

How the fan-shaped body can integrate differential familiarity for route following in desert ants

Evripidis Gkanias and Barbara Webb

School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh





Introduction

- Desert ants use their visual memory to follow familiar routes and find their nest, and this is usually assumed to be processed by their mushroom bodies (MB).
- The MB output neurons (MBONs) are assumed to predict the scene's familiarity, which they project to the fan-shaped body (FB) of the central complex (CX) through tangential neurons.
- > We take a computational approach to explore how this familiarity input can be used by the FB to produce a target velocity for the animal, which can be used for route following.
- 1. Following recent understanding of the function of PFN and h Δ neurons in the FB [1, 2, 3, 4], we build a computational model that encodes the allocentric velocity of the animal.
- 2. We demonstrate computationally that columnar (FC or v Δ) neurons of the FB could encode the allocentric target velocity by integrating differential familiarity and the current velocity (h Δ).
- 3. We finally showed that this target velocity can be used by the PFL3 neurons to follow a familiar route and we suggested that the performance could be enhanced by the use of PFL2 neurons.

The effective central complex circuit for route following





The modelled behaviour of route following

Relative familiarity over the difference between the heading direction and the route's tangent.



Familiarity increases along the route.





PFN_d: allocentric forward velocity PFN_v: allocentric backward velocity $h\Delta$: allocentric velocity





- ► The model uses complex numbers to represent activity bumps.
- The default oscillations of the agent $(\pm 3^{\circ})$ allow for local exploration of the familiarity distribution.
- The target velocity (columnar FCs or $v \triangle s$) is updated based on the difference between consecutive familiarity estimations—see equation (1).

Allocentric heading (box 1) and egocentric speed (box 2) build the allocentric velocity vector (box 3) [1]. Current velocity contributes into the target velocity—red arrow (box 3) becomes the pink arrow (box 4).

$$\vec{\mathsf{C}}(t) = (1 - \alpha_M) \cdot \vec{\mathsf{FC}}(t - 1) + [familiarity(t) - familiarity(t - 1)] \cdot h \vec{\Delta}(t)$$

 $\triangleright \alpha_M$: the memory decay factor of the allocentric target velocity.

▶ The steering direction is the subtraction of the allocentric heading from the target velocity (box 5).

The default oscillation patterns

- Increasing familiarity shifts the target towards the current velocity.
- Decreasing familiarity shifts the target away from the current velocity. ▷ This allows for gradient ascend of the familiarity distribution.
- ▶ The result behaviour is a collection of oscillations of different sizes [5].

The responses producing the modelled behaviour

Responses in the lateral horns (LHs) and lateral accessory lobes (LALs) can build oscillation patterns. ▶ The oscillations can be a trade-off between stop-and-scan and moving forwards in straight line.

Future work

Transverse oscillation could allow for gradient ascent while the agent's heading stays tangent to the route. Next, we will explore whether the PFL2 neurons could contribute in promoting this type of oscillation.

- time (sec) time (sec)
- \blacktriangleright As the agent always moves in the heading direction, the responses of h \triangle neurons are identical to the ones of PFN_d neurons.
 - \triangleright This is due to forward speed, which silences PFN_v neurons.
- ▶ The update rate of the FC (target velocity) depends on its α_M . \triangleright High α_M allows for stronger influence of the current velocity.
- The different (right or left) shifts in the connectivity of the EPG to PFL3 neurons ensures that at least one PFL3 vector is always non-zero.

References

(1)

[1] J. Lu, A. H. Behbahani, L. Hamburg, E. A. Westeinde, <i>et al. Nature</i> , vol. 601, no. 7891, pp. 98–104, 2022.
[2] C. Lyu, L. F. Abbott, and G. Maimon <i>Nature</i> , vol. 601, no. 7891, pp. 92–97, 2022.
[3] A. M. Matheson, A. J. Lanz, A. M. Licata, T. A. Currier, et al. bioRxiv, p. 2021.04.21.440842, 2021.
[4] B. K. Hulse, H. Haberkern, R. Franconville, D. B. Turner-Evans, Sy. Takemura, <i>et al. eLife</i> , vol. 10, 2021.
[5] L. Clement, S. Schwarz, and A. Wystrach <i>bioRxiv</i> , p. 2022.04.22.489150, 2022.

Structure and function of the insect central complex, 2022

evgkanias.github.io

6

0 ev.gkanias@ed.ac.uk