Title: Computational Phenotyping of Electroconvulsive Therapy Outcomes in Treatment-Resistant Depression

Authors: Rachel E. Jones, PhD[1,2], L. Paul Sands, PhD[2,3], Jonathan D. Trattner, MS[2], Angela Jiang, BS[1], Christina K. Johnson, PhD[1,4], Predrag V. Gligorovic, MD, MHA[5,6], Heather E. Douglas, MD[7], Rommel Ramos, MD[5], Kenneth T. Kishida, PhD[1,2,8,9,*]

Affiliations:

1. Department of Translational Neuroscience, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem NC 27157
2. Neuroscience Graduate Program, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem NC 27157
3. Human Neuroimaging Laboratory, Fralin Biomedical Research Institute, Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine, VA 24016
4. Space Biosciences Division, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035
5. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist, Winston-Salem NC 27103
6. Department of Anesthesiology, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist, Winston-Salem NC 27157
7. Department of Behavioral Health, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist, High Point NC 27262
8. Department of Neurosurgery, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem NC 27157
9. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem NC 27157

***Corresponding Author:** Kenneth T. Kishida, PhD; Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Blvd, Winston-Salem NC, 27101, US phone: 336-716-0419, email: kkishida@wakehealth.edu

Manuscript word count: 3163

KEY POINTS

QUESTION: How does ECT treatment change neurocomputational measures of learning and affective experiences in patients with treatment-resistant depression?

FINDINGS: In this observational study, computational models were used to quantify the behavioral dynamics of learning and associated changes in subjective feelings in patients who underwent ECT treatment for treatment resistant depression and controls. In ECT-responders we observed increases in reward-based learning, normalized affective responses to surprising positive and negative outcomes, and associated changes in fMRI-measured BOLD-responses.

MEANING: Computational phenotyping of task behavior and associated brain responses provides quantification of complex neurobehavioral dynamics and provides specific insight into the neurobehavioral mechanisms underlying successful ECT treatment.

ABSTRACT

IMPORTANCE: Electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) is an effective medical procedure for patients with treatment-resistant depression. However, quantitative neural and behavioral measures that characterize how patients respond to ECT treatment are largely lacking.

OBJECTIVE: Determine whether neurocomputational models that integrate information about adaptive learning behavior and associated affective experiences can characterize neurobehavioral changes in patients whose depression improves following ECT treatment.

DESIGN: This observational study included two research visits from 2020-2023 that occurred before and after standard-of-care ECT for treatment-resistant depression. This report focuses on “visit 2”, which occurred after patients received their initial ECT treatment series.

SETTING: Wake Forest University School of Medicine; Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Psychiatric Outpatient Center; Atrium Health Wake Forest Hospital.

PARTICIPANTS: Participants who received ECT for treatment-resistant depression (“ECT”), and participants not receiving ECT but with depression (“non-ECT”) or without depression (“no-depression”) were recruited from the Psychiatric Outpatient Center and community, respectively.

EXPOSURES: Computerized delivery of a Probabilistic Reward and Punishment with Subjective Rating task with functional magnetic resonance imaging.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES: Computational modeling of choice behavior provided parameters that characterized learning dynamics and associated affect dynamics expressed through intermittent Likert scale self-reports. Multivariate statistical analyses relating model parameters, neurobehavioral responses, and clinical assessments.

RESULTS: ECT (N=21; 47.6% female), non-ECT (N=36; 69.4% female), and no-depression (N=38; 65.8% female) participants. Parameters derived from computational models fit to behavior elicited during learning *and* the expression of affective experiences for all groups reveled specific changes in patients who responded favorably to ECT. ECT-responders demonstrated increased rates of learning from rewarding trials, normalized affective response to punishments, and an increase in the influence of counterfactual ‘missed opportunities’ on

affective behavior. Additionally, ECT-responders' showed changes in BOLD activity regions specific to each of these parameters. ECT-responders' BOLD-responses to surprising punishments and counterfactual missed opportunities were altered from visit 1 to visit 2 in the inferior frontal operculum, Rolandic operculum, precentral gyrus, and caudate.

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE: Computational models of neurobehavioral dynamics associated with learning and affect can describe specific hypotheses about neurocomputational-mechanisms underlying favorable responses to treatment-resistant depression. Our results suggest computational estimates of learning and affective dynamics may aid in identifying depression phenotypes and treatment outcomes in psychiatric medicine where objective measures are largely lacking.

INTRODUCTION

Electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) is an effective medical procedure for patients with treatment-resistant depression (TRD) who are unresponsive to standard antidepressants[1,2]. Despite decades of use, it is still unclear how ECT-induced changes in brain function give rise to behavioral changes in treatment responders[3–5]. Objective measures that link neural and behavioral changes produced by ECT treatment may provide a precise explanation of how ECT improves depressive symptoms in patients with TRD[6–8].

Computational models of reinforcement learning (RL) have been increasingly applied to better understand depression pathophysiology and treatment mechanisms[9–11]. Further, quantifying links between measurable and computable learning signals and subjective emotional states has started to reveal how depression impacts the emotional processing of decision outcomes[12–15]. However, to date, no study has applied neurocomputational depictions of learning and affective experiences to characterize ECT treatment outcomes. The goal of this study was to combine computational models of learning and affective dynamics with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to characterize neurobehavioral changes in patients with TRD following their initial ECT treatment series. Specifically, we used a Valence Partitioned Reinforcement Learning (VPRL) model recently shown to explain human choice behavior better than single-valence RL models and that was shown to explain sub-second changes in dopamine fluctuations in humans performing the same task that is used in this work[16–18].

While computational RL methods describing post-ECT effects are lacking, other clinical treatments have been shown to improve reward learning deficits in non-treatment resistant depression[19–24]. For example, antidepressants increase neural responses to reward prediction errors in responsive patients[25–27]. However, there are variable findings regarding punishment learning[28–30]. For example, multiple fMRI studies using similar tasks report inconsistent BOLD responses to ‘negative reward prediction errors’ in unmedicated patients with depression[31–35]. Further, antidepressant studies also report increased[36], decreased[37], or no change[38,39] in patients’ punishment learning when considering ‘negative reward prediction errors’ and the punishment signal.

Brown and colleagues recently separated trials within their RL tasks according to whether the trial was rewarding or punishing (e.g., gains vs. losses, respectively) and demonstrated normalized reward and loss neurocomputations after cognitive behavioral therapy in patients with depression[9]. This separation of valence aligns with recent evidence suggesting positive and negative valence processing occurs through separate

neural systems, which differs from traditional single-valence RL approaches[28,40–42]. The VPRL framework used in this study follows this line of reasoning and hypothesizes that independent neural systems track positive and negative events whether anticipated or actually experienced[16–18,28]. We hypothesize that applying VPRL to investigate ECT treatment outcomes may clarify how ECT alters distinct positive and negative learning mechanisms in patients with TRD.

In addition to reinforcement learning and decision making mechanisms, further investigating how positive and negative learning signals differentially influence affective states using neurocomputational models, may identify specific affective mechanisms altered by ECT treatment[43–48]. For example, Eldar and Niv demonstrated that positive prediction errors improved mood while negative prediction errors worsened mood during a learning task, with emotional states further biasing valuations of subsequent outcomes in individuals with mood instabilities[13]. Also, Rutledge and colleagues showed that reward expectations and reward prediction errors directly affected mood ratings about recent outcomes in patients with depression[12]. While such studies dig deeper into the influence of decision outcomes on affective state, there remains a gap in the literature describing how neurobehavioral computations may give rise to affective experiences and how these processes are altered in depression and perhaps favorably modulated by effective treatments including ECT[49,50].

In this study, we applied a VPRL framework[17,18] to determine whether a computational psychiatric approach[51,52] that uses valenced-partitioned (i.e., positive and negative systems) learning signals to predict affective behavior could provide insight into how ECT treatment changes learning and affective dynamics in patients with favorable responses. We hypothesized that ECT would alter neurobehavioral signals related to both learning and affective behavior in ECT treatment responders.

METHODS

Study Design

Here, we report data collected during research “visit 2” of a two-visit observational study following a standard-of-care ECT-treatment timeline (Fig.1A). All participants completed a Probabilistic Reward and Punishment with Subjective Rating task during fMRI scanning. Following fMRI scanning, participants

completed the Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9)[53], Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM-D)[54], and Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA)[55]. Participants provided written informed consent under Wake Forest University School of Medicine IRB00056131.

Participants

"ECT" patients included patients with TRD who received ECT treatment for the first time at AHWFB Psychiatric Outpatient Center (ECT, N=21; 47.6% female). We defined ECT treatment responders as patients who showed any clinical improvement following their standard-of-care ECT treatment series based on clinician notes or PHQ-9 or HAM-D assessments (ECT Responder, N=17; ECT Non-responder, N=4). Participants with depression not planning ECT (non-ECT, N=36; 69.4% female) and participants without depression (no-depression, N=38; 65.8% female) were recruited from the Winston-Salem, North Carolina area. See eMethods and eTables1-3 for full participant details.

Probabilistic Reward and Punishment with Subjective Rating (PRPwSR) Task

Participants completed the same PRPwSR task completed at research visit 1 (Fig.1B)[17,18]. Briefly, the PRPwSR task is a value-based choice task where participants make choices and learn to maximize probabilistic rewards (i.e., monetary gains) and minimize probabilistic losses (i.e., monetary losses) over 150 trials. After each trial there is a one-third probability that participants would be asked, "How do you feel about the last outcome?". Participants respond using a Likert scale ranging from "very bad" to "very good." See eMethods and eFig.1 for task details. See eFig.2 for group performance measures.

Computational Modeling

We used hierarchical Bayesian methods[56] to fit RL computational models to participants' choice behavior on the PRPwSR task (eMethods). Participants' expected icon values and outcome prediction errors were estimated using a VPRL framework[16–18]. These learning signals were then used to model and predict participants' subjective ratings during the task. We hypothesize that each individual's unique set of learning and affective parameters could represent a *computational phenotype* and that ECT responders' computational phenotype would change relative to pre-ECT-treatment. See below for brief descriptions of model parameters:

Valence Partitioned Reinforcement Learning Model Parameters

A previously validated VPRL framework was used to quantify participants' choice behavior[16–18]. VPRL hypothesizes that brains track appetitive (e.g., positive/rewarding) and aversive (e.g., negative/punishing) stimuli simultaneously, but via independent systems. This allows stimuli to predict benefits and/or costs that may be independently estimated such that cost-benefit comparisons can be made[16]. Each system updates *value estimates* (i.e., Q-values) akin to standard Q-learning with temporal difference RL rules[57]. Hence, Q-values for positive ($\boldsymbol{Q^P_{s_t, a_t}}$) and negative ($\boldsymbol{Q^N_{s_t, a_t}}$) state-action sets ($\boldsymbol{s_t}$, $\boldsymbol{a_t}$) are estimated. Likewise, future states' ($\boldsymbol{s_{t+1}}$) positive ($\boldsymbol{Q^P_{s_{t+1}}}$) and negative ($\boldsymbol{Q^N_{s_{t+1}}}$) values are estimated and, respectively, discounted by independent parameters ($\boldsymbol{\gamma^P}$,$\boldsymbol{\gamma^N}$). The combination of current actual outcomes, discounted expectations of future values, and expected current values are used to calculate independent temporal difference prediction errors ($\boldsymbol{\delta^P_t}$,$\boldsymbol{\delta^N_t}$), which are then used to update respective Q-values by independent learning weights ($\boldsymbol{\alpha^P}$,$\boldsymbol{\alpha^N}$). We modeled choice policy using a softmax function with a temperature parameter ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$) that describes how exploitative versus random a participant's choices are given Q-value estimates. The parameters in the VPRL framework ($\boldsymbol{\alpha^P}$,$\boldsymbol{\alpha^N}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma^P}$,$\boldsymbol{\gamma^N}$, and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$) were used to characterize each participant's computational *learning* phenotype. See eMethods for details about the VPRL model.

Subjective Feeling Regression Model Parameters

We hypothesized that participants' expectations about icon values ($\boldsymbol{Q^P_{s_t}}$,$\boldsymbol{Q^N_{s_t}}$) and prediction errors resulting from choice outcomes ($\boldsymbol{\delta^P_t}$,$\boldsymbol{\delta^N_t}$) collectively contributed to their reported feelings in the PRPwSR task[18]. We also hypothesized that the contribution of learning signals to subjective ratings in ECT-responders would differ from those observed before ECT treatment. We fit a linear regression model[58] with Q-values ($\boldsymbol{Q^P_{s_t, a_t, chosen}}$, $\boldsymbol{Q^P_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}}$, $\boldsymbol{Q^N_{s_t, a_t, chosen}}$, $\boldsymbol{Q^N_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}}$) and prediction errors ($\boldsymbol{+\delta^P_t}$, $\boldsymbol{-\delta^P_t}$, $\boldsymbol{+\delta^N_t}$, $\boldsymbol{-\delta^N_t}$) as independent predictors of subjective ratings. The coefficient parameters in the Subjective Feeling model ($\boldsymbol{\beta_{constant}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{+\delta^P_t}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{-\delta^P_t}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{+\delta^N_t}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{-\delta^N_t}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{Q^P_{s_t, a_t, chosen}}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{Q^P_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{Q^N_{s_t, a_t, chosen}}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_{Q^N_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}}}$) were used to characterize each participant's computational *affective* phenotype. See eMethods for details about the Subjective Feeling model.

fMRI Analyses

See eMethods for details on fMRI data acquisition, pre-processing, and model-based analyses. VPRL and Subjective Feeling models were fit to each participants' behavior. We developed second-level "visit 2" minus "visit 1" contrasts of specific learning and affective neurocomputations that showed behavioral changes across research visits and performed whole-brain i) one-sample t-tests of blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) changes for ECT responders and ii) analysis of the variance (ANOVA) of BOLD changes between ECT, non-ECT, and no-depression groups. All statistical analyses were conducted at an uncorrected threshold of $p<0.001$ and reported results were selected using a family-wise error (FWE)-corrected threshold of $p<0.05$ at cluster and peak voxel levels.

Statistical Analysis

We used hierarchical Bayesian analysis[56] to estimate posterior distributions of free parameters in the VPRL model (α^P, α^N, γ^P, γ^N, and τ) and subsequently conducted a Bayesian linear regression[58] with group-informed posterior coefficients in the Subjective Feeling model ($\beta_{constant}$, $\beta_{+\delta_t^P}$, $\beta_{-\delta_t^P}$, $\beta_{+\delta_t^N}$, $\beta_{-\delta_t^N}$, $\beta_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,chosen}}$, $\beta_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}$, $\beta_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,chosen}}$, $\beta_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}$). For all relevant tests, $p<0.05$ was deemed significant. Analyses were conducted in R version 4.2.2 and Stan version 2.21.0. (rstan version 2.21.8)[59].

RESULTS

Participant characteristics

Across research visits, both ECT and non-ECT groups demonstrated decreases in PHQ-9 and HAM-D scores, indicating depression symptom improvement. ECT patients showed a substantial reduction in PHQ-9 scores compared to both non-ECT and no-depression groups but a substantial reduction in HAM-D scores compared to no-depression participants only. The three groups did not differ in age, gender, race, or ethnicity. See eTable4 for clinical details.

ECT Responder *Computational Phenotypes* for Valence Partitioned Learning

Behavior

We hypothesized that ECT treatment altered neurobehavioral learning mechanisms in responders. To test this hypothesis, we fit the VPRL model separately to ECT responder, ECT non-responder, non-ECT, and no-depression group choice behavior for both research visits and assessed group-level changes in learning parameters across visits.

ECT responders showed an increase in the positive system learning rate (α^P, Table1A) following treatment (median difference [95% HDI] = 0.15 [-0.05, 0.35]). No-depression participants also showed some increase in α^P (0.02 [-0.04, 0.09]) while non-ECT participants showed decreased α^P across research visits (-0.09 [-0.15, -0.02]). Non-ECT and no-depression groups also showed decreases in $1/\tau$ (non-ECT: -0.08 [-0.20, 0.05]; no-depression: -0.04 [-0.13, 0.04]) across visits.

Neural

Given the change in α^P among ECT responders, we performed a one-sample t-test of BOLD change across research visits (visit 2-visit 1) associated with positive system reward prediction errors (δ_t^P) in ECT responders (see Supplementary Eq.1-2). However, we did not find significant changes in this activity following treatment (Table2A). We then tested whether BOLD activity associated with δ_t^P changed more in the ECT cohort compared to non-ECT and no-depression groups. We did not find significant differences between the three cohorts after conducting a whole-brain ANOVA on visit 2-visit 1 change in BOLD-associated δ_t^P activity (eTable5A).

ECT Responder *Computational Phenotypes* for Subjective Feelings

Behavior

We hypothesized that i) VPRL learning signals may drive changes in subjective feelings about the consequences of choices made (Fig.1B) and ii) ECT treatment would alter this affective mechanism in responders for specific learning signal contributions on reported feelings. We expected a linear combination of these signals: $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{constant}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{+\delta_t^P}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-\delta_t^P}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{+\delta_t^N}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-\delta_t^N}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,chosen}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,chosen}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}$ to predict subjective ratings.

In ECT-responders only, receiving worse than expected punishments ($+\delta_t^N$) contributed to

more negative ratings of feelings after treatment (median difference [95% HDI] = -0.65 [-1.09, -0.22], Table1B). Both ECT responders and non-ECT participants demonstrated a shift from a negative to positive influence of positive system counterfactual choice expectations ($Q^P_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}$) on feelings across visits (ECT responders: 1.27 [-0.04, 2.64]; non-ECT: 0.84 [0.10, 1.58]). Alternatively, both ECT responders and no-depression participants shifted from a positive to negative influence of 'less-bad than expected' punishments ($-\delta_t^N$) on rated feelings (ECT responders: -0.57 [-1.14, -2.76e-4]; no-depression: -0.58 [-1.06, -0.10]). No-depression participants demonstrated more negative feelings derived from less rewarding outcomes ($-\delta_t^P$; -0.58 [-0.93, -0.24]) and more positive feelings from positive system chosen choice expectations ($Q^P_{s_t, a_t, chosen}$; 1.01 [0.40, 1.59]).

Neural

Given the changes in the Subjective Feeling model parameters we observed in ECT responders, we performed a one-sample t-test to determine BOLD activity change associated with subjective ratings influenced by $Q^P_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}$, $+\delta_t^N$, and $-\delta_t^N$ across research visits (visit 2-visit 1). We found BOLD-associated changes in all parameters for ECT responders, with increased activity in the right inferior frontal operculum and decreased activity in the left rolandic operculum, left caudate, and right precentral gyrus following treatment (Fig.2; Table2B).

To assess whether BOLD-associated changes in subjective feeling computations differed across ECT, non-ECT, and no-depression groups, we performed a whole-brain ANOVA based on behavioral results (we again assessed for group differences in emotional impacts of $Q^P_{s_t, a_t, unchosen}$, $+\delta_t^N$, and $-\delta_t^N$). We found differences in BOLD-associated punishment prediction error changes across the groups (eTable5B). Post-hoc t-tests showed greater changes in BOLD-related activity for non-ECT participants compared to ECT patients in the right calcarine gyrus, right precuneus, and left posterior cingulum and for no-depression participants compared to ECT patients in the right angular gyrus.

DISCUSSION

We investigated whether and how ECT treatment changed computational phenotypic depictions of the neurobehavioral dynamics of reward and punishment learning and associated subjective experiences in

patients with TRD (who were previously naïve to ECT). We assessed specific changes in ECT-responders, defined by any clinical improvement in depression, participants with depression managed by medications or therapy, and participants without depression to pinpoint treatment specific effects versus general neurobehavioral changes that may have occurred across research visits. We used a hierarchical Bayesian approach to fit a Valence Partitioned Reinforcement Learning (VPRL)[16–18] model to participant choice behavior on a Probabilistic Reward and Punishment with Subjective Rating (PRPwSR) task (Fig.1B). This model provided parameters describing learning mechanisms in which ECT responders demonstrated an increase in reward learning rate following treatment (Table1A). From VPRL parameters, we then estimated participants' expectations and prediction errors to model their influence on participants' subjective feelings of decision outcomes during the task. Following treatment, ECT-responders demonstrated unique shifts in how unchosen potentially good (i.e., 'missed opportunities') and actual worse-than-expected losses affected their feelings, suggesting a treatment effect in positive and negative RL-affective systems (Table1B). These specific changes in subjective experience were further associated with changes in BOLD-responses associated with hypothesized affective processes (Fig.2). Our collective results suggest that specific neurobehavioral mechanisms underlying learning and affective processes are altered by successful ECT treatment. Further, these signals may provide a potential quantitative measure for ECT-responders and a favorable ECT response.

To our knowledge, our study is the first to apply a computational psychiatric approach to investigate ECT treatment mechanisms in patients with TRD, and to pair VPRL[16–18] and related models to extract subjective experience[16,18] in patients with depression. ECT responders demonstrated increased reward learning rates following treatment compared to other cohorts, suggestive of an ECT treatment effect that may allow relearning of the relationship between potentially good experiences and behaviors that promote them. This is consistent with prior work demonstrating that various types of antidepressants can improve reward learning in responsive patients with depression[19,26,27], but demonstrates the role that ECT can have in this specific process in treatment resistant patients. Notably, the ECT patients in this study had tried multiple (and were currently taking) antidepressants that were ineffective and therefore proceeded to ECT treatment. These findings suggest ECT may be effective in targeting similar neural circuits associated with reward processing that the mechanisms of antidepressants could not alter for patients with TRD in our study[29,38]. We did not find

neural correlates to reward prediction error signaling improvements in ECT treatment responders, indicating further work is needed to pinpoint neural effects of reward learning from ECT.

We found both neural and behavioral changes in how learning signals come to drive affective responses in ECT responders. These results suggest that ECT may have changed mechanisms underlying how good and bad outcomes are processed in patients and how they come to affect subjective feelings. Interestingly, counterfactual 'missed opportunities' showed a significant increase in the influence on positive feelings in both ECT-responders and no-depression groups across visits. Originally this parameters promoted strong negative feelings in responders, but after treatment, promoted positive feelings similar to what we observed in no-depression participants. Individuals with depression often experience challenges in experiencing pleasure or motivation (i.e., anhedonia). Despite not seeking rewards, this may cause rumination over missed opportunities and lead to negative feelings[7,60,61]. Our results suggest ECT may normalize this affective mechanism and involve regions such as the caudate and rolandic operculum known to be involved with reward seeking and emotional processing[62,63]. Further, 'worse-than-expected' punishments contributed to more negative feelings after ECT treatment in responders (compared to before ECT). Negative bias is a known depressive symptom where maintained expectations about negative events often lead to unsurprising emotional reactions when such events arise, often contributing to flatter affect in patients with depression[64–66]. As such, ECT may alter cognitive-emotional processes, previously shown to be tracked by the inferior frontal operculum[67], translating to increased emotional reactivity to punishments in responders.

The VPRL framework[16–18] used here allowed us to identify potential computational phenotypes of ECT responders under hypotheses of independent reward and punishment learning systems in the brain. We identified specific learning and affective mechanisms that accompanied depression improvement in responders, which provided an objective, translatable understanding of successful ECT mechanisms[51]. Importantly, we recently demonstrated that the VPRL model tracks sub-second fluctuations in dopaminergic concentrations in the human brain using the same task used in this study[17]. And prior work has suggested that counterfactual signals can have a significantly influence on sub-second dopamine signals in humans[68]. In our visit 1 (pre-ECT) work, we showed that 'worse-than-expected' punishment prediction errors accounted for differences in 'pre-ECT' patients with TRD; here, we show that these differences were normalized in ECT treatment responders and correlated these changes to increased BOLD activity in the inferior frontal

operculum. These results are consistent with prior work that suggested that punishment learning processes may be altered in depression[9] but extend these studies by suggesting specific neurocomputational mechanisms underlying ECT symptom improvement. More work is needed to clarify the specificity of our proposed computational phenotypes of ECT treatment responders and whether these tools may be used to augment clinical work.

Limitations

Our sample sizes for ECT non-responder group were small (N=4) and we did not have enough statistical power to run separate analyses to compare of investigate effects in non-responders. We aimed to observe the natural course of the current standard of care for ECT, therefore, ECT sessions varied by patient due to individual treatment plans that the research team was not involved with; however, this variation likely contributed to the overall successful treatment outcomes. Given this variation in treatment, but uniformity of treatment outcomes, our results may point to a general neurobehavioral state that may be a target for successful treatment. More work is needed to clarify these observations and test these hypotheses.

Conclusions

We estimated the magnitude of dynamic neurobehavioral changes in patients receiving ECT by using neurocomputational models of learning and affective processes fit to behavioral data from patients with TRD. This study demonstrates the utility of applying computational models to assess *dynamic* behavioral, neural, cognitive, and emotional processes that cannot not be captured by current clinical assessments. Future work developing computationally derived estimate of neurobehavioral signals relevant to clinical decisions and patient behaviors is needed to further advance objective and quantitative tools into psychiatry where subjective reports and trial-and-error methods are the current standard of care.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author Contributions: Kishida and Jones had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Kishida, Gligorovic, Douglas, Jones, Sands.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Jones, Kishida.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Jones, Sands, Trattner.

Obtained funding: Kishida.

Administrative, technical, or material support: All authors.

Study supervision: Kishida, Gligorovic, Douglas, Ramos, Jones.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None reported.

Funding/Support: Funding/Support: This work was supported by the National Institute of Health (grants R01DA048096, R01MH12099, R01MH124115, and P50AA026117 to Dr. Kishida; grant F31DA053174 to Dr. Sands). This work was also supported by Wake Forest University School of Medicine: Clinical and Translational Science Institute; and Wake Forest University School of Medicine: Neuroscience Clinical Trial and Innovation Center.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Additional Contributions: We thank all of the individuals who took part in this study, clinic staff who assisted with recruitment, and MRI staff who assisted with research visits. We thank Dr. Mary Moya-Mendez for her work in advertisement and IRB development. The following research assistants from the Translational Neuroscience Department at Wake Forest School of Medicine were involved in data collection: Ashley Shipp, BS and Michael Howze, BS.

REFERENCES

1. McIntyre RS, Filteau MJ, Martin L, et al. Treatment-resistant depression: definitions, review of the evidence, and algorithmic approach. *J Affect Disord*. 2014;156:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2013.10.043

2. Kho KH, van Vreeswijk MF, Simpson S, Zwinderman AH. A Meta-Analysis of Electroconvulsive Therapy Efficacy in Depression. *The Journal of ECT*. 2003;19(3):139-147. Accessed December 8, 2021. https://journals.lww.com/ectjournal/Fulltext/2003/09000/A_Meta_Analysis_of_Electroconvulsive_Therapy.5.aspx

3. Kato N. Neurophysiological mechanisms of electroconvulsive therapy for depression. *Neuroscience Research*. 2009;64(1):3-11. doi:10.1016/j.neures.2009.01.014

4. Leaver AM, Vasavada M, Joshi SH, et al. Mechanisms of Antidepressant Response to Electroconvulsive Therapy Studied With Perfusion Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2019;85(6):466-476. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.021

5. Li M, Yao X, Sun L, et al. Effects of Electroconvulsive Therapy on Depression and Its Potential Mechanism. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2020;11:80. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00080

6. Patzelt EH, Hartley CA, Gershman SJ. Computational Phenotyping: Using Models to Understand Individual Differences in Personality, Development, and Mental Illness. *Personality Neuroscience*. 2018;1:e18. doi:10.1017/pen.2018.14

7. Huys QJM, Daw ND, Dayan P. Depression: A Decision-Theoretic Analysis. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. 2015;38(1):1-23. doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-071714-033928

8. Schurr R, Reznik D, Hillman H, Bhui R, Gershman SJ. Dynamic computational phenotyping of human cognition. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2024;8(5):917-931. doi:10.1038/s41562-024-01814-x

9. Brown VM, Zhu L, Solway A, et al. Reinforcement Learning Disruptions in Individuals With Depression and Sensitivity to Symptom Change Following Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021;78(10):1-11. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.1844

10. Chen C, Takahashi T, Nakagawa S, Inoue T, Kusumi I. Reinforcement learning in depression: A review of computational research. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2015;55:247-267. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.05.005

11. Höflich A, Michenthaler P, Kasper S, Lanzenberger R. Circuit Mechanisms of Reward, Anhedonia, and Depression. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2018;22(2):105-118. doi:10.1093/ijnp/pyy081

12. Rutledge RB, Moutoussis M, Smittenaar P, et al. Association of Neural and Emotional Impacts of Reward Prediction Errors With Major Depression. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017;74(8):790-797. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.1713

13. Eldar E, Niv Y. Interaction between emotional state and learning underlies mood instability. *Nat Commun*. 2015;6(1):6149. doi:10.1038/ncomms7149

14. Bach DR, Dayan P. Algorithms for survival: a comparative perspective on emotions. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2017;18(5):311-319. doi:10.1038/nrn.2017.35

15. Huys QJM, Redish AD, Gordon JA. A valuation framework for emotions applied to depression recurrence. In: *Computational Psychiatry: New Perspectives on Mental Illness*. MIT Press; 2016:275-292. Accessed December 2, 2020. https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/computational-psychiatry

16. Kishida KT, Sands LP. A Dynamic Affective Core to Bind the Contents, Context, and Value of Conscious Experience. In: Waugh CE, Kuppens P, eds. *Affect Dynamics*. Springer International Publishing; 2021:293-328. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-82965-0_12

17. Sands LP, Jiang A, Liebenow B, et al. Subsecond fluctuations in extracellular dopamine encode reward and punishment prediction errors in humans. *Sci Adv*. 9(48):eadi4927. doi:10.1126/sciadv.adi4927

18. Sands LP, Jiang A, Jones RE, Trattner JD, Kishida KT. Valence-partitioned learning signals drive choice behavior and phenomenal subjective experience in humans. Published online March 18, 2023:2023.03.17.533213. doi:10.1101/2023.03.17.533213

19. Kumar P, Waiter G, Ahearn T, Milders M, Reid I, Steele JD. Abnormal temporal difference reward-learning signals in major depression. *Brain*. 2008;131(8):2084-2093. doi:10.1093/brain/awn136

20. Geugies H, Mocking RJT, Figueroa CA, et al. Impaired reward-related learning signals in remitted unmedicated patients with recurrent depression. *Brain*. 2019;142(8):2510-2522. doi:10.1093/brain/awz167

21. Ng TH, Alloy LB, Smith DV. Meta-analysis of reward processing in major depressive disorder reveals distinct abnormalities within the reward circuit. *Translational Psychiatry*. 2019;9(1):1-10. doi:10.1038/s41398-019-0644-x

22. Roiser JP, Elliott R, Sahakian BJ. Cognitive Mechanisms of Treatment in Depression. *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2012;37(1):117-136. doi:10.1038/npp.2011.183

23. Schlaepfer TE, Cohen MX, Frick C, et al. Deep Brain Stimulation to Reward Circuitry Alleviates Anhedonia in Refractory Major Depression. *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2008;33(2):368-377. doi:10.1038/sj.npp.1301408

24. Forbes EE, Olino TM, Ryan ND, et al. Reward-related brain function as a predictor of treatment response in adolescents with major depressive disorder. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*. 2010;10(1):107-118. doi:10.3758/CABN.10.1.107

25. Bellani M, Dusi N, Yeh PH, Soares JC, Brambilla P. The effects of antidepressants on human brain as detected by imaging studies. Focus on major depression. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*. 2011;35(7):1544-1552. doi:10.1016/j.pnpbp.2010.11.040

26. Stoy M, Schlagenhauf F, Sterzer P, et al. Hyporeactivity of ventral striatum towards incentive stimuli in unmedicated depressed patients normalizes after treatment with escitalopram. *J Psychopharmacol*. 2012;26(5):677-688. doi:10.1177/0269881111416686

27. Tremblay LK, Naranjo CA, Graham SJ, et al. Functional Neuroanatomical Substrates of Altered Reward Processing in Major Depressive Disorder Revealed by a Dopaminergic Probe. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2005;62(11):1228-1236. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.62.11.1228

28. Liebenow B, Jones R, DiMarco E, et al. Computational reinforcement learning, reward (and punishment), and dopamine in psychiatric disorders. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2022;13. Accessed October 20, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2022.886297

29. Lan DCL, Browning M. What Can Reinforcement Learning Models of Dopamine and Serotonin Tell Us about the Action of Antidepressants? *Comput Psychiatr*. 6(1):166-188. doi:10.5334/cpsy.83

30. Eshel N, Roiser JP. Reward and Punishment Processing in Depression. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2010;68(2):118-124. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.01.027

31. Rolls ET. The roles of the orbitofrontal cortex via the habenula in non-reward and depression, and in the responses of serotonin and dopamine neurons. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2017;75:331-334. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.02.013

32. Ubl B, Kuehner C, Kirsch P, Ruttorf M, Diener C, Flor H. Altered neural reward and loss processing and prediction error signalling in depression. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2015;10(8):1102-1112. doi:10.1093/scan/nsu158

33. Lawson RP, Nord CL, Seymour B, et al. Disrupted habenula function in major depression. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2017;22(2):202-208. doi:10.1038/mp.2016.81

34. Kumar P, Goer F, Murray L, et al. Impaired reward prediction error encoding and striatal-midbrain connectivity in depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2018;43(7):1581-1588. doi:10.1038/s41386-018-0032-x

35. Robinson OJ, Cools R, Carlisi CO, Sahakian BJ, Drevets WC. Ventral Striatum Response During Reward and Punishment Reversal Learning in Unmedicated Major Depressive Disorder. *AJP*. 2012;169(2):152-159. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.11010137

36. Michely J, Eldar E, Erdman A, Martin IM, Dolan RJ. Serotonin modulates asymmetric learning from reward and punishment in healthy human volunteers. *Commun Biol*. 2022;5(1):1-9. doi:10.1038/s42003-022-03690-5

37. Herzallah M, Moustafa A, Natsheh J, et al. Learning from negative feedback in patients with major depressive disorder is attenuated by SSRI antidepressants. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*. 2013;7. Accessed May 12, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnint.2013.00067

38. Medeiros GC, Rush AJ, Jha M, et al. Positive and negative valence systems in major depression have distinct clinical features, response to antidepressants, and relationships with immunomarkers. *Depression and Anxiety*. 2020;37(8):771-783. doi:10.1002/da.23006

39. Langley C, Armand S, Luo Q, et al. Chronic escitalopram in healthy volunteers has specific effects on reinforcement sensitivity: a double-blind, placebo-controlled semi-randomised study. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2023;48(4):664. doi:10.1038/s41386-022-01523-x

40. Kishida KT, Sands LP. A Dynamic Affective Core to bind the Contents, Context, and Value of Conscious Experience. *bioRxiv*. Published online May 21, 2021:2021.05.20.444839. doi:10.1101/2021.05.20.444839

41. Daw ND, Kakade S, Dayan P. Opponent interactions between serotonin and dopamine. *Neural Networks*. 2002;15(4):603-616. doi:10.1016/S0893-6080(02)00052-7

42. Palminteri S, Pessiglione M. Chapter 23 - Opponent Brain Systems for Reward and Punishment Learning: Causal Evidence From Drug and Lesion Studies in Humans. In: Dreher JC, Tremblay L, eds. *Decision Neuroscience*. Academic Press; 2017:291-303. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-805308-9.00023-3

43. Cunningham WA, Dunfield KA, Stillman PE. Emotional states from affective dynamics. *Emotion Review*. 2013;5(4):344-355. doi:10.1177/1754073913489749

44. Rolls ET. Brain mechanisms of emotion and decision-making. *International Congress Series*. 2006;1291:3-13. doi:10.1016/j.ics.2005.12.079

45. Huys QJM, Renz D. A Formal Valuation Framework for Emotions and Their Control. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2017;82(6):413-420. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.07.003

46. Etkin A, Büchel C, Gross JJ. The neural bases of emotion regulation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2015;16(11):693-700. doi:10.1038/nrn4044

47. Rottenberg J. Mood and Emotion in Major Depression. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*. 2005;14(3):167-170. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00354.x

48. American Psychiatric Association, American Psychiatric Association, eds. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5*. 5th ed. American Psychiatric Association; 2013.

49. Rottenberg J. Emotions in Depression: What Do We Really Know? *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2017;13(1):241-263. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045252

50. Groenewold NA, Opmeer EM, de Jonge P, Aleman A, Costafreda SG. Emotional valence modulates brain functional abnormalities in depression: Evidence from a meta-analysis of fMRI studies. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2013;37(2):152-163. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.11.015

51. Huys QJM, Maia TV, Frank MJ. Computational psychiatry as a bridge from neuroscience to clinical applications. *Nat Neurosci*. 2016;19(3):404-413. doi:10.1038/nn.4238

52. Montague PR, Dolan RJ, Friston KJ, Dayan P. Computational psychiatry. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2012;16(1):72-80. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2011.11.018

53. Spitzer KK, Williams JBW. Patient Health Questionnaire-9. *APA PsycTests*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/t06165-000

54. Hamilton M. A RATING SCALE FOR DEPRESSION. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1960;23(1):56-62. Accessed June 28, 2023. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC495331/

55. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A Brief Screening Tool For Mild Cognitive Impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2005;53(4):695-699. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x

56. Kruschke J. *Doing Bayesian Data Analysis: A Tutorial with R, JAGS, and Stan*. Academic Press; 2014.

57. Sutton RS, Barto AG. *Introduction to Reinforcement Learning*. Vol 135. MIT press Cambridge; 1998.

58. Johnson AA, Ott MQ, Dogucu M. Chapter 10 Evaluating Regression Models. In: *Bayes Rules! An Introduction to Applied Bayesian Modeling*. Chapman & Hall/CRC texts in statistical science. CRC Press; 2022:255-259. Accessed June 28, 2023. https://www.bayesrulesbook.com/chapter-10.html#cross-validation

59. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, et al. Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language. *J Stat Softw*. 2017;76:1. doi:10.18637/jss.v076.i01

60. Rizvi SJ, Pizzagalli DA, Sproule BA, Kennedy SH. Assessing anhedonia in depression: Potentials and pitfalls. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2016;65:21-35. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.03.004

61. Nolen-Hoeksema S. The role of rumination in depressive disorders and mixed anxiety/depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2000;109(3):504-511. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.109.3.504

62. Pizzagalli DA, Holmes AJ, Dillon DG, et al. Reduced caudate and nucleus accumbens response to rewards in unmedicated individuals with major depressive disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2009;166(6):702-710. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2008.08081201

63. Li X, Wang J. Abnormal neural activities in adults and youths with major depressive disorder during emotional processing: a meta-analysis. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*. 2021;15(2):1134-1154. doi:10.1007/s11682-020-00299-2

64. Mennen AC, Norman KA, Turk-Browne NB. Attentional bias in depression, Understanding mechanisms to improve training and treatment. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2019;29:266-273. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.036

65. Ito T, Yokokawa K, Yahata N, Isato A, Suhara T, Yamada M. Neural basis of negativity bias in the perception of ambiguous facial expression. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7(1):420. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-00502-3

66. Watters AJ, Williams LM. Negative biases and risk for depression; integrating self-report and emotion task markers. *Depression and Anxiety*. 2011;28(8):703-718. doi:10.1002/da.20854

67. Liakakis G, Nickel J, Seitz RJ. Diversity of the inferior frontal gyrus--a meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Behav Brain Res*. 2011;225(1):341-347. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2011.06.022

68. Kishida KT, Saez I, Lohrenz T, et al. Subsecond dopamine fluctuations in human striatum encode superposed error signals about actual and counterfactual reward. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2016;113(1):200-205. doi:10.1073/pnas.1513619112

Table 1. Group-level changes in learning and subjective experience behavioral computations across research visits

	ECT Responders (n = 17)				*ECT Non-responders (n = 4)*				*Non-ECT (n = 34)*				*No-depression (n = 38)*			
	Pre-ECT	Post-ECT	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Pre-ECT	Post-ECT	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Visit 1	Visit 2	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Visit 1	Visit 2	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference
	Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]		
A. Learning Parameters																
α^P	0.15 [0.04, 0.31]	0.31 [0.16, 0.46]	**0.15 [-0.05, 0.35]**	[7.94, 92.06]	0.12 [0.04, 0.29]	0.22 [0.11, 0.38]	0.10 [-0.12, 0.30]	[13.63, 86.38]	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	0.12 [0.08, 0.15]	**-0.09 [-0.15, -0.02]**	[99.79, 0.21]	0.15 [0.13, 0.20]	0.18 [0.13, 0.24]	**0.02 [-0.04, 0.09]**	24.82, 75.17
γ^P	0.70 [0.41, 1.0]	0.54 [0.32, 0.84]	-0.15 [-0.56, 0.26]	[74.74, 25.26]	0.72 [0.44, 1.0]	0.81 [0.53, 1.0]	0.08 [-0.35, 0.48]	[36.18, 63.82]	0.83 [0.51, 1.0]	0.79 [0.60, 1.0]	-0.02 [-0.35, 0.39]	[54.17, 45.82]	0.83 [0.55, 0.97]	0.73 [0.55, 0.97]	-0.07 [-0.38, 0.29]	64.45, 35.55
α^N	0.45 [0.02, 0.90]	0.25 [4.35e^{-4}, 0.63]	-0.19 [-0.83, 0.40]	[70.34, 29.66]	0.28 [1.48e^{-5}, 7.34e^{-1}]	0.42 [1.40e^{-5}, 0.93]	0.11 [-0.56, 0.86]	[38.70 61.30]	0.46 [3.2e^{-4}, 0.65]	0.52 [0.08, 0.78]	0.07 [-0.42, 0.62]	[38.20, 61.80]	0.53 [0.02, 0.78]	0.41 [0.03, 0.73]	-0.08 [-0.58, 0.53]	60.06, 39.94
γ^N	0.23 [8.64e^{-3}, 0.53]	0.25 [3.68e^{-3}, 0.81]	0.03 [-0.42, 0.70]	[44.24, 55.76]	0.34 [1.77e^{-3}, 0.89]	0.15 [1.07e^{-5}, 0.68]	-0.15 [-0.86, 0.47]	[69.94, 30.06]	0.11 [1.0e^{-4}, 0.58]	0.15 [0.02, 0.38]	0.04 [-0.50, 0.39]	[38.41, 61.59]	0.19 [0.02, 0.49]	0.23 [0.04, 0.51]	0.03 [-0.35, 0.41]	43.08, 56.93
$1/\tau$	0.10 [0.05 0.27]	0.08 [0.05, 0.17]	-0.01 [-0.21, 0.12]	[61.62, 38.38]	0.08 [0.05, 0.17]	0.08 [0.05, 0.15]	-6.17e^{-4} [-0.13, 0.10]	[50.86, 49.14]	0.17 [0.05, 0.26]	0.08 [0.05, 0.13]	**-0.08 [-0.20, 0.05]**	[85.47, 14.52]	0.11 [0.05, 0.18]	0.07 [0.05, 0.11]	**-0.04 [-0.13, 0.04]**	82.35, 17.65
B. Subjective Experience Parameters																
$\beta_{+\delta_t^P}$	0.83 [0.67, 1.0]	0.70 [0.54, 0.85]	-0.14 [-0.36, 0.09]	[87.44, 12.56]	0.88 [0.44, 1.28]	1.01 [0.44, 1.42]	0.14 [-0.62, 0.74]	[35.30, 64.70]	0.83 [0.73, 0.93]	0.91 [0.81, 1.0]	0.08 [-0.06, 0.22]	[13.97, 86.03]	0.90 [0.77, 1.04]	0.88 [0.75, 1.02]	-0.02 [-0.21, 0.17]	58.34, 41.66
$\beta_{-\delta_t^P}$	-0.39 [-0.69, -0.10]	-0.49 [-0.71, -0.28]	-0.10 [-0.47, 0.26]	[70.81, 29.19]	0.18 [-0.61, 0.95]	-0.20 [-0.74, 0.33]	-0.36 [-1.40, 0.62]	[77.42, 22.58]	-0.44 [-0.61, -0.28]	-0.39 [-0.57, -0.20]	0.06 [-0.19, 0.31]	[32.29, 67.71]	-0.63 [-0.88, -0.39]	-0.61 [-0.84, -0.38]	**-0.58 [-0.93, -0.24]**	99.96, 0.04
$\beta_{Q^P_{s_{t,}a_{t,}chosen}}$	1.10 [0.59, 1.62]	0.96 [0.44, 1.47]	-0.14 [-0.86, 0.62]	[64.45, 35.55]	1.25 [-0.16, 2.57]	0.61 [-0.34, 1.70]	-0.63 [-2.34, 1.28]	[74.80, 25.21]	1.11 [0.83, 1.38]	0.97 [0.64, 1.30]	-0.14 [-0.56, 0.29]	[73.27, 26.73]	0.87 [0.49, 1.25]	1.89 [1.43, 2.34]	**1.01 [0.40, 1.59]**	0.10, 99.90
$\beta_{Q^P_{s_{t,}a_{t,}unchosen}}$	-0.61 [-1.60, 0.34]	0.65 [-0.28, 1.59]	**1.27 [-0.04, 2.64]**	[3.14, 96.86]	0.22 [-1.41, 1.89]	0.31 [-1.14, 1.66]	0.07 [-2.02, 2.24]	[47.33, 52.68]	-0.58 [-0.97, -0.19]	0.26 [-0.36, 0.89]	**0.84 [0.10, 1.58]**	[1.30, 98.70]	0.33 [-0.35, 1.03]	0.75 [-0.07, 1.59]	0.42 [-0.67, 1.49]	[22.58, 77.42]

	ECT Responders (n = 17) (continued)				***ECT Non-responders (n = 4) (continued)***				***Non-ECT (n = 34) (continued)***				***No-depression (n = 38) (continued)***			
	Pre-ECT	Post-ECT	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Pre-ECT	Post-ECT	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Visit 1	Visit 2	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference	Visit 1	Visit 2	Median Δ [95% HDI]	Credible Difference
	Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]			Median [95% HDI]	Median [95% HDI]		
B. Subjective Experience Parameters (continued)																
$\beta_{+\delta_t^N}$	-0.67 [-0.97, -0.38]	-1.32 [-1.65, -1.0]	**-0.65 [-1.09, -0.22]**	[99.83, 0.17]	-1.10 [-1.73, -0.52]	-0.92 [-1.65, -0.20]	0.18 [-0.82, 1.23]	[36.92, 63.08]	-1.23 [-1.40, -1.04]	-1.11 [-1.29, -0.92]	0.12 [-0.14, 0.38]	[17.76, 82.24]	-1.08 [-1.33, -0.82]	-0.98 [-1.23, -0.72]	0.10 [-0.26, 0.46]	[28.51, 71.49]
$\beta_{-\delta_t^N}$	0.19 [-0.18, 0.56]	-0.38 [-0.82, 0.05]	**-0.57 [-1.14, -2.76e^{-4}]**	[97.39, 2.61]	0.18 [-0.84, 1.23]	-0.48 [-1.40, 0.43]	-0.66 [-1.96, 0.61]	[84.34, 15.66]	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41]	-0.05 [-0.19, 0.30]	-0.09 [-0.45, 0.27]	[69.49, 30.51]	0.24 [-0.08, 0.56]	-0.34 [-0.69, 8.6e^{-3}]	**-0.58 [-1.06, -0.10]**	[99.13, 0.87]
$\beta_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,chosen}}$	-0.37 [-2.07, 1.30]	-0.56 [-2.07, 0.99]	-0.19 [-2.49, 2.09]	[56.45, 43.55]	-0.76 [-2.56, 1.33]	-0.21 [-2.12, 1.77]	0.53 [-2.17, 3.31]	[35.26, 64.74]	-1.68 [-2.96, -0.36]	-1.67 [-2.98, -0.36]	0.01 [-1.83, 1.85]	[49.49, 50.51]	-0.39 [-2.12, 1.34]	-0.68 [-2.11, 0.68]	0.71 [-1.40, 2.85]	[25.51, 74.49]
$\beta_{Q^N_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}$	-0.68 [-2.12, 0.73]	0.54 [-0.45, 1.54]	1.22 [-0.46, 2.98]	[8.39, 91.61]	-0.13 [-1.64, 1.39]	0.04 [-1.81, 1.99]	0.15 [-2.26, 2.56]	[44.97, 55.03]	0.29 [-0.48, 0.20]	0.40 [-0.54, 1.36]	0.11 [-1.07, 1.29]	[42.69, 57.31]	0.80 [-0.63, 2.07]	1.08 [0.13, 2.02]	-0.71 [-2.16, 0.82]	[82.79, 17.21]

Bold indicates evidence of distributional differences. Abbreviations: HDI: highest density interval.

Table 2. Paired t-test for ECT responder changes in learning and subjective experience neurocomputations following treatment

Parameter	Region	Voxels	Cluster-level p-value	Peak-level p-value	T-statistic	Peak MNI coordinates [x y z]
A. Learning Computations						
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\delta_t^P))$					NS	
B. Subjective Experience Computations						
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}))$	Left rolandic operculum	92	**0.009**	0.689	T(14) = 6.55	[-40 2 16]
	Left caudate	144	**0.001**	0.921	T(13) = 5.86	[-16 24 10]
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{+\delta_t^N}))$	Right inferior frontal operculum	279	**7.78e-7**	0.366	T(13) = 7.37	[40 8 28]
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{-\delta_t^N}))$	Right precentral gyrus	79	**0.012**	**0.032**	T(13) = 9.19	[42 -20 58]

All analyses were performed at an uncorrected threshold of p<0.001 in which reported results were selected using an FWE-corrected threshold of p<0.05 at cluster and peak voxel levels. Bold font indicates significance.

Figure 1. Study design. (A) This study focuses on research visit 2 results, which took place after patients with treatment-resistant depression received ECT treatment for the first time and approximately one to two months following visit 1 for non-ECT and non-depression participants (to follow along the ECT treatment timeline). All participants completed a probabilistic reward and punishment with subjective rating (PRPwSR) task while receiving fMRI scanning and completed clinical assessments afterward; these measures were identical to those taken at visit 1. **(B)** In the PRPwSR task, each trial starts with an 'option presentation' screen. A participant chooses an option (self-paced) and then the other option disappears. After 3s, the chosen option is reinforced probabilistically (monetary gain, no gain, or loss), and the monetary outcome is shown for 1s. The screen then goes blank for a random-length interval or displays with 33% probability a subjective rating screen (self-paced) followed by the blank screen before the next trial. We fit a valence-partitioned reinforcement learning model to participants' choice behavior in the PRPwSR task to generate learning parameters. Expectations and prediction errors (depicted in red brackets) were then fitted as independent predictors of participant-reported subjective rating in a regression model (i.e., Subjective Feeling Model).

Figure 2. Neural Changes Associated with Subjective Experience Computations in ECT Responders Following Treatment. Between research visits 1 and 2, ECT responders showed increased BOLD activity associated with $+\delta_t^N$ influence on subjective experience (top), and decreased BOLD activity associated with $-\delta_t^N$ influence on subjective experience (middle) and $Q^P_{s_{t,}a_{t,}unchosen}$ influence on subjective experience (bottom).

A. Study Procedure



B. Probabilistic Reward and Punishment with Subjective Rating Task Structure



Figure 1


$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{+\delta_t^N}))$
8
0
Inferior Frontal Operculum
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{-\delta_t^N}))$
9
0
Precentral Gyrus
$\Delta_{visit\ 2-visit\ 1}(\beta_{GLM}(\beta_{Q^P_{s_t,a_t,unchosen}}))$
7
0
Rolandic Operculum
Caudate

Figure 2