

Translating Measures onto Mechanisms: The Cognitive Relevance of Higher-Order Information

Daniel Rebbin^{1,2*}, Keenan J. A. Down^{2,3,4}, Thomas F. Varley^{5,6}, Robin Ince⁷,
Andres Canales-Johnson^{2,8,9}

¹Brain and Cognition Center, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, NL.

²Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

³Department of Psychology, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK.

⁴Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, UK.

⁵Vermont Complex Systems Institute, University of Vermont, Burlington, USA.

⁶Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA.

⁷School of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

⁸CINPSI Neurocog, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Catolica del Maule,
Talca, CL.

⁹Neuroscience Center, Helsinki Institute of Life Science, University of Helsinki, Helsinki,
FI.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): dlrebbin@gmail.com;

Abstract

Higher-order information theory has become a rapidly growing toolkit in computational neuroscience, motivated by the idea that multivariate dependencies can reveal aspects of neural computation and communication invisible to pairwise analyses. Yet functional interpretations of synergy and redundancy often outpace principled arguments for how statistical quantities map onto mechanistic cognitive processes. Here we review the main families of higher-order measures with the explicit goal of translating mathematical properties into defensible mechanistic inferences. Firstly, we systematize Shannon-based multivariate metrics and demonstrate that higher-order dependence is parsimoniously characterized by two largely independent axes: interaction strength and redundancy-synergy balance. We argue that balanced layering of synergistic integration and redundant broadcasting optimizes multiscale complexity, formalizing a computation-communication tradeoff. We then examine the partial information decomposition and outline pragmatic considerations for its deployment in neural data. Equipped with the relevant mathematical essentials, we connect redundancy-synergy balance to cognitive function by progressively embedding their mathematical properties in real-world constraints, starting with small synthetic systems before gradually building up to neuroimaging. We close by identifying key future directions for mechanistic insight: cross-scale bridging, intervention-based validation, and thermodynamically grounded unification of information dynamics.

1 Introduction

Higher-order information theory has gained increasing popularity within computational neuroscience to investigate how the brain’s many components share information to serve cognitive functioning. Information theory has been argued to be the *lingua franca* for the modeling of complex systems [1], such as the brain. If we grant this, extending the vocabulary beyond its usual domain of bivariate interactions to three or more variables would represent a valuable step towards capturing higher-order cognitive functioning. Higher-order information theory provides a more general language for describing information processing beyond linear, bivariate correlations, which still dominate neuroscientific analysis methods, such as functional connectivity analyses. This renders higher-order information theory uniquely sensitive to emergent multivariate effects supporting cognition, whereas conventional methods are otherwise insensitive to them. Cognition is often characterized as an emergent property of the system [2], where the whole is irreducible to the parts in isolation. Stereoscopic vision, for instance, is a canonical example of such a synergistic effect [3]: It is to be found in neither eye or hemisphere in isolation but only through their triangulation with the scene information that they capture complementarily. In contrast, color information is redundantly processed in each hemisphere. The blind spot of established methods for such key emergent properties of cognitive function might be filled in by higher-order information theory.

Redundant information is information copied over multiple subsets of elements, while synergistic information is the information only disclosed when considering them jointly. The alluring promise of synergy and redundancy to capture inherently higher-order effects, where the information present in the whole is greater (or smaller) than the sum of information between the parts, has inspired various functional interpretations in the cognitive neuroscience literature, from their role in multisensory feature integration [4] to explaining psychedelic effects on consciousness [5] (for a recent overview, see [6]). These efforts have been mostly facilitated by the partial information decomposition (PID), since it was first proposed that information contributions of multiple sources about a target variable could be separated into non-negative atoms of redundant, synergistic and unique information [7]. Behind the PID stands a decades-old effort in information theory to deal with negative bit values when generalizing the notion of information sharing to more than two variables, which Claude Shannon had restricted himself to in his foundational work [8–11].

Since [12] published their guide on how to understand and use higher-order information measurement tools up to the PID, their application in interpreting empirical data has risen dramatically. Although more theory has been developed and readily applied since then, questions around fundamental theoretical disagreements (What does redundancy mean in mathematically precise terms?) and functional interpretation have become more immediate. For this reason, we regard it as an appropriate moment to recapitulate the most essential theory to carefully build towards a well-founded functional interpretation when measuring higher-order information. To avoid model reification and interpretational pitfalls, we need to distinguish mathematical ‘map’ of our models and functional ‘territory’ of the cognitive systems they model [13, 14], yet build mechanistic bridges between them. In other words, the properties of our statistical models should not be conflated with the properties of the system that the statistics describe.

In this review, we seek to guide the reader through the foundation mathematics of higher-order information theory to understand how a link between model properties and cognitive function can be meaningfully established (without over-attributing mechanisms where they do not exist). By starting with simple models, we emphasize intuitive understanding that can inform sound application. Concretely, we seek to connect the purely mathematical properties of higher-order information measures to their capacities and limitations in furnishing mechanistic explanations. We first systematize Shannon-based multivariate measures in terms of interaction strength and redundancy-synergy balance, showing how they already constrain functional interpretation. We then review the PID, emphasizing the conceptual and practical consequences of choosing a redundancy function, and illustrating why this choice deserves more than a technical footnote. Finally, we step into the territory of empirical data to trace how synergistic and redundant motifs manifest across temporal, spatial, and contextual scales. The overarching goal is pragmatic: to equip the experimentalist with a principled understanding of what each measure can and cannot tell us about neural function, and how to deploy them in ways that genuinely advance mechanistic insight.

2 From Shannon Entropy to Redundancy-Synergy Balance

Shannon’s original work [8] was concerned with the engineering task of lossless transmission of information from a sender A to a receiver B. Still, the metric he created, mutual information, is itself undirected. Instead of capturing a physical, causally powerful flow of information, it has instead been shown to be much closer to a generalized notion of correlation between two variables that can subsume various other linear, bivariate tests of statistical dependence [15]. Ultimately, as cognitive scientists, we are interested in how function arises from the higher-order interplay among many components, often numbering hundreds or thousands of neurons. This implies a two-fold challenge: (1) using the appropriate higher-order information metrics to fit the research question, and (2) translating these measures onto mechanistic inferences about cognitive function. To this end, we will move from mathematical tools, illustrated in Boolean toy systems, progressively towards biological cognition in the context of real-world demands.

2.1 Diverging Notions of Higher-Order Information Sharing

A common point of confusion at the outset is the distinction between entropy and information. For all practical purposes, we will restrict ourselves to discrete probability spaces, starting with a single variable. Briefly stated, Shannon entropy $H(X)$ is how much an observer can learn on average from observations sampled from the probability distribution $P(X)$ over outcomes x from the set of all possible outcomes X . While entropy can be thought of as the amount of uncertainty inherent to a probability distribution, information is about the reduction of uncertainty. Roughly speaking, entropy inflates the scope of our uncertainty about which state a system is in, while information deflates it. Formally, entropy is defined as

$$H(\mathbf{X}) = - \sum_x p(x) \log_2 p(x) = \sum_x p(x) h(x) \quad (1)$$

where $p(x)$ is the probability associated with a particular outcome x . Each possible outcome (*not* observation) has associated local entropy (pointwise surprisal) values $h(x) = -\log_2 p(x)$. Choosing, by convention, the base 2 for our logarithm, this can be conceived of as how often the space of possible outcomes must be halved to specify a particular outcome uniquely [16]. The logarithm translates this multiplicative process into an additive language, where the primary unit of study is the bit. If, for instance, a neuron fires as often as it stays silent ($p(x=1) = p(x=0) = 0.5$), its entropy $H(X) = 1$ bit, since we could not be more uncertain about what we would observe next (assuming no temporal autocorrelation). At the same time, entropy bounds how much information we can extract from observing a variable.




Fig. 1: a) The mutual information $I(X_1; X_2)$ between two random variables X_1 and X_2 can be thought of as corresponding to the *shared randomness* of the joint entropy (shaded in grey). b) Beyond two variables, various metrics account for the notion of information sharing in different mathematical ways.

Only when considering an additional random variable X_2 can we start to talk about mutual information, uncertainty shared between two variables. Mutual information is necessarily nonnegative, as the joint entropy $H(X_1, X_2)$, the entropy of the composite system (the union of X_1 and X_2), is smaller than the sum of the individual entropies. (Joint) entropy is a subadditive quantity, since the joint entropy $H(X_1, X_2)$ can be smaller (but never greater) than the sum of their entropies individually considered. If two variables are always in the same state, for instance, their joint entropy is reduced to $H(X_1, X_2) = 1$ bit, while the sum of their individual entropies $H(X_1) + H(X_2) = 2$ bits. Since we can learn about the entropy of one from observing the other, in this case, their entropy is said to be overlapping. This gives rise to non-zero mutual information. Regardless of which one is measured, MI is symmetric and undirected, so that

$$I(X_1; X_2) = I(X_2; X_1) = H(X_1) + H(X_2) - H(X_1, X_2). \quad (2)$$

One bit of information about variable X_1 , or even a fraction of it, chips away uncertainty about the state of X_2 , and vice versa. Let's assume a neuron can only occupy two possible states: firing and resting. Then, for two neurons to share one bit of information, both need to be firing with maximal randomness when individually considered ($H(X_1) + H(X_2) = 2$), yet do so in perfect dependence when jointly considered, collapsing their joint entropy into one mutually shared bit ($H(X_1, X_2) = 1$). This means they show a joint firing pattern that reflects either perfect synchrony or perfect asynchrony (one always fires when the other does not, and vice versa). Importantly, mutual information will only tell us about the reliability of this association, but does not distinguish between these polar opposite cases in terms of correlation.

While shared information is easily interpretable for two variables, the idea of shared information between three or more variables remains poorly defined. Under a liberal conception, it could be the information shared by at least two variables (out of possibly hundreds or thousands). In contrast, the strictest conception could count as mutual only randomness shared among *all* variables. Capturing these different definitions of higher-order dependency motivates introducing various ways to account for probing dependency mathematically. Multiple measures have been introduced to generalize mutual information, each effectively querying the system in a different way. We may ask:

1. To what extent are the parts coupled? (Total Correlation)
2. To what extent is the whole constrained by relationships among the parts? (Dual Total Correlation)
3. To what extent does redundancy dominate synergy? (O-information & Co-information (for even n))
4. What is the aggregate information sharing strength? (S-information)
5. What is the average information across a cut through the system? (TSE complexity)

We can illustrate what the (quantitative) answers to these questions (Table 1) mean best by considering the prototypes of redundancy and synergy: the COPY ('giant bit') and XOR ('parity') distributions 2). They represent the prototypical representations of what we actually mean when speak about redundancy and synergy, so it is worth lingering on them. As we can see in Figure 2, the Venn diagram is not very helpful here in distinguishing between these two, since the entropy overlap is maximal for both. If we look at their corresponding truth tables, though, we can see for the former that the state of each individual variable is fully determined by knowing the state of *any* of the other variables. This is redundancy in its purest form: Any of the other variables fully discloses all the information held collectively. In the case of pure synergy, the state of each variable can only be fully determined by knowing the state of *all* of the other variables together. We can therefore a dual mereological (whole-part) relationship between synergy and redundancy: While each part tells us everything about the whole in a redundant system, nothing short of the whole is necessary to define the state of each of the parts for a synergistic one. On the right of Figure 2, it is shown that predominantly redundant systems allow for the 'deduction' of many states from one, via the necessary many-onto-one 'inductive' dependency that characterizes predominantly synergistic systems. This difference is also reflected in the entropy of the joint distribution: While the joint entropy of the whole $H(X_1, X_2, X_3) = 1$ bit for the COPY distribution, $H(X_1, X_2, X_3) = 2$ bits for the XOR distribution. Although each variable, considered individually, is equally likely to be 0 or 1 for both, the joint state introduces additional uncertainty in the synergistic case. As we will now explore, different queries to the system account for these intrinsically higher-order dependencies in various ways.




Fig. 2: Redundancy vs. synergy. On the left, redundancy and synergy are shown overlapping at the intersection of the shared entropy between three variables. As the circles are rotated onto another, two qualitatively different, yet dual, prototypes of higher-order interaction can emerge: In the top row, we see the only purely redundant dependency, signified by a COPY gate in red. As shown in the accompanying truth table, all states are perfectly synchronized, acting like one ‘giant bit’. The XOR gate’s synergistic interdependence also constrains the parts, but each variable is determined only by the joint state of the other two, not by either alone. The associated directed graphs (rightmost figures) show a duality between the broadcasting ‘tail-to-tail’ model (redundancy) and the integrative ‘head-to-head’ models (from [17]): redundancy allows for the ‘deduction’ of all other states from a single one, while synergy requires all other states to ‘induce’ the state of any one of them.

2.2 Total correlation: To what extent are the parts coupled?

From the statistician’s perspective, the most salient use case of information theory is to test for dependence between variables. Indeed, mutual information can provide a versatile nonparametric measure that can substitute for a whole array of statistical tests (ANOVA, chi-squared, GLM, and decoder fit, etc.) [15]. This frames information as evidence towards deviation from independence, as quantified by the KL-divergence:

$$I(X_1; X_2) = D_{\text{KL}}(P(X_1, X_2) || P(X_1)P(X_2)). \quad (3)$$

Conceiving of information as such a generalized test against independence leads to the **total correlation** (TC):

$$TC(\mathbf{X}) = D_{\text{KL}}(P(\mathbf{X}) || \prod_i P(X_i)) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N H(X_i) \right) - H(\mathbf{X}) \quad (4)$$

A higher TC value indicates more evidence for a model that characterizes a system’s components as dependent, since a small entropy of the joint state $H(\mathbf{X})$ detracts little from the sum of individual contributions. The bias towards redundant coupling leads to a smaller joint entropy and, therefore, higher TC for the COPY than for the XOR distribution. Thus, the closer the joint distributions get to acting as one synchronized system, the higher the TC.

2.3 Dual total correlation: To what extent is the whole constrained by relationships among the parts?

While the TC has a bias towards redundancy in its notion of information sharing, its dual metric, the **dual total correlation** (DTC), also called binding information [18], leans towards synergy [19]. It

derives from writing the MI as a subtraction of conditional entropy from the joint state, reducing for two variables to

$$I(X_1; X_2) = H(X_1, X_2) - [H(X_1|X_2) + H(X_2|X_1)] \quad (5)$$

Generalizing this algebraic approach to higher dimensions yields

$$\text{DTC}(\mathbf{X}) = H(\mathbf{X}) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^N H(X_i|X_{-i}) \right), \quad (6)$$

where conditioning each X_i on all other variables X_{-i} removes the non-shared entropy of each variable, also called the residual entropy [11]. Since the implicit question asked by applying the DTC emphasizes how the entropy of the whole cannot be explained away by the exclusively individual entropy, the bit values are flipped from the TC between XOR and COPY: the XOR distribution carries more information in its joint state and therefore has a higher DTC.

2.4 O-information (& co-information): To what extent does redundancy dominate synergy?

Although TC and DTC have a bias towards measuring redundancy and synergy, respectively, they tally their contributions together with the overall information sharing *strength*, which does not differentiate between synergy and redundancy and also includes bivariate dependencies (cf. Figure 3). When one subtracts the synergy-associated DTC from the redundancy-associated TC, we cancel out any notion of information sharing *strength* implicit in them and leave only their association with redundancy and synergy. We arrive at a particularly popular method for describing the redundancy-synergy *balance*: the **O-information** (Ω) [20]. After originally naming it the enigmatic information, [11] showed that the O-information can be written as

$$\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = \text{TC}(\mathbf{X}) - \text{DTC}(\mathbf{X}), \quad (7)$$

seemingly allowing for the not-so-enigmatic interpretation as the overall tendency of a system to be synergy-dominated (for negative values) or redundancy-dominated (for positive values). The O-information gives a strictly higher-order account of information sharing in the sense that it is only sensitive to interactions between at least three variables (compare with the Venn diagram in Fig. 2b). It captures the essence of what differentiates the COPY and XOR distributions: one bit of redundancy and one bit of synergy, respectively.

If and only if $n = 3$, these purely higher-order interactions live at the intersection between all variables, which the **Co-information** (Co-I) [9] measures. Hence, they yield equivalent results in that case but can diverge for $n \geq 4$. The measure is derived from the set-theoretic inclusion-exclusion principle: to obtain the entropy shared by all n variables, one has to add and subtract (include and exclude) the entropies of sets S of different sizes in alternation to avoid double-counting. Hence, the Co-I, also called the interaction information, is defined as a sum of joint entropies, where the sign alternates as one increments the set size up to the inclusion of all n variables:

$$\text{Co-I}(X_1, \dots, X_N) = \sum_{S \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_N\}} (-1)^{|S|} H(S) \quad (8)$$

In this way, the Co-I measures only the dependency present in *all* variables considered, with non-zero (and possibly negative) values indicating higher-order dependencies [21].

2.5 S-information: What is the aggregated information sharing strength?

Complementary to the question whether redundancy or synergy dominates (O-information) stands the **S-information** (Σ) [11], which tallies them both (together with exclusively bivariate information) to




Fig. 3: a) Higher-order information sharing can vary along two axes: (1) the vertical dimension represents the overall strength of the interdependence (opacity gradient), increasing with greater entropy overlap, and (2) the extent to which synergy or redundancy dominates (blue-red gradient), a measure of balance on the horizontal axis. b) The relationship between the different higher-order metrics reviewed is related to the (bounded) coordinate system that results from a). Importantly, a system cannot be more redundant or synergistic than it is interdependent overall (signified by the ‘unattainable’ regions for which $|x| > y$).

give an easily computable overview of the information strength within the system. By summing up the mutual information between each variable and the rest of the system, we get:

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{X}) = \text{TC}(\mathbf{X}) + \text{DTC}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_i I(X_i | X_{-i}). \quad (9)$$

Being agnostic about low- or high-order contributions to the dependency, it yields the same results for the COPY and XOR distributions, where each of the three variables shares one bit with the rest, albeit in different ways that the S-information is insensitive to.

2.6 TSE complexity: What is the average information across a cut through the system?

While the S-information indicates how much information *individual* parts share *on aggregate* with the rest of the system, the Tononi-Sporns-Edelman complexity, or short, **TSE complexity** (C_{TSE}) [22], instead provides the *average* information over all *sets* of individual variables a with the rest:

$$C_{\text{TSE}}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \binom{N}{k}^{-1} \sum_{|a|=k} I(X_a | X_{-a}). \quad (10)$$

Having been originally introduced to simultaneously segregated and integrated system dependencies, it vanishes by construction both for independent collections (no integration) and for fully synchronized collections (no segregation). Reminiscent of the DTC, it is maximized when small subsets are only weakly coupled while the whole is strongly constrained. This captures the segregation–integration balance associated with complex cognitive organization [23].

2.7 Comparing the Multivariate Generalizations of Mutual Information

When contrasting these various metrics, all can be argued for as ‘natural’ extensions of MI, as they invoke different ways of defining information sharing. Each corresponds to a different question the system is queried with, which coincide only in the case of two variables. There is only one way to characterize

Table 1: Comparison of six information measures for XOR and COPY ($n = 3$, fair binary variables). Values in bits.

Measure	XOR	COPY
Total correlation, TC	1	2
Dual total correlation, DTC	2	1
O-information, $\Omega = TC - DTC$	-1	1
Co-information, Co-I	-1	1
S-information, $S = TC + DTC$	3	3
TSE complexity, C_{TSE}	1	1

information sharing between two variables: by mutual information, a one-dimensional scalar. One might suppose that the number of dimensions characterizing information sharing in higher dimensions would scale with the number of a system’s elements. Regardless of the number of variables n , though, it has been recently found to be fully captured by adding to the dimension of information sharing *strength* but a second dimension of *balance* between redundancy and synergy [19], as illustrated in Figure 3a.

Although the two dimensions of information strength and balance can vary independently, they still share an important link through the roles redundancy and synergy play in both. While the O-information and the co-information (for odd n) weigh them *against* one another, like an analogue scale, the S-information and TSE complexity weigh them stacked on top of one another (together with the exclusively bivariate interactions), like a digital scale (Figure 3b). Fittingly, the former are called skew-symmetric and the latter symmetric measures of information sharing [17]. Metrics of overall independence strength are most heavily weighting these intrinsically higher-order interactions while being agnostic about the ‘color’ of the interaction, therefore being called ‘symmetric’ measures (Figure 3b). The XOR and COPY gates are extreme examples in different ways: They provide the maximal information-sharing strength for a three-variable system and the maximal contrast in redundancy-synergy tilt, just as the most extreme dissociation between these two (symmetric and skew-symmetric) dimensions.

From a practical perspective, using the S-information and the O-information in concert provides two values that approximately capture (a) how strongly information is shared and (b) whether the whole or the parts predominantly hold it with minimal computational overhead. Generally, the co-information, total correlation and dual total correlation do not fall neatly into these two categories. The TSE complexity scales much more poorly than the S-information, while correlating strongly with it in neuroscientific data [24].

Overall, these entropy-based measures have established themselves as valuable tools that require few assumptions beyond the core tenets of information theory and can quickly provide answers to key questions about large systems, such as large neural ensembles. Since redundancy and synergy seem to play such a fundamental role in explaining higher-order information sharing, we might ask whether we can cleanly disentangle them, not just to measure their aggregate balance (O-information), but also to measure their contributions directly. Additionally, we might ask how they are distributed among many variables to compose into the purely Shannon-based metrics so far reviewed. These are the objectives behind the various proposals for decomposing higher-order information into disjoint parts, which turns out to be much trickier than it might seem.

3 Partial Information Decomposition(s)

At the core of the Partial Information Decomposition (PID) stands the idea that the information multiple *source* variables hold about a *target* variable (separated by a semicolon, such as in $I(X_1, X_2; X_3)$) can be decomposed into unique, redundant, and synergistic atoms (Figure 4). The label ‘partial information atoms’ suggests that the PID is trying to break information down into its smallest constituent parts. In contrast to the undirected measures previously reviewed, directionality is baked into its approach, so that we consistently quantify information *about* the target in particular. If we take X_3 to be the target, then:

$$I(X_1, X_2; X_3) = \{1\}\{2\} + \{1\} + \{2\} + \{12\}, \quad (11)$$

where $\{1\}\{2\}$ is (the atom representing) the information in either X_1 or X_2 (redundancy) about X_3 , $\{12\}$ is the information about X_3 only available by considering X_1 and X_2 jointly (synergy), while $\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$ represent the information unique to each source. Despite the promise of cutting information at its joints in this way, there are three main issues with the PID that we want to highlight: (1) It is not clear how to measure the atoms in an uncontroversial way, (2) the inherent distinction between sources and targets brings additional, contentious assumptions with it, and (3) its computational as well as interpretational complexity renders its practical usefulness limited.

The decomposition can be algebraically unlocked by defining a function that defines one of the atoms, usually the redundant one, which then allows assigning bit values to all synergistic and unique information atoms. This means that the research program around the PID has revolved around finding a proper mathematical definition of redundancy, although seeking agreement on a particular function has largely been abandoned in favor of conceptual pluralism.

Being a ‘proper’ redundancy function refers here to the property of satisfying a set of axioms, which themselves heavily rely on our intuitions about what redundancy means precisely. However, it is already in the mathematical distillation of these intuitions into axioms where disagreements lurk, which has effectively led to a pluralism of conceptions about what exactly redundancy refers to. This is reminiscent of the disagreements discussed in section 2.1 regarding the mathematical commitments one must make when generalizing MI to higher dimensions. Instead of reviewing the whole battery of redundancy functions that have been proposed (see, e.g., [25] for a thorough technical comparison), we focus our discussion on the general difficulties arising from trying to make the resulting PID satisfy all the properties we would like to see.

To illustrate issues (1) and (2), we consider the AND gate, where the outcome variable X_3 is only in state 1 if both inputs X_1 and X_2 are both in state 1 as well (see Figure 4). In this case, we *do* have a designated target variable, an asymmetry in the truth table that we did not have for the XOR and COPY distributions. This might or might not *align* with the source-target distinction that the PID forces us to make, effectively yielding one ‘aligned’ and two ‘misaligned’ decompositions. In other words, ‘alignment’ here means that the target in the PID is actually the output variable of the AND gate. Looking at Table 2, we can see that a subset of redundancy functions disagree in their assignment of bit values (1) to unique, redundant and synergistic atoms and (2) when comparing ‘aligned’ and ‘misaligned’ target variable choices.

Besides the divergent (negative) results, which I_{\pm} , I_{sx} , and I_{ccs} show, the other shown redundancy functions (of which we have collected seven popular choices) at least show consistency in this simple case of the AND gate. When applied to neuroscientific data, several among the proposals have been shown to correlate strongly with each other [26], or at least permit qualitatively similar conclusions [27]. Again, I_{\pm} and I_{sx} (I_{\pm} ’s differentiable cousin) stand out as notable oddballs, since they permit negative atom values (together with I_{ccs}).

As more and more redundancy functions have been proposed [26, 28–34] with, as yet, only meager convergence of opinions, a central problem at the core of the PID undertaking has become clear: Not only is redundancy taken to mean different things by different authors in their formalizations, but also has the inclusion of one set of axioms resulted in tradeoffs with the violation of other axioms deemed essential by other theorists. Unfortunately, it still remains unclear how one is to make a decision on which redundancy function to use without getting bogged down in mathematical details. The fact that most measures correlate strongly for real data, as mentioned above, should at least allow for qualitatively similar conclusions regardless of the redundancy function chosen. However, one can hardly say that these conclusions are robust, though, since they *do* depend on the assumptions made by the redundancy function.

Even if one were to hypothetically discover the ‘right’ redundancy function, a huge practical limitation of the PID is the superexponential growth of PID atoms with the number of included variables. The case with more than eight variables has already become infeasible, even with high-performance computing, in contrast to the family of entropy-based measures, which can scale easily to hundreds of variables.

The hefty computational price tag arising from the algorithmic mission of the PID is a sweeping one, aiming for a *complete* decomposition instead of just a summary metric, like the co-information or O-information, which only indicate overall tendencies towards redundancy or synergy. It seems neither feasible nor necessarily useful from an epistemological viewpoint to aim for complete decompositions of larger systems, which quickly blow up in their computational as well as semantic complexity. Ultimately, we want to use the measures to tell us something meaningful about information processing in our system of interest. Instead of worrying about the prohibitively high costs of a complete PID for neural recordings from dozens or hundreds of sites, we should take into account that the granularity of our decomposition should be just fine enough, and not necessarily finer than that, to answer our research questions. Otherwise, the complexity of the results exceeds our own capacity to draw interpretable inferences from them.

If one is willing to bite the bullet and commit to a redundancy function, one can ameliorate PID's limitations in several ways. Firstly, for the sake of interpretability, restricting oneself to triads (two sources and one target) is helpful, as is usually done in practice. Then, one should ensure that the inherent source-target directionality in the PID should align itself with the causal source-target directionality in the system modeled. The previously mentioned study by [27] did this at a single-neuron level, for instance, by taking basal and apical dendrites as source and axonal action potential as target variables. Usually, though, the causal directionality is far from being this clear from the outset. In that case, one may infer directed connections between variables by using transfer entropy (TE) [35], which quantifies how much X_1 's past can inform us about X_2 's future states above X_1 's own past. In this way one can subset significantly interconnected triads at the time scale that reflects underlying cause-effect delays [36]. By using the fact that causes generally are taken to precede effects in time, one can harness TE to increase the likelihood of finding proper source-target alignment, while minimizing computational overhead.




Fig. 4: Left: PIDs from trivariate entropy overlap. Depending on the choice of which variables are defined as sources and which as the target, the three-variable case allows for three different ways of decomposing the underlying shared entropy. Each color corresponds to one possible subset of the joint entropy space that is being decomposed. Notice that each of the three decompositions leaves out the entropy shared exclusively between the two source variables. Hence, the entropy space being decomposed is sensitive to the choice of the target variable. Middle: PID for two source variables. The information that two source variables X_1 and X_2 hold individually about a target variable X_3 can be decomposed into unique ($\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$), redundant ($\{1\}\{2\}$ in red) and synergistic ($\{12\}$ in blue) partial information atoms. Right: Although the synergistic region is usually drawn around the two circles (as below), we chose to place (above) the synergistic atom inside their intersection together with the redundant atom for set-theoretical reasons (cf. [37]).

Table 2: Selected PID atoms (bits) for the equiprobable AND gate under several redundancy functions. Aligned decomposition use sources (X_1, X_2) and target $X_3 = X_1 \wedge X_2$. Misaligned decompositions use sources (X_1, X_3) and target X_2 or sources (X_2, X_3) and target X_1 .

Redundancy function	Aligned				Misaligned			
	R	U_0	U_1	S	R	U_0	U_1	S
I_{\min}	0.311	0.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189
I_{mmi}	0.311	0.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189
I_{BROJA}	0.311	0.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189
I_{proj}	0.311	0.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189
I_{ccs}	0.104	0.208	0.208	0.292	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189
I_{pm}	0.561	-0.250	-0.250	0.750	0.061	-0.061	0.250	0.250
I_{sx}	0.123	0.189	0.189	0.311	0.000	0.000	0.311	0.189

4 Functional Interpretations of Synergy and Redundancy

Whether with entropy-based measures or PID, what can we infer from these fundamentally statistical measures about the underlying functional structure of the system it is applied to? We seek to build intuitions from the math to the goal-driven functioning of cognition under external constraints, progressively adding layers of complexity. We start off associating redundancy-synergy balance with (1) directed network motifs, then add (2) temporal evolution to explore functional dynamics, before adding to a functional interpretation (3) the crucial element of their role in adaptation to demands external to the system measured.

4.1 Network Motifs of Redundancy-Synergy Balance and the Computation-Communication Tradeoff

So where does the structure of logical dependencies in maximally redundant / synergistic toy systems point us towards in terms of functional difference? In order to inch closer towards characterizing functional purposes of synergy and redundancy, we consider two systems of seven variables with known directed dependencies that represent dual hierarchies in terms of redundancy and synergy (Figure 5a). For the synergistic example, we find a feedforward hierarchy of XOR gates that recurrently integrates inputs at each level to inform the output at the next level. In this case, we find maximal **sensitivity** to inputs, because a bit flip in any of the input variables leads to a bit flip at the top of the hierarchy. Crucially, all the states of the ‘XOR hierarchy’ jointly shape its state, where knowledge of all the other variables together is necessary to determine the output state.

In contrast, a ‘broadcast hierarchy’ of COPY operations lets all parts move in synchrony so that a bit flip in any variable (here placed at the top) determines the state of all other variables. In this way, the maximally redundant system is constrained to only occupying two possible joint states out of 2^7 allowed ones. The maximally synergistic system has a much higher degree of degeneracy in what joint states correspond to individual states, retaining half (2^6) of the allowed joint state repertoire (Figure 5b). Thus, the parts move in synchronous lockstep for maximally redundant systems as the same state is effectively copied onto other parts. In contrast, the parts move in maximally synergistic systems in complete context-dependence, where no context short of all inputs considered together defines a part.

Due to their statistical degeneracy, maximally synergistic systems look a lot closer to independent noise. Synergy requires by definition weak correlations between individual parts. As correlations are increased, the joint state repertoire becomes so constrained that redundancy starts to dominate. From an inferential perspective we cannot rely on these here *a priori* defined dependencies, so that we are more likely to ascribe synergy to spurious correlations, which can easily appear from undersampling [38].

Coming back to the idealized case, we find an ‘all-onto-one’ motif on the synergistic end of the spectrum, where all the inputs jointly are needed to determine the state of any one of them. On the opposite end, all the arrows point outwards from any one variable, allowing for the deduction of all the other states from a single one. The O-information directly quantifies the balance between these two

Table 3: Seven-variable COPY, XOR (parity), and 50–50 mixed distributions. All entropies and informations are in bits (base-2). For the mixture, $\pi = 0.5$.

Distribution	$H(\mathbf{X})$	TC	DTC	Ω	Co-I	Σ	C_{TSE}
COPY (all copies)	1.000	6.000	1.000	5.000	1.000	7.000	6.000
XOR / parity	6.000	1.000	6.000	-5.000	-1.000	7.000	6.000
Mixture ($\pi = 0.5$)	4.449	2.551	4.096	-1.545	-0.357	6.646	6.911

motifs [17], which can be seen to be at the extremes ($\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = \pm 5$) in Table 3 for the respective XOR / COPY hierarchies.

The brain needs to balance these two extremes against one another to not just move in unison as one (extreme redundancy), associated with epileptic [39] or unconscious states [5], nor to fragment into a brittle, highly context-sensitive regime of runaway integration (extreme synergy). To serve functional purpose, integration and segregation need to be balanced within the system, precisely what the TSE complexity measures. TSE complexity been shown to be intimately linked to optimizing various functional properties of cognition [40], as reflected by measures of perturbational sensitivity [41], criticality [42, 43] or metastability [44]. In line with this intuition, we find that a mixture of XOR and COPY distributions peaks in its TSE complexity for a mixture close ($\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = 0.33$) to where redundancy and synergy are balanced ($\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = 0$) (Figure 5). Although these simple distributions do not functionally compute anything, we find here an example of how redundancy-synergy balance in the very structure of a network can support more complex organization.

The two prototypical directed motifs of information-sharing behind redundancy and synergy may serve complementary, dual purposes within a complex system: Redundant broadcasting of information replicates the same information from one part onto the rest for *communication*, whereas synergistic integration creates information in one part from the rest for *computation*. Several authors have noted that synergy is closely linked to computation, occurring when multiple inputs jointly influence the output of a third element [12, 45–47]. Although redundancy is most frequently associated with robustness [3, 48], we find that its duality to synergistic computation can instead be interpreted as a sign of large-scale broadcasting of information (communication) [49]. This can then underwrite the robust availability of information in multiple variables (or neurons).

Importantly, we find in synergy-redundancy balance a mirroring of the tradeoff between computation and communication: Communicating the same piece of information onto many downstream parts redundantly stands in direct conflict to their capacity to compute their own state from the joint context. If a neuron strongly entrains its neighbors, the communication of its state diminishes their power to deliver their own contributions towards computation jointly. This is directly supported by a series of studies that investigated the network motifs associated with synergy and redundancy in brain organoids at the circuit level [12, 36, 42, 49–53]. One of the main takeaways is that synergy is associated with recurrent integration of inputs towards a joint upstream output, while feedback from target to sources decreases synergy [49, 51]. The authors attribute the negative correlation between feedback of the target neuron and synergy to the top-down signal that reduces the variance of upstream neurons, which they require to interact synergistically. The upstream feedback signal effectively induces redundancy downstream as prediction errors are back-propagated. This echoes the purely mathematical treatment with a functional explanation at the circuit level: Horizontal modulation of source neurons corresponds to increased synergy, while the top-down broadcasting of information reduces it.

4.2 Temporal Evolution and Information Dynamics

So far we have only related the logical structure in essentially atemporal probability distributions to cognitive function. However, cognition, at least in the brain, is primarily taken to unfold across time, which we have to account for in order to investigate synergy and redundancy’s impact on *dynamics*. Once more, we first take recourse to fully transparent Boolean systems to investigate dynamics arising out of informational properties that are determined *a priori*. Particularly insightful work in this domain




Fig. 5: Seven-variable COPY–XOR hierarchy mixture and its multiscale information signatures. Left and right columns illustrate the two extreme hierarchical motifs with $N=7$: a broadcasting/COPY hierarchy (left) and an integrative/XOR hierarchy (right). The dot-maps (top) show the number of admissible global states in each extreme ($H(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ bit for COPY; $H(\mathbf{X}) = 6$ bit for XOR - see Table 3). Schematic trees depict the corresponding logical update structure before and after a single bit-flip at the root (lightning bolt), highlighting top-down communication in COPY versus context-dependent, distributed computation in XOR. Center panels quantify a fair mixture of the two motifs, parameterized by mixture coefficient $\pi \in [0, 1]$ (bottom color bar; $\pi = 0$ pure COPY, $\pi = 1$ pure XOR). Top center: O-information (purple) and normalized TSE complexity (black) as a function of π ; vertical dashed lines mark the π achieving maximal C_{TSE} and the π where the O-information is closest to zero (balance of redundancy and synergy). Bottom center: scale-resolved terms $u_k (k = 1, \dots, 6)$ (information at scale k) across the same sweep show a redistribution of information across scales as the network shifts from redundant broadcasting toward synergistic integration (adapted from [19]).

has come from the study of synergy and redundancy in cellular automata (CAs) [54], where a one-dimensional array of cells iteratively updates their discrete state based on their neighboring cells' states. This adds not only a notion of temporality (the system evolves over time steps) but also locality (only the local vicinity matters), moving it somewhat closer to real cognitive systems. CAs have been shown to provide a Turing-complete [55] model of how complex patterns are generated by simple rules and allow for investigating the dynamics of complex systems in a fully transparent, rule-governed sandbox environment.

[56] used a genetic algorithm to evolve Boolean networks' updating rules towards maximal and minimal O-information, before investigating differences in the patterns these networks generate. While highly redundant networks very quickly settled into a repetitive attractor state, highly synergistic ones took much longer to detour through state space, with average transient lengths on par with those of randomly updating networks. From the perspective of an external observer, synergy acts here as a generator of novelty, or irreducible randomness [57], while redundancy constrains it. Every single-cell update of the network results from a distributed set of inputs, which themselves are highly context-dependent. Thus, a single bit flip can set off interpenetrating cascades of bit flips down the line, reminiscent of chaotic dynamics.

The chaotic dynamics associated with strongly negative O-information can be explained through highly interdependent contributions of neighboring cells, where single bit flips are much more likely to also flip the output state than in redundant networks. [58] support the idea that we can understand purely synergistic networks as highly sensitive to initial conditions and perturbations, setting off an echo of unpredictable ripples through the network as it evolves through time. The opposite holds for redundancy: Periodic, oscillatory dynamics, which are hardly sensitive to single-bit flips, robustly prevail. [58] showed, by translating update rules into logic gates, that higher redundancy corresponds to fewer distributed logical operations. As updates in one part of the CA do not interdependently factor into the computation of output states in other parts, redundancy implies a much poorer computational expressivity of the joint state space. This restriction can be of great advantage, though, when information needs to be reliably communicated with high fault tolerance [59]. Redundant interactions can serve as perturbation-absorbing structures that can channel cascades onto stable trajectories [60].

In line with the more repetitive oscillatory patterns found in redundancy-dominated CAs [56], recent neuroscientific studies of local field potentials (LFPs) [61, 62] showed that narrowband oscillations are almost exclusively connected with redundancy-dominance. If we consider the fact that oscillations picked up by LFPs are generally taken to arise from large-scale synchrony at the circuit level [63], this makes sense in the light of the link we drew in previous sections between synchronous state evolution and redundancy. If, however, broadband signals with no characteristic frequency govern brain dynamics, this is a strong sign of synergy-dominance. As the brain accommodates surprising information, synergy-dominated transients give way to redundancy-dominated oscillations through recurrent feedback loops [64]. Although much work remains to be done on the cross-scale relationship between information decompositions at different levels of resolution, a clearer picture is emerging: As high-dimensional stimuli impinge on the sensorium, synergistic computation rapidly integrates unpredicted information within low-level modules. As the local components converge upon a collective response, gamma oscillations [65] allow for a strong, redundant signal to be broadcasted [62, 66]. Large-scale narrowband oscillations may therefore index high-precision regimes in which predictive inference has reduced uncertainty, yielding low-dimensional, redundant dynamics suitable for broadcasting.

It becomes evident that the brain needs to deploy redundant and synergistic information dynamics in concert to integrate information about the world without losing global coherence. Boolean networks with maximal TSE complexity showed this kind of balance: they exhibited longer transients than redundant networks but showed much clearer attractor dynamics than synergistic ones [56]. Likewise, the brain nests more irregular transients within slower oscillations. Through highly synergistic processing, the brain introduces the variability in outputs needed to respond to the richness of external states flexibly, complying with Ashby’s law of requisite variety [67, 68]. In excess, however, this variability would not allow the state space to be sufficiently bounded to revolve around a set of homeostatic attractor states [69]. From a dynamical stability perspective, redundancy can be thought of as ensuring canalization [70, 71] of trajectories, converting variability in input sequences into coherence in output. What this output should be steered towards depends, though, entirely on the (task-)context, whose role in shaping the synergy-redundancy balance will be investigated in the next section.

4.3 The Contextual Dimension: Connecting Measures to External Influences

In this final section, we will turn to embedding the putative functional roles of synergy and redundancy within the contextual constraints under which cognition operates. Although Boolean systems provide an excellent ground for honing intuitions about the properties of redundancy and synergy, they are far too simple to capture the externally constrained functioning that evolution imposes on cognitive systems. We highlight three factors external to a cognitive system that significantly determine the role that synergy and redundancy end up playing within it: (1) task context, (2) resource constraints, and (3) exogenous noise. We first focus on task-induced effects, then show how task goals select synergistic vs redundant regimes, and finally discuss how resource limits and noise bias this balance.

To understand the functional purposes of redundancy and synergy support, it helps interpret the measures when they are taken within a task context. Only then, redundancy and synergy can be meaningfully related to cognitive states, such as done by [73], for instance: Intracranial recordings from macaques’




Fig. 6: a) A study of triads of neurons in brain organoid revealed that synergy is negatively associated with top-down feedback and positively with recurrence (from [49]). b) Boolean cellular automata were evolved to have maximal redundancy, synergy or TSE complexity. The networks with the highest TSE complexity seemed to balance the chaotic and periodic tendencies of the former two (from [56]). c) Synergy-dominated chaotic transients during recurrent visual feature integration are followed by redundant oscillations as low-level cortices are stabilized through top-down feedback (adapted from [72]).

frontoparietal areas showed that both redundancy and synergy were significantly elevated during movement execution compared to the fixation, cue and memory periods. Redundancy was even more strongly elevated, though: As the cross-region interactions synchronise in a global response, this can perhaps be explained by a low-dimensional behavioral signal that is redundantly broadcasted across regions. Such inferences are only possible, though, if stimulus-evoked activity is taken into account. [74] showed in this way that visual stimulation elevates synergistic long-range correlations more strongly with the PID or [61, 64] incorporated the stimulus contrast information directly into the co-information calculation to identify synergistic cross-regional prediction-error processing.

Artificial neural networks (ANNs), like brains, need to deal with limited resources when solving task demands. This can effectively induce an informational bottleneck [75], which is instrumental in learning task-relevant representations. Only by ignoring some task-irrelevant information can patterns be meaningfully abstracted, while overfitting to irrelevant details is punished. This inductive learning process can be studied transparently in ANNs. It was shown that increased synergy was associated with both layer depth and training time [76, 77]. Information that is redundantly represented by many nodes, dominant during early training, is gradually eliminated as the network learns less complex, more efficient encoding strategies. The algorithm effectively leverages the computational power of synergistic encoding with the limited resources it has. Informational bottlenecks force ANNs towards synergistic dynamics, making them sensitive to information that must be considered jointly to be task-relevant [78].

Beyond characterizing state changes across task epochs, redundancy and synergy have also been used directly to probe how stimulus and behavior are jointly encoded in neural activity. For audiovisual speech, [4] decomposed the mutual information between auditory and visual speech envelopes and MEG responses. It showed that theta-band activity in left posterior STG chiefly carries redundant information about the two modalities. In contrast, the left motor cortex encodes synergistic information that emerges only when both streams are considered together. This highlights that although oscillations exhibit redundancy when considered without context, accounting for a task variable can bring more subtle details about neural representations to light. In a related vein, [79] used redundancy between stimulus, MEG responses, and behavior to distinguish task-relevant from task-irrelevant coding, demonstrating how multivariate information can directly index which aspects of neural activity are functionally recruited for performance.

Synergistic integration of goal-relevant features plays an important computational role for any cognitive system that needs to compress its input-output mapping. Resource constraints, which disallow an

injective (one-to-one) mapping of inputs onto outputs, have been demonstrated in ANNs to be crucial to support why synergy emerges as a computational resource [76]. This efficient computation of outputs comes at the price of instability, though. Once noise corrupts the inputs, as it inevitably does in any natural setting, sufficient redundancies are needed to channel the chaos purely synergistic computation creates towards basins of attraction. When noise is introduced, the vulnerability of synergistic solutions is punished, forcing ANNs redundantly overrepresent information [78]. Not only introduces noise system-side effects but also estimator-side effects: [80] showed how noise correlations can flip a code from synergistic to redundant (or vice versa) and that redundancy often increases as shared noise grows. More recently, [81] demonstrated that noise first penalizes synergistic detectability. [82] developed a noise-robust normalization to counteract fallacious inferences based on spurious synergy/redundancy. This highlights once more how crucial it is to ensure that our models’ readouts are carefully translated into functional interpretations.

5 Future Directions

Although the nascent community applying higher-order information theory to neuroscientific data seems to converge on putative functional interpretations of synergy and redundancy in the brain, many questions remain. As highlighted in this paper, the mapping of information-theoretic quantities in our models onto functionally relevant mechanisms is tricky, yet promising due to the general language with which information theory can describe computation and communication at various scales.

The first issue that needs to be tackled more rigorously is the explicit connection of information dynamics across scales. Various recent studies on whole-brain dynamics have been conducted using highly coarse-grained fMRI data [3, 24, 83–85], measuring the activity of $10^5 - 10^6$ neurons per spatial bin (voxel) [86], a massive difference from the circuit-level studies discussed that come closer to measuring $10^1 - 10^2$ neurons. Too few studies have been conducted at the mesoscale of intracortical recordings (around 10^3 neurons) to allow for an explanatory bridge between micro and macro. This can lead to seemingly conflicting results from the same dataset for the same regions of interest (ROIs), if we choose, for instance, a finer-grained time resolution or a more microscopic measurement apparatus: Synergy at the microscopic circuit level is maximal at synaptic time scales [36, 87] but in macroscopically resolved fMRI recordings at much longer timescales [47]. Similarly, we find different correlations between synergy and distance across different spatial resolutions. Using sufficiently microscopic measurements from U-probes in macaques, stronger synergies have been found within cortical columns within V1 than between them [88], reflecting a decrease of synergy with distance. In contrast, the exact opposite relationship has been detected with a very different technique [3], using much more coarse-grained fMRI recordings on resting-state data. This serves as a reminder that inferences about synergy and redundancy emerge from within the measurement setup we choose, leaving plenty of work for experimentalists and theorists to design cross-scale studies and renormalization tools (e.g., coarse-graining-consistent decompositions).

The second main obstacle to stronger, valid statements about the mechanistic roles of synergy and redundancy is the disentangling of their causal contributions from spurious detection during measurements, a schism we hope to have sufficiently highlighted. Intervention seems indispensable here in order to dissociate mechanism from measurement bias [89]. Further statistical biases induced by undersampling [38] or the lack of null-models [82] are just starting to be accounted for in this context.

A fruitful direction towards a mechanistic, physically grounded interpretation of information atoms in brain data is the explicit grounding of neuroscientific research in thermodynamic principles [90]. Although crucial impetuses have come from researchers in statistical physics (e.g. [11, 68, 91–94], concepts and tools out of this niche are only starting to enter mainstream computational neuroscience [95–100]. There are promising avenues to connect the study of how the brain minimises variational free energy [101–103], a concept that bridges information theory and thermodynamics, focusing on the cross-scale informational architecture that supports the brain’s adaptive functioning [104]. Crucial mathematical links for this unification have been developed [24] but still need to be exploited empirically.

6 Conclusion

Synergy and redundancy represent fundamental concepts in extending our understanding of cognition beyond bivariate interactions. In this review, we tried to provide intuitions and guidance on how to connect the mathematical tools to valid inferences about their complementary roles in cognitive functioning. From purely *a priori* mathematical considerations, it is evident that non-trivial interdependencies between many elements in a system require the amalgamation of synergy and redundancy. Pure redundancy collapses a system into rigid, low-dimensional synchrony, while pure synergy yields high-dimensional sensitivity that becomes functionally brittle. When translated from simple Boolean systems onto neural circuits, we showed that redundancy-synergy balance mirrors a computation-communication tradeoff, so that the computational power of synergistic integration and the robustness of redundant broadcasting can be simultaneously leveraged across scales. The next challenge is to explain through causal interventions how this balance is realized across neural scales and timescales, and when it is adaptively shifted by context. This promises a more rigorous mapping of statistical measures onto physical mechanisms supporting cognitive functioning.

Acknowledgments. D. R. gratefully acknowledges financial support through the Amsterdam Science Talent Scholarship and the German Academic Scholarship Foundation.

Declarations. The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] Varley, T. F. Information theory for complex systems scientists: What, why, and how. *Physics Reports* **1148**, 1–55 (2025).
- [2] Miller, E. K., Brincat, S. L. & Roy, J. E. Cognition is an emergent property. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* **57**, 101388 (2024).
- [3] Luppi, A. I. *et al.* A synergistic core for human brain evolution and cognition. *Nature Neuroscience* **25**, 771–782 (2022).
- [4] Park, H., Ince, R. A. A., Schyns, P. G., Thut, G. & Gross, J. Representational interactions during audiovisual speech entrainment: Redundancy in left posterior superior temporal gyrus and synergy in left motor cortex. *PLOS Biology* **16**, e2006558 (2018).
- [5] Luppi, A. I. *et al.* Unravelling consciousness and brain function through the lens of time, space, and information. *Trends in Neurosciences* **0** (2024).
- [6] Luppi, A. I., Rosas, F. E., Mediano, P. A. M., Menon, D. K. & Stamatakis, E. A. Information decomposition and the informational architecture of the brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* (2024).
- [7] Williams, P. L. & Beer, R. D. Nonnegative Decomposition of Multivariate Information (2010). [1004.2515](#).
- [8] Shannon, C. E. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal* **27**, 379–423 (1948).
- [9] McGill, W. J. Multivariate Information Transmission. *Psychometrika* **19**, 97–116 (1954).
- [10] Watanabe, S. Information Theoretical Analysis of Multivariate Correlation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* **4**, 66–82 (1960).
- [11] James, R. G., Ellison, C. J. & Crutchfield, J. P. Anatomy of a bit: Information in a time series observation. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **21**, 037109 (2011).
- [12] Timme, N., Alford, W., Flecker, B. & Beggs, J. M. Synergy, redundancy, and multivariate information measures: An experimentalist’s perspective. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience* **36**, 119–140 (2014).
- [13] Andrews, M. The math is not the territory: Navigating the free energy principle. *Biology & Philosophy* **36**, 30 (2021).
- [14] Hoel, E. P. When the Map Is Better Than the Territory. *Entropy* **19**, 188 (2017).
- [15] Ince, R. A. *et al.* A statistical framework for neuroimaging data analysis based on mutual information estimated via a gaussian copula. *Human Brain Mapping* **38**, 1541–1573 (2017).
- [16] Wheeler, J. A. *Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links*, 309–336 (CRC Press, 2018), 1 edn.
- [17] Rosas, F. E., Mediano, P. A. M. & Gastpar, M. Characterising directed and undirected metrics of high-order interdependence (2024). [2404.07140](#).
- [18] Abdallah, S. A. & Plumbley, M. D. A measure of statistical complexity based on predictive information with application to finite spin systems. *Physics Letters A* **376**, 275–281 (2012).

- [19] Rosas, F. E., Gutknecht, A. J., Mediano, P. A. M. & Gastpar, M. Characterising high-order interdependence via entropic conjugation. *Communications Physics* **8**, 347 (2025).
- [20] Rosas, F. E., Mediano, P. A. M., Gastpar, M. & Jensen, H. J. Quantifying high-order interdependencies via multivariate extensions of the mutual information. *Physical Review E* **100**, 032305 (2019).
- [21] Bell, A. J. *The Co-Information Lattice* (Nara, Japan, 2003).
- [22] Tononi, G., Sporns, O. & Edelman, G. M. A measure for brain complexity: Relating functional segregation and integration in the nervous system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **91**, 5033–5037 (1994).
- [23] Tononi, G. & Sporns, O. Measuring information integration. *BMC Neuroscience* **4**, 31 (2003).
- [24] Varley, T. F., Pope, M., Faskowitz, J. & Sporns, O. Multivariate information theory uncovers synergistic subsystems of the human cerebral cortex. *Communications Biology* **6**, 451 (2023).
- [25] Kolchinsky, A. A Novel Approach to the Partial Information Decomposition. *Entropy* **24**, 403 (2022).
- [26] Rosas, F. E., Mediano, P. A. M., Rassouli, B. & Barrett, A. B. An operational information decomposition via synergistic disclosure. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 485001 (2020).
- [27] Kay, J. W., Schulz, J. M. & Phillips, W. A. A Comparison of Partial Information Decompositions Using Data from Real and Simulated Layer 5b Pyramidal Cells. *Entropy* **24**, 1021 (2022).
- [28] Niu, X. & Quinn, C. J. *A Measure of Synergy, Redundancy, and Unique Information using Information Geometry*, 3127–3131 (2019).
- [29] Harder, M., Salge, C. & Polani, D. A Bivariate Measure of Redundant Information. *Physical Review E* **87**, 012130 (2013).
- [30] Bertschinger, N., Rauh, J., Olbrich, E., Jost, J. & Ay, N. Quantifying Unique Information. *Entropy* **16**, 2161–2183 (2014).
- [31] Lizier, J. T., Bertschinger, N., Jost, J. & Wibral, M. Information Decomposition of Target Effects from Multi-Source Interactions: Perspectives on Previous, Current and Future Work. *Entropy* **20**, 307 (2018).
- [32] Ince, R. A. A. Measuring Multivariate Redundant Information with Pointwise Common Change in Surprisal. *Entropy* **19**, 318 (2017).
- [33] Makkeh, A., Gutknecht, A. J. & Wibral, M. Introducing a differentiable measure of pointwise shared information. *Physical Review E* **103**, 032149 (2021).
- [34] James, R. G., Emenheiser, J. & Crutchfield, J. P. Unique Information via Dependency Constraints (2018). [1709.06653](#).
- [35] Schreiber, T. Measuring Information Transfer. *Physical Review Letters* **85**, 461–464 (2000).
- [36] Newman, E. L., Varley, T. F., Parakkattu, V. K., Sherrill, S. P. & Beggs, J. M. Revealing the Dynamics of Neural Information Processing with Multivariate Information Decomposition. *Entropy* **24**, 930 (2022).

- [37] Down, K. J. A. & Mediano, P. A. M. A Logarithmic Decomposition and a Signed Measure Space for Entropy (2024). [2409.03732](#).
- [38] Gehlen, J. *et al.* Bias in O-Information Estimation. *Entropy* **26**, 837 (2024).
- [39] Stramaglia, S., Wu, G.-R., Pellicoro, M. & Marinazzo, D. Expanding the transfer entropy to identify information circuits in complex systems. *Physical Review E* **86**, 066211 (2012).
- [40] Tononi, G., Sporns, O. & Edelman, G. M. A complexity measure for selective matching of signals by the brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **93**, 3422–3427 (1996).
- [41] Deco, G., Tononi, G., Boly, M. & Kringelbach, M. L. Rethinking segregation and integration: Contributions of whole-brain modelling. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **16**, 430–439 (2015).
- [42] Timme, N. M. *et al.* High-Degree Neurons Feed Cortical Computations. *PLOS Computational Biology* **12**, e1004858 (2016).
- [43] Shew, W. L. *et al.* Adaptation to sensory input tunes visual cortex to criticality. *Nature Physics* **11**, 659–663 (2015).
- [44] Jang, H., Mashour, G. A., Hudetz, A. G. & Huang, Z. Measuring the dynamic balance of integration and segregation underlying consciousness, anesthesia, and sleep in humans. *Nature Communications* **15**, 9164 (2024).
- [45] Lizier, J. T., Flecker, B. & Williams, P. L. *Towards a synergy-based approach to measuring information modification*, 43–51 (2013).
- [46] Varley, T. F. A Synergistic Perspective on Multivariate Computation and Causality in Complex Systems. *Entropy* **26**, 883 (2024).
- [47] Mediano, P. A. M. *et al.* Greater than the parts: A review of the information decomposition approach to causal emergence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **380**, 20210246 (2022).
- [48] Luppi, A. I. *et al.* A synergistic workspace for human consciousness revealed by Integrated Information Decomposition. *eLife* **12**, RP88173 (2024).
- [49] Sherrill, S. P., Timme, N. M., Beggs, J. M. & Newman, E. L. Partial information decomposition reveals that synergistic neural integration is greater downstream of recurrent information flow in organotypic cortical cultures. *PLOS Computational Biology* **17**, e1009196 (2021).
- [50] Faber, S. P., Timme, N. M., Beggs, J. M. & Newman, E. L. Computation is concentrated in rich clubs of local cortical networks. *Network Neuroscience* **3**, 384–404 (2019).
- [51] Sherrill, S. P., Timme, N. M., Beggs, J. M. & Newman, E. L. Correlated activity favors synergistic processing in local cortical networks in vitro at synaptically relevant timescales. *Network Neuroscience* **4**, 678–697 (2020).
- [52] Wibral, M., Finn, C., Wollstadt, P., Lizier, J. T. & Priesemann, V. Quantifying Information Modification in Developing Neural Networks via Partial Information Decomposition. *Entropy* **19**, 494 (2017).
- [53] Shorten, D. P., Priesemann, V., Wibral, M. & Lizier, J. T. Early lock-in of structured and specialised information flows during neural development. *eLife* **11**, e74651 (2022).

- [54] Wolfram, S. Statistical mechanics of cellular automata. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **55**, 601–644 (1983).
- [55] Cook, M. Universality in Elementary Cellular Automata. *Complex Systems* **15**, 1–40 (2004).
- [56] Varley, T. F. & Bongard, J. Evolving higher-order synergies reveals a trade-off between stability and information-integration capacity in complex systems. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **34**, 063127 (2024).
- [57] Landsman, K. Randomness? What Randomness? *Foundations of Physics* **50**, 61–104 (2020).
- [58] Orio, P., Mediano, P. A. M. & Rosas, F. E. Dynamical noise can enhance high-order statistical structure in complex systems (2023). [2305.13454](#).
- [59] Balasubramanian, P. & Naayagi, R. T. Redundant Logic Insertion and Fault Tolerance Improvement in Combinational Circuits (2017). [1707.06909](#).
- [60] Manicka, S., Marques-Pita, M. & Rocha, L. M. Effective connectivity determines the critical dynamics of biochemical networks. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **19**, 20210659 (2022).
- [61] Olivares, J., Orio, P., Sadílek, V., Schmachtenberg, O. & Canales-Johnson, A. Odorant representations indicate nonlinear processing across the olfactory system. *Cerebral Cortex* **35**, bhaf112 (2025).
- [62] Roberts, L. *et al.* Broadband synergy versus oscillatory redundancy in the visual cortex (2025).
- [63] Buzsáki, G., Anastassiou, C. A. & Koch, C. The origin of extracellular fields and currents — EEG, ECoG, LFP and spikes. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **13**, 407–420 (2012).
- [64] Gelens, F. *et al.* Distributed representations of prediction error signals across the cortical hierarchy are synergistic. *Nature Communications* **15**, 3941 (2024).
- [65] Buzsáki, G. & Wang, X.-J. Mechanisms of Gamma Oscillations. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* **35**, 203–225 (2012).
- [66] Schneider, M. *et al.* A mechanism for inter-areal coherence through communication based on connectivity and oscillatory power. *Neuron* **109**, 4050–4067.e12 (2021).
- [67] Ashby, W. R. Principles of the Self-Organizing Dynamic System. *The Journal of General Psychology* **37**, 125–128 (1947).
- [68] Boyd, A. B., Mandal, D. & Crutchfield, J. P. Leveraging Environmental Correlations: The Thermodynamics of Requisite Variety. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **167**, 1555–1585 (2017).
- [69] Friston, K., Sengupta, B. & Auletta, G. Cognitive Dynamics: From Attractors to Active Inference. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **102**, 427–445 (2014).
- [70] Waddington, C. H. Canalization of Development and the Inheritance of Acquired Characters. *Nature* **150**, 563–565 (1942).
- [71] Carhart-Harris, R. L. *et al.* Canalization and plasticity in psychopathology. *Neuropharmacology* **226**, 109398 (2023).
- [72] Vinck, M., Uran, C., Dowdall, J. R., Rummell, B. & Canales-Johnson, A. Large-scale interactions in predictive processing: Oscillatory versus transient dynamics. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **29**, 133–148 (2025).

- [73] Varley, T. F., Sporns, O., Schaffelhofer, S., Scherberger, H. & Dann, B. Information processing dynamics in neural networks of macaque cerebral cortex reflect cognitive state and behavior (2022).
- [74] Rajpal, H. *et al.* Synergy mediates Long-Range Correlations in the Visual Cortex Near Criticality (2025).
- [75] Tishby, N., Pereira, F. C. & Bialek, W. The information bottleneck method (2000). [physics/0004057](#).
- [76] Ehrlich, D. A. *et al.* Partial Information Decomposition for Continuous Variables based on Shared Exclusions: Analytical Formulation and Estimation (2023). [2311.06373](#).
- [77] Tax, T. M. S., Mediano, P. A. M. & Shanahan, M. The Partial Information Decomposition of Generative Neural Network Models. *Entropy* **19**, 474 (2017).
- [78] Proca, A. M. *et al.* Synergistic information supports modality integration and flexible learning in neural networks solving multiple tasks. *PLOS Computational Biology* **20**, e1012178 (2024).
- [79] Zhan, J., Ince, R. A., Van Rijsbergen, N. & Schyns, P. G. Dynamic Construction of Reduced Representations in the Brain for Perceptual Decision Behavior. *Current Biology* **29**, 319–326.e4 (2019).
- [80] Schneidman, E., Bialek, W. & Berry, M. J. Synergy, Redundancy, and Independence in Population Codes. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **23**, 11539–11553 (2003).
- [81] Wollstadt, P., Schmitt, S. & Wibral, M. A Rigorous Information-Theoretic Definition of Redundancy and Relevancy in Feature Selection Based on (Partial) Information Decomposition. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **24**, 1–44 (2023).
- [82] Liardi, A. *et al.* Null models for comparing information decomposition across complex systems (2024). [2410.11583](#).
- [83] Luppi, A. I. *et al.* Computational modelling in disorders of consciousness: Closing the gap towards personalised models for restoring consciousness (2023).
- [84] Luppi, A. I. *et al.* Local orchestration of distributed functional patterns supporting loss and restoration of consciousness in the primate brain. *Nature Communications* **15**, 2171 (2024).
- [85] Varley, T. F., Pope, M., Maria Grazia, Joshua & Sporns, O. Partial entropy decomposition reveals higher-order information structures in human brain activity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2300888120 (2023).
- [86] Sadil, P., Cowell, R. A. & Huber, D. E. A modeling framework for determining modulation of neural-level tuning from non-invasive human fMRI data. *Communications Biology* **5**, 1244 (2022).
- [87] Luppi, A. I., Rosas, F. E., Mediano, P. A. M., Menon, D. K. & Stamatakis, E. A. Information decomposition and the informational architecture of the brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **28**, 352–368 (2024).
- [88] Nigam, S., Pojoga, S. & Dragoi, V. Synergistic Coding of Visual Information in Columnar Networks. *Neuron* **104**, 402–411.e4 (2019).
- [89] Jansma, A. Decomposing Interventional Causality into Synergistic, Redundant, and Unique Components (2025). [2501.11447](#).

- [90] Friston, K. J. & Frith, C. D. Active inference, communication and hermeneutics. *Cortex* **68**, 129–143 (2015).
- [91] James, R. G., Barnett, N. & Crutchfield, J. P. Information Flows? A Critique of Transfer Entropies. *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 238701 (2016).
- [92] James, R. G. & Crutchfield, J. P. Multivariate Dependence beyond Shannon Information. *Entropy* **19**, 531 (2017).
- [93] Sattari, S. *et al.* Modes of information flow in collective cohesion. *Science Advances* **8**, eabj1720 (2022).
- [94] Wolpert, D. H. *et al.* Is stochastic thermodynamics the key to understanding the energy costs of computation? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **121**, e2321112121 (2024).
- [95] Luppi, A. I., Rosas, F. E., Deco, G., Kringelbach, M. L. & Mediano, P. A. M. Information decomposition reveals hidden high-order contributions to temporal irreversibility (2023). [2308.05664](#).
- [96] Lynn, C. W., Holmes, C. M., Bialek, W. & Schwab, D. J. Decomposing the Local Arrow of Time in Interacting Systems. *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 118101 (2022).
- [97] Prokopenko, M., Lizier, J. T. & Price, D. C. On Thermodynamic Interpretation of Transfer Entropy. *Entropy* **15**, 524–543 (2013).
- [98] Prokopenko, M. *et al.* Biological arrow of time: Emergence of tangled information hierarchies and self-modelling dynamics (2024). [2409.12029](#).
- [99] Deco, G. *et al.* The arrow of time of brain signals in cognition: Potential intriguing role of parts of the default mode network. *Network Neuroscience* **7**, 966–998 (2023).
- [100] Deco, G. & Kringelbach, M. L. Turbulent-like Dynamics in the Human Brain. *Cell Reports* **33**, 108471 (2020).
- [101] Friston, K. The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **11**, 127–138 (2010).
- [102] Kiebel, S. & Friston, K. Free Energy and Dendritic Self-Organization. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience* **5** (2011).
- [103] Isomura, T., Shimazaki, H. & Friston, K. J. Canonical neural networks perform active inference. *Communications Biology* **5**, 1–15 (2022).
- [104] Varley, T. F. Generalized Decomposition of Multivariate Information (2023). [2309.08003](#).