

## **BRAIN MORPHOLOGY IN MASS MURDERERS: AN IN-DEPTH EXPLORATION**

**Ana Starčević<sup>a</sup>, Aleksandra Ilić<sup>b</sup>**

Mass murderers often exhibit extreme violent behavior, prompting questions about the neurobiological factors contributing to such actions. This review examines the brain morphology of mass murderers, focusing on structural and functional abnormalities in brain regions involved in aggression, decision-making, and emotional regulation. Neuroimaging studies indicate that mass murderers commonly show dysfunction in key areas, including the prefrontal cortex (PFC), amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), and hippocampus regions essential for impulse control, emotional processing, and moral decision-making. Reduced activity and structural abnormalities in the PFC and amygdala impair emotional regulation, empathy, and impulse control, while dysfunction in the OFC contributes to poor decision-making and risk assessment. Furthermore, imbalances in neurotransmitter systems, such as serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine, amplify aggression and impulsivity. These neurobiological factors, combined with environmental influences like trauma, suggest that mass murderers may be predisposed to violent behavior due to a complex interplay of brain abnormalities and life experiences. While no single factor can fully explain mass murder, this review highlights the importance of understanding the neuroanatomical underpinnings of violent behavior for developing effective prevention and intervention strategies. Such findings could be useful in the context of the etiology of crime, providing a better understanding of the biological roots of crime, which further influences the improvement of dealing with perpetrators of mass murders in the prison system through the rehabilitation process, despite numerous limitations. Understanding brain morphology in mass murderers is also important from the perspective of

---

<sup>a</sup> Associate Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Belgrade, e-mail: [anastarcevic22@gmail.com](mailto:anastarcevic22@gmail.com), ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2117-4213>.

<sup>b</sup> Associate Professor at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, e-mail: [alex.mag.ilic@gmail.com](mailto:alex.mag.ilic@gmail.com); [aleksandra.ilic@fb.bg.ac.rs](mailto:aleksandra.ilic@fb.bg.ac.rs); ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7298-2347>.

criminal law practice, which forms part of the broader connection between criminal law and neuroscience.

**KEYWORDS:** brain morphology, neuroimaging, mass murderers, neurocriminology, neurolaw.

## **Introduction**

Mass murderers have long been subjects of fascination and study within criminology, psychology, and neuroscience. These individuals commit acts of extreme violence, often with little regard for the lives they destroy, leaving behind a trail of devastation that raises questions about the psychological and neurobiological factors contributing to such behavior. Mass murders disturb entire societies and leave long-term consequences across many aspects of individual and societal functioning, often appearing suddenly without clear warning signs. While psychological factors such as trauma, psychopathy, and personality disorders are frequently explored in the literature, growing evidence suggests that brain structure and function play a crucial role in determining violent tendencies. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the brain morphology of mass murderers, emphasizing key structural abnormalities, neurochemical imbalances, and neurodevelopmental processes that might contribute to such extreme violent behavior. These findings are critical for a better understanding of the complex etiology of mass murders. For a long time, the neurobiological perspective was underestimated, but it can significantly aid criminal law in both theoretical and practical applications.

### **Structural/Morphological Brain Abnormalities in Mass Murderers**

The concept of the “violent brain” refers to structural abnormalities that may predispose individuals to aggressive and violent behavior. Neuroimaging studies using MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) and PET (Positron Emission Tomography) have uncovered specific brain regions exhibiting dysfunction in violent offenders, including mass murderers (Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse, 1997; Kiehl et al., 2019). These regions include the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, hippocampus, and other areas involved in emotional regulation, decision-making, and aggression.

#### *Neuroanatomical Brain Substrate of Impulse Control*

The prefrontal cortex (PFC) is critical for controlling impulses, regulating emotional responses, and engaging in complex decision-making. Dysfunction in the PFC is one of the most commonly observed features in violent individuals and may be particularly relevant in understanding the neurological underpinnings of mass murder (Koenigs et

al., 2018; Savitz, Hodgkinson and Luckenbaugh, 2017). The PFC, often considered the brain's "executive center," oversees the ability to control emotions, plan behavior, and consider the consequences of actions. A key feature of the PFC in violent offenders is its reduced activity and/or structural volume. Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse (1997) conducted a seminal study using PET scans to assess glucose metabolism in the PFC, finding that individuals with antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) a common diagnosis among violent offenders had significantly lower metabolic activity in this region. This suggested that the inability to inhibit aggressive impulses, a hallmark of violent behavior, could be partly attributed to reduced PFC function.

Further neuroimaging studies have confirmed these results, showing that violent offenders especially those diagnosed with ASPD or psychopathy tend to have reduced gray matter volume in the PFC. Yang and Raine (2009) confirmed that offenders with violent tendencies exhibit notable reductions in PFC volume, corresponding to deficits in decision-making, empathy, and social behavior. The lower activity and reduced size of the PFC in violent offenders may impair their ability to process complex moral decisions and control impulsive, aggressive actions, potentially contributing to the risk of committing mass murder.

In addition to structural abnormalities, evidence suggests that the PFC's connectivity to other brain regions, such as the amygdala, is impaired in violent individuals. The PFC normally regulates emotional responses generated by the amygdala, but in individuals with PFC dysfunction, this mechanism can break down. As a result, emotionally charged stimuli may provoke violent responses due to the PFC's failure to inhibit the amygdala's impulsive signals (Davidson, Putnam and Larson, 2000). This impairment in emotional regulation is particularly concerning in mass murderers, who may act impulsively under stress without adequately considering the consequences.

#### *Neuroanatomical Brain Substrate: Amygdala, Its Disruption, and Aggression*

The amygdala is responsible for processing emotions, particularly fear, anger, and aggression, and is involved in forming emotional memories. Dysfunction in the amygdala has been implicated in aggression, anxiety, and psychopathy (Savitz, Hodgkinson and Luckenbaugh, 2017). Research suggests that individuals with violent tendencies, including mass murderers, often exhibit amygdala abnormalities that could contribute to their aggressive behavior.

Neuroimaging studies have shown that violent offenders frequently have a smaller or less active amygdala compared to non-violent individuals. Kiehl et al. (2001) used functional MRI (fMRI) to examine the amygdala's response to emotional stimuli in individuals with a history of violent crime, finding significantly reduced acti-

vation in response to emotional faces, particularly those expressing fear or distress. This blunted emotional response could be a key factor in understanding why mass murderers may fail to empathize with their victims, facilitating violent behavior without emotional distress or remorse.

Additionally, structural MRI studies have identified reductions in amygdala volume in psychopathic offenders, a group often linked to mass murderers. The amygdala's role in emotional learning and empathy means that its dysfunction can impair the ability to recognize others' emotional states, potentially contributing to a lack of empathy and an increased willingness to engage in extreme violence, such as mass murder.

In individuals with psychopathy, the combination of amygdala dysfunction and PFC impairments creates a potent neural substrate for violence. The weakened PFC is less able to inhibit aggressive impulses from the amygdala, leading to a failure of emotional regulation that may explain why these individuals engage in violence without remorse or understanding of the emotional harm caused.

### *Neuroanatomical Brain Substrate of Decision-Making*

The orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) plays a key role in decision-making, risk assessment, and emotional regulation. Damage or dysfunction in the OFC has been associated with impulsivity, poor decision-making, and aggressive behavior (Bechara and Damasio, 2021). The OFC's role in evaluating the consequences of actions is essential for socially appropriate behavior, and when compromised, individuals may act impulsively or violently without considering the ramifications.

Bechara, Damasio and Damasio (2000) researched patients with OFC damage, finding they exhibited a poor ability to make socially appropriate decisions, often disregarding potential negative consequences. Such individuals were more likely to engage in reckless and violent behaviors, suggesting that OFC dysfunction could contribute to violent tendencies, especially when combined with other brain abnormalities.

Further research supports this connection. Damasio et al. (1994) showed that individuals with OFC damage are more likely to make socially inappropriate or impulsive decisions, demonstrating a reduced ability to process emotional consequences. In mass murderers, this lack of consideration for the social and moral consequences of violence may be linked to OFC dysfunction.

The OFC's connections to the PFC and amygdala further complicate its role in violent behavior. While the PFC regulates emotional responses and the amygdala generates emotional reactions, the OFC integrates this information for decision-making. Damage to the OFC may impair the ability to evaluate emotional signals properly, leading to socially inappropriate or violent behavior.

### *Neuroanatomical Brain Substrate of Memory Processing*

The hippocampus, traditionally known for memory consolidation and spatial navigation, also regulates emotional responses and stress. In violent offenders, particularly those with trauma histories, the hippocampus often exhibits structural abnormalities, such as shrinkage or atrophy, which may contribute to aggressive tendencies.

The hippocampus interacts with the amygdala to regulate emotional responses. When damaged or underdeveloped, individuals may experience heightened emotional reactivity or fail to process emotional memories healthily, potentially leading to impulsive and aggressive behavior (Savitz, Hodgkinson and Luckenbaugh, 2017). Bremner et al. (1995) demonstrated that individuals with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), often resulting from early-life trauma, exhibit hippocampal shrinkage. This reduction has been linked to an inability to process stressful events effectively, increasing violence risk. Mass murderers, many of whom have experienced extreme childhood trauma, may have similar hippocampal abnormalities influencing their emotional regulation and aggression.

### **Brain Neurochemical Imbalances: Contributions to Aggression and Violence**

The brain's neurochemical systems are crucial in determining behavior. Neurotransmitters such as serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine regulate mood, aggression, and impulsivity (Viding and McCrory, 2019). Dysregulation in these systems is commonly observed in violent offenders and mass murderers, providing further insight into the neurobiological underpinnings of violent behavior.

#### *Serotonin and Impulse Control*

Serotonin regulates mood, aggression, and impulse control. Low serotonin levels are strongly linked to increased aggression, impulsivity, and violent behavior. Violent offenders, including mass murderers, often exhibit reduced serotonin activity, contributing to their inability to control aggressive impulses. Virkkunen et al. (1994) demonstrated that offenders with low serotonin levels are more prone to aggressive outbursts, supporting serotonin's role in regulating violent behavior.

#### *Dopamine and Reward Sensitivity*

Dopamine, involved in the brain's reward system, is tied to sensation-seeking, motivation, and aggression. Dysregulation may contribute to impulsivity, risk-taking, and violence. Buckholtz and Meyer-Lindenberg (2008) found that individuals with heightened dopamine activity are more likely to engage in impulsive and vio-

lent behaviors, potentially driven by an exaggerated sense of reward or dominance, which may motivate some mass murderers.

### *Norepinephrine and Emotional Reactivity*

Norepinephrine regulates stress responses, and increased activity can heighten emotional reactivity. Stanley and Siever (1991) suggest that elevated norepinephrine levels are associated with heightened emotional lability and aggression, particularly under stress. For mass murderers, this sensitivity could make them more reactive to perceived threats, pushing them toward violent outbursts.

## **The Contribution of Neurocriminology in Understanding the Mass Murder Phenomenon**

Neurocriminology applies neuroscience techniques to explore the causes and cures of crime, seeking correlations between brain characteristics and criminal behavior (Petoft, 2015). It examines structural and functional impairments in brain circuits related to moral decision-making and impulse control in various offenders, including violent and psychopathic individuals. Recent research also sheds light on free will and moral responsibility (Dash, Padhi and Das, 2020). Neurocriminologists by considering, pondering and interpreting brain-imaging, endeavor to prove relative offenders responsibility. There are multiple neuroscientific documents that imply the truth of their claims (Petoft, 2015, p. 55).

Related to the claims that frontal lobe and amygdala dysfunction are involved in violent crime, some reserchers contend that particular types of neural activation patterns within these and related regions give rise to specific violent crimes. Further, that could lead to the establishment the biological bases for all types of human violence, including different forms of mass murders (school shootings, bombings, terrorism incidents...) or unique “neural topography” for every crime from sadistic murders to terrorism act (Pustilnik, 2009, pp. 207, 208).

### *Influences on the Judicial System - Neurolaw Perspective*

Neurocriminology interfaces with the judicial system at three levels: punishment, prediction, and prevention (Glenn and Raine, 2014). Authors advocate for neurolaw, a discipline combining neuroscience and law (Petoft, 2015; Shen, 2016; Dash, Padhi and Das, 2020). Pustilnik (2009) suggests neuroscience could contribute to criminal law by informing models of emotion, behavior, and rehabilitation strategies. In Serbia, post-Ribnikar case debates question whether lowering the criminal liability



age below 14 is justified, given the unfinished brain development in minors a topic beyond this paper's scope but critical to neurolaw.

One of the most important question is how current neuroscience might inform criminal law discourse about regulating violence (Pustilnik, 2009). Theoretically, the system of criminal sanctions which consists of different form of reaction to crimes depends on our knowledge of human behaviour and how it can be controlled through execution of criminal sanctions. If we put more attention to the problemacy of brain morphology and its influences on behaviour of specific perpetrators of crime, as mass murderers, we will might change, especially in the practical manner in judicial procedure, how we react on such crimes. It appears as essential to clarify the contributions of both pathology and normalcy to the commission of violent offenses. It has been suggested that as neuroscience begins to offer a more detailed and specific account of the physical processes that can lead to irresponsible or criminal behaviour, the public perception of responsibility may begin to change in the same way that public viewpoints on addiction have shifted from addiction as a failure of personal responsibility towards addiction as a disease (Glenn and Raine, 2014, p. 59).

Most offenders will not have a history of brain imaging studies revealing structural deficits, but rather have evidence of global cognitive impairment and some neuropathology and cognitive dysfunction. Even if they are examined with structural imaging techniques, such as MRI, EEG, and CAT scan during the pretrial phase, results may not divulge evidence of impairment. Essentially, cognitive dysfunction can be lost in a structure that appears normal via neuroimaging data (Fabian, 2010, p. 218). The connection between neurological and neuropsychological impairment and aggression and violence is notable, and the background histories of many murder defendants breed impairments in these areas. These cognitive impairments, coupled with other biopsychosocial risk factors, may be linked to an individual's capacity to inhibit and control their behavior. Accordingly, some capital or lifeprison defendants may lack the inherent free-will of human behavior due to a shortage in their neural circuitry resources, marked cognitive deficits, and stressful and threatening environmental situations (Pustilnik, 2009, p. 185).

## Discussion

Understanding the neurobiological basis of mass murder is a complex and multifaceted challenge that requires a multidisciplinary approach, incorporating neuroscience, psychology, and criminology. While psychological, social, and environmental factors undoubtedly influence violent behavior, this review emphasizes the critical role that brain structure and neurochemistry play in the predisposition

toward extreme violence. Neuroimaging studies and neuropsychological research consistently reveal structural and functional abnormalities in key brain regions involved in aggression, decision-making, and emotional regulation, suggesting that mass murderers may exhibit distinct neurobiological profiles (Blair et al., 2022). However, it is important to recognize that no single brain abnormality can account for the entirety of mass murder, and these abnormalities likely interact with genetic predispositions and environmental factors to shape violent behavior. At the core of our understanding of mass murderers' brain function lies the prefrontal cortex (PFC), amygdala, and orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) regions crucial for impulse control, moral decision-making, and emotional regulation. The prefrontal cortex, responsible for executive functions such as planning, decision-making, and behavioral inhibition, is often found to be underactive or structurally diminished in individuals who engage in violent behavior. Studies such as those by Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse (1997) and Yang have shown that mass murderers and violent offenders frequently display reduced PFC activity, which can impair their ability to make reasoned decisions and regulate emotional responses. When the PFC fails to suppress aggressive impulses, individuals may act impulsively, without considering the consequences of their actions, which is a key feature in many violent crimes, including mass murder. The amygdala, responsible for processing emotions like fear, anger, and aggression, is another critical region implicated in violent behavior. Neuroimaging studies indicate that reduced amygdala volume or hypoactivity is common among violent offenders (Kiehl et al., 2001). The amygdala is vital for recognizing and responding to emotional cues, and dysfunction in this region may impair the ability to feel empathy or react appropriately to others' distress. For mass murderers, this lack of emotional connection to victims can make extreme violence feel less morally or emotionally significant, facilitating acts of dehumanization and aggression without remorse. Similarly, dysfunction in the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), which helps evaluate consequences and guide socially appropriate behavior, is associated with poor decision-making and impulsivity. Damage to the OFC, as demonstrated by Bechara, Damasio and Damasio (2000), impairs individuals' ability to assess the long-term outcomes of their actions. For mass murderers, the failure to evaluate the moral, social, and legal consequences of their behavior can contribute to the planning and execution of extreme acts of violence. Furthermore, the OFC's role in integrating emotional signals from the amygdala with higher-level cognitive functions underscores the importance of its interaction with the PFC in regulating aggression. When the OFC is dysfunctional, the result may be disconnection between emotional impulses and rational behavior, leading to impulsive and reckless violent acts.



In addition to structural brain abnormalities, neurochemical imbalances also play a crucial role in violent behavior. Serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine are neurotransmitters that regulate mood, aggression, and impulse control. Dysregulation in these systems can increase susceptibility to aggression, impulsivity, and emotional dysregulation, all of which are common in violent offenders, including mass murderers. Low serotonin levels are consistently linked to increased aggression and impulsivity. Research by Virkkunen et al., (1994) and Stanley and Siever (1991) found that individuals with reduced serotonin activity are more likely to engage in violent behavior, particularly under stress. Serotonin helps regulate mood and emotional responses, and its dysfunction can contribute to an inability to control aggressive impulses. For mass murderers, this impairment in serotonin regulation may explain their inability to moderate intense emotional states, leading to violent outbursts in response to perceived threats or stressors. Dopamine, which is central to the brain's reward system, is another neurotransmitter implicated in violent behavior. Dysregulation of dopamine systems has been associated with increased impulsivity, risk-taking, and sensation-seeking behaviors (Buckholtz and Meyer-Lindenberg, 2008). Mass murderers, particularly those with psychopathic tendencies, may be driven by an exaggerated response to reward-related stimuli, such as feelings of power, dominance, or notoriety gained from committing violence. This heightened sensitivity to rewards may reduce the perception of consequences and facilitate violent acts motivated by the desire for attention, control, or emotional release. The reinforcement of violent behavior through dopamine release could make extreme acts of violence more appealing to individuals predisposed to aggression. In addition to serotonin and dopamine, norepinephrine, which regulates the body's response to stress, plays a critical role in aggression. Increased norepinephrine activity heightens emotional reactivity, which can contribute to impulsive and violent behavior, particularly under conditions of stress. Stanley and Siever (1991) found that heightened norepinephrine levels are associated with increased aggression and emotional lability. For mass murderers, this heightened emotional reactivity may contribute to the rapid escalation of violence in response to perceived insults or emotional triggers, fueling aggressive acts without appropriate reflection or moral consideration. While brain structure and neurochemistry provide significant insights into the predisposition for violent behavior, it is essential to consider how these biological factors interact with genetic predispositions and environmental influences. Genetic factors, such as variations in the MAOA gene, which regulates serotonin activity, have been shown to increase the risk for impulsive aggression in individuals exposed to early-life stress (Kiehl et al., 2019). These genetic factors, however, do not operate in isolation; rather, they interact with environmental

stressors, including childhood trauma, abuse, or exposure to violence, to influence brain development and behavior. For example, early exposure to trauma can alter the structure and function of the hippocampus and amygdala, regions involved in emotional regulation and memory processing (Bremner et al., 1995). These alterations can lead to increased emotional reactivity and impair the ability to regulate aggression, potentially heightening the risk of violent behavior.

Mass murderers, many of whom have experienced severe childhood trauma, may have abnormal hippocampal or amygdalar structures that contribute to their violent tendencies. The interaction between genetic predisposition and environmental stressors thus creates a "perfect storm" of neurobiological factors that increase the likelihood of extreme violent behavior. While genetics and environment play a significant role in shaping brain function, it is important to recognize that societal and cultural factors also influence the development of violent behavior. Exposure to violent media, societal glorification of aggression, and easy access to firearms can amplify the risk of violent behavior in individuals already predisposed to aggression. These cultural and social influences interact with the neurobiological vulnerabilities to increase the likelihood of mass murder, particularly in individuals who are already struggling with emotional dysregulation or impaired impulse control.

The modern paradigmatic story linking violent criminality to brain disorder is the tragic story of Charles Whitman, an Eagle Scout, scholarship student at the University of Texas, who murdered his wife, mother, and fourteen students at the University of Texas on August 1, 1966. Whitman began to experience headaches and personality changes about a year before his attacks; he believed that he was suffering from a neurological problem and sought medical and law-enforcement help (including asking the police to arrest him earlier in the day that he committed his murders; the police were obliged to decline because Whitman had not yet committed any crime). A post-mortem shortly after Whitman was shot by police showed a large tumor compressing Whitman's amygdaloid nucleus (Pustilnik, 2009).

### **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

Although the neurobiological framework outlined in this review offers valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying mass murder, it is important to recognize several limitations. First, most of the studies reviewed involve violent offenders more broadly, rather than focusing specifically on mass murderers. This gap in research highlights the need for further studies that directly examine the neurobiological profiles of mass murderers to determine whether they differ significantly from other violent offenders.

Moreover, the research on neurobiological factors often relies on correlational data, making it difficult to establish causal relationships between brain abnormalities and violent behavior. Longitudinal studies that track individuals over time and examine the interactions between genetic, neurobiological, and environmental factors would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the risk factors for mass murder. Despite the fact that it is very difficult to maintain the observed group over a longer period of time, a significant effort should be made to realize that goal for a more complete understanding of the criminogenesis of mass murders as well as other forms of severe violence.

Importance of collaboration between neuroscience and law, especially in complex criminal cases such as mass murders, has to be improved in the future, in different ways. On the one side that means involvement in the process of improving the ways of punishment in such extreme cases. Secondly, such collaboration is important in criminal proceedings in the context of proving and better understanding of the personal dynamic of these offenders. Also, such interdisciplinary arrangement is essential for the rehabilitation process of such offenders.

Finally, much of the research to date has focused on identifying brain abnormalities and neurochemical imbalances, but less attention has been given to interventions that could help individuals with these vulnerabilities. Future research should explore how neurobiological findings can inform preventive strategies and therapeutic interventions for individuals at risk of extreme violence. This could include the development of early identification tools, targeted treatments for impulse control and aggression, and public health strategies aimed at addressing the root causes of violence, such as childhood trauma and social isolation. Besides these pure preventive strategies, more should be done in the context of penitentiary treatment of such offenders. With having in mind all limitations of that undertaking, because even with awareness of weak possibilities to achieve any improvement in relation to that one person which committed an act of extreme violence, such action might be very useful in making better strategies which aim is to prevent mass and other forms of severe murders.

## **Conclusion**

The neurobiological basis of mass murder is complex and multifaceted, involving structural and functional brain abnormalities, neurochemical dysregulation, and the interplay between genetic and environmental factors. Research on brain morphology in mass murderers reveals consistent patterns of dysfunction in regions such as the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, and hippocampus. These abnormalities, coupled with neurotransmitter imbalances in serotonin,

dopamine, and norepinephrine systems, suggest that neurobiological factors play a critical role in shaping violent tendencies. Understanding the neurobiological factors that contribute to mass murder requires an integrated approach that considers both structural and functional brain abnormalities as well as neurochemical imbalances. Dysfunction in key brain regions such as the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, and hippocampus, combined with neurochemical dysregulation, may create a potent substrate for violent behavior. While not all mass murderers exhibit these brain abnormalities, these findings provide critical insights into the biological factors that may underlie extreme acts of violence. Future research into the neurobiology of mass murderers could help identify potential early intervention strategies and contribute to more effective preventative measures.

While no single brain abnormality can fully explain the complex behaviors associated with mass murder, understanding the structural and functional aspects of the brain involved in emotional regulation, decision-making, and aggression provides crucial insights into the risk factors for extreme violence. Continued research in neuroimaging and neurochemistry holds the potential to improve our understanding of violent behavior, ultimately informing prevention strategies and intervention programs for individuals at risk. The connection between neurological and neuropsychological impairment and aggression and violence is notable, and the background histories of many murder defendants breed impairments in these areas. These cognitive impairments, coupled with other biopsychosocial risk factors, may be linked to an individual's capacity to inhibit and control their behavior. Accordingly, some murder defendants may lack the inherent free-will of human behavior due to a shortage in their neural circuitry resources, marked cognitive deficits, and stressful and threatening environmental situations (Fabian, 2010).

## LITERATURE

- Bechara, A. and Damasio, A. R. (2021) 'The orbitofrontal cortex and violence: A model of impaired decision-making in antisocial behavior'. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 629442. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.629442>
- Bechara, A., Damasio, A. R. and Damasio, H. (2000) 'Emotion, decision making, and the orbitofrontal cortex'. *Cerebral Cortex*, 10(3), 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/10.3.295>
- Blair, R. J. R. et al. (2022) 'Structural brain abnormalities and antisocial behavior: A review of neuroimaging studies'. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 45(2), 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2021.12.004>
- Bremner, J. D. et al. (1995) 'MRI-based measurement of hippocampal volume in patients with combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder'. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152(7), 973–981. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.152.7.973>
- Buckholtz, J. W. and Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2008) 'MAOA and the neurogenetic architecture of human aggression'. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 12(3), 120–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.12.006>
- Damasio, H. et al. (1994) 'The return of Phineas Gage: Clues about the brain from the skull of a famous patient'. *Science*, 264(5162), 1102–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8178168>
- Dash, S. S., Padhi, C. H. and Das, B. (2020) 'Neurolaw: A new horizon of neuroscience'. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 7(10), 91–98.
- Davidson, R. J., Putnam, K. M. and Larson, C. L. (2000) 'Dysfunction in the neural circuitry of emotion regulation—A possible prelude to violence'. *Science*, 289(5479), 591–594. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.289.5479.591>
- Fabian, J. M. (2010) 'Neuropsychological and neurological correlates in violent and homicidal offenders: A legal and neuroscience perspective'. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(3), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.12.004>
- Glenn, A. L. and Raine, A. (2014) 'Neurocriminology: Implications for the punishment, prediction and prevention of criminal behaviour'. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 15(1), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3640>
- Kiehl, K. A. et al. (2019) 'Neuroanatomical and neurochemical abnormalities in violent offenders: A study using functional and structural MRI'. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*, 281, 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychresns.2019.05.002>

- Kiehl, K. A. et al. (2001) 'Limbic abnormalities in affective processing by criminal psychopaths as revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging'. *Biological Psychiatry*, 50(9), 677–684. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(01\)01222-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(01)01222-7)
- Koenigs, M. et al. (2018) 'Prefrontal cortex and the regulation of aggression: Insights from neuroimaging studies in violent offenders'. *Cerebral Cortex*, 28(5), 1684–1693. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx097>
- Petoft, A. (2015) 'Neurolaw: A brief introduction'. *Iranian Journal of Neurology*, 14(1), 53–58.
- Pustilnik, A. C. (2009) 'Violence on the brain: A critique of neuroscience in criminal law'. *Wake Forest Law Review*, 44(1), 183–238.
- Raine, A., Buchsbaum, M. and LaCasse, L. (1997) 'Brain abnormalities in murderers indicated by positron emission tomography'. *Biological Psychiatry*, 42(6), 495–508. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(96\)00362-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(96)00362-9)
- Savitz, J., Hodgkinson, C. A. and Luckenbaugh, D. A. (2017) 'Amygdala, prefrontal cortex and aggression: The role of the cortico-limbic circuit in violent behavior'. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 30(1), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000315>
- Shen, F. X. (2016) 'The overlooked history of neurolaw'. *Fordham Law Review*, 85(2), 667–695.
- Stanley, B. and Siever, L. J. (1991) 'Neurobiological correlates of aggression'. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 14(3), 569–586.
- Viding, E. and McCrory, E. J. (2019) 'Neurobiological contributions to understanding antisocial behavior'. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 28(4), 607–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2019.05.009>
- Virkkunen, M. et al. (1994) 'CSF biochemistries, glucose metabolism, and diurnal activity rhythms in alcoholic, violent offenders, fire setters, and healthy volunteers'. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 51(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1994.03950010020003>
- Yang, Y. and Raine, A. (2009) 'Prefrontal structural and functional brain imaging findings in antisocial, violent, and psychopathic individuals: A meta-analysis'. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.850>

© 2025 by authors



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International