

1 **Brain and molecular mechanisms underlying the nonlinear association between**
2 **close friendships, mental health, and cognition in children**

3
4 Chun Shen^{1,2,3,+}, PhD, Edmund T. Rolls^{1,4,5,+}, DPhil, DSc, Shitong Xiang^{1,2}, MSc,
5 Christelle Langley^{6,7}, PhD, Barbara J. Sahakian^{1,6,7}, PhD, DSc, Wei Cheng^{1,2,8,9,10,*},
6 PhD, Jianfeng Feng^{1,2,3,4,8,11,*}, PhD.

7
8 ¹Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Fudan University,
9 Shanghai, China

10 ²Key Laboratory of Computational Neuroscience and Brain-Inspired Intelligence
11 (Fudan University), Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China

12 ³State Key Laboratory of Medical Neurobiology and MOE Frontiers Center for Brain
13 Science (Fudan University), Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China

14 ⁴Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

15 ⁵Oxford Centre for Computational Neuroscience, Oxford, UK

16 ⁶Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

17 ⁷Behavioural and Clinical Neuroscience Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge,
18 UK

19 ⁸Fudan ISTBI—ZJNU Algorithm Centre for Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Zhejiang
20 Normal University, Jinhua, China

21 ⁹Shanghai Medical College and Zhongshan Hospital Immunotherapy Technology
22 Transfer Center, Shanghai, China

23 ¹⁰Department of Neurology, Huashan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

24 ¹¹Zhangjiang Fudan International Innovation Center, Shanghai, China

25

26 ⁺These authors contributed equally to this work.

27

28 ***Corresponding author:**

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29 Professor Jianfeng Feng, Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-inspired
30 Intelligence, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China
31 Email: jffeng@fudan.edu.cn
32 Dr. Wei Cheng, Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-inspired Intelligence,
33 Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China
34 Email: wcheng.fdu@gmail.com

35

36 **Author Contributions:** J.F., C.S. and W.C. proposed the study. C.S. performed the
37 formal analysis with contributions from S.X. W.C., J.F. and E.T.R. contributed to the
38 interpretation of the results. C. S. wrote the manuscript with valuable revision by J.F.,
39 W.C., E.T.R., C.L. and B. J. S. C.S. and W.C. contributed to visualization. All authors
40 considered how to analyze the data and approved the manuscript.

41

42 **Competing Interest Statement:** The authors declare no competing interests.

43 **Abstract**

44 Close friendships are important for mental health and cognition in late childhood.
45 However, whether the more close friends the better, and the underlying neurobiological
46 mechanisms are unknown. Using the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development study,
47 we identified nonlinear associations between the number of close friends, mental health,
48 cognition, and brain structure. Although few close friends were associated with poor
49 mental health, low cognitive functions and small areas of the social brain (e.g., the
50 orbitofrontal cortex, the anterior cingulate cortex, the anterior insula and the temporo-
51 parietal junction), increasing the number of close friends beyond a level (around 5) was
52 no longer associated with better mental health and larger cortical areas, and was even
53 related to lower cognition. In children having no more than 5 close friends, the cortical
54 areas related to the number of close friends revealed correlations with the density of μ -
55 opioid receptors and the expression of OPRM1 and OPRK1, and could partly mediate
56 the association between the number of close friends, ADHD symptoms, and crystalized
57 intelligence. Longitudinal analyses showed that both too few and too many close friends
58 at baseline were associated with more ADHD symptoms and lower crystalized
59 intelligence 2 years later. Additionally, we found friendship network size was
60 nonlinearly associated with well-being and academic performance in an independent
61 social network dataset of middle school students. These findings challenge the
62 traditional idea of “the more, the better”, and provide insights into potential brain and
63 molecular mechanisms.

64 **Introduction**

65 Late childhood and its transition towards adolescence is a period marked by decreasing
66 parental influence alongside increasing peer influence. It is a period critical for social
67 interaction, during which friendships are especially important¹. During this period, the
68 social brain is still undergoing significant development, in parallel with changes in
69 social cognition². Evidence suggests that psychiatric disorders often have an onset in
70 adolescence³, which may be partly influenced by the concurrent changes in the social
71 environment and brain⁴. Therefore, understanding the relationship between friendship,
72 mental health, and cognition during this period, and the underlying brain mechanisms,
73 is of considerable clinical and public health importance.

74

75 It has been well-established that positive social relationships such as close friendships
76 are essential for mental health and cognition in children and adolescents⁵⁻⁷. However,
77 it remains unclear whether having more close friends is necessarily better, and if not,
78 whether there is an optimal quantity of close friendships. Cognitive constraints and time
79 resources limit the number of close social ties that an individual can maintain
80 simultaneously⁸. The innermost layer of the friendship group with the highest emotional
81 closeness is around 5 close friends (the so-called Dunbar's number)⁹. For now, only a
82 few empirical studies have examined the nonlinear association between social
83 relationships, mental health, and cognition. A national investigation reported that
84 adolescents with either too many or too few friends had higher levels of depressive
85 symptoms¹⁰. Two large-scale studies found that the benefits of social interactions for
86 well-being were nearly negligible once the quantity reached a moderate level^{11,12}. A
87 significant U-shaped effect was detected between positive relations with others and
88 cognitive performance¹³. Overall, the assumption of linearity still dominates studies of
89 social relationships, and the effect of the friendship network size at the high end remains
90 largely unexplored.

91


92 The social brain hypothesis suggests that complex social selection pressures drive the
93 evolution of brain size: for example, relative neocortex volume correlates with social
94 group size in primates¹⁴. Both experimental manipulation and free-ranging macaque
95 studies found that social network size could predict mid-superior temporal sulcus
96 volume^{15,16}, a region in which neurons respond to socially relevant stimuli such as face
97 expression and head movement to make or break social contact¹⁷. In humans, a series
98 of studies demonstrated that the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC, i.e. orbitofrontal
99 [OFC] and anterior cingulate cortex [ACC]), the cortex in the superior temporal sulcus
100 (STS), the temporo-parietal junction (TPJ), amygdala and the anterior insula were
101 involved in social cognitive processes^{18,19}. The μ -opioid receptor that is widely
102 distributed in the brain especially in regions implicated in social pain such as the ACC
103 and anterior insula²⁰, has been recognized to be crucial to the formation and
104 maintenance of friendships⁸. Variation in the μ -opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) is
105 associated with individual differences in rejection sensitivity²¹. A range of other
106 neurotransmitters including dopamine, serotonin, GABA and noradrenaline may
107 interact with the opioids, and is involved in social affiliation and social behaviour²².
108 Dysregulation of the social brain and neurotransmitter systems has also been proposed
109 in the pathophysiology of major psychiatric disorders²³. While it has been proposed that
110 the association between social relationships and mental health is mediated through
111 changes in the social brain²⁴, there is a lack of empirical evidence in late childhood and
112 adolescence.

113


114 In this study, based on the existing literature, we hypothesized a nonlinear association
115 between the number of close friends, mental health, and cognitive outcomes. We used
116 data from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Developmental (ABCD) study²⁵, and another
117 independent social network dataset²⁶ (N > 23,000 in total; Figure 1a). Two different
118 analytic approaches were used to evaluate the nonlinear relation between friendship
119 quantity (predictor) and mental health and cognition (outcome). A significant quadratic

120 term would indicate the presence of nonlinearity, and then a two-lines test²⁷ was
121 conducted to estimate an interrupted regression and to identify the breakpoint (Figure
122 1b). To explore the underlying neurobiological mechanisms, we further tested the
123 nonlinear association between the number of close friends and brain structure, and then
124 correlated the related brain differences with the density of 8 neurotransmitter systems,
125 and the expression of OPRM1 and κ -opioid receptor (OPRK1) (Figure 1c). Finally,
126 longitudinal and mediation analyses were conducted to uncover the direction and direct
127 association between the number of close friends, mental health, cognition, and brain
128 structure (Figure 1d). We hypothesized that the number of close friends was nonlinearly
129 related to mental health, cognition, and the social brain; and that the nonlinear
130 association between the number of close friends and behavioral measures may be
131 mediated by brain and molecular mechanisms.


a Study datasets




b Nonlinear association analysis



c Molecular architecture



d Longitudinal and mediation analysis



132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

Figure 1. The study workflow. Study datasets and key measures used in the present study (a). A two-step approach to evaluate the nonlinear association (b). The number of close friends is used as the independent variable in quadratic regression models. Once a significant squared term ('b') is found, a two-lines test is conducted to estimate the breakpoint. Participants are classified into two groups according to the breakpoint in the following analyses. Correlation of brain differences related to the number of close friends with neurotransmitter density and gene expression level (c). Longitudinal and mediation analysis of the number of close friends, ADHD symptoms, crystallized intelligence and the significant surface areas (d).

142 **Results**

143 **Demographic characteristics**

144 In the ABCD study, 7,512 participants (3,625 [48.3%] female, aged 9.91 ± 0.62 years)
145 provided self-reported number of close friends, a broad range of mental health and
146 cognitive measures, and quality-controlled MRI data at baseline, and 4,290 of them
147 (2,044 [47.7%] female, aged 11.49 ± 0.66 years) had two-year follow-up data available.
148 Detailed population characteristics are shown in Table 1. In the social network dataset,
149 16,065 subjects from 48 middle schools (8,065 [50.3%] female, aged 12.00 ± 1.03 years)
150 who had complete key variables were included (Table S1).

151

152 **Table 1. Characteristics of the study population in the ABCD study**

	Baseline (n = 7,512)	2-year follow-up (n = 4,290)
Age, year	9.91 (0.62)	11.49 (0.66)
Sex, n (%)		
Female	3,625 (48.3%)	2,044 (47.7%)
Male	3,887 (51.7%)	2,246 (52.4%)
Race, n (%)		
White	4,169 (55.5%)	2,612 (60.9%)
Black	931 (12.4%)	385 (9.0%)
Hispanic	1,500 (20.0%)	791 (18.4%)
Asian	154 (2.1%)	89 (2.1%)
Other	758 (10.1%)	413 (9.6%)
Family income	7.73 (2.35)	7.83 (2.04)
Parental education	16.87 (2.59)	17.11 (2.44)
BMI	18.72 (4.11)	20.35 (4.63)
Puberty	1.75 (0.87)	2.53 (1.05)
Total close friends	6.26 (9.01)	6.82 (8.37)
Same-sex close friends	4.78 (6.73)	4.99 (5.92)
Opposite-sex close friends	1.48 (3.68)	1.83 (3.66)

153 Descriptive statistics are reported as mean (\pm SD) unless noted otherwise.


154 **Nonlinear association between the number of close friends, mental health and**
155 **cognition**

156 The number of close friends was significantly associated with 12 out of 20 mental
157 health measures, and 7 out of 10 cognitive scores at baseline (the total F-value of the
158 linear and quadratic terms, $p < 0.05/30$; Figure 2a-2g). For these 19 outcomes except
159 the withdrawn/depressed, all quadratic terms reached significance after Bonferroni
160 corrections ($p < 0.05/60$), and all quadratic models provided a significantly better fit
161 than the corresponding linear models ($F = [13.25, 55.53]$, all $p < 0.001$). For mental
162 health, the greatest effect sizes of the quadratic terms were observed for social problems
163 ($\beta = 0.06$, $t = 5.92$, $p = 3.3 \times 10^{-9}$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.43\%$) and attention problems ($\beta = 0.08$, $t =$
164 5.83 , $p = 5.8 \times 10^{-9}$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.42\%$). For cognition, the greatest effect sizes of the
165 quadratic terms were observed for total intelligence ($\beta = -0.06$, $t = -7.45$, $p = 1.0 \times 10^{-13}$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.50\%$) and
166 crystalized intelligence ($\beta = -0.05$, $t = -6.87$, $p = 6.7 \times 10^{-12}$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.43\%$) (Table S2 and Figure S1). The findings were robust with respect to random
167 choice of the siblings (Figure S2).
168

169
170 The average breakpoint of the number of close friends for the mental health and
171 cognitive outcomes with significant quadratic terms was 4.89 ± 0.66 (Figure 2h). The
172 ideal number of close friends was 5 and the closer to that number, the better for
173 participants' mental health. Similarly, for cognition the optimal number of close friends
174 was 5 and the further from that number the poorer the participants' cognition. These
175 nonlinear associations were consistent in males and females (Figure S3). However, the
176 number of same-sex close friends, but not of opposite-sex close friends, was
177 significantly related to mental health and cognition (27 out of 30 measures with a
178 significant F-value after Bonferroni correction), and children with 4.00 ± 0.60 same-
179 sex close friends had the best mental health and cognitive functions (Figure S4). Finally,
180 same analyses were performed using the cross-sectional data collected at 2 years later,
181 and the nonlinear associations of the number of close friends with ADHD symptoms

182 and crystallized intelligence remained significant, with an average breakpoint of $4.83 \pm$
183 0.75 close friends (Figure S5).

184



185

186 **Figure 2. Results of behavior-level nonlinear association analyses in the ABCD**
187 **study at baseline.** Results of quadratic regression models (a). The total F values of
188 quadratic and linear terms, and the t values of linear and quadratic terms are reported.
189 An asterisk indicates statistical significance after Bonferroni correction (i.e., $p <$
190 $0.05/30$ for F value, and $p < 0.05/60$ for t value). Relationship between the number of
191 close friends and the total problems (b), attention problems (c), withdrawn/depressed
192 (d), social problems (e), fluid intelligence (f), and crystallized intelligence (g). The
193 number of close friends is classified into 13 bins. In each bin, the mean (i.e., black dot)
194 and standard error (i.e., error bar) of the dependent variable are shown. The x-axis is in
195 log scale, and the median of the number of close friends in each bin was labeled in the
196 x-axis. The red line is the fitted quadratic model. Results of the two-lines tests (h). The
197 breakpoint and the estimated coefficients with 95% confidence intervals of linear
198 regressions in each group separated by the breakpoint are reported.

199 **The number of close friends was quadratically associated with brain structure**

200 In the ABCD study, the number of close friends was significantly associated with the
201 total cortical area ($F = 6.29, p = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$; Figure 3d), and the total cortical volume (F
202 $= 5.80, p = 3.1 \times 10^{-3}$). No significant relationship between the number of close friends
203 and mean cortical thickness ($F = 0.62, p = 0.54$), and total subcortical volume ($F = 3.94,$
204 $p = 0.02$) was found.

205


206 After FDR correction ($q < 0.05$), the significant cortical areas associated with the
207 number of close friends were mainly located in the OFC, insula, the ACC, the anterior
208 temporal cortex, and the TPJ (Figure 3a and Table S3). The brain region with the largest
209 effect size for the linear term was the OFC (left medial OFC [area 11l and 13l] and
210 lateral OFC [area 47m and 47s]). The quadratic terms of the number of close friends
211 for all these regions were significant (Figure 3b), and the greatest effect sizes were
212 observed in the temporal pole (left STGa: $\beta = -0.001, t = -4.20, p = 2.8 \times 10^{-5}, \Delta R^2 =$
213 0.18% , Figure 3e; right TGd: $\beta = -0.007, t = -4.11, p = 4.0 \times 10^{-5}, \Delta R^2 = 0.18\%$, Figure
214 3f). These findings were robust for random choice of the siblings (Figure S6). Similar
215 findings were found for cortical volumes (Table S4 and Figure S7). As the correlation
216 of cortical area and cortical volume with the number of close friends is high ($r = 0.78,$
217 $p = 3.3 \times 10^{-76}$) and cortical area and volume themselves are highly correlated ($r = 0.92,$
218 $p = 9.0 \times 10^{-151}$; Figure S8), we focused on cortical area in the following analyses.

219

220 Further, two-lines tests suggested that participants with around 5 close friends
221 (breakpoint = 5.30 ± 0.85) had the largest areas in these cortical regions (Figure S9).
222 To illustrate the patterns of nonlinear relationships, we performed linear regression
223 models in participants with ≤ 5 and > 5 close friends, respectively. Similar regions to
224 those found with quadratic models including the OFC, insula, the ACC, and temporal
225 cortex were significant after FDR correction in the ≤ 5 group (Figure S10a and S10b),
226 and the largest effect size was observed in the OFC (Figure S10c). However, the
227 number of close friends was not related to cortical area in the > 5 group (Figure S10d).

228 The differences in cortical area related to the number of close friends in the two groups
229 were not correlated ($r = -0.02$, $p = 0.78$; Figure S10e).

230



231


232 **Figure 3. Nonlinear association between the number of close friends and cortical**
233 **area in the ABCD study at baseline.** Cortical areas significantly associated with the
234 number of close friends after FDR correction (i.e., 360 regions) based on the total F
235 values of linear and quadratic terms (a). Cortical areas with a significant linear or
236 quadratic term (b). FDR correction was performed within the significant regions
237 obtained in (a). Top ten regions with the strongest effect sizes of linear and quadratic
238 terms, respectively (c). Relationship between the number of close friends and the total
239 cortical area (d), left STGa (e), right TGd (f), left p32pr (g), left 13l (h), and left 47m
240 (i). The number of close friends is classified into 13 bins. In each bin, the mean (i.e.,
241 black dot) and standard error (i.e., error bar) of the dependent variable are shown. The
242 x-axis is in log scale, and the median of the number of close friends in each bin was
243 labeled in the x-axis. The red line is the fitted quadratic model. The names of the brain
244 regions are from the HCP-MMP atlas.

245

246 **Relationship to molecular architecture**

247 As the number of close friends was nonlinearly associated with cortical area and the
248 significant regions were only found in participants with no more than 5 close friends,
249 we focused on the brain difference pattern for the number of close friends in the ≤ 5
250 group. We found that the correlations between the spatial pattern of cortical area related
251 to the number of close friends and densities of neurotransmitters were not significant
252 except for the μ -opioid receptor (Spearman's rho = 0.44, Bonferroni corrected $p_{\text{perm}} =$
253 0.02; Figure 4a and 4b). Transcriptomic analyses showed that OPRM1 (Spearman's rho
254 = 0.45, $p_{\text{perm}} = 0.001$; Figure 4c) and OPRK1 (Spearman's rho = 0.46, $p_{\text{perm}} = 0.002$;
255 Figure 4d) were highly expressed in regions related to the number of close friends.

256



257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268


Figure 4. Spatial correlation between cortical area differences related to the number of close friends in children with ≤ 5 close friends and density of neurotransmitters and gene expression level. Bootstrapped Spearman correlations (10,000 times) between t -statistics of close friendship quantity and densities of 14 neurotransmitter receptors or transporters (a). In each box, the line indicates the median and the whiskers indicate the 5th and 95th percentiles. P values were estimated by 5,000 times permutation. *: Bonferroni corrected $p_{\text{perm}} < 0.05$. MOR: μ -opioid receptor. The scatter map of t -statistics of close friendship quantity and the density of μ -opioid receptor (b). The scatter map of t -statistics of close friendship quantity and the expression level of OPRM1 (c). The scatter map of t -statistics of close friendship quantity and the expression level of OPRK1 (d).

269 **Longitudinal and mediation results**

270 As the nonlinear association between the number of close friends and ADHD symptoms
271 is relatively strong and robust, and for cognitive outcomes, only crystallized intelligence
272 was collected at 2-year follow-up in the ABCD study, we focused on these two
273 measures in longitudinal and mediation analyses. The cross-lagged panel model
274 (CLPM) revealed that participants having closer to 5 close friends had fewer ADHD
275 symptoms 2 years later ($\beta = 0.04$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 5a). CLPMs in separate groups
276 confirmed that more close friends contributed to fewer ADHD symptoms in ≤ 5 group
277 ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.003$; Figure S11a), but the effect reversed in the > 5 group ($\beta = 0.05$,
278 $p = 0.019$; Figure S11b). The relationship between the absolute difference of close
279 friend number to 5 and crystallized intelligence was bidirectional (Figure 5b). Only in
280 the ≤ 5 group was a significant negative correlation found between crystallized
281 intelligence at baseline and the number of close friends at 2-year follow-up ($\beta = -0.06$,
282 $p = 0.001$; Figure S11c and S11d).

283

284 Mediation analyses were used to determine whether and the extent to which the
285 association between the number of close friends, ADHD symptoms, and crystallized
286 intelligence could be explained by the identified cortical areas in the ≤ 5 group. The
287 total identified cortical area partly mediated the association between the number of
288 close friends and ADHD symptoms (6.5%, 95%CI [3.4%, 14%]; path a*b: -0.005,
289 95%CI [-0.008, -0.003]; Figure 5c), and the mediation effects of individual significant
290 regions ranged from 1.52% to 4.68% (Figure 5d). Similarly, the association between
291 the number of close friends and crystallized intelligence was partly mediated by the total
292 identified cortical area (13.5%, 95%CI [8.1%, 27%]; path a*b: 0.008, 95%CI [0.005,
293 0.01]; Figure 5e), ranging from 2.58% to 8.52% for each significant region (Figure 5f).



294

295 **Figure 5. Results of longitudinal and mediation analysis in the ABCD study.** CLPM
 296 of the absolute value of close friendship quantity to 5 and ADHD symptoms (a). CLPM
 297 of the absolute value of close friendship quantity to 5 and crystallized intelligence (b).
 298 Mediation analysis of close friendship quantity, the total area of significant regions and
 299 ADHD symptoms (c). The effect of individual significant cortical areas that mediated
 300 the association between close friendship quantity and ADHD symptoms (d). Mediation
 301 analysis of close friendship quantity, the total area of significant regions and crystallized
 302 intelligence (e). The effect of individual significant cortical areas that mediated the
 303 association between close friendship quantity and crystallized intelligence (f). FDR
 304 correction was performed within the significant regions.

305 Findings in an independent social network dataset

306 Utilizing the social network dataset allowed us to validate and extend findings in the
307 ABCD study, as it is an independent and large dataset, the friendship network was
308 generated by nomination, and different measures of mental health and cognition were
309 collected (i.e., well-being and grade point average [GPA]). Three indicators of
310 friendship network size (i.e., outdegree, indegree, and reciprocal degree; Figure S12)
311 were significantly related to well-being (indegree: $F = 38.63, p = 1.8 \times 10^{-17}$; outdegree:
312 $F = 33.55, p = 2.9 \times 10^{-15}$; reciprocal degree: $F = 53.87, p = 4.8 \times 10^{-24}$; Figure S13a) and
313 GPA (indegree: $F = 28.08, p = 6.7 \times 10^{-13}$; outdegree: $F = 46.66, p = 6.2 \times 10^{-21}$;
314 reciprocal degree: $F = 192.65, p = 2.1 \times 10^{-83}$; Figure S13b). Specifically, for well-being,
315 all linear terms were significant, but only the quadratic term of outdegree was
316 significant after Bonferroni correction ($\beta = -2.9 \times 10^{-4}, t = -3.67, p = 2.4 \times 10^{-4}, \Delta R^2 =$
317 0.07% ; Figure S13c). For GPA, the quadratic terms of all three indicators were
318 significant, and the greatest effect size was observed in the outdegree ($\beta = -0.001, t = -$
319 $6.02, p = 1.8 \times 10^{-9}, \Delta R^2 = 0.17\%$; Figure S13c). The two-lines tests revealed that the
320 positive association of outdegree with well-being and GPA diminished once the
321 outward nomination reached 7 or 8 (Figure S13d). The results confirmed that friendship
322 network size especially outdegree was nonlinearly related to mental health and
323 cognitive outcomes.

324

325 Discussion

326 The present study showed that close friendship quantity was associated with better
327 mental health and higher cognitive functions in late childhood, however, the beneficial
328 effects diminished or reversed when increasing the number of close friends beyond a
329 moderate level. Consistent with the hypothesis, a quadratic association between the
330 number of close friends and the areas of social brain regions was found, including the
331 orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), insula, anterior
332 temporal cortex and temporo-parietal junction (TPJ), and these regions mediated the

333 nonlinear association with behavior. In addition, the brain differences related to the
334 number of close friends were correlated with measures of the endogenous opioid
335 involvement of the brain regions.

336

337 Applying two different analytic approaches in two independent large-scale datasets, we
338 provide compelling evidence that the number of close friends was nonlinearly
339 associated with various mental health and cognitive outcomes. Too large a social
340 network size or too frequent social contacts were not beneficial for well-being and were
341 even detrimental for physical and mental health^{10–12,28}. One explanation is that the
342 quantity of relationships an individual can maintain at the same time is limited by a
343 combination of cognitive capacity and time⁸. There is a trade-off between the quantity
344 and quality of friendships, suggesting that an increasing number of close friends may
345 be associated with less intimacy. Meanwhile, as time resources are finite, spending too
346 much time on social activities may lead to insufficient time for study and thereby to
347 lower academic performance. Indeed, adolescents are susceptible to peer influence²⁹.
348 The presence of a peer may increase risk-taking behaviors which can be detrimental to
349 mental health³⁰, and reduce cognitive performance³¹. Having more close friends may
350 increase the possibility of this kind of influence. In addition, ADHD symptoms or
351 novelty seeking may lead to searching for many superficial friendships. Further, in the
352 ABCD study, we identified an optimal number of 5 close friends, which is consistent
353 with the Dunbar's number⁹. People devote about 40% of their total social efforts (e.g.,
354 time and emotional capital) to just their 5 most important people³². In a phone-call
355 dataset of almost 35 million users and 6 billion calls, a layered structure was found with
356 the innermost layer of an average of 4.1 people³³. Our study extends previous findings
357 that there may be an optimal size of close friendship network in late childhood in terms
358 of its relationship to mental health, cognition, and brain structure. The number of 5
359 close relationships appears to be consistent with the social network size limited by

360 cognitive and time resources found in anthropological studies, and greatly extends
361 previous research by relating this to brain systems and transmitter systems in the brain.

362

363 Although friendships are recognized to be especially significant for psychosocial
364 development in late childhood and adolescence, we know relatively little about how
365 brain development relates to close friendships³⁴. Consistent with the behavioral
366 findings, we found that the number of close friends was nonlinearly related to the
367 cortical areas of social brain regions. Children with more close friends had larger areas
368 of social brain regions, but the positive relationship only held for the group with no
369 more than 5 close friends. The areas of social brain regions partly mediated the
370 relationship of the number of close friends with ADHD symptoms and crystallized
371 intelligence. There are two major systems in the brain related to social behavior: an
372 affective system of the OFC, ACC and the anterior insula, and a mentalizing system
373 including the TPJ^{35,36}. The dorsal ACC and anterior insula play an important role in
374 social pain (i.e., painful feelings associated with social disconnection)³⁷. The OFC
375 receives information about socially relevant stimuli such as face expression and gesture
376 from the cortex in the superior temporal sulcus^{17,38}, and is involved in social behavior
377 by representing social stimuli in terms of their reward value^{35,39,40}. The OFC can then
378 influence behavior by a number of routes including the ACC^{35,41-43}. The OFC volume
379 is associated with social network size, which is partly mediated by mentalizing
380 competence⁴⁴. Previously published meta-analysis studies reported an overlap in brain
381 activation between all mentalizing tasks in the mPFC and posterior TPJ⁴⁵. Stimulation
382 of the TPJ improves self-other representations⁴⁶. Animal studies confirmed a casual
383 effect of social relationships on brain development. Adolescent rodents with
384 deprivation of peer contacts showed brain level changes including reduced synaptic
385 pruning in the prefrontal cortex⁴⁷.

386

387 It is known that the endogenous opioid system has an important role in social affiliative
388 processes²². In vivo human positron emission tomography (PET) studies found that μ -
389 opioid receptor regulation in brain regions such as the amygdala, anterior insula, and
390 the ACC may preserve and promote emotional well-being in the social environment⁴⁸.
391 Variation in the μ -opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) was associated with individual
392 differences in rejection sensitivity, which was mediated by dorsal ACC activity in social
393 rejection²¹. OPRM1 variation was also related to social hedonic capacity⁴⁹. Pain
394 tolerance, which is associated with activation of the μ -opioid receptor, was correlated
395 with social network size in humans⁵⁰. Social behaviors like social laughter and social
396 touch increased pleasurable sensations and triggered endogenous opioid release to
397 maintain social relationships⁵¹⁻⁵³. The opioid system is associated with major
398 psychiatric disorders especially depression⁵⁴.

399

400 Several issues should be taken into account when considering our findings. First, as an
401 association study, no causal conclusion should be made in this study. Whether the
402 number of close friends drives the social brain development, or children with larger
403 social brains have more close friends, is unclear. A bidirectional relationship has been
404 reported in the literature¹⁴. Second, the egocentric network size used in the ABCD study
405 is not able to differentiate reciprocal and unilateral friendships. It is possible that the
406 findings may differ using different indicators^{55,56}. For example, in the social network
407 dataset, we showed that outdegree but not indegree and reciprocal degree was
408 quadratically associated with the GPA. Third, the quality of close friendships has not
409 been considered in this study. It has been reported that the relationship between having
410 more friends and fewer depressive symptoms in adolescence was mediated by a sense
411 of belonging⁵⁷. Although current findings on the relative importance of friendship
412 quantity and quality are inconsistent^{58,59}, it is necessary to include their interactions in
413 future studies. Finally, although we found children with 5 close friends had the best
414 mental health and cognitive functions, and the largest social brain areas, the optimal

415 size cannot be generalized to populations of other ages and cultures. Extension of the
416 findings in other cultural and age groups would be useful.

417

418 In conclusion, this study provides new evidence going beyond previous research that a
419 larger number of close friends up to a moderate level in late childhood is associated
420 with better mental health and higher cognitive functions, and that this can be partly
421 explained by the size of the social brain including the OFC and ACC, and the
422 endogenous opioid system. This study may have implications for targeted friendship
423 interventions in the transition from late childhood to early adolescence.

424

425 **Materials and Methods**

426 **Participants and behavioral measures**

427 **The ABCD study**

428 The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study is tracking the brain
429 development and health of a nationally-representative sample of children aged 9 to 11
430 years from 21 centers throughout the United States (<https://abcdstudy.org>). Parents' full
431 written informed consent and all children's assent were obtained by each center, and
432 research procedures and ethical guidelines were followed in accordance with the
433 Institutional Review Boards⁶⁰. The current study was conducted on the ABCD Data
434 Release 4.0. At baseline, 8,835 individuals from 7,512 families (6,225 [82.9%] with a
435 child, 1,252 [16.7%] with 2 children, 34 [0.5%] with 3 children, and 1 [0.01%] with 4
436 children) had complete behavioral and structural MRI data. To avoid the influence of
437 family relatedness, we randomly picked only one child in each family, finally resulting
438 in 7,512 children, of whom 4,290 had two-year follow-up data.

439

440 Close friendships are characterized by enjoying spending time together, having fun, and
441 trust. Participants were asked how many close friends that are boys and girls they have,
442 respectively. Mental health problems were rated by the parent using the Child Behavior

443 Checklist (CBCL), a validated and widely-used assessment of childhood behavior ⁶¹.
444 The CBCL contains 20 empirically based subscales spanning emotional, social and
445 behavioral domains. Raw scores were used in analyses, higher scores indicating more
446 severe problems. Cognitive functions were assessed by the NIH Toolbox^{®62}, which has
447 good reliability and validity in children⁶³. The toolbox consists of seven different tasks
448 covering episodic memory, executive function, attention, working memory, processing
449 speed, and language abilities, and also provides three composites of crystalized, fluid,
450 and total intelligence⁶⁴. Uncorrected standard scores were used in analyses. All ten
451 cognitive scores were available at baseline, but only crystalized intelligence was
452 collected two years later.

453

454 **Social network dataset**

455 In order to validate and generalize the findings in the ABCD study, we utilized a
456 publicly available dataset of a social network experiment, conducted among students in
457 56 middle schools in New Jersey, the United States²⁶
458 (<https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/civicleads/studies/37070>). All parents and students
459 provided informed consent for the survey, and the research protocol was approved by
460 the Princeton University Institutional Review Board. Participants were asked to report
461 which other students (up to ten) in their school they chose to spend time with in the last
462 few weeks. We were able to generate a directed friendship network within each school,
463 and therefore identified three kinds of network measures for each individual: outdegree
464 (i.e., outward nomination), indegree (i.e., inward nomination), and reciprocal degree
465 (i.e., reciprocal nomination). Well-being was assessed by three questions: “I feel like I
466 belong at this school”, “I have stayed home from school because of problems with other
467 students”, and “During the past month, I have often been bothered by feeling sad and
468 down”¹¹. Cognitive function was measured by the GPA on a 4.0 scale, obtained from
469 school administrative records.

470

471 **Structural MRI data**

472 In the ABCD study, 3D T1- and T2-weighted structural images were collected using
473 3T scanners at 21 data collecting sites⁶⁵. The detailed preprocessing pipeline has been
474 described elsewhere⁶⁶. In brief, we used FreeSurfer v6.0 to preprocess the minimal
475 preprocessed T1- and T2-weighted images downloaded from the ABCD study,
476 including cortical surface reconstruction, subcortical segmentation, smoothed by a
477 Gaussian kernel (FWHM = 10 mm), and estimation of morphometric measures (i.e.,
478 cortical area, thickness, and volume). Then, the cortical surface of each subject was
479 registered to a standard fsaverage space and parcellated into 180 cortical regions per
480 hemisphere as defined in the Human Connectome Project multimodal parcellation
481 (HCP-MMP) atlas⁶⁷. Volumetric reconstructions of subcortical structures were also
482 obtained based on the Aseg atlas⁶⁸.

483

484 **Neurochemical data**

485 Fourteen receptors and transporters across eight different neurotransmitter systems
486 (serotonin: 5HT1a, 5HT1b, 5HT2a, 5HT4, and 5HTT; dopamine: D1, D2, and DAT;
487 GABA: GABA_A; glutamate: mGluR5; norepinephrine: NAT; cannabinoid: CB1; opioid:
488 MOR; acetylcholine: VACHT) were investigated. Density estimates were derived from
489 average group maps of healthy volunteers scanned in prior PET and SPECT studies
490 (Table S5). All density maps were downloaded online
491 (https://github.com/juryxy/JuSpace/tree/JuSpace_v1.3/JuSpace_v1.3/PETatlas), which
492 had been registered and normalized into the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI)
493 space, and linearly rescaled to 0-100⁶⁹. For comparability, the HCP atlas in fsaverage
494 space was converted to individual surface space (“mri_surf2surf”) of the MNI brain
495 template ch2⁷⁰ which was preprocessed by FreeSurfer (“recon-all”), and then was
496 projected to volume (“mri_label2vol”). The density maps were parcellated into the 360
497 cortical regions as the structural MRI data according to the volume-based HCP-MMP

498 atlas. Specifically, for the μ -opioid receptor, occipital cortex served as the reference
499 region⁷¹, and was therefore excluded in analysis.

500

501 **Transcriptomic data**

502 Gene expression data was from six neurotypical adult brains in the Allen Human Brain
503 Atlas⁷². We focused on the opioid receptor genes (i.e., OPRM1 and OPRK1). The
504 preprocessed transcriptomic data were imported from Arnatkevičiūtė et al⁷³
505 (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.6852911>), including probe-to-gene re-annotation,
506 intensity-based data filtering, and probe selection using RNA-seq data as a reference.
507 Then, samples were assigned to brain regions according to the volume-based HCP-
508 MMP atlas, and expression values were averaged within each region. Since right
509 hemisphere data were only available for two donors, analyses were conducted on the
510 left hemisphere only, finally resulting in 177 brain regions.

511

512 **Statistical analysis**

513 **Nonlinear association analysis**

514 The nonlinear associations of close friendship quantity with mental health, cognition,
515 and brain structure were investigated. The quantity of close friendship was log-
516 transformed [$\log_{10}(x+1)$] in analyses as it has a skewed distribution⁵⁵ (Figure S14). Two
517 different analytic approaches were used to robustly evaluate the nonlinear relationships.
518 First, we fitted a quadratic regression model ($y = bx^2 + ax + c$) with close friendship
519 quantity as the independent variable. Close friendship quantity was mean-centered to
520 ensure that the linear (a) and quadratic (b) terms were orthogonal. Three statistical
521 parameters were of interest: a total F-value of linear and quadratic terms, reflecting the
522 association between close friendship quantity and the measures of interest⁷⁴; the
523 quadratic term, indicating the presence of a nonlinear association; and the linear term.
524 The effect size of the quadratic term was calculated by the change in the overall
525 proportion of variance (adjusted R^2) between the quadratic model and the

526 corresponding linear model, and the effect size of the linear term was the ΔR^2 between
527 the linear model and the model with only covariates. The model fits of quadratic and
528 linear models were compared by analysis of variance. Although quadratic regression is
529 widely used in psychosocial studies to detect the presence of nonlinearity^{11,75},
530 simulation studies showed that this approach for testing a U-shaped effect has a high
531 false positive rate²⁷. Therefore, we conducted a two-lines test²⁷ once a significant
532 quadratic term was found, which could estimate a data-driven breakpoint. We then split
533 the data accordingly to fit two linear models, respectively. If the segment slopes have
534 opposite signs and both of them are significant, a U-shaped relation exists. Same
535 analytic approaches were used in behavioral and neuroimaging analyses. In the ABCD
536 study, sex, age, parent education level, household income, ethnicity, puberty, BMI and
537 site were used as covariates of no interest for the behavioral analyses. For the
538 neuroimaging analyses, we additionally controlled for handedness, head motion and
539 MRI manufacturer. In the social network dataset, we controlled for sex, age, grade,
540 whether the subject was or was not new to the school, and whether or not most friends
541 went to this school. Bonferroni correction was used in behavioral analyses, and FDR
542 correction was used in neuroimaging analyses.

543

544 Several sensitivity analyses were performed. To examine the potential sex influence,
545 we conducted nonlinear association analyses in male and female, respectively. The
546 effect of the sex of close friends was tested by separating close friends into same-sex
547 and opposite-sex ones. To validate the findings from data at baseline, we replicated the
548 same analyses using the cross-sectional data collected at 2 years later. For neuroimaging
549 analyses, if significant nonlinear associations were detected, we also conducted linear
550 regression models in two groups split by the average breakpoint, respectively.

551

552 **Spatial correlation with neurotransmitter density and gene expression**

553 Unthresholded t -statistic maps of brain structure associated with close friendship
554 quantity in two groups (i.e., split by the average breakpoint) were used to correlate with
555 neurotransmitter density and gene expression level by Spearman's rank correlation.
556 Bootstrapping was performed to ensure the robustness, and the significance was tested
557 by 5,000 times permutation, in which the correlation was re-computed using null t -
558 statistic maps obtained by label shuffling for close friendship quantity⁷⁶.

559

560 **Cross-lagged panel analysis**

561 Longitudinal relationships of close friendship quantity with ADHD symptoms (i.e.,
562 `cbcl_scr_syn_attention`) and crystalized intelligence was investigated using a classic
563 two-wave cross-lagged panel model (CLPM) implemented by Mplus 7.0. Firstly, we
564 conducted CLPMs using the absolute value of the difference between close friendship
565 quantity and the breakpoint, and then established CLPMs for participants with the
566 quantity of close friendship \leq breakpoint and $>$ breakpoint at baseline, respectively. We
567 controlled for several stable (i.e., sex, parent education level, ethnicity, and site) and
568 time-variant variables (i.e., age, household income, and puberty) in these models. The
569 model parameters were estimated by the full information maximum likelihood
570 method⁷⁷, and the model fit was interpreted using common thresholds of good fit⁷⁸.

571

572 **Mediation analysis**

573 We used the baseline data in the ABCD study to test the associations between close
574 friendship quantity, ADHD symptoms, crystalized intelligence, and brain structure. The
575 total area of the significant brain regions was used as the mediator. Variables were
576 normalized and then entered into the model. Sex, age, parent education level, household
577 income, ethnicity, pubertal status, BMI, handedness, head motion, MRI manufacturer
578 and site were used as covariates of no interest. In addition to the total area, the mediation
579 effect of individual significant regions was also evaluated, the p -values of the mediation
580 effect corrected by FDR correction. Total, direct and indirect associations were

581 estimated by bootstrapping 10,000 times, and the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated
582 confidence interval (CI) was reported. Analyses were performed using the R mediation
583 package.

584

585 **Acknowledgements**

586 We thank the children and families whose ongoing participation made this study
587 possible. Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent
588 Brain Cognitive DevelopmentSM (ABCD) Study (<https://abcdstudy.org>), held in the
589 NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit
590 more than 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood.
591 The ABCD Study® is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional
592 federal partners under award numbers U01DA041048, U01DA050989, U01DA051016,
593 U01DA041022, U01DA051018, U01DA051037, U01DA050987, U01DA041174,
594 U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041028, U01DA041134, U01DA050988,
595 U01DA051039, U01DA041156, U01DA041025, U01DA041120, U01DA051038,
596 U01DA041148, U01DA041093, U01DA041089, U24DA041123, U24DA041147. A
597 full list of supporters is available at <https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html>. A
598 listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be
599 found at https://abcdstudy.org/consortium_members/. ABCD consortium investigators
600 designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily
601 participate in the analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views
602 of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD
603 consortium investigators. C.S. is supported by grants from the National Natural
604 Sciences Foundation of China (No. 82101617). W.C. is supported by grants from the
605 National Natural Sciences Foundation of China (No. 82071997), the Shanghai Rising-
606 Star Program (No. 21QA1408700). J.F. is supported by National Key R&D Program
607 of China (No. 2018YFC1312904 and No. 2019YFA0709502), Shanghai Municipal
608 Science and Technology Major Project (No. 2018SHZDZX01), ZJ Lab, Shanghai

609 Center for Brain Science and Brain-Inspired Technology, and the 111 Project (No.
610 B18015).

611 **References**

- 612 1. Blakemore, S.-J. & Mills, K. L. Is Adolescence a Sensitive Period for Sociocultural
613 Processing? *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **65**, 187–207 (2014).
- 614 2. Mills, K. L., Lalonde, F., Clasen, L. S., Giedd, J. N. & Blakemore, S.-J.
615 Developmental changes in the structure of the social brain in late childhood and
616 adolescence. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* **9**, 123–31 (2014).
- 617 3. Kessler, R. C. *et al.* Lifetime Prevalence and Age-of-Onset Distributions of DSM-
618 IV Disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*
619 **62**, 593–602 (2005).
- 620 4. Paus, T., Keshavan, M. & Giedd, J. N. Why do many psychiatric disorders emerge
621 during adolescence? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 947–957 (2008).
- 622 5. Narr, R. K., Allen, J. P., Tan, J. S. & Loeb, E. L. Close Friendship Strength and
623 Broader Peer Group Desirability as Differential Predictors of Adult Mental Health.
624 *Child Dev.* **90**, 298–313 (2019).
- 625 6. Marion, D., Laursen, B., Zettergren, P. & Bergman, L. R. Predicting Life
626 Satisfaction During Middle Adulthood from Peer Relationships During Mid-
627 Adolescence. *J. Youth Adolesc.* **42**, 1299–1307 (2013).
- 628 7. Wentzel, K. R., Jablansky, S. & Scalise, N. R. Do Friendships Afford Academic
629 Benefits? A Meta-analytic Study. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **30**, 1241–1267 (2018).
- 630 8. Dunbar, R. I. M. The Anatomy of Friendship. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **22**, 32–51 (2018).
- 631 9. Zhou, W.-X., Sornette, D., Hill, R. A. & Dunbar, R. I. M. Discrete hierarchical
632 organization of social group sizes. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **272**, 439–444 (2005).
- 633 10. Falci, C. & McNeely, C. Too Many Friends: Social Integration, Network Cohesion
634 and Adolescent Depressive Symptoms. *Soc. Forces* **87**, 2031–2061 (2009).
- 635 11. Ren, D., Stavrova, O. & Loh, W. W. Nonlinear effect of social interaction quantity
636 on psychological well-being: Diminishing returns or inverted U? *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*
637 **122**, 1056–1074 (2022).
- 638 12. Kushlev, K., Heintzelman, S. J., Oishi, S. & Diener, E. The declining marginal
639 utility of social time for subjective well-being. *J. Res. Personal.* **74**, 124–140 (2018).
- 640 13. Brown, M. I., Wai, J. & Chabris, C. F. Can You Ever Be Too Smart for Your Own
641 Good? Comparing Linear and Nonlinear Effects of Cognitive Ability on Life Outcomes.
642 *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **23**.
- 643 14. Dunbar, R. I. M. & Shultz, S. Evolution in the Social Brain. *Science* **317**, 1344–
644 1347 (2007).
- 645 15. Sallet, J. *et al.* Social Network Size Affects Neural Circuits in Macaques. *Science*
646 **334**, 697–700 (2011).
- 647 16. Testard, C. *et al.* Social connections predict brain structure in a multidimensional
648 free-ranging primate society. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabl5794 (2022).
- 649 17. Pitcher, D. & Ungerleider, L. G. Evidence for a third visual pathway specialized
650 for social perception. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **25**, 100–110 (2021).
- 651 18. Blakemore, S.-J. The social brain in adolescence. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 267–277
652 (2008).

- 653 19. Burnett, S., Sebastian, C., Cohen Kadosh, K. & Blakemore, S.-J. The social brain
654 in adolescence: Evidence from functional magnetic resonance imaging and behavioural
655 studies. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **35**, 1654–1664 (2011).
- 656 20. Baumgärtner, U. *et al.* High opiate receptor binding potential in the human lateral
657 pain system. *NeuroImage* **30**, 692–699 (2006).
- 658 21. Way, B. M., Taylor, S. E. & Eisenberger, N. I. Variation in the μ -opioid receptor
659 gene (*OPRM1*) is associated with dispositional and neural sensitivity to social rejection.
660 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 15079–15084 (2009).
- 661 22. Machin, A. J. & Dunbar, R. I. M. The brain opioid theory of social attachment: a
662 review of the evidence. *Behaviour* **148**, 985–1025 (2011).
- 663 23. Porcelli, S. *et al.* Social brain, social dysfunction and social withdrawal. *Neurosci.*
664 *Biobehav. Rev.* **97**, 10–33 (2019).
- 665 24. Lamblin, M., Murawski, C., Whittle, S. & Fornito, A. Social connectedness, mental
666 health and the adolescent brain. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **80**, 57–68 (2017).
- 667 25. Karcher, N. R. & Barch, D. M. The ABCD study: understanding the development
668 of risk for mental and physical health outcomes. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **46**, 131–
669 142 (2021).
- 670 26. Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H. & Aronow, P. M. Changing climates of conflict: A
671 social network experiment in 56 schools. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 566–571 (2016).
- 672 27. Simonsohn, U. Two Lines: A Valid Alternative to the Invalid Testing of U-Shaped
673 Relationships With Quadratic Regressions. *Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci.* **1**, 538–
674 555 (2018).
- 675 28. Stavrova, O. & Ren, D. Is More Always Better? Examining the Nonlinear
676 Association of Social Contact Frequency With Physical Health and Longevity. *Soc.*
677 *Psychol. Personal. Sci.* **12**, 1058–1070 (2021).
- 678 29. Berndt, T. J. Developmental changes in conformity to peers and parents. *Dev.*
679 *Psychol.* **15**, 608–616 (1979).
- 680 30. Chein, J., Albert, D., O'Brien, L., Uckert, K. & Steinberg, L. Peers increase
681 adolescent risk taking by enhancing activity in the brain's reward circuitry. *Dev. Sci.*
682 **14**, F1–F10 (2011).
- 683 31. Wolf, L. K., Bazargani, N., Kilford, E. J., Dumontheil, I. & Blakemore, S.-J. The
684 audience effect in adolescence depends on who's looking over your shoulder. *J.*
685 *Adolesc.* **43**, 5–14 (2015).
- 686 32. Bzdok, D. & Dunbar, R. I. M. The Neurobiology of Social Distance. *Trends Cogn.*
687 *Sci.* **24**, 717–733 (2020).
- 688 33. Mac Carron, P., Kaski, K. & Dunbar, R. Calling Dunbar's numbers. *Soc. Netw.* **47**,
689 151–155 (2016).
- 690 34. Pfeifer, J. H. & Allen, N. B. Puberty Initiates Cascading Relationships Between
691 Neurodevelopmental, Social, and Internalizing Processes Across Adolescence. *Biol.*
692 *Psychiatry* **89**, 99–108 (2021).
- 693 35. Rolls, E. T. *The Orbitofrontal Cortex*. (Oxford University Press, 2019).

- 694 36. Schmäzle, R. *et al.* Brain connectivity dynamics during social interaction reflect
695 social network structure. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 5153–5158 (2017).
- 696 37. Eisenberger, N. I. The pain of social disconnection: examining the shared neural
697 underpinnings of physical and social pain. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **13**, 421–434 (2012).
- 698 38. Hasselmo, M. E., Rolls, E. T. & Baylis, G. C. The role of expression and identity
699 in the face-selective responses of neurons in the temporal visual cortex of the monkey.
700 *Behav. Brain Res.* **32**, 203–218 (1989).
- 701 39. Rolls, E. T. The orbitofrontal cortex and emotion in health and disease, including
702 depression. *Neuropsychologia* **128**, 14–43 (2019).
- 703 40. Rolls, E. T., Critchley, H. D., Browning, A. S. & Inoue, K. Face-selective and
704 auditory neurons in the primate orbitofrontal cortex. *Exp. Brain Res.* **170**, 74–87 (2006).
- 705 41. Rolls, E. T., Cheng, W. & Feng, J. The orbitofrontal cortex: reward, emotion and
706 depression. *Brain Commun.* **2**, fcaa196 (2020).
- 707 42. Rolls, E. T., Deco, G., Huang, C.-C. & Feng, J. The human orbitofrontal cortex,
708 vmPFC, and anterior cingulate cortex effective connectome: emotion, memory, and
709 action. *Cereb. Cortex* bhac070 (2022) doi:10.1093/cercor/bhac070.
- 710 43. Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D. & Williams, K. D. Does Rejection Hurt? An
711 fMRI Study of Social Exclusion. *Science* **302**, 290–292 (2003).
- 712 44. Powell, J., Lewis, P. A., Roberts, N., García-Fiñana, M. & Dunbar, R. I. M. Orbital
713 prefrontal cortex volume predicts social network size: an imaging study of individual
714 differences in humans. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **279**, 2157–2162 (2012).
- 715 45. Schurz, M., Radua, J., Aichhorn, M., Richlan, F. & Perner, J. Fractionating theory
716 of mind: A meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.*
717 **42**, 9–34 (2014).
- 718 46. Santiesteban, I., Banissy, M. J., Catmur, C. & Bird, G. Enhancing Social Ability
719 by Stimulating Right Temporoparietal Junction. *Curr. Biol.* **22**, 2274–2277 (2012).
- 720 47. Orben, A., Tomova, L. & Blakemore, S.-J. The effects of social deprivation on
721 adolescent development and mental health. *Lancet Child Adolesc. Health* **4**, 634–640
722 (2020).
- 723 48. Hsu, D. T. *et al.* Response of the μ -opioid system to social rejection and acceptance.
724 *Mol. Psychiatry* **18**, 1211–1217 (2013).
- 725 49. Troisi, A. *et al.* Social hedonic capacity is associated with the A118G
726 polymorphism of the mu-opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) in adult healthy volunteers
727 and psychiatric patients. *Soc. Neurosci.* **6**, 88–97 (2011).
- 728 50. Johnson, K. V.-A. & Dunbar, R. I. M. Pain tolerance predicts human social network
729 size. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 25267 (2016).
- 730 51. Dunbar, R. I. M. The social role of touch in humans and primates: Behavioural
731 function and neurobiological mechanisms. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **34**, 260–268
732 (2010).
- 733 52. Manninen, S. *et al.* Social Laughter Triggers Endogenous Opioid Release in
734 Humans. *J. Neurosci.* **37**, 6125–6131 (2017).

- 735 53. Nummenmaa, L. *et al.* Social touch modulates endogenous μ -opioid system
736 activity in humans. *NeuroImage* **138**, 242–247 (2016).
- 737 54. Peciña, M. *et al.* Endogenous opioid system dysregulation in depression:
738 implications for new therapeutic approaches. *Mol. Psychiatry* **24**, 576–587 (2019).
- 739 55. Hobbs, W. R., Burke, M., Christakis, N. A. & Fowler, J. H. Online social
740 integration is associated with reduced mortality risk. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 12980–
741 12984 (2016).
- 742 56. Kwak, S., Joo, W., Youm, Y. & Chey, J. Social brain volume is associated with in-
743 degree social network size among older adults. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**, 20172708
744 (2018).
- 745 57. Ueno, K. The effects of friendship networks on adolescent depressive symptoms.
746 *Soc. Sci. Res.* **34**, 484–510 (2005).
- 747 58. Bruine de Bruin, W., Parker, A. M. & Strough, J. Age differences in reported social
748 networks and well-being. *Psychol. Aging* **35**, 159–168 (2020).
- 749 59. Platt, J., Keyes, K. M. & Koenen, K. C. Size of the social network versus quality
750 of social support: which is more protective against PTSD? *Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatr.*
751 *Epidemiol.* **49**, 1279–1286 (2014).
- 752 60. Aucter, A. M. *et al.* A description of the ABCD organizational structure and
753 communication framework. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **32**, 8–15 (2018).
- 754 61. Achenbach, T. & Rescorla, L. *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms & profiles:*
755 *an integrated system of multi-informant assessment.* (Burlington, VT: ASEBA, 2001).
- 756 62. Luciana, M. *et al.* Adolescent neurocognitive development and impacts of
757 substance use: Overview of the adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD)
758 baseline neurocognition battery. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **32**, 67–79 (2018).
- 759 63. Akshoomoff, N. *et al.* NIH Toolbox Cognitive Function Battery (CFB): Composite
760 Scores of Crystallized, Fluid, and Overall Cognition. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Dev.* **78**,
761 119–132 (2013).
- 762 64. Weintraub, S. *et al.* Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology* **80**,
763 S54–S64 (2013).
- 764 65. Casey, B. J. *et al.* The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study:
765 Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **32**, 43–54 (2018).
- 766 66. Gong, W., Rolls, E. T., Du, J., Feng, J. & Cheng, W. Brain structure is linked to
767 the association between family environment and behavioral problems in children in the
768 ABCD study. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 3769 (2021).
- 769 67. Glasser, M. F. *et al.* A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. *Nature*
770 **536**, 171–178 (2016).
- 771 68. Fischl, B. *et al.* Whole Brain Segmentation: Automated Labeling of
772 Neuroanatomical Structures in the Human Brain. *Neuron* **33**, 341–355 (2002).
- 773 69. Dukart, J. *et al.* JuSpace. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* **42**, 555–566 (2021).
- 774 70. Rorden, C. & Brett, M. Stereotaxic Display of Brain Lesions. *Behav. Neurol.* **12**,
775 191–200 (2000).

- 776 71. Kantonen, T. *et al.* Interindividual variability and lateralization of μ -opioid
777 receptors in the human brain. *NeuroImage* **217**, 116922 (2020).
- 778 72. Hawrylycz, M. J. *et al.* An anatomically comprehensive atlas of the adult human
779 brain transcriptome. *Nature* **489**, 391–399 (2012).
- 780 73. Arnatkevičiūtė, A., Fulcher, B. D. & Fornito, A. A practical guide to linking brain-
781 wide gene expression and neuroimaging data. *NeuroImage* **189**, 353–367 (2019).
- 782 74. Li, Y. *et al.* The brain structure and genetic mechanisms underlying the nonlinear
783 association between sleep duration, cognition and mental health. *Nat. Aging* **2**, 425–
784 437 (2022).
- 785 75. Nook, E. C., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., McLaughlin, K. A. & Somerville, L. H.
786 The Nonlinear Development of Emotion Differentiation: Granular Emotional
787 Experience Is Low in Adolescence. *Psychol. Sci.* **29**, 1346–1357 (2018).
- 788 76. Chen, J. *et al.* Intrinsic Connectivity Patterns of Task-Defined Brain Networks
789 Allow Individual Prediction of Cognitive Symptom Dimension of Schizophrenia and
790 Are Linked to Molecular Architecture. *Biol. Psychiatry* **89**, 308–319 (2021).
- 791 77. Muthén, B., Kaplan, D. & Hollis, M. On structural equation modeling with data
792 that are not missing completely at random. *Psychometrika* **52**, 431–462 (1987).
- 793 78. Hu, L. & Bentler, P. M. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
794 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct. Equ. Model. Multidiscip.*
795 *J.* **6**, 1–55 (1999).
- 796
- 797