

Vagus nerve stimulation: Laying the groundwork for predictive network-based computer models

John F. Ingham^{1*}¶ Frances Hutchings¹¶ Paolo Zuliani⁴
Yujiang Wang^{1,2,3} Sadegh Soudjani⁵ Peter N. Taylor^{1,2,3}

June 6, 2024

1. CNNP Lab (www.cnnp-lab.com), Interdisciplinary Computing and Complex BioSystems Group, School of Computing, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom
2. Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom
3. UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, United Kingdom
4. Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”, Rome, Italy
5. Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Kaiserslautern, Germany

* Corresponding author

j.f.ingham2@newcastle.ac.uk

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

1 Abstract

Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) is an established palliative treatment for drug resistant epilepsy. While effective for many patients, its mechanism of action is incompletely understood. Predicting

individuals' response, or optimum stimulation parameters, is challenging. Computational modelling has informed other problems in epilepsy but, to our knowledge, has not been applied to VNS.

We started with an established, four-population neural mass model (NMM), capable of reproducing the seizure-like dynamics of a thalamocortical circuit. We extended this to include 18 further neural populations, representing nine other brain regions relevant to VNS, with connectivity based on existing literature. We modelled stimulated afferent vagal fibres as projecting to the nucleus tractus solitarius (NTS), which receives input from the vagus nerve *in vivo*.

Bifurcation analysis of a deterministic version of the model showed higher background NTS input made the model monostable at a fixed point (FP), representing normal activity, while lower inputs produce bistability between the FP and a limit cycle (LC), representing the seizure state.

Adding noise produced transitions between seizure and normal states. This stochastic model spent decreasing time in the seizure state with increasing background NTS input, until seizures were abolished, consistent with the deterministic model.

Simulated VNS stimulation, modelled as a 30 Hz square wave, was summed with the background input to the NTS and was found to reduce total seizure duration in a dose-dependent manner, similar to expectations *in vivo*.

We have successfully produced an *in silico* model of VNS in epilepsy, capturing behaviour seen *in vivo*. This may aid understanding therapeutic mechanisms of VNS in epilepsy and provides a starting point to (i) determine which patients might respond best to VNS, and (ii) optimise individuals' treatments.

2 Introduction

Epilepsy is a common neurological condition, both disabling and potentially dangerous, with an estimated lifetime prevalence of 0.76% worldwide [1]. First line treatment is pharmacological, but this is not completely effective in up to a third of cases [2] and also prone to common side effects [3].

Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) is among the treatments used for drug resistant cases. VNS can be used for multiple types of epilepsies, and is generally regarded as palliative, reducing seizure

frequency and duration by approximately 50% in around half of patients [4, 5]. It is safe for long term use, and benefits can sometimes improve for as long as two years after starting therapy [6]. It is licensed, not only for epilepsy, but also for the treatment of refractory depression. Other suggested use includes conditions as diverse as heart failure, migraine, cluster headache, post-traumatic stress disorder, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, obesity and inflammatory bowel disease [7]. The vagi are a pair of cranial nerves, originating in brainstem nuclei, which innervate structures in the head, neck, thorax and abdomen. Both efferent (voluntary branchial motor and involuntary visceral motor) and afferent (general somatosensory, general and special visceral sensory) fibres are present.

In the context of epilepsy treatment, VNS is applied by a device implanted subcutaneously in the chest, connected to electrodes on the left vagus nerve as it runs through the neck, aiming to preferentially stimulate afferent fibres. Through a combination of clinical experience and engineering expediency, practice has settled on a 30Hz monophasic square-wave signal, with a pulse width of 250-500 μ s at a current between 0.25mA and 3.5mA. This is then applied cyclically for 30s in every 300s. To minimize side effects, initial settings are conservative, and parameters are adjusted during clinic visits, based on clinical experience and trial and error [8, 9].

Despite its use in epilepsy, and ongoing clinical and animal research, the mechanism of VNS in epilepsy remains incompletely understood. Furthermore, predicting which patients will respond to VNS is imprecise, with few biomarkers identified which correlate to any significant degree [10].

Computational modelling is a technique to capture known aspects of brain function with systems of differential equations. It has provided insights into epilepsy surgery prognosis [11, 12], identifying factors predicting successful seizure termination by cortical stimulation [13], and predicting optimal methods for disrupting seizures with optogenetic stimulation [14]. To our knowledge, no computational model of VNS in epilepsy currently exists.

Here we present our newly developed computational model of VNS in epilepsy and demonstrate that it is able to reproduce behaviours found clinically. We envisage this model will serve as a platform for future investigations into VNS in epilepsy.

3 Materials and methods

We based our model on previously published work, which was able to replicate epileptiform spike and wave discharge (SWD) events that occur and terminate spontaneously with background noise [13]. This model includes equations representing thalamic and cortical areas, and was used to make predictions about single pulse cortical stimulation as a means to elicit or disrupt seizure-like activity. In this paper we first explore the literature surrounding the brain regions thought to be implicated in VNS. We then use this information to extend the thalamocortical model to include this wider network of VNS-implicated regions, and allow us to capture the simulated impact of VNS on the brain. The network is visualised in Fig. 1, which includes references to specific connections identified [9, 15–34].

3.1 Constructing a VNS network from literature

Nucleus Tractus Solitarius

The Nucleus Tractus Solitarius (also known as the Nucleus of the Solitary Tract or the Solitary Nucleus, abbreviated here as NTS) is a brainstem nucleus which receives direct input from the vagus nerve, and is therefore the first brain area to be impacted by VNS [35, 36]. The NTS projects to other brainstem nuclei including the Locus Coeruleus and Parabrachial Nucleus which in particular are associated with VNS [15]. Long range connections to the hypothalamus [21] and nuclei of the thalamus and amygdala [37] have also been described.

Locus Coeruleus

The Locus Coeruleus (LoC) is a region which has been associated with VNS effects in several studies: lesion experiments in rodents showed that damaging the LoC prevented the anti-convulsant effects of VNS [38] and activation of the LoC has been associated with VNS responders [39]. The LoC connects proximally to the NTS and is the primary source of noradrenergic neurons in the brain, making it a region with influence on the wider network [15].

Dorsal Raphe Nucleus

The Dorsal Raphe Nucleus (DRN) is included in our model on a similar basis to the LoC, as it is a region with known close connections to the LoC, which is in turn connected to the NTS, and is a major source of serotonergic innervation of the wider brain [15], making it capable of widespread influence. Serotonin has been implicated in seizure thresholds [40] and VNS has been suggested as a treatment for depression where serotonin is again known to have a strong influence [41–43]. We therefore include in the model this key region for the regulation of the serotonergic network. Possible future expansions of this model could better capture the DRN influence on this wider network beyond the regions modelled in our current system.

Parabrachial Nucleus

The Parabrachial Nucleus (PB) is another brainstem region with a known close connection from the NTS [16], which connects closely with the LoC and DRN. It is also known to have diffuse outputs to the thalamus, amygdala and hypothalamus [15] which are regions we have also included in this network.

Hypothalamus

The hypothalamus is directly innervated by the NTS [15, 19, 21, 37] and connects with all other regions of interest in our model [20, 22, 24, 33, 44, 45]. Another reason to include the hypothalamus is that there is evidence that VNS has an immunomodulatory effect via the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis [46–48]. Inflammation has been proposed to play a role in seizure generation [49] and inflammatory markers may predict VNS response [50]. Other studies investigated the efficacy of VNS for epilepsy associated with hypothalamic hamartomas [51, 52].

Amygdala

The amygdala is often associated with seizure activity, particularly in temporal lobe epilepsy [53]. The amygdala receives connections from the NTS directly as well as from the PB [22] and noradrenergic innervation from the LoC [15, 20]. It is known to have connections with the hypotha-

lamus [33, 44], insula [15, 25, 54], prefrontal cortex [55], anterior cingulate cortex [34, 56] and thalamus [25, 28], all of which are included in our model.

Prefrontal Cortex

The prefrontal cortex (PFC) is connected with the amygdala [55], insula [54], hypothalamus [31, 33, 44] and the anterior cingulate cortex [15, 57], as well as directly to the thalamus [30]. An fMRI study of patients receiving VNS showed activation of the frontal cortex [58], and decreased functional connectivity has been found between the prefrontal cortex and the cingulate cortex in VNS responders [59, 60].

Anterior Cingulate Cortex

Cingulate cortex has been implicated in a number of connectivity studies investigating VNS response [9, 10, 59], and was shown to be activated in fMRI analysis of VNS recipients being treated for epilepsy [58]. Additionally, the anterior cingulate cortex connects to the insula [15, 34], PFC [15, 57], amygdala [31, 34, 56] and hypothalamus [33].

Insula

Connections between the insula and thalamic and temporal regions, as well as between the insula and brainstem and cingulate cortex, have been implicated in VNS response [10, 61]. The insula is interconnected with other regions of interest in the model: the PFC [54], the Anterior Cingulate Cortex [15, 34], the amygdala [15, 25, 31, 32], hypothalamus [33], and the thalamus [26, 27, 62]. The insula has also been shown to be activated by VNS in fMRI [58].

3.2 Determining relative connection strength from neuroimaging data

In order to determine connection weights in the model, we utilise diffusion tensor imaging data from the human connectome project. We computed connectivity networks using DSI Studio [63, 64] and the HCP842 tractography atlas overlaid with fractional anisotropy (FA) maps, sampling the FA along each tract. The Desikan-Killiany parcellation [65] was used as grey matter regions of interest

and we considered two regions connected if a tract ended in both regions. The average connectivity across the controls was computed to form a representative value in this study. However, in future studies we anticipate that these values could be used from individual patient data. The control averaged values were then scaled relative to the model connection weight between S1 and the Thalamus, as determined in [13], such that this weight was equal to the value in the original model, and all other weights take on values relative to it. All connectivity values are included in Table S0.1 of the supplementary materials section.

3.3 Building the computational model

The basis for our model, is a four-population NMM representing excitatory (*PY*) and inhibitory (*IN*) neocortical populations, specifically labelled here as primary somatosensory cortex (S1), as well as the excitatory thalamocortical nucleus (*TC*) and inhibitory reticular (*RE*) nucleus of the thalamus [13]. These, in turn, are modelled using a development of the Amari neural field equations [66–68]. The deterministic version of this model is described by the following differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dPY}{dt} &= \tau_1(h_{PY} - PY + C_1f[PY] - C_3f[IN] + C_9f[TC]) \\
\frac{dIN}{dt} &= \tau_2(h_{IN} - IN + C_2f[PY]) \\
\frac{dTC}{dt} &= \tau_3(h_{TC} - TC + C_7f[PY]) - C_6s[RE] \\
\frac{dRE}{dt} &= \tau_4(h_{RE} - RE + C_8f[PY]) - C_4s[RE] + C_5s[TC],
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where: h_{PY} , h_{IN} , h_{TC} , h_{RE} are input parameters; τ_1, \dots, τ_4 are time constants; C_1, \dots, C_9 are connection weights between populations; and f and s are the activation functions:

$$f[u] = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^{-u}}, \tag{2}$$

$$s[u] = au + b, \tag{3}$$

for $u = PY, IN, TC, RE$. The steepness of the sigmoid function, s , is determined by ε . The mean activity of the PY and IN populations are taken to represent the local field potential (LFP) of the cortex, or an electroencephalogram (EEG) channel measured from the local cortical surface or overlying scalp. Gaussian noise can be added to the TC population input in order to induce spontaneous seizure-like episodes in the system, as in the original model [13].

From this starting point, we modelled the additional brain regions, identified in section 3.1, as pairs of excitatory and inhibitory populations, analogous to those of S1. The connection weights determined in section 3.2 are applied to the connections identified between the populations. Except for where specific evidence exists to the contrary, projections between areas are assumed to be between the excitatory populations. Where the directionality of a tract is not known, half of the weight is assigned to either direction. Thresholding is applied such that exceptionally weak connection weights are ignored.

We first simulated the model deterministically, without the addition of random noise, in order to assess its bifurcation structure over a range of parameters, using the MATLAB ODE45 adaptive time step solver in its default settings. Parameter sweeps were performed with ascending and descending values starting from random points in the state space, and the local minima and maxima plotted.

For the stochastic versions of the model, we choose to retain the TC population as the site of noise injection as, not only is this in keeping with previous literature [69–71], but also has less direct effect on the measurement at S1, allowing easier detection of seizures, while still being able to influence the core dynamics of the model. Noise is normally distributed with a mean of zero, while the standard deviation was adjusted to 0.72, which produced clinically plausible seizure duration and frequency.

A solver utilising the Euler-Maruyama method was used to evaluate stochastic versions of the model. Its fixed time step was determined through comparing zero noise simulations against those from the deterministic system’s variable step solver, and by ensuring consistency between stochastic behaviour and the bifurcation behaviour of the deterministic system. A step size of 100 μ s was the minimum required to give consistent results, and was therefore used throughout.

For stochastic simulations we generated, for each set of parameters, a continuous time series of 10,000 s (approximately 27.8 hours) of simulated time using identical noise sequences in each case. For consistency, the noise was generated by concatenating consistent epochs of 100 s duration, with the random number generator (RNG) seeded at 1 for the first epoch, incremented for each subsequent epoch. Specifying the RNG generation algorithm allowed consistency between versions of MATLAB running on desktop and HPC cluster. Each simulation started at the FP and was allowed to evolve thereafter for the duration of the simulation.

3.4 Seizure detection

The FP was determined at the default parameters and was found to change very little in the parameter ranges scanned. This was also the case for the LoC where present. The same FP values were therefore used throughout. For all time series, the euclidean distance (ED) of the S1 populations from the FP is calculated. We considered other combinations of the 22 neuronal populations to contribute to this measure, but the S1 populations give the clearest signal. The ED time series was smoothed by applying a moving mean with a 2-second window. The system is determined to be in a state of seizure if the smoothed ED is greater than a value of 0.15. Both the threshold and the duration of the moving mean window were determined empirically to minimise rapid switching between the normal and seizure states where possible. The seizure detection method is summarised in Figure S0.1 of the supplementary materials.

Using the same parameters used in the deterministic version of the model, the noise was scaled to the point where the system spent the vast majority of time in the non-seizure state, with a clinically plausible seizure frequency and duration. However, having infrequent seizures necessitates longer simulations to obtain an interpretable quantity of events, so a compromise was made to simulate the more severe end of the clinical spectrum.

3.5 Simulating vagus nerve stimulation

Having established a value of NTS_{PY} placing the system within the seizure prone region, simulated VNS is applied. This was modelled as a 30 Hz square wave with a pulse width of 500 μ s, consistent

with clinical practice, and added to the input of NTS_{PY} . Repeated runs were performed with increasing amplitudes of VNS, starting at zero.

Full details of all parameters are given in Tables S0.1 and S0.2 of the supplementary materials. Code to reproduce the findings is available at: https://github.com/johningham/VNS_model_code.

4 Results

4.1 The deterministic system

When simulating without the addition of noise, our model produced a very similar behaviour to the original model on which it is based. With our chosen set of parameters, the system demonstrated two distinct stable states, a stable FP and a period-2 LC with a biphasically oscillating time series resembling SWD (Figure 2a,b). All 22 populations remained strongly coupled. Time series and phase plots for these states are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2d also shows the effect of varying the background input of the excitatory population of NTS_{PY} , which receives afferent connections from the vagus nerve *in vivo*. At lower values of NTS_{PY} input, the system is bistable between the FP and LC while, at higher values, it is monostable at the FP only. It is interesting to note that the location of the FP and the trajectory of the LC, where it exists, do not substantially change with NTS_{PY} .

4.2 The stochastic system without VNS

Noise was applied such that the system spent a maximum of 0.309% of the total time in the seizure state, as measured over 27.8 hours of simulated time. This was spread over 14 distinct seizures with a mean duration of 61.3s, consistent with the more severe end of the clinical range. We performed repeated simulations, varying the value of NTS_{PY} input, using identical noise for each simulation. With a sufficiently high value of NTS_{PY} input (>0.52), the system remained monostable in the normal state, as with the deterministic version of the model. Conversely, at lower values (<-0.65) the system can reach either state. In the stochastic case, there is an intermediate reduction in the proportion of time spent in seizure before all seizure activity disappears. This is shown in Figure 3a,

together with an example of a time series of the simulated LFP as the system transitions from the normal state into seizure (Figure 3b). This particular example was achieved with an NTS_{PY} input value of -0.7, which was the value chosen as the background value when VNS was applied.

4.3 The stochastic system with VNS

Increasing the amplitude of simulated VNS reduced the total proportion of time spent in seizure in a dose-dependent manner (Figure 4a). This is consistent with expectations from the clinical application of VNS in epilepsy. VNS causes some seizure events to terminate earlier than they otherwise would, also replicating the effect of VNS seen clinically (Figure 4b,c).

5 Discussion

In this study we developed a model of seizures in the human brain, incorporating areas of significance for VNS treatment. The model shows transitions between background, and seizure-like states, whilst being amenable to simulating stimulation. We successfully reproduced the clinical observation of reduced seizure duration, with stimulation of the vagus nerve *in silico*.

The deterministic versions of our model behave in a very similar way to the original model, generating monostable (FP) and bistable (FP and LC) regions within the parameter space. The addition of noise produces a stochastic version of our system with very analogous behaviour. This can be tuned to represent a brain that is prone to seizures to various extents or one in which a seizure will not occur, again just as with the base model.

Computational brain modelling has a long history that parallels scientific understanding of normal and disordered brain function of humans and other species. It has been applied successfully at scales from ion channels across axonal membranes [72], through models of single neurons at various levels of abstraction [73, 74], small scale neuronal circuits, neuronal populations [75–77], cortical regions, and networks through to the whole brain, with each successful model abstracting the properties important at that scale [78, 79]. Many general NMMs of the brain have been successfully applied to the field of epilepsy, such as the Wilson-Cowan [75, 76, 80] and Jansen-Rit [77, 81],

while newer NMMs have been designed from the outset with the epilepsy in mind [82, 83], as have epilepsy specific models at other scales [84]. Connecting multiple instances of NMMs, or other models, has proven fruitful [85, 86] to generate more complex behaviours and to model phenomena such as spread of seizure activity. While models such as those above are typically derived from established physiological principles, with parameters tuned to approximate the modelled phenomena, another approach is to use mathematical first principles to reproduce the physiologically known seizure dynamics, with subsequent identification of the model parameters with known biological correlates. The Epileptor [87] would be an example of this approach.

The thalamocortical model [13], in particular, has been used: to investigate the dynamics created from coupled instances [88], including identifying a proposed regulatory mechanism [89]; as inspiration for an ensemble model of SWD behaviour in a genetic rodent model [90]; for analysis of EEG signals [91]; to create a model measuring proximity to seizure [92] to model brain stimulation in seizure-like states [93, 94], including by closed-loop control techniques [95–97]; to form the basis for a proposed radio-technical model for a hierarchical neural network [98]; to explore the potential dynamical role of electromagnetic induction in seizures [99]; and to simulate Glucose Transporter Deficiency induced epileptic seizures in a network of neurons [100].

It is hoped that this model will contribute to the general understanding of the mechanism of VNS in epilepsy with the expectation that additional testing against experimental findings should result in further refinements. Moreover, a number of specific potential uses are apparent.

A first potential application is to devise and test short term seizure control protocols in a responsive manner. In addition to the continuous scheduled stimulation cycle, many devices have a “Magnet Mode” enabled which allows an instantaneous stimulation to be administered by a patient or carer to treat an impending or ongoing seizure [101]. Some recent devices also have an “AutoStim” feature, which performs a similar function in response to heart rate changes characteristic of a seizure. The possibility that VNS may have multiple mechanisms of action working over different timescales [102], suggests that it may be optimal to consider different stimulation parameters for each mode of operation, beyond the current practice of allowing marginally higher amplitude stimulation in magnet mode [103].

We also foresee an application to personalised models based on a patient’s own brain imaging to constrain model parameters. It currently almost impossible to predict which individuals might respond best to VNS [104]. This approach may be useful for prognostication, aiding in patient selection and preoperative counselling. We also envisage a role in guiding stimulation protocol choice for individuals. This is currently performed on a trial and error basis during scheduled clinic visits [8]. By having an individualised model on which multiple stimulation parameter changes could be optimised in a short period of time, it is hoped that potential options could be narrowed down before trying them clinically.

Individualised models have already been proposed in epilepsy management, especially in the field of surgery, where accurately selecting what tissue to resect is crucially important [105, 106]. In particular, multi-scale models [107], where models of phenomena occurring at adjacent spatial or temporal scales are combined, have been developed which can have additional explanatory power than simpler models [108, 109].

There are some limitations to our model. As with all models, it is, by necessity, a simplification with various assumptions. Our additional regions have each been modelled as two populations, sharing identical parameters with those used for S1. Many of the new regions, especially those which are subcortical or pathological, will have different cell types, architectures, neurotransmitters and physiological parameters, but have not been modelled as extensively as the neocortex. It may be worth pursuing further refinements, for example by constraining regional parameters based on pathology evident from MRI or EEG [11, 110].

The model only captures the effects of VNS over very short timescales (seconds) and ignores potential role of plasticity, modulation of inflammatory processes, and other potential mechanisms [102] that might explain the effect of VNS on timescales up to months and years [111]. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that there remains a very definite benefit from stimulation in the immediate term, as demonstrated by the effectiveness of magnet mode [101], and AutoStim [112]. The model therefore retains its relevance, especially when applied to treatment over shorter time-scales.

In the stochastic modelling, for both increasing background NTS_{PY} input and simulated VNS,

the effect on seizure frequency is not as clear as it is on total seizure duration. This appears to be due to long seizures being broken into multiple short seizures rather than new short seizures being produced at times where runs for the parameters with the lower values were normal.

VNS is used in a group of patients who have been unable to obtain control of their seizures with medication and, in some cases, surgery or other types of stimulation. As such it is especially important that this treatment modality can be fully understood and used optimally. This model will serve as a starting point to investigate the mechanisms of VNS and practical benefits to patients.

6 Acknowledgements

We thank members of the Computational Neurology, Neuroscience & Psychiatry Lab (www.cnp-lab.com) for discussions on the analysis and manuscript; This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [grant number 2595464]. P.N.T. and Y.W. are both supported by UKRI Future Leaders Fellowships (MR/T04294X/1, MR/V026569/1). Sadegh Soudjani is supported by the following grants: EPSRC EP/V043676/1, EIC 101070802, and ERC 101089047.




Figure 1: Network of regions associated with VNS. This figure shows brain regions associated with VNS and known connections between them. (Sources: NTS-LoC [15], NTS-PB [15, 16], NTS-DRN [15], NTS-Thalamus [17, 18], NTS-Amygdala [15, 19, 20], NTS-Hypothalamus [19–21, 113], LoC-PB [15], LoC-DRN [15], LoC-Thalamus [15], LoC-Amygdala [15, 20], LoC-Hypothalamus [20, 44], DRN-PB [22], DRN-PFC [23], PB-Hypothalamus [22, 24], PB-Thalamus [15, 22, 25], PB-Amygdala [22], Thalamus-Insula [25–27, 62], Thalamus-Amygdala [28], Thalamus-S1 [9, 13, 25, 29], Thalamus-Hypothalamus [44], Thalamus-PFC [15, 25, 27, 30, 62], Insula-Amygdala [31, 32, 54, 114], Insula-ACC [15, 34], Insula-Hypothalamus [25, 33, 44], Amygdala-PFC [30, 55], ACC-PFC [15, 57], ACC-Hypothalamus [33], PFC-Hypothalamus [15, 33, 44])




Figure 2: Behaviour of the Deterministic System. Simulated LFP time series at S1, generated from the mean activities of $S1_{PY}$ and $S1_{IN}$, at both the FP (A), and LC (B). These are both states are shown in a phase plot (C). The bifurcation behaviour of the system as the value of NTS_{PY} input varies is shown in (D).




Figure 3: The Stochastic System without VNS. (A) The effect of varying the background input of NTS_{py} on the proportion of the system’s seizure time over an extended run, and (B) a short sample of the simulated LFP in the S1 region at a NTS_{py} input value of -0.7, showing a transition from baseline to a seizure state. This value is used as as the background level in the model once VNS is applied.




A**B****C**

Figure 4: The Application of VNS. (A) The effect on the seizure time of applying various amplitudes of simulated VNS to the model. The time series plots in (B) show simulated LFP data, with the upper plot showing the system without VNS applied and the lower plot showing the effect of VNS, with an amplitude of 10, over the same time interval. The seizure initiates at the same point in either case, but is terminated much earlier in this instance when VNS is applied. This can be compared with with the plots in (C), which are patient EEG data with and without VNS applied. Panel (C) modified with permission from [115].

References

- [1] Kirsten M. Fiest, Khara M. Sauro, Samuel Wiebe, Scott B. Patten, Churl-Su Kwon, Jonathan Dykeman, Tamara Pringsheim, Diane L. Lorenzetti, and Nathalie Jetté. Prevalence and incidence of epilepsy. *Neurology*, 88(3):296–303, 2017.
- [2] Bushra Sultana, Marie-Andrée Panzini, Ariane Veilleux Carpentier, Jacynthe Comtois, Bastien Rioux, Geneviève Gore, Prisca R. Bauer, Churl-Su Kwon, Nathalie Jetté, Colin B. Josephson, and Mark R. Keezer. Incidence and Prevalence of Drug-Resistant Epilepsy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Neurology*, 96(17):805–817, April 2021.
- [3] Robert E. Elliott, Amr Morsi, Omar Tanweer, Bartosz T. Grobelny, Eric B. Geller, Chad Carlson, Orrin Devinsky, and Werner Doyle. Efficacy of vagus nerve stimulation over time: Review of 65 consecutive patients with treatment-resistant epilepsy treated with VNS > 10 years. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 20(3):478–483, March 2011.
- [4] Katja Eva Brückner. Cognitive and Psychological Side Effects of Antiepileptic Drugs. In Sandro Misciagna, editor, *Epilepsy - Update on Classification, Etiologies, Instrumental Diagnosis and Treatment*. IntechOpen, April 2021.
- [5] Christopher M. DeGiorgio, C. M. DeGiorgio, C. M. DeGiorgio, Steven C. Schachter, Adrian Handforth, Adrian Handforth, Martin Salinsky, J. Thompson, Basim M. Uthman, Robin Reed, S. Collin, Evelyn S. Tecoma, George L. Morris, Bradley V. Vaughn, Dean K. Naritoku, Thomas R. Henry, D. Labar, R. C. Gilmartin, D. Labiner, Ivan Osorio, Ivan Osorio, Ivan Osorio, R. Ristanovic, Jana E. Jones, Jerome V. Murphy, G. C. Ney, J. W. Wheless, James W. Wheless, P. Lewis, Paul H. Lewis, and Christianne N. Heck. Prospective Long-Term Study of Vagus Nerve Stimulation for the Treatment of Refractory Seizures. *Epilepsia*, 41(9):1195–1200, September 2000.
- [6] Mueller WM Morris GL 3rd. Long-term treatment with vagus nerve stimulation in patients with refractory epilepsy. *Neurology*, 53(8):1731–5, 1999.

- [7] Rhaya L Johnson and Christopher G Wilson. A review of vagus nerve stimulation as a therapeutic intervention. *Journal of Inflammation Research*, Volume 11:203–213, May 2018.
- [8] Sean L. Thompson, Georgia H. O’Leary, Christopher W. Austelle, Elise Gruber, Alex T. Kahn, Andrew J. Manett, Baron Short, and Bashar W. Badran. A Review of Parameter Settings for Invasive and Non-invasive Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) Applied in Neurological and Psychiatric Disorders. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 15:709436, July 2021.
- [9] Claudia Barth, Arno Villringer, and Julia Sacher. Sex hormones affect neurotransmitters and shape the adult female brain during hormonal transition periods. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 9, February 2015.
- [10] Adriana M. Workewych, Olivia N. Arski, Karim Mithani, and George M. Ibrahim. Biomarkers of seizure response to vagus nerve stimulation: A scoping review. *Epilepsia*, 61(10):2069–2085, 2020.
- [11] Frances Hutchings, Cheol E. Han, Simon S. Keller, Bernd Weber, Peter N Taylor, and Marcus Kaiser. Predicting Surgery Targets in Temporal Lobe Epilepsy through Structural Connectome Based Simulations. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 11(12), December 2015.
- [12] Nishant Sinha, Justin Dauwels, Yujiang Wang, Sydney S. Cash, and Peter N. Taylor. An in silico approach for pre-surgical evaluation of an epileptic cortex. In *2014 36th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, pages 4884–4887, Chicago, IL, August 2014. IEEE.
- [13] Peter Neal Taylor, Yujiang Wang, Marc Goodfellow, Justin Dauwels, Friederike Moeller, Ulrich Stephani, and Gerold Baier. A Computational Study of Stimulus Driven Epileptic Seizure Abatement. *PLoS ONE*, 9(12):e114316, December 2014.
- [14] B. Zaaami, M. Turnbull, A. Hazra, Y. Wang, C. de Souza, E. Escobedo-Cousin, et al. Closed-loop optogenetic control of normal and pathological network dynamics. *ResearchSquare Preprint*, 2020.

- [15] Laureen D. Hachem, Simeon M. Wong, and George M. Ibrahim. The vagus afferent network: Emerging role in translational connectomics. *Neurosurgical Focus*, 45(3):E2, September 2018.
- [16] Horst Herbert, Margaret M. Moga, and Clifford B. Saper. Connections of the parabrachial nucleus with the nucleus of the solitary tract and the medullary reticular formation in the rat. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 293(4):540–580, March 1990.
- [17] Benjamin R. Walker, Amy Easton, and Karen Gale. Regulation of Limbic Motor Seizures by GABA and Glutamate Transmission in Nucleus Tractus Solitarius. *Epilepsia*, 40(8):1051–1057, August 1999.
- [18] Riccardo Ruffoli, Filippo S. Giorgi, Chiara Pizzanelli, Luigi Murri, Antonio Paparelli, and Francesco Fornai. The chemical neuroanatomy of vagus nerve stimulation. *Journal of Chemical Neuroanatomy*, 42(4):288–296, December 2011.
- [19] C. González-Arancibia, J. Urrutia-Piñones, J. Illanes-González, J. Martínez-Pinto, R. Sotomayor-Zárate, M. Julio-Pieper, and J. A. Bravo. Do your gut microbes affect your brain dopamine? *Psychopharmacology*, 236(5):1611–1622, 2019.
- [20] Ashim Maharjan, Eunice Wang, Mei Peng, and Yusuf O. Cakmak. Improvement of Olfactory Function With High Frequency Non-invasive Auricular Electrostimulation in Healthy Humans. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 12:225, April 2018.
- [21] André Jean. Le noyau du faisceau solitaire : Aspects neuroanatomiques, neurochimiques et fonctionnels [The Nucleus Tractus Solitarius: Neuroanatomic, Neurochemical and Functional Aspects]. *Archives Internationales de Physiologie, de Biochimie et de Biophysique*, 99(5):A3–A52, January 1991.
- [22] Thomas C. Pritchard, Robert B. Hamilton, and Ralph Norgren. Projections of the Parabrachial Nucleus in the Old World Monkey. *Experimental Neurology*, 165(1):101–117, September 2000.
- [23] Sun Jung Bang and Kathryn G. Commons. Forebrain GABAergic projections from the

- dorsal raphe nucleus identified by using GAD67–GFP knock-in mice. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 520(18):4157–4167, December 2012.
- [24] Anthony J. M. Verberne, Azadeh Sabetghadam, and Willian S. Korim. Neural pathways that control the glucose counterregulatory response. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 8:38–38, February 2014.
- [25] Thomas A. Woolsey, Joseph Hanaway, and Mokhtar H. Gado. *The Brain Atlas: A Visual Guide to the Human Central Nervous System*. Wiley-Blackwell, 4 edition, January 2017.
- [26] Youngsun T. Cho, Stephen Fromm, Amanda E. Guyer, Allison Detloff, Daniel S. Pine, Julie L. Fudge, and Monique Ernst. Nucleus accumbens, thalamus and insula connectivity during incentive anticipation in typical adults and adolescents. *NeuroImage*, 66:508–521, February 2013.
- [27] C.-J. Shi and Martin D. Cassell. Cortical, thalamic, and amygdaloid connections of the anterior and posterior insular cortices. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 399(4):440–468, October 1998.
- [28] B. O. Fischer, O. P. Ottersen, and J. Storm-Mathisen. Labelling of amygdalopetal and amygdalofugal projections after intra-amygdaloid injections of tritiated D-aspartate. *Neuroscience*, 7, 1982.
- [29] Middleton and Strick. A Revised Neuroanatomy of Frontal-Subcortical Circuits. In David G. Lichten and Jeffrey L. Cummings, editors, *Frontal-Subcortical Circuits in Psychiatric and Neurological Disorders*. The Guilford Press, January 2001.
- [30] Angela C. Roberts, Davorika L. Tomic, Caroline H. Parkinson, Tom A. Roeling, David J. Cutter, Trevor W. Robbins, and Barry J. Everitt. Forebrain connectivity of the prefrontal cortex in the marmoset monkey (*Callithrix jacchus*): An anterograde and retrograde tract-tracing study. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 502(1):86–112, May 2007.
- [31] D. G. Amaral and R. Insausti. Retrograde transport of D-[3 H]-aspartate injected into the monkey amygdaloid complex. *Experimental Brain Research*, 88(2):375–388, 1992.

- [32] Y. Smith and D. Paré. Intra-amygdaloid projections of the lateral nucleus in the cat: PHA-L anterograde labeling combined with postembedding GABA and glutamate immunocytochemistry. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 342(2):232–248, April 1994.
- [33] Dost Öngür, X. An, and Joseph L. Price. Prefrontal cortical projections to the hypothalamus in macaque monkeys. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 401(4):480–505, November 1998.
- [34] Sarah D. Lichenstein, Timothy Verstynen, and Erika E. Forbes. Adolescent brain development and depression: A case for the importance of connectivity of the anterior cingulate cortex. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 70:271–287, November 2016.
- [35] Weihe Zhang and Steve Mifflin. Excitatory amino-acid receptors contribute to carotid sinus and vagus nerve evoked excitation of neurons in the nucleus of the tractus solitarius. *Journal of The Autonomic Nervous System*, 55:50–56, October 1995.
- [36] Barry J. Sessle. Excitatory and inhibitory inputs to single neurones in the solitary tract nucleus and adjacent reticular formation. *Brain Research*, 53(2):319–331, April 1973.
- [37] Jing-Jing Fan, Wei Shan, Jian-Ping Wu, and Qun Wang. Research progress of vagus nerve stimulation in the treatment of epilepsy. *CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics*, 25(11):1222–1228, November 2019.
- [38] Scott E. Krahl, Kevin B. Clark, Douglas C. Smith, and Ronald A. Browning. Locus Coeruleus Lesions Suppress the Seizure-Attenuating Effects of Vagus Nerve Stimulation. *Epilepsia*, 39(7):709–714, 1998.
- [39] Leen De Taeye, Kristl Vonck, Marlies Van Bochove, Paul Boon, Dirk Van Roost, Lies Mollet, Alfred Meurs, Veerle De Herdt, Evelien Carrette, Ine Dauwe, Stefanie Gadeyne, Pieter Van Mierlo, Tom Verguts, and Robrecht Raedt. The P3 Event-Related Potential is a Biomarker for the Efficacy of Vagus Nerve Stimulation in Patients with Epilepsy. *Neurotherapeutics*, 11(3):612–622, July 2014.

- [40] ErikaE Fanselow. Central mechanisms of cranial nerve stimulation for epilepsy. *Surgical Neurology International*, 3(5):247, January 2012.
- [41] Gregory V. Carr and Irwin Lucki. The role of serotonin receptor subtypes in treating depression: A review of animal studies. *Psychopharmacology*, 213(2-3):265–287, February 2011.
- [42] Shubhra Mace and David Taylor. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors: A review of efficacy and tolerability in depression. *Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy*, 1(5):917–933, July 2000.
- [43] Philip J. Cowen. Serotonin and depression: Pathophysiological mechanism or marketing myth? *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 29(9):433–436, September 2008.
- [44] Jean-Jacques Lemaire, Andrew Frew, David L. McArthur, Alessandra Gorgulho, Jeffry R. Alger, Noriko Salomon, Clive Chen, Eric Behnke, and Antonio A.F. De Salles. White matter connectivity of human hypothalamus. *Brain Research*, 1371:43–64, January 2011.
- [45] Hiroyuki Hioki, Hisashi Nakamura, Yunfei Ma, Michiteru Konno, Takashi Hayakawa, Kouichi Nakamura, Fumino Fujiyama, and Takeshi Kaneko. Vesicular glutamate transporter 3-expressing nonserotonergic projection neurons constitute a subregion in the rat midbrain raphe nuclei. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 518(5):668–686, March 2010.
- [46] Veerle De Herdt, V. De Herdt, L. Puimege, Jan J. De Waele, J. J. De Waele, Robrecht Raedt, Tine Wyckhuys, R. El Tahry, C. Libert, Wytse J. Wadman, Paul Boon, Kristl Vonck, and Kristl Vonck. Increased rat serum corticosterone suggests immunomodulation by stimulation of the vagal nerve. *Journal of Neuroimmunology*, 212(1):102–105, July 2009.
- [47] Veronica O’Keane, Timothy G. Dinan, Ted Dinan, Lucinda V. Scott, and Ciaran Corcoran. Changes in hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis measures after vagus nerve stimulation therapy in chronic depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, 58(12):963–968, December 2005.
- [48] Krzysztof Gil, Andrzej Bugajski, Magdalena Kurnik, and Piotr J Thor. Electrical chronic vagus nerve stimulation activates the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis in rats fed high-fat diet. *Neuro endocrinology letters*, 34(4):314–321, January 2013.

- [49] Annamaria Vezzani, Jacqueline French, Tamas Bartfai, and Tallie Z. Baram. The role of inflammation in epilepsy. *Nature Reviews Neurology*, 7(1):31–40, January 2011.
- [50] H.J.M. Majoie, K. Rijkers, M.W. Berfelo, J.A.R.J. Hulsman, A. Myint, M. Schwarz, and J.S.H. Vles. Vagus Nerve Stimulation in Refractory Epilepsy: Effects on Pro- and Anti-Inflammatory Cytokines in Peripheral Blood. *Neuroimmunomodulation*, 18(1):52–56, 2011.
- [51] M. D. Frost, P. E. Penovich, F. J. Ritter, C. A. Hoskin, and J. R. Gates. Vagus nerve stimulator as a treatment for seizures associated with hypothalamic hamartomas. *Epilepsia*, 41:96, 2000.
- [52] Jerome V. Murphy, James W. Wheless, James W. Wheless, and Candy M Schmolli. Left vagal nerve stimulation in six patients with hypothalamic hamartomas. *Pediatric Neurology*, 23(2):167–168, August 2000.
- [53] Dimitri M. Kullmann. What’s wrong with the amygdala in temporal lobe epilepsy? *Brain*, 134(10):2800–2801, October 2011.
- [54] Peter T. Ohara, Alberto Granato, Theodore M. Moallem, Bai-Ren Wang, Yves Tillet, Y. Tillet, and Luc Jasmin. Dopaminergic input to GABAergic neurons in the rostral agranular insular cortex of the rat. *Journal of Neurocytology*, 32(2):131–141, February 2003.
- [55] Christina J. Reppucci and Gorica D. Petrovich. Organization of connections between the amygdala, medial prefrontal cortex, and lateral hypothalamus: A single and double retrograde tracing study in rats. *Brain Structure & Function*, 221(6):2937–2962, July 2016.
- [56] H. A. Marusak, M. E. Thomason, C. Peters, C. Zundel, F. Elrahal, and C. Rabinak. You say ‘prefrontal cortex’ and I say ‘anterior cingulate’: Meta-analysis of spatial overlap in amygdala-to-prefrontal connectivity and internalizing symptomology. *Translational Psychiatry*, 6(11):e944, November 2016.
- [57] Hao Yan, Lin Tian, Jun Yan, Wei Sun, Qi Liu, Yan-Bo Zhang, Xin-Ming Li, Yu-Feng Zang, and Dai Zhang. Functional and Anatomical Connectivity Abnormalities in Cognitive Division of Anterior Cingulate Cortex in Schizophrenia. *PLoS ONE*, 7(9):e45659, September 2012.

- [58] W-C Liu. BOLD fMRI activation induced by vagus nerve stimulation in seizure patients. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 74(6):811–813, June 2003.
- [59] C. Bodin, S. Aubert, G. Daquin, R. Carron, D. Scavarda, A. McGonigal, and F. Bartolomei. Responders to vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) in refractory epilepsy have reduced interictal cortical synchronicity on scalp EEG. *Epilepsy Research*, 113:98–103, 2015.
- [60] Fabrice Bartolomei, Francesca Bonini, Elsa Vidal, Agnes Trébuchon, Stanislas Lagarde, Isabelle Lambert, Aileen McGonigal, Didier Scavarda, Romain Carron, and Christian G. Benar. How does vagal nerve stimulation (VNS) change EEG brain functional connectivity? *Epilepsy Research*, 126:141–146, October 2016.
- [61] Jin Zhu, Jingjuan Wang, Cuiping Xu, Xi Zhang, Liang Qiao, Xueyuan Wang, Xiaohua Zhang, Xiaoming Yan, Duanyu Ni, Tao Yu, Guojun Zhang, and Yongjie Li. The functional connectivity study on the brainstem-cortical/subcortical structures in responders following cervical vagus nerve stimulation. *International Journal of Developmental Neuroscience*, 80(8):679–686, December 2020.
- [62] Elliott J. Mufson and M.-Marsel Mesulam. Thalamic connections of the insula in the rhesus monkey and comments on the paralimbic connectivity of the medial pulvinar nucleus. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 227(1):109–120, July 1984.
- [63] Fang-Cheng Yeh and Wen-Yih Isaac Tseng. NTU-90: A high angular resolution brain atlas constructed by q-space diffeomorphic reconstruction. *NeuroImage*, 58(1):91–99, September 2011.
- [64] Fang-Cheng Yeh. Population-based tract-to-region connectome of the human brain and its hierarchical topology. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):4933, August 2022.
- [65] Rahul S. Desikan, Florent Ségonne, Bruce Fischl, Brian T. Quinn, Bradford C. Dickerson, Deborah Blacker, Randy L. Buckner, Anders M. Dale, R. Paul Maguire, Bradley T. Hyman, Marilyn S. Albert, and Ronald J. Killiany. An automated labeling system for subdividing

- the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *NeuroImage*, 31(3):968–980, July 2006.
- [66] Shun-ichi Amari. Dynamics of pattern formation in lateral-inhibition type neural fields. *Biological Cybernetics*, 27(2):77–87, June 1977.
- [67] Peter N Taylor and Gerold Baier. A spatially extended model for macroscopic spike-wave discharges. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience*, 31(3):679–684, November 2011.
- [68] Peter N. Taylor, Gerold Baier, Sydney S. Cash, Justin Dauwels, Jean-Jacques Slotine, and Yujiang Wang. A model of stimulus induced epileptic spike-wave discharges. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence, Cognitive Algorithms, Mind, and Brain (CCMB)*, pages 53–59, Singapore, Singapore, April 2013. IEEE.
- [69] P. A. Robinson, C. J. Rennie, and D. L. Rowe. Dynamics of large-scale brain activity in normal arousal states and epileptic seizures. *Physical Review E*, 65(4):041924, April 2002.
- [70] M. Breakspear, J. A. Roberts, J. R. Terry, S. Rodrigues, N. Mahant, and P. A. Robinson. A Unifying Explanation of Primary Generalized Seizures Through Nonlinear Brain Modeling and Bifurcation Analysis. *Cerebral Cortex*, 16(9):1296–1313, September 2006.
- [71] Frank Marten, Serafim Rodrigues, Piotr Suffczynski, Mark P. Richardson, and John R. Terry. Derivation and analysis of an ordinary differential equation mean-field model for studying clinically recorded epilepsy dynamics. *Physical Review E*, 79(2):021911, February 2009.
- [72] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley. A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve. *The Journal of Physiology*, 117(4):500–544, August 1952.
- [73] W.S. McCulloch and W. Pitts. A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity. *The Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 5(4):115–133, 1943.
- [74] E.M. Izhikevich. Simple model of spiking neurons. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 14(6):1569–1572, November 2003.

- [75] Hugh R. Wilson and Jack D. Cowan. Excitatory and Inhibitory Interactions in Localized Populations of Model Neurons. *Biophysical Journal*, 12(1):1–24, January 1972.
- [76] Hugh R. Wilson and Jack D. Cowan. A Mathematical Theory of the Functional Dynamics of Cortical and Thalamic Nervous Tissue. *Kybernetika*, 1973.
- [77] Ben H. Jansen and Vincent G. Rit. Electroencephalogram and visual evoked potential generation in a mathematical model of coupled cortical columns. *Biological Cybernetics*, 73(4):357–366, September 1995.
- [78] William W. Lytton. Computer modelling of epilepsy. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9(8):626–637, August 2008.
- [79] Damien Depannemaecker, Alain Destexhe, Viktor Jirsa, and Christophe Bernard. Modeling seizures: From single neurons to networks. *Seizure*, 90:4–8, August 2021.
- [80] Hugh R. Wilson and Jack D. Cowan. Evolution of the Wilson–Cowan equations. *Biological Cybernetics*, 115(6):643–653, December 2021.
- [81] F. Wendling, J. J. Bellanger, F. Bartolomei, and P. Chauvel. Relevance of nonlinear lumped-parameter models in the analysis of depth-EEG epileptic signals. *Biological Cybernetics*, 83(4):367–378, September 2000.
- [82] F. Wendling, F. Bartolomei, J. J. Bellanger, and P. Chauvel. Epileptic fast activity can be explained by a model of impaired GABAergic dendritic inhibition. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 15(9):1499–1508, May 2002.
- [83] P. Suffczynski, S. Kalitzin, and F.H. Lopes Da Silva. Dynamics of non-convulsive epileptic phenomena modeled by a bistable neuronal network. *Neuroscience*, 126(2):467–484, January 2004.
- [84] Roger D. Traub, Diego Contreras, Mark O. Cunningham, Hilary Murray, Fiona E. N. LeBeau, Anita Roopun, Andrea Bibbig, W. Bryan Wilent, Michael J. Higley, and Miles A. Whitting-

- ton. Single-Column Thalamocortical Network Model Exhibiting Gamma Oscillations, Sleep Spindles, and Epileptogenic Bursts. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 93(4):2194–2232, April 2005.
- [85] Yujiang Wang, Andrew J Trevelyan, Antonio Valentin, Gonzalo Alarcon, Peter N Taylor, and Marcus Kaiser. Mechanisms underlying different onset patterns of focal seizures. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(5):e1005475, May 2017.
- [86] Damien Depannemaecker, Mallory Carlu, Jules Bouté, and Alain Destexhe. A Model for the Propagation of Seizure Activity in Normal Brain Tissue. *eneuro*, 9(6):ENEURO.0234–21.2022, November 2022.
- [87] Viktor K. Jirsa, William C. Stacey, Pascale P. Quilichini, Anton I. Ivanov, and Christophe Bernard. On the nature of seizure dynamics. *Brain*, 137(8):2210–2230, August 2014.
- [88] Denggui Fan, Jianzhong Su, and Ariel Bowman. Rich Dynamics Induced by Synchronization Varieties in the Coupled Thalamocortical Circuitry Model. In Shouyi Wang, Vicky Yamamoto, Jianzhong Su, Yang Yang, Erick Jones, Leon Iasemidis, and Tom Mitchell, editors, *Brain Informatics*, volume 11309, pages 74–84. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- [89] Hudong Zhang, Xiaolong Tan, Yufeng Pan, and Yuan Chai. Regulatory Mechanism for Absence Seizures in Bidirectional Interactive Thalamocortical Model via Different Targeted Therapy Schemes. *Neural Plasticity*, 2021:1–12, September 2021.
- [90] T.M. Medvedeva, Marina V. Sysoeva, Annika Lüttjohann, G. van Luijtelaar, E.L.J.M. van Luijtelaar, and Ilya V. Sysoev. Dynamical mesoscale model of absence seizures in genetic models. *PLOS ONE*, 15(9), 2020.
- [91] T.M. Medvedeva, Annika Lüttjohann, Marina V. Sysoeva, G. Van Luijtelaar, and Ilya V. Sysoev. Estimating complexity of spike-wave discharges with largest Lyapunov exponent in computational models and experimental data. *AIMS Biophysics*, 7(2):65–75, 2020.
- [92] Farah Deeba, Paula Sanz-Leon, and Peter A. Robinson. Unified dynamics of interictal events and absence seizures. *Physical Review E*, 100(2):022407, August 2019.

- [93] Zihui Wang and Qingyun Wang. Stimulation strategies for absence seizures: Targeted therapy of the focus in coupled thalamocortical model. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 96(2):1649–1663, April 2019.
- [94] Luyao Yan, Honghui Zhang, Zhongkui Sun, and Zhuan Shen. Control analysis of electrical stimulation for epilepsy waveforms in a thalamocortical network. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 504:110391, November 2020.
- [95] Yafang Ge, Yuzhen Cao, Guosheng Yi, Chunxiao Han, Yingmei Qin, Jiang Wang, and Yanqiu Che. Robust closed-loop control of spike-and-wave discharges in a thalamocortical computational model of absence epilepsy. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):9093, June 2019.
- [96] Bo Zhou, Yanqiu Che, Qing Qin, Yingmei Qin, and Chunxiao Han. Seizure Suppression in a Thalamocortical Computational Model of Absence Epilepsy by Linear Delayed Feedback Control. In *2020 13th International Congress on Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and Informatics (CISP-BMEI)*, pages 872–876, Chengdu, China, October 2020. IEEE.
- [97] Moshu Qian, Zhen Zhang, Guanghua Zhong, and Cuimei Bo. A novel nonsingular integral terminal sliding mode control scheme in epilepsy treatment. *Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control*, 44(6):1194–1204, April 2022.
- [98] N. M. Egorov, V. I. Ponomarenko, I. V. Sysoev, and M. V. Sysoeva. Simulation of Epileptiform Activity Using Network of Neuron-Like Radio Technical Oscillators. *Technical Physics*, 66(3):505–514, March 2021.
- [99] Jinyi Zhao and Qingyun Wang. The dynamical role of electromagnetic induction in epileptic seizures: A double-edged sword. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 106(1):975–988, September 2021.
- [100] Ariel Leslie and Jianzhong Su. Modeling and simulation of a network of neurons regarding Glucose Transporter Deficiency induced epileptic seizures. *Electronic Research Archive*, 30(5):1813–1835, 2022.

- [101] R. S. Fisher, K. S. Eggleston, and C. W. Wright. Vagus nerve stimulation magnet activation for seizures: A critical review. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*, 131(1):1–8, January 2015.
- [102] Romain Carron, Paolo Roncon, Stanislas Lagarde, Maxine Dibué, Marc Zanello, and Fabrice Bartolomei. Latest Views on the Mechanisms of Action of Surgically Implanted Cervical Vagal Nerve Stimulation in Epilepsy. *Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface*, 26(3):498–506, April 2023.
- [103] Breanne Fisher, Breanne Fisher, Julie A. DesMarteau, Elizabeth H. Koontz, Seth J. Wilks, Susan E. Melamed, and Susan E. Melamed. Responsive Vagus Nerve Stimulation for Drug Resistant Epilepsy: A Review of New Features and Practical Guidance for Advanced Practice Providers. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 11:610379–610379, 2021.
- [104] Henrique Jannuzzi Pires Do Prado, Lécio Figueira Pinto, Daniela Fontes Bezerra, Luciano De Paola, Francisco Arruda, Andrea Julião De Oliveira, Tayla Taynan Romão, Vanessa Cristina Colares Lessa, Jonadab Dos Santos Silva, and Isabella D’Andrea-Meira. Predictive factors for successful vagus nerve stimulation in patients with refractory epilepsy: Real-life insights from a multicenter study. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 17:1210221, July 2023.
- [105] M. Goodfellow, C. Rummel, E. Abela, M. P. Richardson, K. Schindler, and J. R. Terry. Estimation of brain network ictogenicity predicts outcome from epilepsy surgery. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1):29215, July 2016.
- [106] Nishant Sinha, Justin Dauwels, Marcus Kaiser, Sydney S. Cash, M. Brandon Westover, Yujiang Wang, and Peter N. Taylor. Predicting neurosurgical outcomes in focal epilepsy patients using computational modelling. *Brain*, 140(2):319–332, February 2017.
- [107] Levin Kuhlmann, David B. Grayden, Fabrice Wendling, and Steven J. Schiff. The role of multiple-scale modelling of epilepsy in seizure forecasting. *Journal of clinical neurophysiology : official publication of the American Electroencephalographic Society*, 32(3):220–226, June 2015.

- [108] Fabrice Wendling, Fabrice Bartolomei, Jean-Jacques Bellanger, Jérôme Bourien, and Patrick Chauvel. Epileptic fast intracerebral EEG activity: Evidence for spatial decorrelation at seizure onset. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, 126(Pt 6):1449–1459, June 2003.
- [109] Fabrice Wendling, Alfredo Hernandez, Jean-Jacques Bellanger, Patrick Chauvel, and Fabrice Bartolomei. Interictal to ictal transition in human temporal lobe epilepsy: Insights from a computational model of intracerebral EEG. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology: Official Publication of the American Electroencephalographic Society*, 22(5):343–356, October 2005.
- [110] Timothée Proix, Timothée Proix, Fabrice Bartolomei, F. Bartolomei, Maxime Guye, Maxime Guye, and Viktor K. Jirsa. Individual brain structure and modelling predict seizure propagation. *Revue Neurologique*, 174, April 2018.
- [111] Emmanouil Giannakakis, Frances Hutchings, Christoforos A. Pappasavvas, Cheol E. Han, Bernd Weber, Chencheng Zhang, and Marcus Kaiser. Computational modelling of the long-term effects of brain stimulation on the local and global structural connectivity of epileptic patients. *PLoS ONE*, 15(2):e0221380, February 2020.
- [112] Robert S. Fisher, Pegah Afra, Mícheál P. Macken, Micheal P. Macken, Daniela Minecan, Daniela Minecan, Anto Bagic, Selim R. Benbadis, Sandra L. Helmers, Saurabh R. Sinha, J. D. H. Slater, Jeremy D. Slater, David M. Treiman, David M. Treiman, Jason Begnaud, Pradheep Raman, Pradheep Raman, and Bitu Najimipour. Automatic Vagus Nerve Stimulation Triggered by Ictal Tachycardia: Clinical Outcomes and Device Performance - The U.S. E-37 Trial. *Neuromodulation*, 19(2):188–195, February 2016.
- [113] Laurent Gautron. Neurobiology of inflammation-associated anorexia. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 3:59–59, January 2009.
- [114] Ning Sun, Hong Yi, and Martin D. Cassell. Evidence for a GABAergic interface between cortical afferents and brainstem projection neurons in the rat central extended amygdala. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 340(1):43–64, February 1994.

- [115] Emilio Franzoni, Valentina Gentile, Maria Colonnelli, Daniela Brunetto, Ilaria Cecconi, Luisa Iero, Filomena C Moscano, Duccio M Cordelli, and Valentina Marchiani. VNS in drug resistant epilepsy: Preliminary report on a small group of patients. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, 36(1):30, 2010.