

1 Titel Page

2 **Title:** Altered frontolimbic activity during virtual reality-based contextual fear learning in
3 patients with posttraumatic stress disorder

4 **Authors:** Sebastian Siehl^{1,2*}, Ph.D., Manon Wicking^{1,3}, Ph.D., Sebastian Pohlack¹, Ph.D.,
5 Tobias Winkelmann¹, Ph.D., Francesca Zidda¹, Ph.D., Frauke Steiger-White¹, Ph.D., Frauke
6 Nees^{1,2+}, Ph.D. & Herta Flor^{1,4+}, Ph.D.,

7 ¹Institute of Cognitive and Clinical Neuroscience, Central Institute of Mental Health, Medical Faculty Mannheim,
8 Ruprecht-Karls-University Heidelberg, Mannheim, Germany; ² Institute of Medical Psychology and Medical
9 Sociology, University Medical Center Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel University, Kiel, Germany; ³Department of Pain
10 Medicine, BG University Hospital Bergmannsheil GmbH, Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany; ⁴Department of
11 Psychology, School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

12

13 **Author Note:** All authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any
14 commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
15 The datasets and scripts for analyses are made available online. Readers seeking further
16 information are welcome to contact the corresponding author.

17 ***Corresponding author:** Sebastian Siehl, Ph.D., Institute of Cognitive and Clinical
18 Neuroscience, Central Institute of Mental Health, J5, 68159 Mannheim, Germany, Phone +49-
19 621-1703-6317, Fax +49-621-1703-6305, e-mail: sebastian.siehl@zi-mannheim.de

20 [+shared last authorshipmailto:](mailto:sebastian.siehl@zi-mannheim.de)

21 **Short running title:** Contextual fear learning in PTSD

22

23 **Keywords:** context conditioning, PTSD, trauma, virtual reality, neuroplasticity, predictability

24 Number of pages: 25; Number of tables: 2; figures: 3; Number of words for abstract: 250;

25 Number of words for text: 3.674; Number of words for references: 993

26

27 **Previous Presentation:** Siehl, S. (2021). Structural and functional neuroplasticity in
28 posttraumatic stress disorder: fear learning and context processing. [doctoral thesis, University
29 of Mannheim]. <https://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de>

30 Poster presentation at the Annual Meeting of the *Organization for Human Brain Mapping* in
31 2021, online due to Covid-19 restrictions, 21.06-25.06.2021

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32 **Abstract**

33 **Background:** Deficiency in contextual and enhanced responding in cued fear learning may
34 contribute to the development of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). We examined the
35 responses to aversive Pavlovian conditioning with an unpredictable spatial context as
36 conditioned stimulus compared to a predictable context. We hypothesized that the PTSD group
37 would depict less hippocampal and ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) activation during
38 acquisition and extinction of unpredictable contexts and an overreactive amygdala response in
39 the predictable contexts compared to controls.

40 **Methods:** A novel combined differential cue-context conditioning paradigm was applied using
41 virtual reality with spatial contexts that required configural as well as cue processing. We
42 assessed 20 patients with PTSD, 21 healthy trauma-exposed (TC) and 22 non-trauma-exposed
43 (HC) participants using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), skin conductance
44 responses and self-report measures.

45 **Results:** During fear acquisition patients with PTSD compared to TC showed lower activity in
46 the hippocampi in the unpredictable and higher activity in the amygdalae in the predictable
47 context. During fear extinction, patients compared to TC showed lower brain activity in the
48 vmPFC in the predictable context. There were no significant differences in self-report or skin
49 conductance responses among the groups.

50 **Conclusions:** Our results suggest that patients with PTSD differ in brain activation from
51 controls in regions such as the hippocampus, the amygdala and the vmPFC in the processing of
52 unpredictable and predictable contexts. Deficient encoding of more complex configurations
53 might lead to a preponderance of cue-based predictions in PTSD. Exposure-based treatments
54 need to focus on improving predictability of contextual processing and reducing enhanced cue
55 reactivity.

56 **Introduction**

57 Studies of fear learning, using pavlovian conditioning (Pavlov, 1927), have greatly advanced
58 our understanding of the psychobiological mechanisms of posttraumatic stress disorder
59 (PTSD), which is characterized by symptoms like re-experiencing, avoidance, hyperarousal and
60 alterations in mood and cognition (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). In pavlovian fear
61 conditioning, an originally neutral cue or context is paired with a biologically relevant stimulus
62 (unconditioned stimulus (US)), to become a conditioned stimulus (CS, cue or context). This CS
63 can then elicit a conditioned response that is similar to the response to the unconditioned
64 response (UR), without the US being present. This association between the US and the CS is
65 learned during fear acquisition and can be overwritten during fear extinction. Deficient context
66 learning has been at the center of recent psychobiological models of posttraumatic stress
67 disorder (PTSD; Liberzon & Abelson, 2016; Maren et al., 2013; Shalev et al., 2017) and has
68 been associated with typical PTSD symptoms (Shalev et al., 2017). Spatial contexts have most
69 often been examined in contextual learning and it has been proposed that patients with PTSD
70 may not be able to sufficiently discriminate safe from dangerous contexts and thus maintain a
71 fear response even in safe contexts (Acheson et al., 2012; Flor & Wessa, 2010). Deficient
72 context learning has been associated with lower functional activity in the hippocampus and
73 ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC; Acheson et al., 2012; Garfinkel et al., 2014; Pitman et
74 al., 2012). In addition, enhanced learning of trauma-related cues has been observed in patients
75 with PTSD, which was associated with higher functional activity in the amygdala (Garfinkel et
76 al., 2014; Pitman et al., 2012). A variety of study protocols were developed to investigate
77 context conditioning (Lonsdorf et al., 2017) using virtual reality in human subjects (Glenn et
78 al., 2017; Kroes et al., 2017). Two factors that are conducive to an environment being perceived
79 as a context are its longer representation time and its higher complexity compared to single cues
80 (Lonsdorf et al., 2017). The larger the time frame, in which a US can occur, the larger the

81 unpredictability and the higher the levels of anxiety (Indovina et al., 2011; Schmitz & Grillon,
82 2012). With the US being presented within a longer presentation phase of a given context it
83 cannot be directly associated with an object within the context, which is why contexts are
84 usually considered to be unpredictable of the US. However, a given context might be
85 recognizable by a single cue, such as a table, which is present in one but not in a second context.
86 Previous context conditioning studies have shown that patients with PTSD show difficulties in
87 contextual fear acquisition, but improve when cues are added to predict if a context is dangerous
88 or safe (Steiger et al., 2015). Furthermore, patients with PTSD show reduced capacity to use
89 context information to regulate fear responses (Garfinkel et al., 2014) during fear extinction
90 (Rougemont-Bücking et al., 2011), memory of the extinction (extinction recall; Milad et al.,
91 2009) and when the already extinguished fear is returning (fear renewal; Wicking et al., 2016).
92 Here, contexts were defined as steady images of an office (Garfinkel et al., 2014; Rougemont-
93 Bücking et al., 2011) or virtual reality scenes of different rooms (Wicking et al., 2016), in which
94 contexts could be distinguished by retrieving a single object from the environments, making it
95 a predictable context. In configural learning (Acheson et al., 2012; Rudy et al., 2004; Rudy &
96 O'Reilly, 1999), multiple objects that are associated to each other form a conjunctive
97 representation of a context. Acheson et al. (2012) hypothesized that lower hippocampal activity
98 leads to an inability of configural-based learning in patients with PTSD. Instead, cue-based
99 associations will be formed, in which a single cue is assumed to predict the occurrence of the
100 US, independent of its predictability or the complexity of the surrounding information (Acheson
101 et al., 2012; Lonsdorf et al., 2017). Each individual cue is then potentially able to elicit a fear
102 response across contexts, with the amygdala being more active (Phillips & Ledoux, 1992),
103 independent of the context being safe or dangerous.

104 The aim of our study was to compare an unpredictable context based on configural learning
105 with a predictable context, in which a single cue predicted the occurrence of a US within a

106 context in patients with PTSD and trauma-naïve and trauma-experienced controls. To this end
107 we developed a new VR-based, combined cue-context conditioning paradigm. This new
108 approach defined contexts via a configural learning approach, in which the configuration of
109 furniture in a room defined a particular context. Participants were presented with unpredictable
110 and predictable contexts as CS during fear acquisition and extinction. We hypothesized that
111 patients with PTSD in comparison to HC and TC subjects would a) show lower BOLD activity
112 in the hippocampi and vmPFCs, b) show lower skin conductance response c) and report higher
113 arousal, valence and contingency ratings during acquisition of the unpredictable context. In the
114 predictable context, we expected higher BOLD activity in the amygdalae in patients with PTSD
115 in comparison to TC and HC subjects. During contextual fear extinction, we hypothesized
116 higher BOLD activity in the amygdalae and lower activity in the vmPFCs for patients with
117 PTSD in comparison to both control groups in both contexts.

118

119 **Methods and Materials**

120 **2.1 Participants**

121 Twenty patients suffering from PTSD, 21 age- and sex matched TC and 22 HC subjects
122 participated in this study (*Table 1*; for details on recruitment and inclusion criteria see *Suppl.*
123 *methods*). The study was carried out in accordance with the Code of Ethics of the World
124 Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki, 2013) and was approved by the Ethical Review
125 Board of the Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University. All participants gave written
126 informed consent.

127 **2.2 Procedure and study design**

128 The study consisted of two assessments on two consecutive days, each lasting for approximately
129 five hours. On the first day, participants completed questionnaires and clinical assessments on
130 PTSD and participated in the Structured Clinical Interviews (SCID I+II; Fydrich et al., 1997;
131 Wittchen et al., 1997). During the first experimental phase participants completed a training-
132 and habituation phase outside the Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) scanner, while sitting in
133 front of a computer screen with a head mounted display (HMD). Participants then determined
134 the intensity of the painful stimulus that served as US (*Suppl. methods*) before completing the
135 context and cue acquisition phases inside the MRI scanner. On the second day, participants took
136 part in the context and cue extinction phases inside the MRI scanner. This was followed by a
137 final testing phase including cognitive and neuropsychological assessments.

138 **2.3 Stimuli and experimental procedure**

139 During the experimental phase, participants were passively navigated through virtual contexts
140 (living rooms) on a parabola shaped trajectory with a constant slow-paced walking speed of
141 0.45 km/h and an egocentric viewpoint (*Figure 1*). A total of four different contexts and two

142 different cues (CS+, CS-, coloured squares) were presented during acquisition and extinction
143 (*Figure 1* and see *Suppl. Methods*) in a differential conditioning paradigm, where the CS+
144 signaled the US and the CS- its absence. The US was a painful stimulus. In one context the cue
145 did not predict the US (unpredictable [unpred]), in the other context a cue reliably predicted the
146 US (predictable [pred]). There were two additional contexts with different configuration of the
147 furniture in which no painful stimulus occurred [safe]. The perspective rotated slightly from
148 right to left and right again, so that each of the four walls of a room was entirely visible at least
149 once. The virtual contexts consisted of several objects (bookshelves, chest of drawers, floor
150 lamp, potted plant, racks, seating corner, television, *Figure 1*) and were built using an online
151 software toolbox Open-Source Graphics Rendering Engine (OGRE; <http://ogre3d.org>) and the
152 support of a software company (Glodeck Software GmbH) using Visual Studio Professional
153 (2010, Redmond, WA, USA). The arrangement of the objects differed for each context but the
154 objects were identical, thus forcing configural processing for context differentiation. Two
155 colored CS+/- squares were presented on the walls of each context in a counterbalanced
156 fashion.

157 **2.4 Statistical analysis**

158 All statistical analyses were performed in R-Statistics (Team, 2013). Data were assessed for
159 outliers, normal distribution, homoscedasticity and multicollinearity. All assumptions were
160 met, if not mentioned otherwise below. Demographic and clinical data as well as self reports
161 and SCRs were analyzed with analyses of variance (ANOVAs) or independent t-tests in case
162 of two sample comparisons (e.g. trauma characteristics). Chi-square tests were performed to
163 assess statistical differences in frequency distributions (e.g. gender). For the ROI analyses we
164 performed ANOVAs including the factors group (PTSD, TC, HC) x context (unpred, pred) x
165 hemisphere (left, right) separately for the ACQ and EXT phase as well as brain region
166 (hippocampus, amygdala, vmPFC). Based on our a priori hypotheses, we only compared the

167 functional activity within the above mentioned ROIs and in the contexts, in which a painful
168 stimulus occurred (unpred, pred). We applied Bonferroni corrections to counteract Type 1
169 errors due to multiple comparisons. We further applied Tukey's honestly significant difference
170 (Tukey's HSD) test as post-hoc single-step comparison procedure. There were few cases of
171 missing data, motion artefacts or outliers (see *Results*).

172 The *supplementary methods* include information about participants, stimuli and
173 experimental procedure, skin conductance responses (SCR), clinical and neuropsychological
174 assessments, self-reports, MRI data acquisition and analysis, manipulation check and statistical
175 analysis.

176 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample.

			Groups										Analysis							
			PTSD [N=20]				TC [N=21]				HC [N=22]				X^2	F	T	Df	p	
			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)						
Demographic data																				
Gender (female)					10	50.0			9	42.9			11	50.0	0.29			2	.87	
Age (in years)			45.4	11.3	20		40.9	12.4	21		40.6	11.2	22			1.09		2	.34	
Education	<=12 years				12	60.0			6	28.6			4	18.2	9.67			2	.008**	
	>12 years				7	35.0			15	71.4			18	81.8					Post-hoc: .015; PTSD≠TC+HC	
Handedness	Right/Left/Both				13/5/2					15/3/3					16/4/2		1.03		4	.91
Intelligence quotients	KAI		102.6	12.1	17		114.1	14.8	21		110.0	16.3	21			2.92		2	.062	
	CFT		114.7	20.1	18		120.9	10.3	21		118.5	10.9	21			0.94		2	.40	
Trauma characteristics																				
Time since trauma (in years)			9.2	7.3	15		14.6	9.3	14								1.75	24.7	.09	
Type of traumatic event (index trauma)	Caused voluntarily	Total (caused voluntarily)			11	55.0			9	42.9					0.61			1	.44	
		(1) Imprisonment			0				0											
		(2) Physical violence			3				1											
		(3) Sexual abuse			3				2											
		(4) Rape			0				3											
		(5) Wartime experience			3				0											
		(6) Witness of sudden death/ serious injury of so.			2				1											
		(7) Other experiences			0				2											
	Caused involuntarily	Total (caused involuntarily)			9	45.0			12	57.1										
		(1) Natural disaster			0				1											
		(2) Fire or explosion			0				0											
		(3) Accident			9				7											
		(4) Sudden death of so.			0				4											
		(5) Other experiences			0				0											

	Groups									Analyses											
	PTSD [N=20]			TC [N=21]			HC [N=22]			X^2	F	T	Df	p	Cont. Diff.	CI [-95%; +95%]	p_{Tukey}	Hedges' g			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)									
Trauma assessment																					
CAPS Combined	61.3	19.0	20		12.0	15.7	21							9.02	36.9	<.001					
CAPS Severity	30.2	10.3	20		7.4	9.9	21							7.20	37.9	<.001					
CAPS Frequency	31.1	9.9	20		5.0	7.3	21							9.56	35.1	<.001					
CTQ	47.5	17.3	19		41.0	12.9	21		36.3	11.7	22		3.27		2	.045	T-H	4.7	-5.6; 0.7;	.52	0.38
																	P-H	11.2	21.8; -4.1;	.035	0.77
																	P-T	6.5	17.2	.31	0.43
Comorbidities																					
Other Axis I disorders	Yes/No		13/7			6/15				0/22			21.05		2	<.001					
Other Axis II disorders	Yes/No		6/14			0/22				0/22			14.26		2	<.001					
ADS	25.5	10.6	19		13.7	11.3	21		5.77	4.34	22		23.58		2	<.001	T-H	7.9	1.2; 12.8;	.018	0.94
																	P-H	19.7	26.6; 4.8;	<.001	2.51
																	P-T	11.8	18.8	<.001	1.08
STAI-T	52.5	11.5	19		40.4	12.3	21		31.3	7.7	22		20.28		2	<.001	T-H	9.1	1.3; 16.9	.019	0.89
																	P-H	21.2	13.2; 29.2	<.001	2.17
																	P-T	12.1	4.0; 20.2	.002	0.99
Medication	Total (yes)		3	15.0		4	19.0			1	4.6	2.18			2	.34					
	Psychopharmacological ¹		1			2				0											
	Non-Psychopharmacological ²		2			2				1											
	Total (no)		17	85.0		17	71.4			21	95.4										

178 [Abbreviations: ADS – Allgemeine Depressionsskala [German version of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CESD)]; CAPS – Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale; CFT – Culture Fair
179 Intelligence Test; CTQ – Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HC – Group of healthy control subjects, who never experienced trauma in their lives; KAI – Kurztest für allgemeine Basisgrößen der
180 Informationsverarbeitung [Short Test for General Factors of Information Processing]; STAI-T – State-Trait Anxiety Inventory – Trait Anxiety; TC – Group of trauma control subjects, who at least experienced one
181 traumatic event but did not fulfill the criteria for PTSD; ¹Psychopharmacological medication: Pregabalin; Quetiapine; Tetrahydrocannabinol; ²Non-Psychopharmacological medication: Contraceptive pill;
182 Levothyroxine; Mesalazine; Prednisolone]

183 **3 Results**

184 **3.1 Sample characteristics**

185 The experimental groups did not significantly differ in any of the demographic variables except
186 for education ($X^2(2, 62) = 9.67, p = .008$). Patients with PTSD had a significantly lower level
187 of education than the TC and HC group ($p = .015$; *Table 1*). All detailed information on
188 demographic data, trauma severity, PTSD assessment and comorbidities can be found in *Table*
189 *1* and the *Suppl. Results*. In addition, we describe more detailed results on personality traits and
190 neuropsychological assessment in *Suppl. Table 1* and in the *Suppl. Results*. There was no
191 significant difference between the experimental groups on any of the debriefing questions
192 concerning the difficulty of the study (*Suppl. Table 2, Suppl. Results*).

193 **3.2 Functional magnetic resonance imaging**

194 During acquisition, there was a significant interaction of group x context ($F_{group \times context}(2,$
195 $47) = 3.42, p = .04$) in the hippocampus with significantly higher beta values in HCs than
196 patients with PTSD in the unpredictable context ($p_{adj.} = .035$). In addition, HCs had significantly
197 higher beta values in the hippocampus during the unpredictable in comparison to the predictable
198 context ($p_{adj.} = .0001$). For the interaction group x context ($F_{group \times context}(2, 47) = 3.42, p = .04$)
199 in the amygdala a post-hoc t-test revealed a significantly higher beta value in the predictable
200 context in HCs than in patients with PTSD ($p_{adj.} = .006$) and HCs in comparison to TCs ($p_{adj.} =$
201 $.02$). Furthermore, HCs had significantly higher beta values in the unpredictable in comparison
202 to the predictable context ($p_{adj.} = .003$). There was no other significant main effect or interaction
203 during acquisition (*Figure 2; Table 2a*).

204 **Table 2a.** Extracted beta values for Region-of-Interest (ROI) analyses on the Hippocampi, Amygdalae and vmPFC for context unpredictable
 205 (unpred) and context predictable (pred) during acquisition and for each group (HC, PTSD, TC).

phase	ROI	Context	He m.	group									analysis
				PTSD			TC			HC			
				M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	
ACQ	Hippocampus	Unpred	left	-0.152	0.67	17	0.015	0.43	18	0.208	0.59	15	group: $F(2, 47) = 0.21, p = .81$ context: $F(1, 47) = 1.87, p = .18$ hemisphere: $F(1, 47) = 3.73, p = .06$ groupXcontext: $F(2, 47) = 3.42, p = .04$ groupXhem.: $F(2, 47) = 0.22, p = .81$ contextXhem.: $F(1, 47) = 0.74, p = .40$ groupXcontextXhem.: $F(2, 47) = 0.16, p = .85$ Tukey HSD: unpred: HC>PTSD, $p_{adj} = .035$ HC: unpred>pred, $p_{adj} = .0001$
			right	-0.009	0.70	17	0.102	0.41	18	0.325	0.45	15	
		Pred	left	0.037	0.04	17	0.036	0.59	18	-0.279	0.42	15	
			right	0.031	0.51	17	0.043	0.57	18	-0.176	0.38	15	
	Amygdala	Unpred	left	-0.205	1.04	17	-0.014	0.96	17	0.14	1.11	16	
			right	-0.032	0.80	17	-0.176	0.65	17	0.16	0.77	16	
		pred	left	0.022	0.79	17	0.072	1.16	17	-0.60	0.67	16	
			right	0.174	0.44	17	-0.024	0.66	17	-0.38	0.63	16	
vmPFC	unpred	left	-0.284	0.51	17	-0.191	0.33	17	-0.070	0.44	16		
		right	-0.160	0.41	17	-0.167	0.29	17	-0.002	0.44	16		
	pred	left	-0.111	0.39	17	0.039	0.46	17	-0.071	0.37	16		
		right	-0.021	0.48	17	0.023	0.51	17	-0.106	0.32	16		

206

207 **Table 2b.** Extracted beta values for Region-of-Interest (ROI) analyses on the Hippocampi, Amygdalae and vmPFC for context unpredictable
 208 (unpred) and context predictable (pred) during extinction and for each group (HC, PTSD, TC).

phase	ROI	context	side	group									analysis		
				PTSD			TC			HC					
				M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
EXT	Hippocampus	unpred	left	0.178	0.46	17	-0.005	0.40	18	0.131	0.48	16	group: $F(2, 48) = 0.79, p = .46$ context: $F(1, 48) = 0.77, p = .38$ hemisphere: $F(1, 48) = 5.30, p = .03$ groupXcontext: $F(2, 48) = 0.18, p = .83$ groupXhem.: $F(2, 48) = 0.94, p = .40$ contextXhem.: $F(1, 48) = 0.06, p = .81$ groupXcontextXhem.: $F(2, 48) = 0.06, p = .95$		
			right	0.220	0.37	17	0.095	0.48	18	0.168	0.63	16			
		pred	left	0.117	0.51	17	-0.053	0.41	18	-0.013	0.41	16			
			right	0.172	0.65	17	0.095	0.49	18	0.015	0.45	16			
		Amygdala	unpred	left	0.511	0.91	17	0.089	0.76	17	0.133	0.56		16	group: $F(2, 45) = 0.81, p = .45$ context: $F(1, 45) = 0.14, p = .71$ hemisphere: $F(1, 45) = 0.03, p = .86$ groupXcontext: $F(2, 45) = 0.54, p = .59$ groupXhem.: $F(2, 45) = 0.26, p = .78$ contextXhem.: $F(1, 45) = 1.46, p = .23$ groupXcontextXhem.: $F(2, 45) = 0.49, p = .61$
				right	0.289	0.53	17	0.030	0.62	17	0.190	0.48		16	
	pred		left	0.107	0.97	17	0.101	0.78	17	0.128	0.52	16			
			right	0.237	0.66	17	0.195	0.57	17	0.187	0.59	16			
	vmPFC		unpred	left	0.050	0.29	17	-0.136	0.36	17	0.000	0.38		16	
				right	0.012	0.24	17	-0.143	0.37	17	0.028	0.37		16	
		pred	left	-0.010	0.36	17	0.166	0.33	17	-0.070	0.21	16			
			right	-0.045	0.30	17	0.187	0.37	17	-0.127	0.30	16			

Tukey HSD:
pred: TC>HC, $p_{adj} = .001$
pred: TC>PTSD, $p_{adj} = .03$
TC: pred>unpred, $p_{adj} < .001$

209 [Abbreviations: ext – extinction; HC – Healthy control subjects without trauma experience; pred – predictable; PTSD – patients with PTSD; TC – healthy control subjects with trauma experience; unpred –
 210 unpredictable]

211 During extinction, we found a significant interaction of group x context ($F_{group \times context}(2, 46) =$
212 $5.03, p = .01$) in the vmPFC. A post-hoc t-test revealed a significantly higher beta value in TCs
213 than patients with PTSD ($p_{adj.} = .03$) and TCs in comparison to HCs ($p_{adj.} = .001$), both in the
214 predictable context. Furthermore, TCs showed higher beta values in the vmPFC in the
215 predictable than in the unpredictable context ($p_{adj.} < .001$). There was no other significant main
216 effect or interaction during extinction (*Figure 2; Table 2b*).

217

218 3.3 Skin Conductance

219 During acquisition, there was a significant main effect for context in the unpredictable
220 ($F_{context}(1, 36) = 14.55, p < .001$) in comparison to the safe and the predictable ($F_{context}(1, 34) =$
221 $66.07, p < .001$) in comparison to the safe contexts. There was also a main effect of group in
222 the predictable condition ($F_{group}(2, 34) = 5.45, p < .009$) with higher SCRs for participants in
223 the HC group than patients with PTSD or TCs. We did not find a significant main effect of
224 group during the unpredictable context condition, nor any significant interaction of group x
225 context (*Figure 3; Suppl. Table 4a*). Patients with PTSD in comparison to HC and TC subjects
226 showed a similar SCR in the unpredictable context. However, we found a significantly lower
227 SCR in the predictable context for patients with PTSD in comparison to the two healthy control
228 groups during the predictable context.

229 Differences in SCRs between CS+ - CS-. During contextual fear acquisition, we found a
230 significant main effect of group for the mean difference of CS+-CS- in the unpredictable
231 ($F_{group}(2, 36) = 3.93, p = .029$) in comparison to the safe and in the predictable ($F_{context}(1, 34) =$
232 $62.59, p < .001$) in comparison to the safe contexts. Patients with PTSD and TC subjects showed
233 a significantly lower CS+/- differentiation than the HC subjects in the unpredictable contexts.
234 In the predictable contexts, the groups did not significantly differ in their difference scores but

235 showed overall higher scores in the predictable context than in the safe context. There was no
236 other significant main effect or interaction of group x context. During context extinction, we
237 found a significant main effect of context for the mean difference of CS+/CS- ($F_{context}(1, 35) =$
238 $5.47, p = .025$) with lower SCRs in the unpred in comparison to the safe context. There was no
239 other significant main effect of interaction of group x context (*Suppl Figure 3; Suppl. Table*
240 *4b*).

241 **3.4 Self-report**

242 Ratings across contexts. We found significant main effects of phase (HAB, ACQ, EXT),
243 separately across all four contexts (unpred, pred, 2x safe) for the arousal and contingency
244 ratings with the highest scores during acquisition and the lowest scores during extinction. For
245 the valence ratings, we found a significant main effect of phase in the unpredictable context,
246 with higher ratings in the acquisition than in the habituation or extinction phase and a significant
247 group x phase interaction (*Suppl. Figure 2a; Suppl. Table 3b-d*). Patients with PTSD in
248 comparison to HC and TC subjects reported similar arousal, valence and contingency ratings
249 during the unpredictable context. There was no significant difference in the ratings between the
250 groups in the predictable context.

251 Differences in ratings between CS+ and CS-. There were significant main effects of
252 phase during acquisition for ratings of arousal ($F_{phase}(1, 56) = 39.13, p < .001$), valence ($F_{phase}(1,$
253 $56) = 21.54, p < .001$) and contingency ($F_{phase}(1, 56) = 42.89, p < .001$), showing that all three
254 groups successfully learned the differential cue conditioning in the acquisition phase . There
255 were no other significant main effects of phase or group nor any significant interaction of group
256 x phase (*Suppl. Figure 2b; Suppl. Table 3e*).

257

Discussion

The present study investigated differences in functional activity in the hippocampus, amygdala and vmPFC in unpredictable and predictable contextual fear learning in patients with PTSD in comparison to healthy trauma or non-trauma exposed control subjects. During contextual fear acquisition, patients with PTSD showed significantly lower functional brain activity in the hippocampi in the unpredictable context and significantly higher activity in the amygdalae and SCR in the predictable context than HC subjects. In addition, HC subjects displayed a main effect of context, with higher activity in the unpredictable in comparison to the predictable context for the hippocampus and amygdala. During contextual fear extinction, patients with PTSD showed significantly lower activity in the vmPFC in the predictable context than TC subjects. Here, TC subjects had significantly higher activity patterns in the vmPFC in the unpredictable in comparison to the predictable context. There were no significant differences between the groups in the behavioral ratings for the contexts. Learning about the predictability of an aversive stimulus within a given context and overwriting what one has learned during extinction are key mechanisms of associative learning. In this novel VR-based combined context-cue conditioning paradigm, we show that both context and cue in context conditioning are altered in patients with PTSD.

During contextual fear acquisition, we showed that patients with PTSD display lower functional brain activity in the hippocampi in the unpredictable and higher functional brain activity in the amygdalae in the predictable context. This fits well with findings that the hippocampi are involved in contextual fear acquisition of complex environments (Maren et al., 2013) and that difficulties in contextual fear acquisition in patients with PTSD might be associated with difficulties in configural learning, which was required in our study (Acheson et al., 2012). The amygdala in contrast has been associated to cued processing (Maren et al., 2013; Rudy, 2009) and is well established as a region of interest in PTSD within a larger brain network

processing salience and threat (Shalev et al., 2017). Previous studies have shown that behavioural and psychophysiological responses as well as functional brain activity during contextual fear learning often show a contrasting picture (Baeuchl et al., 2015; Steiger et al., 2015; Wicking et al., 2016). In line with these findings, we did not observe any differences in behavioural valence, arousal or contingency ratings between the experimental groups, neither during acquisition nor extinction. We showed significantly lower SCRs in patients with PTSD in comparison to both healthy control groups as a response to the predictable context. This is in line with findings in cue-only conditioning studies reporting higher amygdala activity in patients with PTSD suggesting increased threat detection with lower peripheral psychophysiological reactions. In line with this, we did not find a significant correlation between amygdala activity and SCRs. This might be interpreted in a way that higher amygdalae activity in patients suggests that some information about the threat is learned and increases the predictability the cue, which might minimize the peri-physiological response. Our study highlights that it is essential to distinguish the predictive power of the occurrence of an aversive stimulus in a given context and whether a threat can be predicted by a single cue or only by a more complex configuration of objects (e.g. furniture). Furthermore, operationalizing context learning via a configural learning approach facilitates to overserve cue and context related responses in the same environment.

During contextual fear extinction, we showed higher functional brain activity in the vmPFC in TC subjects in comparison to patients with PTSD and HC subjects. The vmPFC is commonly found to be engaged during fear extinction (Lang et al., 2009; Maren et al., 2013), and has been repeatedly associated with the inhibition of fear responses. Difficulties in contextual fear extinction and extinction recall in PTSD have been associated with lower functional activity in the vmPFC (Glenn et al., 2017; Wicking et al., 2016), which is also related to structural white and gray matter reduction in the vmPFC (Siehl et al., 2018, 2020). While

some studies do report hippocampal involvement during contextual fear extinction (Milad et al., 2007) or contextual retrieval (Maren et al., 2013), the findings in the literature do not yield a consistent picture. We suggest that one common factor between contextual fear acquisition and extinction might be the difference in functional brain activation between unpredictable and predictable contexts in healthy control subjects but not in patients with PTSD. Our findings are in line with recent models examining PTSD in a predictive-coding framework (Seriès, 2019). Forming accurate predictions about the safety of one's environment is necessary for the ability to plan actions and interpret bodily sensations. If uncertainty about the danger of safety of the surrounding environment is high, due to difficulties in forming a stable mental representation of the context through configural learning, the prediction may favor safety. High levels of anxiety might be the consequence for patients with PTSD, preparing for a potential danger and paying a metabolic price for a contextual prediction that fails to be updated. Future studies will have to further assess the role of building (via configural learning) a mental representation of a context in contrast to elemental contextual learning as two important factors for predictability in contextual fear learning.

4.2 Limitations

Two main limitations apply to our study. Whereas the complexity of the design allows for the simultaneous examination of context- and cue-related triggers and their interaction, the design limits the choice of where to select the context triggers in each environment. To minimize overlapping, or additive effects in SCR or BOLD activity, the triggers had to be far enough apart from each other. This, however, extended each trial to 50 secs, which in turn limited our total number of trials per given condition to eight. With this rather low number of trials, each missing data point became a potential dropout. The interdependence of the triggers in the unpredictable context was also a problem. Here, almost each trial represented a unique composition of positions for the CSs, US and context triggers. A fear response in a given context

is most likely not limited to a single predictive cue or multiple contextual features but might also generalize to objects being non-predictive to the occurrence of the aversive stimulus. This is, however, a problem in many studies and not limited to our study (Lonsdorf et al., 2017) and the presented results have to be interpreted within the boundaries of the study design. A second limitation concerns a rather high number of potential non-responders in the SCR assessment. The SCR was measured on the foot, instead of the hand of participants, because participants received the painful stimulus on the left hand and responded with the response pad on the right hand. The signal on the foot might not have been strong enough. A potential solution could be to measure SCR on the shoulder instead (van Dooren et al., 2012).

4.3 Conclusions

In this cross-sectional study, we show that patients with PTSD when compared to TC and HC subjects display lower hippocampal activation in unpredictable and higher amygdala activity in predictable contextual fear acquisition as well as lower activity in the vmPFC during extinction of predictable contexts. Our results support the model that patients with PTSD show deficiencies in configural learning, while being more sensitive to cue-based learning and highlight the importance of predictability of fear in contextual learning. Trauma-focused exposure-based treatments might benefit from increasing predictability during the integration of contextual features within traumatic memories during exposure.

Disclosures: The authors report no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Acknowledgements: We thank Birgül Sarun and Claudia Stief for help in data acquisition and Michaela Ruttorf for advice regarding data analysis. This work was supported by a grant of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB636/C1 to H.F).

References

- Acheson, D. T., Gresack, J. E., & Risbrough, V. B. (2012). Hippocampal dysfunction effects on context memory: Possible etiology for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Neuropharmacology*, *62*(2), 674–685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2011.04.029>
- Association, A. P. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)*. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-JivBAAQAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT18&ots=ceWN38MGuf&sig=q8BURwt8Ea6iDopGxU10bmEtgFA>
- Baeuchl, C., Meyer, P., Hoppstädter, M., Diener, C., & Flor, H. (2015). Contextual fear conditioning in humans using feature-identical contexts. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *121*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2015.03.001>
- Flor, H., & Wessa, M. (2010). Memory and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology*, *218*(2), 61–63. <https://doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409/a000012>
- Fydrich, T., Renneberg, B., Schmitz, B., & Wittchen, H. (1997). Strukturiertes Klinisches Interview für DSM-IV Achse II: Persönlichkeitsstörungen (SKID-II) [Structured clinical interview for DSM-IV. Axis II: Personality disorders]. In *Göttingen: Hogrefe*.
- Garfinkel, S. N., Abelson, J. L., King, A. P., Sripada, R. K., Wang, X., Gaines, L. M., & Liberzon, I. (2014). Impaired Contextual Modulation of Memories in PTSD: An fMRI and Psychophysiological Study of Extinction Retention and Fear Renewal. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(40), 13435–13443. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4287-13.2014>
- Garfinkel, Sarah N., Abelson, J. L., King, A. P., Sripada, R. K., Wang, X., Gaines, L. M., & Liberzon, I. (2014). Impaired Contextual Modulation of Memories in PTSD: An fMRI and Psychophysiological Study of Extinction Retention and Fear Renewal. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(40), 13435–13443. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4287-13.2014>
- Glenn, D. E., Risbrough, V. B., Simmons, A. N., Acheson, D. T., & Stout, D. M. (2017). *The Future of Contextual Fear Learning for PTSD Research: A Methodological Review of Neuroimaging Studies* (pp. 207–228). https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2017_30
- Indovina, I., Robbins, T. W., Núñez-Elizalde, A. O., Dunn, B. D., & Bishop, S. J. (2011). Fear-Conditioning Mechanisms Associated with Trait Vulnerability to Anxiety in Humans. *Neuron*, *69*(3), 563–571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.12.034>
- Kroes, M. C. W., Dunsmoor, J. E., Mackey, W. E., McClay, M., & Phelps, E. A. (2017). Context conditioning in humans using commercially available immersive Virtual Reality. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 8640. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-08184-7>
- Lang, S., Kroll, A., Lipinski, S. J., Wessa, M., Ridder, S., Christmann, C., Schad, L. R., & Flor, H. (2009). Context conditioning and extinction in humans: Differential contribution of the hippocampus, amygdala and prefrontal cortex. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*(4), 823–832. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2009.06624.x>
- Liberzon, I., & Abelson, J. L. (2016). Context Processing and the Neurobiology of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. *Neuron*, *92*(1), 14–30.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.039>

- Lonsdorf, T. B., Menz, M. M., Andreatta, M., Fullana, M. A., Golkar, A., Haaker, J., Heitland, I., Hermann, A., Kuhn, M., Kruse, O., Meir Drexler, S., Meulders, A., Nees, F., Pittig, A., Richter, J., Römer, S., Shiban, Y., Schmitz, A., Straube, B., ... Merz, C. J. (2017). Don't fear 'fear conditioning': Methodological considerations for the design and analysis of studies on human fear acquisition, extinction, and return of fear. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *77*, 247–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.02.026>
- Maren, S., Phan, K. L., & Liberzon, I. (2013). The contextual brain: implications for fear conditioning, extinction and psychopathology. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *14*(6), 417–428. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3492>
- Milad, M. R., Pitman, R. K., Ellis, C. B., Gold, A. L., Shin, L. M., Lasko, N. B., Zeidan, M. a, Handwerker, K., Orr, S. P., & Rauch, S. L. (2009). Neurobiological Basis of Failure to Recall Extinction Memory in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, *66*(12), 1075–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.06.026>
- Milad, M. R., Wright, C. I., Orr, S. P., Pitman, R. K., Quirk, G. J., & Rauch, S. L. (2007). Recall of Fear Extinction in Humans Activates the Ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex and Hippocampus in Concert. *Biological Psychiatry*, *62*(5), 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.10.011>
- Pavlov, I. (1927). *Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex*. <https://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Pavlov/lecture19.htm>
- Phillips, R. G., & Ledoux, J. E. (1992). *Differential Contribution of Amygdala and Hippocampus to Cued and Contextual Fear Conditioning*. *106*(2), 274–285.
- Pitman, R. K., Rasmusson, A. M., Koenen, K. C., Shin, L. M., Orr, S. P., Gilbertson, M. W., Milad, M. R., & Liberzon, I. (2012). Biological studies of post-traumatic stress disorder. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *13*(11), 769–787. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3339>
- Rougemont-Bücking, A., Linnman, C., Zeffiro, T. A., Zeidan, M. A., Lebron-Milad, K., Rodriguez-Romaguera, J., Rauch, S. L., Pitman, R. K., & Milad, M. R. (2011). Altered Processing of Contextual Information during Fear Extinction in PTSD: An fMRI Study. *CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics*, *17*(4), 227–236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-5949.2010.00152.x>
- Rudy, J.W., Huff, N. C., & Matus-Amat, P. (2004). Understanding contextual fear conditioning: insights from a two-process model. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *28*(7), 675–685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.09.004>
- Rudy, Jerry W. (2009). Context representations, context functions, and the parahippocampal-hippocampal system. *Learning & Memory (Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.)*, *16*(10), 573–585. <https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.1494409>
- Rudy, Jerry W, & O'Reilly, R. C. (1999). Contextual fear conditioning, conjunctive representations, pattern completion, and the hippocampus. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *113*(5), 867–880. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.113.5.867>

- Schmitz, A., & Grillon, C. (2012). Assessing fear and anxiety in humans using the threat of predictable and unpredictable aversive events (the NPU-threat test). *Nature Protocols*, 7(3), 527–532. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2012.001>
- Seriès, P. (2019). Post-traumatic stress disorder as a disorder of prediction. *Nature Neuroscience*, 22(3), 334–336. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-019-0345-z>
- Shalev, A., Liberzon, I., & Marmar, C. (2017). Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 376(25), 2459–2469. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1612499>
- Siehl, S., King, J. A., Burgess, N., Flor, H., & Nees, F. (2018). Structural white matter changes in adults and children with posttraumatic stress disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 19(May), 581–598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2018.05.013>
- Siehl, S., Wicking, M., Pohlack, S., Winkelmann, T., Zidda, F., Steiger-White, F., King, J., Burgess, N., Flor, H., & Nees, F. (2020). Structural white and gray matter differences in a large sample of patients with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and a healthy and trauma-exposed control group: Diffusion tensor imaging and region-based morphometry. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 28, 102424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102424>
- Steiger, F., Nees, F., Wicking, M., Lang, S., & Flor, H. (2015). Behavioral and central correlates of contextual fear learning and contextual modulation of cued fear in posttraumatic stress disorder. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 98(3), 584–593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.06.009>
- Team, R. (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. <ftp://ftp.uvigo.es/CRAN/web/packages/dplR/vignettes/intro-dplR.pdf>
- van Dooren, M., de Vries, J. J. G. (Gert-J., & Janssen, J. H. (2012). Emotional sweating across the body: Comparing 16 different skin conductance measurement locations. *Physiology & Behavior*, 106(2), 298–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.01.020>
- Wicking, M., Steiger, F., Nees, F., Diener, S. J., Grimm, O., Ruttorf, M., Schad, L. R., Winkelmann, T., Wirtz, G., & Flor, H. (2016). Deficient fear extinction memory in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 136, 116–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2016.09.016>
- Wittchen, H. U., Wunderlich, U., Gruschwitz, S., & Zaudig, M. (1997). SKID-I: Strukturiertes klinisches Interview für DSM-IV, Achse I: Psychische Störungen. [Structured clinical interview for DSM-IV. Axis I: Mental disorders]. *Göttingen: Hogrefe*.
- World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. (2013). *JAMA*, 310(20), 2191. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.281053>

Figure titles and legends

Figure 1. This figure depicts the four conditions (unpredictable, predictable, 2x safe) exemplary for both acquisition phases.

[Abbreviations: cs – conditioned stimulus; ctx – context; ITI – Inter-Trial-Interval; us – unconditioned stimulus]



Figure 2. Extracted beta values for region-of-interest (ROI) analyses on the hippocampi, amygdalae and vmPFC during acquisition (ACQ; top row) and extinction (EXT; bottom row) for each group (HC, PTSD, TC).

[Abbreviations: HC – Healthy control subjects without trauma experience; pred – predictable; PTSD – patients with PTSD; TC – healthy control subjects with trauma experience; unpred – unpredictable; vmPFC – ventromedial prefrontal cortex]

Figure 3. SCRs across each of the four conditions (unpred, pred, 2xsafe), two phases (ACQ, EXT) and each group (HC, PTSD, TC). A) ACQ phase. B) EXT phase.



[**Abbreviations:** ACQ – Acquisition; CTX – Context; EXT – Extinction; HC – Healthy control subjects without trauma experience; pred – Predictable; PTSD – patients with PTSD; SCR – Skin conductance response; TC – healthy control subjects with trauma experience; unpred – Unpredictable]

unpredictable





▲/▲/■ ... 4 sec; no predictability of us
 ★ ... appears in the middle of long ITIs of 7.5 or 9s

safe





predictable




▲ ... 4 sec; 100% predictability of us
 ★ ... starts 0.5 sec before end of cs+

safe












room outline



stimuli

- ctx
- ▲ cs+
- ▲ cs-
- ★ us





		Groups												Analysis				
		PTSD [N=20]				TC [N=21]				HC [N=22]				X^2	F	T	Df	p
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)					
Demographic data																		
Gender (female)				10	50.0			9	42.9			11	50.0	0.29			2	.87
Age (in years)		45.4	11.3	20		40.9	12.4	21		40.6	11.2	22			1.09		2	.34
Education				12	60.0			6	28.6			4	18.2	9.67			2	.008**
<=12 years				7	35.0			15	71.4			18	81.8					
>12 years																		Post-hoc: .015; PTSD≠TC+HC
Handedness				13/5/2					15/3/3					1.03			4	.91
Intelligence quotients																		
KAI		102.6	12.1	17		114.1	14.8	21		110.0	16.3	21			2.92		2	.062
CFT		114.7	20.1	18		120.9	10.3	21		118.5	10.9	21			0.94		2	.40
Trauma characteristics																		
Time since trauma (in years)		9.2	7.3	15		14.6	9.3	14								1.75	24.7	.09
Type of traumatic event (index trauma)																		
Caused voluntarily				11	55.0			9	42.9					0.61			1	.44
Total (caused voluntarily)																		
(1) Imprisonment				0				0										
(2) Physical violence				3				1										
(3) Sexual abuse				3				2										
(4) Rape				0				3										
(5) Wartime experience				3				0										
(6) Witness of sudden death/ serious injury of so.				2				1										
(7) Other experiences				0				2										
Caused involuntarily				9	45.0			12	57.1									
Total (caused involuntarily)																		
(1) Natural disaster				0				1										
(2) Fire or explosion				0				0										
(3) Accident				9				7										
(4) Sudden death of so.				0				4										
(5) Other experiences				0				0										

	PTSD [N=20]			Groups TC [N=21]			HC [N=22]			Analyses					Cont. Diff.	CI [-95%; +95%]	p _{Tukey}	Hedges' g
	M	SD	n (%)	M	SD	n (%)	M	SD	n (%)	X ²	F	T	Df	p				
Trauma assessment																		
CAPS Combined	61.3	19.0	20	12.0	15.7	21						9.02	36.9	<.001				
CAPS Severity	30.2	10.3	20	7.4	9.9	21						7.20	37.9	<.001				
CAPS Frequency	31.1	9.9	20	5.0	7.3	21						9.56	35.1	<.001				
CTQ	47.5	17.3	19	41.0	12.9	21	36.3	11.7	22		3.27		2	.045	T-H 4.7	-5.6; 15.0	.52	0.38
															P-H 11.2	21.8; -4.1	.035	0.77
															P-T 6.5	17.2	.31	0.43
Comorbidities																		
Other Axis I disorders			13/7			6/15			0/22		21.05		2	<.001				
Other Axis II disorders			6/14			0/22			0/22		14.26		2	<.001				
ADS	25.5	10.6	19	13.7	11.3	21	5.77	4.34	22		23.58		2	<.001	T-H 7.9	1.2; 14.6	.018	0.94
															P-H 19.7	12.8; 4.8	<.001	2.51
															P-T 11.8	18.8	<.001	1.08
STAI-T	52.5	11.5	19	40.4	12.3	21	31.3	7.7	22		20.28		2	<.001	T-H 9.1	1.3; 16.9	.019	0.89
															P-H 21.2	13.2; 4.0	<.001	2.17
															P-T 12.1	20.2	.002	0.99
Medication			Total (yes)	3	15.0	4	19.0		1	4.6	2.18		2	.34				
			Psychopharmacological ¹	1		2			0									
			Non-Psychopharmacological ²	2		2			1									
			Total (no)	17	85.0	17	71.4		21	95.4								

Table 1. Demographic and clinical Characteristics of study sample.

[**Abbreviations:** ADS – Allgemeine Depressionsskala [Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CESD)]; CAPS – Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale; CFT – Culture Fair Intelligence Test; CTQ – Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HC – Group of healthy control subjects, who have never experienced anything traumatic in their lives; KAI – Kurztest für allgemeine Basisgrößen der Informationsverarbeitung [Short Test for General Factors of Information Processing]; STAI-T – State-Trait Anxiety Inventory – Trait Anxiety; TC – Group of trauma control subjects, who have at least experienced one traumatic event but do not fulfil the criteria for PTSD; ¹Psychopharmacological: Pregabalin; Quetiapine; Tetrahydrocannabinol; ²Non-Psychopharmacological: Contraceptive pill; Levothyroxine; Mesalazine; Prednisolone]

phase	ROI	context	He m.	PTSD			group TC			HC			analysis	
				M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n		
ACQ	Hippocampus	unpred	left	-0.152	0.67	17	0.015	0.43	18	0.208	0.59	15	<p>group: $F(2, 47) = 0.21, p = .81$ context: $F(1, 47) = 1.87, p = .18$ hemisphere: $F(1, 47) = 3.73, p = .06$ groupXcontext: $F(2, 47) = 3.42, p = .04$ groupXhem.: $F(2, 47) = 0.22, p = .81$ contextXhem.: $F(1, 47) = 0.74, p = .40$ groupXcontextXhem.: $F(2, 47) = 0.16, p = .85$ Tukey HSD: unpred: HC>PTSD, $p_{adj} = .035$ HC: unpred>pred, $p_{adj} = .0001$</p>	
			right	-0.009	0.70	17	0.102	0.41	18	0.325	0.45	15		
		pred	left	0.037	0.04	17	0.036	0.59	18	-0.279	0.42	15		
			right	0.031	0.51	17	0.043	0.57	18	-0.176	0.38	15		
		Amygdala	unpred	left	-0.205	1.04	17	-0.014	0.96	17	0.14	1.11		16
				right	-0.032	0.80	17	-0.176	0.65	17	0.16	0.77		16
	pred		left	0.022	0.79	17	0.072	1.16	17	-0.60	0.67	16		
			right	0.174	0.44	17	-0.024	0.66	17	-0.38	0.63	16		
	vmPFC		unpred	left	-0.284	0.51	17	-0.191	0.33	17	-0.070	0.44		16
				right	-0.160	0.41	17	-0.167	0.29	17	-0.002	0.44		16
		pred	left	-0.111	0.39	17	0.039	0.46	17	-0.071	0.37	16		
			right	-0.021	0.48	17	0.023	0.51	17	-0.106	0.32	16		

Table 2a. Extracted beta values for Region-of-Interest (ROI) analyses on the Hippocampi, Amygdalae and vmPFC for context unpredictable (unpred) and context predictable (pred) during acquisition and for each group (HC, PTSD, TC). [Abbreviations: ACQ – acquisition; HC – healthy control subjects without trauma experience; pred – predictable; PTSD – patients with PTSD; TC – healthy control subjects with trauma experience; unpred – unpredictable]

phase	ROI	context	side	group						analysis					
				PTSD			TC			HC					
				M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
EXT	Hippocampus	unpred	left	0.178	0.46	17	-0.005	0.40	18	0.131	0.48	16	group: F(2, 48)= 0.79, p=.46 context: F(1, 48)= 0.77, p=.38 hemisphere: F(1, 48)= 5.30, p=.03 groupXcontext: F(2, 48)= 0.18, p=.83 groupXhem.: F(2, 48)= 0.94, p=.40 contextXhem.: F(1, 48)= 0.06, p=.81 groupXcontextXhem.: F(2, 48)= 0.06, p=.95		
			right	0.220	0.37	17	0.095	0.48	18	0.168	0.63	16			
		pred	left	0.117	0.51	17	-0.053	0.41	18	-0.013	0.41	16			
			right	0.172	0.65	17	0.095	0.49	18	0.015	0.45	16			
		Amygdala	unpred	left	0.511	0.91	17	0.089	0.76	17	0.133	0.56		16	group: F(2, 45)= 0.81, p=.45 context: F(1, 45)= 0.14, p=.71 hemisphere: F(1, 45)= 0.03, p=.86 groupXcontext: F(2, 45)= 0.54, p=.59 groupXhem.: F(2, 45)= 0.26, p=.78 contextXhem.: F(1, 45)= 1.46, p=.23 groupXcontextXhem.: F(2, 45)= 0.49, p=.61
				right	0.289	0.53	17	0.030	0.62	17	0.190	0.48		16	
	pred		left	0.107	0.97	17	0.101	0.78	17	0.128	0.52	16			
			right	0.237	0.66	17	0.195	0.57	17	0.187	0.59	16			
	vmPFC		unpred	left	0.050	0.29	17	-0.136	0.36	17	0.000	0.38		16	
				right	0.012	0.24	17	-0.143	0.37	17	0.028	0.37		16	
		pred	left	-0.010	0.36	17	0.166	0.33	17	-0.070	0.21	16			
			right	-0.045	0.30	17	0.187	0.37	17	-0.127	0.30	16			

Tukey HSD:
pred: TC>HC, p_{adj}=.001
pred: TC>PTSD, p_{adj}=.03
TC: pred>unpred, p_{adj}<.001

Table 2b. Extracted beta values for Region-of-Interest (ROI) analyses on the Hippocampi, Amygdalae and vmPFC for context unpredictable (unpred) and context predictable (pred) during extinction and for each group (HC, PTSD, TC).

[Abbreviations: ext – extinction; HC – Healthy control subjects without trauma experience; pred – predictable; PTSD – patients with PTSD; TC – healthy control subjects with trauma experience; unpred – unpredictable]