

Strategic Blueprint for Rapid Adoption of a High-Risk, High-Reward Interdisciplinary Theory: A 5-Year Roadmap

I. Foundation: The Strategic Imperative for Interdisciplinary Theory Adoption

The successful dissemination and institutional acceptance of a novel, foundational scientific theory, particularly one that is high-risk and high-reward (HRHR), is fundamentally reliant on a carefully engineered strategic communication paradigm.¹ For complex concepts that bridge multiple disciplines, communication cannot be relegated to a subsidiary function; it must operate as an essential, scientifically rigorous component of the research itself. Achieving awareness and adoption within a restrictive five-year window requires preemptive identification and mitigation of systemic barriers inherent in the scientific establishment.

1.1 Defining the Challenge: The Paradox of High-Risk, High-Reward (HRHR) Innovation

Foundational theories that challenge existing paradigms often face systemic resistance, primarily due to institutional risk aversion. Studies indicate that traditional funding bodies, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), have become increasingly risk-averse, often conditioning grant success on the submission of preliminary findings that demonstrate feasibility.² This cultural disposition systematically disadvantages truly original, high-risk intellectual endeavors which, by definition, lack extensive preliminary validation. This resistance acts as a critical constraint in the initial two years of the adoption timeline.

Successful HRHR adoption necessitates bypassing or actively reshaping the academic ecology to promote original innovation. This involves formulating supportive funding policies and, crucially, reforming the academic review mechanism to select for unconventional, paradigm-shifting research rather than merely incremental progress.³ The path to accelerating adoption therefore must focus on ecosystems that value novelty and long-term potential over immediate, guaranteed success.

An examination of alternative funding models suggests a strategic imperative for selecting partners based on their inherent risk tolerance. For instance, investigators supported by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), which offers longer grant durations and does not demand early results, exhibit distinct research characteristics: they utilize more novel keywords and produce a greater spread of outcomes, including both significant breakthroughs ("hits") and unsuccessful lines of inquiry ("flops").² This pattern confirms that the freedom from immediate outcome pressure fosters disruptive theoretical development. The initial strategy for launching the new theory must therefore incorporate a "stealth launch" within these risk-tolerant environments (such as specialized institutes or private funding sources) to secure foundational support and validation before seeking broader, more risk-averse institutional buy-in. To ensure intellectual claim and track the conceptual progress of the idea, the communication strategy must aggressively define and utilize unique vocabulary, establishing the "vintage of the idea" early in the literature to secure conceptual primacy.²

1.2 The Strategic Communication Paradigm for Interdisciplinary Adoption

The emergence of strategic communication as an interdisciplinary paradigm demonstrates its essential role in managing communication within complex, multi-stakeholder settings.¹ For a theory rooted in complexity science, which seeks to analyze phenomena where simple "Newtonian" causalities fail to provide a full explanation⁵, a structured communication methodology is required for successful conceptual translation.

This approach requires treating the communication process itself as a scientific methodology, thereby validating the interdisciplinary nature of the theory. By employing sophisticated methods such as framing analysis and detailed narrative development, the project establishes a robust system for knowledge transfer. Furthermore, analysis of digital media and framing theory underscores the significant influence of media presentation and cultural values on audience interpretation.⁶ Global events illustrate that cultural values shape receptivity; for example, audiences in Eastern cultures tend to be more receptive to collective action frames, while Western audiences may prioritize individual agency.⁶ This distinction dictates the need

for culturally sensitive framing in global dissemination efforts.

The rapid spread of digital information also introduces the risk of misinformation, which can erode trust and credibility, particularly for a theory that may conflict with established beliefs or values.⁶ Therefore, the 5-year plan must allocate resources for constant digital monitoring and rapid-response communication protocols. This involves proactively establishing the official conceptual framework and aggressively monitoring digital platforms for misinterpretations. By presenting scientific evidence in a compelling, understandable manner, the communication effort can effectively promote evidence-based decision-making and counter the rise of pseudoscientific counter-claims, which is crucial for maximizing adoption probability.⁸

II. Institutional Targeting and Academic Adoption Pathways

The initial strategy for adoption must focus on the most receptive and influential academic ecosystems, defined by their established expertise in complexity, integrated systems, and progressive neurological paradigms. These institutions provide both the intellectual environment and the authoritative endorsement necessary for high-level theory diffusion.

2.1 Identifying Receptive Academic Ecosystems

The target environment is characterized by a commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration across domains like theoretical physics, complexity science, cognitive psychology, and applied mathematics.⁹

Complexity Science and Network Hubs

Institutions dedicated to understanding the principles and mechanisms of complex behavior are primary targets, as their mission aligns directly with the foundational requirements of the theory.⁹ These centers are often state-of-the-art, multidisciplinary units designed to blend analytical and empirical approaches.⁹

- **Key Targets:** The FAU Center for Complex Systems ⁹, the Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems (NICO) ¹⁰, and the CABDyN Complexity Centre at the University of Oxford.¹⁰ These centers are strategically important not only for publication and presentation but also as primary sites for curriculum integration in later years, serving as the first pedagogical anchors for the theory.

Integrated Cognition and High-Profile Research Institutes

High-level authority is often transferred from highly reputable individuals and institutions. The success of theories like Integrated Information Theory (IIT) was significantly bolstered by its association with researchers like Giulio Tononi and institutes such as the University of Wisconsin–Madison Center for Sleep and Consciousness and the Allen Institute for Brain Science, led by Christof Koch.¹¹ This reputation lends a "certain authority or celebrity" to the associated theory.¹¹

A fundamental requirement for overcoming initial academic skepticism is securing formal collaboration or affiliation with 1-2 influential principal investigators from these established institutes (e.g., NICO, Allen Institute) during Year 1. Leveraging their existing authority accelerates peer acceptance and provides a vital authoritative endorsement.

Applied Neurodiversity and Human Relevance Centers

For theories possessing clinical or social implications, engagement with centers focusing on applied neuroscience and neurodiversity ensures the work is ethically grounded and meets real-world community needs. These centers are essential for demonstrating the theory's positive societal impact, moving beyond abstract physics or mathematics.

- **Key Targets:** The Stanford Neurodiversity Project and its annual Summit ¹³, and the National Symposium on Neurodiversity at Syracuse University.¹³ These groups are already committed to promoting academic inquiry into neurological difference as a concept and social movement, providing a receptive audience for a theory that frames diversity as a source of strength.¹⁵

The Strategic Institutional Targeting Matrix (Years 1-3)

Institution Type	Target Centers (Examples)	Adoption Rationale	Year 1-2 Action Item
Complexity Science	FAU Center for Complex Systems, NICO (Northwestern), CABDyN (Oxford) ⁹	Provides the necessary intellectual "glue" for interdisciplinary integration. ¹⁷	Secure joint workshops and seed grant proposals; pilot curriculum modules.
Integrated Cognition	UWM Center for Sleep and Consciousness, Allen Institute for Brain Science ¹¹	Lends "celebrity" authority and institutional credibility to the theoretical framework. ¹¹	Secure 1-2 formal collaborations with senior PIs; joint authorship on initial papers.
Applied Neurodiversity	Stanford Neurodiversity Project, Syracuse Symposium ¹³	Ensures ethical implementation and community validation; provides a high-impact narrative application. ¹⁸	Present at targeted symposia; establish community feedback loops for theory refinement.

2.2 High-Impact Publication Strategy

The publication strategy must deliberately target journals positioned at the intersection of the relevant disciplines, using the journal's scope itself as a framing tool to pre-validate the theory's interdisciplinary status.

- Network Neuroscience and Connectomics:** *Network Neuroscience* is a critical target, explicitly publishing work at the intersection of brain and network sciences, covering connectomics, circuit dynamics, and computational studies across scales.¹⁹ Submitting to this venue frames the theory as legitimate interdisciplinary work, bypassing the initial skepticism that might arise in a purely disciplinary journal. Manuscripts must therefore utilize the methodological language of the journal, such as "modeling relational data" and analyzing "patterns of functional connectivity".¹⁹
- Human Neuroscience and Clinical Translation:** *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* is

essential for publishing results related to the theory's application in neurodevelopmental conditions, such as autism and ADHD, and for discussing how network variability predicts cognitive abilities.¹⁶ This journal's interest in special issues related to neurodiversity ensures that the research addresses ethical implementation and community participation.¹⁶ Submissions to this venue must deliberately integrate qualitative stakeholder data, prioritizing the dimensions identified by neurodivergent communities, rather than sidelining them in favor of a purely quantitative, external perspective.¹⁸

- **Complexity and Physics Journals:** Journals like *PLOS Complex Systems* and related publications focusing on theoretical physics and computation are necessary to establish the foundational mathematical and computational rigor of the model.²¹

The use of **preprints** (e.g., Preprints.org, which collaborates with MDPI journals) is an essential tactic in the initial phase. Preprints allow for immediate dissemination of the theoretical framework and initial data, accelerating scientific dialogue and securing the intellectual "vintage" of the idea prior to formal peer review completion.²³ This rapid sharing is crucial for a 5-year adoption window.

III. Academic Dissemination: Mastering the Controversial Presentation

High-risk theories are often controversial and require a controlled environment for initial presentation to transition potential opposition into constructive intellectual engagement. The framework for this is the Structured Academic Controversy (SAC).

3.1 Principles of Structured Academic Controversy (SAC)

The goal of the academic presentation is to foster an "excellent academic ecology that stimulates HRHR research development".³ The SAC model provides the structure to achieve this by setting strict protocols for intellectual debate.

The core rules of SAC govern behavior and maintain credibility: all criticism must be directed at the position and ideas, not the individual.²⁴ Presenters must commit to changing their viewpoint if the evidence dictates it, thereby signaling a commitment to objective scientific inquiry rather than defensiveness.²⁴ The focus must remain on reaching the most scientifically

robust outcome, not on "winning" the argument.²⁴

When scientific information is inherently controversial, the audience's perception of the scientists' trustworthiness and credibility is paramount.⁷ By voluntarily adhering to a Structured Academic Controversy framework, the theory's proponents signal intellectual humility and a dedication to evidence-based refinement. This commitment to transparent, rigorous debate is critical for mitigating distrust and maximizing the long-term credibility of the theory among skeptical peers. To enforce this, all academic Q&A sessions must be formally moderated, employing strict time limits and procedural rules to maintain adherence to the SAC ethos.

3.2 Presentation Outline: For Technical Academics (The Rigor Presentation)

This presentation is designed for expert audiences and prioritizes quantitative detail, mechanistic clarity, and foundational scientific justification.

I. The Newtonian Failure and Conceptual Crisis (10 minutes)

The presentation begins by establishing the necessity of the new theory. It must define the inherent limitations of reductionist models and explicitly detail where traditional "Newtonian" causalities fail to explain complex phenomena.⁵ In the context of the brain or cognition, this section should explicitly reject the limitations of pure functionalism, arguing that a full explanation requires consideration of the physical substrate itself, emphasizing the importance of systems composed of feedback loops that integrate information.¹¹ This strategic framing establishes the conceptual crisis that the new theory aims to resolve.

II. Mathematical Foundations and Metrics (15 minutes)

The core of the academic presentation is the rigor of the quantitative model. The theoretical framework must be grounded in established tools from statistical physics and computation theory, defining complexity in terms of the amount of information required to describe the system.²⁵ Specific attention must be paid to how these fundamental concepts relate to

emergent behavior and multi-scale organization in neural systems.²⁶ For empirical testing, the presentation must introduce specific network metrics and connectomics terminology relevant to the target journal scopes, such as recording, analyzing, or modeling relational data.¹⁹

III. The Mechanistic Model: Emergence and Dynamics (15 minutes)

This section details the proposed mechanisms. It should clearly illustrate the key concepts of the complex system: non-linear interactions between parts, the spontaneous emergence of unexpected behaviors, temporal dynamics and adaptation, and self-organization without centralized control.²⁷ Computer simulations, network modeling, and machine learning techniques must be utilized to demonstrate these mechanisms.²⁷ If the theory incorporates principles of quantum physics, the presentation must clearly delineate which approach is being adopted (e.g., Quantum Brain, Quantum Mind, or Dual Aspect theory) and highlight the promising features while acknowledging inherent philosophical and technical challenges.²²

IV. Empirical Validation and Interdisciplinary Implications (10 minutes)

The presentation must pivot to empirical evidence, presenting initial findings. Crucially, the data must balance the discovery of patterns with the construction of robust mechanistic models.²⁷ These preliminary results serve the strategic purpose of mitigating institutional risk aversion² and justifying the required subsequent grant funding. The findings should be explicitly positioned within existing literature, such as neuroimaging experiments and structural/functional connectivity studies.¹⁹

V. Call for Replication and Structured Controversy (5 minutes)

The presentation concludes with an explicit invitation for rigorous critique and replication. By reiterating the SAC guidelines—that criticism must be directed at the ideas—the presenter guides the subsequent Q&A toward constructive debate.²⁴ The final framing must be one of collaborative problem-solving, focused on achieving the optimal scientific outcome through community effort.²⁴

IV. Public Engagement and Narrative Architecture

Public adoption of a complex theory relies on narrative resonance and emotional connection, rather than technical detail. This communication requires a deliberate shift from the analytical style of academia to a strategic communication model focused on motivation, purpose, and values, best achieved through the Marshall Ganz Public Narrative framework.

4.1 The Power of Public Narrative (The Marshall Ganz Framework)

Public Narrative is a practice of leadership that enables others to achieve shared purpose in the face of uncertainty.²⁸ Since complex scientific concepts can easily be misunderstood or dismissed if they conflict with established worldviews⁷, the narrative framework must address both the "head" (strategy/analysis) and the "heart" (story/motivation).²⁸

- **Story of Self (Trust and Calling):** Leaders must communicate why they are "called to lead".²⁸ For the scientific leader, sharing personal anecdotes or the research journey creates an emotional hook, which is vital for audience memory and decision-making.⁸ This provides the structured method to safely disclose values and build trust, a prerequisite for effective communication on controversial issues.⁷
- **Story of Us (Shared Values):** The theory must be connected to the community's identity and values. For applications concerning neurodiversity, this requires framing the issue not as a disorder or deficit, but as neurological differences that offer a source of human strength.¹⁵ This alignment of values (e.g., diversity, inclusion) helps secure community buy-in and provides an intrinsic motivation for adoption.
- **Story of Now/Vision (The Dream):** The vision defines the "dream"—what the world will look like if the value promoted by the theory is upheld.²⁸ This provides a clear path forward, articulating measurable outcomes that contribute to the vision. By clearly defining the benefit, this narrative component proactively removes the rational objections or "why nots" that might prevent an audience from embracing the theory.²⁹

A crucial component of translating complex scientific concepts is the use of **cinematic visualization**. Cinematic scientific visualization, which emphasizes aesthetic design and storytelling, captures public attention far more effectively than traditional data presentation.³⁰ This method is necessary to simplify complexity theory—which is abstract by nature—by using analogies and real-world examples (like ecosystems or the brain) to make the research relatable and understandable.⁸ Significant resources must be dedicated in Year 1 to creating

high-production visual assets (short films, interactive displays) that convey the theory's mechanisms metaphorically and emotionally.

4.2 Presentation Outline: For Non-Academic Audiences (The Impact Presentation)

This presentation utilizes the Public Narrative structure, prioritizing audience connection and measurable social impact.

I. The Origin Story: Story of Self (5 minutes)

The presentation begins with the PI's personal narrative, sharing the passion and commitment that motivated the research. This section utilizes emotional hooks and relatable scenarios, such as the personal experience of discovery or the realization of the problem's importance.⁸ This strategy ensures that the audience connects with the messenger and establishes a foundational layer of personal trust.⁷

II. The Shared Human Challenge: Story of Us (10 minutes)

Complexity is introduced using simple, widely understood analogies, such as how flocking behaviors emerge in nature or how markets self-organize.²⁷ The focus then shifts to the human cost of current conceptual failings, for example, the societal costs of misunderstanding cognitive differences. This frames the theory as a solution to a collective problem, emphasizing the human impact of the research and creating a deeper, shared motivation.⁸

III. Seeing the Unseen: The Cinematic Visualization (15 minutes)

This is the core educational segment. Complex mechanics (emergence, self-organization) are conveyed using high-quality cinematic visuals and metaphors.³⁰ The language must be

concise, exact, and unambiguous, strictly avoiding jargon, unnecessary acronyms, and repeating information found in the title.³¹ Key data points are integrated naturally into the narrative flow, serving to illustrate the story rather than functioning as raw reportage.²⁹

IV. The New Frame: Vision and Policy Outcomes (10 minutes)

The presentation contrasts the revolutionary complexity frame with the outdated, reductionist perspective it seeks to replace.⁵ For a theory related to human systems, the vision is defined by the promise of leveraging neurological diversity as a source of strength, countering traditional perspectives based on deficits or disorders.¹⁵ This section must define tangible, measurable outcomes that, when achieved, contribute to the overarching vision.²⁸

V. Enabling Change: Call to Action (5 minutes)

The presentation concludes with a clear, specific call to action. Leadership involves enabling others to achieve a shared purpose, and the final ask must convert passive awareness into active adoption behavior.²⁸ This may involve advocating for policy changes, supporting curriculum implementation, or directly funding the next stage of applied research.

V. The 5-Year Strategic Adoption Roadmap and Implementation

The comprehensive 5-year plan is designed as an implementation science model, prioritizing strategic academic validation in the initial phase to mitigate risk aversion, followed by scaling, curriculum penetration, and policy influence.

5.1 Year 1-2: Establishing Academic Footing (The Validation Phase)

The primary objective during this phase is to secure initial scientific legitimacy, confirm

high-risk, high-reward funding, and establish a repeatable validation mechanism. The focus is on leveraging the risk-tolerant ecosystems identified in Section 2.1.

The academic strategy involves the immediate submission of 3-5 high-quality, interdisciplinary papers, immediately posted as preprints to secure the idea's "vintage".²³ These submissions must target venues like *Network Neuroscience* and *PLOS Complex Systems*.¹⁹ Simultaneously, significant effort must be placed on securing HRHR-style seed funding from private foundations or specialized institutes (mimicking the HHMI model).² The dissemination plan requires executing the initial academic presentation series at 5-7 Complexity and Cognition Centers (e.g., NICO, Allen Institute), strictly adhering to the Structured Academic Controversy protocol to build credibility through rigorous, open debate.²⁴

The public strategy focuses on content development and community grounding. All high-production cinematic visualization assets and the core public narrative script must be finalized.³⁰ Essential to this phase is launching formal, collaborative research projects with relevant stakeholder communities, such as neurodiversity advocates, to ensure the theory's accuracy reflects community-driven dimensions and to build a foundational layer of trust prior to mass public launch.¹⁸

5.2 Year 3-4: Scaling and Interdisciplinary Expansion (The Diffusion Phase)

This phase aims to achieve a citation critical mass, penetrate mainstream funding, and integrate the theory into academic pedagogy and policy discussions.

Academic growth is evidenced by the successful transition to mainstream funding: submitting large-scale federal/national grant proposals (e.g., NIH, NSF), utilizing the robust preliminary data generated by the HRHR seed funding.² Crucially, the theory must be integrated into course curricula at 2-3 targeted complexity centers, as the selection of a substantive topic that provides context for abstract issues is essential for student motivation and long-term acceptance.¹⁷ Dissemination scales globally, including keynote presentations at major international conferences and hosting a special session at established venues, such as the Stanford Neurodiversity Summit.¹³

The public strategy accelerates, launching a national media campaign that uses culturally sensitive framing based on the analysis of digital framing trends.⁶ Communications must focus on the human impact stories developed through community partnerships. Concurrently, the theory transitions into the policy sphere through the publication of 3-5 white papers advocating for specific policy changes (e.g., educational inclusion, workforce standards)

based on the theoretical framework.¹⁵

5.3 Year 5: Measuring Adoption and Cultural Integration (The Maturation Phase)

The final year focuses on securing sustainable propagation and documenting quantifiable changes in institutional behavior and cultural acceptance.

Academic success is measured by the theory's establishment as a foundational concept in related fields. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) include the theory being cited in a minimum of 10 major review articles in adjacent disciplines (e.g., systems biology, quantum physics) and its explicit reference within doctoral dissertations and research methodologies across the target centers.¹⁹ A dedicated institutional research unit focused on the theory should be established.

Public adoption is demonstrated by policy influence, such as concepts being referenced in at least three major policy documents or governmental reports.¹⁵ A shift in public perception or cultural acceptance of related concepts (e.g., neurodiversity) serves as a proxy for the theory's impact. For sustainability, the project must secure second-wave HRHR funding for next-generation research and transition its communication focus from initial awareness to continuous support and defense against emerging theoretical challenges.

The 5-Year Strategic Adoption Roadmap: KPIs and Success Metrics

Phase (Years)	Academic Strategy Focus (KPIs)	Public & Narrative Strategy Focus (KPIs)	Critical Risk Mitigation
1-2: Foundation	Submission of 5+ interdisciplinary papers, immediately preprinted. ²³ HRHR seed funding secured. ² Active collaborations secured with 2+	Core Public Narrative established through active community integration. ¹⁸ Cinematic visualization assets created and	Mandatory enforcement of Structured Academic Controversy (SAC) etiquette to manage controversy. ²⁴ Strict adherence to

	complexity centers. ¹⁰	piloted. ³⁰	non-sensationalized scientific abstract standards. ³²
3-4: Expansion	2+ major mainstream grants secured (e.g., NIH/NSF model). Curriculum integration confirmed in 2+ major universities. ¹⁷ Accumulation of 50+ citations by end of Year 4.	National media campaign executed (5+ high-profile placements). Theory utilized by policy makers (3+ policy papers published).	Continuous monitoring of digital platforms for negative framing to counter misinformation. ⁶ Ensuring qualitative data integrity validates public claims. ⁷
5: Adoption	Theory cited in 10+ major field review articles. Establishment of a dedicated institutional research unit. PI invited to edit major journal special issue (e.g., <i>Frontiers</i>). ²⁰	Theory referenced in major governmental/corporate policy documents. ¹⁵ Documented cultural shift in related domains through surveys/reporting.	Securing second-wave HRHR funding; ensuring community participation remains central to research ethics. ¹⁶

Conclusions and Recommendations

The successful, rapid adoption of a high-risk, high-reward interdisciplinary theory within a five-year horizon demands a dual strategy of uncompromising academic rigor and sophisticated public narrative architecture. The conventional academic environment, characterized by increasing risk aversion², necessitates prioritizing initial validation within specialized, risk-tolerant ecosystems such as Complexity Science and Integrated Cognition centers.¹⁰

The core recommendation is to treat strategic communication as an integral scientific methodology. This involves two essential components: first, utilizing the Structured Academic

Controversy model to ensure intellectual credibility and build trust during peer debate ⁷; and second, deploying the Marshall Ganz Public Narrative framework in public outreach to connect the abstract theory to collective human values and measurable social outcomes.²⁸

By strategically targeting publications like *Network Neuroscience* and *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* to frame the theory as legitimate interdisciplinary work ¹⁶, and by leveraging cinematic visualization to communicate complexity to the public ³⁰, the probability of wide-scale adoption is maximized. The five-year roadmap provides a detailed, measurable pathway, transitioning the theory from an 'edgy' conceptual foundation to an established, ethically implemented framework contributing significantly to both academic and societal understanding.

Works cited

1. Strategic Communication as an Emerging Interdisciplinary Paradigm - ResearchGate, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327008501_Strategic_Communication_as_an_Emerging_Interdisciplinary_Paradigm
2. Encouraging high-risk high-reward research at NIH Paula Stephan, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University - Brookings Institution, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/StephanFranzoniFinal-3.pdf>
3. Developing Science and Technology Policies for High Risk-High Reward Research, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://bulletinofcas.researchcommons.org/journal/vol37/iss5/11/>
4. Strategic Communication as an Emerging Interdisciplinary Paradigm - Semantic Scholar, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Strategic-Communication-as-an-Emerging-Paradigm-Werder-Nothhaft/2f89623ee339a3f54c22964b97014ed70c0dffae>
5. A Brief Introduction to Complexity Theory in Managing Public Services, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://journals.openedition.org/rfcb/8103>
6. A Comprehensive and Critical Literature Review on Framing Theory in the Digital Media Age - Preprints.org, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202504.1728/v1>
7. Building the Knowledge Base for Effective Science Communication - NCBI - NIH, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK425713/>
8. Storytelling in Science: The Key to Engaging Your Audience - MESH Interactive Agency, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://meshagency.com/storytelling-in-science-the-key-to-engaging-your-audience/>
9. FAU - Complex Systems : Florida Atlantic University - Charles E. Schmidt College of Science, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://www.ccs.fau.edu/>
10. 5) International Complexity Institutes and Research Centres, accessed November

- 24, 2025,
<https://complexsystemstheory.net/international-complexity-institutes-and-research-centres/>
11. Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://iep.utm.edu/integrated-information-theory-of-consciousness/>
 12. Integrated Information Theory - Center for Sleep and Consciousness, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://centerforsleepandconsciousness.psychiatry.wisc.edu/integrated-information-theory/>
 13. Conferences - Neurodiversity Network, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.neurodiversitynetwork.net/conferences>
 14. About the Stanford Neurodiversity Project, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://med.stanford.edu/neurodiversity.html>
 15. Neurodiversity: post-cognitivist foundations of the 3E approach for educational inclusion of autistic students with technology - Frontiers, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1493863/full>
 16. Precision neurodiversity: personalized brain network architecture as a window into cognitive variability - Frontiers, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2025.1669431/full>
 17. The State of the Field: Interdisciplinary Theory - ERIC, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1101054.pdf>
 18. From Puzzle to Progress: How Engaging With Neurodiversity Can Improve Cognitive Science - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7616419/>
 19. Submission Guidelines | Network Neuroscience - MIT Press Direct, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://direct.mit.edu/netn/pages/submission-guidelines>
 20. Precision neurodiversity: personalized brain network architecture as a window into cognitive variability - Frontiers, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2025.1669431/pdf>
 21. Submit Now | PLOS Complex Systems, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://journals.plos.org/complexsystems/s/submit-now>
 22. Quantum Approaches to Consciousness - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qt-consciousness/>
 23. Complex Systems and Network Science - MDPI, accessed November 24, 2025,
https://www.mdpi.com/topics/Complex_Systems_Network_Science
 24. How to Teach with Structured Academic Controversy - SERC, accessed November 24, 2025, <https://serc.carleton.edu/sp/library/sac/how.html>
 25. Dynamics of Complex Systems Chapter 0, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://grouper-chiton-2853.squarespace.com/s/DCSchapter0.pdf>

26. A Complex Systems Perspective on Neuroimaging Studies of Behavior and Its Disorders, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9344570/>
27. Complexity Explained: A brief intro to complex systems | PDF - Slideshare, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/complexity-explained-a-brief-intro-to-complex-systems/231238679>
28. Storytelling-Marshall-Ganz.pdf, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Storytelling-Marshall-Ganz.pdf>
29. Storytelling in Science: Four Ways to Use It, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://bbcstorytelling.com/blog/storytelling-in-science-four-ways-to-use-it/>
30. Evidence-Based Methods of Communicating Science to the Public through Data Visualization - MDPI, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/8/6845>
31. Writing an Abstract | School of Public Health, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://www.publichealth.pitt.edu/student-life/annual-signature-events/deans-day/writing-abstract>
32. How to Write an Abstract - PLOS, accessed November 24, 2025,
<https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-great-abstract/>