



Erratum: Contextual Integration in Cortical and Convolutional Neural Networks

Frontiers Production Office*

Frontiers Media SA, Lausanne, Switzerland

OPEN ACCESS

Approved by:

Frontiers Editorial Office, Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*Correspondence:

Frontiers Production Office production.office@frontiersin.org

Received: 08 June 2020 Accepted: 09 June 2020 Published: 07 July 2020

Citation:

Frontiers Production Office (2020) Erratum: Contextual Integration in Cortical and Convolutional Neural Networks.

Front. Comput. Neurosci. 14:67. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2020.00067

Contextual Integration in Cortical and Convolutional Neural Networks

1

by Iyer, R., Hu, B., and Mihalas, S. (2020). Front. Comput. Neurosci. 14:31. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2020.00031

Keywords: contextual modulation, convolutional neuronal network, canonical cortical microcircuit, inhibitory cell

types, extraclassical receptive field, lateral connectivity, natural scene statistics, Bayesian inference

Due to a production error, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. The bold entries indicating the highest accuracy for each case were un-bolded erroneously except for column SNP, 0.1. The correct **Table 1** with bold values in each column appears below.

The publisher apologizes for this mistake. The original article has been updated.

Copyright @ 2020 Frontiers Production Office. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

TABLE 1 | Model accuracy (%) on the MNIST dataset.

Models	Original -	AWGN					SPN				
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5
CNN	98.71	98.61	98.21	96.88	92.03	81.78	97.28	92.01	80.85	65.29	48.28
CNNEx	97.25	97.17	96.83	95.86	93.34	88.24	96.06	93.45	87.97	77.99	63.04
CNNEx (avg)	98.71	98.58	98.15	96.83	91.89	81.90	97.33	92.11	80.79	64.87	47.94
CNNEx (Ir)	97.25	97.18	96.83	95.87	93.37	88.29	96.08	93.49	87.99	78.00	63.10
CNNEx (s)	97.40	97.38	97.00	96.13	93.80	88.84	96.34	93.93	88.44	78.46	63.47

We separate results for the original images and the two types of noise perturbations by columns (AWGN, additive white gaussian noise; SPN, salt-and-pepper noise). The results for the baseline model (CNN) and the model with lateral connections (CNNEx) are shown in the first two rows. The third row [CNNEx(avg)] shows results comparable to the baseline model (CNN) when we replaced the weights in Equation (5) with a uniform distribution of weights ($w = 1/N_T$ where N_T is the total number of lateral connections in each layer). The last two rows, Ir and s correspond to models with just the low-rank and just the sparse component, respectively of the inhibitory lateral connections. Including lateral connections seems to improve performance with increasing noise. Using only the sparse inhibitory component also increases performance, suggesting a regularizing effect. All reported values are averages over 10 random initializations.

Bold values represent highest accuracy for each case.