

Spatial Embedding of Edges in a Synaptic Generative Model of *C. elegans*

Zachary Laborde and Eduardo J. Izquierdo

Cognitive Science Program, Indiana University Bloomington
Program in Neural Science, Indiana University Bloomington
zlaborde@iu.edu

Abstract

The human brain is poorly understood. Although insufficient, understanding its structure is necessary to understanding how it operates. This structure on a microscale can vary wildly between individuals. Understanding how these networks form would help us in understanding this variability. With a relatively small and (near) completely reconstructed connectome, *C. elegans* is an ideal subject for this topic. Computational modeling of these processes can begin to answer these questions, potentially leading to new insights that would otherwise be difficult to attain. Previous research has attempted this by stochastically assigning connections, weighted by distance. We created a minimal model for understanding how neurites result in the particular of network attributes found in *C. elegans*.

Introduction

Despite tremendous computational power, no person has been able to create an algorithm as capable as the human brain. With its approximately 86 billion neurons (Azevedo et al., 2009), the human brain is an organ so complex that charting its synaptic connections alone is a monumental task (Van Essen et al., 2012). Tremendous time and effort are being invested in the creation of a complete human connectome without a definitive explanation of how this data would explain how the human brain functions (Ceylan et al., 2022; Rheault et al., 2020). Accurate mapping of these connections in living brains alone prove difficult given modern technological limitations (Rheault et al., 2020). With a neuronal network that is approximately one percent of one percent the size of a human’s (Azevedo et al., 2009; White et al., 1986), *Caenorhabditis elegans* has the most complete connectome mapped at the cellular level (White et al., 1986). One might expect that the neural functions of *C. elegans* would be well understood. However, the dynamics and behaviors of the *C. elegans* neuronal network (CENN) have not been accurately replicated. To truly understand how a brain works, a neuronal model replicating the structure and dynamics of said brain is essential (Izquierdo, 2019).

Synaptic connections are a fundamental part of microscale connectomes (Sporns et al., 2005), but many of these connections vary dramatically across individuals. Over half of all synaptic connections within an adult *C. elegans* are variable (Witvliet et al., 2021). While the topology of synaptic connections cannot predict the dynamics of a neuronal network, it does restrict what sort of dynamics are possible (Prinz et al., 2004). The process of trying to model it will likely help us understand the principles of how the variability arises and its significance for behavior in living organisms. The CENN exhibits consistent global attributes despite having so many variations (Pérez-Escudero and Polavieja, 2007). What combination of variable connections result in a biologically accurate CENN remains unclear (Witvliet et al., 2021). Without knowing of what variables are important in its formation, our understanding of the *C. elegans* neuronal network, and brains in general, is severely limited.

Knowing what neuronal network topologies are possible for a neurotypical *C. elegans* is necessary to accurately modeling the entire dynamical CENN. Manually mapping all possible topologies of *C. elegans* leads to a combinatorial explosion. With 302 neurons, there are 302^{302} or $\sim 9 \cdot 10^{748}$ possible connection configurations for the CENN. This only becomes worse with more complex organisms such as *Drosophila* or humans. A trial-and-error approach is impractical in this context. Thus, we cannot reasonably expect to understand the nature of *C. elegans* connectomic structure from large sets of connectome data alone.

Generative models are a promising method for understanding network formation and the parameter space where particular connectomes lie. Generative network models create networks from a set of rules defining where and how connections are created (Betz et al., 2017). By focusing on how networks form and not on a complete list of nodes and edges, generative models are applicable to many brains, not just a single instance of one. These models are an effective solution for neu-

ronal networks of any complexity.

Several generative models attempt to accurately predict the network topology of *C. elegans* (Costa et al., 2007; Itzhack and Louzoun, 2010; Khajezade et al., 2019; Nicosia et al., 2013). The Random Distance Dependent Attachment Model (RDDAM) is one such model (Itzhack and Louzoun, 2010). It randomly forms connections with a probability that logarithmically decreases with an increase in spatial distance between two neurons. The RDDAM creates networks shown to resemble the CENN in average length of connections, average connectivity, and shortest path length distribution. Given its simple rules that align with observed neuronal organization in *C. elegans* (Pérez-Escudero and Polavieja, 2007), the RDDAM provides an excellent framework for future generative models of CENN connectivity to which to compare or improve. An essential aspect of the RDDAM is the spatial embedding of each neuron. Neurons exist in physical space, interacting chemically and electrically with their surroundings. What connections they make are in part a result of their location relative to other cells (Hentschel and Ooyen, 2000; Kaiser and Hilgetag, 2006; Pérez-Escudero and Polavieja, 2007).

Spatial embedding is not only relevant for the somas but for the neurites as well. Neurites take up physical space within the body of *C. elegans*, limiting how many connections are physically possible within the organism. The neurons of *C. elegans* each have one or two neurites which rarely branch, forming most of their connections as “en passant” synapses (i.e. synapses that do not form at the tip of the axon) (Durbin, 1987; White et al., 1986). This pattern of neuronal connectivity is not accounted for in existing models of *C. elegans* neuronal connectivity (Costa et al., 2007; Itzhack and Louzoun, 2010; Khajezade et al., 2019; Nicosia et al., 2013). Constraining connectivity to intersections along the path of a neurite may result in a network which is more similar to CENN than the results of existing generative model. This leads us to the question: How much of the *C. elegans* neuronal network structure is explained by the spatial embedding of its neurites?

Model and Methods

We sought to understand how spatial embedding of neurites might explain the neural organizational structure of *C. elegans*. We developed a model to create sets of networks which attempt to recreate the process of neurite growth and synapse formation in Euclidean space. Our aim with this model is examine how neurites impact the structure of a network while keeping the number of assumptions to as few as possible.

Data

The length and organization of neural processes in *C. elegans* are highly variable, particularly in the pharyngeal nervous system. To simplify this, this research focused on the neurons in the frontal ganglia, whose length in connections are less variable.

The synaptic connections of a single L1 (~ 0 hours) and two adult/L5 *C. elegans* were acquired from Witvliet et al. (2021). A third adult/L5 connectome was acquired from Durbin (1987)’s N2U, an updated version of the original White et al. (1986) connectome. 3D positions of the neurons were taken from Skuhersky et al. (2022).

Model

We developed a generative model which spatially embeds edges as well as nodes. It replicates the process of neurite growth and synaptogenesis while keeping the number of assumptions and parameters to a minimum. Doing so allows us to better understand how spatial embedding of neurites alone impacts the makeup of the connectome.

This model will be referred to as the Spatially Embedded Edge Model (SEEM). SEEM iterates over every node. Each node locates the node closest to it that is on the opposite side of the nerve ring, a region which contains more than half of all neural processes (Altun, 2017). We refer to these target nodes as the source node’s “penpal.” A line segment is drawn from the source node through the target node, terminating at the surface of the bounding box of the network (see fig 1). The bounding box is defined as the smallest 3D box that can hold all nodes in the network. These line segments are intended to represent a single neurite. Since most neurons in *C. elegans* only have 1-2 neurites, we chose for each neuron to exhibit a single neurite in our model.

After all “neurites” have been drawn, the minimum distance between any two line segments are recorded. Given these neurons have a diameter of 2-3 microns (Schafer, 2006), a distance less than or equal to 3 microns (ε) between any two lines will be considered an overlap. All possible edges in the model have now been determined. To generate a network, a random selection of directed edges are selected from the set of all possible edges. The number of edges selected can be adjusted. For these experiments, we used as many edges as were in the comparable *C. elegans* neuronal network. The code for this algorithm can be found at the link listed under *Data and Code Availability*.

Additional Model

Our model assumes a particular directionality of its neurons. To account for what effects this assumption




Figure 1: **TODO: Change the Neural Ring to Nerve Ring** Visual depiction of the Spatially Embedded Edge Model (SEEM) algorithm. For each neuron, SEEM finds the neuron whose soma is closest to it and opposite the Nerve Ring (i.e. the neuron’s “penpal”). The algorithm then draws a line segment in 3D space, representative of a neurite, originating in the neuron’s soma, extending through the soma of the “penpal,” and terminating at the boundaries of the body of *C. elegans* (blue lines in left side figure). The boundaries are calculated as a range from the minimum coordinate - ε to the maximum coordinate - ε for each dimension (x, y, z). ε is defined as the width of a neurite (3 μm). If two of these “neurites” are $\leq \varepsilon$ away from one another, the two neurons of these neurites form a potential connection (middle figure). A random subset of these potential connections are chosen equal to the number of total connections found in the *C. elegans* network to which it is being compared.

might have on the results, we created a second model for comparison. The Randomly Embedded Edge Model (REEM) is created in the same way as our other model (SEEM) with one key difference. Rather than passing through the closest neuron opposite of the nerve ring, this model’s neurites form in random directions. This model can explain our algorithm for determining neurite direction influences the results.

Networks for Comparison

In addition to our models, we chose two other sets of networks to compare. The first are a set of networks resulting from the Random Distance Dependent Model (RDDAM) from Itzhack and Louzoun (2010). This network will allow us to see the role of distance between soma alone plays in the network structure. This model determines whether or not to form a connection with the probability function $p(i \rightarrow j) = c(d)^{-\alpha}$. Keeping in line with the original implementation, we kept α to 2.5 and adjusted c so that the resulting number of connections would roughly match the number in the compared *C. elegans* frontal ganglia.

The second set of networks chosen for comparison are a set of random networks. We determined the Erdos-Renyi random network (ERN) to be a suitable random network for our analyses. These random networks will allow us to understand what results are a result of chance and what results are meaningful.

Network Comparison Methods

We compared the four chosen *C. elegans* connectomes with the resulting networks of our model, the Spatially

Embedded Edge Model (SEEM). To better assess the insights from our model, we also compare the results from a model from the literature, the Random Distance Dependent Attachment Model (RDDAM), and with two null models: the Randomly Embedded Edge Model (REEM), and a set of Erdos-Renyi networks (ERN). For each connectome, each model was run for 100 iterations, resulting in 100 possible graphs. Each metric was run over every instance of the graph and the average value was recorded.

In order to make the comparison between different networks, we selected four distinct graph-theoretic properties: the average clustering coefficient, the average edge distance, the average connectivity, and the total number of bidirectional links. These measures are useful means of understanding the general structure of the networks in question and were used when comparing the RDDAM to *C. elegans* (Itzhack and Louzoun, 2010).

The clustering coefficient measures number of instances where two neighbors of a node are connected divided by the total number of instances possible ($k(i)(k(i) - 1)$ in a directed graph where $k(i)$ is the degree of node i). As the name suggests, it helps us to understand how clustered a network is and get a better idea of how interconnected all nodes in the network are on average.

The average edge distance measures the average length of each link/edge in Euclidean space. Given that many of these model account for Euclidean space when forming connections, this measure is relevant. It gives us an idea of how long these connections are, providing

a simple understanding of how these networks compare with *C. elegans*.

The average connectivity measures the average local connectivity between all pairs of nodes in the network. Local connectivity is defined as the minimum number of nodes that need to be pruned from the network to result in no paths connecting the two (resulting in 2 or more connected components). The average connectivity of the network can provide us with an idea of the network’s redundancy, which can coincide with its metabolic efficiency and its resilience to perturbation.

The total number of bidirectional edges is the number of instances where two nodes are connected to each other in a directed graph. When comparing graphs with similar number of edges, this property can help us to understand if nodes prefer to connected with neighbors. It can also show if there is a large amount of symmetry in the network.

For a better understanding of how these networks are distributed, we also compared two distributions for all networks. These were degree distribution and edge distance distribution. Degree distribution gives us a general idea of the network’s structure, and the edge distance distribution shows us how these connections project into Euclidean space.

To see how descriptive these models are of the *C. elegans* frontal ganglia, we plotted a random network from each of these models in 3D Euclidean space. We also calculated the overlapping edges of each network to conclusively understand how close any of these models were to replicating a *C. elegans* connectome.

Results

To answer the question of whether spatially embedding edges is an important factor in the formation of the *C. elegans* Neural Network (CENN), we compared networks from our initial model (SEEM) with *C. elegans*. We wanted to minimize the number of assumptions made in the model. To account for the assumption made in determining neurite direction in SEEM, we compared these results with a random direction version of our model (REEM). We also compared these networks with the Random Distance Dependent Attachment Model (RDDAM) from Itzhack and Louzoun (2010) and a set of random networks (Erdos-Renyi Networks / ERN) to gauge how close our model is to the *C. elegans* network. To rule out development as a factor, we made comparisons to both a single L1 connectome (~ 0 hours) and a set of 3 adult (L5) connectomes. We measured these generative network models from a set of 100.

L1	SEEM	RDDA	ERN	REEM	CENN
Clustering Coefficient	0.07	0.14	0.03	0.06	0.12
Edge Distance	16.27	6.62	19.07	17.10	15.33
Average Connectivity	1.86	2.24	2.59	2.33	1.35
Total Bidirectional Links	22.77	82.41	7.23	33.92	50.00

Table 1: Average network statistics of 100 networks from models when compared with newborn *C. elegans* (L1, ~ 0 hours)

L5	SEEM	RDDA	ERN	REEM	CENN
Clustering Coefficient	0.17	0.24	0.06	0.14	0.20
Edge Distance	16.27	7.39	19.20	16.86	15.17
Average Connectivity	15.05	18.46	20.23	18.02	4.60
Total Bidirectional Links	116.52	251.76	35.13	178.16	150.33

Table 2: Average network statistics of 300 networks from models when compared with the average of 3 adult *C. elegans* (L5)

Network Statistics

Comparing these networks can be done in several different ways. As an initial comparison, we chose to use network statistics to compare essential aspects of these graphs. We chose to compare the average clustering coefficient, average edge distance, average connectivity, and average total number of bidirectional links. These network statistics were chosen as they were used by Itzhack and Louzoun (2010) in their paper on the RDDAM, providing an initial point of comparison with previous work. We plotted the results of the network measures of all 100 instances of each model (see fig 2) and compared them with the results of these measures on the CENN. For the newborn (L1), we compared it to a single graph, but, for the adults (L5), this was three graphs.




Figure 2: Plots of network statistics which were averaged in Table 1. Red lines denote the values of the *C. elegans* connectomes for comparison. L1 results (left) used 100 networks from each model. Adult results (right) used 100 networks sampled from all 3 adult *C. elegans*, resulting in 300 networks total for each model.

In general, there were not many significant differences between the results of L1 and L5 networks. One difference of interest was that the networks of Witvliet et al. (2021) had noticeably different clustering coefficients and total number of bidirectional links when compared with the enhanced connectome of White et al. (1986) (NOTE: N2U). It is difficult to determine what might be causing this discrepancy, whether it is a result of different environmental conditions or if this is indicative of flaws in recording methods of some or all of the connectomes. Rather than averaging the results of the connectomes, we chose to show all three individually

(see fig 1).

Clustering Coefficient Our initial model and RDDAM were the closest to *C. elegans* in this statistic, with our model performing better in adults and RDDAM performing better in the L1 connectome. Given these results, proximity alone might explain the clustering patterns of the *C. elegans* connectome.

Edge Distance The average edge distance found that our model was the closest to *C. elegans* in this regard. It is important to note that our random model (REEM) and random networks (ERN) were not that far behind. RDDAM had much shorter edges on average than any of the other networks. Given that it prioritizes proximity when making connections, this result is unsurprising. Our random model (REEM) had edge distances which were slightly longer. It is unclear why this is the case. One possible explanation is that the neurites of this model was less likely to cross paths with their neighbors given the random directions they take. Since both of our models were most similar to *C. elegans* in edge distance, this suggests that spatial embedding of neurites and soma alone mostly explains this characteristic of the network.

Compared with the results from Itzhack and Louzoun (2010), ranging from 3-4 microns, our results are noticeably higher, ranging from 6-20 microns. The increase in distance can likely be explained by the dimensionality of the embedded space. Given that our tests incorporated three dimensional data of soma body locations from Skuhersky et al. (2022) while Itzhack and Louzoun (2010) only used the one dimensional position data from WormAtlas (2009), the distance in our analysis between any two soma will always be equal to or greater than what one would find using one dimensional positions.

Connectivity Average connectivity was found to be much lower than any of the tested models would predict. In the L1 worm, our initial model appears to somewhat accurately predict this low connectivity. However, in the adult worms, this discrepancy becomes much larger. These results show that the network structure of *C. elegans* connectomes are much more sensitive to perturbation than any of our other networks. This indicates that the connections of neural networks of *C. elegans* are not as redundant as most networks. This is in line with previous work finding the connectome of *C. elegans* contains a “rich club” (i.e. a cluster of nodes all of which have a relatively high degree) and that its connectome is metabolically efficient (CITE).

Bidirectional Links The number of bidirectional links in *C. elegans* were shown to be most similar to the number found in REEM with SEEM being a close




Figure 3: Average degree distributions of all models and *C. elegans* frontal ganglia connectome in log scale (top half) and the Wasserstein distances between the average distribution of each model and *C. elegans* frontal ganglia (bottom half)

second. It is interesting to note that these models have fewer bidirectional links in L1 and more bidirectional links in L5 when compared with *C. elegans*. Given that there are a greater number of connections in the L5 networks, more bidirectional links should be expected just from random chance alone, as we see in the results of our Erdos-Renyi networks. Although, the results of Erdos-Renyi networks show that random chance alone cannot explain amount of growth in connection between the two ages.

Another simple explanation for this growth could be a result of the smaller number of connections possible under our model (see fig 1). One is more likely to flip two heads with a coin than one is to roll two 1's with a die, given the same number of flips/rolls. Our random model (REEM), on average found fewer potential connections compared with our initial model (SEEM). This further supports this explanative factor. Our models do not prefer single or bi-directional connections. Given that the *C. elegans* networks exhibits numbers of bidirectional edges close to or within the range of our models, this would indicate that *C. elegans* frontal ganglia neurons do not show preference for directional connections.

The RDDAM overrepresents bidirectional links. Given its preference for short connections, an even smaller subset of possible connections are most likely to be made, which are direction agnostic. This would explain why RDDAM has so many bidirectional links. These results show that spatial proximity of soma alone cannot explain for the network structure of *C. elegans*.

What does this tell us? Looking at these statistics, it appears that the *C. elegans* connectome clusters in line with what one might expect from such a spatially embedded graph. The number of long distance connections suggests that the connectome of *C. elegans* does not prioritize close connections. It is more likely that short connections are just a result of neurites being more likely to come into contact with nearby neurons. Average connectivity points to a network that is more efficiently organized and far less redundant than any other networks examined. Our measures of bidirectional links show that *C. elegans* does not appear to have a strong preference for bidirectional edges, unlike what might be expected. Our model (SEEM) appears to capture many of these network attributes reasonably well with the exception of total connectivity.




Figure 4: Average distance distributions of all models and *C. elegans* frontal ganglia connectome in log scale (top half) and the Wasserstein distances between the average distribution of each model and *C. elegans* frontal ganglia (bottom half)

Distributions

While these statistics give us an idea of how some of the attributes of these networks in describing the underlying structure of the CENN, it does not give us a picture of how the edges in any of these networks are distributed. Network distributions can give us a better insight into the shape of these networks. We had two questions: 1) What is the structural makeup of these networks? (Are they scale-free, small-world, etc.?) 2) What is the physical makeup of these networks?

To answer these questions, we compared the degree distributions of these networks to examine their network structure and the distance distributions of these networks to examine their physical structure (see fig 2). To get a better idea of how similar these distributions were, we also measured their Wasserstein Distances from the *C. elegans* distribution. For the adults, these distributions were averaged.

Degree Distributions We found that our models and RDDAM to have degree distributions closest to *C. elegans*, with RDDAM being slightly closer. These models result in networks which appear to have more variability in degree than random networks. Since both

rely on spatial proximity of nodes, which are not evenly distributed, it would be expected for their degree distributions to favor nodes which are closer to many others. This could explain why we see these results. It is notable that the degree distributions of CENN have much longer tails. This means that *C. elegans* connectomes are more centralized than any of the other networks. This falls in line with the results measured from Average Connectivity.

Distance Distributions The edge distances of each model show an issue with RDDAM: it favoring close connections. We see that our model is most like *C. elegans* in this distribution, the same as what we found when comparing average edge distances. This indicates that *C. elegans* frontal ganglia is not particularly distance dependent as indicated in Itzhack and Louzoun (2010). Given the similarity in the distributions, spatial embedding of neurites could explain for the edge distance distribution of *C. elegans*.

Spatial Embedding

Examining the makeup in Euclidean space, we observe varying connection patterns between each model. Our random examples, ERN and REEM, show to not ap-




Figure 5: A view of the L1 networks in Euclidean space looking directly through the center (pharynx)

pear to have any skewed distribution in their preferred connections. On the other hand, our model (SEEM) and RDDAM paint a different picture. SEEM appears to prefer connections that do not span the center (pharynx). RDDAM appears to have connections mostly localized to the most clustered areas. From these observations, *C. elegans* frontal ganglia forms connections around the entire pharynx more often than our model would expect. Given that our model is unable to “wrap” around the pharynx, such a result is unsurprising.

Overlaps

Looking at the edges shared by the models and *C. elegans*, we find that none of the models’ resulting networks contain a significant portion of the edges found in *C. elegans*. These results are unsurprising given the results of their average connectivity and their spatial embedding. In spite of the network similarities that SEEM has in common with the *C. elegans* frontal ganglia, it is not an accurate approximation of it.

Conclusion

While significant experimental progress is made to understand the developmental process of *C. elegans*, a computational modeling approach allows us to test what assumptions in our thinking are more and less important for the process. To date, there’s only been one model of the synaptogenesis of the *C. elegans* con-




Figure 6: The edge overlaps of each model with those found in *C. elegans*. The red lines denote the total number of edges in the *C. elegans* frontal ganglia.

nectome that has aimed at predicting the connections between its neurons. In their work, they based their predictions on the distance between neurons alone. In this work, we find that embedding neurites is an important factor in explaining certain network aspects of the *C. elegans* frontal ganglia. Although geometry is an important factor in determining connection in *C. elegans*, it is not the only factor that matters. All models tested failed to effectively replicate average connectivity, implying these biological neurons create networks which are much more metabolically efficient than typical networks. The results of spatial embedding and comparing edge overlaps show that despite the similarities our model has with the *C. elegans* frontal ganglia they are not representative of the *C. elegans* neuronal network.

Future Directions

The results of this study have resulted in many potential avenues for future research. Given the results of average connectivity, it would be interesting what sort of network would look like that is able to capture this network attribute of *C. elegans*. A simple heuristic to locally enforce a low local connectivity in each node could be one way in which this could be possible. It is unclear what sort of biologically realistic mechanism could explain for such an effect.

Another potential direction for this work would be to incorporate more biological mechanisms to the system. One option would be to change the connectome during development. For example, adding nodes to the network over time or adjusting the node locations as the worm grows. It might also be interesting to add genetic factors in determining connectivity patterns.

Data and Code Availability

All scripts and files used to generate all figures are available at <https://github.com/Zach-Attach/SEEM.git>

References

- Altun, Z. (2017). Wormatlas embryo handbook - nervous system in the embryo - nerve ring development. *WormAtlas*.
- Azevedo, F. A., Carvalho, L. R., Grinberg, L. T., Farfel, J. M., Ferretti, R. E., Leite, R. E., Jacob Filho, W., Lent, R., and Herculano-Houzel, S. (2009). Equal numbers of neuronal and nonneuronal cells make the human brain an isometrically scaled-up primate brain. *J Comp Neurol*, 513(5):532–41.
- Betz, R. F. and Bassett, D. S. (2017). Generative models for network neuroscience: prospects and promise. *J R Soc Interface*, 14(136).
- Ceylan, M. E., Yertutanol, F. D. K., Dönmez, A., Öz, P., Ünsalver, B. O., and Evrensel, A. (2022). Connectome or collectome? a neurophilosophical perspective. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 56(1):266–279.
- Costa, L. F., Kaiser, M., and Hilgetag, C. C. (2007). Predicting the connectivity of primate cortical networks from topological and spatial node properties. *BMC Systems Biology*, 1(1):16.
- Durbin, R. M. (1987). Studies on the development and organisation of the nervous system of *Caenorhabditis elegans*.
- Hentschel, H. and Ooyen, A. (2000). Dynamic mechanisms for bundling and guidance during neural network formation. *Physica A Statistical and Theoretical Physics*, 288:369–379.
- Itzhack, R. and Louzoun, Y. (2010). Random distance dependent attachment as a model for neural network generation in the *caenorhabditis elegans*. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 26:647–52.
- Izquierdo, E. J. (2019). Role of simulation models in understanding the generation of behavior in *C. elegans*. *Current Opinion in Systems Biology*, 13:93–101.
- Kaiser, M. and Hilgetag, C. C. (2006). Nonoptimal component placement, but short processing paths, due to long-distance projections in neural systems. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 2(7):e95.
- Khajezade, M., Goliaei, S., and Veisi, H. (2019). A game-theoretical network formation model for *C. elegans* neural network. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 13.
- Nicosia, V., Vértès, P. E., Schafer, W. R., Latora, V., and Bullmore, E. T. (2013). Phase transition in the economically modeled growth of a cellular nervous system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(19):7880–7885.
- Prinz, A. A., Bucher, D., and Marder, E. (2004). Similar network activity from disparate circuit parameters. *Nature Neuroscience*, 7(12):1345–1352.
- Pérez-Escudero, A. and Polavieja, G. G. d. (2007). Optimally wired subnetwork determines neuroanatomy of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(43):17180–17185.
- Rheault, F., Poulin, P., Valcourt Caron, A., St-Onge, E., and Descoteaux, M. (2020). Common misconceptions, hidden biases and modern challenges of dmri tractography. *J Neural Eng*, 17(1):011001.
- Schafer, W. R. (2006). Neurophysiological methods in *C. elegans*: an introduction. *WormBook : the online review of C. elegans biology*, pages 1–4.
- Skuhersky, M., Wu, T., Yemini, E., Nejatbakhsh, A., Boyden, E., and Tegmark, M. (2022). Toward a more accurate 3d atlas of *C. elegans* neurons. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 23(1):195.
- Sporns, O., Tononi, G., and Kötter, R. (2005). The human connectome: A structural description of the human brain. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 1(4):e42.
- Van Essen, D. C., Ugurbil, K., Auerbach, E., Barch, D., Behrens, T. E., Bucholz, R., Chang, A., Chen, L., Corbetta, M., Curtiss, S. W., Della Penna, S., Feinberg, D., Glasser, M. F., Harel, N., Heath, A. C., Larson-Prior, L., Marcus, D., Michalareas, G., Moeller, S., Oostenveld, R., Petersen, S. E., Prior, F., Schlaggar, B. L., Smith, S. M., Snyder, A. Z., Xu, J., and Yacoub, E. (2012). The human connectome project: a data acquisition perspective. *Neuroimage*, 62(4):2222–31.
- White, J. G., Southgate, E., Thomson, J. N., and Brenner, S. (1986). The structure of the nervous system of the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, 314(1165):1–340.
- Witvliet, D., Mulcahy, B., Mitchell, J. K., Meirovitch, Y., Berger, D. R., Wu, Y., Liu, Y., Koh, W. X., Parvathala, R., Holmyard, D., Schalek, R. L., Shavit, N., Chisholm, A. D., Lichtman, J. W., Samuel, A. D. T., and Zhen, M. (2021). Connectomes across development reveal principles of brain maturation. *bioRxiv*, page 2020.04.30.066209.
- WormAtlas (2009). Wormbase project.