. Figures (a) and (b) shows the decision times with unequal inhibition weights when using the Feed Forward Inhibition model and Leaky Competing Accumulator (LCA) model respectively. Figure (c) shows the decision times for the LCA model with unequal leak and inhibition, and (d) for different levels of evidence. Where nothing else is mentioned, the following parameters are used:  $I_1 = 4.5$ ,  $I_2 = 3$ , w = 10, k = 10.

 $(\approx 10\%)$  in the inhibition weights. Fig. 8(c) show that the LCA model is very robust for changes in the relative strength of the leak and the inhibition weight. Only when the leak is 50% larger compared to the inhibition weight, is there an increase in decision times.

Fig. 8(d) shows that even though the decision times of the balanced LCA model increases for more similar inputs, it remains invariant of initial time, suggesting that it suppresses noise effectively for a wide range of input parameters.

# 4.4. Termination

Whereas the role of the integration initiation is to optimise the DT of a single decision, the role of the integration termination is to optimise a series of decisions by lowering the firing rate of the neural integrators, allowing similar subsequent decisions as fast as possible.

There are two basic models for lowering the activity of integrators following a decision: (i) a decision triggered signal is sent to appropriate neural areas inhibiting firing, thereby ensuring that the integration level drops off, (ii) the firing rate of integrators decays after stimulus offset due to neuronal leak. In this subsection we assume the latter model and we come back to the first model in the Discussion.

To test the models' ability to terminate after a decision, we have made simulations where the stimulus is turned off  $(x_1 = x_2 = 0)$ after a decision is made.

Fig. 9(a) shows that the RwT model is not capable of termination, as the activity levels of integrators do not drop off after the stimulus is turned off. In the RwT model, there is no decay above the integration threshold, hence, as Fig. 4(e) shows, there is no net drift above the integration threshold when there is no stimulus input. This results in the activity of the winning integrator undergoing a random walk starting from the point where the decision is made. As mentioned earlier, the FFI model will exhibit exactly the same termination behaviour due to the lack of decay.

It can be seen in Fig. 9(b) that the winning integrator of the LCA model drops off after the decision has been made. This is due to the fact that the decay of activity is always present in this model, and even though the leak is relatively small (10), the integrator is at the baseline after around 100 ms, showing that the ability to make a fast termination does not impair the ability to make fast decisions.

# 5. Discussion

In this article we compared the performance of decision networks in which evidence was integrated according to the RwT, FFI, FFIwT and LCA models and the competition was resolved in the MSPRT model of the basal ganglia. We demonstrated that the LCA model provides the most efficient initiation and termination capabilities to the decision network. It includes the mechanism preventing noise integration before stimulus onset (Brown et al., 2005), does not suffer from decay of information during the decision process (Bogacz et al., 2006; Usher & McClelland, 2001), and allows decay of activity of integrators after stimulus offset.

#### 5.1. External initiation and termination signals

There exists a possibility that initiation and termination of a decision process is caused by external signals that reset the integrators.

An argument for the existence of a reset signal on stimulus onset is the dip in activity reported in both LIP (Roitman & Shadlen, 2002) and FEF (Sato & Schall, 2001) that seems to reset the integrators to a baseline level. This is not inconsistent with the LCA model as there is a small variation in starting point, and the dip might help even faster decisions to be made. One candidate



**Fig. 9.** Decision process for the race with threshold (a) and the leaky competing accumulator (b) models. After an initial time of 500 ms, stimulus of  $x_1 = 4.5$  and  $x_2 = 3$  is turned on. Once enough evidence is integrated to make the decision with 99% certainty, the decision is made and the stimuli is turned off. The end of termination is set to be the point where the activity drops to a level comparable to the activity level reached during the initial time.

for a reset signal prior to a decision is the burst of activity seen in MT neurons on stimulus onset (e.g. Osborne, Bialek, & Lisberger, 2004). However it has been proposed that the dip is rather a result of the subjects change in attention from target stimuli (present before stimulus onset in the motion discrimination experiment) to motion stimuli (Wong, Huk, Shadlen, & Wang, 2007).

Bullock (2004) describes a computational model of competitive queuing of actions that replicates neuron measurements of serial movements presented in Averbeck, Chafee, Crowe, and Georgopoulos (2002) by implementing an inhibiting connection between a choice layer and a planning layer. It is possible that such a mechanism is implemented in the decision process described in this paper, so that when a decision is made, inhibition is sent to the integrator responsible for that particular action, thereby taking away the need for an inherent termination in the integration model.

However, in serial reaction time tasks, an inhibition signal to the winning integrator would most likely lead to this alternative being less likely to be chosen in a quickly succeeding trial, since the integration would have to overcome the inhibition signal. What is actually observed is that subjects are more likely to repeat their decision in a fast serial reaction time (Soetens & Notebaert, 2005), which is consistent with the uninhibited termination of the LCA model.

If such a signal resets the integrators prior to, and/or after a decision, FFI and LCA models would indeed be able to perform equally well. However, the FFI model would still integrate before stimulus onset, which would lead to much more variation in the starting point of integration than is observed in Fig. 1(b). To prevent it, the reset signal would have to be applied all the time except during the decision, which would be energy inefficient.

Furthermore, note that the problem of when to apply the reset signal is a difficult decision task in itself, and thus would potentially require an additional circuit to make this decision.

Moreover, even if reset signals exist, it will not radically change the performance of the LCA model. Therefore, if the initiation and termination of an integration process can be efficiently realised in the LCA model itself, it seems that the alternative, of a separate energy inefficient circuit making additional decisions on whether or not to reset, would bring an evolutionary disadvantage.

# 5.2. Alternative mechanism for initiation of integration

Recently, Wong et al. (2007) presented an alternative mechanism preventing integration of noise in the initial time in a model with architecture similar to the LCA model. Wong et al. assume that the input to the integrators in the initial time is *larger* than in the decision time.<sup>3</sup> By contrast we make the opposite assumption, see Fig. 3.

Their initiation mechanism relies on saturation of NMDAcurrents inside the integrator neurons during the initial period. Thus Wong et al. predict that the mean of the integrators' activity before stimulus onset should not be lower than the mean activity across integrators during decision time (see Figure 2 in Wong et al. (2007)). By contrast, the assumption about inputs made by us in Fig. 3 predict that the mean activity of integrators in the initial time should be lower than during the decision time.

First, we compared these predictions with published data (Figure 7a in Roitman and Shadlen (2002) and Churchland, Kiani, and Shadlen (2008), Huk and Shadlen (2005), Thompson, Hanes, Bichot, and Schall (1996)) from experiments under the free-response paradigm that is the focus of both our and Wong et al.'s work. In all these experiments the average firing rate in the initial time was lower than during the decision time, exactly as predicted by our model. One example of integrator activity during a free-response task is shown in Fig. 1 of this article, note that the levels of activity at stimulus onset are near 0, and the mean at decision time is much higher than the mean at stimulus onset.

Second, we compared the predictions with published data from experiments under the response-signal paradigm (Figure 9 in Roitman and Shadlen (2002) and Kiani, Hanks, and Shadlen (2008), Shadlen and Newsome (2001)). In all these experiments the mean activity of integrators during initial time and decision time were fairly similar. Nevertheless, one could speculate that in the response-signal paradigm, additional mechanisms operate that stop the integrators from achieving higher firing rates during decision time to prevent premature responses before the response signal is presented.

#### 5.3. Predictions and comparison with existing data

Due to the evolutionary pressure for speed and accuracy of decisions, the analysis in this article suggests that the integration of evidence in the cortex should follow the LCA model. Therefore, in this subsection we compare the models with existing data and discuss the experimental predictions that could distinguish whether the neural integration follows the LCA or other models, most notably the FFI model. Note that in this paper we only consider evidence integration in decision making, and even though there is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Wong et al. assume that during the initial time, subjects focus their attention on the target stimuli present in the motion discrimination task. These target stimuli are in the receptive fields of the neural integrators, hence Wong et al. assume that they provide strong input to the integrators.

evidence suggesting that both feed-forward and lateral inhibition are present in the brain, there is currently no neurophysiological evidence for excluding either of the models (Burle, Vidal, Tandonnet, & Hasbroucq, 2004).

#### 5.3.1. Comparison with existing data

One way of distinguishing between the LCA and the FFI model would be a direct examination of the neurobiological network including the motion detecting neurons (area MT) and the integrator neurons (e.g., area LIP). What makes this comparison difficult is that the networks required for making a plausible implementation of each model are very similar. In each of the models the integrator neurons will receive excitatory input from the sensory neurons and inhibitory inputs from a pool of local interneurons. The difference is in the input to the pool of interneurons; in the FFI model the input should come from the sensory neurons, in the LCA model from the integrator neurons. However, since both distal and local connections to the inhibitory interneurons exist (Shepherd, 2004), both models are plausible from a neurobiological perspective, and until the inhibitory pool of interneurons has been localized, distinguishing between the models must be done in a different way.

In a comparison of sequential sampling models for twochoice decisions, Ratcliff and Smith (2004) showed that the LCA model could explain the experimental data from a signal detection experiment, a lexical decision experiment and a studytest recognition memory experiment. The LCA model could, with reasonable success, be fitted to the experimental reaction time data, capturing the initial skewness of the RT distribution, as well as the change in distribution with varying difficulty. Though it was not the only model capable of explaining the data, the others were of the closely related diffusion model type.

It is worth noting that for both the FFI and the FFIwT models, the potential field for the losing alternative will result in the activity of the losing alternative's integrator moving towards 0 following stimulus onset, which makes predictions that are inconsistent with the data shown in Fig. 1, where the activity of the losing integrators initially increase.

# 5.3.2. Predictions

In the LCA model, the integration process has a natural saturation point (Fig. 4(h)) which is not the case in the FFI model. Thus if the stimulus is left on as in the interrogation paradigm (see Section 2.1) with long interrogation times, the FFI models predict that the neural integrator for the winning alternative should continue to integrate until it reaches a biological limit for neural firing rate, while the LCA model predicts that it will saturate at a much lower firing rate. The existing experimental data agrees with the prediction of the LCA model, as for example the mean activity of LIP neurons saturated at levels around 25 Hz in the study of Shadlen and Newsome (2001) (as shown in Figure 8 in their article), which is much lower than the biological limit. To account for these data within the FFI model, Mazurek et al. (2003) introduced an additional assumption to the FFI model, that the activity levels of the integrators are frozen in the interrogation paradigm, when the decision threshold (in the basal ganglia) is reached.

However, the LCA model additionally predicts that the saturation of the activity of the winning integrator should happen when the losing integrator reaches zero (the FFI model with the additional assumptions (Mazurek et al., 2003) does not make such a prediction). This prediction is difficult to test as it requires an analysis of neural activity on individual trials.

There is a prediction that could be used as the basis for an experiment differentiating between the LCA and FFI models. The FFI model predicts that the firing rate of integrator neurons should

only depend on the difference between the inputs but not on the sum of the inputs. By contrast, the LCA model predicts that the firing rate of the integrator neurons should also depend on the sum of inputs, which influences the position of the attracting line (Bogacz et al., 2006). In an experiment testing this prediction one could use stimuli in which the amount of evidence supporting both alternatives can be varied independently (e.g. including dots moving in two directions or more (Niwa & Ditterich, 2008)), and record the integrator neurons.

#### Acknowledgements

This work was supported by EPSRC grants EP/C516303/1 and EP/C514416/1. We thank Kevin Gurney for discussion and Mark Humphries, Andy Lulham, Jiaxiang Zhang and Pete Trimmer for discussion as well as their very useful comments on this manuscript.

#### References

- Alexander, G. E., Crutcher, M. D., & DeLong, M. R. (1990). Basal gangliathalamocortical circuits - parallel substrates for motor, oculomotor, "prefrontal" and "limbic" functions. *Progress in Brain Research*, 85, 119–144.
- Anderson, J. R. (1990). The adaptive character of thought. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Averbeck, B. B., Chafee, M. V., Crowe, D. A., & Georgopoulos, A. P. (2002). Parallel processing of serial movements in prefrontal cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(20), 13172–13177.
- Baum, C. W., & Veeravalli, V. V. (1994). A sequential procedure for multihypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 40(6), 1994–2007.
- Belovsky, G. E. (1984). Herbivore optimal foraging: A comparative test of three models. American Naturalist, 124, 97–115.
- Bogacz, R., & Gurney, K. (2007). The basal ganglia and cortex implement optimal decision making between alternative actions. *Neural Computation*, 19, 442–477.
- Bogacz, R., Brown, E., Moehlis, J., Holmes, P., & Cohen, J. D. (2006). The physics of optimal decision making: A formal analysis of models of performance in twoalternative forced choice tasks. *Psychological Review*, 113, 700–765.
- Bogacz, R., Usher, M., Zhang, J., & McClelland, J. L. (2007). Extending a biologically inspired model of choice: Multi-alternatives, nonlinearity and value-based multidimensional choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B*, 362, 1655–1670.
- Britten, K. H., Shadlen, M. N., Newsome, W. T., & Movshon, J. A. (1993). Responses of neurons in macaque MT to stochastic motion signals. *Visual Neuroscience*, 10, 1157–1169.
- Brown, E., Gao, J., Holmes, P., Bogacz, R., Gilzenrat, M., & Cohen, J. D. (2005). Simple neural networks that optimize decisions. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 15(3), 803–826.
- Bullock, D. (2004). Adaptive neural models of queuing and timing in fluent action. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 9(8), 426–433.
- Burle, B., Vidal, F., Tandonnet, C., & Hasbroucq, T. (2004). Physiological evidence for response inhibition in choice reaction time tasks. *Brain and Cognition*, 56, 153–164.
- Chevalier, G., Vacher, S., Deniau, J. M., & Desban, M. (1985). Disinhibition as a basic process in the expression of striatal functions. i. the striato-nigral influence on tecto-spinal/tecto-diencephalic neurons. *Brain Research*, 334, 215–226.
- Churchland, A. K., Kiani, R., & Shadlen, M. N. (2008). Decision-making with multiple alternatives. *Nature Neuroscience*, 11(6), 693–702.
- Deniau, J. M., & Chevalier, G. (1985). Disinhibition as a basic process in the expression of striatal functions. ii. The striato-nigral influence on thalamocortical cells of the ventromedial thalamic nucleus. *Brain Research*, 334, 227–233.
- Dragalin, V. P., Tartakovsky, A. G., & Veeravalli, V. V. (1999). Multihypothesis sequential probability ratio tests—part 1: Asymptotic optimality. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(7), 2448–2461.
- Frank, M. J. (2006). Hold your horses: A dynamic computational role for the subthalamic nucleus in decision making. *Neural Networks*, 19, 1120–1136.
- Gold, J. I., & Shadlen, M. N. (2001). Neural computations that underlie decisions about sensory stimuli. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 5(1), 10–16.
- Gold, J. I., & Shadlen, M. N. (2002). Banburismus and the brain: Decoding the relationship between sensory stimuli, decisions, and reward. *Neuron*, 36, 299–308.
- Gurney, K., Prescott, T. J., & Redgrave, P. (2001). A computational model of action selection in the basal ganglia. i. A new functional anatomy. *Biological Cybernetics*, 84, 401–410.
- Huk, A. C., & Shadlen, M. N. (2005). Neural activity in macaque parietal cortex reflects temporal integration of visual motion signals during perceptual decision making. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 25(45), 10420–10436.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. American Psychologist, 39, 341–350.

- Kiani, R., Hanks, T. D., & Shadlen, M. N. (2008). Bounded integration in parietal cortex underlies decisions even when viewing duration is dictated by the environment. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(12), 3017–3029.
- Kim, J.-N., & Shadlen, M. N. (1999). Neural correlates of a decision in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex of the macaque. *Nature Neuroscience*, 2(2), 176–185.
- LaBerge, D. A. (1962). A recruitment theory of simple behaviour. *Psychometrika*, 27, 375–396.
- Mazurek, M. E., Roitman, J. D., Ditterich, J., & Shadlen, M. N. (2003). A role for neural integrators in perceptual decision making. *Cerebral Cortex*, 13(11), 1257–1269. McMillen, T., & Holmes, P. (2006). The dynamics of choice among multiple
- alternatives. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 50, 30–57. Niwa, M., & Ditterich, J. (2008). Perceptual decisions between multiple directions of
- visual motion. The Journal of Neuroscience, 28(17), 4435-4445. Olshausen, B. A., & Field, D. J. (1996). Emergence of simple-cell receptive field
- properties by learning a sparse code for natural images. *Nature*, 381, 607–609. Osborne, L. C., Bialek, W., & Lisberger, S. G. (2004). Time course of information about
- motion direction in visual area MT of macaque. The Journal of Neuroscience, 24(13), 3210–3222.
- Pike, R. (1966). Stochastic models of choice behaviour: Response probabilities and latencies of finite markov chain systems. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 21, 161–182.
- Ratcliff, R. (1978). A theory for memory retrieval. *Psychological Review*, 85, 59–108. Ratcliff, R., & McKoon, G. (2008). The diffusion decision model: Theory and data for
- two-choice decision tasks. *Neural Computation*, 20, 873–922. Ratcliff, R., & Smith, P. L. (2004). A comparison of sequential sampling models for
- two-choice reaction time. *Psychological Review*, 111(2), 333–367. Redgrave, P., Prescott, T. J., & Gurney, K. (1999). The basal ganglia: A vertebrate
- solution to the selection problem?. *Neuroscience*, 89(4), 1009–1023. Roitman, J. D., & Shadlen, M. N. (2002). Response of neurons in the lateral
- intraparietal area during a combined visual discrimination reaction time task. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 22(21), 9475–9489. Salinas, E. (2006). How behavioral constraints may determine optimal sensory
- representations. *PLoS Biology*, *12*, e387.
- Samejima, K., Ueda, Y., Doya, K., & Kimura, M. (2005). Representation of actionspecific reward values in the striatum. *Science*, 310(November), 1337–1340.

- Sato, T., & Schall, J. D. (2001). Pre-excitatory pause in frontal eye field responses. Experimental Brain Research, 139(July), 53–58.
- Schall, J. D. (2001). Neural basis of deciding, choosing and acting. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 2, 33–42.
- Shadlen, M. N., & Newsome, W. T. (1996). Motion perception: Seeing and deciding. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 93(January), 628–633.
- Shadlen, M. N., & Newsome, W. T. (2001). Neural basis of a perceptual decision in the parietal cortex (area LIP) of the rhesus monkey. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 86, 1916–1936.
- Shepherd, G. M. (2004). *The synaptic organization of the brain* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Soetens, E., & Notebaert, W. (2005). Response monitoring and expectancy in random serial RT tasks. Acta Psychologica, 119, 189–216.
- Stafford, T., Humphries, M. D., & Chambers, J. M. (2005). The neural circuitry required for decision making by evidence accumulation. In *Computational cognitive neuroscience conference* (pp. V–62) November. Accompanying poster can be found at: http://www.spinsn.group.shef.ac.uk/spinsn/PDFs/Stafford2005.pdf.
- Thompson, K. G., Hanes, D. P., Bichot, N. P., & Schall, J. D. (1996). Perceptual and motor processing stages identified in the activity of macaque frontal eye field neurons during visual search. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 76(6), 4040–4055.
- Usher, M., & McClelland, J. L. (2001). On the time course of perceptual choice: The leaky competing accumulator model. *Psychological Review*, 108, 550–592.
- Vickers, D. (1970). Evidence for an accumulator of psychophysical discrimination. *Ergonomics*, 13(1), 37–58.
- Wald, A. (1947). Sequential Analysis. New York: Wiley.
- Wald, A., & Wolfowitz, J. (1948). Optimum character of the sequential probability ratio test. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 19, 326–339.
- Wang, X. J. (2002). Probabilistic decision making by slow reverberation in cortical circuits. Neuron, 36(5), 955–968.
- Williams, Z. M., Neimat, J. S., Cosgrove, G. R., & Eskander, E. N. (2005). Timing and direction selectivity of subthalamic and pallidal neurons in patients with Parkinson disease. *Experimental Brain Research*, 162(4), 407–416.
- Wong, K.-F., Huk, A. C., Shadlen, M. N., & Wang, X.-J. (2007). Neural circuit dynamics underlying accumulation of time-varying evidence during perceptual decision making. Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience, 1(November).