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How do brains shape social networks, and how do social ties shape the brain? Social networks are complex webs by which ideas spread among people. Brains comprise webs by which information is processed and transmitted among neural units. While brain activity and structure offer biological mechanisms for human behaviors, social networks offer external inducers or modulators of those behaviors. Together, these two axes represent fundamental contributors to human experience. Integrating foundational knowledge from social and developmental psychology and sociology on how individuals function within dyads, groups, and societies with recent advances in network neuroscience can offer new insights into both domains. Here, we use the example of how ideas and behaviors spread to illustrate the potential of multilayer network models.

Brain and Social Networks: Fundamental Building Blocks of Human Experience

The structure of our social world is incredibly complex and involves multiple interacting units [1]. Questions that hinge on understanding when, how, and why these units interact require theories and methods that address this heterogeneous pattern of interpersonal connectivity. Network science offers theories and methods that can capture the richness of interconnection patterns [2], pinpoint local network nodes that influence global function [3], and offer tools to intervene in a way that drives social network change [4,5]. Integrating these theories and methods with empirical studies offers a powerful means to uncover a set of principles that describe behavior in terms of network structure and function across domains. For example, there are intriguing similarities between the patterns of interconnectivity among individuals in a close-knit family [6], members in a team [7], activists in political uprisings [8], companies in the corporate world [9], and countries engaging in efforts supporting global diplomacy [10]. Indeed, the term ‘social network’ is perhaps a misnomer, being a general term for what is in fact a set of interacting networks at multiple levels of analysis that form the fabric of our social and cultural lives.

Although units in social networks can be countries, companies, or compatriots, typically the smallest unit studied in social network research is that of a single person: the atom of the social network universe. Yet, as the atom is composed of first protons and neutrons, then quarks, a person is in fact composed of smaller units that interact in networks of their own [11]. This is the fodder of the emerging field of network neuroscience [12], which pursues new ways to map, record, analyze, and model the elements and interactions of neurobiological systems. In humans, this enterprise seeks to understand the pattern of connections in an individual’s brain that code for their personality [13,14], behavior [15,16], and risk for disease [17–19], as
well as for their potential to adapt to their surroundings [20], engage in meaningful relationships with others [21], and participate in a larger team [22]. Such predictive patterns of connections exist across diverse spatiotemporal scales [23] and can be argued to form a separate intrahuman layer in the multiscale social network hierarchy. These recent advances in network neuroscience complement substantial advances in social and cognitive neuroscience that have mapped patterns of activity and the structure of the human brain within and across brain regions.

Here, we review recent studies that have brought together questions of brain structure and function with insights from social network analysis. It is beyond the scope of this article to provide a substantial review of the foundational literatures in social and developmental psychology and sociology on how individuals function within dyads, groups, and societies, and in neuroscience on how brain structure and function relate to the psychology of the individual. Instead, we argue that understanding brains and social networks in the context of one another is not only important, but also critically necessary, because the two are interacting systems: brain dynamics shape learning and behavior [24], including social interaction [25]; likewise, social contexts alter brain structure and function [26, 27]. Integration of theories and methods linking brain activity and structure to activity and structure within social networks holds great promise to improve our knowledge of the single human by improving our ability to predict behavior, derive core psychological and neurocognitive principles, and distinguish brain health and disease [28]. In addition, integration of social network and brain dynamics holds great promise to improve our knowledge of the collective by improving our ability to predict group behavior [29, 30], gain deeper insight into underlying mechanisms, and potentially intervene more efficiently. For example, questions of communication between individuals and across groups, as well as broader classes of learning and decision making, can be conceptualized both in terms of the neural and psychological mechanisms supporting the decisions and behaviors of each actor (e.g., a decision to share a piece of information or an unconscious facial response to learning a piece of information), as well as how individuals mutually influence one another. In these ways, linking brain and social networks opens new avenues for discovering principles that fundamentally underlie individual decision making, person-to-person interactions, and the broader organization of society (Figure 1).

Although several pieces of this puzzle remain to be discovered, we focus on one example, the neurobiology of how ideas and behaviors spread within social networks, to illustrate ways in which brain network dynamics and social network dynamics might be studied in parallel. Specifically, ideas and behaviors are transmitted and adopted over a period of time, either through verbal or nonverbal communication. This process involves biological coupling (e.g., of language patterns [31–33] or nonverbal signals [34–36], and brain activity between communicators and receivers [37–39]). Given that the behavioral and cognitive processes supporting idea and behavior spread can change over time, tools to reveal their neurophysiological underpinnings must be tuned to characterize and quantify temporally expansive phenomena. Complementing time-varying univariate approaches, including parametric modulation analysis [40], here we focus on dynamic network approaches as a natural set of tools that meet these requirements, and that can specifically be used to understand interactions between brain systems implicated in idea and behavior spread, including the value system and the default mode network [41]. By characterizing patterns of functional connectivity and their changes over fine-scale temporal windows, these approaches can be used to map communication patterns between functionally specialized brain areas that either directly relate to interpersonal communication patterns occurring during the experiment, or that predict features of interpersonal communication occurring outside of the experiment over longer time windows. More generally, markers of brain connectivity (short timescale) can be linked in a correlative or causative manner...
To unpack how a multiscale network perspective can inform both neural and social scientific questions related to the spread of ideas and behaviors, we begin with a discussion of selected brain networks that are broadly relevant, and we review how a network perspective has aided our understanding of these processes. We then move to a discussion of recent studies that have examined brain dynamics in dyads and groups, which comprise intermediate building blocks of social networks, and we consider the ways in which broader social network structure might influence these processes. In doing so, we review work that has conceptualized social network structure as a type of individual difference that might affect, and be affected by, a broader array of psychological functions and individual behaviors [42,43]. The studies we review and the concepts we grapple with are illustrative of the broader potential for integrating brain network and social network perspectives, and motivate a set of open questions at the intersection of these domains. Tackling these questions calls for new methodological approaches and conceptual theories addressing the multiscale nature of social networks, with the smallest scales comprising individual humans whose brains are teaming with interconnected units performing diverse computations and communicating complex information, and scaling up to explain collective phenomena.

Figure 1. Building Hypotheses Bridging Brain Networks and Social Networks. How can we move from typical data collected in a neuroimaging experiment to a multiscale network? Neural regions of interest [e.g., blue and green dots in (A)] can be treated as nodes in a network, connected to one another by estimates of white matter structure or by estimates of functional connectivity, such as a Pearson correlation between pairs of regional mean BOLD time series [e.g., in (A) the blue and green lines represent the time series from each region of interest over the course of a task in an fMRI scanner; see also Box 1 in the main text]. By encoding these relationships in a connectivity matrix [depicted in shades of red in (A)], one can first determine the strength of connectivity between brain regions in a single individual during different task conditions [in (A), the weight of the edges connecting the regions of interest in the right-most brain image represents the strength of the correlation between the time series of those nodes]. Such a matrix can be used to address hypotheses about not only individuals acting in isolation, but also the interplay between brain networks supporting mutual influence between individuals in social networks (e.g., processes facilitating the spread of ideas or behaviors), as depicted by lines connecting brain regions across different people’s brains in (B). In addition, it is possible to model how an individual’s social network resources or placement within their social network relate to their brain or behavior, as depicted in (C). Adapted from [25].
How Do Information and Behaviors Spread from Person to Person in Networks?

As a central example to illustrate the idea that brain and social networks mutually influence one another, and that understanding such interactions has value, we consider the fact that ideas [44,45], emotions [46–49], and behaviors [46–48,50,51] can spread from person to person in both online and offline social networks [52]. What are biological mechanisms for these phenomena? Social scientists have asserted that belonging and coordination are critical for human survival [53,54]; being part of a group confers many advantages, including the potential to guard or defend from predators and the elements, and to learn optimal behaviors from others, thereby ensuring the maintenance and availability of resources and safety. In parallel, neuroscientists have characterized a range of brain systems relevant to communication and decision making. However, the question of how ideas and behaviors spread between brains through social networks has only begun to be addressed [55]. Here, we review studies in individuals, as well as research branching into dyads and networks, that speak to the cognitive mechanisms of, neurophysiological manifestations accompanying, and network influences on idea and behavior spread. Collectively, this growing body of literature provides an example for thinking about a broader framework for traversing levels of analysis from brains to social networks. Bringing these ideas together, we then argue that there are important open questions about how ideas and behaviors spread that could be solved by modeling brains and social networks within a multiscale network framework (Figure 2).

Brain Networks within Individuals’

Cognitive Processes Supporting the Spread of Ideas and Behaviors

Although many cognitive processes may support the spread of ideas and behaviors from person to person, reward-driven learning in ventral striatum (VS) and ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vMPFC) is central to the successful spread of ideas and behaviors, such that people are more likely to share ideas when they believe the outcome of sharing will be positive [55]. In this context, communicators’ intentions to share information [56,57], and their success in doing so [57–59], are associated with activity within the communicator’s value system, which can weigh the potential value of sharing one piece of information over another, or over not sharing it at all. In this case, sharers may find value in sharing content that they themselves find valuable, but self-disclosure and social bonding may also be inherently valuable ends that can motivate sharing (56,60–62); for reviews and information on inputs to the value calculation, see [44,55]). In parallel, neural activation in the analogous brain systems of receivers who are exposed to information about others’ beliefs, preferences, and actions also contributes to the likelihood that the receivers update their own beliefs, preferences, and actions to align with those of the communicators [55,63–67].

Brain Network Dynamics Supporting the Spread of Ideas and Behaviors

Brain areas implicated in the communication or reception of ideas and behaviors do not operate in isolation. Instead, recent advances in network neuroscience [12] suggest that these brain areas form hotspots within a wider, more dynamic web. In this view, individual brain regions interact with each other (e.g., via synchronization, correlation, or other measures of functional connectivity) on the backbone of crisscrossing white matter tracts comprising large bundles of myelinated neuronal axons [68]. Recent advances in neuroscience and computational science have provided unprecedented opportunities to consider the dynamics within and between brain networks as they evolve over time in accordance with people’s changing mental states and behaviors [69,70]. Importantly, reconfiguration of regions working together provides a view of brain activity that is complementary to the more modular view that a given region tends to achieve a specific function in a relatively fixed manner. Thus, the dynamic network perspective can augment the prediction of different behavioral outcomes in humans [24] and provide tools that are particularly appropriate for the study of idea and behavior spread.
Differences in the architectures and functional dynamics of key brain regions and networks across people can alter the tendency for a person to either spread or receive ideas or behaviors via a host of mechanisms. In other words, some people might tend to exhibit brain dynamics that promote a greater tendency to share ideas, or a greater receptivity to assimilating ideas. For example, preliminary evidence demonstrates that individual differences in connectivity within the value system (i.e., between VMPFC and VS) of sedentary adults and smokers predict their receptivity to persuasive appeals aimed at changing those behaviors, and explain variance in real-world health outcomes in physical activity and smoking cessation above and beyond univariate activity in either region alone. More broadly, different brain network dynamics have also been associated with variation in factors that might indirectly alter the tendency for a person to either spread or receive ideas or behaviors, such as social anxiety, emotional state, and perceived social support.
Recent efforts also demonstrate that the manner in which brain networks reconfigure over time can predict a person’s future decisions [76], and can track the processing of linguistic stimuli from words to sentences to stories [77–79]. These findings highlight the role of brain network dynamics in the processing and uptake of information that is naturally provided in social contexts. Importantly, these patterns of brain network reconfiguration differ across different people and, thus, can be used to predict individual differences in learning [80, 81], working memory [82], and cognitive flexibility [82, 83], all cognitive processes that are fundamental to idea and behavior spread. Finally, the intrinsic dynamics of these brain networks encoding patterns of time-varying functional connectivity can change within a single person over short timescales as a function of mood, fatigue, arousal, and attention [74, 84], highlighting the value of using tools capable of capturing network configuration over time and at different temporal scales (e.g., within and between experimental sessions).

As a whole, network neuroscience thus offers a perspective on human cognition [70, 85] and provides insights into specific processes supporting the spread of ideas and behaviors. More broadly, the emerging consideration of network organization in the brain has the potential to improve our understanding of other cognitive processes that cannot be explained by the workings of individual regions [86]. The approach capitalizes on tools from network science, graph theory, and systems engineering [87], which together have offered fundamental insights into the architecture of multiple brain systems relevant to the spread of ideas and behaviors, such as the default mode system [88], the valuation system [89], and the mentalizing system [14].

**From Individuals to Dyads and Multiscale Networks**

Work on the brain network dynamics characteristic of single individuals has recently taken a more ‘social turn’, and begun to uncover the neural basis of how pairs of individuals or groups of individuals interact [90]. For example, although measures of functional connectivity have traditionally focused on intrabrain connectivity within brain regions in single subjects, they can just as straightforwardly be computed between two brain regions in different subjects. These sorts of calculations are referred to as intersubject functional connectivity [77]. The resulting brain-to-brain networks provide an analog to social networks and other social scientific approaches to studying dyads and groups, but fractionate the ‘atomic’ definition of the person into brain regions (Box 1). These within-brain networks can then be integrated in a comprehensive framework of dyads, groups, or even larger communities or cultures. Taking this step is more than a mere thought exercise, but instead can offer new insight into the underpinnings of thoughts and emotions and how they spread in our inherently social world.

In the case of ideas spreading through social networks, the strength of coupling between brain activity in communicators and receivers [38, 39, 91], as well as between receivers exposed to shared content [92], is associated with the success of the communication process (i.e., the successful transmission of signals into the brain networks of the receiver [37, 93]). For example, greater synchrony in several parts of the value system and default mode network more broadly (medial prefrontal cortex, MPFC; striatum; posterior cingulate; and temporal parietal junction, TPJ) has been associated with more successful communication between a communicator telling a story and a listener who was later asked to recall details of that story [38]. Furthermore, activity within a subset of the synchronized brain regions (MPFC; striatum; and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, dLPFC) in listeners precedes the corresponding activity in the speaker’s brain, a process termed ‘anticipatory coupling’, emphasizing the bidirectional nature of communication. Moving from communicating pairs to even larger networks, analyses of intersubject brain connectivity across networks of individuals demonstrate that brain-to-brain networks become increasingly efficiently organized as the level of interaction between subjects increases [94]. Complementary work demonstrates that people who are closer to one another in their
Box 1. Measurement of Integrated Social and Brain Networks

Scaling up beyond individuals to pairs or groups of subjects requires either simultaneous measurement in the form of hyperscanning [138], or post-hoc analyses that take data from individuals who engaged in the same experience and link those data together after acquisition [139]. One way in which the latter can be accomplished is by exposing participants to the same time-locked stimuli and then examining the degree to which different participants show intersubject correlation in response to those stimuli [37,92,140]. An extension of this approach involves collecting brain activity in communicators as they communicate and receivers as they receive; this method similarly allows time-locked analysis of a common time series [37,91,92,140].

Scaling this approach from dyads to networks, one study constructed multibrain networks of two speakers and ten listeners, connected in a single network, to measure synchronous communication between network members [141]. These approaches pave the way to understand the manner in which brain network dynamics in one person might influence or reflect the brain network dynamics in another.

In addition, both brains and social systems have both structural and functional network organization, and both aspects of the systems may be important in understanding system–system interactions. In the human brain, while functional networks are defined based on similar time-varying patterns of regional activity, structural networks are defined based on estimates of white matter tracts connecting region pairs [142,143]. Structural network organization in the brain varies appreciably across individuals [146], over developmental timescales [145], and over healthy aging [148]. This organization has been linked to individual differences in cognitive function [147], and to differences in the patterns of functional connectivity that support it [148–150].

Just as brain networks can be described in terms of structure and function, social networks can likewise be described in terms of the structure of social ties that surround an individual (i.e., who knows or is connected to whom [1,42,131,133,151]) and infrastructure that connects them [152] as well as functional interactions in which people engage (e.g., communication networks [153–155] and the quality of the relationships between people (e.g., liking [121]). As with brain networks, the structure of social networks varies appreciably across individuals [42,133], and within individuals over development [156] and as their context changes [157], although there is some consistency in an individual’s “signature” network characteristics [154].

Social networks show more similar brain responses to stimuli such as movie clips, even controlling for demographic similarity [35]. These data suggest that social network variables influence how people process information, or that people who process information more similarly more easily communicate and become friends.

Biological synchrony is thought to allow communicating pairs of individuals to co-regulate their actions according to shared goals [96]. The growing body of research directly examining the brains of people communicating [90] lays the foundation on which to consider how ideas and behaviors flow in social networks by pointing towards dyads and chains of person-to-person communication as the key building blocks of social networks. Yet, both brain and social systems are known to operate as interconnected networks with emergent collective behaviors [97,98]. Thus, work examining neural processes in dyads, chains, and more complex configurations, such as triangles, might help illuminate how and why ideas spread in small groups and larger populations [99]. What are the network factors, in both brains and social systems, that influence how ideas are propagated and how behaviors are transmitted across groups? Likewise, similar questions can be asked regarding how social network structure might influence a wider array of social, cognitive, and emotional processes in individuals and groups.

Drawing on methods from social sciences that study dyads and groups, neuroscientists have begun to consider how brain activity across individuals synchronizes and what effects this might have on interpersonal communication and decision making more broadly. Although preliminary evidence illustrates that brain activity in one actor can be correlated with activity in other actors, many questions remain, including those about the brain networks involved, their inter-relationships across actors, and the influence of broader social network structures on
brain activity within individuals and pairs. Understanding when, why, and how ideas and behaviors spread can benefit from linking these levels of analysis.

**Multiscale Networks Spanning Brain and Social Networks**

To address questions of mechanism across levels of analysis, it is important to note that, because network architectures are present and influential across levels of the social hierarchy (from individuals, to pairs, to groups), techniques from network science offer ways in which to link mechanisms of cross-scale phenomena [23]. Beyond the fact that network analysis is applicable to both brain and social networks independently, we envision that multiscale network analysis could provide some unique insights. Specifically, mathematical modeling of such a multiscale network could offer a new and parsimonious way of integrating findings from individual brains with findings relevant to social groups (e.g., about how ideas and behaviors spread). This notion builds on: (i) recent advances in the mathematics of multilayer networks [100], including tools for representation [101], characterization [102], and inference regarding function [103]; and (ii) the application of these tools to real-world multilayer systems with structures that are analogous to those observed in brain–human–group networks [104–106]. These studies offer concrete intuitions for how information can be created, manipulated, and processed in regions and networks in one brain and, based on those computations, the information could be transmitted from that brain to another brain in the social network, via processes of active transmission, learning, diffusion, or contagion to name a few (Boxes 2 and 3; Figure 3).

Given that people and, hence, their brains do not function in isolation, it also makes sense to consider how the structure of interconnections between people who influence one another might change the way a given individual operates. Thus, in the next section, we turn our attention to the ways in which the structural properties of a social network might moderate the brains of individual actors and vice versa.

---

**Box 2. Multilayer Brain-Social Networks**

Intuitively, the brain-social multiscale network has two layers: the brain network layer, in which regions are nodes, and structural or functional connections are edges; and the social network layer, in which people are nodes, and interpersonal relationships are edges. An important question is how these distinct layers become connected with one another to form a multilayer structure. Arguably the simplest way in which to link the two layers is to note that all brain areas of person 1 are linked by interlayer links to the node in the social network that represents person 1. Similarly, all brain areas of person 2 are linked by interlayer links to the node in the social network that represents person 2. In this multilayer network, information in one region in person 1 can be transmitted to another region in person 1 via the brain network; that transmission of information can lead to a change in the idea of person 1, which can then be transmitted from person 1 to person 2 via the social network.

To summarize, this architecture comprises region-to-region links in the brain network layer only, person-to-person links in the social network layer only, and region-to-person links that bridge across layers in the multilayer network. While a useful starting point, recent data suggest that this multilayer network also contains a fourth kind of link: a region-to-region link across persons where a brain area in one person can be linked by temporal synchronization of activity to the brain area of another person. Such brain-to-brain connectivity could reflect shared neural representations that arise from assumptions based on cultural knowledge or other variables, which may be, but are not required to be, directly reflected in behavior.

The key advantage of the multilayer framework is that it enables one to formally develop and integrate: (i) models of information transmission across links in the brain network; (ii) models of idea transmission across links in the social network; (iii) models of brain-to-brain synchrony; and (iv) models of computation, cognition, emotion, and perception that translate information into ideas across region-to-person links. Such models can then be used to probe and predict how perturbations at one node in one network layer (e.g., brain) can impact another node in another network layer (e.g., social).
Ideas and behaviors spread from brain to brain through social networks. We offer one example of the type of multiscale network model we envision linking neuro- and social scientific models to explain when, why, and how ideas and behaviors spread. From the neuroscience side, decisions, including whether to share information as a communicator, or act on that information as a receiver, can be modeled in terms of reinforcement learning [158,199]. The reinforcement learning perspective argues that personal subjective value maximization guides behavior [160–163]. Under this framework, when making choices, the brain is thought to compute a predicted reward for each potential course of action. Choices that result in more reward than expected are reinforced, and choices that result in less reward (or more punishment) than expected are devalued [164]. In parallel, social psychologists have highlighted that learning can take place not only with respect to an actor’s own experience, but also through observational and social learning from the experiences of others [93,165,166]. This learning occurs in conjunction with brain systems supporting simulation [166] and understanding of other’s experiences and perspectives (i.e., mentalizing) [93,167,168]. Likewise, the spread of ideas and other group-based problems are also critically influenced by the structure and composition of the social network (e.g., [2,8,169,170]).

Bringing these ideas together with a multiscale network perspective, the flow of ideas and behaviors through social networks could be mathematically modeled by integrating concepts from reinforcement learning and social learning with network science. Here, an actor’s choices could be modeled using terms that capture information about the structure and function of brain networks within and between individuals. For example, at the individual level, such a model would characterize activity within and interactions between brain systems within the individual that support valuation, simulation, and mentalizing as the actor learns from their own choices and the choices they observe in others [171]. Consistent with foundational research in social and developmental psychology and sociology on how individuals function within dyads, groups, and societies, such a model would also explicitly model the actions of social referents surrounding the actor. Finally, to capture the multiscale nature of networks of brains communicating with one another, the model could account for the strength of coupling between key brain systems of actors within the network, as well as the structure of the individuals in the network (e.g., Figure 3 in the main text).

As a simple initial example, the probability that an idea spreads from a sharer (s) to a receiver (r), could be modeled in terms of summary statistics of activation (A) vectors and connectivity (C) matrices capturing: (i) activity within the potential sharer’s brain (e.g., with nodes in the value and mentalizing systems) when describing the idea; (ii) activity and connectivity within parallel regions within the receiver’s brain during exposure to the ideas; and (iii) coupling between the two. Furthermore, one could include a matrix capturing the number and position of other social referents (relative to the sender and receiver) who hold the same view within the social network (N). An example model could be written as follows (Equation 1):

\[
P(\text{spread}_{sr}) = A_s + C_s + A_r + C_r + A_w + C_w + N_s + N_r + \text{error}
\]

Open questions include which summary statistics of each of these types of data to chose, and whether factors remain simply additive or may be better modeled as multiplicative. Although each of these pieces has been modeled in isolation in prior work, such an integrated social reinforcement learning model mathematically links models of brain dynamics with social network structure and dynamics, and allows a more integrated theory of how ideas and behaviors spread in a social world [24].
affective processing, display particularly strong covariation with social network features (see examples in Figure 4).

Mentalizing, operationalized as accurately reporting on someone else’s mental state [112], and empathizing with others [113] are both processes that covary with social network size. In monkeys, experimentally manipulating social group size increases the structure and function of brain regions associated with the processing of social cues [114]. In humans, social network size also covaries with gray matter volume within regions associated with mentalizing [115], as well as broader emotion processing systems comprising the amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, and connectivity between amygdala and cortical regions [116–118]. Also in humans, social network diversity, but not size, is associated with global white matter integrity at the borders of dMPFC, a key component of the mentalizing system [119], and in the corpus callosum.

Differing social network properties are also associated with functional differences in processing within systems necessary for navigating the social world. For example, during resting-state scans, those with larger social networks show greater connectivity between the amygdala and
Box 4. Multiscale Network Models: Description, Prediction, and Perturbation

In principle, the multilayer network framework can be used to model how the change in time-varying activation of a single region (node) in the brain network layer can alter the state (e.g., mental or behavioral) of a person (node) in the social network layer. Key types of open questions in the field can be divided into questions of description, prediction, and perturbation.

First efforts to describe the architecture of the multilayer brain-social network could focus on quantifying the relative strengths of the different sorts of links present. Generally, one set of studies has focused on quantifying the strength and topology of inter-regional links present in brain networks during tasks related to idea transmission and receptivity; a second set of studies has focused on quantifying the strength and topology of brain-to-brain synchrony during perception; and a third set of studies has focused on quantifying the strength and topology of interpersonal links present in social networks that support idea spread and idea contagion. However, at present, no single study has attempted to quantify the strength of region-to-region links within brain networks, brain-to-brain links across individuals, person-to-person links within social networks, and region-to-person links bridging brain networks to social networks during a single task and with the same individuals. The challenge in doing so will be to address the fact that each of these links may need to be estimated on different time scales, with region-to-region links being estimable by fMRI and other neuroimaging methods over short time windows, and person-to-person transmission of ideas potentially occurring over longer time windows in social networks.

After quantifying the strength of different sorts of links, one might wish to predict how far an idea might be expected to spread through a given sort of social network when the pattern of activity and connectivity in a single brain changes. Answering this question will require the construction of causal models for information transmission across links in a brain network, idea transmission across links in a social network as potentially modulated by the likelihood of brain-to-brain synchrony, and the translation of information within a brain region to an idea that is transmittable across persons via intra-personal processes related to computation, cognition, emotion, and perception. The construction and integration of such causal models will provide specific predictions about how perturbations at one node in one network layer can impact on another node in another network layer.

The development of such predictions then motivates perturbative empirical studies that can validate or disprove the predictions. One particularly interesting way in which to test causal predictions in brain-social multilayer networks is to expand behavioral network science experiments [170,172,173] by integrating neuroimaging and neurocognitive phenotyping. Specifically, one could recruit a large group of individuals (e.g., 30 < N < 50), place each individual on a network of communication according to their neural markers of receptivity or influence, and quantify idea or behavior transmission in the group. Such an experimental setup would allow one to test causal predictions such as that a person whose brain network has been statistically linked to high capacity for social influence would have a bigger impact on population-level behaviors if placed in a point of high betweenness in the communication network than if placed in a point of low betweenness and low degree.

Mentalizing tendencies may also be associated with other advantages that are reflected in the brain function of perceivers and social targets. First, more-popular people are perceived by others differently than less-popular people are; when network members viewed the faces of more-popular people in their social networks, popular faces elicited increased activity in functionally localized brain regions associated with mentalizing and valuation, with the effects of mentalizing mediated by value-related activity [121]. Interestingly, these effects were strongest in the most popular individuals, who were also the most accurate in knowing how others viewed them [121]. These data are consistent with the idea that brain and social network
variables may mutually influence each other, with activity in value and mentalizing systems helping perceivers identify important social referents.

The mentalizing system in lateral temporal cortex and TPJ may also encode information about the social network position of people more broadly; in one study, these regions automatically distinguished the social network position of people within a social network whose faces participants observed in an fMRI scanner [122]. Separate regions that have been associated with processing social status, including mPFC, temporal poles, and fusiform gyrus, also encoded information about eigenvector centrality, a measure of prestige that captures the degree to which a participant is connected to well-connected others [122]. The authors note that these features of the social network were encoded automatically upon perception of the social referents (the task involved viewing of brief videos of network members and indicating whether the video was the same as the previous video played, and did not call any specific attention to social judgment). This study highlights one value of integrating brain data with social network data, since the social perception processes in question occur quickly and often outside of conscious awareness. Thus, determining the mechanisms would likely be difficult with self-reports alone.

Moving forward, a more comprehensive and systematic investigation of how different social network properties (e.g., size or closure) relate to brain structure and function across a range of tasks, groups, and stages of development will help fill in this picture. Recent findings have begun to address different types of social tie (e.g., friends versus kin or varying levels of closeness in a social network) may be processed differently in the brain [123], highlighting the need for more nuanced hypotheses and analyses that account for multiscale structure in both social networks and brain networks. In addition, although the growing body of studies reviewed above suggests promise in integrating social network analysis with measures of brain structure and function, almost none of this work has explicitly modeled networks both within the brain and between individuals (c.f. [25]), which we argue is an important intersection to consider.

Concluding Remarks: Current Frontiers and Open Questions

Adopting a multiscale perspective suggests several possible extensions to extant network neuroscience findings. For example, it remains an exciting open question to determine the extent to which the brain network dynamics described in early network neuroscience...
Frontiers at the Intersection of Brain and Social Network Science

As noted in our introduction, the term ‘social network’ encompasses multiple forms of interacting, multiscale networks of friends, family, coworkers, and communities. Work at the intersection of brain science and social network science has only begun to scratch the surface of how a wide range of social network types (e.g., core networks versus full networks [124–129]; strong versus weak ties [130–132]; or online versus offline networks [133,134]) might influence, and be influenced by, brain function across the lifespan. In addition, tools for describing the social networks that individuals inhabit range from objective logs of specific egocentric networks (e.g., Facebook [120,135]) to subjective assessments of the support available from a range of others (e.g., [135]) to interactions with supportive others [136]. Finally, within a given network, several features, ranging from measures of size to measures of topological complexity, might be differentially associated with brain structure and function for different types of task.

Many questions remain at the intersection between brain networks and social networks (see Outstanding Questions). Arguably some of the most fundamental questions relate to notions of causality. To what extent do social network dynamics cause changes in brain dynamics? To what extent do brain dynamics cause changes in social network dynamics? Most existing research at the intersection of brain and social network science has been correlative; in addition to building a deeper and broader picture of how a wide range of cognitive, affective, and social processes interact, experiments that determine causality will also substantially advance science in both domains. Longitudinal studies that span key transitions (e.g., from high school to college) will also provide insight into the direction of causality because both brain networks and social networks can change appreciably over this timescale. Indeed, tracking associations between changes in brain network and social network functioning over time provides a standard of evidence between cross-sectional and experimental designs [137].

A second set of questions relates to how other external processes might change the workings of brain and social networks. What environmental factors moderate the interactions between social and brain network dynamics? In what ways do cultural variables influence social and brain network dynamics? In what ways might interactions between brain networks and social networks vary across development (e.g., in children versus adolescents versus adults)? In each case, we hold that the time is ripe for hypotheses bridging brain and social networks, and building on both recent preliminary data and recently developed computational tools and methods.

Potential Applications

Efforts aimed at understanding and integrating the study of social and brain network dynamics will advance understanding of basic psychological principles and aid in deriving fundamental principles about the organization of society. However, even beyond fundamental knowledge, work at this intersection has the potential to improve real-world practice in clinical treatments for mental and physical disorders, predicting behavior change in response to persuasive messages, and improving educational outcomes including learning and creativity. For example, if people whose brain and/or social networks show differential response to treatments, logged information (e.g., from social media) could aid in providing tailored interventions. Similarly, educational environments could be constructed in which groups of students work with one another in tailored social networks to maximize individual learning potential. Indeed, improved knowledge in these domains also has the potential to aid in constructing optimal teams for...
group learning and for task performance in education, corporate, medical, defense, or other contexts. These possibilities motivate collaborative alliances between social scientists, neuroscientists, and network scientists in building and fine-tuning laboratory experiments, real-world studies, computational infrastructure, and fundamental mathematical theory that bridges the divide between individual brains and social groups by depicting the two as fundamentally interconnected levels in a multiscale network.
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