

1 **Title Page:**

2 **Associations Between Resting State Functional Brain Connectivity and**  
3 **Childhood Anhedonia: A Reproduction and Replication Study**

4 *Authors:*

5 Yi Zhou<sup>1</sup> MSc

6 Narun Pat<sup>2</sup> PhD

7 Michael C. Neale<sup>1</sup> PhD

8 *Affiliations:*

9 <sup>1</sup>Virginia Institute for Psychiatric and Behavioral Genetics, Virginia Commonwealth  
10 University

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Otago, New Zealand

12 *Corresponding Author Email:*

13 zhouy33@vcu.edu

14

15 *Short/Running Title:*

16 Anhedonia and Brain Connectivity in Children

17

18 *6 Keywords:*

19 Childhood Anhedonia, rsfMRI Brain Connectivity, Depressed Mood, Reproducibility,

20 Replicability, Development.

21 **Abstract:**

22 **Background:** Previously, a study using a sample of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive  
23 Development (ABCD)<sup>®</sup> study from the earlier 1.0 release found differences in several  
24 resting state functional MRI (rsfMRI) brain connectivity measures associated with  
25 children reporting anhedonia. Here, we aim to reproduce, replicate, and extend the  
26 previous findings using data from the later ABCD study 4.0 release, which includes a  
27 significantly larger sample.

28 **Methods:** To reproduce and replicate the previous authors' findings, we analyzed data  
29 from the ABCD 1.0 release (n = 2437), in an independent subsample from the newer  
30 ABCD 4.0 release (n = 6456), and in the full ABCD 4.0 release sample (n = 8866).  
31 Additionally, we assessed whether using a multiple linear regression approach could  
32 improve replicability by controlling for the effects of comorbid psychiatric conditions and  
33 socio-demographic covariates.

34 **Results:** We could only replicate the significant association between anhedonia and the  
35 *Within Cingulo-Opercular network connectivity* measure in an independent subsample  
36 of the ABCD 4.0 data release. When using the larger full ABCD 4.0 sample, six out of  
37 the eleven previously reported associations remained significant. Accounting for socio-  
38 demographic covariates and comorbid conditions using multiple linear regression did  
39 not improve replicability but allowed for the identification of specific and independent  
40 effects of anhedonia on 16 rsfMRI connectivity measures in the full ABCD 4.0 release  
41 sample.

42 **Conclusion:** Replication of previous findings were limited. A multiple linear regression  
43 approach helped resolve the specificity of rsfMRI connectivity associations with  
44 anhedonia.

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

## 62 **Main Article Text**

### 63 Introduction

64 Anhedonia is defined as a markedly diminished interest or pleasure in previously  
65 enjoyable activities and is a transdiagnostic symptom that is a core component of major  
66 depressive disorders (MDD) (1) and schizophrenia (SZN) (2). Symptoms of anhedonia  
67 are also present in substance use disorders (3), PTSD (4), bipolar depression  
68 (Gałuszko-Węgielnik et al., 2019), and ADHD (5). Anhedonia in children and  
69 adolescents is a significant prognostic predictor of greater depression severity (6),  
70 treatment resistant depression (7), and suicidal behaviors (8).

71 Functional neuroimaging approaches have been widely used to explore the  
72 neurocircuitry of anhedonia (9). Functional brain connectivity is a measure of the  
73 coactivation of different brain regions, which measures the degree of synchrony  
74 between the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signals across time between  
75 regions in the brain (Lv et al., 2018). In other words, functional connectivity allows for  
76 the characterization of networks of brain activity rather than activity in single brain  
77 regions. Importantly, functional connectivity can be measured at rest.

78 While there have been many studies of brain activity and connectivity in  
79 anhedonic adults, fewer have been conducted in children and adolescents. However,  
80 findings from these studies generally converge on the significance of disruptions in the  
81 reward, default mode, and salience networks (10–12). A recent study using the early 1.0  
82 release of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study data found  
83 several resting state functional MRI (rsfMRI) brain network connectivity measures  
84 associated with anhedonia in children aged 9-10 years old (13). Importantly, it was one

85 of the largest studies of anhedonia in children with a sample size of ~2,500 participants  
86 including 215 children reporting past and/or present anhedonia. Presently, the latest 4.0  
87 release of the ABCD study, which includes a significantly larger sample of participants  
88 with neuroimaging and behavioral data (n = 11,878), has been made available. Given  
89 that prior releases of the ABCD data are archived and publicly available, there is a  
90 significant opportunity to both *reproduce* and *replicate* these findings.

91 We define *reproducibility* as the ability to achieve exactly the same results as a  
92 previous study by using the same data and analytical approach, and *replicability* as the  
93 ability to achieve the same (or similar) results as a previous study in a different dataset  
94 (14). By our definition, reproducibility is better able to assess the consistency of results  
95 while replicability is better able to assess the generalizability of those results. The aims  
96 of this present study are to reproduce the previously reported associations between  
97 rsfMRI connectivity and childhood anhedonia using the ABCD 1.0 release sample, and  
98 to replicate those findings using an independent subset of the larger ABCD 4.0 release  
99 sample, excluding participants from the ABCD 1.0 release sample.

100 Importantly, in depressive disorders, anhedonia is characterized as the loss of  
101 pleasure and interest that is distinct from feelings of sadness or other dysphoric  
102 moods(15). Thus, there is great need to elucidate the specific neurobiological  
103 underpinnings associated with anhedonia, distinct from other comorbid symptoms, to  
104 better understand the underlying brain dysfunction. Thus, we also aim to extend our  
105 analyses and evaluate the specificity of rsfMRI connectivity associations with anhedonia  
106 by evaluating the effects of significantly comorbid psychiatric symptoms and diagnoses.

## 107 Methods and Materials

108 All of our analyses were performed in *R* (version 4.0.3) and *Rstudio*. We used  
109 several scripts, including the *utils.R* and *combat.R*(16) scripts for data harmonization,  
110 which were provided by the previous authors immediately upon request. The code and  
111 data structures used for our study can be accessed from the associated NDA study.  
112 The code we used can also be found at our Open Science Framework repository  
113 ([https://osf.io/vy85h/?view\\_only=0497385708874a6a9cce2bbfc5c30600](https://osf.io/vy85h/?view_only=0497385708874a6a9cce2bbfc5c30600)).

## 114 **ABCD Study Data**

115 The ABCD® study is the largest longitudinal study of brain development in  
116 children in the United States (<https://abcdstudy.org/>). The study has collected structural  
117 and functional brain imaging measures as well as detailed psychiatric and behavioral  
118 data from almost 12,000 children starting from when they were 9-10 years old. Notably,  
119 data is released on a continuous basis. For this study, we used baseline data from the  
120 ABCD 1.0 and ABCD 4.0 releases.

## 121 *rsfMRI Connectivity Measures and Quality Control (QC)*

122 Neuroimaging processing pipelines and analyses for the ABCD study are  
123 reviewed by (17). Briefly, the functional scans include twenty minutes of resting-state  
124 data acquired with eyes open and passive viewing of a crosshair (18). From the ABCD  
125 Data Repository, we obtained rsfMRI connectivity measures which were constructed  
126 using a seed-based correlational approach where regions of interest (ROIs) within  
127 Gordon parcellations (19) were grouped together into predefined cortical networks.  
128 Briefly, correlations between unique pairs of ROI's were obtained and Fisher  
129 transformed into z-statistics. Connectivity measures represent the averaged Fisher-

130 transformed correlations of all the unique pairs of ROIs either within a cortical network,  
131 between cortical networks, or between cortical networks and subcortical regions. From  
132 the ABCD Data Repository, we obtained rsfMRI connectivity measures between 19  
133 subcortical regions and 12 cortical networks (data structure: `mrirscor02`), as well as  
134 rsfMRI connectivity measures from within and between the 12 cortical networks (data  
135 structure: `abcd_betnet02`). Thus, there were 228 (12 x 19) subcortical ROI vs. cortical  
136 network rsfMRI connectivity measures and 78 (12C2 network pairs + 12 within network)  
137 within/between cortical network rsfMRI variables, for a total of 306 rsfMRI connectivity  
138 measures.

139 For QC, we used the `IQC_RSFMRI_GOOD_SER` variable, which represents the  
140 number of rsfMRI runs that were complete, passed protocol compliance and QC, and  
141 had field maps acquired within 2 scans prior to the run that were complete and passed  
142 QC and protocol compliance. Like the previous authors', we retained subjects who had  
143 `IQC_RSFMRI_GOOD_SER` values greater than or equal to four.

144 For analyses using only ABCD 1.0 release sample, we also removed individuals  
145 who were scanned by "Philips Medical Systems" MRI machines because of a post-  
146 processing issue in the ABCD 1.0 release, which was resolved in later releases. When  
147 working with ABCD 4.0 release sample, we retained all the subjects who were scanned  
148 by *Philips Medical Systems* scanners because the post-processing errors identified in  
149 the ABCD 1.0 release had been fixed for the ABCD 4.0 release.

#### 150 *Data Harmonization*

151 Different MRI scanners were used across the 21 sites in the ABCD study. The  
152 original authors harmonized the data across MRI scanners by using the ComBat tool

153 (*combat.R*) to adjust for batch effects due to the different scanners used. Here, we do  
154 the same and harmonize the data separately for the subcortical ROI vs. cortical network  
155 and within/between cortical network rsfMRI measures as it is possible these two  
156 variable types may be affected by scanners differently(20). Note, before the  
157 harmonization step, listwise deletion of subjects with any missing rsfMRI data was done  
158 as data harmonization requires complete data. There were 23 different scanners used  
159 in the study for the ABCD 1.0 release and 29 different scanners for the ABCD 4.0  
160 release. Thus 23 and 29 batch effects were used to adjust the ABCD 1.0 and 4.0  
161 releases, respectively.

## 162 *Psychiatric Symptoms and Diagnoses*

163 The focus of this study were past/present symptoms of anhedonia. However, we  
164 were also interested in other psychiatric conditions that may be comorbid with  
165 anhedonia. Psychiatric data were obtained from the youth (*data structure:*  
166 *abcd\_ksad501*) and parent (*data structure: abcd\_ksad01*) Kiddie Schedule for Affective  
167 Disorders and Schizophrenia (KSADS) data structures from the ABCD study. Using  
168 both youth and parent KSADS items, we combined past and present items for the same  
169 symptom or diagnosis and consolidated some items into a single variable. For example,  
170 we consolidated 18 past and present suicide related diagnosis items into one single  
171 suicide thoughts and behavior variable, which was similarly done in another study (21).

172 For psychiatric conditions besides anhedonia, we first selected the KSADS items  
173 representing psychiatric diagnoses and not individual symptoms. However, in both the  
174 Youth and Parents KSADS data, no diagnosis variables for major depressive disorder  
175 (MDD) were available. Thus, we selected two MDD related symptoms (besides



176 anhedonia), irritability and depressed mood, from both the Youth and Parent data to be  
177 used in our analyses. Similarly, no diagnostic variable was available for ADHD. Thus,  
178 we created a representative variable, *inattention\_distracted\_p*, which is a combination  
179 of two prevalent ADHD related symptom items (*Symptom - Difficulty sustaining attention*  
180 *since elementary school* and/or *Symptom - Easily distracted since elementary school*)  
181 from the parent KSADS data.

## 182 **Statistical Analyses**

### 183 *Student's and Bayes Factor T-Tests*

184 Prior to statistical analyses, participants with missing data for psychiatric  
185 symptoms/diagnoses were removed. We then proceeded to identify and remove outliers  
186 for each rsfMRI connectivity measure as values 1.5 times greater than the interquartile  
187 range (IQR) of values.

188 We performed Student's T-Tests for each of the 306 rsfMRI measures between  
189 controls and individuals with past and/or present psychiatric symptoms/diagnoses of  
190 interest (the reference group consisted of individuals endorsing psychiatric  
191 symptoms/diagnoses, such as anhedonia). We applied the Benjamini-Hochberg  
192 adjustment for multiple testing corrections. Finally, we performed Bayes Factor T-Tests  
193 for each of the rsfMRI measures and reported natural logarithms of the Bayes Factors  
194 (lnBF). As with the previous authors', lnBF values greater than 1.1 were considered  
195 significant.

## 196 *Tetrachoric Correlations*

197 Tetrachoric correlations are suitable for use with binary or categorical variables  
198 as it assumes responses arise from an underlying normal distribution with thresholds  
199 that delineate response categories. The *tetrachoric()* function from the *psych* R package  
200 was used in our analyses. Tetrachoric correlations were used to estimate the  
201 correlations between pairs of 34 binary psychiatric variables.

## 202 *Multiple Linear Regressions*

203 For multiple linear regression analyses, the ABCD rsfMRI data (from both 1.0  
204 and 4.0 releases) were harmonized for MRI scanner using the ComBat tool as  
205 previously described, except we also adjusted for batch effects with covariates (20). The  
206 covariates included during data harmonization were: age, sex, race/ethnicity,  
207 anhedonia, bipolar II, irritability, and depressed mood.

208 We performed linear mixed effects modeling using the *lmer4* package in *R*, a  
209 form of multiple linear regression, on the harmonized data. Individual rsfMRI  
210 connectivity measures were modeled as outcome variables while age, sex,  
211 race/ethnicity, anhedonia (reference group was the control group), depressed mood,  
212 irritability, and bipolar II disorder were modeled as independent explanatory variables.  
213 Age, sex, and race/ethnicity were considered potential confounding variables. The  
214 independent effects of anhedonia, bipolar II, irritability, and depressed mood symptoms  
215 on rsfMRI connectivity measures were assessed by identifying corresponding  
216 statistically significant partial regression coefficients, after multiple testing corrections.  
217 Family ID was included as a random effect to control for the non-independence of  
218 values from participants who belonged to the same family. We adjusted for multiple

219 comparisons with the Benjamini-Hochberg method to control for a False Discovery Rate  
220 of 0.05.

## 221 Results

### 222 **Reproduction of previous findings**

223 To reproduce the previous authors' results, we used the ABCD 1.0 release  
224 sample. Socio-demographic characteristics for this sample can be found in Table 1.  
225 Note that although the two groups appear to exhibit differences in a few of these  
226 characteristics, they were not controlled for statistically when we performed in our t-tests  
227 in order to remain consistent with the previous authors' approach.

228 **Table 1. Comparison of Socio-demographic Measures Between Controls and**  
229 **Those with Anhedonia in the ABCD 1.0 Release Sample.**

Measures	Control (N = 2209)	Anhedonia (N = 215)	Statistic	p-value
% Male	51.8	54	0.286	0.593
Mean Age (months)	120.6	119.9	1.183 <sup>a</sup>	0.238
% Asian	1.8	0.9	0.45	0.502
% Black	8.2	18.1	22.296	<0.001
% Hispanic	20	26.5	4.753	0.029
% Other	9.3	9.8	0.012	0.911
% White	60.8	44.7	20.386	<0.001
% Bipolar II	0.8	7.9	64.358	<0.001
% Depressed Mood	8.1	28.4	87.975	<0.001
% Irritability	4.7	26.5	148.192	<0.001

230 *The proportion (%) of participants in each group for each measure are shown. Student's*  
231 *t-test was done to compare age (in months) between control and anhedonia groups.*  
232 *Chi-square tests of independence were done for all other measures. Note there is a*  
233 *slightly lower number of controls here than reported below due to the exclusion of*

234 *participants with missing sociodemographic and/or comorbid psychiatric syndrome and*  
235 *diagnoses measures.*

236 <sup>a</sup> *Student's t-statistic.*

237 We were able to successfully reproduce their findings (13). To assess how well we  
238 reproduced the previous authors' results, we calculated Pearson correlations of the t-  
239 statistics and lnBF values between our values and those reported by the previous  
240 authors when comparing individuals with or without anhedonia (Fig. 1A and 1B).

241 **Figure 1 – Reproduction of previous statistical analyses.** Pearson correlations  
242 between A) Student's t-statistics and B) lnBF statistics derived from the previous  
243 author's analyses and those derived from our replication analyses. lnBF – natural  
244 logarithm of Bayes Factors.

245 Like the previous authors, we identified 215 individuals who endorsed past  
246 and/or present anhedonia and 2,222 controls who reported neither past nor present  
247 anhedonia at the baseline timepoint. In line with the previous authors findings, 11  
248 rsfMRI connectivity measures were found to be associated with anhedonia using the  
249 lnBF(10) statistic (Table. 2; full table of results found in Supplementary Table. 1). To be  
250 consistent with the previous authors, individuals with anhedonia were the reference  
251 group.

252 **Table. 2 Reproducing Results of rsfMRI Network Connectivity Measures**  
253 **Associated with Anhedonia.**

rsfMRI Measure	t-stat	p-value	p.adj	lnBF	Mean <sub>control</sub>	SD <sub>control</sub>	Mean <sub>anhedonia</sub>
DorsalAttentionLeftHippocampus	-3.931	0	0.027	5.06	-0.129	0.095	-0.101

WithinRetrosplenialTemporal	3.644	0	0.042	3.989	0.525	0.152	0.485
CinguloParietalBrainStem	-3.46	0.001	0.045	3.366	-0.001	0.091	0.023
DefaultDorsalAttention	-3.441	0.001	0.045	3.29	-0.129	0.063	-0.113
SensorimotorHandBrainStem	3.304	0.001	0.051	2.854	0.11	0.106	0.084
SaliencLeftVentraldc	-3.294	0.001	0.051	2.809	-0.12	0.092	-0.097
WithinCinguloOpercular	3.142	0.002	0.074	2.323	0.291	0.078	0.273
RetrosplenialTemporalRightCerebellumCortex	3.084	0.002	0.079	2.151	0.127	0.136	0.097
CinguloParietalRightPallidum	3.024	0.003	0.086	1.974	0.127	0.119	0.101
SensorimotorHandRightHippocampus	2.965	0.003	0.094	1.809	0.099	0.099	0.078
CinguloOpercularBrainStem	2.75	0.006	0.167	1.204	0.026	0.101	0.005

254 *The results of statistically significant univariate Student's T-tests and Bayes Factor T-*  
255 *tests comparing differences in rsfMRI connectivity measures between controls and*  
256 *individuals reporting anhedonia at baseline using the ABCD 1.0 release sample (n =*  
257 *2437). Student's t-statistics (t-stat), p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values*  
258 *(p.adj), natural logarithms of Bayes Factors (lnBF), means (Mean) and standard*  
259 *deviations (SD) for the control and anhedonia groups are reported. lnBF values greater*  
260 *than 1.1 were considered statistically significant.*

## 261 **Replication of previous findings**

262 At the time of writing, the ABCD 4.0 release has been made available. We  
263 wanted to *replicate* the previous findings by using the full cohort, excluding the subjects  
264 used in the previous analyses, which is analogous to replication in an independent  
265 sample. In this sub-sample of the ABCD 4.0 release (which excludes participants from  
266 ABCD 1.0 release), we found 591 participants who endorsed past and/or present  
267 anhedonia and 5,865 controls who did not. Socio-demographic characteristics for this  
268 sample can be found in Table 3.

269 **Table. 3 Comparison of Sociodemographic Measures Between Controls and**  
270 **Those with Anhedonia in the ABCD 4.0 Release, Excluding ABCD 1.0 Release,**  
271 **Sub-sample.**  
272

Measures	Control (N = 5863)	Anhedonia (N = 591)	Statistic	p-value
% Male	51.2	56.7	6.202	0.013
Mean Age (months) <sup>a</sup>	118.5	119.1	-1.705	0.089
% Asian	2.3	0.8	4.703	0.03
% Black	15.2	20.8	12.449	<0.001
% Hispanic	20.5	26.4	11.087	0.001
% Other	10.4	12.9	3.055	0.08
% White	51.6	39.1	33.287	<0.001
% Bipolar II	0.3	8.3	313.34	<0.001
% Depressed Mood	6.4	31.8	431.052	<0.001
% Irritability	4.4	27.9	484.563	<0.001

273 *The proportion (%) of participants in each group for each measure are shown. Student's*  
274 *t-test was done to compare age (in months) between control and anhedonia groups.*  
275 *Chi-square tests of independence were done for all other measures. Note there is a*  
276 *slightly lower number of controls here than reported above due to the exclusion of*  
277 *participants with missing sociodemographic and/or comorbid psychiatric syndrome and*  
278 *diagnoses measures.*

279 <sup>a</sup> *Student's t-statistic.*

280 When comparing the groups using Student's and Bayes Factor t-tests, 18 rsfMRI  
281 connectivity measures were found to be significantly associated with anhedonia  
282 according to the lnBF statistic (Table. 4; full table of results found in Supplementary  
283 Table 2). However, only the *withinCinguloOpercular network* rsfMRI connectivity  
284 identified by the previous authors, was also found to be significant.

285 **Table. 4 Replicating Results of rsfMRI Connectivity Measures Associated with**  
286 **Anhedonia.**

rsfMRI Connectivity Measure	t-stat	p-value	p.adj	lnBF	Mean <sub>control</sub>	SD <sub>control</sub>	Mean <sub>anhedonia</sub>
VisualLeftHippocampus	4.328	0	0.005	6.273	0.056	0.089	0.03
CinguloOpercularLeftAmygdala	4.02	0	0.009	5.002	0.07	0.094	0.05
RetrosplenialTemporalRightThalamusProper	3.852	0	0.012	4.338	0.158	0.083	0.14
AuditoryRightPutamen	3.574	0	0.022	3.321	0.124	0.107	0.10
WithinSensorimotorHand	-3.507	0	0.022	3.092	0.271	0.071	0.28
CinguloParietalLeftThalamusProper	3.498	0	0.022	3.053	0.224	0.093	0.2
SensorimotorHandRightPutamen	3.477	0.001	0.022	2.98	-0.011	0.105	-0.02
RetrosplenialTemporalRightVentraldc	3.367	0.001	0.028	2.611	0.018	0.093	0.00
VentralAttentionLeftCerebellumCortex	-3.332	0.001	0.028	2.491	-0.004	0.076	0.00
SensorimotorHandLeftPallidum	3.315	0.001	0.028	2.436	0.074	0.098	0.0
CinguloOpercularLeftCaudate	3.274	0.001	0.029	2.306	0.018	0.092	0.00
DorsalAttentionRightAmygdala	-3.252	0.001	0.029	2.226	-0.009	0.078	0.00
VisualRightPallidum	3.236	0.001	0.029	2.183	-0.032	0.076	-0.04
CinguloOpercularRightAmygdala	3.213	0.001	0.029	2.111	-0.014	0.105	-0.02
CinguloParietalRightCerebellumCortex	3.087	0.002	0.041	1.708	0.163	0.108	0.14
SensorimotorHandRightAccumbensArea	3.068	0.002	0.041	1.661	0.224	0.093	0.21
AuditorySensorimotorHand	-3.048	0.002	0.042	1.603	0.12	0.057	0.12
CinguloParietalLeftCaudate	2.987	0.003	0.048	1.407	0.259	0.079	0.24
WithinCinguloOpercular <sup>a</sup>	2.968	0.003	0.048	1.35	0.299	0.067	0.2
AuditorySalience	2.931	0.003	0.052	1.244	0.042	0.067	0.03

287 *The results of statistically significant univariate Student's T-tests and Bayes Factor T-*  
288 *tests comparing differences in rsfMRI connectivity measures between controls and*  
289 *individuals reporting anhedonia at baseline using an independent subsample of the*  
290 *ABCD 4.0 release, excluding ABCD 1.0 release, data (n = 6456). Student's t-statistics*  
291 *(t-stat), p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values (p.adj), natural logarithms of*  
292 *Bayes Factors (lnBF), means (Mean) and standard deviations (SD) for the control and*  
293 *anhedonia groups are reported. lnBF values greater than 1.1 were considered*  
294 *statistically significant.*

295 <sup>a</sup> *replicated association between rsfMRI connectivity measure and anhedonia.*

296 To increase our power to detect genuine associations, we next performed our  
297 analyses on the full ABCD 4.0 release sample, including participants from the ABCD 1.0  
298 release. In the full ABCD 4.0 release sample, there were 800 participants who endorsed  
299 past and/or present anhedonia and 8066 controls who did not. Socio-demographic  
300 characteristics for this sample can be found in Table 5.

301 **Table 5. Comparison of Sociodemographic Measures Between Controls and**  
302 **Those with Anhedonia in the Full ABCD 4.0 Release Sample.**

Measures	Control (N = 8064)	Anhedonia (N = 800)	Statistic	p-value
% Male <sup>a</sup>	51.3	55.8	5.589	0.018
Mean Age (months)	119.1	119.3	-0.845	0.398
% Asian <sup>a</sup>	2.2	0.9	5.363	0.021
% Black <sup>a</sup>	13.3	19.8	25.19	<0.001
% Hispanic <sup>a</sup>	20.4	26.6	16.579	<0.001
% Other	10.1	12.1	2.916	0.088
% White <sup>a</sup>	54	40.6	52.043	<0.001
% Bipolar II <sup>a</sup>	0.5	7.9	347.62	<0.001
% Depressed Mood <sup>a</sup>	6.9	30.9	507.29	<0.001
% Irritability <sup>a</sup>	4.4	27.4	627.02	<0.001

303 *The proportion (%) of participants in each group for each measure are shown. Student's*  
304 *t-test was done to compare age (in weeks) between control and anhedonia groups. Chi-*  
305 *square tests of independence were done for all other measures. Note there is a slightly*  
306 *lower number of controls here than reported below due to the exclusion of participants*  
307 *with missing sociodemographic and/or comorbid psychiatric syndrome and diagnoses*  
308 *measures.*

309 <sup>a</sup> *Student's t-statistic.*

310 Notably, 6 out of the 11 rsfMRI connectivity measures identified by the previous  
311 authors were also significantly associated with anhedonia in this analysis (Table. 6; full



312 table of results found in Supplementary Table 3). As well, 17 out of the 20 significant  
 313 rsfMRI connectivity measures identified in the independent sub-sample of the ABCD 4.0  
 314 release (from Table. 4) were also found to be significant in the analyses using the full  
 315 ABCD 4.0 release sample, including the *within CinguloOpercular* network connectivity  
 316 measure (Table. 6).

317 **Table. 6 Significant Associations Between rsfMRI Connectivity Measures and**  
 318 **Anhedonia in the Full ABCD 4.0 Sample.**

rsfMRI Connectivity Measure	t-stat	p-value	p.adj	lnBF	Mean <sub>control</sub>	SD <sub>control</sub>	Mean <sub>anhedonia</sub>
RetrosplenialTemporalRightThalamusProper <sup>b</sup>	4.962	0	0	9.057	0.161	0.082	0.082
CinguloOpercularLeftAmygdala <sup>b</sup>	4.252	0	0.003	5.816	0.072	0.093	0.093
VentralAttentionLeftPutamen	-4.207	0	0.003	5.626	-0.055	0.065	-0.065
AuditoryRightPutamen <sup>b</sup>	4.085	0	0.003	5.125	0.125	0.106	0.106
SensorimotorHandRightPutamen <sup>b</sup>	4.029	0	0.003	4.902	-0.01	0.104	-0.104
SensorimotorHandLeftPallidum <sup>b</sup>	4.027	0	0.003	4.893	0.076	0.098	0.098
WithinCinguloOpercular <sup>ab</sup>	3.865	0	0.004	4.254	0.303	0.066	0.066
VentralAttentionLeftCaudate	3.839	0	0.004	4.153	0.036	0.066	0.066
CinguloParietalLeftThalamusProper <sup>b</sup>	3.836	0	0.004	4.142	0.224	0.092	0.092
SensorimotorHandRightAccumbensArea <sup>b</sup>	3.787	0	0.005	3.961	0.225	0.093	0.093
VentralAttentionLeftCerebellumCortex <sup>b</sup>	-3.762	0	0.005	3.865	-0.007	0.075	-0.075
VisualLeftHippocampus <sup>b</sup>	3.691	0	0.006	3.605	0.056	0.088	0.088
DefaultDorsalAttention <sup>a</sup>	-3.604	0	0.007	3.284	-0.127	0.051	-0.051
CinguloOpercularRightAmygdala <sup>b</sup>	3.601	0	0.007	3.281	-0.013	0.103	-0.103
RetrosplenialTemporalRightCerebellumCortex <sup>a</sup>	3.52	0	0.009	2.993	0.128	0.106	0.106
WithinSensorimotorHand <sup>b</sup>	-3.513	0	0.009	2.975	0.271	0.07	0.07
WithinVisual	3.411	0.001	0.012	2.61	0.409	0.089	0.089
CinguloOpercularBrainStem <sup>a</sup>	3.358	0.001	0.013	2.436	0.025	0.074	0.074
CinguloOpercularLeftCaudate <sup>b</sup>	3.315	0.001	0.013	2.3	0.02	0.09	0.09
VisualRightPallidum <sup>b</sup>	3.31	0.001	0.013	2.283	-0.03	0.076	-0.076
DorsalAttentionRightVentraldc <sup>b</sup>	3.312	0.001	0.013	2.282	0.046	0.067	0.067
FrontoParietalVisual	-3.307	0.001	0.013	2.266	-0.107	0.044	-0.044
SensorimotorHandBrainStem <sup>a</sup>	3.268	0.001	0.015	2.136	0.129	0.08	0.08
SaliencyLeftVentraldc <sup>a</sup>	-3.246	0.001	0.015	2.07	-0.121	0.071	-0.071
FrontoParietalLeftCerebellumCortex	-3.228	0.001	0.015	2.011	-0.063	0.065	-0.065
DorsalAttentionLeftVentraldc	3.189	0.001	0.017	1.885	0.27	0.116	0.116
VentralAttentionLeftThalamusProper	3.154	0.002	0.017	1.773	-0.096	0.11	-0.11

CinguloParietalLeftCaudate <sup>b</sup>	3.149	0.002	0.017	1.76	0.26	0.078	0.
FrontoParietalRightPallidum	-3.148	0.002	0.017	1.755	-0.035	0.058	-0.
RetrosplenialTemporalRightVentraldc <sup>b</sup>	3.114	0.002	0.018	1.657	0.021	0.092	0.
FrontoParietalLeftCaudate	3.111	0.002	0.018	1.645	0.084	0.044	0.
DorsalAttentionRightAmygdala	-3.108	0.002	0.018	1.629	-0.012	0.077	-0.
CinguloOpercularLeftAccumbensArea	3.091	0.002	0.019	1.581	0.111	0.077	0.
SaliencenceVentralAttention	3.04	0.002	0.021	1.423	0.089	0.061	0.
DorsalAttentionLeftAmygdala	-3.035	0.002	0.021	1.408	-0.076	0.064	-0.

319 *The results of statistically significant univariate Student's T-tests and Bayes Factor T-*  
320 *tests comparing differences in rsfMRI connectivity measures between controls and*  
321 *individuals reporting anhedonia at baseline using the full ABCD 4.0 release sample (n =*  
322 *8866). Student's t-statistics (t-stat), p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values*  
323 *(p.adj), natural logarithms of Bayes Factors (lnBF), means (Mean) and standard*  
324 *deviations (SD) for the control and anhedonia groups are reported. lnBF values greater*  
325 *than 1.1 were considered statistically significant.*

326 <sup>a</sup> *rsfMRI connectivity measures also reported by the previous authors as significantly*  
327 *associated with anhedonia.*

328 <sup>b</sup> *rsfMRI connectivity measures that were also found to be significant in the replication*  
329 *analyses.*

330 It is important to note that individuals reporting anhedonia may also report other  
331 symptoms or psychiatric diagnoses. Thus, it is important to evaluate the specificity of  
332 the associations between rsfMRI connectivity and anhedonia. In order to identify  
333 psychiatric conditions significantly comorbid in individuals reporting anhedonia, we  
334 performed tetrachoric correlations between anhedonia and 33 additional psychiatric  
335 diagnoses and symptoms collected at baseline (Supplementary Figure. 1). Three  
336 psychiatric conditions exhibited correlation coefficients greater than or equal to 0.5 with  
337 anhedonia: irritability, depressed mood, and bipolar II disorder. In the full ABCD 4.0

338 release sample, 32%, 28%, and 8% of the participants reporting anhedonia also  
339 reported depressed mood, irritability, and bipolar II disorder (Supplementary Table. 4).

340 We next performed student's and Bayes Factor t-tests to compare rsfMRI  
341 connectivity between individuals with and without depressed mood, irritability, and  
342 bipolar II, respectively (Supplementary Tables. 5-7). We found that several rsfMRI  
343 connectivity measures associated with anhedonia were also associated with these other  
344 psychiatric conditions.

### 345 **Multiple Linear Regression Approach**

346 While we were able to characterize which rsfMRI connectivity measures were  
347 specifically associated with anhedonia vs. shared with other psychiatric conditions,  
348 simple t-tests were not able to estimate the independent effects of each psychiatric  
349 condition on rsfMRI connectivity. Furthermore, t-tests are not able to control for  
350 potentially confounding sociodemographic variables such age, sex, and race/ethnicity.  
351 Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences in race/ethnicity and  
352 sex between individuals reporting anhedonia and those who do not, across the different  
353 samples used in our analyses (Tables 1, 3, and 5).

354 By using a multiple linear regression approach where a rsfMRI connectivity  
355 measure is modeled as the response (or outcome) variable, comorbid psychiatric  
356 conditions as well as confounding factors can be included as explanatory (or predictor)  
357 variables. Thus, multiple linear regression allows for the estimation of the main effects  
358 of anhedonia on rsfMRI connectivity, independent of the effects of depressed mood,  
359 irritability, and bipolar II disorder (and vice versa), and the effects of confounding  
360 covariates.

361 Since the ABCD 1.0 release sample and the subsample of ABCD 4.0 release,  
362 excluding the ABCD 1.0 sample, were not matched on age, sex, or race/ethnicity, we  
363 hypothesized that controlling for these potential confounders may improve replicability.  
364 Thus, we first performed multiple linear regression in the ABCD 1.0 release sample and  
365 then in the ABCD 4.0 release sample, excluding the ABCD 1.0 release sample. The  
366 reference group was the control group without symptoms with anhedonia. In the ABCD  
367 1.0 release sample, only two rsfMRI connectivity measures exhibited statistically  
368 significant partial regression coefficients for anhedonia, after multiple testing corrections  
369 (Table 4; full multiple regression results found in Supplementary Table 8).

370 **Table. 4 rsfMRI Connectivity Measures with Significant Partial Regression**  
371 **Coefficients for Anhedonia in the ABCD 1.0 Sample.**

rsfMRI Connectivity Measure	Effect of Anhedonia	Std.Err	t-value	p-value	p.adj	R <sup>2</sup>
DorsalAttentionLeftHippocampus	0.024	0.007	3.208	0.001	0.019	0.012
CinguloParietalBrainStem	0.021	0.007	2.968	0.003	0.036	0.006

372 *Statistically significant effects of anhedonia as a predictor of rsfMRI connectivity*  
373 *measures from multiple linear regression tests are shown. The standard errors*  
374 *(Std.Err), t-values, p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values (p.adj) for the*  
375 *effects of anhedonia, and overall coefficients of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) for each regression*  
376 *are reported.*

377 It is likely that including the additional explanatory variables into the model  
378 reduced the statistical power to detect significant associations in the relatively small  
379 sample. Accordingly, while more rsfMRI connectivity measures were significantly  
380 associated with anhedonia in the ABCD 4.0 release, excluding ABCD 1.0 release, sub-  
381 sample, we were unable to replicate the associations found using the ABCD 1.0 release

382 sample (Table. 5). rsfMRI connectivity measures with significant partial regression  
 383 coefficients for bipolar II and depressed mood were also identified for analyses in the  
 384 ABCD 1.0 release sample (Supplementary Table. 8) and for depressed mood, irritability,  
 385 and bipolar II in the ABCD 4.0 release, excluding ABCD 1.0 release, sub-sample  
 386 (Supplementary Table. 9). No significant partial regression coefficients for irritability  
 387 were detected in the ABCD 1.0 release sample.

388 **Table. 5 rsfMRI Connectivity Measures with Significant Partial Regression**  
 389 **Coefficients for Anhedonia in the ABCD 4.0 Release, Excluding ABCD 1.0**  
 390 **Release, Sub-sample.**

rsfMRI Connectivity Measure	Effect of Anhedonia	Std.Err	t-value	p-value	p.adj	R <sup>2</sup>
AuditoryRightPutamen	-0.013	0.005	-2.563	0.01	0.036	0.048
DorsalAttentionRightHippocampus	0.009	0.004	2.524	0.012	0.04	0
DorsalAttentionRightAmygdala	0.012	0.004	3.226	0.001	0.006	0.006
RetrosplenialTemporalRightThalamusPrope r	-0.01	0.004	-2.661	0.008	0.028	0.029
VentralAttentionLeftCerebellumCortex	0.01	0.004	2.715	0.007	0.025	0.006
VisualLeftHippocampus	-0.013	0.004	-3.067	0.002	0.009	0.045
AuditoryCinguloParietal	-0.008	0.003	-2.465	0.014	0.046	0.018
AuditorySensorimotorHand	0.007	0.003	2.614	0.009	0.032	0.033
CinguloOpercularSalience	-0.009	0.003	-2.903	0.004	0.015	0.002
CinguloParietalSensorimotorHand	-0.008	0.003	-2.626	0.009	0.031	0.006
FrontoParietalVisual	0.006	0.002	2.732	0.006	0.023	0.011
RetrosplenialTemporalSensorimotorHand	-0.007	0.002	-2.88	0.004	0.015	0.021
WithinSensorimotorHand	0.009	0.003	2.837	0.005	0.017	0.038
WithinSalience	-0.015	0.005	-2.802	0.005	0.019	0.003

391 *Statistically significant effects of anhedonia as a predictor of rsfMRI connectivity*  
 392 *measures from multiple linear regression tests are shown. The standard errors*

393 (Std.Err), t-values, p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values (p.adj) for the  
 394 effects of anhedonia, and overall coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ) for each regression  
 395 are reported.

396 In order to maximize our power to detect associations between rsfMRI  
 397 connectivity measures and anhedonia, we performed multiple linear regression  
 398 analyses in the full ABCD 4.0 release sample. We found that 16 rsfMRI connectivity  
 399 measures exhibited significant partial regression coefficients for anhedonia (Table. 6;  
 400 full table of results found in Supplementary Table 10). Of note, 9 out of these 16 rsfMRI  
 401 connectivity measures were previously identified to be uniquely associated with  
 402 anhedonia from our t-tests. Furthermore, the *Retrosplenial Temporal vs. Right*  
 403 *Cerebellum Cortex* and *CinguloOpercular vs. Brainstem* connectivity measures were  
 404 reported to be significantly associated with anhedonia by the previous authors.

405 **Table. 6 rsfMRI Connectivity Measures with Significant Partial Regression**  
 406 **Coefficients for Anhedonia in the Full ABCD 4.0 Release Sample.**

rsfMRI Connectivity Measure	Effect of Anhedonia	Std.Err	t-value	p-value	p.adj	$R^2$
RetrosplenialTemporalRightThalamusProper <sup>a</sup>	-0.012	0.003	-3.583	0	0.001	0.029
VentralAttentionLeftCerebellumCortex <sup>a</sup>	0.009	0.003	3.161	0.002	0.006	0.008
AuditoryRightPutamen	-0.013	0.004	-3.034	0.002	0.009	0.045
DorsalAttentionRightAmygdala <sup>a</sup>	0.008	0.003	2.751	0.006	0.02	0.007
VentralAttentionLeftPutamen	0.007	0.003	2.745	0.006	0.02	0.019
CinguloOpercularSalience	-0.007	0.003	-2.667	0.008	0.025	0.002
WithinSensorimotorHand <sup>a</sup>	0.007	0.003	2.649	0.008	0.026	0.037
VisualRightPallidum <sup>a</sup>	-0.008	0.003	-2.615	0.009	0.029	0.031
FrontoParietalVisual <sup>a</sup>	0.005	0.002	2.609	0.009	0.029	0.012

WithinSalience	-0.011	0.005	-2.449	0.014	0.04	0.00
CinguloOpercularBrainStem <sup>a</sup>	-0.007	0.003	-2.437	0.015	0.04	0.03
RetrosplenialTemporalSensorimotorHand	-0.005	0.002	-2.422	0.015	0.04	0.02
VisualRightVentraldc	0.008	0.003	2.412	0.016	0.04	0.00
RetrosplenialTemporalRightCerebellumCortex <sup>a</sup>	-0.01	0.004	-2.407	0.016	0.04	0.04
VentralAttentionLeftCaudate <sup>a</sup>	-0.006	0.003	-2.404	0.016	0.04	0.02
SensorimotorHandLeftPallidum	-0.009	0.004	-2.398	0.017	0.05	0.05

407 *Statistically significant effects of anhedonia as a predictor of rsfMRI connectivity*  
 408 *measures from multiple linear regression tests are shown. The standard errors*  
 409 *(Std.Err), t-values, p-values, Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values (p.adj) for the*  
 410 *effects of anhedonia, and overall coefficients of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) for each regression*  
 411 *are reported.*

412 <sup>a</sup> *rsfMRI connectivity measures also found to be specifically associated with anhedonia*  
 413 *from previously performed t-tests in the full ABCD 4.0 release sample.*

414 Two rsfMRI connectivity measures, the *Auditory vs. Right Putamen* and *Ventral*  
 415 *Attention vs. Left Putamen* were previously found to be associated with both depressed  
 416 mood and anhedonia from our t-tests but now only exhibit significant partial regression  
 417 coefficients for anhedonia. Interestingly, the *Sensorimotor-Hand vs. Left Pallidum*  
 418 connectivity measure exhibited significant partial regression coefficients for both  
 419 anhedonia and depressed mood (Table. 6, Supplementary Table. 10), consistent with  
 420 previous t-test results, suggesting the presence of significant independent effects of  
 421 both symptoms on the same rsfMRI connectivity measure.

422 The *CinguloOpercular vs. Left Amygdala* connectivity measure was also  
 423 previously associated with both depressed mood and anhedonia, based on their t-tests,

424 but now only exhibit significant partial regression coefficients for depressed mood  
425 (Supplementary Table. 10). Similarly, the *Ventral Attention vs. Left Thalamus Proper*  
426 connectivity measure was previously associated with both anhedonia and irritability  
427 based on t-tests, but now only exhibit significant partial regression coefficients for  
428 irritability (Supplementary Table. 10). Only one rsfMRI connectivity measure, *Within*  
429 *Ventral Attention*, exhibited a significant partial regression coefficient for bipolar II  
430 disorder (Supplementary Table. 10).

431 Altogether, while multiple linear regression analyses did not improve replicability  
432 between the ABCD study sub-samples, it did allow us to estimate the independent  
433 effects of anhedonia on rsfMRI connectivity measures in the full ABCD 4.0 release  
434 sample and helped resolve the specificity of the effects of connectivity measures that  
435 were previously found to be associated with anhedonia and other psychiatric symptoms.

## 436 Discussion

### 437 **Reproduction and replication of previous findings**

438 While we were able to successfully reproduce the previous authors' findings, we  
439 were mostly unable to replicate them using a larger independent subset of the full  
440 ABCD 4.0 release sample. Interestingly, a recent study exploring the replicability of  
441 brain-behavior association studies using simulations and parametric bootstrapping  
442 methods found that relatively small sample sizes ( $n < 500$ ) produced results with  
443 significantly inflated effect sizes, low precision, and low replicability and it was only  
444 when the sample sizes were increased to the high hundreds or thousands were they  
445 able to produce stable effects that were significantly more replicable (22). Thus, it is



446 possible that associations found by the original authors and in our replication analyses  
447 using relatively small samples are at risk of being driven by random sample variation.

448 To maximize statistical power and to reduce inflated associations between  
449 rsfMRI connectivity associations with anhedonia, future analyses should be conducted  
450 using larger samples, such as in the full ABCD 4.0 release sample. Furthermore, Marek  
451 et al., 2022 found that controlling for socio-demographic covariates further reduced  
452 effect size inflation. Thus, the results from our multiple linear regression analyses using  
453 the full ABCD 4.0 release sample, where we control for socio-demographic covariates,  
454 are more likely to represent less-inflated and more replicable findings.

#### 455 **Specificity of associations**

456 We found depressed mood, irritability, and bipolar II disorder to be significantly  
457 comorbid with anhedonia. Using a multiple linear regression approach in the full ABCD  
458 4.0 dataset, we were able to estimate the effects of anhedonia on rsfMRI connectivity  
459 measures independent of those comorbid conditions, allowing us to disentangle rsfMRI  
460 connectivity measures associated with more than one condition based on t-test results.  
461 In doing so, however, the interpretation of anhedonia requires careful consideration and  
462 reflection.

463 As mentioned previously, while anhedonia and depressed mood are core  
464 symptoms of major depressive disorders, they are considered distinct processes (15).  
465 Alternatively, the hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP) (23), a recently  
466 developed dimensional framework for psychopathology, has classified anhedonia as a  
467 symptom belonging to two high level *sepctra* of psychopathology; the *internalizing* and  
468 *detachment* spectra. Interestingly, low/depressed mood and irritability also fall under the

469 *internalizing* spectrum whereas bipolar II falls under the *thought disorder* spectrum.  
470 Thus, when estimating the effects of anhedonia independent of other internalizing and  
471 thought disorder related symptoms, we could interpret the remaining effect to  
472 emphasize detachment processes. As detachment is a component of the psychosis  
473 super-spectrum (24) our findings may represent anhedonic neurocircuitry that may, in  
474 part, be related to schizophrenia, schizotypal personality, or other psychotic disorder  
475 processes. Further work is required to assess the extent to which differences in rsfMRI  
476 connectivity specific to anhedonia better associates with or even predicts dimensional  
477 measures of internalizing or detachment related psychopathology.

478 We included race/ethnicity as a covariate in our multiple linear regression  
479 analyses and note they exhibited significant partial regression coefficients for many of  
480 the rsfMRI connectivity measures we analyzed. Furthermore, we found there were  
481 significantly higher proportions of Black and Hispanic participants in the anhedonia  
482 group compared to non-anhedonic controls in the full ABCD 4.0 release sample. Race  
483 and ethnicity are social constructs representing complex social and cultural factors (25)  
484 deserving careful consideration. Several previous studies have reported significantly  
485 higher risk of anhedonia in Black and Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic White adults  
486 (26,27) and that these associations may, in part, be accounted for by socioeconomic  
487 factors, such as household income and education, as well as other social determinants  
488 of health (28), such as disparities in access to healthcare (26). In the ABCD sample,  
489 racial discrimination may be an important factor contributing to risk of anhedonia as well  
490 as differences in brain-based measures. For example, several recent studies have  
491 found that racial discrimination is associated with lower total brain volume (29) and

492 alterations in pre-frontal white matter tracts in adults (30,31). While out of the scope of  
493 this study, it will be very important to investigate how social determinants of health and  
494 other related factors contribute to differences in health and brain-based outcomes  
495 between different racial and ethnic groups during child and adolescent development.

## 496 **Limitations**

497 One major limitation of our study was the use of seed-based correlational  
498 methods to compute network connectivity measures in functionally-defined networks. As  
499 such, these network connectivity measures are averages over large and distributed  
500 networks where signals from sub-regions potentially highly associated with anhedonia  
501 may be drowned out by signals from sub-regions with low levels of association. Another  
502 concern is that the Gordon brain parcellations were produced using a boundary-  
503 mapping approach in adult brains (19) so whether they are generalizable to the brains  
504 of developing children is important to consider. For example, one study found that the  
505 functional topography of connectivity networks does change with age which was  
506 predictive of individual differences in executive function (32). One alternative method is  
507 to use a decomposition-based method, such as independent components analysis  
508 (ICA), to define functional connectivity measures (33). ICA is a data driven approach  
509 that extracts components that maximally explain the data and thus, may enhance  
510 predictive performance. One study took such an approach and found that using a  
511 decomposition-based, compared to a seed-based, extraction of functional networks  
512 during a social cognition task achieved significantly greater performance in predicting  
513 the degree of social anhedonia in around 70 adolescents/young adults with varying

514 levels of schizotypy (34). Since the raw neuroimaging data from the ABCD data are  
515 publicly available, this may be a feasible approach to implement in a future study.

516 Another limitation in our study is the use of a binary classifier for childhood  
517 anhedonia. Several studies have reported greater predictive performance of  
518 neuroimaging measures on anhedonia symptom scores (34,35) which suggests that  
519 functional neuroimaging measures may be more useful for predicting symptom severity  
520 rather than for disorder classification. Thus, it may be more reliable to investigate the  
521 associations between functional neuroimaging measures and clinical scales for  
522 assessing behavioral problems (such as the Child Behavior Checklist) or neurocognitive  
523 performance in individuals with anhedonia.

524 Finally, the DSM-V definition of anhedonia conflates two distinct reward  
525 processes: motivational (interest/wanting) and consummatory (pleasurable/liking)  
526 behaviors. These behaviors have been shown to have distinct neurobiological and  
527 behavioral components (9,36). We are limited in our study because we do not  
528 distinguish between these processes. However, the ABCD study data does include  
529 task-based functional neuroimaging of participants completing the monetary incentive  
530 delay task, which is able to assess the anticipatory, consummatory, and learning  
531 aspects of reward (37). These processes were studied previously by  
532 Pornpattananangkul et al., but exceeded the scope of this study. Nevertheless,  
533 exploration of brain connectivity specific to each of these reward-based components in  
534 subjects with anhedonia may help elucidate the underlying circuitry underlying this  
535 complex psychiatric condition.

536 Acknowledgements

537 Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain  
538 Cognitive Development<sup>SM</sup> (ABCD) Study (<https://abcdstudy.org>), held in the NIMH Data  
539 Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than  
540 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The  
541 ABCD Study<sup>®</sup> is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal  
542 partners under award numbers U01DA041048, U01DA050989, U01DA051016,  
543 U01DA041022, U01DA051018, U01DA051037, U01DA050987, U01DA041174,  
544 U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041028, U01DA041134, U01DA050988,  
545 U01DA051039, U01DA041156, U01DA041025, U01DA041120, U01DA051038,  
546 U01DA041148, U01DA041093, U01DA041089, U24DA041123, U24DA041147. A full  
547 list of supporters is available at <https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html>. A listing of  
548 participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at  
549 [https://abcdstudy.org/consortium\\_members/](https://abcdstudy.org/consortium_members/). ABCD consortium investigators designed  
550 and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in  
551 the analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors  
552 and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators.  
553 The ABCD data repository grows and changes over time. The ABCD data used in this  
554 report came from <http://dx.doi.org/10.15154/1523041>.

555 This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or  
556 views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators.

557 This study received no external funding. Yi Zhou was supported by the department of  
558 Psychiatry at Virginia Commonwealth University.

559 Disclosures

560 The authors report no financial interests or potential conflicts of interest

561 References

- 562 1. American Psychiatric Association, American Psychiatric Association, editors.  
563 Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5. 5th ed. Washington,  
564 D.C: American Psychiatric Association; 2013. 947 p.
- 565 2. Gutkovich Z, Morrissey RF, Espallat RK, Dicker R. Anhedonia and pessimism in  
566 hospitalized depressed adolescents. *Depress Res Treat*. 2011;2011:795173.
- 567 3. Garfield JBB, Lubman DI, Yücel M. Anhedonia in substance use disorders: a  
568 systematic review of its nature, course and clinical correlates. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*.  
569 2014 Jan;48(1):36–51.
- 570 4. Frewen PA, Dozois DJA, Lanius RA. Assessment of anhedonia in psychological  
571 trauma: psychometric and neuroimaging perspectives. *Eur J Psychotraumatology*.  
572 2012 Jan 11;3:10.3402/ejpt.v3i0.8587.
- 573 5. Sternat T, Fotinos K, Fine A, Epstein I, Katzman MA. Low hedonic tone and  
574 attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: risk factors for treatment resistance in  
575 depressed adults. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2018 Sep 17;14:2379–87.
- 576 6. Luby JL, Agrawal A, Belden A, Whalen D, Tillman R, Barch DM. Developmental  
577 Trajectories of the Orbitofrontal Cortex and Anhedonia in Middle Childhood and Risk  
578 for Substance Use in Adolescence in a Longitudinal Sample of Depressed and  
579 Healthy Preschoolers. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2018 Oct;175(10):1010–21.
- 580 7. McMakin DL, Olinio TM, Porta G, Dietz LJ, Emslie G, Clarke G, et al. Anhedonia  
581 predicts poorer recovery among youth with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor  
582 treatment-resistant depression. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2012  
583 Apr;51(4):404–11.
- 584 8. Robbins DR, Alessi NE. Depressive symptoms and suicidal behavior in adolescents.  
585 *Am J Psychiatry*. 1985 May;142(5):588–92.
- 586 9. Treadway MT, Zald DH. Reconsidering anhedonia in depression: lessons from  
587 translational neuroscience. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2011 Jan;35(3):537–55.
- 588 10. Gabbay V, Ely BA, Li Q, Bangaru SD, Panzer AM, Alonso CM, et al. Striatum-based  
589 circuitry of adolescent depression and anhedonia. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc*  
590 *Psychiatry*. 2013 Jun;52(6):628-641.e13.
- 591 11. Rzepa E, McCabe C. Decreased anticipated pleasure correlates with increased  
592 salience network resting state functional connectivity in adolescents with depressive  
593 symptomatology. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2016 Nov;82:40–7.



- 594 12. Rzepa E, McCabe C. Anhedonia and depression severity dissociated by dmPFC  
595 resting-state functional connectivity in adolescents. *J Psychopharmacol Oxf Engl*.  
596 2018 Oct;32(10):1067–74.
- 597 13. Pornpattananangkul N, Leibenluft E, Pine DS, Stringaris A. Notice of Retraction and  
598 Replacement. Pornpattananangkul et al. Association between childhood anhedonia  
599 and alterations in large-scale resting-state networks and task-evoked activation.  
600 *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(6):624-633. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020 Oct 1;77(10):1085–  
601 6.
- 602 14. Stevens JR. Replicability and Reproducibility in Comparative Psychology. *Front*  
603 *Psychol*. 2017;8:862.
- 604 15. De Fruyt J, Sabbe B, Demyttenaere K. Anhedonia in Depressive Disorder: A  
605 Narrative Review. *Psychopathology*. 2020;53(5–6):274–81.
- 606 16. Johnson WE, Li C, Rabinovic A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression  
607 data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics*. 2007 Jan 1;8(1):118–27.
- 608 17. Hagler DJ, Hatton S, Cornejo MD, Makowski C, Fair DA, Dick AS, et al. Image  
609 processing and analysis methods for the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development  
610 Study. *NeuroImage*. 2019 Nov 15;202:116091.
- 611 18. Casey BJ, Cannonier T, Conley MI, Cohen AO, Barch DM, Heitzeg MM, et al. The  
612 Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across  
613 21 sites. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2018 Aug 1;32:43–54.
- 614 19. Gordon EM, Laumann TO, Adeyemo B, Huckins JF, Kelley WM, Petersen SE.  
615 Generation and Evaluation of a Cortical Area Parcellation from Resting-State  
616 Correlations. *Cereb Cortex N Y NY*. 2016 Jan;26(1):288–303.
- 617 20. Orhac F, Eertink JJ, Cottureau AS, Zijlstra JM, Thieblemont C, Meignan M, et al. A  
618 Guide to ComBat Harmonization of Imaging Biomarkers in Multicenter Studies. *J*  
619 *Nucl Med Off Publ Soc Nucl Med*. 2022 Feb;63(2):172–9.
- 620 21. Vidal-Ribas P, Janiri D, Doucet GE, Pornpattananangkul N, Nielson DM, Frangou S,  
621 et al. Multimodal neuroimaging of suicidal thoughts and behaviors in a US  
622 population-based sample of school-aged children. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2021 Apr  
623 1;178(4):321–32.
- 624 22. Marek S, Tervo-Clemmens B, Calabro FJ, Montez DF, Kay BP, Hatoum AS, et al.  
625 Reproducible brain-wide association studies require thousands of individuals.  
626 *Nature*. 2022 Mar;603(7902):654–60.
- 627 23. Conway CC, Forbes MK, South SC. A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology  
628 (HiTOP) Primer for Mental Health Researchers. *Clin Psychol Sci*. 2022 Mar  
629 1;10(2):236–58.

- 630 24. Kotov R, Jonas KG, Carpenter WT, Dretsch MN, Eaton NR, Forbes MK, et al.  
631 Validity and utility of Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): I.  
632 Psychosis superspectrum. *World Psychiatry*. 2020 Jun;19(2):151–72.
- 633 25. LaVeist TA. Beyond dummy variables and sample selection: what health services  
634 researchers ought to know about race as a variable. *Health Serv Res*. 1994  
635 Apr;29(1):1–16.
- 636 26. Vyas CM, Donneyong M, Mischoulon D, Chang G, Gibson H, Cook NR, et al.  
637 Association of Race and Ethnicity With Late-Life Depression Severity, Symptom  
638 Burden, and Care. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020 Mar 2;3(3):e201606.
- 639 27. Liu CH, Tronick E. Prevalence and predictors of maternal postpartum depressed  
640 mood and anhedonia by race and ethnicity. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. 2014  
641 Jun;23(2):201–9.
- 642 28. Braveman PA, Cubbin C, Egerter S, Williams DR, Pamuk E. Socioeconomic  
643 disparities in health in the United States: what the patterns tell us. *Am J Public*  
644 *Health*. 2010 Apr 1;100 Suppl 1:S186-196.
- 645 29. Meyer CS, Schreiner PJ, Lim K, Battapady H, Launer LJ. Depressive  
646 Symptomatology, Racial Discrimination Experience, and Brain Tissue Volumes  
647 Observed on Magnetic Resonance Imaging: The CARDIA Study. *Am J Epidemiol*.  
648 2019 Apr 1;188(4):656–63.
- 649 30. Okeke O, Elbasheir A, Carter SE, Powers A, Mekawi Y, Gillespie CF, et al. Indirect  
650 Effects of Racial Discrimination on Health Outcomes Through Prefrontal Cortical  
651 White Matter Integrity. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging* [Internet]. 2022  
652 May 18 [cited 2022 Oct 19]; Available from:  
653 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2451902222001203>
- 654 31. Fani N, Harnett NG, Bradley B, Mekawi Y, Powers A, Stevens JS, et al. Racial  
655 Discrimination and White Matter Microstructure in Trauma-Exposed Black Women.  
656 *Biol Psychiatry*. 2022 Feb 1;91(3):254–61.
- 657 32. Cui Z, Li H, Xia CH, Larsen B, Adebimpe A, Baum GL, et al. Individual Variation in  
658 Functional Topography of Association Networks in Youth. *Neuron*. 2020 Apr  
659 22;106(2):340-353.e8.
- 660 33. McKeown MJ, Hansen LK, Sejnowsk TJ. Independent component analysis of  
661 functional MRI: what is signal and what is noise? *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2003 Oct  
662 1;13(5):620–9.
- 663 34. Krohne LG, Wang Y, Hinrich JL, Moerup M, Chan RCK, Madsen KH. Classification  
664 of social anhedonia using temporal and spatial network features from a social  
665 cognition fMRI task. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2019 Dec 1;40(17):4965–81.



- 666 35. Mellem MS, Liu Y, Gonzalez H, Kollada M, Martin WJ, Ahammad P. Machine  
667 Learning Models Identify Multimodal Measurements Highly Predictive of  
668 Transdiagnostic Symptom Severity for Mood, Anhedonia, and Anxiety. *Biol*  
669 *Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging*. 2020 Jan 1;5(1):56–67.
- 670 36. Der-Avakian A, Markou A. The Neurobiology of Anhedonia and Other Reward-  
671 Related Deficits. *Trends Neurosci*. 2012 Jan;35(1):68–77.
- 672 37. Wilson RP, Colizzi M, Bossong MG, Allen P, Kempton M, Abe N, et al. The Neural  
673 Substrate of Reward Anticipation in Health: A Meta-Analysis of fMRI Findings in the  
674 Monetary Incentive Delay Task. *Neuropsychol Rev*. 2018 Dec 1;28(4):496–506.





Figure