

Supplementary Information for

Reward circuit function and treatment outcome following vALIC deep brain stimulation in treatment-resistant depression

N. Runia^{*,a,b†}, MSc, L.A. van de Mortel^{*,a,b†}, MSc, C. L. C. Smith^{c,d}, MSc, I.O. Bergfeld^{a,b}, PhD, B.P. de Kwaasteniet^e, PhD, J. Luijges^{a,b}, PhD, J. van Laarhoven^f, MD, P. Notten^f, MD, G. Beute^g, MD, dr. P. van den Munckhof^h, MD, P.R. Schuurman^h, PhD, MD, D.A.J.P. Denys^{a,b}, PhD, MD, G.A. van Wingen^{a,b†}, PhD

*These authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

†Corresponding authors at: Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Department of Psychiatry, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

E-mail: n.runia@amsterdamumc.nl; l.a.vandemortel@amsterdamumc.nl
g.a.vanwingen@amsterdamumc.nl

Telephone: +31645255607

Content:

1. Supplementary Methods

1.1 Monetary Reward Task

1.2 Clinical and behavioral statistical analyses

1.3 MRI Acquisition Parameters

Supplementary Table 1

Supplementary Table 2

Supplementary Table 3

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

26 1. Supplementary Methods

27 1.1 Monetary Reward Task

28 To probe NAc activation during fMRI data acquisition participants performed a Monetary Reward
29 task with an event-related design, which has been shown to consistently activate the NAc (1-3). The
30 task consisted of 108 trials which each lasted between 4750 and 8750 ms. A trial started with the
31 presentation of one of three different cues (750 ms). A reward cue (blue circle) predicted a monetary
32 reward, a neutral cue (brown triangle) predicted no reward/loss, and a loss cue (pink square)
33 predicted a monetary loss. Additionally, each cue had either one, two, or three white stripes,
34 indicating a reward or loss of €0.50, €1.00 or €2.00, respectively. The cue was followed by a delay
35 (1000 or 3000 ms), after which a time window followed where a target was presented (orange
36 exclamation mark). The target duration was either long (72 trials) or short (36 trials) and was
37 determined by adding 400 ms to the shortest reaction time during a set of practice trials and
38 subtracting 150 ms from the shortest reaction time during the practice trials, respectively. The order
39 of the long and short target duration was randomly generated, with the same order used for each
40 participant and each session. During the time window in which the target was presented participants
41 had to respond as quickly as possible with a button press. Successful button presses within the
42 response window led to a win or loss avoidance of the predicted monetary value depending on the
43 presented cue, while a failure to respond within the response window led to no win, or loss of the
44 predicted monetary value depending on the cue. The neutral cue never led to a monetary reward or
45 loss. Subsequently, after a short delay, feedback was shown on screen (1000 ms) displaying the
46 amount of money won or lost during the trial as well as the cumulative earnings throughout the task.
47 After another delay (1000 or 3000 ms) the next trial started. This design ensured that all participants
48 performed approximately equal. Reaction times were recorded for each trial. For a visualization of
49 the task see Supplementary Figure 1.

50 *1.2 Clinical and behavioral statistical analyses*

51 Clinical and behavioral data were analyzed with R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020). HAM-D-17
52 scores at baseline and follow-up were compared with a linear mixed-effects model analysis with
53 HAM-D-17 score as the dependent variable and session (baseline vs. follow-up) and days since
54 baseline as independent variables. In addition, for the active/sham stimulation comparison we
55 performed a linear mixed-effects model analysis with HAM-D-17 as the dependent variable and
56 session (active vs. sham), days since baseline, and randomization order as independent variables.

57 Reaction times during the monetary reward task at baseline and follow-up were analyzed
58 using a linear mixed-effects model. Reaction time was included as the dependent variable and group
59 (DBS vs. healthy controls), session (baseline vs. follow-up), condition (reward vs. neutral vs. loss), and
60 their interactions were included as independent variables. Additionally, days since baseline was
61 included in the model as an independent variable. Furthermore, for the active/sham stimulation
62 comparison we performed a linear mixed-effects model analysis with reaction time as the dependent
63 variable, and session (active vs. sham), condition (reward vs. neutral vs. loss), and their interaction
64 were included as independent variables. In addition, days since baseline and randomization order
65 were included in the model as independent variables.

66

67 *1.3 MRI Acquisition Parameters*

68 Echo-planar images with transversal orientation were acquired during the monetary reward task
69 (repetition time=2000 ms, echo-time=30 ms, flip angle=90°, matrix=64x64, number of slices=25, slice
70 thickness=4.0 mm, slice gap=10%, slice order=interleaved ascending (odd first), field of
71 view=230x230, voxel-size= 3.6x3.6x4.0 mm). 390 volumes were acquired with a total duration of 13
72 minutes. For anatomical reference, a three dimensional single shot T1-weighted image with sagittal
73 orientation was acquired (repetition time=1900 ms, echo-time=3.08 ms, flip angle=15°, matrix
74 =512x512, number of slices=192, slice thickness=1.0 mm, slice gap=50%, field of view=256x256,
75 voxel-size=0.5x0.5x1.0 mm).

Supplementary Table 1. Individual patient HAM-D-17 scores (baseline and follow-up), percentage HAM-D-17 reduction, and DBS parameter settings after standardized parameter optimization (follow-up) (Activa PC/RC, Metronic).

Patient (in random order)	HAM-D-17 baseline	HAM-D-17 follow-up	HAM-D-17 percentage reduction (%)	Left electrode							Right electrode										
				Case	Ventral contact	Ventromedial contact	Dorsolateral contact	Dorsal contact	Electric potential (V)	Pulse width (µs)	Frequency (Hz)	Electric current (mA)*	Case	Ventral contact	Ventromedial contact	Dorsolateral contact	Dorsal contact	Electric potential (V)	Pulse width (µs)	Frequency (Hz)	Electric current (mA)*
1 [#]	26	14	46.2	+	-				2.9	90	160	2.59	+	-				2.9	90	160	2.76
2 [†]	16	6	62.5	+			-		4.3	90	180	4.86	+			-		4.3	90	180	5.30
3 [#]	16	8	50.0	+	-	-	-	-	4.0	90	130	7.91	+	-	-	-	-	4.0	90	130	7.75
4 ^{#††}	18	4	77.8	+					5.5	90	180	--	+	-				5.5	90	180	--
5 ^{#††}	23	16	30.4	+					5.2	60	130	5.32	+	-				5.2	60	130	4.19
6 ^{#†}	18	10	44.4	+					4.2	60	130	6.05	+	-				4.2	60	130	5.71
7 [#]	26	22	15.4	+	-	-	-		4.0	150	140	9.02	+	-	-	-		4.0	150	140	8.68
8 ^{#††}	30	14	53.3	+					3.5	90	180	5.82	+	-				6.0	90	180	11.44
9 [#]	15	29	-93.3	+	-	-			3.6	90	180	5.14	+	-				3.6	90	180	4.91
10 ^{#††}	31	16	48.4	+	-	-			4.5	90	130	7.29	+	-				4.5	90	130	7.82
11 ^{††}	16	17	-6.3	+					5.4	90	180	9.43	+	-				5.4	90	180	--
12 [#]	22	15	31.8	+					5.2	90	130	7.45	+					3.5	90	130	--
13 ^{#††}	33	9	72.7	+					7.3	90	180	14.20	+	-				7.3	90	180	14.09
14 ^{#††}	20	10	50.0	+					4.3	90	180	5.63	+					4.3	90	180	6.16
15 [†]	22	16	27.3	+					2.5	60	130	5.42	+					2.5	60	130	3.94
16 ^{#†}	24	26	-8.3	+					6.7	90	180	10.79	+					6.7	90	180	10.93
17 [†]	19	26	-36.8	+					3.8	90	190	6.05	+	-				3.8	90	190	5.99
18 ^{#†}	18	3	83.3	+					5.4	90	180	7.64	+	-				5.4	90	180	--
19 [#]	27	22	18.5	+					4.0	60	130	6.01	+	-				4.0	60	130	5.85

*The electric current was a non-adjustable parameter, resulting from the electric potential settings and the electrical resistance of the circuit. If a value is missing, resistance measures were unavailable.

Included in the baseline analyses

† Included in the baseline vs. follow-up analyses

‡ Included in the active vs. sham analyses


Supplementary Table 2. Number of patients using psychotropic medication over time

		Baseline – follow-up (n=9)		Active-sham (n=11)	
		Baseline	Follow-up	Baseline	Follow-up
Antidepressant	Combination	1	2	1	3
	Single	5	1	6	2
	None	3	6	4	6
Benzodiazepine	Single	3	3	5	5
	None	6	6	6	6
Antipsychotic	Single	5	5	6	5
	None	4	4	5	6
Lithium	Single	0	0	1	1
	None	9	9	10	10
Anxiolytic	Single	0	1	0	1
	None	9	8	11	10
Anti-epileptic	Single	0	0	1	1
	None	9	9	10	10
Antihistaminic	Single	1	1	1	1
	None	8	8	10	10
Opioid	Single	0	0	1	1
	None	9	9	10	10
Sympathomimetic	Single	1	1	2	2
	None	8	8	9	9


Supplementary Table 3. Reasons for missing fMRI data.

Patient	Baseline fMRI data available	Complete baseline/ follow-up fMRI data	Complete cross-over phase fMRI data	Reason for missing data
1	No	No	No	MRI coil was unavailable at baseline. Because there was no baseline data it was decided to not collect fMRI data at follow-up and during the cross-over phase. However, from this patient onwards fMRI data was collected at the following assessments despite missing baseline data.
2	No	No	Yes	MRI coil was unavailable at baseline.
3	No	No	Yes	MRI coil was unavailable at baseline.
4	Yes	Yes	Yes	
5	Yes	Yes	No	Patient was deemed unfit to participate in the cross-over phase due to unstable clinical status.
6	Yes	No	No	Drop-out due to non-response.
7	No	No	No	Patient was treated with MRI-incompatible vagus nerve stimulation.
8	Yes	No	No	Drop-out due to non-response.
9	Yes	Yes	Yes	
10	Yes	No	No	Drop-out due to non-response.
11	Yes	Yes	Yes	
12	Yes	No	No	Follow-up time deviated too much from protocol (2.5 years). Patient was deemed unfit to participate in the cross-over phase due to unstable clinical status.
13	Yes	Yes	Yes	
14	Yes	No	No	Patient withdrew from participation after the baseline assessment due to somatic complaints.
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	
16	Yes	No	No	Drop-out due to non-response.
17	Yes	Yes	Yes	
18	Yes	Yes	No	Unknown
19	No	No	Yes	Baseline fMRI data was not collected due to back complaints at the time.
20	Yes	Yes	No	fMRI data collection was terminated due to an anxiety attack during one of the cross-over assessments.
21	Yes	Yes	Yes	
22	Yes	No	No	At follow-up the buttons necessary for the fMRI task did not work. At one of the assessments during the cross-over phase the reward task did not work.
23	Yes	No	Yes	fMRI data collection was terminated due to an anxiety attack at the follow-up assessment
24	Yes	Yes	Yes	
25	Yes	No	No	Task did not work during the follow-up assessment. Patient was deemed unfit to participate in the cross-over phase due to unstable clinical status.
Healthy control		Complete baseline/ follow-up fMRI data		Reason for missing data
1	Yes	Yes		
2	Yes	Yes		
3	Yes	Yes		
4	Yes	Yes		
5	Yes	Yes		
6	Yes	Yes		
7	Yes	Yes		
8	Yes	No		Participant withdrew from participation after the baseline assessment
9	Yes	Yes		
10	Yes	Yes		
11	Yes	Yes		
12	Yes	Yes		
13	Yes	No		Unknown
14	Yes	Yes		
15	Yes	No		Unknown
16	No	No		MRI-incompatible elbow pin
17	No	No		fMRI data collection was terminated due to an anxiety attack
18	Yes	Yes		
19	Yes	Yes		
20	Yes	Yes		
21	Yes	Yes		
22	Yes	Yes		

Abbreviations: (f)MRI, (functional) magnetic resonance imaging.



Supplementary Figure 1. Monetary Reward Task. a) The three different cues involved in the task: a reward cue (blue circle) predicting monetary reward, a neutral cue (brown triangle) predicting no reward/loss, and a loss cue (pink square) predicting monetary loss. Each cue had either one, two, or three white stripes, indicating a reward or loss of €0.50, €1.00 or €2.00, respectively. The green and red arrows show the result of hit and miss trial respectively for each cue. b) Task design. The trial started with the presentation of a cue followed by a target (orange exclamation mark). During target presentation the participant had to press a button as quickly as possible. Lastly, feedback was shown on screen displaying the amount of money won or lost during the trial as well as the cumulative earnings throughout the task.



Supplementary figure 2. Remaining voxel coverage of the bilateral NAc (red) after removing DBS electrode artifacts as compared to the original NAc mask (white).

84

85

86 **References**

87 1. Knutson B, Adams CM, Fong GW, Hommer D. Anticipation of increasing monetary reward
88 selectively recruits nucleus accumbens. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2001;21(16):RC159-RC.

89 2. Knutson B, Fong GW, Adams CM, Varner JL, Hommer D. Dissociation of reward anticipation
90 and outcome with event-related fMRI. *Neuroreport*. 2001;12(17):3683-7.

91 3. Knutson B, Westdorp A, Kaiser E, Hommer D. FMRI visualization of brain activity during a
92 monetary incentive delay task. *Neuroimage*. 2000;12(1):20-7.

93