Running head: aberrant mood dynamics in adolescent suicidal patients

Mood computational mechanisms underlying increased risk behavior in suicidal patients

Zhihao Wang¶[1*], Tian Nan ¶[2], Fengmei Lu[3], Yue Yu[3], Xiao Cai[3], Zongling He[3*], Yuejia Luo[2], Bastien Blain[1,4]

[1]CNRS - Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, Panthéon-Sorbonne University, France
[2]School of Psychology, Sichuan Center of Applied Psychology, Chengdu Medical College, Chengdu, China
[3]The Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, School of Life Science and Technology, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, PR China,
[4]Department of Experimental Psychology, University College London, London, United Kingdom

*Corresponding authors:

Zhihao Wang, Ph.D.
CNRS - Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, Panthéon-Sorbonne University,
Paris, 75013, France
Email: zhihao.wang@univ-paris1.fr;

Zongling He, M.D., Ph.D.
The Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, School of Life Science and Technology, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, PR China
E-mail: hzl_811015@126.com;

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

Number of pages: 33
Number of figures: 4, Tables: 3
Number of words for abstract: 250, introduction: 650, discussion: 1191[1]

[1] The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Abstract (250)

Suicidal thoughts and behaviors (STB) rank among the foremost causes of death globally. While literature consistently highlights heightened risk behavior in individuals with STB and identifies mood issues as central to STB, the precise cognitive and affective computational mechanisms driving this increased risky behavior remain elusive. Here, we asked 83 adolescent inpatients with affective disorders, where 58 patients with STB (S^+) and 25 without STB (S^-), and 118 gender/age-matched healthy control (HC) to make decisions between certain vs. gamble option with momentary mood ratings. Choice data analyses revealed heightened risk behavior in S^+ compared to S^- and HC. Using a prospect theory model enhanced with approach-avoidance Pavlovian parameters revealed that this rise in risky behavior resulted only from a heightened Pavlovian approach parameter in S^+. Furthermore, Pavlovian approach mediated the rise in gambling choices with STB severity. Altogether, model-based choice data analysis indicated dysfunction in the Pavlovian approach system in S^+ individuals, leading to greater propensity for gambling in favorable outcomes regardless the lotteries expected value. Additionally, mood model-based analyses revealed reduced sensitivity to certain rewards in S^+ compared to S^- and HC. Importantly, these computational markers generalized to healthy population ($n = 747$). In S^+, mood sensitivity to certain reward was negatively correlated with gambling, offering a mood computational account for increased risk behavior in STB. These findings remained significant even after adjusting for demographic, clinical, and medication-related variables. Overall, our study uncovers the cognitive and affective mechanisms contributing to increased risk behavior in STB, with significant implications for suicide prevention.

Keywords: computational psychiatry; suicide; affective disorder; momentary mood; prospect theory; risk decision making

Introduction

Every 40 seconds, a life is lost due to suicide(1). Suicidal thoughts and behaviors (STB) are one of leading causes of death worldwide that have devastating impacts on individuals, families, and societies. STB occurs from adolescence(2,3), especially in the context of mood disorders, e.g., major depressive disorder (MDD), anxiety disorder (AD), and bipolar disorder (BD)(4). Despite the progress made during the last 50 years for identifying risk factors(5) and developing preventing strategies(6), death rate from STB has not declined(5,7). The limited comprehension of cognitive and affective mechanisms creates a substantial gap in pinpointing targets for early prediction, screening, detection, and intervention in cases of suicidal thoughts. Recently, extensive literature has consistently reported increased risky decision making in patients with STB(8–11). Understanding what is impaired in the STB patients' decision process would be key to prevent STB, for example through cognitive behavioral therapy (12,13). However, why patients with STB adopt a riskier behavior and how decisions relate to mood dynamics remain unclear.

Although meta-analyses have shown increased risk behavior in patients with STB(8,10,11), the underlying cognitive computational mechanism is still unknown. Specifically, some studies found heightened loss aversion in STB(14,15), while others observed the opposite pattern(16). This can result from the use of underspecified models. A growing literature indeed shows that behavior can be far better explained after adding Pavlovian approach and avoidance components to prospect theory(17,18), that is by including a decision bias

in favor of the highest gain (approach) and another decision bias against the lowest loss (avoidance), above and beyond options value difference. This class of models highlights the important role of motivational components in decision making in addition to traditional (expected) reward sensitivity (e.g., loss/risk aversion)(19). Importantly, STB has been proposed in theoretical work to result from abnormal Pavlovian motivation system(20–23), but no direct evidence support such proposals. Therefore, investigating Pavlovian motivational components may facilitate understanding why STB is associated with increased risk-taking behavior. We therefore hypothesized that heightened approach motivation, or weakened avoidance motivation, would account for increased risk behavior in STB.

While suicide is a decision process per se, atypical mood dynamics have been thought to be at the core of STB(3). Various suicidal-related theories, including the interpersonal theory(24), integrated motivational-volitional model(25), and three-step theory(26), have proposed that STB is initially caused by low mood experience. Some official organizations, e.g., National Institute of Mental Health, have also listed mood problems as warning signals(5). Interestingly, within the framework of decision making under risk, gambling on lotteries with a revealed outcome has been found to induce high mood variance(27), providing an opportunity to assess the relationship between deficient mood and increased gambling decisions in STB. Specifically, in a gambling task with momentary mood ratings, where participants were asked to make decisions between certain vs. gamble options (2 possible outcomes, 50% probability for each), Rutledge et.al., (2014) found that mood was sensitive to certain reward (CR), reward expectation

(EV), and reward prediction error (RPE; the difference between experienced and expected outcome)(27). Here, we investigated which mood component (among CR, EV and RPE) is associated with STB. We expect the mood response to gamble related quantities (EV and RPE) to be lower in STB compared to the control groups. In contrast, riskier decision may result from aversion to certain reward in STB. Therefore, another possibility is that lower mood sensitivity to CR would relate to increased risk behavior in STB.

To summarize, the aim of this study is to examine cognitive and affective computational mechanisms underlying increased risk behavior in adolescent patients with STB, as adolescent period might provide a developmental window for opportunities for early intervention(2). Regarding choices, we hypothesized heightened approach motivation, or weakened avoidance motivation, in STB, which would account for increased risk behavior. Regarding mood dynamics, we hypothesized that greater mood sensitivity to gamble related variables (i.e., RPE and EV), or reduced mood sensitivity to CR, would explain increased risk behavior in STB.

Methods and materials

Participants

We recruited 95 adolescent patients with mood disorder from the Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (The Mental Health Center of Chengdu, Sichuan, China). According to medical records and information from family and friends, patients with suicidal thoughts and

behaviors were categorized as suicidal group (S^+), while patients without suicidal thoughts and behaviors were identified as control group (S^-). As baseline control, we also recruited 124 gender- and age-matched healthy adolescents (HC). We assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the ethical committee of The Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (number: 2022(33)) on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. All procedures involving human subjects/patients were approved by the ethical committee of The Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (number: 2022(33)). Informed written consent was obtained. Patients were included if 1) they were diagnosed with major depressive disorder (MDD), anxiety disorder (AD), or bipolar disorder (BD) by two experienced psychiatrists using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-TR-Patient Edition (SCID-P, 2/2001 revision); 2) their ages varied from 12 to 19 years old; 3) they had no organic brain disorders, intellectual disability, or head trauma; 4) they had no history of substance abuse; 5) they had no experience of electroconvulsive therapy. In addition, participants were excluded if they failed more than 1/4 of the catch trials. The final sample consisted of 25 patients for S^-, 58 patients for S^+, and 118 HC participants. See Table 1 and Table S1 for demographic, clinical and psychological information. The validation dataset was from our previous online study, with 747 healthy participants completing the same task and numerous anxiety/depression -related questionnaires for different purposes. See (28) for demographic and psychological details.

Table 1. Demographics, clinical, psychological characteristics of patients with and without suicidal thoughts and behaviors.

	Group			Group contrast		S^+ vs. S^-	
	HC (n=118)	**S^- (n=25)**	**S^+ (n=58)**	**F/χ^2**	**p**	**t/χ^2**	***p***
Gender (female/male)	75/43	16/9	41/17	0.912	0.634	0.363	0.547
Age	15.31±2.15	15.68±1.75	14.83±1.80	1.868	0.157	**1.997**	**0.049**
BSI-C	1.29±3.62	2.84±2.66	18.02±7.56	224.230	<0.001	-9.754	<0.001
BSI-W	3.58±6.60	4.04±3.22	27.98±6.02	326.242	<0.001	-18.723	<0.001
CTQ	13.98±11.29	22.64±12.34	33.00±17.03	40.023	<0.001	-2.743	0.008
ERQ-R	14.77±4.38	13.08±6.34	8.48±5.39	31.317	<0.001	3.376	0.001
ERQ-S	6.86±3.64	8.80±3.77	10.79±3.79	22.322	<0.001	-2.200	0.031
Suicidal attempts history (yes)	---	---	32	---	---	---	---
Illness duration (months)	---	31.76±18.80	31.38±18.70	---	---	0.085	0.933
Family history (yes)	---	2	10	---	---	1.206	0.272
Diagnosis (AD/MDD/BD)	---	2/16/7	8/39/11	---	---	1.172	0.557
Medication (yes)	---	25	57	---	---	0.436	0.509
SSRI	---	16	39	---	---	0.082	0.775
SNRI	---	0	2	---	---	0.883	0.347
Trazodone	---	6	16	---	---	0.115	0.734
Antipsychotics	---	14	32	---	---	0.005	0.945
BZDs	---	20	45	---	---	0.060	0.807
Other anxiolytics	---	12	13	---	---	**5.434**	**0.020**
Mood stabilizer	---	13	18	---	---	3.282	0.070
TAI	43.49±8.54	50.38±12.19	65.36±7.62	108.863	<0.001	-6.276	<0.001
PSWQ	44.75±10.94	50.67±15.17	68.56±9.58	80.213	<0.001	-5.990	<0.001
BDI	9.45±9.43	18.62±15.11	38.30±9.67	129.516	<0.001	-6.573	<0.001
CESD	32.96±11.09	42.86±15.66	62.52±9.99	118.084	<0.001	-6.347	<0.001

Note: For the main results, we included gender, age, illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications for control analysis. For anxiety/depression-related questionnaires (TAI, PSWQ, BDI, and CESD), due to time limitation, data from 8 participants in the S+ group and 4 participants in the S- group was not collected. Abbreviations: HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior; BSI-C, Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation at the current time; BSI-W, Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation at the worst time; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; ERQ-R, Emotion Regulation Questionnaire-Reappraisal; ERQ-S, Emotion Regulation Questionnaire-Suppression; AD, anxiety disorders; MDD, major depressive disorders; BD, bipolar disorders; SSRI, Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor; SNRI, serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors; BZDs, Benzodiazepines; TAI, Trait Anxiety Inventory; PSWQ, Penn State Worry Questionnaire; BDI, Beck Depression Inventory, CESD, Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale.

Self-reported questionnaires

Participants completed a set of Chinese-version suicidal-, emotion regulation-, and depression/anxiety-related questionnaires. These measurements included the Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation at the current time (BSI-C, 19 items) and at the worst time (BSI-W, 19 items)(29), the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ, 28 items)(30), Emotion Regulation Questionnaire-Reappraisal (ERQ-R, 6 items) and Suppression (ERQ-S, 4 items)(31). In addition, as patients were available only for a limited duration, anxiety/depression-related scales from only 50 participants in the S^+ group and only 21 participants in the S^- group were collected. Specifically, patients filled the Trait subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (TAI; 20 items)(32), the Penn State Worry Questionnaire (PSWQ; 16 items), the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI; 21 items)(33), and the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CESD; 20 items)(34).

Experimental Procedure

Participants were asked to make a choice between a certain option and a gamble (50% probability for each outcome) to maximize their points and to rate their momentary moods(17,27). Before performing the task, participants were asked to rate their current happiness that we consider as their initial mood. At the beginning of the task, participants were endowed with 500 points. Each trial started with two options (a gamble option and a certain option) which were presented randomly on each side (Figure 1A). Upon response, the chosen option was highlighted in yellow for 0.5 s. Note that Rutledge et al., (2014) displayed the chosen option for about 6 s(27), a delay we shortened for the sake of time.

Then the corresponding outcome at the screen center was presented for 1 s, followed by a fixation cross with a random duration (0.6~1.4 s). If the gamble was chosen, participants had equal probability to obtain each outcome. The obtained outcome was added to their total score, which was presenting at the top-right corner. Every 2~3 trials, participants rated their happiness ("how happy are you at this moment?") from 0 (very unhappy) to 100 (very happy) by moving a slider anchored at midpoint (i.e., 50). Upon identifying their current mood, a fixation cross was presented with a random duration (0.6~1.4 s). This task consisted of 90 randomly presented trials, including 30 mixed trials, 30 gain trials, and 30 loss trials. In mixed trials, participants made a choice between a certain amount 0 and a gamble with a gain amount {40, 45, or 75} and a loss amount determined by a multiplier {0.2, 0.34, 0.5, 0.64, 0.77, 0.89, 1, 1.1, 1.35, or 2} on the gain amount. These trials are therefore particularly suited to measure loss aversion. In gain trials, there was a certain gain amount {35, 45, or 55} and a gamble with 0 and a gain amount determined by a multiplier {1.68, 1.82, 2, 2.22, 2.48, 2.8, 3.16, 3.6, 4.2, or 5} on the certain gain amount. In loss trials, there were a certain loss amount {-35, -45, or -55} and a gamble with 0 and a loss amount determined by a multiplier {1.68, 1.82, 2, 2.22, 2.48, 2.8, 3.16, 3.6, 4.2, or 5} on the certain loss amount. Many amounts and multipliers were used to provide a wide range of risk and loss sensitivity, as in previous literature. We also added an extra 4 trials in the entire task for attentional checks. For example, participants were asked to make a choice between a certain gain 20 and a gamble 35/55, where the correct response for this trial was the gamble choice (as the worst lottery outcome was higher than the certain reward). All experimental procedures were programmed using Psychopy3 (2021.2.3).



Figure 1. Task design, outcome and time effects on mood, and group differences in mood. A) Gambling task with mood ratings. On each trial, participants were asked to choose between a certain option and a gambling option (self-paced). Once selected, the chosen option was highlighted in yellow for 500 ms. Then the corresponding outcome was displayed in the center of the screen for 1000 ms. The cumulated score was always shown in the right-upper corner. Every 2 to 3 trials, participants were asked to complete a self-paced rating of their happiness, answering the question "How happy are you at the moment" on a slider from 0 (very unhappy) to 100 (very happy). B) Patients and healthy controls felt happier after winning than losing. C) Mood drifted over time. D) Group difference in mood before the task show weakened mood in S+. E) Group difference in average mood displays lower mood experience in S^+. The grey dots represent the winning model predictions. F) Mood variance was similar for all the three groups, as indexed by standard deviation of happiness ratings across the task. G) Each group earned about the same amount of point by the end of the task. Abbreviations: HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior; *p<0.05. Error bars correspond to the standard error.

Choice computational models

In line with previous studies(17,18), our choice model space included expected value model (M1), prospect theory model (M2)(35), and approach-avoidance prospect theory model (M3)(17). For M2 (Equations 1-4), there were 3 parameters, including risk aversion (α_{gain}, range: 0.3-1.3), loss aversion (λ: 0.5-5), and inverse temperature (μ: 0-10).

$$U_{gamble} = 0.5(V_{gain})^{\alpha} - 0.5\lambda(-V_{loss})^{\alpha} \quad (1)$$

$$U_{certain} = (V_{certain})^{\alpha} \; if \; V_{certain} \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

$$U_{certain} = -\lambda(-V_{certain})^{\alpha} \; if \; V_{certain} < 0 \quad (3)$$

$$P_{gamble} = \frac{1}{1+e^{-\mu(U_{gamble}-U_{certain})}} \quad (4)$$

where V_{gain} and V_{loss} are the objective gain and loss from a gamble, respectively. $V_{certain}$ is the objective value for the certain option. U_{gamble} and $U_{certain}$ are subjective utilities of the gamble and the certain option, respectively. Choice probability for gamble (P_{gamble}) is determined by the softmax rule.

Based on M2, M3 additionally considered Pavlovian motivation components when making decisions (Equations 1-3 & 5-8). That said, choice probability for P_{gamble} in M3 is jointly determined by the softmax rule and Pavlovian approach/avoidance parameters (β_{gain} : 0-1, β_{loss}: 0-1).

For gain trials,

$$P_{gamble} = \frac{1-\beta_{gain}}{1+e^{-\mu(U_{gamble}-U_{certain})}} + \beta_{gain} \; if \; \beta_{gain} \geq 0 \quad (5)$$

$$P_{gamble} = \frac{1+\beta_{gain}}{1+e^{-\mu(U_{gamble}-U_{certain})}} \; if \; \beta_{gain} < 0 \quad (6)$$

For loss trials,

$$P_{gamble} = \frac{1-\beta_{loss}}{1+e^{-\mu(U_{gamble}-U_{certain})}} + \beta_{loss} \; if \; \beta_{loss} \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

$$P_{gamble} = \frac{1+\beta_{loss}}{1+e^{-\mu(U_{gamble}-U_{certain})}} \; if \; \beta_{loss} < 0 \quad (8)$$

Mood computational models

To quantify how different events impacted participants' momentary mood during the gambling task, we conducted a stage-wise model construction procedure(36). That is, we added or removed each component to the model progressively, based on the best model from the previous stage. In Stage 1, we fit the classic model assuming that momentary mood depends on the recency-weighted average of the chosen certain reward (CR), expected value of the chosen gamble (EV), and reward prediction error (RPE; M1; Equation 9). RPE was defined as the difference between the obtained and expected value.

$$\text{Happiness}(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_{CR}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma^{t-j}CR_j + \beta_{EV}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma^{t-j}EV_j + \beta_{RPE}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma^{t-j}RPE_j \quad (9)$$

Here, t and j are trial numbers, β_0 is a baseline mood parameter, other weights β capture the influence of different event types, $\gamma \in [0,1]$ is a decay parameter representing how many previous trials influence happiness. CR_j is the CR if the certain option was chosen on trial j; otherwise, CR_j is 0. EVj is the EV and RPEj is the RPE on trial j if the gamble was chosen. If the certain option was chosen, then $EV_j = 0$ and RPEj =0.

To check that mood ratings are best explained by a shared forgetting factor (i.e., the recency-weighted history of different event types), we compared a model with a single decay parameter to an alternative model, including a forgetting factors for each event type, e.g., different decay parameters for CR, EV, and RPE (M2; Equation 10).

$$\text{Happiness}(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_{CR}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma_{CR}^{t-j}CR_j + \beta_{EV}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma_{EV}^{t-j}EV_j + \beta_{RPE}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\gamma_{RPE}^{t-j}RPE_j \quad (10)$$

Although M1 has been shown to accurately predict mood data(27), we also fit alternative mood models. Firstly, we fit an alternative model in which mood ratings are explained by

the recency-weighted average of the certain reward (CR) and the gamble reward (GR; M3; Equation 11), a simple model providing a mood sensitivity parameter for certain rewards and gamble rewards. Secondly, we also fit a model with two forgetting factors, one for CR and one for GR (M4; Equation 12).

$$\text{Happiness}(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_{CR} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \gamma^{t-j} CR_j + \beta_{GR} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \gamma^{t-j} GR_j \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Happiness}(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_{CR} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \gamma_{CR}^{t-j} CR_j + \beta_{GR} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \gamma_{GR}^{t-j} GR_j \quad (12)$$

In Stage 2, to identify whether mood can be better explained by different responses to better and worse gamble outcomes, we fit a model splitting GR into better and worse GR terms (M5). We also fit a model with different decay parameters for each event based on M5 (M6).

In Stage 3, to check whether mood data can be better explained by a single event (CR or GR), we compared a CR-mood model (M7) and a GR-mood model (M8).

Model fitting and comparison

We fit model parameters by using the method of maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) with fmincon function of MATLAB (version R2015a) at the individual level. To avoid local minimum, we ran this optimization function with random starting locations 50 times. Bayesian information criteria (BIC) were used to compare model fits.

Replication of suicidal-related results in an independent dataset (n = 747)

We next verified our results in an independent dataset, including the same task and BDI questionnaire in 747 healthy participants (28). In particular, one item in BDI involves the measurement of STB. In item 9 of BDI, participants chose one option that describes them

best: Option 1, “I don't have any thoughts of killing myself.”; Option 2, “I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out.”; Option 3, “I would like to kill myself.”; Option 4, “I would kill myself if I had the chance.”. We identified S^+ group as choosing Option 2, 3, or 4, while participants selecting Option 1 were categorized as S^- group. Therefore, there were 129 participants in S^+ and 618 participants in S^-. We did not find significant group difference in gender and age (*ps* > 0.075). To make it comparable, we fit the winning choice and mood models from the clinical study.

Statistical analysis

We performed chi-square, independent-sample t-test or repeated measure ANOVA to test group-related differences. Spearman correlations were used to check correlations among suicidal-related questionnaires, choice data, and mood data. Generalized linear model was conducted for control analysis using Matlab R2015a. Mediation analyzes were conducted using R (4.1.0) and the R package ‘mediation’. All reported tests are two-tailed in addition to the replication of previous findings in the validation dataset. We set the significance level at $p = 0.05$.

Results

Demographic and clinical characteristics

Overall, gender and age were comparable among S^+, S^-, and HC groups (*ps* > 0.157), though S^+ was significantly younger than S^- ($t = 1.997$, $p = 0.049$). As expected, S^+ scored significantly higher than S^- and HC in suicidal-related scales (e.g., BSI-C; *ps* < 0.001), further validating our group manipulation. There was no significant difference between

S^+ and S^- in illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications use (*ps* > 0.07), except other anxiolytics (χ^2=5.434, p = 0.020). See Table 1 and Table S1 for details. For subsequent control analysis for S^+ vs. S^- contrast, we included gender, illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications use (except other anxiolytics) as covariates, whereas we used to median split to check potential confounds of age and the use of other anxiolytics.

Sanity checks

To ensure engagement and task validation, we performed sanity checks. As expected, we found significant group differences in psychological measurements (*ps* < 0.001), including childhood trauma, emotion regulation, and anxiety/depression (Table 1 and Table S1). In addition, we replicated the classic mood-related effects[37,38]: 1) subjects were happier after winning than losing (t = 11.001, p < 0.001; Figure 1B) and 2) mood drifted over time (t = -3.254, p = 0.001; Figure 1C). As grouping checks, we found a hierarchical pattern of mood level both before the task and across the task (S^+ < S^- < HC; for initial mood, F = 53.415, p < 0.001; S^+ vs. S^-: t = -4.525, p < 0.001; S^+ vs. HC: t = -10.427, p < 0.001; S^- vs. HC: t = -2.634, p = 0.009; Figure 1D; for mean mood, F = 28.018, p < 0.001; S^+ vs. S^-: t = -3.773, p < 0.001; S^+ vs. HC: t = -7.292, p < 0.001; S^- vs. HC: t = -1.458, p = 0.147; Figure 1E). No significant group difference in mood variation were found (Figure 1F) which suggests that any parameter difference between groups in unlikely to be explained by mood variance. Moreover, there was no group difference in terms of mood drift effect, or earnings (Figure 1G; *ps* > 0.276).

Choice results

To replicate previous findings of increased risk behavior in suicidal populations, we conducted a two-way ANOVA on gambling rate with group (S^+/S^-/HC) as a between-subject factor and trial type (mix/gain/loss) as a within-subject factor. We found a significant main effect of group (F = 3.655, p = 0.028, partial η^2 = 0.036; Figure 2A), with more gambling behavior for S^+ than S^- (two-sample t-test, t = 2.145, p = 0.035) and HC (t = 2.465, p = 0.115) and comparable gambling behavior between S- and HC (t = -0.439, p = 0.661) across the task. We also observed the main effect of trial type (F = 51.225, p < 0.001, partial η^2 = 0.206; gain > mix > loss). We did not observe any significant interaction effect between group and trial type (F =0.270, partial η^2 = 0.003). Within patients, this group effect on gambling rate remained significant after controlling for gender, illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications use (*ps* < 0.05). There was also no significant age/other anxiolytics use difference in gambling behavior (*ps* > 109; Figure S5). In addition, there was significant correlations between gambling rate and Suicidal Ideation score at current time (BSI-C, rho = 0.233, p = 0.034; Figure 2B) and Suicidal Ideation score at worst time (BSI-W, rho = 0.219, p = 0.046) among patients.



Figure 2. Choice results. A) Group differences in gambling behavior. The grey dots represent the winning model prediction. B) Positive correlation between Suicidal Ideation score at current time (BSI-C) and gambling behavior in patients. C) The estimated parameters from the winning choice model differed across groups, with higher approach behavior for S+. D) The mediation model among the BSI-C, β_{gain}, and gambling behavior in the gain condition among patients. The Pavlovian approach parameter mediated the effects of BSI-C on increased gambling behavior in the gain condition. Abbreviations: HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior; BSI-C, Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation at the current time; *p<0.05.

We next performed a model comparison to select the model that best explain choice data. This analysis revealed that the winning model to formally quantify mechanisms for gambling behavior is the approach-avoidance prospect theory model (M3; mean R^2 = 0.37; Table 2). As predicted, we found a (marginally) significant group effect in approach parameter (F = 2.989, p = 0.053; Figure 2C), with a significant stronger approach

motivation for S^+ than S^- (t = 2.217, p = 0.029) and HC (t = 2.091, p = 0.038), and comparable between S- and HC (t = -0.737, p = 0.463). No other significant group difference in these parameters was found (ps > 0.135). Within patients, this group effect on the approach parameter remained significant after controlling for gender, illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications use (ps < 0.05). There was also no significant age/other anxiolytics use difference in gambling behavior (ps > 0.223; Figure S5). In addition, we observed significant positive correlations of approach parameter with BSI-C (rho = 0.286, p = 0.009) and BSI-W (rho = 0.222, p = 0.044) among patients, suggesting more gambling in gain (regardless of risk attitude) for patients with high STB severity. Given significant correlations between BSI-C, approach parameter, and gambling rate (ps < 0.034), we further conducted a mediation analysis with the assumption of the mediating effect of approach motivation of suicidality on the risk behavior. Results supported our hypothesis ($a \times b$ = 0.233, 95% CI = [0.074, 0.40], p < 0.001; Figure 2D). Taken together, these choice results suggest that suicidal thoughts and behavior increase risk behavior through stronger approach motivation.

Table 2. Choice model comparison.

Model #	Model specification	# of parameters	Δ BIC	meanR^2	Δ BIC for each group		
					HC	S-	S+
1	μ	1	3873.16	0.08	2272.48	370.19	1230.49
2	λ, α, μ	3	3153.79	0.18	1822.07	263.97	1067.75
3	**λ, α, β_{gain}, β_{loss}, μ**	5	0	0.37	**0**	**0**	**0**

Abbreviations: Δ BIC, Bayesian information criterion relative to the winning model (M3); HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior.

Mood results

Next, we turned to mood model comparison. We observed inconsistent mood winning models for different groups (Table 3), suggesting an effect of STB on mood dynamics. Given that the focus of the current study was STB effect, especially for the S^+ group, with the baseline control of S^- and HC groups, we specially focused on the winning model from the S^+ group. The winning mood model from S^+ assumed that momentary mood fluctuations were explained by the recency-weighted average of certain reward (CR) and the gamble reward (GR; M3; mean $R^2 = 0.42$; Table 3). Overall, both CR and GR weights were significantly higher than 0 (CR: t = 8.033, $p < 0.001$; GR: t = 9.853, $p < 0.001$). The baseline parameter β_0 was significant correlated with the initial mood (rho = 0.580, $p < 0.001$), validating this model. We also replicated previous depression-related findings (39): depression symptom measured by Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) was negatively correlated with the baseline mood parameter β_0 (rho = -0.530, $p < 0.001$; Figure S1). We found significantly lower β_0 in S^+ than S^- (F = 22.861, p <0.001; t = -3.513, $p < 0.001$) and HC (t = -6.606, $p < 0.001$), which mirrors the lower initial mood pattern. Importantly, a two-way ANOVA on mood parameters with group (S^+/S^-/HC) as a between-subject factor, event type (CR/GR) as a within-subject factor showed a significant main effect of group (F = 3.835, $p = 0.023$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.037$), with lower mood sensitivity for S^+ than S^- (t = -2.080, $p = 0.041$) and HC (t = -2.758, $p = 0.006$) and comparable between S- and HC (t = -0.110, $p = 0.913$). We also observed a significant interaction effect between group and event type (F = 4.283, $p = 0.015$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.041$; Figure 3B). Simple effect analysis revealed that S^+ group exhibited significant lower mood sensitivity to CR as compared to GR (F = 4.823, $p = 0.029$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.024$), while there was no significant

CR-GR difference in S^- (although trendy; F = 2.783, p = 0.097, partial η^2 = 0.014) and HC (F = 0.989, p = 0.321, partial η^2 = 0.005). This interaction was driven by the group difference in CR (F = 6.085, p = 0.003, partial η^2 = 0.058) rather than in GR (F = 0.801, p = 0.450, partial η^2 = 0.008). Specifically, S^+ showed lower mood sensitivity to CR than S^- (t = -2.661, p = 0.009) and HC (t = -3.381, p <0.001), while S^- and HC were comparable (t = 0.450, p = 0.679), suggesting S^+ was specifically more insensitive to certain outcome than gamble outcome. No significant main event type (CR vs. GR) effect was found (F = 0.285, p = 0.594, partial η^2 = 0.001). Within patients, this group effect on β_{CR} remained significant after controlling for gambling rate, earnings, mood-related outcome effect, mood drift effect, gender, illness duration, family history, diagnosis, and various medications use (*ps* < 0.032). There was also no significant age/other anxiolytics use difference in gambling behavior (ps > 0.582; Figure S5). In addition, we observed significant negative correlation between BSI-C and β_{CR} among patients (rho = -0.243, p = 0.027). These results indicate decreased mood sensitivity for certain reward in suicidal populations.

Table 3. Mood model comparison.

Model #	Model specification	# of parameters	Δ BIC	meanR^2	Δ BIC for each group		
					HC	S^-	S^+
1	β_0, β_{CR}, β_{EV}, β_{RPE}, γ	5	-106.77	0.48	-182.04	32.54	42.73
2	β_0, β_{CR}, β_{EV}, β_{RPE}, γ_{CR}, γ_{EV}, γ_{RPE}	7	140.00	0.54	-69.40	83.20	126.20
3	**β_0, β_{CR}, β_{GR}, γ**	4	0	0.42	0	0	**0**
4	β_0, β_{CR}, β_{GR}, γ_{CR}, γ_{GR}	5	-146.81	0.48	-272.15	26.37	98.97
5	β_0, β_{CR}, β_{GR_better}, β_{GR_worse}, γ	5	**-331.48**	0.49	**-355.10**	**-6.56**	30.18
6	β_0, β_{CR}, β_{GR_better}, β_{GR_worse}, γ_{CR}, γ_{GR_better}, γ_{GR_better}	7	-105.40	0.56	-313.09	81.34	126.34

7	β_0, β_{CR}, γ	3	2395.62	0.18	1379.96	264.87	749.79
8	β_0, β_{GR}, γ	3	403.46	0.34	228.69	21.24	153.52

Abbreviations: Δ BIC, Bayesian information criterion relative to the winning model in S^+ group (M3); HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior.



Figure 3. Effect of Suicidal thoughts and behavior on mood dynamics. A) Group difference in mood baseline, β_0. B) Group differences in mood sensitivity to certain reward (CR) and gamble reward (GR). C) Correlation between Suicidal Ideation score at current time BSI-C and mood sensitivity to CR. D) Correlational difference in S- and S+ between mood sensitivity to CR and gambling behavior. Abbreviations: CR, certain reward; GR, gamble reward; HC, healthy control; S^-, patients without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, patients with suicidal thoughts and behavior; BSI-C, Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation at the current time; *p<0.05.

In addition to the winning model (M3) from S^+ group, we also checked results from the classic mood model (M1). Overall, we replicated previous findings (Figure S2): 1) mood sensitivity to CR, EV, and RPE were all significantly higher than 0 (ps < 0.001); 2) higher weight for RPE than EV (t = 5.760, p < 0.001). Although no significant group difference between S^+ and S^- was found in each parameter (ps > 0.115), we replicated significant

correlation between BSI-C and β_{CR} (rho = -0.239, p = 0.030). To explore why the classic mood model (M1) did not outperform the CR-GR model, we examined expectation effect on mood, as previous literature showed impaired value expectation in patients with STB(40). Our data suggests a lower mood sensitivity to RPE relative to EV in S^+ than HC (Figure S2; significant interaction between group and EV/RPE: F = 3.422, p = 0.035; with stronger mood sensitivity to RPE than EV in HC (F = 36.658, p < 0.001), while no such significant difference in S^+ (F = 1.161, p = 0.283) and S^- (F = 3.009, p = 0.084)). Equal weights on EV and RPE suggests that expectations cancel out as RPE is the difference between the outcome and EV, resulting in outcome only. Then, we additionally fit a mood model with CR, GR, and EV components (Figure S3). We expect less negative mood sensitivity to EV in S^+ than HC. As expected, in addition to replication of our main results (ps < 0.045; R^2 for this model: 0.487), we observed a less negative mood sensitivity to EV in S^+ than HC (t = 2.302, p = 0.023), which explains why the winning model shifts to M3. Given that M5 (splitting GR into better and worse terms) performed better than our winning model (M3) in the S^- and HC groups, we also checked results from this model (Figure S4). Again, we found that S^+ had significant lower β_{CR} than S^- and HC (for group effect: F = 44.660, p = 0.011; S^+ vs. S^-: t = -2.659, p = 0.009; S^+ vs. HC: t = -2.589, p = 0.010; S^- vs. HC: t = 1.059, p = 0.292) and significant correlation between BSI-C and β_{CR}, (rho = -0.297, p = 0.006) among patients, suggesting the robustness of mood sensitivity to certain reward in suicidal people.

Associations between choice and mood

To examine the association between risk behavior and atypical mood dynamics in suicidal patients, we then tested the correlation between participants' gambling rate and mood sensitivity to certain reward (β_{CR}) in S^+. We found significant negative correlation between gambling rate and β_{CR} in S^+ (rho = -0.274, p = 0.037), suggesting the lower mood sensitivity to certain reward, the more gambling behavior suicidal patients made. We did not observe such a significant correlation in S^- (rho = 0.246, p = 0.237) and there was significant correlational difference between S^+ and S^- (Z = -2.109, p = 0.017; 42)), suggesting the suicidal-specific association of mood and choice.



Figure 4. Validation of suicidal-related results in an independent dataset of healthy populations (n = 747).
A) Group difference in gambling behavior in the gain domain. B) The estimated parameters from the winning choice model (pseudo R^2 = 0.479) differed across groups, with higher approach behavior for S^+. C) The mediation model among the group, β_{gain}, and gambling behavior in the gain condition. The Pavlovian approach parameter mediated the group effect on increased gambling behavior in the gain condition. **D)** Group difference in mood before the task show weakened mood in S^+. E) Group difference in average mood displays lower mood experience in S^+. FG) The estimated

parameters from CR-GR mood model (mean R^2 = 0.588). F) Group difference in mood baseline, β_0. G) Group differences in mood sensitivity to certain reward (CR) and gamble reward (GR). Abbreviations: S^-, healthy participants without suicidal thoughts and behavior; S^+, healthy participants with suicidal thoughts and behavior; *p<0.05, $^+$ p<0.1.

Replication of suicidal-related results in an independent dataset (n = 747)

Next, we collected online data on healthy volunteers in an attempt to replicate our findings. In this large online dataset, we found lower mood experience in healthy volunteers who replied non-negatively to the Suicidal item of the BDI (S^+). Regarding the initial mood rating (before the task), S^+ exhibited significantly lower mood than S^- (t = -6.077, p < 0.001; Figure 4D). There was a trend for lower mood experience across time in S^+ than S^- (t = -1.600, p = 0.055; Figure 4E). Critically, we identified a significantly increased gambling behavior in S^+ than S^-, especially in the gain domain (t = 1.668, p = 0.048; Figure 4F). Approach-avoidance prospect theory model (mean pseudoR^2 = 0.479) revealed a significantly heightened Pavlovian approach parameter in in S^+ than S^- (t = 1.762, p = 0.039; Figure 4B), but not any other choice parameters (ps > 0.172). We also replicated the previous mediation result that suicidal thoughts and behaviors increase risk behavior through stronger approach motivation (a×b = 0.143, 95% CI = [0.016, 0.288], p = 0.031; Figure 4C). Regarding CR-GR mood model (mean R^2 = 0.588), we observed significantly lower β_0 in S^+ than S^- (t = -2.018, p = 0.022; Figure 4F). Mood sensitivity to CR (t = -2.237, p = 0.013; Figure 4G), but not GR (t = -0. 187, p = 0.473; Figure 4G), was significantly reduced in S^+ than S^-. These validation results suggest that our computational markers can generalize to healthy population. However, we did not observe any significant correlation between mood sensitivity to CR and gambling

behavior (*ps* > 0.389), which suggests that the link between mood sensitivity to CR and gambling behavior may be specifically observable in suicidal patients.

Discussion

The current study tested cognitive and affective computational mechanisms for increased risk behavior in adolescent patients with suicidal thoughts and behaviors (STB), with a control group including adolescent patients without STB and gender/age-matched healthy control (HC). Firstly, we observed an increased gambling behavior and a lower overall mood in STB patients (S^+), as compared to non-STB patients (S^-) and HC, replicating previous findings(8–11). Secondly, using an approach-avoidance prospect theory model, we found heightened approach motivation in S^+ than S^- and HC, which explained increased gambling choices for STB, suggesting an over-reactivity of the Pavlovian system to approach risky options. Thirdly, using a momentary mood model, we showed that lower mood sensitivity to certain outcomes in S^+ compared to S^- and HC, which was driven by lower mood sensitivity to certain outcome in S^+ than S^- and HC. These computational markers generalized to healthy population (n = 747). Importantly, mood hyposensitivity to certain reward specifically correlated to more gambling behavior in S^+, offering a mood computational account for increased risk behavior in STB. These results remained significant after controlling for demographics and clinical variables and medication factors.

These findings provide new insights to the putative dynamics underpinning STB, and offer potential markers for the early prediction, screening, detection, and prevention of suicidal behavior. Our results indeed suggest that STB patients' mood would be less

sensitive to certain outcomes than control without STB, which would lead them to take more risk regardless the gain at stake and therefore to potentially experience more suboptimal outcomes than controls(8). These results would explain the observed increase in risk-taking behaviors in STB such as substance use, early onset of sexual intercourse and physical fighting independent of psychiatric diagnosis.

Interestingly, our results suggest a unique reason for the twofold observations that STB patients display an increase in both risk taking and impulsivity, defined as a tendency to act quickly without planning while failing to inhibit a behavior that is likely to result in negative consequences(41,43–46). Indeed, we did not observe a difference in risk attitude per se between STB and controls but instead a higher approach behavior towards largest rewards (i.e., the lotteries) in STB patients. This would result from the value-independent term in the model that represent forms of Pavlovian approach in the face of gains(17,47,48). Such Pavlovian actions are elicited without regard to their actual contingent benefits and therefore corresponds to an impulsive behavior.

The Pavlovian system strongly relates to the dopaminergic system as L-dopa has been shown to increases approach behavior in the context of gambling(17). The modulation of the Pavlovian approach component is consistent with an association between the dopaminergic system and incentive salience(49,50), which provide in principle an account of dopaminergic drug effects on pathological gambling and impulsive behavior in humans(51,52) and rodents(53,54). However, contrary to the proposal of atypical Pavlovian avoidance system(20,23), we did not observe significant group difference in

avoidance, which may be attributed to the different involvement of the Pavlovian system in learning and non-leaning contexts(18,55). In our model specification, Pavlovian systems work in a value independent way in the non-learning context. Consistent with the view that suicide is an escape from intolerable affective states(3), risky behavior in suicidal individuals may be rewarding.

In line with suicidal-related theories(3), we indeed observed lower mood in patients with STB, regarding both initial happiness and mood baseline (the latter corresponding to the steady state mood converges to). Many studies have shown that the serotoninergic system plays a crucial role in mood (e.g. 54). Dysfunctional serotoninergic system has been shown in patients suffering from STB(57), which could potentially build a link between mood and STB. This association corresponds to various suicidal-related theories, holding that mood problems are at the core of STB(3). Recently, pharmacological treatment of serotonin has been found to enhance the impact of mood on decision making under uncertainty (56), providing a promising target for prevention and intervention of suicide.

Surprisingly, mood model-based analysis did not support the effect of expectations and prediction errors on mood in healthy people (the "CR-EV-RPE model"(17,27,59)), but suggest instead a dissociation between certain outcomes and lottery outcomes (the "CR-GR model"). These two models differed with respect to the inclusion of reward expectation terms, the former including it unlike the latter. This difference can be explained by the lower expected value signal in patients with STB(40), resulting in insufficient expectation representations of the gamble option to influence mood dynamics.

An alternative explanation could be the duration of the chosen option display which was considerably lower in our design than in other mood studies (e.g., 0.5 s in our study versus 6 s in (27)), which would not let enough time for expectation to be built. Within the winning CR-GR model, we observed that S^+ specifically exhibited lower mood sensitivity to CR than GR, which was driven by mood hyposensitivity to CR in S^+ than S^- and HC. This mood insensitivity was associated with STB severity, which was replicated when using the CR-EV-RPE model. Importantly, we found that mood hyposensitivity to certain reward was specifically correlated to gambling behavior in patients with STB, suggesting the potential mood computational mechanism for increased risk behavior in STB. This result might imply the potential interplay between dopaminergic and serotoninergic systems in STB, with low serotonin levels reducing mood sensitivity to certain rewards and with high dopaminergic levels resulting in approach behaviors.

Given that STB is a challenging multifactorial phenomenon, the development of a formal theory to quantify suicide seems necessary(20,21,60). Our cognitive and affective computational insights may pave the way for such a formal theory. Although previous literature has shown various cognitive impairments(11), e.g., executive function, in STB(61), our work is the first to quantify mood dynamics impairment and their behavioral consequences, providing insight into potential target to prevent and intervene STB. Our results indeed provide a computational mechanism for the main theories of suicide, linking low mood to suicidal behaviors. Suicide behavior is conceived to result from an intention shaped by various motivational factors (e.g., feeling of entrapment,

belongness, burdensomeness(62)). The suicidal intent may then progress to suicidal behavior, which is thought to be moderated by impulsive decisions (e.g., (63)). A possibility is that the Pavlovian approach component becomes excessive as the suicidal intent emerges.

Several limitations are worth mentioning. First, although we found that aberrant mood sensitivity explained increased risk behavior in STB, the mutual relationship between mood and risk behavior remains to be tested. For example, does mood really influence risk behavior, does risk behavior influence mood, or is there a loop between them? Second, our cross-section findings are of correlational nature. Causal relationships remain to be tested in a longitudinal study.

To conclude, this study examined cognitive and affective computational mechanisms underlying increased risk behaviors in adolescent patients with suicidal thoughts and behaviors. Given very limited predictive abilities of suicide from previous risk-factor investigations(5), our study offers a potential new perspective of mood, at the core of STB, and reveals a relationship between low mood sensitivity to certain reward and an increased risk behavior in STB and possibly suggesting dysfunctional dopaminergic and serotoninergic systems. Our work has important implications for prevention of suicide, especially for clinical populations.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31920103009,62173069,62006038), the Major Project of National Social Science Foundation (20&ZD153), Shenzhen-Hong Kong Institute of Brain Science – Shenzhen Fundamental Research Institutions (2019SHIBS0003),Science and Technology Bureau of Chengdu Program (2022-YF09-00023-SN),Sichuan Province Science and Technology Support Program (2022YFS0180).

Conflict of interest

The authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1. Preventing suicide: A global imperative (2014): *World Health Organization*.
2. Hawton K, Saunders KE, O'Connor RC (2012): Self-harm and suicide in adolescents. *The Lancet* 379: 2373–2382.
3. O'Connor RC, Nock MK (2014): The psychology of suicidal behaviour. *Lancet Psychiatry* 1: 73–85.
4. Guze SB, Robins E (1970): Suicide and Primary Affective Disorders. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 117: 437–438.
5. Franklin JC, Ribeiro JD, Fox KR, Bentley KH, Kleiman EM, Huang X, *et al.* (2017): Risk factors for suicidal thoughts and behaviors: A meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Psychol Bull* 143: 187–232.
6. King CA, Arango A, Ewell Foster C (2018): Emerging trends in adolescent suicide prevention research. *Curr Opin Psychol* 22: 89–94.
7. Schmaal L, van Harmelen A-L, Chatzi V, Lippard ETC, Toenders YJ, Averill LA, *et al.* (2020): Imaging suicidal thoughts and behaviors: a comprehensive review of 2 decades of neuroimaging studies. *Mol Psychiatry* 25: 408–427.
8. Sastre-Buades A, Alacreu-Crespo A, Courtet P, Baca-Garcia E, Barrigon ML (2021): Decision-making in suicidal behavior: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 131: 642–662.
9. Jollant F, Bellivier F, Leboyer M, Astruc B, Torres S, Verdier R, *et al.* (2005): Impaired Decision Making in Suicide Attempters. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 162: 304–310.
10. Perrain R, Dardennes R, Jollant F (2021): Risky decision-making in suicide attempters, and the choice of a violent suicidal means: an updated meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 280: 241–249.
11. Richard-Devantoy S, Berlim MT, Jollant F (2014): A meta-analysis of neuropsychological markers of vulnerability to suicidal behavior in mood disorders. *Psychol Med* 44: 1663–1673.
12. da Silva AG, Malloy-Diniz LF, Garcia MS, Figueiredo CGS, Figueiredo RN, Diaz AP, Palha AP (2018): Cognition As a Therapeutic Target in the Suicidal Patient Approach. *Front Psychiatry* 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2018.00031
13. Oldershaw A, Simic M, Grima E, Jollant F, Richards C, Taylor L, Schmidt U (2012): The Effect of Cognitive Behavior Therapy on Decision Making in Adolescents who Self-Harm: A Pilot Study. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 42: 255–265.
14. Liu Q, Zhong R, Ji X, Law S, Xiao F, Wei Y, *et al.* (2022): Decision-making biases in suicide attempters with major depressive disorder: A computational modeling study using the balloon analog risk task (BART). *Depress Anxiety* 39: 845–857.
15. Baek K, Kwon J, Chae J-H, Chung YA, Kralik JD, Min J-A, *et al.* (2017): Heightened aversion to risk and loss in depressed patients with a suicide attempt history. *Sci Rep* 7: 11228.
16. Alacreu-Crespo A, Guillaume S, Sénèque M, Olié E, Courtet P (2020): Cognitive modelling to assess decision-making impairments in patients with current depression and with/without suicide history. *European Neuropsychopharmacology* 36: 50–59.
17. Rutledge RB, Skandali N, Dayan P, Dolan RJ (2015): Dopaminergic Modulation of Decision Making and Subjective Well-Being. *Journal of Neuroscience* 35: 9811–9822.
18. Rutledge RB, Smittenaar P, Zeidman P, Brown HR, Adams RA, Lindenberger U, *et al.* (2016): Risk Taking for Potential Reward Decreases across the Lifespan. *Current Biology* 26: 1634–1639.
19. Corr PJ, McNaughton N (2012): Neuroscience and approach/avoidance personality traits: A two stage (valuation–motivation) approach. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 36: 2339–2354.
20. Dombrovski AY, Hallquist MN (2022): Search for solutions, learning, simulation, and choice processes in suicidal behavior. *WIREs Cognitive Science* 13. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1561
21. Karvelis P, Diaconescu AO (2022): A Computational Model of Hopelessness and Active-Escape Bias in Suicidality. *Computational Psychiatry* 6: 34.
22. Millner AJ, den Ouden HEM, Gershman SJ, Glenn CR, Kearns JC, Bornstein AM, *et al.* (2019):

Suicidal thoughts and behaviors are associated with an increased decision-making bias for active responses to escape aversive states. *J Abnorm Psychol* 128: 106–118.

23. Dombrovski AY, Hallquist MN (2017): The decision neuroscience perspective on suicidal behavior. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 30: 7–14.
24. Van Orden KA, Witte TK, Cukrowicz KC, Braithwaite SR, Selby EA, Joiner TE (2010): The interpersonal theory of suicide. *Psychol Rev* 117: 575–600.
25. O'Connor RC, Cleare S, Eschle S, Wetherall K, Kirtley OJ (2016): The Integrated Motivational-Volitional Model of Suicidal Behavior. *The International Handbook of Suicide Prevention*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp 220–240.
26. Klonsky ED, May AM (2015): The Three-Step Theory (3ST): A New Theory of Suicide Rooted in the "Ideation-to-Action" Framework. *Int J Cogn Ther* 8: 114–129.
27. Rutledge RB, Skandali N, Dayan P, Dolan RJ (2014): A computational and neural model of momentary subjective well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111: 12252–12257.
28. 'Wang Zhihao' 'Wang Ting' 'Nan Tian'' "Xu Jiahua" "Aleman André" "Luo Yuejia" "Blain Bastien" "Liu Yunzhe" "Xu Pengfei"' (2023): Opposed Mood Dynamics of Depression and Anxiety are related to Reward Prediction Error. *Res Sq*.
29. Zhang J, Brown GK (2007): Psychometric Properties of the Scale for Suicide Ideation in China. *Archives of Suicide Research* 11: 203–210.
30. Zhao X, Zhang Y, Li L, Zhou Y (2005): Evaluation on reliability and validity of Chinese version of childhood trauma questionnaire. *Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research* 209–211.
31. Zhu X, Auerbach RP, Yao S, Abela JRZ, Xiao J, Tong X (2008): Psychometric properties of the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire: Chinese version. *Cogn Emot* 22: 288–307.
32. Shek DTL (1988): Reliability and factorial structure of the Chinese version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* 10: 303–317.
33. Shek DTL (1990): Reliability and factorial structure of the chinese version of the Beck Depression Inventory. *J Clin Psychol* 46: 35–43.
34. Jiang L, Wang Y, Zhang Y, Li R, Wu H, Li C, *et al.* (2019): The Reliability and Validity of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) for Chinese University Students. *Front Psychiatry* 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00315
35. Kahneman, L. DANIE, Tversky A (1979): Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica* 47: 363–391.
36. Wang Z, Nan T, Goerlich KS, Li Y, Aleman A, Luo Y, Xu P (2023): Neurocomputational mechanisms underlying fear-biased adaptation learning in changing environments ((M. F. S. Rushworth, editor)). *PLoS Biol* 21: e3001724.
37. Blain B, Rutledge RB (2020): Momentary subjective well-being depends on learning and not reward. *Elife* 9. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.57977
38. Jangraw DC, Keren H, Sun H, Bedder RL, Rutledge RB, Pereira F, *et al.* (2023): A highly replicable decline in mood during rest and simple tasks. *Nat Hum Behav* 7: 596–610.
39. Rutledge RB, Moutoussis M, Smittenaar P, Zeidman P, Taylor T, Hrynkiewicz L, *et al.* (2017): Association of Neural and Emotional Impacts of Reward Prediction Errors With Major Depression. *JAMA Psychiatry* 74: 790.
40. Dombrovski AY, Szanto K, Clark L, Reynolds CF, Siegle GJ (2013): Reward Signals, Attempted Suicide, and Impulsivity in Late-Life Depression. *JAMA Psychiatry* 70: 1020.
41. Ortin A, Lake AM, Kleinman M, Gould MS (2012): Sensation seeking as risk factor for suicidal ideation and suicide attempts in adolescence. *J Affect Disord* 143: 214–222.
42. Lenhard W, Lenhard A (2014): Hypothesis Tests for Comparing Correlations. *Https://Www.Psychometrica.de/Correlation.Html*.
43. Horesh N, Gothelf D, Ofek H, Weizman T, Apter A (1999): Impulsivity as a correlate of suicidal behavior in adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and*

Suicide Prevention 20: 8–14.

44. Javdani S, Sadeh N, Verona E (2011): Suicidality as a function of impulsivity, callous–unemotional traits, and depressive symptoms in youth. *J Abnorm Psychol* 120: 400–413.
45. KINGSBURY S, HAWTON K, STEINHARDT K, JAMES A (1999): Do Adolescents Who Take Overdoses Have Specific Psychological Characteristics? A Comparative Study With Psychiatric and Community Controls. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 38: 1125–1131.
46. Renaud J, Berlim MT, McGirr A, Tousignant M, Turecki G (2008): Current psychiatric morbidity, aggression/impulsivity, and personality dimensions in child and adolescent suicide: A case-control study. *J Affect Disord* 105: 221–228.
47. Dayan P, Niv Y, Seymour B, D. Daw N (2006): The misbehavior of value and the discipline of the will. *Neural Networks* 19: 1153–1160.
48. Bushong B, King LM, Camerer CF, Rangel A (2010): Pavlovian Processes in Consumer Choice: The Physical Presence of a Good Increases Willingness-to-Pay. *American Economic Review* 100: 1556–1571.
49. Berridge KC, Robinson TE (1998): What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Res Rev* 28: 309–369.
50. McClure SM, Berns GS, Montague PR (2003): Temporal Prediction Errors in a Passive Learning Task Activate Human Striatum. *Neuron* 38: 339–346.
51. Molina JA, Sáinz-Artiga MJ, Fraile A, Jiménez-Jiménez FJ, Villanueva C, Ortí-Pareja M, Bermejo-P F (2000): Pathologic gambling in Parkinson's disease: A behavioral manifestation of pharmacologic treatment? *Movement Disorders* 15: 869–872.
52. Cools R, Barker RA, Sahakian BJ, Robbins TW (2003): l-Dopa medication remediates cognitive inflexibility, but increases impulsivity in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia* 41: 1431–1441.
53. St Onge JR, Floresco SB (2009): Dopaminergic Modulation of Risk-Based Decision Making. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 34: 681–697.
54. Stopper CM, Tse MTL, Montes DR, Wiedman CR, Floresco SB (2014): Overriding Phasic Dopamine Signals Redirects Action Selection during Risk/Reward Decision Making. *Neuron* 84: 177–189.
55. Guitart-Masip M, Huys QJM, Fuentemilla L, Dayan P, Duzel E, Dolan RJ (2012): Go and no-go learning in reward and punishment: Interactions between affect and effect. *Neuroimage* 62: 154–166.
56. Amin Z, Canli T, Epperson CN (2005): Effect of Estrogen-Serotonin Interactions on Mood and Cognition. *Behav Cogn Neurosci Rev* 4: 43–58.
57. Joiner TE, Brown JS, Wingate LR (2005): The Psychology and Neurobiology of Suicidal Behavior. *Annu Rev Psychol* 56: 287–314.
58. Michely J, Eldar E, Martin IM, Dolan RJ (2020): A mechanistic account of serotonin's impact on mood. *Nat Commun* 11: 2335.
59. Vanhasbroeck N, Devos L, Pessers S, Kuppens P, Vanpaemel W, Moors A, Tuerlinckx F (2021): Testing a computational model of subjective well-being: a preregistered replication of Rutledge et al. (2014). *Cogn Emot* 35: 822–835.
60. Millner AJ, Robinaugh DJ, Nock MK (2020): Advancing the Understanding of Suicide: The Need for Formal Theory and Rigorous Descriptive Research. *Trends Cogn Sci* 24: 704–716.
61. Bredemeier K, Miller IW (2015): Executive function and suicidality: A systematic qualitative review. *Clin Psychol Rev* 40: 170–183.
62. Klonsky ED, Saffer BY, Bryan CJ (2018): Ideation-to-action theories of suicide: a conceptual and empirical update. *Curr Opin Psychol* 22: 38–43.
63. O'Connor RC, Kirtley OJ (2018): The integrated motivational–volitional model of suicidal behaviour. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 373: 20170268.