Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Figure 1 Behavior of model synapses subjected to different stimulation protocols. Each row represents one of the five synapse types from **Fig. 1**. First column: average synaptic weight in response to 300 Hz train followed by increasing intervals ranging from 25 ms to 5 s as in ref.³⁸. Inset: zoom on 300 Hz train. Second and third column: average synaptic weight in response to trains of 26 stimuli at 20 Hz and 100 Hz, respectively, similar to ref.³⁹



Supplementary Figure 2 (a) Definition of error components used to assess learning performance. (b) Learning error as a function of MLI-PC inhibition strength. The total error is computed from the individual components according to the formula shown. Black line represents the average over 20 realizations of the network in Fig.2. Error bars are SEM. (c) Same as b for learning error as a function of number of learning iterations. (d1) As in Fig.2e, but without GCs whose transients decayed to 10% of their peak values in more than 150 ms. (d2) Learning performance when using the temporal basis from panel d1. (e1) As in Fig.2e, but without GCs whose transients decayed to 10% of their peak values in less than 150 ms. (e2) Learning performance when using the temporal basis from panel e1. Note that learning of short delays was not completely abolished because our manipulations did not affect the rising phases of the GC transients.



Supplementary Figure 3 Additional examples of MF rate distributions and their impact on learning. (a) Same as Fig. 4a (i.e. reference case, see legend of Fig. 4 for details). (b) Without zero firing rates. (c) Simulations in which all supporter inputs are set to zero before the CS and switch to finite firing rates during the CS. (d) Simulations in which GC thresholds are set as in a (blue and dashed firing rate distributions), but eyelid conditioning is carried out with lower driver inputs (blue and red firing rate distributions).



Supplementary Figure 4 Scan of MF firing rate parameters show distinct roles for driver and supporter inputs. (a) Definition of error components used to assess learning performance. The total error is computed from the individual components according to the formula shown. (b) Definition of the MF firing rate parameters. μ_D , μ_S and σ_D , σ_S denote means and standard deviations of the MF firing rate distributions of drivers (red) and supporters (blue) respectively. (c) Scan over driver parameters while keeping supporter parameters fixed. (d) Scan over supporter parameters while keeping driver parameters fixed. In c and d the total learning error is color coded and parameter configurations corresponding to rows in **Fig. 4** are indicated by black dots.



Supplementary Figure 5 Average total error over seven delay intervals for varying rankcorrelation between the m category and the p_v category for all scenarios shown in **Fig. 5**.



Supplementary Figure 6 Eyelid learning is not significantly affected by simple GoC feedback. **(a1)** Scheme of CC input layer with GoC inhibition that acts in a purely feed-forward manner. This configuration is functionally identical to the reduced model used in the main text. **(a2, a3)** GC temporal basis (as in **Fig. 2c**). White line in **a**₂ indicates GoC activity. **(a4)** PC eyelid response learning. **(b1-4)** Same as row **a**, but with GC-GoC feedback connections. **(c1-4)** Same as row **b**, but without MF-GC STP.



Supplementary Figure 7 Scheme comparing the parallel pool model used here with the serial pool model from ref.³⁸. The symbols $k_0^+, k_0^-, k_1^+, k_1^-$ and k_2 are rate constants described in ref.³⁸.