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**SUMMARY**

The property of mixed selectivity has been discussed at a computational level and offers a strategy to maximize computational power by adding versatility to the functional role of each neuron. Here, we offer a biologically grounded implementational-level mechanistic explanation for mixed selectivity in neural circuits. We define pure, linear, and nonlinear mixed selectivity and discuss how these response properties can be obtained in simple neural circuits. Neurons that respond to multiple, statistically independent variables display mixed selectivity. If their activity can be expressed as a weighted sum, then they exhibit linear mixed selectivity; otherwise, they exhibit nonlinear mixed selectivity. Neural representations based on diverse nonlinear mixed selectivity are high dimensional; hence, they confer enormous flexibility to a simple downstream readout neural circuit. However, a simple neural circuit cannot possibly encode all possible mixtures of variables simultaneously, as this would require a combinatorially large number of mixed selectivity neurons. Gating mechanisms like oscillations and neuromodulation can solve this problem by dynamically selecting which variables are mixed and transmitted to the readout.

**OVERVIEW**

Not all brain functions are complex. They do not need to be. Simple functions can be performed by simple architectures or single layers. Seeing an object approaching, tasting a poison, detecting food in your esophagus and swallowing it, and recoiling from something that causes tissue damage are all simple functions that simple circuits and cells can accomplish. The architectures that underpin these functions can have straightforward properties or simple combinations of properties that serve this function, much like a railroad track providing a straightforward, direct route. The lack of flexibility makes these functions quick, efficient, and stereotyped.

By contrast, the neural systems responsible for complex thought and behavior mandate flexibility. Intelligent thought is flexible thought. All creatures can react reflexively to the environment. But animals with more complex nervous systems can change how they behave by integrating more parameters into the decision-making process. They tailor ongoing behavior to the current situation and to an ever-shifting set of subgoals and goals. They also take into account an accumulating history of events that bias decision thresholds. This capacity for generalizing context-dependent behavior is crucial for our ability to project our behavior into the future, allowing us to make and execute plans.

The neural substrate for this flexibility can be seen in many places, but it is especially prevalent in cortical areas known to be critical for flexible behavior, such as the prefrontal cortex (PFC). Individually, PFC neurons have adaptive and multivariate response properties,1,2 referred to as “mixed selectivity.”3–6 They wear many hats, showing different patterns of selectivity in different behavioral contexts. Information is often widely distributed across them. The signal-to-noise ratio of responses for each individual neuron is low, but decodable information for the population is high. PFC neurons have moderately high basal firing rates and high proportions of neurons responding to many stimuli—relying on mixing more diverse inputs that give each individual neuron many jobs encoding many variables. Our view of
the PFC has evolved: rather than trains of thought on railroad tracks, the PFC more closely resembles cars on the road and highway system. Neurons and their axons provide the highways—the anatomical architecture over which thoughts, feelings, sensations, and motor commands can travel. But the way the roads are used is vastly different based on the immense complexity of the electrical and chemical impulses being trafficked all around the brain. Vehicles of information can take different paths and different destinations. They might share a common path with some vehicles at some times and others at other times. This autonomy provides maximal freedom and dimensionality.

With this comes depth of thought. The multivariate neuronal properties can increase the representational dimensionality of the population, allowing more complex computations. Further, the brain tailors the dimensionality to the task at hand. Dimensionality expands and contracts to focus processing along relevant dimensions. This keeps processing on-task and goal directed.

In short, mixed selectivity gives the brain the processing power needed for complexity and flexibility. The cost of this opportunity for flexibility is the inability to take advantage of the regularities of the world to generalize to novel situations. Mixed selectivity allows representation of a large number of different situations in every detail, but sometimes we need to discard or ignore some information to make the right decision.

In this perspective piece, we consider the impact of mixed selectivity on our understanding of neural processing, with the goal of grounding it in a biological implementation. To maximize the transparency of the concept of mixed selectivity, we will first define and describe mixed selectivity and then discuss its importance.

WHAT IS MIXED SELECTIVITY?

There has been some confusion around this term, which has emerged from a number of related concepts (Box 1), but the definition is simple. At its core, mixed selectivity involves a single cell showing consistent activity, which is modulated by multiple statistically independent variables. This single-cell behavior eventually has broad implications for the activity of neuronal ensembles, enabling them to process and integrate a range of independent inputs.

Pure selectivity

In many ways, the notion of pure selectivity can be traced to Hubel and Wiesel’s description of the “simple and complex cells” in the primary visual cortex. This pioneering work was a leap forward as it was one of the first demonstrations of the functionality of single neurons. Simple and complex cells spiked to single features. For some time, most theories of cortical function considered pure selectivity.
But evidence kept amassing for multifunctionality, including the idea that neurons could do more than one thing was blasphemy (one of us was accused of "turning cortex into a bowl of porridge" at a major meeting). However, neurons have become more dexterous and multifunctional. As we built on this foundational work, our view of cortical neurons has become more dexterous and multifunctional. The more we learn, the preponderance of neurons show多功能性, including observations such as neurons releasing different neurotransmitters for different functions.24,25

It is now evident that pure selectivity, as important as it is, is more of an exception than the rule, especially in the cortex. Its habitats tend to be at the input edges of sensory systems and at the output edges of motor systems. In much of the rest of the cortex, the preponderance of neurons show multifunctional selectivity.7,26–43

Linear mixed selectivity
Within mixed selective neurons, there are either nonlinear or linear mixed selectivity neurons. Linear mixed selectivity neurons typically result from a process of abstraction and can facilitate generalization.34 Linear mixed selectivity neurons show activity that can be expressed as a weighted sum of the responses to each variable (Figure 1B). Consider, for instance, a neuron that responds to both written and oral praise in an email and oral praise.

How does this happen? How do neurons that respond to both written and oral praise find their way to mutually synapse on the same cell? The likely explanation is that many cells have many inputs, and those associated with environmental information that have an eventual impact on our survival, including acceptance by our social group, will be strengthened, while...
less significant ones will be weakened or pruned. Moreover, the surviving connections are tuned in such a way that the neuron operates in a linear regime.

**Nonlinear mixed selectivity**

Neurons that respond to multiple, statistically independent variables, where the activity tracking these two variables cannot be expressed as a weighted sum, are considered to be nonlinear mixed selective neurons (Figure 1B). These neurons can be modeled as computing a weighted sum of the activity of their presynaptic neurons and then passing this sum through a nonlinearity. The input neurons must encode different variables, and they can do so in multiple ways: they can be pure selectivity, nonlinear, or linear mixed selectivity neurons. Moreover, any of the numerous nonlinear mechanisms that are involved in the normal functioning of a neuron can contribute to generating nonlinear mixed selectivity: the frequency-input (f-I) curve of a neuron is typically nonlinear, and that would be sufficient. However, there are also nonlinearities in the dendritic integration and in synaptic transmission.

Rather than abstraction, nonlinear mixed selective neurons offer the capacity for complexity and depth. Because of their versatility, these neurons require a wide array of inputs. To have neurons be readily repurposed in different contexts also suggest a hierarchical organization. Timescales, locations, probabilities, and internal states are all variables that can contribute to context. Context-modulation of cue responding is one of the key applications of this capability. Cues are presented on discrete timescales, while contexts are represented on a longer timescale. Different contexts can influence the value or meaning of cues and, therefore, the same cue should have distinct neural representations under different contexts, as this would be the only way to produce outputs that would yield different behaviors. For example, imagine a mouse encountering an unfamiliar type of berry in its environment. If the mouse is alone and has never experienced this particular berry, it might be hesitant to eat it due to the potential risks of poisoning or illness. However, if the mouse then encounters a conspecific whose breath carries the scent of that same berry, it may interpret this as a sign that the berry is safe to consume. In this context, the smell of the berry on the breath of a fellow mouse serves as a form of social verification, indicating that the food is likely safe and worth the effort to eat. This social cue effectively shifts the mouse’s evaluation of the unfamiliar berry from potentially risky to likely safe, all based on the social transmission of food preference (Figure 3A).

**WHY MIX NONLINEARLY?**

Representations based on nonlinear mixed selectivity have specific computational properties: in particular, they can be high-dimensional and hence usable by a simple linear readout like a downstream neuron. These high-dimensional representations confer enormous flexibility to the neural circuit that reads them out. To understand them, it is instructive to consider what is called representational geometry (Figure 2). It is easier to start from the representations that do not contain mixed selectivity: say, for example, that a visual stimulus can appear in one of two possible contexts. We denote the stimulus by S and the context by C. Both variables have only two values as there are only two stimuli and two contexts. Imagine that all the neurons have pure selectivity to either S or C. For example, we consider three neurons: the firing rate of the first one, r1, is equal to S (pure selectivity to the stimulus); the second one, r2, responds only to context C; and the activity of the third one, r3, depends on S only, but in a more complicated way, i.e., r3 = 1 – S. We now consider the activity space in which r1, r2, and r3 are represented along the coordinate axes. In this simple example, we consider only three neurons, but typically this is a high-dimensional space with many axes. Each point in this space represents the population response in one experimental condition (e.g., the first stimulus is presented in the second context). We will have four points in the activity space as we have two contexts and two stimuli.

The different types of selectivity yield different geometries. As the neurons have only pure selectivity, the four points will define a relatively low-dimensional object: the number of dimensions will be equal to the number of task-relevant variables. In our case, the variables are two, and the four points form a rectangle (Figure 2A). The arrangement of these points defines the geometry of the representation. In the case in which we replace the third neuron with a linear mixed selectivity neuron (Figure 2B), the geometry does not change substantially: the flat object that we saw in the case of pure selectivity neurons will rotate, but it will not change its dimensionality. The geometry changes significantly when introducing a nonlinear mixed selectivity neuron (Figure 2C). Now, the four points define a three-dimensional (3D) object called a tetrahedron.

Why is the dimensionality of the representation important? To understand it, we need to take the perspective of a downstream neuron reading out the representation. What this neuron can or cannot do depends on how the points of the representation are arranged. Consider, for example, the situation in which a readout neuron has to be trained to respond to a particular stimulus always in the same way, ignoring the context in which the stimulus is presented. We consider this a simple task. This can be visualized in the activity space by coloring the points according to the desired response of the readout neuron (Figure 3B). For example, we color purple the points corresponding to the conditions where the readout neuron should be active (S = 1) and orange the points for which the readout neuron should be inactive (S = 0).

Is it possible to connect the readout neuron to the pure selectivity neurons that we discussed in Figure 2A in such a way that it can solve this simple task? To answer this question, we need to make further simplifying assumptions. Say that the readout neuron can perform a simple operation: compute the weighted sum of the inputs and compare it with an activation threshold (linear readout). Biological neurons are complex enough to perform this operation. Graphically, we can visualize this operation by drawing a plane (Figure 3B) that separates the inputs in the activity space that activate the readout neuron (the points above the plane) from the inputs that do not reach the activation threshold (the points below the plane). For this geometry, it is possible to draw a plane separating the purple points from the orange points; in other words, a simple linear readout can...
perform this task. The same applies to the high-dimensional representation that involves a nonlinear mixed selectivity neuron. But consider now the same geometries when the task is more complex: the readout has to respond only to stimulus 1 when it appears in context one and to stimulus 0 when it appears in context zero, but not in the other two cases. Now, the coloring of the points is different and, interestingly, it is possible to separate the purple from the orange points in the case of the high-dimensional representation, but not in the case of the low-dimensional one (Figure 3C). This problem is equivalent to the well-known exclusive-OR (XOR) problem, and no plane can separate the points of the low-dimensional representation as required.

In this simple example with only four points, this coloring is the only one that does not have a linear solution. However, as the number of points increases, the colorings that require high dimensionality grow exponentially and become the majority. So, the more complex the task, the more important nonlinear mixed selectivity becomes. Note also that when the number of points increases, the maximal dimensionality increases as well. If one wants to achieve maximal dimensionality, nonlinear mixed selectivity is not sufficient, we also need an additional ingredient: the responses of the neurons have to be diverse enough. This is possible only when neurons respond to different combinations of the task-relevant variables. Maximal dimensionality confers a great flexibility to simple linear readouts, as they can separate the points in any arbitrary way or perform many different tasks. However, the maximal dimensionality can only be achieved when neurons mix nonlinearly and have diverse responses.

Diversity does not necessarily mean “completely unstructured.” If neuronal responses are characterized by a vector of regression coefficients, and one plots these vectors as points...
from zero, we can describe the neuron as having pure selectivity if the fitted coefficient of only one variable is significantly different from zero, we can describe the neuron as having non-linear mixed selectivity. However, there are also experiments in which it is possible to observe some structure in the form of clustering: there are groups of neurons that tend to respond in a similar way.

**Single-neuron versus population-coding properties**

The above classification into pure, linear, or nonlinear mixed selectivity categories is done at the level of single neurons. Crucially, this first requires us to decide on a set of relevant external variables (describing, e.g., stimuli or behaviors) that we are interested in—for a different choice of this set of variables the classification of a neuron will differ in general. Let us consider again the earlier example of a neuron that responds to both written and verbal praise. If this neuron’s activity corresponds to the total amount of praise received, regardless of its mode of communication, then it could be said to exhibit pure selectivity for praise in general rather than mixed selectivity for written and verbal versions of it, even though the latter description is also valid.

We can establish the selectivity properties of a single neuron by fitting a linear regression model to predict its firing rate from the external variables that we have chosen to investigate. If the fitted coefficient of only one variable is significantly different from zero, we can describe the neuron as having pure selectivity for that variable, whereas multiple non-zero coefficients would correspond to linear mixed selectivity. Furthermore, we can generalize the regression model by including features that are nonlinear combinations (e.g., pairwise products) of the external variables of interest. If this extended model can achieve a significantly higher (cross-validated) accuracy for predicting the firing rate of the neuron by assigning non-zero coefficients to these nonlinear features, the neuron can be said to exhibit nonlinear mixed selectivity. Such a regression analysis is closely related to ANOVA. However, beyond these single-neuron properties, we can also examine the neural representations that the activity patterns of these neurons create at the population level, and many of their properties and computational implications do not depend on the way we choose the external variables of interest. As discussed above, one particularly important geometric property of such a representation is its dimensionality. Pure and linear mixed selectivity lead to low dimensionality, equal to the number of relevant variables. Nonlinear mixed selectivity can increase the dimensionality of the representation beyond this value.

Many computational problems can only be solved by neural networks with hidden units, i.e., they require nonlinear mixing of inputs. A network that has learned to correctly execute such a task will therefore contain at least some neurons that exhibit nonlinear mixed selectivity with respect to the variables encoded in the network inputs. However, if the network was trained for executing a particular task, it may only require very specific nonlinear mixed selectivity neurons that combine task-relevant variables in a certain way that supports the chosen task rather than a variety of different nonlinear mixed selectivity neurons with a diverse set of coding properties. In other words, even if...
the network performs a complex task that requires nonlinear mixing, its representations do not necessarily have to be very high dimensional.

However, representations with (close to) maximal dimensionality, which are achieved only when the responses of different neurons are sufficiently diverse, are an important coding scheme in situations in which a population of neurons does not have sufficient information about which task it is meant to support (perhaps because the neurons are not provided with rich and individually tailored error signals as they would be, e.g., during learning via backpropagation) or if the animal needs to potentially execute a large class of different tasks and flexibly switch between them. In such scenarios, the neural population cannot shape its representations to specifically subserve a particular task, but it can nevertheless try to form a neural representation of the task-relevant variables that is generally useful for executing many possible tasks. One concrete way to achieve this is to create a high-dimensional representation that enables a downstream neuron implementing a linear readout (or linear classifier) to correctly extract many functions of the input (perhaps even all possible dichotomies for a moderate number of binary inputs). In this sense, high dimensionality is associated with the (cognitive) flexibility of the animal—performing new tasks is then simply a matter of finding a different readout, which can be done using a simple perceptron or delta rule, but does not require changing the internal representations, which would necessitate more sophisticated learning algorithms.

Expression of mixed selectivity across circuits and structures

To appreciate what our brains might look like without mixed selectivity, we can examine which functions and structures at the micro- and macrocircuit level rely on mixed selectivity. Few functions are completely devoid of circuit flexibility, and although the labeled lines circuit motif is the oldest in neuroscience, it is not the most prevalent. Conversely, mixed selectivity was discovered in the context of higher cognitive functions, allowing the brain to learn new rules and switch between different rules in different contexts. These computations for complexity can be seen in cells and circuits down to the olfactory glomeruli and in the auditory and somatosensory cortex. The fact that we can learn to like poisons (like caffeine and alcohol) and learn to hate calorie-rich foods (pistachio ice cream after food poisoning) suggests that even our sensory systems have flexibility. There are many circuit motifs that can give rise to flexibility, circuits that diverge depending on gating, that converge to be integrated, or that compete to orchestrate competing mechanisms, and the principles of mixed selectivity are foundational to them all.

Labeled lines circuits have their perks. Signal-to-noise ratio is maximized, as crosstalk is minimized. The lack of crosstalk guarantees high fidelity. Moreover, pure selectivity neurons can have other advantages in terms of energy consumption and number of needed connections. Although the representations based on pure and linear mixed selectivity are completely equivalent from the point of view of a linear readout (they have the same geometry), when one imposes that the neural activity can only be positive, the pure selectivity neurons consume less energy.

Let us begin by considering sensory association systems wherein the goal is to produce appropriate reliable responses to stimuli. Of all types of information, getting reliable sensory information about our dynamic environment as we navigate it is paramount. Bipolar cells relaying information from photoreceptors to retinal ganglion cells do not require complexity or depth as much as fidelity—they know what information that photoreceptor is providing, which makes decoding trivial.

Initially, our brains filter incoming sensory information, forwarding for full processing only what is important to send along. Neurons within the thalamic nuclei handle this initial filtration, sending massive spikes that increase ~500% from their basal activity for the sharpest, most fleeting of signals to be unambiguously broadcast to multiple distributed systems. In parallel, other sensory processing systems through the auditory cortex, for example, will undergo plasticity based on experience, behavioral state, hormonal signals, etc.

The thalamus sends information to many places throughout the corticollimic system—even the basal ganglia, including the basolateral amygdala (BLA) and the PFC.

The BLA is a hub for integrating sensory information and rapidly converting that into a behavioral response. The amygdala is a relatively primitive structure with the capacity for plasticity to form new associations and lies in the middle of the spectrum. The amygdala has been demonstrated to have a substantial amount of hard-wiring in terms of certain neurons driving specific functions irrespective of state or context, although there is still some evidence for mixed selectivity for some variables (see, e.g., O'Neill et al. ). Further support for the notion of fixed functions existing in the BLA include work demonstrating the existence of a long-lasting engrain or memory trace that is stored long term in the same cells in which it was formed.

Both the BLA and PFC receive sensory information from many inputs, including the thalamus, but process it differently. “Structured” as a divergence point for positive and negative valence representation, the amygdala has some neurons selectively responding to positive valence and others to negative, though it mixes some other variables. The striatum then collates these different signals, weighs them, and decides on a single motor plan from several rehearsed or innate motor sequences.

Conversely, the PFC approaches the received information with precisely the opposite strategy as it has diametrically distinct functional goals from the sensorimotor chain. Its computational aim is to weigh choices and delve deeper rather than produce fixed motor responses. Thus, a different set of tools are needed. This requires a different cellular and synaptic architecture that deviates from hardwired functions, opting for maximal flexibility. This flexibility is achieved by sending diffuse signals everywhere, each dimension represented by a combination of decentralized signals, allowing any number of readily decipherable messages to be selected for readout at any given time.

Unlike the strong signals sent out by the amygdala, the PFC communicates with a hum of whispers. Classic plots of
peri-stimulus time rasters or histograms show high baseline noise with modest signals—but an extraordinarily high number of variables can be decoded from PFC activity. Importantly, high dimensionality is not random in the sense that these neurons are always processing different signals; they are reliable and perform consistently within the same context, showing different responses in varying contexts. Information is not represented by individual cells but is more prevalent in the population. Remapping can be interpreted as another expression of this coding scheme: hippocampal neurons encode sequences, the delivery of reward, and the encounter with other animals. All these variables affect the neural representations and they can easily result in some form of remapping when mixed together with position. This is not surprising if one assumes that the hippocampus is fundamentally a memory system that compresses the complex sensory representations by taking advantage of their regularities (see, e.g., Gluck and Myers and Benna and Fusi). The resulting representations are sparser, more decorrelated, higher dimensional, and involve mixed selectivity neurons that encode all the different aspects of sensory experiences that are memorized.

Unlike sparse coding systems like the hippocampus, the PFC employs a more proliferative coding strategy. For instance, in the amygdala, approximately 10%–15% of neurons will respond to a salient stimulus, like a footshock-predicting stimulus, at low basal firing rates (~1 Hz). However, in the PFC, the same predictive cue will be encoded by around 30%–40% of neurons, albeit with a lower signal-to-noise ratio (basal firing rates ~10 Hz). These differences in coding strategies in different micro- and macrocircuits across the brain endow the brain with its versatility and may help illustrate the functional utility of mixed selectivity when it is expressed to greater or lesser degrees within the mammalian brain.

**NOT EVERYTHING CAN BE MIXED**

We often observe that neural representations supporting a specific task exhibit the maximal dimensionality enabled by the task and, hence, that the task-relevant variables are mixed in all possible ways. However, the experiments performed in a laboratory in a highly controlled environment typically involve a relatively small number of variables, sometimes only one or two. What happens when the subjects perform a real-world task? In a simple task, like the one considered in Figure 1 with only two binary variables, context, and stimulus, the total number of possible conditions is 4. In general, however, as a function of the number of binary variables V, the number of task conditions grows exponentially as 2V. For a complex, real-work task expressing a sizable number of task-relevant variables V, this number can therefore be huge, meaning that reaching maximal dimensionality would require a correspondingly large number of mixed selectivity neurons. Because then the maximal dimensionality is bounded by the number of neurons and the number of conditions, we might reach the upper limit imposed by the size of the neural population before all variable combinations are possibly encoded in mixed selectivity neurons.

Fortunately, the world is highly structured and solving a realistic task typically deparst from the worst-case scenario that would require mixing all variables. For example, behavioral contexts are often compartmentalized such that we might have to mix a subset of variables in one task and distinct sets of variables in different tasks but never have to worry about mixing variables that are relevant in different tasks. If we can selectively gate the variables we are interested in, then the number of required neurons would be significantly smaller. In a simple example, where 2 tasks need to be implemented and each only involves a distinct subset of V/2 variables, we would need 2V/2 + 2V/2 = 2V/2+1 neurons as opposed to 2V. The plot in Figure 4A shows how many neurons we need when we have to mix only a fraction, F, of the variables. As the world becomes more structured (i.e., 1/F increases), the number of needed neurons decreases very rapidly (note that the scale of the y axis is logarithmic). How can we implement such a gating mechanism that would allow our population to exploit this structure? One simple answer is to choose properly the connections and the response properties of the input neurons. Indeed, properly connected nonlinear neurons can readily implement the most general form of gating and solve arbitrarily complex problems. However, it is sometimes difficult to learn these connectivity schemes, and there are other forms of gating that can complement those based on the careful choice of the circuit architecture. For example, there are at least two other mechanisms that implement some form of dynamic gating (see Figure 4B), selecting which neurons to listen to depending on the task or the context. There are two implementational motifs for gating responses or signaling to a given neuron that it should participate in one ensemble or another: electrical and chemical. Oscillatory dynamics naturally organize neural activity into functional patterns (Figure 4C). Neurmodulatory signals rely on the diverse distribution of receptor expression profiles to signal the appropriate ensemble to amplify depending on cues, contexts, or internal states (Figure 4D). These two mechanisms likely work together to dynamically form functional networks.

**Oscillatory dynamics flexibly organize mixed selectivity neurons**

Like a stadium crowd doing “the wave,” mixed selectivity neurons can be organized on-the-fly, shifting their participation in different ensembles and networks for different functions. This organization has to occur in real-time at a scale large enough to produce function. One can see such organization in the oscillations of local field potentials (LFPs). They reflect coordinated changes in neuronal excitability at the mesoscale, involving millions of neurons. It is at this scale that the brain focuses attention, makes decisions, executes actions, and retrieves memories—processes that necessitate the coordination of numerous neurons. There is ample evidence for a role for neural oscillations in the dynamic organization of functional networks. Top-down
Changes in oscillatory dynamics track changes in attentional focus and state. Oscillations help route information and form network assemblies in the hippocampus and cortex. Further, LFPs serve as reliable sources of information, unaffected by neuronal representation drift. Further, oscillations form traveling waves that can have precise influences on networks and impact function. The theory of spatial computing ties this together to explain how the brain applies rhythms to physical patches of the cortex to selectively control just the right neurons at the right times to do the right things.

Importantly, the fluctuating electric fields not only reflect organization but can also create organization by having a causal influence. There are numerous instances of ephaptic coupling (i.e., the causal influence of electric fields) in the brain. When cortical neurons are not spiking (which is much of the time) their membrane potentials are oscillating below the spiking threshold. This reflects and contributes to the surrounding electric fields. Thus, cortical neurons spend much of their time “teetering” on the edge of spiking in a sea of fluctuating electric fields. Even small changes in the fields can “push” them one way or another. Electric fields are an ideal “orchestra conductor” for coordinating neural activity. They spread influences at the speed of light. It would
Oscillations likely interact with neuromodulation. Neurons correlate fast neurotransmitters as well as neuromodulators, which are packaged into either vesicles or dense core vesicles. Neuromodulation affects excitability. Plus, certain oscillatory frequencies can cause preferential release of dense core vesicles containing neuromodulatory signals. This offers another layer of control.

**Neuromodulatory signals tune ensemble volume, orchestrating mixed selectivity**

Another organizational push may come from neuromodulation, which can have effects in hundreds of milliseconds and last for hours. Neuromodulation can trigger the transition between behavioral states, often by activating a neuromodulatory or neuropeptidergic nucleus that can modulate the release of a neuromodulator. These neuromodulators have broad but unique innervation patterns across the brain. Their signals will be read out through axonal innervation patterns and downstream receptor expression profiles. The receptor expression profiles are predominantly predetermined but subject to experience-dependent plasticity. They can act as a weighted filter, allowing different neuromodulators to generate varied brain states. From ghrelin inducing hunger to oxytocin-stimulating prosocial behavior, neuromodulatory systems offer a wide spectrum of programs.

There are different uses for neuromodulation and they can have specific effects. In the BLA, at baseline conditions, there is a bias toward prioritizing negative valence—which is adaptive given that predation is a more immediate threat to survival than not obtaining food or water. The relative bias can be altered or even flipped by changes in internal or external conditions. Food restriction can shift the balance between positive and negative valence processing circuits in the BLA, which may facilitate the prioritization of food-seeking via changes in hormonal, peptidergic, or modulatory signals. Additionally, increasing the concentration of neurotensin in the BLA gates reward learning, effectively shifting the bias toward reward learning.

Multivariate and specific effects of neuromodulation are evident in the PFC, where mixed selectivity is expressed by most neurons. Dopamine can serve as the “switch operator” for directing information flow. In the mPFC, increasing dopaminergic tone amplifies the signal-to-noise ratio for information about aversive, but not appetitive, stimuli in a specific projection to a brainstem region, the periaqueductal gray (PAG). Importantly, dopamine concentration does not act uniformly on different PFC neurons; mPFC neurons projecting to the nucleus accumbens (Nac) showed a suppression of activity, while mPFC-PAG neurons showed a selective amplification of information about punishments, such as air puff or foot shock, but not rewards such as sucrose.

Importantly, dendritic nonlinearities are a key subcellular component that provide a possible mechanistic explanation for how mixed selectivity can be implemented in the context of neuromodulation. Various neuromodulatory receptors may be expressed and multiplexed on a single cell, allowing a given cell to be recruited (or suppressed and effectively excluded) from a given ensemble. Neuronal dendrites offer a high level of electrical compartmentalization onto which different functional classes of receptors (ranking from excitatory or inhibitory to different neuromodulatory receptors) may be segregated into different compartments, allowing the cell to receive and transmit information differently in the presence of different concentrations of neuromodulators—such as dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine—as demonstrated in acetylcholine. For example, a single cell may have a proximal dendritic compartment receiving bottom-up sensory input and a distal dendritic compartment receiving top-down, predictive coding inputs, and allow a cell to integrate both of these signals.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

When the first description of mixed selectivity was articulated over a decade ago, the initial focus was on the population dynamics of the PFC and a high-level cognitive function, working memory. Now, we know that mixed selectivity is not a rare feature of neurons of certain brain areas, organisms, and functions. Rather, mixed selectivity is ubiquitous. It is present across species and across functions from high-level cognition to “automatic” sensorimotor processes such as object recognition and even to homeostatic processes. The widespread presence of mixed selectivity underscores its fundamental role in providing the brain with the scalable processing power needed for complex thought and action.
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