Review

Harnessing Neuroplasticity: Evidence-Based Approaches to Behavioral Modification in Contemporary Society

Hossein Bakhtiari *

Posted Date: 6 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

Keywords: neuroplasticity; neurogenesis; behavioral modification; synaptic plasticity; executive function; addiction; physical activity; mindfulness meditation; cognitive training; habit formation

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

Review

Harnessing Neuroplasticity: Evidence-Based Approaches to Behavioral Modification in Contemporary Society

Hossein Bakhtiari

Independent Researcher, Kalmar, Sweden; hossein.bakhtiari100@gmail.com

Abstract: The neuroplasticity of the human brain, characterized by its ability to reorganize itself functionally and structurally in response to experience and environmental demands, offers a practical and scientifically validated framework for addressing contemporary societal challenges such as addiction, sedentary behavior, and personal transformation. By engaging in small, consistent behavioral modifications, such as mindfulness practices, cognitive behavioral therapy, and structured physical activity, individuals can harness neuroplastic mechanisms to break maladaptive patterns, foster resilience, and achieve meaningful self-improvement. This review explores the fundamental principles of neuroplasticity and synthesizes insights from cellular and network-level studies with evidence-based interventions, arguing that incremental lifestyle modifications can yield meaningful, enduring changes in neural circuitry, ultimately fostering personal transformation and improved public health outcomes.

Keywords: neuroplasticity; neurogenesis; behavioral modification; synaptic plasticity; executive Function; addiction; physical activity; mindfulness meditation; cognitive training; habit formation

1. Introduction

1.1. Defining Neuroplasticity

Neuroplasticity, a cornerstone of modern neuroscience, refers to the nervous system's ability to modify its neural pathways, synaptic connections, and overall architecture in response to both intrinsic and extrinsic stimuli [1]. At its core, neuroplasticity encompasses two major categories of mechanisms: synaptic plasticity, which involves alterations in the strength and efficacy of communication between neurons, and structural plasticity, which refers to physical modifications in the brain's architecture, including the generation of new neurons (neurogenesis) and the formation of new synaptic connections (synaptogenesis) [1,2]. This fundamental capacity manifests as both adaptive plasticity, which confers functional improvements and positive outcomes such as learning, memory formation, and recovery from injury, and maladaptive plasticity, which results in negative functional changes underlying pathological conditions such as chronic pain, addiction, and certain neuropsychiatric disorders [3]. Once thought to be largely fixed after early development, the brain is now understood to be highly dynamic, capable of continuous adaptation across the lifespan [1]. The modifications occur continuously in response to sensory experiences, motor activities, cognitive associations, reward processing, action planning, and conscious awareness [1]. This paradigm shift in neuroscience has far-reaching implications for understanding brain function and learning, while simultaneously opening new avenues for therapeutic interventions across a spectrum of neurological and psychological conditions and developing strategies for optimizing cognitive and emotional health [3].

1.2. Historical Context

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

The historical evolution of neuroplasticity reveals a remarkable journey in our understanding of the brain's capacity for change. As early as 1793, Italian anatomist Michele Vincenzo Malacarne provided some of the earliest empirical evidence for experience-dependent alterations in brain structure by comparing the brains of animals subjected to extensive training with those of their untrained counterparts, observing that the trained animals exhibited larger cerebellums [4]. By 1890, pioneering psychologist William James recognized the brain's ability to reorganize in his seminal work The Principles of Psychology, thereby laying the early conceptual foundations for what would later be known as neuroplasticity [5].

Moving into the early 20th century, Santiago Ramón y Cajal, widely regarded as the father of modern neuroscience, challenged the prevailing notion of a static adult brain by suggesting that even mature neural circuits might be capable of change [6]. Nevertheless, for much of the 20th century, the dominant view maintained that the adult brain was essentially immutable after critical developmental periods, a perspective that was deeply rooted in early neuroscientific dogma [7]. This view began to shift in the mid 20th century when Karl Lashley's experiments on rhesus monkeys demonstrated that neural pathways could be altered following injury, hinting at the brain's latent potential for plasticity [8].

A pivotal moment occurred in 1948 when Polish neuroscientist Jerzy Konorski formally introduced the term "neuroplasticity," thereby redefining scientific conceptions of brain adaptability [9,10]. Just one year later, in 1949, Donald Hebb advanced the field by proposing that synaptic efficiency could be modified through activity-dependent processes, a principle famously summarized as "neurons that fire together, wire together", which laid the mechanistic groundwork for understanding neuroplasticity [10,11].

The early 1960s further expanded this evolving framework when Hubel and Wiesel provided compelling evidence of experience-dependent plasticity by demonstrating critical period effects in the visual cortex, thus challenging the idea of fixed neural circuitry [12]. The subsequent discovery of long-term potentiation (LTP) in 1973 by Bliss and Lomo offered a cellular mechanism for enhancing synaptic strength through repeated activity, reinforcing the concept that neural connections are modifiable by experience [13].

In the 1980s, Michael Merzenich and colleagues documented extensive cortical reorganization in adult primates following peripheral nerve injury, decisively showing that the mature brain retains significant adaptive potential [14]. This evidence was further bolstered by observations of functional recovery in stroke patients, where the reorganization of neural circuits was directly linked to improvements in motor and cognitive functions [15]. Furthermore, the discovery of adult neurogenesis in 1998 by Eriksson and colleagues, which demonstrated that new neurons are generated in the human hippocampus, challenged long-held beliefs regarding the fixed nature of the adult brain [16]. Building on this, Eric Kandel's work in 2001 elucidated the molecular underpinnings of learning-induced synaptic plasticity, deepening our understanding of how experiences shape neural networks [17].

The translational significance of these discoveries soon became apparent, as principles of neuroplasticity spurred therapeutic innovations for conditions such as stroke rehabilitation, phantom limb pain, and specific learning disorders [18,19]. Moreover, further research has shown that targeted neuroplastic interventions can address a broader spectrum of behavioral challenges, including substance dependency and sedentary lifestyles, by influencing shared neurobiological substrates [20,21]. Most recently, advances in neuroimaging and electrophysiology have confirmed that neuroplasticity is a continuous process operating at molecular, cellular, and systems levels, with adaptive potential extending into late adulthood, albeit with varying efficiency [22].

1.3. Scope of the Review

This review aims to provide a comprehensive exploration of neuroplasticity, encompassing both its fundamental neurobiological underpinnings and its practical applications in contemporary

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

society. We will begin by delving into the core mechanisms of neuroplasticity, specifically, we address:

- Molecular Mechanisms: At the smallest scale, we examine the molecular pathways that govern experience-dependent plasticity. This includes an in-depth look at the roles of neurotrophins such as BDNF, the NMDA receptor-mediated processes that drive long-term potentiation and depression (LTP/LTD), and the structural modifications at synapses that underpin habit formation and extinction.
- Circuit-Level Reorganization: Expanding our scope, we explore how groups of neurons reconfigure into functional circuits. Here, particular attention is given to the remodeling of networks within corticostriatal, limbic, and prefrontal regions - areas that play a critical role in mediating reward processing, executive control, and self-regulation. Simultaneously, we delve into circuit-specific neuroplasticity, focusing on how particular neural circuits exhibit distinct forms of plasticity that can be selectively targeted through combined approaches such as neurostimulation, behavioral training, and pharmacology.
- Systems-Level Integration: At the broadest level, we synthesize findings across distributed neural networks to understand how coordinated plasticity supports complex behavioral transitions. This section examines how localized synaptic changes integrate with large-scale network dynamics to produce system-wide adaptations.

Beyond these fundamentals, we address the critical periods of neuroplasticity across the lifespan. This section examines how distinct neuroplastic windows, from early development through senescence, offer unique opportunities for targeted interventions, supported by robust longitudinal studies that highlight age-dependent constraints and their clinical implications for rehabilitation, education, and aging.

Building on our understanding of these mechanisms, we then transition to how neuroplasticity can be strategically harnessed through consistent, incremental behavioral interventions. For example, evidence from addiction research indicates that targeted behavioral therapies can attenuate maladaptive neuroplasticity in the mesolimbic dopamine system - restoring more normative neural function [23–25]. Similarly, regular physical activity has been shown to stimulate hippocampal neurogenesis and enhance synaptic efficacy, effectively countering the adverse effects of a sedentary lifestyle [26–28]. We review a range of evidence-based interventions, including mindfulness practices [29–31], cognitive training protocols [32,33], incremental habit reformation strategies [34], and targeted physical activity regimens [26–28,35], which systematically engage neuroplastic processes to facilitate meaningful behavioral change.

By linking the intricate details of basic neuroscience with its practical implications, this review underscores the translational significance of neuroplasticity for enhancing individual well-being and addressing broader societal challenges. These insights lay the groundwork for science-backed practical strategies to improve mental health, boost cognitive function, and achieve personal goals, ultimately paving the way for personalized interventions against issues such as addiction, inactivity, and cognitive impairments.

2. Fundamentals of Neuroplasticity

2.1. Molecular Mechanisms of Neuroplasticity

The mammalian brain possesses an extraordinary property of plasticity - the capacity to modify neural circuit function in response to experiences, thereby altering subsequent thoughts, feelings, and behaviors [36]. This remarkable adaptability is fundamentally rooted in two critical mechanisms: neurotrophic signaling and synaptic plasticity, processes by which neural activity generates persistent modifications in synaptic transmission [36–39].

2.1.1. Neurotrophins: Molecular Architects of Neural Plasticity

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

Neurotrophins, particularly brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), play a crucial role in synaptic plasticity by regulating synaptic strength, structure, and function [37,38]. Of all neuroplasticity-related molecules, BDNF stands uniquely distinguished, being arguably the most comprehensively studied molecule associated with synaptic regulation in humans [38].

BDNF influences synaptic function through three key aspects of synaptic modulation [38]. First, it enhances synaptic transmission by rapidly improving neural communication [38]. For instance, researchers have observed that introducing BDNF to neural tissue can rapidly amplify signal transmission, particularly in hippocampal regions critical for learning and memory [38].

The second aspect of BDNF involves facilitating synaptic plasticity, defined as synaptic strength as a result of a short-lived increase in neuronal activity [38]. BDNF contributes to this by participating in the late phase of long-term potentiation (L-LTP) by promoting gene transcription and protein synthesis, processes essential for long-lasting synaptic changes [38]. Additionally, when neurons experience significant stimulation, BDNF is both secreted and synthesized, playing a fundamental role in maintaining neural adaptability and reinforcing memory formation pathways [38].

The third dimension involves synaptogenesis, i.e. promoting structural neural growth [38]. This regulation of synaptic architecture is achieved by stimulating axonal branching, promoting dendritic development, and increasing the density of synaptic connections [38]. Unlike neuronal loss, the loss of synaptic connectivity in diseases can potentially be reversed by growing new terminals or strengthening existing synapses, with agents like BDNF promoting lasting effects even after its direct application ceases [38]. These three dimensions of neuroplastic effects of BDNF extend to various cognitive and behavioral domains, including episodic memory, fear memory extinction, motor learning, and mood control [38].

Beyond its plasticity functions, BDNF demonstrates remarkable neuroprotective capabilities, preventing neuronal death under various challenging conditions such as ischemia, oxygen deprivation, glucose deprivation, oxidative stress, glutamate toxicity, and exposure to toxic proteins like amyloid-β [38].

Furthermore, BDNF's impact on neural structures varies with its method of delivery [38]. Chronic exposure increases spine mobility, while different application techniques can produce distinct morphological outcomes [38]. For example, rapid BDNF introduction might enlarge existing neural spines, whereas slower introduction could stimulate the formation of new, thin synaptic connections [38]. Simultaneously, the consequences of reduced BDNF levels are significant. Genetic or pharmacological interventions that diminish BDNF can precipitate substantial neural disruptions, including impaired long-term potentiation, reduced synaptic connectivity, and compromised memory consolidation processes [38].

The unique properties of BDNF, particularly its ability to promote long-lasting effects even after withdrawal, make it an attractive target for potential therapeutic interventions in neurodegenerative diseases [38]. Its capacity to modulate synaptic transmission, plasticity, and growth positions BDNF as a critical molecule in understanding and potentially treating neurological conditions [38].

2.1.2. NMDA Receptor-Mediated Synaptic Plasticity in LTP and LTD

A key pathway through which BDNF exerts its effects is primarily through the regulation of NMDA (N-methyl-D-aspartate) receptor activity, which plays a crucial role in modulating synaptic strength [36]. These receptors are central to two fundamental mechanisms of synaptic plasticity, namely, long-term potentiation (LTP), which strengthens synaptic connections, and long-term depression (LTD), which weakens them [36,39]. These bidirectional processes are crucial for learning, memory formation, and behavioral adaptations [36,39].

A well-studied form of LTP occurs in the hippocampal CA1 region which is critically dependent on the activation of NMDA receptors [36]. NMDA receptors are a type of glutamate receptor that function as molecular coincidence detectors, opening only when both presynaptic neurotransmitter release and postsynaptic depolarization occur simultaneously [36]. This allows calcium ions (Ca2+)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

to enter the neuron, triggering intracellular signaling cascades that strengthen synaptic connections [36].

A key mechanism underlying LTP is the increased presence of α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA) receptors at synapses [36,39]. AMPA receptors are another class of glutamate receptors that mediate fast excitatory neurotransmission [36,39]. During LTP, calcium influx through NMDA receptors activates protein kinases, particularly calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II (CaMKII), which enhances the conductance of existing AMPA receptors and promotes the insertion of new AMPA receptors into the synaptic membrane [36,39]. This results in a more responsive postsynaptic neuron and a long-lasting increase in synaptic strength [36,39].

Beyond changes in receptor density, structural modifications also accompany LTP [26]. Dendritic spines, the small protrusions on neurons that house synapses, undergo morphological changes such as enlargement and the formation of new spines [26]. These structural alterations, which depend on the actin cytoskeleton, reinforce the persistence of synaptic strengthening [36,39].

In contrast to LTP, LTD serves to weaken synaptic connections, allowing for the refinement and reorganization of neural networks [36]. Like LTP, NMDA receptors play a central role in LTD, but the mechanisms differ [36]. LTD is typically induced by lower levels of calcium influx through NMDA receptors, leading to the activation of protein phosphatases rather than kinases [36]. These phosphatases trigger the removal of AMPA receptors from the synaptic membrane through endocytosis, reducing synaptic strength [36]. LTD is also associated with structural changes, including spine shrinkage, and may require protein synthesis for long-term maintenance [36].

The ability of synapses to strengthen or weaken in response to activity patterns highlights the dynamic nature of neural plasticity. Together, LTP and LTD form a bidirectional system that allows for the precise modulation of synaptic strength in response to experience [36]. This balance is essential for processes such as memory encoding, sensory adaptation, and behavioral flexibility [36]. Disruptions in these mechanisms have been linked to neurological and psychiatric disorders, emphasizing their significance in both normal brain function and disease states [36,39].

2.1.3. Structural Synaptic Modifications in Habit Formation and Extinction

Building upon the bidirectional processes of LTP and LTD, structural synaptic plasticity represents a complementary and essential mechanism for experience-dependent neural adaptations [36]. While LTP and LTD primarily mediate functional changes in synaptic strength, structural modifications in dendritic spines and axonal boutons underpin the long-term stabilization or elimination of synaptic connections, influencing habit formation and extinction [36,40].

Long-term imaging studies in vivo have revealed that, although the large-scale morphology of neurons remains relatively stable, small synaptic structures such as dendritic spines and axonal boutons exhibit remarkable plasticity [40]. These dynamic elements are subject to continuous remodeling, with spines and boutons appearing and disappearing over time. Under baseline conditions, the turnover of these structures is balanced, maintaining overall synaptic density [40]. However, experience-dependent plasticity introduces asymmetries in this process, promoting the stabilization of newly formed spines in response to repeated behavioral training and sensory learning [40].

In the context of motor learning, for instance, newly formed dendritic spines in the motor cortex are initially transient, but those that become persistent are closely associated with the acquisition and retention of learned motor behaviors [40]. The formation of these stable synapses near preexisting ones suggests that structural plasticity encodes refined movement patterns, facilitating the development of automatic motor skills [40]. Conversely, habit extinction and behavioral flexibility involve the pruning of previously reinforced synapses, a process linked to LTD-like mechanisms that mediate synaptic weakening and elimination [36,40].

Structural modifications in synaptic architecture also play a fundamental role in fear extinction. LTP at amygdalar synapses strengthens fear memories, whereas LTD promotes their extinction by facilitating spine elimination and synapse weakening in fear-associated circuits [36]. Pharmacological

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

enhancement of LTD-related pathways has shown promise in promoting fear extinction, offering potential therapeutic strategies for anxiety disorders [36]. Similarly, addiction-related behaviors rely on persistent synaptic modifications within dopamine circuits, where drug-induced plasticity stabilizes maladaptive synapses that underlie compulsive drug-seeking behaviors [36].

Beyond learned behaviors, structural synaptic plasticity is increasingly recognized as a key factor in recovery from neurological injuries. Stroke recovery, for example, involves heightened dendritic spine turnover, enabling the functional reorganization of cortical circuits to compensate for lost motor function [40]. The ability of the adult brain to undergo experience-dependent synapse formation and elimination underscores the therapeutic potential of targeting structural plasticity mechanisms to enhance cognitive and motor recovery following injury or neurodegenerative diseases [40].

2.2. Circuit-Level Neuroplasticity

While modifications at individual synapses represent the fundamental units of brain adaptation, it is the coordinated reorganization of neuronal groups into functional circuits that ultimately mediates complex behaviors and their modification through experience [41–43]. Neuroplasticity at the circuit level involves the reconfiguration of connections within and between key brain networks, particularly those involved in reward, learning, and executive control, such as the corticostriatal, limbic, and prefrontal systems [23–25,41,43,44]. Understanding these circuit-level changes is essential for comprehending how behaviors transition, for example, from voluntary drug use to compulsive addiction, and how specific circuits might be targeted therapeutically [23–25,41,45]. This section examines neuroplasticity within these critical circuits, focusing on their role in reward processing, executive function, and the maladaptive changes observed in addiction [23–25,41,43–47].

2.2.1. Corticostriatal Circuits: Organization and Dopaminergic Modulation

The striatum functions as the main input structure for the basal ganglia, receiving extensive, topographically organized projections from nearly all areas of the cerebral cortex [43]. This corticostriatal system plays a fundamental role in integrating information that guides goal-directed behaviors [43]. Different regions of the striatum are associated with distinct functional roles: the ventral striatum (VS), which includes the nucleus accumbens (NAc), primarily relates to reward, motivation, and emotional functions; the caudate nucleus is linked to cognitive processes and executive functions; and the putamen is most closely connected to sensorimotor control and habit learning [41,43]. Although these functions are often conceptualized as parallel segregated loops, growing evidence indicates significant integration occurs across these functional domains within the striatum [43]. This integration is made possible by the anatomical convergence of inputs from different cortical areas onto overlapping striatal regions [43]. Medium spiny neurons (MSNs), which serve as the principal projection neurons of the striatum, receive these converging cortical inputs, primarily on their dendritic spines [43].

Dopamine (DA), a neurotransmitter originating from midbrain neurons in the substantia nigra pars compacta (SNc) and ventral tegmental area (VTA), exerts powerful modulatory influence over corticostriatal function and plasticity [23,25,41–44,46]. DA projections innervate the entire striatum, forming connections near cortical and thalamic inputs onto MSNs [43]. The effects of dopamine are complex and multifaceted, capable of both enhancing and reducing neuronal activity and synaptic transmission, depending on several factors, including the specific type of dopamine receptor activated (D1-like vs. D2-like receptors), the baseline level of dopamine present, and the activity state of the receiving neuron [42,44,46]. D1 and D2 receptors are largely segregated onto different populations of MSNs, forming what are known as the direct (striatonigral) and indirect (striatopallidal) pathways, respectively, which have opposing effects on basal ganglia output [42,43]. Phasic dopamine release, characterized by brief, high-amplitude bursts of dopamine neuron firing that often occur in response to reward-predicting cues, is thought to primarily activate D1 receptors and mediate reward learning and the attribution of incentive salience, the process by which stimuli

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

become attention-grabbing and desirable [23,24,41]. In contrast, tonic dopamine signaling, characterized by lower, more sustained dopamine levels, primarily engages high-affinity D2 receptors and may play a role in stabilizing network activity and modulating motivation [25,44]. Both forms of signaling - phasic and tonic - are critical for normal striatal function and plasticity [25,42,44].

2.2.2. Circuit Plasticity in Reward, Learning, and Addiction

The induction and expression of synaptic plasticity (LTP and LTD) at corticostriatal synapses are critically dependent on dopamine [42]. This dopamine requirement is a distinctive feature that sets striatal plasticity apart from that observed in other brain regions such as the hippocampus [42]. The activation of D1 receptors is generally necessary for LTP induction, while LTD induction requires the coordinated activation of both D1 and D2 receptor types [42]. These plasticity mechanisms enable the brain to associate environmental stimuli with specific outcomes and facilitate the learning of action sequences, processes that underpin procedural learning and habit formation [23,41–43]. Beyond dopamine, other neurochemical messengers, including acetylcholine, glutamate (acting through NMDA and AMPA receptors), nitric oxide, and endocannabinoids, interact extensively with dopamine to shape the plasticity of corticostriatal connections [42].

Drugs of abuse dramatically impact these neural circuits by triggering large, rapid increases in striatal dopamine levels, particularly in the nucleus accumbens (NAc), far exceeding the dopamine release observed with natural rewards [23,25,44]. This artificially intense dopamine signal strongly reinforces drug-taking behaviors and powerfully facilitates the association between drug-related environmental cues and the drug's effects [23,25,41,45]. With repeated drug exposure, neuroplastic adaptations accumulate within corticostriatal circuits [23–25,41]. A key aspect in the development of addiction involves the progressive recruitment of dorsal striatal habit-learning systems, diminishing the control exerted by goal-directed action-outcome mechanisms that are mediated more ventrally in the striatum [41]. Drug-associated cues gain powerful control over behavior, functioning as conditioned reinforcers that sustain drug-seeking behaviors even during long periods without drug access [41]. This process depends on plasticity within circuits connecting the basolateral amygdala (BLA), orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), and NAc core [41].

Repeated drug exposure triggers enduring changes in glutamatergic transmission onto MSNs, often involving alterations in AMPA receptor subunit composition and dendritic spine morphology, which are thought to underlie persistent craving and relapse vulnerability [25,42]. Furthermore, chronic drug use is associated with a reduction in striatal D2 receptor availability in both animal models and human addicts [23–25]. This D2 downregulation is linked to reduced baseline activity in associated prefrontal cortex (PFC) regions and may contribute to the compulsive nature of drug intake by impairing inhibitory control exerted via the indirect pathway [23–25,44].

2.2.3. Prefrontal Cortex Circuits: Executive Control and Its Disruption

The prefrontal cortex (PFC) orchestrates executive functions vital for adaptive behavior, including inhibitory control, decision-making, working memory, emotional regulation, assigning salience to stimuli, and self-awareness [24,43,44]. These functions are mediated by distinct but interconnected PFC subregions, including the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), dorsolateral PFC (DLPFC), and ventromedial PFC (vmPFC), which interact extensively with striatal and limbic circuits [24,43,44]. The OFC is crucial for updating the value of expected outcomes based on experience, enabling flexible adjustments in behavior, such as during reversal learning or after reinforcer devaluation [24,41,47]. The ACC monitors performance, detects conflicts or errors, and contributes to regulating behavior based on effort and anticipated outcomes [24,43]. The DLPFC supports working memory, planning, strategic control, and top-down inhibition of inappropriate responses [24,43,44]. The vmPFC integrates emotional and visceral information to guide decision-making and regulate affect [24,43].

Addiction is characterized by profound dysfunction across prefrontal cortical (PFC) circuits [24,44]. The Impaired Response Inhibition and Salience Attribution (iRISA) model proposes that

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

addiction involves two key disruptions: impaired response inhibition, which manifests as difficulty stopping automatic drug seeking and taking behaviors, and aberrant salience attribution, reflected in the overvaluation of drug-related cues and undervaluation of alternative rewards [24]. Neuroimaging studies consistently reveal both structural and functional abnormalities in the prefrontal cortex of individuals with addiction [24]. In many cases, baseline PFC activity (as measured by glucose metabolism) is reduced, particularly in regions such as the OFC and ACC, and this reduction correlates with lower levels of D2 dopamine receptors in the striatum [24].

However, when individuals with addiction are exposed to drug-related cues, these same prefrontal regions typically show heightened reactivity, along with the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) and amygdala [23,24]. The magnitude of this neural activation often correlates with the intensity of subjective craving and can predict relapse to drug use [23,24]. While direct administration of drugs can sometimes temporarily normalize PFC activity or improve performance on cognitive tasks requiring inhibitory control in individuals with addiction, this effect may represent a form of self-medication that ultimately fails to address the underlying circuit dysregulation [24]. Additionally, deficits in inhibitory control, often associated with reduced activity in the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC), are common features of addiction [24]. Furthermore, the impaired functioning of the prefrontal cortex likely contributes to reduced insight into the severity of the addiction and compromised decision-making abilities [24].

2.2.4. Limbic Circuit Contributions and Integration

Limbic structures, especially the amygdala and hippocampus, provide essential emotional and contextual modulation of corticostriatal circuits involved in addiction [23,41,43]. The BLA assigns affective value to stimuli and is critical for learning associations between cues and drug rewards; its projections to the NAc core are necessary for cues to sustain drug-seeking behavior (a process known as conditioned reinforcement) and trigger relapse [23,41]. The hippocampus, particularly the ventral part, processes contextual information; its projections to the NAc shell mediate the ability of drug-associated contexts to reinstate drug seeking [41].

Dopamine signaling within the NAc functions as a gatekeeper for the influence of these limbic inputs, integrating emotional and contextual information with goal-directed planning [41,43]. Stress systems, heavily involving the extended amygdala (which includes the central nucleus of the amygdala and bed nucleus of the stria terminalis) and brainstem norepinephrine pathways, become hyperactive during withdrawal and prolonged abstinence, contributing to the negative emotional state that drives relapse, what researchers call the "dark side" of addiction [23]. Stress-related neurotransmitters such as corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF) and dynorphin act within the extended amygdala and NAc to promote feelings of dysphoria and drug seeking behavior [23].

2.2.5. Circuit Integration, Hubs, and Targeting Plasticity

The development and persistence of addiction involve maladaptive plasticity across an integrated network, rather than isolated dysfunction in parallel circuits [23,41,43]. Information flows and cascades between circuits where ventral striatal activity influences dorsal striatal function via interactions at the level of midbrain dopamine neurons [41,43]. Specific regions within the striatum, particularly in the rostral extent, serve as integration "hubs" where inputs from multiple functionally diverse cortical areas (vmPFC, OFC, dACC, DLPFC) converge, potentially allowing for the computation of a 'common currency' for value to guide complex decisions [43]. Disruptions at these integration points, or in the flow of information between circuits (e.g., weakened PFC control over striatal habit systems, or sensitized limbic drive onto reward circuits), are central to the addictive state [23,24,41,43].

Therapeutic strategies increasingly aim to target these specific circuit-level disruptions [23–25]. Pharmacological interventions might aim to re-balance dopamine tone (for example, through D3 receptor antagonists or partial agonists), modulate glutamate transmission (through compounds like N-acetylcysteine), or dampen stress system hyperactivity (using corticotropin-releasing factor or

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

kappa opioid receptor antagonists) [23,25]. Behavioral therapies, such as cognitive behavioral therapy or contingency management, implicitly or explicitly target executive control circuits in the prefrontal cortex and aim to extinguish conditioned responses to drug-related cues [23,24]. Neurostimulation techniques (like transcranial magnetic stimulation or deep brain stimulation) offer the potential to directly modulate activity within dysfunctional prefrontal cortical or striatal circuits, although optimal targets and parameters are still under investigation [23].

Combining approaches, like pairing cognitive training with medications that enhance prefrontal function or facilitate extinction learning, may prove particularly effective by addressing neuroplastic changes at multiple levels within the relevant circuits [23,24,46]. Given the heterogeneity of addiction, identifying individual-specific patterns of circuit dysfunction could enable more personalized and effective treatment strategies [23–25].

2.3. Systems-Level Neuroplasticity

Neuroplasticity at the systems level involves understanding how distributed networks of brain regions interact and adapt over time to enable complex functions [48]. This approach examines how interactions among neuronal populations, shaped by underlying anatomical pathways, give rise to coordinated, large-scale functional dynamics [49,50]. Here, the brain is conceptualized as a complex system composed of nodes (representing regions or neurons) and edges (representing their connections) [51–53]. A central objective within this field is to understand how the brain manages the competing demands of functional segregation (specialized processing within distinct modules) and functional integration (combining information across modules) through adaptive network reconfigurations [50,51,54].

The foundation for systems-level dynamics is the brain's structural connectivity, the network of physical, anatomical links like white matter tracts [51–53]. This structural framework, known as the connectome, serves as a substrate that both shapes and constrains patterns of functional interaction across the brain [52,53,55,56]. Graph theoretical analysis reveals key organizational features, such as small-world topology, modularity (the presence of densely interconnected communities), and the existence of highly central hub regions [51–53]. Hubs, often located in association cortices like the precuneus, posterior cingulate, superior frontal, and insular regions, play crucial roles in integrating information and ensuring efficient communication across the network [51–53]. Collectively, these hub regions often form a densely interconnected "rich club" or structural core, believed to play a critical role in supporting global integration [52,53]. Although structural connectivity provides a strong foundation for predicting functional connectivity patterns, the correspondence is not exact; robust functional connections can emerge in the absence of direct structural links, often mediated by indirect pathways [51,52,55].

Functional brain networks are inherently dynamic and exhibit considerable variability [53,54,56]. Patterns of functional connectivity fluctuate over time, even during rest, and are further influenced by cognitive demands and contextual factors [53,54,56]. This variability is not merely noise; rather, it reflects the brain’s ongoing exploration of a range of possible functional configurations constrained by its relatively stable anatomical framework [55,56]. Computational models suggest this exploration is driven by an interplay between the deterministic influences of the network's structure (including transmission delays due to physical distance) and stochastic elements, often conceptualized as noise, which prevent the system from settling into a fixed state [55,56]. Operating near a critical point, the system allows for transient synchronization and desynchronization of neuronal populations, where these dynamics give rise to fluctuating patterns of functional connectivity, including the well-established resting-state networks (RSNs) [56]. Such continual reconfiguration enables the brain to adapt flexibly to shifting internal states and external environmental demands [48,49].

Learning provides a powerful example of systems-level plasticity expressed through network reconfiguration [48]. Long-term motor skill acquisition, for instance, involves dynamic changes in the recruitment of and integration between functional modules [48]. Initially, motor and visual systems

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

are highly integrated, reflecting the need to combine sensory input with motor output [48]. As learning progresses and performance becomes more automatic, these systems become more autonomous, showing decreased integration [48]. Simultaneously, cognitive control networks, particularly those involving frontal and cingulate hubs, are heavily recruited early in learning but become progressively disengaged as the skill is mastered [48]. The efficiency of this disengagement, the release of cognitive control, predicts individual differences in learning rates, demonstrating a direct link between systems-level network dynamics and behavioral adaptation [48]. This illustrates how plasticity involves not just strengthening or weakening specific connections, but altering the large-scale coordination and interaction patterns across entire brain systems [48,49].

Furthermore, disruptions in systems-level network organization are increasingly recognized as central to neurological and psychiatric disorders [52,53]. Conditions such as schizophrenia and Alzheimer's disease are marked by alterations in both structural and functional connectivity, often involving disruptions to hub regions and their associated connections, or changes in the brain's modular organization [52,53]. Due to their high metabolic cost and central integrative role, hub regions represent points of particular vulnerability within the network [52,53]. Computational models simulating lesions or disease-related damage demonstrate that impairments targeting hub regions exert a disproportionately large impact on global network function and dynamics, compared to damage affecting more peripheral nodes [52,53,56]. This network-based perspective reframes brain disorders as dysconnectivity syndromes, opening avenues for the development of network-informed biomarkers and therapeutic strategies that target systems-level organization [52,53].

Ultimately, systems-level neuroplasticity reflects the brain's capacity to adapt its distributed network architecture and dynamics in response to experience, injury, or disease [48,49]. It encompasses changes across multiple time scales, from rapid, task-evoked reconfigurations of functional connectivity to slower remodeling potentially involving structural change [49,52]. Bridging the gap between local synaptic mechanisms and these large-scale network phenomena requires integrating multimodal empirical data (structural imaging, functional imaging, electrophysiology) with advanced network analysis techniques and biophysically grounded computational models [49,50,52]. This integrated approach is essential for unraveling how localized plasticity translates into meaningful, system-wide changes that underpin learning, cognition, and behavior [48–50].

2.4. Critical Periods of Plasticity: Windows of Opportunity for Intervention

As established, neural circuits are profoundly shaped by experience, yet the potency of this influence changes dramatically across the lifespan [57,58]. While the adult brain retains a capacity for change, neural circuits generally exhibit heightened plasticity during specific windows early in life, followed by a period of relative stability [57,59]. These epochs of enhanced plasticity are often referred to as sensitive or critical periods [58,60]. Sensitive periods represent times in development when the effects of experience on the brain are unusually strong, allowing experiences to readily shape or alter certain capacities [58]. A specific subset, termed critical periods, represents times when certain environmental inputs are essential for the proper development of a particular brain circuit, and their absence can lead to permanent, irreversible deficits [58,60]. Understanding the mechanisms that open, maintain, and close these windows provides crucial insights into both normal development and potential strategies for intervention in cases of injury, disease, or developmental disorders [57,60].

2.4.1. Sensitive and Critical Periods of Plasticity

Sensitive periods allow experience to instruct neural circuits to process or represent information in a way that is adaptive for the individual [58]. They are essential for tailoring the developing brain to its specific environment, providing a stable, long-lasting experiential foundation [61]. Critical periods are a special class of sensitive periods where environmental input during a specific time window is absolutely required for the proper development of a particular brain circuit [60]. If the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

circuit is left unstimulated or receives atypical input during this time, the function served by that circuit may be permanently compromised, as the effects become irreversible [58,60]. This distinguishes them from sensitive periods, where experiences have their greatest impact but some degree of modification may still be possible later in life, albeit often requiring more effort or specific conditions [58,60]. Documented examples of functions shaped during sensitive or critical periods include visual perception (like ocular dominance and stereopsis), auditory processing (like spectral tuning and spatial hearing), filial imprinting, language acquisition, and aspects of social and emotional development [58–61]. Different brain circuits underlying these diverse functions possess distinct sensitive periods, the timings of which are often staggered throughout development [60]. More complex functions, especially in humans, tend to reflect the cumulative outcome of multiple, potentially overlapping sensitive periods [60].

The opening of a sensitive period is not arbitrary but depends on specific prerequisites being met within the developing circuit [58]. The sensory information reaching the circuit must be sufficiently reliable and precise to guide adaptive changes [58]. Furthermore, the circuit itself must possess adequate connectivity, including both excitatory and inhibitory components, to process this information [58]. Crucially, the molecular and cellular mechanisms that enable plasticity - such as the capacity for morphological changes in axons and dendrites, the formation and elimination of synapses, or the modification of synaptic strength - must be active [58]. The maturation state of specific neuronal components, particularly inhibitory circuits utilizing GABA, plays a key role in triggering the onset [57,60]. Studies in the visual cortex show that once inhibitory neurotransmission, especially mediated by parvalbumin-positive (PV) interneurons, reaches a certain threshold, the critical period for ocular dominance plasticity is initiated [57,60]. Manipulating these inhibitory circuits pharmacologically (e.g., with benzodiazepines) or genetically can prematurely trigger or delay the onset, respectively, demonstrating that critical period timing per se is plastic and actively regulated [57,60]. Similarly, the critical period for spectral tuning in the rat auditory cortex coincides precisely with the rapid maturation of excitatory responses to tones in that area [61].

Once a window is open, experience actively sculpts the neural network [58,60,61]. This involves several underlying mechanisms. Experience can drive the elaboration of new axonal projections and the formation of new synapses, allowing circuits to establish novel connectivity patterns based on environmental input, as seen after retinal lesions in the adult visual cortex [58,59]. Concurrently, connections or synapses that are inactive or do not effectively contribute to the circuit's processing of relevant experience are weakened and selectively eliminated, pruning the network [57,58]. This process is evident in the visual cortex following monocular deprivation and is implicated in filial imprinting and birdsong learning through observed changes in dendritic spine density [58]. Structural plasticity, including dramatic increases in dendritic spine turnover, is significantly enhanced during periods of adult plasticity induced by interventions like retinal lesions, particularly when competitive interactions between inputs are present [59]. A third, potentially crucial mechanism for the persistence of learning acquired during these periods is synapse consolidation [58]. According to this hypothesis, synapses strongly and consistently activated by experience become structurally stabilized, perhaps through the insertion of cell adhesion molecules (CAMs), rendering them resistant to later elimination even if their functional efficacy changes [58]. This stabilization would create a lasting trace of the acquired information within the circuit's architecture [58]. These processes refine the circuit, adapting it specifically to the patterns of activity driven by the individual's environment, moving the circuit's state within its "stability landscape" toward a highly preferred, energy-efficient configuration [58]. Even atypical experience during a critical period can drive the circuit towards a stable, albeit abnormal, state, such as the altered spectral and intensity representations in auditory cortex following pure-tone exposure [58,61].

2.4.2. Plasticity in the Adult Brain

Contrary to the older view that plasticity is simply lost passively with age, accumulating evidence indicates that the potential for plasticity is actively dampened in the mature brain [57,60,62].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

Following the sensitive period, several molecular and structural factors emerge, acting as "brakes" to stabilize neural circuits and limit excessive rewiring [57,59,60,62]. Structural brakes include the formation of dense perineuronal nets (PNNs), rich in chondroitin sulfate proteoglycans (CSPGs), particularly around inhibitory PV cells, which can physically restrain synaptic inputs, limit receptor mobility, and trap diffusing molecules like the transcription factor OTX2 that regulate plasticity timing [59,60,62]. Increased myelination of axons in the mature brain also introduces factors, like Nogo-A, that strongly inhibit axon growth and sprouting, limiting regeneration and structural plasticity [59,60,62]. Functional brakes include molecules that dampen the response to neuromodulatory signals involved in arousal and attention, such as Lynx1 which reduces the sensitivity of nicotinic acetylcholine receptors [59,60,62]. Immune system molecules like MHCI and their receptor PirB (which also binds Nogo-A) are further players limiting adult plasticity [59]. These brakes collectively contribute to the reduced plasticity observed in adulthood, ensuring the stability of circuits established by early experience [57,59,60,62]. The realization that plasticity is actively restricted, rather than merely absent, opens avenues for interventions aimed at temporarily lifting these brakes [59,60,62].

Indeed, research primarily in animal models has identified multiple strategies to reactivate "youth-like" plasticity in the adult brain, effectively re-opening a window for modification [59,60,62]. One approach involves directly targeting the molecular brakes. Enzymatic degradation of CSPGs in PNNs can reinstate ocular dominance plasticity in the adult visual cortex and promote functional recovery after spinal cord injury [59,60]. Similarly, interfering with myelin-based inhibition, for instance by blocking the Nogo receptor or its signaling partners like PirB, can enhance adult OD plasticity and improve recovery after stroke [59,60,62]. Another strategy focuses on modulating the balance between excitation and inhibition (E/I balance), a key factor in gating plasticity [57,59,60,62]. Reducing inhibition pharmacologically, for example using the SSRI antidepressant fluoxetine, has been shown to restore plasticity and promote recovery from amblyopia in adult rats, leading to ongoing clinical trials in humans and demonstrated benefit in stroke recovery [59,60,62]. Drugs that alter the epigenome, such as HDAC inhibitors like valproate, also promote plasticity, with valproate even enhancing absolute pitch learning in human adults [59,62].

Beyond pharmacological or invasive approaches, behavioral and environmental interventions can endogenously promote adult plasticity [59,60,62]. Environmental enrichment, involving housing animals in larger, socially interactive groups with complex objects and opportunities for exercise, effectively reinstates ocular dominance plasticity in adult rodents, likely by reducing cortical inhibition [59,60,62]. Simply housing adult mice in pairs, enhancing social interaction, also boosts plasticity compared to isolation [59]. Intriguingly, a period of complete darkness can also reset the visual cortex, enabling subsequent recovery from amblyopia in rats and cats [59,62]. Furthermore, specific training paradigms can enhance adult plasticity. Perceptual learning, involving intensive practice on a specific task, can improve performance in adults with amblyopia, although transfer to other tasks may be limited [60,62]. More promisingly, playing action video games has shown remarkable success in improving a range of visual functions in amblyopic adults, potentially by engaging top-down attentional systems, enhancing probabilistic inference, and providing a rewarding, varied, and appropriately challenging experience [60,62]. Even non-action games provided sufficient challenge to improve vision in amblyopia, unlike in normally sighted individuals [62]. Sensory-motor interactions, like allowing mice to run while viewing visual stimuli, also strongly promote recovery from visual deficits [59]. Importantly, many of these diverse interventions - pharmacological, environmental, behavioral - may converge on common underlying mechanisms, such as adjusting E/I balance or enhancing neuromodulatory tone (e.g., acetylcholine and dopamine) related to attention and reward, highlighting the crucial role of active engagement and attention in driving adult plasticity [59,60,62]. Additionally, the phenomenon of "savings," where prior experience during a sensitive period leaves a structural trace (like persistent spines or axonal projections), can facilitate relearning or plasticity induction later in life, requiring less intervention [59,62].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

The ability to manipulate critical periods and enhance adult plasticity holds significant therapeutic potential, particularly for neurodevelopmental disorders and recovery from brain injury [60]. Many neurodevelopmental conditions like autism and schizophrenia are increasingly linked to disruptions in E/I balance or mistimed critical periods, suggesting that interventions aimed at restoring balance or reactivating plasticity windows could be beneficial [57,60]. Similarly, strategies shown to promote recovery from amblyopia, such as fluoxetine treatment or video game training, are also being explored for enhancing recovery after stroke, exploiting the common need to reactivate plasticity for functional rewiring [60]. However, caution is imperative when translating these findings to humans [60]. The brakes on plasticity exist for a reason, primarily to ensure the stability of learned information and established neural circuits [58,60]. Indiscriminately enhancing plasticity could lead to instability, potentially erasing existing memories or interfering with learned skills [59,60,62]. Furthermore, critical periods are often hierarchically organized; manipulating one period could have unforeseen cascading effects on downstream circuits [60]. Pharmacological agents inevitably carry risks of side effects, and molecules involved in plasticity often have diverse functions throughout the body [60]. Precise timing and targeting of interventions, potentially combining molecular and behavioral approaches synergistically, will be crucial [59,60].

Perhaps the most immediate and impactful application of our understanding of sensitive periods lies in public policy, particularly concerning early childhood development [60]. There is overwhelming evidence that early life experiences, especially during sensitive periods, lay the foundation for lifelong health, learning, and behavior [58,60]. Conversely, significant adversity experienced during these vulnerable windows, such as toxic stress resulting from poverty, neglect, abuse, or violence without buffering adult support, can disrupt brain architecture and lead to a cascade of negative outcomes across the lifespan [60]. These include increased risk for physical and mental health problems, cognitive and affective deficits, and engagement in harmful behaviors [60]. Recognizing the profound impact of early environments underscores the need for policies that protect children from adversity and capitalize on sensitive periods as windows of opportunity for education [60]. This includes ensuring access to high-quality early care and education, supporting parents and caregivers, providing timely interventions for developmental challenges, and structuring educational systems (e.g., early second language instruction) to align with developmental timelines [60]. Even as science advances toward reactivating plasticity later in life, preventing or mitigating adversity during the critical windows of early development will remain the most effective strategy [60].

3. Strategies for Harnessing Neuroplasticity

Building on our understanding of the fundamentals of neuroplasticity covered in the previous chapter, we now transition to how the brain's capacity for change can be strategically harnessed through consistent, incremental behavioral interventions [30,33,34]. The brain undergoes functional and structural remodelling in response to various stimuli and experiences [29,30]. While neuroplasticity might be seens as inherent, specific interventions can systematically engage these processes to facilitate meaningful behavioral change and counteract maladaptive patterns [23–25,34]. Evidence from addiction research indicates that targeted behavioral therapies can attenuate maladaptive neuroplasticity, potentially restoring more normative neural function [23–25]. Similarly, regular physical activity has been shown to stimulate hippocampal neurogenesis and enhance synaptic efficacy, effectively countering adverse effects associated with sedentary lifestyles or aging [26–28,35]. This chapter reviews a range of evidence-based interventions, including targeted behavioral therapies for addiction, mindfulness practices, cognitive training protocols, incremental habit reformation strategies, and specific physical activity regimens, which systematically engage neuroplastic processes [23–35]. Understanding how these interventions operate on neural circuits and functions provides a practical framework for leveraging neuroplasticity for improved health, well-being, and cognitive function [25,27,29,35].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

3.1. Targeting Maladaptive Neuroplasticity in Addiction

Addiction represents a compelling example of maladaptive neuroplasticity, where drug-induced changes impair brain function, particularly the capacity for self-control over drug-taking behaviors [23,25]. With continued use, the brain becomes increasingly sensitive to stress and negative emotional states [25]. The neurobiology of addiction involves a combination of excessive incentive salience, a loss of normal reward function, and a heightened stress response [23]. Together, these changes contribute to negative reinforcement and compulsive drug-seeking behavior [23]. A key feature of this condition is dysfunction in the prefrontal cortex (PFC), which underlies a syndrome known as impaired response inhibition and salience attribution (iRISA) [24]. This syndrome is marked by exaggerated salience attributed to drugs and drug-related cues, diminished sensitivity to non-drug rewards, and a weakened capacity to suppress maladaptive behaviors [24]. Disruptions in PFC-related processes in addiction further impair functions such as self-control, behavioral monitoring, emotion regulation, motivation, awareness, attention, cognitive flexibility, learning, memory, and decision-making [24].

Neurocircuitry analyses suggest a model involving opposing systems: a 'Go' system driving craving and habits via the basal ganglia, and a 'Stop' system controlling choices and suppressing negative emotional responses [23]. Under this framework, the Stop system should inhibit the Go craving system and the stress system [23]. This dynamic interplay underlies the core cycle of addiction, where dysregulation in these systems fosters compulsive behavior, emotional distress, and impaired executive control, hallmarks of substance use disorders [23].

The transition from controlled to compulsive drug taking has been associated with a shift from ventral striatal regions (implicated in reward) to the dorsal striatum (associated with habit formation) [25,41]. This shift may represent a transition from prefrontal cortical control over goal-directed actions to more habitual, stimulus-response modes of responding governed by striatal systems [41]. Drug-associated conditioned reinforcers can support the learning of new drug-seeking responses, an effect resistant to extinction [41]. Compulsive-like habits may also emerge from the negative affective state associated with withdrawal [23]. Such compulsive behavior can be characterized as a maladaptive stimulus-response habit where the goal (drug effect) may be devalued, yet behavior persists, governed by discriminative stimuli [41]. This aligns with the hypothesis that drug addiction is an aberrant form of learning, potentially mediated by maladaptive recruitment of memory systems [45]. Consequently, drug-seeking behaviors may persist even when the drug's subjective rewarding effects wane, with relapse triggered by cues that reactivate these ingrained habits [45].

Harnessing neuroplasticity to counter addiction involves targeting the disrupted brain circuits and cognitive processes underlying compulsive drug use [23–25]. Cognitive-behavioral interventions play a key role in this effort by helping to restore prefrontal cortex (PFC) function, particularly in addressing impairments linked to dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) hypoactivity [24]. For instance, informative cueing has been shown to enhance inhibitory control in methamphetamine-addicted individuals, with this improvement correlating with increased activation of the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) during a go/no-go task [24].

More broadly, cognitive strategies combined with long-term abstinence can reduce cue-induced responses in the PFC [24]. Instructing participants to actively inhibit craving has been associated with greater activation in brain regions responsible for inhibitory control, alongside reduced activity in areas linked to craving [24]. Similarly, treatment-seeking smokers who were directed to resist craving exhibited increased engagement of the dorsolateral PFC (DLPFC) and ACC [24]. Encouraging individuals to focus on the long-term consequences of drug use also activated PFC control regions while dampening activity in craving-related circuits [24].

Behavioral extinction interventions aim to decrease the motivational value of conditioned responses to drug cues, potentially by targeting the PFC, amygdala, and hippocampus [25]. These interventions can be coupled with medications such as d-cycloserine to enhance their effectiveness [25]. Pharmacological strategies also aim to modulate neuroplastic changes associated with addiction; for instance, kappa opioid receptor (KOR) antagonists show potential for preventing relapse and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

blocking compulsive drug seeking [25]. Similarly, corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF) receptor antagonists can block the stress-like effects of withdrawal and excessive drug taking in animal models [23].

Other promising targets include metabotropic glutamate 1 receptors, whose blockade can prevent cue-induced reinstatement of drug seeking, and the mTORC1 pathway, which is implicated in the reconsolidation of drug-related memories [23]. Enhancing tonic dopaminergic D2 receptor signaling is another strategy that might support better self-regulation and control [25]. Medications such as oral stimulants, methylphenidate (MPH) or modafinil, may enhance PFC function by increasing dopamine signaling [25]. In support of this, oral MPH has been shown to attenuate reduced metabolism in limbic regions, and dorsolateral PFC (DLPFC), following cocaine cue exposure [24]. It also improved performance on a drug-relevant Stroop task (interference control), with associated normalization of anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) activation [24]. Additionally, intravenous MPH improved inhibitory control in cocaine abusers, which correlated with changes in middle frontal cortex and ventromedial PFC activity toward normalization [24]. These dopamine-enhancing effects may facilitate behavioral changes such as improved self-control, particularly when combined with cognitive interventions [24].

Furthermore, interventions can also address the reduced sensitivity to non-drug rewards often observed in addiction [24]. Cognitive-behavioral strategies or pharmacological treatments may help alleviate dysphoria and boost responsiveness to natural, non-drug rewards during withdrawal [25]. Increasing individuals' awareness of the severity of their substance use is also critical; in alcoholics, greater awareness has been linked to higher rates of abstinence, highlighting the potential for personalized interventions targeting self-awareness deficits [24].

Beyond behavioral and pharmacological approaches, brain stimulation techniques such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and direct electrical stimulation are under investigation for their therapeutic potential [23,25]. In animal models, optogenetic stimulation of the prefrontal cortex (PFC) has been shown to prevent cocaine relapse, while optogenetic inhibition affected the incubation of craving and drug-seeking behavior, depending on the specific neuronal populations targeted [25].

Ultimately, normalizing PFC function through empirically grounded pharmacological and cognitive-behavioral interventions, ideally in conjunction with meaningful, non-drug reinforcers, should be a central goal of treatment [24]. Even when immediate abstinence is not achieved, interventions that counteract dysphoria or bolster executive function may significantly improve long-term recovery outcomes [25]. Looking ahead, future advances may allow for highly tailored interventions based on individual specific patterns of circuit dysfunction [25].

3.2. Physical Activity for Cognitive Function and Brain Health

Regular physical activity represents a powerful strategy for harnessing neuroplasticity to enhance brain health and cognitive function across the lifespan [26–28,35]. Exercise influences multiple aspects of brain function and contributes broadly to overall brain health [27], improving learning and memory in both humans and animals [26], [28]. In aging populations, an active lifestyle can delay or prevent cognitive decline associated with aging or neurodegenerative disease [26]. These benefits are particularly evident in older adults, where sustained participation in physical activity has been shown to enhance learning, memory, and executive functioning, helping to counteract age-related mental decline and protect against brain atrophy [27].

The cognitive benefits of exercise are reflected in neurophysiological measures such as EEG and event-related potentials (ERPs); aerobically fit individuals exhibit decreased latency and increased amplitude, signaling improved neuronal conduction and cortical activation [26]. Neuroimaging studies further support these findings, showing that active elderly individuals have greater gray matter volume in prefrontal and temporal regions compared to sedentary peers [26]. Additionally, aerobic training has been linked to increases in both gray and white matter volume in the prefrontal cortex, as well as enhanced functioning of executive control networks in older adults [28].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

The hippocampus, a brain region critical for learning, memory, and spatial navigation, is particularly responsive to the effects of physical exercise [27]. This structure typically shrinks in late adulthood, contributing to memory impairments and an increased risk of dementia [28]. However, individuals with higher levels of aerobic fitness tend to have larger hippocampal and medial temporal lobe volumes [28]. Notably, aerobic exercise training can even reverse hippocampal volume loss in older adults [28].

In a randomized controlled trial involving 120 older adults, one year of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise increased the size of the anterior hippocampus by approximately 2%, effectively reversing age-related loss equivalent to 1-2 years of decline [28]. In contrast, participants in the control group who engaged in stretching exercises experienced continued hippocampal shrinkage over the same period [28]. Interestingly, individuals with higher baseline fitness showed a slower rate of decline in the control group, suggesting that fitness itself offers a degree of neuroprotection [28].

The volume increase from exercise was selective, primarily affecting the anterior hippocampus, including the dentate gyrus, subiculum, and CA1 subfields, rather than the posterior hippocampus, caudate nucleus, or thalamus [28]. This is significant, as cells in the anterior hippocampus, which are heavily involved in spatial memory acquisition, also exhibit greater age-related atrophy [28]. Therefore, aerobic exercise may exert its most pronounced effects in regions that are most vulnerable to age-related decline [28].

The exercise-induced increase in hippocampal volume has been directly linked to improvements in memory function, particularly spatial memory [28]. In a one-year intervention, gains in hippocampal volume were positively correlated with enhancements in spatial memory performance [28]. Individuals with larger hippocampal volumes, both before and after the exercise program, consistently showed better spatial memory [28]. Moreover, those who experienced greater improvements in aerobic fitness also showed larger increases in hippocampal volume, reinforcing the connection between physical fitness and brain structure [28].

Several neurobiological mechanisms contribute to the cognitive and structural benefits of exercise [26]. Physical activity enhances synaptic plasticity by influencing synaptic structure, strengthening synaptic transmission, and supporting broader systems such as neurogenesis, metabolism, and vascular function [27]. A central mechanism behind these effects is the upregulation of both central and peripheral growth factors, most notably Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF) [27]. BDNF plays a critical role in synaptic plasticity, neuronal growth, cell survival, and neurogenesis, and is consistently upregulated by physical activity [26–28,35]. Exercise increases both BDNF mRNA and protein levels in the hippocampus, with effects that are both rapid and sustained [26,35]. Notably, higher hippocampal volume is associated with greater serum levels of BDNF, and individuals showing greater increases in serum BDNF also exhibit larger gains in anterior hippocampal volume following exercise interventions [28].

The effects of BDNF are mediated in part through its receptor, TrkB. Together, BDNF and TrkB contribute to dendritic expansion and are crucial for memory formation [28]. Blocking TrkB signaling in the hippocampus has been shown to reduce the positive impact of exercise on spatial learning and memory retention, underscoring the importance of this pathway [27]. BDNF contributes to dendritic expansion and is critical in memory formation [28].Exercise thus elevates both BDNF and TrkB levels in the hippocampus, forming a key molecular basis for its cognitive benefits [35].

Exercise is also the strongest known stimulus for adult hippocampal neurogenesis [26]. In rodents, voluntary wheel running leads to a dramatic increase in the production and survival of new neurons in the dentate gyrus (DG), an effect that persists throughout life [26,35]. This neurogenic response can even reverse declines caused by factors such as pregnancy or radiation treatment [26]. The newly generated neurons are functionally integrated into existing circuits and possess a lower threshold for excitability, making them especially well-suited for supporting enhanced plasticity [27]. This exercise-induced boost in highly plastic cells may help explain the strong relationship between physical activity and memory improvement [26].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

In addition to promoting neurogenesis, exercise enhances long-term potentiation (LTP), a synaptic correlate of learning, in the DG [26,27,35]. This enhancement is consistent with elevated BDNF levels and is accompanied by structural changes in DG cytoarchitecture, including increased dendritic length, branching complexity, and spine density [27,35]. Exercise also elevates levels of key synaptic proteins and glutamate receptors (e.g., NR2B, GluR5) [27,35]. Furthermore, running has been shown to enhance dendritic spine density in the DG, CA1, and entorhinal cortex, while accelerating the maturation of spines in newborn neurons [26,35].

In addition to BDNF, other growth factors such as Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 (IGF-1) and Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF) play key roles in mediating the effects of exercise on the brain [27]. Physical activity increases circulating levels of both IGF-1 and VEGF [26], and these peripheral sources are essential for promoting exercise-induced neurogenesis and angiogenesis [27]. Experimental studies show that blocking peripheral IGF-1 or VEGF inhibits the neurogenic effects of exercise, highlighting their necessity in this process [26,27]. IGF-1 signaling, in particular, has been linked to improved learning and spatial memory [27]. Notably, IGF-1 and BDNF pathways may converge, suggesting that BDNF could serve as a final common mediator of exercise-induced hippocampal plasticity and cognitive enhancement [27]. Exercise also stimulates widespread angiogenesis, growth of new blood vessels, in the hippocampus, cortex, and cerebellum, which enhances the brain's supply of nutrients and energy [26,27,35]. This vascular remodeling is closely associated with increased brain levels of VEGF, reinforcing its role in the structural and functional brain adaptations to physical activity [27,35].

Furthermore, exercise also mitigates several peripheral risk factors associated with cognitive decline, including hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and systemic inflammation, all of which can weaken growth factor signaling in the brain [27]. By improving overall immune health, physical activity reduces levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines, contributing to a healthier neuroimmune environment [27]. This reduction in both peripheral and central inflammation may represent a shared protective mechanism against metabolic disorders and cognitive decline [27].

Additionally, exercise activates the monoamine system, enhancing serotonin biosynthesis and supporting recovery from depression [26]. The observed increase in neurogenesis may underlie the antidepressant effects of both physical activity and pharmacological treatments [26]. Beyond mood regulation, exercise exerts neuroprotective effects, offering resilience against brain injuries such as stroke and potentially delaying the onset and progression of neurodegenerative conditions, including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and Huntington's diseases [26,27]. For instance, in animal models of Alzheimer's disease, exercise has been shown to reduce amyloid-β plaque accumulation [27].

Most importantly, aerobic exercise is a measurable and effective neuroprotective intervention that enhances cognitive function and brain volume, even when initiated later in life [26,28].

3.3. Mindfulness Meditation for Self-Regulation and Well-Being

Mindfulness meditation is a form of mental training increasingly utilized for stress reduction, health promotion, and cognitive enhancement [29]. It aims to improve core psychological capacities like attentional and emotional self-regulation [29]. Typically described as non-judgmental attention to experiences in the present moment, mindfulness meditation involves interacting components including enhanced attention control, improved emotion regulation, and altered self-awareness (characterized by reduced self-referential processing and heightened body awareness) [29]. Therapeutic programs incorporating mindfulness, such as Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR), have reported positive effects on psychological well-being and symptom amelioration across various disorders [30].

Recent neuroimaging research, particularly longitudinal studies with control groups, has begun to uncover the neural mechanisms mediating these benefits, revealing changes in behavior, brain structure, and function [29]. Over 20 studies have investigated alterations in brain morphometry related to mindfulness meditation, examining metrics like cortical thickness, gray matter volume/density, and white matter integrity [29]. Reported effects span multiple brain regions,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

suggesting involvement of large-scale networks [29]. A meta-analysis identified eight regions consistently altered in meditators: frontopolar cortex (linked to meta-awareness), sensory cortices and insula (linked to body awareness), hippocampus (linked to memory processes), anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), mid-cingulate cortex, and orbitofrontal cortex (linked to self and emotion regulation), and white matter tracts like the superior longitudinal fasciculus and corpus callosum (linked to intra- and inter-hemispheric communication) [29].

Furthermore, a controlled longitudinal study examining an 8-week MBSR program found specific increases in gray matter concentration compared to a control group [30]. Notably, structural analyses confirmed increased gray matter in the left hippocampus [30]. Whole-brain analyses further identified increases in the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), temporo-parietal junction (TPJ), and cerebellum within the MBSR group [30]. These brain regions are associated with key functions such as learning and memory, emotion regulation, self-referential processing, and perspective-taking [30]. Such morphological changes may reflect lasting neural adaptations that support improved mental functioning and overall psychological health [30]. It is widely believed that increased gray matter volume results from the repeated activation of specific brain regions during mindfulness practice [30]. Potential underlying cellular mechanisms include dendritic branching, synaptogenesis, myelin formation, and possibly adult neurogenesis; additional effects may involve modulation of autonomic function, immune activity, neuronal preservation, or inhibition of apoptosis [29].

Functional brain changes are also evident with mindfulness practice [29]. Enhanced attentional control, a central component of meditation. is reported to improve with continued practice [29]. The ACCis consistently implicated in mindfulness-related improvements in attention, with corresponding structural markers such as increased cortical thickness and enhanced white matter integrity [29]. Additionally, mindfulness practice has been linked to reduced age-related decline in gray matter volume in the putamen and to preserved sustained attention performance over time [29]. Even brief mindfulness training (e.g., four days of 20-minute sessions) has been shown to produce measurable cognitive benefits, similar to those observed with long-term practice [31]. This short-term training significantly enhanced performance on tasks requiring sustained attention and executive function, including the Symbol Digit Modalities Test, verbal fluency tasks, and working memory challenges like the n-back task [31]. Participants demonstrated a greater ability to maintain focus and accurately retrieve information under rapid processing demands [31]. Moreover, brief mindfulness practice also led to increased self-reported mindfulness skills and decreased subjective fatigue [31].

Improvements in emotion regulation represent another core benefit of mindfulness practice [29]. Regular meditation is associated with reduced amygdala activation in response to emotional stimuli, indicating decreased emotional reactivity and arousal [29]. This aligns with the idea that mindfulness meditation functions similarly to exposure therapy, in which individuals learn to observe bodily and emotional responses without engaging in reactive patterns [29].

Structural changes have been observed in brain regions involved in emotion regulation following mindfulness training [29]. Functional connectivity studies suggest that mindfulness may enhance the regulatory influence of executive control regions, such as the prefrontal cortex, over limbic areas like the amygdala [29]. A well-documented outcome of mindfulness techniques is stress reduction, which may underlie these neural changes [29]. For instance, mindfulness training has been shown to increase gray matter density in the hippocampus, while reductions in perceived stress were correlated with decreased gray matter density in the amygdala, suggesting that stress reduction might help reverse stress-related brain remodeling [29].

Mindfulness practice also influences self-awareness and self-referential processing [29]. Brain structures involved in self-referential processing, such as the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) and posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), key nodes of the Default Mode Network (DMN), show altered activity and structure as a result of meditation [29,30]. Reduced DMN activity during meditation has been interpreted as a sign of diminished self-referential processing [29]. In meditators, the insula, a region involved in interoception and body awareness, exhibits stronger activation and increased cortical thickness [29]. Additionally, mindfulness training may lead to an uncoupling of the insula

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

from the mPFC, while enhancing connectivity with dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) regions [29]. Structural changes in the temporo-parietal junction (TPJ), which plays a role in embodiment and the spatial integration of the self, may be linked to the cultivation of self-awareness and compassion during mindfulness practice [30]. Increases in PCC structure may reflect its role in integrating self-referential stimuli within an emotional and autobiographical context, functions that are engaged during introspective observation in mindfulness [30].

Mindfulness training may enhance meta-awareness, the ability to observe and control one's own mental processes [31]. This could improve the ability to control self-referential thoughts or mind-wandering, thereby improving attentional efficiency [31]. Mindfulness practice promotes a form of meta-cognitive insight, allowing practitioners to emotionally disengage from distractors and maintain focus on the present task [31]. This form of top-down cognitive control contributes to better performance [31].

In summary, across studies, consistent changes associated with mindfulness meditation are observed in the ACC, PFC, PCC, insula, striatum, hippocampus, and amygdala [29]. These findings suggest mindfulness practices systematically engage neuroplastic mechanisms to enhance self-regulation, cognitive abilities, and psychological well-being [29].

3.4. Cognitive Training for Targeted Enhancement

Cognitive training, particularly training of working memory (WM, the cognitive system responsible for temporarily holding and manipulating information necessary for complex tasks, such as reasoning, learning, and comprehension, unlike), represents another avenue for harnessing neuroplasticity to improve cognitive functions [32]. WM capacity is strongly predictive of performance across a wide range of cognitive tasks, including reasoning and academic performance [33]. While traditionally viewed as a fixed trait, recent research indicates that WM capacity can be improved through adaptive and extended training [32,33]. This training is associated with measurable changes in brain activity and structure, suggesting training-induced plasticity [33].

Two main approaches to WM training exist: strategy training and core training [32]. Strategy training involves teaching specific, effective techniques for encoding, maintaining, or retrieving information in WM, such as articulatory rehearsal or using elaborative imagery [32]. Studies confirm that strategy training can increase the amount of information remembered on WM tasks amenable to the trained strategy [32]. However, the primary expectation is that benefits are largely confined to tasks similar to the training (near transfer), with limited impact on dissimilar tasks (far transfer) [32].

Core WM training, in contrast, typically involves repetitive practice on demanding WM tasks designed to target domain-general WM mechanisms, often focusing on executive attention processes [32]. These paradigms aim to strengthen core WM processes by limiting strategy use, minimizing automation, using varied stimuli/modalities, requiring maintenance amidst interference, imposing rapid processing demands, adapting difficulty to individual proficiency, and demanding high cognitive engagement [32]. Because core training targets domain-general mechanisms, it is hypothesized to produce not only near transfer but also far transfer effects, improving performance on a wider range of cognitive tasks reliant on WM capacity [32].

Evidence suggests that core WM training programs can indeed improve performance on non-trained WM tasks [33]. For example, training developed by Klingberg and colleagues, involving adaptive WM tasks with feedback, led to improvements in general WM capacity, evidenced by better performance on untrained WM tasks differing in materials and testing mode [33]. Notably, these training effects remained evident during follow-up evaluations conducted several months later [33]. Such transfer effects to untrained tasks support the notion of training-induced neural plasticity within a shared WM network [33].

Furthermore, some studies suggest potential far transfer effects to non-WM tasks, although findings are less consistent [33]. For example, improvements in Stroop task performance were observed following WM training in children with ADHD and in young adults, but not in stroke patients [33]. Preschool children who underwent training demonstrated enhanced performance on a

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

continuous performance task assessing sustained attention [33]. Furthermore, in children with ADHD, WM training was associated with a reduction in parent-reported inattentive symptoms (such as difficulty focusing, forgetfulness, or being easily distracted) [33]. Core training studies thus seem to produce more far-reaching transfer effects compared to strategy training, likely due to targeting domain-general mechanisms [32].

Neuroimaging studies provide insights into the neural correlates of WM training [33]. Such training has been linked to alterations in brain activity, particularly within the frontal and parietal cortices, as well as the basal ganglia (specifically the caudate nucleus) [33]. Increased activity in these regions, which form a frontoparietal network involved in WM and attention control, potentially underlies the observed improvements in WM capacity and the transfer of training effects [33]. Changes in the basal ganglia might relate to improved selection of relevant information [33]. Additionally, WM training has been linked to changes in dopamine receptor density [33]. Specifically, increases in WM capacity following training correlated significantly with changes in cortical dopamine D1 receptor density [33]. This suggests that dopamine systems might play a role in mediating training effects, potentially providing another mechanism for transfer if different tasks recruit common neurotransmitter systems [33].

Despite promising findings, challenges remain in WM training research [32]. Transfer effects, especially far transfer, are not always consistently found, particularly in older adults where benefits may be limited beyond the trained tasks [32]. Methodological issues like the use of no-contact control groups (potentially vulnerable to expectancy effects) and reliance on single tasks to measure broad abilities need careful consideration [32]. Lack of standardization across training programs and assessment measures also makes comparisons difficult [32]. Future research needs to clarify the specific mechanisms driving training gains and use robust methodologies, including active control groups and multiple outcome measures, to validate the extent and nature of transfer effects [32]. Nevertheless, the existing evidence suggests that WM training, particularly core training, can induce neuroplastic changes and may serve as a potential intervention for individuals whose academic or daily life functioning is limited by low WM capacity [33]. Combining cognitive training with pharmacological approaches might represent a future direction [33].

3.5. Reforming Habits Through Contextual and Self-Control Strategies

Habits, defined as learned dispositions to repeat past responses triggered by context features, play a significant role in daily behavior [34]. They emerge from the gradual learning of associations between responses and cues in the performance context (e.g., locations, preceding actions, people) that have frequently covaried with past performance [34]. Once formed, perception of these context cues can trigger the associated response automatically, without mediation by a conscious goal or intention [34]. While habits often originate from past goal pursuit, where a behavior is repeatedly used to achieve an outcome, the acquired habit association itself is considered goal-independent [34]. Habit strength independently predicts the repetition of everyday activities, even when controlling for goals or intentions [34]. This slow learning process makes habits resistant to short-term behavioral changes driven by flexible goal pursuit [34].

In the context of addiction, compulsive drug seeking can be understood as involving maladaptive stimulus-response habits, where behavior becomes governed by drug-related cues rather than the drug's current value or goal [41]. This habitual control involves a shift towards dorsal striatal systems [41]. Relapse following abstinence is often triggered when drug-seeking habits are reactivated by exposure to these drug-related cues [45]. General behavioral characteristics of substance abusers, like impulsivity and poor decision-making, resemble effects of frontal lobe damage, highlighting the role of prefrontal systems in controlling habitual or impulsive behaviors [45]. Neural networks involving the prefrontal cortex and striatum are typically implicated in self-control over such responses [45].

Harnessing neuroplasticity for habit change involves strategies that target the cue-response link or the ability to exert control over habitual responses [34]. One approach involves exerting control

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

downstream after a habit cue has activated the response tendency [34]. This typically requires effortful self-control or inhibition to suppress the unwanted habitual response [34]. Success in inhibiting strong, conflicting habits appears dependent on available self-control capacity or regulatory resources [34]. Exerting such control can be effortful and may deplete self-control resources [34]. An avoidance strategy, involving monitoring for cues and vigilance against errors, can be effective for inhibiting conflicting habits [34]. However, interventions based solely on effortful inhibition are unlikely to produce long-term habit change [34]. Effortful inhibition may be most productive when paired with learning and performing a new, desired response in the presence of the old cue [34].

A potentially more effective approach focuses on controlling habit triggering upstream by managing exposure to the cues themselves [34]. This involves altering or avoiding the context cues that automatically elicit the habitual response [34]. Strategies promoting avoidance of contact with habit-triggering cues are widely used in addiction treatment [34]. Simple alterations to cues in performance contexts, such as in eating environments, have shown success in controlling habits like overeating [34]. Reducing exposure to cues (e.g., disabling email notifications to reduce habitual checking) is an example of deliberate upstream control [34].

Habit change can also be facilitated by naturalistic changes in life circumstances that disrupt the consistency of performance contexts [34]. Events like moving house or changing jobs alter the cues associated with old habits, creating opportunities for change [34]. When the performance context changes, individuals may be prompted to think more deliberately about their behavior, bringing actions more in line with current goals rather than old habits [34]. Interventions can leverage these naturally occurring context changes as windows of opportunity for establishing new, desired habits [34]. Understanding the mechanisms of habit formation and control, particularly the power of context cues and the distinction between goal-directed and habitual control, provides a framework for designing effective behavior change interventions that strategically target the neuroplastic processes underlying habits [41].

4. Conclusion: Living with Neuroplasticity

This review has traversed the landscape of neuroplasticity, from its fundamental molecular and cellular underpinnings to its broad systems-level expression and critical developmental windows. We have synthesized evidence demonstrating that the brain's inherent capacity for functional and structural reorganization is not merely a passive biological process but a dynamic substrate that can be actively and intentionally harnessed. Through consistent engagement in evidence-based behavioral interventions, including targeted therapies for addiction, regular physical activity, mindfulness meditation, cognitive training, and strategic habit reformation, individuals can leverage neuroplastic mechanisms to drive meaningful change. The core message emerging from this synthesis is both profound and empowering: the architecture of our brains, and consequently our behaviors, thoughts, and emotions, are malleable throughout life, responsive to dedicated effort and informed strategy.

The practical implications of this understanding are transformative. Moving beyond a deterministic view of brain function, the principles of neuroplasticity offer actionable insights for addressing significant contemporary challenges. The reviewed strategies provide tangible pathways for individuals seeking to overcome addiction by reshaping reward circuits and strengthening executive control [23–25], enhance cognitive function and mitigate age-related decline through exercise-induced hippocampal plasticity [27,28,35], cultivate emotional regulation and attentional stability via mindfulness [29–31], improve specific cognitive abilities like working memory through targeted training [32,33], and break ingrained maladaptive habits by managing contextual triggers and bolstering self-control [34,41]. Collectively, this body of research provides a scientifically validated framework for personal growth, therapeutic intervention, and the promotion of public health, shifting the focus towards proactive engagement in behaviors that foster positive neural adaptation.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

Looking ahead, while our understanding of neuroplasticity has advanced significantly, key areas warrant further investigation to refine and optimize behavioral modification strategies. For those seeking practical application, three areas show particular promise:

1. Dopamine Systems and the Basal Ganglia: Deeper exploration of dopaminergic modulation within corticostriatal circuits is crucial for understanding and manipulating the mechanisms of habit formation and reinforcement learning, offering potential for more effective strategies to instill desired routines and extinguish maladaptive ones [28,30].
2. Prefrontal Cortex (PFC) Function: Continued research into the PFC's role in executive functions, particularly decision-making, impulse control, and goal maintenance, is vital for developing interventions that strengthen top-down regulation over habitual or emotionally driven responses, especially relevant in addiction and self-control challenges [31,33].
3. Anterior Mid-Cingulate Cortex (aMCC) and Resilience: Investigating the aMCC's role in integrating cognitive control with motivation and the willingness to exert effort, particularly in the face of challenges or negative feedback, could unlock strategies to enhance resilience, persistence, and the ability to sustain behavioral change efforts over the long term [63].

Furthermore, translating these insights into accessible, user-friendly tools is paramount for widespread impact. Innovative approaches leveraging digital technology, such as mobile applications integrating mindfulness exercises, personalized cognitive training games, habit-tracking platforms incorporating cue-management features, and wearable sensors providing real-time biofeedback on physiological states related to stress or activity levels, hold significant potential. These tools can lower barriers to entry, provide scalable interventions, offer personalized feedback, and facilitate the consistent practice crucial for inducing lasting neuroplastic changes.

In final reflection, the study of neuroplasticity represents a powerful convergence of basic neuroscience and translational science. By understanding the mechanisms through which experience shapes the brain, we gain the capacity to develop targeted strategies that promote mental health, enhance cognitive abilities, facilitate rehabilitation from injury or disease, and empower individuals to achieve meaningful personal transformation. Integrating these evidence-based approaches into clinical practice, educational settings, and public health initiatives holds profound implications for improving well-being and addressing complex behavioral challenges in contemporary society.

At its core, if there is one takeaway, it is this: to make lasting changes in how you think, feel, or behave, the underlying neural pathways supporting the old patterns must be modified, and new pathways supporting the desired patterns must be created and strengthened.

References

1. A. Pascual-Leone *et al.*, 'Characterizing Brain Cortical Plasticity and Network Dynamics Across the Age-Span in Health and Disease with TMS-EEG and TMS-fMRI', *Brain Topogr.*, vol. 24, no. 3–4, pp. 302–315, Oct. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-011-0196-8.
2. D. E. Feldman, 'Synaptic Mechanisms for Plasticity in Neocortex', *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 32, pp. 33–55, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.051508.135516.
3. S. C. Cramer *et al.*, 'Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications', *Brain*, vol. 134, no. 6, pp. 1591–1609, Jun. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr039.
4. M. R. Rosenzweig, 'Aspects of the search for neural mechanisms of memory', *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 47, pp. 1–32, 1996. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.1.
5. W. James, *The principles of psychology, Vol I.* in The principles of psychology, Vol I. New York, NY, US: Henry Holt and Co, 1890, pp. xii, 697. https://doi.org/10.1037/10538-000.
6. J. A. Rozo, I. Martínez-Gallego, and A. Rodríguez-Moreno, 'Cajal, the neuronal theory and the idea of brain plasticity', *Front. Neuroanat.*, vol. 18, p. 1331666, Feb. 2024. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnana.2024.1331666.
7. G. Berlucchi and H. A. Buchtel, 'Neuronal plasticity: historical roots and evolution of meaning', *Exp. Brain Res.*, vol. 192, no. 3, pp. 307–319, Jan. 2009. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-008-1611-6.
8. K. S. Lashley, *The Mechanism of Vision: XVIII: Effects of Destroying the Visual 'associative Areas' of the Monkey*. Journal Press, 1948.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

9. J. Konorski, *Conditioned Reflexes and Neuron Organization*. University Press, 1948.
10. M. Puderbaugh and P. D. Emmady, 'Neuroplasticity', in *StatPearls*, Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing, 2025. Accessed: Mar. 16, 2025. [Online]. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK557811/
11. D.o Hebb, *The Organization Of Behavior*. 1949. Accessed: Mar. 16, 2025. [Online]. Available: http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.226341
12. J. S. Espinosa and M. P. Stryker, 'Development and Plasticity of the Primary Visual Cortex', *Neuron*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 230–249, Jul. 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2012.06.009.
13. R. A. Nicoll, 'A Brief History of Long-Term Potentiation', *Neuron*, vol. 93, no. 2, pp. 281–290, Jan. 2017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.12.015.
14. M. M. Merzenich, J. H. Kaas, J. Wall, R. J. Nelson, M. Sur, and D. Felleman, 'Topographic reorganization of somatosensory cortical areas 3b and 1 in adult monkeys following restricted deafferentation', *Neuroscience*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 33–55, Jan. 1983. https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4522(83)90024-6.
15. R. J. Nudo, 'Recovery after brain injury: mechanisms and principles', *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, vol. 7, p. 887, Dec. 2013. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00887.
16. P. S. Eriksson *et al.*, 'Neurogenesis in the adult human hippocampus', *Nat. Med.*, vol. 4, no. 11, pp. 1313–1317, Nov. 1998. https://doi.org/10.1038/3305.
17. E. R. Kandel, 'The molecular biology of memory storage: a dialogue between genes and synapses', *Science*, vol. 294, no. 5544, pp. 1030–1038, Nov. 2001. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1067020.
18. H. Flor, L. Nikolajsen, and T. Staehelin Jensen, 'Phantom limb pain: a case of maladaptive CNS plasticity?', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 873–881, Nov. 2006. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1991.
19. E. Temple *et al.*, 'Neural deficits in children with dyslexia ameliorated by behavioral remediation: Evidence from functional MRI', *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 2860–2865, Mar. 2003. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0030098100.
20. J. A. Kauer and R. C. Malenka, 'Synaptic plasticity and addiction', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 844–858, Nov. 2007. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2234.
21. C. Lüscher and R. C. Malenka, 'Drug-evoked synaptic plasticity in addiction: from molecular changes to circuit remodeling', *Neuron*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 650–663, Feb. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.01.017.
22. M. M. Merzenich, T. M. Van Vleet, and M. Nahum, 'Brain plasticity-based therapeutics', *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, vol. 8, p. 385, Jun. 2014. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00385.
23. G. F. Koob and N. D. Volkow, 'Neurobiology of addiction: a neurocircuitry analysis', *Lancet Psychiatry*, vol. 3, no. 8, pp. 760–773, Aug. 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)00104-8.
24. R. Z. Goldstein and N. D. Volkow, 'Dysfunction of the prefrontal cortex in addiction: neuroimaging findings and clinical implications', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 652–669, Oct. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3119.
25. N. D. Volkow and M. Morales, 'The Brain on Drugs: From Reward to Addiction', *Cell*, vol. 162, no. 4, pp. 712–725, Aug. 2015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.07.046.
26. H. van Praag, 'Exercise and the brain: something to chew on', *Trends Neurosci.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 283–290, May 2009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2008.12.007.
27. C. W. Cotman, N. C. Berchtold, and L.-A. Christie, 'Exercise builds brain health: key roles of growth factor cascades and inflammation', *Trends Neurosci.*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 464–472, Sep. 2007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2007.06.011.
28. K. I. Erickson *et al.*, 'Exercise training increases size of hippocampus and improves memory', *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 108, no. 7, pp. 3017–3022, Feb. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015950108.
29. Y.-Y. Tang, B. K. Hölzel, and M. I. Posner, 'The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 213–225, Apr. 2015. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3916.
30. B. K. Hölzel *et al.*, 'Mindfulness practice leads to increases in regional brain gray matter density', *Psychiatry Res.*, vol. 191, no. 1, pp. 36–43, Jan. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pscychresns.2010.08.006.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

31. F. Zeidan, S. K. Johnson, B. J. Diamond, Z. David, and P. Goolkasian, 'Mindfulness meditation improves cognition: Evidence of brief mental training', *Conscious. Cogn.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 597–605, Jun. 2010. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2010.03.014.
32. A. B. Morrison and J. M. Chein, 'Does working memory training work? The promise and challenges of enhancing cognition by training working memory', *Psychon. Bull. Rev.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 46–60, Feb. 2011. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-010-0034-0.
33. T. Klingberg, 'Training and plasticity of working memory', *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 317–324, Jul. 2010. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.05.002.
34. W. Wood and D. T. Neal, 'A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface', *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 114, no. 4, pp. 843–863, Oct. 2007. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.114.4.843.
35. M. W. Voss, C. Vivar, A. F. Kramer, and H. van Praag, 'Bridging animal and human models of exercise-induced brain plasticity', *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 525–544, Oct. 2013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.08.001.
36. A. Citri and R. C. Malenka, 'Synaptic plasticity: multiple forms, functions, and mechanisms', *Neuropsychopharmacol. Off. Publ. Am. Coll. Neuropsychopharmacol.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 18–41, Jan. 2008. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.npp.1301559.
37. P. Caroni, F. Donato, and D. Muller, 'Structural plasticity upon learning: regulation and functions', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 478–490, Jun. 2012. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3258.
38. B. Lu, G. Nagappan, X. Guan, P. J. Nathan, and P. Wren, 'BDNF-based synaptic repair as a disease-modifying strategy for neurodegenerative diseases', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 401–416, Jun. 2013. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3505.
39. R. C. Malenka and M. F. Bear, 'LTP and LTD: an embarrassment of riches', *Neuron*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 5–21, Sep. 2004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2004.09.012.
40. A. Holtmaat and K. Svoboda, 'Experience-dependent structural synaptic plasticity in the mammalian brain', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp. 647–658, Sep. 2009. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2699.
41. B. J. Everitt and T. W. Robbins, 'Neural systems of reinforcement for drug addiction: from actions to habits to compulsion', *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 1481–1489, Nov. 2005. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1579.
42. P. Calabresi, B. Picconi, A. Tozzi, and M. Di Filippo, 'Dopamine-mediated regulation of corticostriatal synaptic plasticity', *Trends Neurosci.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 211–219, May 2007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2007.03.001.
43. S. N. Haber, 'Corticostriatal circuitry', *Dialogues Clin. Neurosci.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 7–21, Mar. 2016.
44. T. W. Robbins and A. F. T. Arnsten, 'The Neuropsychopharmacology of Fronto-Executive Function: Monoaminergic Modulation', *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 32, pp. 267–287, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.051508.135535.
45. T. W. Robbins and B. J. Everitt, 'Drug addiction: bad habits add up', *Nature*, vol. 398, no. 6728, pp. 567–570, Apr. 1999. https://doi.org/10.1038/19208.
46. R. Cools and M. D'Esposito, 'Inverted-U shaped dopamine actions on human working memory and cognitive control', *Biol. Psychiatry*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. e113–e125, Jun. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.03.028.
47. G. Schoenbaum, M. R. Roesch, and T. A. Stalnaker, 'Orbitofrontal cortex, decision-making and drug addiction', *Trends Neurosci.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 116–124, Feb. 2006. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2005.12.006.
48. M. Rubinov and O. Sporns, 'Complex network measures of brain connectivity: uses and interpretations', *NeuroImage*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1059–1069, Sep. 2010. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.003.
49. D. S. Bassett, M. Yang, N. F. Wymbs, and S. T. Grafton, 'Learning-induced autonomy of sensorimotor systems', *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 744–751, May 2015. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3993.
50. E. Bullmore and O. Sporns, 'Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis of structural and functional systems', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 186–198, Mar. 2009. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2575.
51. D. S. Bassett and O. Sporns, 'Network neuroscience', *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 353–364, Feb. 2017. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4502.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.0235.v1

52. C. J. Honey *et al.*, 'Predicting human resting-state functional connectivity from structural connectivity', *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 106, no. 6, pp. 2035–2040, Feb. 2009. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0811168106.
53. M. P. van den Heuvel and O. Sporns, 'Network hubs in the human brain', *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 683–696, Dec. 2013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.09.012.
54. G. Deco, V. K. Jirsa, and A. R. McIntosh, 'Emerging concepts for the dynamical organization of resting-state activity in the brain', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 43–56, Jan. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2961.
55. K. J. Friston, 'Functional and effective connectivity: a review', *Brain Connect.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 13–36, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2011.0008.
56. G. Deco, G. Tononi, M. Boly, and M. L. Kringelbach, 'Rethinking segregation and integration: contributions of whole-brain modelling', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 430–439, Jul. 2015. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3963.
57. A. E. Takesian and T. K. Hensch, 'Chapter 1 - Balancing Plasticity/Stability Across Brain Development', in *Progress in Brain Research*, vol. 207, M. M. Merzenich, M. Nahum, and T. M. Van Vleet, Eds., in Changing Brains, vol. 207. , Elsevier, 2013, pp. 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-63327-9.00001-1.
58. E. I. Knudsen, 'Sensitive periods in the development of the brain and behavior', *J. Cogn. Neurosci.*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1412–1425, Oct. 2004. https://doi.org/10.1162/0898929042304796.
59. M. Hübener and T. Bonhoeffer, 'Neuronal Plasticity: Beyond the Critical Period', *Cell*, vol. 159, no. 4, pp. 727–737, Nov. 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.10.035.
60. T. K. Hensch and P. M. Bilimoria, 'Re-opening Windows: Manipulating Critical Periods for Brain Development', *Cerebrum Dana Forum Brain Sci.*, vol. 2012, p. 11, Jul. 2012.
61. E. de Villers-Sidani, E. F. Chang, S. Bao, and M. M. Merzenich, 'Critical Period Window for Spectral Tuning Defined in the Primary Auditory Cortex (A1) in the Rat', *J. Neurosci.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 180–189, Jan. 2007. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3227-06.2007.
62. D. Bavelier, D. M. Levi, R. W. Li, Y. Dan, and T. K. Hensch, 'Removing brakes on adult brain plasticity: from molecular to behavioral interventions', *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.*, vol. 30, no. 45, pp. 14964–14971, Nov. 2010. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4812-10.2010.
63. A. J. Shackman, T. V. Salomons, H. A. Slagter, A. S. Fox, J. J. Winter, and R. J. Davidson, 'The Integration of Negative Affect, Pain, and Cognitive Control in the Cingulate Cortex', *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 154–167, Mar. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2994.