

A PARADIGM SHIFT IN NEUROSCIENCE DRIVEN BY BIG DATA STATE-OF-THE-ART, CHALLENGES, AND PROOF-OF-CONCEPT

A PREPRINT

 **Zi-Xuan Zhou**

State Key Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience and Learning,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China
Developmental Population Neuroscience Center,
IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

 **Xi-Nian Zuo***

State Key Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience and Learning,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China
Developmental Population Neuroscience Center,
IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China
National Basic Science Data Center, Beijing 100190, China

8 Dec 2022

ABSTRACT

A recent editorial in *Nature* noted that cognitive neuroscience is at a crossroads where it is a thorny issue to reliably reveal brain-behavior associations. This commentary sketches a big data science way out for cognitive neuroscience, namely population neuroscience. In terms of design, analysis, and interpretations, population neuroscience research takes the design controls to an unprecedented level, greatly expands the dimensions of the data analysis space, and paves a paradigm shift for exploring mechanisms of brain-behavior associations.

1 Introduction

Greene and colleagues [1] demonstrated that the relationships between patterns of brain networks and behavioral traits vary markedly across subgroups, and the complexity of the relationships leads to the systematic failure of a widely used predictive modeling protocol [2] in cognitive neuroscience. The accompanying editorial [3] perceptively pointed out that this study [1] and the study of Marek *et al.* [4] published five months beforehand marked a crossroads in cognitive neuroscience. In this comment, we call for a big data science way out for the current dilemma facing cognitive neuroscience, representing a paradigm shift from cognitive neuroscience to population neuroscience.

Approximately a decade ago, Dr. Tomáš Paus sensitively saw the benefits of combining genetics and epidemiology with cognitive neuroscience to emphasize the demand for tackling the genetic and environmental factors that shape the processes leading to a particular brain state, and thus proposed population neuroscience [5]. Falk *et al.* [6] further pointed out the benefits of population neuroscience, such as recruiting representative samples in neuroscience research with the help of population science and opening the neural ‘black box’ in population science research with the help of neuroscience. They stressed the profound influence of context and culture on human behavior, and the risks of ignoring these factors and assuming uniform brain-behavior relationships. Greene and colleagues [1] validated the complexity of the brain-behavior relationships and the urgency of shifting to population neuroscience.

*Correspondence to Xi-Nian Zuo (xinian.zuo@bnu.edu.cn; zuoxn@psych.ac.cn)

2 State-of-the-Art: The Time is Ripe

Openly shared neuroimaging data have grown by orders of magnitude over the past decade, and this big-data momentum continues. With the huge amount of in vivo brain imaging data, cognitive neuroscientists are now able to conduct previously unattainable studies. Notably, several studies based on available large-scale datasets have also revealed the limitations of some common practices in the field. For instance, using a total of approximately 50,000 samples from three datasets, Marek *et al.* [4] found that the effect sizes of cross-sectional brain-behavior links are smaller than the effect sizes commonly reported in previous literature. This result provoked disputes and defenses [7–10], leading to reflections on the importance of improving research design [7, 8, 10], optimizing analysis methods [8, 10, 11], and incorporating multimodal data [12]. Later, as mentioned above, Greene *et al.* [1] demonstrated the flaws in previously established predictive models of brain-behavior associations. The status is reminiscent of Minsky and Papert’s proof in 1969 that it is impossible for single-layer perceptrons to learn an exclusive or (XOR) function [13], which then triggered the first cold winter in artificial neural network research.

Is the current understanding and utilization of neuroimaging data good enough? Insights from population neuroscience are that rich population information remains enclosed in the big data looking forward to being decoded from the perspective of population science. Now, with the increasing number of neuroimaging data acquisition sites, the popularization of smart terminals and wearable devices for epidemiological information collection, as well as the maturity of gene-wide association analysis technology [14], a door tailored for population neuroscience has been opened. A prominent example is the study by Bethlehem *et al.* [15], which aggregated the big data of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) from more than 100,000 participants to model brain charts over the human lifespan. Due to the rich population information encoded, the charts with such big data can serve as ‘microscopes’ for population neuroscience to increase study power and accuracy (see **Proof-of-Concept: A Paradigm with Brain Charts**).

3 More Opportunities than Challenges: Potential Perspectives

Potential perspectives from big data-driven cognitive neuroscience can be categorized into three aspects: design, analysis, and interpretations.

3.1 Design controls

Traditionally, design controls in cognitive neuroscience primarily include controlled tasks or stimuli. In recent years, naturalistic designs, which combine the advantages of controlled tasks and the resting state, have emerged. This paradigm is easy to apply to large-scale samples across the human lifespan and thus can be mutually reinforced with population neuroscience, although the methodological research is still in its infancy. Research with naturalistic designs shows that fMRI data can capture information at the semantic level [16], demonstrating the potential of highly controlled neuroimaging data in reflecting attributes concerned by population neuroscience. Given this opportunity, cognitive neuroscientists should attach importance to demographic and epidemiological information, encompassing factors that affect human cognition and behavior at the family, community, macropolicy, and cultural levels. With these multiple levels of external information, the analysis and interpretations of the acquired neuroimaging data can be supported to the greatest extent.

In addition to paradigm innovations in the control of multilevel sociodemographic variables, population neuroscience also emphasizes the importance of multimodal data (including genetics), extensive sampling, and longitudinal measurements. When population neuroscience was first introduced, Dr. Tomáš Paus emphasized the importance of longitudinal studies, as they provide knowledge of how various factors shape or regulate the developmental processes of the human brain. The perspective of development across the human lifespan has led to the emergence of developmental population neuroscience [17, 18].

Although the ultimate goal of population neuroscience must rely on highly controlled large-scale datasets (i.e., deep and big data) that are not currently available, perspectives from population science can already promote cognitive neuroscience in multiple ways. First, existing large-scale datasets can be examined to chart the associations between the brain and the known basic demographic variables [15]. Since the basic demographic variables are simple and unambiguous, we can expect that these charts are robust and therefore can lead to reliable insights. Second, these charts provide references for accurately assessing confounds caused by demographic variables in brain-wide association studies (BWAS). In other words, the charts can inform small-scale BWAS by interpreting variations rooted in demographic variables. Finally, sociodemographic variables provide informative dimensions for research analysis and interpretations, regardless of the sample size. Given the great opportunities, one can expect that there will be an explosion of highly controlled population neuroscience studies, and the collected data can be accumulated continuously, eventually forming highly controlled large-scale datasets.

3.2 Dimensions of analysis

Current neuroimaging techniques can only indirectly measure brain activity with limited spatiotemporal resolution, inevitably losing physical details reflecting cognitive processes. Even so, neuroimaging data are still intricate under current research practices. Until recently, many neuroscientists remained committed to deriving simple biomarkers from neuroimaging data, which equates to a dimensionality reduction process. For instance, Greene *et al.* [1] employed a predictive modeling protocol [2] to reduce the functional connectivity network to a point on a 2-dimensional plane. However, they found that points corresponding to two types of individuals with distinct behavioral scores are often intertwined and cannot be correctly classified simultaneously.

If a specific sociodemographic variable is used as a third dimension, the classification accuracy will be greatly improved, which is also supported by data presented by Greene *et al.* [1] The approach discussed here is not to simply regress out sociodemographic variables but to take them as intrinsic dimensions within the model. Similarly, the dimension of development (i.e., age) has frequently been regarded as a valid factor in BWAS. A typical example is the association between cortical morphology and intelligence quotient (IQ), which is intrinsically dynamic and encoded throughout the human lifespan. While the pattern of the association is difficult to disentangle from cross-sectional data, with the additional dimension from longitudinal measurements, the differences in the age-dependent trajectories of cortical morphology are detectable and clear across different IQ groups [19, 20]. In light of the uniqueness of the dimension of development, developmental population neuroscience [18, 21] takes age as a key dimension in BWAS from a lifespan perspective [22].

Certainly, higher-dimensional information can be extracted directly and exclusively from neuroimaging data by using multivariate models or even deep learning methods. These approaches, however, pose at least two challenges: interpretability and generalizability. It is difficult, first, to interpret the implications of the high-dimensional model and, second, to determine the model application scope without evaluating the sample representativeness. Fortunately, population neuroscience with big data can help get neuroimaging data analysis out of the rut in four ways. First, based on demographic information, the distribution of the samples is straightforward, so the model application scope is clear. Second, taking sociodemographic and genetic features as additional dimensions beyond simple biomarkers, one can obtain brain-wide association models with higher dimensions and better interpretability. Third, using anchors of demographic variables to determine the application scope and assist in interpretability analysis, sophisticated multivariate models are more desirable. Fourth, exploiting additional information from genetic and sociodemographic variables makes the established models theoretically stronger and therefore more likely to yield valid discoveries.

3.3 Interpretations from associations to mechanisms

With the support of interpretable high-dimensional analysis space, one can model general patterns of brain-wide associations based on large-scale representative samples and reliable measurements [23], i.e., deep and big data. It is important to note that the perspective of population neuroscience requires variables, such as genetic and sociodemographic features, that influence or regulate the brain-behavior relationships to be treated as intrinsic dimensions of the model. By harnessing genetic, sociodemographic, and other population-level variables as intrinsic model dimensions, we can gain better insights into brain-behavior relationships.

While simultaneously accounting for many dimensions is only possible based on very large-scale samples, a simple strategy is to select relatively independent dimensions and to model the normative variations separately [24]. The obtained normative models quantify individual differences in the brain along diverse population information and can further facilitate innovative small-scale BWAS [25], especially precise or personalized health care research (e.g., psychiatry [26, 27]). Individual scores can be evaluated along the intrinsic dimensions characterized by the normative models. In this way, the undetectable brain-behavior associations in the raw data can be revealed with more intrinsic dimensions and increased statistical power. The models encode rich population information of the representative individual differences and function as microscopes to decipher incomprehensible information into comprehensible patterns.

Potential discoveries of the patterns, combined with knowledge from multilevel *neuromaps* [28], will pave the way for researchers to develop further hypotheses and facilitate more targeted population neuroscience research in finding, validating, and evaluating key factors that mediate and moderate the brain-behavior relationships. The knowledge production flywheel called ‘population neuroscience’ will be in motion, continuously generating new insights into mechanisms and principles on how brain and behavior interact with each other, helping to open the black box.

4 Proof-of-Concept: A Paradigm with Brain Charts

From the perspective of population neuroscience, human lifespan brain charts [15], which encode population information along key dimensions such as age and sex, can immediately enable a paradigm shift in BWAS. First, brain charts can help distinguish individual differences originating from subtle developmental and genetic variables by harnessing the most robust and fundamental age- and sex-rooted variations. Second, interpretable normative scores (e.g., centile scores) derived from brain charts enable the transformation of feature/trait space from absolute to relative values, allow for heuristic explorations such as direct comparisons between different brain features/traits, and enhance the validity and generalizability of findings by referencing external big or deep data information. Finally, lifespan brain charts provide precise longitudinal references that can be used to assess within-individual longitudinal changes in centile scores, which can greatly empower innovative longitudinal studies.

A simple proof-of-concept for the research paradigm with brain charts is illustrated in Figure 1. Measurements of the brain are represented by the two features, and therefore samples are represented by points on the 2-dimensional plane with the two features as axes, while different scores of a certain behavioral trait are distinguished by different colors. We can see two groups of differently colored points (indicating markedly different behavioral scores) in panel a. However, the distribution areas of the two groups largely overlap, preventing us from effectively capturing the brain-behavior associations. The tricky situation cannot be overcome simply by a larger sample size (panel b).

With age as the third dimension, the two groups are effectively separated in the 3-dimensional space (panels c, d), demonstrating the great power of additional intrinsic dimensions in helping us gain better insights. A larger sample size (panel d) allows us to more clearly see the different distribution patterns of the groups around the normative trajectory (solid line) than a smaller sample size (panel c). The raw feature scores can be transformed into the normative feature scores by leveraging the human lifespan brain charts to accurately interpret the age-rooted variations (panels e, f). On the brain chart-derived 2-dimensional plane, the distinction between the previously indistinguishable groups is clearly revealed even with a small sample size (panel e), presenting a proof-of-concept of how small-scale studies can reliably discover hidden brain-wide association patterns. Animations that show the distribution of samples in panel c and the process of transforming raw feature scores into normative feature scores are provided online (<https://github.com/zuoxinian/CCS/tree/master/projects/chartdemo>) to improve understanding of the chart guided BWAS.

5 Conclusions

Reconsidering the experimental design, data analysis strategies and interpretations in cognitive neuroscience research from the perspective of population science with big data exhibits great potential to break through the limitations of current research practices [29, 30]. The research paradigm of population neuroscience driven by big data not only outlines a tantalizing vision that ultimately reveals the mechanisms of interactions between brain, behavior, gene, and environment, but also immediately informs small-scale BWAS with the additional intrinsic dimensions and the population information encoded in the normative brain models, allowing us to uncover previously invisible patterns and effects. We believe that population neuroscience will reform the research practices of BWAS and advance cognitive neuroscience.

Acknowledgements

This study has been supported by the STI 2030 - the major project of the Brain Science and Brain-Inspired Intelligence Technology (2021ZD0200500). We thank the *Research Program on Discipline Direction Prediction and Technology Roadmap* of China Association for Science and Technology for bibliometric resources, the *Chinese Data-sharing Warehouse for In-vivo Imaging Brain* at National Basic Science Data Center and the *Lifespan Brain Chart Consortium* (<https://github.com/brainchart/lifespan>) for big data resources.

References

- [1] Abigail S Greene et al. Brain-phenotype models fail for individuals who defy sample stereotypes. *Nature*, 609(7925):109–118, 2022.
- [2] Xilin Shen et al. Using connectome-based predictive modeling to predict individual behavior from brain connectivity. *Nat. Protoc.*, 12(3):506–518, 2017.
- [3] EDITORIAL. Cognitive neuroscience at the crossroads. *Nature*, 608(7924):647, 2022.

- [4] Scott Marek et al. Reproducible brain-wide association studies require thousands of individuals. *Nature*, 603(7902):654–660, 2022.
- [5] Tomáš Paus. Population neuroscience: Why and how. *Hum. Brain Mapp.*, 31(6):891–903, 2010.
- [6] Emily B Falk et al. What is a representative brain? Neuroscience meets population science. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110(44):17615–17622, 2013.
- [7] Caterina Gratton, Steven M Nelson, and Evan M Gordon. Brain-behavior correlations: Two paths toward reliability. *Neuron*, 110(9):1446–1449, 2022.
- [8] Monica D Rosenberg and Emily S Finn. How to establish robust brain–behavior relationships without thousands of individuals. *Nat. Neurosci.*, 25(7):835–837, 2022.
- [9] EDITORIAL. Revisiting doubt in neuroimaging research. *Nat. Neurosci.*, 25(7):833–834, 2022.
- [10] Peter A Bandettini et al. The challenge of BWAs: Unknown unknowns in feature space and variance. *Med.*, 3(8):526–531, 2022.
- [11] Sarah Genon, Simon B Eickhoff, and Shahrzad Kharabian. Linking interindividual variability in brain structure to behaviour. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, 23(5):307–318, 2022.
- [12] Chen Song, Kristian Sandberg, Renate Rutiku, and Ryota Kanai. Linking human behaviour to brain structure: further challenges and possible solutions. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, 23(8):517–518, 2022.
- [13] Marvin Minsky and Seymour Papert. *Perceptrons: An introduction to computational geometry*. MIT press, 1969.
- [14] Lloyd T Elliott et al. Genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in UK Biobank. *Nature*, 562(7726):210–216, 2018.
- [15] Richard AI Bethlehem et al. Brain charts for the human lifespan. *Nature*, 604(7906):525–533, 2022.
- [16] Alexander G Huth et al. Natural speech reveals the semantic maps that tile human cerebral cortex. *Nature*, 532(7600):453–458, 2016.
- [17] Tomáš Paus. Some thoughts on the relationship of developmental science and population neuroscience. *Int. J. Dev. Sci.*, 6(1-2):9–11, 2012.
- [18] Xi-Nian Zuo et al. Developmental population neuroscience: emerging from ICHBD. *Sci. Bull.*, 63(6):331–332, 2018.
- [19] Philip Shaw et al. Intellectual ability and cortical development in children and adolescents. *Nature*, 440(7084):676–679, 2006.
- [20] Hugo G Schnack et al. Changes in thickness and surface area of the human cortex and their relationship with intelligence. *Cereb. Cortex*, 25(6):1608–1617, 2015.
- [21] Damien A Fair et al. Developmental cognitive neuroscience in the era of networks and big data: Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. *Annu. Rev. Dev. Psychol.*, 3(1):249–275, 2021.
- [22] Xi-Nian Zuo et al. Human connectomics across the life span. *Trends Cognit. Sci.*, 21(1):32–45, 2017.
- [23] Xi-Nian Zuo, Ting Xu, and Michael Peter Milham. Harnessing reliability for neuroscience research. *Nat. Hum. Behav.*, 3(8):768–771, 2019.
- [24] Thilo Rieg and Emanuel Schwarz. From mechanistic insight towards clinical implementation using normative modeling. *Nat. Comput. Sci.*, 2(5):278–280, 2022.
- [25] Roni Tibon, Linda Geerligs, and Karen Campbell. Bridging the big (data) gap: levels of control in small-and large-scale cognitive neuroscience research. *Trends Neurosci.*, 45(7):507–516, 2022.
- [26] Andre F Marquand, Iead Rezek, Jan Buitelaar, and Christian F Beckmann. Understanding heterogeneity in clinical cohorts using normative models: Beyond case-control studies. *Biol. Psychiatry*, 80(7):552–561, 2016.
- [27] Li-Zhen Chen, Avram J Holmes, Xi-Nian Zuo, and Qi Dong. Neuroimaging brain growth charts: A road to mental health. *Psychoradiology*, 1(4):272–286, 2021.
- [28] Bradley Voytek. The data science future of neuroscience theory. *Nat. Methods*, 19(11):1349–1350, 2022.
- [29] Xi-Ze Jia et al. Small P values may not yield robust findings: an example using REST-meta-PD. *Sci. Bull.*, 66(21):2148–2152, 2021.
- [30] Tal Yarkoni. The generalizability crisis. *Behav. Brain. Sci.*, 45:e1, 2022.




Figure 1: **Gain better insights with additional intrinsic dimensions and normative brain charts.** (a) The two groups of sample points distinguished by different colors are non-separable on the 2-dimensional plane with the two features as axes. (b) When the sample size increases, the respective distribution areas of the two groups appear clearer but still overlap. (c) With age as the third dimension, the two groups are effectively separated, and their different distribution patterns around the normative trajectory (solid line) of the two features are revealed. (d) Increasing the sample size helps to more clearly obtain the different distribution patterns of the groups. (e)&(f) By obtaining normative features with reference to the normative trajectory, the hidden distinction between the two groups is revealed on the 2-dimensional plane with the two normative axes, which is clear even with a small sample size as in panel e. Animations that show the distribution of samples in panel c and the process of transforming raw feature scores into normative feature scores are provided online (<https://github.com/zuoxinian/CCS/tree/master/projects/chartdemo>).