

EEG Correlates of Affective Processing in Major Depressive Disorder

*Stevan Nikolín^{1,2}, Nicholas Chand², Donel Martin^{1,2}, Jacqueline Rushby³, Colleen K. Loo^{1,2,4},
Tjeerd W. Boonstra^{1,5}*

¹ School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

² Black Dog Institute, Sydney, Australia

³ School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

⁴ St. George Hospital, Sydney, Australia

⁵ Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank William Flannery, Liyi Tan and Yi Yin Tan for their contributions to EEG acquisitions.

Keywords: Depression, Emotional Regulation, Electroencephalography, Event-Related Potentials, Late Positive Potential

Running title: Affective Processing in Depression

18 ABSTRACT

19 **Background:** Individuals with major depressive disorder present with deficits in emotional
20 reactivity. Conflicting models have been proposed to characterise the direction of this
21 effect. Previous studies mostly support the *emotional context insensitivity* model, which
22 suggests that reactivity to positive and negatively-valenced emotional stimuli is blunted in
23 depression. We sought to test the *emotional context insensitivity* hypothesis in a
24 preregistered study.

25 **Methods:** Forty-one depressed participants and 41 age- and gender-matched healthy
26 controls were shown a series of unpleasant and neutrally-valenced pictures in a passive
27 view paradigm while acquiring electroencephalography (EEG). The late positive potential
28 (LPP), an EEG marker of emotional reactivity, was compared between groups using mixed-
29 effects repeated-measures models and exploratory cluster-based permutation tests.

30 **Results:** We found no difference in LPP amplitudes between MDD and healthy individuals
31 using the preregistered analysis plan. However, exploratory permutation analysis revealed a
32 significant reduction in the LPP for MDD participants while viewing unpleasant pictures in
33 EEG electrodes marginally more posterior and within a narrower time interval than specified
34 in our original analysis plan. Secondary analyses found that emotion regulation strategy use
35 and anxiety comorbidity did not influence the LPP.

36 **Conclusions:** We found significantly reduced LPP amplitudes to unpleasant pictures in MDD,
37 in support of the *emotional context insensitivity* hypothesis. However, the parameters used
38 to estimate the LPP deviated from the preregistered analysis plan, suggesting that
39 methodological differences between studies may result in variability in the cortical response
40 to emotional stimuli.

41 INTRODUCTION

42 Major depressive disorder (MDD) is a mental illness that presents as persistent low mood,
43 loss of interest in pleasurable activities, or both, in conjunction with other symptoms
44 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Consistent with the core symptom of disturbed
45 mood, depressed individuals report altered reactivity to emotion-eliciting contexts of
46 positive or negative affect (Rottenberg et al., 2005). Although the terms mood and emotion
47 are sometimes used interchangeably, mood typically refers to slow-moving affective states
48 that are weakly influenced by external stimuli, whereas emotions are considered to be rapid
49 reactions to meaningful affective stimuli (Watson, 2000). The two are deeply intertwined
50 and an improved understanding of the emotional deficits in MDD may thus provide further
51 insight into mood symptoms (Rottenberg, 2005). Currently, three competing models have
52 been proposed to describe the observed abnormalities in emotional reactivity in depressed
53 individuals. The oldest of these, the *positive attenuation* model, suggests that the
54 physiological response is diminished to positive stimuli and unchanged for unpleasant,
55 negatively-valenced stimuli (Clark & Watson, 1991). The *emotional context insensitivity*
56 model argues that depression results in blunted emotional reactivity to positive stimuli as
57 well as to negative emotional contexts (Rottenberg et al., 2005). The most recently
58 proposed *negative potentiation* hypothesis states that depression increases reactivity
59 towards negative contexts (Browning et al., 2010). These theories disagree with regards to
60 the physiological response in MDD to negative stimuli: *positive attenuation* predicts no
61 difference in reactivity compared to healthy individuals, *negative potentiation* predicts
62 increased reactivity, and the *emotional context insensitivity* predicts decreased reactivity in
63 depression.

64 Emotional reactivity is commonly assessed using electroencephalography (EEG). Specifically,
65 the late positive potential (LPP) may provide a reliable measure of affective cortical
66 processing (Codispoti et al., 2006, 2007). The LPP is characterized as the mean amplitude of
67 the event-related potential (ERP) within a time window approximately 400-1000ms
68 following the visual presentation of emotionally laden images (Cuthbert et al., 2000; Schupp
69 et al., 2000). EEG studies in depressed individuals have shown mixed findings of the LPP
70 amplitude and do not provide conclusive support in favour of any current model of
71 emotional reactivity in depression. Two studies have demonstrated attenuated LPP
72 amplitudes in response to unpleasant stimuli, lending support to the *emotional context*
73 *insensitivity* hypothesis (Foti et al., 2010; MacNamara et al., 2016). In contrast, Zhang et al.
74 (2016) found a significant increase in LPP amplitudes while passively observing pictures of
75 faces showing sad emotional expressions as compared to neutral expressions, in agreement
76 with the *negative potentiation* hypothesis. Lastly, Weinberg et al. (2016) did not find a
77 significant difference in LPP amplitudes comparing healthy controls to depressed
78 participants. Although most studies on emotional reactivity reveal attenuation of LPP
79 amplitudes in depressed individuals, in agreement with the *emotional context insensitivity*
80 hypothesis, the evidence is not conclusive.

81 The primary aim of this study was therefore to test the *emotional context insensitivity*
82 hypothesis by comparing the contrast in LPP amplitudes for unpleasant vs neutral pictures
83 between MDD participants and healthy controls. As previous studies (Foti et al., 2010;
84 MacNamara et al., 2016; Weinberg et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016) did not preregister their
85 study protocols and should hence be considered preliminary, we sought to test the
86 difference in emotional reactivity in MDD participants in a preregistered study. We

87 hypothesised that the LPP amplitude difference (i.e. unpleasant vs neutral) would be
88 attenuated in MDD participants in support of the *emotional context insensitivity* model. In
89 addition, studies examining LPP amplitudes in response to emotional images did not
90 investigate the role of emotion regulation in depression. In healthy individuals, the LPP is
91 sensitive to the use of emotion regulation strategies, which refers to conscious or
92 subconscious efforts to exert control over one's emotional experience (Gross & John, 2003).
93 Differences in the frequency or type of emotion regulation strategy use could partly explain
94 the observed differences in the LPP to unpleasant images in MDD participants compared to
95 healthy controls (Foti & Hajcak, 2008; Hajcak & Nieuwenhuis, 2006; Moser et al., 2009). In
96 addition to emotion regulation strategy, anxiety, a common comorbidity of depression
97 (Brown et al., 1998), has also been found to modulate the LPP. Compared to neutral
98 pictures, MacNamara and Hajcak (2009) showed enhanced LPP amplitudes to aversive
99 pictures in individuals with high self-reported anxiety. Anxiety in depressed individuals may
100 therefore explain the conflicting evidence supporting hypotheses of emotional reactivity in
101 MDD. Therefore, the secondary aims of this study were to determine whether the
102 frequency of emotion regulation strategy use differs between MDD and healthy participants
103 and whether emotion regulation strategy use and comorbid anxiety in MDD participants
104 modulates the LPP amplitude in response to unpleasant pictures. We based the research
105 protocol that we used to test our hypotheses – the required sample size and the EEG pre-
106 processing steps to quantify the LPP amplitude – on previous literature, and documented
107 this in a preregistration form (Nikolin et al., 2020). We anticipated that MDD participants
108 would use emotion regulation strategies less frequently than healthy controls, and that LPP
109 amplitude would be moderated by emotion regulation strategy use and anxiety comorbidity
110 in MDD participants.

111

112 MATERIALS AND METHODS

113 Participants

114 A total of 82 participants were recruited in this study, of whom 41 were currently depressed
115 and 41 were healthy adults with no current or past diagnosis of a psychiatric illness. Power
116 analysis shows that this sample is sufficient to detect moderate effect sizes of Cohen's $d =$
117 0.6 (using $\beta = 80\%$ and $\alpha = 0.05$).

118 Inclusion criteria shared by both MDD participants and healthy controls were: aged 18 years
119 and above, able to provide informed consent, normal or corrected-to-normal vision, no
120 recent serious head injury in the last 12 months (e.g. loss of consciousness of more than 30
121 minutes), no current or past neurological condition (e.g. stroke, epilepsy), no history of drug
122 or alcohol dependence in the last three months, not pregnant or possibly pregnant, no past
123 history of distress reaction to affective images, and an ability to cooperate with the EEG
124 procedure (e.g. no tremor).

125 Depressed participants were recruited from those seeking entry into clinical treatment trials
126 at the Black Dog Institute, Sydney Australia. Healthy controls were recruited via the
127 University of New South Wales (UNSW) School of Psychology Paid Sign-Up System, Black
128 Dog Institute Volunteer Research Register, or from flyers distributed in the local area.


129 Healthy controls were age- and gender-matched to MDD participants since these factors
130 have previously been shown to influence the latency, amplitude, and topography of ERP
131 components (Kayser et al., 2000; Oliver-Rodriguez et al., 1999; Renfroe et al., 2016). The
132 study protocol was approved by the UNSW Human Research Ethics Committee (HC16617).

133 Procedure

134 Participants were instructed to passively view and attend to picture stimuli. Pictures were
135 selected to have valence and arousal ratings consistent with those used in previous EEG
136 studies investigating LPP effects (Hajcak & Nieuwenhuis, 2006; MacNamara et al., 2016;
137 Moser et al., 2006). A total of 168 pictures were selected from the International Affective
138 Picture System (IAPS; Lang et al. (2008)). Of these, 84 were unpleasant (e.g. threatening
139 scenes, violence, weapons) and 84 were neutral (e.g. neutral faces, household objects,
140 landscapes). These pictures were chosen from the IAPS based on published valence and
141 arousal ratings. Valence ratings were lower for unpleasant pictures (2.78 ± 0.54) compared
142 to neutral pictures (5.01 ± 0.21), indicating that they elicited more negative emotional
143 affect. Arousal ratings were higher for unpleasant pictures (5.80 ± 0.61) compared to
144 neutral pictures (3.04 ± 0.52). The pictures were divided into three parallel lists consisting of
145 56 images each (28 unpleasant and 28 neutral) with similar valence and arousal ratings (see
146 Supplementary Materials for further details).

147 The stimuli were presented on a 58.4 cm (23-inch) computer screen in a dimly lit, sound-
148 attenuated room using Inquisit 4 software (Version 4, Millisecond Software). Digitised
149 pictures sized 20×30 cm were presented on a black background, consistent with previous
150 EEG studies (Dunning & Hajcak, 2009; MacNamara et al., 2016). The pictures were displayed
151 for 5 s in a pre-determined block-randomised order so participants were unable to
152 anticipate the valence of each picture. A black screen with a centered white fixation cross
153 was presented for 2 s between stimuli (Fig. 1). Pictures of the same valence were not
154 presented more than three times consecutively to prevent participants from generating
155 expectations of upcoming stimuli and to avoid over-saturation of emotional salience.

156 Participants were not informed of any emotional regulation strategies prior to viewing the
157 IAPS images.



158

159 **Figure 1. Study protocol.** Participants passively observed a total of 56 picture stimuli. These
160 were presented in a block-randomised order and consisted of 28 unpleasant images with a
161 negative valence, and 28 neutral images with no emotional valence, sourced from the
162 International Affective Picture System (IAPS). Pictures were displayed for 5 s, followed by a 2
163 s fixation cross. A sample of two trials, showing a neutral image (a towel) and an unpleasant
164 image (a gun), is displayed.

165

166 Behavioural measures

167 Prior to the experimental session, MDD participants had their mood assessed by a trained
168 rater using the ten-item Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) for
169 depressive symptoms (Montgomery & Asberg, 1979). All participants completed the 21-item
170 self-reported Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS; Lovibond and Lovibond (1995)).
171 The DASS was chosen as it reliably discriminates between depression, anxiety, and stress

172 states (Crawford & Henry, 2003). Upon completion of the experimental session, we used an
173 emotion regulation questionnaire adapted from Gross et al. (2003), provided in
174 Supplementary Materials. Participants were able to select from five emotion regulation
175 strategies, including no strategy, reinterpretation, distraction, detachment, and 'other' in
176 which participants could specify their strategy. Strategies specified in the 'other' category
177 were re-assigned to one of the former strategy options by study personnel.

178

179 Electroencephalography data acquisition and processing

180 EEG data were acquired using a 64-channel setup and a TMSi Refa amplifier (TMS
181 International, Oldenzaal, Netherlands) with a sampling rate of 1024 Hz. Offline EEG
182 processing and analysis was conducted using custom-developed MATLAB scripts (v.R2019a;
183 MathWorks) and the Fieldtrip toolbox (Oostenveld et al., 2011). All scripts used for EEG
184 processing and calculation of neurophysiological measures are available at the following
185 link: https://github.com/snikolin/MDDvsCTRL_IAPS.

186 EEG data was pre-processed using a Butterworth IIR digital filter to remove 50 Hz electrical
187 line noise. Following this, a second-order band-pass filter with cut-offs of 0.5 and 70 Hz was
188 used to remove low and high frequency noise generated from head movements and muscle
189 activity. The EEG data were then epoched into 6 s intervals, beginning 1 s before each
190 picture onset and continuing for 5 s after picture onset. Epochs were rejected firstly using a
191 semi-automated procedure, and then on visual inspection to identify any remaining trials
192 with large artefacts. Smaller, non-cortical physiological activity (e.g. cardiac, muscle, or
193 ocular) and non-physiological activity (e.g. environmental noise, or movement) were
194 removed using an Independent Components Analysis (ICA) algorithm (Delorme et al., 2007;

195 Hyvärinen et al., 2001; Makeig et al., 1996). Finally, EEG data was re-referenced to the
196 common average reference.

197

198 *Event-related potentials*

199 ERPs were constructed by separately averaging trials for neutral and unpleasant pictures
200 time-locked to picture presentation. Each averaged ERP was baseline corrected to the mean
201 activity occurring in the 200 ms time interval prior to stimulus onset. The late positive
202 potential (LPP) is a slow, positive wave occurring maximally at centroparietal recording sites,
203 beginning approximately 400 ms after stimulus onset and lasting several seconds (Cuthbert
204 et al., 2000; Schupp et al., 2000). We quantified the LPP component as the mean amplitude
205 of the ERP from 400 to 1000 ms following stimulus onset at a centroparietal cluster of EEG
206 channels (Cz, CPz, Pz, CP1, and CP2), where it has previously been shown to be maximal
207 (Foti et al., 2010; MacNamara et al., 2016). Participants with LPP component amplitudes
208 greater than three standard deviations from the mean, per diagnostic group, were
209 considered outliers and excluded from statistical analyses.

210 **Statistical Analyses**

211 All analyses were performed using SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics 25, SPSS Inc.), and
212 were in accordance with our preregistered protocol (Nikolin et al., 2020). For the primary
213 analysis, LPPs were investigated using a mixed-effects repeated-measures model (MRMM).
214 The model included a repeated factor of Valence (unpleasant vs neutral) using an
215 unstructured covariance matrix, as well as the between-subjects factor of Group (MDD vs
216 healthy controls), and the Valence \times Group interaction. Subject was included as a random
217 effect. Residuals were visually inspected to ensure an adequate fit of the model. Cohen's *d*

218 was calculated to estimate the effect size for the LPP amplitude contrast between
219 unpleasant and neutral images comparing MDD participants to healthy controls:

220 $[MDD LPP_{unpleasant} - MDD LPP_{neutral}]$ vs $[Healthy LPP_{unpleasant} - Healthy LPP_{neutral}]$

221 A follow-up exploratory non-parametric cluster-based permutation test was performed to
222 identify any significant differences between MDD participants and healthy controls beyond
223 the *a priori* time interval and channels operationalised for the LPP. This method controls for
224 multiple comparisons while comparing differences across a large spatiotemporal parameter
225 space (Maris & Oostenveld, 2007). Permutation testing was performed across all EEG
226 channels within the time interval 0 – 1000 ms following presentation of IAPS stimuli.
227 Participants' ERPs were permuted 3000 times, and the resulting distributions were
228 compared using independent samples *t*-tests. A value of $\alpha < 0.05$ was adopted as the two-
229 tailed significance threshold. Statistically significant clusters were required to comprise at
230 least two neighbouring channels.

231 For secondary analyses, a Fisher's Exact Test was used to investigate whether there were
232 differences in emotion strategy regulation use between diagnostic groups. Emotion
233 regulation strategies were entered into a 2 x 2 contingency table using the binary variables
234 of Strategy (no strategy vs strategy) and Group (MDD vs healthy controls). Acceptable
235 strategies consisted of reinterpretation, distraction, or detachment.

236 We performed simple univariate linear regression analyses to confirm whether emotion
237 regulation strategy or comorbid anxiety had an effect on LPP amplitudes. LPP amplitude was
238 included as the dependent variable, with emotion regulation strategy or comorbid anxiety
239 entered separately as independent variables. Strategy was included as a binary categorical

240 variable (no strategy vs strategy). Anxiety was included as a continuous variable using the
241 anxiety subscore of the DASS. These analyses were initially restricted to LPP amplitudes
242 obtained from MDD participants while viewing unpleasant images. Additional confirmatory
243 multivariate linear regression analyses were then performed using the full dataset of MDD
244 and healthy participants, including both unpleasant and neutral pictures. Independent
245 variables in these regressions included Valence (unpleasant vs neutral), Group (MDD vs
246 healthy controls), as well as Strategy or Anxiety as described previously for univariate
247 analyses.

248 Scripts for EEG analyses in MATLAB and statistical analyses using SPSS are provided at:

249 https://github.com/snikolin/MDDvsCTRL_IAPS.

250 RESULTS

251 Behavioural and EEG measures were assessed in 82 participants (41 with MDD and 41 aged-
252 and gender-matched controls). Table 1 shows baseline demographic and clinical information
253 for MDD participants and healthy controls. One participant was excluded from EEG analyses
254 due to values greater than three standard deviations from the group mean, leaving a total
255 of 40 MDD participants and 41 healthy controls.

256

257 **Table 1. Baseline demographic and clinical information.** Means and standard deviations
258 (SD) are shown for continuous measures, and frequency counts for categorical measures.

	MDD	Controls
<i>n</i>	41	41
Age (years)	46.3 (13.2)	46.0 (13.9)
Education (years)	15.8 (3.6)	17.3 (3.6)
Gender (females/males)	15/26	15/26
TRD (yes/no)	32/9	-
Concurrent antidepressants (yes/no)	31/9	-
MADRS	29.6 (5.0)	-
DASS Depression	33.7 (7.1)	4.2 (5.2)
DASS Anxiety	11.0 (9.7)	3.3 (4.5)
DASS Stress	21.3 (9.5)	6.8 (5.5)
DASS Total	66.5 (19.7)	14.2 (12.9)


259 MDD: Major Depressive Disorder; TRD: Treatment-Resistant Depression – Defined as failure to respond to at least two
260 adequate courses of antidepressant medication; MADRS: Montgomery-Asperg Depression Rating Scale (Montgomery et
261 al., 1979); DASS: 21-item Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (Lovibond et al., 1995). DASS scores were not available for
262 two MDD participants.

263

264 Primary Analysis

265 The LPP amplitude was compared across groups (MDD and controls) and valence conditions
266 (unpleasant and neutral). MRMM results showed a significant main effect of Valence ($F =$
267 19.62 , $p < 0.001$), indicating increased LPP amplitude for unpleasant compared to neutral
268 images (Fig. 2). The main effect of Group ($F = 0.39$, $p = 0.54$) and the Group \times Valence
269 interaction ($F = 0.26$, $p = 0.61$) were not significant. Comparison of the valence difference
270 between MDD participants and healthy controls showed a small effect size ($d = 0.11$).

271



272

273 **Figure 2. Preregistered EEG measures of affective processing.** The LPP was quantified as

274 the mean EEG amplitude in the time interval from 400 to 1000 ms following stimulus onset

275 for a cluster of centroparietal EEG channels (highlighted in red). ERPs, spatial topographies,

276 and scatter plots of LPP amplitude are presented for MDD participants and controls while

277 viewing unpleasant and neutral images. ERPs are displayed with bootstrapped 95%

278 confidence intervals and with the time interval used to calculate LPPs shaded in light grey.

279 Spatial topographies are of average ERP amplitude from 400 to 1000 ms. Scatter plots show


280 the mean (black line), median (red line), and the 95% confidence interval (dark grey region).

281 **A)** ERPs and topographies for MDD participants. **B)** ERPs and topographies for healthy
282 controls. **C)** ERPs and spatial topographies of the valence difference (unpleasant – neutral)
283 for MDD participants and healthy controls. **D)** Scatter plots of LPP amplitude for unpleasant
284 (U) and neutral (N) images at the centroparietal cluster. **E)** Spatial topography of the valence
285 difference (unpleasant – neutral) contrasting MDD participants with healthy controls.

286

287 Exploratory non-parametric cluster-based permutation testing compared the difference
288 scores (unpleasant – neutral stimuli) between MDD participants and healthy controls. These
289 revealed a significant cluster (Fig. 3). The time interval for the significant cluster fell within
290 the preregistered LPP window (662 – 755 ms). EEG channels identified in this cluster were
291 slightly more posterior than those for our preregistered LPP analysis and included CPz, CP1,
292 Pz, POz, P1, and P2. Three of these channels are also found in the preregistered cluster (CPz,
293 CP1, and Pz). See Supplementary Material for further details regarding cluster channels.

294 Repeating the MRMM using the EEG channels and time interval identified in the exploratory
295 cluster revealed a main effect of Valence ($F = 9.55$, $p = 0.003$) and a significant Group \times
296 Valence interaction effect ($F = 15.59$, $p < 0.001$). The main effect of Group was not
297 significant ($F = 0.56$, $p = 0.46$). Post-hoc independent t -tests found that the MDD group had
298 lower LPPs while viewing unpleasant images compared to healthy controls ($p = 0.02$), but
299 there was no difference for neutral images ($p = 0.23$). Comparison of the valence differences
300 between MDD participants and healthy controls showed a large effect size of Cohen's $d =$
301 0.88.



302

303 **Figure 3. Exploratory EEG measures of affective processing.** Exploratory cluster-based
304 permutation testing revealed a significant cluster from 662 to 755 ms in EEG channels CPz,
305 CP1, Pz, POz, P1, and P2 (highlighted in red). ERPs, spatial topographies, and scatter plots of
306 LPP amplitude are presented for MDD participants and controls while viewing unpleasant
307 and neutral images. ERPs are displayed with bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals and
308 with the time interval used to calculate the mean amplitude within the exploratory cluster

309 shaded in light grey. Spatial topographies are of average ERP amplitude from 662 to 755 ms.
310 Scatter plots show the mean (black line), median (red line), and the 95% confidence interval
311 (dark grey region). **A)** ERPs and topographies for MDD participants. **B)** ERPs and
312 topographies for healthy controls. **C)** ERPs and spatial topographies of the valence
313 difference (unpleasant – neutral) for MDD participants and healthy controls. **D)** Scatter plots
314 of LPP amplitude for unpleasant (U) and neutral (N) images at the exploratory cluster. **E)**
315 Spatial topography of the valence difference (unpleasant – neutral) for the time interval 662
316 – 755 ms contrasting MDD participants with healthy controls.

317 Secondary Analyses

318 As a secondary analysis, we compared the emotion regulation strategies used by MDD
319 participants and control. The majority of participants reported that they did not use a
320 strategy (Table 2). A Fisher's Exact Test revealed that strategy use was not significantly
321 different between both groups ($p = 0.34$).

322

323 Table 2. Emotion regulation strategy use.

	MDD (<i>n</i> = 40)	Controls (<i>n</i> = 41)
<i>No strategy</i>	30	26
<i>Strategy</i>	10	15
Reinterpretation	1	5
Distraction	2	5
Detachment	7	5

324 MDD: Major Depressive Disorder

325

326 We also investigated the association between strategy use and anxiety on the LPP
327 amplitude. We performed simple univariate linear regression analyses, restricting the
328 dataset to LPP values obtained from MDD participants while viewing unpleasant images.
329 Strategy was not significantly associated with LPP amplitudes ($r = 0.13$, $r^2 = 0.02$, $\beta = -0.18$, p
330 $= 0.44$; Supp Fig. 1A). Similarly, Anxiety was not significantly associated with the LPP ($r =$
331 0.21 , $r^2 = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.01$, $p = 0.20$; Supp Fig. 1B). Next, we performed multivariate linear
332 regression analyses using the full dataset (incorporating healthy controls as well as neutral
333 images), including Group and Valence as independent variables. Neither the regression
334 model including Strategy ($r = 0.18$, $r^2 = 0.03$, $p = 0.17$), nor the model including Anxiety ($r =$
335 0.17 , $r^2 = 0.03$, $p = 0.20$), met the significance threshold.

336 Univariate regression analyses were repeated for the exploratory cluster identified during
337 permutation testing with similar results. Neither Strategy ($r = 0.02$, $r^2 = 0.00$, $\beta = -0.04$, $p =$
338 0.90) nor Anxiety ($r = 0.05$, $r^2 = 0.00$, $\beta = -0.00$, $p = 0.76$) were significantly associated with
339 LPP amplitudes. After expanding the dataset to incorporate healthy controls and neutral
340 images, and including Group and Valence as independent variables, neither the model
341 including Strategy ($r = 0.14$, $r^2 = 0.02$, $p = 0.39$), nor Anxiety ($r = 0.21$, $r^2 = 0.04$, $p = 0.08$),
342 were significant.

343 DISCUSSION

344 We performed a preregistered study to test the *emotional context insensitivity* model by
345 comparing the LPP amplitude for unpleasant and neutral stimuli in depressed participants
346 and age- and gender-matched healthy controls. Our preregistered data analysis plan found
347 no difference in emotional reactivity between MDD participants and controls within the
348 preregistered centroparietal region of interest and time interval, which were based on
349 previous studies. However, exploratory permutation analysis revealed a significant
350 difference between MDD participants and healthy individuals in the hypothesised direction.
351 The difference in amplitudes between unpleasant pictures relative to neutral pictures was
352 lower for MDD participants compared to healthy controls, in agreement with the *emotional*
353 *context insensitivity* model of depression. The exploratory results revealed a significant
354 cluster of parietal EEG channels slightly posterior to the preregistered region of interest and
355 within a narrower post-stimulus time interval (662-755 ms). We also investigated the effect
356 of strategy use and anxiety comorbidity but found no evidence that emotion regulation
357 strategy use differed between diagnostic groups, nor that strategy use or anxiety influenced
358 the LPP in a passive view paradigm.

359 The primary aim of the study was to obtain stronger evidence for the *emotional context*
360 *insensitivity* model through registered predictions (Nosek et al., 2018), and to replicate the
361 reduced LPP to unpleasant stimuli in depression. We found a large reduction (Cohen's $d =$
362 0.88) in LPP amplitude in the predicted direction for negatively-valenced stimuli. However,
363 the reduction was not statistically significant when using the preregistered analysis plan to
364 quantify the LPP (i.e. mean ERP amplitude in a time interval of 400-1000ms following
365 simulation presentation in a cluster of predefined EEG electrodes). The predicted reduction

366 in LPP amplitude was only observed when using a narrower time window (662-755 ms) and
367 slightly more posterior EEG electrodes, which were determined using a data-driven
368 approach. Ledgerwood (2018) made a distinction between two types of preregistration:
369 preregistering a theoretical, *a priori*, directional prediction to ensure a study tests (rather
370 than informs) a theory and preregistering an analysis plan to help control type I error. The
371 current findings matched the *a priori* directional prediction (i.e. lower LPP in the MDD group
372 while viewing unpleasant images compared to healthy controls) and as such provides
373 evidence supporting the *emotional context insensitivity* model of depression. While the
374 predicted difference was not observed with the preregistered analysis plan, we used a
375 cluster-based permutation test that controls the family-wise error rate (Maris et al., 2007;
376 Pernet et al., 2015). Cluster-based permutation tests should not be used to make inferences
377 about the latency or location of effects (Sassenhagen & Draschkow, 2019), but the current
378 results show that the temporal and spatial extent of the LPP – as outlined in the
379 preregistered analysis plan and based on previous literature – may not necessarily
380 generalise across stimulus steps and measurement contexts (Yarkoni, 2019).

381 Relatively few EEG studies have investigated the emotional reactivity of depressed
382 individuals (Foti et al., 2010; MacNamara et al., 2016; Weinberg et al., 2016; Zhang et al.,
383 2016). These have reported mixed effects, including studies suggesting reduced reactivity to
384 unpleasant stimuli in MDD relative to a healthy cohort (Foti et al., 2010; MacNamara et al.,
385 2016), increased reactivity (Zhang et al., 2016), and no difference between unpleasant and
386 neutral stimuli (Weinberg et al., 2016). The discrepancy observed in the present study
387 between preregistered and exploratory analyses, as well as in outcomes between previously
388 mentioned studies, suggests that relatively minor differences in the protocol used to

389 generate and operationalise the LPP may contribute to mixed findings. These include the
390 selection of EEG electrodes for analysis, the LPP time interval, as well as other
391 methodological choices such as the set of images used to evoke a physiological response.

392 The set of images used to generate the LPP differs markedly between studies, specifically
393 with regards to the selection of aversive, unpleasant stimuli. Zhang et al. (2016) and Foti et
394 al. (2010) used pictures of faces bearing emotional expressions. The former using faces
395 depicting sadness, whereas the latter displayed angry and fearful expressions. In contrast,
396 Weinberg et al. (2016) and MacNamara et al. (2016) chose their stimuli from the IAPS,
397 which contains a broader array of picture options (e.g. photographs of people, faces,
398 everyday objects, and scenes). However, even working from the same image set, the choice
399 of unpleasant stimuli was substantially different between these studies. Weinberg et al.
400 (2016) selected threatening images, defined as “*images of mutilation, death, and animal*
401 *and human threat*”, whereas MacNamara et al. (2016) used less restrictive criteria to pick
402 their negatively-valenced content. Although there is overlap in the brain regions used to
403 process faces and emotionally evocative scenes, specialised regions of the brain activate in
404 response to human faces, i.e. both image types activate the visual cortex, amygdala,
405 posterior hippocampus, and ventromedial prefrontal cortex, whereas only images of
406 expressive faces activated the superior temporal gyrus, insula and anterior cingulate
407 (Britton et al., 2006). Furthermore, angry or fearful facial expressions have been shown to
408 produce a stronger amygdala response in comparison to matched fearful or threatening
409 scenes (Hariri et al., 2002). Consequently, this has important implications for the expected
410 neurophysiological response measured using EEG, which may differ between these image
411 types (Mavratzakis et al., 2016).

412 Regarding the EEG electrodes preselected for measuring the LPP, the exploratory cluster
413 identified in the present study was marginally more posterior than the centroparietal region
414 of interest used in previous studies of depression, but in agreement with studies of healthy
415 participants reporting that a maximum effect occurred parietally (Hajcak, Moser, et al.,
416 2006; Kessel et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2012). Interestingly, there is evidence to suggest that the
417 LPP is initially largest parietally, and then shifts to a more centroparietal location in the
418 latter stages of affective processing (Hajcak et al., 2012).

419 Studies of affective processing have operationalised the LPP using a diverse range of time
420 intervals. These report it as commencing as early as 300 ms (Liu et al., 2012; Thiruchselvam
421 et al., 2011), and as late as 600 ms (Mehmood & Lee, 2016). The LPP has been suggested to
422 terminate as early as 500 ms (Schupp et al., 2003; Schupp et al., 2004), and as late as 1700
423 ms (MacNamara, Foti, et al., 2009; Thiruchselvam et al., 2011). Lastly, the duration of the
424 LPP interval has been defined to be as narrow as 50 ms (Schupp et al., 2003), and as wide as
425 1400 ms (Liu et al., 2012). Broadly, the cluster identified in our exploratory analysis falls
426 within the time interval of previous LPP studies.

427 Our secondary hypotheses stated that LPP amplitude would be moderated by emotion
428 regulation strategy use and anxiety comorbidity in MDD participants. Contrary to these
429 hypotheses, emotion regulation strategy use did not differ between diagnostic groups.
430 Further, we found no evidence to suggest that emotion regulation strategy use attenuated
431 LPP amplitudes to unpleasant pictures, in contrast to previous EEG studies. Extensive
432 research has shown reduced LPP amplitude to unpleasant pictures when
433 reinterpretation/reappraisal (Foti et al., 2008; Hajcak, Moser, et al., 2006; Hajcak &
434 Nieuwenhuis, 2006; Moser et al., 2006) or distraction were used to regulate negative

435 emotions (Dunning et al., 2009; Hajcak et al., 2007; Thiruchselvam et al., 2011; Uusberg et
436 al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2014). A possible reason for this discrepancy may be that the majority
437 of healthy and depressed participants in the current study reported no emotion regulation
438 strategy use (MDD: 30/40; healthy controls: 26/41), thus limiting the ability to statistically
439 infer the effects of strategy on LPP amplitudes. We also did not find evidence that anxiety
440 levels modulate LPP amplitudes. The prevailing view is that anxiety increases attentional
441 resources towards emotionally salient, aversive, stimuli thereby resulting in enhancement
442 of LPP amplitude (MacNamara & Hajcak, 2009). Previous research has shown enhanced LPP
443 to aversive pictures in healthy individuals with high self-reported anxiety (MacNamara &
444 Hajcak, 2009), and patients suffering from generalized anxiety disorder (MacNamara &
445 Hajcak, 2010; MacNamara et al., 2016). Although our results differ considerably from these
446 studies, they are corroborated by Weinberg et al. (2016), who found that a diagnosis of
447 anxiety did not modulate the LPP. The reason for these disagreements in the field is unclear
448 but may be related to idiosyncratic features of the study samples, including criteria used to
449 estimate anxiety symptoms.

450

451 Conclusion

452 In conclusion, exploratory analyses found significantly reduced EEG amplitudes to
453 unpleasant pictures in MDD, in support of the *emotional context insensitivity* hypothesis.
454 However, we did not find a difference in emotional reactivity between MDD participants
455 and healthy controls using our preregistered analysis plan, which was based on the existing
456 literature. Compared to preregistered LPP features, the parietal EEG cluster identified in
457 exploratory analyses was marginally more posterior and subtended a narrower time interval

458 (660-755ms). These results suggest that methodological differences between studies may
459 play an important role in variability in the cortical response to emotional stimuli, limiting the
460 generalisability of the findings. Neither emotion regulation strategy use, nor comorbid
461 anxiety, were found to modulate LPP amplitude. Although the pathophysiology of
462 depression remains poorly understood, arising possibly due to its inherent heterogeneity
463 (Fried & Nesse, 2015), our findings indicate that a core feature and promising biomarker of
464 depression may be reduced emotional reactivity to unpleasant stimuli. The presence of
465 heterogeneity in EEG correlates of affective processing indicates the need for standardised
466 EEG tests and analyses of emotional reactivity in depression.

467 REFERENCES

- 468 American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental*
469 *disorders (DSM-5®)*: American Psychiatric Pub.
- 470 Britton, J. C., Taylor, S. F., Sudheimer, K. D., & Liberzon, I. (2006). Facial expressions and
471 complex IAPS pictures: common and differential networks. *Neuroimage*, *31*(2), 906-
472 919.
- 473 Brown, T. A., Chorpita, B. F., & Barlow, D. H. (1998). Structural relationships among
474 dimensions of the DSM-IV anxiety and mood disorders and dimensions of negative
475 affect, positive affect, and autonomic arousal. *Journal of abnormal psychology*,
476 *107*(2), 179.
- 477 Browning, M., Holmes, E. A., & Harmer, C. J. (2010). The modification of attentional bias to
478 emotional information: A review of the techniques, mechanisms, and relevance to
479 emotional disorders. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *10*(1), 8-20.
- 480 Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1991). Tripartite model of anxiety and depression: psychometric
481 evidence and taxonomic implications. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *100*(3), 316.
- 482 Codispoti, M., Ferrari, V., & Bradley, M. M. (2006). Repetitive picture processing: autonomic
483 and cortical correlates. *Brain research*, *1068*(1), 213-220.
- 484 Codispoti, M., Ferrari, V., & Bradley, M. M. (2007). Repetition and event-related potentials:
485 distinguishing early and late processes in affective picture perception. *J Cogn*
486 *Neurosci*, *19*(4), 577-586.
- 487 Crawford, J. R., & Henry, J. D. (2003). The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS):
488 Normative data and latent structure in a large non-clinical sample. *British journal of*
489 *clinical psychology*, *42*(2), 111-131.
- 490 Cuthbert, B. N., Schupp, H. T., Bradley, M. M., Birbaumer, N., & Lang, P. J. (2000). Brain
491 potentials in affective picture processing: covariation with autonomic arousal and
492 affective report. *Biological psychology*, *52*(2), 95-111.
- 493 Delorme, A., Sejnowski, T., & Makeig, S. (2007). Enhanced detection of artifacts in EEG data
494 using higher-order statistics and independent component analysis. *Neuroimage*,
495 *34*(4), 1443-1449.
- 496 Dunning, J. P., & Hajcak, G. (2009). See no evil: Directing visual attention within unpleasant
497 images modulates the electrocortical response. *Psychophysiology*, *46*(1), 28-33.
- 498 Foti, D., & Hajcak, G. (2008). Deconstructing reappraisal: descriptions preceding arousing
499 pictures modulate the subsequent neural response. *J Cogn Neurosci*, *20*(6), 977-988.
- 500 Foti, D., Olvet, D. M., Klein, D. N., & Hajcak, G. (2010). Reduced electrocortical response to
501 threatening faces in major depressive disorder. *Depression and anxiety*, *27*(9), 813-
502 820.
- 503 Fried, E. I., & Nesse, R. M. (2015). Depression is not a consistent syndrome: an investigation
504 of unique symptom patterns in the STAR* D study. *Journal of affective disorders*,
505 *172*, 96-102.

- 506 Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes:
507 implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of personality and social*
508 *psychology, 85*(2), 348.
- 509 Hajcak, G., Dunning, J. P., & Foti, D. (2007). Neural response to emotional pictures is
510 unaffected by concurrent task difficulty: an event-related potential study. *Behavioral*
511 *neuroscience, 121*(6), 1156.
- 512 Hajcak, G., Moser, J. S., & Simons, R. F. (2006). Attending to affect: appraisal strategies
513 modulate the electrocortical response to arousing pictures. *Emotion, 6*(3), 517.
- 514 Hajcak, G., & Nieuwenhuis, S. (2006). Reappraisal modulates the electrocortical response to
515 unpleasant pictures. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience, 6*(4), 291-297.
- 516 Hajcak, G., Weinberg, A., MacNamara, A., & Foti, D. (2012). ERPs and the study of emotion.
517 *The Oxford handbook of event-related potential components, 441*, 474.
- 518 Hariri, A. R., Tessitore, A., Mattay, V. S., Fera, F., & Weinberger, D. R. (2002). The amygdala
519 response to emotional stimuli: a comparison of faces and scenes. *Neuroimage, 17*(1),
520 317-323.
- 521 Hyvärinen, A., Hoyer, P. O., & Inki, M. (2001). Topographic independent component
522 analysis. *Neural computation, 13*(7), 1527-1558.
- 523 Kayser, J., Bruder, G. E., Tenke, C. E., Stewart, J. E., & Quitkin, F. M. (2000). Event-related
524 potentials (ERPs) to hemifield presentations of emotional stimuli: differences
525 between depressed patients and healthy adults in P3 amplitude and asymmetry.
526 *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 36*(3), 211-236.
- 527 Kessel, E. M., Kujawa, A., Goldstein, B., Hajcak, G., Bufferd, S. J., Dyson, M., & Klein, D. N.
528 (2017). Behavioral observations of positive and negative valence systems in early
529 childhood predict physiological measures of emotional processing three years later.
530 *Journal of affective disorders, 216*, 70-77.
- 531 Lang, P., Bradley, M., & Cuthbert, B. (2008). *International affective picture system (IAPS):*
532 *affective ratings of pictures and instruction manual. University of Florida, Gainesville.*
533 Retrieved from
- 534 Ledgerwood, A. (2018). The preregistration revolution needs to distinguish between
535 predictions and analyses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(45),
536 E10516-E10517.
- 537 Liu, Y., Huang, H., McGinnis-Deweese, M., Keil, A., & Ding, M. (2012). Neural substrate of the
538 late positive potential in emotional processing. *Journal of Neuroscience, 32*(42),
539 14563-14572.
- 540 Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states:
541 Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression
542 and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour research and therapy, 33*(3), 335-343.
- 543 MacNamara, A., Foti, D., & Hajcak, G. (2009). Tell me about it: neural activity elicited by
544 emotional pictures and preceding descriptions. *Emotion, 9*(4), 531.
- 545 MacNamara, A., & Hajcak, G. (2009). Anxiety and spatial attention moderate the
546 electrocortical response to aversive pictures. *Neuropsychologia, 47*(13), 2975-2980.

- 547 MacNamara, A., & Hajcak, G. (2010). Distinct electrocortical and behavioral evidence for
548 increased attention to threat in generalized anxiety disorder. *Depression and*
549 *anxiety*, 27(3), 234-243.
- 550 MacNamara, A., Kotov, R., & Hajcak, G. (2016). Diagnostic and symptom-based predictors of
551 emotional processing in generalized anxiety disorder and major depressive disorder:
552 An event-related potential study. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 40(3), 275-289.
- 553 Makeig, S., Bell, A. J., Jung, T.-P., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1996). *Independent component analysis*
554 *of electroencephalographic data*. Paper presented at the Advances in neural
555 information processing systems.
- 556 Maris, E., & Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG-and MEG-data.
557 *Journal of neuroscience methods*, 164(1), 177-190.
- 558 Mavratzakis, A., Herbert, C., & Walla, P. (2016). Emotional facial expressions evoke faster
559 orienting responses, but weaker emotional responses at neural and behavioural
560 levels compared to scenes: A simultaneous EEG and facial EMG study. *Neuroimage*,
561 124, 931-946.
- 562 Mehmood, R. M., & Lee, H. J. (2016). A novel feature extraction method based on late
563 positive potential for emotion recognition in human brain signal patterns. *Computers*
564 *& Electrical Engineering*, 53, 444-457.
- 565 Montgomery, S. A., & Asberg, M. (1979). A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to
566 change. *Br J Psychiatry*, 134, 382-389.
- 567 Moser, J. S., Hajcak, G., Bukay, E., & Simons, R. F. (2006). Intentional modulation of
568 emotional responding to unpleasant pictures: an ERP study. *Psychophysiology*, 43(3),
569 292-296.
- 570 Moser, J. S., Kropfing, J. W., Dietz, J., & Simons, R. F. (2009). Electrophysiological
571 correlates of decreasing and increasing emotional responses to unpleasant pictures.
572 *Psychophysiology*, 46(1), 17-27.
- 573 Nikolin, S., Chand, N., Martin, D., Rushby, J., Loo, C. K., & Boonstra, T. (2020). EEG correlates
574 of affective processing in major depressive disorder. *OSF*.
575 doi:<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/R6XEM>
- 576 Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration
577 revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600-2606.
- 578 Oliver-Rodriguez, J. C., Guan, Z., & Johnston, V. S. (1999). Gender differences in late positive
579 components evoked by human faces. *Psychophysiology*, 36(2), 176-185.
- 580 Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J.-M. (2011). FieldTrip: open source
581 software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data.
582 *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, 2011, 1.
- 583 Pernet, C., Latinus, M., Nichols, T., & Rousselet, G. (2015). Cluster-based computational
584 methods for mass univariate analyses of event-related brain potentials/fields: A
585 simulation study. *Journal of neuroscience methods*, 250, 85-93.

- 586 Renfroe, J. B., Bradley, M. M., Sege, C. T., & Bowers, D. (2016). Emotional modulation of the
587 late positive potential during picture free viewing in older and young adults. *PLoS*
588 *one*, *11*(9).
- 589 Rottenberg, J. (2005). Mood and emotion in major depression. *Current Directions in*
590 *Psychological Science*, *14*(3), 167-170.
- 591 Rottenberg, J., Gross, J. J., & Gotlib, I. H. (2005). Emotion context insensitivity in major
592 depressive disorder. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *114*(4), 627.
- 593 Sassenhagen, J., & Draschkow, D. (2019). Cluster-based permutation tests of MEG/EEG data
594 do not establish significance of effect latency or location. *Psychophysiology*, *56*(6),
595 e13335.
- 596 Schupp, H. T., Cuthbert, B. N., Bradley, M. M., Cacioppo, J. T., Ito, T., & Lang, P. J. (2000).
597 Affective picture processing: the late positive potential is modulated by motivational
598 relevance. *Psychophysiology*, *37*(2), 257-261.
- 599 Schupp, H. T., Markus, J., Weike, A. I., & Hamm, A. O. (2003). Emotional facilitation of
600 sensory processing in the visual cortex. *Psychological science*, *14*(1), 7-13.
- 601 Schupp, H. T., Öhman, A., Junghöfer, M., Weike, A. I., Stockburger, J., & Hamm, A. O. (2004).
602 The facilitated processing of threatening faces: an ERP analysis. *Emotion*, *4*(2), 189.
- 603 Thiruchselvam, R., Blechert, J., Sheppes, G., Rydstrom, A., & Gross, J. J. (2011). The temporal
604 dynamics of emotion regulation: An EEG study of distraction and reappraisal.
605 *Biological psychology*, *87*(1), 84-92.
- 606 Uusberg, A., Thiruchselvam, R., & Gross, J. J. (2014). Using distraction to regulate emotion:
607 Insights from EEG theta dynamics. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *91*(3),
608 254-260.
- 609 Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*: Guilford Press.
- 610 Weinberg, A., Perlman, G., Kotov, R., & Hajcak, G. (2016). Depression and reduced neural
611 response to emotional images: Distinction from anxiety, and importance of symptom
612 dimensions and age of onset. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *125*(1), 26.
- 613 Yarkoni, T. (2019). The generalizability crisis.
- 614 Zhang, D., He, Z., Chen, Y., & Wei, Z. (2016). Deficits of unconscious emotional processing in
615 patients with major depression: an ERP study. *Journal of affective disorders*, *199*, 13-
616 20.
- 617 Zhang, W., Li, H., Chen, J., Chen, N., Liu, X., Wang, D., & Shen, J. (2014). Posterior P1 and
618 early frontal negativity reflect developmental changes in attentional distraction
619 during adolescence. *Brain and cognition*, *87*, 30-38.

620

621

622

623 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS**

624 Some participants repeated the experimental protocol over three separate session. Only
 625 results from the first of these sessions is reported in the present study. To prevent carryover
 626 effects between sessions, the set of pictures participants viewed at each session was
 627 randomised and counterbalanced from the available parallel lists described below:

628 **IAPS Picture Sets**

IAPS List A	Description	Valence		Arousal		Class
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
6230	AimedGun	2.37	1.57	7.35	2.01	Unpleasant
2053	Baby	2.47	1.87	5.25	2.46	Unpleasant
9620	Shipwreck	2.70	1.64	6.11	2.10	Unpleasant
2745.1	Shopping	5.31	1.08	3.26	1.96	Neutral
7035	Mug	4.98	0.96	2.66	1.82	Neutral
2691	Riot	3.04	1.73	5.85	2.03	Unpleasant
7950	Tissue	4.94	1.21	2.28	1.81	Neutral
6821	Gang	2.38	1.72	6.29	2.02	Unpleasant
9520	Kids	2.46	1.61	5.41	2.27	Unpleasant
7150	Umbrella	4.72	1.00	2.61	1.76	Neutral
3300	DisabledChild	2.74	1.56	4.55	2.06	Unpleasant
2570	Man	4.78	1.24	2.76	1.92	Neutral
2688	Hunters	2.73	2.07	5.98	2.22	Unpleasant
2703	SadChildren	1.91	1.26	5.78	2.25	Unpleasant
2516	ElderlyWoman	4.90	1.43	3.50	1.88	Neutral
5532	Mushrooms	5.19	1.69	3.79	2.20	Neutral
1302	Dog	4.21	1.78	6.00	1.87	Unpleasant
2811	Gun	2.17	1.38	6.90	2.22	Unpleasant
2393	FactoryWorker	4.87	1.06	2.93	1.88	Neutral
2683	War	2.62	1.78	6.21	2.15	Unpleasant
7185	AbstractArt	4.97	0.87	2.64	2.04	Neutral
7034	Hammer	4.95	0.87	3.06	1.95	Neutral
2710	DrugAddict	2.52	1.69	5.46	2.29	Unpleasant
7100	FireHydrant	5.24	1.20	2.89	1.70	Neutral
5731	Flowers	5.39	1.58	2.74	1.95	Neutral
7037	Trains	4.81	1.12	3.71	2.08	Neutral
6260	AimedGun	2.44	1.54	6.93	1.93	Unpleasant

7050	HairDryer	4.93	0.81	2.75	1.80	Neutral
3220	Hospital	2.49	1.29	5.52	1.86	Unpleasant
7009	Mug	4.93	1.00	3.01	1.97	Neutral
2810	Boy	4.31	1.65	4.47	1.92	Unpleasant
2840	Chess	4.91	1.52	2.43	1.82	Neutral
7590	Traffic	4.75	1.55	3.80	2.13	Neutral
5535	StillLife	4.81	1.52	4.11	2.31	Neutral
3500	Attack	2.21	1.34	6.99	2.19	Unpleasant
2455	SadGirls	2.96	1.79	4.46	2.12	Unpleasant
7705	Cabinet	4.77	1.02	2.65	1.88	Neutral
7080	Fork	5.27	1.09	2.32	1.84	Neutral
2981	DeerHead	2.76	1.94	5.97	2.12	Unpleasant
2750	Bum	2.56	1.32	4.31	1.81	Unpleasant
6020	ElectricChair	3.41	1.98	5.58	2.01	Unpleasant
2200	NeutFace	4.79	1.38	3.18	2.17	Neutral
2141	GrievingFem	2.44	1.64	5.00	2.03	Unpleasant
1930	Shark	3.79	1.92	6.42	2.07	Unpleasant
6212	Soldier	2.19	1.49	6.01	2.44	Unpleasant
2191	Farmer	5.30	1.62	3.61	2.14	Neutral
2305	Woman	5.41	1.12	3.63	2.04	Neutral
7000	RollingPin	5.00	0.84	2.42	1.79	Neutral
6200	AimedGun	2.71	1.58	6.21	2.28	Unpleasant
7500	Building	5.33	1.44	3.26	2.18	Neutral
9920	CarAccident	2.50	1.52	5.76	1.96	Unpleasant
7004	Spoon	5.04	0.60	2.00	1.66	Neutral
7010	Basket	4.94	1.07	1.76	1.48	Neutral
7235	Chair	4.96	1.18	2.83	2.00	Neutral
2700	Woman	3.19	1.56	4.77	1.97	Unpleasant
6834	Police	2.91	1.73	6.28	1.90	Unpleasant

629

IAPS List B	Description	Valence		Arousal		Class
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
6210	AimedGun	2.95	1.83	6.34	2.14	Unpleasant
2661	Baby	3.90	2.49	5.76	2.13	Unpleasant
5740	Plant	5.21	1.38	2.59	1.99	Neutral
2717	DrugAddict	2.58	1.32	5.70	2.16	Unpleasant
7493	Man	5.35	1.34	3.39	2.08	Neutral
2095	Toddler	1.79	1.18	5.25	2.34	Unpleasant
2120	AngryFace	3.34	1.91	5.18	2.52	Unpleasant

2595	Women	4.88	1.24	3.71	1.88	Neutral
9902	CarAccident	2.33	1.38	6.00	2.15	Unpleasant
9421	Soldier	2.21	1.45	5.04	2.15	Unpleasant
7043	Drill	5.17	1.26	3.68	2.09	Neutral
7003	Disk	5.00	1.22	3.07	1.98	Neutral
2900	CryingBoy	2.45	1.42	5.09	2.15	Unpleasant
7036	Shipyard	4.88	1.08	3.32	2.04	Neutral
1111	Snakes	3.25	1.64	5.20	2.25	Unpleasant
7547	Bridge	5.21	0.96	3.18	2.01	Neutral
7175	Lamp	4.87	1.00	1.72	1.26	Neutral
3230	DyingMan	2.02	1.30	5.41	2.21	Unpleasant
9050	PlaneCrash	2.43	1.61	6.36	1.97	Unpleasant
3350	Infant	1.88	1.67	5.72	2.23	Unpleasant
7233	Plate	5.09	1.46	2.77	1.92	Neutral
6244	AimedGun	3.09	1.78	5.68	2.51	Unpleasant
9430	Burial	2.63	1.59	5.26	2.55	Unpleasant
2190	Man	4.83	1.28	2.41	1.80	Neutral
7491	Building	4.82	1.03	2.39	1.90	Neutral
6831	Police	2.59	1.50	5.55	2.16	Unpleasant
9600	Ship	2.48	1.62	6.46	2.31	Unpleasant
2514	Woman	5.19	1.09	3.50	1.81	Neutral
7056	Tool	5.07	1.02	3.07	1.92	Neutral
6370	Attack	2.70	1.52	6.44	2.19	Unpleasant
7006	Bowl	4.88	0.99	2.33	1.67	Neutral
7180	NeonBuilding	4.73	1.31	3.43	1.95	Neutral
1301	Dog	3.70	1.66	5.77	2.18	Unpleasant
2102	NeuMan	5.16	0.96	3.03	1.87	Neutral
7038	Shoes	4.82	1.20	3.01	1.96	Neutral
1201	Spider	3.55	1.88	6.36	2.11	Unpleasant
5510	Mushroom	5.15	1.43	2.82	2.18	Neutral
2880	Shadow	5.18	1.44	2.96	1.94	Neutral
9941	Fire	2.91	1.54	5.83	2.14	Unpleasant
7090	Book	5.19	1.46	2.61	2.03	Neutral
7211	Clock	4.81	1.78	4.20	2.40	Neutral
2512	Man	4.86	0.84	3.46	1.75	Neutral
2130	Woman	4.08	1.33	5.02	2.00	Unpleasant
1300	PitBull	3.55	1.78	6.79	1.84	Unpleasant
2480	ElderlyMan	4.77	1.64	2.66	1.78	Neutral
7002	Towel	4.97	0.97	3.16	2.00	Neutral
2385	Girl	5.20	1.32	3.64	1.81	Neutral
3301	InjuredChild	1.80	1.28	5.21	2.26	Unpleasant

2205	Hospital	1.95	1.58	4.53	2.23	Unpleasant
3160	EyeDisease	2.63	1.23	5.36	1.79	Unpleasant
2383	Secretary	4.72	1.36	3.41	1.83	Neutral
9911	CarAccident	2.30	1.37	5.76	2.10	Unpleasant
7217	ClothesRack	4.82	0.99	2.43	1.64	Neutral
7001	Buttons	5.32	1.19	3.20	2.15	Neutral
6825	Military	2.81	1.19	5.36	2.19	Unpleasant
2800	SadChild	1.78	1.14	5.49	2.11	Unpleasant

630

IAPS List C	Description	Valence		Arousal		Class
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
8485	Fire	2.73	1.62	6.46	2.10	Unpleasant
7059	Keyring	4.93	0.81	2.73	1.88	Neutral
2495	Man	5.22	1.10	3.19	1.76	Neutral
9427	Assault	2.89	1.47	5.50	2.09	Unpleasant
6150	Outlet	5.08	1.17	3.22	2.02	Neutral
9590	Injecting	3.08	1.63	5.41	2.23	Unpleasant
8230	Boxer	2.95	1.88	5.91	2.15	Unpleasant
7546	Bridge	5.40	1.13	3.72	2.16	Neutral
9491	DeadBody	2.78	1.71	5.69	2.22	Unpleasant
7032	Shoes	4.82	1.46	3.18	1.88	Neutral
7062	Sewing	5.27	1.06	3.40	1.94	Neutral
6555	Knife	3.33	1.59	5.69	2.21	Unpleasant
6220	BoysW/Guns	3.10	1.91	5.89	2.43	Unpleasant
9120	OilFires	3.20	1.75	5.77	1.94	Unpleasant
7025	Stool	4.63	1.17	2.71	2.20	Neutral
9250	WarVictim	2.57	1.39	6.60	1.87	Unpleasant
7365	Meat	5.20	1.57	4.13	1.93	Neutral
9424	Bomb	2.87	1.62	5.78	2.12	Unpleasant
9611	PlaneCrash	2.71	1.95	5.75	2.44	Unpleasant
9621	Ship	3.22	1.76	5.76	2.05	Unpleasant
7020	Fan	4.97	1.04	2.17	1.71	Neutral
9480	Skull	3.51	2.08	5.57	1.87	Unpleasant
7030	Iron	4.69	1.04	2.99	2.09	Neutral
6250	AimedGun	2.83	1.79	6.54	2.61	Unpleasant
9909	BurningCar	2.78	1.45	5.98	2.04	Unpleasant
7255	Cracker	5.07	1.18	3.36	1.99	Neutral
2214	NeuMan	5.01	1.12	3.46	1.97	Neutral
2397	Men	4.98	1.11	2.77	1.74	Neutral

6838	Police	2.45	1.44	5.80	2.09	Unpleasant
7045	Zipper	4.97	0.76	3.32	1.96	Neutral
6190	AimedGun	3.57	1.84	5.64	2.03	Unpleasant
2396	Couple	4.91	1.05	3.34	1.83	Neutral
7053	CandleStick	5.22	0.75	2.95	1.91	Neutral
9622	Jet	3.10	1.90	6.26	1.98	Unpleasant
7130	Truck	4.77	1.03	3.35	1.90	Neutral
6830	Guns	2.82	1.81	6.21	2.23	Unpleasant
7041	Baskets	4.99	1.12	2.60	1.78	Neutral
6213	Terrorist	2.91	1.52	5.86	2.06	Unpleasant
7055	Lightbulb	4.90	0.64	3.02	1.83	Neutral
7380	RoachOnPizza	2.46	1.42	5.88	2.44	Unpleasant
9630	Bomb	2.96	1.72	6.06	2.22	Unpleasant
7224	FileCabinet	4.45	1.36	2.81	1.94	Neutral
1525	Attack Dog	3.09	1.72	6.51	2.25	Unpleasant
2038	NeuWoman	5.09	1.35	2.94	1.93	Neutral
7014	Scissors	5.15	0.97	3.25	2.03	Neutral
9800	Skinhead	2.04	1.57	6.05	2.71	Unpleasant
7017	Video	5.18	1.07	3.12	1.97	Neutral
2411	Girl	5.07	0.85	2.86	1.84	Neutral
6571	CarTheft	2.85	2.05	5.59	2.50	Unpleasant
9904	CarAccident	2.39	1.36	6.08	2.06	Unpleasant
6510	Attack	2.46	1.58	6.96	2.09	Unpleasant
7187	AbstractArt	5.07	1.02	2.30	1.75	Neutral
9321	Vomit	2.81	2.14	6.24	2.23	Unpleasant
7283	Fruit	5.50	1.84	3.81	2.01	Neutral
2890	Twins	4.95	1.09	2.95	1.87	Neutral
5531	Mushroom	5.15	1.45	3.69	2.11	Neutral

631

632

633 Emotion Regulation Questionnaire

634 An emotion regulation questionnaire adapted was used to identify which strategy, if any,

635 participants used to moderate their emotional response while passively viewing pictures.

Choose only one option:

While viewing unpleasant pictures:

1. I did not use any strategy
2. I looked on the bright side
3. I thought about something else
4. I distanced myself from the picture
5. I did not do any of the above, I did...

636


637 Exploratory Cluster Channels

638 Channels from the significant cluster identified by the exploratory cluster-based

639 permutation testing are displayed below. These are sorted as a proportion of the length of


640 time they were identified relative to the total duration of the cluster time interval. Channels

641 that were present for >75% of the cluster time interval were used in follow-up analyses.



642

643 Secondary Analyses of Emotion Regulation Strategy and Anxiety



644

645 **Supplementary Figure 1. Effects of emotion regulation strategy and anxiety on LPP**

646 **amplitude. A)** The LPP for the preregistered centroparietal cluster and time interval in both

647 MDD participants and healthy controls who used an emotion regulation strategy or not.

648 Black lines show the mean, red lines show the median, light grey shaded boxes indicate the

649 standard deviation, and dark grey regions indicate the 95% confidence interval. **B)**

650 Association between the anxiety subscore from the 21-item DASS and LPP amplitude for

651 MDD participants while viewing unpleasant images. Dotted line shows the regression slope

652 ($p > 0.05$; ns).