The temporal paradox of Hebbian learning and homeostatic plasticity

Friedemann Zenke[1], Wulfram Gerstner[2] and Surya Ganguli[1]

Hebbian plasticity, a synaptic mechanism which detects and amplifies co-activity between neurons, is considered a key ingredient underlying learning and memory in the brain. However, Hebbian plasticity alone is unstable, leading to runaway neuronal activity, and therefore requires stabilization by additional compensatory processes. Traditionally, a diversity of homeostatic plasticity phenomena found in neural circuits is thought to play this role. However, recent modelling work suggests that the slow evolution of homeostatic plasticity, as observed in experiments, is insufficient to prevent instabilities originating from Hebbian plasticity. To remedy this situation, we suggest that homeostatic plasticity is complemented by additional rapid compensatory processes, which rapidly stabilize neuronal activity on short timescales.

Addresses
[1] Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
[2] Brain Mind Institute, School of Life Sciences and School of Computer and Communication Sciences, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, EPFL, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Corresponding author: Zenke, Friedemann (fzenke@stanford.edu)

Introduction

More than half a century ago, Donald Hebb [1] laid down an enticing framework for the neurobiological basis of learning, which can be succinctly summarized in the well-known mantra, 'neurons that fire together wire together' [2]. However, such dynamics suffers from two inherent problems. First, Hebbian learning exhibits a positive feedback instability: those neurons that wire together will fire together more, leading to even stronger connectivity. Second, such dynamics alone would lead to all neurons in a recurrent circuit wiring together, precluding the possibility of rich patterns of variation in synaptic strength that can encode, through learning, the rich structure of experience. Two fundamental ingredients required to solve these problems are stabilization [3], which prevents runaway neural activity, and competition [4•,5,6•], in which the strengthening of a synapse may come at the expense of the weakening of others.

In theoretical models, competition and stability are often achieved by augmenting Hebbian plasticity with additional constraints [3,5,7•]. Such constraints are typically implemented by imposing upper limits on individual synaptic strengths, and by enforcing some constraint on biophysical variables, for example, the total synaptic strength or average neuronal activity [6•,7•,8–12]. In neurobiology, forms of plasticity exist which seemingly enforce such limits or constraints through synaptic scaling in response to firing rate perturbations [13,14], or through stabilizing adjustments of the properties of plasticity in response to the recent synaptic history, a phenomenon known as homeostatic metaplasticity [6•,11,15,16]. Overall, synaptic scaling and metaplasticity, as special cases of homeostatic mechanisms that operate over diverse spatiotemporal scales across neurobiology [17–22], are considered key ingredients that contribute both stability and competition to Hebbian plasticity by directly affecting the fate of synaptic strength.

The defining characteristic of homeostatic plasticity is that it drives synaptic strengths so as to ensure a homeostatic set point [23,24•], such as a specific neuronal firing rate or membrane potential. However, it is important that this constraint is implemented only on average, over long timescales, thereby allowing neuronal activity to fluctuate on shorter timescales, so that these neuronal activity fluctuations, which drive learning through Hebbian plasticity, can indeed reflect the structure of ongoing experience. This requisite separation of timescales is indeed observed experimentally; forms of Hebbian plasticity can be induced on the timescale of seconds to minutes [25–28], whilst most forms of homeostatic synaptic plasticity operate over hours or days [14,24•,29]. This separation of timescales, however, raises a temporal paradox: homeostatic plasticity then may become too slow to stabilize the fast positive feedback instability of Hebbian learning. Indeed modeling studies that have attempted to use homeostatic plasticity mechanisms to stabilize Hebbian learning [11,30,31•,32•,33,34] were typically required to speed up homeostatic plasticity to timescales that are orders of magnitude faster than those observed in experiments (Figure 1).

Figure 1

Comparison of the typical timescale of different forms of homeostatic plasticity in models and in experiments. **(a)** Weight normalization in models. Here we plot the characteristic timescale on which synaptic weights are either normalized or scaled. **(b)** Synaptic scaling in experiments. Here we plot the typical time at which synaptic scaling is observed. **(c)** Models of metaplasticity. We plot the characteristic timescale on which the learning rule changes. **(d)** Metaplasticity in experiments. Here we show the typical timescale at which metaplasticity is observed. Literature referenced in the figure [5,7•,13,31•,32•,36,37•,53,54,55•,68,69,72,104•,109–117].

This temporal paradox could have two potential resolutions. First, the timescale of Hebbian plasticity, as captured by recent plasticity models fit directly to data from slice experiments [28,35,36,37•,38], may overestimate the rate of plasticity that actually occurs *in vivo*. This overestimate could arise from differences in slice and *in vivo* preps, or because complex nonlinear synaptic dynamics, both present in biological synapses and useful in learning and memory [39–41], are missing in most, but not all [42–44], data-driven models. While slow plasticity may be a realistic possibility in cortical areas exhibiting plastic changes over days [45,46], it may not be a realistic resolution in other areas, like the hippocampus, which must rapidly encode new episodic information [47,48]. The second potential resolution to the paradoxical separation of timescales between Hebbian and homeostatic plasticity may be the existence of as yet unidentified rapid compensatory processes (RCPs) that stabilize Hebbian learning. Below, we explore both the theoretical utility and potential neurobiological instantiations of these putative RCPs.

The temporal paradox of Hebbian and homeostatic plasticity

To understand the theoretical necessity for RCPs to stabilize Hebbian plasticity, it is useful to view a diversity of synaptic learning models through the unifying lens of control theory (Figure 2a). Here we can view the 'fire together, wire together' interplay of neuronal activity and Hebbian synaptic plasticity as an unstable dynamical system. Also, we can view a compensatory process as a feedback controller that observes some aspect of either neuronal activity or synaptic strength, and uses this observation to compute a feedback control signal which then directly affects synaptic strength so as to stabilize global circuit activity. Indeed homeostatic plasticity is often thought of as a negative feedback control process [23,24•,49,50]. In general, the delay in any feedback control loop must be fast relative to the time-scale over which the unstable system exhibits run-away activity [51]. If the loop is slightly slow, the run-away will start before the stabilizing feedback arrives, generating oscillations within the system. In some cases, if the loop is even slower, the unstable runaway process might escape before stabilization is even possible (Figure 2b).

Such oscillations and run-away are demonstrated in Figure 3 for several compensatory mechanisms with feedback timescales that are chosen to be too slow, including the Bienenstock–Cooper–Munro (BCM) rule [6•,52], and triplet spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) [36] with either synaptic scaling [13,53] or a metaplastic sliding threshold, as stabilizing controllers. For example, the BCM rule (Figure 3a) can be thought of as a feedback control system where the controller observes a recent average of the postsynaptic output firing

Figure 2

A control theoretic view of homeostatic plasticity and Hebbian learning. **(a)** The coupled dynamics of Hebbian plasticity and neural activity constitutes an unstable dynamical system. Homeostatic plasticity, and more generally any compensatory mechanism, can be viewed as a controller that observes aspects of neuronal activity and synaptic strengths, and uses these observations to compute a feedback control signal that acts on synaptic dynamics so as to stabilize circuit properties. **(b)** The cart pole problem is a simple example of stabilizing a non-linear dynamical system with feedback. The task of the controller is to exert horizontal forces on the cart to maintain the rod ($m = 1$ kg) in an upright position. For simplicity we assume a weightless cart with no spatial constraints on the length of the track. The controller has access to an exponential average (time constant τ) over recent observations of both the angle θ and angular velocity $\dot{\theta}$ of the pole. For small values of τ the controller can successfully maintain the rod upright ($\theta \approx 0$; top panel). However, as τ and the associated time lag in the observed quantities gets larger, oscillations arise (middle panel) and eventually the system becomes unstable (bottom panel).

rate of a neuron, and uses this information to control both the sign and amplitude of associative plasticity; if the recent average is high (low), plasticity is modulated to be anti-Hebbian (Hebbian). However, to achieve stability, the BCM controller must average recent output-activity over a short enough time-scale to modulate plasticity before this activity itself runs away (Figure 3a; [11,31[•],32[•]]). This result is not limited to BCM like rate models, but applies equally to STDP models which rely on similar metaplasticity processes to ensure stability (Figure 3bc; [31[•],36,37[•],54]). These modified STDP rules can be thought of as employing feedback controllers which also observe a recent average of output firing rate, but use this information to modulate the STDP window, thereby stabilizing the system by changing relative rates of long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depression (LTD).

Another class of models relies on re-normalization of afferent synaptic weights to stabilize Hebbian plasticity. We distinguish between models with instantaneous algorithmic re-normalization of the weights [4[•],5,7[•],55[•]] and models which proportionally scale synaptic weights in an activity dependent way [8,31[•],56]. In the former case the controller observes total synaptic strength and uses this information to adjust synapses to keep this total strength constant. In the latter case, the controller observes neuronal firing rate, or recent average thereof, and uses this information to proportionally adjust afferent synaptic weights to enforce either a specified target output, or a

total synaptic strength. Just as in the case of metaplasticity discussed above, the temporal average of the activity sensor has to be computed over a short timescale, related to the timescale over synaptic strengths and neuronal activity change, to ensure stability (Figure 3d [31[•],32[•],33]). Moreover, the rate at which the synaptic scaling process itself causes synaptic strengths to scale must be finely tuned to a narrow parameter regime that is neither too fast nor too slow [31[•],32[•],33,53]; if too slow, then stabilization is not possible, while if too fast, the stabilization process overshoots, causing oscillations.

Finally, some STDP models can be intrinsically stable, especially in feedforward circuits. One example are pair-based STDP models in which the integral of the STDP window is slightly biased toward depression. When weights are additionally limited by hard bounds, this can lead to bimodal weight distributions and firing rate stabilization [9,57]. However, these learning rules typically require fine-tuning and become unstable when input correlations are non-negligible. Other stable models arise from a weight dependence in the learning rule such that high (low) synaptic strength makes LTP (LTD) weaker [53,58–62]. Such a stabilizing weight dependence is advantageous because it can lead to more plausible unimodal weight distributions as observed empirically [60,62]. However, the unimodal weight distribution, by precluding multi-stability in the configurations of synaptic strengths, typically leads to

Current Opinion in Neurobiology

Instability in different plasticity models. **(a)** Unstable oscillations in the BCM model for a simple feed-forward circuit [6•,11]. Model: $\tau_w \frac{dw}{dt} = \alpha v_{in} v_{out}(v_{out} - \beta \bar{v}_{out}^2)$, $\tau_c \frac{d}{dt} \bar{v}_{out} = v_{out} - \bar{v}_{out}$ with $v_{out} = w v_{in}$, $\tau_w = 0.9\tau_c$, $v_{in} \equiv 1$ in arbitrary units (a.u.) and α and β are dimensionful scalar constants that ensure correct units; we take simply $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Here $\bar{v}_{out}$ can be thought of as the observation of a controller, corresponding to an average of output neuronal activity v_{out} over time-scale τ_c. Moreover, the multiplicative term in parenthesis in the weight dynamics can be interpreted as a control signal that modulates both the sign and amplitude of associative plasticity, dictating a stabilizing anti-Hebbian rule if the recent average $\bar{v}_{out}$ is too large. If the control dynamics τ_c is too slow relative to the synaptic plasticity dynamics τ_w, unstable oscillations arise. **(b–d)** Runaway activity in a recurrent neural network simulation consisting of 25 000 excitatory and inhibitory integrate-and-fire neurons and plastic excitatory synapses using a minimal triplet STDP model [36] with different homeostatic mechanisms such as sliding threshold metaplasticity (violet) and synaptic scaling (green), both described in detail in [31•]. (b) Population firing rate as a function of time. (c,d) Raster plot of spiking activity. The bottom 3 groups of 100 neurons received rate modulated spiking input with 100ms correlation time constant to emulate sensory input to a small set of neurons. The timescale of sliding threshold metaplasticity was τ_c = 3 min. The timescale for the rate detector and the scaling dynamics for synaptic scaling were τ_c = 10 s and τ_{scl} = 1 hour respectively. Because of these slow stabilization dynamics, the fast interplay between Hebbian plasticity and recurrent network dynamics leads to rapid population firing rate destabilization within 10–20 s for both learning rules.

the rapid erasure of synaptic memory traces in the presence of background activity driving plasticity [61,63]. Moreover, when such weight dependent synaptic learning rules are embedded in a recurrent neuronal circuit without any additional control mechanisms, they can succumb to runaway neural activity as experience dependent neural correlations emerge in the recurrent circuit [61,64,65].

In summary, empirical findings and control-theoretic considerations suggest that compensatory mechanisms capable of stabilizing Hebbian plasticity must operate on tightly constrained timescales. In practice, such compensatory mechanisms must act on similar or even faster timescales than Hebbian plasticity itself [31•,32•,36,37•,54,55•,56]. STDP, as one of the most common manifestations of Hebbian plasticity in the brain, can be induced in a matter of seconds to minutes [25–27,66,67]. Homeostatic plasticity, on the other hand, acts on much longer timescales of hours to days [14,16,19,29,68–70]. This separation of timescales poses a temporal paradox as it renders most data-driven STDP models unstable [3,71]. In spiking network models, this instability has severe consequences (Figure 3b–d); it precludes the emergence of stable synaptic structures or memory engrams [31•,61,64], unless the underlying plasticity models are augmented by RCPs [31•,55•,56,72,73•]. Overall, these considerations suggest that one or more RCPs exist in neurobiological systems, which are missing in current plasticity models.

Putative rapid compensatory processes
What putative RCPs could augment Hebbian plasticity with the requisite stability and competition? Here we focus on several possibilities, operating at either the network, the neuronal or the dendritic level (Figure 4a). However, we note that these possibilities are by no means exhaustive.

At the network level, recurrent or feedforward synaptic inhibition could influence and potentially stabilize plasticity at excitatory synapses directly. For instance, [74] demonstrated via dynamic-clamp that a simulated increase in total excitatory and inhibitory background conductance, which could originate from elevated levels of network activity, rapidly reduces the amplitude of LTP, but not LTD, of the STDP window. This rapid effect may be mediated through changes in calcium dynamics in dendritic spines and could constitute an RCP. Another study [75] showed that global inhibition in a rate-based network model is sufficient to stabilize plasticity at excitatory synapses with a sliding presynaptic and fixed postsynaptic plasticity threshold. Finally, using a model-based approach, Wilmes *et al.* [76] have proposed that dendritic inhibition could exert binary switch-like control over plasticity by gating back-propagating action potentials.

Other modeling studies have suggested a role for inhibitory synaptic plasticity (ISP) [77,78], instead of

Figure 4

(a) Schematic representation of the many potential loci of rapid compensatory processes. **(b)** Example of a plastic network model displaying attractor dynamics in three distinct cell assemblies. Because these dynamics outlast the stimulus that triggers them they have been considered as neural substrate for working memory. The top panel shows a spike raster, whereas the bottom panel shows the population firing rates of the three cell assemblies. This particular model uses an augmented triplet STDP learning rule (cf. Figure 3) in which heterosynaptic plasticity and single-synapse-level plasticity have been added as stabilizing RCPs. Moreover, this model relies on a slow form of inhibitory plasticity which normalizes the overall network activity and ensures that cell assemblies do not grow indefinitely over time by recruiting additional neurons. This provides a proof of principle that a biologically inspired learning rule can indeed be stabilized by a sensible combination of RCPs, whereas the same learning rule endowed with slow compensatory mechanisms leads to run-away dynamics (cf. Figure 3b–d). Figure adapted from Zenke *et al.* [73].

non-plastic inhibition, in stabilizing Hebbian plasticity. It has been suggested, for instance, that ISP in conjunction with a fixed plasticity threshold at the excitatory synapse could have a similar effect as the sliding threshold in the BCM model [79]. Finally, in some experiments excitatory and inhibitory plasticity are not integrated as independent events, but can influence each other. For instance, there are cases in which induction of ISP alone can flip the sign of subsequent plasticity at excitatory synapses [80]. While inhibition and ISP may act as RCPs, a clear picture of how these elements tie together has not yet emerged. Further experimental and theoretical work is required to understand their potential for acting as RCPs.

Neuromodulation may also play an important role in stabilizing plasticity. Neuromodulators have been implicated in both homeostatic signalling [21] and in gating the expression of synaptic plasticity [81–84]. However, to successfully serve as RCP, neuromodulatory mechanisms have to either drive rapid compensatory changes directly, or substantially reduce the average rate of Hebbian plasticity *in vivo* to enable slower forms of homeostatic plasticity to preserve stability. While a detailed account of the role of neuromodulators goes beyond the scope of this article (but see [84,85] for reviews), here we note that

several neuromodulators at least partially meet one of these core requirements for RCPs. For example, nitric oxide (NO), which is involved in synaptic homeostasis and plasticity [86], is released in response to increased NMDA activity and decays within some tens of seconds [87]. Because cell membranes are permeable to NO, the molecule diffuses rapidly and thus could potentially act as a fast proxy of bulk neuronal activity that can be read out locally [88]. Similarly, dopaminergic transmission can be fast [89] and is known to affect induction, consolidation and possibly maintenance of synaptic long-term plasticity [82,84,90–92]. A sensible gating strategy implemented by dopamine or other neuromodulators could result in a drastically reduced and more manageable average rate of plasticity *in vivo*. In contrast, *in vitro* such neuromodulatory mechanisms might be disengaged, thus potentially creating less natural and much faster plasticity rates compared to *in vivo*. Apart from the neuromodulatory system, recent work has highlighted the complexity of the local interactions between astrocytes and synaptic plasticity which may also act as RCPs [93–95]. However, to unequivocally answer which aspects of neuromodulation and glial interactions constitute suitable RCPs will require further experimental and theoretical work.

A more well studied possibility for an RCP is heterosynaptic plasticity, which operates at the level of individual neurons or potentially dendritic branches. Heterosynaptic plasticity refers to a non input-specific change at *other* synapses onto a neuron that are not directly activated [30,96,97,98[•],99[•]]. Its viability as putative RCP arises from the fact that some forms of heterosynaptic plasticity can be induced rapidly, and moreover, similar to synaptic scaling, can show aspects of weight normalization [97]. For instance, a rapid form of heterosynaptic plasticity, in which neuronal bursting causes bi-directional weight-dependent changes in afferent synapses, has been observed recently [98[•],100[•]]. While the observed weight-dependence is reminiscent of Oja's rule [8], as strong synapses weaken, it is not identical because weak synapses can also strengthen. Nevertheless, this form of heterosynaptic plasticity has been shown to prevent runaway of LTP in models of feedforward circuits [30] and has been demonstrated to co-occur with Hebbian plasticity in experiments [100[•]].

Recently, the utility in stabilizing runaway LTP has also been demonstrated in a recurrent network model of spiking neurons [73], in which a similarly burst dependent form of heterosynaptic plasticity is crucial to ensure stable formation and recall of Hebbian cell assemblies (Figure 4b). Moreover, the work suggests a potential role of heterosynaptic plasticity in triggering the reversal of LTP and LTD [101].

At the level of dendritic branches, a recently described form of structural heterosynaptic plasticity [99[•]], involves local dendritic competition between synapses. Specifically, glutamate induced structural synaptic potentiation of a set of clustered dendritic spines causes shrinkage of nearby, but unstimulated spines. Interestingly, even when structural potentiation was switched off through inhibition of Ca^{2+}/calmodulin dependent protein kinase II (CaMKII), the heterosynaptic effect persists, suggesting a model in which spines send and receive shrinkage signals instead of competing for limited resources. Moreover, the observed dendritic locality is consistent with work on local or branch specific conservation of total synaptic conductance [97,102].

Finally, in some cases heterosynaptic plasticity might not actually be heterosynaptic, as it may still depend on low levels of spontaneous synaptic activity in unstimulated synapses [103]. A recent biophysical model derived from synaptic plasticity data [104[•]] actually requires such low-levels of activity to match the data. Interestingly, this model suggests such 'heterosynaptic' plasticity could arise as a consequence of a rapid (timescale ~12 s) homeostatic sliding threshold possibly related to autophosphorylation of CaMKII.

While heterosynaptic plasticity, like synaptic scaling, can have a stabilizing effect, it is distinct from synaptic scaling in two ways. First, heterosynaptic plasticity need not multiplicatively scale all weights in the same manner. Second, it is unclear whether heterosynaptic plasticity in general drives neuronal activity variables to a specific set point, like synaptic scaling does [24[•]]. Thus, while heterosynaptic plasticity has the rapidity to act as a putative RCP, its functional utility in storing memories requires further empirical and theoretical study, as it may lack the ability to precisely preserve ratios of synaptic strengths. However, its clear functional utility in preventing instability (Figure 3d), along with even an approximate preservation in ratios of strengths, could potentially endow the interaction of heterosynaptic plasticity and Hebbian learning with the ability to stably learn and remember memories. Further network modeling, building on promising heterosynaptic plasticity models [30,73[•],104[•]], could be highly instructive in elucidating the precise properties, beyond rapidity, a putative RCP must obey in order to provide appropriate competition and stability to Hebbian plasticity.

Conclusion

The trinity of Hebbian plasticity, competition and stability are presumed to be crucial for effective learning and memory. However, a detailed theoretical and empirical understanding of how these diverse elements conspire to functionally shape neurobiological circuits is still missing. Here we have focused on one striking difference between existing models and neurobiology: the paradoxical separation of timescales between Hebbian and homeostatic plasticity. In models, such a separation of timescales typically leads to instability, unless plasticity is constrained by RCPs that act much faster than observed forms of homeostatic plasticity. In principle, RCPs could be implemented at various spatial scales. Here we have primarily discussed different forms of heterosynaptic plasticity and processes involving synaptic inhibition as possible candidates. However, rapid processes involving neuromodulation, glial interactions, or intrinsic plasticity [105–108] could also constitute RCPs. Thus, identifying the key neurobiological processes that provide stability and competition to Hebbian learning rules remains an important direction for future research.

Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

Acknowledgements

References and recommended reading
Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review,

have been highlighted as:

• of special interest

1. Hebb DO: *The Organization of Behavior: A Neuropsychological Theory*. New York: Wiley & Sons; 1949.

2. Shatz CJ: **The developing brain**. *Sci Am* 1992, **267**:60-67 http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-developing-brain/.

3. Abbott LF, Nelson SB: **Synaptic plasticity: taming the beast**. *Nat Neurosci* 2000, **3**:1178-1183 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/81453 ISSN: 1097-6256, http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v3/n11s/full/nn1100_1178.html.

4. Rochester N, Holland J, Haibt L, Duda W: **Tests on a cell**
• **assembly theory of the action of the brain, using a large digital computer**. *IEEE Trans Inf Theory* 1956, **2**:80-93 http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1956.1056810 ISSN: 0096-1000.
Of historical interest as probably the earliest modeling study — the authors show that Hebbian LTP needs to be complemented by two mechanisms: (i) LTD formulated as an early version of a covariance rule and (ii) and a rapid heterosynaptic mechanism formulated as normalization of the sum over all weights of afferent synapses.

5. von der Malsburg C: **Self-organization of orientation sensitive cells in the striate cortex**. *Kybernetik* 1973, **14**:85-100 ISSN: 0023-5946.

6. Bienenstock E, Cooper L, Munro P: **Theory for the development**
• **of neuron selectivity: orientation specificity and binocular interaction in visual cortex**. *J Neurosci* 1982, **2**:32-48 In: http://www.jneurosci.org/cgi/content/abstract/2/1/32.
This classic modeling paper for metaplasticity via a sliding threshold between LTP and LTD links thorough mathematical analysis to experimental data available at that time.

7. Miller KD, MacKay DJ: **The role of constraints in Hebbian**
• **learning**. *Neural Comput* 1994, **6**:100-126.
A careful and transparent mathematical study on the role of synaptic constraints in Hebbian learning.

8. Oja E: **Simplified neuron model as a principal component analyzer**. *J Math Biol* 1982, **15**:267-273 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00275687 ISSN: 0303-6812, http://www.springerlink.com/content/u9u6120r003825u1/abstract/.

9. Kempter R, Gerstner W, van Hemmen J: **Hebbian learning and spiking neurons**. *Phys Rev E* 1999, **59**:4498-4514 http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.59.4498 ISSN: 1063-651X, 1095-3787, http://infoscience.epfl.ch/record/97790.

10. Song S, Miller KD, Abbott LF: **Competitive Hebbian learning through spike-timing-dependent synaptic plasticity**. *Nat Neurosci* 2000, **3**:919-926 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/78829 In: http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v3/n9/full/nn0900_919.html.

11. Cooper LN, Intrator N, Blais BS, Shouval HZ: *Theory of Cortical Plasticity*. New Jersey: World Scientific; 2004978-981-238-746-2.

12. Brito CSN, Gerstner W: **Nonlinear Hebbian learning as a unifying principle in receptive field formation**. *PLOS Comput Biol* 2016, **12**:e1005070 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005070 ISSN: 1553-7358, http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005070.

13. Turrigiano GG, Leslie KR, Desai NS, Rutherford LC, Nelson SB: **Activity-dependent scaling of quantal amplitude in neocortical neurons**. *Nature* 1998, **391**:892-896 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/36103 ISSN: 0028-0836.

14. Turrigiano GG: **The self-tuning neuron: synaptic scaling of excitatory synapses**. *Cell* 2008, **135**:422-435 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.10.008 ISSN: 0092-8674, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0092867408012981.

15. Abraham WC, Bear MF: **Metaplasticity: the plasticity of synaptic plasticity**. *Trends Neurosci* 1996, **19**:126-130 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236(96)80018-X ISSN: 0166-2236, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016622369680018X.

16. Abraham WC: **Metaplasticity: tuning synapses and networks for plasticity**. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2008, **9**:387 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn2356 ISSN: 1471-003X, http://www.nature.com/nrn/journal/v9/n5/abs/nrn2356.html.

17. Davis GW: **Homeostatic control of neural activity: from phenomenology to molecular design**. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2006, **29**:307-323 http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.28.061604.135751.

18. Marder E, Goaillard J-M: **Variability, compensation and homeostasis in neuron and network function**. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2006, **7**:563-574 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn1949 ISSN: 1471-003X, http://www.nature.com/nrn/journal/v7/n7/abs/nrn1949.html.

19. Rabinowitch I, Segev I: **Two opposing plasticity mechanisms pulling a single synapse**. *Trends Neurosci* 2008, **31**:377-383 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2008.05.005 ISSN: 0166-2236, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166223608001483.

20. Turrigiano G: **Too many cooks? Intrinsic and synaptic homeostatic mechanisms in cortical circuit refinement**. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2011, **34**:89-103 http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-060909-153238.

21. Turrigiano GG: **Homeostatic synaptic plasticity: local and global mechanisms for stabilizing neuronal function**. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 2012, **4**:a005736 http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a005736 ISSN: 1943-0264, http://cshperspectives.cshlp.org/content/4/1/a005736.

22. Gjorgjieva J, Drion G, Marder E: **Computational implications of biophysical diversity and multiple timescales in neurons and synapses for circuit performance**. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 2016, **37**:44-52 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2015.12.008 ISSN: 0959-4388, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959438815001865.

23. Cannon WB: *The Wisdom of the Body*. New York: Norton; 1967:. ISBN: 0-393-00205-5 978-0-393-00205-8.

24. Turrigiano GG: **The dialectic of Hebb and homeostasis**. *Philos*
• *Trans R Soc B* 2017, **372**:20160258 http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0258 ISSN: 0962-8436, 1471-2970, http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/372/1715/20160258.
A broad review of synaptic homeostatic plasticity which also addresses open questions regarding timescales of plasticity and homeostasis.

25. Markram H, Lübke J, Frotscher M, Sakmann B: **Regulation of synaptic efficacy by coincidence of postsynaptic AP and EPSP**. *Science* 1997, **275**:213-215.

26. Bi G-Q, Poo M-M: **Synaptic modifications in cultured hippocampal neurons: dependence on spike timing, synaptic strength, and postsynaptic cell type**. *J Neurosci* 1998, **18**:10464-10472 In: http://www.jneurosci.org/content/18/24/10464.abstract.

27. Zhang LI, Tao HW, Holt CE, Harris WA, Poo M-m: **A critical window for cooperation and competition among developing retinotectal synapses**. *Nature* 1998, **395**:37-44 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/25665 ISSN: 0028-0836, http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v395/n6697/abs/395037a0.html.

28. Froemke RC, Dan Y: **Spike-timing-dependent synaptic modification induced by natural spike trains**. *Nature* 2002, **416**:433-438 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/416433a ISSN: 0028-0836, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11919633.

29. Watt AJ, Desai NS: **Homeostatic plasticity and STDP: keeping a neuron's cool in a fluctuating world**. *Front Synaptic Neurosci* 2010, **2**:5 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnsyn.2010.00005 In: http://www.frontiersin.org/synaptic_neuroscience/10.3389/fnsyn.2010.00005/abstract.

30. Chen J-Y, Lonjers P, Lee C, Chistiakova M, Volgushev M, Bazhenov M: **Heterosynaptic plasticity prevents runaway synaptic dynamics**. *J Neurosci* 2013, **33**:15915-15929 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5088-12.2013 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/33/40/15915.

31. Zenke F, Hennequin G, Gerstner W: **Synaptic plasticity in neural**
• **networks needs homeostasis with a fast rate detector**. *PLoS*

Comput Biol 2013, **9**:e1003330 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003330.
Mathematical analysis of network dynamics in rate neurons indicating the need for RCP implemented through either weight normalization or meta-plastic sliding threshold.

32. Toyoizumi T, Kaneko M, Stryker MP, Miller KD: **Modeling the dynamic interaction of Hebbian and homeostatic plasticity**. *Neuron* 2014, **84**:497-510 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.09.036 ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.cell.com/article/S0896627314008940/abstract.
The authors show that the time course drop of synaptic strength observed in ocular deprivation experiments cannot be captured by a standard bcm model. Instead the authors suggest a model in which plasticity is intrinsically bistable whereas homeostasis is multiplicative

33. Yger P, Gilson M: **Models of metaplasticity: a review of concepts**. *Front Comput Neurosci* 2015:138 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2015.00138 In: *http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncom.2015.00138/full*.

34. Zenke F, Gerstner W: **Hebbian plasticity requires compensatory processes on multiple timescales**. *Philos Trans R Soc B* 2017, **372**:20160259 http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0259 ISSN: 0962-8436, 1471-2970, http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/372/1715/20160259.

35. Senn W, Markram H, Tsodyks M: **An algorithm for modifying neurotransmitter release probability based on pre- and postsynaptic spike timing**. *Neural Comput* 2001, **13**:35-67 http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089976601300014628 ISSN: 0899-7667, http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089976601300014628.

36. Pfister J-P, Gerstner W: **Triplets of spikes in a model of spike timing-dependent plasticity**. *J Neurosci* 2006, **26**:9673-9682 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1425-06.2006 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/26/38/9673.

37. Clopath C, Büsing L, Vasilaki E, Gerstner W: **Connectivity reflects coding: a model of voltage-based STDP with homeostasis**. *Nat Neurosci* 2010, **13**:344-352 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn.2479 ISSN: 1097-6256, http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v13/n3/full/nn.2479.html.
Voltage-based plasticity model with parameters extracted from experimental data (see also [104*]).

38. Graupner M, Brunel N: **Calcium-based plasticity model explains sensitivity of synaptic changes to spike pattern, rate, and dendritic location**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2012, **109**:3991-3996 http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1109359109 ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490, http://www.pnas.org/content/109/10/3991.

39. Fusi S, Drew PJ, Abbott LF: **Cascade models of synaptically stored memories**. *Neuron* 2005, **45**:599-611 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.02.001 ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15721245.

40. Lahiri S, Ganguli S: **A memory frontier for complex synapses**. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Tahoe, USA: Curran Associates, Inc.; 2013, 1034-1042 In: *http://papers.nips.cc/paper/4872-a-memory-frontier-for-complex-synapses*.

41. Benna MK, Fusi S: **Computational principles of synaptic memory consolidation**. *Nat Neurosci* 2016 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn.4401. ISSN: 1097-6256, http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nn.4401.html.

42. Clopath C, Ziegler L, Vasilaki E, Büsing L, Gerstner W: **Tag-trigger-consolidation: a model of early and late long-term-potentiation and depression**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2008, **4**:e1000248 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000248.

43. Barrett AB, Billings GO, Morris RGM, van Rossum MCW: **State based model of long-term potentiation and synaptic tagging and capture**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2009, **5**:e1000259 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000259.

44. Ziegler L, Zenke F, Kastner DB, Gerstner W: **Synaptic consolidation: from synapses to behavioral modeling**. *J Neurosci* 2015, **35**:1319-1334 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3989-14.2015 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/35/3/1319.

45. Rittenhouse CD, Shouval HZ, Paradiso MA, Bear MF: **Monocular deprivation induces homosynaptic long-term depression in visual cortex**. *Nature* 1999, **397**:347-350 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/16922 ISSN: 0028-0836, http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v397/n6717/abs/397347a0.html.

46. Rose T, Jaepel J, Hübener M, Bonhoeffer T: **Cell-specific restoration of stimulus preference after monocular deprivation in the visual cortex**. *Science* 2016, **352**:1319-1322 http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aad3358 ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203, http://science.sciencemag.org/content/352/6291/1319.

47. Nakazawa K, Sun LD, Quirk MC, Rondi-Reig L, Wilson MA, Tonegawa S: **Hippocampal CA3 NMDA receptors are crucial for memory acquisition of one-time experience**. *Neuron* 2003, **38**:305-315 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00165-X ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S089662730300165X.

48. Lee I, Kesner RP: **Differential contributions of dorsal hippocampal subregions to memory acquisition and retrieval in contextual fear-conditioning**. *Hippocampus* 2004, **14**:301-310 http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hipo.10177 ISSN: 1098-1063, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hipo.10177/abstract.

49. O'Leary T, Wyllie DJA: **Neuronal homeostasis: time for a change?** *J Physiol* 2011, **589**:4811-4826 http://dx.doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2011.210179 ISSN: 1469-7793, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1113/jphysiol.2011.210179/abstract.

50. Williams A, O'Leary T, Marder E: **Homeostatic regulation of neuronal excitability**. *Scholarpedia* 2013, **8**:1656 http://dx.doi.org/10.4249/scholarpedia.1656 ISSN: 1941-6016, http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Homeostatic_Regulation_of_Neuronal_Excitability.

51. Aström KJ, Murray RM: *Feedback Systems: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers*. Princeton University Press; 2010:. ISBN: 978-1-4008-2873-9, google-Books-ID: cdG9fNqTDS8C.

52. Udeigwe LC, Munro PW, Ermentrout GB: **Emergent dynamical properties of the BCM learning rule**. *J Math Neurosci* 2017, **7**:2 http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13408-017-0044-6 ISSN: 2190-8567, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13408-017-0044-6.

53. van Rossum MCW, Bi GQ, Turrigiano GG: **Stable Hebbian learning from spike timing-dependent plasticity**. *J Neurosci* 2000, **20**:8812-8821 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/20/23/8812.

54. Gjorgjieva J, Clopath C, Audet J, Pfister J-P: **A triplet spike-timing–dependent plasticity model generalizes the Bienenstock–Cooper–Munro rule to higher-order spatiotemporal correlations**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2011, **108**:19383-19388 http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1105933108 In: *http://www.pnas.org/content/108/48/19383.abstract*.

55. Litwin-Kumar A, Doiron B: **Formation and maintenance of neuronal assemblies through synaptic plasticity**. *Nat Commun* 2014, **5** http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6319 In: *http://www.nature.com/ncomms/2014/141114/ncomms6319/full/ncomms6319.html*.
This article demonstrates stable learning and transient recall (∼100 ms) of Hebbian cell assemblies in a recurrent network model through the combination of a plausible model of stdp with two homeostatic processes: a fast one that is implemented as a renormalization of the sum of all synaptic weights onto a given neuron every 20 ms, plus a rapid firing rate homeostasis (FRH) implemented by plasticity isp following a model by [77] (see also [73]).

56. Yger P, Harris KD: **The Convallis rule for unsupervised learning in cortical networks**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2013, **9**:e1003272 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003272.

57. Kempter R, Gerstner W, van Hemmen JL: **Intrinsic stabilization of output rates by spike-based Hebbian learning**. *Neural Comput* 2001, **13**:2709-2741 http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089976601317098501 ISSN: 0899-7667, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11705408.

58. Kistler WM, Hemmen JL: **Modeling synaptic plasticity in conjunction with the timing of pre-and postsynaptic action**

potentials. *Neural Comput* 2000, **12**:385-405 In: *http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/089976600300015844*.

59. Rubin J, Lee DD, Sompolinsky H: **Equilibrium properties of temporally asymmetric Hebbian plasticity**. *Phys Rev Lett* 2001, **86**:364-367 http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.364.

60. Gütig R, Aharonov R, Rotter S, Sompolinsky H: **Learning input correlations through nonlinear temporally asymmetric Hebbian plasticity**. *J Neurosci* 2003, **23**:3697-3714 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/23/9/3697.

61. Morrison A, Aertsen A, Diesmann M: **Spike-timing-dependent plasticity in balanced random networks**. *Neural Comput* 2007, **19**:1437-1467 http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/neco.2007.19.6.1437 ISSN: 0899-7667, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17444756.

62. Gilson M, Burkitt AN, Grayden DB, Thomas DA, Hemmen JL: **Emergence of network structure due to spike-timing-dependent plasticity in recurrent neuronal networks. I. Input selectivity–strengthening correlated input pathways**. *Biol Cybern* 2009, **101**:81-102 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00422-009-0319-4 ISSN: 0340-1200, 1432-0770, http://www.springerlink.com/content/8441p585w93u0576/.

63. Billings G, van Rossum MCW: **Memory retention and spike-timing-dependent plasticity**. *J Neurophysiol* 2009, **101**:2775-2788 http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/jn.91007.2008 In: *http://jn.physiology.org/content/101/6/2775.abstract*.

64. Kunkel S, Diesmann M, Morrison A: **Limits to the development of feed-forward structures in large recurrent neuronal networks**. *Front Comput Neurosci* 2011, **4**:160 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2010.00160 In: *http://www.frontiersin.org/Computational_Neuroscience/10.3389/fncom.2010.00160/pdf/abstract*.

65. Delattre V, Keller D, Perich M, Markram H, Muller EB: **Network-timing-dependent plasticity**. *Front. Cell. Neurosci.* 2015, **220** http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2015.00220 In: *http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncel.2015.00220/full*.

66. Bi G-q, Poo M-m: **Synaptic modification of correlated activity: Hebb's postulate revisited**. *Ann. Rev. Neurosci.* 2001, **24**:139-166.

67. Markram H, Gerstner W, Sjöström PJ: **A history of spike-timing-dependent plasticity**. *Front Synaptic Neurosci* 2011, **3**:4 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnsyn.2011.00004 In: *http://www.frontiersin.org/Synaptic_Neuroscience/10.3389/fnsyn.2011.00004/pdf/abstract*.

68. Aoto J, Nam CI, Poon MM, Ting P, Chen L: **Synaptic signaling by all-trans retinoic acid in homeostatic synaptic plasticity**. *Neuron* 2008, **60**:308-320 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.08.012 ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627308007071.

69. Ibata K, Sun Q, Turrigiano GG: **Rapid synaptic scaling induced by changes in postsynaptic firing**. *Neuron* 2008, **57**:819-826 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.02.031 ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627308002134.

70. Yee AX, Hsu Y-T, Chen L: **A metaplasticity view of the interaction between homeostatic and Hebbian plasticity**. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 2017, **372**:20160155 http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0155 ISSN: 0962-8436, 1471-2970, http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/372/1715/20160155.

71. Babadi B, Abbott LF: **Stability and competition in multi-spike models of spike-timing dependent plasticity**. *PLOS Comput Biol* 2016, **12**:e1004750 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004750 ISSN: 1553-7358, http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004750.

72. El Boustani S, Yger P, Frégnac Y, Destexhe A: **Stable learning in stochastic network states**. *J Neurosci* 2012, **32**:194-214 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2496-11.2012 In: *http://www.jneurosci.org/content/32/1/194.abstract*.

73. Zenke F, Agnes EJ, Gerstner W: **Diverse synaptic plasticity**
•   **mechanisms orchestrated to form and retrieve memories in spiking neural networks**. *Nat Commun* 2015, **6** http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7922.

Here the authors demonstrate stable learning and recall of Hebbian cell assemblies in a recurrent network model by combining a plausible stdp model with heterosynaptic and transmitter-induced plasticity which both act as RCPs to prevents runaway activity (see also [55•])

74. Delgado JY, Gomez-Gonzalez JF, Desai NS: **Pyramidal neuron conductance state gates spike-timing-dependent plasticity**. *J Neurosci* 2010, **30**:15713-15725 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3068-10.2010 ISSN: 0270-6474, http://www.jneurosci.org/cgi/doi/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3068-10.2010.

75. Lim S, McKee JL, Woloszyn L, Amit Y, Freedman DJ, Sheinberg DL, Brunel N: **Inferring learning rules from distributions of firing rates in cortical neurons**. *Nat Neurosci* 2015 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn.4158. ISSN: 1097-6256, http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nn.4158.html.

76. Wilmes KA, Sprekeler H, Schreiber S: **Inhibition as a binary switch for excitatory plasticity in pyramidal neurons**. *PLOS Comput Biol* 2016, **12**:e1004768 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004768 ISSN: 1553-7358, http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004768.

77. Vogels TP, Sprekeler H, Zenke F, Clopath C, Gerstner W: **Inhibitory plasticity balances excitation and inhibition in sensory pathways and memory networks**. *Science* 2011, **334**:1569-1573 http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1211095 In: *http://www.sciencemag.org/content/334/6062/1569.abstract*.

78. Luz Y, Shamir M: **Balancing feed-forward excitation and inhibition via Hebbian inhibitory synaptic plasticity**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2012, **8**:e1002334 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002334.

79. Clopath C, Vogels TP, Froemke RC, Sprekeler H: **Receptive field formation by interacting excitatory and inhibitory synaptic plasticity**. *bioRxiv* 2016:066589 http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/066589 In: *http://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2016/07/29/066589*.

80. Wang L, Maffei A: **Inhibitory plasticity dictates the sign of plasticity at excitatory synapses**. *J Neurosci* 2014, **34**:1083-1093 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4711-13.2014 ISSN: 0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/34/4/1083.

81. Bear MF, Singer W: **Modulation of visual cortical plasticity by acetylcholine and noradrenaline**. *Nature* 1986, **320**:172-176.

82. Frey U, Morris RGM: **Synaptic tagging: implications for late maintenance of hippocampal long-term potentiation**. *Trends Neurosci* 1998, **21**:181-188 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236(97)01189-2 ISSN: 0166-2236, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166223697011892.

83. Zhang JC, Lau PM, Bi GQ: **Gain in sensitivity and loss in temporal contrast of STDP by dopaminergic modulation at hippocampal synapses**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2009, **106**:13028-13033.

84. Pawlak V, Wickens JR, Kirkwood A, Kerr JND: **Timing is not everything: neuromodulation opens the STDP gate**. *Front Synaptic Neurosci* 2010, **2**:146 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnsyn.2010.00146 ISSN: 1663-3563, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21423532.

85. Frémaux N, Gerstner W: **Neuromodulated spike-timing-dependent plasticity, and theory of three-factor learning rules**. *Front Neural Circuits* 2016, **85** http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fncir.2015.00085 In: *http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncir.2015.00085/full*.

86. Hardingham N, Dachtler J, Fox K: **The role of nitric oxide in pre-synaptic plasticity and homeostasis**. *Front Cell Neurosci* 2013, **7**:190 http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2013.00190.

87. Crespi F, Rossetti ZL: **Pulse of nitric oxide release in response to activation of N-methyl-D-aspartate receptors in the rat striatum: rapid desensitization, inhibition by receptor antagonists, and potentiation by glycine**. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2004, **309**:462-468 http://dx.doi.org/10.1124/jpet.103.061069 ISSN: 0022-3565, 1521-0103, http://jpet.aspetjournals.org/content/309/2/462.

88. Sweeney Y, Hellgren Kotaleski J, Hennig MH: **A diffusive homeostatic signal maintains neural heterogeneity and**

responsiveness in cortical networks. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2015,
11:e1004389 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004389.

89. Schultz W: **Multiple dopamine functions at different time
courses**. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2007, **30**:259-288.

90. Gu Z, Yan Z: **Bidirectional regulation of Ca²⁺/calmodulin-
dependent protein kinase II activity by dopamine D4 receptors
in prefrontal cortex**. *Mol Pharmacol* 2004, **66**:948-955 http://
dx.doi.org/10.1124/mol.104.001404 ISSN: 0026-895X, 1521-
0111, http://molpharm.aspetjournals.org/content/66/4/948.

91. Redondo RL, Morris RGM: **Making memories last: the synaptic
tagging and capture hypothesis**. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2011, **12**:17-
30 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn2963 ISSN: 1471-003X, http://
www.nature.com/nrn/journal/v12/n1/abs/nrn2963.html.

92. Lisman J: **Glutamatergic synapses are structurally and
biochemically complex because of multiple plasticity
processes: long-term potentiation, long-term depression,
short-term potentiation and scaling**. *Philos Trans R Soc B* 2017,
372:20160260 http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0260 ISSN:
0962-8436, 1471-2970, http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/
content/372/1715/20160260.

93. Min R, Nevian T: **Astrocyte signaling controls spike timing-
dependent depression at neocortical synapses**. *Nat Neurosci*
2012, **15**:746-753 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn.3075 ISSN: 1097-
6256, http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v15/n5/full/nn.3075.
html.

94. Volterra A, Liaudet N, Savtchouk I: **Astrocyte Ca²⁺ signalling: an
unexpected complexity**. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2014, **15**:327-335
http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn3725 ISSN: 1471-003X, http://www.
nature.com/nrn/journal/v15/n5/abs/nrn3725.html.

95. De Pittà M, Brunel N, Volterra A: **Astrocytes: orchestrating
synaptic plasticity?** *Neuroscience* 2016, **323**:43-61 http://
dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.04.001 ISSN: 0306-4522,
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/
S0306452215003188.

96. Lynch GS, Dunwiddie T, Gribkoff V: **Heterosynaptic depression:
a postsynaptic correlate of long-term potentiation**. *Nature*
1977, **266**:737-739 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/266737a0 In: *http://
www.nature.com/nature/journal/v266/n5604/abs/266737a0.html*.

97. Royer S, Paré D: **Conservation of total synaptic weight through
balanced synaptic depression and potentiation**. *Nature* 2003,
422:518-522 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature01530 ISSN: 0028-
0836, http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v422/n6931/full/
nature01530.html.

98. Chistiakova M, Bannon NM, Bazhenov M, Volgushev M:
• **Heterosynaptic plasticity multiple mechanisms and multiple
roles**. *Neuroscientist* 2014, **20**:483-498 http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/
1073858414529829 ISSN: 1073-8584, 1089-4098, http://nro.
sagepub.com/content/20/5/483.
A comprehensive review of heterosynaptic plasticity in experiments and
its putative role as a RCP.

99. Oh W, Parajuli L, Zito K: **Heterosynaptic structural plasticity on
• local dendritic segments of hippocampal CA1 neurons**. *Cell
Rep* 2015, **10**:162-169 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/
j.celrep.2014.12.016 ISSN: 2211-1247, http://www.sciencedirect.
com/science/article/pii/S2211124714010456.
This article shows that when a cluster of spines is stimulated through
glutamate uncaging, which under control conditions leads to structural
growth which is presumably related to Hebbian plasticity, nearby unsti-
mulated spines shrink which corresponds to heterosynaptic depression.

100. Volgushev M, Chen J-Y, Ilin V, Goz R, Chistiakova M, Bazhenov M:
• **Partial breakdown of input specificity of STDP at individual
synapses promotes new learning**. *J Neurosci* 2016, **36**:8842-
8855 http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0552-16.2016 ISSN:
0270-6474, 1529-2401, http://www.jneurosci.org/content/36/34/
8842.
A recent experimental study with additional modelling demonstrating that
heterosynaptic plasticity co-occurs with input-specific homosynaptic
plasticity and can effectively stabilize runaway LTP.

101. Zhou Q, Tao HW, Poo M-M: **Reversal and stabilization of
synaptic modifications in a developing visual system**. *Science*
2003, **300**:1953-1957 http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1082212

In: *http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/sci;300/
5627/1953*.

102. Bourne JN, Harris KM: **Coordination of size and number of
excitatory and inhibitory synapses results in a balanced
structural plasticity along mature hippocampal CA1 dendrites
during LTP**. *Hippocampus* 2011, **21**:354-373 http://dx.doi.org/
10.1002/hipo.20768 ISSN: 1098-1063, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.
com/doi/10.1002/hipo.20768/abstract.

103. Abraham WC, Logan B, Wolff A, Benuskova L: **Heterosynaptic
LTD in the dentate gyrus of anesthetized rat requires
homosynaptic activity**. *J Neurophysiol* 2007, **98**:1048-1051
http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/jn.00250.2007 ISSN: 0022-3077, 1522-
1598, http://jn.physiology.org/content/98/2/1048.

104. Jedlicka P, Benuskova L, Abraham WC: **A voltage-based STDP
• rule combined with fast BCM-like metaplasticity accounts for
LTP and concurrent ''heterosynaptic'' LTD in the dentate
gyrus in vivo**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2015, **11**:e1004588 http://
dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004588.
A biophysical plasticity model is presented and fitted to experimental
data. Interestingly, best fits are obtained for parameters which are
suggestive of a rapid (∼10 s) sliding threshold mechanism reminiscent
of the bcm model.

105. Daoudal G, Debanne D: **Long-term plasticity of intrinsic
excitability: learning rules and mechanisms**. *Learn Mem* 2003,
10:456-465 http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/lm.64103 ISSN: 1072-0502,
1549-5485, http://learnmem.cshlp.org/content/10/6/456.

106. Sjöström P, Rancz E, Roth A, Häusser M: **Dendritic excitability
and synaptic plasticity**. *Physiol Rev* 2008, **88**:769 http://
dx.doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00016.2007 ISSN: 0031-9333, http://
scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:
Dendritic+Excitability+and+Synaptic+Plasticity#0.

107. Johnston D, Narayanan R: **Active dendrites: colorful wings of
the mysterious butterflies**. *Trends Neurosci* 2008, **31**:309-316
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2008.03.004 ISSN: 0166-2236,
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/
S0166223608001197.

108. O'Leary T, Williams A, Franci A, Marder E: **Cell types, network
homeostasis, and pathological compensation from a
biologically plausible ion channel expression model**. *Neuron*
2014, **82**:809-821 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.04.002
ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/
pii/S089662731400292X.

109. Lazar A, Pipa G, Triesch J: **SORN: a self-organizing recurrent
neural network**. *Front Comput Neurosci* 2009, **3** http://dx.doi.org/
10.3389/neuro.10.023.2009 ISSN: 1662-5188, http://www.ncbi.
nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2773171/.

110. Huang YY, Colino A, Selig DK, Malenka RC: **The influence of prior
synaptic activity on the induction of long-term potentiation**.
Science 1992, **255**:730-733 ISSN: 0036-8075..

111. Greenhill SD, Ranson A, Fox K: **Hebbian and homeostatic
plasticity mechanisms in regular spiking and intrinsic bursting
cells of cortical layer 5**. *Neuron* 2015, **88**:539-552 http://
dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.025 ISSN: 0896-6273,
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/
S0896627315008144.

112. Christie BR, Abraham WC: **Priming of associative long-term
depression in the dentate gyrus by theta frequency synaptic
activity**. *Neuron* 1992, **9**:79-84 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0896-
6273(92)90222-Y ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.sciencedirect.
com/science/article/pii/089662739290222Y.

113. Goel A, Jiang B, Xu LW, Song L, Kirkwood A, Lee H-K: **Cross-
modal regulation of synaptic AMPA receptors in primary
sensory cortices by visual experience**. *Nat Neurosci* 2006,
9:1001-1003 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn1725 ISSN: 1097-6256,
http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v9/n8/abs/nn1725.html.

114. Kaneko M, Stellwagen D, Malenka RC, Stryker MP: **Tumor
necrosis factor-α mediates one component of competitive,
experience-dependent plasticity in developing visual cortex**.
Neuron 2008, **58**:673-680 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/
j.neuron.2008.04.023 ISSN: 0896-6273, http://www.
sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627308003772.

115. Mockett B, Coussens C, Abraham WC: **NMDA receptor-mediated metaplasticity during the induction of long-term depression by low-frequency stimulation**. *Eur J Neurosci* 2002, **15**:1819-1826 http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2002.02008.x ISSN: 1460-9568, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2002.02008.x/abstract.

116. Li L, Gainey MA, Goldbeck JE, Feldman DE: **Rapid homeostasis by disinhibition during whisker map plasticity**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2014, **111**:1616-1621 http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312455111 ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490, http://www.pnas.org/content/111/4/1616.

117. Benuskova L, Abraham W: **STDP rule endowed with the BCM sliding threshold accounts for hippocampal heterosynaptic plasticity**. *J Comput Neurosci* 2007, **22**:129-133 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10827-006-0002-x ISSN: 0929-5313, http://www.springerlink.com/content/b51224m81192h232/abstract/.