Bouncing the Network: A Dynamical Systems Model of Auditory-Vestibular Interactions Underlying Infants' Perception of Musical Rhythm

A preprint is available here! https://bit.ly/2Ygu7Jg

Background

Previous work suggests that auditory-vestibular interactions, which emerge during bodily movement to music, can influence the perception of musical structure, such as the perception of accented beats in musical rhythm¹⁻³. In a seminal study on the development of musical rhythm, Phillips-Silver & Trainor (2005) found that periodic, maternal bouncing of 7-month-old infants to an unaccented rhythm influenced infants' listening preferences for accented rhythms that matched the rate of maternal bouncing, suggesting that auditoryvestibular interactions shape rhythm perception in infancy. Expanding a recent theoretical model of infant rhythm perception⁴, in the current study, we propose a dynamical systems model of auditory-vestibular interactions thought to underlie infants' listening preferences for accented rhythms. The model, featuring two neural networks of non-linear oscillators to represent developmentally nascent auditory and motor systems, was used to simulate the effect of maternal bouncing (e.g., vestibular input) on infants' listening preferences for duple- and triple-accented rhythms. First, we demonstrate that simultaneous auditoryvestibular training shaped the model's response to musical rhythm online, enhancing vestibular-related frequencies in the model's oscillatory activity. Next, we demonstrate that simultaneous auditory-vestibular training, relative to models that received auditory- or vestibular-only training, facilitated neural plasticity, producing stronger connections between network oscillators during a period of unsupervised learning. Finally, we show that models which received simultaneous auditory-vestibular training, but not models that received auditory-only or vestibular-only training, "preferred" rhythmic frequencies related to their "bouncing," resonating more strongly at frequencies related to the combined auditory-vestibular stimulation. This finding is qualitatively similar to infants' preferences for accented rhythms that matched the rate of maternal bouncing to an unaccented rhythm.







Phillips-Silver & Trainor, 2005

Methods

Model Architecture



• The model consisted of two multi-frequency oscillatory neural networks, representing developmentally nascent auditory and motor systems, with a Hebbian plasticity rule in the auditory network.

Training and Test Procedures

Network	Training Phase	Test Phase
Auditory Network		♪/♪♪♪/
Motor Network		

• Similar to the infants in Phillip-Silver & Trainor (2005), the model was trained on the unaccented rhythm (i.e., auditory input) and maternal bouncing at a duple or triple rate (i.e., vestibular input modeled as sinusoidal forcing).

The model was, then, tested only on the unaccented rhythm to ascertain whether the model preferred rhythmic frequencies related to its bouncing.

Training Stimuli



 Notation and frequency-domain representations of the (A) Unaccented Rhythm (i.e., auditory input) (B) and Duple- and Triple-Rate Maternal Bouncing (i.e., vestibular input modeled as sinusoidal forcing).

Training Regimes

Model: Training	Auditory Training	Vestibular Training
Duple-trained model	X	X
Triple-trained model	X	X
Auditory-only model	X	-
Duple-only model	-	Х
Triple-only model	-	X

• To assess the effects of combined auditory-vestibular training on the model's behavior, two models were trained on simultaneous auditory-vestibular input (e.g., duple- and tripletrained models), similar to the infants in Phillips-Silver & Trainor (2005).

To assess the independent effects of auditory or vestibular training on the model's behavior, three control models were trained on auditory-only input (e.g., auditory-only model) or vestibular-only input (e.g., duple- and triple-only models).

Parker Tichko¹, Ji Chul Kim² & Ed Large^{2,3} Department of Music, Northeastern University¹ Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut² Department of Physics, University of Connecticut³

Vestibular Input Shapes the Neural Response to Musical Rhythm Resonant Responses: Training Phase Α B Triple-Trained Model Duple-Trained Model Duple-Trained Model 1.5 Hz (Duple) Triple-Trained Model Auditory-Only Model Oscillator Natural Frequency (Hz)

(A) Training stimuli for the duple-trained, triple-trained, and auditory-only models. (B) Resonant responses in the auditory network of the duple-trained (red), triple-trained (blue), and auditory-only (green) models during the final half of the training procedure. (C) Resonant-response amplitude values that were extracted from the resonant responses in the duple-trained (red), triple-trained (blue), and auditory-only (green) models for duple-related (0.75, 1.5 Hz, marked with red asterisks), triple-related (0.5, 1 Hz, marked with blue asterisks), and the beat frequency (3 Hz). Here, the duple-trained model produced larger responses at duple-related frequencies (0.75, 1.5 Hz) relative to the other models, while the triple-trained models produced larger responses at triple-related frequencies (0.5, 1 Hz) relative to the other models, suggesting that simultaneous auditory-vestibular training enhanced oscillatory responses to musical rhythm specifically at frequencies (i.e., harmonic and subharmonic frequencies) related to the rate of vestibular input.

Auditory-Vestibular Training Facilitates Neural Plasticity



(A) Connection matrix of the dupletrained model. The duple-trained model. which was trained on an unaccented rhythm and duple-rate vestibular input, learned strong, bi-directional connections between 1.5 - 3 Hz, reflecting its rate of bouncing (1.5 Hz) and the beat level (3)Hz) of the rhythm.

(B) Connection matrix of the triple-trained model. The triple-trained model, a model trained on an unaccented rhythm and triple-rate vestibular input, exhibited more distributed learning, with bidirectional connections emerging between 0.5 - 1Hz and 1 - 3 Hz, reflecting its rate of bouncing (1 Hz) and the beat and measure level (3 Hz, 0.5 Hz, respectively) of the rhythm.

(C) The time-course of learning oscillator connections at the strongest duple-related frequencies (1.5 - 3 Hz) and triple-related frequencies (0.5 - 1 Hz). **(C, Left)** The duple-trained network learned the strongest synaptic connection between network oscillators at 1.5 and 3 Hz, across all models. (C, Right) The tripletrained network learned the strongest synaptic connection between network oscillators at 0.5 and 1 Hz, relative to all models.

Auditory-Vestibular Models Preferred Vestibular-Related Rhythmic Frequencies

(A) Resonant responses (i.e., average oscillatory activity) for the dupletrained (red), triple-trained (blue), and auditory-only (green) models during the final half of the test procedure. Here, the duple- and triple-trained models resonated strongly at frequencies related to their vestibular training in response to the unaccented rhythm, suggesting that the models preferred rhythmic frequencies related to their bouncing.

(B) Resonant-response amplitude values for all models for duple-related frequencies during the test phase. Here, the duple-trained model produced the largest resonant responses at duplerelated frequencies (0.75, 1.5 Hz; red asterisks) in response to the unaccented rhythm during the test phase, suggesting that the duple-trained model preferred rhythmic frequencies related to its bouncing.

Duple Rate Triple Rate

(C) Resonant-response amplitude values for all models for triple-related frequencies during the test phase. Here, the tripletrained model produced the largest resonant responses at triple-related frequencies (0.5, 1 Hz; blue asterisks) in response to the unaccented rhythm during the test phase, suggesting that the tripletrained model preferred rhythmic frequencies related to its bouncing.

Summary and Interpretations

- Auditory-vestibular training shaped the neural response to musical rhythm, enhancing oscillatory activity at vestibular-related frequencies.
- Auditory-vestibular training facilitated neural plasticity, producing stronger connections between oscillators, relative to auditory- or vestibular-only training.
- Auditory-vestibular training engendered a preference in the model for vestibular-related rhythmic frequencies:
- Similar to infants' preference for accented rhythms that matched the rate of maternal bouncing (Phillips-Silver & Trainor, 2005).

Future Directions

- Towards a general framework of rhythm development using Neural Resonance Theory^{4,5}.
- Model the effects of short- and long-term training on rhythm perception-action⁶
- Model tempo preferences across the lifespan⁷
- Implement multiple timescales of learning into the model

References

- 1. Phillips-Silver, J., & Trainor, L. J. (2005). Feeling the Beat: Movement Influences Infant Rhythm Perception. Science (New York, N.Y.), 308(5727), 1430.
- 2. Phillips-Silver, J., & Trainor, L. J. (2007). Hearing what the body feels: auditory encoding of rhythmic movement. Cognition, 105(3), 533–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2006.11.006
- 3. Phillips-Silver, J., & Trainor, L. J. (2008). Vestibular influence on auditory metrical interpretation.
- Brain and Cognition, 67(1), 94–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2007.11.007 4. Tichko, P., & Large, E. W. (2019). Modeling infants' perceptual narrowing to musical rhythms: neural oscillation and Hebbian plasticity. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences,
- 1453(1), 125–139. 5. Large, E., Herrera, J., & Velasco, M. (2015). Neural Networks for Beat Perception in Musical Rhythm. Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience, 9(November), 159.
- 6. Zhao, T. C., & Kuhl, P. K. (2016). Musical intervention enhances infants' neural processing of temporal structure in music and speech. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 201603984.
- 7. Drake, C., Jones, M. R., & Baruch, C. (2000). The development of rhythmic attending in auditory sequences: attunement, referent period, focal attending. Cognition, 77(3), 251–288.

Model Equations

Intrinsic Dynamics

$$\operatorname{Time-}_{(1a)}\tau_{1i}\dot{z}_{1i} = z_{1i}\left(\alpha + i2\pi + \beta_1|z_{1i}|^2 + \frac{\beta_2|z_{1i}|^4}{1 - |z_{1i}|^2}\right) + x(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} c_{ij} z_{1j}^{k_{ij}} \bar{z}_{1i}^m$$

(1b)
$$\tau_{2i}\dot{z}_{2i} = z_{2i}\left(\alpha + i2\pi + \beta_1|z_{2i}|^2 + \frac{\beta_2|z_{2i}|^4}{1 - |z_{2i}|^2}\right) + y(t)$$

Equations (1a, 1b) describe the dynamics of neural oscillators in the auditory (1a) and motor networks (1b). Here, z_{1i} and z_{2i} are complex-valued state variables whose real part represents the excitatory activity and whose imaginary part represents the inhibitory activity of the *i*th neural oscillator in the auditory network, 1, and motor network, 2, respectively. The natural frequencies of the *i*th oscillator in the auditory network, 1, and motor network, 2, is given by $f_{1i} = 1/\tau_{1i}$ and $f_{2i} = 1/\tau_{2i}$, respectively. When $\beta_1 < 0$, the endogenous activity of network oscillators is governed by the α parameter, where $\alpha_c = 0$ is the critical point. For $\alpha < 0$, the network oscillators will exhibit damped oscillation, while for $\alpha > 0$, the network oscillators will spontaneously oscillate via an Andronov-Hopf bifurcation. The *βs* reflect nonlinear damping parameters. Finally, *c_{ii}* represents input from the synaptic connection between the ith oscillator to the ith oscillator in the auditory network that are in a mode-locked relationship (i.e., *k:m* integer-ratio relationships), while *d_{ii}* represents oscillatory input from efferent connections that connect the motor network to the auditory network. x(t) and y(t) are time-varying inputs to the auditory and motor network, which reflect a musical rhythm and maternal bouncing. respectively.

Hebbian Learning Dynamics Between Mode-Locked Oscillators

(2)
$$\tau \dot{c}_{ij} = c_{ij} \left(\lambda_1 + \mu_1 |c_{ij}|^2 + \frac{\epsilon_c \mu_2 |c_{ij}|^4}{1 - \epsilon_c |c_{ij}|^2} \right) + \kappa \sqrt{\epsilon_c}^{k_{ij} + m_{ij} - 2}$$

Equation (2) describes the dynamics of Hebbian learning in the auditory network of the model. Here, c_{ii} is a complex variable that represents the amplitude and phase of the synaptic connection between the *i*th and *i*th oscillator in the auditory network. The parameters λ , μ 1, μ 2, κ , and ε_c determine the dynamics of the plasticity for oscillators that are near resonant frequency relationships, $m_{ij}f_i = k_{ij}f_i$. The unsubscripted t represents the global learning timescale. We set t to a small value (i.e., faster timescale) to simulate short-term plasticity thought to arise from auditory-vestibular training.

UCONN | UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Varying Input and Oscillator Connections

 $z_i^{m_{ij}} \overline{z}_j^{k_{ij}}$