

Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation conditions increased invigoration and wanting in depression

Magdalena Ferstl^{1*}, Anne Kühnel^{2*}, Johannes Klaus¹, Wy Ming Lin^{1,4},
& Nils B. Kroemer¹⁻³

¹ Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Tübingen Center for Mental Health, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

² Section of Medical Psychology, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Faculty of Medicine, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

³ German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), Tübingen, Germany

⁴ Hector Research Institute for Education Science and Psychology, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

* Equal contribution

Corresponding author*

Prof. Dr. Nils B. Kroemer, nkroemer@uni-bonn.de

Venusberg Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany

Abstract

Background: Major depressive disorder (MDD) is often marked by impaired motivation and reward processing, known as anhedonia. Many patients do not respond to first-line treatments, and improvements in motivation can be slow, creating an urgent need for rapid interventions. Recently, we demonstrated that transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) acutely boosts effort invigoration in healthy participants, but its effects on depression remain unclear.

Objective: To assess the impact of taVNS on effort invigoration and maintenance in a sample that includes patients with MDD, evaluating the generalizability of our findings.


Methods: We used a single-blind, randomized crossover design in 30 patients with MDD and 29 matched (age, sex, and BMI) healthy control participants (HCP).

Results: Consistent with prior findings, taVNS increased effort invigoration for rewards in both groups during Session 1 ($p=.040$), particularly for less wanted rewards in HCP ($p_{boot}<.001$). However, invigoration remained elevated in all participants, and no acute changes were observed in Session 2 (Δ invigoration=3.52, $p=.093$). Crucially, throughout Session 1, we found taVNS-induced increases in effort invigoration ($p_{boot}=.008$) and wanting ($p_{boot}=.010$) in patients with MDD, with gains in wanting maintained across sessions (Δ wanting=0.06, $p=.97$).

Conclusions: Our study replicates the invigorating effects of taVNS in Session 1 and reveals its generalizability to depression. Furthermore, we expand upon previous research by showing taVNS-induced conditioning effects on invigoration and wanting within Session 1 in patients that were largely sustained. While enduring motivational improvements present challenges for crossover designs, they are highly desirable in interventions and warrant further follow-up research.

Graphical abstract

Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation conditions increased invigoration and wanting in depression



Introduction

While we often experience temporary low moods and motivation, persistent negative feelings may signify depressive episodes instead. With over 280 million people affected globally, major depressive disorder (MDD) is a leading cause of disability ^{1, 2}. The prevalence of MDD highlights the need for improved treatment options. Particularly, somatic symptoms ³ and anhedonia are associated with greater severity and persistence of MDD ^{4, 5} and they respond worse to conventional treatments ^{4, 6}. Recent hypotheses implicate aberrant interoceptive signaling as a potential cause in the etiology of somatic and motivational symptoms ⁷⁻⁹. The required communication between peripheral organs and the brain is channeled through the vagus nerve and converges on the nucleus of the solitary tract in the brainstem to modulate motivational circuits ¹⁰. Consequently, vagal afferents tune motivated behavior ^{11, 12} such as food seeking ^{13, 14} and response vigor ¹⁵. While preliminary evidence has shown the potential of transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) to affect motivated behavior and brain–body signaling in healthy participants ^{16, 17}, its potential for improving motivational deficits in MDD has not yet been established.

Anhedonia is a cardinal symptom of depression and involves diminished reward anticipation and effort exertion ¹⁸⁻²⁰. Although rewards typically boost motivation ²¹⁻²³, this function appears impaired in patients with MDD ^{20, 24}. In addition to struggling to adapt their behavior to reward magnitude, these patients often experience increased exhaustion after effort tasks ^{21, 24, 25}. Since this motivation deficit worsens with symptom severity and correlates with a poorer prognosis ^{20, 26}, there is an unmet need for rapid, targeted treatments addressing motivational alterations in MDD.

To treat symptoms of anhedonia and boost mood in people with depression, pharmacotherapy with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) is the first line of treatment ^{27, 28}. On the behavioral level, SSRIs have been shown to increase effort expenditure for rewards ²⁹, a behavioral proxy of motivational facets of anhedonia ³⁰. Still, antidepressant medication only improves reward-related symptoms in a subset of patients ³¹ and anhedonia is less responsive to SSRI treatments compared to mood-related symptoms ³². Moreover, the antidepressant effects of SSRIs only materialize after several weeks of use ³³⁻³⁶. Hence, adjunct treatments, such as vagus nerve stimulation (VNS), have been proposed to improve symptoms more rapidly and

increase overall response rates ^{37, 38}. Indeed, studies have shown antidepressant effects of invasive VNS ³⁹⁻⁴¹ and non-invasive VNS ⁴²⁻⁴⁵. In addition to motivational effects, non-invasive VNS has been shown to acutely counteract anxiety-related mechanisms and symptoms ^{46, 47}. Since non-invasive VNS is well-tolerated ⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰, it could be used as an adjunct treatment for motivational or somatic symptoms.

Despite the promising long-term effectiveness of VNS ⁵¹⁻⁵³, the acute effects on motivational symptoms remain largely elusive ⁵⁰. In healthy participants, we have recently shown that taVNS boosts the drive to work for rewards ¹⁶ and ameliorates the dampened mood after effortful tasks ⁵⁴. Since taVNS-induced improvements in motivation were stronger for participants with low baseline mood, it might be a promising technique to rapidly increase motivational drive in patients with MDD as well. To close this gap, we investigated taVNS-induced changes in the motivation to work for rewards¹⁶ using a single-blind crossover design (taVNS vs. sham) in participants with MDD as well as matched healthy control participants (HCP). Based on preclinical findings and our previous results, we expected taVNS to acutely boost motivation, generalizing to patients with MDD. In accordance with this hypothesis, we observed taVNS-induced increases in invigoration during the first session, whereas there was no acute effect of taVNS in the second session. Intriguingly, we observed conditioning effects in patients with MDD during the first session that were largely maintained, pointing to a potentially longer-lasting improvement elicited by taVNS.

Methods

Participants

We included 31 participants with MDD as well as 34 HCP in the study who completed two sessions: one with right-sided taVNS and the other with sham stimulation (order randomized). However, data had to be excluded from the analysis due to dropout (n=2), technical issues (n=3), or medication (1 HCP), leading to a final sample size of N=59 (i.e., n=29 HCP and n=30 with MDD, Table 1). To be included, participants went through a screening protocol to ensure they were physically healthy, 18 to 65 years old, and within a normal or overweight range of their body mass index (BMI, 18.5-30 kg/m²). Participants with MDD had to fulfill the criteria for MDD ¹ within the last 12 months and had to have a current BDI-II score ≥ 14 ⁵⁵. In contrast, HCPs had no history of depression. We only included participants without other mental comorbidities apart from anxiety disorders (in HCP only specific phobias) and tobacco use disorder ⁵⁶. Participants provided written informed consent at the beginning of Session 1 and received either monetary compensation (32€ fixed amount) or course credit for their participation after completing the second session. Moreover, they received money and snacks depending on their performance during the tasks. The study protocol was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05120336). The study was approved by the ethics committee of the medical faculty of the university of Tübingen and conducted in accordance with the ethical code of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki).

Variable	N	Overall, N=59	HCP, N=29	MDD, N=30	p-value ²
Sex	59				0.71 ¹
male		19 (32%)	10 (34%)	9 (30%)	
female		40 (68%)	19 (66%)	21 (70%)	
Age	59	34.2 (13.5)	37.1 (14.5)	31.4 (12.1)	0.12 ²
Stimulation Session 1	59				0.70 ¹
Sham		30 (51%)	14 (48%)	16 (53%)	
taVNS		29 (49%)	15 (52%)	14 (47%)	
Comorbidities					
Anxiety	59	13 (22%)	5 (17%)	8 (27%)	0.38 ¹
Trauma-related	59	2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.7%)	0.49 ³
Substance dependence (Tobacco)	59	5 (8.5%)	3 (10%)	2 (6.7%)	0.67 ³
Personality disorders	59	1 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	>0.99 ³
Medication					
SSRI	59	8 (14%)	0 (0%)	8 (27%)	0.005 ³
SNRI	59	4 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	4 (13%)	0.11 ³
Other	59	3 (5.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	0.24 ³
Tetracyclic	59	3 (5.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	0.24 ³
Atypical antipsychotics	59	2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.7%)	0.49 ³
Tricyclic	59	1 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	>0.99 ³
BMI [kg/m²]	59	24.3 (3.4)	24.0 (3.4)	24.6 (3.5)	0.42 ²
BDI	59	13.1 (11.3)	4.1 (3.7)	21.7 (9.2)	<0.001 ²
Minimal to mild				14 (48%)	
Moderate				7 (24%)	
Severe				8 (29%)	
SHAPS	59	2.5 (2.9)	0.9 (2.5)	4.1 (2.4)	<0.001 ²

Table 1: Characteristics of the sample. Values reported are mean (SD) for continuous variables and n (%) for categorical variables. ¹Pearson's Chi-squared test; ²Wilcoxon rank sum test; ³Fisher's exact test. taVNS = transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation, SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor, SNRI = selective noradrenaline reuptake inhibitor, BMI = Body mass index, BDI = Beck Depression inventory, SHAPS = Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale.

Experimental procedure

Experimental sessions were conducted in a randomized, single-blind crossover design that was adapted with minor modifications from our previous studies (see ^{16, 54}, Figure 1). Before the first session, participants were asked to answer several questionnaires at home, including the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II; ⁵⁵), Snaith Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS; ⁵⁷) and behavioral inhibition/activation scales (BIS/BAS; ⁵⁸) to assess reward processing and quantify depressive symptoms.

Participants were asked to fast 3-5h before each session ($M_{\text{fast}} = 4.05\text{h} \pm 2.12\text{h}$) so that they felt neither full nor hungry. Sessions started at approximately the same time of the day ($\pm 1\text{h}$) and lasted about 2.5h. In Session 1, participants provided written informed consent. After measuring physiological and anthropometric parameters (e.g., pulse and weight), we recorded their preceding food and drink intake. Participants were allowed to drink water during the whole session. Next, participants reported their current mood state based on the Positive And Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; Watson ⁵⁹) using visual analog scales (VAS). To practice the effort task and calibrate the individual maximum frequency of button presses, we included a training run of the effort allocation task (EAT). Then, the stimulation electrode of the NEMOS® tVNS device (cerbomed GmbH, Erlangen, Germany) was attached and secured with surgical tape on the right ear, either at the cymba conchae for taVNS or at the ear lobe for sham. For each session, we individually adjusted the stimulation amplitude by slowly increasing it in 0.1-0.2 mA steps until the participants' sensation (assessed with VAS) was rated as a "mild pricking" and below the pain threshold ^{16, 60, 61}. The stimulation then continued according to the default protocol (i.e., alternating 30 s phases of stimulation with biphasic impulse frequency of 25 Hz and 30 s pauses).

After a food-cue reactivity task (~ 20 min; ^{56, 60}), participants completed the EAT (~ 40 min). The EAT ¹⁶, was adapted from ⁶² and assesses reward-related processes by the willingness to exert physical effort to gain food or money rewards depending on the difficulty and reward magnitude. Briefly, participants either worked for food or money tokens of either low (1 point) or high (10 points) magnitude. Difficulty also varied (easy vs. hard), leading to 8 possible trial combinations that were presented 6 times each. In each trial, participants saw a blue ball inside a vertical tube with a red horizontal line above it on the screen. The height of the red line indicated the level of

difficulty and trial type (i.e., reward type and reward magnitude) was displayed in the upper right corner throughout the trial. To lift the blue ball above the red line, participants had to repeatedly press the right trigger button of an Xbox 360 controller (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA); the faster the button was pressed, the higher the ball would go. For every second the ball was held above the line, money or food points were collected and the current score was displayed in the upper right corner of the screen. After each trial, participants were asked about how much they wanted the rewards and how much they exerted themselves via VAS. The task included 48 trials and two 15s breaks. During the EAT, taVNS was started in synchronization with the reward cue by the experimenter. Then, the stimulation continued with the default protocol while participants completed a reinforcement learning task (~15 min; ⁶³).

The task block was followed by VAS ratings. After removal of the taVNS electrode, the participants received their snack reward according to their achieved energy points and had time to eat as much as they liked during a short break. Then, participants answered the state VAS ratings for the last time. To complete the session, monetary winnings were paid out based on their earnings in the tasks. Both sessions followed the same standardized protocol and were conducted within an interval of 2-7 d ($M = 4.68d \pm 2.70$). To evaluate the success of blinding, participants reported whether they received sham or taVNS at the end of each session. Their responses did not exceed the chance level (*recorded guesses*: 118, *correct guesses*: 63, *accuracy*: 53.3%, $p_{binom} = .52$), suggesting successful blinding.




Figure 1. Experimental procedure and overview of the effort allocation task (EAT). Participants (29 healthy control participants, HCP, and 30 with major depressive disorder, MDD) completed two experimental sessions, one with active transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) and one with sham stimulation (randomized crossover). Within each session, participants complete tasks during stimulation. In the EAT, participants have to repeatedly press a button on an Xbox controller to elevate a ball above a red difficulty line to collect food and monetary reward points. Trials differ in their reward magnitude, reward type, and difficulty. After each trial, participants rated how much they wanted to receive the reward and how much they exerted themselves using visual analog scales (VAS). RF = relative frequency (to the maximal frequency of the participant during the training)

Data analysis

Estimation of invigoration and maintenance of effort as a motivational index

To isolate invigoration and maintenance of effort as motivational indices, we segmented the behavioral data into work and rest segments (<https://github.com/neuromadlab>)¹⁶. We calculated taVNS effects using univariate mixed-effects models for our two dependent variables: effort invigoration and maintenance¹⁶. Briefly, the models predicted each dependent variable based on the following dummy-coded variables: stimulation (taVNS, sham), reward type (food, money), reward magnitude (low, high), and difficulty (easy, hard), and the interaction between reward magnitude and difficulty. Additionally, we included interaction terms of stimulation with all other terms mentioned. To assess differential effects of taVNS in the MDD group compared to HCP, we included MDD diagnosis as a between-participant factor in interaction with the stimulation effect as well as reward magnitude and difficulty. Additionally, stimulation order (centered) was included as a nuisance variable. To account for deviations from fixed group effects, random slopes and

intercepts were modeled for all predictors. Comparable models were used to investigate taVNS-induced changes in wanting.

To evaluate whether taVNS modulates the association between subjective ratings and motivation, we additionally used robust regression analysis that is preferable in the presence of heteroscedasticity and outliers⁶⁴ as is common in the rating data. Analogous to our previous work¹⁶, we ran a robust regression (MATLAB `robustfit`, weight function `huber`) at the group level separately for the MDD and HCP groups as many participants had a restricted range in wanting ratings leading to uninformative individual slope estimates. Significance was assessed using permutation tests (with 10,000 iterations). We then compared the observed difference in slopes (taVNS – sham) to the null distribution to calculate *p*-values for the complete sample as well as HCP and MDD groups separately. Due to the advantages of robust regression, we used the same approach to compare increases in wanting and invigoration across trials and between taVNS and sham.

Statistical threshold and software

For our analyses, we used a two-tailed $\alpha \leq .05$ threshold. Mixed-effects analyses were conducted with `lmerTest` in R⁶⁵. Data was visualized using `ggplot2`⁶⁶ and `ggdist`⁶⁷. We processed data with MATLAB vR2021b and plotted results with R v4.1.1 (R Core Team, 2021).

Results

To evaluate taVNS effects on effort invigoration and maintenance, we used mixed-effects models. First, we replicated the main task effects as participants worked more vigorously (invigoration: $b= 6.2$, $p= .007$) and harder for higher rewards; (maintenance: $b= 9.3$, $p= .002$). Participants also showed higher effort maintenance ($b= 9.1$, $p= .0001$), but not effort invigoration ($b= -1.5$, $p= .35$) for easy trials. In contrast to our previous study when participants were fasted, they now worked more vigorously ($b= 5.1$, $p= .0005$) and harder ($b= 7.6$, $p < .001$) for money as opposed to food. Regarding trial-wise subjective ratings, wanting was associated with both effort invigoration ($b= 0.16$, $p < .001$) and effort maintenance ($b= 0.19$, $p < .001$, Figure S1), whereas exertion was more strongly associated with effort maintenance ($b= 0.35$, $p < .001$) compared to invigoration ($b= 0.08$, $p= .013$), again replicating the pattern of our previous study.

Next, we compared performance between the HCP and MDD groups across conditions. To this end, we did not include interactions with group in this model. Participants with MDD did not exert less effort than HCP (Figure 2, all $ps > .21$) and performance was independent of symptom severity (as assessed by the BDI) and anhedonia (as assessed by the SHAPS (all $ps > .38$), see Tables S1-S4 for session specific differences). Adding sex, age, and BMI as covariates did not affect group- or stimulation-related inferences. In Session 1, patients with MDD reported lower wanting ($b= -8.7$, $p= .032$), but this difference was attenuated in Session 2 ($b= -5.9$, $p= .33$) and not significant across both sessions ($b= -8.1$, $p= .078$). Mirroring task performance, subjective ratings of exertion (S1: $b= 0.9$, $p= .75$, S2: $b= 2.4$, $p= .41$) were not different between groups. Again, neither symptom severity, nor anhedonia were specifically associated with wanting or exertion ratings (Table S5-S8).




Figure 2. Patients with major depressive disorder (MDD) invest comparable effort for rewards but report lower wanting initially compared to healthy control participants (HCP). a: The absolute frequency of button presses showed no differences between groups in either session (Session 1: $b = -0.05$, $p = .74$, Session 2: $b = -0.12$, $p = .46$). b: Effort maintenance as assessed by the relative button press frequency throughout the trial was comparable across groups in Session 1 ($b = 3.1$, $p = .33$) and Session 2 ($b = 4.5$, $p = .15$). The nominally higher relative frequency was primarily due to the initial calibration at an individual level as absolute frequencies were nearly identical. c: There were no differences in invigoration slopes between groups in Session 1 ($b = 1.9$, $p = .33$) or Session 2 ($b = 1.8$, $p = .59$). d: Wanting was significantly lower in MDD compared to HCP in Session 1 ($b = -7.0$, $p = .017$), with a similar, non-significant trend in Session 2 ($b = -2.4$, $p = .42$).

taVNS boosts the drive to work for less wanted rewards

We then sought to replicate our previous findings that taVNS increases effort invigoration in healthy participants and evaluated whether it generalizes to patients with MDD. In line with Neuser et al. ¹⁶, there was no taVNS-induced increase in effort maintenance ($b= 1.1$, $p= .64$, Table S10) across the sample. However, there was no taVNS-induced increase in invigoration ($b= 0.02$, $p= .99$, Table S9, Fig. 2a) across the sample and sessions. Nevertheless, in line with Neuser et al. ¹⁶, taVNS boosted invigoration ($b= 5.6$, $p= .040$, Cohen's $d_{S1}= 0.55$, Figure 2a) in Session 1, and invigoration did not change any further in Session 2 (Δ invigoration= 3.3, $p= .12$). Moreover, taVNS-induced changes were comparable in participants with vs. without MDD (Stim \times Group: invigoration $p= .87$, maintenance $p= .80$). Hence, participants who received taVNS in the first session continued to benefit from the stimulation but showed little additional change due to the acute stimulation in Session 2 (Figure 2a).

Next, we conducted a post hoc re-analysis of our previous data ¹⁶ to compare carryover effects. Although the previously reported taVNS-induced increase in invigoration was significant across both sessions, acute taVNS effects were also larger in the first session (Cohen's $d_{S1}= 0.47$, Cohen's $d_{S2}= 0.01$). Moreover, we replicated that taVNS increased the drive to work for less wanted rewards as indexed by a reduced correlation between wanting ratings and effort invigoration in the HCP group (HCP: $b= -0.10$, $p_{perm}= .0014$, Fig. 3b-c). Notably, this taVNS-induced decrease in the slope was absent in patients with MDD ($b= 0.05$, $p= .080$). Whereas there was no difference in the correspondence of wanting and invigoration between groups in the sham condition ($b= 0.05$, $p_{perm}= .11$), the HCP group had significantly lower correspondence between wanting and invigoration in the taVNS condition ($b= -0.10$, $p= .008$). To summarize, acute taVNS-induced increases in invigoration are replicably larger in Session 1, and these gains were more conserved and carried over to Session 2 in the present study.




Figure 3. Vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) boosts the drive to work in Session 1 and for less wanted rewards in healthy control participants (HCP). **a:** Invigoration is increased in Session 1 compared to sham ($b=5.6$, $p=.036$) across both groups. In Session 2, invigoration did not change and differences from Session 1 were maintained (Δ invigoration= 3.3, $p=.12$). Participants receiving taVNS first are depicted in red in Session 1 and blue (sham) in Session 2 due to the crossover design of the study. Error bars depict 95% confidence intervals at the trial level. **b:** During taVNS, effort invigoration becomes less dependent on wanting in HCP ($p_{\text{perm}}=.0014$), but not in patients with MDD (where the slope tends to increase, $p_{\text{perm}}=.089$). Wanting ratings are shown as 2d-density polygon, where brighter colors indicate a higher density of data. **c:** Distributions of the permuted associations between invigoration and wanting during taVNS vs. sham. We fitted robust regression coefficients, b , after permuting the labels for taVNS vs. sham stimulation, and calculated the difference in slopes (colored bars: dark gray = HCP, light blue = MDD, light gray = combined sample) to a permuted null distribution (violin plots in the background in gray). This permutation test showed a significant main effect of taVNS in HCP, but not patients with MDD. BPR/s = button press rate in % per s.

taVNS durably enhances motivation and gains extend to wanting in depression

To better understand how taVNS-induced increases in Session 1 are translated to lasting motivational differences in Session 2, we further explored trial-based dynamics of taVNS effects. We reasoned that stimulation-induced changes in behavior and ratings across trials might track behavioral adaptations and that taVNS-induced gains might be linked to durable changes in the subjective value of the rewards at stake. To investigate trial-based dynamics, we estimated the effect of taVNS (vs. sham) on changes in effort invigoration and wanting within sessions (i.e., by estimating trial slopes capturing changes over trials). In line with an instrumental conditioning effect, taVNS induced stronger increases in effort invigoration ($p_{\text{perm}} = .005$) and wanting ($p_{\text{perm}} = .011$) during the first session in patients with MDD, but not HCP (invigoration: $p_{\text{perm}} = .96$; wanting: $p_{\text{perm}} = .90$). When including continuous symptom severity instead of group, participants with a higher BDI showed lower trial-wise increases in invigoration ($r = .37$, $p = .046$, Figure S1-2) during Session 1 (with a comparable trend for wanting, $r = .28$, $p = .14$). During taVNS, this association of increases in invigoration with BDI was fully attenuated ($r = .00$, $p = .99$), indicating that taVNS normalized motivation in Session 1 (for associations with other baseline characteristics, see Figure S1). Notably, invigoration and wanting plateaued at the end of Session 1 and there were no incremental changes in Session 2 (invigoration: $b = 3.3$, $p = .12$, wanting: $b = -0.29$, $p = .88$), suggesting that gains were largely preserved across sessions and only marginally influenced by acute stimulation after learning on the task. Hence, we also assessed whether taVNS-induced changes between sessions were affected by the delay. While we observed nominally lower indices when sessions were further apart, the association was not significant (invigoration: $b = -0.97$, $t(55) = -1.48$, $p = .15$; wanting: $b = -0.97$, $t(55) = -1.37$, $p = .17$, Figure S3) and a reanalysis of the previous HCP data did not show the same pattern (invigoration: $b = 1.1$, $t(79) = 1.51$, $p = .13$; wanting: $b = -0.81$, $t(79) = -1.28$, $p = .21$). Taken together, our results suggest that taVNS induces rapid gains in invigoration and wanting in patients with MDD that persist into Session 2.




Figure 3. Transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) increases effort invigoration and wanting across trials in patients with major depressive disorder (MDD). **a:** Trajectories of effort invigoration across trials split by stimulation, session, and group. In Session 1, patients with MDD show stronger taVNS-induced increases in invigoration across trials ($p_{\text{perm}}=.005$), indicating instrumental learning. **b:** Across participants, the conditioned increase in invigoration in Session 1 does not change in Session 2 ($p=.12$). **c:** taVNS-induced increases in invigoration across trials are observed in patients with MDD, but not HCP compared to permuted null distributions (colored bars: dark gray = HCP, light blue = MDD, light gray = combined sample). **d:** Trajectories of wanting ratings across trials split by stimulation, session, and group. In Session 1, patients with MDD show stronger taVNS-induced increases across trials ($p_{\text{perm}}=.011$) indicating instrumental conditioning. **e:** Learned evaluation of the reward at stake as indexed by wanting in the last quarter of the experiment in Session 1 does not change in Session 2 ($p=.88$) across participants. **f:** taVNS-induced increases in invigoration slope across trials are observed in patients with MDD, but not HCP compared to permuted null distributions.

Discussion

Loss of motivation is a pervasive symptom of MDD that is often not effectively treated by the current first line of treatment. To this end, we evaluated acute effects of taVNS on the willingness to work for rewards in participants with and without MDD. First, we replicated that taVNS boosts invigoration in both groups during the first session, corroborating our previously reported findings in healthy participants¹⁶. Second, we did not replicate that acute taVNS leads to an increase in invigoration across both sessions. Instead, taVNS-induced gains in effort invigoration persisted into the second session, demonstrating durable increases that could reflect instrumental conditioning. In support of this interpretation, we observed increases in invigoration and wanting in patients with MDD across trials in the first session, indicating that taVNS may facilitate effort-related learning processes that translate to the subjective evaluation. Surprisingly, these transfer effects were stable and largely resistant to the effects of acute stimulation during the second session. Third, we also replicated an increased invigoration for less wanted rewards in HCP, but not in patients with MDD. This discrepancy corroborates differences in the dynamics of learning during the effort task, where taVNS facilitated a rapid improvement of motivation during the first session that translated immediately to changes in subjective wanting in patients with MDD, but not in HCP. Taken together, our study demonstrates that acute taVNS-induced changes in invigoration and wanting may facilitate value-related learning processes that could be beneficial for the development of novel treatments for motivational symptoms of MDD.

In line with our previous results in healthy participants, taVNS increased invigoration in both groups in the first session. However, taVNS-induced increases in invigoration persisted into the second session and were no longer substantially altered by the acute stimulation, indicating longer-lasting learning effects. We then reanalyzed our previously collected data¹⁶ and observed larger taVNS-induced effects in the first session as well that were comparable to the new sample. In contrast, carryover effects were more pronounced compared to Neuser et al.¹⁶. These differences might be due to changes in our procedure. First, more participants completed their second session

two days after the first, leading to a shorter time interval between sessions. Second, to ease the recruitment of patients with MDD during the pandemic, participants completed the sessions in a non-fasting state corresponding to neither hungry nor full⁶⁸ and at different times of day⁶⁹. Persistent effects of taVNS due to learning are in line with rodent studies showing that VNS improves memory persistence⁷⁰. In humans, taVNS-enhanced memories were primarily reported for emotional stimuli and episodic content^{46, 47, 71, 72}. Likewise, taVNS has been shown to reduce learning rates which may also reflect longer-lasting memory traces for rewards⁶³. The interpretation that taVNS leads to a differentially learned memory trace is strengthened by the observation that taVNS-induced gradual increases of invigoration and wanting in patients with MDD in the first session. Crucially, the transfer of a heightened reward drive with corresponding changes in the subjective wanting of rewards in patients with MDD is highly promising for potential interventions. Such trial-to-trial increases in effort invigoration might be explained by enhanced motor learning which has been observed in rats^{73, 74} and translated for clinical use in the recovery of motor function after a stroke⁷⁵. In healthy humans, the evidence for taVNS effects on reinforcement learning is still mixed^{63, 76}, but a small study in patients with epilepsy also reported taVNS-induced improvements in learning across trials⁷⁷. Taken together, taVNS might lead to changes in effort-related learning processes, and harnessing these effects might help normalize motivation in patients with MDD to provide a lasting boost in reward-related behavior.

In support of a largely subconscious boost of motivational drive, we replicated that taVNS enhances invigoration for less wanted rewards in healthy participants¹⁶. Hence, taVNS might enhance the utility to work for rewards regardless of the expected benefit which would be in line with changes in monoaminergic signaling⁷⁸. Intriguingly, this reduction in the utility slope was only observed in healthy participants, and not in patients with MDD. To better understand this discrepancy, we conducted additional analyses within Session 1, demonstrating trial-wise increases in wanting during taVNS in patients with MDD. This gradual change in subjective ratings that we did not observe in healthy participants might reflect a normalization of reward-related dysfunctions in patients with MDD^{21, 25, 32, 79}. Previous work in patients with MDD has shown that their

behavior is less sensitive to manipulations of reward values⁸⁰ and taVNS may rapidly improve sensitivity to task-related performance feedback as a mechanism of learning. Likewise, taVNS may enhance sensitivity to interoceptive signals^{12, 17} contributing to effortful behavior and the subjective evaluation of costs and benefits of action^{16, 81, 82}. Therefore, alterations in interoception that have been recently linked to depression⁸³⁻⁸⁶ might provide a mechanism for taVNS to rapidly improve instrumental learning, both in terms of invigoration and subjective wanting. Since MDD is also characterized by dysregulation of the autonomic nervous system^{87, 88} and the monoaminergic system^{35, 89-91}, taVNS may help normalize signaling in patients with MDD. Consequently, taVNS might reveal differential modes of action in healthy populations compared to patients with MDD which may ultimately contribute to an improved understanding of the role of vagal afferent signals in regulating motivation in both health and disease.

To guide future research, several limitations of the current study must be considered. First, although persistent taVNS-induced gains in motivation are desirable for interventions, our crossover design was not optimized to resolve such carryover effects. Our post hoc analyses indicate that longer intervals between sessions may attenuate carryover effects (Figure S2). However, this pattern was not visible in our previous data¹⁶. Therefore, future work should investigate carryover effects with more longitudinal sessions, including the pressing clinical questions how long taVNS-induced changes in invigoration and wanting last and how long-term changes in motivation could be facilitated. Second, to improve accessibility for patients with MDD, experimental sessions took place throughout the day, not only after an overnight fast as in our previous studies^{16, 54, 60, 63}. Hence, metabolic states were more variable among participants (i.e., sessions took place 3 to 5 h after the last meal). Considering the role of vagal signaling in conferring the current state of the body¹¹, the effects of taVNS might conceivably depend on the metabolic state⁶⁸. Third, patients with MDD did not exert less effort compared to HCP as previous research has suggested^{18, 20}. Here, we predominantly recruited patients with mild to medium severity of depression (~71%) who were receiving treatment. MDD is a heterogeneous disorder with distinct subgroups and symptom profiles²⁶, and impaired motivation is one facet of anhedonia^{18, 20, 32}. Nevertheless, patients with MDD reported lower wanting of rewards during the

first session. Larger samples including patients with greater symptom severity and, ideally, without concurrent medication with SSRIs might yield more robust associations with behavior, even though this would reduce the representativeness of the patient sample. Fourth, although including the current medication (i.e., taking antidepressants vs. no medication) did not alter the reported results, taVNS might interact differently with antidepressants depending on whether they primarily target the dopamine or serotonin system³⁰. Since the current study is not sufficiently powered to evaluate differences between antidepressant classes, future studies are needed to investigate potential interactions of taVNS with commonly prescribed antidepressants.

Motivational symptoms of MDD are difficult to treat and we tested whether previously discovered acute invigorating effects of taVNS also occur in patients with MDD. Accordingly, we found that taVNS boosted invigoration across groups in the first session and taVNS-induced gains even persisted into the second session. In patients with MDD, taVNS-induced gains in invigoration evolved over trials and were mirrored in increases in wanting, suggesting an instrumental conditioning of subjective value that also persisted into the second session. Notably, we also replicated that taVNS boosted invigoration for less wanted rewards in healthy participants while patients with MDD showed instant improvements in subjective ratings of reward. To conclude, our results highlight distinct dynamics of instrumental learning elicited by taVNS in HCP and MDD. Specifically, taVNS-induced instrumental conditioning of effort, leading to durable effects on invigoration and wanting, appears highly promising for future motivational treatments, where taVNS could be used as an adjuvant in behavioral modules of therapy.

Acknowledgement

We thank Franziska Kräutlein and Larissa Katz for help with data acquisition as well as Wiebke Ringels for support in processing the data. The study was supported by the University of Tübingen, Faculty of Medicine fortune grant 2453-0-0, Daimler & Benz Foundation 32-04/19, and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), grants KR 4555/7-1, KR 4555/9-1, & KR 4555/10-1.

Author contributions

NBK was responsible for the study concept and design. MF, JK, & WML recruited participants and collected data under supervision by NBK. NBK conceived the method and MF & AK processed the data. MF, AK, & NBK performed the data analysis. MF, AK, & NBK wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to the interpretation of findings, provided critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, and approved the final version for publication.

Financial disclosure

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Data availability

The datasets used during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed. 2013.
2. World Health O. *Depression and other common mental disorders: global health estimates*. 2017. 2017. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/254610>
3. Simon GE, VonKorff M, Piccinelli M, Fullerton C, Ormel J. An international study of the relation between somatic symptoms and depression. *New England journal of medicine*. 1999;341(18):1329-1335.
4. Bekhuis E, Boschloo L, Rosmalen JG, de Boer MK, Schoevers RA. The impact of somatic symptoms on the course of major depressive disorder. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2016;205:112-118.
5. Iob E, Kirschbaum C, Steptoe A. Persistent depressive symptoms, HPA-axis hyperactivity, and inflammation: the role of cognitive-affective and somatic symptoms. *Molecular psychiatry*. 2020;25(5):1130-1140.
6. Argyropoulos SV, Nutt DJ. Anhedonia revisited: is there a role for dopamine-targeting drugs for depression? *Journal of psychopharmacology*. 2013;27(10):869-877.
7. DeVille DC, Kerr KL, Avery JA, et al. The neural bases of interoceptive encoding and recall in healthy adults and adults with depression. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. 2018;3(6):546-554.
8. Simmons WK, Burrows K, Avery JA, et al. Depression-related increases and decreases in appetite: dissociable patterns of aberrant activity in reward and interoceptive neurocircuitry. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2016;173(4):418-428.
9. Barrett LF, Simmons WK. Interoceptive predictions in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. Jul 2015;16(7):419-29. doi:10.1038/nrn3950
10. Han W, Tellez LA, Perkins MH, et al. A Neural Circuit for Gut-Induced Reward. *Cell*. Oct 18 2018;175(3):665-678 e23. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.08.049
11. Paciorek A, Skora L. Vagus Nerve Stimulation as a Gateway to Interoception. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:1659. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01659
12. Teckentrup V, Kroemer NB. Mechanisms for Survival: Vagal Control of Goal-Directed Behavior. *under review*. 2023;

13. Alhadeff AL, Grill HJ. Hindbrain nucleus tractus solitarius glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor signaling reduces appetitive and motivational aspects of feeding. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol*. Aug 15 2014;307(4):R465-70. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00179.2014
14. Kanoski SE, Alhadeff AL, Fortin SM, Gilbert JR, Grill HJ. Leptin signaling in the medial nucleus tractus solitarius reduces food seeking and willingness to work for food. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. Feb 2014;39(3):605-13. doi:10.1038/npp.2013.235
15. Varazzani C, San-Galli A, Gilardeau S, Bouret S. Noradrenaline and dopamine neurons in the reward/effort trade-off: a direct electrophysiological comparison in behaving monkeys. *J Neurosci*. May 20 2015;35(20):7866-77. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0454-15.2015
16. Neuser MP, Teckentrup V, Kühnel A, Hallschmid M, Walter M, Kroemer NB. Vagus nerve stimulation boosts the drive to work for rewards. *Nat Commun*. Jul 16 2020;11(1):3555. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17344-9
17. Müller SJ, Teckentrup V, Rebollo I, Hallschmid M, Kroemer NB. Vagus nerve stimulation increases stomach-brain coupling via a vagal afferent pathway. *Brain Stimul*. Sep-Oct 2022;15(5):1279-1289. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2022.08.019
18. Horne SJ, Topp TE, Quigley L. Depression and the willingness to expend cognitive and physical effort for rewards: A systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. Aug 2021;88:102065. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102065
19. Nielson DM, Keren H, O'Callaghan G, et al. Great Expectations: A Critical Review of and Suggestions for the Study of Reward Processing as a Cause and Predictor of Depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. Jan 15 2021;89(2):134-143. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.06.012
20. Yang XH, Huang J, Zhu CY, et al. Motivational deficits in effort-based decision making in individuals with subsyndromal depression, first-episode and remitted depression patients. *Psychiatry Res*. Dec 30 2014;220(3):874-82. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2014.08.056
21. Forbes EE, Dahl RE. Research Review: altered reward function in adolescent depression: what, when and how? *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. Jan 2012;53(1):3-15. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02477.x
22. Hird EJ, Beierholm U, De Boer L, et al. Dopamine and reward-related vigor in younger and older human participants. 2021;doi:10.1101/2021.03.17.435869

23. Fromer R, Lin H, Dean Wolf CK, Inzlicht M, Shenhav A. Expectations of reward and efficacy guide cognitive control allocation. *Nat Commun*. Feb 15 2021;12(1):1030. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21315-z
24. Clery-Melin ML, Schmidt L, Lafargue G, Baup N, Fossati P, Pessiglione M. Why don't you try harder? An investigation of effort production in major depression. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(8):e23178. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0023178
25. Admon R, Pizzagalli DA. Dysfunctional Reward Processing in Depression. *Curr Opin Psychol*. Aug 1 2015;4:114-118. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.011
26. Malgaroli M, Calderon A, Bonanno GA. Networks of major depressive disorder: A systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. Apr 2021;85:102000. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102000
27. Hollon SD, Cohen ZD, Singla DR, Andrews PW. Recent Developments in the Treatment of Depression. *Behav Ther*. Mar 2019;50(2):257-269. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2019.01.002
28. Olfson M, Blanco C, Marcus SC. Treatment of Adult Depression in the United States. *JAMA Intern Med*. Oct 1 2016;176(10):1482-1491. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5057
29. Meyniel F, Goodwin GM, Deakin JW, et al. A specific role for serotonin in overcoming effort cost. *Elife*. 2016;5:e17282.
30. Husain M, Roiser JP. Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: a transdiagnostic approach. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. Aug 2018;19(8):470-484. doi:10.1038/s41583-018-0029-9
31. Kraus C, Kadriu B, Lanzenberger R, Zarate CA, Jr., Kasper S. Prognosis and improved outcomes in major depression: a review. *Transl Psychiatry*. Apr 3 2019;9(1):127. doi:10.1038/s41398-019-0460-3
32. Treadway MT, Zald DH. Reconsidering anhedonia in depression: lessons from translational neuroscience. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. Jan 2011;35(3):537-55. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.06.006
33. Keller MB, Hirschfeld RM, Demyttenaere K, Baldwin DS. Optimizing outcomes in depression: focus on antidepressant compliance. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. Nov 2002;17(6):265-71. doi:10.1097/00004850-200211000-00001
34. Lopez-Torres J, Parraga I, Del Campo JM, Villena A, Group A. Follow up of patients who start treatment with antidepressants: treatment satisfaction, treatment

compliance, efficacy and safety. *BMC Psychiatry*. Feb 20 2013;13:65.
doi:10.1186/1471-244X-13-65

35. Racagni G, Popoli M. The pharmacological properties of antidepressants. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. May 2010;25(3):117-31. doi:10.1097/YIC.0b013e3283311acd

36. Sansone RA, Sansone LA. Antidepressant adherence: are patients taking their medications? *Innov Clin Neurosci*. May 2012;9(5-6):41-6.

37. Muller HHO, Moeller S, Lucke C, Lam AP, Braun N, Philipsen A. Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) and Other Augmentation Strategies for Therapy-Resistant Depression (TRD): Review of the Evidence and Clinical Advice for Use. *Front Neurosci*. 2018;12:239. doi:10.3389/fnins.2018.00239

38. Cimpianu CL, Strube W, Falkai P, Palm U, Hasan A. Vagus nerve stimulation in psychiatry: a systematic review of the available evidence. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*. Jan 2017;124(1):145-158. doi:10.1007/s00702-016-1642-2

39. George MS, Rush AJ, Marangell LB, et al. A one-year comparison of vagus nerve stimulation with treatment as usual for treatment-resistant depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. Sep 1 2005;58(5):364-73. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.07.028

40. Rush AJ, Marangell LB, Sackeim HA, et al. Vagus nerve stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: a randomized, controlled acute phase trial. *Biol Psychiatry*. Sep 1 2005;58(5):347-54. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.05.025

41. Nahas Z, Marangell LB, Husain MM, et al. Two-year outcome of vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) for treatment of major depressive episodes. *J Clin Psychiatry*. Sep 2005;66(9):1097-104. doi:10.4088/jcp.v66n0902

42. Frangos E, Ellrich J, Komisaruk BR. Non-invasive Access to the Vagus Nerve Central Projections via Electrical Stimulation of the External Ear: fMRI Evidence in Humans. *Brain Stimul*. May-Jun 2015;8(3):624-36. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2014.11.018

43. Hein E, Nowak M, Kiess O, et al. Auricular transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in depressed patients: a randomized controlled pilot study. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*. May 2013;120(5):821-7. doi:10.1007/s00702-012-0908-6

44. Liu J, Fang J, Wang Z, et al. Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation modulates amygdala functional connectivity in patients with depression. *J Affect Disord*. Nov 15 2016;205:319-326. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.08.003

45. Tu Y, Fang J, Cao J, et al. A distinct biomarker of continuous transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation treatment in major depressive disorder. *Brain Stimul*. May - Jun 2018;11(3):501-508. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2018.01.006

46. Burger AM, Van Diest I, Van der Does W, et al. The effect of transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation on fear generalization and subsequent fear extinction. *Neurobiol Learn Mem.* May 2019;161:192-201. doi:10.1016/j.nlm.2019.04.006
47. Szeska C, Richter J, Wendt J, Weymar M, Hamm AO. Promoting long-term inhibition of human fear responses by non-invasive transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation during extinction training. *Sci Rep.* Jan 30 2020;10(1):1529. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-58412-w
48. Bottomley JM, LeReun C, Diamantopoulos A, Mitchell S, Gaynes BN. Vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) therapy in patients with treatment resistant depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Compr Psychiatry.* Dec 12 2019;98:152156. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2019.152156
49. Redgrave J, Day D, Leung H, et al. Safety and tolerability of Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve stimulation in humans; a systematic review. *Brain Stimul.* Nov-Dec 2018;11(6):1225-1238. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2018.08.010
50. Vlaicu A, Bustuchina Vlaicu M. Vagus nerve stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: is this therapy distinct from other antidepressant treatments? *Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract.* Nov 2020;24(4):349-356. doi:10.1080/13651501.2020.1779751
51. Berry SM, Broglio K, Bunker M, Jayewardene A, Olin B, Rush AJ. A patient-level meta-analysis of studies evaluating vagus nerve stimulation therapy for treatment-resistant depression. *Med Devices (Auckl).* 2013;6:17-35. doi:10.2147/MDER.S41017
52. Colzato LS, Ritter SM, Steenbergen L. Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation (tVNS) enhances divergent thinking. *Neuropsychologia.* Mar 2018;111:72-76. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.01.003
53. Ohemeng KK, Parham K. Vagal Nerve Stimulation: Indications, Implantation, and Outcomes. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am.* Feb 2020;53(1):127-143. doi:10.1016/j.otc.2019.09.008
54. Ferstl M, Teckentrup V, Lin WM, et al. Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation boosts mood recovery after effort exertion. *Psychol Med.* Feb 15 2021;52(14):1-11. doi:10.1017/S0033291720005073
55. Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown G. Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II). 2011;doi:10.1037/t00742-000

56. Koepp V, Klaus J, Ferstl M, Müller FK, Kühnel A, Kroemer NB. Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation normalizes food liking and improves liking ratings in depression. *PsyArXiv*. 2021;doi:10.31234/osf.io/3j5xy
57. Snaith RP, Hamilton M, Morley S, Humayan A, Hargreaves D, Trigwell P. A scale for the assessment of hedonic tone the Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 1995;167(1):99-103.
58. Carver CS, White TL. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: the BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1994;67(2):319.
59. Watson DC, L. A. Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scale. 1988;
60. Müller FK, Teckentrup V, Kühnel A, Ferstl M, Kroemer NB. Acute vagus nerve stimulation does not affect liking or wanting ratings of food in healthy participants. *Appetite*. 2022/02/01/ 2022;169:105813.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105813>
61. Teckentrup V, Neubert S, Santiago JCP, Hallschmid M, Walter M, Kroemer NB. Non-invasive stimulation of vagal afferents reduces gastric frequency. *Brain Stimul*. Mar - Apr 2020;13(2):470-473. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.12.018
62. Meyniel F, Sergent C, Rigoux L, Daunizeau J, Pessiglione M. Neurocomputational account of how the human brain decides when to have a break. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Feb 12 2013;110(7):2641-6. doi:10.1073/pnas.1211925110
63. Kühnel A, Teckentrup V, Neuser MP, et al. Stimulation of the vagus nerve reduces learning in a go/no-go reinforcement learning task. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. Jun 2020;35:17-29. doi:10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.03.023
64. Wilcox RR, Keselman H. Robust regression methods: Achieving small standard errors when there is heteroscedasticity. *Understanding Statistics*. 2004;3(4):349-364.
65. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RH. lmerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of statistical software*. 2017;82:1-26.
66. Wickham H, Wickham H. *Data analysis*. Springer; 2016.
67. Kay M. ggdist: Visualizations of Distributions and Uncertainty in the Grammar of Graphics. 2023;
68. Altinkaya Z, Ozturk L, Buyukguduk I, et al. Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation in a hungry state decreases heart rate variability. *Physiol Behav*. Jan 1 2023;258:114016. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2022.114016

69. von Wrede R, Brohl T, Rings T, Pukropski J, Helmstaedter C, Lehnertz K. Modifications of Functional Human Brain Networks by Transcutaneous Auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation: Impact of Time of Day. *Brain Sci.* Apr 26 2022;12(5)doi:10.3390/brainsci12050546
70. Vazquez-Oliver A, Brambilla-Pisoni C, Domingo-Gainza M, Maldonado R, Ivorra A, Ozaita A. Auricular transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation improves memory persistence in naive mice and in an intellectual disability mouse model. *Brain Stimul.* Mar-Apr 2020;13(2):494-498. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.12.024
71. Mertens A, Naert L, Miatton M, et al. Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Does Not Affect Verbal Memory Performance in Healthy Volunteers. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11:551. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00551
72. Ventura-Bort C, Wirkner J, Wendt J, Hamm AO, Weymar M. Establishment of Emotional Memories Is Mediated by Vagal Nerve Activation: Evidence from Noninvasive taVNS. *J Neurosci.* Sep 8 2021;41(36):7636-7648. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2329-20.2021
73. Bowles S, Hickman J, Peng X, et al. Vagus nerve stimulation drives selective circuit modulation through cholinergic reinforcement. *Neuron.* Jul 13 2022;110(17):2867-2885.e7. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2022.06.017
74. Hulse DR, Hays SA, Khodaparast N, et al. Reorganization of motor cortex by vagus nerve stimulation requires cholinergic innervation. *Brain Stimul.* Mar-Apr 2016;9(2):174-81. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2015.12.007
75. Dawson J, Liu CY, Francisco GE, et al. Vagus nerve stimulation paired with rehabilitation for upper limb motor function after ischaemic stroke (VNS-REHAB): a randomised, blinded, pivotal, device trial. *Lancet.* Apr 24 2021;397(10284):1545-1553. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00475-X
76. D'Agostini M, Burger AM, Franssen M, et al. Effects of transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation on reversal learning, tonic pupil size, salivary alpha-amylase, and cortisol. *Psychophysiology.* Jul 10 2021;n/a(n/a):e13885. doi:10.1111/psyp.13885
77. Weber I, Niehaus H, Krause K, et al. Trust your gut: vagal nerve stimulation in humans improves reinforcement learning. *Brain Commun.* 2021;3(2):fcab039. doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcab039
78. Zenon A, Devesse S, Olivier E. Dopamine manipulation affects response vigor independently of opportunity cost. *J Neurosci.* Sep 14 2016;36(37):9516-25. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4467-15.2016

79. Halahakoon DC, Kieslich K, O'Driscoll C, Nair A, Lewis G, Roiser JP. Reward-Processing Behavior in Depressed Participants Relative to Healthy Volunteers: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Dec 1 2020;77(12):1286-1295. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.2139
80. Zald DH, Treadway MT. Reward Processing, Neuroeconomics, and Psychopathology. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*. May 8 2017;13:471-495. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-044957
81. Dunn BD, Galton HC, Morgan R, et al. Listening to your heart. How interoception shapes emotion experience and intuitive decision making. *Psychol Sci*. Dec 2010;21(12):1835-44. doi:10.1177/0956797610389191
82. Herbert BM, Ulbrich P, Schandry R. Interoceptive sensitivity and physical effort: implications for the self-control of physical load in everyday life. *Psychophysiology*. Mar 2007;44(2):194-202. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8986.2007.00493.x
83. Barrett LF, Quigley KS, Hamilton P. An active inference theory of allostasis and interoception in depression. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. Nov 19 2016;371(1708)doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0011
84. Bonaz B, Lane RD, Oshinsky ML, et al. Diseases, Disorders, and Comorbidities of Interoception. *Trends Neurosci*. Jan 2021;44(1):39-51. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2020.09.009
85. Nord CL, Garfinkel SN. Interoceptive pathways to understand and treat mental health conditions. *Trends Cogn Sci*. Jun 2022;26(6):499-513. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2022.03.004
86. Nord CL, Lawson RP, Dalgleish T. Disrupted Dorsal Mid-Insula Activation During Interoception Across Psychiatric Disorders. *Am J Psychiatry*. Aug 1 2021;178(8):761-770. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20091340
87. Tobaldini E, Carandina A, Toschi-Dias E, et al. Depression and cardiovascular autonomic control: a matter of vagus and sex paradox. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. Sep 2020;116:154-161. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.06.029
88. Vinkers CH, Kuzminskaite E, Lamers F, Giltay EJ, Penninx B. An integrated approach to understand biological stress system dysregulation across depressive and anxiety disorders. *J Affect Disord*. Mar 15 2021;283:139-146. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2021.01.051
89. Wijaya CS, Lee JJZ, Husain SF, et al. Differentiating Medicated Patients Suffering from Major Depressive Disorder from Healthy Controls by Spot Urine

Measurement of Monoamines and Steroid Hormones. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.

Apr 26 2018;15(5)doi:10.3390/ijerph15050865

90. Prins J, Olivier B, Korte SM. Triple reuptake inhibitors for treating subtypes of major depressive disorder: the monoamine hypothesis revisited. *Expert Opin Investig Drugs*. Aug 2011;20(8):1107-30. doi:10.1517/13543784.2011.594039

91. Montoya A, Bruins R, Katzman MA, Blier P. The noradrenergic paradox: implications in the management of depression and anxiety. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2016;12:541-57. doi:10.2147/NDT.S91311