

1134

Presentation Preference

Please check one:

(PA) Paper only or Withdraw

(PO) Poster only or Withdraw

(NP) Paper or Poster (no preference)

(PA1) Paper #1, Poster #2

(PO1) Poster #1, Paper #2

Scientific Section Preference

Section descriptions starting on page 5. Check the Section best suited to your presentation:

(AN) Anatomy & Pathology

(BI) Biochemistry

(CL) Clinical Research

(CO) Cornea

(EL) Electrophysiology

(EY) Eye Movements, Strabismus & Amblyopia

(GL) Glaucoma

(IM) Immunology & Microbiology

(LE) Lens

(PH) Physiology & Pharmacology

(RE) Retina

(RC) Retinal Cell Biology

(VI) Visual Psychophysics

Key Words

See instructions on page 4. Make the number of no more than 3 key words. Do not write the word.

7	6	5
4	3	7
7	6	1

Suggested Key Words

See instructions on page 4. Key words that were not on this year's list, should be included in 1989.

A/V Requirements

See information on page 13.

(OH) Overhead

(MP) 16 mm movie projector

(VE) Video equipment (contact AVA Tech directly)

(OT) Other (specify)

Travel Grant

Check here if you are applying for a Travel Grant.

COMPLETE FORM ON REVERSE SIDE.

First (presenting) Author

Member

Applying Member (Application enclosed) Membership No. (look on mailing label)

New Member (since October 1987) Non-Member

Provide full name, address and phone numbers of 1st author on abstract. This should be the address used by AVA for Journal mailings etc.

Field David J.

Physiological Laboratory, Downing Street

Cambridge CB2 3EG England

England 0223-333854 Home Phone Number 0223-321657

Sponsor (must be member if 1st author is not; cannot be 1st author on another abstract)

Provide full name of sponsoring member, phone number and signature. You may sponsor only one abstract only if you are not the presenting author of another abstract.

Last First Middle

Office Phone Number Home Phone Number

Signature Membership No. (look on mailing label)

IS REDUNDANCY INCREASED OR DECREASED IN VISUAL CODING. D. Field¹, D. Kersten², and H.B. Barlow¹ Physiological Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge England¹ and Dept. of Psychology and Dept. of Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences, Brown University.²

Several recent studies have pointed out similarities between "efficient" image coding techniques and the spatial properties of neurones in the mammalian visual cortex. The efficiency of an image code is usually defined in terms of a change in the entropy of the coefficients (e.g., bits per pixel). A code which is capable of representing an image with relatively few bits is considered to be an efficient code. By definition, redundancy and entropy are inversely related. Hence, such theories seem to imply that the cortical representation of spatial information is more redundant than the original image. This notion appears to contrast with theories that suggest that the goal of visual processing is to represent the environment with reduced redundancy. We will suggest that there is no conflict between these two notions. In theory, a complete recoding (e.g., a Fourier transform) will have no effect on the total redundancy of the representation. Rather, such coding shifts the redundancy from one level to another.

The total redundancy of a set of images must be defined in relation to all the nth-order conditional probabilities of the coefficients. The visual cortex can be shown to be efficient at converting high-order redundancy (e.g., correlations between pixels) into first-order redundancy (i.e., the response distribution of the coefficients). First-order redundancy is increased by decreasing the high-order redundancy. Although this has no effect on overall redundancy, the conversion has a number of advantageous effects on the cortical representation of an image (e.g., an increase in signal to noise). These effects are demonstrated quantitatively with a variety of natural images using models that code the image into coefficients localized in space, spatial frequency and orientation (Gabor-like transforms).