

Popularity is linked to neural coordination: Neural evidence for an Anna Karenina principle in social networks

Elisa C. Baek^{1*}, Ryan Hyon¹, Karina López¹, Emily S. Finn², Mason A. Porter³, and Carolyn Parkinson^{1,4*}

¹Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, ²Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Dartmouth College, ³Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, ⁴Brain Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles

* Corresponding authors

Abstract

People differ in how they attend to, interpret, and respond to their surroundings. Convergent processing of the world may be one factor that contributes to social connections between individuals. We used neuroimaging and network analysis to investigate whether the most central individuals in their communities (as measured by in-degree centrality, a notion of popularity) process the world in a particularly normative way. More central individuals had exceptionally similar neural responses to their peers and especially to each other in brain regions associated with high-level interpretations and social cognition (e.g., in the default-mode network), whereas less-central individuals exhibited more idiosyncratic responses. Self-reported enjoyment of and interest in stimuli followed a similar pattern, but accounting for these data did not change our main results. These findings suggest an “Anna Karenina principle” in social networks: Highly-central individuals process the world in exceptionally similar ways, whereas less-central individuals process the world in idiosyncratic ways.

Introduction

Humans are incredibly social, and deficits in social connection have been linked to myriad negative consequences, including increased likelihood of morbidity and mortality¹⁻⁴. Having many social ties (i.e., being popularⁱ, such as by having a high in-degree centrality in a social network by being nominated as a friend by many peers) is one factor that can protect against the detrimental consequences of social isolation and disconnection⁵⁻⁹. Differences in the extent of social connectedness occur in many human social networks¹⁰⁻¹². Such differences are critical determinants for the well-being of individuals. They can also have far-reaching consequences for the social network in which individuals are embedded because central individuals often have significant influence in shaping the opinions and attitudes of social groups¹³⁻¹⁶.

Despite robust evidence for the benefits of being well-connected for one's health and well-being and the fact that well-connected individuals are well-positioned to exert influence on others in their social networks, there are significant gaps in our understanding of which factors distinguish popular individuals. For instance, although some personality traits (such as extraversion and emotional stability) have been associated with being well-connected in some social networks^{17,18}, such links have not been found in other contexts¹⁹⁻²¹. It is possible that approaches that focus on personality do not capture features that distinguish popular individuals across various social contexts. For example, one possibility is that individuals who occupy centralⁱⁱ positions in social networks process the world around them in a way that allows them to

ⁱ There are many ways of defining popularity. In the present paper, we use the notion of “popularity” as synonymous with having a high in-degree centrality. In our data, an individual's in-degree centrality is equal to the number of times that they were nominated as a friend by other community members. See the “Methods” section for more details.

ⁱⁱ In the present paper, we use the term “central” to refer to having a high in-degree centrality.

relate to, understand, and connect with a larger number of people in their communities. Recognizing and adhering to social norms is critical to being successful in forming and maintaining social ties²², so popular individuals may be more attuned to their peers' norms either as a cause or as a consequence of their central position in a network. Accordingly, popular individuals may process the world around them in ways that are exceptionally similar to their peers. Correspondingly, it is possible that less-popular individuals may process the world around them in ways that are less similar to their peers (including each other) than is the case for popular individuals. Therefore, it may be the case that less-popular individuals hold less-central positions in their social networks because they process the world around them in a way that does not reflect of the norms of their peers (i.e., in a way that is more idiosyncratic than others). We refer to this possibility as an “Anna Karenina principle” because of the famous first line of Leo Tolstoy’s novel *Anna Karenina*: “All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”²³

In the present paper, we test the hypothesis that individuals who occupy central positions in their social networks have neural responses to naturalistic stimuli (specifically, videos) that are exceptionally similar to those of their peers in comparison to individuals who occupy less-central positions. Specifically, we test whether individuals who many others nominate as a friend (i.e., who have a high in-degree centrality) have neural responses that are, on average, more similar to their peers than is the case for individuals who are unpopular in their social network (i.e., who fewer people indicate as a friend and thus have a low in-degree centrality). Measuring neural activity during a naturalistic paradigm (in which people view complex audiovisual stimuli, such as videos, that unfold over time) allows one to obtain insight into individuals’ unconstrained thought processes as they unfold²⁴. Coordinated brain activity between individuals (i.e., large

inter-subject correlations of neural responses) during the viewing of dynamic, naturalistic stimuli has been associated both with friendship²⁵ and with shared interpretations and understanding of events²⁶⁻²⁸. Therefore, the extent to which an individual, on average, has similar neural-response time series as their peers can provide insight into the extent to which they process the world around them in a way that reflects the norms of their communities.

We also test whether associations between social-network centrality (specifically, in-degree centrality) and neural similarities follow an Anna Karenina principle, which is inspired by the famous opening line of the novel *Anna Karenina*: “Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”²³ An Anna Karenina principle posits that endeavors with particular outcomes share similar characteristics (so, in that sense, they are “are all alike”) but that a lack of any one of the characteristics results in the absence of the outcome in question²⁹. The concept of an Anna Karenina principle has been applied to study various phenomena³⁰. In one recent application, it was used to link neural similarity with behavioral outcomes, such as trait paranoia³¹. In the present work, we test the hypothesis that “Popular individuals are all alike, but each unpopular individual is dissimilar in their own way.” In other words, we test whether individuals who are central in their social networks, with a large number of people who nominate them as a friend, are exceptionally similar to each other in how they process the world around them, whereas less-central individuals process the world around them in their own idiosyncratic ways.

We first test whether individuals who are popular process the world around them in a way that is exceptionally similar to other community members. We assess this idea by calculating the mean neural similarity between them and their peers. (See “Subject-level ISC analysis” in the “Methods” section for more details.) We also test whether the relationship

between popularity and neural similarity follows an Anna Karenina principle. That is, we examine whether popular individuals have exceptionally similar neural responses to each other, whereas each unpopular individual responds in their own unique way (i.e., idiosyncratically). Our results provide support for both hypotheses. We observe that, on average, popular individuals had exceptionally similar neural responses to other members of their communities and especially to other popular individuals in brain regions that are associated with shared high-level interpretations and social cognition (e.g., regions of the default-mode network). By contrast, less-central individuals had more idiosyncratic neural responses. Although participants' self-reported enjoyment of and interest in the stimuli followed a similar pattern as the brain data, accounting for participants' self-reported preferences did not change our main results. Furthermore, our results remained similar when we controlled for demographic similarities and social distances between individuals. Taken together, our findings provide evidence for an Anna Karenina principle in social networks: Popular individuals tend to be exceptionally similar to each other in the ways that they process the world around them, whereas each unpopular individual is dissimilar in their own idiosyncratic way.

Results

Social-network characterization. We characterized the social networks of individuals who live in two different residential communities of first-year students at a large state university (specifically, at University of California, Los Angeles) in the United States. A total of 120 participants completed an online survey in which they indicated individuals with whom they were friends within their community (see the “Methods” section for further details). Some of these participants also completed the functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) part of the study. (The fMRI part of the study included $N = 63$ people after exclusions; see the “Methods”

section.) Using the responses of the participants, we constructed a directed network for each of the two communities (see Fig. 1). In each of these networks, a node represents an individual and a directed edge represents one individual nominating another as a friend. For each individual, we calculated in-degree centrality, which counts the number of times that the individual was nominated as a friend by others in the network. We chose to quantify an individual's popularity within their community in terms of in-degree centrality because it captures the extent to which others in the community consider the individual to be a friend. Another advantage of in-degree centrality is that an individual's in-degree centrality (unlike some other measures of centrality, such as out-degree centrality) does not rely at all on one's own self-reported answers about the relationships that one has with others. Therefore, in-degree centrality is not susceptible to erroneous perceptions of one's own friendships and is less susceptible to the mischaracterization of friendship ties due, for example, to any given participant's inattention during a survey or atypical interpretations of survey questions (because each participant's in-degree centrality is based on data that is aggregated across many other participants' responses). Additionally, in-degree centrality is particularly suitable for our study because it is not affected by the presence of multiple components in a network, unlike most other measures of centrality (e.g., eigenvector centrality)³².

In our primary analyses, we used a median split to binarize our sample into high-centrality and low-centrality groups. This choice is consistent with recent studies that related neural similarity with behavioral measures^{33,34}. In our fMRI study, we classified participants as part of the high-centrality group if they had an in-degree that was larger than the median (specifically, if it was more than 2; there were $n_{\text{high}} = 23$ such people) and into the low-centrality group if they had an in-degree that was less than or equal to the median (specifically, if it was

less than or equal to 2; there were $n_{\text{low}} = 40$ such people). See Fig. S1 in the Supplemental Information for plots of the in-degree distributions. We also conducted exploratory analyses to examine the relationships between the original, non-binarized version of centrality and neural similarity whenever possible, as we describe in more detail below.

Neural similarity. During our fMRI study, participants watched 14 video clips that span a variety of topics. (See Table S1 in the Supplemental Information.) We calculated inter-subject correlations (ISCs) of time series of neural responses that were measured with fMRI to capture shared neural responses across subjects during the processing of naturalistic stimuli³⁵ (see Fig. 1). First, we extracted the mean-response time series across the entire video-viewing task from both (1) each of the 200 cortical parcels in the 200-parcel version of the Schaefer et al. (2018)³⁶ parcellation scheme and (2) 14 subcortical parcels³⁷. (See the “Methods” section for more details.) This resulted in a total of 214 brain regions across the whole brain. For each of the 1,952 unique pairs of participants (i.e., dyadsⁱⁱⁱ) in our fMRI sample, we then computed the Pearson correlation between the dyad members’ time series of neural responses for each cortical parcel. This yields one correlation coefficient per unique dyad for each brain parcel. See the “Methods” section for more details.

ⁱⁱⁱ The term "dyad" is sometimes used to refer specifically to an adjacent pair of nodes in a network (i.e., to include both nodes and the edge that connects them). One can think of the set of ISCs between all participants for a given brain region as a complete, weighted graph in which edge weights encode ISCs. Therefore, we refer to each possible pair of fMRI participants (whether or not there was a friendship connection between them) as a "dyad".




Fig. 1. Study paradigm and calculations. (a) Schematic of the fMRI study paradigm. In Session 1 of the study, participants attended an in-lab session in which their brain activity was measured using fMRI while they watched a series of naturalistic stimuli (i.e., videos). After the fMRI scan, the participants provided ratings on how enjoyable and interesting they found each video. (b) Schematic of our social-network survey. In Session 2 of the study, participants completed an online social-network survey in which they indicated the individuals in their residential community with whom they were friends. (c) Schematic of neural similarity. We extracted the time series of neural responses that were obtained as participants viewed the stimuli. We then calculated inter-subject correlations (ISCs) of these time series for each of 214 brain regions. (d) Schematic of our network calculations. Based on the participants' responses in (b), we constructed two directed and unweighted networks — with one for each residential community — in which each node represents an individual and each directed edge represents one individual nominating another as a friend. For each individual, we calculated in-degree centrality, which counts the number of times that that individual was nominated as a friend by others in their own residential community.

Subject-level ISC analysis. We tested whether individuals who were more popular in their communities (i.e., who had higher in-degree centralities) exhibited more normative neural responses than less-popular individuals (i.e., those with lower in-degree centralities). To do this, we transformed our dyad-level neural similarity measure to a subject-level measure by calculating the mean Fisher z -transformed³⁸ ISC value between each subject with every other subject for each brain region. This yields one ISC value for each subject for each brain region; this value encodes a mean similarity in neural responses between the subject and all other

subjects in the corresponding brain region (see Fig. 2a). After calculating these values, we fit one generalized linear model (GLM) for each brain region with the ISC in the respective brain region as the dependent variable (which we transformed into z-scores to produce standardized coefficients) and the binarized in-degree as the independent variable (see Fig. 2b). Finally, we employed false-discovery rate (FDR) correction to correct for multiple comparisons across brain regions. From our analysis, we found that high in-degree centrality was associated with larger mean neural similarity with peers in the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (DMPFC) bilaterally (left DMPFC: $B = 0.964$, $SE = 0.233$, $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.012$; right DMPFC: $B = 0.977$, $SE = 0.232$, $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.012$) and right precuneus ($B = 0.912$, $SE = 0.237$; $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.020$) (see Fig. 2c). We did not find any significant associations in the subcortical regions (see Table S1). We also fit analogous models to control for demographic variables that may be associated with neural similarity^{25,39}, models that only examined neural similarities between subjects who were living in the same residential community, and models that controlled for social distances between participants in the same community. These other approaches yielded similar results. (See Figs. S2-S4 in the Supplementary Information.)

We also conducted an analogous exploratory analysis to relate participants' mean ISCs with each other in each brain region with the original (non-binarized) in-degree centrality values. For each brain region, we calculated the Spearman rank correlation ρ to examine the relationship between ISCs in each brain region and in-degree centrality. We again employed FDR correction to correct for multiple comparisons across brain regions. Using these computations, we identified similar regions as when we used binarized in-degree centrality (i.e., as low versus high values). Neural similarity in the bilateral DMPFC (left DMPFC: $\rho = 0.420$; $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.048$; right DMPFC: $\rho = 0.415$; $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.048$), precuneus ($\rho = 0.408$; $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.048$), and the left

superior parietal lobule ($\rho = 0.424$; $p_{\text{corrected}} = 0.048$) was significantly correlated with in-degree centrality (see Fig. 2d). In other words, we found that there was a positive association between an individual's in-degree centrality and their mean neural similarity with their peers in the DMPFC, precuneus, and superior parietal lobule. See Fig. 3 for a visualization of the ISC in the right DMPFC and its association with in-degree centrality in the network. We did not find any significant associations in subcortical regions (see Table S3).

Notably, for both sets of analyses, we found a positive relationship in all cases in which participants' ISCs with their peers were related significantly to their in-degree centrality. That is, in both analyses, we found that a higher in-degree centrality was associated with more normative neural responses.




Fig. 2. Subject-level analysis. (a) First, we Fisher z-transformed the dyad-level inter-subject correlations, which are encoded by a matrix of pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients (r values). We then computed the mean of each subject’s ISC with every other subject. (In other words, we took the mean of each row of the matrix.) We performed the above calculations for each of the 214 brain regions. This yields one ISC value for each subject for each brain region. The ISC value encodes the mean similarity in neural responses between the subject and all other subjects in the corresponding brain region. (b) We tested for relationships between the subjects’ in-degree centrality and these subject-level ISC values in each brain region. (c) Our results that relate mean ISCs with the binarized in-degree centrality variable indicated that individuals with high in-degree centrality had a much larger mean neural similarity with their peers in the bilateral DMPFC and precuneus than individuals with a low in-degree centrality. (d) Our results that relate mean ISCs with the original, non-binarized in-degree centrality values gave similar results as the analysis in (c). We found that the mean ISCs in the bilateral DMPFC, precuneus, and the superior parietal lobule were positively correlated with in-degree centrality. The quantity B denotes the standardized regression coefficient, and ρ denotes the Spearman rank correlation. All results are FDR-corrected at $p < 0.05$.




Fig. 3. ISC results visualized in the network structure. Visualizations of the social networks of (a) residential community 1 and (b) residential community 2 of a first-year dorm. Our subjects were residents of two distinct residential communities, where one “community” consists of the set of people who live in the same wing and floor of a residence hall. Each node (which we show as a disc) represents one resident who was living in one of the communities, and each line segment represents a directed edge between two nodes if it is unidirectional and two edges if it is bidirectional. For example, an arrow from node A to node B conveys that node A nominated node B as a friend. An edge with two arrowheads indicates a mutually-nominated friendship. The size of a node represents its in-degree centrality, with larger nodes indicating individuals with higher in-degree centrality. The color of the nodes represents a node’s mean neural similarity in the rDMPFC to other members of its residential community, with darker colors indicating greater neural similarity. As this figure indicates, individuals who had higher in-degree centrality in a network (i.e., individuals who many other individuals nominated as a friend) tended to have the largest mean ISCs in the rDMPFC with their peers.

Preference similarity. After the neuroimaging portion of the fMRI study, participants rated the extent to which they felt that each video that they saw in the scanner was enjoyable and interesting. We used the extent to which these two distinct ratings of an individual were similar to those of other subjects in the study as a measure of preference similarity. For each of the 1,952

unique dyads (i.e., pairs of individuals), we calculated the Euclidean distance between the two subjects' enjoyment ratings across the 14 different videos and transformed the distance measure into a normalized similarity measure (where the similarity is $s = 1 - [\text{distance} / \max(\text{distance})]$). Larger similarity values, which range from 0 to 1, indicate greater similarity in the content that the two subjects in a dyad found to be enjoyable. We repeated the same process for interest ratings. This resulted in two preference similarity measures per dyad that represent the similarity in the extent to which they found content to be enjoyable and interesting.

Subject-level preference analysis. We were interested in (1) whether individuals who were more popular in their residential dorm had preferences that were more similar to others in the community than less-central individuals and (2) if such self-reported differences in preferences could account for the neural results that we reported above. To investigate this, we transformed the dyad-level preference similarity measures to subject-level variables. First, for each subject, we calculated their mean similarity in enjoyment ratings with all other subjects. This estimates the extent to which that subject, on average, had similar preferences to other subjects in how enjoyable they found each piece of content. We repeated the same process for the interest ratings. Our approach resulted in one number for each subject to represent their mean similarity with their peers in enjoyment ratings and one number to represent their mean similarity with their peers in interest ratings. We then related the mean enjoyment and interest similarity measures with the binarized in-degree centrality variable by fitting a GLM for each similarity measure with z-scores of the similarity measures as the dependent variables and the binarized in-degree centrality variable as the independent variable. Our results indicated that individuals who were more popular in their social networks were more similar, on average, than less-popular

individuals with their peers in the content that they found to be enjoyable ($B = 0.578$, $SE = 0.253$, $p = 0.026$) and interesting ($B = 0.491$, $SE = 0.256$, $p = 0.061$).

Given our finding that individuals who had a high in-degree centrality were more similar to peers in self-reported preferences of content than those with a low in-degree centrality, we tested whether our findings that link ISC to in-degree centrality might arise from inter-subject similarities in self-reported preferences. To investigate this possibility, we fit GLMs to test the relationship between the ISC in each brain region and in-degree centrality while controlling for similarity in enjoyment and interest ratings. Our results indicate that the relationships between ISC and in-degree centrality remain significant after controlling for similarity in enjoyment and interest ratings (see Fig. S5 in the Supplementary Information), suggesting that neural similarity in these regions captures similarities beyond what one can attribute purely to self-reported preference ratings.

Dyad-level ISC analysis. Our subject-level ISC results indicate that subjects with a higher in-degree centrality—i.e., subjects who many individuals nominated as a friend—had, on average, greater neural similarity with their peers than subjects with a lower in-degree centrality. We also took a finer-grained approach to test if individuals with similar in-degree centralities were most similar to one another, irrespective of if they had a high or a low in-degree centrality, or if our data reflects an Anna Karenina principle, such that individuals who were highly central in their residential community were most similar to other highly-central individuals and less-central individuals were comparatively idiosyncratic (i.e., dissimilar to others, including other individuals with low in-degree centralities). To relate our dyad-level neural similarity measure with individuals' in-degree centralities, we transformed the subject-level binarized in-degree centrality measure into a dyad-level variable. We categorized the dyads into (1) {high, high} if

both subjects in the dyad had a high in-degree centrality, (2) {low, low} if both subjects in the dyad had a low in-degree centrality, and (3) {low, high} if one subject in the dyad had a low in-degree centrality and the other subject had a high in-degree centrality. For each of our 214 brain regions, we fit a linear mixed-effects model with crossed random effects to account for the dependency structure of the data⁴⁰ (see the “Methods” section) with ISC in the corresponding brain region as the dependent variable and the dyad-level centrality variable as the independent variable. We then performed a planned-contrast analysis⁴¹ to compare the different in-degree centrality groups and thereby identify brain regions for which including one or more low-centrality individuals in a dyad was associated with less-coordinated neural responses (i.e., $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$, $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, high\}}$, and $ISC_{\{low, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$) (see Fig. 4a).

We illustrate the results of the three contrasts ($ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$, $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, high\}}$, and $ISC_{\{low, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$) in Fig. 4. As in our subject-level results, our dyad-level results reveal that there were larger ISCs in the DMPFC, precuneus, and portions of the superior parietal lobule in dyads of people who both had high in-degree centralities (i.e., {high, high}) than in dyads of people who both had low in-degree centralities (i.e., {low, low}) (see Fig. 4b). Additionally, ISCs in the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (VLPFC) and temporal pole were larger in {high, high} dyads than in {low, low} dyads. ISCs in subcortical regions—including the amygdala, hippocampus, left pallidum, and the right thalamus—were larger in {high, high} dyads than in {low, low} dyads (see Table S4). We found similar patterns when we contrasted high-centrality dyads with mixed-centrality dyads ($ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, high\}}$) and mixed-centrality dyads with low-centrality dyads ($ISC_{\{low, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$), although the effect sizes were smaller. (See Figs. 4b,c and Tables S5–S6.) In the Supplementary Information, we

report results of analogous models that control for demographic variables and friendship (see Fig. S6) and that examine neural similarities only in subjects who live in the same residential community (see Fig. S7). The latter approach allowed us to control for both demographic similarities and social distances between individuals (see Fig. S8). The results of these additional analyses were similar to those in Fig. 4. Our findings suggest that highly-central individuals were exceptionally similar in neural responses to one another, whereas less-central individuals had neural responses that were dissimilar both to highly-central individuals and to other less-central individuals. In other words, less-central individuals displayed neural responding that was idiosyncratic, which is consistent with each less-central individual differing from the normative response of other participants in their own way.

We also conducted an exploratory analysis to relate mean ISC with the original, non-dichotomized values of the dyad-level in-degree centralities. To do this, we related the minimum in-degree centrality for each dyad to neural similarity in each of our 214 brain regions. Our choice of taking the minimum in-degree centrality value of each dyad allowed us to test the hypothesis that only dyads with two highly-central individuals had exceptionally similar neural responses to one another. If a low in-degree centrality is associated with idiosyncratic neural responding, then the inclusion of even just one low-centrality individual in a dyad should be associated with a small ISC. For each brain region, we fit a linear mixed-effects model with crossed random effects to account for the dependency structure of the data⁴⁰ (see the “Methods” section) with the ISC in the corresponding brain region as the dependent variable and the minimum in-degree centrality value of each dyad as the independent variable.

As with our dyad-level results using the binarized centrality variable, we found a positive association between the minimum in-degree centrality of dyads and neural similarity in the left

DMPFC, precuneus, posterior cingulate cortex, superior parietal lobule, and the middle temporal gyrus. That is, there was greater neural similarity in these brain regions in dyads with a higher minimum in-degree centrality. Mirroring our results with a binary in-degree centrality variable, dyads in which both individuals were highly central in their residential community (as encoded by a higher minimum in-degree centrality) had greater neural similarity than dyads in which both individuals were less central (as encoded by a lower minimum in-degree centrality) (see Fig. S9).




Fig. 4. Dyad-level analysis and results. (a) Dyad-level inter-subject correlations are represented for a brain region in a matrix whose entries consist of pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients. The rows and columns of the matrix are ordered according to the in-degree centralities of the subjects. We performed planned contrasts of the different centrality groups to test whether larger ISCs occurred in dyads in which both individuals were highly central (i.e., $ISC_{\{high, high\}}$), than in dyads in which both individuals were less central (i.e., $ISC_{\{low, low\}}$) and in ones with mixed centralities (i.e., $ISC_{\{low, high\}}$), where one individual of the dyad had a low centrality and the other had a high centrality). [The figure in (a) is adapted from prior work³³.] (b) There were larger ISCs in the DMPFC, VMPFC, VLPFC, precuneus, temporal pole, and portions of the superior parietal lobule in $\{high, high\}$ dyads than in $\{low,$

low} dyads. (c) We found similar patterns when we compared {high, high} dyads to {low, high} dyads and (d) when we compared {low, high} dyads to {low, low} dyads. The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions with significant differences for each contrast are outlined in black ($p < 0.001$, FDR-corrected).

Dyad-level preference analysis. We tested whether our self-reported preference data were consistent with an “Anna Karenina” hypothesis that more-central individuals have preferences that are exceptionally similar to each other and that less-central individuals have preferences that are idiosyncratic, with each low-centrality individual’s preferences differing from those of other individuals in their own way; we also tested if such self-reported differences in preferences could account for our neural results. We first fit two mixed-effects models, with crossed random effects to account for dependency structure of the data⁴⁰. (See the “Methods” section.) We employed one such model for each type of preference (i.e., similarities in enjoyment and interest ratings). We used dyad-level similarities in enjoyment and interest ratings (see the above discussion of “Preference similarity”) as the dependent variables — one in each of the two models — and the dyad-level minimum-centrality variable as the independent variable. We then performed planned contrasts of the three different dyad-level centrality groups (i.e., {low, low}, {low, high}, and {high, high}) to test if the inclusion of one or more low-centrality individuals in a dyad was associated with lower levels of interpersonal similarities in preferences (i.e., $S_{\{high, high\}} > S_{\{low, low\}}$, $S_{\{high, high\}} > S_{\{low, high\}}$, and $S_{\{low, high\}} > S_{\{low, low\}}$, where S corresponds to dyad-level preference similarity, as defined in the above section on “Preference similarity”). We employed FDR correction to correct for multiple comparisons due to the multiple planned contrasts. Our results indicated that dyads that consisted of two highly-central individuals (i.e., {high, high}) were more similar to one another in what they found enjoyable and interesting than dyads that consisted of two less-central individuals ({low, low}) (see Tables S7 and S8). We

found similar patterns when we compared highly-central dyads to mixed-centrality dyads and when we compared mixed-centrality dyads to less-central dyads (see Tables S7 and S8).

We next tested whether the above behavioral findings, which (like our neural findings) support an Anna Karenina principle, could account for the neural results. Specifically, we examined whether inter-subject similarities in self-reported preferences could explain our observation that individuals who were highly central in their residential community were exceptionally similar in their neural responses to other highly-central individuals, whereas less-central individuals were comparatively idiosyncratic. To examine this possibility, we fit additional linear mixed-effects models to test the relationship between ISCs in each brain region and dyad-level in-degree centrality (i.e., whether a given dyad was composed of two high-centrality participants, two low-centrality participants, or one high-centrality participant and one low-centrality participant) while controlling for similarity in enjoyment and interest ratings. Our results indicate that the “Anna Karenina” pattern of results that link ISCs and dyad-level in-degree centralities remain significant after controlling for similarity in enjoyment and interest ratings (see Fig. S10), suggesting that our findings that greater neural similarity tends to occur between highly-central individuals and that reduced neural similarity tends to occur between less-central individuals arose from differences beyond those that were captured by self-reported preference ratings.

Discussion

What factors distinguish highly-central individuals in social networks? Our results are consistent with the notion that popular individuals (who are central in their social networks) process the world around them in normative ways, whereas unpopular individuals process the world around them idiosyncratically. Popular individuals exhibited greater mean neural

similarity with their peers than unpopular individuals in several regions of the brain, including ones in which similar neural responding has been associated with shared higher-level interpretations of events and social cognition (e.g., regions of the default mode network) while viewing dynamic, naturalistic stimuli⁴². Our results indicate that the relationship between popularity and neural similarity follows an Anna Karenina principle. Specifically, we observed that popular individuals were very similar to each other in their neural responses, whereas unpopular individuals were dissimilar both to each other and to their peers' normative way of processing the world. Our findings suggest that highly-central people process and respond to the world around them in a manner that allows them to relate to and connect with many of their peers and that less-central people exhibit idiosyncrasies that may result in greater difficulty in relating to others.

Brain areas in which popular individuals exhibited, on average, greater neural similarity with their peers than was the case for unpopular individuals included the bilateral DMPFC and the precuneus, which are both regions of the default mode network. Mirroring our findings that link popularity with mean neural similarity with community members, brain areas in which we observed an Anna Karenina pattern (i.e., areas in which highly-central individuals responded exceptionally similarly to each other, whereas less-central individuals responded idiosyncratically) include the DMPFC, the precuneus, and other regions of the default mode network (such as the posterior cingulate cortex and the inferior parietal lobule). These regions have been implicated in social cognitive processes such as mentalizing and perspective-taking^{43–45}. Neural similarity in these regions has also been associated with similarities in the understanding and interpretation of narratives^{28,33,46}, as people who share similar viewpoints and perspectives have greater similarity in these higher-order brain regions during the viewing of

naturalistic stimuli than those who do not. Additionally, neural similarity in these regions has been associated with friendship²⁵; friends have greater similarity in these regions than people who are not friends. Of particular relevance to the present study, it was suggested recently⁴² that the default mode network helps promote a critical “sense-making” function by combining external information about one’s surroundings with internal experiences and schemas to create models of situations as they unfold over time and that ISCs in such regions support the creation of shared meaning across individuals. Our results suggest that popular individuals process the world around them in a way that closely reflects their peers’ normative way of understanding and responding to the world. Such similarity may help them relate and connect to many people. Our findings also suggest that popular individuals are exceptionally similar to each other, whereas less-popular individuals are dissimilar from a group’s normative ways of processing and understanding the world (such that they process and respond to the world around them in their own idiosyncratic way). Our results were significant even when we controlled for (1) demographic variables that may be associated with neural similarity and (2) social distances between individuals. Therefore, our findings suggest that the association of neural similarity in regions of the default mode network (and in other regions) with popularity is not merely a confound of the most popular individuals being more likely to be friends with one another. Instead, we observed that highly-central individuals had exceptionally similar neural responses to those of many of their peers, including those with whom they were not friends.

Popular individuals also self-reported preferences for the stimuli that were more reflective of the norms of their peers. Specifically, popular individuals had greater mean similarity with their peers in the extent to which they found stimuli to be enjoyable and interesting. These results also support an Anna Karenina principle, as popular individuals had

exceptionally similar preferences for the stimuli as one another but each unpopular individual had idiosyncratic preferences for the stimuli that were both different from the preferences of their peers and from those of other unpopular individuals. In concert, the observed behavioral patterns suggest that highly-central individuals self-report preferences that are more aligned with their peers' preferences and thus more "in tune" with what others find enjoyable or interesting; this may help them connect with many of their peers through mutually shared interests. Notably, controlling for similarities in the enjoyment and interest ratings did not change our results linking neural similarity with popularity. That is, we found that neural similarity in brain regions that have been implicated in higher-level interpretation and social cognition was associated with network centrality above and beyond what we were able to capture using self-report preferences. This suggests that measuring neural responses to naturalistic stimuli as they unfold over time allows one to capture consequential aspects of mental processing beyond what one can obtain using a few targeted self-report questions. The strong link between popularity and ISCs (even when controlling for similarities in participants' self-reported preferences), relative to links between similarities in popularity and self-reported preferences, may be attributable to several factors, including the finer temporal granularity of ISCs than our self-report measures (because ISCs capture similarities in how responses evolve over time), the limits of self-reporting (because people are often unaware of and/or unwilling to report features of their attitudes and other aspects of their mental processing⁴⁷), and the possibility that the similarities in processing that are linked to centrality reflect similarities in the creation of internal models of situations as they evolve over time (rather than similarities in what participants found interesting or enjoyable)⁴². Indeed, a notable benefit calculating ISCs is that one can use them to characterize similarities in many different aspects of mental processing in parallel, and one can thereby obtain

insight into diverse emotional and cognitive processes that unfold in response to various situations and which may be shaped by individuals' pre-existing beliefs, values, attitudes, and experiences.

In the present study, we obtained data from two different residential communities and characterized the neural similarity of each participant with all other participants, including participants from the other community. We successfully replicated all of our main effects linking ISCs and popularity when we fit models using only intra-community dyads. (See Figs. S3 and S7.) The two residential communities both consisted of first-year students who were attending the same university. Although each residential community is relatively bounded and interactions between community members were likely to be uncommon — both because of restrictions that arose from the building structure and because of programming that focused on intra-community social activities — it is likely that the two residential communities had similar norms. Therefore, the types of normative processing that are associated with popularity in one residential community were likely similar to those that are associated with popularity in the other community. However, in some contexts, looking specifically at only intra-community similarities in neural activity may be important when relating ISCs with popularity, particularly when drawing on participants from communities with norms that are markedly different from each other. Future work can further elucidate the extent to which ISCs within and between communities are associated with individual differences in the centralities of individuals in social networks.

Does more normative processing of the world lead to certain individuals becoming central in their social network, does being highly central in a social network lead an individual to process the world around them in a more normative way, or is it some combination of the two?

Do popular people, as a result of their central position in a network, exert influence on the rest of the community members so that many individuals in the network become more similar to the popular people? Or do popular people change the way that they process the world around them to fit the norms of a social network? Or is it some combination of the two? Because the present study has only one wave of fMRI data, we are not able to ascertain the causal direction(s) of our effects (i.e., whether neural similarity is a cause, a consequence, or some of both of individuals' centrality in a social network). Prior work suggests that popular individuals have more behavioral and neural sensitivity than unpopular people to interpersonal cues⁴⁸ and that highly-central individuals are more likely than less-central individuals to adapt their brain activity to match that of their social group⁴⁹. Therefore, one possibility is that people who become popular may adapt their views of the world to meet their social network's normative ways of processing the world, perhaps due to a greater need to belong socially or a desire to connect with a large number of people. Future studies that employ longitudinal data can help elucidate the direction(s) of these effects and further clarify the mechanisms that may be at play.

In summary, our results suggest that highly-central individuals in a social network are exceptionally similar to their peers in how they process the world, as indicated by neural responses to naturalistic stimuli in brain regions that are associated with social cognition and building shared internal models of situations. We also found support for an Anna Karenina principle: Highly-central individuals were exceptionally alike in their neural processing, whereas each less-central individual was dissimilar from the social group's normative ways of processing the world and from one another in their own idiosyncratic ways. We demonstrated that although participants' self-reported enjoyment of and interest in the stimuli followed a similar pattern, accounting for those self-reported preferences did not change our main results. Overall, our

results suggest that a similar understanding of the world, as reflected in similar brain responses across people, may help humans achieve and maintain social connections.

Methods

Characterization of the two social networks. A total of 119 participants completed our social-network survey, with $n_{\text{residential community 1}} = 70$ and $n_{\text{residential community 2}} = 49$ people in the two residential communities. All participants were living in one of these two communities of a first-year dorm in a large state university (specifically, University of California, Los Angeles) in the United States. We conducted our social-network survey in accordance with the Institutional Review Board of the University of California, Los Angeles. It was administered during December and January of the students' first year in the university, which began in the last week of September. Therefore, the subjects had been living together in their communities for 3–4 months prior to completing the social-network survey. In the survey, participants were first asked to indicate their full names and any nicknames by which they were known. This allowed us to match individuals' names with the number of friendship nominations that they received from other residents of their community. Participants were then asked to type the names of other residents in their dormitory community with whom they interacted regularly. Participants answered the following prompt: "Consider the people you like to spend your free time with. Since you arrived at [institution name], who are the people you've socialized with most often? (Examples: eat meals with, hang out with, study with, spend time with)." The participants in the study could name as many people as they wished who fit that description without any restrictions, and no time limit was imposed on the survey. We adapted this question from prior work that investigated social networks of university students^{13,25,50}.

We used the IGRAPH package⁵¹ in R⁵² to analyze the social-network data. We constructed two networks (i.e., one for each residential community) and encoded the participants' answers with unweighted and directed edges. We then calculated the in-degree centrality of each

individual. This quantity gives the number of the individual's community members (who participated in the social-network survey) who named them as someone with whom they interacted regularly. The distributions of the in-degree centralities were similar across subsets of the fMRI sample from each community (see Fig. S1).

Combining data across residential communities. As we just noted in the prior section, each participant was living in one of two residential communities, and we operationalized popularity by calculating in-degree centrality based on the number of nominations that each participant received from peers who were living in the same residential community. Each residential community was relatively bounded, and residents were encouraged (e.g., via intra-community social activities) to form social connections within their community. To maximize statistical power, we compared the neural responses across all possible pairs of participants (i.e., dyads) in both residential communities and then related the ISCs to in-degree centrality values across all possible pairs of participants, including ones who were living in different residential communities. It is possible that this approach may have diminished our capacity to detect relationships between neural similarity and popularity, depending on how much the link between popularity within communities and neural similarity is based on community-specific norms. However, both communities consisted of first-year students who were attending the same university, so we reasoned that norms were likely to be similar across the two communities and that it would thus be reasonable for our neural analysis to include ISCs between participants from different residential communities. We later complemented these main analyses with analyses that were based on only intra-community neural similarities. The results of these subsequent analyses (see Figs. S3 and S7) yielded similar results as our main analyses.

fMRI study subjects. A total of 70 participants from the aforementioned two residential communities participated in the neuroimaging portion of our study. We excluded four subjects from the fMRI data that we analyzed; two subjects had excessive movement in more than half of the scan, one subject fell asleep during half of the scan, and one subject did not complete the scan. Four fMRI subjects did not complete the social-network survey, and we also excluded one of these participants from the fMRI data. This resulted in a total of 63 participants (40 female) between the ages of 18 and 21 (with a mean age of $M = 18.19$ and a standard deviation of $SD = 0.59$) that we included for all analyses. The distributions of in-degree centralities were similar across the fMRI sample and the full social-network sample (see Fig. S1). Of these participants, one subject had excessive head movement in one of the four runs and one subject reported falling asleep in one of the four runs. In analyses that involved brain data, we excluded the associated runs for these subjects and only included the remaining three runs for these subjects. All participants provided informed consent in accordance with the procedures of the Institutional Review Board of the University of California, Los Angeles.

fMRI Procedure. Participants attended an in-person study session that included self-report surveys and a 90-minute neuroimaging session in which we measured their brain activity using blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) fMRI. The fMRI data collection occurred between September and early November during the subjects' first year at the university, and it was thus completed before the start of data collection for the social-network part of our study. Prior to entering the scanner, participants completed self-report surveys in which they provided demographic information, including their age, gender, and ethnicity. During the fMRI portion of the study, the participants watched 14 video clips with sound. The stimuli consisted of 14 different videos that varied in both duration (from 91 to 734 seconds) and content. (See Table S1

for descriptions of the content.) Prior to scanning, we informed the participants that they would be watching video clips of heterogeneous content and that their experience would be like watching television while someone else “channel surfed”^{iv}. A subset of video clips were selected from ones that have been used previously (10 of the videos were used in prior studies, and 4 of them were new), and we used similar criteria to what was used in prior work to select new stimuli^{25,39}. First, we selected stimuli that were not likely to have been seen previously by the participants in an effort to avoid inducing inter-subject differences that arose from familiarity with the content. Second, we selected stimuli that were likely to be engaging to minimize the likelihood that participants would engage in mind-wandering during viewing, as this could potentially introduce undesirable noise into our data. Third, we selected stimuli that were likely to elicit meaningful variability in the interpretations and meaning that different individuals can draw from the content. The participants were asked to watch the videos naturally (i.e., as they would watch them in a normal situation in life). All participants saw the videos in the same order to avoid any potential variability in neural responses from differences in the way that the stimuli were presented (rather than from endogenous participant-level differences). The video “task” was divided into four runs, and the task lasted approximately 60 minutes in total. Structural images of the brain were also collected. (We describe the image collection in more detail in the “fMRI data acquisition” subsection.) After the fMRI scan, the participants provided ratings (in the form of integers between 1 and 5) both on how much they enjoyed each video (“How much did you enjoy this video?”); response options ranged from 1 to 5, with the anchors “1 = not at all” and “5 = very much”, and on how interesting they found each video (“How interesting did

^{iv} The term “channel-surfing” is an idiom refers to scanning through different television channels to find something to watch.

you find this video?"); response options ranged from 1 to 5, with the anchors “1 = very boring” and “5 = very interesting”).

fMRI data acquisition. The participants were scanned using a 3T Siemens Prisma scanner with a 32-channel coil. Functional images were recorded using an echo-planar sequence (with echo time = 37 ms, repetition time = 800 ms, voxel size = 2.0 mm × 2.0 mm × 2.0 mm, matrix size = 104 × 104 mm, field of view = 208 mm, slice thickness = 2.0 mm, multi-band acceleration factor = 8, and 72 interleaved slices with no gap). A black screen was included at the beginning (with duration = 8 seconds) and the end (duration = 20 seconds) of each run to allow the BOLD signal to stabilize. We also acquired high-resolution T1-weighted (T1w) images (with echo time = 2.48 ms, repetition time = 1,900 ms, voxel size = 1.0 mm × 1.0 mm × 1.00 mm, matrix size = 256 × 256 mm, field of view = 256 mm, slice thickness = 1.0 mm, and 208 interleaved slices with 0.5 mm gap) for coregistration and normalization. We attached adhesive tape to the head coil in the MRI scanner and applied it across the participants’ foreheads; it is known that this significantly reduces head motion⁵³.

fMRI data analysis. We used fMRIPrep version 1.4.0 for the data processing of our fMRI data⁵⁴. We have taken the descriptions of anatomical and functional data preprocessing that begins in the next paragraph from the recommended boilerplate text that is generated by fMRIPrep and released under a CC0 license, with the intention that researchers reuse the text to facilitate clear and consistent descriptions of preprocessing steps, thereby enhancing the reproducibility of studies.

For each subject, the T1-weighted (T1w) image was corrected for intensity non-uniformity (INU) with N4BiasFieldCorrection, distributed with ANTs 2.1.0⁵⁵, and used as T1w-reference throughout the workflow. Brain tissue segmentation of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF),

white matter (WM) and gray matter (GM) was performed on the brain-extracted T1w using FSL fast⁵⁶. Volume-based spatial normalization to the ICBM 152 Nonlinear Asymmetrical template version 2009c (MNI152Nlin2009cAsym) was performed through nonlinear registration with antsRegistration (ANTs 2.1.0⁵⁵).

For each of the four BOLD runs per participant, the following preprocessing was performed. First, a reference volume and its skull-stripped version were generated using a custom methodology of fMRIPrep. The BOLD reference was then coregistered to the T1w reference using FSL flirt⁵⁶ with the boundary-based registration cost function. The coregistration was configured with nine degrees of freedom to account for distortions remaining in the BOLD reference. Head-motion parameters with respect to the BOLD reference (transformation matrices, and six corresponding rotation and translation parameters) were estimated before any spatiotemporal filtering using FSL mcflirt⁵⁶. Automatic removal of motion artifacts using independent component analysis (ICA-AROMA) was performed on the preprocessed BOLD on MNI space time series after removal of non-steady state volumes and spatial smoothing with an isotropic, Gaussian kernel of 6mm FWHM (full-width half-maximum). The BOLD time series were then resampled to the MNI152Nlin2009cAsym standard space.

The following 10 confounding variables generated by fMRIPrep were included as nuisance regressors: global signals extracted from within the cerebrospinal fluid, white matter, and whole-brain masks, framewise displacement, three translational motion parameters, and three rotational motion parameters.

Cortical parcellation into brain regions. We extracted neural responses across the whole brain using the 200-region cortical parcellation scheme of Schaefer et al.³⁶ and 14

subcortical parcels using the Harvard–Oxford subcortical atlas³⁷. Together, this resulted in 214 parcels that span the whole brain.

Inter-subject correlations. We extracted and concatenated preprocessed time-series data across all four runs for each subject, except for the two subjects for whom we used only partial data. For these two subjects, we concatenated their three usable runs into a single time series and then calculated ISCs for these subjects by comparing their data to the corresponding three runs in the other subjects. We extracted the mean time series in each of the 214 brain regions for each subject at each time point [i.e., at each repetition time (TR)]. Our analyses included 63 subjects after the various exclusions, so there were 1,952 unique dyads. For each unique dyad, we calculated the Pearson correlation between the mean time series of the neural response in each of the 214 brain regions. We then Fisher z-transformed the Pearson correlations and normalized the subsequent values (i.e., using z-scores) within each brain region.

Subject-level analysis. As we explained in the “Results” section, we were interested in whether an individual’s in-degree centrality is associated with their mean neural similarity with their peers. To test this relationship, we transformed the dyad-level neural similarity measures into subject-level measures to obtain a single number that encoded a subject’s mean neural similarity with other subjects for each brain region. For each subject, we calculated the mean Fisher z-transformed ISC value for the subject with every other subject in each brain region. We then fit a separate GLM for each brain region to test the association between individual differences in in-degree centrality and the mean neural similarity in the respective brain region. We FDR-corrected all results because of the multiple comparisons.

Dyad-level ISC analysis. For our dyad-level analysis, we took the following steps to test for associations between in-degree centrality and neural similarity in each of the 214 brain

regions. First, we transformed the subject-level in-degree centrality measure into a dyad-level measure by creating a binarized variable that indicated whether the two members of the dyad had high, low, or mixed in-degree centralities (i.e., {high, high}, {low, high}, {low, low}). See the “Results” section for details. Of the 1,952 unique dyads, 253 of them were {high, high}, 779 of them were {low, low}, and 920 of them were {low, high}. To relate this dyad-level in-degree centrality measure and neural similarity, we used the method in Chen et al.⁴⁰ and fit linear mixed-effects models with crossed random effects using LME4 and LMERTEST⁵⁷ in R. This approach allowed us to account for non-independence in the data due to repeated observations for each subject (i.e., because each subject is part of multiple dyads). Following the method that was suggested by Chen et al.⁴⁰, we “doubled” the data (with redundancy) to allow fully-crossed random effects. In other words, we accounted for the symmetric nature of the ISC matrix and the fact that one participant contributes twice in a dyad, as $(i, j) = (j, i)$ for participants i and j . See Chen et al.⁴⁰ for more details. Following Chen et al.⁴⁰, we manually corrected the degrees of freedom to $N - k$, where N is the number of unique observations (in our case, $N = 1,952$ because there are 1,952 unique dyads) and k is the number of fixed effects in the model, before performing statistical inference. All findings that we have reported in the present paper use the corrected number of degrees of freedom. For each brain region, we first fit a mixed-effects model to infer neural similarity in that brain region from the binarized dyad-level in-degree variable, with random intercepts for each member of the dyad (i.e., “subject 1” and “subject 2”). We then conducted planned-contrast analyses using EMMEANS⁵⁸ in R to compare which brain regions had larger ISCs for the different values of the dyadic in-degree centrality variable: $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$, $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, high\}}$, and $ISC_{\{low, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$. We transformed all variables into z-scores prior to our subsequent computations to obtain

standardized coefficients (B) as outputs. We FDR-corrected all p -values at $p < 0.001$ because of multiple comparisons at $p < 0.001$.

Dyad-level behavioral analysis. We took an analogous approach as in our dyad-level ISC analysis to test the relationships between dyadic in-degree centrality and preference similarity. (See “Preference similarity” in the “Results” section.) To do this, we followed the same procedure as the one that we described above in “Dyad-level ISC analysis” and fit two mixed-effects models that take into account the dependence structure of the data. We constructed one such model for each type of rating to infer similarity in enjoyment and interesting ratings from the dyad-level in-degree variable, with random intercepts for each member of the dyad. We then conducted planned-contrast analyses using EMMEANS in R⁵⁸ to examine whether there was an association between preference similarity and different levels of the dyadic in-degree centrality variable: $S_{\{high, high\}} > S_{\{low, low\}}$, $S_{\{high, high\}} > S_{\{low, high\}}$, and $S_{\{low, high\}} > S_{\{low, low\}}$, where s corresponds to dyad-level preference similarity, as defined in the section on “Preference similarity”. We transformed all variables into z -scores prior to our subsequent calculations to obtain standardized coefficients (B) as outputs. We FDR-corrected all p -values at $p < 0.001$ because of the multiple comparisons from the planned contrasts.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1. Cacioppo, J. T. & Cacioppo, S. Social relationships and health: The toxic effects of perceived social isolation. *Soc. Personal. Psychol. Compass* **8**, 58–72 (2014).
2. Shankar, A., McMunn, A., Banks, J. & Steptoe, A. Loneliness, social isolation, and behavioral and biological health indicators in older adults. *Heal. Psychol.* **30**, 377–385 (2011).
3. Hawkey, L. C., Burlison, M. H., Berntson, G. G. & Cacioppo, J. T. Loneliness in everyday life: Cardiovascular activity, psychosocial context, and health behaviors. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **85**, 105–120 (2003).
4. Hawkey, L. C. & Cacioppo, J. T. Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Ann. Behav. Med.* **40**, 218–227 (2010).
5. Moieni, M. & Eisenberger, N. I. Social Isolation and Health. *Wiley Encycl. Heal. Psychol.* **2**, 695–702 (2020).
6. Yang, Y. C., McClintock, M. K., Kozloski, M. & Li, T. Social isolation and adult mortality: The role of chronic inflammation and sex differences. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* **54**, 183–203 (2013).
7. Seeman, T. E. Social ties and health: The benefits of social integration. *Ann. Epidemiol.* **6**, 442–451 (1996).
8. Snyder-Mackler, N. *et al.* Social determinants of health and survival in humans and other animals. *Science.* **368**, (2020).
9. House, J. S., Landis, K. R. & Umberson, D. Social relationships and health. *Science.* **241**, 540–545 (1988).
10. Hill, R. A. & Dunbar, R. I. M. Social network size in humans. *Hum. Nat.* **14**, 53–72

- (2003).
11. Roberts, S. G. B., Wilson, R., Fedurek, P. & Dunbar, R. I. M. Individual differences and personal social network size and structure. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **44**, 954–964 (2008).
 12. Apicella, C. L., Marlowe, F. W., Fowler, J. H. & Christakis, N. A. Social networks and cooperation in hunter-gatherers. *Nature* **481**, 497–501 (2012).
 13. Burt, R. S. Structural holes and good ideas. *Am. J. Sociol.* **110**, 349–399 (2004).
 14. Ibarra, H. & Andrews, S. B. Power, social influence, and sense making: Effects of network centrality and proximity on employee perceptions. *Adm. Sci. Q.* **38**, 277–303 (1993).
 15. Burt, R. S. The social capital of opinion leaders. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* **566**, 37–64 (1999).
 16. Cacioppo, J. T., Fowler, J. H. & Christakis, N. A. Alone in the crowd: The structure and spread of loneliness in a large social network. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **97**, 977–991 (2009).
 17. Linden, D. Van Der, Scholte, R. H. J., Cillessen, A. H. N. & Segers, E. Classroom ratings of likeability and popularity are related to the Big Five and the general factor of personality. *J. Res. Pers.* **44**, 669–672 (2010).
 18. Feiler, D. C. & Kleinbaum, A. M. Popularity, similarity, and the network extraversion bias. *Psychol. Sci.* **26**, 593–603 (2015).
 19. Berndt, T. J. & Das, R. Effects of popularity and friendship on perceptions of the personality and social behavior of peers. *J. Early Adolesc.* **7**, 429–439 (1987).
 20. Dauber, S. L. & Benbow, C. P. Aspects of personality and peer relations of extremely talented adolescents. *Gift. Child Q.* **34**, 10–14 (1990).
 21. Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Gest, S. D. & Gariépy, J. L. Social

- networks and aggressive behavior: Peer support or peer rejection? *Dev. Psychol.* **24**, 815–823 (1988).
22. Cialdini, R. & Trost, M. Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. in *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (eds. Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T. & Lindzey, G.) 151–192 (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1998).
 23. Tolstoy, L. *Anna Karenina*. (Wordsworth Editions, Ware, 1997).
 24. Sonkusare, S., Breakspear, M. & Guo, C. Naturalistic stimuli in neuroscience: Critically acclaimed. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **23**, 699–714 (2019).
 25. Parkinson, C., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Wheatley, T. Similar neural responses predict friendship. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 332 (2018).
 26. Lahnakoski, J. M. *et al.* Synchronous brain activity across individuals underlies shared psychological perspectives. *NeuroImage* **100**, 316–324 (2014).
 27. Nummenmaa, L., Lahnakoski, J. M. & Glerean, E. Sharing the social world via intersubject neural synchronisation. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **24**, 7–14 (2018).
 28. Nguyen, M., Vanderwal, T. & Hasson, U. Shared understanding of narratives is correlated with shared neural responses. *NeuroImage* **184**, 161–170 (2019).
 29. Diamond, J. Zebras, Unhappy marriages and Anna Karenina principle. in *Guns, Germs, and Steel* 157–175 (W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1997).
 30. Zaneveld, J. R., McMinds, R. & Thurber, R. V. Stress and stability: Applying the Anna Karenina principle to animal microbiomes. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2**, (2017).
 31. Finn, E. S. *et al.* Idiosynchrony: From shared responses to individual differences during naturalistic neuroimaging. *NeuroImage* **215**, 116828 (2020).
 32. Baek, E. C., Porter, M. A. & Parkinson, C. Social network analysis for social

- neuroscientists. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* nsaa069 (2020) doi:10.1093/scan/nsaa069.
33. Finn, E. S., Corlett, P. R., Chen, G., Bandettini, P. A. & Constable, R. T. Trait paranoia shapes inter-subject synchrony in brain activity during an ambiguous social narrative. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2043 (2018).
 34. Leong, Y. C., Chen, J., Willer, R. & Zaki, J. Conservative and liberal attitudes drive polarized neural responses to political content. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 27731–27739 (2020).
 35. Nastase, S. A., Goldstein, A. & Hasson, U. Keep it real: Rethinking the primacy of experimental control in cognitive neuroscience. *NeuroImage* **222**, 117254 (2020).
 36. Schaefer, A. *et al.* Local-global parcellation of the human cerebral cortex from intrinsic functional connectivity MRI. *Cereb. Cortex* **28**, 3095–3114 (2018).
 37. Desikan, R. S. *et al.* An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *NeuroImage* **31**, 968–980 (2006).
 38. Fisher, R. A. Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an indefinitely large population. *Biometrika* **10**, 507–521 (1915).
 39. Hyon, R., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Parkinson, C. Social network proximity predicts similar trajectories of psychological states: Evidence from multi-voxel spatiotemporal dynamics. *NeuroImage* **216**, 116492 (2020).
 40. Chen, G., Taylor, P. A., Shin, Y. W., Reynolds, R. C. & Cox, R. W. Untangling the relatedness among correlations, Part II: Inter-subject correlation group analysis through linear mixed-effects modeling. *NeuroImage* **147**, 825–840 (2017).
 41. Casella, G. & Berger, R. L. *Statistical Inference*. (Wadsworth Group, Pacific Grove, 2001).

42. Yeshurun, Y., Nguyen, M. & Hasson, U. The default mode network: Where the idiosyncratic self meets the shared social world. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **22**, 181–192 (2021).
43. Schurz, M., Radua, J., Aichhorn, M., Richlan, F. & Perner, J. Fractionating theory of mind: A meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **42**, 9–34 (2014).
44. Spunt, R. P., Meyer, M. L. & Lieberman, M. D. The default mode of human brain function primes the intentional stance. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **25**, 719–729 (2013).
45. Dufour, N. *et al.* Similar brain activation during false belief tasks in a large sample of adults with and without autism. *PLoS One* **8**, e75468 (2013).
46. Yeshurun, Y. *et al.* Same story, different story: The neural representation of interpretive frameworks. *Psychol. Sci.* **28**, 307–319 (2017).
47. Nisbett, R. E. *et al.* Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychol. Rev.* **84**, 231–259 (1977).
48. Zerubavel, N., Bearman, P. S., Weber, J. & Ochsner, K. N. Neural mechanisms tracking popularity in real-world social networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 15072–15077 (2015).
49. Sievers, B., Welker, C., Hasson, U., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Wheatley, T. How consensus-building conversation changes our minds and aligns our brains. *Psyarxiv* (2020) doi:<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/562z7>.
50. Parkinson, C., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Wheatley, T. Spontaneous neural encoding of social network position. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **1**, 0072 (2017).
51. Csardi, G. & Nepusz, T. The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal Complex Systems*, 1695 (2006).

52. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, 2013).
53. Krause, F. *et al.* Active head motion reduction in magnetic resonance imaging using tactile feedback. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* **40**, 4026–4037 (2019).
54. Esteban, O. *et al.* FMRIPrep: A robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. *Nat. Methods* **16**, 111–116 (2019).
55. Avants, B. B. *et al.* A reproducible evaluation of ANTs similarity metric performance in brain image registration. *NeuroImage* **54**, 2033–2044 (2011).
56. Smith, S. M. *et al.* Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *NeuroImage* **23**, S208–S219 (2004).
57. Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B. & Christensen, R. H. B. lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *J. Stat. Softw.* **82**, (2017).
58. Russell, A. *et al.* emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. *CRAN* (2021) doi:10.1080/00031305.1980.10483031.

Acknowledgements

We thank Elena Sternlicht and Kelly Xue for providing support with data collection, as well as the UCLA Center for Cognitive Neuroscience (particularly Jared Gilbert). We thank Oshton Tsen for providing support with the figures. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation SBE Postdoctoral Research Fellowship [Grant No. 1911783] and the National Science Foundation [Grant No. SBE-1835239].

Author Contributions

E.C.B., R.H., M.A.P., and C.P. designed the study and experiments. E.C.B., R.H., and K.L. collected the data. E.C.B. analyzed the data with support from R.H., E.S.F., and C.P. E.C.B., M.A.P., and C.P. wrote the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Supplementary Information for **“Popularity is linked to neural coordination: Neural evidence for an Anna Karenina principle in social networks”**

Elisa C. Baek^{1*}, Ryan Hyon¹, Karina López¹, Emily S. Finn², Mason A. Porter³, and Carolyn Parkinson^{1,4*}

¹Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, ²Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Dartmouth College, ³ Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, ⁴Brain Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles

* Corresponding authors

**Supplementary figure for “Social-network characterization” in the “Results” section:
Distribution of in-degree centrality**




Fig. S1. Distributions of in-degree centrality. The distributions of in-degree centrality were relatively similar across the different samples and subsamples. (a) The distribution of in-degree centrality in our full sample of participants who participated in the social-network survey. (b) The distribution of in-degree centrality in the subset of our fMRI sample who were living in Residential Community 1. (c) The distribution of in-degree centrality in the subset of our fMRI sample who were living in Residential Community 2.

Supplementary table for “Neural similarity” in the “Results” section: Stimuli descriptions

Table S1. Descriptions of stimuli

	Video	Content
1	An Astronaut’s View of Earth	An astronaut discusses viewing Earth from space and, in particular, witnessing the effects of climate change from space. He then urges viewers to mobilize to address this issue.
2	All I Want	A sentimental music video depicting a social outcast with a facial deformity who is seeking companionship.
3	Scientific demonstration	An astronaut at the International Space Station demonstrates and explains what happens when one wrings out a waterlogged washcloth in space.
4	Food Inc.	An excerpt from a documentary discussing how the fast-food industry influences food production and farming practices in the United States.
5	We Can Be Heroes	An excerpt from a mockumentary-style series in which a man discusses why he nominated himself for the title of Australian of the Year.
6	Ban College Football	Journalists and athletes debate whether football should be banned as a college sport.
7	Soccer match	Highlights from a soccer match.
8	Ew!	A comedy skit in which grown men play teenage girls disgusted by the things around them.
9	Life’s Too Short	An example of a ‘cringe comedy’ in which a dramatic actor is depicted unsuccessfully trying his hand at improvisational comedy.
10	America’s Funniest Home Videos	A series of homemade video clips that depict examples of unintentional physical comedy arising from accidents.
11	Zima Blue	A philosophical, animated short set in a futuristic world.
12	Nathan For You	An episode from a ‘docu-reality’ comedy in which the host convinces people, who are not always in on the joke, to engage in a variety of strange behaviors.
13	College Party	An excerpt from a film depicting a party scene in which a bashful college student is pressured to drink alcohol.
14	Eighth Grade	Two excerpts from a film that depict a young teenager who video blogs about her mental-health issues and an awkward scene between two teenagers on a dinner date.

Note: Videos 1–10 are a subset of the videos that were used in a prior study¹. The descriptions of them in the present paper are the same as those in the prior study.

Supplementary tables for “Subject-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section: Subject-level subcortical results

Table S2. Subject-level results that relate ISCs with the binarized in-degree centrality (high versus low): Subcortical results

Subcortical region	B	SE	p
Accumbens (L)	0.363	0.260	0.325
Amygdala (L)	0.578	0.253	0.164
Caudate (L)	0.269	0.262	0.466
Hippocampus (L)	0.550	0.254	0.180
Pallidum (L)	0.611	0.252	0.144
Putamen (L)	0.300	0.261	0.415
Thalamus (L)	0.432	0.258	0.247
Accumbens (R)	0.080	0.264	0.834
Amygdala (R)	0.493	0.256	0.210
Caudate (R)	0.171	0.263	0.640
Hippocampus (R)	0.587	0.253	0.158
Pallidum (R)	0.068	0.264	0.845
Putamen (R)	0.302	0.261	0.414
Thalamus (R)	0.482	0.256	0.220

We have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons; the quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient, and the quantity SE is the standard error.

Table S3. Subject-level results relating ISCs without binarizing in-degree centrality: Subcortical results

Subcortical region	ρ	p
Accumbens (L)	0.248	0.217
Amygdala (L)	0.350	0.104
Caudate (L)	0.167	0.355
Hippocampus (L)	0.302	0.175
Pallidum (L)	0.256	0.217
Putamen (L)	0.123	0.491
Thalamus (L)	0.212	0.262
Accumbens (R)	0.054	0.787
Amygdala (R)	0.217	0.262
Caudate (R)	0.063	0.742
Hippocampus (R)	0.279	0.200
Pallidum (R)	-0.003	0.989
Putamen (R)	0.154	0.392
Thalamus (R)	0.251	0.217

We have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Supplementary methodological information and figures for “Subject-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section

Binarized subject-level results that control for similarities in self-reported demographic traits. We fit analogous models to those that we described in the “Subject-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section to test the relationship between in-degree centrality and ISC while controlling for all available self-reported demographic variables: similarities in age, gender, ethnicity, and home country (which we define as the country where an individual was living prior to enrolling at the university). To control for similarities in demographic variables, for each unique dyad (i.e., for each pair of participants) in the fMRI sample, we computed an absolute difference of the age between each individual in the dyad (i.e., $\text{age_difference} = |\text{age}_{\text{sub1}} - \text{age}_{\text{sub2}}|$). We then transformed this difference score into a similarity score such that larger numbers indicated greater similarity (specifically, $\text{age_similarity} = 1 - (\text{age_difference}/\max(\text{age_difference}))$). To control for similarities in gender, we created an indicator variable in which 0 signifies different genders and 1 signifies the same gender. To control for similarities in ethnicity and race, we created an indicator variable for each ethnicity category (Asian, Black/African, Hispanic/Latinx, Native American, Pacific Islander, and Caucasian/White) in which 0 signifies a different self-reported ethnicity and 1 signifies the same self-reported ethnicity. Participants were able to self-report as many ethnicities as they desired. For each unique dyad, we created an overall indicator variable for ethnicity in which 0 signifies no shared ethnicity and 1 signifies a shared ethnicity. If two members of a dyad self-reported even one same ethnicity, we coded them as having a shared ethnicity. To control for similarities in home country, we created an additional indicator variable in which 0 signifies different home countries and 1 signifies the same home country. For each subject, we then calculated the mean

similarity between them and every other participant for each of the demographic variables and used these variables as covariates in our mixed-effects models. These models gave a similar pattern of results as those that we reported in the main manuscript (see Fig. S2).




Fig. S2. Subject-level results that control for similarities in demographic traits (mean similarities with other participants in age, gender, ethnicity and race, and home country). The association between ISC in the bilateral DMPFC and in-degree centrality that we reported in the main manuscript remained significant after we controlled for similarities in demographic traits. The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.05$).

Binarized subject-level results: Intra-community ISC only. Because our participants came from two different residential communities, we also conducted analyses to test if we could observe similar patterns when testing for associations between ISCs and popularity while only using intra-community ISCs. To do this, we fit analogous models as to those that we described in the “Subject-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section, except that we calculated each subject’s mean neural similarity in each brain region using only other members of their own

residential community (i.e., we removed dyads in which both members did not belong to the same community). The results of these calculations (see Fig. S3) are similar to those that we reported in the main manuscript.




Fig. S3. Subject-level results for intra-community ISCs only. The results of our calculations using only intra-community ISCs identified a similar pattern of results (specifically, large ISCs in the bilateral DMPFC) as significantly associated with in-degree centrality. The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.05$).

Binarized subject-level results: Intra-community ISCs only that control for self-reported demographic traits and social distance. We also conducted analyses to test if the associations between ISCs and in-degree centrality remained significant after controlling both for demographic variables (specifically, mean similarities with community members in age, gender, ethnicity and race, and home country; see “Binarized subject-level results that control for similarities in self-reported demographic traits” above for details about on how these similarities were calculated) and for social distance between individuals, given that social distance has been associated previously with neural similarities^{1,2}. To do this, we fit GLMs to infer ISCs in each brain region from in-degree centrality while including all of the control variables as covariates in the model. For these computations, we used ISCs in intra-community dyads only, so we calculated each individual’s mean ISC based on their ISCs only with other members of their own residential community. For each participant, we took the following steps to calculate their mean social distance from each other participant within their community. For each dyad within a community, we defined “social distance” to be the smallest number of intermediate social ties (i.e., the geodesic distance) that are necessary to connect the two individuals in the network via a path. We calculated social distances based on an unweighted and undirected graph that included the existence of any tie between two individuals, even if only one of them nominated the other as a friend. For any pair of individuals who were on different connected components of the network, we coded them as having a social distance that was equal to 1 more than the maximum social distance in the network. In both of the residential communities, the maximum social distance was 6, so we coded such individuals who were on different connected components of the network to have a social distance of 7. For the subject-level analysis, for each subject, we took the mean social distance between them and each other member in their residence

community and used this variable as a covariate in our model for inferring ISC. The results of these calculations (see Fig. S4) are similar to those that we reported in the main manuscript.




Fig. S4. Subject-level results for intra-community ISCs only in which we controlled for similarities in demographic traits and social distance. We again identified a similar pattern of results (specifically, large ISCs in the bilateral DMPFC) as in our main analysis to be significantly associated with in-degree centrality. The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.05$).

Binarized subject-level results that control for preference similarities. The relationships between ISC in the right and left DMPFC and in-degree centrality remain significant after controlling for similarities in enjoyment and interest ratings, suggesting that neural similarities in these regions capture similarities beyond those that we observed from self-reported preference ratings (see Fig. S5).




Fig. S5. Subject-level results that control for similarities in self-reported preference ratings. The associations between ISC in the right and left DMPFC and in-degree centrality remained significant after we controlled for similarities in self-reported preference ratings (i.e., ratings of enjoyment of and interest in stimuli). The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.05$).

Supplementary tables for “Dyad-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section: Subcortical results

Table S4. Dyad-level results that relate ISC with binarized in-degree centrality

Contrast: $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$

Subcortical region	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
Accumbens (L)	0.194	0.120	0.054
Amygdala (L)	0.505	0.218	0.007*
Caudate (L)	0.193	0.174	0.190
Hippocampus (L)	0.448	0.208	0.012*
Pallidum (L)	0.263	0.109	0.005**
Putamen (L)	0.185	0.160	0.168
Thalamus (L)	0.218	0.146	0.078
Accumbens (R)	-0.026	0.114	0.795
Amygdala (R)	0.402	0.210	0.024*
Caudate (R)	0.105	0.172	0.466
Hippocampus (R)	0.525	0.213	0.004**
Pallidum (R)	0.020	0.094	0.807
Putamen (R)	0.242	0.175	0.103
Thalamus (R)	0.294	0.171	0.041*

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; we have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Table S5. Dyad-level results that relate ISC with binarized in-degree centrality

Contrast: $ISC_{\{high, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, high\}}$

Subcortical region	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
Accumbens (L)	0.151	0.011	0.034*
Amygdala (L)	0.268	0.002	0.009**
Caudate (L)	0.123	0.092	0.156
Hippocampus (L)	0.221	0.007	0.024*
Pallidum (L)	0.139	0.015	0.041*
Putamen (L)	0.099	0.151	0.232
Thalamus (L)	0.064	0.331	0.413
Accumbens (R)	-0.120	0.039	0.085
Amygdala (R)	0.197	0.017	0.046*
Caudate (R)	0.043	0.551	0.625
Hippocampus (R)	0.319	0.000	0.002**
Pallidum (R)	0.004	0.941	0.951
Putamen (R)	0.192	0.009	0.029*
Thalamus (R)	0.101	0.162	0.241

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; we have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Table S6. Dyad-level results that relate ISC with binarized in-degree centrality

Contrast: $ISC_{\{low, high\}} > ISC_{\{low, low\}}$

Subcortical region	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
Accumbens (L)	0.043	0.365	0.448
Amygdala (L)	0.237	0.003	0.013*

Caudate (L)	0.070	0.282	0.367
Hippocampus (L)	0.226	0.003	0.014*
Pallidum (L)	0.124	0.006	0.022*
Putamen (L)	0.086	0.153	0.233
Thalamus (L)	0.154	0.006	0.022*
Accumbens (R)	0.094	0.041	0.088
Amygdala (R)	0.205	0.008	0.026*
Caudate (R)	0.062	0.332	0.413
Hippocampus (R)	0.206	0.008	0.027*
Pallidum (R)	0.016	0.692	0.746
Putamen (R)	0.050	0.445	0.518
Thalamus (R)	0.193	0.003	0.012*

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; we have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Supplementary figures for “Dyad-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section

Binarized dyad-level ISC results that control for similarities in demographic traits and friendships. We also tested whether our findings of an “Anna Karenina” principle remained significant after controlling for dyadic similarities in demographic traits (specifically, similarities in age, gender, ethnicity and race, and home country) and whether or not the a given pair of participants were friends with each other. (See “Binarized subject-level results that control for similarities in self-reported demographic traits” above for descriptions of how we computed similarities in these variables.) If either member of a dyad nominated the other as a friend, we coded the dyad as signifying an undirected friendship. We controlled for friendship, rather than social distance, because our primary analyses included ISCs between individuals from different residential communities. In “Binarized dyad-level results: Intra-community ISCs only” below, we discuss analyses that are based only on intra-community dyads that also controlled for social distances between dyad members. Our results indicate that an “Anna Karenina” pattern of results that links ISC and dyad-level in-degree centrality remains significant after we control for demographic variables and friendship (see Fig. S6). This suggests that our findings that the greatest neural similarity occurs between highly-central individuals and the least neural similarity occurs between less-central individuals arose from differences beyond what we captured using similarities in demographic traits and friendships between the dyads.




Fig. S6. Dyad-level associations of neural similarity with in-degree centrality when we control for similarities in demographic traits and friendships. We identified similar brain regions to be significantly associated with in-degree centrality as in our results in the main manuscript (see Fig. 4). The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.001$).

Binarized dyad-level results: Intra-community ISCs only. Because our participants came from two different residential communities, we also conducted analyses to test if our findings of an Anna Karenina pattern remained when we used only intra-community ISCs. To do this, we fit analogous models to those that we described in “Dyad-level ISC analysis” in the “Results” section of the main manuscript test for associations between ISCs and dyad-level popularity, except that we calculated each subject’s mean neural similarity in each brain region based only on other members of their own community (i.e., we removed dyads whose individuals did not belong to the same community). We obtained similar results (see Fig. S7) as the ones that we reported in the main manuscript.

Dyad-Level Results: Intra-Community ISCs Only




Fig. S7. Dyad-level associations of neural similarity with in-degree centrality when we use intra-community ISCs only. We identified similar brain regions to be significantly associated with in-degree centrality as in our results in the main manuscript (see Fig. 4). The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.001$).

Binarized dyad-level results: Intra-community ISCs only when controlling for both demographic variables and social distances. We also tested if our results that there was an Anna Karenina pattern remained significant after we controlled both for demographic variables (specifically, mean similarities with community members in age, gender, ethnicity and race, and home country; see “Binarized subject-level results that control for similarities in self-reported demographic traits” above for descriptions on how we computed similarities in these variables) and for social distances between individuals. To do this, we fit mixed-effects models that infer ISCs in each brain region from the dyad-level in-degree centrality variable while including all of the control variables as covariates. For these analyses, we examined ISCs in intra-community dyads only, so we included only data from individuals from the same residential community. We defined social distance as we described in “Binarized dyad-level ISC results that control for similarities in demographic traits and friendships”, and we included the social distance between the individuals of each dyad as a covariate in our mixed-effects models for inferring ISC in each

brain region from the dyad-level in-degree centrality variable. We obtained results (see Fig. S8) that were similar to those that we reported in the main manuscript. This suggests that our finding that neural similarity was linked with popularity is not merely a confound of the most-popular individuals being more likely to be friends with one another.




Fig. S8. Dyad-level associations of neural similarity with in-degree centrality for intra-community ISCs only when we control for similarities both in demographic traits and in social distances between individuals in a dyad. We identified similar brain regions to be significantly associated with in-degree centrality as in our results in the main manuscript (see Fig. 4). The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.001$).

Dyad-level ISC results using the minimum in-degree centrality variable. As with our dyad-level results using the binarized in-degree centrality variable, we found a positive association between the minimum in-degree centrality of dyads and neural similarity in the left DMPFC, precuneus, posterior cingulate cortex, superior parietal lobule, and the middle temporal gyrus. In other words, mirroring our results using the binary in-degree centrality variable, dyads in both individuals were highly central in their social network (as quantified by a higher minimum in-degree centrality in their dyad) had larger ISCs than dyads in which both

individuals were less central (as represented by a lower minimum in-degree centrality) (see Fig. S9).




Fig. S9. Dyad-level associations of neural similarity with the minimum in-degree centrality of dyads. We found a positive association between ISC and minimum in-degree centrality. Larger ISCs in brain regions — including the DMPFC, the VLPFC, the precuneus, the temporal pole, and portions of the superior parietal lobule — were associated with a higher minimum in-degree centrality. The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.001$).

Supplementary tables for “Dyad-level preference analysis” in the “Results” section

Our findings in the main text suggest that self-reported preference data were consistent with an “Anna Karenina” hypothesis in which more-central individuals have preferences that are exceptionally similar to each other and less-central individuals have preferences that are idiosyncratic, with each low-centrality individual’s preferences differing from those of other participants in their own way. See Tables S7 and S8.

Table S7. Inferring similarities in enjoyment ratings from dyad-level in-degree centralities

Contrast	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
$S_{\text{high, high}} > S_{\text{low, low}}$	0.589	0.251	0.001**
$S_{\text{high, high}} > S_{\text{low, high}}$	0.322	0.133	0.001**
$S_{\text{low, high}} > S_{\text{low, low}}$	0.267	0.133	0.003**

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; we have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Table S8. Inferring similarities in interest ratings from dyad-level in-degree centralities

Contrast	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
$S_{\text{high, high}} > S_{\text{low, low}}$	0.509	0.259	0.008**
$S_{\text{high, high}} > S_{\text{low, high}}$	0.277	0.137	0.008**
$S_{\text{low, high}} > S_{\text{low, low}}$	0.232	0.137	0.013*

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; we have FDR-corrected all p -values because of multiple comparisons

Supplementary figure for “Dyad-level preference analysis” in the “Results” section

Binarized dyad-level ISC results: Controlling for similarities in preference. We tested whether our findings of an “Anna Karenina” principle, in which individuals who were highly central in their social network tended to have exceptionally similar neural responses to other highly-central individuals and less-central individuals were comparatively idiosyncratic, could be attributable to inter-subject similarities in self-reported preferences. Our results indicate that an “Anna Karenina” pattern of results that link ISC and dyad-level binarized in-degree centrality remain significant after controlling for similarity in enjoyment and interest ratings (see Fig. S10). This suggests that our findings that the greatest neural similarity occurs between highly-central individuals and the least neural similarity occurs between less-central individuals resulted from differences beyond what we captured using self-reported preference ratings.




Fig. S10. Dyad-level associations of neural similarity with in-degree centrality when we control for similarities in self-reported preferences (specifically, interest and enjoyment ratings) about the videos. We identified similar brain regions as significantly associated with in-degree centrality as in our main manuscript (see Fig. 4). The quantity B is the standardized regression coefficient. Regions where we observed significant associations between in-degree centrality and ISC are outlined in black (using an FDR-corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.001$).

References

1. Parkinson, C., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Wheatley, T. Similar neural responses predict friendship. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 332 (2018).
2. Hyon, R., Kleinbaum, A. M. & Parkinson, C. Social network proximity predicts similar trajectories of psychological states: Evidence from multi-voxel spatiotemporal dynamics. *NeuroImage* **216**, 116492 (2020).