Published in final edited form as:

Cortex. 2015 November ; 72: 168–178. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2015.07.007.

Specificity of V1-V2 Orientation Networks in the Primate Visual Cortex

Anna W. Roe¹ [Professor] and Daniel Y. Ts'o²

¹ Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, 301 Wilson Hall, 111 21st Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37240

² Department of Neurosurgery, SUNY-Upstate Medical University, 750 East Adams St
Neurosurgery / IHP 4111, Syracuse, NY 13210, Tel: 315-464-5531, FAX: 315-464-5504,
dan@tsolab.org

Abstract

The computation of texture and shape involves integration of features of various orientations. Orientation networks within V1 tend to involve cells which share similar orientation selectivity. However, emergent properties in V2 require the integration of multiple orientations. We now show that, unlike interactions within V1, V1-V2 orientation interactions are much less synchronized and are not necessarily orientation dependent. We find V1-V2 orientation networks are of two types: a more tightly synchronized, orientation-preserving network and a less synchronized orientation-diverse network. We suggest that such diversity of V1-V2 interactions underlies the spatial and functional integration required for computation of higher order contour and shape in V2.

INTRODUCTION

Orientation networks within V1 are embodied within horizontal networks of anatomical patches (Malach et al 1993, Sincich & Blasdel 2001) whose cells share similar orientation selectivity (Ts'o et al 1986). Such networks are viewed as the first step towards the generation of visual object shape recognition. Area V2 is distinguished from V1 by its generation of higher properties that enable it to encode orientation selectivity independent of specific inducing cue orientation or cue type. These inferred contours include occluded contours or illusory contours (von der Heydt & Peterhans 1989, Ramsden et al 2001, Ramsden et al 2013), motion contrast borders (Lu et al 2008, Malte, Chen et al 2013), disparity capture borders (Bakin et al 2000), texture borders (Merigan et al 1993), and borders inferred from colinearity or other complex shapes (Gilert, Hegde & Van Essen 2000, Gilad et al, 2012). Furthermore, some higher order orientation selective cells are specific to

Correspondence should be addressed to AWR , (615) 343-0901 phone (615) 343-8449 fax, anna.roe@vanderbilt.edu, <https://my.vanderbilt.edu/annaroe/>.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

cue type (e.g. illusory contours), whereas others appear to be invariant across different types of cues (e.g. orientation tuned regardless of inducer cue type) (Ramsden et al 2014). These emergent contour recognition properties in area V2 suggest an integration, either directly or indirectly, across multiple oriented inputs from V1 and a diversity of functional interactions between V1 and V2. However, to date, there is little understanding regarding the relationship of oriented responses in V1 with those in V2.

In this study, using optical imaging and cross correlation methods, we examine the functional relationships between orientation-selective cells in V1 and V2. By examining similarity of orientation selectivity and degree of receptive field overlap, we find evidence for two types of V1-V2 orientation networks. The relationship of these findings to previous anatomical and functional studies of V1-V2 connectivity is discussed.

RESULTS

Our data set consists of 76 oriented-oriented V1-V2 cell pairs (subsequently referred to as 'oriented cell pairs') identified out of entire population of 273 V1-V2 cell pairs. Cross-correlograms were computed from the stimulated activity of these cell pairs, shuffled-corrected and normalized. The distribution of peak heights was then divided into quartiles, creating four peak strength categories (0, 1, 2, 3), corresponding to flat or weak correlations (0-1), and moderate to strong correlations (2-3) (see Methods and Roe & Ts'o, 1999). Of these, 34 cell pairs were of peak strength 2-3. Numbers of cell pairs are shown in Table 1. 130 V2-V2 and 336 V1-V1 correlograms were also collected for comparison. All cell pairs included in this study were recorded on separate electrodes, and confined to the superficial cortical layers (a laminar dependence of V1/V2 correlations has been reported, Smith et al, 2013). For each correlogram, we used peak height as a measure of interaction strength, peak width as a measure to temporal dispersion of spike firing coincidence, and peak position (offset from exact coincidence 0msec) as a measure of relative V1-V2 timing.

Within the distances sampled (0-4 deg), we found no significant relationship between peak height and receptive field separation for the overall population (V1-V2 $r^2 = 0.0085$, V2-V2 $r^2 = 0.0133$) or for any of the subpopulations in this study. Thus, differences in peak characteristics were not due to effect of receptive field separation. For most analyses, we focused on correlograms with moderate to strong peaks (peak strength 2 or 3) because we could interpret the peak positions and widths of strong peaks with greater confidence.

General characteristics of V1-V2 correlograms

Figure 1 illustrates a few examples of correlograms obtained from oriented V1-V2 cell pairs. Typical of V1-V2 correlograms, they have broad peaks in comparison to V1-V1 correlograms. A range of dependencies on spatial overlap and orientation matching was observed (see Figure 1). Both cell pairs shown in Figure 1A and 1B share similar orientations and have strong peak strengths even though there is receptive field overlap in 1A but not 1B. However, receptive field overlap without matched orientation can also result in strong interaction peaks (Figure 1C). High receptive field overlap does not always predict strong correlation (Figure 1D). Thus, strong interactions between oriented cell pairs can occur with (Figure 1A, C) or without (Figure 1B) receptive field overlap and with similar

(Figure 1A, B) or different (Figure 1C) orientation selectivities. We then examined the prevalence of these characteristics within the population.

Peak Width: V1-V2 Temporal Dispersion

To measure the extent of temporal dispersion in V1-V2 interactions (that is, tightness of synchronization between two cells), we examined the peak width of the correlogram. Narrow peaks imply a smaller degree of jitter in relative spike timing, whereas broad peaks indicate a large distribution of spike coincidences.

As shown in Figure 2A, the peak widths of the V1-V2 correlograms (blue bars) are typically 5-50 msec wide (average = 28.0 msec). This is similar to the distribution of V2-V2 peak widths (red bars, mean = 21.0 msec), but is much broader than that of V1-V1 peaks (yellow bars, mean = 3.9 msec). Thus, on average V1-V2 and V2-V2 peak widths are at least several times broader than V1-V1 peak widths, indicating that V1-V2 and V2-V2 interactions are more temporally dispersed than V1-V1 interactions.

Figure 2B illustrates the peak width distribution of oriented V1-V2 correlograms. The peak widths of oriented cell pairs are similar in breadth to the overall V1-V2 population; 90% of the widths fell between 5-50 msec (oriented-oriented mean = 19.3 msec, all pairs mean = 28.0, $p < 0.002$). The primary difference is that more oriented cell pairs (39%) had narrow 5-10 msec widths than in the overall population (18%) ($p < 0.002$). Oriented V1-V2 peak widths are broader than those of V1-V1 cell pairs, and do not differ from oriented V2-V2 cell pairs (mean = 16.6 msec, $p > 0.2$, not shown).

Peak Height: Oriented Cell Pairs Have Smaller Peaks

The histology stain for cytochrome oxidase (CO) has helped define several important functional subcompartments and pathways in V1 and V2. The V1 interblob-V2 pale/thick stripe pathway has been shown to contain a prominence of non-color selective (broadband) oriented cells, whereas the V1 CO blob-V2 thin stripe pathway contains a prominence of color selective, non-oriented cells (Livingstone & Hubel, 1984; Roe & Ts'o, 1999; Roe & Ts'o, 1995; Hubel & Livingstone, 1987; Ts'o and Gilbert, 1988; Landisman & Ts'o, 2002ab; Levitt et al, 1994a). To examine whether these two parallel V1-V2 systems are distinguishable with respect to their functional interactions, we made two comparisons: oriented vs non-oriented V1-V2 cell pairs and broadband oriented vs color non-oriented V1-V2 cell pairs.

As shown in Figure 3A, oriented-oriented cell pairs (blue dots, mean width = 19.3 msec, mean height = 0.0125) had significantly narrower and smaller peaks than non-oriented/non-oriented cell pairs (pink open dots, mean width = 28.5 msec, mean height = 0.0164) (width $p < 0.008$, height $p < 0.003$). A similar dichotomy exists between broadband oriented (Figure 2B, blue dots) and color-selective non-oriented (Figure 3B, pink open dots) cell pairs (width $p < 0.02$, height $p < 0.05$). These differences in peak height and peak width are not related to differences in receptive field separation ($p > 0.1$). These results suggest that V1-V2 interactions between oriented cells are weaker than those between non-oriented cells.

Importance of Receptive Field Overlap

We previously reported that receptive field overlap is important for some classes of V1-V2 color cells but not others (Roe & Ts'o, 1999). To examine whether interactions between oriented cell pairs require receptive field overlap, we examined peak height for overlapped and non-overlapped cell pairs. We found that overlapped receptive fields ($n = 37$) had significantly stronger peaks than non-overlapped ($n = 39$) ($p < 0.001$). As shown in Figure 4A, over 70% of non-overlapped cell pairs had weak or flat correlogram peaks (Peak 0/1), while over 60% of overlapped cell pairs had moderate or strong peaks (Peak 2/3; $\chi^2(0.99) = 15.25$, $df = 3$). This dependency on receptive field overlap was not related to orientation similarity. As shown in Figure 4B, for cell pairs with matched orientation (diff = 30° , $n = 30$), non-overlapped receptive fields tended to have weak interactions (76% = 13/17) and overlapped receptive fields strong interactions (62% = 8/13) ($\chi^2(0.9) = 7.15$, $df = 3$). Similarly, for cell pairs with non-matched orientation (diff $> 30^\circ$, $n = 46$), non-overlapped receptive fields tended to have weak interactions (68% = 15/22) and overlapped receptive fields strong interactions (63% = 15/24) ($\chi^2(0.99) = 10.9$, $df = 3$). Thus, both pairs with matched orientation and those with non-matched orientation selectivity exhibit a dependency on receptive field overlap. Such dependency on receptive field overlap implies that orientation interactions between V1 and V2 occur over limited spatial extents. This is in sharp contrast to color-color interactions (Roe & Ts'o, 1999).

Peak Position

Given the hierarchical positions of V1 and V2 (Felleman & Van Essen, 1991) and their relative latency distributions (Nowak et al, 1995a; Munk et al 1995; Schroeder et al, 1998; Girard et al, 2001), one might predict a greater number or a greater strength of feedforward than feedback interactions. As shown below, this hierarchical relationship between V1 and V2 is reflected in interaction strength and not in the numbers of feedforward vs feedback interactions.

Feedforward interactions are stronger than feedback—Consistent with previous reports, the position of many V1-V2 correlogram peaks are centered on zero, indicating a significant amount of common input to V1-V2 cell pairs (Figure 5A). Peak positions of the large majority (92%) fall between -7 msec and $+7$ msec, with half (55%) falling between -2 msec and $+2$ msec. Although positive (presumptive feedforward) and negative (presumptive feedback) peak positions are equally numerous, there is a tendency for peaks with positive position (mean = 0.0158) to be stronger than those with negative (mean = 0.0129, $p < 0.025$). This distinction is even more apparent for oriented cell pairs (Fig 5B). Here, we see that the strongest peaks (peak 3) are mostly feedforward (positive position points in large gray rectangle to right). This is true for both pairs with similar orientations (3 out of 4, pink dots) and with different orientations (7 out of 9, blue dots). However, moderate sized peaks (peak 2) are mostly feedback (points in smaller gray rectangle to left). Thus, strong V1-V2 coactivation is coupled with a tendency for feedforward interactions to be stronger than feedback.

No dependence of peak height on orientation similarity—To examine whether similarity of orientation-selectivity is also a determinant of interaction strength, we

examined the matched (≤ 30 deg orientation difference) and non-matched (> 30 deg orientation difference) populations. One expectation might be that V1-V2 cell pairs with matching orientation exhibit stronger correlation peaks than non-matching cell pairs.

Contrary to expectations, as shown in Figure 5B, both orientation matched ($n = 12$) and non-matched ($n = 22$) populations exhibited a similar range of interaction strengths; there was no significant difference in their peak strengths ($p > 0.3$). Receptive field separations for matched ($n = 12$, mean = 0.6 deg, range 0.5 – 1.3 deg) and non-matched ($n = 22$, mean = 0.6, range = 0.5 - 1.3) pairs were not different ($p > 0.3$). We next asked whether, for cell pairs that have overlapped receptive fields, orientation similarity might increase interaction strength. After separating the population of overlapped cell pairs into orientation matched and non-matched groups, we found no difference in peak height distribution (matched, $n = 13$, mean = 0.0114; non-matched, $n = 24$, mean = 0.0090, $p > 0.3$). Neither did non-overlapped cell pairs, separated into orientation matched and non-matched populations, exhibit any differences in peak height (similar mean = 0.0045, different mean = 0.0056, $p > 0.05$). Thus, for either overlapping or non-overlapping oriented cell pair populations, adding the criterion of orientation similarity does not increase interaction strength as measured by peak height.

Peak position: possible difference in feedforward/feedback interaction strengths or orientation matched vs non-matched cell pairs—Another point that can be observed from Figure 5B is that for cell pairs with different orientation (blue dots), most (12 out of 13) of the moderate peak (peak 2) oriented cell pairs exhibited feedback interactions. Thus, although our sample size is limited, these comparisons suggest a dichotomy in the strength of feedforward vs feedback interactions. First, feedforward interactions (both orientation matched and non-matched) are stronger than feedback (most peak 3 pairs have positive peak positions). And second, most feedback interactions in the moderate interaction strength category (peak 2) occur between orientation non-matched cell pairs.

Peakwidth: Dependence on Orientation Matching

Although we found no difference in peak height for similarly preferring vs dissimilarly oriented cell pairs, we did find differences in peak width. As shown in Figure 6A, orientation matched cell pairs (mean = 13.1 msec, $n = 30$) had narrower peak widths than non-matched cell pairs (mean = 20.2 msec, $n = 46$) ($\chi^2(0.9) = 12.0$, $df = 7$; $p < 0.02$). This also holds for the subset of color oriented-color oriented cell pairs (Figure 6B, non-matched: $n = 23$, mean = 27.0 msec; matched: $n = 17$, mean = 11.8 msec, $p < 0.004$). Non-color selective (broadband) oriented-broadband oriented cells also showed a similar tendency (Figure 6C), but this difference did not reach significance, probably because of small sample size (All pairs: matched, $n = 8$, mean = 11.6 msec; non-matched: $n = 20$, mean = 16.8 msec, $p > 0.1$). Thus, some difference in temporal dispersion of coincidence exists between oriented cell pairs with similar and with different orientations.

DISCUSSION

Summary

We report here that oriented V1-V2 cell pairs exhibit a significant degree of specificity. In contrast to V1-V1 correlograms, V1-V2 peaks are several times broader and are not necessarily dependent on orientation similarity. In contrast to non-oriented cell pairs, V1-V2 oriented interactions are weaker and spatially dependent. Oriented V1-V2 cell pairs can further be separated into orientation-preserving and orientation-diverse networks.

Figure 7A summarizes the relative peak heights and widths of different V1-V2 cell pairs. These 'average' correlograms illustrate that, of the interactions examined, interactions between color non-oriented cell pairs (red line) are the strongest and those between oriented cell pairs (blue and black lines) the weakest. In addition, as shown in (Roe & Ts'o, 1999), average interactions between color non-oriented V1 cells and oriented V2 cells are of intermediate size (green line). Although orientation-matched (black line) and orientation-nonmatched (blue line) interactions are of equal strength, non-matched interactions exhibit more temporal scatter (broader peaks). Below, we discuss the interpretation of these relative peak heights and widths, especially with regard to network size.

Peak Height and Peak width as an indicator of network size

Peak height is a measure of the maximal capability (under a specific context) of a cell to fire within a fixed temporal offset to another. Thus peak height is an indication and measure of interaction strength. Peak width is an indicator of temporal dispersion in relative spike firings, and, in principle, is independent of peak height. One can have large number of coincidences that are tightly (narrow tall peak) or loosely correlated (broad tall peak), or a small number of coincidences that are tightly (narrow low peak) or loosely correlated (low broad peak). That they are independent measures in this data set is supported by the poor correlation between peak height and peak width of V1-V2 cell pairs ($r^2 = 0.03$).

Why does one cell pair fire in a temporally dispersed manner and another pair with a fairly fixed temporal coincidence? Synaptic strength is one obvious answer, as broad peaks could indicate that individual connectivities are relatively ineffective. Another possibility is the specific network configuration. Other factors such as bursting can also lead to a broadening of peak widths (Nowak & Bullier, 2000; van Vreeswijk & Hansel, 2001). In addition, network size (number of neurons) also contributes to peak width. A cell that is influenced by only one other cell is likely to have much tighter temporal correlation (i.e. narrower peak) than a cell that is influenced by 100 other cells and even more so than a cell that is influenced by 10,000 other cells. So to the extent that it is more probable that two cells in a large network will have greater temporal correlation dispersion, peak width may be indicative of network size. We will focus our discussion below on possible relationship of peak width to network size, which may not necessarily refer to the anatomical network but rather the currently active functional network.

V1-V2 networks are larger and less synchronized than V1-V1 networks

The breadth of V1-V2 peaks could indicate that, relative to V1-V1 interactions, individual V1-V2 connectivities are relatively less effective and/or that there are many more cells contributing to the spike firing of the V2 cell (i.e. a larger network). Anatomically, V1-V2 connections are much more spatially convergent and divergent than those in V1. Whereas lateral horizontal connections within the superficial layers of V1, as studied with anatomical tracers, extend up to only 2 mm from an injection site (Gilbert & Wiesel, 1979; Rockland, 1985; Blasdel et al, 1985; Malach et al, 1993; Sincich & Blasdel, 2001), feedforward and feedback projections are highly divergent (Livingstone & Hubel, 1984; Sincich & Horton, 2002ab; Ts'o et al, 2001; Weller & Kaas, 1983). Indeed, individual V1-V2 and V2-V1 arbors can extend as much as 3-4 mm (Rockland & Virga, 1989), converging onto single loci in V2 (Livingstone & Hubel, 1984; Sincich & Horton, 2002ab; Ts'o et al, 2001). In addition, intrinsic V2-V2 connections extend for several millimeters and are well poised to mediate V1 influences on distant locations in V2 (Rockland, 1985; Malach et al, 1993; Levitt et al, 1994b). This anatomical convergence and divergence suggests that V1-V2 networks may involve more neurons than V1-V1 networks (Budd, 1998). Thus, the finding that V1-V2 correlogram peaks are considerably broader than V1-V1 peaks is consistent with a larger neuronal network of V1-V2 than V1-V1 interactions.

Larger non-oriented networks, smaller orientation-selective networks

Several studies exist that have identified the CO stripe location of anatomical tracer injection sites within V2 (Livingstone & Hubel, 1984; Sincich & Horton, 2002ab). Careful examination of these studies suggests that thin stripe injections label a larger area of V1 than pale/thick stripe injections. From measurements taken from Figs 25-28 in (Livingstone & Hubel, 1984) and Figure 2 in (Sincich & Horton, 2002a) and Figure 5 in (Sincich & Horton, 2002b), thin stripe injections produced labeled area of patches in V1 measuring 5 mm, 6 mm, and >5 mm in extent, and pale stripe injections resulted in labeled V1 regions 3 mm, 3.5 mm, 4.5 mm, 4.5 mm in size, and one thick stripe injection resulted in labeled V1 interblob regions 3 mm in size. Differences in labeled area did not appear to be due to differences in injection site. Furthermore, this is consistent with the observation that layer 2/3 neurons in V1 project to only a single pale stripe (Federer et al 2013). Thus, these anatomical observations are consistent with our findings that oriented interactions are weaker (Figure 2) and more spatially restricted (Figure 4) than non-oriented interactions (Roe & Ts'o, 1999). We suggest that large, less synchronous non-oriented networks are consistent with their role in the encoding of surface properties (such as brightness and color), whereas greater temporal and spatial synchrony may be required for the computation of contours.

Larger orientation-diverse networks, smaller orientation-preserving networks

We observe that correlogram peaks of orientation-matched pairs have similar heights but narrower peaks than orientation-nonmatched interactions. This suggests that both populations have similar interaction strengths, but, as discussed above, may participate in different sized networks. We discuss possible roles of a smaller stimulus-preserving network and a slightly larger stimulus-diverse network.

On a local scale it is important to compute orientation accurately and to localize its position precisely in visual space. These are functions that V1 is capable of performing (Vogels, 1990). However, to compute, for example, the orientation of inferred contours is a much more complex process requiring both specific integration and generalized outcome (Peterhans & von der Heydt, 2001; Gove et al, 1995). In the computation of curvature and shape (Hegde & Van Essen, 2000), where nearby points on a curve share the same orientation and distant points on a curve may have quite different orientations, different modes of orientation integration may also be required. Multiple orientation networks may also be tied to multiple orientation domains in V2, some of which are V1-like and others which respond to a combination of lower and higher order contours (Ramsden et al 2014). Thus, multiple contour processing networks between V1 and V2 may serve to preserve local contour information and at the same time produce emergent transformations that are a hallmark of contour processing in V2.

The present study did not systematically attempt to present stimulus configurations designed to trigger V2 contour processing per se, or evoke binding between disparate stimulus elements. Such stimuli have been proposed to elicit increases in gamma band synchrony, which in turn has been shown to strengthen intracortical and V1-V2 cortico-cortical coupling (Jia et al, 2013). We might expect that using such stimuli would tap into specific correlational networks that are also specific to particular V2 functional subcompartments.

Relationship to the two pale stripe system

Orientation selective cells lie primarily within the thick and pale stripes of V2, which receive inputs from interblob regions of V1 (Livingstone & Hubel 1984; Sincich & Horton 2002a). Pale stripes are further distinguished into two types (Roe & Ts'o 1995; Shipp & Zeki 2002; Federer et al 2009, 2013; Felleman et al 2014). Pale stripes associated with thick stripes (lying lateral to thick stripes, Type II) receive input from layer 4B in V1, exhibit greater orientation selectivity, smaller receptive fields with smaller scatter, and larger orientation domains with smoothly changing orientation preference across the stripe. Those associated with thin stripes (lying lateral to thin stripes, Type I) do not receive input from layer 4B in V1, exhibit lower orientation selectivity and greater color selectivity, larger receptive size and scatter, and smaller orientation domains and maps with rapidly changing orientation preference. Thick stripes are heterogeneous and contain functional domains selective for ocular disparity (Chen et al 2008), lower and higher order contour orientation selectivity (Ramsden et al, 2001, 2014; Pan et al, 2012; Chen et al, 2014), and motion contrast borders (Lu et al 2010; Chen et al 2014). They have direct projections to MT (DeYoe & Van Essen, 1985; Shipp & Zeki, 1985, 1989; Born & Bradley, 2005) and likely indirect projections to V4 (Ninomiya et al, 2011), and thus have strong ties with both the dorsal and ventral pathways.

This dichotomy raises the possibility that the orientation matched V1-V2 networks are associated with the thick/pale stripe system and the orientation non-matched V1-V2 networks are associated with the thin/pale stripe system. This interesting possibility will require future studies.

A role of feedback in dissimilar orientation interactions?

Although V1-V2 interactions are predominantly centered on zero, indicating prevalence of common input (see Nowak & Bullier, 2000), the strongest interactions are feedforward while moderate-sized interactions are feedback (Fig 5). Although our sample size is not large, we find it notable that many of the orientation-nonmatched interactions are feedback interactions (represented by light blue feedback arrow in Figure 7B). This is consistent with the finding that feedback connections from V2 orientation domains distribute across a broad range of orientations in V1 (Shmuel et al., Soc Neurosci Abstr 24:767, 1998). Furthermore, some of the observed higher order, contextual effects associated with V2 feedback (Ramsden et al, 2001; Bullier et al, 1996; Hupe et al, 1998) are likely to involve interactions between cells of non-matching orientation.

METHODS

Surgical prep, optical imaging, and electrophysiology

9 adult monkeys (*Macaca fascicularis*) were used as described in a previous study (Roe & Ts'o, 1999). Animals were anesthetized (sodium pentothal, 1-2mg/kg/hr), paralyzed (pancuronium bromide, 100ug/kg/hr) and artificially respired. Vital signs including heartrate and EEG were continuously monitored, CO₂ was maintained at 4%, and rectal temperature at 38 deg. Eyes were dilated, refracted and fitted with contact lens to focus on a computer monitor. A 1 cm² craniotomy and durotomy were made over the lunate sulcus, and a stainless-steel chamber mounted. All procedures were conducted in accordance with NIH guidelines.

Optical imaging of intrinsic cortical signals was used to localize functional compartments within V1 and V2 (Roe & Ts'o, 1999; Ts'o et al, 1990; Roe & Ts'o, 1995). Several microelectrodes were positioned to simultaneously target CO blobs and interblobs in V1, and CO thin, pale, and thick stripes in V2. The receptive field locations of cell pairs were separated by at most a few degrees, which was the extent of spatial representation in our craniotomies (typically 8 mmx6 mm at 3-5 deg eccentricity).

Receptive fields were plotted and qualitatively characterized. Orientation-selectivity was rated on a qualitative scale (see Livingstone & Hubel, 1984; Roe & Ts'o, 1999): A (<30 deg total width), B (<60 deg), C (<120 deg), to D (non-oriented), and only cells with A or B orientation sharpness were considered "oriented". Color selectivities were determined by using narrow band interference filters ranging from 450-630 nm. Further details of neuron classification are provided in Roe & Ts'o (1999).

Spike train collection and cross correlation analysis

Following isolation and characterization, neural spike trains were collected. Because of the low spontaneous firing rates typical of cortical neurons, we collected spike trains in response to visual stimulation. Both cells were stimulated simultaneously with bars (optimal orientation and color) moving in synchrony across each receptive field. Spike trains and stimulus sync pulses were recorded and time stamped (temporal resolution 0.1 ms). Post-stimulus time histograms and raw cross correlograms were calculated.

We used shuffle subtraction methods to minimize stimulus-induced increases in correlation (Perkel et al, 1966; Nowak et al, 1995b; Nowak et al, 1999; Brody, 1999). Correlograms (computed at ± 400 ms, 1.6msec binwidths and ± 50 ms, 0.1ms binwidths) were normalized for spike firing rate [$1/\sqrt{\text{numspike1}*\text{numspike2}}$] and smoothed (weighted, moving gaussian average 7 bins). Peak position, peak height, and peak widths (at half-height) were determined. Only peaks at least 2 standard deviations above baseline were considered for peak analysis. Our data set peak values ranged from 0 – 0.05. The dataset was divided into quartiles and indexed from 0-3, yielding four peak strength categories (Roe & Ts'o, 1999). Receptive field separation was defined as center-to-center distance. Receptive field (RF) overlap is defined as $\max[\% \text{ RF}(i) \text{ overlapping RF}(j)]$. Statistical comparison of distributions were evaluated with student's t-test unless otherwise indicated.

Acknowledgements

We thank Lara Hinderstein and Carmela LoRusso for excellent technical support, Ben Ramsden, Rob Friedman, and Barbara Heider for helpful comments on manuscript. Supported by EY06347, EY08240, EY11744 and the Whitaker Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Bakin JS, Nakayama K, Gilbert CD. Visual responses in monkey areas V1 and V2 to three-dimensional surface configurations. *J Neurosci.* 2000; 20:8188–8198. [PubMed: 11050142]
- Blasdel GG, Lund JS, Fitzpatrick D. Intrinsic connections of macaque striate cortex: axonal projections of cells outside lamina 4C. *J Neurosci.* 1985; 5:3350–69. [PubMed: 3001243]
- Brody CD. Correlations without synchrony. *Neural Computation.* 1999; 11:1537–1551. [PubMed: 10490937]
- Born RT, Bradley DC. Structure and function of visual area MT. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 2005; 28:157–89. [PubMed: 16022593]
- Budd JM. Extrastriate feedback to primary visual cortex in primates: a quantitative analysis of connectivity. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 1998; 265:1037–44.
- Bullier J, Hupé JM, James A, Girard P. Functional interactions between areas V1 and V2 in the monkey. *J Physiol (Paris).* 1996; 90:217–220. [PubMed: 9116670]
- Chen G, Lu HD, Roe AW. A map of horizontal disparity in primate V2. *Neuron.* 2008; 58:442–450. [PubMed: 18466753]
- Chen M, Li P, Zhu S, Han C, Xu H, Fang Y, Hu J, Roe AW, Lu HD. An orientation map for motion boundaries in macaque V2. *Cereb. Cortex.* 2014
- DeYoe EA, Van Essen DC. Segregation of efferent connections and receptive field properties in visual area V2 of the macaque. *Nature.* 1985; 317(6032):58–61. [PubMed: 2412132]
- Federer F, Ichida JM, Jeffs J, Schiessl I, McLoughlin N, Angelucci A. Four projection streams from primate V1 to the cytochrome oxidase stripes of V2. *J. Neurosci.* 2009; 29:15455–15471. [PubMed: 20007470]
- Federer F, Williams D, Ichida JM, Merlin S, Angelucci A. Twoprojection streams from macaque V1 to the pale cytochrome oxidase stripes of V2. *J. Neurosci.* 2013; 33:11530–11539. [PubMed: 23843523]
- Felleman DJ, Van Essen DC. Distributed hierarchical processing in the primate cerebral cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* 1991; 1:1–47. [PubMed: 1822724]
- Felleman DJ, Lim H, Xiao Y, Wang Y, Eriksson A, Parajuli A. The representation of orientation in macaque V2: Four stripes not three. *Cereb. Cortex.* 2014
- Gilad A, Meirovitz E, Leshem A, Arieli A, Slovlin H. Collinear stimuli induce local and cross-areal coherence in the visual cortex of behaving monkeys. *PLoS ONE.* 2012; 7(11):e49391. [PubMed: 23185325]

- Gilbert CD, Wiesel TN. Morphology and intracortical projections of functionally characterised neurones in the cat visual cortex. *Nature*. 1979; 280:120–5. [PubMed: 552600]
- Girard P, Hupe JM, Bullier J. Feedforward and feedback connections between areas V1 and V2 of the monkey have similar rapid conduction velocities. *J Neurophysiol*. 2001; 85:1328–31. [PubMed: 11248002]
- Gove A, Grossberg S, Mingolla E. Brightness perception, illusory contours, and corticogeniculate feedback. *Vis. Neurosci*. 1995; 12:1027–1052. [PubMed: 8962825]
- Hegde J, Van Essen DC. Selectivity for complex shapes in primate visual area V2. *J Neurosci*. 2000; 20:RC61. [PubMed: 10684908]
- Hubel DH, Livingstone MS. Segregation of form, color, and stereopsis in primate area 18. *J Neurosci*. 1987; 7:3378–3415. [PubMed: 2824714]
- Hupe JM, James AC, Payne BR, Lomber SG, Girard P, Bullier J. Cortical feedback improves discrimination between figure and background by V1, V2 and V3 neurons. *Nature*. 1998; 394:784–7. [PubMed: 9723617]
- Jia X, Tanabe S, Kohn A. Gamma and the coordination of spiking activity in early visual cortex. *Neuron*. 2013; 77:762–774. [PubMed: 23439127]
- Landisman CE, Ts'o DY. Color processing in Macaque striate cortex: relationships to ocular dominance, cytochrome oxidase, and orientation. *J Neurophysiol*. 2002a; 87:3126–3137. [PubMed: 12037213]
- Landisman CE, Ts'o DY. Color processing in macaque striate cortex: electrophysiological properties. *J Neurophysiol*. 2002b; 87:3138–51. [PubMed: 12037214]
- Levitt JB, Kiper DC, Movshon JA. Receptive fields and functional architecture of macaque V2. *J Neurophysiol*. 1994a; 71:2517–2542. [PubMed: 7931532]
- Levitt JB, Yoshioka T, Lund JS. Intrinsic cortical connections in macaque visual area V2: evidence for interaction between different functional streams. *J Comp Neurol*. 1994b; 342:551–570. [PubMed: 8040365]
- Livingstone MS, Hubel DH. Anatomy and physiology of a color system in the primate visual cortex. *J Neurosci*. 1984; 4:309–356. [PubMed: 6198495]
- Lu HD, Chen GC, Tanigawa H, Roe AW. A motion direction map in macaque V2. *Neuron*. 2010; 68(5):1002–1013. [PubMed: 21145011]
- Malach R, Amir Y, Harel M, Grinvald A. Relationship between intrinsic connections and functional architecture revealed by optical imaging and in vivo targeted biocytin injections in primate striate cortex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1993; 90:10469–10473. [PubMed: 8248133]
- Merigan WH, Nealey TA, Maunsell JHR. The effects of lesions of cortical area V2 in macaques. *J Neurosci*. 1993; 13:3180–3191. [PubMed: 8331392]
- Munk MH, Nowak LG, Girard P, Choumlamountri N, Bullier J. Visual latencies in cytochrome oxidase bands of macaque area V2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1995; 92:988–92. [PubMed: 7862679]
- Ninomiya T, Sawamura H, Inoue K, Takada M. Differential architecture of multi-synaptic geniculocortical pathways to V4 and MT. *Cereb. Cortex*. 2011; 21:2797–2808. [PubMed: 21515714]
- Nowak LG, Munk MHJ, Girard P, Bullier J. Visual latencies in areas V1 and V2 of the macaque monkey. *Vis Neurosci*. 1995a; 12:371–384. [PubMed: 7786857]
- Nowak LG, Munk MHJ, Nelson JJ, James AC, Bullier J. Structural basis of cortical synchronization. I. Three types of interhemispheric coupling. *J Neurophysiol*. 1995b; 74:2379–2400. [PubMed: 8747200]
- Nowak LG, Munk MHJ, James AC, Girard P, Bullier J. Cross-correlation study of the temporal interactions between areas V1 and V2 of the Macaque monkey. *J Neurophysiol*. 1999; 81:1057–1074. [PubMed: 10085333]
- Nowak, LG.; Bullier, J. Cross correlograms for neuronal spike trains. Different types of temporal correlation in neocortex, their origin and significance.. In: Miller, R., editor. *Time and the Brain, Conceptual advances in Brain Research*. Harwood Academic Publishers; 2000. p. 53-96.
- Pan Y, Chen M, Yin J, An X, Zhang X, Lu Y, Gong H, Li W, Wang W. Equivalent representation of real and illusory contours in macaque V4. *J. Neurosci*. 2012; 32(20):6760–6770. [PubMed: 22593046]

- Perkel DH, Gerstein GL, Moore GP. Neuronal spike trains and stochastic point processes. ii. simultaneous spike trains. *Biophysics Journal*. 1966; 7:419–440.
- Peterhans E, von der Heydt R. Functional organization of area V2 in the alert macaque. *Eur J Neurosci*. 1993; 5:509–524. [PubMed: 8261126]
- Peterhans E, von der Heydt R. Simulation of neuronal responses defining depth order and contrast polarity at illusory contours in monkey area V2. *J. Comput. Neurosci*. 2001; 10:195–211. [PubMed: 11361259]
- Ramsden BM, Hung CP, Roe AW. Real and illusory contour processing in area V1 of the primate: a cortical balancing act. *Cereb Cortex*. 2001; 11:648–65. [PubMed: 11415967]
- Ramsden BM, Hung CP, Roe AW. Orientation domain diversity in macaque area V2. *Eye Brain*. 2014; 6:97–112.
- Rockland KS. A reticular pattern of intrinsic connections in primate area V2 (area 18). *J Comp Neurol*. 1985; 235:467–478. [PubMed: 2987317]
- Rockland KS, Virga A. Terminal arbors of individual “feedback” axons projecting from Area V2 to V1 in the Macaque monkey: a study using immunohistochemistry of anterogradely transported Phaseolus vulgaris-leucoagglutinin. *J Comp Neurol*. 1989; 285:54–72. [PubMed: 2754047]
- Rockland KS, Virga A. Organization of individual cortical axons projecting from area V1 (area 17) to V2 (area 18) in the macaque monkey. *Vis Neurosci*. 1990; 4:11–28. [PubMed: 2176095]
- Roe AW, Ts'o DY. Visual topography in primate V2: multiple representation across functional stripes. *J Neurosci*. 1995; 15:3689–3715. [PubMed: 7751939]
- Roe AW, Ts'o DY. Specificity of color connectivity between primate V1 and V2. *J Neurophysiol*. 1999; 82:2719–2731. [PubMed: 10561440]
- Schroeder CE, Mehta AD, Givre SJ. A spatiotemporal profile of visual system activation revealed by current source density analysis in the awake monkey. *Cereb Cortex*. 1998; 8:575–592. [PubMed: 9823479]
- Shipp S, Zeki S. Segregation of pathways leading from area V2 to areas V4 and V5 of macaque monkey visual cortex. *Nature*. 1985; 315(6017):322–25. [PubMed: 2987702]
- Shipp S, Zeki S. The organization of connections between areas V5 and V2 in macaque monkey visual cortex. *Eur. J. Neurosci*. 1989; 1(4):333–54. [PubMed: 12106143]
- Sincich LC, Blasdel GG. Oriented axon projections in primary visual cortex of the monkey. *J Neurosci*. 2001; 21:4416–4426. [PubMed: 11404428]
- Sincich LC, Horton JC. Divided by cytochrome oxidase: a map of the projections from V1 to V2 in macaques. *Science*. 2002a; 295:1734–1737. [PubMed: 11872845]
- Sincich LC, Horton JC. Pale cytochrome oxidase stripes in V2 receive the richest projection from Macaque striate cortex. *J Comp Neurol*. 2002b; 447:18–33. [PubMed: 11967892]
- Smith MA, Jia X, Zandvakili A, Kohn A. Laminar dependence of neuronal correlations in visual cortex. *J. Neurophys*. 2013; 109:940–947.
- Ts'o DY, Gilbert CD, Wiesel TN. Relationships between horizontal interactions and functional architecture in the cat striate cortex as revealed by cross-correlation analysis. *J Neurosci*. 1986; 6:1160–1170. [PubMed: 3701413]
- Ts'o DY, Gilbert CD. The organization of chromatic and spatial interactions in the primate striate cortex. *J Neurosci*. 1988; 8:1712–1727. [PubMed: 3367218]
- Ts'o DY, Frostig RD, Lieke EE, Grinvald A. Functional organization of primate visual cortex revealed by high resolution optical imaging. *Science*. 1990; 249:417–420. [PubMed: 2165630]
- Ts'o DY, Roe AW, Gilbert CD. A hierarchy of the functional organization for color, form and disparity in primate visual area V2. *Vision Research*. 2001; 41:1333–1349. [PubMed: 11322978]
- van Vreeswijk C, Hansel D. Patterns of synchrony in neural networks with spike adaptation. *Neural Comput*. 2001; 13:959–92. [PubMed: 11359640]
- Vogels R. Population coding of stimulus orientation by striate cortical cells. *Biol Cybern*. 1990; 64:25–31. [PubMed: 2285759]
- von der Heydt R, Peterhans E. Mechanisms of contour perception in monkey visual cortex. I. Lines of pattern discontinuity. *J Neurosci*. 1989; 9:1731–1748. [PubMed: 2723747]

Weller RE, Kaas JH. Retinotopic patterns of connections of area 17 with visual areas V-II and MT in Macaque monkeys. *J Comp Neurol.* 1983; 220:253–279. [PubMed: 6315784]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Figure 1.

Examples of oriented V1-V2 cell pairs. Receptive fields and orientations indicated by rectangles and central lines, respectively. Temporal coincidence on ordinate (msec). Likelihood of occurrence (probability per msec) on abscissa. **A)** Cell pair with similar orientation selectivities (0 deg diff) and 50% RF overlap. RF separation 0.3 deg. **B)** Cell pair with similar (20 deg diff) orientation selectivities and 0% receptive field overlap. RF separation 1.3 deg. **C)** Cell pair with dissimilar (95 deg diff) orientation selectivities and 45% RF overlap. RF separation 0.75 deg. **D)** Cell pair with dissimilar (60 deg diff) orientation selectivities and 100% RF overlap. RF separation 0.1 deg.

Figure 2.

V1-V2 peak width (at half height) distributions. Only strong peaks (Peak 2/3) are shown. Bin 10 indicates all values > 5 msec and < 10 msec; Bin 20 indicates all values >10 msec and < 20 msec. Means are indicated by arrowheads at top of graph. **A**) Peakwidth distributions of V1-V1 (yellow, mean = 3.9 msec), V1-V2 (blue, mean = 28.0 msec), and V2-V2 (red, mean = 21.0 msec) cell pairs. Dashed vertical line denotes mean of oriented-oriented V1-V2 peak widths (below) for comparison. **B**) Distribution of oriented-oriented V1-V2 peak widths (Peak 2/3, mean = 19.3 msec).

Figure 3.

Oriented V1-V2 cell pairs have weaker interactions than non-oriented V1-V2 cell pairs. Peak 2/3 cell pairs are shown. Dotted horizontal lines indicate cutoff value for strongest (Peak 3) peaks. **A**) Oriented cell pairs have narrower peak widths (blue dots, mean = 19.3 msec) than non-oriented (pink dots, mean = 28.5 msec) cell pairs ($p < 0.008$). They also have significantly smaller peak heights (oriented height mean = 0.0125, non-oriented height mean = 0.0164, $p < 0.003$). Solid pink dot has actual peak width of 137 msec and peak height of 0.0144. **B**) Broadband oriented pairs (blue dots, mean = 15.9 msec) have narrower peak width than color non-oriented (pink dots, mean = 24.6 msec) cell pairs ($p < 0.02$). They also have smaller peak height (broadband oriented mean = 0.0135; color non-oriented mean = 0.0171, $\chi^2(0.95) = 4.54$, $df = 1$).

Figure 4.

Importance of receptive field overlap. **A**) Overlapped oriented cell pairs ($n = 37$) had significantly stronger peak heights than non-overlapped cells pairs ($n = 39$). **B**) Both matched orientation (left) and non-matched orientation (right) cell pairs exhibit dependency on receptive field overlap.

Figure 5.

Peak height vs peak position. Positive peak position indicates V1-V2 feedforward interaction; negative peak position indicates V2-V1 feedback interaction. Horizontal dotted lines demarcate divisions between Peak Strengths 0, 1, 2, and 3. **A**) Most V1-V2 peaks are centered on zero. Feedforward interactions tend to be stronger. **B**) Matched (pink dots) and non-matched (blue dots) oriented pairs have similar peak strengths. Stronger interactions are feedforward (Peak 3, points falling in large gray rectangle) and weaker interactions are feedback (Peak 2, points falling in smaller gray rectangle). Note that some points overlap and appear as single points. Circled pink dot has a peak position of +2 msec and a peak height of 0.053.

Figure 6.

Matched orientation cell pairs have narrower peak widths than non-matched pairs. Matched orientation (dark blue bars, ≤ 30 deg difference), non-matched orientation (light blue bars, > 30 deg difference). **A**) All oriented-oriented cell pairs. Matched: $n = 30$, mean = 13.1. Non-matched: $n = 46$, mean = 20.2 ($p < 0.02$). **B**) Color oriented-color oriented cell pairs. Matched: $n = 17$, mean = 11.8. Non-matched: $n = 23$, mean = 27.0 ($p < 0.004$). **C**) Broadband oriented-broadband oriented cell pairs ($n = 28$). Matched: $n = 8$, mean = 11.6. Non-matched: $n = 20$, mean = 16.8 ($p > 0.1$).

Figure 7.

Summary of V1-V2 interactions. **A)** Average correlograms for different populations of V1-V2 cell pairs, and their mean full width at half height (FWHH) in msec. Color-nonoriented/color-nonoriented (red, $n = 80$, mean height = 0.115, mean width = 21.5 msec), color-nonoriented/color-oriented (green, $n = 30$, mean height = 0.0090, mean width = 28.2 msec), non-matched oriented-oriented (blue, $n = 46$, mean height = 0.0074, mean width = 20.2 msec), and matched oriented-oriented (black, $n = 30$, mean height = 0.0080, mean width = 13.1 msec). On average, interactions between color non-oriented cell pairs are strongest and those between oriented cell pairs weakest. **B)** Schematized V1-V2 networks. Interactions between some types of color cells do not require receptive field overlap and occur over large spatial extents (12). These include non-oriented color cell pairs (schematized by red/green disks) and oriented V1 (red bar)-nonoriented V2 cell pairs. In contrast, oriented interactions (blue bars) between V1 and V2 are spatially specific (depend on receptive field overlap). Two orientation-selective networks are suggested: one orientation-preserving (dark blue)

and another orientation-diverse (light blue). Prevalence of feedback interactions for orientation-diverse network is depicted by light blue feedback arrow.

Table 1

Number of V1-V2 Cell Pairs

	All	Peak 2 or 3
Total	273	133
All Oriented-Oriented	76	34
Similarly Oriented	30	17
Differently Oriented	46	22
Broadband Oriented-Broadband Oriented	28	13
Color Oriented-Color Oriented	40	19
Total Nonoriented-Nonoriented	102	60