

Annual Review of Neuroscience

Magnetic Strategies for Nervous System Control

Michael G. Christiansen,¹ Alexander W. Senko,²
and Polina Anikeeva²

¹Department of Health Sciences and Technology, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology,
8093 Zürich, Switzerland

²Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Research Laboratory of Electronics,
and McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA; email: anikeeva@mit.edu

Annu. Rev. Neurosci. 2019. 42:271–93

First published as a Review in Advance on
April 2, 2019

The *Annual Review of Neuroscience* is online at
neuro.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-070918-050241>

Copyright © 2019 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

**ANNUAL
REVIEWS CONNECT**

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Keywords

magnetic field, neuromodulation, magnetoreception, magnetic stimulation,
magnetic nanoparticles

Abstract

Magnetic fields pass through tissue undiminished and without producing harmful effects, motivating their use as a wireless, minimally invasive means to control neural activity. Here, we review mechanisms and techniques coupling magnetic fields to changes in electrochemical potentials across neuronal membranes. Biological magnetoreception, although incompletely understood, is discussed as a potential source of inspiration. The emergence of magnetic properties in materials is reviewed to clarify the distinction between biomolecules containing transition metals and ferrite nanoparticles that exhibit significant net moments. We describe recent developments in the use of magnetic nanomaterials as transducers converting magnetic stimuli to forms readily perceived by neurons and discuss opportunities for multiplexed and bidirectional control as well as the challenges posed by delivery to the brain. The variety of magnetic field conditions and mechanisms by which they can be coupled to neuronal signaling cascades highlights the desirability of continued interchange between magnetism physics and neurobiology.

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 272 |
| NATURAL MAGNETORECEPTION AS A MODEL | 273 |
| MAGNETOGENETICS | 276 |
| INDUCTIVE METHODS | 277 |
| MAGNETIC MATERIALS | 279 |
| Basis for the Utility of Magnetic Particles | 279 |
| Synthesis of Magnetic Nanoparticles | 281 |
| Magnetomechanical Methods | 282 |
| Magnetoelectric Composites | 283 |
| Magnetothermal Methods | 284 |
| CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK | 286 |

INTRODUCTION

Systems neuroscience and interventions in psychiatric patients would benefit from the ability to robustly upregulate or downregulate the activity of specific neural circuits or neuronal subtypes. Historically, this has been dominated by pharmacology or surgical lesions. However, in the past several decades, various neuromodulation approaches have emerged, some of which have found wide clinical use. For example, deep-brain stimulation (DBS) with chronically implanted electrodes is an approved therapy for Parkinson's disease (Obeso et al. 2001) and is being investigated as a treatment for psychiatric disorders. Other methods, such as optogenetics, are mainly employed in basic neuroscience research (Deisseroth 2015). This review focuses on a class of neuromodulation approaches that rely on magnetic fields as stimuli.

Compared to other signals such as electric fields, light, or ultrasound that may be used to deliver stimuli to the brain, magnetic fields are appealing due to their limited coupling to biological tissue (Young et al. 1980). A notable exception involves the magnetic fields with large time derivatives, which are used for transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and discussed in the section titled Inductive Methods. The ability of magnetic fields to pass through the body undiminished and without deleterious effects recommends their use in the wireless delivery of stimuli to deep targets. For many organisms, magnetic stimuli should be imperceptible, which is a desirable feature for behavioral experiments in which the subject's ability to sense the application of a stimulus may compromise the results. This could be an issue in optogenetics, in which visible light leaking from waveguides or scattered by the tissue may be seen peripherally by the subjects. Medical interventions would also benefit from completely remote stimulation methods, and indeed, one of the goals of magnetic neuromodulation strategies is to offer a means of DBS with a system that does not rely on a physical connection to sites of stimulation. This would reduce the invasiveness of DBS therapy and the tissue damage associated with implanted hardware.

Some organisms exhibit magnetoreception, the ability to perceive magnetic fields (Ritz et al. 2000, Wiltschko & Wiltschko 2005). Although the biophysical mechanisms underlying magnetoreception remain poorly understood (Johnsen & Lohmann 2005), its existence suggests that reverse engineering could be an intriguing approach to developing tools for magnetic control over neural activity, especially if the necessary genetic machinery could be transferred to specific neural circuits to permit selective activation with magnetic stimuli.

Alternatively, magnetic fields can be used as an intermediary for almost every type of stimulus to which neurons have evolved to respond. Because all neurons can communicate electrically and

chemically, it is natural to consider coopting these mechanisms for external modulation of their activity. One approach to doing this using magnetic fields entails inducing electric currents in the brain that can either elicit or suppress action potentials, as in TMS. Alternatively, the localized actuation of voltage-gated ion channels by magnetic fields may be made possible by the introduction of nanoscale magnetoelectric composite materials (Guduru et al. 2015).

Other routes to magnetically modulating neuron activity are suggested by specialized neurons that exhibit sensitivity to physical cues by incorporating ion-transporting proteins that respond to a specific stimulus, such as light, mechanical forces, or temperature changes. Such channel proteins can be transgenically introduced where they would otherwise be absent, as is done in optogenetics with opsins, microbial optically sensitive ion channels and pumps, to sensitize neurons to light. By analogy, proteins native to mammalian sensory neurons can be artificially expressed in neurons deep in the brain to sensitize them to mechanical force or heat. The magnetic field energy can be locally converted to heat (Chen et al. 2015; Munshi et al. 2017, 2018) or force (Mannix et al. 2008, Tseng et al. 2012, Lee et al. 2014) by using magnetic materials as transducers.


It is worth noting that magnetic approaches represent a subset of a broader effort to identify wireless means of stimulating neurons, such as transcranial focused ultrasound (Legon et al. 2014), temporally interfering high-frequency electric fields (Grossman et al. 2017), infrared light illumination (Wells et al. 2005), and near-infrared (NIR) light coupled to plasmonic nanoparticles for heat-mediated neuromodulation (Carvalho-de-Souza et al. 2015) or to upconverting nanoparticles for transcranial optogenetic stimulation of deep-brain structures (Chen et al. 2018). However, none of these approaches match the combined resolution and penetration depth afforded by magnetic fields.

NATURAL MAGNETORECEPTION AS A MODEL

Behavioral studies suggest that various animals have the ability to perceive the Earth's magnetic field, including insects, amphibians, reptiles, fish, and birds. Migratory birds, for instance, have been suggested to not only orient themselves by sensing the inclination of the field (Wiltschko & Wiltschko 1972) but also may deduce their location by discerning minute local variations in the geomagnetic field (Kishkinev et al. 2015). By analogy to other sensory inputs such as light or sound, the existence of specialized receptor cells has been thought to enable the detection of magnetic field direction and intensity. The biophysical mechanisms that underlie magnetoreception in nature would be an appealing source from which to draw inspiration for the development of effective technologies to enable magnetic control of the nervous system. One can imagine either emulating these mechanisms indirectly or perhaps manipulating cells of interest to artificially produce the requisite biomolecules for magnetic sensitivity. Although it has its merits, this line of reasoning has thus far encountered practical difficulties for two likely reasons: (a) It fails to account for the dissimilarity between natural magnetic cues and the magnetic stimuli available in the laboratory, and (b) unequivocal mechanisms for natural magnetoreception remain elusive despite decades of research and debate.

The Earth's geomagnetic field is relatively weak (50–60 μ T) and can be regarded as uniform, at the scale of an organism, and constant, at the timescale of animal behavior. Aside from a rare transient magnetic field pulse associated with lightning strikes at very close range (Fuchs et al. 1998) or weak electromagnetic signals linked to human technology or solar wind (LaBelle & Treumann 2002, Engels et al. 2014), the geomagnetic field seems to be the principal magnetic stimulus of evolutionary significance to animals in their natural habitat. In contrast, the types of magnetic fields available in the laboratory are orders of magnitude stronger (e.g., ~ 1 T for TMS), can exhibit dramatic gradients (e.g., >100 T/m), and can act dynamically, for instance, by

Spatial characteristics



Temporal characteristics




Figure 1

An array of artificial magnetic stimuli categorized according to spatial and temporal characteristics. (a) Nearly uniform fields can be created, for example, using a Helmholtz coil (two current-carrying rings separated by a distance equal to their radius). (b) A conical permanent magnet magnetized along its axis with uniform magnetization \mathbf{M} produces a field at the tip that decays rapidly with distance, resulting in a high magnetic field gradient. Fields with various spatial distributions can also be categorized by how they vary in time. (c) Magnetic fields can remain constant over the timescale of interest. (d) Rotating fields maintain a constant magnitude while changing direction by revolving around some axis. A simple, planar rotation is shown. (e) Alternating magnetic fields sinusoidally change polarity and are typically generated by applying alternating current to a solenoid. If the linear dimensions of the solenoid are much less than the corresponding wavelength of electromagnetic radiation, the field is quasimagnetostatic. (f) Pulsed fields, which exhibit high $|dB/dt|$, can be generated by discharging a momentary burst of current through a coil. This approach is often used in transcranial magnetic stimulation.

rotating or alternating (**Figure 1**). Although examining biological magnetoreception presents an exciting research avenue, leveraging the full array of magnetic field conditions accessible in the laboratory may offer a more expedient and robust route to controlling the nervous system than direct emulation of magnetically sensitive molecular and cellular machinery.

Despite many decades of scientific research into the biophysical mechanism underlying magnetoreception, a consensus has not been forthcoming, and key questions remain unanswered (Mouritsen 2018). There are two main hypotheses for mechanisms of magnetoreception in terrestrial animals (**Figure 2**): (a) magnetically influenced radical pair chemistry, typically thought to involve cryptochrome (Hore & Mouritsen 2016), and (b) the use of biomineralized magnetic nanoparticles, or assemblies formed from them, to actuate mechanotransduction (Kirschvink et al. 2001). A third hypothesis suggests that elasmobranch fishes such as sharks may perceive magnetic fields via sensitive detection of induced electric potentials (Kalmijn 1981, Paulin 1995).

Many regard radical pair formation as a likely explanation of the compass sense in at least some organisms, and a growing body of biophysical, genetic, and behavioral evidence is consistent with this hypothesis and with the notion that cryptochrome is necessary for magnetoreception (Gegear et al. 2008, Muheim et al. 2016). Cryptochrome is thought to mediate the formation of




Figure 2

Lessons offered by hypothesized mechanisms of magnetoreception. (a) Pigeons are an example of organisms that sense the inclination of the Earth's magnetic field and may possess what is referred to as a map sense. They are thought to detect minute local variations in the magnetic field and remember those variations to navigate. (b) In the radical pair hypothesis, cryptochrome generates radical pairs when exposed to ultraviolet or blue light, and weak magnetic fields bias the proportion of radical pairs in the triplet or singlet state, altering the generation of downstream products detectable by neurons. Here, a generalized representation depicts a molecule with subunits A and B excited by a photon to form a radical pair that can either revert back to the original molecule or proceed to some unspecified set of products C, with a fate biased by the ambient magnetic field. (c) Magnetite nanoparticles have been reported in many animals and could perhaps interact with the Earth's magnetic field strongly enough to produce forces detectable by neurons. A 50-nm magnetite particle is contrasted with the mineralized core of ferritin in terms of interaction energy with the Earth's magnetic field (50 μT). Thermal energy at room temperature is marked as $k_B T$, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is temperature.

metastable radical pairs upon exposure to photons of ultraviolet or visible light with suitable energy and polarization, a nonequilibrium state that soon proceeds along reaction paths toward one of two possible sets of products (Müller & Ahmad 2011). Because radicals contain unpaired electrons, they exhibit a net magnetic moment, and the presence and orientation of the geomagnetic field can plausibly influence the fraction of these radical pairs existing in either singlet or triplet states. This property of radicals in turn biases the products resulting from their reaction, and a currently unknown mechanism downstream is thought to use this shifting balance of products to transduce neural activity. One compelling form of evidence based on a magnetic stimulus is the use of alternating magnetic fields varied over a wide frequency band in the low megahertz range to induce transitions between the singlet and triplet states that apparently interfere with magnetosensation (Ritz et al. 2004, Wiltschko et al. 2015). The full radical pair hypothesis is conceptually richer and is discussed in detail in a recent comprehensive review by Hore & Mouritsen (2016). For the present discussion, the most intriguing aspect of this theory is the elegant way in which it plausibly circumvents the intrinsic energetic weakness of magnetic interactions with individual spin moments, merely requiring it to bias the path of a metastable state toward possible stable end states.

Another hypothesis of magnetoreception circumvents the energetic weakness of biomolecular interactions with magnetic fields by instead supposing that biomineralized magnetic materials

could play a role. The magnetic moments of these particles, which are orders of magnitude larger than the moment of an unpaired electron, are capable of interacting with the geomagnetic field at energies significantly exceeding the ambient thermal noise. This principle is illustrated by magnetotactic bacteria, which contain magnetosomes, cellular membrane invaginations filled with chains of magnetite (Fe_3O_4) nanoparticles that align with the local geomagnetic field. Although magnetite of suspected biogenic origin has also been identified in other organisms (Gould et al. 1978, Walcott et al. 1979, Kirschvink et al. 1985), including humans (Kirschvink et al. 1992, Gilder et al. 2018), it likely serves a metabolic rather than sensory function, and evidence of magnetite-dependent cell signaling remains elusive (Treiber et al. 2012, Edelman et al. 2015). Perhaps the most compelling evidence for this hypothesis comes from the reversal of the magnetic compass sense in a variety of organisms upon application of a millisecond magnetic pulse, a phenomenon that could be straightforwardly explained by remanence magnetization in magnetic particles or their assemblies and not by any of the other theories (Holland 2010).

To draw useful lessons from the progress in the field, one must consider the implications each hypothesis could have for informing magnetic stimulation technology if it were true. Note that the hypotheses discussed above are not mutually exclusive, and that additional unanticipated mechanisms are likely at work. The cryptochrome-dependent radical pair mechanism requires the formation of metastable chemical intermediates via optical excitation at wavelengths absorbed and scattered by tissue. An approach requiring both illumination and a magnetic field to stimulate cell populations in the central nervous system does not offer clear advantages over existing optogenetic methods. If the hypothesis of magnetoreception via cellular interaction with nanoscale biogenic magnetite crystals holds true in some instances, then natural magnetoreception could share an underlying mechanistic similarity with the methods reliant on synthetic magnetic nanoparticles, discussed at length in the section titled Magnetic Materials.

MAGNETOGENETICS

The desire for simple and robust magnetogenetics methods has drawn significant interest in recent years. In concept, these techniques would be analogous to optogenetics (Deisseroth 2015) or chemogenetics (Rogan & Roth 2011), relying solely upon the expression of a single protein responsive to a magnetic field. This vision is appealing because such methods would be readily adoptable by the neuroscience community, allowing for the retention of many of the established methodologies used in optogenetics, while eliminating the need for the implanted optical waveguides or light-emitting devices that deliver stimuli in behavioral experiments.

This goal has been pursued by fusing the iron (Fe)-binding protein ferritin to ion channels from the transient receptor potential vanilloid (TRPV) family. The earliest published example fused ferritin to the capsaicin receptor, TRPV1, and showed that exposure to a weak (5 mT), rapidly alternating (465 kHz) magnetic field triggered intracellular calcium ion (Ca^{2+}) influx (Stanley et al. 2012). Because TRPV1 is a heat-responsive, Ca^{2+} -permeable cation channel (Caterina et al. 1997), hysteretic heating of the ferritin was suggested as a putative mechanism for actuating the channel (Stanley et al. 2012). In a follow-up study, the same ferritin-fused TRPV1 appeared to be actuated by applying comparatively large (~ 0.5 T) static magnetic fields (Stanley et al. 2014). An independent study presented evidence that a similar fusion of ferritin to another TRPV channel, TRPV4, was sufficient to produce a similar effect at ten-times-lower applied field magnitudes (50 mT) (Wheeler et al. 2016). The ability of TRPV1 and TRPV4 to respond to mechanical stimuli has led to a hypothesis that the mechanism underlying the observed effects of magnetic fields on cellular signaling and rodent behavior was mechanical (Stanley et al. 2014, Wheeler et al. 2016). A single amino acid substitution in the pore of the modified TRPV1 was subsequently reported

to convert this protein to a chloride-selective channel activated by similar magnetic stimuli to produce inhibitory effects (Stanley et al. 2016).

However, the energy scale of interaction between ferritin and the magnetic fields employed in these studies was shown to be 4–10 orders of magnitude below the ambient thermal fluctuations (Anikeeva & Jasanoff 2016, Meister 2016) (**Figure 2c**), which is far too weak to directly generate mechanically induced conformational changes in a protein. Although these articles appear careful in their experimental execution, the attempts to identify mechanisms should be regarded as tentative. For instance, the functional equivalence of the ferrihydrite core of ferritin and magnetite nanoparticles implicitly posited by this work is not substantiated by the body of literature characterizing ferritin (Chasteen & Harrison 1999). Furthermore, in this work, magnetic fields generated at length scales of centimeters and alternating at frequencies corresponding to electromagnetic radiation with a wavelength of more than 0.5 km are referred to as radio waves, which is imprecise given their quasimagnetostatic nature (Stanley et al. 2012, 2014, 2016). For these magnetogenetics methods based on TRPV fusions to be properly understood and disseminated, additional experimental and theoretical studies are necessary to uncover the biophysical principles at the core of the observed physiological effects.

Another strategy for developing magnetogenetics has been to attempt to identify a previously unknown magnetic receptor. If valid, such a discovery would simultaneously enhance our understanding of magnetoreception and offer a valuable technology for genetically targeted magnetic stimulation. It was recently claimed that the iron-sulfur cluster assembly 1 (IscA1) protein, isolated through a genome-wide screening of *Drosophila* and renamed as MagR, interacts with cryptochrome to generate torque in magnetic fields and acts as a magnetic protein biocompass (Qin et al. 2016). Concerns have been raised over the underlying mechanisms of magnetoreception asserted in this work, especially since the reported data showed the magnetization of MagR to be about 1,000 times lower than that of ferritin (Meister 2016, Winklhofer & Mouritsen 2016). Independent efforts to reproduce the key findings from this work have not yet succeeded (Pang et al. 2017).

These studies highlight the powerful impetus that exists to offer magnetogenetics as a tool to the neuroscience community (Long et al. 2015), and the discussions they have sparked highlight the need for the refinement or revision of our understanding of the basic physics of these systems.

INDUCTIVE METHODS

Electromagnetic induction is a phenomenon described by Faraday's law, in which a time-varying magnetic flux induces electric fields in a conductive medium. TMS is based on this effect, but electromagnetic induction also plays a central role in several other wireless brain stimulation techniques.

TMS, transcranial direct current stimulation, and electroconvulsive therapy all rely on passing current through the brain to alter neural firing patterns. It is hypothesized that this gives rise to neuroplasticity (Nitsche et al. 2008, Lefaucheur et al. 2017), although the exact mechanism by which long-term behavioral changes are manifested is still unclear. Understanding the effects of TMS is further complicated by inhomogeneity in the induced current, the likely significance of the orientation of the axons being stimulated, the influence of pulse duration (which can either potentiate or depress activity), and the indirect activation of other brain regions (Yasuo & Yoshikazu 2002, Ruff et al. 2009). Some efforts to elucidate the mechanisms involve combining TMS with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to correlate behavioral changes to hemodynamic signals as a proxy for neural activation (Bergmann et al. 2016). TMS has shown promise for treating depression (Brunoni et al. 2017, McClintock et al. 2018) and neuropathic pain, and emerging




Figure 3

Electromagnetic induction can be used to control neural activity. (a) Schematic of electromagnetic induction in the context of transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). A butterfly coil is held over the head of a human and a pulsed current is applied, resulting in a rapidly increasing magnetic field that induces a current in the brain. (b) Examples of TMS coils, including the single and butterfly geometries. (c) Diagram of a millimeter-scale solenoid that could be implanted to stimulate deep brain structures, as in Bonmassar et al. (2012). (d) Example of an implanted device that may be powered using electromagnetic induction. When implanted into the brain, this device can rectify the induced voltage from an externally applied alternating magnetic field into a DC current that can stimulate neural activity, as in Freeman et al. (2017).

applications such as the treatment of stroke and Alzheimer's disease require further investigation (Lefaucheur et al. 2014).

TMS involves placing a magnetic field coil close to the scalp and applying millisecond pulses of current through the coil to produce time derivatives of the magnetic field ($dB/dt \approx 3 \times 10^4$ T/s, peak field amplitude ~ 2 T) that induce currents in the brain (Wagner et al. 2007) (Figure 3a). Only the top 1–2 cm of cortex directly below the coil will be stimulated, and by engineering the coil shape, one can concentrate the field to spot sizes smaller than the coil diameter. A common coil geometry is the figure eight or butterfly coil, which has two slightly overlapping coils wound in opposite directions (Figure 3b). This geometry produces a concentrated field at the point of overlap between the coils. Regardless of the TMS coil shape, the magnetic field decreases with distance from the center of the coil, which implies that superficial brain structures will consistently receive a stronger stimulus than deeper brain regions (Wagner et al. 2007).

Although TMS cannot reach deep brain structures without stimulating the cortical tissue with greater intensity, the implantation of miniature magnetic coils has been suggested as an alternative to DBS electrodes. An example of such a device consists of an approximately 1-mm solenoid connected by wires to a battery pack, which generates a magnetic field that causes electromagnetic induction in neighboring neural tissue (Figure 3c). This device is thought to be potentially immune to the eventual failure caused by glial scarring that plagues implanted electrodes because

the induced fields extend for several hundred micrometers (Bonmassar et al. 2012). This would also mitigate safety concerns associated with electrochemical reactions at direct interfaces between electrodes and neural tissue (Park et al. 2013, Lee et al. 2016).

Related alternatives to DBS electrodes include inductively powered implanted devices. Such devices use a pickup coil to couple to an external primary coil through mutual inductance, and power is transferred via an alternating magnetic field in a manner analogous to a transformer. One example of a miniaturized implantable device has been demonstrated to work 7.5 cm away from the power coil in a rat model (**Figure 3d**). It has approximate dimensions of $2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5$ mm and operates by rectifying induced voltages at a predetermined resonance frequency (e.g., 10 MHz) to produce a DC electric field capable of depolarizing adjacent neurons (Freeman et al. 2017). Like TMS, this device relies on the external application of magnetic fields, but in this case the field is used solely as a source of wireless power for an electrical device. Other types of miniature, implanted, inductively powered electrical devices have also been designed, for example, to drive microscale light-emitting diodes for optogenetics (Kwon et al. 2015).

MAGNETIC MATERIALS

Basis for the Utility of Magnetic Particles

Techniques employing magnetic materials to stimulate the central nervous system tend to rely on coupling magnetic fields to other stimuli that are more readily detected by neuronal biochemical machinery. The role of the magnetic material in this approach is to provide an energetically plausible handle upon which a magnetic field can act. The dissimilarity in magnetic properties between the magnetic material and the tissue surrounding it serves as the basis for the selective influence of the field. To appreciate why the interaction of a magnetic field with such materials differs from its interaction with biomolecules or clusters of atoms, it is helpful to consider the origins of their magnetism (**Figure 4**).

Although certain elements such as Fe or rare earth metals exhibit higher magnetic moments than other atoms, their presence alone in a system does not constitute a magnet. A magnetic field applied to a population of such atoms, responding in effective isolation from one another, results in paramagnetic behavior (Cullity & Graham 2009) (**Figure 4a**). This is observed at room temperature in FeO (wüstite), which contains Fe and oxygen atoms in a rock salt crystal arrangement. The competition between thermal fluctuations and the energetic influence of an applied magnetic field determines the extent to which such a population of moments aligns with the field. For a paramagnetic material, the energies of interaction between the field and individual atoms are so small that even an applied field as strong as 1 T will typically produce a magnetization value of less than 1% of saturation (complete alignment). Because paramagnetism is an inherently weak effect, such materials are suboptimal handles for magnetic actuation (**Figure 4a**).

When atoms are arranged in close proximity, for example, in a crystal, the possibility of the spontaneous ordering of their magnetic moments sometimes arises (**Figure 4b**). Magnetic moments of atoms can interact with one another through the exchange interaction, a quantum mechanical phenomenon that can either occur between nearest neighbors or be mediated via neighboring nonmagnetic atoms (Cullity & Graham 2009). Because they require overlapping wave functions, exchange interactions between atoms are appreciable only when those atoms are separated by subnanometer distances. If this interaction causes neighboring magnetic moments in a crystal to align in parallel, for instance, as in a body-centered cubic crystal of metallic Fe, the material is referred to as ferromagnetic (**Figure 4b**). If instead the exchange interaction drives antiparallel alignment and their moments cancel, the material is referred to as antiferromagnetic




Figure 4

Forms of magnetic ordering. (a) In paramagnetism, uncoupled spins are randomly oriented in the absence of an applied field, but they asymptotically approach complete alignment with the application of large magnetic fields. (b) In ferromagnetic materials, magnetic moments spontaneously align to give the material a net magnetic moment. In antiferromagnetic materials, adjacent magnetic moments align antiparallel to perfectly cancel each other, resulting in zero net magnetization. In ferrimagnetic materials, adjacent magnetic moments align antiparallel but have unequal magnitudes, resulting in a net magnetic moment for the material. (c) Below a critical size determined by the material properties, all moments within a ferromagnetic particle are aligned. At larger sizes, particles develop multiple domains to minimize their magnetostatic energy. For simplicity, the domain wall (dashed line) is illustrated as if it were abrupt, though spins of intermediate orientation would actually exist between the two opposing domains. (d) In superparamagnetism, an ensemble of single-domain particles of ferromagnetic or ferrimagnetic material has zero net magnetization at zero applied field, but upon the application of moderate magnetic fields, the particle moments align with the applied field.

(Figure 4b), such as FeO at temperatures below -80°C (Fischer et al. 2009). Intermediate ferrimagnetic cases are possible, with antiparallel alignment of dissimilar moments or unequal subpopulations of moments so that an overall net magnetization remains (Figure 4b). Biomineralized crystals of magnetite (Fe_3O_4) and greigite (Fe_3S_4) fall into this category (Roberts et al. 2011). Crystal defects and surface effects in sufficiently small nanoscale crystals can play a significant role in determining properties. Although the protein shell of ferritin has been used as a nucleation site for the growth of a variety of synthetic nanomaterials (Jutz et al. 2015), in humans and other mammals its mineralized 5.5–6.0-nm core consists of ferrihydrite ($5\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 9\text{H}_2\text{O}$) (Chasteen & Harrison 1999). The Fe^{3+} ions in the ferrihydrite crystal are antiferromagnetically ordered, but defects and surface states lead to incomplete cancellation, leaving a weak residual moment of approximately $300 \mu_{\text{B}}$ (Jutz et al. 2015). Magnetic ordering is an effect that emerges from structure and cannot be reduced to the presence or absence of certain elemental constituents. The above examples of paramagnetic, ferromagnetic, antiferromagnetic, and ferrimagnetic materials all derive their magnetic properties from Fe, yet the behavior of these materials differs markedly.

In a macroscopic object, the presence of magnetic ordering at the scale of the crystal often does not result in an overall net magnetization because, in the absence of an applied field, magnetostatic energy can be reduced through the spontaneous formation of opposing domains (Figure 4c). These domains are separated by domain walls, where the local magnetization turns gradually from one direction to another. These walls have a characteristic width that depends on the strength of the exchange interaction and other material properties. In particles much smaller than this width, the energy cost associated with forming a domain wall outweighs the resulting reduction in magnetostatic energy, so multiple domains do not form. For magnetite, the approximate cutoff for single domain behavior is approximately 80 nm (Moskowitz & Banerjee 1979). Notably, in structures with linear dimensions within this range, intermediate behaviors between single and multidomain states can emerge, including the possibility for vortex states (Liu et al. 2015, Yang et al. 2015).

Simply because a particle is uniformly magnetized does not imply that its moment maintains a fixed direction. Indeed, the moments of sufficiently small particles fluctuate rapidly with respect to their crystal axes at a rate that decreases exponentially with increasing particle volume at a given temperature (Neél 1949). When a magnetic field is applied, if the timescale is longer than the characteristic rate of fluctuation, a population of these particles will show behavior similar to paramagnetism, with the important distinction that saturation occurs at field magnitudes thousands or tens of thousands of times smaller (millitesla to tens of millitesla), depending on their volume and the magnetization of the material (**Figure 4d**). This behavior is known as superparamagnetism because the population of single domain magnetic nanoparticles acts as a collection of magnetic moments that are individually many thousands of times larger than those of individual atoms (Bean & Livingston 1959).

It is these large effective moments, made possible by ferro- or ferrimagnetic ordering in the crystals, that make these particles useful for external magnetic manipulation. This is reflected in the chains of high-quality, biomineralized magnetite or greigite nanoparticles that natural selection has favored in magnetotactic bacteria (Moskowitz et al. 1993, Schüler & Frankel 1999, Faivre & Schüler 2008).

Synthesis of Magnetic Nanoparticles

The observation that high-quality magnetic nanoparticles can be generated by cells led to the hope that the requisite genes could be transferred to mammalian cells to provide a handle for magnetic manipulation. This vision has not yet been realized, but some progress has been made, including the induction of Fe oxide nanoparticle synthesis in human mesenchymal stem cells (Elfick et al. 2017). One barrier to transfecting brain cells with magnetosome genes *in vivo* is their large size. In the case of one study that recapitulated magnetosome formation in *Rhodospirillum rubrum*, a bacterium that does not normally produce magnetosomes, 29 genes totaling 26 kb were required (Kolinko et al. 2014). Packing such a large quantity of genetic material into even a relatively large viral capsid, such as that of a lentivirus, is problematic (Kumar et al. 2001).

An alternative to genetically engineering cells to produce magnetite is to introduce synthetic magnetite into an organism, for example, by injecting a solution of magnetite nanoparticles directly into the target brain area (Chen et al. 2015, Munshi et al. 2017). Magnetite nanoparticles can be synthesized in several ways, and each method offers certain advantages. For instance, coprecipitation cheaply produces large quantities of magnetite, and hydrothermal methods can create interesting morphologies such as hollow structures (Wu et al. 2015). High-temperature thermal decomposition methods are often preferred to achieve a high degree of size uniformity and high saturation magnetization (a measure of the particles' magnetic moments), (Park et al. 2004, Kim et al. 2009). During thermal decomposition synthesis, a solution of high-boiling point organic solvents and organometallic precursor (such as Fe oleate or Fe acetylacetonate) is heated until the decomposition of the organometallic precursor leads to the nucleation and growth of Fe oxide nanoparticles (van Embden et al. 2015). By choosing solvents that undergo radical decomposition to favor an oxidative environment, the production of phase-pure magnetite can be promoted (Hufschmid et al. 2015, Chen et al. 2016). The magnetic properties of nanoparticles can be influenced not only by altering their shape and dimensions but also by introducing other transition metal atoms, including cobalt (Co), manganese (Mn), and zinc (Zn). Although partial substitution of Fe^{2+} by Zn^{2+} allows for increased saturation magnetization as compared to magnetite (Jang et al. 2009, Noh et al. 2012), the other two atoms are typically used to modify magnetic anisotropy, a property that is discussed in greater detail below in the context of nanoparticle heating. Akin to pure magnetite, tertiary ferrite nanoparticles doped with these atoms ($\text{Me}_x\text{Fe}_{3-x}\text{O}_4$, Me = Mn, Co,

Zn) are readily produced via thermal decomposition at similarly high uniformity and crystallinity (Sun et al. 2004, Chen et al. 2013).

Magnetomechanical Methods

Magnetic nanoparticles in a uniform magnetic field experience a torque that pulls their magnetization in the direction of the applied field, and magnetic nanoparticles in a magnetic field gradient experience a translational force (as in magnetic tweezers) (Figure 5a). These two




Figure 5

Strategies for using synthetic nanomaterials to stimulate neurons with magnetic fields. (a) Forces may be applied to magnetic particles in highly nonuniform fields, and torques may be generated if particles exhibit anisotropy. (b) Magnetoelectric composite nanoparticles couple the strain resulting from magnetostriction of their core to a piezoelectric shell, producing a change in electric polarization. (c) The lag in response of magnetization to an applied alternating magnetic field, which can be graphically represented by hysteresis loops, results in dissipated heat (red shading). (d) Force or torque may be used to actuate mechanosensitive ion channels. (e) Magnetoelectric composite particles can, in principle, be used to trigger the response of voltage-gated ion channels. (f) Temperature-sensitive channel proteins may be actuated by the heat (red shading) dissipated by magnetic nanoparticles, whether through nanoscale or bulk effects. (g) Heat (red shading) may also be used to trigger the release of chemical agonists or antagonists that actuate ion channels.

mechanisms of interaction of magnetic nanoparticles with magnetic fields allow particles attached to biomolecules, organelles, and cells to exert forces on these structures (Pankhurst et al. 2003, Monzel et al. 2017). Sensory neurons in the peripheral nervous system express mechanosensitive ion channels that are responsible for our sense of touch, balance (via neurons in the inner ear), and painful pressure (Coste et al. 2010, Delmas et al. 2011) (**Figure 5d**). Mechanosensitive ion channels open in response to tension in the membrane or directly applied mechanical force. In principle, akin to opsins in optogenetics and designer receptors in chemogenetics, these channels could be transfected into the central nervous system to allow for magnetic nanoparticle-mediated, force-based control of the nervous system.

The ability of magnetic nanoparticles to activate mechanosensitive ion channels has been demonstrated *in vitro* via patch-clamp studies (Hughes et al. 2007) and calcium imaging (Lee et al. 2014, Tay & Di Carlo 2017). These studies have relied on devices similar to magnetic tweezers (Seo et al. 2016), which generate high magnetic field gradients on the order of 100 T/m. This implies that the cells being stimulated must be in close proximity to the magnetic elements (within tens to hundreds of micrometers), and for this reason the high magnetic field gradient approach does not translate easily to studies *in vivo*.

In contrast, it is possible to create low-gradient magnetic fields over volumes large enough to fit a human, for example, those in an MRI magnet. As noted above, uniform magnetic fields can exert torques on magnetic nanoparticles, especially anisotropic ones. This torque-based approach has been used to trigger necrosis in cancer cells, using both anisotropic particles such as discs (Kim et al. 2010, Shen et al. 2017) and chains of isotropic particles (Cheng et al. 2017) in combination with low-frequency uniform fields (<20 Hz) tens of millitesla in amplitude. By analogy with magnetothermal neural stimulation, which was originally inspired by magnetic hyperthermia treatment of cancer, magnetomechanical neural stimulation may work most effectively by adapting this torque-based approach to tumor destruction and tuning down the applied forces to physiologically safe levels.

Another interesting application of magnetic nanoparticles as force transducers is in neural regeneration scaffolds that can be wirelessly actuated. Neurons respond to mechanical cues (Lamoureux et al. 2002), and neural regeneration may be enhanced by mechanical actuation (Smith et al. 2001, Abraham et al. 2018). Prototype neural regeneration scaffolds actuated by magnetic nanoparticles have been shown to enhance the growth of cultured sensory neurons (Tay et al. 2018a). These scaffolds consist of hydrogels impregnated with magnetic nanoparticles that stretch in response to periodic magnetic field application and removal, exerting forces on the neurons. In the future, it may be possible to implant such scaffolds to bridge nerve injuries and then externally and noninvasively apply a slowly varying magnetic field to actuate the scaffold and promote growth. Such hydrogel scaffolds would be resorbable, and thus magnetic actuation would enable devices that are powered remotely and do not require explantation.

Magnetoelectric Composites

As all neurons express voltage-gated ion channels, which are necessary for propagating an action potential, it could be advantageous to develop nanomaterials capable of transducing externally applied magnetic fields into localized electric fields in the vicinity of the membrane and at the scale of the relevant cellular machinery (Kargol et al. 2012, Yue et al. 2012) (**Figure 5b,e**). This method does not rely on electromagnetic induction, which is fundamentally electrodynamic in nature, and instead finds its basis in quasi-electrostatic and quasi-magnetostatic behavior. In intrinsically magnetoelectric materials, coupling is typically weak and manifested only at temperatures far lower than the physiological environment (Brown et al. 1968). Magnetoelectric (multiferroic)

composites offer a more feasible approach and combine a material in which strain and magnetization are coupled (magnetostriction) to a material in which strain and electrical polarization are coupled (piezoelectricity) (Nan et al. 2008). The strain within the composite structure then links magnetization and electric polarization (**Figure 5b**). In practice, macroscopic versions of such composites exhibiting high coupling coefficients are typically driven at mechanical resonance to maximize the strain amplitude (Nan et al. 2008). In contrast, studies aiming to apply magnetostrictive-piezoelectric nanoscale composites for neural stimulation have driven these particles with slowly varying magnetic fields with frequencies from 0 to 20 Hz and amplitudes of 10 mT (Guduru et al. 2015). Because the magnetoelectric response of a composite can be limited by the materials properties of either component, it is important to select constituents that are strongly magnetostrictive and piezoelectric. Unfortunately, many strongly piezoelectric materials contain lead, which poses toxicity concerns for deployment in biological settings. Moreover, the absence of such elements alone does not ensure the biocompatibility of oxide nanoparticles, which can stress surrounding cells by generating reactive oxygen species or triggering inflammatory responses (Xia et al. 2008). Composite nanoparticles designed for neural stimulation at the stage of exploratory experiments have incorporated cobalt ferrite (CoFe_2O_4) as the magnetostrictive component and barium titanate (BaTiO_3) as the piezoelectric component (Guduru et al. 2015).

Magnetothermal Methods

Several minimally invasive neural stimulation strategies have recently emerged that either directly or indirectly make use of heat dissipated by magnetic nanoparticles in alternating magnetic fields with frequencies ranging from tens of kilohertz to the low megahertz and amplitudes in the tens-of-millitesla range. This heating arises from the work done by magnetic torque against dissipative forces during the cyclic response of the magnetization (**Figure 5c**). Dissipative forces can include either friction with the surrounding liquid medium when the entire particle physically rotates with the magnetization vector or damping processes internal to the crystal when the magnetization vector rotates independent of the particle's motion (Rosensweig 2002). Whichever process occurs more rapidly will dominate the behavior of the system, but the internal reversal tends to dominate when alternating magnetic field amplitudes are sufficiently large. This is because nanoparticles exhibit preferred orientations of their magnetic moment with respect to the crystal (i.e., magnetocrystalline anisotropy), and applied fields lower the energy barriers separating preferred axes (Neél 1949). The symmetry of these easy axes and the height of the energy barriers separating them can be influenced by properties of the crystal, particle shape (Usov & Barandiarán 2012), strain (Suzuki et al. 1999), and surface effects (Peddis et al. 2008). Among particles with similar material properties and different sizes, the anisotropy barrier approximately scales with volume (Neél 1949), a fact that helps explain the crucial importance of size control and monodispersity for synthetically produced magnetic nanoparticles.

When viewing the magnetic nanoparticles from a macroscopic vantage point, the periodic lag in response between their population-averaged magnetization and the rapidly alternating magnetic field has a convenient graphical representation in the form of hysteresis loops, which assume shapes that reflect the particular response of the magnetization. Despite their differences, models describing the heat dissipation of magnetic nanoparticles predict hysteresis loops and find their area, which corresponds to the energy dissipated per cycle of the field. Examples of common models with differing domains of validity include linear response theory (valid at low-field amplitudes compared to the Stoner-Wohlfarth coercive field, i.e., the anisotropy field) (Rosensweig 2002), dynamic hysteresis (valid at low frequencies compared to the precession of the particle moment) (Carrey et al. 2011), and the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert model that incorporates a stochastic thermal term (the most general, but still containing simplifying assumptions) (Usov 2010).

The suitability of ferrimagnetic particles for heat dissipation compared to biomolecules and weakly magnetic nanoparticles like the ferrihydrite core of ferritin can be anticipated by considering the influence of their magnetic properties on hysteresis loops. A magnetite nanoparticle 20 nm in diameter contains approximately 500,000 Fe atoms in a ferrimagnetic inverse spinel lattice. This ferrimagnetic ordering results in a higher magnetization compared to other phases of Fe oxide, stretching the scale of the vertical axis. The anisotropy energy barrier increases with the volume of the particle and enables larger coercive fields at sufficiently high applied amplitudes. Both influences tend to increase the hysteresis loop area and result in greater dissipated power. In contrast, the ferrihydrite core of ferritin that contains approximately 2,500 Fe atoms exhibits a low saturation magnetization that arises only because of a small number of uncompensated spins in crystal defects of its otherwise antiferromagnetic arrangement. Furthermore, its minute anisotropy barrier, evidenced by a low blocking temperature of 40 K, ensures that it should be expected to exhibit virtually no hysteresis at physiological temperatures (Chasteen & Harrison 1999).

Local increases in temperature are capable of triggering the response of temperature-sensitive channel proteins such as TRPV1, and several studies have demonstrated stimulation following injections of magnetic nanoparticles and viral delivery of *trpv1* transgenes (Huang et al. 2010, Stanley et al. 2012, Chen et al. 2015). Applications making use of hysteretic heat dissipation can be divided into two categories: those relying on bulk heating effects and those relying on nanoscale heating effects (**Figure 5f**). The former requires a highly concentrated and localized droplet of injected nanoparticles to heat itself and the surrounding tissue, and combined with TRPV1 expression, this has been demonstrated as a viable approach for neuromodulation (Chen et al. 2015). On the other hand, the possibility for nanoscale heating is less intuitive when considering the effect of scaling relationships on the expected surface temperature of a heat-dissipating nanoscale sphere. Indeed, an extrapolation of macroscopic heat transport equations to the scale of nanometers suggests rapid equilibration on the timescale of hundreds of nanoseconds and an infinitesimal temperature change that drops off inversely with distance (Kebllinski et al. 2006, Meister 2016). Nevertheless, a growing and varied body of experimental evidence contradicts this prediction, instead suggesting that temperatures at nanoscale interfaces reach steady state far more slowly (seconds or even tens of seconds) and can achieve effective temperature increases of tens of degrees Celsius in the nanometer vicinity of the nanoparticle surfaces before dropping off rapidly in solution (Huang et al. 2010, Riedinger et al. 2013, Dong & Zink 2014).

The use of nanoscale heating to wirelessly actuate the response of temperature-sensitive channel proteins for neuromodulation precedes not only the bulk heating approach for neuromodulation but also much of the work that has recently produced compelling evidence of nanoscale heating in similar situations. In principle, the main advantage of systems based on nanoscale heating is that they require lower quantities of magnetic material and avoid bulk heating effects on surrounding tissue. This work often includes targeting moieties that link the magnetic nanoparticles to cell membranes or even the heat-sensitive channels, a design feature consistent with the close proximity that seems to be a requisite for the nanoscale heating effects to be relevant (Huang et al. 2010, Stanley et al. 2012). The technique has been demonstrated to trigger TRPV1 and drive neural activity and behavioral responses in awake, freely moving mice (Munshi et al. 2017). More recently, the concept was extended to neural inhibition by actuating the temperature-gated chloride channel TMEM16A (Munshi et al. 2018), offering a route to bidirectional neuromodulation analogous to chloride channels leveraged for optogenetics (Deisseroth 2015).

Nanoscale effects of hysteretic heating have also been used as a means of triggering the release of chemical payloads from a variety of carriers, including temperature-sensitive liposomes (Amstad et al. 2011) (**Figure 5g**), mesoporous silica particles (Rühle et al. 2016), and individual

magnetic nanoparticles functionalized with thermally labile bonds (Riedinger et al. 2013). If the released chemical species can act as an agonist or antagonist for a channel protein, then it is possible to couple a magnetic stimulus to the chemical actuation or downregulation of neuronal activity mediated by heat. This concept has been demonstrated *in vitro* when allyl isothiocyanate, an agonist of TRPV1, was anchored to the surface of magnetic nanoparticles via thermally sensitive azide bonds and used to stimulate neurons expressing this cation channel (Romero et al. 2016). Although conceptually promising, this approach was restricted to payloads suited for chemical fusion to nanoparticle surfaces via thermally labile bonds, and the quantity available for release was quickly exhausted. Future work in this area could further develop the concept by making use of release schemes that are less chemically restrictive and focus on receptor-agonist pairs that respond sensitively and consistently to a wide range of concentrations.

In the coming years, an appreciation of the physics underlying nanoparticle heat dissipation in magnetic fields could offer opportunities to extend the functionality of these techniques. For instance, dynamic hysteresis models have revealed the possibility for magnetothermal multiplexing, the ability to selectively heat magnetic nanoparticles with distinct physical or chemical properties using different alternating magnetic field conditions (Christiansen et al. 2014). This may enable bidirectional neural control, whether through actuating the separate release of excitatory and inhibitory compounds from carriers or selectively actuating TRPV1 or TMEM16A.

The spatial selectivity of stimulation offered by magnetothermal methods is presently limited by the localization of the injection, but recent research suggests the possibility for more precise targeting enabled by superimposed magnetostatic gradient fields (Liu et al. 2018, Tay et al. 2018b). For such a configuration, in regions with a large magnetostatic contribution, the net field oscillates with an offset, and magnetic nanoparticles remain saturated and largely unresponsive to the superimposed alternating component of the field. At the point or line where the magnetostatic field vanishes, the magnetic nanoparticles are able to undergo hysteretic heat dissipation. Precisely the same kind of superposition of alternating and static magnetic fields enables magnetic particle imaging to isolate the signal from voxels (Knopp & Buzug 2012), although the amplitude and frequencies typically used for imaging are insufficient to produce appreciable heating (Tay et al. 2018b). Although efficiently producing strong alternating magnetic fields at frequencies in the hundreds of kilohertz in medically relevant working volumes is nontrivial, there is no fundamental barrier to scaling (Christiansen et al. 2017), and these technical opportunities for multiplexed and site-specific neuromodulation techniques may spur further development of the necessary instrumentation.

CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

Magnetic fields offer unparalleled access to the signaling processes occurring at arbitrary depths within the body because of the negligible magnetic permeability and low conductivity of tissue. Harnessing magnetic field energy to control neuronal activity, however, requires transducing imperceptible magnetic fields into stimuli capable of triggering endogenous or genetically engineered signaling cascades within these cells. The enigmatic magnetoreception of migratory animals continues to inspire a vigorous search for genetically encoded machinery that responds directly to magnetic fields. The cryptochrome-dependent radical pair mechanism proposed to underlie the magnetic compass sense in birds and insects appears to necessitate an optical stimulus, and thus it cannot be implemented within the body without implanted light sources. Magnetosomes produced by magnetotactic bacteria, although suitable for the transduction of weak magnetic fields into mechanical or thermal stimuli, require an amount of genetic material too large to be delivered by a single viral vector.

Paralleling the basic study of biological magnetoreception, the use of synthetic nanomaterials is a promising and expanding means for controlling neuronal activity. Magnetic nanoparticles can mediate interactions between magnetic fields and the cellular machinery equipped to respond to heat, forces, and chemical stimuli. Magnetic neuromodulation methods can, in many cases, be implemented without transgenes, relying solely on endogenously expressed ion channels in mammalian neurons. Furthermore, nanomaterials composed of magnetite are considered to be biocompatible, with notable examples being used as approved MRI contrast agents (Wang 2011), and a promising means to treat brain tumors, as demonstrated in a recent phase II clinical trial (van Landeghem et al. 2009). One outstanding issue is that of delivering nanomaterials to targets in the brain, which at present requires direct injection. Although it is not a significant concern for experiments in animal models, the present need for direct injection into neural tissue may slow down the translation of otherwise promising magnetic neuromodulation methods to clinical applications. Challenges posed by delivery across the blood-brain barrier are topics of active research, and several strategies, including monovalent antibodies (Niewoehner et al. 2014) and temporary permeabilization of the barrier with focused ultrasound (Hynynen et al. 2001, Szablowski et al. 2018, Wang et al. 2018) or chemical compounds (Cosolo et al. 1989), have recently emerged to aid the transport of systemically injected molecules or viruses. Such methods may require additional engineering to account for the sizes of magnetic nanoparticles needed to effectively transduce magnetic fields into thermal (tens of nanometers), electrical (tens to hundreds of nanometers), or mechanical (hundreds of nanometers) stimuli.

The emerging interest in magnetic neuromodulation demands close collaborations between physicists, chemists, engineers, and neurobiologists. Understanding the biophysical mechanisms governing the transduction of magnetic stimuli into cellular responses is an essential starting point, not only for delivering robust magnetic neuromodulation tools to the neuroscience community but also for refining these tools as a future means to understand and treat diseases of the nervous system. For magnetic stimulation methods to become truly commonplace methodologies for experimentation in awake and freely behaving animals or for treatment in humans, they must be honed to the point that they are easy, reliable, and inexpensive with respect to biological, material, and instrumentation considerations. Although the generation of magnetic fields alternating at frequencies of hundreds of kilohertz with the amplitudes typically necessary to heat magnetic nanoparticles has been demonstrated in volumes sufficient to accommodate some behavioral studies in rodents, scaling the necessary instrumentation to experiments in large arenas or to therapeutic applications in human patients imposes significant electrical power demands (Christiansen et al. 2017). In contrast, slowly varying, transiently pulsed, or low-amplitude megahertz-frequency magnetic fields can be delivered to similar volumes at a fraction of the power budget, offering more straightforward routes to volumetric scaling. This variety of available magnetic stimuli can be further expanded through the diversity among magnetic materials and the assortment of biochemical mechanisms that effectively amplify environmental signals by producing action potentials. With so many choices, the correspondingly vast parameter space makes scaling up an optimization problem in many dimensions that requires deep knowledge of the different components of the system. It is only through the exchange of ideas between experts in these different fields that we can hope to move efficiently toward the most useful and feasible magnetic stimulation technologies for the central nervous system.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

P.A. and M.G.C. are among the inventors listed on US Patent 9,681,979, entitled “Independent Magnetically-Multiplexed Heating of Portions of a Target.”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

P.A. is supported in part by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ElectRx Program (HR0011-15-C-0155), the Bose Research Grant, and the US National Institutes of Health BRAIN Initiative (1R01MH111872). M.G.C. is supported by the ETH Zürich Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abraham J-A, Linnartz C, Dreissen G, Springer R, Blaschke S, et al. 2018. Directing neuronal outgrowth and network formation of rat cortical neurons by cyclic substrate stretch. *Langmuir*. In press. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.8b02003>
- Amstad E, Kohlbrecher J, Müller E, Schweizer T, Textor M, Reimhult E. 2011. Triggered release from liposomes through magnetic actuation of iron oxide nanoparticle containing membranes. *Nano Lett.* 11:1664–70
- Anikeeva P, Jasanoff A. 2016. Magnetogenetics: problems on the back of an envelope. *eLife* 5:e19569
- Bean CP, Livingston JD. 1959. Superparamagnetism. *J. Appl. Phys.* 30:S120–29
- Bergmann TO, Karabanov A, Hartwigsen G, Thielscher A, Siebner HR. 2016. Combining non-invasive transcranial brain stimulation with neuroimaging and electrophysiology: current approaches and future perspectives. *NeuroImage* 140:4–19
- Bonmassar G, Lee SW, Freeman DK, Polasek M, Fried S, Gale JT. 2012. Microscopic magnetic stimulation of neural tissue. *Nat. Comm.* 3:921
- Brown WF, Hornreich RM, Shtrikman S. 1968. Upper bound on the magnetoelectric susceptibility. *Phys. Rev.* 168:574–77
- Brunoni AR, Chaimani A, Moffa AH, Razza LB, Gattaz WF, et al. 2017. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the acute treatment of major depressive episodes: a systematic review with network meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 74:143–53
- Carrey J, Mehdaoui B, Respaud M. 2011. Simple models for dynamic hysteresis loop calculations of magnetic single-domain nanoparticles: application to magnetic hyperthermia optimization. *J. Appl. Phys.* 109:083921
- Carvalho-de-Souza JL, Treger JS, Dang B, Kent SB, Pepperberg DR, Bezanilla F. 2015. Photosensitivity of neurons enabled by cell-targeted gold nanoparticles. *Neuron* 86:207–17
- Caterina MJ, Schumacher MA, Tominaga M, Rosen TA, Levine JD, Julius D. 1997. The capsaicin receptor: a heat-activated ion channel in the pain pathway. *Nature* 389:816–24
- Chasteen ND, Harrison PM. 1999. Mineralization in ferritin: an efficient means of iron storage. *J. Struct. Biol.* 126:182–94
- Chen R, Christiansen MG, Anikeeva P. 2013. Maximizing hysteretic losses in magnetic ferrite nanoparticles via model-driven synthesis and materials optimization. *ACS Nano* 7:8990–9000
- Chen R, Christiansen MG, Sourakov A, Mohr A, Matsumoto Y, et al. 2016. High-performance ferrite nanoparticles through nonaqueous redox phase tuning. *Nano Lett.* 16:1345–51
- Chen R, Romero G, Christiansen MG, Mohr A, Anikeeva P. 2015. Wireless magnetothermal deep brain stimulation. *Science* 347:1477–80
- Chen S, Weitenmier AZ, Zeng X, Linmeng H, Wang X, et al. 2018. Near-infrared deep brain stimulation via upconversion nanoparticle-mediated optogenetics. *Science* 359:679–84
- Cheng Y, Muroski ME, Petit DCMC, Mansell R, Vemulkar T, et al. 2017. Rotating magnetic field induced oscillation of magnetic particles for in vivo mechanical destruction of malignant glioma. *J. Control. Release* 223:75–84
- Christiansen MG, Howe CM, Bono DC, Perreault DJ, Anikeeva P. 2017. Practical methods for generating alternating magnetic fields for biomedical research. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 88:084301
- Christiansen MG, Senko AW, Chen R, Romero G, Anikeeva P. 2014. Magnetically multiplexed heating of single domain nanoparticles. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 104:213103

- Cosolo WC, Martinello P, Louis WJ, Christophidis N. 1989. Blood-brain barrier disruption using mannitol: time course and electron microscopy studies. *Am. J. Physiol.* 256:443–47
- Coste B, Mathur J, Schmidt M, Earley TJ, Ranade S, et al. 2010. Piezo1 and Piezo2 are essential components of distinct mechanically activated cation channels. *Science* 330:55–60
- Cullity BD, Graham CD. 2009. *Introduction to Magnetic Materials*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons
- Deisseroth K. 2015. Optogenetics: 10 years of microbial opsins in neuroscience. *Nat. Neurosci.* 18:1213–25
- Delmas P, Hao J, Rodat-Despoix L. 2011. Molecular mechanisms of mechanotransduction in mammalian sensory neurons. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 12:139–53
- Dong J, Zink JJ. 2014. Taking the temperature of the interiors of magnetically heated nanoparticles. *ACS Nano* 8:5199–207
- Edelman NB, Fritz T, Nimpf S, Pichler P, Lauwers M, et al. 2015. No evidence for intracellular magnetite in putative vertebrate magnetoreceptors identified by magnetic screening. *PNAS* 112:262–67
- Elfick A, Rischitor G, Mouras R, Azfer A, Lungaro L, et al. 2017. Biosynthesis of magnetic nanoparticles by human mesenchymal stem cells following transfection with the magnetotactic bacterial gene *mms6*. *Sci. Rep.* 7:39755
- Engels S, Schneider N-L, Lefeldt N, Hein CM, Zapka M, et al. 2014. Anthropogenic electromagnetic noise disrupts magnetic compass orientation in a migratory bird. *Nature* 509:353–56
- Faivre D, Schüler D. 2008. Magnetotactic bacteria and magnetosomes. *Chem. Rev.* 108:4875–98
- Fischer G, Däne M, Ernst A, Bruno P, Lüders M, et al. 2009. Exchange coupling in transition metal monoxides: electronic structure calculations. *Phys. Rev. B* 80:014408
- Freeman DK, O'Brien JM, Kumar P, Daniels B, Irion RA, et al. 2017. A sub-millimeter, inductively powered neural stimulator. *Front. Neurosci.* 11:659
- Fuchs F, Landers EU, Schmid R, Wiesinger J. 1998. Lightning current and magnetic field parameters caused by lightning strikes to tall structures relating to interference of electronic systems. *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.* 40:444–51
- Gegear RJ, Casselman A, Waddell S, Reppert SM. 2008. Cryptochrome mediates light-dependent magnetosensitivity in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 454:1014–18
- Gilder SA, Wack M, Kaub L, Roud SC, Petersen N, et al. 2018. Distribution of magnetic remanence carriers in the human brain. *Sci. Rep.* 8:11363
- Gould JL, Kirschvink JL, Deffeyes KS. 1978. Bees have magnetic remanence. *Science* 201:1026–28
- Grossman N, Bono D, Dedic N, Kodandaramaiah SB, Rudenko A, et al. 2017. Noninvasive deep brain stimulation via temporally interfering electric fields. *Cell* 169:1029–41
- Guduru R, Liang P, Hong J, Rodzinski A, Hadjikhani A, et al. 2015. Magnetoelectric ‘spin’ on stimulating the brain. *Nanomedicine* 10:2051–61
- Holland RA. 2010. Differential effects of magnetic pulses on the orientation of naturally migrating birds. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 7:1617–25
- Hore PJ, Mouritsen H. 2016. The radical-pair mechanism of magnetoreception. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* 45:299–344
- Huang H, Delikanli S, Zeng H, Ferkey DM, Pralle A. 2010. Remote control of ion channels and neurons through magnetic-field heating of nanoparticles. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 5:602–6
- Hufschmid R, Arami H, Ferguson RM, Gonzales M, Teeman E, et al. 2015. Synthesis of phase-pure and monodisperse iron oxide nanoparticles by thermal decomposition. *Nanoscale* 7:11142–54
- Hughes S, McBain S, Dobson J, El Haj AJ. 2007. Selective activation of mechanosensitive ion channels using magnetic particles. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 5:855–63
- Hynynen K, McDannold N, Vykhodtseva N, Jolesz FA. 2001. Noninvasive MR imaging-guided focal opening of the blood-brain barrier in rabbits. *Radiology* 220:640–46
- Jang JT, Nah H, Lee JH, Moon SH, Kim MG, Cheon J. 2009. Critical enhancements of MRI contrast and hyperthermic effects by dopant-controlled magnetic nanoparticles. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 48:1234–38
- Johnsen S, Lohmann KJ. 2005. The physics and neurobiology of magnetoreception. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 6:703–12
- Jutz G, van Rijn P, Santos Miranda B, Böker A. 2015. Ferritin: a versatile building block for bionanotechnology. *Chem. Rev.* 115:1653–701

- Kalmijn A. 1981. Biophysics of geomagnetic field detection. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 17:1113–24
- Kargol A, Malkinski L, Caruntu G. 2012. Biomedical applications of multiferroic nanoparticles. In *Advanced Magnetic Materials*, ed. L Malkinski, pp. 89–118. Rijeka, Croat.: InTech
- Kebllinski P, Cahill DG, Bodapati A, Sullivan CR, Taton TA. 2006. Limits of localized heating by electromagnetically excited nanoparticles. *J. Appl. Phys.* 100:054305
- Kim D-H, Rozhkova EA, Ulasov IV, Bader SD, Rajh T, et al. 2010. Biofunctionalized magnetic-vortex microdiscs for targeted cancer-cell destruction. *Nat. Mater.* 9:165–71
- Kim D, Lee N, Park M, Kim BH, An K, Hyeon T. 2009. Synthesis of uniform ferrimagnetic magnetite nanocubes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 131:454–55
- Kirschvink JL, Kobayashi-Kirschvink A, Woodford BJ. 1992. Magnetite biomineralization in the human brain. *PNAS* 89:7683–87
- Kirschvink JL, Walker MM, Chang S-B, Dizon AE, Peterson KA. 1985. Chains of single-domain magnetite particles in chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* 157:375–81
- Kirschvink JL, Walker MM, Diebel CE. 2001. Magnetite-based magnetoreception. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 11:462–67
- Kishkinev D, Chernetsov N, Pakhomov A, Heyers D, Mouritsen H. 2015. Eurasian reed warblers compensate for virtual magnetic displacement. *Curr. Biol.* 25:R822–24
- Knopp T, Buzug TM. 2012. *Magnetic Particle Imaging: An Introduction to Imaging Principles and Scanner Instrumentation*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag
- Kolinko I, Lohße A, Borg S, Raschdorf O, Jogler C, et al. 2014. Biosynthesis of magnetic nanostructures in a foreign organism by transfer of bacterial magnetosome gene clusters. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 9:193–97
- Kumar M, Keller B, Makalou N, Sutton RE. 2001. Systematic determination of the packaging limit of lentiviral vectors. *Hum. Gene Ther.* 12:1893–905
- Kwon KY, Lee H-M, Ghovanloo M, Weber A, Li W. 2015. Design, fabrication, and packaging of an integrated, wirelessly-powered optrode array for optogenetics application. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* 9:69
- LaBelle J, Treumann RA. 2002. Auroral radio emissions, 1. Hisses, roars, and bursts. *Space Sci. Rev.* 101:295–440
- Lamoureux P, Ruthel G, Buxbaum RE, Heidermann SR. 2002. Mechanical tension can specify axonal fate in hippocampal neurons. *J. Cell Biol.* 159:499–508
- Lee J-H, Kim J-W, Levy M, Dao A, Noh S-H, et al. 2014. Magnetic nanoparticles for ultrafast mechanical control of inner ear hair cells. *ACS Nano* 8:6590–98
- Lee SW, Fallegger F, Casse BDF, Fried SI. 2016. Implantable microcoils for intracortical magnetic stimulation. *Sci. Adv.* 2:e1600889
- Lefaucheur J-P, Andre-Obadia N, Antal A, Ayache SS, Baeken C, et al. 2014. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS). *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 125:2150–206
- Lefaucheur J-P, Antal A, Ayache SS, Benninger DH, Brunelin J, et al. 2017. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 128:56–92
- Ligon W, Sato TF, Optiz A, Mueller J, Barbour A, et al. 2014. Transcranial focused ultrasound modulates the activity of primary somatosensory cortex in humans. *Nat. Neurosci.* 17:322–29
- Liu XL, Yang Y, Ng CT, Zhao LY, Zhang Y, et al. 2015. Magnetic vortex nanorings: a new class of hyperthermia agent for highly efficient in vivo regression of tumors. *Adv. Mater.* 27:1939–44
- Liu JF, Neel N, Dang P, Lamb M, McKenna J, et al. 2018. Radiofrequency-triggered drug release from nanoliposomes with millimeter-scale resolution using a superimposed static gating field. *Small* 14:1802563
- Long X, Ye J, Zhao D, Zhang S-J. 2015. Magnetogenetics: remote non-invasive magnetic activation of neuronal activity with a magnetoreceptor. *Sci. Bull.* 60:2107–19
- Mannix RJ, Kumar S, Cassiola F, Montoya-Zavala M, Feinstein E. 2008. Nanomagnetic actuation of receptor-mediated signal transduction. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 3:36–40
- McClintock SM, Reti IM, Carpenter LL, McDonald WM, Dubin M, et al. 2018. Consensus recommendations for the clinical application of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) in the treatment of depression. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 79:16cs10905
- Meister M. 2016. Physical limits to magnetogenetics. *eLife* 5:e17210
- Monzel C, Vicario C, Piehler J, Coppey M, Dahan M. 2017. Magnetic control of cellular processes using biofunctional nanoparticles. *Chem. Sci.* 8:7330–38

- Moskowitz BM, Banerjee SK. 1979. Grain size limits for pseudosingle domain behavior in magnetite: implications for paleomagnetism. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 15:1241–46
- Moskowitz BM, Frankel RB, Bazylinski DA. 1993. Rock magnetic criteria for the detection of biogenic magnetite. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 120:283–300
- Mouritsen H. 2018. Long-distance navigation and magnetoreception in migratory animals. *Nature* 558:50–59
- Muheim R, Sjöberg S, Pinzon-Rodriguez A. 2016. Polarized light modulates light-dependent magnetic compass orientation in birds. *PNAS* 113:1654–59
- Müller P, Ahmad M. 2011. Light-activated cryptochrome reacts with molecular oxygen to form a flavin-superoxide radical pair consistent with magnetoreception. *J. Biol. Chem.* 286:21033–40
- Munshi R, Qadri SM, Pralle A. 2018. Transient magnetothermal neuronal silencing using the chloride channel anoctamin 1 (TMEM16A). *Front. Neurosci.* 12:560
- Munshi R, Qadri SM, Zhang Q, Castellanos Rubio I, del Pino P, Pralle A. 2017. Magnetothermal genetic deep brain stimulation of motor behaviors in awake, freely moving mice. *eLife* 6:e27069
- Nan C-W, Bichurin MI, Dong S, Viehland D, Srinivasan G. 2008. Multiferroic magnetoelectric composites: historical perspective, status, and future directions. *J. Appl. Phys.* 103:031101
- Neél L. 1949. Théorie du traînage magnétique des ferromagnétiques en grains fins avec applications aux terres cuites. *Ann. Geophys.* 5:99–136
- Niewoehner J, Bohrmann B, Collin L, Urich E, Sade H, et al. 2014. Increased brain penetration and potency of a therapeutic antibody using a monovalent molecular shuttle. *Neuron* 81:49–60
- Nitsche MA, Cohen LG, Wasserman EM, Priori A, Lang N, et al. 2008. Transcranial direct current stimulation: state of the art 2008. *Brain Stimul.* 1:206–223
- Noh S-H, Na W, Jang J-T, Lee J-H, Lee EJ. 2012. Nanoscale magnetism control via surface and exchange anisotropy for optimized ferrimagnetic hysteresis. *Nano Lett.* 12:3716–21
- Obeso JA, Olanow CW, Rodriguez-Oroz MC, Krack P, Kumar R, Lang AE. 2001. Deep-brain stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus or the pars interna of the globus pallidus in Parkinson's disease. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 345:956–63
- Pang K, You H, Chen Y, Chu P, Hu M, et al. 2017. MagR alone is insufficient to confer cellular calcium responses to magnetic stimulation. *Front. Neural Circuits* 11:11
- Pankhurst QA, Connolly J, Jones SK, Dobson J. 2003. Applications of magnetic nanoparticles in biomedicine. *J. Phys. D Appl. Phys.* 36:R167–81
- Park H-J, Bonmassar G, Kaltenbach JA, Machado AG, Manzoor NF. 2013. Activation of the central nervous system induced by micro-magnetic stimulation. *Nat. Comm.* 4:2463
- Park J, An K, Hwang Y, Park J-G, Noh H-J. 2004. Ultra-large-scale synthesis of monodisperse nanocrystals. *Nat. Mater.* 3:891–95
- Paulin MG. 1995. Electoreception and the compass sense of sharks. *J. Theor. Biol.* 174:325–39
- Peddis D, Mansilla MV, Mørup S, Cannas C, Musinu A, et al. 2008. Spin-canting and magnetic anisotropy in ultrasmall CoFe₂O₄ nanoparticles. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 112:8507–13
- Qin S, Yin H, Yang C, Dou Y, Liu Z, et al. 2016. A magnetic protein biocompass. *Nat. Mater.* 15:217–26
- Riedinger A, Guardia P, Curcio A, Garcia MA, Cingolani R, et al. 2013. Subnanometer local temperature probing and remotely controlled drug release based on azo-functionalized iron oxide nanoparticles. *Nano Lett.* 13:2399–406
- Ritz T, Adem S, Schulten K. 2000. A model for photoreceptor-based magnetoreception in birds. *Biophys. J.* 390:371–76
- Ritz T, Thalau P, Phillips JB, Wiltschko R, Wiltschko W. 2004. Resonance effects indicate a radical-pair mechanism for avian magnetic compass. *Nature* 429:177–80
- Roberts AP, Chang L, Rowan CJ, Horng C-S, Florindo F. 2011. Magnetic properties of sedimentary greigite (Fe₃S₄): an update. *Rev. Geophys.* 49:RG1002
- Rogan SC, Roth BL. 2011. Remote control of neuronal signalling. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 63:291–315
- Romero G, Christiansen MG, Stocche Barbosa L, Garcia F, Anikeeva P. 2016. Localized excitation of neural activity via rapid magnetothermal drug release. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 26:6471–78
- Rosensweig RE. 2002. Heating magnetic fluid with alternating magnetic field. *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* 252:370–74

- Ruff CC, Driver J, Bestmann S. 2009. Combining TMS and fMRI. *Cortex* 45:1043–49
- Rühle B, Datz S, Argyo C, Bein T, Zink JI. 2016. A molecular nanocap activated by superparamagnetic heating for externally stimulated cargo release. *Chem. Commun.* 52:1843–46
- Schüler D, Frankel RB. 1999. Bacterial magnetosomes: microbiology, biomineralization and biotechnological applications. 52:464–73
- Seo D, Southard KM, Kim J-W, Lee H-W, Farlow J, et al. 2016. A mechanogenetic toolkit for interrogating cell signaling in space and time. *Cell* 165:1507–18
- Shen Y, Wu C, Uyeda TQP, Plaza GR, Liu B, et al. 2017. Elongated nanoparticle aggregates in cancer cells for mechanical destruction with low frequency rotating magnetic field. *Theranostics* 7:1735–48
- Smith DH, Wolf JA, Meaney DF. 2001. A new strategy to produce sustained growth of central nervous system axons: continuous mechanical tension. *Tissue Eng.* 7:131–39
- Stanley SA, Gagner JE, Damanpour S, Yoshida M, Dordick JS, Friedman JM. 2012. Radio-wave heating of iron oxide nanoparticles can regulate plasma glucose in mice. *Science* 336:604–8
- Stanley SA, Kelly L, Latcha KN, Schmidt SF, Yu X, et al. 2016. Bidirectional electromagnetic control of the hypothalamus regulates feeding and metabolism. *Nature* 531:647–50
- Stanley SA, Sauer J, Kane RS, Dordick JS, Friedman JM. 2014. Remote regulation of glucose homeostasis in mice using genetically encoded nanoparticles. *Nat. Med.* 21:92–98
- Sun S, Zeng H, Robinson DB, Raoux S, Rice PM. 2004. Monodisperse MFe_2O_4 ($M = Fe, Co, Mn$) nanoparticles. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 126:273–79
- Suzuki Y, Hu G, van Dover RB, Cava RJ. 1999. Magnetic anisotropy of epitaxial cobalt ferrite thin films. *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* 191:1–8
- Szabłowski JO, Lee-Gosselin A, Lue B, Malounda D, Shapiro MG. 2018. Acoustically targeted chemogenetics for the non-invasive control of neural circuits. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* 2:475–84
- Tay A, Di Carlo D. 2017. Magnetic nanoparticle-based mechanical stimulation for restoration of mechanosensitive ion channel equilibrium in neural networks. *Nano Lett.* 17:886–92
- Tay A, Sohrabi A, Poole K, Seidlits S, Di Carlo D. 2018a. A 3D magnetic hyaluronic acid hydrogel for magneto mechanical neuromodulation of primary dorsal root ganglion neurons. *Adv. Mater.* 10:e1800927
- Tay ZW, Chandrasekharan P, Chiu-Lam A, Hensley DW, Dhavalikar R, et al. 2018b. Magnetic particle imaging-guided heating in vivo using gradient fields for arbitrary localization of magnetic hyperthermia therapy. *ACS Nano* 12:3699–713
- Treiber CD, Salzer MC, Riegler J, Edelman N, Sugar C, et al. 2012. Clusters of iron-rich cells in the upper beak of pigeons are macrophages not magnetosensitive neurons. *Nature* 484:367–70
- Tseng P, Judy J, Di Carlo D. 2012. Magnetic nanoparticle-mediated massively-parallel mechanical modulation of single-cell behavior. *Nat. Methods* 9:1113–19
- Usov NA. 2010. Low frequency hysteresis loops of superparamagnetic nanoparticles with uniaxial anisotropy. *J. Appl. Phys.* 107:123909
- Usov NA, Barandiarán JM. 2012. Magnetic nanoparticles with combined anisotropy. *J. Appl. Phys.* 112:053915
- van Embden J, Chesman ASR, Jasieniak JJ. 2015. The heat-up synthesis of colloidal nanocrystals. *Chem. Mater.* 27:2246–85
- van Landeghem FKH, Maier-Hauff K, Jordan A, Hoffmann K-T, Gneveckow U, et al. 2009. Post-mortem studies in glioblastoma patients treated with thermotherapy using magnetic nanoparticles. *Biomaterials* 30:52–57
- Wagner T, Valero-Cabre A, Pascual-Leone A. 2007. Noninvasive human brain stimulation. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 9:527–65
- Walcott C, Gould J, Kirschvink J. 1979. Pigeons have magnets. *Science* 205:1027–29
- Wang Y-XJ. 2011. Superparamagnetic iron oxide based MRI contrast agents: current status of clinical application. *Quant. Imaging Med. Surg.* 1:35–40
- Wang JB, Aryal M, Zhong Q, Vyas DB, Airan RD. 2018. Noninvasive ultrasonic drug uncaging maps whole-brain functional networks. *Neuron* 100:728–38
- Wells JD, Kao C, Jansen ED, Konrad PE, Mahadevan-Jansen A. 2005. Application of infrared light for in vivo neural stimulation. *J. Biomed. Opt.* 10:064003

- Wheeler MA, Smith CJ, Ottolini M, Barker BS, Purohit AM, et al. 2016. Genetically targeted magnetic control of the nervous system. *Nat. Neurosci.* 19:756–61
- Wiltshko R, Thalau P, Gehring D, Nießner C, Ritz T, Wiltshko W. 2015. Magnetoreception in birds: the effect of radio-frequency fields. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 12:20141103
- Wiltshko W, Wiltshko R. 1972. Magnetic compass of European robins. *Science* 176:62–64
- Wiltshko W, Wiltshko R. 2005. Magnetic orientation and magnetoreception in birds and other animals. *J. Comp. Physiol. A Neuroethol. Sens. Neural. Behav. Physiol.* 191:675–93
- Winklhofer M, Mouritsen H. 2016. A room-temperature ferrimagnet made of metallo-proteins? bioRxiv 094607. <https://doi.org/10.1101/094607>
- Wu W, Wu Z, Yu T, Jiang C, Kim W-S. 2015. Recent progress on magnetic iron oxide nanoparticles: synthesis, surface functional strategies and biomedical applications. *Sci. Technol. Adv. Mater.* 16:023501
- Xia T, Kovochich M, Liong M, Mädler L, Gilbert B, et al. 2008. Comparison of the mechanism of toxicity of zinc oxide and cerium oxide nanoparticles based on dissolution and oxidative stress properties. *ACS Nano* 2:2121–34
- Yang Y, Liu X, Lv Y, Herng TS, Xu X, et al. 2015. Orientation mediated enhancement on magnetic hyperthermia of Fe₃O₄ nanodisc. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 25:812–20
- Yasuo T, Yoshikazu U. 2002. Basic mechanisms of TMS. *J. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 19:322–43
- Young JH, Wang MT, Brezovich IA. 1980. Frequency/depth penetration considerations in hyperthermia by magnetically induced currents. *Electron. Lett.* 16:358–59
- Yue K, Guduru R, Hong J, Liang P, Nair M, Khizroev S. 2012. Magneto-electric nano-particles for non-invasive brain stimulation. *PLOS ONE* 7:e44040