



2009 Special Issue

Error-probability noise benefits in threshold neural signal detection

Ashok Patel, Bart Kosko*

Department of Electrical Engineering, Signal and Image Processing Institute, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-2564, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 May 2009

Received in revised form 7 June 2009

Accepted 25 June 2009

Keywords:

Optimal noise intensity

Stochastic resonance

Threshold neurons

Signal detection

Error probability

Array detection

ABSTRACT

Five new theorems and a stochastic learning algorithm show that noise can benefit threshold neural signal detection by reducing the probability of detection error. The first theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for such a noise benefit when a threshold neuron performs discrete binary signal detection in the presence of additive scale-family noise. The theorem allows the user to find the optimal noise probability density for several closed-form noise types that include generalized Gaussian noise. The second theorem gives a noise-benefit condition for more general threshold signal detection when the signals have continuous probability densities. The third and fourth theorems reduce this noise benefit to a weighted-derivative comparison of signal probability densities at the detection threshold when the signal densities are continuously differentiable and when the noise is symmetric and comes from a scale family. The fifth theorem shows how collective noise benefits can occur in a parallel array of threshold neurons even when an individual threshold neuron does not itself produce a noise benefit. The stochastic gradient-ascent learning algorithm can find the optimal noise value for noise probability densities that do not have a closed form.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Neural noise benefits: Total and partial SR

Stochastic resonance (SR) occurs when a small amount of noise improves nonlinear signal processing (Amblard, Zozor, McDonnell, & Stocks, 2007; Chapeau-Blondeau & Rousseau, 2004; Gammaitoni, 1995; Kay, 2000; Kosko, 2006; Levy & Baxter, 2002; McDonnell, Stocks, Pearce, & Abbott, 2006, 2008; Moss, Ward, & Sannita, 2004; Patel & Kosko, 2009b; Rousseau & Chapeau-Blondeau, 2005b; Saha & Anand, 2003; Stocks, 2001). SR occurs in many types of subthreshold and suprathreshold neural signal detection (Bulsara, Jacobs, Zhou, Moss, & Kiss, 1991; Deco & Schürmann, 1998; Hänggi, 2002; Hoch, Wenning, & Obermayer, 2003; Li, Hou, & Xin, 2005; Mitaim & Kosko, 1998, 2004; Moss et al., 2004; Patel & Kosko, 2005, 2008; Sasaki et al., 2008; Stacey & Durand, 2000; Stocks, Appligham, & Morse, 2002; Stocks & Mannella, 2001; Wang & Wang, 1997; Wiesenfeld & Moss, 1995). Biological noise can arise from an internal source such as thermal noise (Faisal, Selen, & Wolpert, 2008; Manwani & Koch, 1999) or ion channel noise (Schneidman, Freedman, & Segev, 1998; White, Rubinstein, & Kay, 2000). Or it can arise from an external source such as synaptic transmission (Levy & Baxter, 2002; Markram & Tsodyks, 1996). We focus on noise-enhanced signal detection in threshold neurons where a user can control only the noise variance or dispersion (Läer et al., 2001; Pantazelou, Dames, Moss, Douglass,

& Wilkens, 1995; Rao, Wolf, & Arkin, 2002). We measure detection performance with the probability of correct decision $P_{CD} = 1 - P_e$ when P_e is the probability of error (Patel & Kosko, 2009a).

We classify SR noise benefits as either total SR or partial SR. The SR effect is *total* if adding independent noise in the received signal reduces the error probability. Then the plot of detection probability versus noise intensity increases monotonically in some noise-intensity interval starting from zero. The SR effect is *partial* when the detection performance increases in some noise-intensity interval away from zero. Total SR ensures that adding small amounts of noise gives a better detection performance than not adding noise. Partial SR ensures only that there exists a noise intensity interval where the detection performance increases as the noise intensity increases. The same system can exhibit both total and partial SR. We derive conditions that screen for total or partial SR noise benefits in almost all suboptimal simple threshold detectors because the SR conditions apply to such a wide range of signal probability density functions (pdfs) and noise pdfs. Learnings laws can then search for the optimal noise intensity in systems that pass the screening conditions. Section 5 presents one such stochastic learning law.

We have already proven necessary and sufficient “*forbidden interval*” conditions on the noise mean or location for total SR in mutual-information-based threshold detection of discrete weak binary signals (Kosko & Mitaim, 2003, 2004): SR occurs if and only if the noise mean or location parameter μ obeys $\mu \notin (\theta - A, \theta + A)$ for threshold θ where $-A < A < \theta$ for bipolar subthreshold signal $\pm A$. More general forbidden interval theorems apply to many stochastic neuron models with Brownian or even Levy (jump)

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: kosko@usc.edu (B. Kosko).

Fig. 1. Stochastic resonance (SR) noise benefits in binary neural signal detection for five out of six types of additive noise. The discrete signal X can take subthreshold values $s_0 = -1$ or $s_1 = 0$ with equal probability ($p_0 = P(s_0) = P(s_1) = p_1$) and $\theta = 1.5$ is the detection threshold. We decide $X = s_1$ if the observation $W = X + N > \theta$. Else $X = s_0$. There is a noise benefit in (a)–(e) because the zero-mean uniform, Gaussian, Laplacian, generalized Gaussian ($r = \frac{1}{2}$), and zero-location Cauchy noise satisfy condition (5) of Theorem 1. The SR effect is partial in (a) because condition (6) does not hold while the SR effect in (b)–(e) is total in each case because condition (6) holds. The dashed vertical lines show that the maximum SR effect occurs at the theoretically predicted optimal noise intensities. There is no noise benefit in (f) for Laplacian noise because its mean μ lies in the forbidden interval in accord with Corollary 1: $\mu = 1 \in (0.5, 1.5) = (\theta - s_1, \theta - s_0)$.

noise (Patel & Kosko, 2005, 2008). Corollary 1 gives a forbidden-interval necessary condition for SR in error-probability detection. But we did find necessary and sufficient conditions for both total and partial SR noise benefits in error-probability-based threshold signal detection when the noise has a scale-family distribution.

Theorem 1 gives the a simple necessary and sufficient SR condition for a noise benefit in threshold detection of discrete binary signals. This result appears in Section 3. The condition also determines whether the SR effect is total or partial if the noise density belongs to a *scale family*. Scale-family densities include many common densities such as the normal and uniform but not the Poisson. The condition implies that SR occurs in simple threshold detection of discrete binary signals only if the mean or location of additive location-scale family noise does not fall in an open forbidden interval. The uniform, Gaussian, Laplacian, and generalized Gaussian ($r = \frac{1}{2}$) noise in Fig. 1(a)–(e) produce a noise benefit because they satisfy condition (5) of Theorem 1. But the Laplacian noise in Fig. 1(f) violates this forbidden-interval condition of Corollary 1 and so there is no noise benefit. Section 4 shows that the SR condition of Theorem 1 also allows us to find the optimal noise dispersion that maximizes the detection probability for a given closed-form scale-family noise pdf. Section 5 shows that an adaptive gradient-ascent learning algorithm can find this optimal intensity from sample data even when the noise pdf does not have a closed form as with many thick-tailed noise pdfs.

Total SR can never occur in an optimal threshold system if we add only independent noise in the received signal. Kay and coworkers showed that the optimal independent additive SR noise is just a constant that minimizes the detection error probability of a given detection scheme (Kay, Michels, Chen, & Varshney, 2006). So total SR can never occur if the detection threshold

location is optimal even when the overall detection scheme is suboptimal. But we show that partial SR can still occur in a single-threshold suboptimal system even if the detection threshold is optimal. Rousseau and Chapeau-Blondeau found earlier that what we call partial SR occurs in some special cases of optimal threshold detection (Rousseau & Chapeau-Blondeau, 2005b). Fig. 3 shows such a partial SR effect for the important but special case of an optimal threshold. Our result still holds in the general case of non-optimal thresholds. The suboptimality of the signal detection remains only a necessary condition for total SR noise benefits based on error probability.

Theorem 2 in Section 6 presents a related necessary and sufficient condition for a noise benefit in a more general case of threshold detectors when the signals have continuous pdfs and when the additive independent noise has a pdf from a scale family. Then Theorem 3 gives a necessary and sufficient condition for total SR with zero-mean discrete bipolar noise. Corollary 2 gives a necessary and sufficient condition for partial SR with zero-mean discrete bipolar noise when there is no total SR in Theorem 3. Theorems 3 and 4 each gives a necessary and sufficient condition for total SR when the additive noise is zero-mean discrete bipolar or when it comes from a finite-mean symmetric scale family. These two theorems compare weighted derivatives of continuously differentiable signal pdfs at the detection threshold to determine the total SR effect. Theorem 5 shows when noise produces a collective SR effect in parallel arrays of threshold neurons even when an individual threshold neuron does not produce an SR effect. The next section describes a general problem of threshold-based neural signal detection and defines the two SR effects based on error probability.

