

Supplemental Materials

Individuals with Methamphetamine Use Disorder Show Reduced Directed Exploration and Learning Rates Independent of an Aversive Interoceptive State Induction

Carter M. Goldman^{*1}, Toru Takahashi^{*1,2}, Claire A. Lavalley¹, Ning Li¹, Samuel Taylor¹, Anne E. Chuning¹, Rowan Hodson¹, Jennifer L. Stewart^{1,3}, Robert C. Wilson^{4,5}, Sahib S. Khalsa^{1,3}, Martin P. Paulus^{1,3} & Ryan Smith^{1,3}

¹Laureate Institute for Brain Research, Tulsa, OK.

²Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Tokyo, Japan.

³Oxley College of Health and Natural Sciences, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK.

⁴Department of Psychology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

⁵Cognitive Science Program, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

*indicates co-first authorship

Corresponding author: Ryan Smith, rsmith@laureateinstitute.org

Laureate Institute for Brain Research. 6655 S. Yale Ave. Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74136, United States

Table S1. Comorbidity Table for Participants with Methamphetamine Use Disorder (MUD)

Disorder	AUD	Opioid	Cann.	Other SUD	Sedative	Cocaine	MDD	Anti-social	PTSD	GAD	SAD
AUD	18										
Opioid	5	18									
Cann.	4	1	15								
Other SUD	0	2	0	3							
Sedative	1	1	0	0	2						
Cocaine	1	0	2	0	0	2					
MDD	7	5	3	1	2	0	14				
AntiSoc.	5	3	4	0	0	0	3	8			
PTSD	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1		
GAD	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	
SAD	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1

Note. All 56 individuals with MUD (iMUDs) received a diagnosis of Amphetamine Use Disorder. Additional diagnoses are listed in the table above, where AUD = Alcohol Use Disorder, Opioid = Opioid Use Disorder, Cann. = Cannabis Use Disorder, Other SUD = Other Substance Use Disorder, Sedative = Sedative, Hypnotic, or Anxiolytic Use Disorder, Cocaine = Cocaine Use Disorder, MDD = Major Depressive Disorder, Antisocial = Antisocial Personality Disorder, PTSD = Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder, SAD = Social Anxiety Disorder.

Table S2. Computational Model Parameters, Priors, Hyperparameters, and Hyperpriors

Parameter	Prior	Hyperparameters	Hyperpriors
Initial Learning Rate α_0	$\alpha_0 \sim \text{Beta}(a_{\alpha_0}, b_{\alpha_0})$	$\theta_{\alpha_0} = \text{Beta}(a_{\alpha_0}, b_{\alpha_0})$	$a_{\alpha_0} \sim \text{Uniform}(0.1, 10)$ $b_{\alpha_0} \sim \text{Uniform}(0.5, 10)$
Asymptotic Learning Rate α_∞	$\alpha_\infty \sim \text{Beta}(a_{\alpha_\infty}, b_{\alpha_\infty})$	$\theta_{\alpha_\infty} = \text{Beta}(a_{\alpha_\infty}, b_{\alpha_\infty})$	$a_{\alpha_\infty} \sim \text{Uniform}(0.1, 10)$ $b_{\alpha_\infty} \sim \text{Uniform}(0.5, 10)$
Information Bonus A	$A \sim \text{Gaussian}(\mu_A, \sigma_A)$	$\theta_A = \text{Gaussian}(\mu_A, \sigma_A)$	$\mu_A \sim \text{Gaussian}(0, 100)$ $\sigma_A \sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.001)$
Spatial Bias B	$B \sim \text{Gaussian}(\mu_B, \sigma_B)$	$\theta_B = \text{Gaussian}(\mu_B, \sigma_B)$	$\mu_B \sim \text{Gaussian}(0, 100)$ $\sigma_B \sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.001)$
Decision Noise σ	$\sigma \sim \text{Gamma}(k_\sigma, \lambda_\sigma)$	$\theta_\sigma = \text{Gamma}(k_\sigma, \lambda_\sigma)$	$k_\sigma \sim \text{Exp}(0.1)$ $\lambda_\sigma \sim \text{Exp}(10)$




Figure S1. Correlations of Horizon Task Parameters. Note DE=Directed Exploration, RE=Random Exploration, α_0 =Initial Learning Rate, α_∞ =Asymptotic Learning Rate controlling for Initial Learning Rate (comprising the residuals of the linear model predicting α_∞ based on α_0 separately for each resistance condition). Correlations above the diagonal show the relationships between parameters for the task run without breathing resistance; correlations below the diagonal show relationships for the task run with breathing resistance.

Anxiety During the Task

Results for the linear mixed-effect models (LMEs) predicting self-reported anxiety based on group, resistance condition (baseline, task run without resistance, and task run with resistance), and their interaction are shown in **Table S3**. Age, sex, task version, and working memory were included in the model as covariates. Coefficients were estimated with reference to baseline anxiety. Results of an analogous model predicting STAI State Anxiety are shown in **Table S4**.

Table S3. LME Predicting Self-Reported Anxiety During the Task

Predictor	Statistical Results
Group	$F(1, 103.0)=17.86, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.15, b=0.34$
Resistance Condition	$F(2, 214.0)=83.65, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.44,$ $b(\text{task run without resistance})=0.50,$ $b(\text{task run with resistance})=2.19$
Interaction	$F(2, 214.0)=10.75, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.09,$ $b(\text{group effect} \mid \text{task run without resistance})=0.35,$ $b(\text{group effect} \mid \text{task run with resistance})=0.81$

Table S4. LME Predicting STAI Anxiety During the Task

Predictor	Statistical Results
Group	$F(1, 103.0)=8.67, p=.004, \eta_p^2=0.08, b=1.43$
Resistance Condition	$F(2, 214.0)=115.14, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.52,$ $b(\text{task run without resistance})=3.72,$ $b(\text{task run with resistance})=11.91$
Interaction	$F(2, 214.0)=5.98, p=.003, \eta_p^2=0.05$ $b(\text{group effect} \mid \text{task run without resistance})=1.81,$ $b(\text{group effect} \mid \text{task run with resistance})=2.71$

Anxiety During the Resistance Sensitivity Protocol

Results for the LMEs predicting self-reported anxiety during the resistance sensitivity protocol by group, continuous resistance level (0, 10, 20, 40, 60, and 80 cmH₂O/L/sec), and their interaction are shown in **Table S5**. Age, sex, task version, and working memory were included in the model as covariates.

Table S5. LME Predicting Self-Reported Anxiety During the Resistance Sensitivity Protocol

Predictor	Statistical Results
Group	$F(1, 103.1)=8.49, p=.004, \eta_p^2=0.076, b=0.658$
Resistance Level	$F(1, 539.5)=364.75, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.403, b=0.041$
Interaction	$F(1, 539.5)=23.83, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.042, b=0.01$

Model-Free Task Performance

We tested an LME predicting first free-choice accuracy in the Horizon Task based on group, information condition (equal/unequal information games), horizon (H1/H6), breathing resistance (present/absent), and the three-way interactions of horizon, group, and breathing resistance, as well as horizon, group, and information condition (including respective two-way interactions; see **Table S6**). Age, sex, task-version, and working memory were included in the model as covariates. Post-hoc analysis showed that the significant interaction between horizon and group was due to HCs having a greater increase in accuracy from H6 to H1 (EMM=.09) than iMUDs (EMM=.05).

Table S6. LME Predicting First Free Choice Accuracy in the Horizon Task

Predictor	Statistical Results
Horizon	$F(1, 753.0)=131.99, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.149, b=-0.037$
Group	$F(1, 103.0)=20.91, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.169, b=-0.062$
Info Condition	$F(1, 753.0)=74.32, p<.001, \eta_p^2=0.09, b=-0.028$
Resistance	$F(1, 753.0)=0.00, p=.958, \eta_p^2=0, b=0$
Horizon x Group	$F(1, 103.0)=0.06, p=.809, \eta_p^2=0.001, b=0$
Horizon x Info Condition	$F(1, 103.0)=1.29, p=.258, \eta_p^2=0.012, b=-0.014$
Group x Info Condition	$F(1, 103.0)=1.50, p=.224, \eta_p^2=0.014, b=-0.045$
Group x Resistance	$F(1, 753.0)=8.76, p=.003, \eta_p^2=0.012, b=0.01$
Horizon x Resistance	$F(1, 753.0)=0.88, p=.348, \eta_p^2=0.001, b=0.003$
Horizon x Group x Info Condition	$F(1, 753.0)=0.46, p=.497, \eta_p^2=0.001, b=-0.002$
Horizon x Group x Resistance	$F(1, 753.0)=0.16, p=.685, \eta_p^2=0, b=-0.001$

Testing if Parameter Values Differed by Group or Resistance Condition

Results for the LMEs (and logistic mixed-effects models for α_0) predicting model parameters based on group, resistance, and their interaction are shown in **Table S7**. Age, sex, task version, and working memory were included in each model as covariates.

Table S7. Results for Models Predicting Parameter Values Based on Group and Resistance

	DE	RE	α_0	α_∞
Group	$F(1, 103.0)=3.32, p=.071, \eta_p^2=0.031, b=-0.634$	$F(1, 103.0)=4.71, p=.032, \eta_p^2=0.044, b=-0.385$	$\chi^2(1)=7.80, p=.005, b=-1.29$	$F(1, 109.2)=8.17, p=.005, \eta_p^2=0.07, b=-0.039$
Resistance	$F(1, 107.0)=0.00, p=.962, \eta_p^2=0, b=0.002$	$F(1, 107.0)=0.15, p=.696, \eta_p^2=0.001, b=-0.048$	$\chi^2(1)=0.51, p=.473, b=-0.136$	$F(1, 106.7)=0.00, p=.978, \eta_p^2=0, b=0$
Group x Resistance	$F(1, 107.0)=1.80, p=.182, \eta_p^2=0.017, b=-0.207$	$F(1, 107.0)=0.38, p=.542, \eta_p^2=0.003, b=-0.071$	$\chi^2(1)=2.16, p=.142, b=0.289$	$F(1, 106.8)=1.48, p=.227, \eta_p^2=0.014, b=0.008$

Model Parameters and Substance Use Symptoms

We tested if each model parameter could be predicted by DAST and MAWQ (separately). In these models, we included the interaction between resistance and symptom measure (and main effect of resistance) to test if the relationship between each model parameter and symptom severity differed by task condition (resistance present/absent). An additional set of models tested if each parameter could be predicted by the change in DSQ from somatic anxiety induction and baseline DSQ. To ensure that the effects of somatic anxiety induction were not accounted for by baseline DSQ differences, we instead used the residuals derived from a linear regression using baseline DSQ as a predictor of the change in DSQ scores (referred to as DSQ-Change). In these models, we likewise included the interaction between resistance and DSQ-Change as well as the interaction between resistance and baseline DSQ (and potential main effects) to test if breathing resistance moderated the effect of either variable. Unfortunately, these models had less statistical power given that only 39 iMUDs completed the DSQ before and after anxiety induction, because the measure was added part-way into the study. Age, sex, and working memory were included in all models as covariates (task version was not included, as all iMUDs completed the same version of the task).

In an LME predicting α_{∞} , there was an interaction between MAWQ and resistance (see **Table S8**). This was explained by a negative association without resistance (estimated marginal trend [EMT]=-.003) but a positive association with resistance (EMT=.002).

We did not observe any significant effects of DAST or interaction effects between DAST and breathing resistance predicting model parameters (see **Table S9**).

Given that one participant had a DSQ-Change value that was an outlier (on the high end) based on a Grubb's test, their data was excluded from models testing this effect. In the LME predicting DE, there was an interaction between DSQ-Change and resistance (see **Table S10**). This was explained by a

negative association without resistance (EMT=-.063) but a positive association with resistance (EMT=.026).

Table S8. Model Parameters and MAWQ

	DE	RE	α_0	α_∞
MAWQ	$F(1, 48.0)=0.07$, $p=.798$, $\eta_p^2=0.001$, $b=-0.014$	$F(1, 48.0)=0.18$, $p=.669$, $\eta_p^2=0.004$, $b=0.013$	$F(1, 48.0)=0.83$, $p=.367$, $\eta_p^2=0.017$, $b=-0.006$	$F(1, 47.5)=0.00$, $p=.965$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0$
Resistance	$F(1, 51.0)=0.96$, $p=.332$, $\eta_p^2=0.018$, $b=-0.201$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.77$, $p=.383$, $\eta_p^2=0.015$, $b=-0.125$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.02$, $p=.878$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0.002$	$F(1, 50.4)=1.40$, $p=.243$, $\eta_p^2=0.027$, $b=0.008$
MAWQ x Resistance	$F(1, 51.0)=0.53$, $p=.469$, $\eta_p^2=0.01$, $b=0.022$	$F(1, 51.0)=1.53$, $p=.222$, $\eta_p^2=0.029$, $b=-0.024$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.10$, $p=.756$, $\eta_p^2=0.002$, $b=0.001$	$F(1, 50.4)=6.35$, $p=.015$, $\eta_p^2=0.112$, $b=0.002$

Table S9. Model Parameters and DAST

	DE	RE	α_0	α_∞
DAST	$F(1, 48.0)=1.00$, $p=.322$, $\eta_p^2=0.02$, $b=0.196$	$F(1, 48.0)=2.59$, $p=.114$, $\eta_p^2=0.051$, $b=0.168$	$F(1, 48.0)=2.51$, $p=.119$, $\eta_p^2=0.05$, $b=0.034$	$F(1, 48.3)=1.42$, $p=.240$, $\eta_p^2=0.029$, $b=0.01$
Resistance	$F(1, 51.0)=0.96$, $p=.332$, $\eta_p^2=0.018$, $b=-0.205$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.77$, $p=.384$, $\eta_p^2=0.015$, $b=-0.12$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.02$, $p=.878$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0.002$	$F(1, 50.4)=1.24$, $p=.270$, $\eta_p^2=0.024$, $b=0.008$
DAST x Resistance	$F(1, 51.0)=0.51$, $p=.480$, $\eta_p^2=0.01$, $b=0.079$	$F(1, 51.0)=1.28$, $p=.264$, $\eta_p^2=0.024$, $b=-0.08$	$F(1, 51.0)=0.18$, $p=.672$, $\eta_p^2=0.004$, $b=0.003$	$F(1, 50.5)=0.33$, $p=.567$, $\eta_p^2=0.007$, $b=0.002$

Table S10. Model Parameters and DSQ Before and After Somatic Anxiety Induction

	DE	RE	α_0	α_∞
--	----	----	------------	-----------------

DSQ-Change	$F(1, 31.0)=0.29$, $p=.595$, $\eta_p^2=0.009$, $b=-0.018$	$F(1, 31.0)=1.49$, $p=.231$, $\eta_p^2=0.046$, $b=0.023$	$F(1, 31.0)=0.02$, $p=.874$, $\eta_p^2=0.001$, $b=-0.001$	$F(1, 30.1)=0.74$, $p=.396$, $\eta_p^2=0.024$, $b=-0.001$
Baseline DSQ	$F(1, 31.0)=0.05$, $p=.826$, $\eta_p^2=0.002$, $b=-0.003$	$F(1, 31.0)=0.00$, $p=.974$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0$	$F(1, 31.0)=0.15$, $p=.699$, $\eta_p^2=0.005$, $b=0.001$	$F(1, 30.2)=0.02$, $p=.878$, $\eta_p^2=0.001$, $b=0$
Resistance	$F(1, 34.0)=2.16$, $p=.151$, $\eta_p^2=0.06$, $b=-0.267$	$F(1, 34.0)=2.59$, $p=.117$, $\eta_p^2=0.071$, $b=-0.259$	$F(1, 34.0)=0.74$, $p=.396$, $\eta_p^2=0.021$, $b=0.011$	$F(1, 33.8)=0.47$, $p=.498$, $\eta_p^2=0.014$, $b=0.007$
Resistance x DSQ-Change	$F(1, 34.0)=6.62$, $p=.015$, $\eta_p^2=0.163$, $b=0.044$	$F(1, 34.0)=3.09$, $p=.088$, $\eta_p^2=0.083$, $b=-0.019$	$F(1, 34.0)=2.94$, $p=.095$, $\eta_p^2=0.08$, $b=-0.002$	$F(1, 34.7)=1.30$, $p=.261$, $\eta_p^2=0.036$, $b=0.001$
Resistance x Baseline DSQ	$F(1, 34.0)=2.15$, $p=.152$, $\eta_p^2=0.059$, $b=-0.01$	$F(1, 34.0)=0.59$, $p=.449$, $\eta_p^2=0.017$, $b=-0.003$	$F(1, 34.0)=0.78$, $p=.382$, $\eta_p^2=0.023$, $b=0$	$F(1, 33.8)=0.00$, $p=.978$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0$

Relationship Between Task Accuracy and Model Parameters

We tested LMEs predicting task accuracy based on model parameters in both information conditions separately (**Table S11** and **Table S12**). Separate models were run with information bonus, α_0 , or α_∞ as a predictor, additionally including main effects of breathing resistance condition, group, free choice number (2–6; i.e., excluding the first free choice to which these parameters were directly fit), and the interaction between the given model parameter and choice number. Age, sex, task version, and working memory were also included as covariates.

Table S11. Results for Models Predicting Task Accuracy in the Unequal Information Games

	Information Bonus	α_0	α_∞
Parameter	$F(1, 795.0)=0.14$, $p=.711$,	$F(1, 712.3)=47.31$, $p<.001$,	$F(1, 990.2)=9.96$, $p=.002$,

	$\eta_p^2=0$, $b=-0.001$	$\eta_p^2=0.062$, $b=0.134$	$\eta_p^2=0.01$, $b=0.118$
Resistance	$F(1, 982.6)=0.01$, $p=.928$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0$	$F(1, 979.4)=0.14$, $p=.704$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0.001$	$F(1, 977.1)=0.00$, $p=.997$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0$
Group	$F(1, 103.3)=17.63$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.146$, $b=-0.056$	$F(1, 109.8)=11.82$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.097$, $b=-0.038$	$F(1, 106.8)=15.72$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.128$, $b=-0.049$
Choice Number	$F(1, 977.1)=54.13$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.052$, $b=0.014$	$F(1, 977.1)=53.95$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.052$, $b=0.014$	$F(1, 977.0)=53.52$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.052$, $b=0.014$
Info Bonus x Resistance	$F(1, 977.1)=4.28$, $p=.039$, $\eta_p^2=0.004$, $b=0.001$	--	--
α_0 x Resistance	--	$F(1, 977.1)=2.71$, $p=.100$, $\eta_p^2=0.003$, $b=-0.01$	--
α_∞ x Resistance	--	--	$F(1, 977.0)=0.07$, $p=.792$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=-0.003$

Table S12. Results for Models Predicting Task Accuracy in the Equal Information Condition Games

	Decision Noise	α_0	α_∞
Parameter	$F(1, 1077.1)=0.99$, $p=.320$, $\eta_p^2=0.001$, $b=-0.002$	$F(1, 791.9)=22.21$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.027$, $b=0.097$	$F(1, 1011.7)=7.68$, $p=.006$, $\eta_p^2=0.008$, $b=0.107$
Resistance	$F(1, 977.1)=0.26$, $p=.609$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0.001$	$F(1, 979.2)=0.70$, $p=.402$, $\eta_p^2=0.001$, $b=0.002$	$F(1, 977.1)=0.34$, $p=.561$, $\eta_p^2=0$, $b=0.002$
Group	$F(1, 102.9)=15.11$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.128$, $b=-0.054$	$F(1, 109.3)=10.83$, $p=.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.09$, $b=-0.041$	$F(1, 106.6)=12.99$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.109$, $b=-0.048$

Choice Number	$F(1, 977.0)=68.54,$ $p<.001,$ $\eta_p^2=0.066,$ $b=0.016$	$F(1, 977.1)=67.69,$ $p<.001,$ $\eta_p^2=0.065,$ $b=0.016$	$F(1, 977.0)=68.06,$ $p<.001,$ $\eta_p^2=0.065,$ $b=0.016$
Decision Noise x Resistance	$F(1, 977.0)=5.41,$ $p=.020, \eta_p^2=0.006,$ $b=0.003$		
α_0 x Resistance		$F(1, 977.1)=0.74,$ $p=.390, \eta_p^2=0.001,$ $b=0.005$	
α_∞ x Resistance			$F(1, 977.0)=2.77,$ $p=.097, \eta_p^2=0.003,$ $b=0.022$