


## Supplementary Material

### S1. Medication type and severity of depression and anhedonia




#### SI1. Atypical Balance Score

The atypical items of the SIGH-ADS include social withdrawal, weight gain, appetite increase, increased eating, carbohydrate craving or eating, hypersomnia, fatigability, and diurnal variation type B (i.e., mood or energy dips in the afternoon). Following Williams & Terman (2003) we calculated an atypical balance score from the SIGH-ADS as follows: total 8-items Atypical Symptoms score divided by the total 25-item SIGH-ADS score (i.e., 17-item Hamilton score + 8-item Atypical Symptom score), multiplied by 100. Thus, the atypical balance score represents the percentage of atypicality, ranging from 0 (minimum) to 100 % (maximum). In our MDD sample, the scores were approximately normal distributed and ranged from 20 to 60 (mean = 40,21, median = 39,64, sd = 8,28). We stratified the MDD sample into participants with low atypical MDD (below median) versus high atypical MDD (above median), allowing to include the categorical *Atypical Group Factor* (HCP vs. melancholic MDD vs. atypical MDD) to test across the whole sample. We complemented the analysis using the atypical balance score as a continuous measure by setting the scores of HCPs to zero and group-centering the scores before including the atypical balance score as a continuous factor.


## **SI2. Neither depression nor anhedonia is characterized by differences in perceived taste**

To evaluate if group differences in wanting were accounted for by differences in perceived taste, we also tested for differences in ratings of intensity, sweetness, saltiness, and savoriness acquired during the consummatory phase of the taste test. Patients with MDD did not differ in their ratings of intensity ( $b = 3.12, p = .11$ ), sweetness ( $b = .78, p = .43$ ), saltiness ( $b = -1.14, p = .27$ ), or savoriness ( $b = -1.35, p = .46$ ) compared with HCPs. Likewise, there were no associations with SHAPS or the atypical balance score, except for higher intensity ratings in atypical MDD ( $b = 5.07, p = .035$ ) compared to HCPs. Further, intensity ratings did not contribute to the observed differences in wanting between HCPs and depression subtypes ( $b_{Intensity} = .0003, p = .95, p_{Intensity \times MDD} = .88$ ) or the absence thereof in liking ( $b_{Intensity} = .0005, p_{Intensity} = .95$ ). These results further corroborate that depression and anhedonia are not associated with altered taste perception per se. Further, as we reported previously in [Fahed et al. \(2023\)](#), patients with MDD did not differ from HCPs in subjective ratings of metabolic state (i.e., hunger, fullness).

**Figure S2. Comparison of Phase coding**


As per hypothesis, we first modelled the phase factor as a 2-level factor with the first two phases (food cues, sight and smell of snacks) as one anticipatory phase, and the last three phases (repeated consumption) as one consummatory phase [Ant-Cons]. However, inspecting raw data we found that individuals adjusted their ratings already markedly after the first phase (Fig. S1a), indicating that ratings in the 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipation phase already differed qualitatively. Followingly, we decided to model the phase factor as a 3-level factor (1<sup>st</sup> anticipation, 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipation, consumption) [Ant1-Ant2-Cons] and as a 2-level phase factor (1<sup>st</sup> anticipation, 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipation/consumption) [Ant1-Ant2/Cons] and compared the models [Fig. S1b-d]. First, we found that the latter two models performed better than the original model in a model comparison using the Bayesian and Akaike Information criteria (Fig. S1b-c), indicating a better fit-complexity trade-off. Second, we found that the random slopes correlation for the 3-level phase factor was very high ( $r = 0.83$ ; Fig. S1d), suggesting that the additional third phase does not differ qualitatively. Therefore, we used the 2-level phase factor to separate first anticipation (i.e., cued) from later anticipation (i.e., sight and smell) and consumption for all further analysis. Importantly, the conclusions for the group differences (next paragraph) did not change qualitatively using different phase codings.

**Fig. S3. Lower wanting in melancholic MDD**




**Fig. S3. Lower wanting in melancholic MDD.** For participants with MDD extend of atypical symptoms were evaluated using the atypical balance score from the SIGH-ADS. Lower wanting during cued anticipation was driven by participants with melancholic ( $b = -8.97$ ,  $p = .004$ ) and not atypical MDD ( $b = -1.20$ ,  $p = .70$ ). Both, melancholic ( $b = 5.73$ ,  $p = .044$ ) and atypical MDD ( $b = 7.80$ ,  $p = .008$ ) increased their wanting ratings after cued anticipation.

**Fig. S4. SHAPS and atypical depression**



**Fig. S4.** No differences in SHAPS for depression subtype. Cumming estimation plots show no difference in SHAPS ratings between melancholic and atypical MDD (left). Effect size and bootstrapped 95% CIs are plotted below the raw data. Within participants with depression, atypical balance score was also not associated with SHAPS ( $r = -.082$ ,  $p = .56$ , right).

**Fig. S5 Depression as anticipatory but not consummatory deficit**



**Fig. S6 Bayes factor robustness check for Independent Samples T-Test**




Fig. S6. Robustness Check for the Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test. Left: Robustness check for the one-sided test that HCPs show greater wanting during consumption than patients with MDD compared to anticipation. Right: Robustness check for the two-sided test that HCPs and patients with MDD differ in their wanting adjustments during consumption.

**Fig. S7 Bayes factor robustness check for Correlation**




Fig. S7. Robustness Check for the Bayesian Correlation. Left: Robustness check for the directed correlation that SHAPS is negatively associated with changes in wanting with consummation. Right: Robustness check for a correlation test whether SHAPS is correlated with changes in wanting with consummation.

**Fig. S8 Ghrelin and atypical depression**




Fig. S8. Cumming estimation plots show lower ghrelin in melancholic but not atypical MDD vs. HCPs ( $b = -.44$ ,  $p = .039$ , left). Effect size and bootstrapped 95% CIs are plotted below the raw data. The atypical balance score (with HCPs set to zero) was not significantly correlated with ghrelin levels ( $r = .14$ ,  $p = .17$ , right).

**Fig. S9 Ghrelin and SHAPS**





Fig. S9. Acyl ghrelin was only weakly associated with SHAPS ratings.

**Fig. S10 HOMA-IR and SHAPS depending on depression subtype**



### S11. HOMA-IR is not associated with wanting or liking




Fig. S6. A, B: Estimated marginal means plot of fitted linear mixed effect models to predict liking (A) and wanting (B) using HOMA-IR as a fixed effect and its interaction with phase. Despite the strong association between HOMA-IR and SHAPS (see Fig. 3), and SHAPS and wanting ratings (see Fig. 2), we did not observe HOMA-IR as a significant predictor for lower wanting or liking ratings.

### References

- Kroemer, N. B., Opel, N., Teckentrup, V., Li, M., Grotegerd, D., Meinert, S., Lemke, H., Kircher, T., Nenadić, I., Krug, A., Jansen, A., Sommer, J., Steinsträter, O., Small, D., Dannlowski, U., & Walter, M. (2022). *Functional connectivity of the reward circuit predicts changes in appetite in depression*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/4ua8x>
- Thuile, J., Even, C., Musa, C., Friedman, S., & Rouillon, F. (2009). Clinical correlates of atypical depression and validation of the French version of the Scale for Atypical Symptoms (SAS). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *118*(1), 113–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.02.005>
- Williams, J., & Terman, M. (2003). *STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE HAMILTON DEPRESSION RATING SCALE with Atypical Depression Supplement (SIGH-ADS 2003)*.