

**ESSAY:**  
**86 billion and counting:**  
**Do we know the number of neurons in the human brain?**

Alain Goriely

Mathematical Institute, Andrew Wiles Building  
University of Oxford, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter  
Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG UK

Email: [goriely@maths.ox.ac.uk](mailto:goriely@maths.ox.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** neurons, numbers, human brain

**Abbreviations:** bn (billion)

**Strap line:** The current estimates for the number of neurons in the human brain cannot be properly justified.

## 1 Introduction

When the number of entities is large in a system, it becomes impossible to enumerate them all and indirect techniques for counting are needed. We will never know exactly how many stars there are in the Milky way or how many humans were alive in the history of the world. In these cases, statistical methods, based on clear assumptions, can be used to provide estimates with a given range. Typically, we rely on the notion of density. If we can count how many red blood cells there are on average in a given volume of blood (around 5 trillion per litre) and we know, on average, the total volume of blood (around 5 litres), we can obtain a reasonable estimate of the number of red blood cells in an organism (around 25 trillion).

Knowing how many things there are in a system is central to most scientific disciplines. In physics, it is the first step to characterise matter. In chemistry, the fundamental definition of a mole (exactly  $6.02214076 \times 10^{23}$  units) expresses the importance of counting the number of entities in a given weight. In engineering, one expects that any piece that belongs to a device is catalogued before assembly so that, in principle, one could know the number of parts.

When it comes to the brain, the situation is not that simple due to the heterogenous nature of brain tissues. Neuroscientists will study the most intimate details of cells and proteins and gather immense data sets about every possible measurable aspect of the brain. Yet, a naive

question such as the number of neurons in the human brain is not a central question for the field. A cursory look at the literature shows that, in recent times, there is an almost universal agreement that there are 86 bn neurons in the brain (bn stands for billion). Indeed, many scientific papers on the brain, including mine, starts with a statement of the form: "*the human brain contains 86 billion neurons....*" followed by a citation to one of the most cited papers in neuroscience by the group of Prof. Herculano-Houzel who has worked extensively on challenging neuromyths and was the first to truly address the question.<sup>1</sup>

In the same spirit that drove her initial study, the goal here is to challenge the accepted fact that the human brain has 86 bn neurons. Indeed, I will show that the data of the original and subsequent studies on neurons number do not warrant this generic conclusion and that the only statements that can be made about the number of neurons are much weaker.

## **2. The situation pre-86 bn**

In an excellent review on the topic, Prof. Herculano-Houzel and colleagues provide a remarkable account of the history of the problem.<sup>2</sup> Before their ground-breaking work of 2009, the accepted number of neurons varied widely from the first estimate in 1895 of 3 bn to a puzzling 1 trillion in 1981, until it settled, rather mysteriously, to 100 bn around 1991. Until 2009, 100 bn was the accepted estimate and is still widely quoted. Now, the number 100 is what we call a round number and its roundness suggests that it is a rough estimate and not a measured quantity obtained through a scientific study. The absence of a clear reference or a study for this number further indicates that the problem was not settled with any scientific rigour. It just emerged in the literature like mushrooms after a heavy rain.

The landscape completely changed in 2009 by the use of the so-called "isotropic fractionator" to measure cell numbers.<sup>1,3,4</sup> I will not review or challenge the method itself but constrain myself to an analysis of the data provided by these studies. Yet, it is important to note that, Neuronal Nuclei (NeuN), the protein used as a neuronal marker, is not universally expressed in all neuronal types and its levels vary with neuronal maturation, increasing postnatally, which complicates its use as a marker for neurogenesis.

### 3. The problem with the 2009 paper

Before we proceed, let us look at the data and main claim of the 2009 paper.<sup>1</sup> Following the text, we know that "*brains from 50-, 51-, 54-, and 71- year-old males, deceased from nonneurological causes and without cognitive impairment (CDR 0, IQCODE 3.0), were analyzed*".<sup>a</sup> The average weight of the four brains is 1508.91 g with a standard deviation of 299.14 g. The weight of each brain or the number of neurons is not given. However, according to the paper, the average number of neurons over the four brains is 86.06 bn with a standard deviation of 8.12 bn. We are further given the information that the range is 78.82 to 95.40 bn. We can then combine these data to reconstitute the original data set and find that the numbers of neurons are: {78.82, 79.72, 90.30, 5.40} bn. From this small data set, the authors make the most important claim "*We find that the adult male human brain contains on average  $86.1 \pm 8.1$  billion NeuN-positive cells ("neurons")*". With over 3,000 citations, it is probably the single most cited number about the brain.

It is quite an achievement and the low number of data points in the study demonstrates how difficult the process must have been. But before we close the matter, let us reflect on what can be really said from four data points as we know that statistical statements strongly depend on the number of data points. If we have one or two data points, we would gladly agree that a mean would not be representative of the entire population. How about four?

This type of problem has been studied by statisticians in great details: If we sample  $n \geq 2$  points from a distribution, it is easy to take the sample mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$  of these  $n$  samples. We want to know to what extent these values are representative of the actual (but unknown) population mean that we are interested in. In our case, the question is: to what extent is  $\mu = 86.1$  bn with  $n = 4$  a valid estimate for the human brain?

This type of problem is addressed by the so-called 'standard error of the mean'. Assuming that the underlying population is normally distributed, we can calculate the upper and lower 95% confidence limits  $x_{\pm}$  for the true population mean as

$$x_{\pm} = \mu \pm t^* \times \text{SEM},$$

---

<sup>a</sup> rather unsettling comment follows: "*The brain of the 71-year-old male was included in the analysis because it contained a similar number of cells and an even slightly higher number of neurons than the other brains.*" This fourth brain was thus included because it matched the expected number of neurons. Would it have been discarded otherwise? This is an example of selection bias and, technically, this brain cannot be considered as an independent data point in a statistical analysis.

where  $\mu$  is the sample mean,  $SEM = \sigma/\sqrt{n}$  is the standard error of the mean with  $\sigma$  as the standard deviation of the sample and  $t^*$  is the critical  $t$ -value given by a  $t$ -distribution. Since it is a two-tailed test (we are considering both tails of the distribution), we need the  $t$ -value where the cumulative probability is  $(1 + 0.95)/2 = 0.975$  with degrees of freedom  $d = n - 1 = 3$ . The critical  $t$ -value for  $d = 3$  at 95% confidence is approximately  $t^* = 3.182$ .

In our case, we have  $\mu = 81.6$  bn,  $\sigma = 8.1$  bn which leads to a margin of error  $ME = t^* \times SEM = 13.0$  bn and to the confidence interval for the population mean  $\bar{x}$  given by:

$$73.1 \text{ bn} < \bar{x} < 99.0 \text{ bn},$$

Hence, from the data given the only statement about the mean we can make is that an estimate of the average number of neurons in this study is between about 73 and 99 bn neurons.<sup>b</sup> This is a very different statement than giving 86 bn as an average. Unfortunately, we cannot make any other statement since the data from this study is not public and repeated requests to the main author for clarification and data remained unanswered.

A difference of 26 bn is rather large, but by itself it could be considered a technical correction made by a pedantic mathematician. Yet, the problem becomes more acute when we look at another study that uses the same method.

## 4 Another study, another number

The only other study on the total number of neurons in the human brain that I was able to find was performed by the group of Roberto Lent using the same technique and published four years later.<sup>5</sup> The data is from five elderly females with no cognitive impairment between the age of 71 and 84, who died of non-neurological causes. I am grateful to Professor Lent for responding to my queries and for sharing their data. The data set with  $n = 5$  is  $\{62.1, 67.3, 63.3, 72, 72.0627\}$ bn. We can now repeat the same computation with  $\mu = 67.3$  bn,  $\sigma = 4.6$  bn,  $d = 4$ , and  $t^* = 2.776$  to obtain

$$61.5 \text{ bn} < \bar{x} < 73.1 \text{ bn}.$$

The data also gives the mass of the brains  $\{1385.93, 1363.91, 1403.24, 1013.70, 1289.32\}$ g with no clear relations with the number of neurons as shown in Fig. 1 (with the second lighter

---

<sup>b</sup> Since the estimate is so vague, I see no point in providing it with decimal fractions of a billion.

brain having the highest number of neurons and the second heaviest brain having the smallest number of neurons).

## 5 Comparing the two data sets

Despite the fact that both groups claim to follow the same procedure, there is no clear explanation on the differences between the two studies and we are left to speculate:

- The tentative post-hoc explanation in 2015 for the difference between the two sample means in the two different studies, namely that "*biological variation may account for 25% or more, especially in humans and with small sample sizes*",<sup>6</sup> is not satisfactory since there is no rationale for a variation of 25% and if this type of variations would occur, it should have been observed in each of the two experiments.
- There is a large difference in average brain weights (1291g vs 1509 g). If we assume a purely proportional effect, it would boost the sample mean from 67.3 bn to  $67.3 \times 1509/1291 = 78.6$  bn, which would bring the two data sets much closer. However, as discussed above, no clear trend emerges between volume and neuron numbers in the second data set (data not available for the first data set).
- The difference in sex between the two populations may not be an explanation either as there is no evidence of systematic differences in the number of neurons for the same brain weight between males and females.
- There is a marked difference in ages between the two groups. Change of volume with aging is well established<sup>7,8</sup> but the extent to which it would contribute to a large change in the number of neurons is not known. Indeed, the relationship between volume and neuron numbers has not been established and it is now believed that there is very little decline in cortical neuron numbers during normal aging.<sup>9</sup>
- Another possibility is that within a given experimental set-up, there are systematic errors being made and not identified. It is clear that the landmarks for dissections, dehydration, postmortem time, age, sex, can vary. These errors may differ in different experiments leading to different estimates.<sup>4,10</sup> In short, we have no real information about the variability of the methods itself with respect to multiple factors.

## 6 Statements and questions

We have now reached a difficult point: the two estimates are widely different with no overlap and no clear explanation, which does not give us any confidence or a consensus. The only statements that we can make are much weaker:

- Experiments have shown variations between 62 and 94 billion neurons in the human brain ( $n = 9$ ).
- An experimental study on the number of neurons suggests an average between 73 and 99 billion neurons in the healthy male human brain ( $n = 4$ ).
- An experimental study on the number of neurons suggests an average between 61 and 73 billion neurons in the healthy female human brain ( $n = 5$ ).

Clearly none of these statements are satisfactory or as catchy as "*the human brain has 86 billion neurons*". Yet, they are the true reflection of our knowledge. Unless we have more available data, we cannot present a more precise assertion.

It is worth noting that the problem is not unique to neuroscience: astrophysicists have faced similar challenges when trying to establish the number of stars in our galaxy, with the same lack of success, which has gone from an accepted 100 billion stars to newer estimates of 200 to 400 billion.

## 6 Does it matter?

No and Yes. In the case of the red blood cells, it is of the utmost importance to know the red blood cell count (the number of cells per unit volume) as it is a critical biomarker for anaemia, polycythaemia, and other conditions. Therefore, the variability of blood cell concentration has been extensively studied and is well understood. However, in the case of the brain, there is no medical need to know either the total number or the concentration of cells in different parts of the brain. Therefore, the question is not as important and when neuroscientists hear or write the number 86 bn, they are most likely fully aware that it is an estimate that comes with certain assumptions and uncertainties. It should also be clear that most papers that cite this number in an introduction never actually use its value subsequently. Such numbers mostly serve a comparative purpose, either to study how different parts of the brain contribute to the total number of neurons, or between different species (which also suffer from the same sampling problem). In such cases, we can hope that the same bias and

distributions affect other similar numbers as to not affect the overall conclusion of the study. We could argue that very little damage is done by assigning a number to the brain to satisfy our basic human curiosity about '*how many things are there in this thing?*'.

Yet scientists are not children who need to be appeased, and numbers should not be used as pacifiers. Scientists should strive for rigour and insist for precision in all instances, even when scientific facts are awkward to formulate, or their mis-formulation does not have dire consequences. Why claim that the brain has 86.1 bn neurons if the data does not support it? Whether or not the number is just used in an introduction, or implicitly assumed to be an estimate, when we state it, we make it a scientific truth and bias any further investigation. More dangerously, it has been used to establish scaling laws of neuron numbers with respect to body weight which are then used in other contexts, forever stacking uneven blocks on a scientific tower built on sand.

Finally, I would like to reiterate that my comments here in no way diminish the accomplishments of the different groups involved. They started with a difficult question that had been previously ignored and found an experimental way to obtain estimates for the number of neurons. This is a remarkable achievement that has been used to challenge established ideas and open new avenues of research. Yet, from the data available, the only possible answer to the titular question "Do we know the number of neurons in the human brain?" is: No, we don't.

## **Data availability**

All data used is given explicitly in the main text.

## **Funding**

No funding was received towards this work.


## **Competing interests**

The author reports no competing interests.

## References

1. Azevedo FA, Carvalho LR, Grinberg LT, et al. Equal numbers of neuronal and nonneuronal cells make the human brain an isometrically scaled-up primate brain. *J Comp Neurol.* 2009;513(5):532-541.
2. Von Bartheld CS, Bahney J, Herculano-Houzel S. The search for true numbers of neurons and glial cells in the human brain: A review of 150 years of cell counting. *J Comp Neurol.* 2016;524(18):3865-3895.
3. Herculano-Houzel S, Lent R. Isotropic fractionator: a simple, rapid method for the quantification of total cell and neuron numbers in the brain. *J Neurosci.* 2005;25(10):2518-2521.
4. Deniz OG, Altun G, Kaplan AA, Yurt KK, von Bartheld CS, Kaplan S. A concise review of optical, physical and isotropic fractionator techniques in neuroscience studies, including recent developments. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2018;310:45-53.
5. Andrade-Moraes CH, Oliveira-Pinto AV, Castro-Fonseca E, et al. Cell number changes in Alzheimer's disease relate to dementia, not to plaques and tangles. *Brain.* 2013;136(12):3738-3752.
6. Herculano-Houzel S, von Bartheld CS, Miller DJ, Kaas JH. How to count cells: the advantages and disadvantages of the isotropic fractionator compared with stereology. *Cell Tissue Res.* 2015;360(1):29-42.
7. Dekaban AS, Sadowsky D. Changes in brain weights during the span of human life: relation of brain weights to body heights and body weights. *Ann Neurol.* 1978;4(4):345-356.
8. Weickenmeier J. Exploring the multiphysics of the brain during development, aging, and in neurological diseases. *Brain Multiphysics.* 2023;4:100068.
9. von Bartheld CS. Myths and truths about the cellular composition of the human brain: A review of influential concepts. *J Chem Neuroanat.* 2018;93:2-15.
10. Neves K, Guimaraes DM, Rayêe D, Valério-Gomes B, Iack PM, Lent R, Mota B. The reliability of the isotropic fractionator method for counting total cells and neurons. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2019;326:108392.





**Figure 1: Number of neurons vs brain mass.** For the available data of  $n = 5$  female brains, the number of neurons vs brain mass does not show any clear pattern.