

Towards principles of brain network organization and function

Suman Kulkarni^{1,*} and Dani S. Bassett^{1,2,3,4,5,6,†}

¹*Department of Physics & Astronomy, College of Arts & Sciences,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

²*Department of Bioengineering, School of Engineering & Applied Science,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

³*Department of Electrical & Systems Engineering, School of Engineering & Applied Science,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

⁴*Department of Neurology, Perelman School of Medicine,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

⁵*Department of Psychiatry, Perelman School of Medicine,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

⁶*Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA*

(Dated: August 6, 2024)

The brain is immensely complex, with diverse components and dynamic interactions building upon one another to orchestrate a wide range of functions and behaviors. Understanding patterns of these complex interactions and how they are coordinated to support collective neural activity and function is critical for parsing human and animal behavior, treating mental illness, and developing artificial intelligence. Rapid experimental advances in imaging, recording, and perturbing neural systems across various species now provide opportunities and challenges to distill underlying principles of brain organization and function. Here, we take stock of recent progresses and review methods used in the statistical analysis of brain networks, drawing from fields of statistical physics, network theory and information theory. Our discussion is organized by scale, starting with models of individual neurons and extending to large-scale networks mapped across brain regions. We then examine the organizing principles and constraints that shape the biological structure and function of neural circuits. Finally, we describe current opportunities aimed at improving models in light of recent developments and at bridging across scales to contribute to a better understanding of brain networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed phenomenal experimental strides in producing detailed large-scale maps of neural systems, as well as in probing and perturbing neural activity. Advances in electron microscopy and volumetric reconstructions now enable researchers to examine increasingly larger organisms at the cellular level to map out synaptic connections between neurons. While the synaptic connectivity of *C. elegans* was first mapped in 1986 [1], we now have wiring maps of an adult fly brain [2, 3], portions of the mouse [4] and human cerebral cortex [5], among other species [6–8]. These fine-scale maps add to approaches that probe connectivity at coarser scales, such as DTI and MRI [9–11]. In addition to these structural measures, technological advances in large-scale recordings of neuronal activity—such as optical calcium imaging and electrophysiological probes—now make it possible to measure the activity of thousands of neurons simultaneously [12–15]. In fact, with Neuropixels probes, researchers can track neuronal activity at high spatio-temporal resolution in freely moving animals [14–16]. With this increasing access to large quantities of experimental data comes opportunities to develop quantitative methods that can cope with these

large datasets and distill from them underlying principles of brain structure and function.

A central theme in the study of neural systems is to examine how macroscopic functions and behaviors arise from fine-scale interactions between neural elements. This perspective aligns well with the framework of statistical physics, which studies the macroscopic behavior of large ensembles of interacting microscopic entities. However, a major caveat here is that in traditional applications of statistical physics, the elementary components of studied systems are relatively simple and well understood. That is, collective effects result from the interaction of many ‘simple’ elements rather than from the complex behaviors of the entities themselves. In contrast, the brain is extremely complex, characterized by heterogeneous and dynamic elements and interactions that span multiple scales. Still, despite this complexity and inherent messiness, one hopes to take some inspiration from statistical physics and attempt to build simple, tractable models that can capture important properties of the system. Here, we discuss opportunities that recent large-scale experimental efforts provide to glean principles of neural system design and function. Our account is explicitly multi scale, focusing on methods rooted in statistical physics, network theory and information theory.

We structure our initial discussion in Sections II–IV based on spatial scales (as depicted in Fig. 1), focusing on the organization and modeling approaches relevant at each scale. It is important to note, however, that there is no clean separation between these scales and they are

* sumank@sas.upenn.edu

† dsb@seas.upenn.edu

interdependent. We begin at the fine scale in Section II, briefly describing detailed biophysical models of individual neurons to highlight features often not captured in coarser-scale models. In Section III, we describe small populations of neurons, surveying modeling approaches and trade-offs involved. Section IV expands to large-scale brain networks, detailing methods to probe the structure and activity of large brain regions at both coarse and fine scales, and summarizing how tools from physics and mathematics are used to analyze these datasets. Having built this multi-scale picture in Sections II–IV, Section V explores biological design principles and constraints that shape the properties and functioning of brain networks discussed throughout the paper. In Section VI, we describe several critical frontiers: expanding theory and modeling to make sense of the latest connectome data, enhancing the feedback loop between theory and experiment, and using perturbative approaches to better understand neural systems. We conclude with an overview of formal accounts of explanation and causation in the context of neurophysics, underscoring the importance of contextualizing ongoing efforts.

II. ORGANIZATION AND MODELS AT THE CELLULAR LEVEL

Though this review primarily focuses on large brain networks, it is crucial to discuss the neurons that make up the brain (see Fig. 1). Neuron biophysical properties affect both information processing within cells and collective behavior networks, such as synchronization [17, 18]. Since synchronization is considered vital for information processing and altered neural synchronization is associated with brain disorders [19–21], these properties have implication for health and disease. Morphologically, neurons are specialized structures that allow for communication and computations: dendrites branch out extensively to collect signals from other neurons, while the axon extends to transmit signals onwards. There is enormous diversity in the morphological, physiological and connective features of neurons, which influences their functional properties [22–24]. Neurons transmit information in the form of electrical pulses (called spikes or action potentials) characterized by a rapid change in membrane potential over very short timescales, though there are classes of non-spiking neurons which generate graded potentials instead¹ [25–28]. Once a spike is generated, neurons relay signals to neighboring neurons through synaptic connections that may be chemical (orchestrated through neurotransmitters) or electrical (through gap junction channels that connect neurons). Ultimately, a combination of all the excitatory or inhibitory influences on a neuron determine whether it generates an action potential.

An cornerstone for computational neuroscience was the Hodgkin-Huxley model [29], developed in the 1950s to describe the generation of action potentials in a space-clamped squid giant axon. This detailed biophysical model describes the generation of action potentials through fast depolarizing and slow hyperpolarizing currents. The original model consists of a system of four coupled, nonlinear differential equations with parameters obtained from neurophysiological recordings. This model has been extended in several ways to study different kinds of neurons, for example incorporating additional ion channels [30] (as most neurons have many more ion channels) and stochastic elements [31]. At the same time, the relatively high dimensionality of the Hodgkin-Huxley model motivated simpler lower-dimensional models that can still reproduce many key features of neuronal dynamics such as the FitzHugh-Nagumo model [32] and the Morris-Lecar model [33, 34]. These simplified models are far more amenable to mathematical analysis and facilitate efficient large-scale simulations of groups of neurons. A distinct approach is to consider phenomenological models that do not directly capture the detailed biophysics of spike generation. Examples of this include the integrate-and-fire model². At its heart, this model uses a differential equation to describe the membrane potential dynamics, and spikes are said to occur when the potential crosses a threshold, following which the potential is algorithmically reset to a certain value below the threshold. Several versions of this model exist with varying levels of biophysical realism, including nonlinear [36] and adaptive integrate-and-fire models [37]. Another popular type of model is the Izhikevich model which combines some of the biologically realistic aspects of Hodgkin-Huxley type models with the computational efficiency of integrate-and-fire type models [38].

As noted earlier, neurons are not point-like objects and have intricate spatial structure. Much of the total membrane area of neurons is occupied by the dendritic tree, whose structure and extent relates to the properties and firing rates of the neurons that it makes up [39]. Dendrites are typically modelled using a cable equation describing the potential as a function of time and space, and the numerous branches can be accounted for using compartmental models. While ion channels can also be added to these compartments for more biological realism, a more tractable approach is to lump all processes responsible for spike generation in the soma and treat the dendrites as passive cables. In addition to dendrites, the length and the level of myelination of axons is known to affect signal conduction [40]. Evidently, there is astounding diversity in neuronal properties and morphology that can influence activity. Consequently, it is useful to classify action potentials into excitability classes according to the type of bifurcation that occurs close to the threshold

¹ including many neurons in the *C. elegans* nervous system.

² which was originally introduced long before the mechanisms of spike generation were even known [35].




FIG. 1. **Organization of the brain viewed at different scales.** (A) At the fine scale, neural systems are comprised of interacting neurons (*left*). To study the activity arising out of collective behavior of groups of neurons, researchers build coarse-grained models describing networks of neurons (*center*). To study the large-scale activity of an entire brain, researchers consider even coarser descriptions where nodes correspond to brain regions or neuronal populations (*right*). (B) The activity and functioning of neural systems is governed by the individual properties of the units, the properties of their interactions, and the structure of interactions. Together, all these factors shape the dynamics of the network itself and the dynamics of activity that occurs on the network.

[34, 41, 42]. The qualitative features of action potentials depend on the type of bifurcation. For more detailed descriptions of the models discussed in this section, we refer the reader to Refs.[40, 43–45]

III. MODELLING SMALL GROUPS OF NEURONS

In principle, one could keep adding detail to neuron models accounting for various biological nuances. However, there is a trade-off here between building models that are extremely detailed and building models that are tractable. This is particularly important for research questions aimed at understanding how large populations of neurons orchestrate activity, function and behavior. The challenge with detailed models is not solely a matter of the computational power required. These models rely on numerous biophysical parameters that can be difficult to measure reliably in experiments. Ideally, parameters

for each neuron could be estimated from *in vivo* experiments [46–48]. However, this requires experiments to collect data for each type of ion channel, many of whose details may still be unknown. When such experiments are infeasible, parameters are often tuned in an ad-hoc manner. Even when measured, these parameters are often obtained under specific conditions, making them less generalizable. Models with hundreds of parameters can also become difficult to reliably estimate, interpret and analyze. Even for a small and relatively well-studied organism like *C. elegans*, which has 302 neurons, including the dozens of (known) ion channels can result in over a hundred parameters. Further, many parameter combinations can produce similar neural activity and network behavior [49, 50]. While this degeneracy may be a feature rather than a drawback (possibly underpinning resilience)[49, 51], it makes detailed bottom-up approaches challenging.

Though detailed biophysical models are useful for studying cellular processes, it remains unclear how these

detailed processes combine to generate the range of complex macroscopic behaviors observed, even in relatively simple organisms. Not all of these details may be relevant to higher-level processes in organisms. Moreover, experiments in humans and other large animals typically track the activity of regions, not individual neuron spikes. Arguments such as these align well with the principles of statistical physics, which provides a framework to study of macroscopic phenomena arising from large ensembles of interacting microscopic entities. To examine collective behavior, it often suffices to use coarse-grained descriptions instead of capturing every detail. Across fields of science, from physics to systems biology, several multi-parameter models display behaviors that largely depend only on a few combinations of parameters, with many other parameters being relatively unimportant for model behavior and prediction [52, 53]. Indeed, to build a theory of how sound waves propagate, we only need information such as the density and compressibility of matter, not the precise shape of each individual molecule. The goal is to build minimal models that reproduce the key features of interest. This approach is not to devalue details or lower-level explanations. Rather, the choice of model depends on the phenomena being studied and on the research questions guiding the investigation. Motivated by statistical physics, then, it is of interest to ask: Can we apply similar principles to the nervous system? How can we bridge fine-scale descriptions of brain organization with the functioning of nervous systems and the behaviors of organisms?

To model larger populations of neurons, researchers typically track the average activity of groups of neurons rather than modeling individual spikes of every neuron. Indeed, there is evidence that the brain tends to be organized into assemblies of neurons that display strongly correlated activity, operating as a functionally homogeneous unit [54, 55]. Broadly speaking, there are two different approaches in constructing such lower-dimensional average-rate models. The first is to build phenomenological neural-mass models that capture observations at the scale of neuron groups. The second, more bottom-up approach involves developing approximations of spiking neuron models. Such population-level models are better suited to study data recordings that reflect coarse-grained neural activity, such as EEG (electroencephalogram) or MEG (magnetoencephalogram), which are commonly used in humans and large animals where invasive fine-scale single-neuron resolution studies are not always possible [56–58].

A popular phenomenological model is the Wilson-Cowan model, which (in its original form) describes the average firing rates of two homogeneous populations of excitatory and inhibitory neurons [59, 60]. Another example is the Jansen-Rit model [61], which was developed as a model for EEG recordings. Coarse-grained neural-mass models like these have been used to describe a range of phenomena, such as seizure activity observed in epilepsy [62, 63], traveling waves in the visual cor-

tex [64, 65], visual hallucination patterns [66], working memory [60] and the impact of Alzheimer’s disease proteins [67]. While such phenomenological models are insightful, it can be difficult to directly connect them to microscale properties of neurons as they lack sufficient detail [68, 69]. Instead, bottom-up approaches, wherein neuron models are reduced either exactly or through approximation schemes provide an opportunity to bridge dynamics on microscopic and macroscopic scales [68–71]. A common approach is to start with spiking neuron models that incorporate basic microscopic properties of a neuron (typically a variant of the integrate-and-fire model) and develop a mean-field approximation [68, 72–74].

Such neural mass models are also key ingredients for modeling approaches used in the Virtual Brain [75–77], which aims to simulate collective whole-brain dynamics. A key goal of this initiative is to build ‘digital twins’ capturing most relevant features, enabling researchers to test specific hypotheses and intervention strategies for healthcare and personalized medicine [78]. Ongoing efforts focus on applying these models to healthcare applications, including multiple sclerosis [79], epilepsy [80], ageing [81] and Parkinson’s disease [82]. A key challenge in building such biophysically principled models is inferring the microscopic parameters that underlie macroscale recordings. Efforts, such as the Human Neocortical Neurosolver (HNN) [83], are underway to study the circuit and cellular-level mechanisms and origins of measured EEG/MEG signals. A better understanding of these origins could be useful for predictions of neural function and disease, and in probing the effects of stimulation on neural systems [84, 85]. As our discussion has already reached the regime of large datasets, in the next section we discuss larger brain networks in more detail.

IV. ANALYZING LARGE NETWORKS

With experimental advances, we are now obtaining increasingly high-quality and large-scale data on both the structure and activity of neural systems. Tools from complex systems provide a means to represent and analyze this data. Although we primarily discussed networks of interconnected neurons in the previous sections, these tools can be applied to various types of brain network models representing connections or interactions at scales that are coarser or finer. These also include models that do not solely reflect anatomical connections, such as signal propagation maps. Before surveying these methods, we first discuss the kinds of brain networks that researchers typically study. Our goal is to build a high-level understanding of the information these brain networks capture; for more detailed discussion, we refer the reader to recent review articles and books [87–90]. Very broadly speaking, most brain networks fall into two categories: those that capture relationships of structure and those that capture relationships of activity, as depicted in Fig. 2.



(A) Structure**(B) Activity**

FIG. 2. Measuring brain network structure and activity. A range of experimental techniques are used to probe the structure and activity of neural systems at different resolutions. (A) For the fine-scale structure of the brain, electron microscopy imaging can be used to map out neurons and their synaptic connections (left panel, figure reproduced from data in Ref. [5]). To measure the brain’s macroscale axonal or white matter organization, diffusion tensor imaging is used (center panel). From these structural data, whether mapping connections at the microscale or at the macroscale, an adjacency matrix can be constructed, with entries weighted appropriately (right panel. Colors represent connection strength). In DTI imaging, nodes represent non-overlapping grey matter volumes while in synaptic connectomes, nodes represent individual neurons. (B) At the microscale, activity of neurons can be measured using fluorescence calcium imaging or electrophysiological methods (left panel, figure reproduced from Ref. [86]). Large-scale brain activity is typically monitored by measuring blood oxygen level variations in different parts of the brain using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) or by measuring the overall electrical activity using electroencephalography (EEG) (center panel). Similarities between pairs of activity time series can be calculated and represented in a functional correlation matrix (right panel, top). Alternatively, direct or indirect causal measures of the net influence of one region (or neuron) on another can be calculated as effective connectivity (right panel, bottom).

Advances in electron microscopy and automated image analysis have enabled detailed 3D reconstructions of brain networks at single-neuron resolutions [91]. These connectomes map out neurons and the chemical synapses between them. We now have connectomes for a range for species including *C. elegans* [1], larval zebrafish [8], *Drosophila* [2, 3, 92], and parts of the mouse [4] and human cortex [5]. Simultaneously, non-invasive methods have made it possible to study neural circuits in humans and larger animals. Techniques like diffusion MRI tractography and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) track the diffusion of water molecules to reconstruct white matter tracts connecting distinct brain regions [87, 89]. Whether mapping synapses linking neurons or white matter tracts connecting brain regions, one can construct structural brain networks that capture how neural elements are wired together. The nodes and edges in these networks are defined according to the method used to quantify them. For networks built from methods that probe

the microscale structure, such as electron microscopy, nodes represent individual neurons and edges are generally weighted based on the number of synapses between neuron pairs. For networks built from methods that probe the macroscale structure, such as DTI, nodes represent brain regions and edges are weighted based on the strength and density of the white matter tracts connecting them [87]. Building appropriate representations of structural data is an ongoing challenge, and the best approach depends upon researchers’ goals and the data available. It is important to recognize the assumptions and limitations of current methods. For instance, synaptic networks are typically weighted by synapse count, but not all synapses may have the same strength or neurotransmitter type. Similarly, current tractography algorithms used in macroscale studies are unable to resolve directionality of connections [93]. In Section VI, we elaborate on how more detail can be incorporated in models when available.

In addition to structural mappings, various experimental techniques are employed to probe brain activity at different scales. At the neuronal scale, calcium imaging and electrophysiological recordings are used to monitor the activity of individual neurons. These methods have enabled simultaneous whole-brain measurements of single-neuron activity in small transparent animals like *C. elegans*, hydra and zebrafish [12, 94, 95]. Efforts are now underway to expand the number of neurons simultaneously tracked in *Drosophila* and cortical neurons in mammals [15, 16, 96]. Neuropixels probes now enable single-spike resolution recordings in large populations of neurons distributed across brain regions in freely moving animals, with the ability to track this activity over the scale of weeks and even months [14–16]. The ability to perform such recordings stably over longer timescales opens up exciting opportunities to understand processes such as learning, memory and behavior [14]. In humans, researchers use noninvasive methods like electroencephalography (EEG), which records electrical activity through sensors placed on the scalp, and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), which uses blood oxygen levels in 3D brain images as a proxy for neural activity [87]. When building networks from fMRI or EEG data, researchers measure correlations, coherence, or other statistical dependences between the activity of different regions to quantify functional similarity [87, 88]. We note that correlative approaches, though insightful, do not provide direct measures of causality.

From these datasets, tools developed in physics and mathematics enable researchers to uncover patterns of organization that may not otherwise be immediately apparent. Across different organisms and spatial scales, such efforts have identified properties common in nervous systems. These include small-world properties [98], heavy-tailed edge weight and degree distributions, modularity [99, 100], and the existence of hubs [101, 102], among others. The presence of these features across vastly different species suggests that there might be general organizing principles at play and that these features might support specific functions, which we explore in detail in Section V. While network science provides an array of metrics to quantify organization, we emphasize that the goal has never been to be merely descriptive. Instead, we seek insight into how these properties arise and their implications for neural function [103].

When examining a new network and its features, comparisons with null models enable researchers to benchmark the significance of these features [104] (Fig. 3A). Null models are ensembles of networks that preserve certain selected features of a network but are otherwise random. In the best scenario, null models can disentangle a given network feature from other network properties, though this may not always be possible. The selection of graphs for sampling null models requires careful consideration. For example, the Erdős–Rényi graph model, which places edges between nodes with equal probability, often does not reflect processes or constraints relevant to

the brain. Conversely, overly stringent null models that constrain the space of graphs too much can limit how generalizable the results are. Constraints inherent to the empirical network, such as the presence of self-loops or multi-edges, can be usefully reflected in the null graph space, as these can directly impact conclusions [105]. In practice, null networks are typically obtained by either rewiring the original network according to specific rules or building them from the ground up using generative models [104]. An example of a rewiring model is the degree-preserving configuration model, which involves rewiring the graph using double-edge swaps among edges [105]. This model retains the exact degree sequence, preserving features like hubs and heavy-tailed degree distributions that are typical of brain networks, allowing researchers to assess how the network’s degree sequence influences features of interest. Rewired null models can also be constructed to make the edge swaps based on other constraints, such as edge weight or path lengths.

In contrast to rewiring models, generative models build networks from scratch using specific rules, such as homophilic attachment or minimizing the total edge length [97, 104]. Generative modeling is also insightful in examining design principles that shape network features. Since brain networks are an outcome of biological processes that are inherently noisy, it is often useful to view neural systems probabilistically. That is, not as a fixed network, but as a distribution over a space of networks informed by biologically-motivated design principles. Exponential random graph models (ERGMs), provide a means to identify such local design principles behind real networks [106, 107]. A part of the family of maximum entropy models [108], the exponential random graph probability distribution reproduces certain selected features, but is otherwise maximally random (Fig. 3B). While all our discussion so far has focused on static networks, we know that brain networks—both structural and functional—are dynamic. Exponential random graphs can be appended with this information by creating a time series and estimating parameters for this sequence. These are referred to as temporal exponential random graph models [106].

Methods based on the maximum entropy principle are also used to construct models of neural activity, complementing the biophysical modeling approaches discussed in Section III. Instead of starting with a biophysical model, this approach involves constructing probability distributions over the space of network states that match selected observed properties of the system while otherwise remaining as random as possible [108, 109]. Initially, pairwise maximum entropy models were developed by constraining over the average activity and correlations between pairs of elements [109, 110]. Although this method effectively captured correlations among tens of neurons, it struggled to capture correlations among hundreds of neurons sampled across more distant subgroups [111, 112], hinting at the role of higher-order correlations




FIG. 3. **Statistical analysis of brain networks.** (A) Comparisons with null networks facilitates a principled assessment of how significant an empirically observed property is. To determine whether a feature of the empirical network is statistically unlikely, one can generate an ensemble of null networks. These null networks preserve specific desired properties of the empirical network, forming the null hypothesis, but are otherwise random. The feature of interest can then be calculated for each null network to obtain a probability distribution of the feature under the null hypothesis. (B) The exponential random graph model enables the generation of ensembles from the ground up that constrain certain properties, producing a probability distribution in the space of all possible graphs. Such an ensemble can then be used to test whether the constrained properties are explanatory of an observed network’s structure. These ensembles can also function as null networks. (C) More broadly, generative modelling is a framework for constructing synthetic networks based on a set of rules. The space of generative models can span different timescales. In single shot models, connection probabilities are defined early on, and the network is generated in a single step. More biologically realistic models operate on timescales closer to that of development and can be used to model network growth and development. Intermediate models lie between these two extremes, where the network grows over arbitrary timescales that do not have biological interpretation. Figure in panel (C) reproduced from Ref. [97].

for such samples. While higher-order correlations can be incorporated manually to improve these models [112], a more scalable approach for larger datasets is based on random projections [113]. The philosophy behind random projections is also rooted in statistical mechanics: higher-order interactions are captured in the form of random projections, and the structure of this randomness is constrained using data. A less explored class of models are maximum caliber models, which generalize the maximum entropy principle to account for dynamical correlations [114]. Instead of constraining correlations at the same time point, these models constrain correlations between current and future time points.

While concepts stemming from the network theory lit-

erature have provided a valuable starting point for gaining insight into data from neural systems, they need to be adapted or generalized to quantify structures coming out of the latest neuroscience experiments and for dynamics relevant to neuroscience [115]. Future progress in this field will be shaped by how effectively we can bridge data and models. For example, it is known that spatial structure plays an important role at different scales and brain networks are spatially embedded. These constraints can be usefully captured in null models of brain networks [116, 117]. We discuss ways in which current models can be expanded to derive meaningful insight from experimental data in Section VI.

V. DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND FUNCTIONAL AFFORDANCES

We have discussed so far how advances in experimental research and mathematical tools have enabled systematic analysis of neural systems. Despite the inherent stochastic and noisy nature of biological processes, neural systems display remarkable structure and organization across various spatial and temporal scales. Many of these features are observed across vastly different organisms, suggesting general design principles at play [118]. Alongside these common features though, distinctions across organisms and sensory modalities within an organism could reflect specific adaptations and different constraints. Indeed, the brain must perform extremely complex and diverse processes under stringent resource constraints—be it space, material, energy or time—in a manner that is fast and adaptable. This fact raises important questions: What biological design principles shape the organization of neural systems across spatial scales and in different functional domains? How does the observed organization enhance information processing given various constraints? Recent experimental and modelling advances can be used to infer potential design principles and test hypotheses out across various organisms and developmental stages. These principles can illuminate how neural systems achieve high levels of performance and how their structure supports function. Additionally, such principles could offer insights into how perturbations might affect neural circuit organization and function, with implications for behavior and dysfunction. In this section, we discuss various design principles thought to shape the structure of neural circuits. The central questions are twofold: Why are neural circuits structured the way they are, and what biologically relevant functions or advantages do these structures provide? While determining if these principles are indeed *causal* may require further experimental characterization, they nevertheless provide valuable general insights.

Several factors influence the architecture and functioning of brain networks, including the need to manage metabolic and material costs [119], ensure efficient information transmission [119, 120], maintain robustness to noise or injury, and adapt to process new information (Figure 4). However, prior to discussing these factors, we first emphasize that brain networks are inherently spatial. Circuits in the brain are physically embedded in 3D space within a fixed enclosure and the neurons themselves have intricate spatial structure. This spatial nature constrains brain growth, development, and function [116]. It is important to consider this fact when applying tools from network science, as certain models do not account for spatial information. One of the earliest observed features of (larger) neural systems is their segregation into specialized anatomical modules that interact with one another. Within each module, there is further specialization; as concrete examples, in large mammals, the visual

system has functional areas that process different visual features, while the motor system has regions that control different parts of the body. Even within these segregated regions, there is enormous diversity in neuron types, each performing specialized tasks. Thus, at every scale—from the entire brain down to single cells—the brain is composed of heterogeneous components that are arranged in modules which interact hierarchically, simultaneously segregating and integrating information to produce high-level responses. Neural heterogeneity is thought to shape computational functions differently in different cell types, providing a means to control properties of neural circuits [121]. Several studies have examined the modular and hierarchical structure in both structural and functional networks across organisms [99, 122, 123]. This modular structure reflects segregation and functional specialization, which can also make the network robust to perturbations, either internal (in the form of noise or genetic variation) or external (in the form of injury) [124].

Another feature of large-scale brain networks is their small-world architecture [98, 125, 126]. That is, in addition to high clustering in tightly connected modules, the brain has short characteristic path lengths. This architecture supports the idea that the brain balances segregation and integration, with modules for local information processing and efficient routes for long-range communication. More generally, brain network communication, the study of how information is transmitted throughout the brain in an efficient and biologically plausible manner, is a rich area of research [127]. Indeed, the brain has to process and communicate immense amounts of information under strict time, energetic, and material costs. Physical connections in the brain come with a cost of building and maintenance, a factor which becomes important particularly for larger brains. However, the presence of many of the complex properties discussed earlier—including the high efficiency of information transfer between regions that are anatomically distant—suggests that the brain does not strictly minimize wiring costs. Rather, the pressure for minimizing wiring competes with pressures for efficient communication [128–130], and the brain negotiates a trade-off between these factors. In addition to the modular and small-world structure, large-scale brain networks are heterogeneous, featuring nodes that form a rich core of densely connected ‘hubs’ [101]. These hubs are thought to play important roles in a range of functions, serving as broadcasters of information. Further, these hubs also reduce the overall average path length across the network, supporting integration of information.

From a metabolic standpoint, the brain is one of the most expensive systems within an organism: the human brain is 2 % of the body weight but 20 % of its metabolic load [131, 132]. How the brain manages its energy budget among the processes carried out by its units is an area of active research. Some findings suggest that the cost involved in communication is more substantial than the cost involved in computation [133]. As discussed earlier,




FIG. 4. **Organizing principles that shape the structure and working of neural circuits at various scales.**

(A) Network motifs commonly observed in neural systems show immense heterogeneity in both their components and interaction patterns. Many large-scale brain networks possess community structure, displaying modularity at several scales organized hierarchically. Large-scale brain networks also feature high-degree hubs that form a densely connected core. (B) These observed patterns could be shaped by various biologically-motivated design principles. Neural systems balance managing energetic and material costs, being robust to noise and external perturbations, and remaining flexible enough to adapt to new environments. While optimizing these constraints, their functioning must also be efficient.

this possibility has implications for the structure of neural systems at each scale. At the microscale, it has been observed that the distribution of mitochondria and the thickness of axons correlates with typical firing rates. At the macroscale, the features discussed in previous paragraphs could contribute to metabolically efficient communication. Thus, such heterogeneity could in part support the brain’s efficiency [134]. Turning from communication to computation, we note that despite the high metabolic load of the brain, the cost of computation is still cheaper than artificial machines. How does the brain achieve this efficiency in computation? One idea is that this efficiency exists in part because circuits are adapted to the structure of the world, and have the capacity to adapt further in the future [135–137]. Additionally, neural codes must also be able to overcome noise while representing information. One potential way to do this is by choosing codes that are sufficiently far apart in the space of patterns [138]. Finally, the consumption of energy to perform function is inherently a non-equilibrium process and the framework of stochastic thermodynamics may be fruitful in examining some of these questions.

VI. CURRENT FRONTIERS

We now discuss exciting opportunities for research aimed at improving our understanding of neural systems in light of recent advances (Figure 5). Broadly speaking, we classify these directions into four key themes. The first theme involves expanding theory and modeling to keep up with data coming in from large-scale experiments. The second relates to how theory can feed back into experiments and guide measurements. Together, these two themes contribute to strengthening the loop between theory and experiment. The third explores how methods for perturbing neural systems open new ways of understanding the brain. Finally, the fourth theme emphasizes linking modeling and experiments with formal accounts of explanation and causation to contextualize their contributions.

A. Expanding models to make sense of connectomes

As discussed in Sections III and IV, tools from network theory have been applied to connectomes at various scales—from macroscale connectivity between brain regions [9, 10, 101] to microscale synaptic connectivity between neurons [139–141]—to uncover patterns of organization. These approaches also provide a quantitative means to compare the organization and working of neural systems across individuals within the same specie, across different developmental stages [142], and across distinct species [118, 143]. With advances in high throughput electron microscopy and reconstruction methods, the microscale structure of neural systems is becoming increasingly accessible, even in larger organisms [2, 5, 144]. Researchers have employed graph-theoretical tools to study these neuron-level connectome datasets, such as chemical synapses and gap junctions in *C. elegans* [139] and the whole-brain connectome of *Drosophila* [140]. These studies are identifying motifs crucial for computation and neural function as well as uncovering general mechanisms that underlie observed network patterns.

At the same time, existing mathematical tools can be expanded to reflect biologically relevant information when necessary (Figure 5 (A), Panel I). For example, attributes such as cell types, neurotransmitter receptor profiles, gene expression, tendency to activation during certain tasks can be crucial to build a complete picture of neural organization, activity, and function. One approach to improve the biological descriptiveness of existing models is to overlay these attributes onto nodes and edges as ‘metadata’, creating annotated networks [145, 146]. This method can bridge abstract models with important microscale features, opening up new opportunities for discovery. It enables researchers to explore sophisticated questions, such as how observed patterns of structural connectivity relate to micro-scale biological attributes [146, 147]. In addition to biological at-




FIG. 5. **Ongoing and emerging future directions.** (A) Effectively bridging experimental data and models is an important area of ongoing research. These involve: (I) Expanding theoretical tools and models to incorporate biological detail to make sense of connectomes. These expanded models also motivate efforts to bridge between different scales of description. (II) Using theoretical tools to guide experimental efforts and measurements. This could involve identifying which measurements are most informative of behaviors of interest at a given scale and examining the effects of sparse measurements. (B) Perturbative techniques provide new opportunities to improve our understanding of neural systems. (C) Linking the contributions of modeling and experiments to distinct kinds of explanations can inform the design of effective experimental and theoretical approaches.

tributes, traditional graph theory methods can also be usefully adapted to reflect the spatial nature of brain networks. Incorporating both spatial and biological information into null models can enhance their relevance and utility. Although developing null models can involve tricky choices, improving them to account for the spatial and biological aspects of networks will improve our ability to address sophisticated research questions.

Other useful extensions of network representations include multilayer [148, 149] and higher-order networks [150, 151]. Multilayer networks provide a framework to study different kinds of interaction within neural systems and to integrate multiscale data [149, 152]. For instance, the connectome of *C. elegans* can be modeled as a multilayer network to capture different modes of communication, including synapses, gap junctions, monoamines, and neuropeptides [153]. Multilayer networks can also capture temporal information, allowing researchers to examine how networks evolve over time [154–156]. Capturing temporal aspects of brain activity and structure, including modeling the relationship between dynamics *on* networks and dynamics *of* networks [157] is a crucial area for current and future efforts. Although these approaches offer richer descriptions of neural systems, they require appropriate experimental data and careful consideration to ensure suitability for specific research questions.

B. Using theoretical analysis to guide experiments and measurements

As highlighted throughout this review, applying theory and modeling to large-scale recordings offers valuable insights into neural systems. But how exactly can these models then inform experimental efforts? Biophysical models of large-scale brain activity often involve on the order of hundred parameters. However, previous research has demonstrated that a range of multi-parameter models across physics and biology exhibit ‘sloppiness’, meaning that their behavior is primarily influenced by a few combinations of parameters, while the rest are relatively unimportant for predictions [52, 53, 158]. Applying this approach to models of large-scale neural activity could illustrate how sensitive these models are to different parameters (Figure 5 (A), Panel II). Identifying which parameters are critical at a given scale could then help guide experimental efforts to measure these parameters more reliably or even inform the selection of the most appropriate models.

As the community advances towards tracking thousands of simultaneously recorded neurons across multiple brain areas, the size of datasets is expanding rapidly. This growth makes it increasingly impractical to monitor all correlations in neural activity, highlighting the need

for reliable models and analysis techniques that can handle these larger datasets. Fortunately, recent research suggests that while the space of possible states of a network is vast, neural activity often remains constrained to a lower-dimensional manifold [159–161]. Rather than relying on individual neural activity, neural function may be better understood through population-wide activity patterns, known as neural modes. This has led to a range of studies aimed at manifold identification. In parallel with efforts to study an increasing number of brain regions, another approach could be to use theoretical insights to identify which populations or regions provide the most unique (or least redundant) information about neural activity (Figure 5 (A), Panel II). This strategy could be especially valuable in human neuroscience, where it can guide more effective probe placement. By optimizing probe placement, researchers may be able to reduce the number of required electrodes, thereby decreasing health risks.

Finally, we point out that most studies of larger organisms are based on incomplete sampling, either by recording only a subset of regions [162] or by examining only a small population [163]. Though recent strides in population-level recordings allow for simultaneous recording of up to tens of thousands of neurons, this still is a small fraction of circuits in larger animals. Sampling from a subset could create errors in models of collective behavior. This issue calls for quantifying the kinds of errors that partial measurements could create, and for methods to infer models from such partial data reliably (Figure 5 (A), Panel II). A deeper understanding of the effects of partial measurements could in turn guide experimental efforts and how to allocate resources, potentially identifying regions that could benefit from more sampling and regions which do not require as much. Additionally, systematically examining noise in experimental measurements that could bias measurements is key to maximizing the impact of experimental methods [12].

C. Perturbation approaches might open new ways of modeling and understanding neural systems.

Anatomical maps of the brain provide some information regarding circuit structure. However in certain cases, the exact nature of the inputs and outputs including their signs, strengths, and timescales cannot always be established. Hence, these maps do not capture the full picture behind neural function. On the other hand, correlative approaches, which attempt to infer function based on activity do not measure causality and might not capture the detailed mechanism behind observed activity. The recent few years has seen improvement in methods to directly perturb neural elements—be it brain regions in humans or even single neurons in smaller animals—and measure the propagation of activity among other elements (Figure 5 (B)). These perturbative approaches can directly measure signal propagation, capturing all kinds of inter-

actions and processes that might be present. Such approaches are more suited to studying network-level phenomena and are also causal. By using simultaneous stimulation and recording, the interactions or network can be inferred in a principled manner [164]. In humans, methods like Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) are increasingly being used for such perturbations [165]. For smaller organisms, it is possible to stimulate even single neurons with light or ablate groups of neurons [94]. These smaller organisms can thus serve as a test bed for simulating the behavior of an entire nervous system. These perturbative approaches have the potential to open new avenues for neural system modeling and understanding, offering exciting opportunities to test hypotheses derived from models.

D. Linking theory and modelling to different kinds of explanations

As efforts progress on the experimental and theoretical fronts, it is also worth discussing the kinds of explanations that can be sought and gained (Figure 5 (C)). Explanations come in a variety of kinds, and can be distinguished in multiple ways. Perhaps the most commonly raised distinction is between causal and non-causal explanations [166]. Causal explanations are often sought to explain why or how a phenomena occurs, while non-causal explanations are often sought to explain what a phenomenon is. However, it is also possible to identify non-causal explanations to answer why and how questions. An prime example is a mathematical explanation, wherein an equation is used to explain a phenomenon such as a process, behavior, or dynamics [167].

Here in this review we have focused on approaches from statistical physics, information theory, and network science that can be used to explain principles of brain network architecture and function. Do these approaches provide causal explanations, non-causal explanations, both, or neither? When our methods focus on mathematical descriptions (such as, for example, the maximum entropy model), we may be excavating non-causal mathematical explanations. When our methods focus on network topology, we may be excavating structural explanations. In some cases, structural explanations can be causal, as has been investigated in regard to social phenomenon [168] and topological factors [169], whereas in other cases, structural explanations can be non-causal [170]. In addition to causal structural explanations, the approaches canvassed in this review also have potential to provide other causal factors, including pathways [171], mechanisms [172], cascades, triggering causes [173], and causal constraints.

The accessibility of this causal diversity motivates a renewed examination of how we as scholars approach scientific problem solving [174]. Detecting *a* cause is less satisfying than determining *what type of* cause is involved and why. How might we design experiments, models, and

theory to distinguish types of causation in brain network function? How might distinctions between causal relationships influence how we engage in causal reasoning or use causal knowledge to control the functional outcomes of neural systems? Engaging these and related questions is important as we aim to shape future research and the training of young scholars interested in understanding the brain.

VII. OUTLOOK

The brain is an astounding feat of natural engineering whose structure and function is becoming increasingly accessible to the tools of modern science. As experimental techniques continue to mature, physicists generally and biophysicists specifically have contributed markedly to the development and application of models and theory. Here in this review, we have canvassed those contributions and associated recent advances in the use of statistical mechanics, information theory, and network science with the goal of identifying principles of brain network architecture and function. Spanning from models of single neurons and small groups to large-scale ensembles and

networks, the efforts examined here have proven useful in isolating design principles of neural systems and the functional affordances thereof. As these efforts continue to produce insights in the coming years, we envision several critical frontiers. These include expanding models to make sense of connectomes, using theoretical analysis to guide experiments and measurements, and using perturbative approaches to provide new kinds of understanding. Throughout these (and other) expansions, we think it will be critical to link the contributions of modeling and theory to distinct sorts of explanation. By pursuing both causal and non-causal explanations, and by detecting specific types of causes, the field of neurophysics will be poised to better design effective and specific experimental, computational, and theoretical approaches, better engage in causal reasoning, and better use causal knowledge to control the functional outcomes of neural systems.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank L. Papadopoulos, C. W. Lynn, A. Winn, C. G. Alexandersen, J. K. Brynildsen, I. Stallworthy and S. Patankar for helpful comments on earlier drafts.

-
- [1] John G White, Eileen Southgate, J Nichol Thomson, Sydney Brenner, *et al.*, “The structure of the nervous system of the nematode *caenorhabditis elegans*,” *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **314**, 1–340 (1986).
 - [2] Sven Dorkenwald, Arie Matsliah, Amy R Sterling, Philipp Schlegel, Szi-Chieh Yu, Claire E McKellar, Albert Lin, Marta Costa, Katharina Eichler, Yijie Yin, *et al.*, “Neuronal wiring diagram of an adult brain,” *bioRxiv* (2023).
 - [3] Louis K Scheffer, C Shan Xu, Michal Januszewski, Zhiyuan Lu, Shin-ya Takemura, Kenneth J Hayworth, Gary B Huang, Kazunori Shinomiya, Jeremy Maitlin-Shepard, Stuart Berg, *et al.*, “A connectome and analysis of the adult *drosophila* central brain,” *elife* **9**, e57443 (2020).
 - [4] MICrONS Consortium, J Alexander Bae, Mahaly Baptiste, Caitlyn A Bishop, Agnes L Bodor, Derrick Brittain, JoAnn Buchanan, Daniel J Bumbarger, Manuel A Castro, Brendan Celii, *et al.*, “Functional connectomics spanning multiple areas of mouse visual cortex,” *BioRxiv*, 2021–07 (2021).
 - [5] Alexander Shapson-Coe, Michal Januszewski, Daniel R Berger, Art Pope, Yuelong Wu, Tim Blakely, Richard L Schalek, Peter H Li, Shuohong Wang, Jeremy Maitin-Shepard, *et al.*, “A petavoxel fragment of human cerebral cortex reconstructed at nanoscale resolution,” *Science* **384**, eadk4858 (2024).
 - [6] Kerriane Ryan, Zhiyuan Lu, and Ian A Meinertzhagen, “The cns connectome of a tadpole larva of *ciona intestinalis* (l.) highlights sidedness in the brain of a chordate sibling,” *Elife* **5**, e16962 (2016).
 - [7] Csaba Verasztó, Sanja Jasek, Martin Gühmann, Réza Shahidi, Nobuo Ueda, James David Beard, Sara Mendes, Konrad Heinz, Luis Alberto Bezares-Calderón, Elizabeth Williams, *et al.*, “Whole-animal connectome and cell-type complement of the three-segmented *platynereis dumerilii* larva,” *BioRxiv*, 2020–08 (2020).
 - [8] David Grant Colburn Hildebrand, Marcelo Cicconet, Russel Miguel Torres, Woohyuk Choi, Tran Minh Quan, Jungmin Moon, Arthur Willis Wetzell, Andrew Scott Champion, Brett Jesse Graham, Owen Randlett, *et al.*, “Whole-brain serial-section electron microscopy in larval zebrafish,” *Nature* **545**, 345–349 (2017).
 - [9] Longchuan Li, Xiaoping Hu, Todd M Preuss, Matthew F Glasser, Frederick W Damen, Yuxuan Qiu, and James Rilling, “Mapping putative hubs in human, chimpanzee and rhesus macaque connectomes via diffusion tractography,” *Neuroimage* **80**, 462–474 (2013).
 - [10] Jennifer Stine Elam, Matthew F Glasser, Michael P Harms, Stamatios N Sotiropoulos, Jesper LR Andersson, Gregory C Burgess, Sandra W Curtiss, Robert Oostenfeld, Linda J Larson-Prior, Jan-Mathijs Schoffelen, *et al.*, “The human connectome project: a retrospective,” *NeuroImage* **244**, 118543 (2021).
 - [11] Seung Wook Oh, Julie A Harris, Lydia Ng, Brent Winslow, Nicholas Cain, Stefan Mihalas, Quanxin Wang, Chris Lau, Leonard Kuan, Alex M Henry, *et al.*, “A mesoscale connectome of the mouse brain,” *Nature* **508**, 207–214 (2014).
 - [12] Anne E Urai, Brent Doiron, Andrew M Leifer, and Anne K Churchland, “Large-scale neural recordings call for new insights to link brain and behavior,” *Nature neuroscience* **25**, 11–19 (2022).

- [13] Siegfried Weisenburger and Alipasha Vaziri, “A guide to emerging technologies for large-scale and whole-brain optical imaging of neuronal activity,” *Annual review of neuroscience* **41**, 431–452 (2018).
- [14] Nicholas A Steinmetz, Cagatay Aydin, Anna Lebedeva, Michael Okun, Marius Pachitariu, Marius Bauza, Maxime Beau, Jai Bhagat, Claudia Böhm, Martijn Broux, *et al.*, “Neuropixels 2.0: A miniaturized high-density probe for stable, long-term brain recordings,” *Science* **372**, eabf4588 (2021).
- [15] Angelique C Paulk, Yoav Kfir, Arjun R Khanna, Martina L Mustroph, Eric M Trautmann, Dan J Soper, Sergey D Stavisky, Marleen Welkenhuysen, Barundeb Dutta, Krishna V Shenoy, *et al.*, “Large-scale neural recordings with single neuron resolution using neuropixels probes in human cortex,” *Nature Neuroscience* **25**, 252–263 (2022).
- [16] James J Jun, Nicholas A Steinmetz, Joshua H Siegle, Daniel J Denman, Marius Bauza, Brian Barbarits, Albert K Lee, Costas A Anastassiou, Alexandru Andrei, Çağatay Aydin, *et al.*, “Fully integrated silicon probes for high-density recording of neural activity,” *Nature* **551**, 232–236 (2017).
- [17] Janina Hesse, Jan-Hendrik Schleimer, Nikolaus Maier, Dietmar Schmitz, and Susanne Schreiber, “Temperature elevations can induce switches to homoclinic action potentials that alter neural encoding and synchronization,” *Nature Communications* **13**, 3934 (2022).
- [18] Robert P Gowers and Susanne Schreiber, “How neuronal morphology impacts the synchronisation state of neuronal networks,” *PLOS Computational Biology* **20**, e1011874 (2024).
- [19] RC Budzinski, BRR Boaretto, TL Prado, and SR Lopes, “Phase synchronization and intermittent behavior in healthy and alzheimer-affected human-brain-based neural network,” *Physical Review E* **99**, 022402 (2019).
- [20] Peter J Uhlhaas and Wolf Singer, “Abnormal neural oscillations and synchrony in schizophrenia,” *Nature reviews neuroscience* **11**, 100–113 (2010).
- [21] Premysl Jiruska, Marco De Curtis, John GR Jefferys, Catherine A Schevon, Steven J Schiff, and Kaspar Schindler, “Synchronization and desynchronization in epilepsy: controversies and hypotheses,” *The Journal of physiology* **591**, 787–797 (2013).
- [22] Lynette Lim, Da Mi, Alfredo Llorca, and Oscar Marín, “Development and functional diversification of cortical interneurons,” *Neuron* **100**, 294–313 (2018).
- [23] Richard H Masland, “Neuronal diversity in the retina,” *Current opinion in neurobiology* **11**, 431–436 (2001).
- [24] Hanchuan Peng, Peng Xie, Lijuan Liu, Xiuli Kuang, Yimin Wang, Lei Qu, Hui Gong, Shengdian Jiang, Anan Li, Zongcai Ruan, *et al.*, “Morphological diversity of single neurons in molecularly defined cell types,” *Nature* **598**, 174–181 (2021).
- [25] Alan Roberts and Brian MH Bush, *Neurons without impulses: their significance for vertebrate and invertebrate nervous systems*, Vol. 6 (Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- [26] Mikko Juusola, Andrew S French, Raimo O Uusitalo, and Matti Weckström, “Information processing by graded-potential transmission through tonically active synapses,” *Trends in neurosciences* **19**, 292–297 (1996).
- [27] Loïs Naudin, Juan Luis Jiménez Laredo, and Nathalie Corson, “A simple model of nonspiking neurons,” *Neural Computation* **34**, 2075–2101 (2022).
- [28] Loïs Naudin, Juan Luis Jiménez Laredo, Qiang Liu, and Nathalie Corson, “Systematic generation of biophysically detailed models with generalization capability for non-spiking neurons,” *PloS one* **17**, e0268380 (2022).
- [29] Alan L Hodgkin and Andrew F Huxley, “A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve,” *The Journal of physiology* **117**, 500 (1952).
- [30] Bertil Hille, *Ion Channels of Excitable Membranes Third Edition* (2001).
- [31] Joshua H Goldwyn and Eric Shea-Brown, “The what and where of adding channel noise to the hodgkin-huxley equations,” *PLoS computational biology* **7**, e1002247 (2011).
- [32] Richard FitzHugh, “Impulses and physiological states in theoretical models of nerve membrane,” *Biophysical journal* **1**, 445–466 (1961).
- [33] Catherine Morris and Harold Lecar, “Voltage oscillations in the barnacle giant muscle fiber,” *Biophysical journal* **35**, 193–213 (1981).
- [34] John Rinzel and G Bard Ermentrout, “Analysis of neural excitability and oscillations,” *Methods in neuronal modeling* **2**, 251–292 (1998).
- [35] L Lapicque, “Recherches quantitatives sur l’excitation électrique des nerfs,” *J. Physiol. Paris* **9**, 620–635 (1907).
- [36] Nicolas Fourcaud-Trocmé, David Hansel, Carl Van Vreeswijk, and Nicolas Brunel, “How spike generation mechanisms determine the neuronal response to fluctuating inputs,” *Journal of neuroscience* **23**, 11628–11640 (2003).
- [37] Romain Brette and Wulfram Gerstner, “Adaptive exponential integrate-and-fire model as an effective description of neuronal activity,” *Journal of neurophysiology* **94**, 3637–3642 (2005).
- [38] Eugene M Izhikevich, “Simple model of spiking neurons,” *IEEE Transactions on neural networks* **14**, 1569–1572 (2003).
- [39] Michael London and Michael Häusser, “Dendritic computation,” *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **28**, 503–532 (2005).
- [40] Wulfram Gerstner, Werner M Kistler, Richard Naud, and Liam Paninski, *Neuronal dynamics: From single neurons to networks and models of cognition* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- [41] Bard Ermentrout, “Type I membranes, phase resetting curves, and synchrony,” *Neural computation* **8**, 979–1001 (1996).
- [42] Eugene M Izhikevich, *Dynamical systems in neuroscience* (MIT press, 2007).
- [43] Bard Ermentrout and David Hillel Terman, *Foundations of mathematical neuroscience* (Citeseer, 2010).
- [44] Christof Koch, *Biophysics of computation: information processing in single neurons* (Oxford university press, 2004).
- [45] Mikhail I Rabinovich, Pablo Varona, Allen I Selverston, and Henry DI Abarbanel, “Dynamical principles in neuroscience,” *Reviews of modern physics* **78**, 1213 (2006).
- [46] Werner Van Geit, Pablo Achard, and Erik De Schutter, “Neurofitter: a parameter tuning package for a wide range of electrophysiological neuron models,” *Frontiers in neuroinformatics* **1**, 89 (2007).

- [47] Allan R Willms, Deborah J Baro, Ronald M Harris-Warrick, and John Guckenheimer, “An improved parameter estimation method for hodgkin-huxley models,” *Journal of computational neuroscience* **6**, 145–168 (1999).
- [48] Jimin Kim, William Leahy, and Eli Shlizerman, “Neural interactome: Interactive simulation of a neuronal system,” *Frontiers in computational neuroscience* **13**, 8 (2019).
- [49] Astrid A Prinz, Dirk Bucher, and Eve Marder, “Similar network activity from disparate circuit parameters,” *Nature neuroscience* **7**, 1345–1352 (2004).
- [50] Eve Marder and Adam L Taylor, “Multiple models to capture the variability in biological neurons and networks,” *Nature neuroscience* **14**, 133–138 (2011).
- [51] Gerald M Edelman and Joseph A Gally, “Degeneracy and complexity in biological systems,” *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **98**, 13763–13768 (2001).
- [52] Mark K Transtrum, Benjamin B Machta, Kevin S Brown, Bryan C Daniels, Christopher R Myers, and James P Sethna, “Perspective: Sloppiness and emergent theories in physics, biology, and beyond,” *The Journal of chemical physics* **143** (2015).
- [53] Benjamin B Machta, Ricky Chachra, Mark K Transtrum, and James P Sethna, “Parameter space compression underlies emergent theories and predictive models,” *Science* **342**, 604–607 (2013).
- [54] M Breakspear and JR Terry, “Nonlinear interdependence in neural systems: motivation, theory, and relevance,” *International Journal of Neuroscience* **112**, 1263–1284 (2002).
- [55] Gustavo Deco, Viktor K Jirsa, Peter A Robinson, Michael Breakspear, and Karl Friston, “The dynamic brain: from spiking neurons to neural masses and cortical fields,” *PLoS computational biology* **4**, e1000092 (2008).
- [56] Olivier David and Karl J Friston, “A neural mass model for meg/eeg:: coupling and neuronal dynamics,” *NeuroImage* **20**, 1743–1755 (2003).
- [57] Olivier David, Diego Cosmelli, and Karl J Friston, “Evaluation of different measures of functional connectivity using a neural mass model,” *Neuroimage* **21**, 659–673 (2004).
- [58] Federico Tesler, Núria Tort-Colet, Damien Depannemaecker, Mallory Carlu, and Alain Destexhe, “Mean-field based framework for forward modeling of lfp and meg signals,” *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* **16**, 968278 (2022).
- [59] Hugh R Wilson and Jack D Cowan, “Excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized populations of model neurons,” *Biophysical journal* **12**, 1–24 (1972).
- [60] Alain Destexhe and Terrence J Sejnowski, “The wilson-cowan model, 36 years later,” *Biological cybernetics* **101**, 1–2 (2009).
- [61] Ben H Jansen and Vincent G Rit, “Electroencephalogram and visual evoked potential generation in a mathematical model of coupled cortical columns,” *Biological cybernetics* **73**, 357–366 (1995).
- [62] Hil GE Meijer, Tahra L Eissa, Bert Kiewiet, Jeremy F Neuman, Catherine A Schevon, Ronald G Emerson, Robert R Goodman, Guy M McKhann, Charles J Marcuccilli, Andrew K Tryba, *et al.*, “Modeling focal epileptic activity in the wilson-cowan model with depolarization block,” *The Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience (JMN)* **5**, 1–17 (2015).
- [63] Vladimir Shusterman and William C Troy, “From baseline to epileptiform activity: a path to synchronized rhythmicity in large-scale neural networks,” *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **77**, 061911 (2008).
- [64] Hugh R Wilson, Randolph Blake, and Sang-Hun Lee, “Dynamics of travelling waves in visual perception,” *Nature* **412**, 907–910 (2001).
- [65] James A Roberts, Leonardo L Gollo, Romesh G Abey-suriya, Gloria Roberts, Philip B Mitchell, Mark W Woolrich, and Michael Breakspear, “Metastable brain waves,” *Nature communications* **10**, 1056 (2019).
- [66] G Bard Ermentrout and Jack D Cowan, “A mathematical theory of visual hallucination patterns,” *Biological cybernetics* **34**, 137–155 (1979).
- [67] Kamalini G Ranasinghe, Parul Verma, Chang Cai, Xihe Xie, Kiwamu Kudo, Xiao Gao, Hannah Lerner, Danielle Mizuri, Amelia Strom, Leonardo Iaccarino, *et al.*, “Altered excitatory and inhibitory neuronal subpopulation parameters are distinctly associated with tau and amyloid in alzheimer’s disease,” *Elife* **11**, e77850 (2022).
- [68] Stephen Coombes and Áine Byrne, “Next generation neural mass models,” in *Nonlinear dynamics in computational neuroscience* (Springer, 2018) pp. 1–16.
- [69] Christian Bick, Marc Goodfellow, Carlo R Laing, and Erik A Martens, “Understanding the dynamics of biological and neural oscillator networks through exact mean-field reductions: a review,” *The Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience* **10**, 9 (2020).
- [70] Mallory Carlu, Omar Chehab, Leonardo Dalla Porta, Damien Depannemaecker, Charlotte Héricé, Maciej Jedynak, E Köksal Ersöz, Paolo Muratore, Selma Souihel, Cristiano Capone, *et al.*, “A mean-field approach to the dynamics of networks of complex neurons, from nonlinear integrate-and-fire to hodgkin-huxley models,” *Journal of neurophysiology* **123**, 1042–1051 (2020).
- [71] Michael Breakspear, “Dynamic models of large-scale brain activity,” *Nature neuroscience* **20**, 340–352 (2017).
- [72] Alfonso Renart, Nicolas Brunel, and Xiao-Jing Wang, “Mean-field theory of recurrent cortical networks: working memory circuits with irregularly spiking neurons,” *Computational neuroscience: A comprehensive approach*, 432–490 (2003).
- [73] Ernest Montbrió, Diego Pazó, and Alex Roxin, “Macroscopic description for networks of spiking neurons,” *Physical Review X* **5**, 021028 (2015).
- [74] Matteo Di Volo, Alberto Romagnoni, Cristiano Capone, and Alain Destexhe, “Biologically realistic mean-field models of conductance-based networks of spiking neurons with adaptation,” *Neural computation* **31**, 653–680 (2019).
- [75] Paula Sanz-Leon, Stuart A Knock, Andreas Spiegler, and Viktor K Jirsa, “Mathematical framework for large-scale brain network modeling in the virtual brain,” *Neuroimage* **111**, 385–430 (2015).
- [76] Paula Sanz Leon, Stuart A Knock, M Marmaduke Woodman, Lia Domide, Jochen Mersmann, Anthony R McIntosh, and Viktor Jirsa, “The virtual brain: a simulator of primate brain network dynamics,” *Frontiers in neuroinformatics* **7**, 10 (2013).
- [77] Dipanjan Roy, Rodrigo Sigala, Michael Breakspear, Anthony Randal McIntosh, Viktor K Jirsa, Gustavo Deco,

- and Petra Ritter, “Using the virtual brain to reveal the role of oscillations and plasticity in shaping brain’s dynamical landscape,” *Brain connectivity* **4**, 791–811 (2014).
- [78] Huifang E Wang, Paul Triebkorn, Martin Breyton, Borana Dollomaja, Jean-Didier Lemarechal, Spase Petkoski, Pierpaolo Sorrentino, Damien Depannemaecker, Meysam Hashemi, and Viktor K Jirsa, “Virtual brain twins: from basic neuroscience to clinical use,” *National Science Review* **11**, nwae079 (2024).
- [79] Isabel Voigt, Hernan Inojosa, Anja Dillenseger, Rocco Haase, Katja Akgün, and Tjalf Ziemssen, “Digital twins for multiple sclerosis,” *Frontiers in immunology* **12**, 669811 (2021).
- [80] Viktor Jirsa, Huifang Wang, Paul Triebkorn, Meysam Hashemi, Jayant Jha, Jorge Gonzalez-Martinez, Maxime Guye, Julia Makhalova, and Fabrice Bartolomei, “Personalised virtual brain models in epilepsy,” *The Lancet Neurology* **22**, 443–454 (2023).
- [81] Mario Lavanga, Johanna Stumme, Bahar Hazal Yalcinkaya, Jan Fousek, Christiane Jockwitz, Hiba Sheheitli, Nora Bittner, Meysam Hashemi, Spase Petkoski, Svenja Caspers, *et al.*, “The virtual aging brain: Causal inference supports interhemispheric dedifferentiation in healthy aging,” *NeuroImage* **283**, 120403 (2023).
- [82] Marianna Angiolelli, Damien Depannemaecker, Hasnae Agouram, Jean Regis, Romain Carron, Marmaduke Woodman, Letizia Chiodo, Paul Triebkorn, Abolfazl Ziaemehr, Meysam Hashemi, *et al.*, “The virtual parkinsonian patient,” *medRxiv*, 2024–07 (2024).
- [83] Samuel A Neymotin, Dylan S Daniels, Blake Caldwell, Robert A McDougal, Nicholas T Carnevale, Mainak Jas, Christopher I Moore, Michael L Hines, Matti Hämäläinen, and Stephanie R Jones, “Human neocortical neurosolver (hnn), a new software tool for interpreting the cellular and network origin of human meg/eeg data,” *Elife* **9**, e51214 (2020).
- [84] Caglar Cakan and Klaus Obermayer, “Biophysically grounded mean-field models of neural populations under electrical stimulation,” *PLoS computational biology* **16**, e1007822 (2020).
- [85] Lia Papadopoulou, Christopher W Lynn, Demian Battaglia, and Danielle S Bassett, “Relations between large-scale brain connectivity and effects of regional stimulation depend on collective dynamical state,” *PLoS computational biology* **16**, e1008144 (2020).
- [86] Christine Grienberger, Andrea Giovannucci, William Zeiger, and Carlos Portera-Cailliau, “Two-photon calcium imaging of neuronal activity,” *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* **2**, 67 (2022).
- [87] Alex Fornito, Andrew Zalesky, and Edward Bullmore, *Fundamentals of brain network analysis* (Academic press, 2016).
- [88] Onerva Korhonen, Massimiliano Zanin, and David Papo, “Principles and open questions in functional brain network reconstruction,” *Human Brain Mapping* **42**, 3680–3711 (2021).
- [89] Fan Zhang, Alessandro Daducci, Yong He, Simona Schiavi, Caio Seguin, Robert E Smith, Chun-Hung Yeh, Tengda Zhao, and Lauren J O’Donnell, “Quantitative mapping of the brain’s structural connectivity using diffusion mri tractography: A review,” *Neuroimage* **249**, 118870 (2022).
- [90] Kevin L Briggman and Davi D Bock, “Volume electron microscopy for neuronal circuit reconstruction,” *Current opinion in neurobiology* **22**, 154–161 (2012).
- [91] Moritz Helmstaedter, Kevin L Briggman, and Winfried Denk, “3d structural imaging of the brain with photons and electrons,” *Current opinion in neurobiology* **18**, 633–641 (2008).
- [92] Robert Court, Marta Costa, Clare Pilgrim, Gillian Millburn, Alex Holmes, Alex McLachlan, Aoife Larkin, Nicolas Matentzoglou, Huseyin Kir, Helen Parkinson, *et al.*, “Virtual fly brain—an interactive atlas of the drosophila nervous system,” *Frontiers in physiology* **14**, 1076533 (2023).
- [93] Kurt G Schilling, Vishwesh Nath, Colin Hansen, Prasanna Parvathaneni, Justin Blaber, Yurui Gao, Peter Neher, Dogu Baran Aydogan, Yonggang Shi, Mario Ocampo-Pineda, *et al.*, “Limits to anatomical accuracy of diffusion tractography using modern approaches,” *Neuroimage* **185**, 1–11 (2019).
- [94] Francesco Randi, Anuj K Sharma, Sophie Dvali, and Andrew M Leifer, “Neural signal propagation atlas of caenorhabditis elegans,” *Nature* **623**, 406–414 (2023).
- [95] Wataru Yamamoto and Rafael Yuste, “Whole-body imaging of neural and muscle activity during behavior in hydra vulgaris: effect of osmolarity on contraction bursts,” *eneuro* **7** (2020).
- [96] Jeffrey Demas, Jason Manley, Frank Tejera, Kevin Barber, Hyewon Kim, Francisca Martínez Traub, Brandon Chen, and Alipasha Vaziri, “High-speed, cortex-wide volumetric recording of neuroactivity at cellular resolution using light beads microscopy,” *Nature Methods* **18**, 1103–1111 (2021).
- [97] Richard F Betzel and Danielle S Bassett, “Generative models for network neuroscience: prospects and promise,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **14**, 20170623 (2017).
- [98] Danielle S Bassett and Edward T Bullmore, “Small-world brain networks revisited,” *The Neuroscientist* **23**, 499–516 (2017).
- [99] Claus-C Hilgetag, Gully APC Burns, Marc A O’Neill, Jack W Scannell, and Malcolm P Young, “Anatomical connectivity defines the organization of clusters of cortical areas in the macaque and the cat,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **355**, 91–110 (2000).
- [100] Olaf Sporns and Richard F Betzel, “Modular brain networks,” *Annual review of psychology* **67**, 613–640 (2016).
- [101] Martijn P Van Den Heuvel and Olaf Sporns, “Rich-club organization of the human connectome,” *Journal of Neuroscience* **31**, 15775–15786 (2011).
- [102] Emma K Towilson, Petra E Vértes, Sebastian E Ahnert, William R Schafer, and Edward T Bullmore, “The rich club of the c. elegans neuronal connectome,” *Journal of Neuroscience* **33**, 6380–6387 (2013).
- [103] Danielle S Bassett, Perry Zurn, and Joshua I Gold, “On the nature and use of models in network neuroscience,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **19**, 566–578 (2018).
- [104] František Váša and Bratislav Mišić, “Null models in network neuroscience,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **23**, 493–504 (2022).
- [105] Bailey K Fosdick, Daniel B Larremore, Joel Nishimura, and Johan Ugander, “Configuring random graph models with fixed degree sequences,” *Siam Review* **60**, 315–355

- (2018).
- [106] Vito Dichio and Fabrizio De Vico Fallani, “Statistical models of complex brain networks: a maximum entropy approach,” *Reports on progress in physics* (2023).
- [107] Sean L Simpson, Satoru Hayasaka, and Paul J Laurenti, “Exponential random graph modeling for complex brain networks,” *PloS one* **6**, e20039 (2011).
- [108] Edwin T Jaynes, “Information theory and statistical mechanics,” *Physical review* **106**, 620 (1957).
- [109] Elad Schneidman, Michael J Berry, Ronen Segev, and William Bialek, “Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly correlated network states in a neural population,” *Nature* **440**, 1007–1012 (2006).
- [110] Arian Ashourvan, Preya Shah, Adam Pines, Shi Gu, Christopher W Lynn, Danielle S Bassett, Kathryn A Davis, and Brian Litt, “Pairwise maximum entropy model explains the role of white matter structure in shaping emergent co-activation states,” *Communications biology* **4**, 210 (2021).
- [111] Leenoy Meshulam, Jeffrey L Gauthier, Carlos D Brody, David W Tank, and William Bialek, “Successes and failures of simplified models for a network of real neurons,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14735* (2021).
- [112] Elad Ganmor, Ronen Segev, and Elad Schneidman, “Sparse low-order interaction network underlies a highly correlated and learnable neural population code,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of sciences* **108**, 9679–9684 (2011).
- [113] Ori Maoz, Gašper Tkačik, Mohamad Saleh Esteki, Roozbeh Kiani, and Elad Schneidman, “Learning probabilistic neural representations with randomly connected circuits,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 25066–25073 (2020).
- [114] Steve Pressé, Kingshuk Ghosh, Julian Lee, and Ken A Dill, “Principles of maximum entropy and maximum caliber in statistical physics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85**, 1115 (2013).
- [115] Carina Curto and Katherine Morrison, “Relating network connectivity to dynamics: opportunities and challenges for theoretical neuroscience,” *Current opinion in neurobiology* **58**, 11–20 (2019).
- [116] Jennifer Stiso and Danielle S Bassett, “Spatial embedding imposes constraints on neuronal network architectures,” *Trends in cognitive sciences* **22**, 1127–1142 (2018).
- [117] Anastasiya Salova and István A Kovács, “Combined topological and spatial constraints are required to capture the structure of neural connectomes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06110* (2024).
- [118] Martijn P Van den Heuvel, Edward T Bullmore, and Olaf Sporns, “Comparative connectomics,” *Trends in cognitive sciences* **20**, 345–361 (2016).
- [119] Ed Bullmore and Olaf Sporns, “The economy of brain network organization,” *Nature reviews neuroscience* **13**, 336–349 (2012).
- [120] Martijn P Van Den Heuvel, René S Kahn, Joaquín Goñi, and Olaf Sporns, “High-cost, high-capacity backbone for global brain communication,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 11372–11377 (2012).
- [121] Richard Gast, Sara A Solla, and Ann Kennedy, “Neural heterogeneity controls computations in spiking neural networks,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **121**, e2311885121 (2024).
- [122] Danielle S Bassett, Edward Bullmore, Beth A Verchinski, Venkata S Mattay, Daniel R Weinberger, and Andreas Meyer-Lindenberg, “Hierarchical organization of human cortical networks in health and schizophrenia,” *Journal of Neuroscience* **28**, 9239–9248 (2008).
- [123] David Meunier, Renaud Lambiotte, and Edward T Bullmore, “Modular and hierarchically modular organization of brain networks,” *Frontiers in neuroscience* **4**, 7572 (2010).
- [124] Marcus Kaiser and Sreedevi Varier, “Evolution and development of brain networks: from caenorhabditis elegans to homo sapiens,” *Network: Computation in Neural Systems* **22**, 143–147 (2011).
- [125] Xuhong Liao, Athanasios V Vasilakos, and Yong He, “Small-world human brain networks: perspectives and challenges,” *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **77**, 286–300 (2017).
- [126] Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz, “Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks,” *nature* **393**, 440–442 (1998).
- [127] Caio Seguin, Olaf Sporns, and Andrew Zalesky, “Brain network communication: concepts, models and applications,” *Nature reviews neuroscience* **24**, 557–574 (2023).
- [128] Marcus Kaiser and Claus C Hilgetag, “Nonoptimal component placement, but short processing paths, due to long-distance projections in neural systems,” *PLoS computational biology* **2**, e95 (2006).
- [129] Danielle S Bassett, Daniel L Greenfield, Andreas Meyer-Lindenberg, Daniel R Weinberger, Simon W Moore, and Edward T Bullmore, “Efficient physical embedding of topologically complex information processing networks in brains and computer circuits,” *PLoS computational biology* **6**, e1000748 (2010).
- [130] Julian ML Budd and Zoltán F Kisvárdy, “Communication and wiring in the cortical connectome,” *Frontiers in neuroanatomy* **6**, 42 (2012).
- [131] Peter Sterling and Simon Laughlin, *Principles of neural design* (MIT press, 2015).
- [132] Julia J Harris, Renaud Jolivet, and David Attwell, “Synaptic energy use and supply,” *Neuron* **75**, 762–777 (2012).
- [133] William B Levy and Victoria G Calvert, “Communication consumes 35 times more energy than computation in the human cortex, but both costs are needed to predict synapse number,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, e2008173118 (2021).
- [134] Vijay Balasubramanian, “Heterogeneity and efficiency in the brain,” *Proceedings of the IEEE* **103**, 1346–1358 (2015).
- [135] Stephanie E Palmer, Olivier Marre, Michael J Berry, and William Bialek, “Predictive information in a sensory population,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 6908–6913 (2015).
- [136] Siwei Wang, Idan Segev, Alexander Borst, and Stephanie Palmer, “Maximally efficient prediction in the early fly visual system may support evasive flight maneuvers,” *PLoS computational biology* **17**, e1008965 (2021).
- [137] Byron H Price and Jeffrey P Gavornik, “Efficient temporal coding in the early visual system: existing evidence and future directions,” *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* **16**, 929348 (2022).
- [138] Carina Curto, Vladimir Itskov, Katherine Morrison, Zachary Roth, and Judy L Walker, “Combinatorial neu-

- ral codes from a mathematical coding theory perspective,” *Neural computation* **25**, 1891–1925 (2013).
- [139] Lav R Varshney, Beth L Chen, Eric Paniagua, David H Hall, and Dmitri B Chklovskii, “Structural properties of the caenorhabditis elegans neuronal network,” *PLoS computational biology* **7**, e1001066 (2011).
- [140] Albert Lin, Runzhe Yang, Sven Dorkenwald, Arie Matsliah, Amy R Sterling, Philipp Schlegel, Szi-chieh Yu, Claire E McKellar, Marta Costa, Katharina Eichler, *et al.*, “Network statistics of the whole-brain connectome of drosophila,” *bioRxiv* (2023).
- [141] Christopher W Lynn, Caroline M Holmes, and Stephanie E Palmer, “Heavy-tailed neuronal connectivity arises from hebbian self-organization,” *Nature Physics* **20**, 484–491 (2024).
- [142] Daniel Witvliet, Ben Mulcahy, James K Mitchell, Yaron Meirovitch, Daniel R Berger, Yuelong Wu, Yufang Liu, Wan Xian Koh, Rajeev Parvathala, Douglas Holmyard, *et al.*, “Connectomes across development reveal principles of brain maturation,” *Nature* **596**, 257–261 (2021).
- [143] Julia K Brynildsen, Kanaka Rajan, Michael X Henderson, and Dani S Bassett, “Network models to enhance the translational impact of cross-species studies,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **24**, 575–588 (2023).
- [144] Larry F Abbott, Davi D Bock, Edward M Callaway, Winfried Denk, Catherine Dulac, Adrienne L Fairhall, Ila Fiete, Kristen M Harris, Moritz Helmstaedter, Viren Jain, *et al.*, “The mind of a mouse,” *Cell* **182**, 1372–1376 (2020).
- [145] Mark EJ Newman and Aaron Clauset, “Structure and inference in annotated networks,” *Nature communications* **7**, 11863 (2016).
- [146] Vincent Bazinet, Justine Y Hansen, and Bratislav Mistic, “Towards a biologically annotated brain connectome,” *Nature reviews neuroscience* **24**, 747–760 (2023).
- [147] Vincent Bazinet, Justine Y Hansen, Reinder Vos de Wael, Boris C Bernhardt, Martijn P van den Heuvel, and Bratislav Mistic, “Assortative mixing in micro-architecturally annotated brain connectomes,” *Nature Communications* **14**, 2850 (2023).
- [148] Mikko Kivelä, Alex Arenas, Marc Barthelemy, James P Gleeson, Yamir Moreno, and Mason A Porter, “Multilayer networks,” *Journal of complex networks* **2**, 203–271 (2014).
- [149] Michael Vaiana and Sarah Feldt Muldoon, “Multilayer brain networks,” *Journal of Nonlinear Science* **30**, 2147–2169 (2020).
- [150] Federico Battiston, Giulia Cencetti, Iacopo Iacopini, Vito Latora, Maxime Lucas, Alice Patania, Jean-Gabriel Young, and Giovanni Petri, “Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics,” *Physics Reports* **874**, 1–92 (2020).
- [151] Christian Bick, Elizabeth Gross, Heather A Harrington, and Michael T Schaub, “What are higher-order networks?” *SIAM Review* **65**, 686–731 (2023).
- [152] Charley Presigny and Fabrizio De Vico Fallani, “Colloquium: Multiscale modeling of brain network organization,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **94**, 031002 (2022).
- [153] Barry Bentley, Robyn Branicky, Christopher L Barnes, Yee Lian Chew, Eviatar Yemini, Edward T Bullmore, Petra E Vértes, and William R Schafer, “The multilayer connectome of caenorhabditis elegans,” *PLoS computational biology* **12**, e1005283 (2016).
- [154] Petter Holme and Jari Saramäki, “Temporal networks,” *Physics reports* **519**, 97–125 (2012).
- [155] William Hedley Thompson, Per Brantefors, and Peter Fransson, “From static to temporal network theory: Applications to functional brain connectivity,” *Network Neuroscience* **1**, 69–99 (2017).
- [156] Danielle S Bassett, Nicholas F Wymbs, M Puck Rombach, Mason A Porter, Peter J Mucha, and Scott T Grafton, “Task-based core-periphery organization of human brain dynamics,” *PLoS computational biology* **9**, e1003171 (2013).
- [157] Rico Berner, Thilo Gross, Christian Kuehn, Jürgen Kurths, and Serhiy Yanchuk, “Adaptive dynamical networks,” *Physics Reports* **1031**, 1–59 (2023).
- [158] Ryan N Gutenkunst, Joshua J Waterfall, Fergal P Casey, Kevin S Brown, Christopher R Myers, and James P Sethna, “Universally sloppy parameter sensitivities in systems biology models,” *PLoS computational biology* **3**, e189 (2007).
- [159] John P Cunningham and Byron M Yu, “Dimensionality reduction for large-scale neural recordings,” *Nature neuroscience* **17**, 1500–1509 (2014).
- [160] Juan A Gallego, Matthew G Perich, Lee E Miller, and Sara A Solla, “Neural manifolds for the control of movement,” *Neuron* **94**, 978–984 (2017).
- [161] Peiran Gao and Surya Ganguli, “On simplicity and complexity in the brave new world of large-scale neuroscience,” *Current opinion in neurobiology* **32**, 148–155 (2015).
- [162] Erin C Conrad, John M Bernabei, Lohith G Kini, Preya Shah, Fadi Mikhail, Ammar Kheder, Russell T Shinohara, Kathryn A Davis, Danielle S Bassett, and Brian Litt, “The sensitivity of network statistics to incomplete electrode sampling on intracranial eeg,” *Network Neuroscience* **4**, 484–506 (2020).
- [163] Scott Marek, Brenden Tervo-Clemmens, Finnegan J Calabro, David F Montez, Benjamin P Kay, Alexander S Hatoum, Meghan Rose Donohue, William Foran, Ryland L Miller, Timothy J Hendrickson, *et al.*, “Reproducible brain-wide association studies require thousands of individuals,” *Nature* **603**, 654–660 (2022).
- [164] Kyle Q Lepage, ShiNung Ching, and Mark A Kramer, “Inferring evoked brain connectivity through adaptive perturbation,” *Journal of computational neuroscience* **34**, 303–318 (2013).
- [165] Vincent Walsh and Alan Cowey, “Transcranial magnetic stimulation and cognitive neuroscience,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **1**, 73–80 (2000).
- [166] James Woodward and Lauren Ross, “Scientific Explanation,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021) Summer 2021 ed.
- [167] Paolo Mancosu, Francesca Poggiolesi, and Christopher Pincock, “Mathematical Explanation,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2023) Fall 2023 ed.
- [168] Lauren N Ross, “What is social structural explanation? A causal account,” *Noûs* **58**, 163–179 (2024).
- [169] Lauren N Ross, “Distinguishing topological and causal explanation,” *Synthese* **198**, 9803–9820 (2021).
- [170] Daniel Kostić, “General theory of topological explanations and explanatory asymmetry,” *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*, B37520190321 (2020).

- [171] Lauren N. Ross, “Causal concepts in biology: How pathways differ from mechanisms and why it matters,” *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **72**, 131–158 (2021).
- [172] Lauren N Ross and Dani S Bassett, “Causation in neuroscience: keeping mechanism meaningful,” *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **25**, 81–90 (2024).
- [173] Fred Dretske, “Triggering and structuring causes,” in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Action*, edited by Timothy O’Connor and Constantine Sandis (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) pp. 139–144.
- [174] Lauren N Ross, “Causes with material continuity,” *Biol Philos* **36**, 52 (2021).