

BACKGROUND

- What mechanisms allow the brain to rapidly shift between different cognitive processes and maintain a balance between the stability necessary to support ongoing behavior and the flexibility necessary to adapt to new exigencies?
- Cognitive performance appears to be supported by large-scale, dynamic changes in functional brain connectivity [1,2].
- Neuromodulatory actions of norepinephrine (NE) may help facilitate these changes [3,4].
- Here we probed the relationship between NE and network dynamics within an exploration/exploitation task, a type of task that is known to induce changes in NE activity as measured by pupil diameter [5].

HYPOTHESES

METHODS

Both more *integrated* brain network states and moderate NE activity facilitate focused task performance (*exploitation*), while less integrated states and high NE activity lead to distraction/error (*exploration*) [2, 6]. Therefore we expect:

- Across blocks, average baseline pupil diameter will be associated with less integration between modules.
- Within blocks, network integration will be correlated with behavior (exploitative vs. exploratory) and pupil diameter.

Subjects

N=9 completed 4 fMRI runs (80 trials/run) of an isoluminant version of the Leapfrog bandit task [7] while undergoing continuous pupillometry

Leapfrog Bandit



A simplified bandit task

- Two armed
- Deterministic reward Options "take turns" being the best, changing based on underlying P_{flip} Goal: Always choose the option that is currently the best. This requires balancing *exploration* and
- Fixed distance between options

- exploitation.
- Two Block types: Low volatility (P_{flin}) = 0.05), High volatility ($P_{flip} = 0.20$) Volatility level alternates between runs, order counterbalanced across
- subject

Network Construction



Arousal-induced changes in functional brain networks during exploration and exploitation

Nathan Tardiff, Danielle S. Bassett, & Sharon L. Thompson-Schill

RESULTS

Task Performance





Exploratory choice

Subjects are sensitive to volatility condition, demonstrating increased exploration in high volatility vs. low volatility blocks (t(8) = 3.11, p = .01)

However the exploration difference is less than might be expected given the volatility difference (mean # of flips: $M_{low} = 3.72$ (1.18), $M_{high} = 14.67$ (2.87), t(8) = 10.71, p < .001).



Pupil-linked Arousal

Explore vs. Exploit Trials

Post-choice pupil dilation (max deviation from pre-trial baseline) is reliably larger on explore trials than exploit trials ($M_{explore} =$ 0.45 (0.16), $M_{\text{exploit}} = 0.32$ (0.09), t(8) = 4.27, p = .003).



Block-level arousal

- High volatility blocks have higher average baseline pupil diameter than low volatility blocks, but this difference failed to reach significance (t(8) = 0.56, p = .59).
- Our block-level arousal manipulation does not yet show success, possibly due to the very small difference in exploratory choice between conditions.

0 0.05 9 -0.05

2.15

-0.2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for this research was provided by NIH grant #R01DC009209.





Peri-explore Pupil

Baseline pupil diameter (reflecting tonic NE activity) falls in the 3 trials preceding exploration (*F*(1,8) = 21.48, *p* = .002), rises over the 3 trials centered on exploration (*F*(1,8) = 16.66, *p* = .004), and falls over the 3 trials following exploration (F(1,8) =12.37, p = .008).

• This pattern is confirmed by an overall cubic trend (F(1,8) = 16.72, p = .003).



CONTACT

Thompson-Schill Lab >> ntardiff@sas.upenn.edu



Pupil-linked Arousal and Integration

Integration

Block level

- subjects (t(8) = -3.82, p = .005).



Identifiability of exploration-induced changes: The quadratic trend for peri-explore pupil is reliable at a .05 level (<math>F(1,8) = 3.75, p = .089). The apparent dip in integration around exploration is not significant.

Nonlinear effects?

- Pupil-integration correlations were computed in 20 window sliding windows, demonstrating large variance across all data [M = .03 (0.48)].
- Block-wise average correlations are related
- to average baseline pupil diameter (r = -.37).
- This relationship is reliable across subjects (t(8) = -2.83, p = .02).

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- pupil diameter at the block level.

- Braun et al. (2015). PNAS.
- Medaglia, Lynall, & Bassett (2015 Neurosci.
- Eldar, Cohen, & Niv (2013). Nat.
- Shine et al. (2016). *Neuron*.





We replicate the pupil responses to exploratory choice found in [5]. We confirm our prediction of decreased integration with increasing baseline

Within block, there is a nonsignificant dip in integration during exploration. This effect may not be robust due to a potential nonlinear relationship

between integration and pupil diameter that appears dependent on baseline pupil diameter. Our window size may also be too large.

Overall, these results support a role for NE in brain network reconfiguration.

REFERENCES

5). J. Cog. 6	5. 5.	Jepma & Nieuwenhuis (2011). J. Cog. Neurosci. Aston-Jones & Cohen (2005). Annu. Rev.
Neurosci. 7	7.	<i>Neurosci.</i> Knox et al. (2012). <i>Front. Psychol.</i>