Running title: *Interpersonal Neuroscience*

The interpersonal neuroscience of social learning

Yafeng Pan^{1*}, Giacomo Novembre^{2,3}, & Andreas Olsson^{1*}

¹ *Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden*

² *Neuroscience of Perception and Action Laboratory, & Neuroscience and Behaviour Laboratory, Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia, Rome, Italy*

³ *Department of Neuroscience, Physiology and Pharmacology, University College London, London, United Kingdom*

***Corresponding Author:**

Yafeng Pan: yafeng.pan@ki.se;

Andreas Olsson: andreas.olsson@ki.se

Abstract

The study of the brain mechanisms underpinning social behavior is currently undergoing a paradigm shift, moving its focus from single individuals to the real-time interaction among groups of individuals. Although this development opens unprecedented opportunities to study how interpersonal brain activity shapes behaviors through learning, there have been few direct connections to the rich field of learning science. Our paper examines how the rapidly developing field of interpersonal neuroscience is (and could be) contributing to our understanding of social learning. To this end, we first review recent research extracting indices of brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC) in the context of social behaviors, and in particular social learning. We then discuss how studying communicative behaviors during learning can aid the interpretation of BtBC, and how studying BtBC can inform our understanding of such behaviors. Importantly, we then discuss how BtBC and communicative behaviors collectively can predict learning outcomes, suggesting several causative and mechanistic models. Finally, we highlight key methodological and interpretational challenges, as well as exciting opportunities for integrating research in interpersonal neuroscience with social learning, and propose a multi-person framework for understanding how interpersonal transmission of information between individual brains shapes social learning.

Keywords: interpersonal neuroscience, social learning, brain-to-brain coupling, machine learning, causation

1. Introduction

Across the lifespan, much of human learning is shaped by observing and interacting with others, and such *social learning* (i.e., learning the value of stimuli, actions, or knowledge from others) is critical for a range of human activities, from basic survival behaviors to the mastering of complex cultural tasks (Apps, Rushworth, & Chang, 2016; Bandura, 1977; Boyd, Richerson, & Henrich, 2011; Debiec & Olsson, 2017; Olsson, Knapska, & Lindström, 2020). For example, individuals commonly learn what is safe and dangerous by observing one another approaching rewards or avoiding threats (Lindström, Golkar, Jangard, Tobler, & Olsson, 2019). Social learning often involves the exchange of complex information, which must be swiftly and dynamically decoded by the human brain (e.g., Fan, Chen, & Cheng, 2016; Joiner, Piva, Turrin, & Chang, 2017; Lindström, Haaker, & Olsson, 2018; Olsson et al., 2020). The aim of the present work is to integrate the growing knowledge about the neural bases of such social learning with new and exciting developments in the nascent field of interpersonal neuroscience, in particular, research using measures of brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC, i.e., neural processes in one brain that are temporally coupled to neural processes in another brain, Hasson, Ghazanfar, Galantucci, Garrod, & Keysers, 2012; see more details in the next section), and to discuss how this integration can contribute to our understanding of social learning.

In spite of the surge in interest in the neural mechanisms of social learning, important gaps in our understanding remain. First, although “social learning” involves, by definition, at least two agents (e.g., an observer and a demonstrator), conventional neuroscientific approaches to social learning have mostly focused on the activity of single brains (Lindström et al., 2019; Olsson, Nearing, & Phelps, 2007), without exploring the dependencies among activities in two or more (interacting) brains (Cui, Bryant, & Reiss, 2012; Montague, 2002). Second, most studies in the field of social learning have adopted ecologically-deprived setups in which natural behavior is strongly constrained (Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020), requiring further validation in more

naturalistic situations (D'Ausilio, Novembre, Fadiga, & Keller, 2015; Holleman, Hooge, Kemner, & Hessels, 2020).

Recent efforts to bridge these two major gaps in understanding have prompted a paradigm shift in studying social behaviors, from the use of single-person, ecologically-deprived experiments, to multi-person, ecologically-valid tasks (Gvirts & Perlmutter, 2020; Shamay-Tsoory & Mendelsohn, 2019; Wass, Whitehorn, Marriott Haresign, Phillips, & Leong, 2020) (**Fig. 1a**). This paradigm shift is seen as a development towards a “second-person neuroscience” (Redcay & Schilbach, 2019; Schilbach et al., 2013) or “interpersonal neuroscience” (hereafter). Although this development has opened unprecedented opportunities to study how interpersonal neural responses shape memories and behaviors through learning (**Fig. 1b**), there have been few direct links to the rich field of learning science, including that focusing on social learning. Strikingly, research on the neural mechanisms of social learning, which lends itself particularly well for such an integration, has largely progressed in parallel domains of research with little integration with the work in interpersonal neuroscience.

To fill this blank in the literature, we aim to provide a perspective on the research emerging in the nexus between the fields of interpersonal neuroscience and social learning. Our review (*i*) highlights important recent developments of interpersonal neuroscience, and (*ii*) offers a novel, synthesized framework for better understanding the transmission of information between individual brains during social learning, and how such interactions shape memories and behavior.

Fig. 1. Interpersonal neuroscience and its applications in social learning. (a) To study the neural processes of social behaviors and interactions (Socio-behavioral level), conventional neuroimaging studies mostly focus on activation and/or functional connectivity of brains in isolation (Single-brain level). The neurophysiological investigations of social behaviors have witnessed a transition from a single-brain to a brain-brain focus; the latter entails the examination of coupling between brain regions across individuals (Inter-brain level). Adapted from Pan, 2019. (b) Illustrations of experimental paradigms studying different types of learning: (i), *Direct (Pavlovian) learning*: a single brain is monitored while the learner is presented with a conditioned stimulus (e.g. a spider), previously paired with a painful unconditioned stimulus (e.g. an electric shock) (e.g., Lindström et al., 2018); (ii), *Unidirectional observational learning*: the learner observes the a demonstrator's defensive responses (anxiety, fear) to a conditioned stimulus (unidirectional dash line represents potential sequential brain-to-brain coupling, indicating that brain activity of the observer/learner measured at a later time could be coupled with that of the demonstrator) (e.g., Kistorz, Flanagan, & Glasauer, 2020); (iii), *Interactive learning*: a learner acquires threat information by interacting with another individual (bidirectional solid line denotes concurrent coupling, indicating that simultaneously measured brain activity from two individuals couple with each other) (e.g., J. Liu et al., 2019); (iv), *Interactive group learning*: a group of individuals learns about threat information through interaction (bi-directional lines constitute a complex coupling network, indicating that simultaneously measured brain activity from group members couple with each other) (e.g., Dikker et al., 2017). Figure created with BioRender.com.

2. Brain-to-brain coupling and social learning

Social learning, defined as the process through which individuals learn from others instead of through direct, individual experience only, is crucial for survival in many species, and plays an important role in evolution of human culture (Gariépy et al., 2014). Learning by capitalizing on others' experiences can guide decisions and facilitate the acquisition of new skills and values without paying the costs of individual trial-and-error learning. Social learning has been observed across many social species, including octopuses, birds, rodents, and humans (Debiec & Olsson, 2017; Fiorito & Scotto, 1992; Sherry & Galef, 1984; Thornton, 2008; van de Waal, Borgeaud, & Whiten, 2013), and applied to multiple domains, ranging from decision-making, fear responses, to problem-solving (Gruber, Muller, Strimling, Wrangham, & Zuberbühler, 2009; Lindström et al., 2019; Olsson & Phelps, 2007; Wisdom, Song, & Goldstone, 2013; Zhang & Gläscher, 2020). Here, we use “social learning” to refer to any form of learning acquired by observing or interacting with conspecifics.

A key prerequisite of social learning is the presence of at least two individuals – one learning from another. Accordingly, recent methodological advances (i.e., hyperscanning – the measurement of brain activity from two or more individuals simultaneously, Babiloni & Astolfi, 2014; Cui et al., 2012; Montague et al., 2002) allow researchers to measure similar or synchronized neural responses, known as brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC) (see Hasson et al., 2012), across dyads and groups of individuals during social learning in an ecologically valid setting (Dikker et al., 2017; Holper et al., 2013).

BtBC during learning has been demonstrated across multiple brain regions, predominantly including temporoparietal junctions and prefrontal regions (Holper et al., 2013; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan, Guyon, Borragán, Hu, & Peigneux, 2020; Pan, Novembre, Song, Li, & Hu, 2018; Takeuchi, Mori, Suzukamo, & Izumi, 2017; Zheng et al., 2018). According to some authors, these regions may contribute to mentalizing and interpreting the intentions of others (Behrens,

Hunt, & Rushworth, 2009; Carter, Bowling, Reeck, & Huettel, 2012; Gvirts & Perlmutter, 2020; Knoch, Pascual-Leone, Meyer, Treyer, & Fehr, 2006), which is of course relevant for any form of social learning. In addition, BtBC has been measured using various statistical approaches (for a review, see Fairhurst & Dumas, 2019) and imaging modalities (for a review, see Babiloni & Astolfi, 2014). For the sake of simplicity, here we refer to BtBC as a unitary phenomenon without making distinctions between underlying neural structures, imaging modalities, and measurement sources (for a detailed review of BtBC, see e.g. Babiloni & Astolfi, 2014; Fairhurst & Dumas, 2019; Gvirts & Perlmutter, 2020; Wass et al., 2020). Our goal is to understand how BtBC in interpersonal neuroscience can contribute to our knowledge about social learning.

Whereas single-brain studies are useful in localizing and characterizing brain activity associated with social learning (Apps et al., 2016; Lindström et al., 2018; Olsson et al., 2020), BtBC can directly assess the dynamic interaction of two or more brains (Cui et al., 2012) (**Fig. 2**). Thus, studying BtBC is key to a full understanding of social learning, which requires dynamic social engagement. Surprisingly few studies have directly examined the role of BtBC in social learning. To address this gap in the literature, we review four broad strains of research (**Fig. 1b**): (i) direct (Pavlovian) learning, (ii) unidirectional observational learning, (iii) interactive learning, and (iv) interactive group learning (varied by different forms of learning). First, research examining *direct (Pavlovian) learning* has mostly used a single brain approach (serving as a contrast to the BtBC described in *ii-iv* below): activity in a single brain is measured while the learner is passively observing a conditioned stimulus (e.g., a spider), which is previously paired with an unconditioned stimulus (e.g., an electric shock). For example, using fMRI, Lindström et al. (2018) found that direct fear learning activates a neural network that has been linked to the acquisition, storage, and expression of conditioned fear (LeDoux, 2012), as

well as the aversive value of pain (Kober, Buhle, Weber, Ochsner, & Wager, 2019; López-Solà, Geuter, Koban, Coan, & Wager, 2019).

Second, recent advances examining *unidirectional observational learning* have attempted to measure sequential BtBC (Redcay & Schilbach, 2019): in these studies, a stimulus is first shown to a demonstrator, who's responses are recorded and later presented to an observer; sequential BtBC is identified when brain activity of the observer (measured at a later time) is coupled with that of the demonstrator. For example, using fMRI, Kostorz et al. scanned the brains of a demonstrator and observers when learning an origami skill (Kostorz et al., 2020). Brain activity of the demonstrator during action production was coupled with that of the observer while they later viewed the demonstrator's videotaped actions. The results revealed a sequential demonstrator-observer brain coupling, which was reported to support action understanding, mentalizing, and visual simulation (Hesslow, 2002; Van Overwalle, D'aes, & Mariën, 2015).

Third, research examining *interactive learning* in naturalistic situations has measured concurrent (simultaneous) BtBC: in these studies, a learner acquires information by interacting with another individual; concurrent BtBC is identified when brain activity between two individuals is coupled together simultaneously during interactions. For example, using fNIRS, Liu and colleagues showed that ongoing demonstrator-observer interaction elicited concurrent BtBC in the left prefrontal cortex (J. Liu et al., 2019). Such BtBC was dependent on the observer's knowledge state (with vs. without prior knowledge about learning materials) and communication mode (face-to-face communication vs. computer-mediated communication): observers with prior knowledge and in a face-to-face communication elicited the strongest BtBC with demonstrators.

Fourth, BtBC was found to track *interactive group learning*, which can be seen as extending the work described above on BtBC between two individuals to BtBC across a group

of individuals. For example, in a real-world classroom situation, Dikker and co-workers followed a group of high-school students, and recorded their brain activity using EEG during regular class activities (Dikker et al., 2017). Students' BtBC predicted how much they were engaged during class and how much they liked the teacher and each-other.

Apart from the four broad strains of research reviewed above, many additional domains of social learning could be investigated in future multi-brain studies (not shown in **Fig. 1**). These additional domains entail, for instance, a learner acquiring information about threat by observing a real person interacting with a real conditioned stimulus (e.g., a real spider); or, observing artificial stimuli (e.g., a static picture of a spider) versus observing real stimuli (e.g., a real spider).

The studies reviewed so far, illustrate how the growing research interest in BtBC can inform the study of interpersonal learning. For the research on BtBC to be maximally informative about social learning, we need a better understanding of the behavioral significance of BtBC (Hamilton, 2020). In the next sections, we first discuss how communicative behaviors during learning can help interpreting BtBC (**Fig. 2a**), and conversely how BtBC can help understanding those behaviors (**Fig. 2b**). Then, we discuss how BtBC and communicative behaviors collectively can predict learning outcomes (**Fig. 2c**). Importantly, we discuss several causative and mechanistic considerations for BtBC and learning (**Fig. 2d**).

Fig. 2. Illustration of the relationship among brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC), communicative behavior, and social learning outcome. A demonstrator is transmitting knowledge to an observer, during which their brain activities are simultaneously recorded; BtBC emerges as a result of learning interactions within the dyad. (a) Communicative behaviors (e.g., gestures) during learning can help interpreting BtBC, and conversely, (b) BtBC can help understanding those behaviors. (c) BtBC and communicative behaviors collectively can predict future learning outcome. (d) BtBC and communicative behaviors jointly cause social learning through various mechanisms. The laptop in the right bottom corner represents the collection of learning outcome. Adapted from Pan, Borragán, & Peigneux, 2019.

3. Understanding brain-to-brain coupling via communicative behaviors

We discuss how to improve the interpretability of BtBC by examining communicative behaviors during interpersonal learning (**Fig. 2a**). In an endeavor to advance our understanding of BtBC, researchers have used video-based behavioral tools to measure communicative behaviors (“behavioral coding”) of two or more interacting agents to quantify the degree that specific communicative behaviors contribute to BtBC (see **Fig. 4** for some examples of the behavioral coding approach) (Jiang et al., 2015, 2012; Leong & Schilbach, 2019; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2018; Piazza, Hasenfratz, Hasson, & Lew-Williams, 2020; Wass et al.,

2018, 2020). In an interactive learning setting, examples of behavioral coding data are measures of exact start and end times of turn-taking behaviors (e.g., dialog, demonstration, and imitation) and body language (e.g., orofacial movements, facial expressions, kinematics, and gestures), all of which might contribute to learning in different ways during social interaction (e.g., verbal interactions transmit abstract information, body language facilitating acquisition of behaviors).

The behavioral coding approach has been successfully applied for tracking communicative behaviors across both humans (e.g., mutual gaze and smile, Bilek et al., 2015; Leong et al., 2017; Leong & Schilbach, 2019; Piazza et al., 2020; Wass et al., 2018) and non-human animals (e.g., grooming and sniffing, Kingsbury et al., 2019; Zhang & Yartsev, 2019), as well as across scientific fields, such as sociology (e.g., turn-taking and nod, J. Jiang et al., 2012), pedagogy (e.g., observation and imitation, Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2018) and psychiatry (e.g., posture and gaze, Leong & Schilbach, 2019). For example, Jiang and colleagues showed that interaction compared to no-interaction behaviors elicited stronger BtBC during face-to-face communication (Jiang et al., 2012). With relevance to learning, Pan and colleagues (2018) further categorized learning-relevant behaviors into vocal interactions and non-vocal interactions, and found that BtBC during interpersonal learning was mainly driven by vocal interactions. In another study, infant language learning (phonemic discrimination) was found to improve in the presence of peers; such improved early learning was related to behaviorally coded infant vocalizations and eye gaze (Lytle, Garcia-Sierra, & Kuhl, 2018).

How can the use of behavioral coding be optimized to examine social learning? A common practice based on recent applications entails the following three steps when collecting behavioral data (Jiang et al., 2015, 2012; Leong et al., 2017; Leong & Schilbach, 2019; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2018; Wass et al., 2018, 2020): (i) Specifying a coding scheme, which includes defining different types of communicative behaviors during learning (e.g., turn-taking behaviors and body language); (ii) Coding communicative behaviors, either manually or

semi-automatically based on digital videos recorded during the whole learning procedure; and finally, (iii) obtaining time-stamped behavioral markers – those behavioral indices could be further analyzed along with the brain data (**Fig. 3**).

What are the potential limitations of the behavioral coding approach? One limitation is the subjective nature of the rating procedure, raising concerns about reliability. It is therefore important to pre-determine a detailed coding scheme, and include multiple raters to allow for formal testing of the inter-rater reliability. Sufficient training in the relevant method and theory for raters is also needed to ensure valid and inter-rater reliable coding. A second limitation is that manual coding is time-consuming. This constraint (along with the previous one) can, however, be mitigated by the use of automated algorithms to extract behavioral information from videos (Cao, Hidalgo Martinez, Simon, Wei, & Sheikh, 2019; Ramseyer & Tschacher, 2011). For example, a motion energy analysis algorithm can quantify the pixel changes from one frame to the next, providing a continuous measure of movement (Ramseyer & Tschacher, 2011); and a real-time multi-person system (i.e., OpenPose) allows for jointly detecting human body, hand, facial, and foot keypoints on images or videos, and tracking their kinematics (Cao et al., 2019).

In sum, we contend that learning-relevant behavioral coding (i.e., the measurement of concurrent social behaviors of interacting individuals) is highly relevant for interpreting BtBC, parsing learning procedures, and quantifying brain-behavior relationships. The behavioral coding approach is advantageous for researchers to quantify the contribution of specific communicative behaviors to BtBC, thus enhancing our knowledge about the functional significance of BtBC.

Fig. 3. A learning-relevant behavioral coding approach. (a) Example behaviors coded from video frames, adapted from Pan et al., 2018. The demonstrator and the observer are coded with green and blue edges, respectively. (b) Brain signals, recorded from the demonstrator and the observer, are analyzed as a function of dyadic communicative behavior (including observation, imitation, facial expressions, and body movements) across time (in seconds). The demonstrator's and observer's behaviors (and brain signals) are marked in green and blue, respectively.

4. Understanding communicative behaviors via brain-to-brain coupling

Apart from the role of communicative behaviors during interpersonal learning in improving our understanding of BtBC (**Fig. 2a**), in turn, BtBC can be used to decode behaviors during learning (**Fig. 2b**). In this section, we propose that the study of BtBC can add importantly to our ability to decode or classify behaviors in social learning tasks.

Decoding analyses have previously been used to better understand social learning paradigms (Aquino et al., 2020; Haaker, Yi, Petrovic, & Olsson, 2017), but it has seldom been approached from an interpersonal neuroscience perspective. Methods used to decode behaviors during learning (e.g., turn-taking behaviors and body language) based on BtBC during

interpersonal learning have gained increasing attention lately. One such approach is the use of machine learning-based decoding, which builds mathematical models based on sample data (i.e., "training set") to classify behaviors automatically (Koza, Bennett, Andre, & Keane, 1996). This machine learning-based decoding approach has several benefits: it allows us to (i) assess how accurately BtBC can classify learning behaviors (i.e., accuracy), (ii) test whether data from various brain regions provide distinctive information for classification (i.e., spatial information), and (iii) track the temporal evolution of the performance of the decoding algorithms (i.e., temporal information). In these ways, the decoding approach can provide valuable (accuracy, spatial, and temporal) information about whether learning states or learning-relevant communicative behaviors of an individual can be inferred based solely on BtBC (Dai et al., 2018; Jiang et al., 2015).

To provide an intuition of how machine learning can be applied to BtBC to aid our understanding of learning relevant behavior, we describe the generic steps of this procedure (Dai et al., 2018; Hou, Song, Hu, Pan, & Hu, 2020; Jiang et al., 2015, 2012; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020) (**Fig. 4**). First, BtBC is estimated for every time point and every participant dyad; communicative behaviors during learning are labeled via the video-based behavioral coding technique (see the previous section). Next, brain data and behavioral markers are combined or fused. The whole dataset is then split into training and testing sets. Finally, a classification algorithm on BtBC is trained to classify different types of communicative behaviors during learning (cf. Dai et al., 2018; Hou et al., 2020; J. Jiang et al., 2015, 2012; Pan, Dikker et al., 2020).

Very few studies have combined machine learning and BtBC to examine social learning. In a pioneering study using EEG, Cohen and colleagues asked students to watch a series of educational videos, during which students' brain activity was recorded (Cohen et al., 2018). The researchers found that BtBC (indexed by the inter-subject correlation of the video-evoked

EEG) discriminated between attentive and inattentive video viewing in the students. Also, students with higher BtBC retained more learning content. In another study, using the same approach, Zhu and colleagues further found that BtBC among students discriminates between different levels of learning desire towards online courses (Zhu, Pan, & Hu, 2019). However, these combinations of machine learning and BtBC in educational settings did not involve real-time learning interactions between individuals. In other words, they did not entail an actual bidirectional interaction among individuals.

Addressing this gap in previous research, we recently combined machine learning and BtBC in a naturalistic learning task that allowed for real-time interactions (Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020). A demonstrator was asked to teach psychological concepts to an observer, during which their brain activity was recorded simultaneously. The demonstrator could either use a scaffolding strategy (e.g., asking guiding questions or providing hints) or an explanation strategy (e.g., providing definitions or clarifications) to transmit the knowledge. A logistic regression classifier, based on demonstrator-observer brain coupling, successfully distinguished demonstrators who used the scaffolding or explanation strategy, with a nearly perfect decoding performance. To evaluate the additional value of BtBC in decoding, we applied the same decoding analysis but based on individual brain activation. Importantly, and extending previous research, we found that machine learning techniques were more successful when decoding behaviors during learning from BtBC data than when using a single-brain method: whereas BtBC allowed us to discriminate between instructional strategies with a reasonable classification performance, the decoding analysis based on the individual brain activation was insufficient to do so (possibly because BtBC data may be associated with a higher signal-to-noise ratio, as opposed to single-brain data, Parkinson et al., 2018; Simony et al., 2016). These findings echo previous studies showing that BtBC predicts memory retention (as a form of learning outcome) more accurately than individual brain measures (Davidesco et al., 2019).

In light of current evidence, we argue that BtBC serves as a good neural-classification feature that optimizes the decoding of social learning. Machine learning in combination with interpersonal neuroscience is promising yet nascent, and many outstanding questions remain unanswered, for example, how to optimize sample size to reach a reliable decoding performance in interpersonal neuroscience, and how to develop the dual brain-based machine learning model (e.g., logistic regression).

Fig. 4. Exemplified steps of analysis for decoding communicative behaviors from brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC). First, BtBC and communicative behaviors during learning are estimated for each time point. Brain data and behavioral labels are then fused. The whole dataset is split into training and testing sets. Finally, a classification algorithm is implemented to differentiate different types of communicative behaviors (e.g., demonstrator performs vs. observer imitates) during learning. Classification performance is evaluated e.g. using accuracy or area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC). Video frames are adapted from Pan et al., 2018.

5. Brain-to-brain coupling predicting learning outcome

Here, we have suggested that BtBC can serve to better understand social behaviors *during* learning (**Fig. 2a-b**). In addition, we suggest that BtBC can predict *future* learning outcome (**Fig. 2c**). To the extent that BtBC has functional significance (i.e., contributing to successfully learned and adaptive behaviors) in social learning, BtBC measured during learning should be positively correlated with behavioral learning outcomes and memory retention.

Indeed, recent studies have shown that BtBC during learning is reliably linked to the success of social learning across different tasks (Holper et al., 2013; J. Liu et al., 2019; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2018; Zheng et al., 2018). For example, using fNIRS, Zheng and colleagues monitored and recorded the brain activity of a teacher and student simultaneously (Zheng et al., 2018). Their results showed that stronger BtBC between the right temporoparietal junction of the teacher and anterior superior temporal cortex of the student (regions classically associated with high-level mentalizing and semantic representation, Carter, Bowling, Reeck, & Huettel, 2012; Pobric, Lambon Ralph, & Zahn, 2016) predicted better learning outcomes; this was the case when the teacher's brain activity preceded that of the student (i.e., time-lagged BtBC – neural processes in one brain are coupled with those in another brain with a time delay), regardless of teaching style. BtBC can predict not only immediate learning performance, but also long-term memory retention: For example, Davidesco et al. (2019) recorded EEG in a classroom from groups of four students and a teacher during a science course, showing that BtBC successfully predicted how much information students retained immediately, as well as after one week (Davidesco et al., 2019).

The link between coupled neurophysiological responses (i.e., synchronized neurophysiological signals) and learning outcomes was also found in an observational learning task examining skin conductance responses (as an index of threat learning) in observer-demonstrator dyads (Pärnamets, Espinosa, & Olsson, 2020): observers successfully acquired

threat responses by observing the fearful reactions of a demonstrator, who sat side-by-side to them. Importantly, greater synchronization of phasic skin conductance between demonstrator and observer during the learning phase predicted the observer's threat learning performance as measured later in the absence of the observer.

To note, some researchers did not observe the association between BtBC and learning outcome in an interactive learning task (Bevilacqua et al., 2019). This lack of relationship deserves further exploration, as it may reflect a lack of sensitivity of learning paradigms, depend on learning interaction modality (J. Liu et al., 2019) or instructional strategy (Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020), or require a moment-to-moment variance analysis (Davidesco et al., 2019; Pan et al., 2018).

Based on recent advances showing that synchronicity between brains' signals predicts learning outcomes (J. Liu et al., 2019; Pan, Dikker, et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2018; Zheng et al., 2018), we propose that BtBC during social learning can be described as a means to a functional end – contributing to successfully learned and adaptive behavior (measured as expressed memories and behavioral performance). It is possible that the functional qualities of BtBC result from an improved real-time transfer of information. One of the ultimate goals of studying BtBC is to enable individualized predictions of learning outcomes that may eventually benefit pedagogical and clinical practices. Certainly, this will require massive future efforts to consolidate existing findings, and extend them to various real-world learning settings (e.g., classroom and field).

6. Causation between brain-to-brain coupling and social learning

Despite the observation that BtBC measured during the learning procedure strongly links to learning outcomes, nearly all evidence in this area is purely correlational: synchronicity between brains' signals is only measured and correlated with learning. Scarcely any studies examine whether BtBC is simply epiphenomenal to interpersonal learning – BtBC might

emerge as a biproduct of intrinsic motoric and perceptual similarities between individuals during learning, or it might play a causative role in social learning mechanisms. To provide causal insights into the functional role of BtBC in learning (**Fig. 2d**), it is imperative to control or manipulate BtBC and observe its effects on learning.

Recently, we addressed this open question (i.e., epiphenomenal vs. causative perspectives on BtBC) by taking a novel approach (Pan, Novembre, Song, Zhu, & Hu, 2021): we used a multi-person transcranial alternating current stimulation protocol developed by Novembre and colleagues (Novembre, Knoblich, Dunne, & Keller, 2017) to exogenously synchronize two brains, hence manipulating BtBC, and measured the resulting behavioral effects on social learning (this is generally called multi-brain stimulation, Novembre & Iannetti, 2021). We collected two distinct measures of behavior – (i) learning outcome and (ii) interpersonal body movements. The second measure was meant to be exploratory; it was inspired by previous research indicating that interpersonal synchronous movement can promote pro-social behaviors (Hu, Hu, Li, Pan, & Cheng, 2017; Reddish, Tong, Jong, Lanman, & Whitehouse, 2016), and therefore possibly also learning. In our study, a demonstrator was asked to teach a four-phrase musical song to an observer, without constraints on using natural movements or body language to facilitate learning. During this learning session, the demonstrator's and observer's inferior frontal cortices (regions associated with interactive learning of musical songs, Pan et al., 2018) were synchronized through multi-brain alternating current stimulation. The results showed that during multi-brain stimulation, the dyad exhibited spontaneous body movements that were synchronized. This result is intriguing as it reflects a non-explicitly-instructed action synchronization in a social setting (Yun, Watanabe, & Shimojo, 2012), possibly having communicative significance. Importantly, multi-brain stimulation also enhanced final learning outcome. Further analysis disclosed that interpersonal movement synchrony acted as a partial mediator of the effect of multi-brain stimulation on learning performance, i.e., movement

synchrony possibly facilitated the effect of brain stimulation on learning. Altogether, we provided a causal demonstration that exogenous manipulation of BtBC enhanced interpersonal learning through communicative behavior.

Apart from multi-brain stimulation, another experimental approach that has been discussed as relevant for addressing the potentially causal role of BtBC is cross-brain neurofeedback (CBN) (Dikker, Montgomery, & Tunca, 2019; Duan et al., 2013). CBN entails providing feedback of indices of brain activity to interacting people in order to let them possibly regulate BtBC. This could allow researchers to tease apart experimental conditions associated with either higher or lower BtBC, and measure the consequences on social behavior (being a dependent variable). A pioneering study in this area has shown that CBN is feasible (Duan et al., 2013), although its consequences on social behavior have not been explored yet. We note that this approach is not qualitatively different from hyperscanning (i.e., the measurement of two or more brains simultaneously, Babiloni & Astolfi, 2014; Montague et al., 2002), because here the experimenters are not exogenously manipulating BtBC, but they are creating an experimental situation favoring the emergence of BtBC. Yet, as Duan et al. (2013) put it, this approach could provide “more causal insights” than classical hyperscanning does. We believe this is a promising approach and should be exploited further.

In summary, we have highlighted a causative role of BtBC in facilitating social learning. Our view that BtBC can be causally efficacious to improve real-time information transfer between live pairs of individuals stands in contrast to the view of BtBC as purely an epiphenomenon of social learning (at least in some instances).

7. Mechanistic models for brain-to-brain coupling and learning

Several potential mechanistic models can be proposed to account for the suggested (causal) influence of BtBC in social learning (**Fig. 5**). Before that is presented, however, a better understanding of how the field has explained social learning so far is needed. Current

knowledge of social learning suggests that transmission of information during social learning can occur through a variety of mechanisms (Gariépy et al., 2014), including enhancement of attention to others (van de Waal, Renevey, Favre, & Bshary, 2010; Watson & Platt, 2012), recognition of others' reactions (e.g., facial expressions, approach or avoidance behaviors) to stimuli (Golkar, Selbing, Flygare, Ohman, & Olsson, 2013; Olsson et al., 2007; Olsson & Phelps, 2007), motor simulation and imitation (Charpentier, Iigaya, & O'Doherty, 2020; Iacoboni & Mazziotta, 2007), and theory of mind (i.e., modeling the goals, intentions, and emotions of others, Burke et al., 2010; Joiner et al., 2017; Koster-Hale & Saxe, 2013). Though informative, existing models mostly focused on the mechanistic features within the boundary of observers (learners), leaving behavioral/cognitive/affective dependencies between observers and demonstrators less explored.

Beyond the single-person mechanisms for social learning reviewed above, interpersonal neuroscience along with measures of BtBC can offer novel insights. Below, we propose several mechanistic models for BtBC and social learning based on a multi-person perspective (**Fig. 5**). First, temporally concurrent patterns of task-related shared experiences may lead to phase alignment of neural processes across individuals (Leong et al., 2017). Alignment of the phase of brain oscillations was proposed to facilitate efficient information transfer between multiple brain regions in a single brain (Buzsáki, 2009; Fell & Axmacher, 2011). Here, we extend the previous proposal by arguing that phase alignment also contributes to information transfer across brains. Such BtBC might impact upon real-time transfer of ongoing information, and eventually upon learning (Pan et al., 2018; Wass et al., 2020). Also, communicative behaviors (e.g., eye-to-eye contact, Hirsch, Zhang, Noah, & Ono, 2017; Noah et al., 2020) might help resetting the phase of neural oscillations between individuals: as a plausible explanation, if the timing of behaviors during learning reflected the phase of the oscillations in one individual, then this timing information could be used to synchronize the phase of the neural oscillations

of another individual (Hu et al., 2018; Leong et al., 2017). Second, BtBC might either cause, or be caused by, behavioral entrainment (or interpersonal movement synchrony) between individuals (Pan et al., 2021). Behavioral entrainment (associated with BtBC) between individuals has been reported to lead to pro-social effects (Hu et al., 2017), which hypothetically impact learning outcomes (Bevilacqua et al., 2019). The effect of BtBC could also call for other high-order cognitive functions, for instance, joint attention (Dikker et al., 2017; Lachat, Hugueville, Lemaréchal, Conty, & George, 2012; Tomasello, 1995) and shared understanding (Y. Liu et al., 2017; Stephens, Silbert, & Hasson, 2010) that impact learning. Specifically, joint attention has been reported to scaffold social cognition in various social contexts (Mundy & Newell, 2007) and real-life classroom learning (Dikker et al., 2017); shared narrative understanding was correlated with shared neural responses across individuals (Nguyen, Vanderwal, & Hasson, 2019), both of which may lead to better memory retention and learning performance. Moreover, social affective or reward networks might also be recruited (Fairhurst, Janata, & Keller, 2013) and facilitate empathy and emotional contagion that in turn can promote social learning (Pärnamets et al., 2020). Importantly, it should be noted that the potential causal mechanisms described here are not mutually exclusive, and could be working interdependently and/or jointly to promote social learning.

The aforementioned mechanistic models for BtBC and learning are likely to also interact with hormonal and other physiological states (Gvirts & Perlmutter, 2020). Prior reports have demonstrated the roles of opioids and oxytocin in both social behaviors and learning. For instance, Haaker et al. (2017) reported that blockade of endogenous opioids enhanced observational threat learning and activity within the amygdala, midline thalamus and periaqueductal gray in humans (Haaker et al., 2017). The administration of oxytocin enhanced coordination of behaviors (Arueti et al., 2013), as well as BtBC during social coordination (Mu, Guo, & Han, 2016). A large pool of evidence also suggests that oxytocin is crucial for forming

social memories and regulating social behaviors in interactive settings. For example, exposure to a stressed (familiar) partner increased consolation behaviors and anterior cingulate activity of an unstressed partner in rodents, and an injection of an oxytocin receptor antagonist in the anterior cingulate cortex abolished these consolation behaviors (Burkett et al., 2016).

Although these mechanistic models all have merit, the question of whether and how emerging multi-brain techniques can carve nature at its joints, and tap into the real mechanisms, deserves further examination (Hamilton, 2020; Novembre & Iannetti, 2021).

Fig. 5. A synthesized mechanistic framework for brain-to-brain coupling (BtBC) and social learning. BtBC may reflect phase alignment of neural processes across individuals, facilitating efficient information transfer between brains, and therefore social learning. BtBC might either cause, or be caused by, distinct kinds of social alignment (i.e., the coupling of behavioral, cognitive, or emotional states of multiple individuals, Shamay-Tsoory, Saporta, Marton-Alper, & Gvirts, 2019), such as (i) behavioral entrainment (e.g., interpersonal movement synchrony), (ii) cognitive alignment (e.g., shared understanding and joint attention), and (iii) affective contagion (e.g., emotional contagion and empathy). The above mechanistic processes could further interact with hormonal and other physiological states. Note that the three distinct kinds of social alignment might affect learning, either directly or indirectly through other neural mechanisms, irrespectively of BtBC (top arrow); it is also possible that social learning might, in turn, affect BtBC.

8. Current challenges and future opportunities

Currently, the major challenges that constrain the advancements of interpersonal neuroscience in social learning are methodological and interpretational. One significant challenge comes from the lack of a uniform and user-friendly data analysis workflow for interpersonal neuroscience. Compared to standard statistical approaches used in single-person neuroscience, analyzing pipelines for interpersonal neuroscience should consider not only ongoing activity in individuals but also mutual temporal dependencies between individuals, and the potential nesting of participants in dyads and dependence of data points (such as the case that one demonstrator is paired with multiple observers; see e.g. Davidesco et al., 2019). Along this line, pioneering research has attempted to set up standardized analyzing guidelines for interpersonal neuroscience (Ayrolles et al., 2020; Nastase, Gazzola, Hasson, & Keysers, 2019). Another challenge is related to whether BtBC can be described as a mechanism in itself (Hasson et al., 2012), or if it is a measurable reflection or byproduct of psychological processes (e.g., joint attention) (Dikker et al., 2017). In our view, BtBC mechanisms (e.g., how multiple brains are coupled together to allow for efficient interpersonal information transfer; Hasson et al., 2012) are distinguishable from “mechanisms” in conventional neuroscience (by which latent neural properties within a single brain biophysically underlie emergent psychological constructs; Cavanagh & Frank, 2014). The fact that BtBC plays functional roles in social behaviors, suggests that it is not epiphenomenal (though the aforementioned evidence should not be taken as conclusive for all sorts of BtBC discussed in previous studies). Future investigations are needed to address causative issues by, for example, exclusively testing how BtBC can be augmented or perturbed following interventions (e.g., neurostimulation or distractor), and the resulting effects upon psychological constructs and behaviors, in an endeavor to better understand the role of BtBC in learning.

We identify three other important avenues for future research, the first being to apply computational modeling techniques to integrate interpersonal neuroscience and social learning. Computational approaches have been increasingly applied in social learning tasks (Burke et al., 2010; Charpentier et al., 2020; Lindström et al., 2019, 2018; Selbing, Lindström, & Olsson, 2014), but with limited attempts in interpersonal neuroscience (but see Bolis & Schilbach, 2017; Hampton, Bossaerts, & O’Doherty, 2008; Heggli, Cabral, Konvalinka, Vuust, & Kringelbach, 2019). Future efforts are needed to formulate a neuro-computational account for social learning in two- or multi-person experimental setups. A second important research avenue pertains to the diagnostic techniques and complementary interventions for learning deficits or maladaptive learning (Schilbach, 2016). Compared to social observation scales and instruments, which rely heavily on raters’ subjective experience, interpersonal neuroscientific approaches might lead to earlier and more sensitive identification of atypical interpersonal/social learning behaviors (Leong & Schilbach, 2019; Schilbach, 2016). Such state-of-the-art technologies, e.g., multi-brain stimulation (Novembre & Iannetti, 2021; Novembre et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2021) and cross-brain neurofeedback (Dikker et al., 2019; Duan et al., 2013), could make a significant contribution by addressing methodological and translational barriers. Finally, when aiming for a better understanding of the significance of BtBC, it might be ideal for future research to adopt multimodal recordings, such as EEG-fMRI hyperscanning, to obtain complementary temporal and spatial information.

Acknowledgements

We thank Joy Hirsch, Adam Noah, and Philip Pärnamets for helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by a Consolidator Grant (2018-00877) from the Swedish Research Foundation (Vetenskapsrådet) and the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW 2014.0237) to Andreas Olsson.

Author contributions

Yafeng Pan, Giacomo Novembre, and Andreas Olsson wrote the manuscript.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared that there were no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or the publication of this article.

References

- Apps, M. A. J., Rushworth, M. F. S., & Chang, S. W. C. (2016). The Anterior Cingulate Gyrus and Social Cognition: Tracking the Motivation of Others. *Neuron*, 90(4), 692–707. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.04.018>
- Aquino, T. G., Minxha, J., Dunne, S., Ross, I. B., Mamelak, A. N., Rutishauser, U., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2020). Value-related neuronal responses in the human amygdala during observational learning. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, JN-RM-2897-19. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2897-19.2020>
- Arueti, M., Perach-Barzilay, N., Tsoory, M. M., Berger, B., Getter, N., & Shamay-Tsoory, S. G. (2013). When Two Become One: The Role of Oxytocin in Interpersonal Coordination and Cooperation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25(9), 1418–1427. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00400
- Ayrolles, A., Brun, F., Chen, P., Djalovski, A., Beauxis, Y., Delorme, R., ... Dumas, G. (2020).

- HyPyP: a Hyperscanning Python Pipeline for inter-brain connectivity analysis. *PsyArXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/x5apu>
- Babiloni, F., & Astolfi, L. (2014). Social neuroscience and hyperscanning techniques: Past, present and future. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 44, 76–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.07.006>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Behrens, T. E. J., Hunt, L. T., & Rushworth, M. F. S. (2009). The Computation of Social Behavior. *Science*, 324(5931), 1160–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1169694>
- Bevilacqua, D., Davidesco, I., Wan, L., Chaloner, K., Rowland, J., Ding, M., ... Dikker, S. (2019). Brain-to-Brain Synchrony and Learning Outcomes Vary by Student–Teacher Dynamics: Evidence from a Real-world Classroom Electroencephalography Study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 31(3), 401–411.
https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01274
- Bilek, E., Ruf, M., Schäfer, A., Akdeniz, C., Calhoun, V. D., Schmahl, C., ... Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2015). Information flow between interacting human brains: Identification, validation, and relationship to social expertise. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(16), 5207–5212. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1421831112>
- Bolis, D., & Schilbach, L. (2017). Beyond one Bayesian brain: Modeling intra- and inter-personal processes during social interaction: Commentary on “Mentalizing homeostasis: The social origins of interoceptive inference” by Fotopoulou & Tsakiris. *Neuropsychanalysis*, 19(1), 35–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15294145.2017.1295215>
- Boyd, R., Richerson, P. J., & Henrich, J. (2011). The cultural niche: Why social learning is essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(Supplement_2), 10918–10925. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1100290108>

- Burke, C. J., Tobler, P. N., Baddeley, M., & Schultz, W. (2010). Neural mechanisms of observational learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(32), 14431–14436. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1003111107>
- Burkett, J. P., Andari, E., Johnson, Z. V., Curry, D. C., de Waal, F. B. M., & Young, L. J. (2016). Oxytocin-dependent consolation behavior in rodents. *Science*, 351(6271), 375–378. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4785>
- Buzsáki, G. (2009). Rhythms of the Brain. In *Rhythms of the Brain*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195301069.001.0001>
- Cao, Z., Hidalgo Martinez, G., Simon, T., Wei, S.-E., & Sheikh, Y. A. (2019). OpenPose: Realtime Multi-Person 2D Pose Estimation using Part Affinity Fields. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2019.2929257>
- Carter, R. M., Bowling, D. L., Reeck, C., & Huettel, S. A. (2012). A Distinct Role of the Temporal-Parietal Junction in Predicting Socially Guided Decisions. *Science*, 337(6090), 109–111. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1219681>
- Cavanagh, J. F., & Frank, M. J. (2014). Frontal theta as a mechanism for cognitive control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(8), 414–421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.012>
- Charpentier, C. J., Iigaya, K., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2020). A Neuro-computational Account of Arbitration between Choice Imitation and Goal Emulation during Human Observational Learning. *Neuron*, 106(4), 687–699.e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.02.028>
- Cohen, S. S., Madsen, J., Touchan, G., Robles, D., Lima, S. F. A., Henin, S., & Parra, L. C. (2018). Neural engagement with online educational videos predicts learning performance for individual students. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 155, 60–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2018.06.011>

- Cui, X., Bryant, D. M., & Reiss, A. L. (2012). NIRS-based hyperscanning reveals increased interpersonal coherence in superior frontal cortex during cooperation. *NeuroImage*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.09.003>
- D'Ausilio, A., Novembre, G., Fadiga, L., & Keller, P. E. (2015). What can music tell us about social interaction? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19(3), 111–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.01.005>
- Dai, B., Chen, C., Long, Y., Zheng, L., Zhao, H., Bai, X., ... Lu, C. (2018). Neural mechanisms for selectively tuning in to the target speaker in a naturalistic noisy situation. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04819-z>
- Davidesco, I., Laurent, E., Valk, H., West, T., Dikker, S., Milne, C., & Poeppel, D. (2019). Brain-to-brain synchrony predicts long-term memory retention more accurately than individual brain measures. *BioRxiv*, 644047. <https://doi.org/10.1101/644047>
- Debiec, J., & Olsson, A. (2017). Social Fear Learning: from Animal Models to Human Function. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(7), 546–555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.04.010>
- Delaherche, E., Dumas, G., Nadel, J., & Chetouani, M. (2015). Automatic measure of imitation during social interaction: A behavioral and hyperscanning-EEG benchmark. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 66, 118–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2014.09.002>
- Dikker, S., Montgomery, S., & Tunca, S. (2019). Using Synchrony-Based Neurofeedback in Search of Human Connectedness. In *Brain Art* (pp. 161–206). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14323-7_6
- Dikker, S., Wan, L., Davidesco, I., Kaggen, L., Oostrik, M., McClintock, J., ... Poeppel, D. (2017). Brain-to-Brain Synchrony Tracks Real-World Dynamic Group Interactions in the Classroom. *Current Biology*, 27(9), 1375–1380.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.04.002>

Duan, L., Liu, W. J., Dai, R. N., Li, R., Lu, C. M., Huang, Y. X., & Zhu, C. Z. (2013). Cross-Brain Neurofeedback: Scientific Concept and Experimental Platform. *PLoS ONE*, 8(5).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064590>

Dumas, G., Nadel, J., Soussignan, R., Martinerie, J., & Garnero, L. (2010). Inter-Brain Synchronization during Social Interaction. *PLoS ONE*, 5(8), e12166.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012166>

Fairhurst, Janata, P., & Keller, P. E. (2013). Being and Feeling in Sync with an Adaptive Virtual Partner: Brain Mechanisms Underlying Dynamic Cooperativity. *Cerebral Cortex*, 23(11), 2592–2600.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs243>

Fairhurst, M. T., & Dumas, G. (2019). *Reciprocity and alignment: quantifying coupling in dynamic interactions*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/nmg4x>

Fan, Y.-T., Chen, C., & Cheng, Y. (2016). The Neural Mechanisms of Social Learning from Fleeting Experience with Pain. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 10, 11.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00011>

Fell, J., & Axmacher, N. (2011, February 20). The role of phase synchronization in memory processes. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, Vol. 12, pp. 105–118.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2979>

Fiorito, G., & Scotto, P. (1992). Observational Learning in *Octopus vulgaris*. *Science*, 256(5056), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.256.5056.545>

Gariépy, J.-F., Watson, K. K., Du, E., Xie, D. L., Erb, J., Amasino, D., & Platt, M. L. (2014). Social learning in humans and other animals. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 8, 58.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2014.00058>

Golkar, A., Selbing, I., Flygare, O., Ohman, A., & Olsson, A. (2013). Other people as means to

- a safe end: vicarious extinction blocks the return of learned fear. *Psychological Science*, 24(11), 2182–2190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613489890>
- Gruber, T., Muller, M. N., Strimling, P., Wrangham, R., & Zuberbühler, K. (2009). Wild Chimpanzees Rely on Cultural Knowledge to Solve an Experimental Honey Acquisition Task. *Current Biology*, 19(21), 1806–1810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.08.060>
- Gvirts, H. Z., & Perlmutter, R. (2020). What Guides Us to Neurally and Behaviorally Align With Anyone Specific? A Neurobiological Model Based on fNIRS Hyperscanning Studies. *The Neuroscientist*, 26(2), 108–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858419861912>
- Haaker, J., Yi, J., Petrovic, P., & Olsson, A. (2017). Endogenous opioids regulate social threat learning in humans. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15495>
- Hamilton, A. F. de C. (2020). Hyperscanning: Beyond the Hype. *Neuron*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.11.008>
- Hampton, A. N., Bossaerts, P., & O’Doherty, J. P. (2008). Neural correlates of mentalizing-related computations during strategic interactions in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(18), 6741–6746. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0711099105>
- Hasson, U., Ghazanfar, A. A., Galantucci, B., Garrod, S., & Keysers, C. (2012). Brain-to-brain coupling: A mechanism for creating and sharing a social world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.12.007>
- Heggli, O. A., Cabral, J., Konvalinka, I., Vuust, P., & Kringelbach, M. L. (2019). A Kuramoto model of self-other integration across interpersonal synchronization strategies. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 15(10), e1007422. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007422>
- Hesslow, G. (2002). Conscious thought as simulation of behaviour and perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(6), 242–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(02\)01913-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(02)01913-7)

- Hirsch, J., Zhang, X., Noah, J. A., & Ono, Y. (2017). Frontal temporal and parietal systems synchronize within and across brains during live eye-to-eye contact. *NeuroImage*, 157, 314–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.06.018>
- Holleman, G. A., Hooge, I. T. C., Kemner, C., & Hessels, R. S. (2020). The ‘Real-World Approach’ and Its Problems: A Critique of the Term Ecological Validity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 721. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00721>
- Holper, L., Goldin, A. P., Shalóm, D. E., Battro, A. M., Wolf, M., & Sigman, M. (2013). The teaching and the learning brain: A cortical hemodynamic marker of teacher-student interactions in the Socratic dialog. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2013.02.002>
- Hou, Y., Song, B., Hu, Y., Pan, Y., & Hu, Y. (2020). The averaged inter-brain coherence between the audience and a violinist predicts the popularity of violin performance. *NeuroImage*, 211, 116655. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116655>
- Hu, Y., Hu, Y., Li, X., Pan, Y., & Cheng, X. (2017). Brain-to-brain synchronization across two persons predicts mutual prosociality. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(12). <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx118>
- Hu, Y., Pan, Y., Shi, X., Cai, Q., Li, X., & Cheng, X. (2018). Inter-brain synchrony and cooperation context in interactive decision making. *Biological Psychology*, 133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2017.12.005>
- Iacoboni, M., & Mazziotta, J. C. (2007). Mirror neuron system: basic findings and clinical applications. *Annals of Neurology*, 62(3), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21198>
- Jiang, J., Chen, C., Dai, B., Shi, G., Ding, G., Liu, L., ... Fiske, S. T. (2015). Leader emergence through interpersonal neural synchronization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(14), 4274–4279.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1422930112>

- Jiang, J., Dai, B., Peng, D., Zhu, C., Liu, L., & Lu, C. (2012). Neural Synchronization during Face-to-Face Communication. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(45), 16064–16069. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2926-12.2012>
- Joiner, J., Piva, M., Turrin, C., & Chang, S. W. C. (2017a). Social learning through prediction error in the brain. *Npj Science of Learning*, 2(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-017-0009-2>
- Joiner, J., Piva, M., Turrin, C., & Chang, S. W. C. (2017b). Social learning through prediction error in the brain. *Npj Science of Learning*, 2(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-017-0009-2>
- Kingsbury, L., Huang, S., Wang, J., Gu, K., Golshani, P., Wu, Y. E., & Hong, W. (2019). Correlated Neural Activity and Encoding of Behavior across Brains of Socially Interacting Animals. *Cell*, 178(2), 429-446.e16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.05.022>
- Knoch, D., Pascual-Leone, A., Meyer, K., Treyer, V., & Fehr, E. (2006). Diminishing Reciprocal Fairness by Disrupting the Right Prefrontal Cortex. *Science*, 314(5800), 829–832. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1129156>
- Kober, H., Buhle, J., Weber, J., Ochsner, K. N., & Wager, T. D. (2019). Let it be: mindful acceptance down-regulates pain and negative emotion. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 14(11), 1147–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsz104>
- Koster-Hale, J., & Saxe, R. (2013). Theory of Mind: A Neural Prediction Problem. *Neuron*, 79(5), 836–848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.08.020>
- Kostorz, K., Flanagin, V. L., & Glasauer, S. (2020). Synchronization between instructor and observer when learning a complex bimanual skill. *NeuroImage*, 116659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116659>

- Koza, J. R., Bennett, F. H., Andre, D., & Keane, M. A. (1996). Automated Design of Both the Topology and Sizing of Analog Electrical Circuits Using Genetic Programming. In *Artificial Intelligence in Design '96* (pp. 151–170). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-0279-4_9
- Lachat, F., Hugueville, L., Lemaréchal, J.-D., Conty, L., & George, N. (2012). Oscillatory Brain Correlates of Live Joint Attention: A Dual-EEG Study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00156>
- LeDoux, J. (2012). Rethinking the Emotional Brain. *Neuron*, 73(4), 653–676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2012.02.004>
- Leong, V., Byrne, E., Clackson, K., Georgieva, S., Lam, S., & Wass, S. (2017). Speaker gaze increases information coupling between infant and adult brains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(50), 13290–13295. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702493114>
- Leong, V., & Schilbach, L. (2019). The promise of two-person neuroscience for developmental psychiatry: using interaction-based sociometrics to identify disorders of social interaction. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 215(5), 636–638. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2019.73>
- Lindström, B., Golkar, A., Jangard, S., Tobler, P. N., & Olsson, A. (2019). Social threat learning transfers to decision making in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(10), 4732–4737. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810180116>
- Lindström, B., Haaker, J., & Olsson, A. (2018). A common neural network differentially mediates direct and social fear learning. *NeuroImage*, 167, 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.11.039>
- Liu, J., Zhang, R., Geng, B., Zhang, T., Yuan, D., Otani, S., & Li, X. (2019). Interplay between

- prior knowledge and communication mode on teaching effectiveness: Interpersonal neural synchronization as a neural marker. *NeuroImage*, 193, 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.03.004>
- Liu, Y., Piazza, E. A., Simony, E., Shewokis, P. A., Onaral, B., Hasson, U., & Ayaz, H. (2017). Measuring speaker-listener neural coupling with functional near infrared spectroscopy. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 43293. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep43293>
- López-Solà, M., Geuter, S., Koban, L., Coan, J. A., & Wager, T. D. (2019). Brain mechanisms of social touch-induced analgesia in females. *PAIN*, 160(9), 2072–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001599>
- Lytle, S. R., Garcia-Sierra, A., & Kuhl, P. K. (2018). Two are better than one: Infant language learning from video improves in the presence of peers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(40), 9859–9866. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1611621115>
- Montague, P. (2002). Hyperscanning: Simultaneous fMRI during Linked Social Interactions. *NeuroImage*, 16(4), 1159–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2002.1150>
- Mu, Y., Guo, C., & Han, S. (2016). Oxytocin enhances inter-brain synchrony during social coordination in male adults. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 11(12), 1882–1893. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw106>
- Mundy, P., & Newell, L. (2007). Attention, Joint Attention, and Social Cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(5), 269–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00518.x>
- Nastase, S. A., Gazzola, V., Hasson, U., & Keysers, C. (2019). Measuring shared responses across subjects using intersubject correlation. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 14(6), 667–685. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsz037>
- Nguyen, M., Vanderwal, T., & Hasson, U. (2019). Shared understanding of narratives is

- correlated with shared neural responses. *NeuroImage*, 184, 161–170.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.09.010>
- Noah, J. A., Zhang, X., Dravida, S., Ono, Y., Naples, A., McPartland, J. C., & Hirsch, J. (2020). Real-Time Eye-to-Eye Contact Is Associated With Cross-Brain Neural Coupling in Angular Gyrus. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 14, 19.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00019>
- Novembre, G., & Iannetti, G. D. (2021). Hyperscanning Alone Cannot Prove Causality. Multibrain Stimulation Can. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(2), 96–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.11.003>
- Novembre, G., Knoblich, G., Dunne, L., & Keller, P. E. (2017). Interpersonal synchrony enhanced through 20 Hz phase-coupled dual brain stimulation. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(4), 662–670. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw172>
- Olsson, A., Knapska, E., & Lindström, B. (2020). The neural and computational systems of social learning. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 21(4), 197–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-0276-4>
- Olsson, A., Nearing, K. I., & Phelps, E. A. (2007). Learning fears by observing others: The neural systems of social fear transmission. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsm005>
- Olsson, A., & Phelps, E. A. (2007). Social learning of fear. *Nature Neuroscience*, 10(9), 1095–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1968>
- Pan, Y. (2019). *Instructor-learner brain synchronization tracks interactive learning: Identification, modulation, and causation*. Université libre de Bruxelles.
- Pan, Y., Borragán, G., & Peigneux, P. (2019). Applications of Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy in Fatigue, Sleep Deprivation, and Social Cognition. *Brain Topography*,

- 32(6), 998–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-019-00740-w>
- Pan, Y., Dikker, S., Goldstein, P., Zhu, Y., Yang, C., & Hu, Y. (2020). Instructor-learner brain coupling discriminates between instructional approaches and predicts learning. *NeuroImage*, 211, 116657. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116657>
- Pan, Y., Guyon, C., Borragán, G., Hu, Y., & Peigneux, P. (2020). Interpersonal brain synchronization with instructor compensates for learner's sleep deprivation in interactive learning. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 114111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcp.2020.114111>
- Pan, Y., Novembre, G., Song, B., Li, X., & Hu, Y. (2018). Interpersonal synchronization of inferior frontal cortices tracks social interactive learning of a song. *NeuroImage*, 183, 280–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.08.005>
- Pan, Y., Novembre, G., Song, B., Zhu, Y., & Hu, Y. (2021). Dual brain stimulation enhances interpersonal learning through spontaneous movement synchrony. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 16(1–2), 210–221. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsaa080>
- Pärnamets, P., Espinosa, L., & Olsson, A. (2020). Physiological synchrony predicts observational threat learning in humans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1927), 20192779. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2779>
- Piazza, E. A., Hasenfratz, L., Hasson, U., & Lew-Williams, C. (2020). Infant and Adult Brains Are Coupled to the Dynamics of Natural Communication. *Psychological Science*, 31(1), 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619878698>
- Pobric, G., Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Zahn, R. (2016). Hemispheric Specialization within the Superior Anterior Temporal Cortex for Social and Nonsocial Concepts. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 28(3), 351–360. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00902
- Ramseyer, F., & Tschacher, W. (2011). Nonverbal synchrony in psychotherapy: Coordinated body movement reflects relationship quality and outcome. *Journal of Consulting and*

- Clinical Psychology*, 79(3), 284–295. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023419>
- Redcay, E., & Schilbach, L. (2019). Using second-person neuroscience to elucidate the mechanisms of social interaction. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 20(8), 495–505. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-019-0179-4>
- Reddish, P., Tong, E. M. W., Jong, J., Lanman, J. A., & Whitehouse, H. (2016). Collective synchrony increases prosociality towards non-performers and outgroup members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(4), 722–738. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12165>
- Schilbach, L. (2016). Towards a second-person neuropsychiatry. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1686), 20150081. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0081>
- Schilbach, L., Timmermans, B., Reddy, V., Costall, A., Bente, G., Schlicht, T., & Vogeley, K. (2013). Toward a second-person neuroscience. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(4), 393–414. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12000660>
- Selbing, I., Lindström, B., & Olsson, A. (2014). Demonstrator skill modulates observational aversive learning. *Cognition*, 133(1), 128–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.06.010>
- Shamay-Tsoory, S. G., & Mendelsohn, A. (2019). Real-Life Neuroscience: An Ecological Approach to Brain and Behavior Research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(5), 841–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619856350>
- Shamay-Tsoory, S. G., Saporta, N., Marton-Alper, I. Z., & Gvirts, H. Z. (2019). Herding Brains: A Core Neural Mechanism for Social Alignment. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(3), 174–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.01.002>
- Sherry, D. F., & Galef, B. G. (1984). Cultural transmission without imitation: Milk bottle opening by birds. *Animal Behaviour*, 32(3), 937–938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003->

- Stephens, G. J., Silbert, L. J., & Hasson, U. (2010). Speaker-listener neural coupling underlies successful communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(32), 14425–14430. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1008662107>
- Takeuchi, N., Mori, T., Suzukamo, Y., & Izumi, S.-I. (2017). Integration of Teaching Processes and Learning Assessment in the Prefrontal Cortex during a Video Game Teaching–learning Task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 2052. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02052>
- Thornton, A. (2008). Social learning about novel foods in young meerkats. *Animal Behaviour*, 76(4), 1411–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.07.007>
- Tomasello, M. . (1995). Joint attention as social cognition. In C. Moore & P. Dunham (Eds.), *Joint attention: its origins and role in development* (pp. 103–130). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- van de Waal, E., Borgeaud, C., & Whiten, A. (2013). Potent Social Learning and Conformity Shape a Wild Primate’s Foraging Decisions. *Science*, 340(6131), 483–485. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232769>
- van de Waal, E., Renevey, N., Favre, C., & Bshary, R. (2010). Selective attention to philopatric models causes directed social learning in wild vervet monkeys. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277(1691), 2105–2111. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.2260>
- Van Overwalle, F., D’aes, T., & Mariën, P. (2015). Social cognition and the cerebellum: A meta-analytic connectivity analysis. *Human Brain Mapping*, 36(12), 5137–5154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.23002>
- Wass, S. V., Noreika, V., Georgieva, S., Clackson, K., Brightman, L., Nutbrown, R., ... Leong,

- V. (2018). Parental neural responsivity to infants' visual attention: How mature brains influence immature brains during social interaction. *PLOS Biology*, 16(12), e2006328. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2006328>
- Wass, S. V., Whitehorn, M., Marriott Haresign, I., Phillips, E., & Leong, V. (2020). Interpersonal Neural Entrainment during Early Social Interaction. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(4), 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.01.006>
- Watson, K. K., & Platt, M. L. (2012). Social Signals in Primate Orbitofrontal Cortex. *Current Biology*, 22(23), 2268–2273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.10.016>
- Wisdom, T. N., Song, X., & Goldstone, R. L. (2013). Social Learning Strategies in Networked Groups. *Cognitive Science*, 37(8), 1383–1425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12052>
- Yun, K., Watanabe, K., & Shimojo, S. (2012). Interpersonal body and neural synchronization as a marker of implicit social interaction. *Scientific Reports*, 2(1), 959. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00959>
- Zhang, & Gläscher, J. (2020). A brain network supporting social influences in human decision-making. *Science Advances*, 6(34), eabb4159. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb4159>
- Zhang, W., & Yartsev, M. M. (2019). Correlated Neural Activity across the Brains of Socially Interacting Bats. *Cell*, 178(2), 413–428.e22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.05.023>
- Zheng, L., Chen, C., Liu, W., Long, Y., Zhao, H., Bai, X., ... Lu, C. (2018). Enhancement of teaching outcome through neural prediction of the students' knowledge state. *Human Brain Mapping*, 39(7), 3046–3057. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24059>
- Zhu, Y., Pan, Y., & Hu, Y. (2019). Learning desire is predicted by similar neural processing of naturalistic educational materials. *ENeuro*, 6(5). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0083-19.2019>