Published in final edited form as:

Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci. 2013 September ; 13(3): 437–451. doi:10.3758/s13415-013-0156-8.

Candy and the Brain: Neural Response to Candy Gains and Losses

Katherine R Luking¹ and Deanna M Barch^{1,2,3,4}

¹Neuroscience Program, Washington University in St. Louis

²Department of Psychology, Washington University in St. Louis

³Department of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis

⁴Department of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis

Abstract

Incentive processing is a critical component of a host of cognitive processes including attention, motivation, and learning. Neuroimaging studies have clarified the neural systems underlying processing of primary and secondary rewards in adults. However, current reward paradigms have hindered comparison across these reward types as well as between age groups. To address methodological issues regarding timing of incentive delivery (during versus post-scan) and the age-appropriateness of the incentive type we utilized fMRI and a modified version of a card guessing game (CGG), where candy pieces delivered post-scan served as the reinforcer, to investigate neural responses to incentives. Healthy young adults aged 22–26 years won and lost large and small amounts of candy based on their ability to guess the number on a mystery card. BOLD activity was compared following candy gain (large/small), loss (large/small) and neutral feedback. During candy gains, adults recruited regions typically involved in response to monetary and other rewards such as the caudate, putamen, and orbitofrontal cortex. During losses, adults displayed greater deactivation in the hippocampus compared to neutral and gain feedback. Additionally, individual difference analyses suggested a negative relationship between reward sensitivity (assessed by behavioral inhibition/behavioral activation scales) and the difference between high and low magnitude losses in the caudate and lateral orbitofrontal cortex. Also within the striatum greater punishment sensitivity was positively related to the difference in activity following high compared to low gains. Overall these results show strong overlap with those from previous monetary versions of the CGG and provide a baseline for future work with developmental populations.

Introduction

How we react to, seek out, avoid or anticipate rewarding and aversive stimuli in our environment influences a host of cognitive and behavioral processes essential to everyday life. Understanding the basic functional mechanics of how gains and losses are processed in healthy adults is a critical first step before investigating how these processes change over the course of typical development, or how abnormalities in these processes manifest in child and adult onset psychopathology (Barch & Dowd, 2010; Bjork, Smith, & Hommer, 2008; Forbes et al., 2006; Gotlib et al., 2010; Knutson, Bhanji, Cooney, Atlas, & Gotlib, 2008). There is a rich literature establishing the neurocircuitry involved in reward and punishment processing

in animals and humans (Haber & Knutson, 2010). The animal literature has focused on primary rewards (i.e., food and liquids), but the human neuroimaging literature has more frequently focused on secondary rewards (i.e., money) that have value based on their ability to procure other rewards. However, monetary rewards may be less appropriate for examining the development of reward processing in young children, who may not yet understand the value of such abstract rewards and the exchange rate between specific amounts of money and desired goods. As such, the goal of the current study was to validate the modification of a gambling task using candy that is appropriate for use across a wide age range, including very young children.

Decades of work in animals and humans have established the roles of the striatum, orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), prefrontal cortex (PFC), and other regions of the limbic system in incentive processing (Haber & Knutson, 2010). The majority of human studies investigating gain/loss processing have utilized secondary monetary rewards and have reported consistent patterns of activity during receipt of monetary gains versus loss or no-gain events (Delgado, Locke, Stenger, & Fiez, 2003; Elliott, Newman, Longe, & Deakin, 2003; Galvan et al., 2005; Knutson, Fong, Adams, Varner, & Hommer, 2001; J. O'Doherty, Kringelbach, Rolls, Hornak, & Andrews, 2001). Specifically, regions of the dorsal and ventral striatum along with medial portions of OFC display greater functional responses to reward events compared to loss and/or baseline, as well as greater responses to larger versus smaller rewards (Elliott et al., 2003; Galvan et al., 2005; Knutson et al., 2001; Knutson, Fong, Bennett, Adams, & Hommer, 2003; Knutson, Westdorp, Kaiser, & Hommer, 2000; Santesso et al., 2008; Simon et al., 2010). Moreover, patients with neuropsychiatric illnesses characterized in part by a lack of experienced pleasure such as depression and schizophrenia display reduced striatal activation during reward processing (Dowd & Barch, 2012; Forbes et al., 2006; Knutson, Bhanji, Cooney, Atlas, & Gotlib, 2008). This relationship between hedonic capacity and striatal reward response also extends to healthy populations where again individuals with greater reward responsivity (Behavioral Activation Scale (BAS) total score), reduced behavioral inhibition (Behavioral Inhibition Scale (BIS) total score), and fewer anhedonic symptoms (Chapman Anhedonia Scales) display greater striatal activity during reward events (Dowd & Barch, 2012; Simon et al., 2010).

There is less consensus regarding regions that respond maximally to receipt of punishment/loss. Some studies report increased response to punishment/loss in regions such as the hippocampus, amygdala, and insula (Anderson et al., 2003; Camara, Rodriguez-Fornells, & Munte, 2008; Elliott, Friston, & Dolan, 2000; Phelps & LeDoux, 2005; Small et al., 2003). However, other studies have found increased responses in these regions to *both* punishment/loss *and* reward when compared to neutral events, possibly indicating encoding of salience rather than valence alone (Elliott et al., 2000; Elliott et al., 2003). There is also mixed evidence as to which regions of OFC and PFC respond maximally to losses; some studies report a lateral/medial punishment/reward distinction within the OFC, where lateral regions show increased response to punishment/loss events while others report greater response to reward in both lateral and medial PFC (Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004; J. O'Doherty, Kringelbach, et al., 2001; J. O'Doherty, Rolls, Francis, Bowtell, & McGlone, 2001); (Bjork et al., 2004; Elliott et al., 2003; Kim, Shimojo, & O'Doherty, 2006, 2011; J. O'Doherty, Kringelbach, et al., 2001; Sescousse, Redoute, & Dreher, 2010; Simon et al., 2010).

Monetary rewards are advantageous in many ways, they lend themselves to manipulation of amount without overwhelming concerns of satiation, are simple to deliver in scanner via visual cue, and allow the participant to obtain any number of other goods that he/she desires with money earned during the task. However, there may be significant and systematic differences in how monetary incentives are processed/valued across development. Specifically, monetary rewards may be less salient and may be more difficult to value for

children who have less life experience with money and less developed abstract reasoning/mathematical skills compared to adults. Thus the subjective value of a given amount of money likely changes from childhood through adolescence and into adulthood. Some innovative investigators have utilized token economies (system where points/tokens earned during the task are later exchanged for prizes) to reduce such developmental confounds (Geier & Luna, 2012). While this approach is clearly effective for adolescent populations, preschool and school-aged children may have difficulty with such an abstract system of exchange. Token economies require the participant to understand the exchange rate between points and prizes (ex: 15 points = 1 prize) and associate a given trial's outcome with the subjective value of a prize. Moreover, enough points to obtain another whole prize are not typically won/lost on each individual trial meaning that a given trial's derived value is equivalent only to a portion of a prize. This requires the child to maintain a representation of accumulated earnings across trials and evaluate the current trial's outcome in the context of a total sum. Given the complexity of such secondary paradigms and developmental differences in abstract reasoning ability, children's attention/motivational drive may be better captured when more immediate/tangible rewards (i.e. candy) are employed that can be directly represented on screen during the scan.

Primary rewards offer an opportunity to investigate incentive processing without as many concerns regarding how age may interact with the processing of abstract incentives. Primary reward paradigms utilize a host of incentives including liquids (sweet, bitter, and/or salty solutions delivered in scanner), candy (delivered post-scan), food odors (pleasant and unpleasant delivered in scanner), and even erotic pictures (displayed in scanner) among others (Achenbach, 2003; Clithero, Reeck, Carter, Smith, & Huettel, 2011; Kim et al., 2011; Kringelbach, O'Doherty, Rolls, & Andrews, 2003; Levy & Glimcher, 2011; J. O'Doherty, Rolls, et al., 2001; Sescousse et al., 2010). Such studies in adults have yielded largely similar patterns of activation to those reported in monetary paradigms. Specifically, greater responses to delivery of rewarding (e.g., juice, chocolate milk) compared to neutral solutions are found in regions such as the caudal OFC, medial OFC, basal ganglia, and in the anterior insula, where activity is related to the subjective pleasantness of the consumed liquid (Frank et al., 2008; Kobayashi et al., 2004; Kringelbach, de Araujo, & Rolls, 2004; Kringelbach et al., 2003; J. O'Doherty, Rolls, et al., 2001; J. P. O'Doherty, Deichmann, Critchley, & Dolan, 2002). Responses to "punishing" solutions such as saline and quinine also echo responses to monetary loss. Regions of lateral OFC, anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), hippocampus, amygdala (AMY), and insula (INS) display increased response to the delivery of punishing solutions. Again there are also mixed results regarding the medial/lateral OFC distinction for reward and punishment response when using primary rewards (Frank et al., 2008; J. O'Doherty, Rolls, et al., 2001; J. P. O'Doherty et al., 2002; Sescousse et al., 2010; Zald, Lee, Fluegel, & Pardo, 1998).

There are also a handful of studies directly comparing responses to primary and secondary rewards that help to build a bridge between the literature on monetary reward processing in adults, and the potentially utility of using more primary rewards in young child populations (Chib, Rangel, Shimojo, & O'Doherty, 2009; Clithero et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2011; Levy & Glimcher, 2011; Sescousse et al., 2010). Once again, similar patterns of responses are found in striatal and insular regions when primary and secondary rewards are employed. Of note is a potential dissociation within the OFC in terms of responses to these two types of rewards. A metaanalysis conducted by Kringelbach and Rolls including both primary and secondary reward studies suggests a posterior/anterior distinction in OFC response to primary versus more abstract rewards respectively (Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004). This posterior/anterior distinction is further supported by work directly comparing primary (erotic pictures) and secondary rewards (money) (Sescousse et al., 2010). However, there is also evidence supporting the opposite pattern (Kim et al., 2011; Sescousse et al., 2010).

Although the literature reviewed above suggests that primary and secondary rewards modulate many of the same neural systems, there are a number of challenges when adapting primary reward paradigms for use in developmental populations in ways that would allow clear conceptual and/or empirical comparisons to the existing monetary reward literature. First, the logistical characteristics of the paradigms historically used to deliver the two incentive types often differ. In secondary paradigms a trial's outcome is signaled via a visual cue indicating the size and valence (gain/loss) of the outcome with a lump sum of money to be delivered post-scan. In primary paradigms participants traditionally directly experience/consume the incentive in-scanner i.e. tasting a sweet liquid/smelling a pleasant odor. Second, the intrinsic properties of primary/secondary rewards often make comparison problematic. This difference is most apparent in the punishment/loss domain where directly consuming or experiencing something aversive (ex. quinine/saline solution or unpleasant odor) may elicit different psychological and neural responses compared to losing something appetitive (ex. money or tokens). Other hindrances include difficulty in manipulating magnitude of primary rewards (ex: delivery of larger liquid rewards can be uncomfortable and potentially dangerous, especially in children), and satiation/habituation where the value of an incentive can decrease throughout the experiment.

To address these challenges, we developed a modified version of the card guessing game (CGG), a task where *monetary* gains/losses have traditionally been employed, and used fMRI to investigate how healthy adults respond to gains and losses of candy as a means to validate this paradigm before moving to its use in a developmental population (Delgado, Nystrom, Fissell, Noll, & Fiez, 2000). We felt that a paradigm in which primary rewards did not have to be consumed in scanner would be most comparable to current secondary paradigms, would allow us to investigate responses to primary rewards without concerns regarding delivery timing, increased head motion, and choking hazards, and would be the simplest to implement from a logistical standpoint. Moreover candy readily lends itself to developmental questions, children will not need to consume liquids in the scanner (a choking hazard associated with increased motion), and very young children may find it easier to comprehend differing amounts candy displayed on screen versus differing amounts of money or points aggregated across trials and then later exchanged for prizes. As such, we believe results from this paradigm will provide a baseline describing functional responses to candy rewards and losses in healthy young adults that can be used to inform future studies investigating these processes in developmental and other special populations as well as directly comparing responses to different reward types.

As our modification of the CGG uses a primary reward (candy), but delivers the reward out of scanner, we hypothesize that our results will resemble a bridge between the responses reported in studies using primary and secondary rewards. We expect to see reward and loss related modulation of BOLD activity in regions of the striatum, amygdala, and OFC as reported in previous studies using the CGG and other secondary reward paradigms (Cox, Aizenstein, & Fiez, 2008; Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado, Stenger, & Fiez, 2004; Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004; E. Tricomi, Delgado, McCandliss, McClelland, & Fiez, 2006; E. M. Tricomi, Delgado, & Fiez, 2004). What is less clear is whether within the OFC we will see a more anterior or posterior pattern of activity, which the literature suggests may in part relate to the type of reward used (primary versus abstract). Additionally, we expect that individuals with greater reward responsivity and hedonic tone will display greater striatal activity during reward feedback, replicating findings in the extant literature (Dowd & Barch, 2012; Simon et al., 2010).

Methods

Participants

Twenty-one young adults participated in this study. One participant was excluded from analysis based on a history of Major Depressive Disorder (assessed through self-report on the Adult Behavior Check List) (Achenbach, 2003). The remaining twenty participants included were aged 22–26 years (mean age = 23.95, SD = 1.353; 8 males and 12 females). Participants were healthy and free of any major medical disorder, did not report a past history of any mental disorder, had not taken psychotropic medications within the past two weeks, and were non-smokers. Participants were recruited through posted advertisements at Washington University and were not given any instructions/restrictions regarding food or beverage consumption. All participants gave informed consent and the Washington University in St. Louis Institutional Review Board approved the study.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted over the course of two separate in-person sessions, a behavioral session followed by a neuroimaging session. In the behavioral session, participants completed several individual difference questionnaires (see below) and a demographic form. Additionally participants completed a behavioral probabilistic reward task based on Pizzagalli et al., 2005 and Tripp and Alsop 1999 not addressed in these analyses (Pizzagalli, Jahn, & O'Shea, 2005; Tripp & Alsop, 1999). Participants returned on a different day (within three weeks of the behavioral session) to complete the neuroimaging session. During this fMRI session, participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) (Beck AT, 1996), out-of-scanner practice for the neuroimaging task and an in-scanner card guessing game based on Delgado et al., 2000, 2004, followed by a post-scan questionnaire (Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004).

Individual Difference Measures—Participants were administered the following individual differences measures during the behavioral session: 1) the Behavioral Inhibition Scale and Behavioral Activation Scale (BIS/BAS)(Carver CS, 1994); 2) Chapman Anhedonia Scales (CS)(Chapman, Chapman, & Raulin, 1976); and 3) the Snaith Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHPS)(Snaith et al., 1995). As the chapman scales (both physical and social components) were strongly correlated with the SHPS a composite variable, hedonics (HED), was created by reverse coding the physical and social components of the CS, computing z-scores for the two reverse coded CS scales and the SHPS, then summing the three z-scores such that a higher HED value indicates that an individual is more hedonic. A subset of the participants also completed the Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scales (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) but these measures were not included in further analyses. Descriptive statistics and pairwise correlations between individual difference measures can be found in Supplementary Tables 1–2.

Card Guessing Game—Participants were told they would play a card guessing game where they were to guess the number on a mystery card (represented by a “?”) and potentially win or lose candy based upon whether or not that guess was correct. The type of candy incentive, M&Ms or Skittles, was determined by the participant's preference indicated during study enrollment (visual feedback did not differ for candy type). The participants were told that potential card numbers ranged from 1–9 and to indicate if they thought the mystery card number was more or less than 5 by pressing one of two buttons with either the left or right thumb. Participants were required to make their guess while the mystery card “?” was displayed on screen (2000 msec). If no response was made, the “?” was replaced by a fixation cross for the remaining duration of that missed trial. If a guess was made, feedback was displayed for 2000 msec immediately following the button press.

Feedback included the actual number on the card, “Great Job!” and a green up arrow for gain trials, “Sorry” and a red down arrow for loss trials, along with a picture of the number of candy pieces gained or lost (see Figure 1).

Participants could gain or lose both large and small amounts of candy based on their guess and the number on the card. Participants received a high gain (4 candies) if their guess was above 5, and the number was 8 or 9, or if their guess was below 5, and the number was 1 or 2. Participants received a low gain (2 candies) if their guess was above 5 and the number was 6 or 7, or if their guess was below 5 and the number was 3 or 4. Conversely, participants received a high loss (2 candies) if their guess was above 5 and the number was 1 or 2, or their guess was below 5 and the number was 8 or 9. They received a low loss (1 candy) if their guess was above 5 and the number was 3 or 4, or their guess was below 5 and the number was 6 or 7. If the number 5 was displayed, no candy was gained or lost and feedback on these neutral trials included the card number, “Next Trial” and two dash marks (see Figure 1). The computer program was designed so that if the trial was meant to be – for example – a high reward trial, the program adapted the card number to the subject’s choice to ensure the appropriate outcome for that trial type. Based on previous research, a 2:1 ratio of gain to loss amount was used such that participants added 4 and 2 pieces of candy to their total on high and low gain trials respectively and lost 1 and 2 pieces from their total on low and high loss trials respectively. This ratio was used to prevent frustration with the task and maintain engagement as well as to ensure that the participants received candy at the end of the task. (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981) Participants were told that they would receive a lump sum of candy at the conclusion of the experiment reflecting the net amount of candy earned during the task.

To ensure that all participants understood the task, written instructions were presented on a computer using PsyScope software followed by actual task practice prior to entering the fMRI scanner. (Cohen, 1993) All trial types were experienced during the practice task and participants were told that any candy earned during the practice would be added to their candy total. This served as a candy endowment to offset any initial losses during the in-scanner task.

In-scanner trials were presented in a fixed order with a rapid event-related design using PsyScope software on a Macintosh computer for stimulus presentation and data collection (Cohen, 1993). The computer selected a card number on each trial following the participant’s guess depending on the predetermined trial type. Determining the card number shown after the participant’s button press ensured that the guess, predetermined trial type (gain, loss, or neutral), and card numbers were always congruent and there were no ‘correct/incorrect’ guesses. This is the standard procedure with the card guessing game and ensures that all participants experience roughly the same events in scanner (i.e., no one by chance gets a disproportionate amount of high reward trials). The task was divided into six blocks each lasting 5 minutes and containing 8 potential instances (if the participant made a guess for all trials) of the five trial types, high/low gain/loss and neutral, delivered in a fixed pseudo random order such that each participant experienced the same order of events. On average, participants failed to make a response on 4 trials over the course of the entire scanning session. Each trial lasted for 4000 msec (see Figure 1) followed by an inter-trial interval (ITI) of 0–14000 msec that was randomly jittered in 2000 msec increments. All participants completed the six scan blocks and no data were excluded due to excessive head movement (excessive motion is defined by mean voxelwise standard deviation, mode 1000 normalized, of greater than 15 for a given BOLD run). Participants were given \$50 as compensation for their time along with 150 M&Ms at the end of the scanning session regardless of performance.

fMRI Data Acquisition and Processing

Imaging data were collected using a 3T TIM TRIO Siemens whole body system and included a T1 [sagittal acquisition, TE=3.16ms, TR=2400ms, FOV=256mm, flip angle=8°, 1 acquisition, 176 slices, 1×1×1 mm voxels] image and functional images collected with a 12-channel head coil using a standard gradient-echo EPI sequence sensitive to BOLD contrast (T2*) (TR=2000ms, TE=27ms, FOV=384mm, flip=77°). During each functional run 150 whole-brain volumes were acquired consisting of 36 contiguous axial images with isotropic voxels (4mm³) acquired parallel to the anterior-posterior commissure plane. Two functional runs of 160 TRs (~11 minutes total) while participants rested with eyes closed.

The fMRI data were preprocessed using in-house Washington University software. Prior to preprocessing, the first 4 frames of each run were discarded to allow for signal stabilization. The data were then: 1) reconstructed into images and normalized across runs by scaling whole-brain signal intensity to a fixed value and removing the linear slope on a voxel-by-voxel basis to counteract effects of drift (Bandettini, Jesmanowicz, Wong, & Hyde, 1993); 2) corrected for head motion using rigid-body rotation and translation correction algorithms (Friston, 1994; Snyder, 1996; Woods, 1992); 3) registered to Talairach (Talairach, 1988) space using a 12 parameter linear (affine) transformation; and 4) smoothed with a 8 mm FWHM Gaussian filter.

Estimates of functional activation during each of the five trial types (high/low gain/loss and neutral) were obtained by using a general linear model (GLM) also incorporating regressors for linear trend and baseline shift to estimate the hemodynamic response function for each trial type. The task analyses used a GLM approach that did not assume a specific hemodynamic response shape. While it is possible that developmental effects are mostly explained by differences in magnitude of activation, it is also likely that development will interact with BOLD response over time. Thus we felt that using an unassumed (FIR type) approach would provide the most information without imposing assumptions regarding the shape of the hemodynamic response that may bias future investigations. For each trial type, neural response at 10 time points (20 seconds) were estimated relative to baseline fixation to provide adequate temporal resolution of the hemodynamic response. We felt that this approach provided the best balance between the cost of power and benefit of a more complete picture of the hemodynamic response. The task was designed to focus on trial outcomes and does not allow for dissociation of anticipation and receipt of feedback. Although timecourses were estimated beginning with trial onset, participants were quick to make a response (mean reaction time 521.8 msec; standard deviation 91.4 msec) thus feedback onset occurred well within the first timepoint on average for each participant. These estimates were then entered into group levels analyses treating subjects as a random factor. We also computed an assumed response shape GLM for each subject for use in the individual difference analyses, since this type of GLM provided us with a single beta estimate for each condition. This GLM included same five trial types (and regressors for linear trends and baseline shifts across runs) and used the Boynton function (Boynton, Engel, Glover, & Heeger, 1996).

fMRI Data Analysis

To examine the influence of the valence (gain versus loss) and the magnitude (low versus high) of feedback we performed a voxelwise repeated measures ANOVA with three within subject factors: outcome valence (two levels: gain, loss), outcome magnitude (two levels: high, low) and timepoint within trial (the 10 frame estimates for each trial type beginning at trial onset). We then followed up this analysis with an additional repeated measures ANOVA to identify regions where activation was related to salience (responses to gain/loss are similar and different from neutral) versus the valence and/or magnitude of feedback.

Because there was only one level of neutral feedback, neutral trials were not included in the first ANOVA. The second ANOVA included timepoint and condition (reward [both high and low gain trials], neutral, and loss [both high and low loss trials]) as within-subject factors.

In the analyses described above, we focused on regions showing interactions with timepoint within trials, given our use of unassumed (FIR type) GLMS. When appropriate, post hoc ANOVAs were performed within all significant regions identified by the ANOVAs described above. For these post hoc analyses the mean percent signal change across each region was extracted for each of the 10 estimated timepoints. This was done for each applicable condition and then post hoc ANOVAs were run comparing two trial types (ex. gain versus neutral) over the 10 timepoints..

To focus our results these two voxelwise ANOVAs were conducted within an anatomically defined *a priori* mask developed by Beck and colleagues (Beck, Locke, Savine, Jimura, & Braver, 2010). This mask (see Supplemental Figure 1) covered an *a priori* network of regions implicated in reward processing that were hand-drawn in Talairach space on the basis of anatomical landmarks and previously published functional coordinates, including the dorsal and ventral striatum, ventral tegmental area, substantia nigra, amygdala (AMY), orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), ventromedial prefrontal cortex (VMPFC), and insula (INS) (Beck et al., 2010). ANOVA results within the *a priori* mask were corrected for multiple comparisons using a combined p-value/cluster size threshold ($p < .005$ and 21 voxels) determined using *AlpaSim* simulations (smoothing = 2 voxels, 1000 iterations, voxels in mask = 5332) to provide a false positive rate of $p < .05$ for the whole mask (Forman et al., 1995; McAvoy, Ollinger, & Buckner, 2001).

To reduce redundancy across the two ANOVA results, all significant regions identified in first ANOVA were converted to a binary mask. This mask was then applied to the second ANOVA prior to thresholding. The remaining voxels were subjected to the same multiple comparison correction criteria ($p < .005$ and 21 voxels). Regions identified in each of the two ANOVAs were then partitioned such that peaks of activity were considered separate regions if they were more than 10mm apart based on a peak-splitting algorithm (Kerr, Gusnard, Snyder, & Raichle, 2004; Michelon, Snyder, Buckner, McAvoy, & Zacks, 2003).

We also conducted exploratory voxelwise whole-brain analyses, which were corrected for multiple corrections using a p-value/cluster size threshold ($p < .0013$ and 17 voxels) determined by Monte Carlo simulations to provide a whole-brain false-positive rate of $p < .05$ and partitioned such that peaks of activity were considered separate regions if they were more than 12mm apart using the same peak-splitting algorithm (Kerr et al., 2004; Michelon et al., 2003). Whole-brain results are reported and discussed in the supplementary material. We felt that combination of threshold and cluster size provided a good balance between detecting small regions showing strong effects and larger regions with subtler task related activity differences

Individual Difference Data Analysis

To identify regions where task activation related to reward/punishment sensitivity and hedonic tone, individual difference measures of reward sensitivity (BAS total score), loss sensitivity (BIS total score) and hedonics (HED) were each correlated separately with magnitude estimates from the assumed GLMs. Magnitude estimates used in the correlation analyses included differences between each of the four individual trial types and neutral (e.g. HG-NU). Additionally differences between high and low trial types for both loss and gain (HL-LL and HG-LG) were included on an exploratory basis. Functional regions identified by the correlations within the mask were thresholded using a p-value/cluster size threshold

($p < .005$ and 26 voxels) to provide a false-positive rate of $p < .01$. To identify potential multivariate outliers mahalanobis D^2 scores were computed for each resultant region using the individual difference measure and imaging contrast of interest as independent variables. No participant passed the $p < .001$ threshold required for multivariate outliers for any region. To further test the robustness of reported effects, correlations were computed again within the regions identified in the voxel-wise correlations without participants whose multivariate outlier score was less than $p < .05$. All discussed correlations remained significant ($p < .05$) when these participants were removed from analyses.

Results

We started analysis using an ANOVA with valence (gain, loss), magnitude (high, low) and timepoint (10 timepoints within trial estimate, timepoint 1 corresponding to onset of button press cue) as within subject factors.

Effects of Valence—Regions identified as displaying a valence X timepoint interaction within the reward mask included regions of the insula, lateral OFC, caudate, putamen, amygdala and the hippocampus (Table 1 and Figures 2,3). All of these regions other than the hippocampus showed greater activation during gain than loss trials. The hippocampus showed less deactivation for gain compared to loss trials. Planned within-region post-hoc ANOVAs involving all trial types, including neutral trials which were not included in the original ANOVA, indicated that activity was greater in gain than neutral trials in the lateral OFC region, but that neutral trials did not differ significantly from loss trials. In addition, neutral trials elicited greater activity than loss trials in dorsal putamen regions and the insula. However, neutral trial activity did not differ significantly from gain or loss in the remaining regions (including ventral putamen, caudate, thalamus, amygdala, and hippocampus) as shown in Table 1, Figure 3, and Supplemental Figures 2–3. This result was surprising as graphs depicting timecourses particularly for the caudate/putamen regions seemed to indicate a difference between neutral and either gain or loss peak activation in several of these regions.

To further investigate the relationship between neutral and gain/loss activation within the striatum, we performed exploratory post hoc paired t-tests designed to specifically test for differences in peak activation between the neutral condition and the gain and loss conditions respectively. Percent signal change for individual trial types (neutral, gain, loss) was averaged for timepoints 4 and 5 (the timepoints corresponding to peak response across all regions included in these analyses) within each caudate and putamen regions identified in the analyses described above (valence X magnitude ANOVA). Because of the exploratory nature of these post hoc tests, uncorrected p-values are reported. Interestingly, the relationship between neutral and gain/loss activation differed along the rostral-caudal axis of the striatum. Specifically, within the caudate and more rostral putamen/caudate regions, neutral trial activity did not differ from loss activation but did differ from gain. Within the caudal putamen regions, neutral trial activity significantly differed from loss trial activity while it did not differ from gain trial activity (p-values reported in Supplementary Table 3).

Effects of Magnitude and the Interaction of Valence and Magnitude—There were no regions that displayed a significant two-way interaction between magnitude and timepoint or a three-way interaction between valence, magnitude, and timepoint within the *a priori* anatomical mask.

Effects of Salience—The above ANOVA identified regions where activity differed depending on the valence of the trial outcome. However it is possible that some regions

encode salience rather than the valence of feedback. In these regions we would expect to see a similar pattern of activity to feedback of different valence (gain/loss) that then significantly differs from the response to neutral feedback. To identify such regions, we conducted an additional voxel-wise ANOVA within our *a priori* mask that included the neutral condition. Thus, this ANOVA used condition (gain, loss, neutral) and timepoint as within-subject factors. However, no significant regions unique to the condition and timepoint interaction were found within the *a priori* reward mask.

Individual Difference Results

To evaluate whether individual differences in task related activity were related to individual differences in reward/punishment sensitivity or hedonic tone, magnitude estimates for the difference between the trial types and neutral (e.g. HL-NU) and the difference between high and low trials within gain/loss (e.g. HG-LG) were correlated with BAS, BIS and HED within the *a priori* reward mask. Only contrasts with significant correlations ($p < .01$ corrected for multiple comparisons using a combined p-value and cluster size ($p < .005$, $n = 26$)) are reported.

Behavioral Activation System (BAS) Correlations—Interestingly reward sensitivity (BAS total score) was most strongly correlated with loss related activity and not with gain related activity as hypothesized (Table 2 A,D; Supplementary Figures 4–6). Specifically, low loss trial activity showed a positive correlation with BAS in a region of inferior frontal gyrus ($-35, 7, -11$). A positive correlation was also found between BAS and the difference in low loss and neutral trial activity (LL-NU) within the right caudate and a portion of the right lateral OFC. The same lateral OFC and caudate regions displayed a negative correlation between BAS and the difference in high and low loss trial activity (HL-LL) (Supplementary Figures 5). Specifically, as BAS increases so does the difference in activity between low loss and neutral trials, additionally the difference in activity between high and low loss decreases with increasing BAS scores in these lateral OFC and caudate regions.

Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) Correlations—Mirroring the BAS correlation results, punishment sensitivity (BIS) was most strongly associated with gain trial activity and no significant correlations were found with loss related activity (Supplementary Figures 4 and 6; Table 2 B–D). Portions of the insula, caudate and putamen displayed a positive correlation between BIS and the difference in high and low gain trial activity (HG-LG) indicating that individuals with increased punishment sensitivity show greater neural responses to high gain compared to low gain trials while those with lower punishment sensitivity showed the opposite relationship.

There were several regions including the left caudate and bilateral putamen that showed both significant negative correlation between BAS and HL-LL and a positive correlation between BIS and HG-LG. The BIS correlation did not remain significant within the insula region when a potential outlier was excluded. (Supplemental Figure 6).

Hedonics Correlations—No regions showing a significant correlation between the hedonics composite variable (HED) and any task conditions were found within the *a priori* reward mask.

Discussion

The goals of this study were to develop a paradigm using primary rewards congruent with current secondary reward paradigms, and then to establish baseline responses in healthy young adults for use in future investigation of gain/loss processing in developmental

populations. To do this we modified a version of the CGG, which previously utilized monetary incentives, to employ small candy pieces (consumed out of scanner) as a reinforcer. This modification allowed us to modulate both incentive valence (gain, loss, neutral) and magnitude (high and low) similarly to previous monetary studies.

Valence effects

Consistent with the secondary reward literature, we observed strong valence (gain versus loss) effects in regions of dorsal (caudate body/putamen) and ventral (ventral putamen) striatum, lateral OFC, insula, thalamus, hippocampus, and amygdala (Cox et al., 2008; Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004; Elliott et al., 2003; Estle, Green, Myerson, & Holt, 2007; Kim et al., 2011; Knutson et al., 2001; J. O'Doherty, Rolls, et al., 2001; E. Tricomi et al., 2006; E. M. Tricomi et al., 2004; Valentin & O'Doherty, 2009; Zald et al., 1998). All regions except the hippocampus displayed greater activation during gain feedback compared to loss feedback, with bilateral putamen displaying the most extensive effects. Dorsal striatal activation, particularly the caudate, is the most consistently reported valence effect observed in studies using the CGG. Feedback modulated responses in this region are expected given that the CGG requires a timely button press that the participant believes will impact the type of feedback he/she receives (gain versus loss), and the dorsal striatum's involvement in the goal-directed action component of reward-processing/decision-making (J. O'Doherty et al., 2004; E. M. Tricomi et al., 2004).

We also observed an interesting dissociation between responses to neutral feedback in the caudate body/rostral putamen and more caudal portions of the putamen. In caudate and rostral putamen regions, activation to neutral and loss feedback was similar and less than gain responses while in more caudal putamen regions, neutral and gain responses were similar and greater than loss. This pattern of activity may indicate a reduced response during loss trials in the caudal putamen as opposed to an increased response to gain/neutral feedback and vice versa in more rostral regions. It is important to note that analyses investigating these effects were exploratory, however, this pattern of activation is remarkably consistent both between hemispheres and within the given structures. Studies investigating functional dissociations within the striatum have traditionally focused on comparisons between the dorsal/ventral striatum with less evidence for a rostral/caudal distinction in function (Joel, Niv, & Ruppin, 2002; J. O'Doherty et al., 2004). However, functional connectivity studies report distinct patterns of connectivity for the caudate and more caudal putamen with the caudate displaying positive functional relationships with frontal control regions (eg DLPFC, ACC) while the putamen displays positive functional connections with cortical regions involved in movement (Barnes et al., 2010; Di Martino et al., 2008). How these patterns of connectivity relate to our findings is unclear and future work is needed to determine whether this result is replicable and how it relates to dissociations in function across basal ganglia subregions.

We also observed valence effects in the ventral putamen, as in previous CGG studies using monetary incentives (Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004). We did not, however, observe valence effects in the nucleus accumbens. Other CGG have also found ventral striatal activity in the ventral putamen/pallidum but not in the accumbens (Cox et al., 2008; Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004; Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004; E. M. Tricomi et al., 2004). While the ventral striatum, including the ventral putamen, is involved in representation of incentive value, the nucleus accumbens may be maximally sensitive to anticipation/prediction of rewards or when reward information can be used to alter behavior (Delgado, Miller, Inati, & Phelps, 2005; Knutson et al., 2001; J. O'Doherty et al., 2004; E. M. Tricomi et al., 2004). Additionally this is a very small region and it is possible that there was significant between subject variability in accumbens morphology within our sample. Another explanation of the absence of nucleus

accumbens activity could be the pseudo-random structure of the CGG, which is ideal for isolating responses to task feedback independent of learning effects.

In addition to finding no valence effects in the accumbens, most adult studies using the CGG have not reported valence effects in the OFC, although a recent paper with a larger sample ($n=28$) reported valence effects in regions of medial OFC (Cox et al., 2008; Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004; Forbes et al., 2010; E. Tricomi et al., 2006; E. M. Tricomi et al., 2004; Wilbertz et al., 2012). It is surprising that few adult card guessing game studies report OFC activation considering the role of the OFC in incentive processing and given that studies with younger participants have reported both medial and lateral OFC valence effects (Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004). Unlike other adult CGG studies, we found a significant effect of valence in the lateral OFC such that activity to high gain trials was greater than either neutral or loss trials. May and colleagues also report increased response to reward in lateral OFC using a monetary version of the CGG in children/adolescents (May et al., 2004). Reward processing studies frequently report a lateral/medial OFC distinction in activity patterns, with greater response to punishment in lateral regions and greater response to reward in medial regions (Kringelbach, 2005; Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004). However, some studies suggest that this lateral/medial relationship may rely at least in part on whether the gain/loss feedback leads to behavioral change (Breiter, Aharon, Kahneman, Dale, & Shizgal, 2001; Elliott et al., 2000; Elliott et al., 2003; Kringelbach, 2005; Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004). As our task has been specifically designed so that feedback information cannot be used to alter behavior, it is not entirely clear why we (and May et al) found gain related responses in lateral OFC, though it may reflect some more general property of value processing in response to gain (Elliott et al., 2003; Kringelbach, 2005; Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004; J. O'Doherty, Kringelbach, et al., 2001).

Also of interest is the posterior position of our lateral OFC region. As noted above, there is evidence in the literature that more abstract rewards such as money elicit activation in more anterior portions of OFC while primary rewards elicit activation in more posterior portions of OFC (Kringelbach & Rolls, 2004; Sescousse et al., 2010). However, we did not have clear hypotheses regarding whether we would observe valence effects in posterior versus anterior OFC given of our combination of elements from secondary and primary reward tasks (timing of reward delivery and reward type respectively). Interestingly, studies using monetary CGGs report valence effects in anterior portions of the OFC while in our candy version, valence effects were observed more posteriorly (Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004). Thus, our results are generally consistent with an anterior-posterior gradient of secondary (abstract) to primary rewards in OFC responses. However, the OFC is a difficult region of the brain to image and signal within our sample was much stronger in posterior OFC compared more anterior portions of the OFC. Thus, these OFC results should be interpreted as a positive finding regarding valence effects in posterior OFC, but not as a strong null finding regarding anterior OFC response to primary-like rewards, as their absence could reflect reduced signal quality.

Other regions identified as showing significant valence effects in our candy version of the CGG, including regions of the amygdala, hippocampus, thalamus, and insula, have mixed support from other monetary CGG studies. Regions of thalamus are constantly identified in CGG studies, however support is mixed as to whether the thalamus shows general responsivity to the task (e.g., main effect of time) or valence specific effects (Delgado et al., 2003; Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004; Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004; E. Tricomi et al., 2006). Studies that do report thalamic valence effects find greater activity to reward than loss feedback, in line with our results (Delgado et al., 2003; E. Tricomi et al., 2006). We also observed greater activation to gain compared to loss trials in the amygdala.

This result is consistent with a hypothesized role for the amygdala in processing affectively salient stimuli. However, surprisingly, previous CGG studies have not reported modulation of amygdala activity as a function of valence (Elliott et al., 2003; Forbes et al., 2010; Knutson et al., 2001; Sescousse et al., 2010). We observed greater deactivation in the hippocampus to loss compared to gain events, however again previous CGG studies have not found hippocampal modulation. Insula regions have been identified in several CGG studies, however only one found significant valence effects (Delgado et al., 2000; Delgado et al., 2004; E. Tricomi et al., 2006). In this prior study the insula region displayed greater activation to loss compared to reward, the opposite pattern of activity we report. However, our insula region (35, -5, 16) was located anterior and medial to the region identified by Tricomi and colleagues (E. Tricomi et al., 2006). The majority of CGG studies focus on effects of valence within the striatum, whereas we chose to focus on regions within a much larger *a priori* mask. It is possible that previous CGG studies failed to find valence effects in regions such as the amygdala and hippocampus simply because they fell outside of *a priori* ROIs and were thus subjected to a higher statistical threshold.

Magnitude Effects

Other groups using the CGG have found interactions between valence and magnitude particularly within the caudate (Delgado et al., 2003; Elliott et al., 2000). Unlike these other studies, we did not find a significant interaction between feedback valence (gain, loss) and magnitude (high, low) within the dorsal striatum, though we did observe significant valence effects in the caudate. A possible explanation for this result could be that the difference between high and low magnitude conditions was not large enough to elicit significantly different striatal responses between high and low trials or that the effect size is small in this paradigm and more trials are needed to detect such a relationship. Importantly particularly for future between group developmental studies, it is possible that healthy young adults who are receiving monetary compensation for their time are not engaged sufficiently by winning/losing a few small candies to elicit parametric modulation of the BOLD response by outcome “value”, though it is possible that such differences in the amount of candy are more salient in younger children.

Individual Difference Effects

We observed a relationship between task related activity in several striatal/insular regions and individual differences in reward and punishment sensitivity (BIS/BAS total scores), but failed to identify any regions where task activity related to our hedonics composite score (Carver CS, 1994). Interestingly BAS scores were related to loss responses rather than gain responses. Specifically, bilateral regions of the caudate displayed a negative correlation between BAS and the difference in response to high loss and low loss feedback. This correlation was related to reduced response to low loss feedback in individuals with lower BAS total scores. The right caudate region also displayed a positive correlation between BAS and the difference in response to low loss and neutral feedback. This correlation was related to both decreased response to low loss and increased response to neutral feedback in individuals with lower BAS scores. Similar correlations with BAS and task activity were found within a region of right lateral OFC that also displayed greater response to high gain feedback compared to low gain, neutral, and loss feedback in the main analyses. Again individuals with increased reward sensitivity showed reduced differences between different levels of loss.

Our individual difference results are a bit counterintuitive given evidence that reward sensitivity (BAS) is traditionally thought to relate to processing of appetitive stimuli and punishment sensitivity (BIS) related to aversive processing. However, there is some evidence linking BAS and negative affect following significant events.(Carver, 2004) Our

results suggest that individuals more sensitive to reward show reduced responses to low losses within the striatum, potentially suggesting a heightened sensitivity to minor losses. In contrast, our results suggest that individuals more sensitive to punishment show increased response to the best gain option and less response to the worst gain option, potentially suggesting more sensitivity to the relative “bad” versus “good” options within rewards. Given that most of the previous studies examining individual differences in punishment and reward sensitivity have used monetary rewards, it will be important to directly compare these individual relationships for monetary versus more primary rewards in future studies.

Also of note are our null findings involving the composite hedonics variable HED. Although other studies have reported negative relationships between striatal activation during reward and anhedonia in control samples, it is possible that we simply did not have enough power and/or our non-clinical population did not have enough variance in hedonic tone to detect this relationship (Dowd & Barch, 2010, 2012).

Limitations and Future Directions

Although we observed results that were largely consistent with other CGG studies, interpretation of results that differed from other monetary studies would be strengthened by future within-subject studies designed to directly compare responses to candy and monetary incentives. Because we were interested in designing a paradigm appropriate for use across a wide developmental spectrum, we have chosen to use small amounts of candy delivered post-scan as an incentive. While we believe that this paradigm has promise for developmental applications, it is by no means the only option and is not entirely free of potential developmental confounds. Studies utilizing and directly comparing responses to other incentive types (ex: food odors, liquid rewards, and even social rewards) and structures (ex: token economies) while perhaps more difficult to implement for developmental questions, are certainly warranted to empirically evaluate which methods best designed to address developmental incentive processing questions.

We have chosen to focus our individual difference analyses on self-report measures of reward/punishment sensitivity, but there may be interesting individual differences within task behavior that we have not investigated that may influence group level task responses. For example, interesting individual differences are likely to exist in how the neutral conditioned is interpreted (positively, successfully avoiding loss, negatively, failing to obtain a gain, or maybe a combination of the two depending on what feedback has recently occurred). Also, although this task is explicitly designed to elicit responses to gain/loss independent of any ongoing learning, it is possible that some individuals did try and adjust their behavior in an organized attempt to obtain more gains. Studies with larger and more diverse samples would be better designed to investigate these questions.

Future studies are also needed to determine the influence of timing of reward delivery (in-scanner versus post-scan) on incentive processing. In-scanner ratings of hedonic and/or affective response to the different feedback types/amounts would also have strengthened our interpretations and ensured that participants were actively engaged in the task over the course of the entire experiment. Thus, our results are an important first step in establishing methods for delivering primary rewards in a manner congruent to traditional monetary studies, validation in larger, more diverse samples are needed both for our individual difference and valence effects.

Conclusions

We aimed to create a modified version of the CGG that would both be appropriate for developmental populations and allow for more direct comparison with secondary reward

paradigms. As hypothesized, we observed differential activity to gain and loss feedback in the striatum, amygdala, and OFC. Unlike other monetary CGG studies, a posterior OFC region displayed valence dependent activation in our task. This finding potentially supports an anterior/posterior distinction in OFC response to abstract/primary rewards, however poor anterior OFC signal quality could also explain these null results. Overall our results show strong continuity with previous studies using both primary and secondary rewards and provide an important baseline for use of this paradigm with child and other special populations.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Funding for this work was provided by NIH grants MH097335-01, MH090786, and MH64769. We would like to thank the MR staff at the Center for Clinical Imaging Research at Washington University, the members of the Cognitive Control and Psychopathology Laboratory, and the participants in this study.

References

- Achenbach, TM.; Rescorla, LA. Manual for the ASEBA Adult Forms & Profiles. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families; 2003.
- Anderson AK, Christoff K, Stappen I, Panitz D, Ghahremani DG, Glover G, Sobel N. Dissociated neural representations of intensity and valence in human olfaction. *Nat Neurosci.* 2003; 6(2):196–202. [PubMed: 12536208]
- Bandettini PA, Jesmanowicz A, Wong EC, Hyde JS. Processing strategies for time-course data sets in functional MRI of the human brain. *Magn Reson Med.* 1993; 30(2):161–173. [PubMed: 8366797]
- Barch DM, Dowd EC. Goal representations and motivational drive in schizophrenia: the role of prefrontal-striatal interactions. *Schizophr Bull.* 2010; 36(5):919–934.10.1093/schbul/sbq068 [PubMed: 20566491]
- Barnes KA, Cohen AL, Power JD, Nelson SM, Dosenbach YB, Miezin FM, Schlaggar BL. Identifying Basal Ganglia divisions in individuals using resting-state functional connectivity MRI. *Front Syst Neurosci.* 2010; 4:18. [PubMed: 20589235]
- Beck, ATSR.; Brown, GK. Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory—II. San Antonio, Texas: Psychological Corporation; 1996.
- Beck SM, Locke HS, Savine AC, Jimura K, Braver TS. Primary and secondary rewards differentially modulate neural activity dynamics during working memory. [Clinical Trial Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural]. *PLoS One.* 2010; 5(2):e9251. [PubMed: 20169080]
- Bjork JM, Knutson B, Fong GW, Caggiano DM, Bennett SM, Hommer DW. Incentive-elicited brain activation in adolescents: similarities and differences from young adults. *J Neurosci.* 2004; 24(8):1793–1802. [PubMed: 14985419]
- Bjork JM, Smith AR, Hommer DW. Striatal sensitivity to reward deliveries and omissions in substance dependent patients. *Neuroimage.* 2008; 42(4):1609–1621. [PubMed: 18672069]
- Boynton GM, Engel SA, Glover GH, Heeger DJ. Linear systems analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging in human V1. *J Neurosci.* 1996; 16(13):4207–4221. [PubMed: 8753882]
- Breiter HC, Aharon I, Kahneman D, Dale A, Shizgal P. Functional imaging of neural responses to expectancy and experience of monetary gains and losses. *Neuron.* 2001; 30(2):619–639. [PubMed: 11395019]
- Camara E, Rodriguez-Fornells A, Munte TF. Functional connectivity of reward processing in the brain. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2008; 2:19. [PubMed: 19242558]
- Carver CS. Negative affects deriving from the behavioral approach system. [Research Support, U.S. Gov't, P.H.S.]. *Emotion.* 2004; 4(1):3–22.10.1037/1528-3542.4.1.3 [PubMed: 15053723]

- Carver CSWT. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: the BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1994; 67(2):319–333.
- Chapman LJ, Chapman JP, Raulin ML. Scales for physical and social anhedonia. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 1976; 85(4):374–382. [PubMed: 956504]
- Chib VS, Rangel A, Shimojo S, O'Doherty JP. Evidence for a common representation of decision values for dissimilar goods in human ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2009; 29(39): 12315–12320. 29/39/12315 [pii]. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2575-09.2009 [PubMed: 19793990]
- Clithero JA, Reeck C, Carter RM, Smith DV, Huettel SA. Nucleus accumbens mediates relative motivation for rewards in the absence of choice. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2011; 5:87. [PubMed: 21941472]
- Cohen JD, MacWhinney B, Flatt M, Provost J. PsyScope: An interactive graphic system for designing and controlling experiments in the psychology laboratory using Macintosh computers. *Behav Res Methods Instruments Comput*. 1993; 25:257–271.
- Cox KM, Aizenstein HJ, Fiez JA. Striatal outcome processing in healthy aging. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci*. 2008; 8(3):304–317. [PubMed: 18814467]
- Delgado MR, Locke HM, Stenger VA, Fiez JA. Dorsal striatum responses to reward and punishment: effects of valence and magnitude manipulations. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci*. 2003; 3(1):27–38. [PubMed: 12822596]
- Delgado MR, Miller MM, Inati S, Phelps EA. An fMRI study of reward-related probability learning. *Neuroimage*. 2005; 24(3):862–873. [PubMed: 15652321]
- Delgado MR, Nystrom LE, Fissell C, Noll DC, Fiez JA. Tracking the hemodynamic responses to reward and punishment in the striatum. *J Neurophysiol*. 2000; 84(6):3072–3077. [PubMed: 11110834]
- Delgado MR, Stenger VA, Fiez JA. Motivation-dependent responses in the human caudate nucleus. *Cereb Cortex*. 2004; 14(9):1022–1030. [PubMed: 15115748]
- Di Martino A, Scheres A, Margulies DS, Kelly AM, Uddin LQ, Shehzad Z, Milham MP. Functional connectivity of human striatum: a resting state FMRI study. *Cereb Cortex*. 2008; 18(12):2735–2747. [PubMed: 18400794]
- Dowd EC, Barch DM. Anhedonia and emotional experience in schizophrenia: neural and behavioral indicators. [Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural]. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2010; 67(10):902–911. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.10.020 [PubMed: 20004364]
- Dowd EC, Barch DM. Pavlovian reward prediction and receipt in schizophrenia: relationship to anhedonia. [Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural]. *PLoS One*. 2012; 7(5):e35622. 10.1371/journal.pone.0035622 [PubMed: 22574121]
- Elliott R, Friston KJ, Dolan RJ. Dissociable neural responses in human reward systems. *J Neurosci*. 2000; 20(16):6159–6165. [PubMed: 10934265]
- Elliott R, Newman JL, Longe OA, Deakin JF. Differential response patterns in the striatum and orbitofrontal cortex to financial reward in humans: a parametric functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *J Neurosci*. 2003; 23(1):303–307. [PubMed: 12514228]
- Estle SJ, Green L, Myerson J, Holt DD. Discounting of monetary and directly consumable rewards. *Psychol Sci*. 2007; 18(1):58–63. [PubMed: 17362379]
- Forbes EE, Christopher May J, Siegle GJ, Ladouceur CD, Ryan ND, Carter CS, Dahl RE. Reward-related decision-making in pediatric major depressive disorder: an fMRI study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2006; 47(10):1031–1040. [PubMed: 17073982]
- Forbes EE, Ryan ND, Phillips ML, Manuck SB, Worthman CM, Moyles DL, Dahl RE. Healthy adolescents' neural response to reward: associations with puberty, positive affect, and depressive symptoms. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2010; 49(2):162–172. e161–165. [PubMed: 20215938]
- Forman SD, Cohen JD, Fitzgerald M, Eddy WF, Mintun MA, Noll DC. Improved assessment of significant activation in functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI): Use of a cluster-size threshold. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 1995; 33:636–647. [PubMed: 7596267]

- Frank GK, Oberndorfer TA, Simmons AN, Paulus MP, Fudge JL, Yang TT, Kaye WH. Sucrose activates human taste pathways differently from artificial sweetener. *Neuroimage*. 2008; 39(4): 1559–1569. [PubMed: 18096409]
- Friston KJ, Jezzard P, Turner R. The analysis of functional MRI time series. *Human Brain Mapping*. 1994; 1:153–171.
- Galvan A, Hare TA, Davidson M, Spicer J, Glover G, Casey BJ. The role of ventral frontostriatal circuitry in reward-based learning in humans. *J Neurosci*. 2005; 25(38):8650–8656. [PubMed: 16177032]
- Geier CF, Luna B. Developmental effects of incentives on response inhibition. *Child Dev*. 2012; 83(4): 1262–1274. [PubMed: 22540668]
- Gotlib IH, Hamilton JP, Cooney RE, Singh MK, Henry ML, Joormann J. Neural processing of reward and loss in girls at risk for major depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2010; 67(4):380–387. [PubMed: 20368513]
- Haber SN, Knutson B. The reward circuit: linking primate anatomy and human imaging. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010; 35(1):4–26. [PubMed: 19812543]
- Joel D, Niv Y, Ruppin E. Actor-critic models of the basal ganglia: new anatomical and computational perspectives. *Neural Netw*. 2002; 15(4–6):535–547. [PubMed: 12371510]
- Kerr DL, Gusnard DA, Snyder AZ, Raichle ME. Effect of practice on reading performance and brain function. *Neuroreport*. 2004; 15(4):607–610. [PubMed: 15094461]
- Kim H, Shimojo S, O'Doherty JP. Is avoiding an aversive outcome rewarding? Neural substrates of avoidance learning in the human brain. *PLoS Biol*. 2006; 4(8):e233. [PubMed: 16802856]
- Kim H, Shimojo S, O'Doherty JP. Overlapping responses for the expectation of juice and money rewards in human ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *Cereb Cortex*. 2011; 21(4):769–776. [PubMed: 20732900]
- Knutson B, Bhanji JP, Cooney RE, Atlas LY, Gotlib IH. Neural responses to monetary incentives in major depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2008; 63(7):686–692. [PubMed: 17916330]
- Knutson B, Fong GW, Adams CM, Varner JL, Hommer D. Dissociation of reward anticipation and outcome with event-related fMRI. *Neuroreport*. 2001; 12(17):3683–3687. [PubMed: 11726774]
- Knutson B, Fong GW, Bennett SM, Adams CM, Hommer D. A region of mesial prefrontal cortex tracks monetarily rewarding outcomes: characterization with rapid event-related fMRI. *Neuroimage*. 2003; 18(2):263–272. [PubMed: 12595181]
- Knutson B, Westdorp A, Kaiser E, Hommer D. FMRI visualization of brain activity during a monetary incentive delay task. *Neuroimage*. 2000; 12(1):20–27. [PubMed: 10875899]
- Kobayashi M, Takeda M, Hattori N, Fukunaga M, Sasabe T, Inoue N, Watanabe Y. Functional imaging of gustatory perception and imagery: “top-down” processing of gustatory signals. *Neuroimage*. 2004; 23(4):1271–1282. [PubMed: 15589092]
- Kringelbach ML. The human orbitofrontal cortex: linking reward to hedonic experience. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2005; 6(9):691–702. [PubMed: 16136173]
- Kringelbach ML, de Araujo IE, Rolls ET. Taste-related activity in the human dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Neuroimage*. 2004; 21(2):781–788. [PubMed: 14980581]
- Kringelbach ML, O'Doherty J, Rolls ET, Andrews C. Activation of the human orbitofrontal cortex to a liquid food stimulus is correlated with its subjective pleasantness. *Cereb Cortex*. 2003; 13(10): 1064–1071. [PubMed: 12967923]
- Kringelbach ML, Rolls ET. The functional neuroanatomy of the human orbitofrontal cortex: evidence from neuroimaging and neuropsychology. *Prog Neurobiol*. 2004; 72(5):341–372. [PubMed: 15157726]
- Levy DJ, Glimcher PW. Comparing apples and oranges: using reward-specific and reward-general subjective value representation in the brain. [Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural]. *J Neurosci*. 2011; 31(41):14693–14707. [PubMed: 21994386]
- May JC, Delgado MR, Dahl RE, Stenger VA, Ryan ND, Fiez JA, Carter CS. Event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging of reward-related brain circuitry in children and adolescents. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2004; 55(4):359–366. [PubMed: 14960288]
- McAvoy MP, Ollinger JM, Buckner RL. Cluster size thresholds for assessment of significant activation in fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2001; 13:S198.

- Michelon P, Snyder AZ, Buckner RL, McAvoy M, Zacks JM. Neural correlates of incongruous visual information. An event-related fMRI study. *Neuroimage*. 2003; 19(4):1612–1626. [PubMed: 12948716]
- O'Doherty J, Dayan P, Schultz J, Deichmann R, Friston K, Dolan RJ. Dissociable roles of ventral and dorsal striatum in instrumental conditioning. *Science*. 2004; 304(5669):452–454. [PubMed: 15087550]
- O'Doherty J, Kringelbach ML, Rolls ET, Hornak J, Andrews C. Abstract reward and punishment representations in the human orbitofrontal cortex. *Nat Neurosci*. 2001; 4(1):95–102. [PubMed: 11135651]
- O'Doherty J, Rolls ET, Francis S, Bowtell R, McGlone F. Representation of pleasant and aversive taste in the human brain. *J Neurophysiol*. 2001; 85(3):1315–1321. [PubMed: 11248000]
- O'Doherty JP, Deichmann R, Critchley HD, Dolan RJ. Neural responses during anticipation of a primary taste reward. *Neuron*. 2002; 33(5):815–826. [PubMed: 11879657]
- Phelps EA, LeDoux JE. Contributions of the amygdala to emotion processing: from animal models to human behavior. *Neuron*. 2005; 48(2):175–187. [PubMed: 16242399]
- Pizzagalli DA, Jahn AL, O'Shea JP. Toward an objective characterization of an anhedonic phenotype: a signal-detection approach. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2005; 57(4):319–327. [PubMed: 15705346]
- Santesso DL, Dillon DG, Birk JL, Holmes AJ, Goetz E, Bogdan R, Pizzagalli DA. Individual differences in reinforcement learning: behavioral, electrophysiological, and neuroimaging correlates. *Neuroimage*. 2008; 42(2):807–816. [PubMed: 18595740]
- Sescousse G, Redoute J, Dreher JC. The architecture of reward value coding in the human orbitofrontal cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2010; 30(39):13095–13104. [PubMed: 20881127]
- Simon JJ, Walther S, Fiebach CJ, Friederich HC, Stippich C, Weisbrod M, Kaiser S. Neural reward processing is modulated by approach- and avoidance-related personality traits. *Neuroimage*. 2010; 49(2):1868–1874. [PubMed: 19770056]
- Small DM, Gregory MD, Mak YE, Gitelman D, Mesulam MM, Parrish T. Dissociation of neural representation of intensity and affective valuation in human gustation. *Neuron*. 2003; 39(4):701–711. [PubMed: 12925283]
- Snaith RP, Hamilton M, Morley S, Humayan A, Hargreaves D, Trigwell P. A scale for the assessment of hedonic tone the Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1995; 167(1):99–103. [PubMed: 7551619]
- Snyder, AZ. Difference Image Versus Ratio Image Error Function Forms in PET–PET Realignment. In: Myer, R.; Cunningham, VJ.; Bailey, DL.; Jones, T., editors. *Quantification of Brain Function Using PET*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1996.
- Talairach, J.; Tournoux, P. *Co-planar stereotaxic atlas of the human brain..* New York: Thieme; 1988.
- Tricomi E, Delgado MR, McCandliss BD, McClelland JL, Fiez JA. Performance feedback drives caudate activation in a phonological learning task. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2006; 18(6):1029–1043. [PubMed: 16839308]
- Tricomi EM, Delgado MR, Fiez JA. Modulation of caudate activity by action contingency. *Neuron*. 2004; 41(2):281–292. [PubMed: 14741108]
- Tripp G, Alsop B. Sensitivity to reward frequency in boys with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *J Clin Child Psychol*. 1999; 28(3):366–375. [PubMed: 10446686]
- Tversky A, Kahneman D. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*. 1981; 211(4481):453–458. [PubMed: 7455683]
- Valentin VV, O'Doherty JP. Overlapping prediction errors in dorsal striatum during instrumental learning with juice and money reward in the human brain. *J Neurophysiol*. 2009; 102(6):3384–3391. [PubMed: 19793875]
- Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1988; 54(6):1063–1070. [PubMed: 3397865]
- Wilbertz G, van Elst LT, Delgado MR, Maier S, Feige B, Philipsen A, Blechert J. Orbitofrontal reward sensitivity and impulsivity in adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. [Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 60(1):353–361. [PubMed: 22197790]

- Woods RP, Cherry SR, Mazziotta JC. Rapid automated algorithm for aligning and reslicing PET images. *Journal of Computer Assisted Tomography*. 1992; 16:620–633. [PubMed: 1629424]
- Zald DH, Lee JT, Fluegel KW, Pardo JV. Aversive gustatory stimulation activates limbic circuits in humans. *Brain*. 1998; 121(Pt 6):1143–1154. [PubMed: 9648549]

Figure 1. Timing of Card Guessing Game

example of possible feedback types following a "more than 5 guess" Each trial lasted 4-seconds in total. The cue to make guess (?) was displayed for up to 2-seconds. Feedback (including the number on the mystery card, arrow denoting gain/loss or dashes for no gain/loss, and amount of candy exchanged) was presented as soon as a guess was made and lasted for 2 seconds. A fixation cross was presented for any remaining portion of the 4-seconds. Inter-trial intervals (ITIs) lasted 0–14 seconds with random jitter in 2-second increments. If a guess was not made during the 2-second cue to make a guess, a fixation cross was presented for 2 seconds in place of feedback.

Figure 2. Valence by Timepoint Interaction – *A priori* reward mask

ROIs identified as showing a significant valence by timepoint interaction within the *a priori* reward mask.

Red = ROIs with greater activation during gain trials compared to loss trials

Blue = ROI with greater deactivation during loss trials compared to gain trials

Figure 3. Striatal Regions displaying Valence by Timepoint Interaction

Representative timecourses of striatal regions displaying a rostral/caudal distinction in response to neutral feedback. Caudate regions as well as rostral putamen/caudate regions show greater activation following gain feedback compared to neutral and loss feedback. Dorsal and ventral putamen regions display greater activation following gain and neutral feedback compared to loss feedback.

Table 1

Valence by Timepoint Interaction Regions

Talairach Coordinates					
Region of Activation	Laterality	x	y	z	Pattern
Activation					
Lateral Orbitofrontal Cortex BA 47	R	42	26	-9	G>N=L
Insula BA 13	R	35	-5	16	G=N>L
Dorsal Putamen	R	27	-13	10	G=N>L
Dorsal Putamen	R	24	5	9	G=N>L
Dorsal Putamen	L	-26	-13	10	G=N>L
Dorsal Putamen	L	-23	3	11	G=N>L
Putamen/Caudate	L	-17	9	4	G>L
Putamen/Caudate	R	15	9	5	G>L
Ventral Putamen	L	-23	-2	-3	G>L
Ventral Putamen	R	22	-1	-7	G>L
Ventral Putamen	R	30	-13	-4	G>L
Thalamus	L	-8	-8	18	G>L
Amygdala	L	-18	-5	-13	G>L
Caudate Body	L	-15	7	17	G>L
Caudate Body	R	15	12	15	G>L
Caudate Body	L	-6	3	6	G>L
Deactivation					
Hippocampus	L	-26	-17	-11	L>G

Regions displaying an interaction of valence x timepoint within the *a priori* reward mask

Post Hoc analyses detailed in Methods section were performed on each region. Regions in which activation during neutral trials did not significantly differ from activity during either gain or loss trials are noted as showing either G>L or L>G patterns of activity.

BA = Broadmann Area

L = Left; R = Right (in 'Laterality' Column)

G = Gain; N = Neutral; L = Loss

Table 2

Individual Difference Correlations

		Talairach Coordinates		
Region of Activation	Laterality	x	y	z
<u>A) HG-LG Positive Correlation with BIS</u>				
Putamen	R	23	2	8
Clastrum	R	38	−8	8
Putamen	L	−19	1	12
Caudate Body	L	−12	7	8
Insula BA 13	R	39	−4	−3
Insula BA 13	L	−36	9	6
<u>B) LL-NU Positive Correlation with BAS</u>				
Inferior Frontal Gyrus BA 47	R	46	19	−1
Caudate Body	R	11	7	13
<u>C) HL-LL Negative Correlation with BAS</u>				
Putamen	L	−22	−3	9
Caudate Body	R	11	10	11
Inferior Frontal Gyrus BA 47	R	50	18	−1
Putamen	L	−29	1	−2
Caudate Body	L	−14	3	17
Putamen	R	28	−12	9
Clastrum	R	35	−11	0
Putamen	L	−33	−17	0
Putamen	R	24	1	6
Superior Temporal Gyrus BA38	R	37	2	−9
Insula BA13	L	−34	−23	16
Insula BA13	R	41	−3	7
Lateral Globus Pallidus	L	−13	3	4
Clastrum	L	−33	10	3
Putamen	R	21	1	−8
Caudate Body	L	−18	11	12
Clastrum	R	33	8	8
Inferior Frontal Gyrus BA 47	R	50	33	−2
Putamen	R	24	15	−5
<u>D) Overlap between HG-LG with BIS and HL-LL with BAS</u>				
Insula**	R	38	−7	2
Putamen	L	−21	0	10
Putamen	R	23	0	7
Caudate Body	L	−13	5	10

A) Regions displaying a significant correlation between BAS and the difference between low loss and neutral trial activity (LL-NU); B) Regions displaying a significant correlation between BAS and the difference between high loss and low loss trial activity (HL-LL); C) Regions displaying a

significant correlation between BIS and the difference between high gain and low gain trial activity (HG-LG); D) Regions showing both a negative correlation between HL-LL and BAS along with a positive correlation between HG-LG and BIS.

L = Left, R = Right BA = Broadmann Area HG = High Gain LG = Low Gain NU = Neutral HL = High Loss LL = Low Loss BAS = BAS total score, measure of reward sensitivity from BIS/BAS Scale (behavioral activation/inhibition scale)

BIS = BIS total score, measure of loss sensitivity from BIS/BAS Scale (behavioral activation/inhibition scale)

** = Correlation between High Gain – Low Gain and BIS is non-significant when a within ROI correlation is conducted excluding the participant with the lowest BIS score.